

## Some remarks on your article

### «Fulvio Orsini e Pirro Ligorio: due antiquari d'eccezione nella roma dei Farnese»

*Dal canto suo, Pirro Ligorio ha indubbiamente sofferto una cattiva fortuna critica nelle fonti letterarie antiche, ritardando soltanto al secolo scorso l'avvio di indagini - ancora incomplete - su un tanto complesso personaggio.* — You should, at least, mention the large edition project, though still incomplete, regarding his manuscripts.

*il presente contributo vuole quindi tentare, una volta ripercorse le rispettive formazioni e i rapporti con i Farnese, di rilevare i punti di tangenza dei loro studi, sottolineare analogie e differenze presenti nelle loro collezioni, nell'approccio all'Antico e alle diverse fonti documentarie, nonché nel cogliere le preziose opportunità che offrì a entrambi la capitale pontificia.* — This sounds rather like a project for a collaborative, interdisciplinary research project and not for just an article ...

*Come racconta Giuseppe Castiglione nella biografia a lui dedicata* — Today it is easy to link the digital copies on the web in an article, especially if it appears on the web, too, in a «Bollettino telematico»; for instance here:

<https://patrimonioidigital.ucm.es/s/patrimonio/item/683440>

*Gentile Delfini* — Again, it would be helpful to link a source of information about this person, e.g. at the *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, because not everybody knows Delfini — in fact, I am sure that Orsini is better known today than Delfini. Oh, I'm right: He does not even have his own personal entry in the *DBI* (which is a *shame!*), and if one searches for him there, the first article mentioning him is the one about Orsini! At least, some information is provided in:

[https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/collezioni-archeologiche\\_%28Enciclopedia-dell%27-Arte-Antica%29/](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/collezioni-archeologiche_%28Enciclopedia-dell%27-Arte-Antica%29/)

*Gentile Delfini, che sin dall'ammissione di Fulvio al chiericato di San Giovanni in Laterano nel 1539 ne diviene protettore e precettore, garantendogli contatti con altri illustri eruditi dell'epoca.* — Wouldn't it be interesting for the reader to know where this information comes from and who these «illustri eruditi» are/were?

*la direzione della propria biblioteca.* — In the «academic» Roman context of the time it would be interesting for readers that Marcello Cervini only a few years earlier took care of the Farnese library ...

*al secondo piano del palazzo a Campo de' Fiori,* — If you are studying in Rome, you should have noticed that the Palazzo Farnese is *not* at the Campo de' Fiori, but some 150 m away: a distance, that can mean centuries in Rome ... The Palazzo even has its own Piazza called ... Farnese!

*e di quelli della propria costituenda raccolta personale* — I still wonder how a librarian was able to buy such an important collection for himself just from his salary? Don't you?

... *Gian Vincenzo Pinelli.* ... — Again, it would be easy and helpful for readers, to link here to some basic information about these persons (and, maybe, why *these* persons are mentioned, and others not).

*Giusto Lipsio* — It would be easier to find for those searching for information about *Justus Lipsius* on the web if you would cite this quite well-known Latin version of his name.

*Fulvio stringe una forte amicizia anche con il cardinal de Granvelle* — Sure, but how did they manage to stay close friends when Granvelle was only rarely in Rome, and Orsini almost never left the Eternal city? Are there (published) letters supporting this claim of a strong friendship? Where?

*che condivide il desiderio di consentire l'accesso alle collezioni Farnese non solo a studiosi locali di chiara fama, ma anche ai giovani provenienti dalle varie regioni d'Europa in visita a Roma.* — Is there any written proof for this *desiderio*? (I do not doubt that, I am just curious – and, therefore, would like to know where you do know this from.)

«Un antiquario, il quale è il primo di Roma, [...] eccellentissimo [...] non nella professione sola delle medaglie, ma de' disegni, nelle fortificazioni et in molte cose» — After so many bad (seemingly, many are just misinterpretations of contemporary notes) opinions it would be interesting to know, where this citation comes from. One *may* guess from Baglione (though I could not find a digital copy of the 1649 edition online; but at least the 1642 edition is there (which is important, because Baglione died in 1644, so his book could have been changed after his death by others...)): At least, the citation from the headline does not seem to be part of the Baglione's short biographical sketch. So: Where does it come from?

*Ottavio Bagatto* — I could not find information about this person. Maybe it is in reality Ottavio Pantagato? Ligorio often misspelled names, so I guess, this is here the case, too?

*Congregazione dei Virtuosi al Pantheon* — I would mention here that this *congregazione* still exists today (<https://www.accademiavirtuosi.it/>) and that its archive may contain lots of valuable information.

*Urbis Romae situs (1552)* — Again, it would be easy and helpful for readers to link to one of the many digital versions online.

*Antichità di Roma* — but the correct title is: *Libro di m. Pyrrho Ligori napolitano, delle antichità di Roma:*

[https://archive.org/details/bub\\_gb\\_IU-2bV56nsgC/mode/2up](https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_IU-2bV56nsgC/mode/2up)

*vendere i dieci libri manoscritti della sua enciclopedia antiquaria ad Alessandro Farnese* — IIRC, this acquisition was organised by Agustìn and Panvinio (who, therefore, may not have held such an «insanabile inimicizia»? — But I'm too lazy now to look for the letter/source mentioning this transfer of Ligorio's books.)

*al palazzo di Campo dei Fiori* — see above

*natura "simbiotica" del legame* — There is an empty space missing before «del», and the citation marks suggest, that «simbiotica» is a citation ... who or what is the source?

*non può essere superficialmente definita un gesto di mera gratitudine verso i suoi protettori* — Why not?

*8 RONCHINI, POGGI 1880, p. 65, n. 21.* — There is no such title in your bibliography; and archive.org does not have something under «Ronchini» from 1880. So, what and where is this? If it is this one: [Ronchini 1880] = Ronchini, Amadio: Fulvio Orsini e le sue lettere ai Farnese. – In: *Atti e memorie delle RR. Deputazioni di Storia Patria per le Provincie dell'Emilia*, n.s. 6,2 (1880) pp. 37–106 ... I don't know, what the name «Poggi» does mean here. ... ah, I found it: First, there is an article by Ronchini about Orsini's letters, but not in the volume «n.s. 6, 2», but in volume «IV, parte II», attached in Google Books to the volume IV, 1 from 1879 = which makes it difficult to find. I guess, you didn't check this source yourself (even though you should have done that)?

And: There is no «note 21» on page 65, but a *letter* numbered «XXI» (obviously numbered by Ronchini and/or Poggi), and it doesn't mention the «studiosi di tutta Europa», but only the «studiosi».

*che aveva progettato insieme al cardinal De Granvelle 9 [9 CASTIGLIONE 1657, p. 8; DE NOLHAC 1887, pp. 55 e seguenti.]* — While I could not find immediately a copy of Castiglione online, de Nohac mentions Granvelle frequently, but – as far as I could see – not in connection to a common project of a «public library» together with Orsini. Where does this information come from? Castiglione?

*nel palazzo di Campo dei Fiori* — see above

*riunioni dell'Accademia di Claudio Tolomei* — which sounds as if this *accademia* was founded or, at least, headed by Tolomei ... which it was not. The one (presumably) founded by him (but surely together with

others) was the *Accademia della Virtù*, which — as far as I understand it — dedicated itself rather to philological topics and poetry, not to Vitruvius and antiquarian studies in general.

*Gentile Delfini ... Fulvio ...; sin dalla giovinezza, ha il privilegio di interfacciarsi con umanisti di prim'ordine come Angelo Colocci* — Chi? Delfini or Orsini? Because Colocci died in 1549 when Orsini was 20 years old, I would expect that it is Orsini you're talking here about?

*lettera scritta a Baccio Valori il 4 luglio del 1587:* — Such an important source, even cited literally, should show up in the bibliography or, even better, with a link to the source!

*Familiae Romanae quae reperiuntur in antiquis numismatibus del 1577, che segna la nascita della moderna numismatica* — There are good reasons to see other, earlier books as this *nascita*, e.g. those by Strada, Erizzo, even Vico ... all of whom surely influenced Orsini's knowledge on numismatic topics – in the same way as his interest in prosopography may be seen related to Panvinio and Agustín. Surely, Orsini's book is a giant step, but one that would have been virtually (methodologically and with regard to the materials he used) impossible without those mentioned here (and, maybe, several others).

*La medesima ambizione aveva già guidato la stesura delle Imagines et elogio virorum illustrium del 1570: in aperta contestazione delle integrazioni frequentemente attuate in quegli anni a testi e manufatti antichi (peraltro anche da Ligorio), Fulvio suddivide statue, monete, gemme e iscrizioni per classi,* — Again, he is standing on the shoulders of giants, e.g.: the methodological approach is described in Pighius' *Themis dea* from 1568 which describes a meeting between Agustín, Matal, Pighius and Morillon in the garden of Rodolfo Pio da Carpi in 1555, and is dedicated to Granvelle: It is surely intended not as a publication of a certain archaeological interpretation of some ancient herme but as a demonstration of a methodology which could be called «archaeological» and academic in a very modern sense. (Unfortunately, their conclusions are wrong, as Henning Wrede has shown...). But this is not the starting point for the «interdisciplinary» method taking into account all available sources (inscriptions, books, coins, other statues and images etc.): Because Annibale Caro is making fun of this approach already in his famous report on a meeting of the *Accademia: Commento di ser Agresto da Ficaruolo [= Caro] sopra la prima ficata del padre Siceo [Molza]*. – Roma: Barbapaglia Stampatore [= Antonio Blado], 1539.

<https://archive.org/details/ita-bnc-pos-0000066-001>

*Codice Vaticano Latino 3439, inizialmente di proprietà di Onofrio Panvinio e solo in un secondo momento passato nelle mani di Fulvio:* — maybe it should be mentioned that Panvinio and Orsini must have known each other very well? This remark sounds, as if Orsini somehow got the manuscript, e.g. on a book market or through other hands, which is (IMHO) not the case.

*che forse li avrebbe utilizzati come materiale per le sue Antiquitates Romanae.* — Readers could be interested if this is a printed book, a book project, a manuscript ... or (what it is in reality) a project for a 100 volume edition of all knowledge about Roman antiquity.

*Non può sfuggire ad un lettore attento come tanto la scelta dei soggetti quanto la precisa organizzazione dei fogli per tematica rispondano agli interessi e alle direttive dell'Accademia di Claudio Tolomei, che dovette influenzare a più livelli gli studi orsiniani.* — ... and already those by Panvinio: Panvinio was called to Rome at the age of 20 by Marcello Cervini who must be regarded as one of the if not THE mastermind(s) behind the project described [! – but surely not invented] by Tolomei and many other related projects, too. Panvinio later states in a letter that he owns his introduction to the study of Roman antiquities in the broadest sense to Jean Matal, 1545-55 together with Agustín at the center of the Roman research network identifiable with the *Accademia de lo Studio de l'Architettura* (but not the *Accademia della Virtù*, even if Luca Contile seems to mix them both in his letter from 1541. But that may not really be his fault: many persons around Tolomei were members of both academies, which is why I prefer to call it a *network* instead of *one* academy.)

*Dalle edizioni successive dell'inventario emerge che la raccolta scultorea di Orsini crebbe ulteriormente grazie all'acquisizione di molti altri ritratti di uomini illustri, alcuni provenienti dalle collezioni Cesi e Garimberti.* — Again, one may ask how a librarian could have the money to buy objects from such prestigious collections? By the way: Garimberto (not: -ti) reports a meeting in Tolomei's house after a visit of several architects (Antonio da Sangallo the Younger, Jacopo Melegghino) and academics to the Palatin when they start to discuss if an ancient building could be fully reconstructed if only its foundations have survived. (see Garimberto, Girolamo: *De regimentis publicis de la città*. Venezia: Girolamo Scoto, 1544. [online]).

*Per quanto riguarda infine la vastissima collezione numismatica di Fulvio,* — ... one should know that his friend Agustìn owned one of the largest collections of coins of the time (over 1,000 pieces, many of them described by Jacopo Strada in his *Diaskeue* manuscripts in Vienna and Prague; and most of them presumably today in the royal collection or royal institute of numismatics – named after Agustìn – in Spain).

*Orsini, ciò che emerge è il profilo di un umanista deciso a superare la cesura tra le varie discipline per giungere a una concezione unitaria di scienza dell'Antichità* — i.e., something that sounds *very* familiar to people who know about the publication project described by Tolomei and Panvinio's 100-volume-project. In fact, I am convinced that hardly anyone at the time in Rome could not think about the research on Roman antiquity in terms of an «interdisciplinary» project involving many persons: They all knew, that there is too much material to be overseen by one person alone. Only the separation of these different fields of study (IMHO emerging from Tolomei's project) could lead to the «different» disciplines that still wait for their «interdisciplinary» reunification.

*non è un caso se, in una lettera del 10 aprile 1568, un inviato ferrarese raccomanda l'architetto napoletano anzitutto come «eccellentissimo nella professione delle medaglie» (cioè come antiquario) e in secondo luogo come encomiabile disegnatore* — But doesn't that contradict Agustìn's judgement as reported by Mandowsky/Mitchell? Of course it does, because they did not only translate Agustìn's sentence wrongly or, at least, with a tendency *against* Ligorio (even though it should be read in the opposite intention): They even added a pejorative sentence that is simply not there in Agustìn's text!

*Notevolissimo è tuttavia, in Ligorio, il rapporto tra la produzione grafica e le sue conquiste in ambito cartografico, di cui si tratterà nel paragrafo seguente.* — I think this is a wrong suggestion: after some 40 manuscript volumes on all kinds of antiquities, cartography (or rather: Roman topography) may, of course, have been one of his most important interests, but only one among many others.

*Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane, della cui intensa attività di scavi archeologici lascia preziose testimonianze scritte* — and who had to measure everything in Rome just for the reorganization of its fortifications as ordered by Paul III. One helping hand in this project was Leonardo Bufalini. . .

*dall'impresa di Raffaello voluta da papa Leone X* — I think it was the other way 'round: We have three versions of the so-called Letter to Leo X (but not the final version or the letter itself), but we do not know if the letter even arrived in the pope's hands. Surely, we may assume that they (Raffael and Leo) even talked about the topic personally, but there is not proof for that. And surely not one showing that the pope wanted Raffael to develop and execute the project described in the different versions of his «letter».

*Marliano 35. . . [note: 35 L'Urbis Romae topographia di Marliani del 1544]* — The man's name in all contemporary sources that I know of is MarlainO. Or in Latin: MarlianUS. MarlianI is the genetiv of this Latin version of his name, taken by someone who did not realise that from the title of the *Topographia* as the real name of the author: «Marliani». Those repeating that mistake over and over again cannot be taken seriously . . .

In the same note: *sulla ricostruzione dei Fasti* — the *Fasti* were found in 1546, so no connection to the 1544 edition of the *Topographia* or to Agustin who arrived in Rome in 1545. Or do I misunderstand here something?)

*Tra il 1552 e il 1558 Pirro pubblica anche diverse incisioni effigianti ricostruzioni di monumenti antichi* — which ones? A list would be helpful . . . because I do not know of many, in fact: none. Drawings, yes, of course. But *incisioni*? Of buildings or other monuments?

*frutto delle ricognizioni archeologiche nell'Urbe dell'ultimo decennio* — all by himself alone . . . ? I doubt that.

*come noto, non sarà mai possibile per l'artista dare integralmente alle stampe la sua opera monumentale* — This could be understood as: He was not able to publish *all* («integralmente») of his manuscripts . . . when, in fact, he published almost nothing.

*notevolissimo sarà l'influsso dei suoi studi cartografici nei secoli successivi.* — I would doubt that Ligorio's topographical maps had such an influence, because they were not precise enough: showing many fantastic reconstructions of buildings and leaving almost no place for «normal» houses. While Bufalini mixes old and new Rome in his map, others may have wanted to get a more systematic, real topographic map of ancient Rome. But in the same way as Serlio took up things that were «in the air» and – too rapidly – published his books with many raw and even wrong reconstructions (and caused some anger among other antiquarian specialists of his time. . . ), Ligorio may have been the first with his large plan, but – again – from the point of view of others at the time, his map may have been too imprecise. Why do I think so? Because Jean Matal (in Rome from 1545-55) became later a close collaborator and advisor to Ortelius. And judging from Matal's immense and impressive precision in his collection of inscriptions (from my point of view: his contribution to the project described by Tolomei), one can assume that his influence on the precision of Ortelius' maps can hardly be overestimated . . . and must have emerged already in his Roman years, side by side with Ligorio, maybe. — But anyway: The developments in cartography took another direction as Ligorio's maps with pure orthogonal projections like in Bufalini and avoiding «too fancy» reconstructions of buildings and entire quarters of the ancient *Urbs*.

*Note 38: Tale collaborazione viene direttamente attestata G. G. De Rossi nel testo aggiunto alla tiratura della nuova pianta fatta nel 1674 da Villamena (cfr. DE NOLHAC 1887, p. 65, n. 3).* — I would not regard a note from 1674 as a confirmation of something that may have happened some 100 years ago. . . According to Nollac, Duperac writes *in 1674* (almost 100 years after his death !!!) that he profited from the support of cardinal Farnese? This must be an apocryph addition and surely not a reliable source.

*l'interesse che il bibliofilo nutriva anche per l'ambito della cartografia è ulteriormente dimostrato dalla già citata sezione del Codex Ursinianus dedicata ai frammenti della Forma Urbis severiana, testimonianza grafica del monumento più unica che rara nel panorama cinquecentesco* — But the idea to reconstruct ancient Rome in its entirety is already formulated in Tolomei's description . . . and (partly) realised in Marliano's 1544 edition (published by the Dorico brothers, calling themselves «Accademiae romanae impressorum»)

6. *L'Accademia dello studio dell'architettura* — Where does this name come from? (Atanagi in 1565, of course. . . ). Because the name «accademia dello studio dell'architettura» could be misunderstood as a general description, for instance for the academy in Mendrisio, I would prefer to use the ancient/Atanagi's spelling = «Accademia de lo studio de l'architettura» to make clear that it is (somewhat of) a proper name.

*l'Accademia dello studio dell'architettura fondata da Claudio Tolomei 40 a Roma nel 1542 circa* — First of all, you should introduce the program and link the first edition (1547) of Tolomei's letters here.

Then, while the letter describing the program by Tolomei dates from 1542, it surely cannot have been developed by this one man alone in a simple letter, but must have emerged from a collaborative attempt ... started earlier and obviously going back to Antonio da Sangallo (misleadingly called) «Proemio» from 1531/39. (see my freely available article)

The academy, even under the name «*accademia della virtù*» wrongly attributed by Contile, already met in 1541 in Tolomei's house: [https://archive.org/details/bub\\_gb\\_hANqNWL3\\_McC/page/n45/mode/2up](https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_hANqNWL3_McC/page/n45/mode/2up)  
*ancora troppo spesso confusa con l'Accademia della Virtù istituita dallo stesso umanista senese* — Remembering Caro's text from 1538, I doubt that the *Accademia della Virtù* was founded later, and that Tolomei was really its «founder» and not just one of them.

*nella formulazione dell'innovativo metodo di approccio all'Antico di Orsini.* — I would doubt that Orsini really developed or even invented this method: I'm sure that he took it over from the Tolomei circle. I'd rather say that he took it up and – maybe – developed it further by simply applying it constantly.

*la sensazione è che esso costituì il nucleo e il punto di partenza di sviluppi metodologici e collezioni sistematiche fino alla fondazione delle discipline attinenti l'antichità romana.* — and even more: I think that, e.g., Ulysse Aldrovandi's approach to zoology and botanics took up the methodology he learned while in Rome studying the ancient statues (and, therefore, writing the text part of the book planned by Tolomei's circle as part of the program). Aldrovandi may have influenced with this approach – via Penelli, e.g. – even Galilei. And, as I wrote above, also the connections to the emerging geography from Matal to Ortelius (who also visited Rome and met the old members of the network like Agustín, Orsini etc. – IIRC) may have functioned in the same way. I would dare to say, that the birth of the (natural) sciences and the humanities dealing with art and history may be placed in the Roman academic network of the 1530/40s.

*Note 41: svaniti i fantasmi dell'Accademia romana di Pomponio Leto, a suo avviso, è proprio l'Accademia di Tolomei a catalizzare le molteplici istanze dei diversi operatori nel campo della cultura antiquaria.* — No. There are several personal continuities among the old «*Accademia Romana*» founded by Leto and (presumably) destroyed in the *Sacco di Roma* 1527, and the new one which (see above the Dorico brothers' self-description) existed still / again in 1544 under the same name. One of the leading members of the «old» *accademia* was Colocci. And his closest personal friend in the 1530s and 40s was Marcello Cervini (who seems to have been a member of the old academy himself). And we may assume that the clearly important interest of the old academy in architecture (which led to the Sulpizio edition of Vitruvius – the same one used by Sangallo's brother Giovanni Battista for his illustrations, see the «*Corsini incunabulum*» <https://opac.bncf.firenze.sbn.it/Record/RML0137482?uri=RML0137482>) stood in a non-accidental relation to the studies of the Sangallo and Peruzzi circle. Bembo surely was another connecting link between the two «generations» ...

*In una lettera inviata ad Agostino de' Landi nel 1542, Tolomei illustrò minuziosamente l'obiettivo del suo sodalizio* — This letter should be linked here, especially when it is now easily available on the web! (see above).

BUT: Tolomei does NOT mention a «*sodalizio*», some sort of organization, but only «some interested spirits». And because he does not give any name — not for the circle/network of persons, not even for ONE of the persons involved — it is misleading to assume without further evidence, that this circle of «anonymous» persons mentioned in the letter can be identified easily with one of the academies in Rome involving Tolomei.

*una rinascenza meticolosamente pianificata dell'architettura antica di Roma e dintorni* — No. No «*rinascenza*», no «*renaissance*» of the *architecture* of ancient Rome was planned, but to «*svegliare nuovamente questo nobile studio [di architettura]*! I hope the difference is clear enough: No-one in 16th-century Rome had an interest or a need to erect architecture in ancient Roman style: There was simply no need for

giant baths, temples, *domus*, insulae, amphitheatres, not even «normal» theatres (following the same constructions of ancient theatres like that of Marcellus) etc. – the only ancient type of ancient buildings that were used from time to time were triumphal arches. But these would have mostly been ephemeral architectures for certain occasions. And we can be sure that Tolomei and his friends were well aware that a «resurrection» or a «rebirth» of ancient architecture was nothing anyone wanted or needed — and that's why the *philologist* (i.e. someone who knew how to use words carefully!) wrote: the *study* of architecture (according to Vitruvius a «multi-disciplinary» field comprising almost all kinds of knowledge) had to be re-awaken and re-established! (I recently published an article on the topic in German where I also showed that, in the same way as Tolomei, also Claudio Monteverdi some 60 years later *did not* argue for or demand a «renaissance» of ancient music, but a modern music which would turn back to a practice of composing already demanded by Plato! – So far about the «new» *seconda pratica* of 1600 ...)

*il cui studio era da intendersi come una ricostruzione comprensiva di qualsiasi conoscenza sulla teoria e la pratica architettonica* — ah, so you actually DO KNOW the difference between architecture and its study, but treat them as if they were one and the same?

*incentrato sull'opera di Vitruvio* — No, Vitruvius is «only» the starting point and represents (almost entirely) the theoretical part of the study of architecture. Because there are no other treatises of the same extension left from antiquity. (Frontinus is a special case and would certainly be dealt with in the last volume).

*composto complessivamente da circa 24 volumi, presentati nell'ordine seguente:* — Isn't it strange that you do not cite the original *Italian* text by Tolomei but rather a summary that sounds *very* familiar to me and almost like a translation from my own publications in German or (rather those in) English? Why do you think that your italian readers would not understand Tolomei's original? Because you didn't read it yourself? Why not?

And: *if you cite or translate someone else's summary of Tolomei's program, you HAVE TO MENTION your source!! Everything else is a plagiarism — one of the deadly sins (if not THE deadly sin) of academic work! So, you better retract your article and correct that. (And no: because of several wordings it is easy to show that you translated one of the versions of the list that I published before.)*

*Also: You cite in your bibliography ONE of my articles but you do not link it here as your source for the list — and, somewhat, rightly so: First of all, the title is wrong. The one you cite is that of the paper given at the converage in Liege in 2015, but I changed it for the publication in 2018. Secondly, because I was concentrating then on the architectural drawings (which is still my main field of research) I made a mistake and counted only 23 books then. So, the version of the list containing 24 books must be from a later article. But you DO NOT mention it in the bibliography and — were it certainly would belong — in the notes for this passage of your article containing the list.*

*Note: 42 Tale volume è ad oggi identificato con le Annotationes di Philandrier.* — It has been identified as such much earlier. Find out yourself, when ...! And: of course the *Annotationes* have to appear in your bibliography, especially when it is now easily available on the web. 20 years ago one could write something like: «I heard/read of this book but could not see it myself in a library, so I mention it here in the bibliography but cannot cite directly from ist.» But these times are over for your lucky generation. ;-)

*Note 43 I possibili contatti di Palladio e quelli certi di Trissino con l'Accademia suggerirebbero che le edizioni critiche di Vitruvio realizzate da Daniele Barbaro (pubblicate a Venezia rispettivamente nel 1556 e nel 1567, e per le quali Palladio fornì illustrazioni e suggerimenti) richiamino da vicino tanto il presente volume quanto l'opera descritta al punto 8 del programma di Tolomei.* — If you didn't find that out yourself (and I doubt that) you should mention where the idea comes from. Certainly NOT from the «establish» (and published) Palladio research, which still thinks that the genius from Vicenza found out

and developed every idea alone by himself (which is, even if one only looks at *any* other «genius» in history, simply laughable. Palladio did not have the «greatness» to admit that he was «standing on the shoulders of giants», but that does not mean that he did not!)

*Note 44 Pare rispondere alle intenzioni di tale volume la Regola delli cinque ordini d'architettura di Jacopo Barozzi da Vignola (membro del sodalizio di Tolomei, come testimoniano le biografie a lui dedicate da Giorgio Vasari ed Egnazio Danti).* — Again, you will not find this idea anywhere in modern research accept in my articles. So, in case you found that out yourself: congratulations. In case you plagiarized it (and that's what I have to assume based on your formulations): shame on you!

And, of course: You should mention the exact sources for your claims about Vasari and Danti. You'll find them in my articles.

*note 12. una cronologia ragionata e illustrata dello sviluppo urbanistico di Roma nell'antichità* — If you compare that with Tolomei's formulation, you'll see that it is virtually impossible to come to a formulation as close to mine as yours by simply «translating» Tolomei = i.e. a clear case of plagiarism! (At least, you name the author correct ... but let me guess: this is just simply a result of copy-paste?)

*Note: 46 Il Codex Destailleur D alla Kunstbibliothek di Berlino deve contenere materiale preparatorio per tale pubblicazione (forse anche per il diciassettesimo volume del progetto editoriale di Tolomei),* — Ah, you did see the Codex yourself, studied it, found its possible relation to Tolomei's program (despite of its wrong dating to the 1560s by modern research) ... and *did not publish* these important findings elsewhere? Well, I did ...

*ma anche le descrizioni e le illustrazioni degli edifici antichi di Palladio presenti nell'ultimo tomo dei suoi Quattro libri dell'architettura paiono riflettere, pur in modo limitato, gli obiettivi di questo punto del programma dell'Accademia.* — Again something which the enormous (and well-funded) Palladio research never realized ... But you did? Alone, all by yourself??

By the way: You forgot to mention that the Berlin Codex (what is its inventory number – why don't you mention it? Try to order it in the *Kunstbibliothek* without that number: you won't get it. But you won't get it anyway, because the drawings are not accessible because of conservational reasons ...) is only the nucleus of a much larger «network» of drawings. Didn't you find that out yourself, too? Or would it have been far too obvious if you just copied this information from my publications, too? Doesn't matter: your other remarks already unmask you ...

*Note: 47 Il Codex Coburgensis e il Codex Pighianus devono contenere del materiale preparatorio per esso, come potrebbero esserlo altresì numerosissimi disegni della bottega di Jacopo Strada e un gruppo di 6 manoscritti alla BAV (Vat. Lat. 6034, 6036-6040), raccolti da Jean Matal tra il 1546 e il 1550.* — If you should have found all of that out yourself, we must have seen each other a dozen times in the respective museums, or you must have been my shadow (which I never noticed...)

But you misunderstood something: The *Codices* contain drawings of statues, Matal's manuscripts contain copies of inscriptions ... So, you are not even able to read carefully, which is a precondition to understand and then plagiarize something accurately?

*Note: 48 L'Österreichische Nationalbibliothek di Vienna possiede un codice di Jacopo Strada relazionabile con il libro qui descritto da Tolomei.* — Which one? (Btw: there are at least two ...)

*Note 49 Potrebbero costituire del materiale preparatorio per una simile opera molti libri di disegni di Jacopo Strada e bottega, raffiguranti centinaia di vasi che lo stesso Strada dichiara copiati da rilievi e sculture antichi.* — Again, and again, and again: Where? Which ones? Did you see them yourself (surely not, most of them are in private collections and not accessible) or did you again simply copy that information from a source you do not mention = plagiarized?



*Note: 50 Almeno 16 codici oggi alla Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana documentano migliaia di iscrizioni antiche, ordinati da Jean Matal nei suoi anni romani.* — There are only 6 codices in the Vaticana clearly attributed to Matal. The others are by his collaborators and disciples = information you know about but did not want to share with your readers...?

*Note 51 Vi sono almeno due libri a stampa inerenti l'argomento firmate da membri della rete di Tolomei (il Discorso sopra le medaglie antiche di Sebastiano Erizzo — Hm, what is the connection between Erizzo and Tolomei's Roman network? Any source ...?*

*e i Dialoghi di Antonio Agustín), senza dimenticare alcuni disegni di Jacopo Strada di medaglie raffiguranti edifici romani (corpus grafico attualmente conservato a Gotha, a Vienna e a Londra).* — «alcuni disegni»??? There are 29 (of originally 30) volumes in Gotha, others in Vienna, Prague, Paris and London = altogether some 15-20,000 drawings = «alcuni»? You must be kiddin' ...

*23. un libro dedicato alle macchine descritte da Vitruvio e altri autori, completa di note esplicative e disegni;* — I surely mentioned that they would also try to reconstruct machines after ancient depictions like the famous one from the tomb of the Haterii' (And you forgot to mention that there are several volumes with drawings of machines by Strada ... which no-one ever checked if they contain reconstructions of ancient machines...)

*note 52 Agostino Steuco, prefetto della Biblioteca Vaticana, quando nel 1545 si prese due mesi — three months, IIRC*

*di pausa dai suoi doveri per cercare i resti degli acquedotti romani nella campagna circostante, stava forse raccogliendo materiale per un'opera simile.* — ... which he published, at least one about the Aqua Vergine ... which certainly was used as preparation for its reconstruction in the late 1560s under Ligorio (I guess you heard of that guy?) and Vignola (maybe even this one?) \*laugh\*

*La lista dei volumi da realizzare e pubblicare si presenta ben ordinata e mostra un preciso approccio metodologico;* — which you could(n't) certainly explain, right?

*come si è visto, l'Accademia fu responsabile, più o meno direttamente, della realizzazione di molti manoscritti e di alcuni libri a stampa d'innegabile rilievo, prodotti dai membri di una cerchia internazionale ed interdisciplinare attiva a Roma tra il 1531 e il 1555 circa.* — even more information that you found out yourself? Surely ... These are the results of YEARS of hard work, almost entirely financed with my own money. To plagiarize them, therefore, is really *THEFT* and nothing less!

*... Ligorio sta raccogliendo materiale per la sua imponente enciclopedia sul patrimonio antico; d'altra parte, almeno due suoi amici fanno parte del circolo erudito (Francesco Maria Molza e Guillaume Philandrier)* — ... not to mention some dozen others to whom Ligorio stood in contact in Rome: Sangallo, Vignola, Melegghino (see Garimberto 1544), Caro, Farnese, Orsini (uups!), Panvinio, Matal, Palladio, Agustín ... and many persons today rather forgotten like Lucena ... to cut it short: almost everybody then in Rome and interested in antiquities. Even being an «enemy» of Marliano is some sort of a relation that (presumably) was based in personal contact and discussions ...

*Notevole è anche il fatto che, se molti membri dell'accademia di Tolomei non portano a compimento buona parte del loro programma,* — It's difficult to conclude from a lack of surviving materials that they never existed. With regard to all that survived (and taking into account, that at least 70% of all manuscript sources including drawings from the Renaissance are lost) one can certainly assume that there was *much* more ... So, to claim that some of the academicians did not finish their work is ... somewhat bold. (Just to give two examples: Philipp II sent *all* project proposals for the *Escorial* to Vignola to get his opinion – and none of these drawings survived. And: According to Vasari *and* Danti – both of which you cite indirectly – Vignola «measured all the antiquities in Rome» ... but none of these drawings survived, too

... except: you would know something about how such surveys have been and are made and why it is plausible, that no drawings resulting from them exist from the hands of Vignola ...)

*va pure sottolineato che i volumi napoletani si dimostrano molto influenzati dalle ambizioni dell'Accademia,* — «si dimostrano»? How? I would at least give *one* example, and not (like many others to today) one to which dozens of counterexamples exist (which are simply ignored...)

*presentandosi infatti come una sorta di embrione di enciclopedia del mondo antico,* — ... like the one Panvinio planned? Or did you not know about it ...?

*Un commento critico, filologico ed antiquario a Vitruvio, nonché una raccolta enciclopedica sulla vita nell'antichità, sono obiettivi condivisi anche dalla Congregazione dei Virtuosi al Pantheon, di cui Ligorio diviene membro nel dicembre del 1548.* — Really? Where is their program? I never heard or read about it. But, after all, I do not know everything ... But IMHO the *Virtuosi* were almost all artist, craftsmen, and I regard their congregazione as an attempt to establish a «faster» connection between the archaeological studies in Rome (in which many of them took part) and the creative usage of their findings in their daily work as architects, sculptors, painters: They didn't want to wait until Tolomei's publication program was finished; and they simply did not need this sort of «academic», even pedantic, exact reconstruction of ancient objects and rules. They simply needed some good examples and wanted to understand their basic rules of proportion etc.

*Vagenheim ha dimostrato...* — Where?

*... che la partecipazione di Pirro all'Accademia degli Sdegnati fu nodale specialmente per la conoscenza delle fonti greche* — ... because in the earlier *Accademia* there was no-one who could help Ligorio with Greek? Really? (If you knew that almost all of the *Sdegnati* were members of the academic circle around Tolomei before, you could not write something like that.

*negli anni ferraresi, Pirro Ligorio aveva istituito anche una sorta di "accademia per corrispondenza" con Fulvio Orsini, definita da Madonna dei "Virtuosi dell'Antiquaria" o dei "cavalieri della Santa Antichità".* — And who were the members? Just these two?

*Note 55: Si legga in proposito la lettera scritta dal napoletano a Orsini il 22 giugno 1577, MS. Vat. Lat. 4105, ff. 57-58. Cfr. DE NOLHAC 1886, p. 319.* — The letter is on fol. 57 recto/verso, but not on folio 58 (which is empty). And: There is no «Nolhac 1886» in your bibliography ... and you surely do not mean <https://archive.org/details/lecanzoniereaut00nolhgoog>, because it has only 30 pages ... and on page 319 Nolhac deals with Colocci and others, but surely not mentions Ligorio's letter! What a mess!! (And I simply don't have the time to do YOUR work and find, which passage you may refer to in reality ...)

So: If you don't want me to destroy your entire professional future by making your plagiarism public, you should *immediately* retract your article or provide *any* evidence that you just found out everything yourself – without even knowing about my work ... but oh: you did, at least in an early version from 2015, published in 2018) ... – and just by accident used the same formulations that I used...