

PEGASUS

Berliner Beiträge
zum Nachleben der Antike
Heft 8 · 2006

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

www.census.de/pegasus.htm

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: Charlotte Schreiter, Anne Leicht, Frederike Steinhoff

Kunstgeschichtliches Seminar
Unter den Linden 6
10099 Berlin

© 2006 Census of Antique Works of Art
and Architecture Known in the Renaissance

Layout und Satz: Jürgen Brinckmann, Berlin
Druck: Gulde Druck GmbH, Tübingen

ISSN 1436-3461

THE CODEX STOSCH: SURVEYS OF ANCIENT BUILDINGS
BY GIOVANNI BATTISTA DA SANGALLO

IAN CAMPBELL AND ARNOLD NESSELRATH

PREAMBLE*

In March 2005, the Edinburgh auction house, Lyon and Turnbull, consulted the authors about an album of drawings of ancient Roman buildings. Within days, it was established that, in the eighteenth century, the drawings had belonged to Philipp von Stosch and were thought to be Raphael's lost reconstruction of ancient Rome, but that, in fact, the draughtsman was Giovanni Battista da Sangallo. One of the present authors prepared a descriptive catalogue for the sale of the album, given the name the »Codex Stosch«, in July 2005. The present article goes beyond that catalogue and tries to answer outstanding questions about the dating of the drawings, their purpose, and their relationship, if any, with Raphael and other draughtsmen of his period. We begin with a short description of the volume, which was acquired by the RIBA British Architectural Library in May 2006.¹

DESCRIPTION

The vellum binding, which certainly dates after 1706, and probably from around 1760, on the evidence of the endpapers,² contains 23 folios, all roughly 278 × 210 mm in size, of which only folio 3, 4 and 17 are single sheets, the rest making up ten bifolia. Folios 18/21 and 19/20 comprise a gathering. Several carry an anchor watermark very similar to examples on paper used around 1517–22.³

Out of a total of 46 pages 43 carry drawings. All are executed in brown ink, with signs of the use of stylus for straight lines and compass for curves. Black chalk seems to have been used only as underdrawing for the reliefs in the frieze of the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina (fol. 10r) and for the corrections in the lettering of formal inscriptions (fols 11, 9v and 14r).⁴

The subjects of the drawings are reconstructions of temples and arches in Rome and two temples at Cori, south-east of Rome.

TABLE OF SUBJECTS

The whole Codex is reproduced at the end of the article.

Folio	r/v	Subject
1	r	Arch of Titus: Front Elevation
1	v	Arch of Titus: Section and Details
2	r	Janus Quadrifrons: Plan and Detail
2	v	Janus Quadrifrons: Elevation and Part-section
3	r	Cori, Door of Temple of Hercules: Elevation and Details
3	v	>Archi Triophali< (no drawings)
4	r	Cori, Temple of Hercules: Side Elevation
4	v	Cori, Temple of Hercules: Plan and Details
5	r	Cori, Temple of Hercules: Front Elevation
5	v	Cori, Temple of Castor and Pollux: Plan
6	r	Hadrianeum: Plan
6	v	Hadrianeum: Side Elevation and Detail
7	r	Hadrianeum: Front Elevation and Section
7	v	Temple of Portunus: Plan
8	r	Temple of Portunus: Side Elevation
8	v	Temple of Portunus: Front Elevation
9	r	Temple of Antoninus and Faustina: Plan and Detail
9	v	Temple of Antoninus and Faustina: Front Elevation
10	r	Temple of Antoninus and Faustina: Side Elevation
10	v	Temple of Antoninus and Faustina: Details
11	r	S.Nicola in Carcere, Middle Temple: Plan
11	v	S.Nicola in Carcere, Middle Temple: Side Elevation
12	r	S.Nicola in Carcere, Middle Temple: Front Elevation and Detail
12	v	S.Nicola in Carcere, North Temple: Plan
13	r	S.Nicola in Carcere, North Temple: Front Elevation and Section, and Details
13	v	S.Nicola in Carcere, North Temple: Side Elevation
14	r	S.Nicola in Carcere, Doric Temple: Plan
14	v	S.Nicola in Carcere, Doric Temple: Side Elevation and Details
15	r	S.Nicola in Carcere, Doric Temple: Front Elevation and Door
15	v	Temple of Vespasian: Plan
16	r	Temple of Vespasian: Front Elevation and Details
16	v	Temple of Vespasian: Side Elevation

Folio	r/v	Subject
17	r	Temple of Vespasian: Details
17	v	Largo Argentina, Temple A: Plan
18	r	Blank
18	v	Temple of Saturn: Plan
19	r	Temple of Saturn: Front Elevation and Details
19	v	Rome, Temple of Castor and Pollux: Plan
20	r	Rome, Temple of Castor and Pollux: Front Elevation and Details
20	v	Rome, Temple of Castor and Pollux: Side Elevation
21	r	Ink Marks
21	v	Temple of Minerva, Forum of Nerva: Plan
22	r	Temple of Minerva, Forum of Nerva: Front Elevation and Details
22	v	Temple of Minerva, Forum of Nerva: Side Elevation and Details
23	r	Forum of Nerva: Details of the »Colonnacce«
23	v	Forum of Nerva: Details of the Temple of Minerva

The table testifies that the draughtsman strove to represent the monuments comprehensively with plans, front and side elevations, sections and details, all of which are in orthogonal projection, except for one detail of the door of the Temple of Hercules at Cori (fol. 3r), which is depicted axonometrically.⁵ Sections are the drawing mode most often missing, possibly because, as in the case of the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina (fol. 9v), no evidence of the interior survived. Where there was some internal evidence, such as the Hadrianeum (fol. 7r), a section is usually included.

The monuments are fully, and, where we can check, accurately, measured using the »piede antico«, the ancient Roman foot (294.5 mm) divided into 16 »dita« (fingers), except for the temples at Cori, which are instead measured in »palmi romani« (Roman palms), the standard unit of length in medieval and early modern Rome, which measured 223 mm, and was divided into 12 »oncie« (inches).⁶ Several of the drawings include scales.

Despite the poor quality of paper, the drawings are highly finished and usually accompanied by rather formulaic inscriptions identifying the subjects, written in a formal italic hand, often placed symmetrically above or below the drawings. In some cases, such as most of the Latin inscriptions on monuments (fol. 12r) and some of the captions (fol. 5r), the lettering is written with a thicker pen, suggesting they were added sometime after the rest, although by the

1 a, b ›Fragmentum epistolae Coelii Calcagnini a[d] Jac. Zieglerum‹, an extract from the Calcagnini Letter, transcribed by Philipp von Stosch

same hand. Some of these later inscriptions have corrections in black chalk, which must have been added even later (fol. 9v). Human figures are sometimes included, explicitly to give a sense of scale to the buildings depicted, as the annotation on the side elevation of the Hadrianeum (fol. 6v) tells us: »Quelle fiurine son grande de Quanto naturale« (>those small figures are as big as natural<).⁷ They also impart a liveliness rarely found in architectural drawings, which undoubtedly enhances their attractiveness. Some sheets also have headings (>Temples<, >Triumphal Arches< and >Doors<; fols 3r, 3v, 4v, 23r) indicating that the drawings were to be ordered by building types or parts.⁸

The layout of the drawings on the page, the presence of figures, the formal nature of the inscriptions, and the explicitly recorded measurements all suggest that they were preparatory material to be worked up for presentation and/or publication.⁹ However, given that we have only two arches, and one door treated independently, compared with thirteen temples, there must have been at least an intention to include more material. Page numbers in ink from 1–46, indicate that nothing has been lost since they were added, but in style they could be as late as eighteenth century, and the fact that they are all upside down and start from the last folio demonstrate that they do not represent the original arrangement. More helpful are graphite folio numbers at the bottom right corner of each recto, beginning with 4 and running to 26, revealing that we are certainly lacking three folios. Since graphite only begins to be used in drawings from the late sixteenth century, and the condition of several sheets suggests they were poorly treated at some early stage in their history, it is possible that they were originally more sheets. The arbitrary placing of the subject headings (see above) certainly implies that the present foliation does not reflect their originally intended order.¹⁰

Besides the bound sheets, there is one unbound bifolium, 280 mm × 420 mm, with a horn watermark and bearing writing in Latin in an eighteenth-century italic hand (figs 1 a, b). It is headed »Fragmentum epistolae Coelii Calcagnini a[d] Jac. Zieglerum« (>Fragments of a letter of Celio Calcagnini to Jacob Ziegler<), and consists of extracts from the letter pertaining to the translation of Vitruvius, undertaken for Raphael (1483–1520) by Fabio Calvo (c. 1440–1527), and to Raphael's own graphic reconstruction of Rome, adumbrated in his famous letter to Pope Leo X (r. 1513–21), which is discussed below. Calcagnini's original letter was written about 1519, first published in 1544, and again in 1687, which is the version copied here.¹¹

BARON PHILIPP VON STOSCH AND JOHANN JOACHIM
WINCKELMANN

In 1754, an account of the antiquarian activities of Baron Philipp von Stosch (1691–1757) was published in a work collecting the lives of major Enlightenment figures across Europe.¹² Stosch was born in Prussia to a minor noble family so poor that it had abandoned the title, but Philipp resumed it to facilitate his European travels, which he began at the age of eighteen.¹³ A voracious collector of gems, coins, books, prints and drawings he financed his passion by a variety of means, including, from 1722, spying on the Jacobite court of the Old Pretender in Rome. While in Rome he published a work on antique engraved gems and cameos, which established his scholarly credentials.¹⁴ In 1731, after his cover as a spy was blown, he retreated to Florence, where the British government continued to pay him a pension until his death, even though he could only furnish them with second hand observations on the Stuarts. It was Stosch who, in 1755, recommended Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717–68) as librarian to his old patron and friend in Rome, Cardinal Alessandro Albani (1692–1779), despite only knowing the art historian through correspondence.

A sequel to the 1754 article appeared in 1757, which gives an overview of Stosch's collections, among which occurs the earliest reference to the Codex Stosch:

»Mit der eigenen Hand des Rafael d'Urbino auf Kosten Leonis X. nachgemessene Zeichnungen; als welcher Pabst bis auf den tiefsten Grund der alten Gebäude zu Rom graben ließ. Der andere Theil dieser zu gleichem Zweck verfertigten Zeichnungen ist in den Händen des Lords Grafen von Leicester. Sie waren aber alle mit der Absicht gezeichnet, um unter der Aufsicht des Balthasar Castiglione einen vollständigen Abriß des alten Roms zu liefern.«¹⁵

The reference to the drawings attributed to Raphael owned by Lord Leicester is to an album containing drawings of miscellaneous antiquities, including a few buildings, which Thomas Coke (1691–1759), created Earl of Leicester in 1744, acquired in Rome during his Grand Tour which lasted from 1712 until 1718. It remains in the library of Holkham Hall in Norfolk, which Coke began building in the 1730s, but its fame has long since diminished and it is now recognized that none of the drawings has anything directly to do with Raphael, being by 23 different late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century hands.¹⁶ It may

be difficult for us to understand how the Holkham Hall Album should ever have been bracketed with the very different Codex Stosch, as two parts of Raphael's project to create a graphic reconstruction of ancient Rome, but, given that the former had left Italy by 1718, it is unlikely that anyone had direct knowledge of both or had seen them side by side.

Turning now specifically to the drawings of the Codex Stosch, until their rediscovery in 2005, Winckelmann's writings were the only other testimony to their existence. In September 1760, he wrote from Rome to Jean-Jacques Barthélemy (1716–95), Louis XV's keeper of the Cabinet of Medals in Paris as follows:

»En parcourant les Monumens de M. le Roy j'aurois souhaité qu'il ait vu les temples di Piesti ou Pesto, et pour la troisieme Epoque de l'Ordre Dorique le Prostile tout entier d'un temple Dorique à Cori, Ville située vers Veletri. Je le tiens copié d'un dessein du grand Raphael quand il étoit plus entier, avec toutes les mesures. Raphael fit un nombre de desseins quand il eût a executer le grand dessein de Leon X. Ces Colonnes Doriques ont le Collarino et le plinthe comme les Corinthiennes et des bâtons au[x] canelures presque à leurs tiers. Le Diametre des Colonnes est de $3\frac{1}{4}$ Palmes, la hauteur de 27–10 palmes. Les Intercolonnes de $5\frac{1}{2}$ p. l'Intercol. au milieu ou l'entrée $10\frac{3}{4}$ p. L'étreecissement de la porte étoit de $10\frac{2}{3}$ à 10–1 palmes ...«¹⁷

The specific measurements cited by Winckelmann are those found in the Codex Stosch (fols 3r–4v).

By this date, the drawings belonged to Philipp von Stosch's nephew, Wilhelm Muzell (1723–82). He had inherited the collection (and debts) on his uncle's death in November 1757, on condition that he assumed the surname Stosch, but to avoid confusion we will refer to him as Muzell-Stosch. It was he, who, in 1758, invited Winckelmann to Florence to write a catalogue of his deceased uncle's gem collection, published in 1760, which succeeded persuading Frederick the Great to buy the collection. As an appendix to the catalogue Winckelmann listed the 324 volumes of Stosch's »Atlas«. ¹⁸ This was an enormous project to amass maps, topographical and architectural prints and drawings of all the world, following the order of Jan Blaeu's multi-volume atlas, published in the mid-seventeenth century, but probably also inspired by Casiano dal Pozzo's »Paper Museum«, the seventeenth-century encyclopaedic collection of several thousand drawings and prints, ranging from antiquities and Aztec herbals to zoological specimens, which Cardinal Albani acquired in

1714, the year before he first met Stosch, who would certainly have known it during his residence in Rome.¹⁹

One would expect to find the drawings attributed to Raphael to appear in the Atlas, which was acquired ›en bloc‹ by the imperial library in Vienna in 1769,²⁰ but nothing exactly fits their description. Nor do they appear in the sale catalogue printed in 1758, of the baron's vast library of printed books and manuscripts, which was sold to the Vatican Library in February 1759.²¹

Winckelmann refers to them twice more, firstly in a letter to Muzell-Stosch in December 1760, where he writes about his hopes to include a note about them in his forthcoming ›Anmerkungen über die Baukunst der Alten‹ (›Remarks on the Architecture of the Ancients‹), which was evidently near completion, and asked Muzell-Stosch to send him a copy of a letter about the drawings and details of the book where the letter appears.²²

Finally in the ›Anmerkungen‹, published in 1762, Winckelmann refers in the main text to drawings by Raphael of the temple at Cori.²³ The accompanying footnote explains that the drawing belonged with drawings of other buildings, which together made up a volume of ›twenty something‹ sheets, in the ›museum of the renowned Herr von Stosch‹.²⁴ He goes on to say that Raphael made the drawings after he became architect of New St Peter's (1514), as part of the commission of Leo X to prepare a paper reconstruction of ancient Rome (see below). He gives his source of information on that project as a letter from Celio Calcagnini (1479–1541) to Jacob Ziegler (c. 1470–1549), published in a miscellany of letters appended to an edition of St Clement's two Epistles to the Corinthians.²⁵

By 1762, however, it is likely that the drawings no longer formed part of the Stosch ›museum‹. Muzell-Stosch may have originally intended to hold on to them, which would explain their omission from the Atlas, but the fact that they were bound in plain vellum with endpapers dating around 1760 (see above p. 9) suggests a sudden change of plan, perhaps connected with his extended visit to England which began in July 1760.²⁶ From his correspondence with Horace Walpole (1717–97) and the latter's with Horace Mann (1706–84), we know that Muzell-Stosch came primarily to find a buyer for his uncle's collections, but also to learn English and to find employment as a travelling companion to ›a young man of fashion‹.²⁷ He spent the first few weeks in London before moving to Salisbury for the autumn.²⁸ In early December he was in Bath (where Winckelmann's request for the Calcagnini transcription would have reached him) with the intention of being back in London within the month, although

he had not arrived by late January.²⁹ He was probably there by mid-April when he was elected to the Society of Antiquaries.³⁰ By August 1761, unable to afford to stay longer, and disappointed to have found neither buyer nor employer, he had started his return journey to Florence.³¹

London seems the most likely location for him to have sold the codex directly or through an intermediary to Anthony Askew M.D., who was accumulating one of the greatest private classical libraries known in England at his house in Hampstead, which was dispersed after his death in 1775.³² No item in the Askew sale catalogue resembles the codex and so we can assume that it remained the property of his heirs, who brought them to Pallinsburn, a minor country house in Northumberland, to lie unregarded on the shelves of its library for over two centuries.

Since 1762, Winckelmann's references have tantalized art historians but the mystery has remained unsolved until the appearance of the present volume, which entirely fits his description, and, hence, it seems appropriate to dub it the *Codex Stosch*.³³

AUTHORSHIP

Having rediscovered the drawings seen by Winckelmann, we can immediately dismiss the attribution to Raphael. The drawings and annotations are so close in both character and style to those by Giovanni Battista da Sangallo (1496–1548), brother of Antonio da Sangallo the Younger (1487–1546), illustrating and elucidating a copy of Sulpitius' first edition of Vitruvius' *De Architectura* (Rome, c. 1486), preserved in Rome, that we can conclude that he is also the draughtsman of the *Codex Stosch*.³⁴

One of the general characteristics shared by both sets of drawings is that the plans of peripteral temples (with columns on all four sides) are shown on stylobates (steps all the way round) following the Greek practice favoured by Vitruvius, rather than putting them on Roman-style podia. The fact that most of the temples were so buried that evidence for the podia was not visible could excuse Giovanni Battista's errors. However, in the case of the Doric temple at S. Nicola in Carcere (fol. 14r), he admits that *»Questa scalea non ci poteua essere tutta·p[er]che le scale du naltro tempio le impediuaano«* (*>*[t]here cannot have been all these steps here because the steps of another temple got in their way) and the corresponding front and side elevations (fols 14v and 15r) both

correctly show the temple on a podium.³⁵ The same plan (fol. 14r), like all those of the peripteral temples in both sets of drawings, erroneously has the cella shown open at both ends, a feature derived from the first illustrated edition of Vitruvius, that of Fra Giocondo, published in Venice in 1511.³⁶

Another idiosyncrasy found in both sets of drawings is the occasional use of Roman numerals in place of Arabic for dimensions as on fols 13r, 17v, 18v and 19v of the Codex Stosch and on the plan of Vitruvius' basilica at Fano in the Corsini Incunabulum.³⁷

There are also strong correspondences between some of the individual drawings. The Corsini Incunabulum drawing illustrating the side elevation of an Ionic temple to elucidate Vitruvius' enigmatic ›scamilli in pares‹ (Vit. 3.4.5) makes the point well (fig. 2). The annotation below refers to the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina in the Roman Forum. The side elevation of that temple in the Codex Stosch (fol. 10r), includes identical latticed parapets between the columns of the porch, which are almost certainly taken from Roman coins depicting the temple, which show a fence in front.³⁸

From the similarities between the two sets of drawings, one might expect that they form part of a single project or at least were executed around the same time. However this does not appear to be the case. The drawings in the ›Corsini Incunabulum‹, which are sometimes on the wide margins of the printed pages and sometimes on interleaved folios (which Rowland believes were added in more than one campaign³⁹) fall into two broad groupings. Some are characterised by neat and careful draughtsmanship and are found mainly in the margins of the original book, the rest, which form the majority, are sketchier and occur both in the margins and on the interleaved folios. Similarly the accompanying annotations in Italian are sometimes in a neater hand and at other times in an untidy, hurried hand. This suggests that both the drawings and the annotations were executed in at least two phases, but definitive dating of these is not yet established. Based largely on dating the different handwriting styles, Pagliara suggests Giovanni Battista began work on the volume before 1531 and continued until the late 1530s.⁴⁰ Rowland instead puts the earliest drawings and annotations to the 1520s and the latest to after 1546.⁴¹

The Codex Stosch drawings, instead, have a stylistic consistency, which suggests they were executed in a single campaign (with the possible exception of the Cori drawings which are measured in a different unit). They are generally even more highly finished than those in the neater Corsini Incunabulum drawing group. The handwriting of the annotations, however, ranges from neat to untidy. The former is close to the earliest firmly attributed sample of Giovanni Battista's handwriting on a drawing datable 1521–4.⁴²

The date range 1521–4 corresponds well with the 1517–22 range of the anchor watermark found on the folios of the Codex Stosch (see above, p.9),

and some of the content of the annotations also point to an early dating. One example is the presence of the spelling mistake »iochinicho« instead of »ionicho« (fols 8r and 12r), which appears to display a lack of familiarity with basic architectural vocabulary for someone engaged in illustrating Vitruvius. If this were a solitary piece of evidence, one would be unwise to put too much weight on it since it could be a mere slip of the pen. In fact, »ionicho« appears correctly on fol. 8v and in the same paragraph on fol. 12r as the incorrect spelling. However, it has to be seen together with the identifications Sangallo gives to the three temples from the Forum Holitorium, which were incorporated into the Romanesque rebuilding of S. Nicola in Carcere: Honour for the southern Doric temple, Virtue for the north and »Templum Mariana« or the middle temple, which last he also describes as »dermodi« (fols 11r–15r).⁴³ These are not the conventional names given by humanist topographers but depend on a passage in Vitruvius 3.2.5: »... quemadmodum est in porticu Metelli Iovis Statoris Hermodori et ad Mariana Honoris et Virtutis sine postico a Mucio facta«, which can be translated »... just as there is in Hermodorus' Temple of Jove Stator in the Porticus of Metellus and, in the Temple of Honour and Virtue, made by Mucius, without a rear porch, near the Monuments of Marius«. Giovanni Battista has catastrophically misread the Latin, splitting into two the Temple of Honour and Virtue (which was on the slopes of the Capitoline not far from the Forum Holitorium), and taking »Mariana« to mean a third temple. He compounded his mistake by linking the middle temple, his »Templum Mariana«, with Hermodorus (»Dermodi«) instead of the Temple of Jove Stator.⁴⁴ It is difficult to believe Giovanni Battista could have gone so astray once he had access to translations of Vitruvius into Italian.⁴⁵

The earliest possibility is the manuscript translation by Fabio Calvo undertaken for Raphael to which Calcagnini refers in his letter of circa 1519 to Ziegler,⁴⁶ but, although it was physically present in Rome, we have no proof that it was accessible to Giovanni Battista. Secondly there is Cesare Cesariano's translation, the first printed, which was published in Como in 1521, but its distribution is believed to have been very limited and again there is no evidence Giovanni Battista knew it.⁴⁷ A third and most likely possibility is Lucio Durantino's 1524 Vitruvius, which plagiarised Cesariano's translation for the text together with the woodcuts from Fra Giocondo's Latin edition of 1511, a copy of which was owned and annotated by Giovanni Battista's brother, Antonio.⁴⁸ We do not know when he acquired it, but even if it did not reach Rome immediately after publication, Antonio could have brought it back with him from his

3 *Antonio da Sangallo the Younger: Studies of the temples at S. Nicola in Carcere; Florence, Uffizi, UA 1174r*

visit with Michele Sanmicheli (1484–1559) to the Veneto in spring 1526 (possibly accompanied by Giovanni Battista).⁴⁹ Annotations on some of Antonio's drawings of the Forum Holitorium temples in the Uffizi, reveal that he too thought they were Vitruvius' examples, identifying the Doric one with Jove Stator and the northern one with Honour and Virtue (fig. 3).⁵⁰ However, these names reveal a correct understanding of Vitruvius (apart from the siting of the temples) and must thus post-date the Codex Stosch, even though there are many correspondences between the actual drawings.⁵¹

There is, however, a problem in that the mistakes that display the misunderstanding of Vitruvius and the mis-spelled »iochinicho« are written in the untidy hand, which, if we were to date them on the basis of the untidier hand in the annotations to the Corsini Incunabulum, would put them into at least the 1530s if not 1540s. This would be improbably late given what we have argued about the access to translations of Vitruvius. It is difficult to conceive that the second phase of annotations, in the untidy hand in the Codex Stosch could have been added after 1530, and therefore we must include that Giovanni Battista had already begun to write in an untidy hand on occasion at some point later in the 1520s. In support of this are the annotations by Antonio the

Younger on his group of parallel drawings to those in Codex Stosch (see below, p. 23 f.), which appear to date to the 1520s.

To sum up, the strongest evidence for dating the Codex Stosch is the errors in understanding Vitruvius, which have to have been made before Giovanni Battista had access to an Italian translation, which could be as early as 1519, but was almost certainly by 1530. Such a dating is consistent with the watermark evidence, with the drawing style, with some of the handwriting of the annotations, and with those on the parallel drawings of Antonio.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER DRAWINGS FROM THE SANGALLO CIRCLE

Of the fifteen monuments represented in the album, only the drawings of the Temple of Castor and Pollux in Rome (fols 19v–20v), are completely unrelated to other drawings from elsewhere within the Sangallo Circle.⁵² The rest fall into three categories: the largest group of drawings, comprising ten subjects, has exact or very close parallels on four sheets of drawings by Antonio da Sangallo the Younger in the Uffizi in Florence. The drawings of the second group of subjects, the three S. Nicola in Carcere temples, display many correspondences both in drawing and in the annotations, with the large corpus of studies of the temples in the Uffizi, by various members of the Sangallo Circle, although exact parallels are fewer.⁵³ The third category is represented by a single drawing, the front elevation of the Arch of Titus (fol. 11), which echoes in some of its details the elevation by his uncle, Giuliano da Sangallo (1445–1516) in the »Barberini Codex«.⁵⁴ We will discuss them in order.

Antonio da Sangallo the Younger's parallels

If we only had Antonio's sheets UA 1165r and v (figs 4 and 5),⁵⁵ with the parallels of the two temples at Cori and the Hadrianeum, and UA 1166r (fig. 6) and v,⁵⁶ on which appear the Temple of Portunus and that of Antoninus and Faustina, one might conclude that Antonio was simply copying the Codex Stosch, since his freehand sketches either repeat or abbreviate the information. The fact that he distorts the proportions of the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina to fit the page, making the figures no longer to scale, seems to support the

4 *Antonio da Sangallo the Younger: Studies of the temples of Hercules and Castor and Pollux at Cori; Florence, Uffizi, UA 1165r*

assumption that he is dependent on Giovanni Battista rather, but it could also merely reflect the fact that Antonio's parallels are generally sketchier than his brother's ›in pulito‹ versions. The only case where one of Antonio's drawings apparently includes more information than his brother's is that of the side elevation of the Temple of Hercules at Cori, which is complete on UA 1165v (fig. 5) whereas the rear corner is omitted in the Codex Stosch (fol. 4r). In fact, looking closer, one sees that Giovanni Battista had to omit it for reasons of space, and includes a note on fol. 4r, ›mancha·ancora/ unpilastro qua·adrieto‹, which can be translated as ›another pilaster is missing behind here‹.⁵⁷

However, some of the drawings on Antonio's other two sheets complicate matters. While the plan and detail of the Janus Quadrifrons on UA 1046r are so close to those on fol. 2r that they may even been copied by superimposing the sheets, Antonio's elevation reconstructs the attic very differently and adds a perspectival sketch of the cross-vault of the arch, absent from the Codex Stosch.⁵⁸ These differences could be interpreted as Antonio borrowing from Giovanni Battista but, subsequently, adapting the drawings for his own purposes. However, it is not so easy to explain away the divergences in the drawings of details of the Temple of Vespasian on UA 1140r and v, which also in-

5 *Antonio da Sangallo the Younger: Studies of the Temple of Hercules at Cori, and of the Hadrianeum; Florence, Uffizi, UA 1165v*

clude parallel drawings of the Temple of Saturn (fols 18v–19r), Temple >A< at Largo Argentina (fol. 17v), and a detail of the >Colonnacce< of the Forum of Nerva (fols 22r and 23r).⁵⁹ Whereas Giovanni Battista’s detail of the entablature shows it entirely in elevation (fol. 17r),⁶⁰ Antonio draws the upper parts of the cornice accurately in section, providing information absent from the Codex Stosch. Similarly, an adjacent detail shows the ornament on the abacus of a Corinthian capital from the temple. Giovanni Battista draws more of the capital but fails to include the ornament of the abacus. It appears as if Antonio had access to other information to add to or alter that which he had from the Codex Stosch. This could have been gained from direct examination of the temple, but might also mean that both his and Giovanni Battista’s drawings depend on another independent source.

As far as dating Antonio’s parallels, the handwriting of the annotations on UA 1046 is similar to that on UA 717r, datable to circa 1523,⁶¹ which fits well with the possible 1521–4 dating for the neat hand in Giovanni Battista’s annotations to the Codex Stosch. None of Antonio’s parallels includes annotations which appear in the Codex Stosch somewhat later untidy hand, and Antonio’s inscription of the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina (UA 1166r) does not in-

6 *Antonio da Sangallo the Younger: Studies of the temples of Portunus and of Antoninus and Faustina; Florence, Uffizi, UA 1166r*

clude Giovanni Battista's corrections added in black chalk, again suggesting Antonio's parallel sheets are close in date with the first phase of the drawings of the Codex Stosch. The Cori drawings, however, may derive from surveys going back to around 1514, since there is an eighteenth-century report that the humanist Giovanni Battista Veralli recommended that Cardinal Alessandro Farnese (the future Pope Paul III), to model the doors and windows of the new Palazzo Farnese on the door of the Temple of Hercules at Cori.⁶² The long brackets supporting the lintels of the ground-floor windows of the palace do indeed resemble those of the temple, and work was already well advanced by 1514–5.⁶³ The Cori drawings differ in two respects: they are the only monuments included from outside Rome and, they are measured in a different unit, suggesting that they do not belong in the main sequence of drawings, but rather were either the first or last. It is worth noting here that the earliest evidence that Giovanni Battista had arrived in Rome to work with Antonio is an orthogonal profile of the entablature of the Temple of Castor and Pollux dated to a little after 1513–5 (UA 1181v).⁶⁴

The drawings of the temples at S. Nicola in Carcere

The three temples incorporated into S. Nicola in Carcere, were the subject of intense scrutiny by members of the Sangallo circle as is testified by the mass of surviving drawings in the Uffizi. They are often combined with Vitruvian theoretical studies, because, as we have seen, they were believed to be the very exemplars Vitruvius cites.⁶⁵ Some of the drawings, mainly measured using the Florentine ›braccio‹, are not closely related to the Codex Stosch but, others using the ›piede antico‹, are: only a handful will be discussed here, namely UA 1090r+1230v and 1090v+1230r, UA 1174r and UA 1657r.⁶⁶ The last, by Giovanni Battista, is the closest with sketch plans and details of all three temples. Most of the annotations echo those on the Codex Stosch parallels and the drawings themselves are either exact or very close parallels, even though the plans of the middle and north temples are both one bay longer, which can be put down to carelessness in copying. There are, however, some minor differences in measurements, suggesting that they include information from other sources, most probably some of the other survey drawings.

Antonio's UA 1090r+1230v has sketch plans of all three temples. Those of the middle and northern temples match those in the Codex Stosch, but the cella of the Doric temple is drawn accurately with only one entrance and the pronaos three intercolumniations deep leaving only one at the rear. This suggests that Antonio corrected his plan in the light of the evidence from the temple which was already largely demolished by the late 1520s, some of its stone being taken to the Palazzo Farnese, probably for re-use.⁶⁷ We have already referred to the other sides of these sheets (see above p. 21), UA 1090v+1230r (fig. 7), where Antonio identifies the Doric temple as that of Honour and Virtue, the northern ›Jove Stator‹ and crosses out at some unknown stage ›Santo Nicola di Ermodi‹ as his name for the middle temple, all additional evidence that the sheet is later than the Codex Stosch.

The same names for the Doric and northern temples appear on UA 1174r (fig. 3), but the middle one is now merely ›Santo Nichola‹ perhaps suggesting it is slightly later still. This is confirmed by the three plans, where now the cellas all correctly have only one entrance (although that of the Doric has regressed to having a pronaos only two intercolumniations deep, leaving two behind the cella). Despite these improvements, the sketch of the part section through the north temple still follows the Codex Stosch in wrongly giving it Corinthian capitals rather than Ionic, making the three temples exemplars also

of the three Greek orders. Presumably, no Ionic capital can have been readily visible to the Sangallo brothers, although Baldassare Peruzzi must have seen evidence of one, because he notes the temple was Ionic on his plan of all three temples (UA 478v+631r).⁶⁸ Another elevational detail on UA 1174r (fig. 3), demonstrating the difference in height between the Doric and the middle temples, also follows perhaps the oddest Codex Stosch drawing, the front elevation of the middle temple (fol. 12r), in showing the Ionic capitals side on. Giovanni Battista admits that this is a »cosa rara« (»a rare thing«).⁶⁹ The mistake was the result of the assumption that there were two rows of columns in front of the cella rather than three as in reality, so that the capitals drawn actually belonged to the inner row.

The bulk of the Sangallo Circle Uffizi Forum Holitorium studies have conventionally been dated to not earlier than 1519, largely on the basis that related studies of the adjacent Theatre of Marcellus probably date from when Peruzzi was believed to have begun work on converting the Theatre into the Palazzo Savelli, although more recent studies suggest he may have been working there around 1525.⁷⁰ This would fit well with a report that Antonio and Giovanni Battista's brother, Francesco (c. 1490 – after 1552) was paid for work at the »Carcer Tulliano« (i.e. the north temple) in the same year.⁷¹

The elevation of the Arch of Titus

As we said above, the first folio of the album with a front elevation of the Arch of Titus (fol. 1r) stands alone from all the succeeding drawings in displaying the influence of Giuliano da Sangallo's »Barberini Codex«.⁷² The conjectural pediments on the attic are clearly borrowed from the latter's reconstruction drawing, but the erroneous assumption that the aedicules in the piers were open rather than blind also derive from the same source. Apart from these two errors, the rest of the reconstruction is exemplary and comes close to matching in accuracy the drawings of »Master C of 1519« a member of the Raphael circle, whose reconstruction (fig. 8) has until now been regarded as giving us the best idea of what Raphael's project to reconstruct ancient Rome on paper might have looked like.⁷³ It is to that question that we now turn.

RELATIONSHIP TO RAPHAEL'S RECONSTRUCTION OF ROME AND
CALVO'S TRANSLATION OF VITRUVIUS; DATING IMPLICATIONS

The famous Letter to Pope Leo X, composed by Raphael together with Baldassare Castiglione, adumbrates the project. It survives in three versions, one in manuscript in Mantua, perhaps begun as early as 1515, another in manuscript in Munich from shortly before Raphael's death in 1520, while the third only survives in print from 1733.⁷⁴

The most explicit description of what was proposed only occurs in the Mantua first draft. It states that Raphael proposed a ›universal‹ plan of the whole city; then individual plans of each region, and, finally individual studies of the ›most noble‹ buildings.⁷⁵ The Munich draft tells us that the principal ancient source for the city was to be ›Publius Victor‹, a redaction of the fourth-century regionary catalogue, which lists all the significant monuments in the fourteen ancient regions of Rome, as well as the lengths of their boundaries.⁷⁶ Whatever the minor differences, all three versions agree that at least one plan of the city and plans, elevations and sections in orthogonal projection of particular buildings were intended.⁷⁷

That the reconstruction project was underway before Raphael's death on 6 April 1520 is attested by the letter from Calcagnini to Ziegler (fig. 1), which Stosch copied to go along with the drawings now bound in the Codex Stosch (see above p. 14), although the letter fails to provide any clue as to the project's exact nature. Within a day after Raphael's death, Marcantonio Michiel recorded in his diary that the artist had been unable to finish »la descrizione e pittura di Roma antiqua, che'l faceva, che era cosa bellissima ...« (›the description and picture of ancient Rome, which he was making, which was a most beautiful thing‹), which has been interpreted as if it was a single representation of the whole city.⁷⁸ However, in a letter dated 11 April, Michiel wrote that the reconstruction:

»... stendeva in un libro, sicome Ptholomeo ha isteso il mondo, gli edificii antiqui di Roma, mostrando sì chiaramente le proportioni, forme et ornamenti loro, che averlo veduto harà iscusato ad ogniuno haver veduta Roma antiqua; e già havea forniita la prima regione. Ne mostrava solamente le piante delli edificii et il sito, il che con grandissima fatica e industria de le ruine saria raccolto, ma ancora le facia, cum li ornamenti quanto da Vitruvio e dalla ragione de la architectura e da le istorie antiche, ove le ruine non le rintenevano, havea expressimamente designava ...« (›It was displayed in a

8 >Master C of 1519<: *Front elevation and plan of the Arch of Titus; Vienna, Albertina, inv. Egger, no. 19, fol. 2v*

book, as Ptolemy has displayed the world, the ancient buildings of Rome showing so clearly their proportions, forms and ornaments, that, having seen it, it would be as if one had seen ancient Rome [itself]; and he had already finished the first region. Nor did it show only the plans of the buildings and the site, which will have been collected with the greatest effort and industry from the ruins, but the façades were most expressively drawn, with ornaments [reconstructed] according to Vitruvius and from the rationale of architecture and from ancient reliefs [alternative translation: histories], where the ruins did not retain them⁷⁹.

This is so explicit that one must conclude that Michiel had seen at least part of the project, and that it consisted of more than a single plan, and included detailed elevation drawings of individual buildings. The reference to Ptolemy is probably to his »Geographia«, which includes both overall maps of the world and continents and maps of individual countries and regions.⁸⁰ However, Michiel records that only the »first region« had been completed. Quite what this means is not obvious: »Regio I« (Porta Capena) was outlying and contained few major monuments apart from the Baths of Caracalla, but it is feasible that the plan of that region was finished, while work on drawing monuments proceeded elsewhere, but, alternatively, it might merely mean that only one of the fourteen regions was completely finished.⁸¹ Nothing more is known for certain of the fate of the project, leading to much speculation over the centuries.

It is highly unlikely that Raphael executed the reconstruction drawings himself. Just as he organised his assistants paint the »Logge« and the »Stanze«, so surveying the city and its monuments would have been undertaken by a team under his direction.⁸² Buddensieg was the first to suggest that the Master C sketchbook was part of the missing reconstruction, believing it fitted Winckelmann's description of the Codex Stosch.⁸³ It did indeed belong to Stosch, but only has nineteen folios, and lacks drawings of the Doric temple at Cori.⁸⁴ Others have argued that some of the meticulous studies of ancient monuments by members of the Sangallo circle, now preserved in the Uffizi, are part of the project.⁸⁵ Given that Antonio da Sangallo the Younger was Raphael's chief assistant on St Peter's, it would be strange if some of his drawings and those of his circle were not related. However, Anton Springer's suggestion over a century ago that the Letter to Leo X was intended as a dedicatory epistle for the Rome reconstruction project,⁸⁶ is now generally accepted and few of the Sangallo circle drawings in the Uffizi have the appearance of being preparatory for a pres-

entation manuscript or published volume. Those of ›Master C‹ do qualify on that count,⁸⁷ but, are hardly ›most expressively drawn‹ as Michiel puts it. The Codex Stosch drawings fit the description of being preparatory material for the project on both counts, but there are also two stumbling blocks, namely the presence of the Cori temples, and the fact that it is ordered typologically. Neither objection is unsurmountable, if we assume Giovanni Battista continued to work on the drawings after Raphael's death, as we know he reworked the related Corsini Incunabulum drawings over years,⁸⁸ but they should make us pause before we jump to hasty conclusions and briefly consider Raphael's Vitruvius project.

Drawings in the Fossombrone Sketchbook by a member of the Raphael circle testify that Raphael was preparing an illustrated edition of Calvo's translation of Vitruvius.⁸⁹ Like the reconstruction project, illustrating it would have been a team effort. Given that the watermark of the Codex Stosch folios is also found on some Raphael drawings, it is possible that its drawings are actually related to, or at least reflect, both of Raphael's projects. The objection that the Codex Stosch identifications of the S.Nicola temples betray a lack of understanding of Vitruvius' text could be met if we assume that the illustrations were being prepared at the same time, not after, Calvo was making his translation, which would accord with a pre-1520 dating of the drawings, which is not impossible. The drawings of the Doric temple at Cori would fit the Raphael Vitruvius project better than the Rome reconstruction, but the aims of the two projects are so close that there is no reason why the Codex Stosch drawings might not have served or reflect both purposes. If they are not related in some way with Raphael, one is left with the question of what they were for at that date.

We do not know how the Codex Stosch drawings came to be separated from the rest of Giovanni Battista's drawings and writings, most of which he left to the Roman confraternity of S.Giovanni Decollato at his death in 1548, although parts of one of the Vitruvian translations and some related material were detached and are now in Florence.⁹⁰ We have no evidence for where the drawings came into Stosch's hands. One remote possibility is that they were among a large quantity of large and small »fogli di disegni di Raffaello ...« (›sheets of drawings of Raphael‹), among material mainly cartographical or topographical in content, included in two inventories of February 1528 and of the Florentine workshop of the cartographer and printseller, Alessandro Rosselli, who died in 1525.⁹¹ Di Teodoro speculates that these ›sheets of drawings‹

may relate to the missing reconstruction.⁹² It is certainly intriguing that the material mentioned in the inventory was last seen in Florence and that the Codex Stosch should first appear there two centuries later. However, there are reasons to be cautious about connecting the two. Shearman pointed out that »disegni« is sometimes used to mean prints in Renaissance inventories, and that another related document of March 1528 refers to »foli instanpati de' disegni di Roma di Rafaello« (>printed sheets of the drawings of Rome of Raphael<) at the same price as the >drawings< in the inventories, and therefore they may have been no drawings at all.⁹³ A second objection is that the Codex Stosch would need to have been in Florence by as early as 1528. This is not impossible if we accept that Giovanni Battista was already using his untidy hand before 1530 as we have argued but it is nevertheless constructing a very tight timetable.

CONCLUSIONS

We have seen that Stosch's and Winckelmann's belief that the drawings in the Codex Stosch are Raphael's own drawings of his famous lost reconstruction of Rome cannot be sustained. Instead, we have established that they are by Giovanni Battista da Sangallo and are closely related but probably predate at least the majority of his Corsini Incunabulum illustrations and most likely date from some time in the early 1520s. He has started editing them in a second instance and the relationship with the Corsini illustrations may be more complex, i.e. in part contemporary. Stosch's and Winckelmann's ideas that the Codex Stosch was Raphael's reconstruction was not conceived in a vacuum. The publication of the Calcagnini letter in 1687 and of the Letter to Leo X in 1733 demonstrate that they were working within a tradition or new scholarly opinion, which we have so far been unable to reconstruct. The late seventeenth- or eighteenth-century copies of many sixteenth-century books of drawings in the still unpublished and presently unphotographed Codex Destailleur-Polofzoff >C< in the Hermitage could reveal a clue.⁹⁴

NOTES

- * We would like to acknowledge the generous help of the following in the preparation of this article: Peter Black, Iain Gordon Brown, Arnaldo Bruschi, Joe Connors, Stephanie Gerrit-Bruer, Mary Guyatt, Charles Hind, Lisa Nash, Pier Nicola Pagliara, Sebastian Pryke, Ingrid Rowland, Georg Schelbert, Charlotte Schreiter and Michael Snodin.
- 1 Ian Campbell: Lyon & Turnbull. The Codex Stosch, to be included in the sale of books and manuscripts Tuesday 12th July 2005, Edinburgh 2005. In the following quoted as: Campbell 2005.
 - 2 The 1706 date comes from the spine linings, which include fragments of a printed title page coming from Ignazio Orsolini: *Inclytæ nationii Florentinae familiae Suprema Romani Pontificatu: ac Sacra Cardinalatus Dignitatae illustratae...*, Florence 1706. The endpapers carry a watermark very similar to Heawood 3874, dated 1761–3. See Campbell 2005, p. 4.
 - 3 Campbell 2005, p. 10. The anchor in a circle with a six-pointed star is a very common type of watermark in early sixteenth-century Italy but the ones here are particularly close to Briquet 492 (Lucca 1522) and to one on a drawing attributed to Raphael at Windsor (RL 12754) from about 1517–8 (Martin Clayton: *Raphael and his circle*, London 1999, pp. 121–3, no. 31, and p. 214).
 - 4 Fols 1r, 2v, 9v, 11r, 14r, 15v and 19r, see Campbell 2005, pp. 46 f.; 51 f.; 54–6 and 58.
 - 5 Campbell 2005, p. 47 f.
 - 6 Bramante had revived the use of Roman foot in the Vatican spiral staircase, see Christiane Denker Nesselrath: *Bramante's spiral staircase*, Vatican City 1996, p. 20.
 - 7 Campbell 2005, p. 50.
 - 8 Campbell 2005, pp. 47 f. and 60.
 - 9 The thinness of the paper precludes the possibility that the Codex Stosch drawings themselves would form part of a >de luxe< presentation volume, but we have examples such as Jacques Androuet du Cerceau, who prepared parallel sets of drawings and engravings, 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, Torino 1986, vol. III, pp. 89–147 at p. 140.
 - 10 Note also that most of the folios consist of bifolia, bound with their immediate neighbours, with only fols 18–21 grouped as a small gathering, see Campbell 2005, p. 10. – Folio 3 appears to have been reversed and turned upside down by the time the graphite foliation numbers were added (see above, p. 14), as is indicated by the similarity in condition of the bottom left corner to that of top right corners on neighbouring versos. When guard strips were added to the centrefolds of most bifolia (probably at the time of binding), folios 3 and 4 were erroneously linked together as if they formed a bifolium and sewing holes down the left edge of fol. 3r also testify that it was bound that way round. We have retained this latest ordering rather than trying to reconstruct any earlier sequence. Unfortunately, the photography of folio 3 gives a very misleading impression; fol. 3r is shown as if facing fol. 5r, so that it appears as a verso, but that it is clearly out of sequence is demonstrated at bottom left where the sheet underneath is clearly fol. 2v. Similarly fol. 3v appears as a recto facing fol. 4v, but the sheet on which it rests is fol. 5r.
 - 11 >Fragmentum epistolae Coelii Calcagnini ad Jac. Zieglerum< in Clement I, Pope: *Epistolae duae ad Corinthios. Interpretibus Patricio Junio, Gottifredo Vendelino, et Joh. Bapt. Coterio. Recensuit et notarum spicilegium adjecit Paulus Colomesius ... Accedit Thomae Brunonis Dissertatio de Therapeutis Philonis. His subnexae sunt epistolae aliquot singulares*, ed.

- by Paul Colomiès, London 1687, pp. 231–4. A slightly different version of the letter, published originally in Calcagnini's »Opera«, Basle 1544, is now accessible in John Shearman: Raphael in early modern sources, 2 vols, New Haven/London 2003, vol. I, item 1519–20/1, pp. 546–50. For the Calcagnini copy see Campbell 2005, pp. 44 f.; 61.
- 12 Das neue gelehrte Europa, ed. by Johann Christoph Strodtmann, continued by Ferdinand Stosch, 19 vols, Wolfenbüttel 1752–73, vol. 5, pp. 1–54.
 - 13 A brief summary of Stosch's career can be found in Ingrid Sattel Bernardini: Philipp von Stosch, in: The Dictionary of Art, ed. by Jane Shoaf Turner, 34 vols, London 1996, vol. 29, p. 724 f. Unfortunately its bibliography omits the excellent article by Lesley Lewis: Philipp von Stosch, in: Apollo 85 (1967), pp. 320–7, and the same author's: Connoisseurs and Secret Agents in Eighteenth Century Rome, London 1961, in which Stosch features prominently.
 - 14 Philipp von Stosch: Gemmae Antiquae Caelatae, Amsterdam 1724.
 - 15 Johann Christoph Strodtmann, Ferdinand Stosch: Fortsetzung der Geschichte des Freiherrn von Stosch zu Florenz. Verzeichnis von Sammlungen, in: Das neue gelehrte Europa 1757 (note 12), vol. 10, pp. 257–301 at p. 273, no. 22.
 - 16 Arnold Nesselrath: Carlo Maratta's Designs for the »Piatti di San Giovanni«, in: Master Drawings 17 (1979), pp. 417–26; Arnold Nesselrath: Das Fossombroner Skizzenbuch, London 1993 (Studies of the Warburg Institute 41), p. 51; Arnold Nesselrath: Artista dell'Italia settentrionale o del Veneto e altri 22 disegnatore, Album con disegni, prevalentemente di architetture, in: La Roma di Leon Battista Alberti, ed. by Francesco Paolo Fiore in collaboration with Arnold Nesselrath, Milano 2005, pp. 268 f., no. II. 10. 9.
 - 17 »On perusing the Monuments of M. Le Roy I should have wished that he had seen the temples of Paestum or Pesto, and, for the third period of the Doric Order the wholly entire prototype of a Doric temple at Cori, [a] town situated towards Velletri. I have it copied in a drawing of the great Raphael when it was more complete with all the measurements. Raphael made a number of drawings when he had to execute the great design of Leo X. These Doric columns have the base and the plinth like the Corinthians and rods [?] to almost a third of their flutes. The diameter of the columns is $3\frac{1}{4}$ palms, the height 27–10 palms. The intercolumniations of $5\frac{1}{2}$ p., the middle intercolumniation or the entry $10\frac{3}{4}$ p. The narrowing of the door [towards the top] was from $10\frac{2}{3}$ to 10–1 palms«, Johann Joachim Winckelmann: Briefe, ed. by Walther Rehm, Hans Diepolder, 4 vols, Berlin 1952, vol. 2, pp. 99–101, no. 374.
 - 18 Johann Joachim Winckelmann: Catalogue abrégé de L'Atlas du feu Baron de Stosch en 324 tomes in fol. Grand Papier Impérial avec cartes, planches, et dessins, in: Johann Joachim Winckelmann: Description des pierres gravées du feu baron de Stosch, Florence 1760, pp. 571–96. Horace Mann wrote to Horace Walpole on 15 April 1758 that »[a] catalogue of his [Stosch's] maps has been printed by Natter in Holland and will, I believe, be sent into England«, see Horace Walpole's Correspondence with Sir Horace Mann, ed. by Wilmarth Sheldon Lewis, Warren Hunting Smith, George L. Lam, 11 vols, The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence, vols 17–27, New Haven/London 1954–71, at vol. 21, p. 192. Johann Lorentz Natter (1705–63) was a German gem-engraver and a medallist, whom Stosch employed from 1732 to copy ancient carved gems in Florence. In the late 1730s he moved to London, where he made a medal of Walpole's father, Robert in 1741. In 1756–7 he worked as chief engraver at the mint in Utrecht, before settling in The Hague (Hermann Maué: Johann Lorentz Natter, in: The Dictionary of Art, ed. by Jane Shoaf Turner, 34 vols, London 1996, vol. 22, p. 683 f.). No copy of Natter's catalogue has been traced.

- 19 The »Paper Museum« is being published in thirty volumes by the Royal Collection Trust. The Paper Museum of Cassiano dal Pozzo. A catalogue raisonné. Drawings and prints in the Royal Library at Windsor Castle, the British Museum, the Institut de France and other collections. Series A, Antiquities and Architecture; Series B, Natural history, gen. eds: Francis Haskell and Jennifer Montagu, London 1996 –.
- 20 Peter Metz, Paul Ortwin Rave: Eine neuerworbene Bildnisbüste des Barons Philipp von Stosch von Edme Bouchardon, in: Berliner Museen. Berichte aus den ehem. Preußischen Kunstsammlungen, N.S.VII, 1 (1957), pp. 19–26 at p. 25. On the Atlas see Rudolf Kinauer: Der Atlas des Freiherrn Philipp von Stosch der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Ein Beitrag zu seiner Rekonstruktion und zur Geschichte der Atlanten, unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Wien 1950. – The »Master C of 1519« sketchbook had been put forward as a candidate (see above, pp. 32 and note 33) but that speculation has been superseded by the rediscovery of the Codex Stosch.
- 21 Jeanne Bignami Odier: Premières Recherches sur le Fonds Ottoboni, Città del Vaticano 1966 (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana; Studi e testi 245), p. 20; Jeanne Bignami Odier, José Ruyschaert: La Bibliothèque Vaticane de Sixte IV à Pie XI. Recherches sur l'histoire des collections des manuscrits, Città del Vaticano 1973 (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana; Studi e testi 272), p. 167; Ian Campbell wrongly reports that the library was disposed of piecemeal, see Campbell 2005, p. 6.
- 22 »Vielleicht habe ich noch Zeit eine Nachricht in einer Anmerkung anzubringen von Ihren Zeichnungen von Raphael, deren ich gedacht habe. Mir fehlet der Brief welcher in Abschrift zu diesen Zeichnungen geleet ist. Ich ersuche Sie mir denselben abzuschreiben, so gut Sie können, und das Buch sonderlich anzumerken, woraus derselbe abgeschrieben« Winckelmann, Briefe 1952 (note 17), vol. 2, p. 108 f., no. 379.
- 23 »... Ich habe aber Zeichnungen des großen Raphaels von diesem Gebäude vor Augen, welches gezeichnet und genau ausgemessen worden, da dasselbe weniger also 1/2 gelitten hatte. Die dorischen Säulen deßelben, deren unterer Durchmesser 3 und einen Viertel Palm, und der obere 2 Palme und 8 Zolle hält, haben 7 Durchmesser in die Höhe, ohne die Base und das Kapitäl, und die ganze Höhe derselben ist 27 Palme und zehen Zolle...« Johann Joachim Winckelmann: Sämtliche Werke, ed. by Joseph Eiselein, 12 vols, Donauöschingen 1825–9, vol. 2, p. 392 f. The »Anmerkungen« were originally published in Leipzig in 1762. They were translated into Italian and published posthumously as part of a collection of Winckelmann's writings: *Storia delle Arti del disegno presso gli antichi*, ed. by Carlo Fea, 3 vols, Rome 1783–4, in which see vol. 3, p. 50 for the Cori drawings. Citing this reference, Paola Brandizzi Vittucci: *Cora*, Rome 1968, p. 93, n. 1, also refers to a nineteenth-century document in the Archivio di Stato of Rome (Camerlengato II, IV, 39), which states that the drawings were in the Vatican Library, but they have not been traced.
- 24 »Diese Zeichnungen befanden sich, nebst anderen von alten Gebäuden genommenen, in dem Museo des berühmten Herrn von Stosch, und machten einen Band von etlichen und zwanzig Stuken aus. Ein anderer Band von ähnlichen Zeichnungen des Raphaels befindet sich in der Bibliothek des vor kurzem verstorbenen Thomas Coke, Lords Leicester, welcher sich durch herausgebung der *Etruria Regalis Dempsteri* bei der gelehrten Welt verdient gemacht hat. Raphael verfertigte diese Zeichnungen, nachdem der zum Baumeister von St. Peter in Rom ernennet worden; es sollten dieselben dienen zu dem großen Vorhaben, das alte Rom gleichsam wieder zu erneuern, welches Papst Leo X. gefasset hatte. Man findet hierin Nachricht in einem Briefe des Celio Calcagnini an Jakob Zieglern, zweien Zeitgenossen dieses Künstlers. Es ist dieser Brief, nebst andern, zweien Sendschreibern des h. Clemens

- beigefüget, welche betitelt sind: S. Clementis Epistolae duae ad Corinthios. His subnexae sunt aliquot singulares vel nunc primum editae, ita facile obviae. Londini 1687« Winckelmann 1825–9 (note 23), vol. 2, p. 392.
- 25 It is tempting to jump to the conclusion that the transcription he requested from Muzell-Stosch is that which is now on the loose leaf with the codex, but the handwriting of the latter matches exactly that of Philipp von Stosch's spy reports, for example, London, National Archives, SP 98/32.
- 26 Lewis 1961 (note 13), p. 195 f.
- 27 Horace Walpole's Correspondence 1954–71 (note 18), vol. 21, pp. 380, 427 and 433 f. It might be objected that Winckelmann claimed to be looking at the album in 1762. In the letter to Barthélemy in September 1760 (see above p. 16 and note 17), Winckelmann writes of a ›copy‹ of Raphael's drawings, which raises the possibility that he had them copied. If Muzell-Stosch did take the album as a sample of his uncle's collections, does this mean that he considered its value as works by Raphael?
- 28 Horace Walpole's Correspondence 1954–71 (note 18), vol. 21, pp. 426 f.; 433 and 440.
- 29 Horace Walpole's Correspondence 1954–71 (note 18), vol. 21, pp. 461 and 474.
- 30 Society of Antiquaries of London: A List of the members of the Society of Antiquaries of London, from their revival in 1717 to June 19, 1796, London 1798, p. 16.
- 31 Horace Walpole's Correspondence 1954–71 (note 18), vol. 21, pp. 503, 512 and 527.
- 32 On Askew, see M. J. Mercer: Anthony Askew M.D., in: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, ed. by Henry Colin Gray Matthew, Brian Harrison, 60 vols, Oxford 2004, vol. 2, p. 712; The library contents are known from the sale catalogue: Anthony Askew: Bibliotheca Askeviana. Sive catalogues librorum rarissimorum Antonii Askew, M.D. quorum auctio fiet, London 1775.
- 33 On earlier attempts to identify it, see Nesselrath 1993 (note 16), p. 54 and Francesco Paolo di Teodoro: Raffaello, Baldassar Castiglione e la lettera a Leo X, 2nd edition, Bologna 2003, p. 42 f.
- 34 On Giovanni Battista, see Pier Nicola Pagliara: Cordini, Giovanni Battista, in: Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani, Rome 1984, vol. 29, pp. 23–28; Pier Nicola Pagliara: Giovanni Battista, in: The Dictionary of Art, ed. by Jane Shoaf Turner, 34 vols, London 1996, vol. 27, pp. 747–749. The annotated and illustrated Vitruvius is in Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana (the library of the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei): Inc. 50.F.1. It has recently been published in facsimile: Vitruvius. Ten books on architecture. The Corsini incunabulum Vitruvius; with the annotations and autograph drawings of Giovanni Battista da Sangallo; edited with an introductory essay by Ingrid Drake Rowland, Rome 2003. In the following quoted as: Vitruvius, Corsini Incunabulum 2003. We will follow Rowland in referring to it as the ›Corsini Incunabulum‹ to distinguish it from Battista's two manuscript translations of Vitruvius preserved in the same Library: Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana, Mss. Cors. 1846 and 2093.
- 35 London, RIBA British Architectural Library, Codex Stosch, fol. 14r: Campbell 2005, pp. 54–56.
- 36 M. Vitruvius per Jocundum solito castigatior factus ..., ed. by Fra Giocondo, Venice 1511. Antonio the Younger owned a copy of the 1513 edition of Giocondo's Vitruvius, see Pier Nicola Pagliara: Alcune minute autografe di Giovanni Battista da Sangallo. Parte della traduzione di Vitruvio e la lettera a Paolo III contro il cornicione michelangiolesco di Palazzo Farnese, in: Architettura Archivi: fonti e storia 1 (1982), pp. 25–50, at p. 33 a.
- 37 Vitruvius, Corsini Incunabulum 2003, p. 269.

- 38 Compare Harold Mattingly: *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, 5 vols, London 1923–50, vol.4, Antoninus Pius 339, 383 and 1562; see also Amanda Claridge: *Rome. An Oxford Archaeological Guide*, Oxford 1998, fig.43. Curiously, however, the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina fails to illustrate Giovanni Battista's understanding of the meaning of ›scamilli inpaes‹ since its podium is not articulated with engaged pedestals. Ian Campbell: *Scamilli Inpaes: a problem in Vitruvius*, in: *Papers of the British School at Rome XLVIII* (1980), pp. 17–22 at p.21, speculated that Giovanni Battista was actually thinking of the Hadrianeum, which at the time was often thought to be the Temple (or Basilica) of Antoninus Pius, and did have such a podium. However, in the Codex Stosch Giovanni Battista reconstructs the Hadrianeum on a stylobate, which weakens that possibility.
- 39 Vitruvius, Corsini Incunabulum 2003, p.26.
- 40 Pagliara 1982 (note 36); Pier Nicola Pagliara: *Studi e pratica vitruviana di Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane e di suo fratello Giovanni Battista*, in: *Les traités d'architecture de la Renaissance: Actes du Colloque tenu à Tours du 1er au 11 juillet 1981*, ed. by Jean Guillaume, Paris 1988, pp. 179–206, at p.181; Pagliara 1984 (note 34), p.27; Pagliara 1996 (note 34), p.748.
- 41 Vitruvius, Corsini Incunabulum 2003, pp.27 and 34. Rowland actually tries to distinguish three phases of annotations: 1) 1520s; 2) 1530s – early 1540s; 3) 1546–8, but in our view most examples of the alleged intermediate hand can as easily be assigned to the other two phases. Her datings depend largely on Christoph Luitpold Frommel: *Introduction. The Drawings of Antonio da Sangallo the Younger. History, Evolution, Method, Function*, in: *The Architectural drawings of Antonio da Sangallo the Younger and his circle*, ed. by Christoph Luitpold Frommel and Nicholas Adams, New York/Cambridge/London 1994, vol. 1, pp. 1–61, who discusses Giovanni Battista's handwriting at p.45 with illustrations on fig.38. Rowland does not give reasons for accepting Frommel's conclusions, which are not always supported by evidence or argument, rather than those of Pagliara (see references in note 40) which are better-founded.
- 42 Frommel 1994 (note 41), fig.38 f. and p.45.
- 43 Campbell 2005, pp.52–6.
- 44 For the temples of Honour and Virtue and of Jove Stator, see Domenico Palombi: *Honos et Virtus, Aedes*, in: *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae*, ed. by Eva Margareta Steinby, 6 vols, Rome 1993–2000, vol. 3, pp.31–3; Domenico Palombi: *Honos et Virtus, Aedes Mariana*, in: *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae 1993–2000*, vol. 3, pp.33–5; Alessandro Viscogliosi: *Iuppiter Stator, Aedes ad Circum*, in: *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae 1993–2000*, vol. 3, pp.157–9. For the S.Nicola temples see Livia Crozzoli Aite: *I tre templi del Foro Olitorio*, Roma 1981 (*Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia: ser. 3; XIII*). Cf. also Silvio Ferri's comment on the passage in Vitruvius in his edition of the ancient text: *Vitruvio Pollione ›Architettura‹ (dai libri I-VII)*, introduzione di Stefano Maggi, testo, traduzione e commento di Silvio Ferri, 2nd edition, Milano 2003, pp.174–175. Note also that the alternative name for the middle temple ›Dermodi‹ strengthens the likelihood that Fra Giocondo's edition was being used. ›Dermodi‹ should be read ›d'Ermodi‹ i.e. ›of ›Hermodus‹. Adrian Turnebus (1512–65) in his *Adversariorum libri triginta*, 3 vols, Paris 1580, I, p.343 (Bk 11, ch. 2) recognised that ›Hermodi‹ was a contraction of ›Hermodori‹ and his emendation has been universally accepted. In his 1486 edition (the one Giovanni Battista illustrated) Sulpitius substituted ›huiusmodi‹. The Florence 1496 edition correctly reads ›Hermodi‹, the Venice 1497 ›huiusmodi Hermodi‹; and in Fra Giocondo's 1511 edition ›Hermodi‹.

- 45 Ingrid Rowland has pointed out (Vitruvius, Corsini Incunabulum, 2003, p. 50) a similar howler. In the Sulpitius edition, ›species‹ in Vitr., 5.6.8 is contracted apparently to read ›spes‹ which means ›hope[s]‹ in Latin. Giovanni Battista fails to recognize the contraction and translates it in the margin as ›speranza‹, which means ›hope‹ in Italian. She would date the marginal translation to the 1530s-early 1540s (Vitruvius, Corsini Incunabulum 2003, p. 34) but the dating is not secure (cfr. note 41).
- 46 Shearman argues for Calvo's translation being completed before March 1519, but fails to hazard a start date, but Calvo is unlikely to have begun before finishing his translation of Hippocrates in 1515, see Shearman 2003 (note 11), I, pp. 397–404. Calvo's translation, preserved in two manuscript versions in Munich has been published: Vitruvio e Raffaello: Il *De Architectura* di Vitruvio nella traduzione inedita di Fabio Calvo Ravennate, ed. by Vincenzo Fontana and Paolo Morachiello, Rome 1975.
- 47 For the question of the limited distribution we are grateful for personal communications from Pier Nicola Pagliara and Arnaldo Bruschi to Arnold Nesselrath, 16 December 2005. Rowland's observation that it is »... clear that Giovanni Battista da Sangallo studied Cesariano's Vitruvius as carefully as he must have studied Giocondo's« makes it appear that he must have known it, but she goes on to say that he »... adopted virtually none of Cesariano's visual conventions«: Vitruvius, Corsini Incunabulum, 2003, p. 20. This would suggest that he knew it from the Durantino edition of Vitruvius, which combines Cesariano's text with Giocondo's woodcuts.
- 48 On Antonio's copy of Durantino see Pagliara 1988 (note 40), p. 185 f. Rowland states that it is clear that Giovanni Battista studied Cesariano's Vitruvius as carefully as Giocondo's, see Vitruvius, Corsini Incunabulum 2003, p. 21.
- 49 See Lionello Puppi: Un viaggio per il Veneto di Antonio da Sangallo e di Michele Sanmicheli nella primavera del 1526, un progetto per i Grimani; e qualche riflessione a margine, in: Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane. La vita e l'opera, Atti del XXII Congresso di Storia dell'Architettura Roma, 19–21 febbraio 1986, ed. by Gianfranco Spagnesi, Roma 1986, pp. 101–8; Pagliara suggests Giovanni Battista accompanied Antonio and Sanmicheli at least to the Romagna, see Pagliara 1984 (note 34), p. 25.
- 50 Florence, Uffizi, UA 1090v+1230r, fig. 7 (Alfonso Bartoli: I Monumenti antichi di Roma nei disegni degli Uffizi di Firenze, 6 vols, Rome 1914–22, vol. III, fig. 418, vol. VI, p. 77 f.) and UA 1174r (Bartoli 1914–22, vol. III, fig. 472, vol. VI, p. 78). On the Vitruvian identifications, see Ian Campbell: Renaissance reconstructions of Roman temples made in Italy between 1450 and 1600, 2 vols, unpub. D. Phil. Thesis, University of Oxford, 1984, vol. I, p. 229 and Pagliara 1988 (note 40), p. 191.
- 51 Also note that on UA 1090v+1230r, Antonio has crossed out »Santo Nicola di Ermodi« as the name for the middle temple.
- 52 Campbell 2005, p. 58 f.
- 53 Campbell 2005, pp. 52–6.
- 54 *Census*, RecNo. 44522: Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Barb. lat. 4424, fol. 23r (Il libro di Giuliano da Sangallo, Codice Vaticano Barberiniano Latino 4424 riprodotto in fototopia, ed. by Christian Hülsen, 2 vols, Leipzig 1910 (Codices e Vaticanis selecti 11)), vol. 1, p. 32.
- 55 Bartoli 1914–22 (note 50), vol. III, figs 478–9; Susanna Valori: Disegni di antichità dell'Albertina di Vienna, Rome 1985 (Xenia Quaderni 6), pp. 118–21, nos 92–3; Brandizzi Vittucci 1968 (note 23), pp. 63, 88 and 92, figs 96 and 190.
- 56 *Census*, RecNo. 64044; Bartoli 1914–22 (note 50), vol. III, figs 476–7, vol. VI, p. 89 f.

- 57 Campbell 2005, p.48.
- 58 Bartoli 1914–22 (note 50), vol. III, fig. 416, vol. VI, p. 77; Campbell 2005, p.46f.
- 59 Bartoli 1914–22 (note 50), vol. III, figs 474–5, vol. VI, p. 89; Campbell 2005, pp.57f. and 59f.
- 60 Campbell 2005, p. 57.
- 61 Frommel 1994 (note 41), fig. 37 c.
- 62 Christoph Luitpold Frommel: Sangallo et Michel-Ange, in: *Le Palais Farnèse. Ecole Française de Rome*, 2 vols, Rome 1981, vol. I, pp. 127–74 at p. 168, n. 218.
- 63 Frommel 1981 (note 62), pp. 143 and 168, n. 218.
- 64 Pagliara 1984 (note 34), p. 24. Christoph Dittscheid in his entry on UA 1181 r and v in: *The Architectural Drawings of Antonio da Sangallo the Younger and his Circle*, ed. by Christoph Luitpold Frommel and Nicholas Adams, New York/Cambridge/London, 1994–, vol. 3 (forthcoming), argues that the profile is drawn by Antonio and only the measurements are by Giovanni Battista, but still dates it 1513–15. We do not believe the case for Antonio's authorship is proven but even if it were the fact of Giovanni Battista's intervention so early remains.
- 65 Crozzoli Aite 1981 (note 44); Campbell 1984 (note 50), vol. I, pp. 213–45; Pagliara 1988 (note 40), pp. 190–5.
- 66 Respectively Bartoli 1914–22 (note 50), vol. III, figs 417–8, vol. VI, p. 76f.; vol. III, fig. 472, vol. VI, p. 78; vol. III, fig. 502, vol. VI, p. 94; Crozzoli Aite 1981 (note 44), nos 23; 28–9; 31.
- 67 Campbell 2005, p. 54f.; Crozzoli Aite 1981 (note 44), p. 43; Ian Campbell: *Rescue Archaeology in the Renaissance*, in: *Archives and Excavations. Essays on the history of excavations in Rome and Southern Italy from the Renaissance to the early twentieth century*, ed. by Ilaria Bignamini, London 2004 (*Archaeological Monographs of the British School at Rome* 14), pp. 13–22, at p. 17.
- 68 Campbell 2005, p. 53 f.; *Census*, RecNo. 66984 and 66990; Bartoli 1914–22 (note 50), vol. II, fig. 320, vol. VI, p. 59; Crozzoli Aite 1981 (note 44), no. 10.
- 69 Campbell 2005, p. 53.
- 70 For the 1519 dating see Bartoli 1914–22 (note 50), vol. VI, p. 76 f; Nesselrath 1993 (note 16), p. 80 puts it anywhere between 1513 and 1527. But Tessari (Cristiano Tessari: *Baldassare Peruzzi: il progetto dall'antico*, Milano 1995, p. 124f.) dates the Palazzo Savelli to around 1525. Ann Huppert in her entries on UA 1090r + 1230v for the forthcoming third volume of Christoph Luitpold Frommel and Nicholas Adams: *The Architectural drawings of Antonio da Sangallo the Younger and his circle* (note 64), dates Antonio's handwriting on the sheet to after 1527. She dates the writing of Gianfrancesco da Sangallo on UA 1372r, another sheet with studies of the Doric temple, but unconnected with the Codex Stosch, to around 1520. Frommel 1994 (note 41), fig. 38h dates Giovanni Battista's writing on UA 1657v to after 1534.
- 71 Pagliara 1984 (note 34), p. 23.
- 72 *Census*, RecNo. 44522: Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Barb. lat. 4424, fol. 23r. Two sheets of details of the Arch of Titus by Antonio da Sangallo the Younger survive in the Uffizi, UA 1231r and UA 1255r (*Census*, RecNo. 60673 and 60674). Both are measured with the Florentine ›braccio‹ and seem unrelated to the Codex Stosch drawings, see the relevant entries by Ian Campbell in the forthcoming ›*The Architectural Drawings of Antonio da Sangallo the Younger*‹, vol. 3 (note 64).

- 73 *Census*, RecNo. 228196: »Master C of 1519« Vienna, Albertina, inv. Egger, no. 19, fol. 2v; Arnold Nesselrath: Raphael's archaeological method, in: Raffaello a Roma, il convegno di 1983, ed. by Christoph Luitpold Frommel, Roma 1986, pp. 357–71 at pp. 366–68.
- 74 All three versions are printed and analysed in Di Teodoro 2003 (note 33). Shearman 2003 (note 11), vol. I, item 1519/70, pp. 500–545.
- 75 Di Teodoro 2003 (note 33), p. 86.
- 76 Di Teodoro 2003 (note 33), p. 136; Shearman 2003 (note 11), vol. I, p. 520. The regionaly catalogue had been published, spuriously attributed to Publius Victor by Giano Parrasio, see Publius Victoris de regionibus Urbis Romae libellus aureus, ed. by Giano Parrasio, Roma, c. 1503–6.
- 77 Di Teodoro 2003 (note 33), pp. 76; 140f.; 181f.; Shearman 2003 (note 11), vol. I, pp. 507; 515f.; 524. Christof Thoenes' contention that the idea of a plan was dropped in favour of only studies of individual buildings is not supported by the evidence, see Christof Thoenes: La »Lettera« a Leone X, in: Raffaello a Roma, il convegno di 1983, ed. by Christoph Luitpold Frommel, Roma 1986, pp. 373–81 at p. 375.
- 78 Shearman 2003 (note 11), vol. I, item 1520/15, pp. 572–4, at p. 572. For other contemporary testimonies to the reconstruction project, see Francesco Maria Molza's »Canzone« on the death of Raphael (Nesselrath 1986 (note 73), p. 357; Shearman 2003 (note 11), vol. I, item 1520/82, pp. 656–9) and on Paolo Giovio's »Vita« of Raphael (ibid., vol. I, item 1525/15, pp. 807–11).
- 79 Shearman 2003 (note 11), vol. I, item 1520/22, pp. 581–3, at p. 581. On the likelihood of »istorie« meaning reliefs, see Antony Grafton: »Historia« and »Istoria«. Alberti's terminology in context, in: I Tatti Studies. Essays in the Renaissance 8 (1999), pp. 37–68, at pp. 60–62.
- 80 There were many editions before 1520, but the most likely one for Michiel to have seen was that printed in Venice in 1511. Philip Joshua Jacks states that in the Renaissance Ptolemy's plans were soon supplemented by views of major cities. See Philip Joshua Jacks: *The Simulachrum* of Fabio Calvio. A View of Roman Architecture »all'antica in 1527«, in: *Art Bulletin* LXXII (1990), pp. 453–81, at p. 457.
- 81 In any case we have no idea where exactly Raphael thought Region 1 was. The boundaries of the ancient regions have to be inferred from the location of known monuments, and even now there are scholarly disputes about what goes where: see Armin von Gerkan: *Grenzen und Größen der vierzehn Regionen Roms*, in: *Bonner Jahrbücher des Rheinischen Landesmuseums* 149 (1949), pp. 5–65. And note that the Temple of Honour and Virtue near Porta Capena was in the first region, which may have been confused with the lesser known one on the Capitoline, which, as we have seen, Giovanni Battista confused with the Forum Holitorium temples!
- 82 Arnold Nesselrath: Giovanni da Udine disegnatore, in: *Bollettino dei Monumenti Musei e Gallerie Pontificie* 9.2 (1989), pp. 237–91 and Arnold Nesselrath: Giovanni da Udine (Udine 1487 – Roma 1561) – Decorazione con tralci e tre putti torceri, in: *Disegno, giudizio e bella maniera. Studi sul disegno italiano in onore di Catherine Monbeig Goguel*, ed. by Philippe Costamaga, Florian Härb and Simonetta Prosperi Valenti Rodinò, Cinisello Balsamo/Milano 2005, p. 52, no. 19 discuss Giovanni's role within Raphael's workshop, including the reconstruction project.
- 83 Tilmann Buddensieg: Raffaels Grab, in: *Munuscula discipulorum: Kunsthistorische Studien Hans Kauffmann zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. by Tilmann Buddensieg, Matthias Winner, Berlin 1968, pp. 45–70; Nesselrath 1993 (note 16), p. 54.

- 84 Valori 1985 (note 55), pp. 75–131.
 85 Thoenes 1986 (note 77), p. 380.
 86 See Nesselrath 1986 (note 73), p. 363.
 87 Nesselrath 1986 (note 9), p. 135 f.
 88 Vitruvius, *Corsini Incunabulum* 2003, *passim*.
 89 See Arnold Nesselrath: entry 3.3.2, in: Raffaello Architetto, Roma, Campidoglio, Palazzo dei Conservatori, 29 febbraio – 15 maggio 1984, ed. by Christoph Luitpold Frommel, Stefano Ray and Manfredo Tafuri, Roma 1984, pp. 424 f.; Nesselrath 1986 (note 73), pp. 361 f.; Nesselrath 1993 (note 16), pp. 171–4 and Ingrid D. Rowland: Raphael, Angelo Colocci, and the Genesis of the Architectural Orders, in: *Art Bulletin* LXXVI (1994), pp. 80–104 at pp. 90–2.
 90 Pagliara 1984 (note 34), p. 27.
 91 Di Teodoro 2003 (note 33), pp. 40–42.
 92 Di Teodoro 2003 (note 33), p. 42.
 93 Shearman 2003 (note 11), I, items 1528/1–3, pp. 833–37.
 94 Arnold Nesselrath: *Codex Coner – 85 years on*, in: *Quaderni Puteani* 3 (1992), pp. 145–67, at p. 160.

PHOTOGRAPHIC CREDITS

Fig. 1 a, b: Ian Campbell: Lyon & Turnbull. The Codex Stosch, to be included in the sale of books and manuscripts Tuesday 12th July 2005, Edinburgh 2005, pp. 44; 45. – Fig. 2: Roma, Biblioteca dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei e Corsiniana. – Fig. 3–7: Soprintendenza Speciale per il Polo Museale Fiorentino. – Fig. 8: Albertina, Wien.

Tables: Reproduction of the Codex Stosch by John McKenzie

