



DIGITAL ACCESS TO SCHOLARSHIP AT HARVARD

Giovanni Battista Falda and Lievin Cruyl: Rivalry between Printmakers and Publishers in the Mapping of Rome

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
[Please share](#) how this access benefits you. Your story matters.

Citation	Connors, Joseph. 2012. Giovanni Battista Falda and Lievin Cruyl: Rivalry between Printmakers and Publishers in the Mapping of Rome. In <i>Piante di Roma dal Rinascimento ai Catasti</i> , ed. Mario Bevilacqua and Marcello Fagiolo, 218-231. Rome: Artemide.
Accessed	February 19, 2015 1:11:27 PM EST
Citable Link	http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:11644162
Terms of Use	This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA

(Article begins on next page)

Joseph Connors

“Giovanni Battista Falda and Lievin Cruyl: Rivalry between Printmakers and Publishers in the Mapping of Rome,” in Mario Bevilacqua and Marcello Fagiolo, eds., *Piante di Roma dal Rinascimento ai Catasti*, Rome, 2012, pp. 218-31

For years a reproduction of Falda’s great map of 1676, in the Danesi edition mounted on canvas, hung on my walls in successive homes in Cambridge, Chicago, and New York. It was testimony to my homesickness for the *Urbs*. Falda helped me walk in my imagination through the streets of baroque Rome, “spatiando con gli occhi per tutte le vie, piazza, giardini, et contrade della Città”, as the publisher, Giovanni Giacomo De Rossi, says on the map. Now I know that I was not very original, and that many lovers of Rome have hung the Falda map on their walls. A drawing of about 1693 (Fig. 1) shows the Falda plan decorating the library of Samuel Pepys, the great English diarist, in York House in London, amidst the presses holding his celebrated collection of 3000 books.¹ Since Pepys was always being accused by his political enemies of being a secret papist, it was daring to hang a map of Rome, full of papal imagery, in such a prominent place. The map was not yet two decades old, but it was already an icon of the far-off Mistress of the World, gracing the wall like the maps in Vermeer.

In 1989, I arranged for an exhibition of the drawings of Lievin Cruyl to be installed at the American Academy in Rome.² It was stimulating to work together with Barbara Jatta, who was preparing her monograph on the artist. Michael Miller, the curator of the Cleveland Museum, brought to the exhibition all seventeen of the Cruyl vedute in his museum; Leonard Boyle lent us the ten prints in the *Prospectus* that Cruyl dedicated to Alexander VII; and the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford lent the two large Cruyl views of the Ponte S. Angelo and St. Peter’s seen from the south. It was a small but splendid exhibition. One could gage its success with the Roman public not only by the high attendance figures, but also by the number of fingerprints on the glass, as eager visitors pointed out the parts of Rome they knew and loved.

My essay for the catalogue took up the theme of the competition that one could see in the prints between Falda and Cruyl.³ Hülsen, in his invaluable article of 1915, had noted the rivalry between their publishers: “Le due case per circa quarant’ anni si sono fatte una concorrenza spietata...”⁴ However, it was now possible to speak in more detailed terms about the publishing industry in Rome thanks to the work of Francesca Consagra on the De Rossi family. Her essential studies unearthed in the archives much important information on the economics of publishing and the importance of securing a papal privilege.⁵ With this information in mind, it was possible to look with fresh eyes at the prints themselves, and the rivalry became

more obvious than ever. Two different visions were in competition, in the service of two different business models. A good publisher could offer a talented etcher fame and fortune, while an unscrupulous publisher could drive a genius from the printmaking trade. These were the respective fates of Falda and Cruyl.

Giovanni Battista Falda (1643-78) was born in Valduggia near the Lago d'Orta in Piedmont in 1643.⁶ He arrived in Rome at the age of 14, possibly as an apprentice to Bernini. He soon moved to the shop of the most successful printmaker in Rome, Giovanni Giacomo De Rossi (1627-91), and his first print is dated 1662, when he was nineteen.⁷ Giovanni Giacomo treated Falda almost as a son, sent him for instruction in perspective (though probably not, *pace* Cotta, to Borromini and Cortona), and gave him the run of his own vast print collection, where he studied the work of Silvestre, Callot, and Della Bella.⁸ Had Falda lived longer, he would have succeeded Giovanni Giacomo as his heir and inherited both his shop and the *palazzetto* he built for himself on the Via della Lungara (Fig. 2). Falda's print of the *palazzetto* shows the house of a wealthy, self-ennobling craftsman, who put Caesar medallions flanking his doorway and fashioned a coat of arms for himself, a lion rampant quartered with waves, motives that are also present in the fountain we see in the courtyard.⁹

In all their collaborations, Giovanni Giacomo never failed to give Falda credit. Thus we speak of Falda's *Nuovo teatro delle fabbriche*, even though it was Giovanni Giacomo who took the financial risk. Giovanni Giacomo's presence is strongly marked on the large map of 1676. He signs the dedication to Innocent XI as well as the greeting "Al nobile et studioso lettore", where he reminds the reader of his long career as a publisher: "Per il corso di molti anni, mi sono affaticato in sodisfare con le mie stampe al tuo nobile, et studioso genio". He then gives a summary list of the firm's publications, "le mie fatiche". Indeed, Giovanni Giacomo De Rossi was a pioneer in this respect, issuing a catalogue of the firm's productions in 1677 and updating it periodically.¹⁰ Nevertheless, Giovanni Giacomo put Falda's name in the title before his own, and we still call it the Falda map. We have come to regard acknowledgment of the artist and author by the publisher a natural thing, but it was not universally the case in seventeenth-century Rome, as we shall see in the case of Lievin Cruyl.

We finally have firm dates for the birth and career of Lievin Cruyl thanks to the work of Barbara Jatta.¹¹ He was born in Ghent in 1634 and is last mentioned in the documents there in 1662. He was ordained a priest in 1658. His Italian sojourn seems to date from about 1662 to about 1676. He is last documented as a resident of Rome in 1671, and he did dated views of Naples in 1675 and views of Venice and Genoa in

1676, presumably on his return to Flanders. After Rome, he had a career as an architect in Ghent and as a view artist in Marly, Versailles, Chantilly, and Paris. He is not documented after the 1690s, though his supposed date of death is 1720 or 1722.

To judge from the architectural projects Cruyl submitted on his return to Flanders he probably had training as a young man in architecture. We can also be confident that his education in Ghent included immersion in the perspective culture flourishing in the city of Jan van Eyck, and that he had training in optics and the use of lenses. Rome was thus doubly attractive for him, first, as a priest, and second, as a student of optics and perspective. The Minims at the Trinità ai Monti were at the cutting edge of this field. When Cruyl returned to Ghent after his eleven-year stay in Rome, he designed an altar for the church of St. Bavo that incorporates a *trompe l'oeil* perspective of a kind used by the Minims for Eucharistic displays.¹² Cardinal Bernardino Spada, protector of the Minims, was himself immersed in the culture of perspective, such as we see in the famous *prospettiva* of Palazzo Spada.¹³ Cruyl may have learned something about lenses in the museum-workshop of Eustachio Divini (1610-95), the most famous telescope maker of the 1660s.¹⁴ The little figure of the draftsman often found sketching at street corners or on rooftops in Cruyl's *vedute* (Fig. 3) is endearing but misleading. Cruyl did indeed sketch, but he also must have used a camera obscura or some other system of lenses, combined with elaborate perspective constructions, to create his *vedute* back in the studio.

Cruyl had a vision which was simultaneously telescopic and wide-angle. Looking ahead, for a moment, to his *vedute* of 1665-66, formerly in the Albertina and now divided between The Cleveland Museum of Art and the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, we find drawings in which the atmosphere is always limpid and the eye penetrates to the most distant recesses of streets and buildings. In many of them he includes a telescopic view down a street or even into the heart of a building. In the *veduta* of Ponte S. Angelo, for example, he lets the viewer look down Via Alessandrina as far as the door of the Vatican Palace inside Bernini's colonnade. In the *veduta* of S. Ivo he positions his eye so that the viewer can see through the long south corridor of the Sapienza, and similarly, in the *veduta* of S. Maria di Loreto, the axis of sight penetrates deep into the church to culminate at the high altar. In the *veduta* of the terrace of S. Francesca Romana he lets the viewer glimpse the north façade of the Lateran in the far distance, between gaps in the masonry of the Colosseum (Fig. 4). In the *veduta* of Piazza Colonna the gaze ranges to the far north end of the Corso, coming to rest on the obelisk and gate of Piazza del Popolo, while in the *veduta* of S. Maria in Via Lata the eye ranges to the south end of the Corso, coming to rest on the tower of the Villa of Paul III (Fig. 5). In the amazing pair of

vedute of the Quattro Fontane, he gives us four telescopic views penetrating to the farthest possible reaches of vision, compressing miles of distance into a tiny space.

Cruyl's vision also resembles that of a wide-angle lens. He opens up the streets of Rome into grand boulevards that dwarf carriages and spectators. In his veduta of S. Maria in Via Lata the rooflines of the buildings on the Corso do not point to a single vanishing point but to many vanishing points, approximating the curved vanishing lines that would be made by a wide-angle lens (Fig. 5). Many of his vedute cover an unnaturally wide angle of vision. In his veduta of Piazza del Popolo, Cruyl's eye takes in a span of more than 200 degrees, swiveling from Porta del Popolo to the Twin Churches at the head of the trident of streets (Fig. 6). This is an exact but not a natural vision. In Daniela Del Pesco's nice phrase, Cruyl's topography is "precisa negli elementi ma falsata nella sintesi".¹⁵ In this case it is made less natural still by the fact that the twin churches show an early, unexecuted project for the facades, at a period when Bernini, Rainaldi, and Carlo Fontana were involved with the design.¹⁶

Cruyl's staffage figures are of secondary importance, though rendered with unusual verve, like figures in a Claude landscape. However, they are often apt for the time and place of the veduta in which they appear. The view of Palazzo Barberini is dated February 1665, just the right season for the Carnival maskers and street musicians in the foreground. The view of S. Ivo alla Sapienza shows students climbing the spiral, which is just what Borromini wanted the *laureandi* of the Sapienza to do. Climbers real and virtual were meant to ascend by foot or at least by eye to the flaming laurel crown at the summit: a symbol of the *laurea* or doctorate that the Sapienza conferred on its graduates.¹⁷

Cruyl had a wonderful eye, but was not as lucky as Falda in his publisher. He was hired by Giovanni Giacomo De Rossi's cousin and rival, Giovanni Battista De Rossi (1601-1678), whose shop was in Piazza Navona. Giovanni Battista was sixty-three when he met Cruyl, and he had begun to pass on the business to his son, Matteo Gregorio De Rossi, who had artistic pretensions of his own. Giovanni Battista seems to have thought of Cruyl as a mere instrument for hire, and Matteo Gregorio was even more exploitative. Both father and son use Cruyl's work extensively but give him little credit.

In 1664, both of the De Rossi firms were gearing up for great enterprises and were nervous about the competition. In November 1664 Giovanni Battista De Rossi (the Cruyl publisher) asked for a papal privilege in order to publish "tutte le vedute principali della Città di Roma...in nove fogli reale come anco un'altra Roma in doi fogli grande in pianta et alsata fatiche tutte che l'Oratore fa disegnare da tre anni in

qua con grand spesa”. One month later, Giovanni Giacomo De Rossi (the Falda publisher) applied for a privilege too: “et havendo intentione, et anche in pronto di fare stampare altre novità non più fatte”.¹⁸ Like rival trainers with superb young athletes in their camps, the two publishers were eyeing each other nervously.

Here is the chronology of their competition from 1664 to 1678. Cruyl and Giovanni Battista De Rossi started first. The Cruyl drawings of the piazzas of Rome, now divided between Cleveland and Amsterdam, are dated between February 1664 and April 1665. Somehow or other, by hook or by crook, Falda must have seen them. When Falda’s first publication, *Nuovo teatro delle fabbriche: Libro Primo*, came out in late 1665, it bordered on plagiarism. Falda was talented but he did not have Cruyl’s lens-like eye. Cruyl’s wide-angle vision was too difficult for Falda and he split many of Cruyl’s vedute into two. Thus Cruyl’s sweeping view of Piazza del Popolo is split into two plates in Falda. Falda splits Cruyl’s vedute of the Campidoglio and Piazza Colonna into two plates, while that of the Casa dei Filippini is split into three. Other Falda vedute, like those of the Propaganda Fide and S. Maria in Via Lata, derive from Cruyl in their essentials, but become simplistic in Falda’s hands. Falda makes the main monument stand out more heroically over the smaller buildings surrounding it. S. Maria in Via Lata is shown with entirely different optics by the two artists. Falda was simpler, but faster and more productive. Once the *Nuovo teatro* was out, Falda and Giovanni Giacomo De Rossi were definitely ahead in the competition.¹⁹

Cruyl’s publisher was slower and shoddier. All Giovanni Battista De Rossi produced in 1665 was the small Cruyl plan of Rome, dated 4 June 1665.²⁰ Though “très-utile per les voyageurs” according to later reprints, it cannot be described as a *succès d’estime*. It shows most of the city as an ichnographic plan while rendering the important buildings clumsily in three dimensions. Cruyl’s name is given in the smallest possible lettering. The engraver, Giulio Testone, was not worthy of Cruyl’s talents, and one wonders what Cruyl thought of his first appearance in print. Yet the publisher promised the public better things to come: “il presente Disegno, fatto in forma piccola, della sua Roma, il quale serve come di preludio all’istesso Disegno, fatto in forma assai maggiore, et agli altri Disegni degli edificij più famosi dell’istessa sua città, colle loro vedute e lontananze”. Part of this promise was filled the following year.

The *Prospectus Locorum Urbis Romae Insign[iorum]* of 1666 brought Cruyl back into the lead.²¹ If he could not compete with Falda in quantity he could easily surpass him in quality, and the ten large plates in this book are far more interesting than anything Falda had produced (Fig. 7). By now, Cruyl had learned to etch his own

plates, and the prints capture much of the optical magic of the drawings. For example, reflections in puddles (in the Piazza Farnese drawing and the Piazza Navona print, Figs. 8a and 8b) are a sign of Cruyl's general interest in optics. However, an ominous note is struck on the title page of the *Prospectus*. Giovanni Battista De Rossi's son, Matteo Gregorio De Rossi, takes credit as the "Inventore" of the enterprise and relegates Cruyl to the role of draftsman and engraver.

In 1667, Falda scored a triumph with his small plan of Rome.²² It gives the impression that the whole city with its buildings and gardens and even the countryside outside the walls has been drawn from the air. As Hülsen observed long ago, Falda took the overall layout of the map – walls, streets, and general orientation – directly from the Greuter plan of 1618. This saved him the time of making a new survey. In a long inscription, the publisher, Giovanni Giacomo De Rossi, takes a swipe at the competition, meaning the small plan of Matteo Gregorio De Rossi and Cruyl. He says that Alexander the Great allowed only Apelles to paint him and only Lysippus to sculpt him. If Rome allowed only one artist to do her portrait, then the Roman public would be spared monstrosities:

più Madrigne che Madri, più aborto che parto: e come informe sbozzo
d'un orsa il bisogno d'essere dall'industria altrui riformata e corretta.
Et si veduta tal Roma in cui di Roma non era ch'el nome, peggio dal
bolino, o l'acquaforte trattata, che un tempo dal ferro el foco de
Barbari: invilupata senza un filo fra più laberinti, che linee: e fra
tanti scogli quanti punti naufraga in una carta.²³

"More labyrinth than line": this is a harsh verdict on the small Cruyl plan, harsher still when we remember how much Falda owed Cruyl. To make matters worse, this invective came at a time when Cruyl was looking for new patronage and, it seems, a new publisher.²⁴ All the drawings that Cruyl had done up to this time – a good year's work – were the property of Giovanni Battista and Matteo Gregorio De Rossi, and they had no intention of letting them go, or even giving Cruyl credit for them.

In 1668, Giovanni Battista De Rossi brought out a large plan, "disegnata et intagliata da Matteo Gregorio De Rossi", whose name is mentioned three times.²⁵ It is the fulfillment of the promise Matteo Gregorio had made three years earlier on the small Cruyl plan. It is clearly based on the Greuter plan for the outline of the walls and the course of almost all the streets. I might describe it as "Greuter ichnographized", that is, Greuter with all the buildings rubbed out to get down to the original survey plan that underlay it. The Greuter plan is, of course, updated in many ways, the most evident being the new walls of the Janiculum and Piazza San Pietro.

The 1668 plan is also indebted to efforts to map the city accurately according to conventions followed by the *maestri di strade*, originating in the early seventeenth century but coming to fruition under Alexander VII. The convention of an ichnographic plan with houses and other features drawn in perspective is shown on a series of plans for the urbanization of Trastevere in the area below the Acqua Paola fountain drawn by Orazio Torriani, acting for the *maestri di strade*, in 1617.²⁶ An example that is still closer in date and style to the Matteo Gregorio de Rossi map is a street plan of Trastevere drawn in 1655-56 to indicate the zone of quarantine around the Tiber Island during the plague of that year (Fig. 9). Here too we have an accurately surveyed ichnographic plan, with the major churches shown as “pop-up” elevations.²⁷

The plans of many churches are rendered with considerable accuracy on the Matteo Gregorio de Rossi plan, even difficult Borromini plans, like San Carlo alle Quattro Fontane or the Lateran. Some “pop-up” pictures of famous buildings are added, but not that many, perhaps about twenty or thirty in all. The Vatican complex demonstrates a strange pairing, with St. Peter’s shown in plan, quite accurately, while the Papal Palace is shown in elevation.

Matteo Gregorio De Rossi nowhere mentions Cruyl, but Cruyl leaps off the pages of the map in the twenty-two *vedutine* shown at the bottom (Fig. 10). I still remember the excitement when I realized that these were small versions of the Cruyl drawings of 1665-66 in Cleveland and Amsterdam, and of the Cruyl prints in the *Prospectus* of 1666. No one, not even the perspicacious Hülsen, had mentioned this essential fact. Thirteen of the *vedutine* reflect Cruyl’s drawings in Cleveland and Amsterdam, but several others reflect Cruyl vedute of which we have no other record: the basilicas of S. Paolo, S. Sebastiano and S. Lorenzo fuori le mura; S. Croce; Piazza S. Marco looking up the Corso; S. Maria della Pace; the Pantheon; and Piazza Termini near S. Susanna.²⁸ Cruyl’s veduta of the Tiber with St. Peter’s in the distance is reproduced in miniature inside a lion’s skin at the left-hand side of the map. With twenty-three authentic Cruyl drawings in his hand, of which only ten had been published so far, Matteo Gregorio De Rossi confidently promised his public more volumes to come:

Gradisci questo per hora insino che uscirà fuori il compimento dell’opera nostra tanto desiderata delle prospettive pure di Roma presente.

He had paid for the drawings, and it mattered little to him that Cruyl had been left out in the cold.

Cruyl’s vedute were the models for the vignettes, but who did the plan and the other decorative elements? In the 1989 catalogue I thought all of this was by Cruyl, and I wanted to call the whole map the “grande Cruyl”. The *vedutina* of Ponte

Sant'Angelo, which obviously derives from Cruyl, fits so neatly into its lion's skin frame that it seems as though both were done by the same hand. The "pop-up" façade of the Propaganda and S. Andrea delle Fratte on the map also matches the Cruyl veduta of these buildings. In the end, however, I now think that we have a division of labor between the unacknowledged Cruyl and the trumpeted Matteo Gregorio De Rossi. The decorative details surrounding the vignettes are probably by Matteo Gregorio. They reflect the ornament of Jacques Callot and Stefano della Bella, a style that Cruyl never adopted.

Perhaps an emblem on the map offers us a clue (Figs. 11a, 11b, 11c). On the small Cruyl plan of 1665 we read "*Labore et Constantia*" under the emblem of a hand with a compass coming out of a cloud. Doubtless this is a form of signature for Cruyl. It is the motto of the Plantin press in Antwerp, and adopting it allowed him express his nationality as well as his own hard work and constancy.²⁹ On the 1668 map, however, the hand and compass emblem reappears with a different motto, "*Sibi Respondet*" ("He answers to himself"). Could this be Matteo Gregorio's riposte to Cruyl, the signature of a printmaker who was his own publisher?

In 1676 patient Falda, still working with the benevolent Giovanni Giacomo De Rossi, came out with a large plan of Rome, which swept aside all competition and captured the imagination of his own and future generations.³⁰ Falda makes it seem as though he had flown over the city many times, and simultaneously studied every single street and building from the ground. He shows a transit with a magnetic compass to make us think that he measured the city, like Leonardo Bufalini a century earlier. This is a false impression, however. There was no fresh survey. Once again Falda took the basic layout from the Greuter plan, copying the ruins, walls, and streets directly from Greuter, down to small country lanes.³¹

Falda's formula can be summarized as "update and infill". The updating ("adjusting and correcting" in the publisher De Rossi's words) is extensive. The Janiculum shows the walls of Urban VIII, which of course are not on the Greuter plan. St. Peter's has been totally updated. The new buildings of baroque Rome are spliced into the urban fabric. The Casa dei Filippini at the Vallicella is an obvious example, but many smaller new buildings are included too. Falda had the many prints of his *Nuovo teatro* to guide him. As Martha Pollak aptly says, "the map is in effect a collection of views".³²

What gives the map its air of verisimilitude, however, is the repetitive infill. Many or most of the smaller buildings and *vigne* are filled in on what Jennifer Montagu calls "the *et cetera* principle". Both his stock of vedute and his strategy of "update and

infill” gave Falda an edge over all the competition, tricking us into thinking that we are flying over the city as it looked in 1676. Rome was not ready for an ichnographic or semi-ichnographic plan like the large Matteo Gregorio De Rossi plan. It would have to wait until Nolli for that.

This raises the question of whether Falda or Cruyl were in contact with architects and obtained unexecuted designs from them. For both, the answer is, yes, in a few cases they did have access to projects on the drawing board. Helmut Hager noted long ago that the churches of Piazza del Popolo on the Cruyl veduta of 1665 showed an early project by Bernini or Rainaldi for twin porticoes fronting the facades.³³ On the back of the Cleveland veduta of the Propaganda Fide, Cruyl sketches details of the new attic that Borromini was about to install over the façade, which is shown as complete on the title page of the *Prospectus* of 1666.³⁴ Cruyl was definitely attracted to Borromini, and he shows many of his buildings. However, he is a relentless realist whose camera eye shows details that the architect might have wanted to photoshop out. Returning to Cruyl’s veduta of the Propaganda Fide, we see the building exactly as it stood in 1665, with the structures to the left and to the right of the façade looking quite different from one another. Falda, on the other hand, gives us an idealizing view where these areas match each other and make a satisfyingly symmetrical design, just as the architect would have liked us to see the building. In his printed view of S. Agnese in Navona (Fig. 12), Cruyl shows the church just as Borromini left it, with the bell towers unfinished, and the two Serliana windows set into backdrops that do not match. Instead, Falda gives us the ideal façade, with finished bell towers and completely symmetrical palace wings flanking them (Fig. 13). Since the building would not actually reach this state until the eighteenth century, Falda must be working from a project, such as the idealizing drawing by Carlo Rainaldi in the Chigi papers (Fig. 14).³⁵ Falda also knew Carlo Rainaldi’s design for S. Maria in Campitelli, complete with a sculpture program that was never carried out. Here too he shows symmetrical convent wings framing the church according to an ideal project that was never carried out.³⁶ Falda shows an unexecuted project for diagonal corner bays attached to the sides Cortona’s façade of SS. Martina e Luca, a late afterthought that was never carried out.³⁷ Finally, there are tantalizing images on the Falda map of 1676 that make it seem as though the etcher were working with drawings from celebrated architects, such as the strangely baroque cupola atop S. Ignazio or the five-bay façade of the Propaganda Fide (which corresponds to Borromini’s original design, though it was rendered obsolete since by Borromini’s seven-bay façade of 1666).

It was a coup to publish projects by the star architects, and Falda continued to hunt for them. One turned up for Palazzo Falconieri, which he inserted into the second

volume of Pietro Ferrerio's *Palazzi di Roma* in 1670-77 (Fig. 15).³⁸ He probably obtained it from Ottavio Falconieri, a cousin of the owner. It shows a seven-bay loggia over the façade, one that is much more impressive than the three-bay loggia we see today. Actually, the print is based on an optical trick. First of all it is reversed, so we have to reverse it again mentally to get at the project drawing. Second, it shows two separate loggias. On the right of the print (left in the original drawing) we have the three-bay loggia built in 1647-49. On the left of the print (right in the original drawing) we see a four-bay loggia, not over the Via Giulia wing of the palace but over a wing closer to the river, which was planned but never built. The convention of the orthogonal elevation makes these two separate loggias look like one continuous structure. For the rest of the roofline, Falda conveys the impression of an architect trying to shape a flat façade in a dynamic way, which is entirely characteristic of Borromini and another indication that he was working with an original drawing of the master.

A print in Falda's posthumous *Giardini di Roma*, published in 1681, three years after the etcher's death, also suggests that Falda had access to an authentic Borromini drawing.³⁹ It is a tiny detail in the corner of a bird's-eye view of the Quirinal gardens (Fig. 16). Across the street from the garden we see the façade of San Carlino with an Oratory-like pediment on the upper story. It is a far more convincing and satisfying design than the upper story carried out by Borromini's nephew in 1677.

From the dates established by Barbara Jatta, it seems that Cruyl left Rome and returned to his native Flanders around 1675, shortly before the publication of the large Falda plan. After his bad experience with Matteo Gregorio De Rossi, Cruyl had abandoned the career of *artiste-graveur* and did no more drawings in reverse. Instead, he turned to the production of vedute for the grand tour market. The sets of small views now in Poggio Imperiale in Florence and Palazzo Braschi were done in 1672-73 for this clientele, and so were the very large drawings of St. Peter's and the Tiber now in Oxford, which were in our exhibition at the American Academy.⁴⁰ None of these was ever turned into a print. During his remaining years in Rome, Cruyl frequented the community of scientists and *curiosi*. He travelled up and down the peninsula, executing small vedute—drawings, not prints—of Naples, Venice, and Genoa. Then, when he returned to the north, he had a decade and a half of productive and highly remunerated work ahead of him, as an architect in Ghent, and as an artist of incredible views of bridges, gardens, and engineering works in Paris, Versailles, and Marly. In 1697, his views of Rome were acquired by the Dutch collector Conrad Ruysch and were published with full credit in the *Thesaurus* of Graevius, thus finally affording him the acclaim that his Roman publisher had denied him.⁴¹

Falda had only two more years to live after the large plan of 1676. A detail in the lower left corner shows the directions his late work would take. It is a map of the *agro romano* from Farfa to Fiumicino and from the Lago di Vico to Palestrina, with Rome in the center (Fig. 17). Unlike the Catasto Alessandrino, which emphasizes roads, this map emphasizes rivers: the Tiber, the Teverone, and many minor streams. It indicates that Falda was already collaborating with the Dutch inventor and hydraulic engineer, Cornelis Meijer (Cornelio Meyer). Meijer arrived in Rome in 1675 and already by early 1676 had written a manuscript relation on the navigability of the Tiber. He enlisted a Dutch compatriot who arrived in Rome at the same time, Gaspar Van Wittel, to illustrate it. The manuscript discusses plans to make the Tiber navigable. In particular, it discusses Meijer's celebrated proposals for shoring up the riverbank just north of Piazza del Popolo, near S. Andrea in Via Flaminia. Meijer's project for a dyke, or *passonata*, to protect the eroding riverbank was eventually successful, but it incurred the wrath of his main competitor, Carlo Fontana. In this climate of hostility, Meijer was afraid that his ideas would be neglected or stolen, and so he brought out a book, *L'arte di restituire à Roma la tralasciata Navigazione del suo Tevere*, in constantly growing editions in 1679, 1683 and 1685. It is well illustrated, and the largest number of signed plates is by Falda, some of which are dated 1677 or 1678. That was the year Falda died, but his prints would be used by Meijer for the next twenty years.⁴²

By the late seventeenth century Giovanni Giacomo De Rossi (Falda's publisher) had successfully elevated his firm to the leading position among Roman printmakers. He vastly increased the small stock of copperplates that he had inherited in 1648. He invested heavily in new undertakings, cultivated contacts among the aristocracy and College of Cardinals, and exploited the advantages of the papal privilege. He rode the wave of Alexander VII's interest in topographical prints as a means of propagating the glory of papal Rome. His only setback was the unexpected death of Falda in 1678, at the age of thirty-five, after a painful illness that lasted a year. He was buried in S. Maria della Scala in Trastevere, the parish closest to Giovanni Giacomo's house on the Lungara. Had he lived, Falda would have become his adopted son and heir. The following year, recoiling from the blow, Giovanni Giacomo adopted the young printmaker Domenico Freddiani (born 1646), obliging him to change his name to Domenico De Rossi. In 1692, Domenico inherited Giovanni Giacomo's shop in Piazza della Pace with its large collection of copperplates. He also inherited his adoptive father's tendency to expand aggressively and to advertise himself at every turn, both with printed catalogues and announcements of his extensive list on the frontispiece of new publications.

The rivalry between the two leading publishing houses – with Domenico (Freddiani)

De Rossi now representing the house of Giovanni Giacomo De Rossi and Matteo Gregorio De Rossi representing the house of Giovanni Battista De Rossi – took a new turn at the end of the seventeenth century. We can study the production of this period by returning to Samuel Pepys’s library, now housed in Magdalene College, Cambridge. Pepys never visited Italy, but his nephew, John Jackson, made the ground tour in 1693 and bought large numbers of prints from the major Roman publishers, including the Falda map. Amidst the guidebooks, vedute, and music, Jackson brought back some extra-large prints, which were the latest fashion in Rome. These treasures of the Pepys library are not well known, so let me conclude by showing you two of them.

We have seen how Matteo Gregorio De Rossi minimized the credit due to Cruyl and then omitted his name altogether from his map of 1668. The bad streak in his character is shown again in the way he stole Falda’s work after his death. In 1686, he reissued the *Nuovo teatro delle fabbriche* with the new title *Nuovo splendore*.⁴³ Falda is acknowledged on the title page in the tiniest possible type, but his name is deleted from every print in the book and replaced by Matteo Gregorio’s. By the late 1680s, however, Matteo Gregorio had found a new protégé in a highly talented but little known artist from Recanati, Giuseppe Tiburtio Vergelli.⁴⁴ He published Vergelli’s book on the fountains of Rome in 1690, and then his prints of the Pantheon in 1692 and the Lateran in 1693. Vergelli’s Pantheon is a print of magisterial format that shows the exterior and interior in dramatic perspective, combined with subtle geometric analysis (Fig. 18).⁴⁵ It is the first print to show the play of circle and sphere in the design of the dome. Vergelli’s wonderful print of the Lateran of 1693 captures Borromini’s sense of light and space like no other print.⁴⁶ The space is dramatically rendered, swept by beams of focused light, while the side aisles show the alternation of light and dark that was so carefully orchestrated by Borromini. At the end of his career it seems that Matteo Gregorio finally learned the lesson that talent had to be acknowledged and rewarded.

The final triumph, however, went to Domenico De Rossi, the heir of Falda’s publisher, Giovanni Giacomo De Rossi. Domenico needed a Falda of his own, and he found one in the person of the young Alessandro Specchi (1666-1729). Specchi had an unusual combination of talents that would not be seen again until Piranesi: architect, draftsman, and skillful etcher. He quickly showed his mettle and even outdid the late lamented prodigy. Specchi developed a wide-angled vision and a preference for telescopic views that is reminiscent of Cruyl. The fifty-two magnificent etchings in the fourth and final volume of the *Nuovo teatro* offered a fresh view of Roman Seicento architecture.⁴⁷ We can see Specchi’s genius as a printmaker even better in the giant etching of the Porto di Ripetta, done in 1704-06.

Wide-angled and telescopic simultaneously, enlivened by insets showing the previous condition of the site, picturesque in a way that seeks to charm (“*pascere la vista*”), informative about the “*Idea*” or geometric plan, the etching is one of the landmarks of early eighteenth-century topographical printmaking.⁴⁸ It is no coincidence that it was published by the astute Domenico De Rossi. With the publication of the three magnificent volumes of the *Studio d’architettura civile* of 1701-1721, Domenico De Rossi swept the field.

In conclusion, it is worth asking why Falda, who showed less brilliance at the start of his career than Lievin Cruyl, should have emerged as the popular favorite, while Cruyl relapsed, until recent scholarship, into obscurity. Falda was fast, facile, and incredibly productive. In his short working life of fifteen years he produced three hundred plates. We now know from the research of Francesca Consagra and Sarah McPhee that he assembled an impressive library of 285 volumes and 252 maps, with titles on optics and perspective that helped him catch up to some extent with Cruyl.⁴⁹ However, Falda’s publisher must be regarded as the key to his success. Giovanni Giacomo de Rossi encouraged his creativity and gave him full credit on every title page. The team of publisher and printmaker knew how to clothe Alexander VII’s town planning projects in an elaborate language of allegory. The frontispiece of Book II of the *Nuovo teatro*, for example, turns the Chigi stars and *monti* into an elaborate allegory of Prometheus stealing Zeus’s fire and Deucalion throwing stones to re-create human race after the primeval flood.⁵⁰ Falda’s allegories have the same dense layers of allusiveness that Louise Rice has taught us to interpret in baroque thesis prints.⁵¹

Finally, the *Nuovo teatro* and the two Falda plans make the building projects of the 1660s seem like the manifestations of a master plan, directed by the all-controlling mind of Alexander VII. Many were: Piazza S. Pietro, the buildings along the Corso, and the piazzas of S. Maria della Pace and S. Maria del Popolo.⁵² But many were scattered initiatives controlled by religious orders or noble families, who could be bullied by Alexander VII into going faster but were not controlled by him. “Roma Alessandrina” in all its multi-faceted glory was created by Falda and Giovanni Giacomo De Rossi as much as by the building crews working for Bernini, Borromini, Cortona, and Rainaldi.

We cannot study the maps of Cruyl and Falda apart from the larger context of the rivalry between their publishers, a rivalry that continued long after the departure of Cruyl from Rome in 1675 and the death of Falda in 1678. Falda’s abundant, charming, and simplifying vision has won the hearts of all lovers of Rome, thanks to his benevolent publisher, Giovanni Giacomo De Rossi. But notwithstanding his

exploitative publisher, Cruyl had the eye of the lynx, and he showed Romans and northerners alike that science, optics, and virtuoso perspective could help the artist create images of haunting beauty.

¹ A. Hobson 1970, p. 215. This is one of a pair of drawings showing the library in York House in London in c. 1693; the other drawing is illustrated in F.M.C. Turner [1959], pl. b. On Pepys (1633-1703), see the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online edition. D. Mcguire 1965 discusses Falda's success in England. M. Bevilacqua 2005, pp. 98-99, discusses Pepys's participation in the project initiated by Robert Hooke and Christopher Wren to map London after the Great Fire of 1666, which resulted in the map published by John Ogilby in 1676, the year of the Falda plan.

² B. Jatta and J. Connors 1989.

³ J. Connors 1989, with further remarks by J. Connors in F. Borromini 1998, pp. LXII-LXVII. See also B. Jatta 1992, pp. 25-71 and D. Del Pesco 2000.

⁴ C. Huelsen 1915, p. 27.

⁵ F. Consagra 1988 and F. Consagra 1995, which draw on the rich fund of original material in the author's doctoral dissertation: F. Consagra 1992.

⁶ On Falda see L.A. Cotta 1701, p. 293; D. Mcguire 1965; R. D'Amico 1976; P. Bellini 1983 and 1993; F. Haskell 1987, pp. 8-18; F. Consagra 1992, pp. 412-29; A. Marziotta, S. Tozzi 1994; J. Connors in F. Borromini 1998, pp. LXIII, n.1; D. Del Pesco 2000; M. Pollak 2000, pp. 131-40 and 345-59. F. Consagra 1995 is the best study of Falda in the context of the publishing industry of Rome.

⁷ D. Del Pesco 2000, p. 232, cat. 140, dated 1662; most versions of this print are dated 1663, as for example the loose sheet in the British School at Rome, S.082. R. D'Amico 1976, p. 94, n. 11 says that Falda's first task was to depict the papal church and villa at Castelgandolfo.

⁸ Falda drawings are rare but several have been published. There is an elevation preparatory to a print of the façade of Palazzo Medici-Madama in the Lanciani Collection in Palazzo Venezia (52.162), reproduced in H. Hibbard 1967 [1970], and an elaborate perspectival view of Piazza Navona in Stockholm (NMH 2331 / 1863) reproduced in M. Laine, B. Magnusson 2002, p. 11, pl. 1. Two drawings in the Berlin Kunstbibliothek (Hdz. 3670 and 4600) are reproduced in S. Jacob 1975, p. 84 and figs. 384 and 385; and twenty-five preparatory drawings for *Le fontane di Roma* in the Berlin Kupferstichkabinett are mentioned in Kieven 1991, p. 170.

⁹ F. Consagra 1995 says that Giovanni Giacomo de Rossi wanted to adopt Falda as early as 1657, when he married a woman thirteen years his elder, Chaira D'Amico. The De Rossi palazzetto is shown in on the last plate in the second volume of Ferrerio-Falda [1670-77], pl. 61 (illustrated in F. Borromini 1998, fig. 51), where the architecture is attributed to Giovanni Maria Baratta. As noted below, Baratta was the source for Falda's veduta of S. Agnese in Piazza Navona.

¹⁰ G.G. De Rossi 1677, followed by the catalogues of D. De Rossi 1709, 1714, and 1759. The final catalogue issued from the Calcografia della Reverenda Camera

Apostolica in 1797 (copy in ASR, Camerale II, Calcografia, busta 1, fasc. 3) lists the prices of the stock, with the Falda plan of 1676 valued at 2.20 scudi, Ferrerio's *Palazzi I* at 2.50 scudi, Falda's *Palazzi II* at 3.50 scudi, Falda's *Nuovo teatro I* at 1.50 scudi, II at .75 scudi, III at 1.50 scudi and Specchi's vol. IV at 3.50 scudi. For the Calcografia and its inheritance of the De Rossi firm's plates, see A. Petrucci 1953.

¹¹ B. Jatta 1992 is now the standard monograph, with a useful chronology of Cruyl's dates on pp. 87-89. Some of the earlier bibliography still repays consultation: T. Ashby 1923, pp. 221-29; H. Egger 1911-31 (the famous *Römische Veduten*, where nearly all the Cruyl drawings, then still in the Albertina, are reproduced); H. Egger 1927, pp. 183-96; H.W. Schmidt 1934; K. Langedijk 1961; D. Bodart 1970, I, pp. 345-55; C. Pietrangeli 1971; G. Walton 1981, pp. 425-37; D. Del Pesco 2000. The Cruyl drawings are used to illustrate the urban projects of Alexander VII in R. Krautheimer 1985 and D. Metzger Habel 2002. The eighteen Cleveland drawings are reproduced in color, and the three Amsterdam drawings in black and white, in J. Connors and L. Rice 1991, tav. 1-21, with commentary by Barbara Jatta and Michael Miller.

¹² G. Walton 1981, p. 430, fig. 5 (detail); J. Connors 1989, p. 17; B. Jatta 1992, pp. 95f., cat. 5 and fig. 107.

¹³ The classic monograph on the scientific activity of the French Minims, P.J.S. Whitmore 1967, has yet to work its way into the art historical literature; in addition, see L. Neppi 1975, pp. 175-87; M. Tabarrini 2008, pp. 11-16.

¹⁴ S. Bedini 1963 and 1971; A. Van Helden 1974 [1997].

¹⁵ D. Del Pesco 2000, p. 260.

¹⁶ H. Hager 1967-68, especially pp. 215-20.

¹⁷ J. Connors 1996.

¹⁸ F. Consagra 1988, p. ciii and p. xcvi, n. 25; F. Consagra 1992, p. 424.

¹⁹ *Nuovo teatro II* would seem to postdate the unveiling of the *Cathedri Petri* on 16 January 1666 (shown in a plate by G.F. Venturini), but precede Alexander VII's death on 22 May 1667. A plate shows Bernini's *Elephant and Obelisk*, begun in 1666 and unveiled on 11 July 1667. By the time of the third volume of the *Nuovo teatro*, dedicated to Clement IX (1667-69), Falda has found his stride and the prints exhibit his picturesque style at its best.

²⁰ The small Cruyl plan of 1665 (Giovanni Battista de Rossi, Matteo Gregorio de Rossi, Lievin Cruyl e Giulio Testone, *Pianta di Roma come si trova al presente colle alzate delle fabbriche più notabili così antiche come moderne*, Roma 1665): C. Huelsen 1915, p. 28 and p. 87, cat. XXIVa; A. Frutaz 1962, vol. I, pp. 216f. and vol. III, pl. 343; R. Krautheimer 1985, p. 132, fig. 100; B. Jatta 1992, p. 166f., cat. 31S, fig. 120.

²¹ Matteo Gregorio de Rossi e Lievin Cruyl, *Prospectus Locorum Urbis Romae*

Insign[ium], Rome, ed. Giovanni Battista de Rossi, 1666. Rare. The copies I know are in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, St. Chigi S. 168 (the presentation copy to Alexander VII); Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Rome; Regenstein Library in the University of Chicago; and The Cleveland Museum of Art, acquired from Plinio Nardecchia by Michael Miller at the time of the 1989 exhibition at the American Academy. See T. Ashby 1920, p. 136, n. 2; T. Ashby 1923; H. Egger 1927; H. Hager 1967-68, p. 216, n. 58; D. Bodart 1970, fig. 182; B. Jatta 1992, pp. 153f., cat. 1S and fig. 119.

²² The small Falda plan of 1667 is dedicated to Alexander VII (d. 22 May 1667): C. Huelsen 1915, pp. 89f., cat. XXV; A. Frutaz 1962, vol. I, pp. 218f. and vol. III, pls. 345-348.

²³ C. Huelsen 1915, p. 90.

²⁴ Cruyl dedicated a self-financed print (“a se aeri incisum”) of the Pantheon to Urbano Sacchetti in 1667. See A. Bartoli 1911, pl. XLIX; G.K. Nagler [1919], II, p. 121, no. 330; Holstein n.d., vol. 5, p. 99; Connors 1989, p. 20; Jatta 1992, pp. 158f., cat. 125 and fig. 81.

²⁵ The large Cruyl-Matteo Gregorio De Rossi plan of 1668 (Matteo Gregorio de Rossi [e Lievin Cruyl], *Nuova pianta di Roma presente...*, Rome, ed. Giovanni Battista de Rossi, 1668): Huelsen 1915, pp. 94f., cat. XXVI; A. Frutaz, vol. I, pp. 219-20, and vol. III, pls. 350-356, and Georg Schelbert in this volume. My illustration is taken from the second state of 1680, with additional captions, in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, St. Geogr. I 625.

²⁶ Archivio capitolare di San Pietro, Mappe urbane, n. 78a-c. See A. Roca De Amicis 1984, pp. 14-15; and T. Manfredi in KAHN-ROSSI, FRANCIOLLI 1999, pp. 240f., cat. 116.

²⁷ Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Chigi P VII 10, fol. 123; illustrated in L. Salerno, L. Spezzaferro, M. Tafuri 1973, p. 84, fig. 26 (“di epoca tardo seicentesca”).

²⁸ J. Connors 1989, pp. 20-21; B. Jatta 1992 (p. 147, cat. 122D and fig. 182) accepts only the last four of these as reflecting lost Cruyl vedute.

²⁹ L. Voet 1969-1972, p. 31 and pl. 75, which shows the emblem over the door of the Officina Plantiniana, where the compasses and motto are flanked by Hercules (for Labore) and a female allegorical figure (for Constantia). It was adopted as Christopher’s third printer’s mark in 1557 and served for three centuries. (Reference courtesy of Machtelt Israëls.)

³⁰ The large Falda plan of 1676 (G.B. Falda, *Nuova pianta ed alzato della città di Roma...*, Rome, ed. Giovanni Giacomo De Rossi, 1676): C. Huelsen 1915, pp. 95-97, cat. XXVIIa; Ehrle 1931; A. Frutaz 1962, vol. I, pp. 221f. and vol. III, pls. 357-363; C. D’Onofrio 1969, between pp. xxxvi and 1; and S. McPhee in this volume. M. Bevilacqua 2005, pp. 96-97, discusses an attempted updating of the Greuter plan in the Cassiano volumes in Windsor (p. 96, fig. 3), dating to the early years of the reign

of Alexander VII, done perhaps in anticipation of a plan like Falda's.s

³¹ C. Huelsen 1915, p. 27: "Ma essa [la pianta del Greuter] meriterebbe di essere paragonata con l'opera del Falda, che appare in gran parte eseguita sul modello della Greuteriana".

³² M. Pollak 2000, p. 134. For Falda's accurate representation of Palazzo Spada, see M. Tavarrini 2008, p. 57.

³³ H. Hager 1967-68.

³⁴ B. Jatta and M. Miller in J. Connors and L. Rice 1991, p. 166.

³⁵ Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Chigi P VII 9, fol. 85, in Eimer 1971, vol. I, pp. 165-71 and Taf. LXIII, fig. 93 (though the date given there, July-August 1653, is at least five years too early). Falda's print of S. Agnese appears in *Nuovo teatro III* (unnumbered) [1667-69], where the caption reads: "Chiesa dedicata a S. Agnese V.M. in Piazza Navona la facciata in sino la cornice con l'alzata della cupola è architettura del Cav. Fran. Borromini, il frontespizio col'timpano ornamento della cupola, e campanili sono architettura di Gio. Maria Baratta". The description of Borromini's role is accurate, but the rest of the work and the drawing should be attributed to Carlo Rainaldi, not Baratta, who was merely the *soprastante*. Baratta was favored by Falda because of his role in building the palazzetto of Giovanni Giacomo de Rossi on Via della Lungara; doubtless it was Baratta who supplied a copy of Carlo Rainaldi's drawing to Falda.

³⁶ J. Connors 1989, pp. 246f., figs. 41-42.

³⁷ G.B. Falda, *Nuovo teatro III* [1667-69].

³⁸ G.B. Falda [1670-77] (Ferrerio-Falda II), pl. 30 (façade elevation), 31-32 (details of courtyard), and 33 (plan). All four prints are reproduced in D. De Bernardi Ferrero 1967, pls. 14-18; one is reproduced in G. Curcio and L. Spezzaferro 1989, p. 125. On the palace see E. Howard 1981, pp. 72-75 and 307-10; and on the print see J. Connors in F. Borromini 1998, pp. LXVII-LXVIII and fig. 46. The drawing may have been supplied by Ottavio Falconieri, whose treatise on the Pyramid of Caius Cestius (O. Falconieri 1665) was illustrated by Falda.

³⁹ G.B. Falda [1681], facsimile ed. R. Assunto and A. Tagliolini 1980; J. Connors in F. Borromini 1998, p. LXVII and fig. 47.

⁴⁰ F. Ehrle and H. Egger 1956, pl. LIII; Jatta and Connors 1989, p. 92; B. Jatta 1992, pp. 107f., and figs. 88 and 34.

⁴¹ J.G. Graevius 1697, vol. IV; Jatta 1992, p. 61.

⁴² G.J. Hoogewerff 1920; C. D'Onofrio 1968, pp. 80-85; P. Bellini 1983, p. 84, figs. 5 and 6; K. van Berkel 2002; M. Segarra Lagunes 2004, pp. 171-90 and 389. The 1685 edition of *L'arte di restituire à Roma la tralasciata Navigazione del suo Tevere* can be consulted on the Brown University website, "The Theater that was Rome", at <http://www.stg.brown.edu:8080/exist/rome/index.html>; my thanks to Evelyn Lincoln for the reference.

⁴³ T. Ashby 1925-26, pp. 160-62.

⁴⁴ The earliest collaboration between Matteo Gregorio and Vergelli is *Il terzo libro del nuovo splendore di Roma moderna*, Rome, 1688, dedicated to Don Taddeo Barberini, though the prints are derivative and of poor quality.

⁴⁵ Cambridge, Magdalene College, Pepys Library 2960 (1); another copy of the Pantheon print is reproduced in S. Pasquali 1996, figs. 16-17.

⁴⁶ R. Latham 1980, p. 268; Cambridge, Pepys Library 2960(i); there is also a copy of the Lateran print in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, reproduced by J. Connors in F. Borromini 1998, p. LXX and fig. 48.

⁴⁷ D. De Rossi and Specchi 1699.

⁴⁸ On Specchi see T. Ashby and S. Welsh 1927; H. Hager 1992, pp. 83-149, especially p. 87f.; G. Morolli 1987; B. Principato 1990; A. Braham and H. Hager 1977, pp. 22f., 90, 115 and figs. 251-52; G. Spagnesi 1997, pp. 14-26 and fig. 49; and especially T. Marder 1978 and 1980.

⁴⁹ F. Consagra 1995, pp. 195f. and p. 202, n. 36 (giving the notarial reference in ASR to the list of titles and an overview of the contents); S. McPhee in this volume.

⁵⁰ D. Del Pesco 2000, p. 240.

⁵¹ L. Rice 1998 and 2000.

⁵² R. Krautheimer 1985; D. Metzger Habel 2002; A. Antinori 2008.