



Michael J. Waters

**Francesco di Giorgio and the Reconstruction of Antiquity.
Epigraphy, Archeology, and Newly Discovered Drawings**

In:

Pegasus : Berliner Beiträge zum Nachleben der Antike ; 16.2014, S. 9-102

Berlin : Census of Antique Works of Art and Architecture Known in the Renaissance, 2015

Persistent Identifier: [urn:nbn:de:kobv:b4-opus4-33749](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:kobv:b4-opus4-33749)

Die vorliegende Datei wird Ihnen von der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften unter einer Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (cc by-nc-sa 4.0) Licence zur Verfügung gestellt.



PEGASUS

Berliner Beiträge
zum Nachleben der Antike
Heft 16 · 2014

Census of Antique Works of Art
and Architecture Known in the Renaissance
Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

www.census.de

Census of Antique Works of Art
and Architecture Known in the Renaissance
Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

Herausgeber: Horst Bredekamp, Arnold Nesselrath

Redaktion: Barbara Lück, Philipp Schneider, Maika Stobbe, Timo Strauch

Institut für Kunst- und Bildgeschichte
Unter den Linden 6
10099 Berlin

© 2015 Census of Antique Works of Art
and Architecture Known in the Renaissance

Satz: Susanne Werner (Lukas Verlag)
Druck: Elbe Druckerei Wittenberg

ISBN: 978-3-86732-201-0

ISSN: 1436-3461

FRANCESCO DI GIORGIO AND THE RECONSTRUCTION OF
ANTIQUITY.
EPIGRAPHY, ARCHEOLOGY, AND NEWLY DISCOVERED DRAWINGS

MICHAEL J. WATERS

This article fundamentally reinterprets a group of Renaissance drawings of ancient monuments – preserved primarily in the Houfe Album and Codex Cholmondeley – in light of a newly discovered set conserved at the Yale Center for British Art. It argues that these various drawings derive from a lost set of originals made by the architect Francesco di Giorgio Martini and his collaborators sometime in the late-1490s. Furthermore, by reconstructing this initial corpus and examining its use of inscriptions, this article suggests that these drawings were part of an attempt to visualize the monuments of ancient Rome primarily through inscriptions, specifically those recorded in an early sylloge. As such, they represent a lost episode in the development of Renaissance antiquarianism in which the graphic reconstruction of Roman architecture intersected with the philological study of ancient epigraphy. These drawings moreover suggest that Francesco di Giorgio, during the last years of his life, was producing a drawn corpus of ancient monuments that combined epigraphic evidence, archeological information, and *all'antica* invention. While sometimes fanciful on the surface, these reconstructions were the product of an erudite synthetic process, one that attempted to distill typological norms and resurrect ancient Rome from its fragmentary remains. Although this effort was quickly overshadowed by the work of later architects, this rediscovered set of drawings sheds important light on the dynamic and multifaceted practice of reconstructing antiquity in the late-Quattrocento and reaffirms Francesco di Giorgio's central role in this phenomenon.

RECONSTRUCTING A CORPUS: THE YALE MANUSCRIPT AND
RELATED DRAWINGS

Within the Paul Mellon collection at the Yale Center for British Art there is a manuscript copy of the second version of Francesco di Giorgio's architectural treatise (figs 1a–b).¹ Purchased some time before 1974, the treatise has gone

1a–b Francesco di Giorgio (copy after): *Trattato di architettura*, 1521, New Haven, Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection, Mil Mss (4to flat), fol. F Iv–F IIr

unnoticed for decades among Mellon's collection of military manuscripts and was not included in Gustina Scaglia's 1992 catalogue of Francesco di Giorgio manuscripts.² Composed of ninety-five folios, the treatise closely replicates the Codex Magliabechianus II.I.141 conserved at the Biblioteca Nazionale in Florence. The hand of the illustrator is consistent throughout as is the hand of the scribe, who also labeled all of the drawings. The scribe and illustrator may also have been the same person.³ The text of the treatise was clearly carefully transcribed first, then the illustrations were added afterwards. Also, unlike some early copies of the second version of the treatise, all of the labels and captions in Magliabechianus II.I.141 were replicated, though some subtle changes to spelling were made throughout.⁴ The illustrations in the first half of the treatise were laid out with pencil, and then drawn in pen and ink, while those of the second half, primarily fortifications and machines, were shaded with wash. These drawings were faithfully copied and in general are well executed with the exception of the numerous sketchily rendered human figures. The last page of the treatise is inscribed »Telos 1521«, a date which is confirmed by both stylistic and watermark evidence.⁵ An early owner signed the final page of the manuscript (Y.12), but this signature was later crossed out. While it is still possible to make out the beginning of the inscription »Al M.^o et Nobile et Bello et Virtuoso / Signore U. Thadeo Pie...«, the identity of the owner remains obscure.

At the end of the treatise, there are six additional folios with sixteen drawings. Illustrated in brown ink and wash on the same paper and by the same hand as the rest of the treatise, these drawings were not a later addition, but original to the manuscript. Also like the drawings of the treatise, they were carefully laid out with ruled lines and pencil underdrawing before being executed in ink. As a set, they range greatly in their ancient subject matter and include a triumphal arch, a tomb monument, two temples, two statue groups, four bridges, two pyramids, and four Roman ships (see Appendix 1 for a catalogue). Additionally, all but five of the drawings prominently feature inscriptions. From this epigraphy, it is possible to identify the bridges as the Pons Fabricius (Y.7a), Pons Aemilius (Y.7b), Pons Neronianus (Y.8a), and Pons Cestius (Y.8b), and the two temples as the Temple of Saturn (Y.3) and Porticus of Octavia (Y.4). Another drawing represents the Pyramid of Cestius (Y.10), while the other conical monument (Y.11), inscribed PATERTERA and ΠΑΤΕΡΤΕΡΑ, likely references a passage in Suetonius describing a column to Julius Caesar which bore the inscription PARENTI PATRIAE. Equally strange are two drawings of statues set in niches that according to their inscriptions represent the funerary stele of a gladiator

(Y.5) and the statues of Constantine I and his son Constantine II (Y.6). Likewise, the tomb monument (Y.2) refers to an inscription to C. Calpurnius found in the vicinity of Fara in Sabina.

Obviously very little unites these sixteen drawings. Even the eleven with inscriptions depict a wildly diverse group of monuments, from the well-known to the exceptionally obscure. Yet in spite of this apparent disunity, other evidence suggests that all of these drawings were part of a cohesive set. In fact, all eleven inscriptions derive from the earliest known sylloges of ancient Roman inscriptions, beginning with those produced by Nicolò Signorili. This includes the curious inscription *PATERTERA*, which could not have been transcribed directly from the column of Julius Caesar since it was destroyed shortly after it was built. Yet why would an artist choose to illustrate these specific inscriptions of the many recorded in early sylloges? As there is little logic to the selection, it is more likely the Yale drawings are copies from a larger corpus.

Two albums now in private collections that contain drawings also found in the Yale Album support this theory. The first of these is the Houfe Album, which contains four drawings also in the Yale Album. The other is the Codex Cholmondeley, which shares five drawings with the Yale Album. Likewise, seven reconstructions of ancient monuments found in the Codex Cholmondeley are also illustrated in the Houfe Album, in addition to many drawings of architectural details (see Appendix 2 for full list of concordances). Furthermore, none of the drawings in these albums directly copy each other, but instead derive from a now lost set of originals. As such, the drawings contained in these albums, along with two others in Windsor, demonstrate that the designs in the Yale Album represent a portion of a much larger collection, which can now be reconstructed here for the first time (see Appendix 3 for images of the reconstructed corpus).

The Codex Cholmondeley has only recently become the subject of scholarly attention. Sold at Christie's in 1996, the album was once owned by the Marquis of Cholmondeley and before him by the Royal Library of France.⁶ Arnold Nesselrath has proposed that it was likely a gift to Catherine de' Medici, either upon her marriage to the future Henry II of France in 1533 or upon the birth of their first child in 1543. Either of these dates would also support his attribution of the Codex to the so-called Anonymus Mantovanus A, who was active in Italy in the 1530s and 1540s.⁷ The deluxe album, titled »aedificorvm antiqvae vrbis monvmenta qvaedam e rvinis exerpta«, is composed of 108 folios of drawings depicting a variety of ancient subject matter. As Nesselrath has outlined, the

drawings in the album derive primarily from two sources. The first of these is a series produced by Raphael and his circle in the early sixteenth century. Known today primarily through copies, such as those in the Kassel Codex, the majority of these drawings depict architectural ornament, triumphal arches, and other highly detailed ancient buildings rendered in plan, section, and elevation. The other source for the Codex Cholmondeley, specifically its drawings of capitals, bases, vases, and other ancient monuments, is a lost set of drawings that was also copied into the Houfe Album.

The Houfe Album is a collection of drawings likely executed near the beginning of the sixteenth century that was later assembled into an album.⁸ Drawn on paper soaked in linseed oil, Arnold Nesselrath has convincingly argued that these drawings were traced directly from a set of originals.⁹ This helps explain their generally mechanical quality and the numerous small details randomly omitted. Nesselrath has also suggested that this specific technique was often used to create copies to be engraved onto woodblocks, an issue I will return to in the conclusion. As it exists today, the album consists of fifty-one folios with drawings by a single artist. Thirty ancient Roman monuments are depicted, all but five of which also bear inscriptions. The other folios are filled with drawings of bases, capitals, cornices, vases, and armor, some of which are also found in the Codex Cholmondeley.

Despite their many similarities, it is unlikely that the artist of Codex Cholmondeley copied drawings from the Houfe Album. Not only does the Codex Cholmondeley contain drawings not found in the Houfe Album, but some of the Cholmondeley drawings also reproduce details not included in this earlier album. For example, the reconstruction of the Mausoleum of Cecilia Metella in the Codex Cholmondeley is topped by a spherical finial – a feature common to many of the reconstructions in the set – while the Houfe drawing omits this detail altogether (H.55).¹⁰ Similarly, it is also doubtful that the artist of the Yale Album copied the drawings in the Houfe Album. The reconstructions of the Calpurnius Tomb (Y.2) and the Temple of Saturn (Y.5) in the Yale Album, for instance, both contain details not found in the Houfe drawings (H.2; H.39). While these inclusions could conceivably be later inventions, in the case of the Temple of Saturn drawing, they are also found in two earlier copies, suggesting they were in the original drawing.¹¹

In addition to these two albums, there is also a single folio with two drawings in the Royal Library at Windsor Castle that should be included in the reconstructed corpus. Both of these drawings depict the Mausoleum of Au-

gustus according to their inscriptions.¹² The building illustrated on the recto (W.1) is also found in the Codex Cholmondeley.¹³ The drawing on the verso (W.2), in contrast, is in none of the other albums, though it was later copied by Oreste Biringuccio and Raffaello da Montelupo and likely served as the model for Antonio Labacco's reconstruction of the Mausoleum of Hadrian.¹⁴ Both Windsor drawings are executed in brown ink with wash and closely resemble the drawings in the Yale Album. In fact, there are a number of stylistic similarities between the Yale and Windsor drawings, from the sketchy handling of figures, to the haphazard copying of inscriptions, to the mode of architectural rendering. The Yale drawings are much larger and executed with greater care, so it is unlikely the Windsor folio was once part of this album. Nonetheless, it is possible that the same artist produced both examples.

Taken as a group, these various drawings yield a set of almost fifty reconstructions of ancient monuments, the majority of which are labeled with inscriptions. It is these inscriptions that are the key to understanding this collection. They not only reveal the logic behind this curious set, but also demonstrate that it was part of a systematic attempt to reconstruct the monuments of ancient Rome and beyond.

INSCRIPTIONS, SYLLOGES, AND THE RECONSTRUCTION OF ANTIQUITY

The original corpus of drawings includes nearly fifty individual inscriptions, almost all of which, extraordinarily, are also found in early fifteenth-century sylloges. Produced by humanists and antiquarians, these epigraphic collections were at the core of the study of antiquity in the early Renaissance.¹⁵ The earliest of these sylloges was assembled by Nicolò Signorili in 1409 and consists largely of inscriptions transcribed from monuments in Rome (fig. 2).¹⁶ Signorili titled the final redaction of his collection »Descriptio Urbis Romae eiusque excellentiae« and dedicated it in the 1420s to Pope Martin V under whom he served as secretary of the Roman Senate.¹⁷ Over the course of the century this collection of inscriptions was copied, corrected, and expanded by a number of antiquarians, yet all the while, they remained at the core of the tradition of sylloges. It was only at the end of the fifteenth century that individuals such as Fra Giovanni Giocondo began to systematically study ancient epigraphy and create a more accurate, philologically correct corpus of inscriptions.

2 First redaction of Nicolò Signorili sylloge, Vatican City, BAV, Barb. Lat. 1952, fol. 172r

As few of these sylloges are identical in their content and spelling, it is often possible to trace their origins. Yet in the case of the drawings discussed here, the process is problematic because the original corpus is lost. Despite the fact the Houfe and Cholmondeley copies appear largely epigraphically faithful, the inscriptions found in these albums cannot be directly linked to a known fifteenth-century sylloge.¹⁸ Nevertheless, these inscriptions still reveal

information about their origins. For example, many of the drawings maintain antiquated or incorrect spellings found in early sylloges but corrected in many later transcriptions. In a drawing in the Yale Album, for instance, the name of a gladiator is transcribed twice as M. ANTONIVS EXOCVS (Y.5). Yet, later representations of this monument confirm that the name was actually spelled EXOCHVS, which was mistranscribed by Signorili as EXOCVS.¹⁹ This error was later reiterated in the sylloges of Cyriac of Ancona and Michele Ferrarini, but for the most part, fifteenth-century syllogists correct this mistake.²⁰ For example, Giovanni Marcanova already adds the missing H to his earliest sylloge (ca. 1460) and subsequent redactions.²¹ Likewise the corrected spelling is also found in the sylloges of Fra Giocondo and Andrea Alciato, and also in Jacopo Mazzocchi's »Epigrammata antiquae urbis«, published in 1521.²² Mazzocchi (possibly assisted by Angelo Colocci, Mariangelo Accursio, or Andrea Fulvio) fixed many similar errors that are still found in the Houfe, Cholmondeley, and Yale drawings, proving that these inscriptions do not derive from this publication as Gustina Scaglia posited.²³ For the same reason it is also unlikely that they originate from the work of Fra Giocondo. Rather, all of the evidence suggests that these inscriptions derive from an early fifteenth-century sylloge, or a later copy of one.

This is supported by the fact that over four-fifths of the inscriptions illustrated in the reconstructed corpus of drawings are also found in the core of Signorili's »Descriptio Urbis Romae«. While this could be simply coincidence as many of the drawings depict well-known Roman monuments such as the Arch of Septimius Severus (H.28), Temple of Saturn (H.39), and Column of Trajan (H.42), the presence of a number of more obscure inscriptions confirms this connection. These include some mentioned previously, such as the Calpurnius tomb (Y.2) and PATERTERA inscription (Y.8), as well as others such as the Pons Mammeus (H.34c), two Roman elogia (H.1), an inscription from an unknown mithraeum (C.112), and the destroyed Arch of Lentulus and Crispinus (H.19). In all of these cases, it is either impossible or extremely unlikely that an artist could have recorded these inscriptions in situ. Rather, they must have come from a collection of inscriptions that derived in part from Signorili's original sylloge.

This idea is further supported by drawings in which the setting for the inscription has been completely changed or invented. The most striking of these is the just mentioned epitaph to M. Antonius Exochus, which adorned a stele with a gladiator and various objects (fig. 3). While many Renaissance artists copied this relief, the Yale drawing (Y.5) suggests no knowledge of the actual

monument and instead depicts two figures set in a niche. The artist similarly transformed other inscriptions into invented monuments, such as an eulogium to Q. Fabius Maximus into a triumphal arch (H.1) and an obscure Mithraic inscription located in a garden near S. Susanna into an enormous mausoleum-like structure (C.112).²⁴ In all of these cases, inscriptions originally transcribed by Signorili were the generative force behind the drawings.

The artist also grafted two similarly obscure inscriptions onto the well-known Arch of Janus Quadrifrons (H.10). The first of these originally adorned the Augustan Arch of Lentulus and Crispinus that stood near the church of S. Maria in Cosmedin until it was destroyed in the 1440s.²⁵ The other, which according to many sylloges adorned the portico of S. Giorgio in Velabro, falsely commemorates a census conducted by the Emperor Claudius. Both inscriptions were thus said to be located in the immediate vicinity of the Arch of Janus, a fact that must have compelled the artist to place them atop the monument, which was obscured by the Frangipani tower in the Renaissance. Strikingly, no other artist used these inscriptions in their depiction of the arch, though both Antonio and Giovanni Battista da Sangallo later included an invented inscription in their reconstructions of this monument.²⁶

Yet, despite the numerous correspondences to Signorili's »Descriptio Urbis Romae«, it is unlikely that the artist of this corpus of drawings directly transcribed inscriptions from an original redaction of this sylloge. Instead, he must have copied a slightly later sylloge, one that expanded Signorili's original collection. This is because the set of drawings also includes nine inscriptions not found in the »Descriptio Urbis Romae«. While two of these derive from the medieval Einsiedeln Itinerary, two others come from a later sylloge assembled by Cyriac of Ancona. A merchant, antiquarian, diplomat, and prodigious traveler, Cyriac was a voracious collector of antiquities and inscriptions from throughout the Mediterranean world. Yet it was only in 1421, at the age of thirty, that he began to document ancient monuments, first with the Arch of Trajan in his native Ancona. Soon afterwards he traveled to Rome, where beginning in 1424 he studied the ruins of the ancient city and copied Signorili's collection of inscriptions.²⁷ While Cyriac greatly expanded this original epigraphic corpus over the next thirty years, the inscriptions assembled by Signorili remained at the core of many of his sylloges.

The two drawings with inscriptions first transcribed by Cyriac of Ancona depict a pair of ancient arches – the Arch of Augustus in Fano (H.18) and the Arch of Melia Anniana in Zadar (H.27). Cyriac first visited Fano in 1423 and

3 *Funerary Stele to Gladiator Marcus Antonius Exocbus, from Raffaele Fabretti: De columna Traiani, Rome 1683, p. 256*

it was likely at this time that he lectured publicly about the city's arch and recorded its inscriptions. This documentation effort took on special importance when in 1463 the troops of Federico da Montefeltro destroyed the top portion of the arch while attacking the city. While the lower two inscriptions remained undamaged, the upper one commemorating the emperor Constantine was almost completely lost and is known today through Cyriac's transcription. The presence of this destroyed inscription in the Houfe drawing of the arch therefore suggests it derives from a sylloge linked to Cyriac of Ancona.²⁸

In the Houfe Album, there is also a drawing of an ancient arch in Zadar (H.27), which is the only known Renaissance representation of the present day Porta Marina. Built by Melia Anniana in honor of her husband, the arch was restored in 1434 by Pietro de Crissava, the abbot of San Grisogono.²⁹ A year later, Cyriac of Ancona mentioned the arch in a letter to Leonardo Bruni and noted that it featured both an inscription and a statue of a triton.³⁰ It was likely at this time that the syllogist recorded both of these elements in his notebook. While his drawing of the triton is now lost, the transcription survives in several manuscript copies as well as in a handful of sylloges.³¹ Yet, whereas many of these later sylloges replicate the long Latin inscription commemorating Melia Anniana and her husband, almost none include the much shorter Latin and Greek labels that accompanied the triton figure.³² Interestingly, the Houfe drawing includes all of these inscriptions further connecting it directly to a sylloge produced by Cyriac of Ancona. Since the arch was rebuilt within the new city fortifications in 1573, it is unclear if this reconstruction contains other details found in the actual ancient structure, though it seems unlikely. What can be said for sure is that the inscriptions, like those from the Arch of Augustus in Fano, derive either directly or indirectly from a transcription and possibly a drawing made by Cyriac of Ancona in the first half of the fifteenth century.

The question of the epigraphic source of the drawings is further complicated by three additional inscriptions included in the Houfe Album that are not found in the sylloges of Signorili and Cyriac of Ancona. Two of these come from the town of Città di Castello. Once found in the Duomo, today they are embedded in the walls of the Palazzo Comunale. The first of these inscriptions commemorates C. Aninius Gallus, a soldier from Arezzo who served in the Praetorian Guard, while the other refers to the Empress Faustina Minor. In the Houfe Album, these inscriptions were placed within two statue bases on the same folio (H.46). Above these bases, the artist of the album depicted a bald general with a staff and a nude female figure with a candelabrum derived from the ancient Belvedere Venus.³³ The other inscription, which has been conserved since at least the eighteenth century in the Palazzo Ducale in Urbino, commemorates an ancient bridge built by Diocletian that crosses the river Metaurus between Calmazzo and Fossombrone (H.34b).³⁴ Besides their geographic proximity, very little unites these three inscriptions. In fact, the only Renaissance syllogist to record them all is Fra Giocondo.

This connection to Fra Giocondo once again raises the possibility that the inscriptions used in the drawings derive from a sylloge he produced in the late

fifteenth century. Yet, as mentioned previously, Fra Giocondo was one of the first antiquarians to employ a modern epigraphic method, in which he examined ancient inscriptions and compared earlier transcriptions to create a more philologically accurate corpus.³⁵ As such, many of his transcriptions correct errors commonly found in early sylloges, as well as in the drawings in question. Additionally, although Fra Giocondo is the only fifteenth-century syllogist to record the Faustina Minor inscription from Città di Castello, his transcription, unlike that in the Houfe drawing, omits the final letter of the inscription.³⁶

Thus, as a whole, the nearly fifty inscriptions employed in these drawings do not clearly reveal their origins. Nonetheless, based on the evidence outlined above, they likely derive from a sylloge assembled in the mid-fifteenth century possibly after a copy made by Cyriac of Ancona that maintained the original Signorili corpus of inscriptions. At the same time, the artist of this set of drawings had access to at least three inscriptions located in the vicinity of the Duchy of Urbino. What is clear is that these inscriptions taken from a sylloge were the generative force behind the set of drawings. As such, these reconstructions of ancient Roman monuments are unique among Renaissance drawings of antiquity.

This is not to say syllogists were not interested in the visual representation of antiquity.³⁷ Cyriac of Ancona, beyond transcribing inscriptions, drew many ancient monuments, statues, coins, and gems throughout his travels. While most of these drawings are lost today or known only through copies, an autographed album in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana reveals that he was a capable draftsman.³⁸ Other antiquarians also included drawings in their sylloges. Some, such as Michele Ferrarini, even placed inscriptions abstractly within small drawings of ancient monuments, such as the Pyramid of Cestius (fig. 4).³⁹ Felice Feliciano

4 Michele Ferrarini: *Pyramid of Cestius*, ca. 1480, Paris, BnF, MS Lat. 6128, fol. 132

likewise executed similar simplistic drawings of tombs and steles with inscriptions for the second version of Giovanni Marcanova's sylloge. This impressive compilation, which was initially dedicated to Malatesta Novello, also included lavish full-page illustrations by Marco Zoppo that fancifully reconstruct a variety of Roman monuments, including the Baths of Diocletian, Colosseum, and Mausoleum of Hadrian.⁴⁰ A late fifteenth-century sylloge conserved in Florence similarly features images of ancient Roman monuments interspersed throughout.⁴¹ While all of these examples include drawings of antiquities, they are either pictorial or descriptive, none attempt to use inscriptions in the process of reconstructing ancient structures. Indeed, most of the inscriptions in the Marcanova drawings simply function as labels. Likewise, even as antiquarians became increasingly interested in replicating the formal attributes of Roman inscriptions, from their lineation to letter forms, they rarely attempted to accurately represent major monuments with correctly placed epigraphy. Even in Mazzocchi's »Epigrammata antiquae urbis«, inscriptions and monuments are in most cases printed separately.⁴² Sylloges, even well into the era of printing, remained primarily textual rather than visual.

Fifteenth-century artists similarly made only limited attempts to join image and epigraphy while recording ancient monuments. As is well known, both Andrea Mantegna and Jacopo Bellini, in addition to imaginatively reinventing ancient fragments, were active antiquarians who copied inscriptions.⁴³ Felice Feliciano even dedicated his sylloge to Mantegna with whom he had searched for antiquities around Lake Garda.⁴⁴ Yet, little physical evidence of this activity survives besides a few drawings by Bellini of partially invented monuments with inscriptions possibly copied from a sylloge.⁴⁵ Later albums, such as the Zichy Codex now in Budapest, for example, include a handful of inscriptions interspersed among late fifteenth-century drawings of architectural fragments and ornament.⁴⁶ The Codex Chlumczansky, likely created for Federico Gonzaga after a lost album produced around 1500, also features numerous ancient cornices and decorated bases juxtaposed with hundreds of inscriptions taken from monuments in Rome and elsewhere.⁴⁷ While some of the architectural fragments are labeled with their topographic location, the inscriptions lack almost any textual explanation. Moreover, there is no clear relationship between the inscriptions and architectural details. An ancient inscription from Como, for example, accompanies the distinctive entablature of the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina in Rome.⁴⁸ Similarly, a decorated entablature from the Basilica of Neptune displays an inscription from Trieste (fig. 5).⁴⁹ In these cases,

5 *Prague, Národní Muzeum,*
XVII A 6, Codex
Chlumczansky, fol. 26r

epigraphy and architecture have no connection despite their equal prominence. Their primary purpose seems neither antiquarian nor archeological.

Renaissance architects, such as Baldassare Peruzzi, Antonio da Sangallo the Younger, and Giovanni Antonio Dosio, also copied inscriptions into their sketch-books, some even directly from ancient monuments. Yet few before Pirro Ligorio widely employed this epigraphic evidence in their reconstructions. Giuliano da Sangallo is the most notable exception. Many ancient buildings recorded in his *Codex Barberini*, for instance, prominently feature epigraphy. Some of these inscriptions, even very long ones, were transcribed by the architect directly from monuments such as the Arch of Septimius Severus, Porticus of Octavia,

6 Salzburg, Universitäts-
bibliothek, Ital. M III 40,
Codex Salzburg, fol. 15v

and Arch of Trajan in Ancona. In other cases, including the Column of Trajan and Arch of Constantine, as well as possibly the Porta Maggiore, Giuliano employed inscriptions copied from a sylloge.⁵⁰ An unknown Lombard artist similarly utilized a sylloge for some of the drawings in the late fifteenth-century Salzburg Codex.⁵¹ The rendering of the Column of Trajan (fig. 6), for example, contains two inscriptions first found in the Einsiedeln Itinerary that were later copied into sylloges as well as the Houfe Album (H.42) but not found on the actual monument.⁵² The Vatican Obelisk is similarly depicted alongside two variations of the same inscription recorded by Signorili, while the reconstructed Arch of Janus Quadrifrons features an inscription from the nearby Arch of the Argentarii.⁵³ The nearly dozen additional monuments illustrated in the codex, by contrast, are devoid of epigraphic evidence.

Thus, a handful of fifteenth-century reconstructions did exploit the potential of inscriptions, just as some sylloges included reconstructed ancient monuments. Yet, unlike the Yale, Houfe, and Cholmondeley albums, none of these collections employed epigraphy systematically in the process of reconstruction. It is this aspect that makes this corpus of drawings unique. They are a methodical collection of ancient buildings reconstructed based on inscriptions found in an early sylloge. As such, epigraphy provided both the organizing framework and generative force behind the set. These drawings in this way represent much more than just reconstructions with inscriptions; they are part of a graphic sylloge in which epigraphy and archeology were both used to visualize the monuments of ancient Rome. The significance of this collection therefore lies in both the systematic quality and hybrid nature of its reconstructions. Yet the question remains, what was the source of this cohesive set? Based on a variety of evidence, it is possible to trace its origins to one of the most important architects of the fifteenth century: Francesco di Giorgio.

THE ATTRIBUTION TO FRANCESCO DI GIORGIO

The task of attributing a corpus of Renaissance architectural drawings known only through copies with limited comparative evidence must rely largely upon a network of tenuous connections. Yet in this case, when this nebulous body of evidence is assembled together, a fairly clear picture emerges. Despite a number of lacunae, it strongly suggests that these drawings derive from originals produced by the painter, sculptor, architect, and engineer Francesco di Giorgio. Active primarily in Siena and Urbino during the second half of the fifteenth century, Francesco produced numerous buildings and works of art as well as an architectural treatise, which he continued to revise over the course of his career. In addition to this, he also began a translation of Vitruvius and closely studied ancient monuments in Rome and elsewhere as testified to by comments found in his treatise and by a series of drawings now in Florence and Turin.

The earliest of these drawings are preserved in nineteen folios at the Uffizi.⁵⁴ Known today as the »Taccuino del Viaggio«, this remnant of a much larger collection contains sketches made in situ by the architect during his travels throughout Umbria, Lazio, and Campania. Most of these roughly executed drawings depict ancient buildings in plan and perspective with basic measurements. Francesco di Giorgio also recorded a handful of architectural details as well as two Roman

*7 Francesco di Giorgio:
Imperial Palace on
the Palatine Hill, Flo-
rence, Uffizi, GDSU
320 Ar*

inscriptions.⁵⁵ While the dating of these drawings is debated, several served as the basis for reconstructions found in the addendum to the first version of his treatise in Turin.⁵⁶ Likely executed in the 1480s, the drawings found at the end of Saluzziano 148 were conceived of as the final chapter to his architectural treatise and are prefaced by a short introduction in which the architect laments the destruction of ancient Roman buildings and describes how he recorded them despite their ruined state.⁵⁷ The addendum as whole contains almost two hundred individual drawings of ancient monuments and architectural details arranged roughly typologically progressing from amphitheaters, theaters, and baths to temples, palaces, and other ancient structures. Most of the reconstructions, which are carefully constructed and minutely detailed, take the form of plans

8 *Francesco di Giorgio:*
Imperial Palace on
the Palatine Hill, Turin,
Biblioteca Reale, Saluz-
ziano 148, fol. 82v

labeled with topographic information and measurements as well as elevations, sections, and perspective views. As mentioned, many of these finished drawings were elaborations on his earlier rough onsite sketches. For example, while in Rome, Francesco quickly drew the plan of the nearly incomprehensible imperial palace atop the Palatine Hill (fig. 7).⁵⁸ Later he used this sketch as the basis for his larger, more elaborate drawing in Saluzziano 148 (fig. 8), which contains parts that he »added according to fantasy because many of the ruins cannot be comprehended«⁵⁹. Francesco di Giorgio thus employed an iterative method of reconstruction in which fragmentary onsite studies were later elaborated in the workshop to create final renderings that were included in at least one copy of his architectural treatise. This was a methodical process of selection and revision

in which the architect even crossed out with an \times the sketches included in the addendum.⁶⁰ At the same time, as he explicitly states, this method of reconstruction fully embraced both >invenzione< and >fantasia< . Creativity and imagination were essential to his restoration and renewal of the monuments of antiquity, just as they were for his contemporary Giuliano da Sangallo.⁶¹

Despite the wide circulation of his architectural treatise through numerous still extant copies, his drawings of antiquity had a relatively limited afterlife. Nevertheless, the Sienese artists Lorenzo Donati and Giovanbattista Alberto both copied some of these reconstructions into their sketchbooks.⁶² The sixteen decorated bases found at the end of the Saluzziano addendum, which possibly derive from an earlier source, were similarly replicated by a number of later artists, including those of the Houfe Album and the Codex Cholmondeley.⁶³ In fact, a handful of other drawings from Saluzziano 148 also appear in these two albums.⁶⁴ Specifically, the reconstructions of the Arch of Titus (H.5), Arch of Constantine (H.31), and Porta Portuensis (H.20) found in the Houfe Album are strikingly similar to those in the Turin addendum.⁶⁵ While these ancient arches in Saluzziano 148 largely omit sculpture and ornament (besides coffering, keystone consoles, and a handful of architectural details), their method of representation, overall form, and limited ornamental details are extremely close to the Houfe drawings. The drawing of the Tomb of the Plautii in Tivoli from the Codex Cholmondeley (C.113) is also somewhat similar to the reconstruction found in the Turin addendum, though it lacks some details and the prominent central inscription.⁶⁶

Several sketches of architectural details found in the Taccuino del Viaggio were also copied into the Houfe Album. These include drawings of an ancient capital from the church of S. Angelo in Perugia, an entablature from the Abbey of Montecassino, and various cornices from S. Giovanni Maggiore in Naples.⁶⁷ Just as with the addendum to Saluzziano 148, the images found in the Houfe Album were additionally crossed off in the Taccuino del Viaggio, in this case with a simple diagonal line. This suggests that the Houfe tracings derive from a now lost finished set of architectural details that Francesco di Giorgio produced based on his earlier rough sketches. Thus, a number of drawings in the Houfe Album can be linked to those executed by Francesco di Giorgio. Yet despite this evidence, it is still plausible that these drawings are only indirectly related to the late fifteenth-century architect. Indeed this was the conclusion of Gustina Scaglia, who despite acknowledging some of the previously stated connections believed the artist of the Houfe Album simply used the drawings of Francesco

di Giorgio as starting point for his own collection of reconstructions.⁶⁸ This is highly unlikely. Rather, a large body of additional evidence suggests that the drawings in the Houfe Album were copied directly from a set of originals by Francesco di Giorgio, as first posited by Arnold Nesselrath.⁶⁹ Moreover, this evidence further confirms that the drawings in the Yale Album and Codex Cholmondeley also derive from this same corpus.

The first piece of evidence to support this conclusion is the Yale Album itself, which consists of a copy of the second version of Francesco di Giorgio's treatise as well as the additional six folios of drawings. Like the addendum to Saluzziano 148, these drawings were original to the manuscript. They were also executed in the same ink, on the same paper, and by the same hand as the rest of the treatise. Thus, it is extremely likely that the drawings replicated in the Yale Album were originally found together with a copy of the second version of Francesco di Giorgio's treatise when the manuscript was copied in 1521. The four ancient Roman warships at the end of the Yale Album (Y.11, Y.12) can also be linked to Francesco di Giorgio. Specifically, these drawings are similar to four panels carved by Ambrogio Barocci as part of the »Art of War Frieze« on the exterior of the Palazzo Ducale in Urbino (fig. 9). Despite the fact they may have been executed in the 1490s, several years after Francesco left the city, Barocci based them on drawings found in a copy of the architect's »Opusculum de architectura« now in the Vatican Library.⁷⁰ Furthermore, while these same ships appear in other books of drawings, such as the Codex Barberini and Codex Escorialensis, some critical details found in the Yale drawings are only replicated in the Vatican codex and the »Art of War Frieze«. Thus, they likely all derive from a common source originally held in the workshop of Francesco di Giorgio.

The drawing of the Vatican Obelisk (C.114) in the Codex Cholmondeley further links these reconstructions to Francesco di Giorgio's graphic work.

9 *Ambrogio Barocci: Quinquereme, Urbino, Palazzo Ducale, Art of War Frieze, cat. 19*

10 *Francesco di Giorgio:
Trattato di architettura, Flo-
rence, Biblioteca Medicea
Laurenziana, Ashburnham
361, fol. 28r, detail*

Specifically, it closely matches an obelisk drawn in the earliest version of his treatise known as Ashburnham 361 (fig. 10).⁷¹ While there are some differences between these drawings, both depict an obelisk set on four S-shaped supports and a square plinth. Curiously, when the treatise was revised in Saluzziano 148 this monument was simplified by removing the elaborate plinth and four ornate feet.⁷² Nevertheless, many later copies replicate the earlier illustration, including an album in the Uffizi assembled by Pietro Cataneo, which also contains a number of architectural details found in the Houfe Album.⁷³ Two entablatures from the church of S. Giovanni Maggiore in Naples found in both the Houfe Album and the Taccuino del Viaggio were also copied into the second version of Francesco di Giorgio's treatise.⁷⁴

Less directly, it is also notable that the plans of the Temple of Minerva (H.36), Porticus of Octavia (Y.4), and Temple of Saturn (H.39, Y.3) resemble some of the churches illustrated by Francesco di Giorgio in the first version of his treatise.⁷⁵

11 *Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Ashburnham App. 1828, fol. 103*

They also recall to some degree a series of drawings of temples in the Uffizi that are often linked to the architect.⁷⁶ The reconstructions of the Temple of Saturn and Porticus of Octavia also bear a striking resemblance to Francesco di Giorgio's church of S. Bernardino, which also features three clerestory windows on each side of the nave and a prominent dome. The temples found in the Yale and Houfe albums are further linked to the architect by an album of drawings in the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana in Florence. Known as the Ashburnham Album, this collection, which was likely assembled by Muzio Oddi in the seventeenth century, features over three hundred individual architectural drawings, including three autographed designs for monasteries by Francesco di Giorgio.⁷⁷ It also contains a series of sketches attributed to Giovanbatista Alberto after drawings by the architect, as well as copies of the three temples in question.⁷⁸ While Scaglia believed that the fragmentary Ashburnham drawings served as the model for those in the Houfe Album, this is unlikely since the former are rough, quickly executed sketches that omit many details found in the latter. Rather, it is much more plausible that Giovanbatista Alberto copied the same

12 *Francesco di Giorgio: Nativity (cropped), ca. 1495, Siena, S. Domenico*

drawings that the Houfe artist traced. The Ashburnham Album also contains a handful of additional fragmentary drawings of unknown temples. One of these closely matches an unidentified monument in the Codex Cholmondeley, while two others depict a temple in plan and oblique perspective just like those found in the Houfe and Yale albums (fig. 11).⁷⁹ Despite the fact these drawings cannot be identified, they likely replicate another reconstruction that was part of the original corpus of drawings, possibly the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina which also has a hexastyle portico with Corinthian columns.

The drawings in the Houfe and Yale album can also be linked stylistically to the figural work of Francesco di Giorgio. The figures in the gladiator stele (Y.5), for instance, resemble in their dress Francesco di Giorgio's painting of Scipio Africanus now in the Bargello.⁸⁰ The right-hand figure in the Yale illustration of Constantine and his son (Y.6), as well as the Houfe drawing of C. Aninius

Gallus (H.46a), similarly recall this painting, as well as a light drawing of a Roman soldier in Saluzziano 148 and a sketch in the *Taccuino del Viaggio*.⁸¹ Arnold Nesselrath has also suggested that the angels that flank a central panel in one of the triumphal arches in the Houfe Album (H.24) imitate those found in Francesco di Giorgio's »Coronation of the Virgin« altarpiece from Monte Oliveto Maggiore now in Siena.⁸² He has also noted that the statue of Empress Faustina Minor in the Houfe Album (H.46b) echoes the left-hand angel in the artist's painting of the »Nativity« in the Sienese church of S. Domenico (fig. 12).⁸³

13 Detail of fig. 12

While it is possible to draw other links to the pictorial work of Francesco di Giorgio, this evidence is largely circumstantial, none of it directly links the corpus of drawings to the artist. The exception is a small detail found in the background in the S. Domenico »Nativity« that has previously gone unnoticed.⁸⁴ Behind the billowing hair of the left-hand angel stands an octagonal building with prominent corner buttresses and a central dome. Receding further into the background is another temple with a square podium punctured by a pedimented doorway above which rises a tall drum encircled by columns (fig. 13). This building closely matches one of the Mausoleum of Augustus reconstructions conserved in the Royal Library at Windsor (W.2). Although the painting omits the figural elements and paired columns found in the drawing, the two are without a doubt related. Another structure in the background of the painting also resembles the Houfe reconstruction of the Temple of Minerva (H.36). It is impossible to say whether Francesco di Giorgio or an assistant executed these details, but either way they must have been based on drawings in the artist's workshop.⁸⁵

While scholars have debated the dating of this painting, documentary evidence indicates it was executed beginning in 1495.⁸⁶ Thus at least some of the drawings found in the original corpus of reconstructions were completed by this time. This is supported by the Houfe Album tracings, which were executed around the beginning of the sixteenth century based on watermark evidence.⁸⁷

14
*Francesco di Giorgio:
Porticus of Octavia,
Turin, Biblioteca Reale,
Saluzziano 148,
fol. 86v*

The corpus as a whole must certainly predate the Yale Album, which was finished in 1521. It also precedes a bas-relief of the Arch of Augustus in Fano on the facade of the adjacent church of S. Michele that is based on a drawing also found in the Houfe Album (H.18). Commemorating the destruction of the arch in 1463, this relief was planned in 1504 and likely carved by Bernardino di Pietro da Carona between 1511 and 1513.⁸⁸ It is also likely that Giovanbatista Alberto copied at least a few of the drawings in the corpus during the late-1490s. On the other hand, some of the material found in the Houfe Album, specifically the architectural details from Naples, must post-date Francesco's first visit to the city in either 1484 or 1491.⁸⁹ Thus, the limited external evidence suggests

that the drawings found in the Houfe Album and its related copies likely derive from a set assembled near the end of the 1490s. While it is certainly possible that this corpus was constructed over an extended period of time, the stylistic unity of the tracings in the Houfe Album indicates that the original drawings were conceived of as a cohesive set, not a collection of disparate material.

Taken together, this body of evidence suggests that Francesco di Giorgio shortly before his death in 1501 assembled a corpus of reconstructed ancient buildings and architectural details. As previously examined, some of this material derived from his earlier drawings. Yet curiously, very few of the monuments found in the addendum to Saluzziano 148 were included in this later set. More problematically, a handful of the Houfe, Cholmondeley, and Yale drawings are dramatically different than those in the *Taccuino del Viaggio* and the Turin addendum. The reconstruction of the Porticus of Octavia in the Yale Album (Y.4), for example, bears almost no resemblance to the plan and elevation in Saluzziano 148 (fig. 14) beyond the large portico with four Corinthian columns in antis.⁹⁰ The Houfe drawing of the Temple of Minerva (H.36) likewise radically departs from Francesco di Giorgio's earlier reconstruction of the monument.⁹¹ Only the hexastyle portico with Corinthian columns is similar, and even then, their inscriptions are significantly different. Still more problematic is the drawing of the Pons Aemilius (also known as the Ponte S. Maria and later the Ponte Rotto) in the Yale Album (Y.7b). As Francesco di Giorgio quickly sketched in his *Taccuino del Viaggio* (fig. 15), this ancient bridge originally had six arches

divided by piers with flood openings flanked by pilasters.⁹² In contrast, the Yale drawing depicts a three-arched bridge with large round, bastion-like piers.

Some of these representations are also dramatically less archeologically accurate than the earlier drawings of Francesco di Giorgio. While the architect freely invented ancient structures and famously corrected perceived errors in the Pantheon, many drawings in the later corpus of reconstructions look almost nothing like the monuments they claim to represent.⁹³ While this might be justified in the case of poorly preserved or partially buried buildings – such as the Porticus of Octavia, Temple of Minerva, Temple of Saturn, and Mausoleum of Augustus – it is more difficult to explain with fully extant monuments. These include the Pons Fabricius (H.34a, Y.7a), Pons Aemilius (Y.7b), and Pons Cestius (Y.8b), as well as the Porta Maggiore (H.8), funerary stele to Marcus Antonius Exochus (Y.5) and statues of Constantine I and Constantine II (Y.6). How could it be that the same artist who produced the extremely veristic representations of the Arch of Septimius Severus (H.28), Arch of Constantine (H.31), Arch of the Argentarii (H.3), and other ancient structures could deviate so much from available physical evidence? How can some reconstructions be proto-archeological, while others are incredibly fantastical?

A simple explanation for this dissonance is that the corpus of drawings is an assemblage of disparate material. With so little surviving comparative evidence, one cannot definitively rule out this possibility. Indeed, it is even conceivable that the corpus contains copies of earlier drawings. The decorated bases found in both the Turin addendum and the Houfe Album, for example, are strikingly similar to two drawings executed by an artist in the circle of Benozzo Gozzoli in the 1460s.⁹⁴ Likewise, the liburnian warship in the Yale Album (Y.12a) closely resembles an illustration found in early fifteenth-century copies of the late-antique »De rebus bellicis« (fig. 16).⁹⁵ In fact, the earliest surviving copy of this treatise was produced in 1436 for Bishop Pietro Donato, who was a close associate of Cyriac of Ancona. The antiquarian even dedicated one of his earliest sylloges – the partially autographed Hamilton Codex now in Berlin – to the bishop.⁹⁶ As discussed, inscriptions originally transcribed by Cyriac of Ancona were also used in the Houfe drawings of the arches of Fano (H.18) and Zadar (H.27). It is therefore not inconceivable that these and other drawings could derive from originals made by Cyriac of Ancona.

Yet at the same time, there are a number of problems with this interpretation. As the Houfe tracings suggest, the original corpus of reconstructions was unified stylistically. Even in the later Yale and Cholmondeley copies, invented

16 *Liburna*, from *De rebus bellicis*, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Canon. Misc. 378, fol. 75v, detail

monuments and well-known buildings employ the same methods of representation and architectural details. Most of the reconstructions in the corpus also utilize inscriptions taken from a sylloge. As already explored, not only is this use of epigraphy exceptional, it also clearly provides the organizing framework for the corpus as a whole. Several of the reconstructions only make sense if this is a cohesive set based primarily on material found in a sylloge. This unity thus suggests that a singular individual or workshop produced this corpus. It is therefore most likely that Francesco di Giorgio conceived of this cohesive set, even if parts of it cannot be directly linked to him. Yet the question still remains, why do some of the drawings in the corpus depart from his earlier work? More importantly, how could an architect well acquainted with Rome have produced freely invented versions of monuments that were well preserved and easily accessible in the Renaissance? These questions can only be answered by attempting to understand Francesco di Giorgio's process of reconstruction and the purpose of this corpus of drawings.

INTERPRETING THE CORPUS: VISUALIZING ANTIQUITY IN THE LATE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

As examined earlier, Francesco di Giorgio's method of reconstruction was based on an iterative process in which onsite sketches were later refined and elaborated to produce final drawings. In these initial sketches with limited ability to excavate, the architect often documented only a few architectural details, some measurements, and the overall form of a given monument. This incomplete source material then served as the basis for later reconstructions. In the case of the addendum to Saluzziano 148, these drawings were carefully executed in his workshop months if not years after he conducted his onsite surveys. This temporal and geographic distance from the monuments of ancient Rome was critical to his process of invention. With limited graphic evidence, Francesco relied on his architectural skills to imagine not only the overall form of these often-ruinous buildings, but also many of their architectural details. Indeed, as Richard Betts has recently demonstrated, Francesco di Giorgio meticulously laid out and elaborated some of these reconstructions using the same system of quadrature he employed in his contemporary architectural designs.⁹⁷ Thus, this method of reconstruction was more than just filling in what was unknown. The creation of final renderings regularized the monuments of antiquity through a system of architectural design giving unity to a variety of disparate material that was then arranged roughly typologically as the final book of his architectural treatise.

This process, moreover, was not purely linear. Instead, Francesco di Giorgio revised his reconstructions over time. The remnants of these intermediary modifications can still be seen in his drawing of the Basilica of Maxentius in the Turin addendum. As Tilmann Buddensieg first noted, this reconstruction conspicuously records the location of the colossal statue of Constantine unearthed in 1486.⁹⁸ Francesco's earlier sketch of this structure, on the other hand, makes no indication of the statue.⁹⁹ This is not surprising since the architect's earliest studies of Roman monuments in the *Taccuino del Viaggio* are generally dated to the 1470s.¹⁰⁰ Thus, Francesco must have updated his initial sketch when producing the final Turin reconstruction. While in this case incorporating additional information yielded a more faithful representation of the ancient basilica, I would suggest that over time Francesco di Giorgio's reconstructions did not move teleologically toward archeological accuracy. Rather, as the Houfe, Cholmondeley, and Yale albums demonstrate, his method of reconstruction could produce varied results.

For example, in the case of the Porticus of Octavia, neither of his reconstructions is objectively more accurate than the other by modern standards. While the Turin elevation depicts the complex corner piers in elevation, it omits them in plan (fig. 14). The opposite is true of the later Yale drawings, where the portico piers are rendered more accurately in plan than in perspective (Y.4). Yet despite their disparities, both sets clearly depict the same monument with its distinctive propylaeum topped by an inset inscription that interrupts the entablature. Thus, through the process of revision the portico moved both closer and further away from the actual structure. Francesco di Giorgio clearly saw the act of reconstruction as a fluid and open-ended undertaking. Only monuments that required little restoration such as the Arch of Constantine (H.31) reached a point of graphic stasis. Thus, rather than simply replicating his earlier drawings, Francesco di Giorgio likely continued the inventive process of reconstruction when assembling his final corpus of drawings. Yet this time, his method was shaped by additional factors.

One of these new considerations was the incorporation of epigraphy. Francesco di Giorgio had earlier recorded at least two inscriptions in his *Taccuino del Viaggio* and partially transcribed three others in Saluzziano 148.¹⁰¹ A drawing of the Arch of Trajan in Benevento attributed to the architect also prominently displays the full dedicatory inscription.¹⁰² Yet despite this evidence, epigraphy only played a minor role in Francesco di Giorgio's early antiquarian activities. In contrast, ancient inscriptions taken from a sylloge were integral to his later corpus of reconstructions. How the architect came to transcribe these inscriptions is unknown. It is plausible that while in Urbino he had access to a sylloge through one of the many humanists at the court of Federico da Montefeltro.¹⁰³ At the same time, he could have come across a sylloge after returning to Siena in 1488 or while in Naples during the early 1490s. It is in Naples that he may have also met Fra Giocondo, who was commissioned in June 1492 to copy 126 drawings from Francesco di Giorgio's architectural treatise for the Duke of Calabria.¹⁰⁴ Although it is tempting to think these two architects and antiquarians discussed ancient epigraphy at some point in the late-Quattrocento, the inscriptions found in the Houfe, Yale, and Cholmondeley drawings contain numerous errors that Fra Giocondo had already corrected in his earliest sylloges.

Regardless of how Francesco di Giorgio came to copy a sylloge, it is clear that he utilized more than just a random collection of inscriptions, such as those found in the Zichy Codex. Not only are the majority of inscriptions originally

recorded by Signorili represented in the corpus of drawings, but they are also by and large correctly transcribed onto the monuments from which they were originally copied. This task of matching inscription to monument would have required a vast knowledge of Roman topography as well as a sylloge with descriptive labels. This topographic information, which was often embedded in early sylloges, undoubtedly helped Francesco di Giorgio to place inscriptions on the monuments of Rome, possibly long after he had last visited the city. This is particularly apparent in his reconstruction of the Arch of Janus Quadrifrons (H.19), which employs an inscription that originally adorned the nearby Arch of Lentulus and Crispinus. It also includes an invented epigraph derived from a passage in the Jerome version of Eusebius that many syllogists claimed was found in the adjacent portico of S. Giorgio in Velabro. Since the Arch of Lentulus and Crispinus was destroyed in the 1440s and the other inscription likely never existed, only topographic information recorded in a sylloge would have suggested to the architect to place it atop the still extant nearby Arch of Janus.¹⁰⁵

Yet what differentiates the Houfe Album and its related copies from Francesco di Giorgio's earlier drawings is not just the presence of inscriptions taken from a sylloge but how epigraphy became the driving force behind the act of reconstruction. Specifically, he consciously chose to give visual form to a collection of inscriptions. This meant inventing monuments that never existed, such as a triumphal arch with the elogium of Q. Fabius Maximus (H.1), as well as envisioning structures that were known only through their inscription, such as the monument to Julius Caesar (Y.9). It also required Francesco to monumentalize fragments such as a Mithraic inscription found near S. Susanna (C.112) and a tombstone commemorating a member of the Calpurnius family (H.2). The systematic nature of this undertaking also forced the architect to represent antiquities with which he likely had little familiarity. This explains why the stele to the gladiator Marcus Antonius Exochus in the Yale Album (Y.5) looks nothing like other Renaissance representations of this fragment. It is likely Francesco knew the funerary monument only through its inscription. This may also justify the curious drawing of the statues of Constantine I and Constantine II (Y.6).

At the same time, these visualizations of inscriptions were more than just fantasies. Instead, like Francesco di Giorgio's more archeologically informed reconstructions, they were hybrid creations that combined material gleaned from various sources to create all'antica monuments with an air of authenticity. In the case of the monument to Julius Caesar (Y.9), the architect created

17 *Nicolas Beatrizet (attr.): Ancient frieze with naval trophies and sacrificial instruments from S. Lorenzo fuori le Mura, detail*

a conical memorial that conflated the Vatican Obelisk, which was believed in the fifteenth century to contain the ashes of the ancient Roman leader, with the Meta Sudans and possibly other conical structures such as the Tomb of the Horatii.¹⁰⁶ This was then combined with details taken from the Column of Trajan and possibly a contemporary tomb with swags and putti to create a synthetic ancient monument. A similar hybridity can be seen in the Yale drawing of the Emperor Constantine and his son (Y.5).¹⁰⁷ Here, the right-hand figure combines features found in late-antique consular diptychs, as well as Francesco di Giorgio's sketch of an ancient warrior in Saluzziano 148, his painting of Scipio Africanus, and the Houfe drawing of a Roman soldier (H.46a). None of these likely served as a direct model, rather many exempla were combined possibly with a sketch of the original statue to produce the image of Constantine.

This mode of hybrid reconstruction is also evident in the Roman ships found in the Yale Album (Y.11-12).¹⁰⁸ While they appear to be drawings after the antique, only the *liburna* can be directly traced to a possibly ancient source. The other three vessels, on the other hand, appear to derive from individual elements on an ancient frieze conserved during the Renaissance in the church of S. Lorenzo fuori le Mura (fig. 17). Copied by Francesco di Giorgio in the addendum to Saluzziano 148, these various naval trophies were recombined – possibly following the model of ships found on other ancient reliefs, coins, or manuscripts – to create three additional distinct types of ancient Roman

warships. So successful were these ingenious reconstructions that they were copied numerous times in the Renaissance. Although the origins of these specific drawings cannot be definitively pinpointed, in example after example, through a process of synthesis, Francesco di Giorgio combined a variety of disparate source material to generate numerous reconstructions.

This process also yielded buildings that were homogenous, not just stylistically, but also in terms of their lexicon of forms. In this way, just as in the addendum to Saluzziano 148, Francesco di Giorgio normalized the monuments of ancient Rome. This method of reconstruction also gave unity to a variety of disparate structures and established typological norms. For example, all of the temples in the set, in addition to employing the same method of representation, have a portico attached to a complex domed church-like cella. All follow the same clear formula. At the same time, they also contain archeological references – the Temple of Saturn has six Ionic columns; the Temple of Minerva has six Corinthian columns; the Porticus of Octavia has four Corinthian columns flanked by piers. There are still undoubtedly elements of fantasy in these reconstructions, just like the late fifteenth-century Codex Santarelli »Roma Antica« drawings and their related copies.¹⁰⁹ Yet, this method of reconstruction also provided a template onto which physical and epigraphic information could be grafted. The same can also be said for the drawings of city gates and aqueducts, as well as ancient bridges, all of which are depicted in the same manner with three arches. While the bridges especially bear little resemblance to the actual monuments, some contain archeological quotations. For instance, the upper portion of the Pons Cestius drawing resembles the inscribed parapet of the actual bridge (Y.8b). Francesco di Giorgio in this way created typological models that could be modified based on available evidence. When archeological remains were limited, as in the case of the Pons Neronianus (Y.8a), the architect simply affixed the inscription onto a generic bridge. He likely did the same thing with an inscription from the near Pons Aemilius (Y.7b) perhaps not realizing it was associated with a bridge he had studied in person. In another example, he probably combined elements from his sketch of the rusticated Bridge of Augustus in Narni with an inscription from the Bridge of Diocletian near Fossombrone to produce a fully reconstructed ancient bridge (H.34b).¹¹⁰ Yet despite their variety, all these cases, even those embedded with archeological information, are variations on the same typological theme.

The vast majority of reconstructions found in this corpus of drawings are thus hybrid monuments that follow typological norms. Rather than relying

on abstract theoretical principles or the writings of Vitruvius, they were created by combining epigraphy, archeological evidence, and all'antica invention. As the Houfe tracings reveal, the original set was a highly detailed, finished product that employed uniform representational conventions and carefully transcribed inscriptions.

It was clearly conceived of as an integrated compendium of ancient monuments accompanied by carefully drawn architectural fragments and other antique objects. It also likely contained other drawings that are now lost. Specifically, one would expect to find reconstructions of the Arch of Gallienus, Pantheon, Temple of Antoninus and Faustina, and Mausoleum of Hadrian, all of which feature inscriptions transcribed by Signorili.¹¹¹ It is also possible that the corpus contained other invented monuments, which were not copied by later artists due to their fantastical appearance. Indeed, it is perhaps not coincidental that some of the strangest reconstructions are only found in the Yale Album. The artist of the Codex Cholmondeley, despite including a few of these inventions, replaced others with more accurate reconstructions produced by Raphael and his circle two decades later.¹¹² The original owner of the Houfe Album may have similarly omitted some of the more inventive and verifiably inaccurate monuments when pasting the fragile tracings into an album in the seventeenth century.¹¹³ Thus, the original corpus of drawings was most likely larger. At the same time, it is also possible that Francesco di Giorgio never finished the process of assembling this collection of reconstructions before his death.

Without additional information, it is impossible to know the full scope of this undertaking. Similarly, the function of this anthology is not self-evident. One possibility is that like the addendum to Saluzziano 148 this collection was conceived of as a final chapter to Francesco di Giorgio's architectural treatise. As the Yale Album is the only copy of the second version of his treatise to contain some of these drawings, there is only limited physical evidence to support this conclusion. Nonetheless, the architect was working on both projects in the 1490s. The corpus of reconstructions, moreover, was presumably arranged typologically, just like the first part of the Turin addendum. Yet, at the same time, there are a number of differences between these two sets. They not only depict different monuments, but also do so in markedly divergent ways. For instance, the ancient structures in the Turin addendum are represented using 48 plans, 35 exterior elevations or perspectives, and 14 sections or interior views. In contrast, all of the drawings found in the later corpus are exterior elevations

and perspective renderings with the exception of three temple plans. Furthermore, all of the monuments in this set, excluding the temples, are represented using only a single image. Many of those found in Saluzziano 148, on the other hand, are depicted with multiple drawings and methods of representation. This graphic disparity may suggest that the later corpus of drawings served a different purpose. The avoidance of plans, simplified representational manner, and pictorial clarity especially indicate a desire to reach a more general audience. In this way, the corpus could have been conceived of as an independent entity, possibly a deluxe album initially produced for a specific patron, not unlike Francesco di Giorgio's »Opusculum de architectura«, the sylloges of Giovanni Marcanova and others, or even the later Codex Cholmondeley. In this way it would have functioned as both an illustrated treatise on ancient architecture and a graphic sylloge.

At the same time, Arnold Nesselrath has suggested that the tracings found in the Houfe Album indicate that Francesco di Giorgio intended to print these reconstructions, making them part of the earliest printed architectural treatise.¹¹⁴ It is clear that the Houfe drawings were executed on paper treated with linseed oil.¹¹⁵ As Nesselrath has noted, printmakers commonly used this technique to produce tracings that were then pasted atop woodblocks and incised with a gouge.¹¹⁶ Because this is a destructive process, few of these preparatory tracings survive. Besides the Houfe drawings – as well as two additional tracings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art and one in the Uffizi, all after drawings from the original corpus of reconstructions – the only other similar surviving collection of architectural tracings were used to produce the etchings for Étienne Dupérac's »I Vestigi dell'Antichità di Roma«, first published in 1575.¹¹⁷ Therefore, it seems plausible the Houfe drawings were produced explicitly for mechanical reproduction. As the paper on which these tracings were made can be dated to the beginning of the sixteenth century, it is theoretically possible this project was begun under the direction of Francesco di Giorgio.¹¹⁸ Yet it is much more likely that they were executed after the architect's death in 1501. In fact, throughout the sixteenth century architectural drawings were printed long after they were originally produced.¹¹⁹ Later engravers even reproduced seemingly antiquated fifteenth-century reconstructions, such as the fantastical »Roma Antica« drawings of ancient temples.¹²⁰

Regardless of whether or not Francesco di Giorgio was behind the effort to publish these drawings, it is clear this undertaking did not extend past the preliminary phase. It was instead the Roman printer and bookseller

Jacopo Mazzocchi who first printed the monuments of ancient Rome alongside their inscriptions in his 1521 book »Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis«. ¹²¹ But unlike his predecessor, Mazzocchi chose to illustrate only a handful of structures, almost all of which required little reconstruction. In fact, like most sylloges, the primary purpose of his book was the transmission of ancient epigraphy. It was not until the publication of Sebastiano Serlio's book on antiquities in 1540 that many of the monuments of ancient Rome were first disseminated through the medium of print. Yet in this case, only a small number of inscriptions mostly taken from ancient triumphal arches were included alongside his reconstructions. ¹²² Thus, neither Mazzocchi nor Serlio attempted to fully unite epigraphy and archeology in their publications. The same can be said of most early sixteenth-century albums of drawings. Even as architects attempted to systematically reconstruct the monuments of ancient Rome, epigraphy often played only a minor role in this process. It was only with Pirro Ligorio in the second half of the sixteenth century that another artist attempted to similarly merge epigraphy and archeology in the process of reconstruction.

There are still many questions that remain, but it is clear that near the end of his life Francesco di Giorgio was assembling a definitive corpus of reconstructions that sought to comprehensively visualize the monuments of ancient Rome using inscriptions found in an early sylloge. While this project drew extensively on his first-hand study of antiquity, it was epigraphy that gave order to this undertaking. Hopefully time will reveal more drawings that were once part of this corpus, but thanks to the newly discovered Yale Album, the full scope of this project is beginning to come into focus. Together with the Houfe Album and Codex Cholmondeley, these drawings demonstrate that Francesco di Giorgio engaged in a complex, multifaceted method of reconstruction in which physical and textual evidence was inventively amalgamated to visualize ancient structures. While this hybrid mode of reconstruction was quickly eclipsed by the rise of proto-archeology in the sixteenth century, the newly reassembled corpus represents a significant chapter in the Renaissance study of antiquity. It is also testament to the continuing desire of Francesco di Giorgio – described by contemporary Giovanni Santi as the »restorer of ancient ruins« – to resurrect ancient Roman monuments through a process of graphic reconstruction. ¹²³

ADDENDUM

As this article was going to press, I discovered, thanks to Angelamaria Aceto, two folios at the Ashmolean Museum (A.1 & A.2) that are directly related to the corpus of reconstructions discussed here.¹²⁴ Specifically, these loose drawings were once part of the same original set as those now in the Houfe Album. Like the drawings in this album, as well as a sheet in the Louvre depicting figures from a Bacchic sarcophagus now at Woburn Abbey, the Ashmolean folios feature partially finished tracings (some with wash) of ancient monuments with inscriptions executed on oiled paper.¹²⁵ The same hand also later sequentially numbered all of these drawings.¹²⁶

Most importantly for this article, one of the Ashmolean drawings (A.1b) replicates the same monument to the gladiator Marcus Antonius Exochus found in the Yale Album (Y.5). This is further proof that the drawings in this album, even the most imaginative, derive from the same set of originals traced by the Houfe artist. The much finer Ashmolean drawing, which includes details such as niche pilasters omitted in the Yale drawing, additionally solidifies the link to Francesco di Giorgio. Specifically, the bald man on the left side of the niche closely resembles the central figure in a drawing by the artist at the Metropolitan Museum of Art.¹²⁷ The same can be said of the adjacent drawing on this folio (A.1a). Depicting a nude female statue set on a rectangular plinth, this tracing is reminiscent of Francesco di Giorgio's drawing of Eve at Christ Church, Oxford, and is a near mirror-image of the Empress Faustina Minor statue found in the Houfe Album (H.46b).¹²⁸ It is also almost identical to a drawing at the Biblioteca Nazionale in Florence, which was recently attributed to the workshop of Francesco di Giorgio.¹²⁹ Pasted into an album with material related to the Zacchi family of Volterra and dated 1479, this drawing, according to its label, depicts Deianira (the wife of Hercules) and accompanies a group of poems by Giovanni Zacchi dedicated to a woman of the same name. In contrast, the Ashmolean drawing, according to its inscription, depicts the Roman maiden Tifernia Sabina. As these two drawings are almost indistinguishable in every other way, this difference suggests that when Francesco di Giorgio assembled his corpus of reconstructions, he reimagined some of his earlier drawings through the addition of epigraphy.

The inscription to Tifernia Sabina included in the Ashmolean drawing (A.1a) is also noteworthy as it once adorned the Cathedral of Città di Castello, just like those that accompany two statues in the Houfe Album (H.46).¹³⁰ This is also the case with one of the other newly discovered drawings (A.2a), which

according to its inscription represents *Lutatia Frugifera*.¹³¹ Thus, the original corpus of reconstructions contained at least four monuments with inscriptions from Città di Castello. The Ashmolean drawings also demonstrate that Francesco di Giorgio, like Jacopo Bellini decades earlier, freely invented monuments by combining found inscriptions with all'antica imagery inspired by ancient sculptural fragments.¹³² This creative process of assemblage is especially evident in the *Lutatia Frugifera* drawing (A.2a). Here, a partially nude female figure pointing upward stands next to a small bowl on an elaborate base wearing a winged laurel crown. On a ledge behind her, a small freestanding satyr attends a flaming vase or makes an offering. Below them is a large pedestal adorned with an inscription and a pair of fantastic Greek sphinxes. Defying any clear iconographical interpretation or singular ancient precedent, this invented hybrid monument instead combines a statue of *Venus at her bath* with other ancient and all'antica motifs to create a distinctly Renaissance amalgam.¹³³

This process of reinvention also extends to the final drawing at the Ashmolean (A.2b). Depicting a nude female statue set on an unfinished pedestal, this image is strikingly similar to the drawings previously discussed (H.46b, A.1a, A.2a), all of which are variations on the *Cnidian Venus* type. But more than that, these four drawings appear to be reconstructions of the same ancient fragment. In each case, the presumably lost arms, head, and drapery were positioned in slightly different ways while the central body remains the same, despite being rotated and flipped. These drawings in this way represent a serial process of reconstruction, one that was likely informed by the workshop practice of recording ancient fragments, copying drawings, and sketching malleable wax models.

The last Ashmolean drawing (A.2b) is also significant because of its epigraphy. Dedicated to *Rubria Daphne*, this inscription was found in a palace in Ostia during the early sixteenth century according to Battista Brunelleschi, the only syllogist to have recorded it.¹³⁴ As Brunelleschi's transcription differs from the Ashmolean drawing in a handful of significant ways, it is unlikely that the two copies are directly related.¹³⁵ Rather, Francesco di Giorgio probably recorded this inscription, like those from the Cathedral of Città di Castello, during his travels and later grafted it onto an invented monument. Why this was done remains unknown, but it is clear that the corpus of drawings reconstructed in this article originally included a greater number of figural monuments that were purposefully paired with inscriptions. More broadly, the newly discovered Ashmolean drawings demonstrate how Francesco di Giorgio's process of visualizing the monuments of antiquity also extended to the reconstruction of ancient works of sculpture.

1) *Unidentified Triumphal Arch*

This drawing is almost identical to an unidentified triumphal arch found in the Houfe Album. Like the Houfe drawing, no inscriptions have been included and the central panel supported by two figures is left blank. The lower register of the arch consists of four plinths atop which four figures are set in niches. Despite the crude rendering of these figures, they maintain the same poses as those in the Houfe drawing. Above these niches stand four sets of paired Corinthian columns supporting an entablature above. Unlike the Houfe drawing, the Yale copy generally represents the arch orthogonally, flattening the perspective of the architectural elements, especially those of the upper register. Likewise, whereas the Houfe artist carefully rendered the niches of the arch, including their moldings, the Yale artist simply darkened these areas with wash.

Comparanda: Houfe Album, fol. 16

2) *Calpurnius Tomb Monument*

Described by Signorili as »repertum ad altare castris Farae«, this inscription was likely found in the vicinity of Fara in Sabina and the Abbazia di Farfa, roughly twenty-five miles north of Rome.¹³⁶ In translating this inscription into a drawing, Francesco di Giorgio placed the inscription atop a monument with paired columns and a broken triangular pediment that resembles a contemporary altarpiece. While the central panel of the monument is blank in the Houfe drawing, the Yale artist depicts two men in robes flanking a pair of infants on what might be a baptismal font. The Yale artist also made several errors transcribing the inscription from the original drawing. Comparing the Yale inscription with the Houfe drawing, whose text is significantly closer to that found in fifteenth-century sylloges, it is clear the Yale artist not only forgot letters in the process of copying, but also combined words that were divided by two lines such as PRAECONIPECVLIAR and AGRINFRONTE.

Comparanda: Houfe Album, fol. 2

Signorili CIL:¹³⁷ 62

CIL: IX.4967

Yale inscription:

C· CALPHVRNIO· SP· F· COL· APOLINARIA· P· P· ARI/TORI· AVG· PRAECONIPECVLIAR·
IVLIAE· M· FVL/ISTAE· MATRI CAL^{PH}EVARNIAE· C· F· TELVRI / CALPHVRNIAE· C· LIB
DAPNE FECIT· C· CAIPHVR/NVS· C· F· QVIRIPOLVMARIS· MIN· POSTERI/ S· QVE FAMI·
LIAE NOSTRE· NOMINIS· NOSTRI· HVIC· MONVMENTO IVRIS AGRINFRONTE· P· L· XX
CVI DEBEBITVR AB OMNIBVS PROSSS/RIBVS EIVS

Houfe inscription:

C· CALPHVRNIO· SP· F· COL· APOLIN/ARIA· P· P· ARITORI· AVG· PRAECONI / PEC·
VLIAR· IVLIAE· M· FVLLITAE / MATRI· CALPHVRNIAE· C· F· TELLV/RI· CALPHVBNIAE·
C· LIB· DAP(H)NE / FECIT· C· CALPHVRNIVS· C· F· QVIR / IPOLIMARIS· MIN· POSTERIS·
QVE· FA/MILIAE· NOSTRE· NOMINIS· NOSTRI / HVIC· MONVMENTO· IVRIS· AGRIN /
FRONTE· P· LXX· CVI· DEBEBITVR· AB/OMNIBVS· POSSESSORIBVS EIVS·

3) *Temple of Saturn*

As the inscription on the portico of the temple makes clear, this is a representation of the Temple of Saturn in the Roman Forum. While much of the reconstruction is invented, the portico with its six Ionic columns, entablature, and pediment closely resembles the still extant hexastyle portico of the temple, despite the omission of the flanking side columns. On the exterior, the central cella is divided into two stories with four corner piers articulated with pilasters. The upper storey is punctured by three simple windows and the whole central space is topped by an arcaded lantern and a dome set on a drum with paired pilasters and windows. The rear of the temple is composed of a round centrally planned space with three circular radiating chapels. This type of tribune is reminiscent of a number of designs for churches found in the first version of Francesco di Giorgio's treatise as well as a drawing in the Uffizi linked to the architect.¹³⁸ It also recalls contemporary centrally planned churches such as S. Maria della Croce in Crema. Likewise, the exterior of the temple, especially the three side windows, resembles Francesco di Giorgio's church of S. Bernardino outside of Urbino.

Five additional copies of this drawing are known. The Yale copy is closest to the version in the Houfe Album, despite some notable differences. In particular, the temple in the Houfe drawing has a large central portal with pilasters and a pediment, while the Yale drawing has a simple doorway flanked by two stories of pilasters. Likewise, all of the lanterns in the Yale drawing have arches, while those in the Houfe drawing are unarticulated. The Ashburnham Album copy includes both the Houfe portal and the Yale lantern suggesting that the lost original may have contained both components. The presence of arcaded

lanterns in the highly modified Mellon Codex drawing also indicates it does not derive from the Houfe Album, which omits this detail.

Comparanda: Houfe Album, fol. 39; New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, Mellon Codex, fol. 63v–64r; Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Ashburnham App. 1828, fol. 40, no. 58, fol. 101, no. 148; Windsor, Royal Library 19245v; London, Sir John Soane’s Museum, vol. 124, Montano Album II, fol. 18r

CensusID: 151320

Signorili CIL: 18

CIL: VI.937

Yale inscription:

SENATVS·POPVLVS·QVE / ROMANVS·INCENDIO·CO/NSVMPTVM·RESTITVIT·

Houfe inscription:

SENATVS·POVLVS·QVE·ROMAN/VS·INCENDIO·CONSVMP·TVM / RESTITVIT

4) *Porticus of Octavia*

Based on the inscription, it is possible to identify this reconstructed monument as the Porticus of Octavia, which was believed to be a temple in the Renaissance. Like the still extant monument, this drawing depicts the central propylaeum of the Porticus with four Corinthian columns in antis. Moreover, in plan, the drawing closely replicates the compound corner piers of the monument, which are drastically simplified in perspective. The remainder of the structure is imaginatively reconstructed in the shape of a modified basilican plan church divided into two separate spaces. The first of these is centrally planned and composed of a circle set in a square with rectangular niches on the major axes and semicircular niches on the minor axes with eight engaged columns similar to contemporary churches such as S. Maria di Canepanova in Pavia. The rear space has a major apse screened by two columns and two minor apses on the cross axis with two additional rows of columns.¹³⁹

In general, there is little correspondence between the plan and the perspective view. This disconnect is especially apparent in the representation of the portico piers which are square in perspective and compound in plan. There are also significant differences between the Yale drawing and another copy in the earlier Ashburnham Album. This drawing, for example, depicts a central pedimented portal, while the entryway is completely omitted in the Yale drawing. The Ashburnham plan similarly includes corner pilasters, a feature absent in the Yale drawing. Yet, in perspective, the Ashburnham drawing depicts the portico as having six columns, rather than four in antis, suggesting that Giovanbattista Alberto also made errors while quickly copying the original drawing.

The Yale drawing is further complicated by Francesco di Giorgio's earlier depiction of the same monument in the addendum to Saluzziano 148 (fig. 14).¹⁴⁰ In this drawing, the propylaeum of the Porticus is depicted in elevation relatively accurately, with the noticeable omission of the inscription and pediment. These same four columns in antis are also visible in the adjacent plan, the remainder of which is largely invented. Both in plan and elevation this earlier drawing differs significantly from the Yale drawing. In fact, besides the four columns in antis and the inset inscription panel that breaks the architrave, only the Yale portico as depicted in plan recalls the elevation drawn in Saluzziano 148. All of these discrepancies further suggest the Yale drawings and their related copies are not in all cases directly linked to Francesco di Giorgio's earlier reconstructions. A drawing in the Ashburnham Album that contains elements found in both Saluzziano 148 and the Yale drawing may even suggest that this reconstruction went through several phases of development.¹⁴¹

Comparanda: Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Ashburnham App. 1828, fol. 37, no. 53; fol. 102, no. 149

CensusID: 150992

Signorili CIL: 19

CIL: VI.1034

Yale inscription:

IMP· CAES LVTIVS· SETIMVS· SEVERVS/ PERTINAS AVG· ARABICVS· ADSAVABE/ NO·
DACTIVS· MAX· TRI· POT· XI· / IMP· XI· COS· IIII ET· M· ET· AURELIVS· ANT/ NNINVS·
PIVS· FELIX· AVG· MAX COS/PROROS· IN· CENDIO· CONSVMTV· RE/ STAVRAVERVNT :

5) *Funerary Stele to Gladiator Marcus Antonius Exochus*

The inscription refers to a funerary stele of a gladiator found in Rome. According to Signorili, this stele was located in the house of the Arcioni on the Quirinal Hill in the early fifteenth century.¹⁴² Later Andrea Bregno acquired it, and by the second half of the sixteenth century it was on display in a house near the Torre delle Milizie. It was at this time that many Renaissance artists copied both the relief and its associated inscription.¹⁴³ Surprisingly, Francesco di Giorgio's drawing suggests no knowledge of the accompanying relief, which depicted a semi-nude, bearded gladiator holding a victory palm in his left hand, along with a griffin, a crooked sica sword, and a shield decorated with the symbol of Alexandria (fig. 3). The Yale drawing instead portrays two men in cuirasses, one of which holds a book. In their dress, both men resemble Francesco di Giorgio's painting of Scipio Africanus now in the Bargello, as well as late-antique statuary and relief sculp-

ture.¹⁴⁴ The figures in the drawing also stand in a shallow niche with flanking columns and a shell that recalls late-antique ivories, such as the Querini diptych in Brescia. The same niche is also used in the drawing on the verso (Y.6) as well as in the Houfe reconstruction of the Porta Marina in Zadar (H.27).

Like the other drawings in the album, the inscription on the monument was transcribed from a fifteenth-century sylloge rather than the monument itself. It is also noteworthy that the Yale artist wrote »M· ANTONIVS· EXOCVS· T· M· R« rather than »T· H· R« as found in all known representations of the stele and the original Signorili transcription. The only fifteenth-century sylloge with this same mistake is a manuscript in Berlin linked to Cyriac of Ancona.¹⁴⁵ As the Berlin manuscript replaces VIII· FIMBRIAM· LIB· with HONO, it is impossible that the Yale inscription derives directly from this manuscript. Nonetheless, the artist must have copied another early sylloge in which EXOCVS had yet to be corrected to EXOCHUS.¹⁴⁶

Comparanda: Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, WA2003.Douce.4840

CensusID: 157304

Signorili CIL: 25

CIL: VI.10194

Yale inscription:

M· ANTONIVS· EXOCVS· T· M· R

· M· ANTONIVS· EXOCVS· NAT· ALESXANDRINVS· ROM· / OB· TTV· MP· DIVI· TRAIANI·
DIE· II· CIRCVM· ARAXE CAE· / ST MISS· ROM· EIVSD· DIE· VIII· FIMBRIAM· LIB· VIII·
MISS ET· ROM· MVN· EIVSD

Ashmolean Inscription:

M· ANTONIVS· EXOCVS· T· M· R

M· ANTONIVS EXOCVS· NAT· ALEXANDRINVS ROM· OB· TTV / MP· DIVI TRAIANI DIE
· II· CIRCVM ARAXECAE· ST· MISS· R / OM· EIVSD· DIE· VIII· FIMBRIAM· LIB· VIII
· MISS· ET ROM· / MVN· EIVSD

6) *Statues of Constantine I and Constantine II*

Like on the recto of this sheet, this drawing represents two men set in a niche. The text below them refers to inscriptions found on the statues of Constantine I and Constantine II that now flank the Cordonata of the Campidoglio. Originally these statues stood in the Baths of Constantine on the Quirinal Hill, where presumably their inscriptions were copied by Signorili in the early fifteenth century. It is clear that the Yale drawing is only very loosely based on these statues. That said, the figure on the right does recall the statue of Constantine I in both its dress and physiognomy, and even holds a staff like the statue. Thus, it may in

fact have been partially modeled on the actual statue, or a similar one now at the Lateran. The right-hand figure in the Yale drawing also resembles Francesco di Giorgio's sketch of a Roman soldier in Saluzziano 148 and a similar drawing by him in the Uffizi.¹⁴⁷ The bearded figure crowned with a laurel wreath on the left, in contrast, more closely resembles a stoic philosopher rather than an emperor. It is also possible that this figure was inspired by the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius, which was believed to be the emperor Constantine in the fifteenth century and depicts a bearded emperor wearing a toga rather than a military uniform.

Comparanda: None

CensusID: 151732, 151741

Signorili CIL: 20

CIL: VI.1148, 1149, 1150

Yale inscription:

CONSTANTINVS· AVGVSTVS· · CONSTANTINVS· CAESAR·

7a) *Pons Fabricius*

This is the only drawing in the Yale Album found in both the Houfe Album and Codex Cholmondeley. All three drawings are very similar, though the piers in the Houfe drawing are unfinished. Likewise, the artist of the Codex Cholmondeley placed the two inscriptions in the attic storey rather than on the upper entablature as was done in the other two drawings. The inscriptions in the Houfe drawing, which is partially damaged, and the Cholmondeley drawing appear to be identical, while the Yale artist forgot several words and letters in the process of transcribing. All the drawings bear little resemblance to the actual bridge, which has a distinctive arched opening over the central pier, a feature universally found in other Renaissance representations of the monument.

Comparanda: Houfe Album, fol. 34a; Codex Cholmondeley, fol. 82a

CensusID: 152358

Signorili CIL: 27, 28

CIL: VI.1305a, 1305d

Yale inscription:

L· FABRICVS· C· F· VIAM· FACIENDĀ CVRAVIT

Q· LEPIDVS· M· OVIVS· M· P· COS· IIII

Houfe inscription:

L· FABRICIVS· C· F· CVR· VIAM· FACIVN/DVM· CVRAVIT

Q· LEPIDVS· M· F· M· [...] / P· COS· IIII

Cholmondeley inscription:

L· FABRICIVS· C· F· / CVR· VIAM· FACIVNDVM / CVRAVIT·

· Q· LEPIDVS· M· F· M· /OVIVS· M· P· / COS· IIII

7b) *Pons Aemilius*

This drawing represents the Pons Aemilius, better known today as the Ponte Rotto. The inscription commemorates the restoration of the bridge by Augustus and likely adorned an arch that once stood at the end of the bridge. As with the other bridges in the original corpus, this representation is unlike the actual ancient monument, which originally had six major arches flanked by pilasters and secondary arches set above the piers. Indeed, almost nothing in the drawing recalls the still partially extant monument besides the prominent round piers, which indirectly evoke the cutwaters of the south side of the bridge. Moreover, the drawing differs greatly from a sketch made by Francesco di Giorgio in his *Taccuino del Viaggio* (fig. 15).¹⁴⁸ It is clear from this small drawing labeled »ponte di santa maria« that Francesco not only knew this ancient bridge, but also drew it in person, even noting it had six arches.

Comparanda: Codex Cholmondeley, fol. 81b

CensusID: 152361

Signorili CIL: 1

CIL: VI.878

Yale inscription:

DIVS· AVG· PONT / MAXIMVS· EX· S· G· /· REFECIT·

Cholmondeley inscription:

· DIVVS· AVG· PO/NT· MAX· EX· /· S· C· REFECIT·

8a) *Pons Neronianus with inscription from a Hadrianic cippus found nearby*

By the fifteenth century, all that remained of the ancient Pons Neronianus were its piers, which are still partially visible today. Nonetheless, beginning with Signorili, an inscription found on a cippus located somewhere nearby became associated with this ancient bridge and was included by Francesco di Giorgio in his reconstruction of the structure. The inscription itself as transcribed in the Codex Cholmondeley, and less accurately in the Yale Album, cannot be directly linked to a specific sylloge. Its first half is significantly closer to the Signorili transcription, while its second half recalls that of Poggio Bracciolini.¹⁴⁹

Comparanda: Codex Cholmondeley, fol. 81a

CensusID: 152364

Signorili CIL: 17

CIL: VI.1240a

Yale inscription:

IMPER· CAESARIS· DIVI· TRAIAN· PRATICI· / DIVIS NERVAE NEPOTIS· TRA· ET· ADRI /
ANI· AVG· PONT· MAX· TRIB· PONT· V· / IMP· IIII· COS· III· DERESIVS· AMESIVS· RVSTIC·
V/S· CVRATOR ALVEI· ET· RIPARV̄· VETERI/ARVM· TIBERIS· ET· COLOCARVM· VRBIS· / R·
R· RESTITVIT· SECV· / PER ACEDENTEM· PRESIDENTER / MINATIONEM PROXIMI / C·
I· P· P· PED· CXV· S·

Cholmondeley inscription:

IMP· CAESARIS· DIVI TRAIANI PARTI/CI DIVI NAERVE NEPOTIS TRAIANI ET/ ADRI·
ANI AVG· PONT· MAX· TRIB· POT· V· / IMP· IIII· COS· III· DERESIVS· AMESIVS· RV/STICVS
CVRATOR ALVEI· ET· RIPARVM/ VETRIARVM TIBERIS· ET· CLOACARVM/ VRBIS· R· P·
RESTITVIT· SECV· PRAECID / ENTEM PRAESIDENTEM TERMINATIO/NEM PROXIMI·
C· I· P· P· PED· CXV· S·

8b) *Pons Cestius*

The two inscriptions included in this reconstruction still adorn the ancient Pons Cestius. The first of these is found on a panel at the center of the bridge and commemorates the rebuilding of the structure under the late-antique emperor Gratian. The other is inscribed on a pedestal flanking the other inscription and records the restoration of the bridge by Benedictus Carushom in the twelfth century. While the drawing in the Yale Album and its related copy in the Codex Cholmondeley (which lacks both inscriptions) have very little in common with the actual ancient bridge, the upper portion of the reconstruction does closely resemble the parapet on which the two inscriptions are still found today. Thus, despite the generic quality of the reconstruction, this drawing may be based in part on the ancient monument itself.

Comparanda: Codex Cholmondeley, fol. 82b

CensusID: 154983

Signorili CIL: 29, 30

CIL: VI.1175

Yale inscription:

DOMNIS NOSTRI· IMP· CAES· FL· VALENTIANVS· PIVS FELIX MAX· VICTOR AC· TRI·
VMPHAT· SEMPER AVG· / PONT· MAX· GERMANCE· MAX· ALAMANIC· MAX· FRANC·
MAX· CONTHICI· MAX· TRIB· POT· VII· IMP· VI· CON· II· P· P· P· ET· FL· / VALENS· PIVS·
FELIX· MAX· VICTOR· AC· TRIVNF· SEMPER· AVG· PONT· MAX· GERMANIC· MAX·
FRANC· MAX· CONTHIC / TRIB· PONT· VII· IMP· VII· COS· II· P· P· P· ET· EL· GRATIANVS·
PIVS· FELIX· MAX· VICTOR ACTRIVM· SEMPER / AVG· PONT· MAX· GERMANIC· MAX·
ALAMNN· FRANC· MAX· CONTIC· MAX· TRIB· POT· III· IMP· II· COS· IIII· / PRIMV̄· P· P·
P· PONTEM· FELICIS· NOMINIS· GRATIAM· IN· SVVM· SENATVS AC POPVLI· ROMANI
CONSTVI / DEDICARI· QVE· IVSERVNT·

BE BENEDITVS· ALME· VRBIS· SENATOR· ILLVSTRIS· RESTAVRARI· HVNC· PONTEM·
FERE· DIRVPTVM·

9) *Monument to Julius Caesar*

This cryptic drawing depicts what appears to be a conical monument set atop four sphinxes, two of which are fully visible. A cylindrical base supports the monument and is decorated with a bird and two putti holding garlands loosely recalling the base of the Column of Trajan as well as Renaissance tombs such as Jacopo della Quercia's monument for Ilaria del Carretto. An orb set atop a tripod crowns the monument, the upper part of which is also adorned with a linear pattern, possibly representing two types of fluting or a sundial. The monument is also inscribed PATERTERA and in Greek ΠΑΤΕΡΤΕΡΑ. This same strange Latin inscription is also found in many fifteenth-century sylloges. According to Signorili, the original inscription was written in Greek and is analogous to the Latin PATER PATRIAE. He further notes that it came from the tomb of Julius Caesar and is found in a place called »lo Perso«, a mithraeum located below the church of S. Maria in Aracoeli on the Capitoline Hill.¹⁵⁰ In other copies, the inscription is simply described as being associated with the tomb (»sepulcro«) of Caesar.

Confronted with this unknown Greek inscription, fifteenth-century antiquarians beginning with Signorili seem to have associated it with a passage from »The Life of Julius Caesar« by Suetonius. In this work, the ancient author describes an almost twenty foot high column of giallo antico erected in the Forum dedicated to Julius Caesar after his assassination and inscribed PARENTI PATRIAE.¹⁵¹ According to Cicero, within six weeks of its construction, the monument was destroyed and the area paved over by order of the consul Dolabella. While other ancient sources also mention the presence of an altar, and possibly a mound, little else is known about this monument that preceded the Temple of Caesar.¹⁵²

Francesco di Giorgio based his reconstruction largely on information from a fifteenth-century sylloge. It is also significant that the drawing includes the Greek transcription as only some sylloges note that the original inscription was not in Latin; Giovanni Marcanova for example omits this detail completely.¹⁵³ Furthermore, only the early sixteenth-century sylloges of Andrea Alciato and Johannes Choler similarly transliterate the inscription into Greek, albeit in the slightly different form ΠΑΤΗΡΤΕΡΑ.¹⁵⁴

As the drawings in the Yale Album and Codex Cholmondeley demonstrate, rather than depicting an honorific column, Francesco di Giorgio imagined this funerary monument as a cenotaph that combines elements from both his

reconstruction of the Pyramid of Cestius (Y.10) and the Vatican Obelisk (C.114). At the same time, he must have also known the conical Meta Sudans that stood in front of the Arch of Constantine. A similar conical monument now identified as the Umbilicus Urbis Romae also once stood in the Roman Forum.¹⁵⁵ While this ancient monument was largely unknown in the Renaissance, the nearby Milliarium Aureum was often mentioned in early guides to the city, and occasionally described as either a column or a meta.¹⁵⁶ Pietro Cataneo in his architectural treatise of 1554 even describes it as a »colonna meta«. ¹⁵⁷ Francesco di Giorgio in the first version of his treatise similarly labels an obelisk or pyramid as »cholonna piramidale«. ¹⁵⁸ While there are no known Renaissance representations of the Milliarium Aureum, a conical obelisk-column flanked by the palaces of Cicero and Crassus was drawn in the Modena copy of the Marcantonia sylloge. ¹⁵⁹ Giuliano da Sangallo topped his reconstruction of the arch at Malborghetto with a conical pyramid and similarly depicted numerous conical structures atop his drawing of the Tomb of the Horatii on the Via Appia. ¹⁶⁰ Francesco di Giorgio's reconstruction is thus best understood as another hybrid invention that incorporates archeological details and antiquarian references in an attempt to visualize a monument about which he knew almost nothing.

Comparanda: Codex Cholmondeley, fol. 116; Kassel, Museumslandschaft Hessen-Kassel, Schloss Wilhelmshöhe, Graphische Sammlung, inv. Fol. A45, Kassel Codex, fol. 37v

CensusID: 204358

Signorili CIL: 43

CIL: VI.719

Yale inscription:

PATERTERA· ΠΑΤΕΡΤΕΡΑ

Cholmondeley inscription:

· PATERTERA· ΠΑΤΕΡΤΕΡΑ·

10) *Pyramid of Cestius*

According to its two inscriptions, this drawing depicts the Pyramid of Cestius located next to the Porta San Paolo in Rome. Known as the Meta Remi in the Middle Ages, it was long thought to be a funerary monument to Remus. Yet whereas the still extant structure is a simple pyramid faced with white marble, the Yale drawing depicts a pyramidal monument crowned by a nude figure with a sword and shield set atop four sphinxes and an elaborate base that recalls Renaissance tombs such as Verrocchio's monument to Piero de Medici. Furthermore,

instead of placing both inscriptions directly on the pyramid itself, Francesco di Giorgio relocated one of these inside a tabula ansata on the base below. By setting the monument on four sphinxes, he also alluded to the Vatican Obelisk, which according to the medieval »Mirabilia Urbis Romae« stood atop four bronze lions, and the Capitoline obelisk, which was supported by four marble lions carved by the Cosmati in the thirteenth century.¹⁶¹ This conflation of pyramid and obelisk was not uncommon in the Renaissance. Both were referred to by the Latin word »meta« (which could also mean »cone«), and were often interchangeable. Francesco di Giorgio, for example, drew machines that could lift both obelisks and pyramids. Yet at the same time, since the Pyramid of Cestius was still well preserved in the Renaissance, no other artist felt the need to dramatically reconstruct it in this manner.¹⁶² Still, many representations of the monument, including the illustration in Michele Ferrarini's sylloge (fig. 4), represent the pyramid with a missing top.¹⁶³ This lacuna thus may have suggested to some that a triumphant statue of the deceased crowned the pyramid.

Comparanda: None

CensusID: 150957

Signorili CIL: 50

CIL: VI.1374

Yale inscription:

OPVS ABSOLVTVM / EX TESTAMENTO / DIEBVS CCCXXV / ARBITRATV

PONTI· P· F CIAME LE· HERE / DIS· HI· L· G· CESTIVS· L· F· POB / EPVLO· PR· TR· PL· VII·

VIR· EPVLO / NVM

11 & 12) *Ancient Roman Ships*

The final drawings in the Yale Album depict four Roman ships. One of these, the liburna (Y.12a) – a massive warship propelled by paddlewheels and powered by oxen – derives from an illustration found in the late-antique military treatise »De rebus bellicis« (fig. 16).¹⁶⁴ The earliest illustrated copy of this text is conserved today at the Bodleian Library. According to its colophon, this manuscript was copied specifically for Bishop Pietro Donato during the Council of Basel in 1436 from the Carolingian Codex Spirensis. While only a single folio of this earlier manuscript now survives, scholars have suggested that the images found in the Oxford copy, and a slightly later manuscript in Paris, are relatively faithful to the original.¹⁶⁵ The drawing in the Yale album closely replicates almost all of the elements found in the Bodleian illumination, with

the exception of the six oxen. Yet even though these animals are omitted, their attached ropes were retained and transformed into a small railing.

No other sea vessels are discussed or illustrated in surviving copies of »De rebus bellicis«. Therefore, the other three ships found in the Yale album likely derive from another source. In fact, all of them contain elements found on an ancient frieze conserved in the Capitoline Museums that was located in the church of S. Lorenzo fuori le mura during the Renaissance. This frieze, which originally adorned an unknown Augustan monument, features a series of sacrificial instruments and naval trophies, specifically ship prows, anchors, oars, acrostolia, and aplustre (fig. 17).¹⁶⁶ While some of these elements are generic, the figures on two of the prows – a wolf head accompanied by a triton and a boar head next to a seahorse – closely match those found in the Yale drawings of the bireme (Y.11b) and quadrireme (Y.12b) respectively. Thus, it is likely that through a process of assemblage, an unknown fifteenth-century artist recombined these various parts to produce three additional types of warships. These distinct variations, which were illustrated alongside the liburna, are labeled in at least two sets as a quinquereme, bireme, and quadrireme (these identifications are also used here). Giuliano da Sangallo around the end of the fifteenth century produced the first of these labeled copies. Shortly afterward, another artist drew the same set of ships in the *Codex Escorialensis*. As Hülsen and Nesselrath have noted, both of these sets derive from lost originals, which also likely served as the model for two later copies now in the Houthakker collection.¹⁶⁷ Another group of copies are conserved in an album of drawings in the Vatican, one of the many versions of Francesco di Giorgio's »Opusculum de architectura«. ¹⁶⁸ Likely produced in the 1490s, the drawings in this album, including those of Roman ships, served as models for a series of reliefs known as the »Art of War Frieze« carved by Ambrogio Barocci for the exterior of the Palazzo Ducale in Urbino.¹⁶⁹ One of these drawings was also copied into the contemporaneous *Codex Santini* still in Urbino.¹⁷⁰

The origin of these drawings has never been fully explored. Luca Leoncini in his article on the afterlife of the S. Lorenzo frieze, for example, only briefly discusses them. Despite this omission, he did catalogue all known Renaissance drawings of the frieze, the earliest of which are found in the Saluzziano 148 addendum.¹⁷¹ Therefore it is quite possible that it was Francesco di Giorgio who first recombined elements from the S. Lorenzo frieze to create a series of ancient ships just as he reconstructed ancient Roman monuments by assembling various fragments into hybrid compositions. This process of composi-

tion clearly drew on the model of the *liburna* found in a copy of »De rebus bellicis«. It may have also copied imagery found on other ancient reliefs, such as the Column of Trajan, or even Roman coins.¹⁷² The quinquereme drawing especially resembles a ship with sailors manning the rigging and lowering the sail found on the funerary monument of Munatius Faustus and his wife Naevoleia Tyche in Pompeii.

Although Francesco di Giorgio's authorship is impossible to confirm, similar drawings must have been circulating in his workshop when they were copied into the Vatican copy of his »Opusculum de architectura«. While these four drawings differ significantly from other copies, they do share some important similarities with the Yale drawings. Specifically, the Vatican drawing of the quinquereme and the later »Art of War« panel (fig. 9) depict the mast, sail, and steering mechanism of the ship. These details were omitted in all the other copies except for the Yale drawing (Y.11a). There are certainly many differences between these two drawings – most notably the Yale drawing depicts four figures, two of which are raising the sail of the ship – yet it is clear from their similarities that both drawings derive from the same lost original which featured an ancient ship complete with its mast, sail, rigging, and even steering oar handles.

11a) *Quinquereme*

Comparanda: Urbino, Palazzo Ducale, Art of War Frieze, Cat. 19; Vatican City, BAV, Vat. Urb. Lat. 1397, fol. 18r; Vatican City, BAV, Barb. Lat. 4424, Codex Barberini, fol. 35r; El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo, 28-II-12, Codex Escorialensis, fol. 67v; Amsterdam, Collection of Lodewijk Houthakker.

11b) *Bireme*

Comparanda: Urbino, Palazzo Ducale, Art of War Frieze, Cat. 46; Vatican City, BAV, Vat. Urb. Lat. 1397, fol. 2v; Urbino, Codex Santini, fol. 64v; Vatican City, BAV, Barb. Lat. 4424, Codex Barberini, fol. 35r; El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo, 28-II-12, Codex Escorialensis, fol. 68r; Siena, Biblioteca comunale degli Intronati, S.IV.7, fol. 57v

12a) *Liburna*

Comparanda: Urbino, Palazzo Ducale, Art of War Frieze, Cat. 65; Vatican City, BAV, Vat. Urb. Lat. 1397, fol. 19v; Vatican City, BAV, Barb. Lat. 4424, Codex Barberini, fol. 35r; El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo, 28-II-12, Codex Escorialensis, fol. 67r
»De rebus bellicis« copies: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Canon. Misc. 378, fol. 75v; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département des manuscrits, Latin 9661, fol. 61r; Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, CLM 10291, fol. 75v, 175v; Notitia Utraque Cum Orientis, Basel 1552, pp. R 2 recto

12b) *Quadrireme*

Comparanda: Urbino, Palazzo Ducale, Art of War Frieze, Cat. 42; Vatican City, BAV, Vat. Urb. Lat. 1397, fol. 1r; Vatican City, BAV, Barb. Lat. 4424, Codex Barberini, fol. 35r; El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo, 28-II-12, Codex Escorialensis, fol. 66v; Siena, Biblioteca comunale degli Intronati, S.IV.7, fol. 60v; Amsterdam, Collection of Lodewijk Houthakker.

APPENDIX 2: CONCORDANCES

- Y: Yale Album – New Haven, Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection, Mil Mss (4to flat)
 H: Houfe Album – private collection
 C: Codex Cholmondeley – private collection
 W: Windsor, Royal Library, RL 19255r and v
 A: Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, WA2003.Douce.4840 and 4841

Signorili inscriptions and drawings

Signorili CIL	Drawings	Monument Associated with Inscription	CIL	Monument CensusID
1	Y.7b, C.81b	Pons Aemilius	VI.878	152361
2	H.5	Arch of Titus	VI.945	150958
3	H.28	Arch of Septimius Severus	VI.1033	150940
4	H.3	Arch of the Argentarii	VI.1035	150975
5	H.31	Arch of Constantine	VI.1139	150908
6	H.7? (no inscrip.)	Arch of Gallienus	VI.1106	151814
7	H.19	Arch of Lentulus and Crispinus (Houfe drawing of Arch of Janus Quadrifrons)	VI.1385	155275 (150969)
8	H.8	Porta Maggiore	VI.1256	152623
9	H.8	Porta Maggiore	VI.1257	152623
10	H.8	Porta Maggiore	VI.1258	152623
11	H.14, C.77	Aqua Claudia (Arcus Neroniani)	VI.1259	152772
12	—————	Porta Tiburtina (repairs to the Aqua Marcia)	VI.1246	152634
13	H.14, C.77	Porta Tiburtina (repairs to all aqueducts)	VI.1244	152634
14	H.13, C.78	Aqua Virgo	VI.1252	155673
15	—————	Porta Tiburtina (repairs to the Aqua Marcia)	VI.1245	152634
16	H.20	Porta Portuensis	VI.1188	152627
17	Y.8a, C.81a	Pons Neronianus (Hadrianic Cippus found nearby)	VI.1240a	152364
18	H.38, Y.3	Temple of Saturn	VI.937	151320
19	Y.4	Porticus of Octavia	VI.1034	150992
20	Y.6	Statues of Constantine I and Constantine II	VI.1148, 1149, 1150	151732, 151741
21	—————	Pantheon	VI.896	150770
22	—————	Pantheon	VI.896	150770
23	—————	Temple of Antoninus and Faustina	VI.1004	151328
24	H.36	Temple of Minerva	VI.953	151930
25	Y.5, A.1b	Funerary Stele to the Gladiator Marcus Antonius Exochus	VI.10194	157304
26	—————	Statue in the Roman Forum (restored by Castalius Innocentius Audax)	VI.1663	—————

Signorili CIL	Drawings	Monument Associated with Inscription	CIL	Monument CensusID
27	H.34a, Y.7a, C.82a	Pons Fabricius	VI.1305a	152358
28	H.34a, Y.7a, C.82a	Pons Fabricius	VI.1305d	152358
29	Y.8b, C.82b (no inscrip.)	Pons Cesitius	VI.1175	154983
30	Y.8b, C.82b (no inscrip.)	Pons Cesitius (medieval inscription)	—————	154983
31	H.34c, C.83a	Pons Mammeus	VI.1199b	161003
32	H.42	Column of Trajan	VI.960	151057
33	—————	Mausoleum of Hadrian	VI.984	151259
34	—————	Mausoleum of Hadrian	VI.986	151259
35	—————	Mausoleum of Hadrian	VI.992	151259
36	—————	Mausoleum of Hadrian	VI.991	151259
37	—————	Mausoleum of Hadrian	VI.985	151259
38	H.1	Elogium of Q. Fabius Maximus	I.Elogia.29; XI.1828	—————
39	H.1	Elogium of Gaius Marius	I.Elogia.33; XI.1831	—————
40	—————	Inscription commemorating Septimius Severus	—————	—————
41	—————	Inscription to L. Aurelio Commodo	—————	—————
42	—————	Inscription to M. Ulpio	—————	—————
43	Y.9, C.116	Monument to Julius Caesar	VI.719	204358
44	C.114	Vatican Obelisk	VI.882	151080
45	C.114	Vatican Obelisk	VI.882	151080
46	W.1, C.117, W.2	Mausoleum of Augustus	VI.885	153433
47	W.2	Mausoleum of Augustus	VI.887	153433
48	W.2	Mausoleum of Augustus	VI.886	153433
49	W.2	Mausoleum of Augustus	VI.914	153433
50	Y.10	Pyramid of Cestius	VI.1374	150957
51	—————	Tomb of C. Publicius Bibulus	VI.1319	150879
52	—————	Inscription from near S. Nicola in Carcere	—————	—————
53	—————	Mausoleum of Augustus	VI.895	153433
54	H.55, C.115	Mausoleum of Caecilia Metella	VI.1274	150967
55	—————	Horsetamers	—————	150776
56	—————	Inscription near Porta Latina	—————	—————
57	—————	Carcer Mamertinus	VI.1539	155016
58	—————	Tomb of Marcia, the wife of Cato, derived from a description in Lucan	—————	—————
59	—————	Inscription to Trebellia T. Gymnasio	VI.27587	—————
60	C.112	Mithream near S. Susanna	VI.728	—————
61	W.2	Mausoleum of Augustus	VI.884	153433
62	H.2, Y.2	Calpurnius Tomb Monument	IX.4967	—————
<hr/>				
81	H.23	Arch of Trajan in Ancona	IX.5894	152219
82	H.23	Arch of Trajan in Ancona	IX.5894	152219

Drawings with inscription not in Signorili

Drawings	Monument Associated with Inscription	CIL	Monument CensusID	Other Transcriptions
H.18, C.72	Arch of Augustus in Fano	XI.6218, 6219	152475	Cyriac, Marcanova, Ferrarini, Fra Giocondo
H.19	Unknown, from the portico of S. Giorgio in Velabro (House drawing of Arch of Janus Quadrifrons)	VI.Falsa.1q	————	Ferrarini, Cholier, Giraldi
H.27	Porta Marina in Zadar	III.2922	————	Cyriac, Ferrarini, Fra Giocondo
H.34b, C.83b	Bridge of Diocletian over the Metauro River in San Lazzaro di Fossombrone	XI.6623	————	Fra Giocondo, Alciato, Cholier, Giraldi,
H.42	Column of Trajan	VI.Einsiedeln 13, Poggio 86	151057	Einsiedeln, Poggio, Cyriac, Alciato, Cholier
H.42	Column of Trajan	VI.967	151057	Einsiedeln, Poggio, Cyriac, Marcanova, Ferrarini, Fra Giocondo, Alciato, Cholier
H.46a	Inscription to C. Aninius Gallus, from Città di Castello	XI.5935	————	Marcanova, Ferrarini, Fra Giocondo
H.46b	Inscription to Empress Faustina Minor, from Città di Castello	XI.5932	————	Fra Giocondo
A.1a	Inscription to Tifernia Sabina, from Città di Castello	XI.5940	————	Marcanova, Ferrarini, Fra Giocondo, Giraldi
A.2a	Inscription to Lutatia Frugifera, from Città di Castello	XI.5947	————	Pietro Stefanoni
A.2b	Inscription to Rubria Daphne, from Ostia	XIV.1554	————	Battista Brunelleschi

Identifiable drawings without inscriptions

Drawing	Monument Associated with Inscription	Monument CensusID
H.22	Arch of Portugal	150900
H.24	Arch of Marcus Aurelius?	151650
Y.11a	Roman Ship (Quinquereme)	_____
Y.11b	Roman Ship (Bireme)	_____
Y.12a	Roman Ship (Liburna)	_____
Y.12b	Roman Ship (Quadrireme)	_____
C.113	Tomb of the Plautii in Tivoli	151312

Unidentifiable drawings

Drawing	Description of Monument Associated
H.7	Triumphal Arch (possibly Arch of Gallienus)
H.9	Triumphal Arch
H.11	Triumphal Arch
H.16, Y.1	Triumphal Arch
H.17	Triumphal Arch
C.106	Temple

APPENDIX 3: THE RECONSTRUCTED CORPUS

The following drawings form the corpus of reconstructions discussed in this article. All monuments are located in Rome unless otherwise noted. Not included in this appendix are associated drawings of unidentified monuments and architectural ornament, with the exception of those found in the Yale Album. Drawings from the Codex Cholmondeley that are also found in the other albums have also been omitted. The numeration for the Houfe and Cholmondeley drawings references their folio numbers.

Y.1 Unidentified Triumphal Arch

Y.2 Calpurnius Tomb Monument, Fara in Sabina

68 MICHAEL J. WATERS

Y.3 Temple of Saturn

Y.4 Porticus of Octavia

Y.5 Funerary Stele to Gladiator Marcus Antonius Exocbus

Y.6 Statues of Constantine I and Constantine II

Y.7 Pons Fabricius; Pons Aemilius

Y.8 Pons Neronianus; Pons Cestius

74 MICHAEL J. WATERS

Y.9 Monument to Julius Caesar

Y.10 Pyramid of Cestius

76 MICHAEL J. WATERS

Y.II Ancient Roman Ships

Y.12 Ancient Roman Ships

78 MICHAEL J. WATERS

A.1 Statue of Tifernia Sabina (inscription from Città di Castello); Funerary Stele to Gladiator Marcus Antonius Exochus

A.2 Statue of Lutatia Frugifera (inscription from Città di Castello); Statue of Rubria Daphne (inscription from Ostia)

*H.1 Elegia of Q. Fabius Maximus and Gaius
Marinus*

*H.2 Calpurnius Tomb Monument, Fara in
Sabina*

H.3 Arch of the Argentarii

H.5 Arch of Titus

H.8 Porta Maggiore

H.13 Aqua Virgo

*H.14 Arcus Neroniani of the Aqua Claudia (with
additional inscription from Porta Tiburtina)*

H.18 Arch of Augustus, Fano

H.19 Arch of Janus Quadrifrons (with inscriptions from S. Giorgio in Velabro and Arch of Lentulus and Crispinus)

H.20 Porta Portuensis

H.22 Arco di Portogallo

H.23 Arch of Trajan, Ancona

H. 24 Arch of Marcus Aurelius (?)

H.27 Porta Marina, Zadar

H.28 Arch of Septimius Severus

H.31 Arch of Constantine

H.34 Pons Fabricius; Bridge of Diocletian, H.36 Temple of Minerva
S. Lazzaro di Fossombrone; Pons Mammeus

H.39 Temple of Saturn

H.42 Column of Trajan

*H.46 Statues of C. Aninus Gallus and Empress
Faustina Minor (with inscriptions from Città di
Castello)*

H.55 Mausoleum of Caecilia Metella

C.112 Mithraeum near S. Susanna

C.113 Tomb of the Plautii, Tivoli

C.114 Vatican Obelisk

W.1 Mausoleum of Augustus

*W.2 Mausoleum of Augustus (possibly intended
to represent the Mausoleum of Hadrian)*

NOTES

I would like to thank Howard Burns and Ian Campbell for discussing these drawings at length with me. Thank you also to Seth Bernard, Nathaniel Jones, Nicholas Herman and Emily Morash. I am extremely grateful to Arnold Nesselrath for his initial interest, subsequent insight, and continual encouragement. This article builds greatly upon his prodigious work on this subject. An abridged version of this research was presented at the *Census Study Day* »Zeichnungen nach antiker Architektur im Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe degli Uffizi« and is much improved thanks to the comments of the participants. Finally, this article is dedicated to Richard Betts who first introduced me to Renaissance architecture and the work of Francesco di Giorgio.

- 1 New Haven, Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection, Mil Mss (4to flat). The manuscript is bound in an eighteenth-century English marbled calf binding with gilt ornaments. The sheets of the treatise measure 43 × 28 centimeters. The collation is as follows: A–E¹⁰, F⁸, G¹⁰, H⁸, J¹⁰, K³ plus six folios of drawings. On the chronology of Francesco di Giorgio's architectural treatise and the distinctions between the first and second version, see Massimo Mussini: *La trattatistica di Francesco di Giorgio. un problema critico aperto*, in: Francesco di Giorgio architetto, ed. by Francesco Paolo Fiore, Manfredo Tafuri, Milan 1993, pp. 358–379; Massimo Mussini: *Francesco di Giorgio e Vitruvio. Le traduzioni del »De architectura« nei Codici Zichy, Spencer 129 e Magliabechiano II.I.141, Mantua 2003.*
- 2 Gustina Scaglia: *Francesco di Giorgio. Checklist and History of Manuscripts and Drawings in Autographs and Copies from ca. 1470 to 1687 and Renewed Copies (1764–1839)*, Bethlehem 1992.
- 3 The uppercase lettering throughout the treatise closely resembles the inscriptions in some of the drawings at the end of the treatise, but this is not conclusive evidence.
- 4 A mid-sixteenth-century copy of this treatise at the New York Public Library (Spencer 181), for example, does not copy several captions, especially those associated with ground plans for palaces. Most of these spelling changes involve the addition of an extra letter, such as l or h in words like *sallotto*, *salla*, *cortille*, *collonna*, *chollona*, and *achroteria*.
- 5 The watermark of an anchor in a circle matches Briquet 475, which was produced in the early sixteenth century.
- 6 Nicolas Schwed: *Roman Ruins and Antiquities*, in: *Valuable Architecture, Atlases, and Natural History Books*, 30 October 1996, Christie's London, London 1996, pp. 94–97, lot 149.
- 7 Arnold Nesselrath: *aedificiorum antiquae urbis monumenta quaedam e ruinis excerpta*, in: *Hochrenaissance im Vatikan. Kunst und Kultur im Rom der Päpste 1503–1534*, exhibition catalogue Bonn, ed. by Petra Kruse, Ostfildern-Ruit 1999, pp. 571–572, no. 367; Arnold Nesselrath: *Il Codice Cholmondeley*, in: *Palladio, 1508–2008*, ed. by Franco Barbieri, Donata Battilotti, Venice 2008, pp. 140–143; Arnold Nesselrath: *Der Zeichner und sein Buch. Die Darstellung der antiken Architektur im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert*, Ruppolding/Mainz 2014, (Cyriacus. Studien zur Rezeption der Antike 5), pp. 133–141.
- 8 The album was previously owned by Simon Houfe who inherited it from his grandfather Sir Albert Richardson. On the Houfe Album, see Arnold Nesselrath: *I libri di disegni di antichità. Tentativo di una tipologia*, in: *Memoria dell'antico nell'arte italiana*, ed. by Salvatore Settis, 3 vols., Turin 1986, vol. 3, pp. 87–147, here pp. 103–104; Gustina Scaglia: *Drawings of Roman Antiquities in the Metropolitan Museum of Art and in the Album Houfe*, Amptill, in: *Annali di architettura* 4–5 (1992–93), pp. 9–21; Arnold Nesselrath:

- Disegni di Francesco di Giorgio Martini, in: Francesco di Giorgio alla Corte di Federico da Montefeltro, ed. by Francesco Paolo Fiore, 2 vols., Florence 2004, vol. 1, pp. 337–367; Arnold Nesselrath: Codice con 51 fogli di calchi da disegni, in: La Roma di Leon Battista Alberti. umanisti, architetti e artisti alla scoperta dell'antico nella città del Quattrocento, exhibition catalogue Rome, ed. by Francesco Paolo Fiore, Arnold Nesselrath, Milan 2005, pp. 256–257, no. II.9.5; Nesselrath 2014 (note 7), pp. 77–107.
- 9 Nesselrath 2004 (note 8), p. 350; Nesselrath 2014 (note 7), p. 87.
 - 10 Houfe Album, fol. 55; Codex Cholmondeley, fol. 115.
 - 11 See Appendix 1, no. 3.
 - 12 Windsor, Royal Library, RL 19255r and v; Ian Campbell: Ancient Roman Topography and Architecture, 3 vols., London 2004 (The Paper Museum of Cassiano dal Pozzo, Series A, Part IX), vol. 1, pp. 80–85, nos 3–4.
 - 13 Codex Cholmondeley, fol. 117; Nesselrath 2014 (note 7), fig. 149.
 - 14 Siena, Biblioteca Comunale degli Intronati, S.IV.1, fol. 7; Lille, Musée des Beaux Arts, Lille Sketchbook, Pluchart 749; Antonio Labacco: Libro appartenente a l'architettura, Rome 1559, pl. 6.
 - 15 On the fifteenth-century sylloge tradition, see Wilhelm Henzen, et al.: Corpus Inscriptio-num Latinarum. Inscriptiones urbis Romae latinae, Berlin 1876, vol. VI.1, pp. i–xlvii; Ida Calabi Limentani: Primi orientamenti per una storia dell'epigrafia Latina classica, in: Acme 19 (1966), pp. 155–219, here pp. 157–164; Roberto Weiss: The Renaissance discovery of classical antiquity, Oxford 1969, pp. 145–166; William Stenhouse: Reading inscriptions and writing ancient history. Historical scholarship in the late Renaissance, London 2005, pp. 21–41.
 - 16 Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. Lat. 1952, fol. 170r–175v; Marco Buono-core: Tra i codici epigrafici della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Faenza 2004, pp. 106–107. Signorili's authorship of this earliest sylloge has been questioned by Kajanto and Stenhouse, but this remains largely conjecture, along with their attribution of these early sylloges to Poggio Bracciolini; Iiro Kajanto: Poggio Bracciolini and Classical Epigraphy, in: Arctos. Acta Philologica Fennica 19 (1985), pp. 19–40, here p. 21; Stenhouse 2005 (note 15), p. 21, note 3. A manuscript in the British Library (Add. 34758), dated palaeographically to the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century, contains a folio with ten inscriptions also found in Barb. Lat. 1952, suggesting Signorili may have used an earlier source when compiling his sylloge; Marco Petoletti: Nuove testimonianze sulla fortuna di epigrafi classiche latine all'inizio dell'Umanesimo (con una nota sul giurista Papiniano e CIL, VI/5, n. II), in: Italia medioevale e umanistica 44 (2003), pp. 1–26.
 - 17 There are several surviving copies of this sylloge. The earliest is Subiaco, Biblioteca del Monumento Nazionale di Santa Scolastica, Archivio Colonna II. A. 50, followed by Vatican City, BAV, Vat. Lat. 10687, fol. 10r–30v; Chig. I. VI. 204; Chig. I. V. 168, fol. 1r–22v. A later redaction is found in Vatican City, BAV, Ottob. Lat. 2970, fol. 1r–28v; Vat. Lat. 3851. For transcriptions, see Giovanni Battista de Rossi: Le prime raccolte d'antiche iscrizioni compilate in Roma tra il finire del secolo XIV e il cominciare del XV, Rome 1852; Henzen 1876 (note 15), vol. VI.1, pp. xv–xxvii; Roberto Valentini, Giuseppe Zucchetti: Codice topografico della città di Roma, 4 vols., Rome 1940–53, vol. 4, pp. 151–208.
 - 18 The inscriptions in the Yale Album contain more errors. See Appendix 1 for differences, especially no. 2.
 - 19 Vatican City, BAV, Barb. Lat. 1952, fol. 173r; Vat. Lat. 10687, fol. 14r; see note 143 for representations.

- 20 Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Codex Hamilton 254, fol. 58r; Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, MS lat qu 432, fol. 62v; Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, 1191, fol. 82r; Reggio Emilia, Biblioteca Panizzi, C398, fol. 16v; Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Hs 1 K 9, fol. 93v.
- 21 Bern, Burgerbibliothek, B 42, fol. 57r; Modena, Biblioteca Estense Universitaria, ms. Lat. 992, fol. 60v. Similarly in the Yale and Houfe Albums, part of the inscription of the Calpurnius monument is transcribed APOLINARIA· P· P· ARITORI, copying the transcription made by Signorili. Marcanova, on the other hand, corrects this inscription, first in the Bern sylloge as APOLINARI· A· APPARITORI, then in later redactions as the more correct APO-LINARIA· APPARITORI; Henzen 1876 (note 15), vol. VI.1, pp. xxv, no. 62; Bern, Burgerbibliothek, B 42, fol. 63r; Modena, Biblioteca Estense Universitaria, ms. Lat. 992, fol. 63v.
- 22 Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare, ms 270, fol. 14r; Vatican City, BAV, Vat. Lat. 10546, fol. 90r; Jacopo Mazzocchi: Epigrammata antiquae urbis, Rome 1521, fol. 52v.
- 23 Scaglia 1992–93 (note 8), p. 16. On the source of Mazzocchi's sylloge, see Stenhouse 2005 (note 15), p. 32.
- 24 According to Signorili, the inscription was found: »In quodam lapide marmoreo reperto in vineo Mancini prope s. Susannam«; De Rossi 1852 (note 17), p. 87.
- 25 Samuel Ball Platner, Thomas Ashby: A topographical dictionary of ancient Rome, London 1929, p. 40; Zacaria Mari: Arcus Lentuli et Crispini, in: Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae, ed. by Eva Margaretha Steinby, 6 vols., Rome 1993–2000, vol. 1, p. 97. Biondo Flavio describes the destruction of the arch; Biondo Flavio: Roma instaurata, 2 vols., Verona 1481, vol. 1, p. 20.
- 26 Florence, Uffizi, GDSU 1046 A; London, Royal Institute of British Architects, Codex Stosch (now Rootstein-Hopkins), fol. 2v; Ian Campbell, Arnold Nesselrath: The Codex Stosch: surveys of ancient buildings by Giovanni Battista da Sangallo, in: Pegasus. Berliner Beiträge zum Nachleben der Antike 8 (2006), pp. 9–90, here pp. 24, 48.
- 27 Edward W. Bodnar: Cyriacus of Ancona and Athens, Brussels 1960, pp. 20–22.
- 28 On the Arch of Fano, see Roberto Weiss: L'arco di Augusto a Fano nel rinascimento, in: Italia medioevale e umanistica 8 (1965), pp. 351–358; Nesselrath 1986 (note 8), pp. 102–104; Gunnar Brands: Der Augustusbogen von Fano und der Beginn des Architekturstudiums in der Renaissance, in: Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts 103 (1988), pp. 489–513.
- 29 The only record of this restoration is a now lost inscription dated 13 November, 1434, which was transcribed by Cyriac and exists in manuscripts in Modena, Vienna, and Wolfenbüttel: »DLIII OLYMPIADIS ANNO .II. PETRVS CRESIL .F. CRESIAVIVS .IAd. DIVINI .IVR. DOCT. AC.B. MAT. ET IADERT. PATRONI CRISONORII ECCLESIAE VENER. ABB. ARC. PLIR. TEMP. LAB. ET LONGA PA... MAIOR INCVR. OBSCVRE ATQVE INDIGN. OPRESS. PROPRIO SVMTV HODIE IDIB. NOVEMB. AD PRISTINAM SV. FACIEM SPLENDQ. RESTITVIT.« Bodnar 1960 (note 27), pp. 88–89; Alessandro Dudan: La Dalmazia nell'arte italiana. Venti secoli di civiltà, 2 vols., Milan 1921–22, vol. 1, p. 21. For expanded Latin inscription and Italian translation, see Vitaliano Brunelli: Storia della città di Zara. Dai tempi più remoti sino al 1409 compilata sulle fonti e integrata da tre capitoli sugli usi e costumi, Venice 1913, p. 127.
- 30 »Etenim eo duce alia inter civitatis egregia et memoratu dignissima vidi maritima prope moenia, insignem Meliae nobilissimae mulieris arcum, ubi tubicen ille aequorei numinis Τῦριτων mira fabrefactoris arte conspicitur, et consculptum quod habet epigramma ut nostrae dignum spectationis, quom nec vidisse semel satis esset, sed et pluries utique lectitare iuvasset, primorum in conspectu Liburnorum hominum de altissimis maiorum

- nostrorum meritis ad inextimabilem comparacionem incidimus»; James Hankins: Add. 13 (inedited), in: *Censimento dei codici dell'epistolario di Leonardo Bruni*, vol. 2: *Manoscritti delle biblioteche italiane e della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, ed. by Lucia Gualdo Rosa, Rome 2004, pp. 396–406, here pp. 397–398.
- 31 The image is missing from the Parma sylloge. Moroni in the seventeenth century also noted that his copy was lacking the original triton drawing: »Sed deest icon in originali«; Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, 1191, fol. 1r; Carlo Moroni: *Epigrammata reperta per Illyricum a Cyriaco Anconitano apud Liburniam*, Rome c. 1660, p. 1.
- 32 TRITON NEPTVNI TVBICEN / TPITON TOY ΠΟΞΙΑΔΩΝΟΣ ΣΑΛΠΥΤΞ; Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, 1191, fol. 1r; Moroni 1660 (note 31), p. 1.
- 33 Arnold Nesselrath: *The Venus Belvedere: An Episode in Restoration*, in: *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 50 (1987), pp. 205–214, here p. 214.
- 34 Antonella Trevisiol: *Fonti letterarie ed epigrafiche per la storia romana della provincia di Pesaro e Urbino*, Rome 1999, p. 124; Sabina Migani: *Il »Ponte di Diocleziano« in località San Lazzaro di Fossombrone*, in: *Atlante tematico di topografia antica*, vol. 3: *Opere di assetto territoriale ed urbano*, ed. by Lorenzo Quilici, Stefania Quilici Gigli, Rome 1995, pp. 131–138.
- 35 See Michael Koortbojian: *Fra Giovanni Giocondo and his Epigraphic Methods*, in: *Kölner Jahrbuch* 26 (1993), pp. 49–55.
- 36 Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare, ms 270, fol. 159r.
- 37 On imagery in sylloges, see Carlo Roberto Chiarlo: »Gli frammenti dilla sancta antiquitate«. *Studi antiquari e produzione delle immagini da Ciriaco d'Ancona a Francesco Colonna*, in: *Settis* 1986 (note 8), vol. 3, pp. 271–297; Christopher S. Wood: *Notation of visual information in the earliest archeological scholarship*, in: *Word & Image* 17 (2001), pp. 94–118.
- 38 Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Ms. Trotti 373; Remigio Sabbadini: *Ciriaco d'Ancona e la sua descrizione autografa del Peloponneso trasmessa da Leonardo Botta*, in: *Miscellanea Ceriani*, Milan 1910, pp. 183–247; Rossana Frigeri: *Commentaria in Codice miscellaneo*, in: *Fiore, Nesselrath* 2005 (note 8), pp. 326–327, no. III.4.1.
- 39 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Lat. 6128; Reggio Emilia, Biblioteca Panizzi, C398. On Ferrarini, see Claudio Franzoni, Alessandra Sarchi: *Entre peintures, archeologie et museographie. L'antiquarium de Michele Fabrizio Ferrarini*, in: *Revue de l'Art* 125 (1999), pp. 20–31; Xavier Espluga: *Michele Fabrizio Ferrarini*, in: *Epigraphica* 70 (2008), pp. 255–267.
- 40 Modena, Biblioteca Estense Universitaria, ms. Lat. 992; Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Ms. Nuovi acquisti 1174; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. 5825F; Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Library, Ms. Garrett 158. On Feliciano and Marcanova, see Christian Hülsen: *La Roma antica di Ciriaco d'Ancona*, Rome 1907; Chiarlo 1986 (note 37), pp. 280–289; Christiane Denker Nesselrath: *Anfiteatro con torneo cavalleresco*, in: *Fiore, Nesselrath* 2005 (note 8), p. 209, no. II.3.4; Sarah Cartwright: *The »Collectio Antiquitatum« of Giovanni Marcanova and the Quattrocento Antiquarian Sylloge*, PhD Dissertation, New York University 2007.
- 41 Florence, Biblioteca della Soprintendenza alle Gallerie di Firenze, ms. 7.1; Maria Elisa Micheli: *Un taccuino di un ignoto umanista del XV secolo*, in: *Xenia* 6 (1983), pp. 63–82; Arnold Nesselrath: *Monumenta Antiqua Romana. Ein illustrierter Rom-Traktat des Quattrocento*, in: *Antikenzeichnung und Antikenstudium in Renaissance und Frühbarock*, ed. by Richard Harprath, Henning Wrede, Mainz 1989, pp. 21–37, here pp. 22–23.

- 42 The antiquarian Battista Brunelleschi, in drawings that may derive from Mazzochi's illustrations or were copied from a shared source, did in some cases insert inscriptions into representations of monuments. Florence, Biblioteca Marucelliana, Cod. A.78.I, fol. 5r–8r; Antonio Giuliano: *La Roma di Battista Brunelleschi*, in: *Rendiconti dell'Accademia di archeologia, letteratura e belle arti di Napoli* 46 (1971), pp. 43–50; Arnold Nesselrath: *Il Codice Escurialense*, in: *Domenico Ghirlandaio. Atti del Convegno Internazionale*, Firenze, 16–18 ottobre 1994, ed. by Wolfram Prinz and Max Seidel, Florence 1996, pp. 175–198, here pp. 194–195; Nesselrath 2014 (note 7), pp. 157–158.
- 43 See Fritz Saxl: *Jacopo Bellini and Mantegna as Antiquarians*, in: *Id.: Lectures*, 2 vols., London 1957, vol. 1, pp. 150–160; Annegrit Schmitt: *Antikenkopien und künstlerische Selbsterwirklichung in der Frührenaissance. Jacopo Bellini auf den Spuren römischer Epitaphien*, in: *Harprath, Wrede* 1989 (note 41), pp. 1–20.
- 44 Chiarlo 1986 (note 37), pp. 280–287.
- 45 Paris, Musée du Louvre, Bellini Drawing Book, fol. 44–45; see Bernhard Degenhart, Annegrit Schmitt: *Jacopo Bellini, der Zeichnungsband des Louvre*, Munich 1984; Patricia Fortini Brown: *The Antiquarianism of Jacopo Bellini*, in: *Artibus et Historiae* 13 (1992), pp. 65–84.
- 46 Budapest, Fővárosi Szabó Ervin Könyvtár, Zichy Codex, fol. 13r, 29r, 38r, 49r, 58r, 62r, 70r, 92r, 97r, 133r, 135r, 136r, 147r, 150r, 167r. The end of the album (fol. 187r–190r) also features a short sylloge containing about thirty inscriptions. On the Zichy Codex, see Carolyn Kolb: *The Francesco di Giorgio Material in the Zichy Codex*, in: *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 47 (1988), pp. 132–159; Mussini 2003 (note 1).
- 47 Prague, Národní Muzeum, XVII A 6, Codex Chlumczansky; Vladimír Juřen: *Le Codex Chlumczansky. Un recueil d'inscriptions et de dessins du XVIe siècle*, in: *Monuments et mémoires de la Fondation Eugène Piot* 68 (1986), pp. 105–212; Vladimír Juřen: *Le Codex Chlumczansky. Addenda et corrigenda*, in: *Pegasus. Berliner Beiträge zum Nachleben der Antike* 15 (2013), pp. 53–91. An anonymous drawing at the Uffizi (GDSU 1689 Ar) similarly depicts ancient cornices with superimposed inscriptions. Juřen has proposed that this drawing, which he dates around 1500, is likely an earlier copy of the now lost source of the Codex Chlumczansky.
- 48 Codex Chlumczansky, fol. 15r.
- 49 Codex Chlumczansky, fol. 26r.
- 50 Vatican City, BAV, Barb. Lat. 4424, Codex Barberini, fol. 5r, 18v, 19v, 21r, 21v, 35v; Christian Hülsen: *Il libro di Giuliano da Sangallo: Codice Vaticano Barberiniano Latino 4424*, Vatican City 1910, pp. xxv, 10, 29–31.
- 51 On the Salzburg Codex, see Nesselrath 1989 (note 41), pp. 21–37; Birte Rubach: *Codex Salisburgensis*, in: *Fiore, Nesselrath* 2005 (note 8), p. 213, no. II.4.1; Cristina Fumarco: *»E molti ne aveva summa deletatione«. Architetture, spettacoli e feste romane nel racconto e nei disegni del Taccuino di Salisburgo*, in: *Arte lombarda* 167 (2013), pp. 52–80.
- 52 Salzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, Ital. M III 40, Salzburg Codex, fol. 15v.
- 53 Salzburg Codex, fol. 17r (Janus Quadrifrons), 20v (Vatican Obelisk).
- 54 Florence, Uffizi, GDSU 318 A–337 A; On these drawings, see Christoffer H. Ericsson: *Roman Architecture Expressed in Sketches by Francesco di Giorgio Martini*, Helsinki 1980; Scaglia 1992 (note 2), pp. 53–54; Howard Burns: *I disegni di Francesco di Giorgio agli Uffizi di Firenze*, in: *Francesco di Giorgio architetto*, exhibition catalogue Siena, ed. by Francesco Paolo Fiore, Manfredo Tafuri, Milan 1993, pp. 350–377.
- 55 The first inscription was taken from a statue base dedicated to Lucius Caesar possibly originally located at the Mausoleum of Augustus while the other was transcribed from an altar

- to Epaphroditos near the Mausoleum of Cecilia Metella. Florence, Uffizi, GDSU 326 Ar (CIL VI.895), 330 Ar, 334 Ar (CIL VI.2; VI.8439).
- 56 Turin, Biblioteca Reale, Ms Saluzziano 148, fol. 71r–100v; The addendum is reproduced in Francesco di Giorgio Martini: *Trattati di architettura ingegneria e arte militare*, ed. by Corrado Maltese, 2 vols., Milan 1967, vol. 1, pp. 275–289, pls 129–186. On the drawings in the addendum, see Nesselrath 1986 (note 8), pp. 108–109, 120–122; Hubertus Günther: *Das Studium der antiken Architektur in den Zeichnungen der Hochrenaissance*, Tübingen 1988, pp. 30–37; Scaglia 1992 (note 2), pp. 61–63; Howard Burns: »Restaurator delle ruine antiche«. *Tradizione e studio dell'antico nell'attività di Francesco di Giorgio*, in: Francesco di Giorgio architetto, ed. by Francesco Paolo Fiore, Manfredo Tafuri, Milan 1994, pp. 151–181, here pp. 164–173; Nesselrath 2004 (note 8); Francesco Paolo Fiore: *Trattati di architettura, addenda dei disegni di monumenti antichi*, in: Fiore, Nesselrath 2005 (note 8), pp. 255–256, no. II.9.1; Richard J. Betts: Francesco di Giorgio's Reconstruction of the Temple of Minerva in the Forum of Nerva, in: *Reconstructing Francesco di Giorgio Architect*, ed. by Berthold Hub, Angeliki Pollali, Frankfurt 2011, pp. 85–106; Nesselrath 2014 (note 7), pp. 75–94.
- 57 »Poi che l'antica città di Roma di Roma per li continovi assedioni et ghuerre cominciò a manchare e grandi hediftii spogliando e diruendo et in più parti ruinare in modo che al presente tucti manchati sonno. Unde mosso da huno aceso desiderio di volere quelle innovare, il che hessendo presso al fine in poco tempo in tucto spente verranno, sì per la vetustà loro ed anco per li molti et continovi ghuastatori et pertanto el meglio ched ò possuto non con piccola fatica investighando in Roma et fuore molti vari et dengni ediftii ho raccholto per benché molto ruinati sieno et la dengnità degli ornamenti loro poco se ne vede. De' quali ediftii qui di socto fondi facce circunferentie et hornamenti loro sicondo el mio debile ingiengnio fighurati saranno«; Saluzziano 148, fol. 71r, Martini 1967 (note 56), vol. 1, p. 275.
- 58 Florence, Uffizi, GDSU 320 Ar.
- 59 »Palatio Maggiore in Roma. In più parte chopiato et parte agionto a fantasia che per le molte ruine in tucto comprender non si può«; Saluzziano 148, fol. 82v; Martini 1967 (note 56), vol. 1, p. 282.
- 60 This notation, along with the use of a + sign for monuments represented in plan as well as section or elevation, has been noted by both Fiore and Nesselrath. Francesco Paolo Fiore: Review of Christoffer H. Ericsson, *Roman Architecture Expressed in Sketches* by Francesco di Giorgio Martini, in: *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 42 (1983), pp. 201–202, here p. 202; Nesselrath 1986 (note 8), p. 121; Nesselrath 2004 (note 8), p. 339; Nesselrath 2014 (note 7), pp. 74–75.
- 61 See for example Cammy Brothers: *Reconstruction as Design: Giuliano da Sangallo and the »palazzo di mecenate«* on the Quirinal Hill, in: *Annali di architettura* 14 (2002), pp. 55–72.
- 62 See Scaglia 1992 (note 2), pp. 119–121, 127–129.
- 63 Saluzziano 148, fol. 99r–100v; Houfe Album, fol. 12, 15, 30, 41, 42, 44; Codex Cholmondeley, fol. 2–10; See Nesselrath 2004 (note 8), pp. 358–361; Nesselrath 2014 (note 7), pp. 85–86, 94, figs 118, 133, 139, 141–142. In terms of their method of representation and details, these drawings are similar to two drawings of a decorated base from the Roman church of S. Bartolomeo in Isola, Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, inv. no. I.562, Gozzoli Model-book, fol. 1v. Similar copies of bases are also found in Codex Barberini, fol. 15r; Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, Larger Talman Album, fol. 108, 109, 131; El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo, 28-II-12, Codex Escorialensis, fol. 23r; Kassel, Museums-

- landschaft Hessen-Kassel, Graphische Sammlung, inv. Fol. A45, fol. 35v, 38r, 65r; Zichy Codex, 120r, 142r; Pietro Cataneo, Florence, Uffizi, GDSU 3286 Ar, 2387 Ar, 3290 Ar.
- 64 Arnold Nesselrath and Gustina Scaglia have also noted this connection. Nesselrath 1986 (note 8), pp. 103–104, figs 58–59; Nesselrath 2004 (note 8), p. 343; Scaglia 1992–93 (note 8), p. 10; Nesselrath 2014 (note 7), pp. 80–84.
- 65 Saluzziano 148, fol. 88v, 94v; Martini 1967 (note 56), vol. 1, pl. 164, 176.
- 66 Saluzziano 148, fol. 93v; Martini 1967 (note 56), vol. 1, pl. 174.
- 67 This connection was noted in Nesselrath 2004 (note 8), pp. 342, 359–363; Nesselrath 2014 (note 7), pp. 78–79, 82–83, 94–98, figs 103–104, 134–135; S. Angelo, Perugia: GDSU 335 Ar = Houfe Album, fol. 37; Montecassino: GDSU 325 Av = Houfe Album, fol. 26; S. Giovanni Maggiore, Naples: GDSU 333 Av = Houfe Album, fol. 26.
- 68 Scaglia 1992–93 (note 8), pp. 16–17.
- 69 See Nesselrath 2004 (note 8); Nesselrath 2014 (note 7), pp. 77–107.
- 70 Vatican City, BAV, Vat. Urb. Lat. 1397. For full discussion and notes, see Appendix 1, nos 11 & 12.
- 71 Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Ashburnham 361, fol. 28r.
- 72 Saluzziano 148, fol. 28r; Martini 1967 (note 56), vol. 1, pl. 51.
- 73 New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, MS 491, fol. 28r; Turin, Biblioteca Reale, Serie Militare 238; London, Sir John Soane's Museum, Vol. 118; Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, Ital.IV.3-4; Vicenza, Biblioteca Bertoliana, G.3.5.3, fol. 10v; Florence, Uffizi, GDSU 3289 Ar; It is likely that Cataneo copied his drawings directly from the Houfe Album as he replicates in one example (GDSU 3293 Ar) an unfinished capital (Houfe fol. 9) that presumably was complete in the original corpus of drawings. On the Cataneo Album, see Scaglia 1992 (note 2), pp. 164–165; Marco Rosei: *Il Codice Cataneo del Gabinetto dei Disegni e delle Stampe degli Uffizi*, in: *Arte Documento 8* (1994/95), pp. 67–72; Rita Binaghi: *Fortuna critica del Codice Cataneo*, in: *Arte Documento 8* (1994/95), pp. 73–82; Ead.: *Un manoscritto di Pietro Cataneo conservato agli Uffizi*, in: *Disegno di architettura 9* (1994), pp. 60–66.
- 74 Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Magliabechianus II.I.141, fol. 36r. See note 67; Nesselrath 2004 (note 8), pp. 359, 362–363; Nesselrath 2014 (note 7), pp. 94, 98–99.
- 75 Saluzziano 148, fol. 121–13v; Martini 1967 (note 56), vol. 1, pl. 19–22.
- 76 Florence, Uffizi, GDSU 1686A–1698A. On these drawings, see Meg Licht: *L'edificio a pianta centrale. Lo sviluppo del disegno architettonico nel Rinascimento*, Florence 1984, pp. 45–46, no. 18, pp. 136–137, no. 76, pp. 141–142, no. 81, pp. 146–147, no. 85.
- 77 Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Ashburnham App. 1828; Howard Burns: *Progetti di Francesco di Giorgio Martini per i conventi di San Bernardino e Santa Chiara ad Urbino*, in: *Studi Bramanteschi*, Rome 1970, pp. 293–311; Gustina Scaglia: *Architectural Drawings by Giovanbatista Alberto in the Circle of Francesco di Giorgio Martini*, in: *Architectura 8* (1978), pp. 104–124; Manuela Morresi: *Francesco di Giorgio e Bramante. Osservazioni su alcuni disegni degli Uffizi e della Laurenziana*, in: *Disegno di architettura*, ed. by Paolo Carpeggiani, Luciano Patetta, Milan 1989, pp. 117–124; Scaglia 1992 (note 2), pp. 57–58, 119–121, 218–219.
- 78 The Temple of Saturn (H.39, Y.3) = Ashburnham Album, fol. 40, 101. The Temple of Minerva (H.36) = Ashburnham Album, fol. 37, 100. The Porticus of Octavia (Y.4) = Ashburnham Album, fol. 37, 102. See Appendix 1 for full discussion.
- 79 Ashburnham Album, fol. 99 = Codex Cholmondeley, fol. 106. The other similar drawings are found on Ashburnham Album, fol. 36, 103.
- 80 See Appendix 1, no. 5.

- 81 Florence, Uffizi, GDSU 336 Ar; Saluzziano 148, fol. 92v; Martini 1967 (note 56), vol. 1, pl. 172; see Appendix 1, no. 6.
- 82 Houfe Album, fol. 24; Nesselrath 2004 (note 8), pp. 343–346; Nesselrath 2014 (note 7), p. 84, figs 110–111.
- 83 Nesselrath 2004 (note 8), p. 343; Nesselrath 2014 (note 7), p. 84.
- 84 Tafuri illustrates these temples and briefly mentions them as combinations of archeology and fantasia; Manfredo Tafuri: *Le chiese di Francesco di Giorgio Martini*, in: Francesco di Giorgio architetto 1993 (note 54), pp. 21–73; here pp. 32–35, 58.
- 85 That these images are based on drawings is supported by the fact they were later copied, along with a variety of other material related to Francesco di Giorgio, into an album assembled by Oreste Biringuccio, Siena, Biblioteca Comunale degli Intronati, S.IV.1, fol. 7r, 67r.
- 86 The painting has been dated variously from 1485–1500. While Francesco was in Siena beginning in 1485, the first document related to the Tancredi chapel in S. Domenico, for which the painting was commissioned, is dated 7 September 1493. The altarpiece was certainly begun before 24 September 1495 when Francesco Tancredi and his wife were buried in the chapel; Luciano Bellosi: *Francesco di Giorgio e il Rinascimento a Siena. 1450–1500*, Milan 1993, pp. 478–480; see also Ralph Toledano: *Francesco di Giorgio Martini. Pittore e scultore*, Milan 1987, p. 102.
- 87 The watermarks, which depict a paschal lamb with a halo and pennant set in a circle, are nearly identical to Briquet 49. The use of this paper is documented in Florence in 1511, and subsequently (with small watermark variations) in Treviso (1514), Rome (1526), and Florence (1529); Charles M. Briquet: *Les filigranes*, 4 vols., Paris 1907, vol. 1 p. 21.
- 88 On 14 January 1504, the confraternity approved the sculpting of »l'arco antiquo di San Michele cum tutte le sue inscriptioni et pertinentie cioè cum l'arco e cum le altre colonne che erano sopra detto arco et li altri soi ornamenti antiqui«; Nesselrath 1986, p. 103; Giuseppina Boiani Tombari: *La ricostruzione storica dai documenti d'archivio*, in: *Il complesso monumentale di San Michele a Fano. Dalle origini all'ultimo restauro*, ed. by Gianni Volpe, Fano 2008, pp. 121–157, here p. 134.
- 89 See note 67.
- 90 See Appendix 1, no. 4.
- 91 Saluzziano 148, fol. 77r; Martini 1967 (note 56), vol. 1, pl. 141; On this reconstruction, see Betts 2011 (note 56).
- 92 Florence, Uffizi, GDSU 334 Av; see Appendix 1, no. 7b for full discussion.
- 93 Saluzziano 148, fol. 80r; Martini 1967 (note 56), vol. 1, pl. 147; see Tilmann Buddensieg: *Criticism and Praise of the Pantheon in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, in: *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 500–1500*, ed. by Robert R. Bolgar, Cambridge 1971, pp. 259–67, here pp. 263–264.
- 94 See note 63.
- 95 See Appendix 1, nos 11–12.
- 96 Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Codex Hamilton 254.
- 97 Betts 2011 (note 56), pp. 96–98.
- 98 Saluzziano 148, fol. 76r; Martini 1967 (note 56), vol. 1, pl. 139; Tilmann Buddensieg: *Die Konstantinsbasilika in einer Zeichnung Francescos di Giorgio und der Marmorkoloss Konstantins des Großen*, in: *Münchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst* 13 (1962), pp. 37–48.
- 99 Florence, Uffizi, GDSU 330 Av.
- 100 See note 63. Betts dates some of these drawings to as early as the mid-1460s, Betts 2011 (note 56), pp. 89–90.

- 101 On the Uffizi drawings see note 55; The three inscriptions in Saluzziano 148 are inscribed on the reconstructions of the Temple of Minerva (fol. 77r), the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina (fol. 77v), and the Tomb of the Plautii (fol. 93v).
- 102 This drawing is now in the private collection of Peter Silverman; Arnold Nesselrath: *Arch of Trajan, Benevento*, in: *Campbell 2004* (note 12), vol. 1, pp. 76–78, no. 1.
- 103 No stand-alone sylloge of ancient inscriptions is listed in the earliest catalogue (»indice vecchio«) of the ducal library. The library under Federico da Montefeltro did have numerous ancient texts about Rome as well as a copy of the fifteenth-century »Tractatus de Rebus Antiquis et Situ Urbis Romae« (BAV, Urb. Lat. 984). Cyriac of Ancona, who had spent time in Urbino during the reign of Guidantonio da Montefeltro, may have left a collection of inscriptions in the city.
- 104 Allen Weller: *Francesco di Giorgio, 1439–1501*, Chicago 1943, p. 382; Scaglia 1992 (note 2), p. 179; Burns 1994 (note 56), p. 162; Nicholas Adams: *L'architettura militare di Francesco di Giorgio*, in: *Francesco di Giorgio architetto 1994* (note 56), pp. 126–161, here pp. 127–138; Nesselrath 2004 (note 8), p. 357; Nesselrath 2014 (note 7), pp. 93–94.
- 105 See note 25.
- 106 See Appendix 1, no. 9.
- 107 See Appendix 1, no. 5.
- 108 See Appendix 1, nos 11–12.
- 109 Florence, Uffizi, GDSU, Codex Santarelli, fol. 159r–165v; On the Santarelli drawings and their related copies, see: Gustina Scaglia: *Fantasy Architecture of Roma antica*, in: *Arte Lombarda 15* (1970), pp. 9–24; Sabine Jacob: *Italienische Zeichnungen der Kunstbibliothek Berlin. Architektur und Dekoration 16. bis 18. Jahrhundert*, Berlin 1975, p. 15; Geneviève Monnier: *A Northern Italian drawing from the early sixteenth century*, in: *Design into art: drawings for architecture and ornament. The Lodewijk Houthakker collection*, ed. by Peter Fuhring, London 1989, pp. 463–466; Campbell 2004 (note 12), vol. 3, pp. 962–965; Hubertus Günther: *Fantasie scritte e disegnate a confronto. La rappresentazione di edifici antichi nei disegni della collezione Santarelli*, in: *Linea I. Grafie di immagini tra Quattrocento e Cinquecento*, ed. by Marzia Faietti, Venice 2008, pp. 121–134, 285–292; Hubertus Günther: *Phantasiearchitektur in Bild und Wort. Ein Vergleich am Beispiel der Vorstellungen von der römischen Antike*, in: *De re artificiosa. Festschrift für Paul von Naredi-Rainer zu seinem 60. Geburtstag*, ed. by Lukas Madersbacher, Regensburg 2010, pp. 199–216.
- 110 Florence, Uffizi, GDSU 337 Ar.
- 111 The drawing on the verso of the Windsor folio (W.2) resembles many Renaissance reconstructions of the Mausoleum of Hadrian despite the fact it contains inscriptions from the Mausoleum of Augustus. Three drawings in the Ashburnham Album (fol. 36, 99, 103), may copy the drawing of the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina from the original corpus of reconstructions. The Tomb of C. Publicius Bibulus drawn by Francesco di Giorgio in the Turin addendum (fol. 86r) may have also been included in the set as it contains an inscription found in Signorili's »Descriptio Urbis Romae«.
- 112 These include the Column of Trajan (fol. 2), Arch of the Argentarii (fol. 59), Arch of Titus (fol. 65), Arch of Septimius Severus (fol. 66), Arch of Trajan in Ancona (fol. 67), Arch of Constantine (fol. 68), and Arch of Janus Quadrifrons (fol. 70–71).
- 113 Many drawings were certainly left out as the later numeration found on each cut out fragment frequently skips numbers. Assuming the number 220 written on the reconstruction of the Pons Fabricius (H.55a) indicates continuous numeration, over a hundred drawings were omitted from the album. As Nesselrath has noted, the same numbering is found on a

- tracing now in the Louvre (inv. 459) after a drawing by Francesco di Giorgio, suggesting that parts of the original set were dispersed. At the same time, the system of numbering used in the Houfe Album is not consistent. Six numbers, for example, are used twice. Nevertheless, the numeration suggests – omitting duplications and unnumbered tracings – that the Houfe drawings progressed from architectural details (3–51) to ancient monuments (56–83). After that, the only numbered drawings that survive are 144, 215, 217, and 220. Nesselrath 2014 (note 7), p. 93.
- 114 Nesselrath 2004 (note 8), pp. 359–367; Nesselrath 2005 (note 8), pp. 256–257; Arnold Nesselrath: A Little Gift from an Old Friend. Dürer's Drawings by Fra Giocondo, in: *Print Quarterly* 28 (2011) pp. 244–248, here p. 245; Nesselrath 2014 (note 7), pp. 85–106.
- 115 Cennino Cennini describes this procedure in his handbook. As he notes, tracing paper can be made out of parchment by adopting the following method: »take some clear and fine linseed oil; and smear it with some of this oil on a piece of cotton. Let it dry thoroughly, for the space of several days; and it will be perfect and good.« He continues by stating that: »this same tracing paper which we have been discussing may be made out of paper, the paper, to begin with, being made very thin, smooth, and quite white. Then grease this paper with linseed oil, as described above. It becomes transparent, and it is good«; Cennino Cennini: *The craftsman's handbook. The Italian »Il libro dell'arte«*, trans. by Daniel V. Thompson, New Haven 1933, pp. 13–14.
- 116 Nesselrath 2004 (note 8), p. 354; Nesselrath 2014 (note 7), pp. 87–90; This method of producing woodcuts is described in a fifteenth-century account preserved in Nuremberg; Wilhelm Ludwig Schreiber: *Handbuch der Holz- und Metallschnitte des XV. Jahrhunderts*, 3rd ed., Stuttgart 1969, vol. 8, p. 19.
- 117 New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 80.5.585, 80.3.632; Florence, Uffizi, GDSU 6711 Ar; See Scaglia 1992–93 (note 8); Giorgio Ortolani: Arco di Costantino, Arco di Settimio Severo, Arco di Giano, in: Fiore, Nesselrath 2005 (note 8), p. 256; no. II.9.2-4; Palermo, Biblioteca Comunale, Resta Codex, no. 120–158; Fabio Fiorani: Etienne Du Pérac, in: *I disegni del Codice Resta di Palermo*, ed. by Simonetta Prosperi Valenti Rodinò, Milan 2007, pp. 202–214; Fabio Fiorani, Gabriella Pace: *I disegni di Étienne Du Pérac per i »Vestigi dell'antichità di Roma«*. *Le prime carte traslucide*, in: *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 52 (2008), pp. 240–251.
- 118 See note 87. Nesselrath also believes that the manner in which the examples were selected, specifically the architectural details, indicates the personal involvement of Francesco di Giorgio. He additionally suggests that the tentative, somewhat disorganized layout of some of the tracings, as well as their partially unfinished state, makes it unlikely that a later artist copied them from a finished manuscript produced by the architect before his death. Nesselrath 2004 (note 8), p. 355; Nesselrath 2014 (note 7), p. 93.
- 119 Enea Vico in 1547, for example, engraved two drawings from the Codex Coner over two decades after they were created. Sebastiano Serlio similarly relied on earlier drawings by Baldassare Peruzzi and others for his architectural treatise. See Michael Waters: *A Renaissance without Order. Ornament, Single-sheet Engravings, and the Mutability of Architectural Prints*, in: *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 71 (2012), pp. 488–523, here pp. 495, 503–504; Hubertus Günther: *Das geistige Erbe Peruzzis im vierten und dritten Buch des Sebastiano Serlio*, in: *Les Traités d'architecture de la renaissance*, ed. by Jean Guillaume, Paris 1988, pp. 227–245.
- 120 These were first printed in Rome in the 1530s, possibly by Master G.A. with the Caltrap, then reprinted in various forms by the French engraver Jacques Androuet du Cerceau

- around 1550, the German publisher Rudolf Wyssenbach between 1545 and 1561, and the Dutch publisher Gerard de Jode in 1555. See Peter Fuhring: »Ruinarum variarum fabricarum«. The final flowering of Roma antica fantasy architecture in European printmaking, in: *Reibungspunkte: Ordnung und Umbruch in Architektur und Kunst*, ed. by Hanns Hubach, Barbara von Orelli-Messerli, Tadej Tassini, Petersberg 2008, pp. 91–101; See also note 109 on the original drawings.
- 121 The book was originally granted a six-year privilege in 1517 but not published until 1521. This privilege was granted along with one for Andrea Fulvio's »*Illustrium imagines*«, which featured 204 woodcuts; Christopher Witcombe: *Copyright in the Renaissance. Prints and the Privilegio in Sixteenth-Century Venice and Rome*, Boston 2004, p. 51. The first section of Mazzocchi's book progresses typologically – city gates, bridges, triumphal arches, temples, fora, dedicatory columns, pyramids, obelisks, aqueducts, mausoleums, porticos, and finally baths – with rough woodcuts of the Porta Maggiore (p. 1r), Pons Aemilius (p. 2r), Arch of Septimius Severus (p. 4r), Arch of Constantine (p. 4v), Pantheon (p. 6v), Column of Trajan (p. 9v), Pyramid of Cestius (p. 10r), Vatican Obelisk (p. 10v), Porta Tiburtina (p. 11v), and Mausoleum of Hadrian (p. 12v). This is followed by over three hundred additional pages of inscriptions interspersed with a handful of ancient reliefs. Mazzocchi 1521 (note 22). On the origins of Mazzocchi's publication, see notes 23 and 42.
- 122 Sebastiano Serlio: *Il terzo libro*, Venice 1540; Serlio includes inscriptions from the following monuments: Column of Trajan (pp. 60–61), Vatican Obelisk (pp. 62–63), Arch of Titus (p. 105), Arch of Septimius Severus (p. 111), Arch of Trajan in Benevento (p. 115), Arch of Constantine (p. 119), Arch of Trajan in Ancona (p. 123), Arch of Pola (p. 127), Arco dei Gavi in Verona (p. 131), Porta dei Leoni in Verona (pp. 134–135).
- 123 Giovanni Santi: *La vita e le gesta di Federico di Montefeltro, Duca d'Urbino. Poema in terza rima* (Codice Vat. Ottob. lat. 1305), ed. by Luigi Michelini Tocci, 2 vols., Vatican City 1985, vol. 1, p. 148; Burns 1994 (note 56), p. 164.
- 124 Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, WA2003.Douce.4840 & 4841 (formerly N.9 [413 & 414]). These drawings are part of a large collection of uncatalogued antiquarian material arranged loosely by subject matter bequeathed by Francis Douce to the Bodleian Library in 1834 and transferred to the Ashmolean in 1863. They were subsequently returned to the Bodleian in 1915 and finally brought back to the Ashmolean in 2003. The two drawings in question measure 35,6 × 27,7 cm and 35,4 × 26,4 cm respectively and are executed on the same type of paper with a paschal lamb watermark (Briquet 49) as those in the Houfe Album. On the watermarks, see note 87.
- 125 Paris, Louvre, inv. 459. The Louvre acquired this drawing, which measures 35,5 × 24,5 cm, in 1878 from the collection of Aimé-Charles Horace His de la Salle. Its previous ownership includes Alcide Donnadieu, Pierre Gaspard Marie Grimod d'Orsay, and Pierre-Jean Mariette. Bernhard Degenhart: *Unbekannte Zeichnungen Francescos di Giorgio*, in: *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 8 (1939), pp. 117–150, here pp. 142–143, fig. 59; Nesselrath 2014 (note 7), p. 93, fig. 130.
- 126 See note 113.
- 127 New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Robert Lehman Collection, 1975.1.376. This drawing has been traditionally interpreted as a study for a wall monument depicting a male patron flanked by muses. More recently, Luke Syson has suggested it was originally part of Francesco di Giorgio's »*Opusculum de architectura*« now at the British Museum (1947.0117.2). While this seems unlikely, it is possible that the central figure is a self-portrait of the architect as Syson proposes. See Laurence Kanter: *Design for a Wall Monu-*

- ment, in: *Painting in Renaissance Siena 1420–1500*, exhibition catalogue New York, ed. by Keith Christiansen, Laurence Kanter, Carl Strehlke, New York 1988, pp. 325–327, no. 68; Luke Syson: *Self portrait (?) with female attendants*, in: *Renaissance Siena: Art for a city*, exhibition catalogue London, ed. by Luke Syson, London 2007, pp. 186–189, no. 43.
- 128 Oxford, Christ Church, inv. 1976; Luke Syson: *Adam and Eve*, in: Syson 2007 (note 127), pp. 158–159, no. 31.
- 129 Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Magliabechiano XXIII.79 (Gaddi 769), fol. 1r; Fabia Borroni Salvadori: *Deianira, San Sebastiano e il guerriero contro il marzocco*. Disegni inediti provenienti da Volterra, in: *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 21 (1977), pp. 307–314, here pp. 307–309, fig. 1; Alessandro Angelini: *Allegoria della lotta tra Volterra e Firenze; Martirio di San Sebastiano*, 1480, in: Francesco di Giorgio e il Rinascimento a Siena 1450–1500, ed. by Luciano Bellosi, Milan 1993, pp. 428–429, no. 91.
- 130 CIL XI.5940.
- 131 CIL XI.5947. While the inscription on the previous drawing (A.1a) is recorded in many Renaissance sylloges, the earliest transcription of this epigraph is found in an early seventeenth-century collection by Pietro Stefanoni (Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Burmann XXI F 3, fol. 153). This is further evidence that the inscriptions from Città di Castello in the set were not taken from a sylloge, but recorded directly by Francesco di Giorgio, or possibly a close associate.
- 132 See notes 43, 45.
- 133 The laurel crown, for example, seems to be a play on the winged helmet of Perseus. The statue's pose most clearly recalls some of the late fifteenth-century female figures of Botticelli and Ghirlandaio. The sphinxes depicted are reminiscent of those on Antonio Federighi's holy water font in Orvieto Cathedral (ca. 1470) as well as the façade of SS. Giovanni e Paolo in Venice.
- 134 CIL XIV.1554. Battista Brunelleschi described this funerary inscription as being »a mezo la schala del palazzo«. According to his drawing, it was also flanked by two representations of Eros with down-turned torches and accompanied by a bearded man below; Florence, Biblioteca Marucelliana, Cod. A.78.I, fol. 36v.
- 135 The inscription in the Ashmolean drawing is transcribed as D· M / RVBRIAE· DAPNNE / RVBRIVS TELESPEIO / RVS· CONIVGI INCOM / PARABILI ET SIBI VI / VOS· FIC, while Battista Brunelleschi recorded it as D· M / RVBRIAE / DAPHNE / RVBRIVS / TELESICCO / RVS· CONIV / INCONPARA / BILI· ET· SIBI / VIVOS· FEC.
- 136 De Rossi 1852 (note 17), pp. 88–89.
- 137 The numbering here and in Appendix 2 corresponds to the transcriptions of Nicolò Signorili's »Descriptio Urbis Romae eiusque excellentiae« (following BAV, Chig. I. VI. 204) in Henzen 1876 (note 15), vol. VI.1, pp. xv–xxvii; for related publications, see note 17.
- 138 Florence, Uffizi, GDSU 1698 Ar; Saluzziano 148, fol. 13v; Martini 1967 (note 56), vol. 1, pl. 22.
- 139 Francesco di Giorgio's reconstruction of an ancient bath near S. Maria sopra Minerva (Saluzziano 148, fol. 85v) similarly depicts two minor apses screened by two rows of columns.
- 140 Saluzziano 148, fol. 86v; Martini 1967 (note 56), vol. 1, pl. 160.
- 141 Ashburnham Album, fol. 36, no. 56.
- 142 De Rossi 1852 (note 17), 52; Valentini, Zucchetti 1940–53 (note 17), vol. 4, p. 198.
- 143 Depictions of the relief and inscription include: Coburg, Kunstsammlungen, Kupferstichkabinett, Codex Coburgensis, no. 189; Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Codex Pighianus,

- fol. 97r; Vatican City, BAV, Lat. 3439, Codex Ursinianus, fol. 58r, 98r; Stockholm, Kungliga Bibliotek, Codex Holmiensis, fol. 77r; Windsor, Royal Library, Dal Pozzo Albums, vol. IV, fol. 39; Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, N.A. 1159, Dosio Circle Sketchbook, fol. 55; Jean Jacques Boissard: *Romanae Urbis Topographiae & Antiquitatum*, 6 vols., Frankfurt 1597–1602, vol. 4, p. 132; Raffaele Fabretti: *De columna Traiani*, Rome 1683, p. 256.
- 144 For example, the dress of the two figures roughly resembles the consular diptych of Anicius Petronius Probus made in 406 and now in the treasury of the Duomo of Aosta.
- 145 Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, MS lat qu 432, fol. 62v.
- 146 See notes 19 and 20.
- 147 Florence, Uffizi, GDSU 336 Ar; Saluzziano 148, fol. 92v; Martini 1967 (note 56), vol. 1, pl. 172.
- 148 Florence, Uffizi, GDSU 334 Av.
- 149 It is noteworthy that both the Yale and Cholmondeley inscriptions finish with »C I P P PED· CXV· S«. While no other sylloge matches this transcription exactly, it is relatively close to a handful of examples: Poggio Bracciolini »C I P P PED· CXVS«, Cyriac of Ancona »CIPP· PED· C XV· S«, Giovanni Francesco da Sangallo »C I P P PED· CXVS«, Bartolomeo Marliani »CIPP· PED· CXV· S«, Henzen 1876 (note 15), vol. VI.1, pp. xix, no. 17, xxxvi, no. 60; Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Codex Hamilton 254, fol. 57v; Florence, Uffizi, GDSU 2103 Ar; Bartolomeo Marliani: *Urbis Romae topographia*, Rome 1544, p. 105.
- 150 De Rossi 1852 (note 17), 76; Valentini, Zucchetti 1940–53 (note 17), vol. 4, p. 201.
- 151 Suet. Iul. 1,85.
- 152 Lise Vogel: *The column of Antoninus Pius*, Cambridge 1973, pp. 26, 112.
- 153 Bern, Burgerbibliothek, B 42, fol. 57v; Modena, Biblioteca Estense Universitaria, ms. Lat. 992, fol. 61r.
- 154 Both of these sylloges preface the inscription with »in tumulto vetustate dirrupto«; Vatican City, BAV, Vat. Lat. 10546, fol. 58; Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 394, fol. 1; see also *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, vol. VI.1, p. xxiii; Antonio Ferrua: *Andrea Alciato e l'epigrafi pagana di Roma*, in: *Archivio della Società Romana di Storia Patria* 228 (1990) pp. 209–233, here p. 228.
- 155 Hülsen even suggests this monument may have been topped by a statue; Christian Hülsen: *Il Foro Romano: storia e monumenti*, Rome 1905, p. 70.
- 156 Marliani 1544 (note 149), p. 40.
- 157 Pietro Cataneo: *I Quattro Primi Libri di Architettura*, Venice 1554, fol. 9r.
- 158 Saluzziano 148, fol. 28r; Martini 1967 (note 56), vol. 1, p. 262, pl. 51.
- 159 Modena, Biblioteca Estense Universitaria, ms. Lat. 992, fol. 32v.
- 160 Codex Barberini, fol. 8v, 36v; The five conical markers atop the Tomb of the Horatii likely also served as the inspiration for Antonio da Sangallo the Younger's design for the tomb of Piero de' Medici (Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, PD.28–2000) which employs a series of similar conical structures; see fig. 22 in Andreas Raub's article in the present *Pegasus* volume.
- 161 Master Gregorius: *The Marvels of Rome*, trans. John Osborne, Toronto 1987, pp. 34–35, 91; Anne Roulet: *The Egyptian and Egyptianizing monuments of imperial Rome*, Leiden 1972, pp. 73–74. For a representation of the Vatican Obelisk atop the lions, see the early trecento fresco of the martyrdom of the saints in the church of S. Pietro a Grado.
- 162 Even in the Dupérac album of reconstructions now at the Morgan Library the pyramid is simply depicted as it was in the sixteenth century; New York, The Morgan Library & Museum, Dupérac Codex, B1 370 D MS M.1106, fol. 36r.

- 163 Reggio Emilia, Biblioteca Panizzi, C398, fol. 8r; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Ms Lat. 6128, fol. 132r.
- 164 This was first noted in Christian Hülsen, though he accepted Schneider's belief that the illustrations were a fifteenth-century invention; Hülsen 1910 (note 50), p. 51; on this text, see E. A. Thompson: A Roman reformer and inventor, being a new text of the treatise »De rebus bellicis«, Oxford 1952.
- 165 See Otto Pächt and Jonathan Alexander: *Illuminated Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* Oxford, 3 vols., Oxford 1966–1973, vol. 1, p. 52, no. 666, vol. 2, p. 60, no. 599; Jonathan Alexander: The illustrations of the Anonymus de rebus bellicis, in: *De rebus bellicis*, ed. by M. Hassall, Oxford 1979, pp. 11–15. Jonathan Alexander has suggested that style of illustrations found in the copies suggest that the Codex Spirensis likely replicates an earlier Carolingian model rather than the late-antique original, which he believes was perhaps produced in the same center as the Vatican Virgil.
- 166 On the frieze and its afterlife, see Luca Leoncini: Frammenti con trofei navali e strumenti sacrificali dei Musei Capitolini: Nuova ipotesi ricostruttiva, in: *Xenia* 13 (1987), pp. 13–24; Luca Leoncini: Storia e fortuna del cosiddetto »Fregio di S. Lorenzo«, in: *Xenia* 14 (1987), pp. 59–110.
- 167 Hülsen 1910 (note 50), pp. 50–51; Arnold Nesselrath: Review of Codices e Vaticanis selecti phototypice expressi, volumen XXXIX, in: *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 52 (1989), pp. 281–292, here pp. 289–290, figs 4–5.
- 168 Paolo Galluzzi: Disegni di macchine, in: *Prima di Leonardo: Cultura delle macchine a Siena nel Rinascimento*, exhibition catalogue Siena, ed. by Paolo Galluzzi, Milan 1991, p. 211, no. I.f.6; Scaglia 1992 (note 2), pp. 108–110, no. 39.
- 169 Grazia Bernini Pezzini: Il fregio dell'arte della guerra nel Palazzo Ducale di Urbino: catalogo dei rilievi, Rome 1985, pp. 37–47; Scaglia 1992 (note 2), pp. 108–112.
- 170 On the Codex Santini, see Paolo Galluzzi: Codice Santini, in: Galluzzi 1991 (note 168), p. 210, no. I.f.5; Scaglia 1992 (note 2), pp. 104–105, no. 37; Sergio Bettini: Intorno a Francesco di Giorgio. Un codice di macchine civili e militari della collezione Santini, in: *Some degree of happiness. Studi di storia dell'architettura in onore di Howard Burns*, ed. by Maria Beltramini, Caroline Elam, Pisa 2010, pp. 69–87, 643–666.
- 171 Saluzziano 148, fol. 97v; Martini 1967 (note 56), vol. 1, pl. 180; Leoncini 1987 (note 166), pp. 72–73, 77, 79.
- 172 For example, the reverse of a silver Republican denarius issued by C. Fonteius depicts a ship with a projecting prow and acrostolia, a crew rowing with oars (remi), and a captain steering a large rudder (gubernaculum) with a flowing aplustre behind him; Michael H. Crawford: *Roman Republican Coinage*, 2 vols., London/New York 1974, vol. 2, no. 290.1.

PHOTOGRAPHIC CREDITS

Fig. 1: Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection. – Fig. 2: © 2014 Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. – Fig. 3: Research Library, The Getty Research Institute. Digital image courtesy of the Getty's Open Content Program. – Fig. 4: Bibliothèque nationale de France. – Fig. 5: Knihovna Národního muzea, Praha. – Fig. 6: Universitätsbibliothek Salzburg. – Figs 7, 15: © Ministero dei Beni e delle Attività Culturali e del Turismo, Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della città di Firenze – Tutti i diritti riservati. All rights reserved. – Figs 8, 14: Su concessione del Ministero dei Beni e delle Attività Culturali e del Turismo, Direzione Regionale per i Beni Culturali e Paesaggistici del Piemonte – Biblioteca Reale di Torino. – Fig. 9: Bernini Pezzini 1985 (note 169), cat. 19. – Figs 10, 11: Su concessione del Ministero dei Beni e delle Attività Culturali e del Turismo. – Fig. 12: Scala, Florence/Fondo Edifici di Culto – Ministero dell'Interno. – Fig. 13: Photo Michael J. Waters. – Fig. 16: The Bodleian Library, University of Oxford. – Fig. 17: Metropolitan Museum of Art, Harris Brisbane Fund 1941, acc. no. 41.72 (3.14), (www.metmuseum.org).
Appendix 3: Y: Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection. – A: © Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford. – H: Conway Library, The Courtauld Institute of Art. – C: The Warburg Institute, Photographic Collection. – W: Royal Collection Trust / © Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II 2014.