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On 7 September this year the architectural world lost a unique creative mind who helped to bind the built Roman past to contemporary design. For the architect Lambert Rosenbusch, Roman buildings were a vital source of inspiration. The Pantheon dome informs his rebuilding project, with Peter Wilkens, for the library at Wolfenbüttel; his monopteros on the Elbe resuscitates classical form; his built and un-built projects, including others derived from Renaissance works such as Bramante’s Tempietto, show how the impact of Roman buildings on architectural theory that was charted in the exhibition this autumn at the Skulpturhalle Basel remains vibrant up to the present day. Moreover, classicism is not restricted to conventional replications of form. Designers for the 2012 Olympics in London still base their landscaping and reshaping of architectural space on ancient complexes such as Hadrian’s Villa at Tivoli and Piazza Armerina.

The relationship between Roman architectural history and theory is an evolving one. Our understanding of even the most fixed of monuments, the Pantheon in Rome, is constantly changing. In 2006 scholars gathered at the Karman Center in Bern to make sense of the revelation that its rebuilding after the fire of A.D. 110 was initiated not by the architect Hadrian, but by his predecessor Trajan. This great domed hall, the largest unreinforced concrete dome ever built, now emerges as an expansion of the semicircular exedras of Trajan’s baths or Forum. The Bern Digital Pantheon Project presents high-resolution images to a worldwide audience, and similar digitization projects have been developed during the last decade for the Theater of Pompey and the whole ancient city.

The close nexus of architecture, empire and power is the special concern of the German Archaeological Institute (DAI), whose own empire of scholarship extends from Madrid to Beijing. Its focus is on the highest loci of power, the imperial palaces in Rome and the poorly-studied, fortified Palace of Galerius at Gamzigrad-Romuliana in Serbia. It has investigated in detail the area of the Palatine that is most visible, but least well-known: the Severan wing of the palace whose bulky remnants overlook the Circus Maximus and which were once the attempt of a dynasty sprung from Africa to leave its mark on the supreme Italian city and the nerve-center of European power. The same endurance and mutability of ancient buildings in the palimpsest of Rome is the theme of Ingrid Rowland’s article. As we view the massive rusticated basement of the Temple of Claudius beneath the campanile of Santi Giovanni e Paolo, we should look beyond these ruins at what ancient viewers saw and imagined. Roman buildings were not the lonely, empty
hulks devoid of ornament and color that we see today; they were part of a performative architecture, processional or congregational, that demanded response but at the same time prevented it. Since Poggio Bracciolini, the ruins of ancient Rome have led viewers to highlight the monumental as Rome’s legacy to posterity; yet, while this was something which the buildings themselves promoted through their inscriptions, it causes us to overlook the dialogue between monumentality and ephemerality which stimulated creativity and innovation in Roman design. Roman theatres, the subject of Frank Sear’s book, the fruit of decades of research as intensive as that practiced by the DAI, emerged from a tradition of ambitious temporary stage-structures which have left vestiges only in Pliny’s text. In these high-density zones pioneering classicism found a captive audience.

We can understand more broadly the role played by Roman buildings in shaping personal, civic or cultural identities when we look beyond Rome to provincial cities. If the documentation is less abundant than for late-medieval Siena, it still provides traces of a similar vitality in architectural decision-making. Projects conceived by some “for the ornament of the city,” as in Siena, were for others the loathsome object of political conflict. Personal factors often prevailed in the process of creating the symbolic language that was the architecture of the ancient Roman city.

Edmund Thomas
Department of Classics and Ancient History, Durham University
EAHN Fifth Annual Business Meeting

Bologna, 18-21 February 2010

The fifth annual business meeting of the EAHN committee will take place in Bologna from 18-21 February 2010, hosted by committee member Maris-tella Casciato and the Dipartimento di Architettura e Pianificazione Territoriale (DAPT) of the Università di Bologna.

The weekend will begin already Thursday evening, 18 February, with a lecture by Richard Schofield (IUAV, Venice) in memory of the late Richard Tuttle, professor of architectural history in Bologna. A research grant in Tuttle’s name will also be launched on this occasion. Friday will be devoted to meetings of the following subcommittees: Funding and Long-Range Planning, 2012 Conference Planning, Nominating, Ranked Journals, Publications, and Guimarães Conference. A tour will be organized on Friday afternoon for those not involved in subcommittee meetings. A presentation of Italian architectural history opens the day on Saturday, followed by the main business meeting Saturday afternoon and Sunday morning. The weekend concludes with a tour to Rimini and Leon Battista Alberti’s church of San Francesco—the Tempio Malatestiano—on Sunday after-noon.

General members are cordially invited to attend the meeting: please contact Isabel van der Zande at office@eahn.org as soon as possible, but no later than 15 January, if you would like to attend. Comments and suggestions from the general membership for inclusion in the agenda may be sent to Isabel by the end of January.

University of Westminster Donates Staff Support to EAHN

Beginning in November 2009, the EAHN can draw on additional staffing donated by the University of Westminster, London. Two postdoctoral fellows in the Westminster Department of Architecture, Davide Deriu and Josephine Kane, will together contribute about ten hours per week to tasks
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for the EAHN as the organization’s new Westminster Editorial Assistants. Deriu and Kane will be responsible for development of the extensive collection of weblinks to be placed on the EAHN website, as well as other projects relating to the website, the EAHN Newsletter, and development of the organization’s future journal. The EAHN is extremely grateful for this generous support and is pleased to introduce its new supporting institution and editorial assistants to EAHN members.

The Department of Architecture at the University of Westminster forms part of the larger School of Architecture and the Built Environment, one of comparatively few in Britain which spans the full range from design to construction to transport and urban development policy. Westminster began life in the mid-nineteenth century as Britain’s first polytechnic, famous for its role in the early development of flight, cinema and professional training; as such, it is mentioned in George Bernard Shaw’s *Man and Superman* (1903). The Department of Architecture has long been one of the leading centers for architectural education, with a particular interest in architectural history and theory. Well-known architectural history tutors in the past have included Alan Colquhoun, Demetri Porphyrios, Robin Evans and, for a short while, Daniel Libeskind. While these scholars tended to focus on questions of discourse and representation, today their counterparts like Murray Fraser, Jeremy Till and Kester Rattenbury adopt approaches that are consciously blended with cultural studies to look at issues such as post-colonial theory, power structures and media analysis in architecture. As such, the wide-ranging approach of the European Architectural History Network, both in terms of its geographical spread and the kinds of subjects its members are involved in, meshes closely with the aims of the Westminster Department of Architecture and so it is delighted to offer support to the organization.

Dr. Davide Deriu was educated at the Politecnico di Torino and University College, London, where he completed his Ph.D. He has worked as an architect in Germany, and taught in Turkey at METU in Ankara, as well as at the Bartlett School of Architecture, UCL. He has been a visiting scholar in residence at the Canadian Centre for Architecture, and a research fellow at
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Yale University’s Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, London. He is currently at work on a book about the impact of aerial photography on urban visions in early twentieth-century Europe. He is also jointly organizing a major international conference on “Emerging Landscapes” to be held at the University of Westminster in June 2010.

Dr. Josephine Kane earned a Ph.D from the Bartlett School of Architecture, UCL, in 2007, and has recently joined the Department of Architecture at Westminster as a British Academy Post Doctoral Fellow. Over the next three years, she will be studying how the experience of mass pleasure in Britain has been commodified and defined by the architectural landscape. Her interdisciplinary approach incorporates cultural geographies, histories of tourism and entertainment as well as architectural history and theory. Outside academia, she has worked as a live interpreter for Historic Royal Palaces, and a freelance education practitioner in schools and heritage sites across the UK.

**Early Registration for Guimarães Conference Opens 1 January**

Early registration will be open from 1 January – 28 February 2010 for the EAHN First International Meeting, to be held in Guimarães, Portugal from 17-20 June 2010. During early registration period, session chairs, speakers, and anyone else definitely planning to attend the conference may take advantage of the discounts in many registration categories compared with the standard registration fees. Most categories include the conference abstracts and several dinners; special discounts are available for students and those attending from countries with emerging economies. The complete conference program will be published in late February, in time for the regular conference registration from 1 March – 30 April. For full details, visit the conference website: www.eahn2010.org, and click on “Registration.”
Palace, Centro Cultural Vila Flor, Guimarães, eighteenth century; part of the EAHN 2010 conference venue. Photograph: Centro Cultural Vila Flor
EAHN Approaching 1000 Members

Membership in the EAHN has grown dramatically since the inauguration of the revised website in February 2009 and currently stands at 988. In the nine months since the website launch, thirty-five members have joined per month, double the previous rate, and even triple the rate before the launch of the EAHN Newsletter in December 2007.

The members hail from every continent, confirming the organization’s fulfillment of its broad international mission. By far the largest contingent resides in the United States. Among the European countries, the largest numbers of members come from France, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, and the United Kingdom. There are also sizable numbers in Turkey, Belgium, Switzerland, and Portugal. Nearly every European nation is represented, including Estonia, Lithuania, the Czech Republic, Croatia, Bulgaria, Serbia, Slovenia, the Slovak Republic, Romania, Macedonia, and Bulgaria. Members can also be found in Australia and New Zealand. In Asia there are members in Japan, South Korea, Hong Kong, Singapore, and Indonesia, as well as in India, the United Arab Emirates, Israel, and Algeria. In Central and South America, there are members in Brazil, Columbia, and Guatemala. Click here for a complete list of all forty-eight countries with EAHN members.

TU Delft Supports EAHN Secretariat in 2010

On 8 December 2009, Wytze Patijn, dean of the Faculty of Architecture at the Technische Universiteit Delft, announced that the school will continue its support of the EAHN secretariat in 2010. This followed a day of intense discussion among EAHN representatives and Delft faculty on 3 December about ways that the EAHN can foster international research exchanges. A representative of the Netherlands Architecture Institute also attended. Delft will cover half of the secretariat’s expenses; the EAHN is developing the strategy to raise the remaining funds.
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When the Division of Building Archaeology at the Head Office of the German Archaeological Institute (DAI) was founded in 1973, it was the aim to give an institutional base to the discipline of building archaeology as it derived from a long and successful tradition of architects involved in archaeological research. Wilhelm Dörpfeld (1853 – 1940) and Armin von Gerkan (1884 – 1969) should be mentioned as the two outstanding figures who established the methodology of building archaeology in the context of excavations such as Olympia, Pergamon, Miletus and many other sites.

Building archaeology takes the building and its fabric as the primary source of information about its history. Its method is based on exact measurement and on-site visual analysis. Thus it aims to understand layout, design, construction process and the sequence of modifications each building underwent in its history. Critical, theoretical reconstructions deriving from corresponding investigations are another important product of the scientific process. In practice, building archaeological research at the DAI is well integrated in interdisciplinary discourses with the different disciplines of archaeology and historical studies.

Building archaeology thus became a division of the German Archaeological Institute, which was established at Rome in 1829 as an international circle of correspondence by European scholars, artists, antiquarians and diplomats interested in the study of antiquity. In the course of the nineteenth century, the “Istituto di corrispondenza archaeologica” was funded mainly by the later Prussian King Friedrich Wilhelm IV and finally turned into the “German Archaeological Institute” in 1874 as a state institution based in Berlin and attached to the German Foreign Office. The mission remained the same: exploration, publication and promotion of discourse on the monuments of antiquity. Today the DAI has departments and branches all around the Mediterranean and further east: in Rome, Athens (1874), Istanbul (1929), Damascus (1980), Sanaa (1978), Cairo (1907), Madrid (1943), Teheran (1961) and Peking (2009). The former Baghdad department (1955, today Oriental department) dedicated to the Middle East region is now located in Berlin as is the Eurasia department (1995). The Roman-Germanic Commission at Frankfurt am Main (1902) focuses on activities regarding prehistoric
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Europe whereas the Commission for the Archaeology of Non-European Cultures at Bonn (1979) is dedicated to archaeological research in America, Africa, Asia and Oceania. Finally, a Commission for Ancient History and Epigraphy is based in Munich (1951).

The Division of Building Archaeology in Berlin is part of the headquarters of the DAI and has its seat at the so-called Wiegand-Haus, a neoclassical villa built in 1911-12 for the German archaeologist Theodor Wiegand and his wife Marie von Siemens by Peter Behrens. Theodor Wiegand (1864 – 1936) was one of the leading archaeologists who managed the excavations at Pergamon, Priene and Miletus before he became the director of the Collection of Antiquities in Berlin and finally—in 1932—president of the German Archaeological Institute. The Institute has been located in his magnificent villa since 1957.

Wolfram Hoepfner was the founding head of the division, introducing the question of urbanism into the debate of archaeological field study. Together with Ernst-Ludwig Schwandner, head of the division from 1994 – 2004, he worked on the interdependency of societal constitution and town planning, resulting in their widely discussed
When Wolfram Hoepfner became professor of classical architecture at the Free University (FU) of Berlin in 1988, Adolf Hoffmann took over the directorship of the division. As a well-known expert on Roman architecture who worked on the Garden Stadium of the Villa Hadriana, on the Casa del Fauno at Pompei or on the Temple of Asclepius at Pergamon, he started with the excavation of Gadara/Umm Qais, one of the cities of the Syrian Decapolis strongly influenced by Greek culture. Adolf Hoffmann left the German Archaeological Institute in 1994, establishing a new school of building archaeology at Cottbus Technical University.

Ernst-Ludwig Schwandner, who was a member of the Division of Building Archaeology from the beginning, then took over the lead. According to the emphasis of his studies on classical Greek architecture and urbanism, the focus concentrated on the investigation of the ancient landscape of Arkanania in western Greece. He retired in 2004. As second architect Klaus Rheidt entered the department in 1994, running the excavation at Aizanoi in Asia Minor. Klaus Rheidt also left the Institute in 2004, when he became Professor of Building History at Cottbus Technical University.

Since 2004 Ulrike Wulf-Rheidt has been the head of the division, emphasizing the use of architecture as a medium of political power as it is the theme of the Roman imperial palaces on the Palatine Hill in Rome or at Gamzigrad in Serbia. The division investigated the Domus Augustana, the Domus Flavia and the Domus Severiana in Rome over the last ten years identifying elements indicating constant changes and expansions. Recognizing the different phases of construction from Augustus to Maxentius, the history of the palace complex turned out to be far more complicated than previously thought. In contrast, the residence of the Tetrarch Galerius, built at the beginning of the fourth century, is a new foundation of a residence at the periphery of the empire. The investigation of the palace and its surroundings aims to identify the impact of the residence on the new hierarchization of space within the province, caused by reallocation of elites and resources.

The development of information systems for research on large-scale buildings is another focus of conceptual research, particularly concerning the dimensions of...
the Flavian and Severian palaces in Rome. Together with the Technical University of Cottbus, a modular database for archaeology and building archaeology (CISAR) has been developed to facilitate analysis for a large team of scientists scattered over various locations.

The categories both of large-scale building and representation of power also apply to the urban fortification systems currently studied by Peter I. Schneider (Fortifications of Tayma, Saudi Arabia), who succeeded Klaus Rheidt as second architect. In addition, a fluctuating number of fellows and predoctoral staff members do work on their own field projects. The support team includes a photographer, a surveyor and two draftsmen and illustrators.

Apart from thematic focuses, research at the German Archaeological Institute is always concerned with fundamental research advancing the knowledge about single buildings or specific problems of building archaeology. Further projects, most of them linked to doctoral theses, are dedicated to trade buildings within the Suq of Tripoli, Lebanon (Juren Meister), to the Şekerhane Köşk (possibly a cenotaph for the Roman emperor Trajan) at Selinus, Turkey (Claudia Winterstein), to the Hellenistic city walls of Pergamon (Janet Lorentzen), to the Domus Augustana at Rome (Jens Pflug) and to the Faustina baths at Miletus, Turkey (Peter I. Schneider).

Within the German Archaeological Institute as an institution operating worldwide and not restricted to a particular culture, the Division of Building Archaeology has the mission of addressing current architectural questions in a comparative perspective, based on the methods of building archaeology. Workshops and colloquia are initiated frequently on projects of a geographically or chronologically limited scope. Regular conferences on specific topics of broader scope are organized in Berlin and published as “Diskussionen zur Archäologischen Bauforschung.” Beginning with the publication of the first conference on The Ancient City and its Parts (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Architekturreferat (ed.), Die antike Stadt und ihre Teilbereiche, Berlin, 1974) these volumes have always generated wide interest among archaeologists and building historians.

The last conference in 2009 was dedicated to the comparative study of light concepts in premodern architecture. Papers covered the time span from ice age caves through to Neoclassical and nineteenth-century European architecture, and included
German Archaeological Institute
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presentations on Egyptian, Minoan and Sabaeic architecture. Numerous aspects of Greek and Roman architecture were treated: sacred architecture, theaters, “hall buildings,” palaces, residential buildings, funerary architecture and workshops. Further lectures were dedicated to the use of light in Byzantine and medieval European architecture. Lioba Theis (Vienna) reported on changes in the liturgical use of light in the middle Byzantine period, whereas the opening lecture by Robert Suckale (Berlin) reflected on the meaning of light at the beginning of Gothic development in the Île-de-France. The Palazzo Piccolomini in Pienza and the hunting lodge of Maulnes-en-Tonnerrois were discussed in connection with lighting concepts in Renaissance architecture. The proceedings will be published as the tenth volume of the “Diskussionen zur Archäologischen Bauforschung.”

In the course of the last thirty-six years the Division of Building Archaeology has turned into a vital platform for architects and building archaeologists involved in archaeological field work. In close cooperation with universities and other research institutions in Germany and abroad it integrates building archaeology as a central component of interdisciplinary scientific practice into the field of archaeological science.

Peter Schneider
Architekturreferat an der Zentrale des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts
Preparing the Faustina Baths at Miletus, Turkey for investigation
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A Walk through Old Rome

The Roman Forum, as David Watkin points out in his delightfully polemical book on the subject, is in some ways as much an artifact of the twentieth century as it is of Roman antiquity, the result of demolitions, excavations and restorations that transformed a once-thriving neighborhood into a modern archaeological park before the city knew what it had lost.* Yet we need not move very far away from the Forum to find traces of that same old Rome, where the ancient past still takes its own part in the day-to-day business of the living city—along with traces of everything that has happened in between the age of the Caesars and yesterday.

For many reasons, the Arch of Constantine is a good starting point; a walk from here to the church of St. John Lateran takes us down streets that have certainly been in use since ancient Roman times, and may go back as far as the sixth century B.C.E. The Arch itself marks one of the great transitions in Roman history, when the Empire turned from a plethora of cults to a nearly exclusive preoccupation with Christianity. Its present physical isolation is the result of two large-scale urban campaigns, one undertaken by Pope Sixtus V in the late 1580s and one by Benito Mussolini in the 1930s. Both men made massive efforts to streamline Rome’s labyrinthine streets for wheeled traffic; for Sixtus this meant accommodating the stylish new taste for horse-drawn carriages, whereas Mussolini’s tastes ran to automobiles and tanks. It is a permanent monument that marks a single, short-lived event: Constantine’s triumphal procession after he defeated his rival Maxentius in a battle along the banks of the river Tiber just north of Rome, the Battle of the Milvian Bridge, 312 A.D. The night before the clash, Constantine had a dream in which the Christian starburst symbol, the Chi-Rho, appeared to him, and a plaque at the top of his triumphal arch gives credit to the God of Abraham for his victory. Two years later, in 313, the Emperor would grant official tolerance to Christianity, an illegal religion up to then (Christians refused to worship the Emperor as a god, which amounted to treason). In addition, Constantine would endow two huge, splendid churches, St. Peter’s and St. John Lateran.

Architecture in the age of Constantine had reached a level of fantastic sophistication, thanks to the lightness and strength of Roman concrete, and the fact that it could be molded into any shape an architect desired. Domes soared to dizzying heights; walls seemed to melt away into windows; columns and statues were carved in colored stone imported from every corner of the Empire, with porphyry, the deep maroon granite from Egypt, reserved exclusively for the Imperial house. The Arch of Constantine still preserves its yellow columns and some of its porphyry cladding; the rest of the cladding was stolen long ago, perhaps to decorate the floors of medieval churches. Its design, aside from its striking color scheme,
VIRTUAL TOUR
Rome’s Caelian Hill

Arch of Constantine, Rome, dedicated 315
Photograph: EAHN

Arch of Constantine, detail of attic with sculpture plundered from earlier monuments
Photograph: EAHN
is carefully traditional, putting Constantine into the long line of Roman—and even Etruscan—generals who had driven their chariots along this same street for perhaps as long as nine hundred years: a large central opening with two minor openings on either side. The Arch is nothing more than a ceremonial gate, a permanent monument to a single procession—but it was nonetheless a procession that changed the history of Christianity.

A close look at the Arch will reveal that the sculpture of Constantine’s time was considerably less skillful than the architecture: in fact, the striking differences in style among its various panels reveal that much of the Arch has been permanently “borrowed” from other monuments. Constantine knew what he was doing; he took panels that had been carved for the two emperors who presided over the Empire at the moment of its greatest geographical expansion: Trajan and Hadrian. Popular, cultured, and honored as gods at their death, Trajan and Hadrian were also outstanding patrons of art and architecture—Hadrian even designed buildings himself, beautiful buildings like the Pantheon and his country villa outside the nearby spa of Tivoli. The sculpture that Constantine appropriated was some of the most sophisticated the Empire ever produced. His own sculptors could not equal that refinement, but they could and did assemble the pieces in an elegant design.
VIRUTAL TOUR
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The first person to notice these discrepancies was the painter Raphael, who wrote about them in the early sixteenth century in a letter to Pope Leo X (written between 1516 and 1519): the architecture is well thought out, he said, but the sculptures are “clumsy, with no style whatsoever.”

The Arch is still surrounded by big basalt paving stones, the original Roman pavement of Constantine’s time, made from the same volcanic rock, from the same nearby quarries, as the smaller squared cobblestones on the surrounding streets—except for the road we shall soon be following, the Via di San Gregorio which leads from the Arch toward the Circus Maximus. For the Jubilee of 2000, this street was paved with cobblestones imported from China. The Chinese cobbles were cut short and blocky to save money, but they have turned out to represent a false economy. Roman cobblestones are long and cone-shaped, so that once set, they stay rooted in place, just like the human teeth they closely resemble. The short Chinese cobblestones have the shape, and the staying power, of human baby teeth, and the roadside is already littered with them, with no tooth fairy in sight.

Aside from its dental problems, the Via di San Gregorio looks much as Mussolini left it, with a Fascist-era fountain in yellow marble on the left and the imposing remains of the Palatine palace on the right. The red-brick arches of an aqueduct have been heavily restored in recent times to preserve them; some of the brickwork looks surprisingly new because it is new, but the aqueduct itself goes back to the time of Nero, who died in A.D. 68. A stone staircase rises up the hill behind the yellow marble fountain, designed in 1933 by Antonio Muñoz (1884-1960), an architect, sculptor, painter and restorer who served for many years as Superintendent of Antiquities for the City of Rome, and bears a great deal of responsibility for the way places like the Forum look today.

The fountain in Via di San Gregorio originally marked the entrance to a museum (now abandoned) celebrating the connection between Rome’s ancient heritage and the exploits of Mussolini. The fountain itself was vandalized after the Second World War, when angry Romans hacked away its Fascist symbols (the ancient fasces were bundles of rods bound together with an axe, symbolizing the authority of Roman consuls over the lives and limbs of Roman citizens; Mussolini appropriated them to symbolize his own authority). This is Mussolini’s entrance to the Caelian Hill, one of Rome’s traditional seven, a steep outcrop of volcanic stone whose outlines have been smoothed away and eroded in the past two thousand years. The promontory’s original name was apparently “Oak Hill,” Querquetal, but in the fifth century B.C.E. it was taken over by two Etruscan brothers, the warlords Aule and Caile Vipinas, or, as the Romans called them, Aulus and Caelius Vibenna, and renamed Caille’s Hill.
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This northern slope is dominated by the façade of the church of Saint Gregory the Great and its three sixteenth-century oratories, but the street that leads uphill through narrow walls is a piece of Imperial Rome, with an Imperial Roman name, Clivus Scauri, “Scaurus’s Street.” The brick shop fronts on the left-hand side of the street, surmounted by a medieval church and a series of reinforcing arches (the tallest one is ancient), go back at least to the time of Trajan and Hadrian, and perhaps even to the time of Nero. These buildings are so sturdy and so well preserved that it has always been easier simply to use them than to tear them down. The church above them is dedicated to Saints John and Paul, two brothers (legend says that they were officers under Constantine) martyred in the year 362, during the reign of Julian the Apostate, the last Roman emperor to resist Christianity. The church itself was dedicated in 398, and built over the ancient Roman shop fronts and the houses behind them. Modern archaeological excavations (begun in 1887, now a well-kept museum) revealed a whole tiny neighborhood, with a communal well decorated with a large, voluptuous marine Venus—or perhaps the underworld goddess Proserpina—floating on her half-shell with a male companion as cupids fish from an elegant boat. One large frescoed room, remodeled in the third century, was used as a meeting place for Christians. Most of the figures on its walls and ceiling, the animals and lush garlands, cannot be securely identified either as Christian or classical; they were painted at the very moment when the Empire began to change its dominant religion. One person, however, is definitely Christian, a young man with his hands flung outward in the early church’s typical gesture of prayer. This house was eventually deeded to the Church by its owner, becoming one of the ancient properties known as tituli (“title deeds”). Santi Giovanni e Paolo is the one surviving Roman titulus where we can see a private Christian home transformed into a public building, although a similar story must have happened many times in the early history of the Church.

The church itself has undergone a long series of transformations since its construction at the end of the fourth century. The arcaded gallery that dominates its apse is a twelfth-century addition, as are the colonnaded portico in front, with its reused ancient columns of Egyptian granite, and the magnificent bell tower, decorated with colorful green and yellow ceramic plates. The interior of the church was entirely remodeled in the eighteenth and twentieth centuries; only its shape recalls its Early Christian origins. That shape was borrowed from ancient Roman law courts, or basilicas: a long box with a tall central space, two side aisles, and a recess, or tribunal, at one end. The Early Christians needed buildings that would hold a crowd, but they wanted to avoid any suggestion of ancient temples. The bell tower, annexed to the convent rather than the church, rests on an imposing ancient ruin: the remains of a temple to the Emperor Claudius, erected by his successor Nero. Huge blocks of travertine are carved to look as if they just came
The Temple of Claudius (Claudianum), with rusticated masonry
Photograph: Wikimedia Commons
from the quarry. The temple stood in a dramatic position along the sheer edge of the Caelian Hill; beneath it, Nero installed a monumental fountain, whose brick core, long stripped of its marble facing, is still visible from the street. There is no doubt that this majestic monument inspired the eighteenth-century engraver Giovanni Battista Piranesi, whose famous Prisons evoke its huge rusticated arcades.

As we continue down the Clivus Scauri between narrow walls, we pass underneath the red brick structure of Nero’s aqueduct, which rests here on a still older travertine arch, erected in the year 10 by the Roman consuls Publius Cornelius Dolabella and Gaius Junius Silanus. There has been an arch here, however, since the time of the Etruscan warriors Aule and Caile Vipinas—for on this site the city’s most ancient fortification, the Servian Wall, had one of its gates, the Porta Querquetulana. A tiny church, San Tommaso in Formis, “Saint Thomas in the Aqueduct,” is tucked in among Nero’s brick arches, restored in the seventeenth century; it is home to a tiny convent of Trinitarian fathers and a neat little garden full of fat, contented cats.

Just up the hill from the Arch of Dolabella stands another Early Christian church, Santa Maria in Domnica; like Santi Giovanni e Paolo, it has preserved its original basilica shape through all its later remodelings. Pope Paschal I redid the mosaics in the ninth century (he also added mosaic apse decorations to the Early Christian churches of Santa Prassede and Santa Cecilia in Trastevere—all of them lively works in vibrant colors); Pope Leo X, with the architect and sculptor Andrea Sansovino, contributed the Renaissance portico and the coffered roof in 1518—the same Leo to whom Raphael addressed his observations about the Arch of Constantine. The little marble ship that stands in front of the basilica is ancient (possibly a votive gift to the Egyptian goddess Isis), and has been in this place at least since 1518, when Andrea Sansovino sculpted the base on which it stands. But the fountain and its pebble mosaic of fish were installed in the nineteenth century, as joyously colorful, if nowhere near as formal, as the mosaics inside the church. The assemblage is called the “Navicella,” the “little ship.”

Across the Via della Navicella, behind a garden wall, we can see the central tower of another Early Christian building, the church of Santo Stefano Rotondo (“Round Saint Stephen”), built in the fifth century as a series of three concentric rings of columns. The entrance portico, however, was installed circa 1453, perhaps by the great Tuscan architect Leon Battista Alberti. We see Alberti’s portico here in a nineteenth-century watercolor by Ettore Roesler Franz. The interior, newly restored, is a dazzling play of light and space, one more indication that Raphael was right to say that architecture still throve in the Early Christian period. The church became a house for Jesuit novices in the mid-sixteenth century.
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Nero’s nymphaeum underneath the Temple of Claudius
Photograph: Wikimedia Commons

Giovanni Battista Piranesi, Carceres XVI (“Pier with Chains”), second state, 1761
Photograph: Wikimedia Commons
For this community, in the 1570s, the painters Pomarancio and Antonio Tempesta painted frescoes of gruesome martyrdom as a preparation for mission abroad, and many Jesuits would indeed meet violent deaths in the Americas, Asia and—not least—Europe. Santo Stefano Rotondo now houses a community of nuns whose lives are devoted to a more placid way of life, and the gardens around the church, insulated from Rome’s maddening traffic, still seem to belong, like so many of the buildings in this area, to an older, less hectic era. This region of Rome retains its antique flavor because it never recovered entirely from the terrible street fighting that pitted Pope Gregory VII and his Norman allies against Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV in 1084; it was not built up again until the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, and even now it is an oasis in the middle of a chaotic modern city.

Ingrid D. Rowland
School of Architecture, University of Notre Dame
Rome
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SELECTED LINKS FOR ROME AND THE CAELIAN HILL
*Sovrintendenza ai Beni Culturali*
http://www.sovraintendenza-roma.it/i_luoghi/
A marvelous website maintained by the office of the superintendent for cultural heritage of the City of Rome. Includes informative individual entries on dozens of city-owned historic sites, monuments, parks and villas. The category “Fontane” contains entries on both the Navicella fountain and the fountain in via San Gregorio discussed here. Over thirty brochures describing various sites are available for download under “Depliant da scaricare.” In Italian.

*Musei in Comune*
http://en.museiincomuneroma.it/
The official website of all municipal museums in Rome, including the Capitoline Museums, the Museum of the Imperial Fora, and the Museum of Rome, with links to the individual museum websites. In Italian, English, French and Spanish.

*Case Romane del Celio*
Website of the museum in the Roman houses on the Clivus Scauri, with history, photos, contact information and opening hours. In Italian and English.

*Santo Stefano Rotondo*
http://www.santo-stefano-rotondo.it/
Website of the church of Santo Stefano Rotondo, with history, photos and opening hours. In Italian and German.
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Ettore Roesler Franz, view of Santo Stefano Rotondo with its mid fifteenth-century portico, watercolor, c. 1880.
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BOOK REVIEW

Frank Sear

Roman Theatres: An Architectural Study
Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006, xxxix + 465 pp., 25 tables, 451 plans, 34 figures, 144 plates. 7 maps, £226.00 / $399.00
ISBN: 978-0-19-814469-4

The ancient theater played a fundamental role in the Roman cultural-historical landscape. Yet in spite of the many technical studies that have focused on architectural design tenets, clear links between architectural and cultural meaning have remained relatively elusive. Frank Sear’s book, however, represents a significant step in bridging the gap between built form and social realities. In this light, it is a welcome addition to the research literature. Not since Margarete Bieber’s publication on The History of the Greek and Roman Theater (Princeton, 1939) has there been such an important work on the subject. Even Paola Ciancio and Giuseppina Pisani Sartorio’s three-volume Teatri greci e romani (Rome, 1994), with an essay by Sear, does not offer such a broad discussion of the subject. Sear has clearly spent considerable time assembling the components of his book and has in turn generated a research tool that can best be described as the most important book on the Roman theater to date.

The book is organized into two main sections: the first is made up of individual chapters on specific theater-related topics. These include “Theatres and Audience,” “Finance and Building,” “Roman Theatre Design,” “Theatres and Related Buildings,” “Republican Theatres in Italy,” “The Theatres of Rome,” “The Cavea and the Orchestra,” “The Scene Building,” and “Provincial Theatres.” The essays build upon intensive, detailed work by Sear, also incorporating the efforts of others and offering fresh perspectives on each theme. The second section comprises a detailed catalogue, divided into eight broad present-day geographic regions, further divided by Augustan regions for Italy, and by province for other areas. The catalogue reflects the state of the research up to 1996 and often beyond, providing updated plans for most theaters.
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ROMAN THEATRES
AN ARCHITECTURAL STUDY

Frank Sear

OXFORD MONOGRAPHS ON CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

Edited by John Bennett, John Boardman, J. J. Coulton, Donna Kurtz, R. R. Smale, and Margaret Sheedy.
Thus the book contains detailed essay discussions, design elucidations, as well as technical descriptions in its catalogue. The whole is presented in clear language, with the themes of most of the individual chapters presenting subject matter that directly links architecture and society: the discussion of seating placement in the first chapter, for example, reveals a great deal about who comprised different groups and where these were allowed to sit. This is significant in terms of social status, rank and rights, and how each was connected to the theater. Similarly, in the second chapter, Sear reminds the reader of the high priority the theater had in public finances. And the discussion of the monument type in Rome in the sixth chapter renders a better picture of daily life in the city. In the chapters where architecture per se remains the focus, Sear reiterates some of the main theories he has previously advanced, synthesizing much of the work that has been done over the past decades, all the while providing fresh perspectives and conclusions.

Sear’s account, though, ignores some potentially useful authorities. For example, Edmond Frézouls, whose outline of the important differences between the theaters of Gaul and other geographic areas is key to understanding theaters that do not necessarily fit within the “pure” definition of the type. Related to the use of authorities, the book offers little comparative discussion: the essays present themes without, for the most part, questioning any of the previous theories, and one is left to accept (or reject) Sear’s arguments without much opportunity for balanced assessment. In the catalogue, a clearer link to Vitruvius and the De Architectura may have been useful for making connections between Republican times and the “origins” of the theater; while the latter is discussed in the third chapter, a comment in the catalogue on adherence of theater design to Vitruvius’s principles could also have been relevant to researchers.

Indeed, the catalogue is important. Here we find summarized in a single place comments on location, dimensions, state of the remains, architectural design details, and a bibliography for the vast majority of the monument type. For any researcher, this will serve as an ideal starting point for a variety of investigations. At the most basic level, for instance, it is easy to envision a new way of comparing each cavea using the catalogue. The catalogue entries, however, are at times too compressed. Comments on the state of explorations and excavations in progress, for example, might have been useful for the reader. And while the catalogue is
extremely well researched, one sometimes has difficulty navigating the myriad sections that are not as well integrated as they could have been. This difficulty seems more related to decisions of the book designer (bold face or capitalized headings, for instance) than to Sear’s content, and might have been avoided with a more sensitive coordination of content and its presentation by the publisher.

The organizational difficulties just pointed out should not be seen as a scholarly shortfall. This book is at once a starting point and synthesis. With its approach to looking at built form as a method of understanding social mores and with its comprehensive scope, it has the potential to trigger new methodologies and inspire new interest in classical (architectural) studies.

In short, this is the most useful book on the Roman theater that has emerged in several decades. Some readers might possibly prefer more essays on specific related topics, but this is not the author’s purpose; other readers might possibly look for a more in-depth discussion within the catalogue, but neither is this the author’s intent. One only wishes that some additional detail could have been provided in the catalogue (which Sear, a detail-oriented scholar, certainly must have collected), thereby connecting the chapter essays more closely to the catalogue entries. Ultimately, though, Sear has provided us with a solid, straightforward and honest tool which will certainly facilitate further advances in the field.

Daniel M. Millette
School of Architecture, University of British Columbia
BOOK REVIEW

Fabrizio Nevola

Siena: Constructing the Renaissance City
New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007, 320 pp., 190 b/w + 60 color illus.,
$65.00 / £40.00

The fifteenth century in Siena lives in the shadow of its illustrious predecessor. Builder of great monuments (the cathedral and the Palazzo Pubblico), patron of masterpieces of painting (Duccio’s Maesta) and sculpture (Nicola Pisano’s pulpit and Giovanni Pisano’s cathedral façade), and the authority that fashioned Italy’s most coherent urban environment, the late medieval commune dominates our picture of the city. Art historical scholarship, naturally, has followed the monuments. The physical city became a cornerstone of the history of urban design with Wolfgang Braunfels’s Mittelalterliche Stadtbaukunst in der Toskana of 1953. Overshadowed, the fifteenth-century city has been imagined (more than studied) as a weak continuation of the earlier commune, its architecture characterized as decorative and without formal rigor, and dependent on the city’s Florentine rival for its limited essays in the new, classical idiom.

Fabrizio Nevola’s Siena provides the first English language treatment of that part of the city that we owe to the Renaissance. It is a complex book that makes full use of the rich documentary holdings of the Siena archives, of the recent body of scholarship on the fifteenth century, and of a broad range of contemporary political, cultural and ceremonial events to make interpretive sense of the work done on the city fabric by its fifteenth-century citizens. Its principal themes are the cooperative relationship between government and citizens which, the author shows, is responsible for much of the streetscape that we admire today as medieval, and a closer attention to architectural style that identifies the progressive, precocious, and original in the city’s building.

Like many other Italian cities, medieval Siena left an extensive record of its efforts to build new streets, rectify old ones, and limit the intrusion of private structures
SIENA
Constructing the Renaissance City

Fabrizio Nevola
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onto publicly owned ground. An office of government, the Viarii, oversaw this work and a collection of the legislation that it administered is preserved for the period around 1290. Nevola examines the fifteenth-century officers who dealt with related materials and illustrates the striking changes. The Viarii were concerned with functional issues. They widened streets and removed the projecting upper stories of houses to facilitate the passage of traffic. The government did not, however, pay for these improvements. That fell to the abutters, part of the cost of participating in the flourishing urban economy. In the fifteenth century, with the city in economic decline, the government assumed more of the financial burden of urban improvement. Derelict residential properties were confiscated and rebuilt with public money as part of a policy aimed at stimulating immigration into the city. Other projects were funded by the state by awarding salaried public offices to owners of residences in need of repair. An office called the Ufficiali del Ornato facilitated this process and the projects they identified involved rebuilding street fronts. The petitions for this kind of subvention do not speak of functionality, but rather the “ornament of the city.” It is for the city, not themselves, the petitions assert, that the work is being done.

Nevola makes two important claims about these projects. The first is that they are concentrated on the main streets of the city, particularly the Strada Romana, the section of the pilgrimage road from the north of Europe to Rome within the city walls. It was these streets that were cleared of butchers, shoemakers and other activities that polluted or were simply too mundane and devoted to the shops of bankers, cloth merchants and other, “noble” trades. The target audience was now travelers, whose opinion is given a new value. With these changes to the physical city, the patrician regime of fifteenth-century Siena retreats from the vibrant chaos of Ambrogio Lorenzetti’s Allegory of Good Government (1338) and moves toward the ideal of decorum represented by monumental architecture as it will ultimately be imagined in the ideal cities of the Urbino and Baltimore panels (end of the fifteenth century).

Nevola’s second claim is that the visits of the emperors and popes who stayed in the city with their courts for months at a time in the course of the century had a profound impact on the physical city. They created alternate centers of public activity at the convents and palaces in which they were lodged, were the focus of
elaborate public spectacle, and stimulated extensive urban improvement in the
preparations for their arrival. Of these, the Sienese Pope, Pius II Piccolomini, made
the most substantial impression. Nevola connects the formation of the Ufficio del
Ornato in 1458 with Pius’s influence and the office’s greatest activity with his visits
to the city. He cites the similarity of the Sienese projects with the urban improve-
ments for the papal city of Viterbo that Pius describes in his Commentarii. He ex-
amines in detail the building projects of the pope’s family and of the noble faction
in city politics of which Pius was the champion, including the immense, square,
quasi-free standing palace on the Banchi di Sotto (a section of the city’s main road)
planned during Pius’s papacy and built in modified form by his nephews from
1469.

It is this building that characterizes Sienese classicism for Nevola. Earlier projects
had combined classicizing detail with traditional materials and gothic forms. The
Bichi-Tegliacci Palace (now the Pinacoteca Nazionale), dated to around 1453, with
its triple light, pointed arched windows to the street and Ionic courtyard is his
example. The Piccolomini-related palaces, most often described as inspired by Flo-
rentine design (even carrying traditional attributions to the Florentine Bernardo
Rosselino) are, for Nevola, more generally classical than specifically Florentine.
They reflect an antiquarianism that finds expression in the increasing interest in
the myth of the city’s Roman origin and in the placement of monuments to the
she-wolf—the symbol of that identity—at strategic spots along the Strada Romana.
The buildings themselves, he argues, are both traditionally Sienese (the shops
around their base, etc.) and more closely related to contemporary palace architec-
ture in Rome, Urbino, and Naples than to what was being done in Florence.

The text is adventurous and stimulating. It makes a substantial case for the con-
nection of urban planning events to the city’s politics and its cultural ambitions
as they change over the century. It assembles a beautiful collection of images and,
most importantly, gives its reader a sympathetic picture of the role of the Renais-
sance in the creation of what is arguably Italy’s most beautiful and least spoiled
city.

David Friedman
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
EXHIBITION REVIEW

The New Acropolis Museum
Curator: Ioannis Mylonopoulos

Miriam and Ira D. Wallach Art Gallery, Columbia University, New York
21 October to 19 December 2009

Few monuments loom as large in the cultural imagination of the West as the half-ruined temples occupying the summit of the ancient Acropolis in Athens. The complex has inspired various political, cultural, and aesthetic ideologies that continue to shape contemporary debates on topics as disparate as the function of Greek nationalism and the formation of modern museum collections. Thus, given the highly charged nature of the site, it comes as a mild surprise that the current exhibition in the Wallach Art Gallery at Columbia University, *The New Acropolis Museum*, fails to explore the relationship between the complex history of the monument and the design of the new institutional landmark built to commemorate it.

Curated by Ioannis Mylonopoulos, a professor of art history and archaeology at Columbia, the exhibition addresses three separate but loosely related subjects: the design of the museum, its collections, and the history of modern scholarship on the Acropolis. The objects on view thus fall into three corresponding categories: architectural drawings and models of the museum complex designed by Bernard Tschumi; full-scale casts of some of its major artifacts; and materials related to the work of the influential archaeologist and art historian, William Bell Dinsmoor (1886-1973), whose scholarship arguably represents the most significant research conducted on the Acropolis in the modern era. Obtaining loans of such an impressive array of material—from Bernard Tschumi Architects, the Organization for the Construction of the New Acropolis Museum, and the Avery Architectural and Fine Arts Library at Columbia, respectively—represents a curatorial feat, especially considering the relatively small scale of the exhibition, and suggests an ambitious attempt to conceptualize the museum as a polyvalent institution defined by the congruence of its physical environment, assembled collection, and institutional history. The extent to which this theme constitutes the explicit organizing
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principle of the show remains unclear, however, and closer examination of the selection and arrangement of objects on view indicates that their resonance with each other may not be wholly intentional.

Several items in the exhibition stand apart for the way in which they illuminate the relationship between the New Acropolis Museum (opened in June 2009) and the ancient site. Early design diagrams by Tschumi—a professor at Columbia and former dean of its Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation from 1988 to 2003—clearly illustrate the architect’s approach to coordinating the individual components of the complex museum project. Two large site models of the building zone, one depicting the relationship between the museum and the Acropolis and the other describing the archaeological remains preserved beneath the structure, are similarly enlightening. Less helpful are architectural drawings depicting schematic computer models of the museum project set within larger compositions of confusing structural details. Five cases of casts, modeled after artifacts excavated on the museum site, serve as physical proof of the extraordinary efforts made to accommodate archaeological work during construction but seem tangential to the rest of the exhibition.

More interesting in regard to preservation efforts are reproductions of letters that Dinsmoor, executive director of Columbia’s Department of Fine Arts and Archaeology from 1933 to 1955, wrote to colleagues about the maintenance and restoration of monuments on the Acropolis. These documents illustrate some of his intense archaeological work on the site and also reveal him to be a prescient preservationist who identified the detrimental effects of using concrete in restoration work long before many of his peers. Lithographs depicting the Acropolis in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries ostensibly serve to contextualize Dinsmoor’s pioneering work but remain little more than historical curiosities since they receive such little critical commentary. This is symptomatic of a larger weakness in the exhibition as a whole: the absence of any fundamental sense of thematic integration. Although most of the objects on view are somehow related to the Acropolis, their connection with each other is often tenuous at best, thereby inhibiting one’s ability to understand the site as a single historical or architectural phenomenon.
Bernard Tschumi, “Viewing the frieze and the Parthenon, simultaneously,” sketch, June 2001
Photograph: Courtesy Bernard Tschumi Architects
The exhibition section dedicated to casts made from prominent sculptures installed in the New Acropolis Museum perhaps best exemplifies this problem. The room contains a series of life-size votive statues discovered either on or near the Acropolis as well as various architectural sculptures from the Parthenon itself. These latter objects include five slabs from the cella frieze, four metopes from the exterior colonnades, and the fractured head of a monumental horse from the east pediment. The quality of the casts—particularly the Parthenon sculptures—is impressive. But their presence is puzzling. Nothing in the exhibition either clarifies the criteria for selecting the objects or provides much information regarding their historical or archaeological context. This suggests that the subject of the exhibition is not the sculptures themselves but rather the museum that houses them—a conclusion consistent with the title of the show. Since the aforementioned horse head fragment and several other objects on display currently reside in the British Museum rather than the New Acropolis Museum, though, it seems the exhibition’s focus is not strictly limited to the Athenian institution. This flexibility would be understandable if it were exploited to highlight the ongoing controversy surrounding the repatriation of the so-called Elgin marbles from Britain to Greece—a high-profile dispute largely responsible for spurring the construction
of the New Acropolis Museum in the first place. But the international debate goes unmentioned, suggesting the exhibition organizers wished to avoid the subject of the Elgin marbles altogether. Such evasion only undermines the thematic unity implied in the title of the show and reduces it to a visual spectacle lacking any larger ideological framework. Neither the museum nor the ancient temple emerges from the resulting ambiguity as a comprehensible spatial entity.

One wonders how much more insightful the exhibition would have been had it been limited to a careful examination of the work of Tschumi and Dinsmoor, using their engagement with the site as a paradigm for understanding the impact of modern attempts to safeguard and study the Acropolis. Despite its deficiencies, however, the exhibition nevertheless provokes important questions about the identity of the contemporary museum and its role in facilitating the display and reception of artistic objects.

Zachary D. Stewart
[Columbia University]

Publication related to the exhibition:

EXHIBITION REVIEW

Curator: Elke Seibert

Skulpturhalle Basel
8 September to 29 November 2009

What is the theory of architectural practice? It has come out of fashion among architects to ask about the theoretical foundations of their own discipline. But reflection on one’s own work and its publication has been an important aspect of architectural practice for centuries, as was demonstrated in the exhibition of rare and valuable illustrated books on architecture in Basel “Von Harmonie und Maß”: Antike Monumente in den Architekturlehrbüchern des 16. bis 19. Jahrhunderts (“Of Harmony and Measure”: Antique Monuments in the Architectural Treatises of the Sixteenth through Nineteenth Centuries). An overall presentation of architectural theory from the Renaissance to the nineteenth century can, of course, hardly ever raise a claim to completeness. Nevertheless, with a group of dedicated students from the University of Heidelberg’s Institut für Europäische Kunstgeschichte, Elke Seibert assembled an impressive exhibition on the topic which featured rare architectural books from the university libraries of Basel, Bern and Zurich as well as the Stiftung Bibliothek Werner Oechslin in Einsiedeln, and gave a broad overview of the evolution of architectural theory.

The thread of continuity weaving through the entire exhibition was the reception of antiquity through readings of Vitruvius. After a manuscript of the De Architectura by Marcus Vitruvius Pollio was rediscovered in 1430 by Poggio Bracciolini in the St. Gall monastery library, generations of architects and scholars used the ancient material as a source for establishing their architectural theories. They arranged the contents and, where necessary, added further information. From the beginning it was also a central concern to add illustrations to the text.

 Appropriately, the tour through the history of architectural theory began with Leon Battista Alberti’s De re aedificatoria in a precious edition of 1485 with
Detail of a Doric temple pediment, from Fra Giocondo, *M. Vitruvius per Jocundum solito castigatior factus cum figuris et tabulis ut iam legi et intelligi posit*. Venetiis: Jo. Tacuinus, 1511, p. 37
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handwritten annotations, and continued with early editions of Vitruvius, such as Fra Giocondo’s *De architectura* (Venice, 1511) and the first translation from Latin into Italian, Cesare Cesariano’s treatise published in Como in 1521. The German translation by Walter Ryff was of particular interest at the exhibition venue since it was displayed in an edition published in Basel in 1575.

These textual analyses of Vitruvius, which were the initial focus of scholarly interest, were followed during the sixteenth century by increasingly sophisticated illustrated manuals for practical use. Sebastiano Serlio’s *Sette libri d’architettura*, which - with the exception of Book VI - were published between 1537 and 1575, are the best examples for this period. The exhibition displayed an impressive range of numerous translations and editions of Serlio’s treatise that illustrated the great international success of his writings. Giacomo Barozzi da Vignola’s *Regola delle cinque ordini d’architettura* aimed still more at practical use: Vignola reduced architectural theory to an analysis of the five classical orders of columns and in so doing prepared the ground for a dogmatization of form that lasted well into the twentieth century. A particular highlight was the edition of Vignola’s *Regole* published in Siena in 1635, featuring engravings of some portals attributed to Michelangelo.

The seventeenth-century discourse of architectural theory was determined mainly by French authors and accordingly Roland Fréart de Chambray, Claude Perrault and François Blondel were represented with their fundamental architectural treatises. Consistent with the exhibition concept, less significant seventeenth-century contributions were omitted. This omission, however, constitutes one of the few criticisms of the exhibition: a broader perspective including the English and Spanish developments during the century would have been instructive.

The exhibition concluded with an eclectic mix of travel literature and contributions from the beginnings of scientific archaeology in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; among these Gottfried Semper’s *Der Stil in den technischen und tektonischen Künsten oder praktische Ästhetik. Ein Handbuch für Techniker, Künstler und Kunstfreunde*, and Charles Garnier’s reconstructions of ancient monuments with lavish color illustrations deserve particular mention.
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Rounding out the successful exhibition concept were a number of cork models of Roman antiquities from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Together with engravings from Giovanni Battista Piranesi’s *Vedute di Roma* they strikingly evoked the reception of ancient architecture during this period.

With its varying perspectives—the rediscovery of Vitruvius in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the orders of columns in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the colored and three-dimensional reconstructions of the ancient world in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries—the exhibition offered a dense and vivid picture of architectural theory as a response to the heritage of antiquity across four hundred years. Furthermore, it provided a rare opportunity to see a rich display of precious early architectural books and related objects which normally are carefully preserved in libraries and archives throughout Switzerland and Germany.

Niklas Naehrig
[ Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule (ETH), Zürich ]

Publication related to the exhibition:


The book contains eleven essays (with contributions by Elke Seibert, Tomas Lochman, Werner Oechslin, Heiner Knell and others) as well as a large section with catalogue entries on the individual treatises and cork models.
Antonio Chichi, cork model of the Temple of Saturn, Rome, c. 1782
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