In 1622 Rubens published a splendid volume on Genoese Renaissance architecture, with precise engravings depicting façades and plans of a dozen villas and palaces, reproduced from the original architectural drawings which were in the master’s own collection. He followed this publication some time later with further editions to which he added plans and elevations of another twenty-three Genoese buildings. In publishing famous examples of ‘modern’ architecture, Rubens intended to trace the development of architecture in his own country and all over Europe. He believed that the true principles of good building, both aesthetically and functionally, were discovered by the Ancients and rediscovered in Renaissance Italy. He published his book at the height of his fame, and thus succeeded in presenting himself not only as a great painter, but also as a connoisseur and authoritative teacher in the field of architecture.

The present publication explains the history of Rubens’s book and analyses in detail his comments and interpretations of the original plans. The illustrations show the engravings and original drawings in juxtaposition, and there are additional comparative illustrations in the Catalogue Raisonné, reproducing photographs of the actual buildings as well as other later engravings and plans.

Rubens regarded his volume of engravings as a collection of patterns for use by architects and patrons in his home country. But for us today it stands for much more: it throws light on Rubens’s concern for finding an artistic identity for the Southern Netherlands and moreover it offers us an aspect of Rubens’s personality not found elsewhere in his art – his role as an editor.
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AUTHOR’S PREFACE

THE VOLUME of engravings entitled Palazzi di Genova is unique both within Rubens’s oeuvre and among the architectural books of the period. To some, it may appear marginal among the artist’s works – in part because Rubens himself apparently had so little to do with it. He did not draw the originals himself, and he delegated the execution of the engravings to others. He did not even produce one of his evocative, opulent designs for the title page, and instead simply had it set in plain lettering. Nevertheless, the work as a whole unmistakably bears his hallmark, and the volume of engravings has proved to represent a significant part of Rubens’s artistic world. It is the only book that Rubens published. His preface – short, but carefully conceived and formulated, and richly expressive – is the only coherent text on issues of art theory that Rubens wrote and also published. In addition, the drawings he used for the engravings are of considerable interest. Since 1908 they have been held in the Drawings Collection at the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) in London – the same collection in which the major part of Palladio’s surviving drawings are preserved. These plans are an invaluable source for the history of Renaissance architecture in Genoa. They are among the few collections of Italian architectural drawings from the Renaissance that have come down to us as a complete historical unit.

In the present work, an attempt is made to investigate the various conditions in which this book of engravings arose and to gather together the issues that arise. Rubens as a person remains the focus of interest throughout. It was he who incorporated the Genoese plans into his collection and thereby probably preserved them from later dispersal or destruction, and it was he who turned the drawings into an impressive volume of engravings, that immediately declares itself as the artist’s work through the superb quality of the engravings and through the grand scale of the approach it takes.

In view of the comparatively minor ‘personal’ share that Rubens had in this project, one cannot necessarily take it for granted that the work should be included as part of the Catalogue Raisonné, and moreover to have a separate volume in the Corpus Rubenianum devoted to it. For example, Max Rooses lists the Palazzi di Genova in volume 5 of his catalogue among the ‘Dessins pour graveurs, architectes et sculpteurs’, numbering it subsequent to the Apostles series, the antique busts, the cameos, and the ‘Livre à dessiner’. The way in which Ludwig Burchard conceived its treatment within his corpus is not entirely clear from the generally sparse and apparently rather casually
assembled collection of material concerning the Palazzi di Genova. He was aware both of the existence of the London drawings and of the proof sheets in Amsterdam. However, due to the difficulties he faced as a result of historical and personal circumstances, he was unable to travel to Genoa to develop his own impression of conditions. In addition, research into the architectural history of Genoa was at that time still in its beginnings.

The aim of this volume of the Corpus, which is to include all material connected with Rubens’s publication, made it necessary to conduct a fresh review of the London drawings. These were already dealt with in 1976 in the RIBA catalogue, in which they were discussed carefully and thoroughly. However, the publication included practically no illustrations. For the present volume, the drawings were catalogued with almost full transcriptions of inscriptions, and for the first time they are illustrated here in their entirety. I was also concerned to give more extensive attention to the historical conditions in which the collection came into being and how it gained its significance. If the view that this collection of drawings is unique and that its composition is highly unusual should meet with wider acceptance, the effort will have been worthwhile.

A German version of the manuscript was accepted as a doctoral dissertation in 1994 by the University of Augsburg. Hanno-Walter Kruft — unforgettable in his intellectual discipline and fertile sense of curiosity — provided encouragement for the study and supervised it until his untimely death in 1993. The role of supervisors was taken over by Elisabeth Kieven and Thomas Raff, to whom I am most grateful. The study was supported by grants from the Studienstiftung des deutschen Volkes in Bonn and by the Gerda Henkel Stiftung in Düsseldorf. Hubertus Günter was of assistance here in providing an expert report, for which my thanks are also due to him. Dietrich Erben was an invaluable interlocutor, with his amicable frankness and unerring judgement. The study received vital input from a continual exchange of views with both him, as well as with Thomas Eser and Thomas Weidner. I was frequently absent from my family to complete both the dissertation and the book, and I am grateful to Sabine, Adrian and Leon Paul for the patience and understanding with which they helped bear this burden.

I am also grateful to the late Roger d’Hulst and Frans Baudouin for their willingness to include the study in the Corpus Rubenianum. Frans Baudouin checked the manuscript thoroughly and contributed a series of important additional points. Michael Robertson translated the text into English with particular care and attention. Susan Klaiber translated the texts included in
the Appendix – postponing work on her own projects to do so, for which I am particularly grateful. The Government of Flanders supported the publication by covering the translation costs; in this respect, André Leysen also kindly provided financial assistance. Arnout Balis took on the task of editing, and together with the publisher’s editor Ann Matchette prepared the manuscript for the printer with care and attention. He worked on the layout in collaboration with Elly Miller, and finally he also took the trouble to prepare the indexes. My warm thanks go to him for all of these contributions. At the publishers, Elly Miller looked after the production of the book with a degree of dedication that is nowadays rarely seen.

The translation and editing of the text were completed in the spring of 1998; publications that have appeared since then could only be taken into account in relation to a few individual points.

_Augsburg/Munich, February 2002_
_H.W.R._
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INTRODUCTION

WHEN PETER PAUL RUBENS published his *Palazzi di Genova* in the spring of 1622, the book was unique among the architectural publications that had appeared up to that time. In detailed plans, the 72 plates present twelve villas and palaces in Genoa and its surroundings, all of which had been built during the third quarter of the sixteenth century. In formal terms, they represent a homogeneous group, at the centre of which stand the Genoese villas of the architect Galeazzo Alessi. Rubens regarded the book not as a treatise, but as a book of engravings. The illustrations are preceded by only three short texts: the dedication and the foreword, both by Rubens, and the imprimatur of the Antwerp canon Laurent Beyerlinck. Rubens’s foreword is short, comprising one printed page, and it provides information about his reasons for publishing the collection and some notes on how the book should be used. However, it also contains several fundamental reflections on questions of architecture. Its basic premise is the humanistic view of the history of art and its development. Rubens observes that architecture, like the other arts, after a period of decline in the Middle Ages, had begun to renew itself on the basis of the art of antiquity. Rubens also detects the beginnings of this fresh orientation in his own country, the Spanish Netherlands—but restricted as yet to ecclesiastical architecture alone. In order to promote development in the area of domestic architecture as well, he had decided to present the plans and elevations of Genoese palaces in his collection of drawings to the interested public in his own country as model buildings for economical yet prestigious urban dwellings. After the short introductory texts, the plates follow without any further detailed comments.

Each building is presented with a sequence of up to nine plates showing plans and elevations, as well as longitudinal sections and transverse sections. The illustrative techniques are strictly orthographic. None of the buildings is shown in a perspective view. The individual plates are labelled with precise dimensions, and the functions of the various rooms are inscribed in detail. Thus, the observer is given a complete overview of the arrangement of rooms in the building. This is true not only of the location and sequence of the formal rooms, but also of the service areas and servants’ quarters. From the point of view of commodità, which Rubens emphasizes in the foreword as a central criterion in domestic architecture, this is of decisive significance. The precision of the engravings gives the book an objective, even standardizing
quality. This claim to universal validity is emphasized by the fact that the first ten palaces are not presented under the names of their owners, but anonymously using the letters A to K (omitting J). This type of complex, detailed monograph publication of contemporary buildings from a single city in Europe was unprecedented at the time.

In the foreword, Rubens provides information concerning the basis for his publication. The 72 plates are based on a collection of drawings which he had purchased, probably in Genoa itself, during his time in Italy between 1600 and 1608. Rubens bore the sole responsibility for the production of the engravings and the distribution of the book. The first engraving bears the triple privilege, the formula for which was ‘Cum privilegiis Regis Christianissimi, Principum Belgarum et Ordinum Bataviae’. This privilege, which Rubens had been permitted to use since January 1620, was intended to protect his authorized reproduction engravings from unauthorized copying in both parts of the Netherlands and in France. The volume of engravings was therefore subject to the same conditions as the graphic reproduction of Rubens’s own paintings in the period after 1619. To carry out his project, Rubens employed the services of people with whom he also cooperated in other work in the field of reproduction graphics. The plates were engraved by Nicolaes Ryckemans, whom Rubens had entrusted on several occasions during this period to produce engravings based on his own paintings. Rubens had the three pages of text typeset and printed at the Officina Plantiniana. His friend, Balthasar Moretus, was the owner of the publishing house, and he had been regularly supplying designs for title-pages and illustrations for books printed by Moretus since 1613.

The engraving of the plates was probably begun between January 1620 (after Rubens had also received the privilege for the northern Netherlands) and the death of Archduke Albert in July 1621. After Albert’s death, the privilege formula, now referring only to the Governess Isabella, was ‘Serenissimae Infantis’, while the first engraving in the book still uses the older privilege formula for the regents, ‘Principum Belgarum’. Laurent Beyerlinck issued his imprintum on 28 April 1622. The engravings were already with

3. See Rubens’s explanation of this anonymous presentation at the end of his foreword: Appendix I.2, p. 254.
4. See Chapter III, pp. 91f.
6. This was demonstrated by Mario Labò through a comparison of the typefaces used. See Labò, Palazzi di Genova, 1970, pp. 4f.
the censor at this time. One month later, on 29 May, Rubens signed the dedication of the book to Carlo Grimaldi. Three weeks later the volume of engravings was complete, and on 19 June 1622 Rubens wrote to Pieter van Veen, ‘Ho pubblicato ancora un libro d’architettura de più belli palazzi di Genoua de qualque 70 foglie insieme colle piante’. He immediately sent a copy to his Parisian correspondent, Claude Nicolas Fabri de Peiresc, who had already thanked him for it by 1 July 1622.

However, matters were not left at this one edition of the Palazzi di Genova with 72 plates. Somewhat later, Rubens had a second block of 67 plates engraved, containing the plans and elevations of a further 23 buildings. This second series differs distinctly in its approach and in its quality from the first. The period in which the buildings were constructed is much broader, ranging from 1540 to 1620. The stylistic and typological variations among them, as well as the qualitative differences, are correspondingly wide. In contrast to the original conception, expressed in the title and foreword, the second part now also includes the designs of four Genoese churches. The engravings reveal a markedly poorer illustrative technique. The differences appear most clearly in the treatment of the façades. The basic principle of using a purely orthogonal projection is not applied with the same degree of consistency as in the first series. The elevations are often combined with perspective views of individual elements, such as cornices and steps. Apart from these weaknesses in the draughtsmanship, the overall presentation of the buildings is also more modest. Instead of the variable use of four to nine illustrations per building in the first series, the second series has a rigid system of three plates per building, with two plans and one façade elevation. Differences in the labelling are also apparent. In contrast to the anonymous designation of the buildings using letters of the alphabet in the first series, the palaces all bear the names of their commissioning patrons or owners. The rest of the labelling is incomplete and sometimes inaccurate. Substantially fewer dimension measurements mark the plans. The functions of the rooms are only included occasionally, and the identification of the rooms is much less differentiated.

The differences between the two parts of the book are so serious that it has sometimes been doubted whether Rubens was at all responsible for the expanded edition. However, there can be no doubt that it was Rubens himself who initiated the second series of engravings. The difference in quality cannot be attributed to the editor or the engraver, but rather results from the different nature of the source materials used. Not until around 1620, from his base in Antwerp, did Rubens acquire most of the drawings for the second

7. The full text of the letter is given in Appendix II.1, p. 258.
8. See the extracts from this correspondence in Appendix II.2, p. 259.
series. These drawings had been produced at a later date, and were of a different composition than the much more detailed drawings that he had purchased in Italy around fifteen years earlier. The drawings bear numerous inscriptions with supplementary labelling for the edition. The handwriting of many of these inscriptions is that of Rubens’s own hand. The engravings, however, were executed to the same high standards as those in the first series. It is not absolutely certain when the expanded edition of the Palazzi di Genova, now with a total of 139 plates, was completed. There are several reasons for believing that the time between the two editions was actually rather short. After Rubens’s death, the Palazzi di Genova in this expanded form with 139 plates was published in four further editions during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The first posthumous edition was prepared in 1652 by the Antwerp publisher Jakob Meursius, who had apparently purchased the printing plates from Rubens’s estate. Meursius gave each of the two blocks its own title-page. The first series was introduced as Palazzi Antichi, and the second as Palazzi Moderni. However, these titles describe only the sequence in which the two series were actually published, and do not refer to the dates of the buildings illustrated, since several of the Palazzi Moderni are actually older than all of the Palazzi Antichi. Nevertheless, these two titles subsequently became established to distinguish between the two series. A second Meursius edition appeared in 1663, which is largely identical with the earlier 1652 one. In 1708, a new edition was brought out by Hendrik and Cornelius Verdussen in Antwerp. A final edition of the book of engravings was brought out by the publishers Arkstée and Merkus in Amsterdam and Leipzig in 1755. In addition to the foreword, this edition also includes the dedication, which had been omitted from the earlier Antwerp editions. The two texts by Rubens are given in French translation, supplemented by the biography of Rubens by Jean Baptiste Descamps. The plates in all four posthumous editions were printed from the original printing plates.

The 139 plates in Rubens’s book are based on 137 drawings, 122 of which survive. Since 1919 they have been kept in the Drawings Collection of the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) in London. The collection was probably still in Rubens’s possession when he died, and like the rest of the drawings in his estate, it would only have been sold in August 1657 after the expiration of the period specified in his will. Numerous sheets in both series

9. See Introduction to the Catalogue, p. 112 and Fig. 290.
10. For a more detailed discussion of the date of the second series of engravings, see Chapter 1, pp. 50ff.
11. See Appendix III, p. 263.
bear the pencil mark N°1 L22, mainly on the verso, which may be a collector’s mark probably made by one of the owners after Rubens. The drawings found their way to England at the beginning of the eighteenth century, at the latest. The only early owner after Rubens whom we know of was a certain Sr Tho. Franklin, whose name the subsequent owner—apparently the one who had the drawings bound—noted on one of the first sheets in the volume to indicate its provenance. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, the volume of drawings was in the collection of M.J. Harvey. In 1906 it was auctioned at Sotheby’s, and in 1919 its then owner, Welbore St Claire Baddeley, donated it to the Royal Institute of British Architects.

The first modern scholar dealing with the Palazzi di Genova, Charles Ruelens, had already clearly determined that Rubens’s role in connection with the book was purely that of an editor. Nonetheless, for many years the view stubbornly persisted that the engravings were based on drawings Rubens himself had produced on site. This view was disseminated primarily in the biography of Rubens by Giovanni Pietro Bellori. Bellori, who provides the most detailed and best informed report on Rubens’s years in Italy, strongly emphasizes the artist’s good relations with Genoa, and remarks regarding his visits to the city: ‘Attese egli quivi all’architettura, e si esercitò in disegnare li palazzi di Genova con alcune Chiese, formandone piante, alzate, e profili, con li loro tagli di dentro in croce, in più vedute, e misure dell’i membri, com’egli dopo pubblicò in un libro stampato in Anversa l’anno 1622, per fine, com’egli dice, di torre in Fiandra l’architettura barbara, ed introdursi la buona forma italiana’. This report by Bellori is repeated in shorter form in various eighteenth-century biographies. Finally, the title-page of the last edition of the Palazzi di Genova in 1755 describes the plates as: ‘les plans et elevations des plus beaux palais et edifices de la ville de Genes levé et dessiné par le celebre

15. A more detailed discussion of evidence of their provenance is given in Tait, Introduction, 1968, p. 27 and Cat. RIBA, 1976, p. 171. Both also suggest the identification of this collector as Sir Thomas Francklyn of Moor Park, Hertfordshire, 3rd Baronet, who died in 1728.
17. This misunderstanding is still found even in more recent publications, e.g. in Huemer, Portraits, 1977, p. 43, and M. Jaffé, Rubens and Italy, Oxford, 1977, p. 19.
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P.P. Rubens'. The title-pages of the earlier Antwerp editions of 1652, 1663 and 1708, by contrast, give the facts accurately: 'Palazzi di Genova ... raccolti e designati [selected] da Pietro Paolo Rubens'.

The London drawings first entered scholarly discussion as a result of Genoese architectural research. Mario Labò, who spent decades examining Rubens's book as the central source for the Renaissance architecture of his home town, was the first to subject the drawings to more detailed examination.20 Significantly, he observed that the drawings were by Genoese draughtsmen and could not have been by Rubens. In 1976, the volume of drawings was included in the Catalogue of the Drawings Collection of the Royal Institute of British Architects. The author of the entries emphasizes the independent status particularly of the older part of the collection—the drawings providing the basis for the 72 plates of the Palazzi Antichi. He could demonstrate that these ten sets of drawings were produced in the third quarter of the sixteenth century and suggested that they must have been the original designs for the individual buildings.21 This new identification augmented the number of surviving architectural drawings from the Italian Renaissance, which is very limited for northern Italy, with an extraordinary collection. This discovery, however, met with little response in research on Genoese architecture.

The attention given to Rubens's book by modern scholars has been rather one-sided. Interest has focused almost exclusively on the significance of the engravings as a source for the history of individual buildings.22 However, there were several immediate obstacles to easy recognition of the palaces represented in Rubens's engravings. In the case of the Palazzi Antichi, Rubens had deprived posterity of every indication of the identity of the owners or location of the buildings. Further difficulty lay in the uniformity of the collection of plans, with its concentration on buildings by Alessi and his successors. The sometimes close formal affinities between numerous Genoese cinquecento villas and palaces, and the often substantial later alterations...
made clear identification very difficult in many cases. An example of this is Palazzo I, which Cornelius and Hildebrand Gurlitt regarded as the Palazzo Doria on the Strada Nuova, while Mario Labò believed that it was the cinquecento predecessor of the later Palazzo Bianco. Ennio Poleggi finally identified it with Bartolomeo Lomellino’s palace (Rostan Raggio). In the case of the Palazzi Moderni, Rubens did include the owners’ names, but changes of ownership during the subsequent centuries, and the constant recurrence of the same names from a very few families belonging to the Genoese patriciate, made clear identification difficult here as well. The loss of the exterior decoration and alterations to the interiors also meant that some of the palaces were distorted beyond recognition. The identification of individual buildings with engravings in Rubens’s book has sometimes been achieved by accident, such as the discovery of the early nineteenth-century building description that enabled the Palazzo dell’Acquedotto to be identified with Rubens’s Palazzo del Sig. Thomaso Pallavicino (XV).

It is not surprising, therefore, that the problem of identifying the Palazzi di Genova occupied several generations of scholars. Efforts were begun by Robert Reinhardt (1886) and Cornelius Gurlitt (1887). These two authors succeeded in naming 14 of the total 31 palaces correctly—primarily those in which recognition was possible without too much difficulty. Hildebrand Gurlitt accurately named seven more palaces in the introduction to the first modern reprint of the Palazzi di Genova (1924). The problem of identification of very similar buildings, or those that had been severely altered, was largely solved by two scholars in the 1920s and 1930s. In a series of studies, Mario Labò dealt with individual villas and palaces, including several that are included in Rubens’s book and have hitherto been more or less anonymous. In the appendix to her study of Galeazzo Alessi’s activities in Genoa (1929), Margarethe Kühn, like Gurlitt before her, gave a complete list of the Palazzi di Genova, in which a further three buildings are correctly named for the first time. Mario Labò, and Margarethe Kühn in particular, were also the first
authors to make substantial use of Rubens’s engravings as historical sources and also as illustrations of their studies. Three inconspicuous palaces in the old city included in the *Palazzi Moderni*, which had previously remained unrecognized, were identified by Emmina De Negri (1954).²⁹ The identification of Palazzo I by Ennio Poleggi (1967) completed this chapter in the history of the research.

The one-sided concentration on the value of the book as a source for the architectural history of Genoa resulted in a narrowing of the perspective to focus only on the individual engravings. Only a few studies—mostly originating in Genoa—turned their attention to the preconditions for, and history of, Rubens’s book as a whole.³⁰ Nor did Rubens scholarship compensate for this predominant focus. The *Palazzi di Genova* are included in the relevant catalogues of Rubens’s works throughout—of the artistic oeuvre and of the graphic works.³¹ However, the book is only mentioned marginally in the monographs. The position usually assigned to the book in surveys of the artist’s life and work also significantly affects the assessment of the publication: it is usually mentioned in connection with Rubens’s visits to Genoa in the period around 1606.³² Consequently, it is evaluated exclusively as providing evidence of the close relationship between Rubens and members of the Genoese patriciate, from whom he received important commissions dur-


³⁰. The first fundamental monograph is Labò, *Palazzi di Genova*, 1938–39. The four-part article contains an introduction on the history of the book of engravings and short monographs on the twelve buildings in the first series. However, the complete survey of all 35 buildings that was already planned at that time was only published in 1970, nine years after the author’s death: Labò, *Palazzi di Genova*, 1970. On the history of Rubens’s volume of engravings, see the introductory sections, pp. 1–38, in which the London drawings are discussed. A general appreciation of the engravings is given by Alan Tait in the introduction to the 1968 reprint of *Palazzi di Genova* (Tait, *Introduction*, 1968, pp. 7–28). The London drawings are discussed in detail, including their significance as sources for the book of engravings, in *Cat. RIBA*, 1976, pp. 158–173. The basic studies of the context in the history of architecture within which the drawings were produced are by Ennio Poleggi. Special mention should be made of his monumental study of Genoese architectural history during the Strada Nuova period: Poleggi, *Strada Nuova*, 1972; and, with regard to Rubens’s book, the article Poleggi, *Documento*, 1977.


Text. ill. 1. Giacomo Brusco, *Map of Genoa*, 1766 (from *Description des beaux de Gênes*, 1768)
Text. ill. 2. Via Garibaldi looking East (photo c. 1900)
Text. ill. 3. Via Balbi looking West (photo c. 1900)
Text. ill. 4. Detail of text ill. 1, Giacomo Brusco, Map of Genoa, 1766 (from *Description des beautes de Gênes*, 1768), with location of the buildings in the *Palazzi di Genova*. 
ing his years in Italy, as well as later in Antwerp. The status which the book could potentially have within the broad spectrum of Rubens’s artistic activities and public influence in the period around 1622, by contrast, has only been touched on by a few scholars. Jakob Burckhardt, in a discussion of the basic conditions for Rubens’s art, mentioned his relationship with architecture and pointed to the immense significance of the Palazzi di Genova as an attempt at an authoritative transmission of Italian Renaissance architecture to the north. Martin Warnke referred to the fundamentally political aspect of the book that was published at a time when Rubens had extended his sphere of influence as an artist to European dimensions and was beginning to be active as a diplomatic negotiator as well.

Thus, the material to deal with in this volume is quite complex. The 139 plates in the Palazzi di Genova are based on drawings, some of which Rubens purchased in Italy himself, while others were acquired many years later when he was in Antwerp. The conception and character of the engraved plates would be inexplicable without the drawings. What Rubens found in the drawings, and the way in which he went about converting them into a book of engravings, are discussed in Chapter I. Besides the London Palazzi collection, extremely few Genoese architectural drawings from the Renaissance have survived. The survival of these particular drawings is certainly due to the fact that it was Rubens who owned and published them, and that his name was thereafter associated with them. Particularly interesting in this respect are the drawings of the Palazzi Antichi—less because of their artistic quality than because of their unique illustrative technique and way in which their contents are conceived. The special qualities of this extraordinary collection, its significance for the Genoese architecture of the Alessi period and the purpose it originally might have served form the subjects of Chapter II. Between the purchase of the drawings in Italy and their costly reproduction in the form of an impressive volume of engravings in 1622 lay a period of fifteen years. The outward circumstances of Rubens’s life as an artist had in the meantime changed considerably, and it is therefore natural to inquire into the reasons that may have motivated Rubens to convert the drawings into a large book at

33. J. Burckhardt, Erinnerungen aus Rubens, ed. H. Kauffmann, Stuttgart, 1938, pp. 18f.: ‘Auf einmal offenbart sich dann ein ganz unmittelbarer Wille der Einwirkung im Großen: derselbe Mann, welcher für Antwerpen jenes mächtige Altarbild des Caravaggio sichert, veröffentlicht 1622 seine Palazzi di Genova, Pläne, Durchschnitte und Aufrisse ersten Ranges, meist von Strada Nuova, darunter Meisterwerke des Galeazzo Alessi, aus dessen Nachlaß die betreffenden Zeichnungen stammen mochten’ (‘All at once, a quite direct will to achieve large-scale influence is revealed: the same man who acquires the tremendous Caravaggio altarpiece for Antwerp publishes in 1622 his Palazzi di Genova—plans, sections and elevations of the first order, mostly of the Strada Nuova, including masterpieces by Galeazzo Alessi, from whose estate the corresponding drawings may have derived’).

INTRODUCTION

this particular time. These attendant artistic and historical circumstances are examined in more detail in Chapter III. A fortunate concurrence of very different sets of circumstances was therefore required to enable the Palazzi di Genova to achieve its unique position: as an outstanding work of architectural engraving, and as a means by which Rubens successfully enhanced his artistic reputation.
I. Rubens, the Book and the Drawings

Palazzi di Genova and Strade Nuove

The Palazzi di Genova, as published by Rubens in its first edition in 1622, contains 72 plates with the plans of twelve Genoese villas and palaces. The earliest of the buildings is Galeazzo Alessi's Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B; under construction in 1548). Only slightly later in date is the Villa Grimaldi Sauli (H; pre-1554), also by Alessi. The latest building is the Palazzo Lercari Parodi on Strada Nuova (K), construction of which began in 1571. All of the other villas and palaces were constructed, or at least planned, in the single decade between the mid 1550s and the mid 1560s. No less than five palaces belong to the ensemble of the Strada Nuova, the ambitious urban development project, which included the palaces of some of Genoa's most influential families.

In typological terms, the buildings form a homogeneous group, centred on two designs by Alessi. As many as seven of the twelve buildings represent more or less independent variations on the Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B). Alessi's villa is characterized by a rational arrangement of rooms that succeeds in combining formal rooms and private accommodation within an outwardly compact architectural body. The villa enjoys the full range of rooms required for a comfortably equipped permanent residence, and was therefore able to serve as a typological pattern for the urban palace, such as those in the Strada Nuova. Plan and elevation are clearly structured, lending themselves to reproduction. On both storeys, there are three parallel rows of rooms. In the central section are the loggias, vestibule, staircase and sala—the entrance and formal rooms. The two sections on each side consist of private rooms (Figs. 16, 18). The formal rooms in the central section take up the full height of a storey, while the side sections have mezzanine storeys with the service areas and servants' quarters above the living apartments. The formal rooms are connected via the main staircase, and the mezzanines via smaller stairs at the sides. The internal arrangement of the rooms is clearly reflected in the façade (Fig. 20). Like the plan, it is divided into three by ressauts. The central and side sections are distinguished from one another by the rhythm of the window axes and the selection of architectural forms. The ground floor and piano nobile each have their own orders, each of which also incorporates the corresponding mezzanine. Thus, the façade is placed in a close relationship with the structure of the rooms behind it.

The Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B) is the only Genoese palace building for which Alessi's involvement is documented. A large group of Genoese villas and palaces were in no sense planned by Alessi himself, but were, however, directly shaped by the influence of this great model. Several of the most important examples of these are found in Rubens's book, and include the Villa Spinola di San Pietro (C), Villa Grimaldi ‘Fortezza’ (D) and Villa Pallavicino delle Peschiere (E), as well as the Palazzo Cambiaso in Strada Nuova (Nos. 68–69). The unusual type of the Villa Grimaldi Sauli (H), which can be plausibly attributed to Alessi on stylistic grounds, is recalled in the Palazzo Lercari Parodi (K). The Palazzi Antichi thus document the significance and formative influence of Alessi's designs on Genoese villa and palace architecture in the third quarter of the sixteenth century.

In contrast to the first series of engravings, with its concentration on buildings that almost all date from a single decade, the 23 buildings in the Palazzi Moderni range over three-quarters of a century, with some buildings predating those in the Palazzi Antichi. The three oldest buildings in the series, the della Meridiana (VIII), di Cipriano Pallavicino (XII) and Doria Spinola (XIV) palaces, were all constructed around 1540. These are the first Genoese palaces that demonstrate the influence of Roman architecture of the High Renaissance. They also illustrate the stage that local developments had reached before the arrival of Alessi. All three represent ambitious projects on the part of the patrons, but little is known about the circumstances that gave rise to them. The Palazzi Moderni also include a number of palaces in the medieval city centre. These buildings had to be constructed on sometimes irregular sites, and occasionally they also incorporated parts of older buildings—revealing a fundamental difference in conception between these and the Palazzi Antichi, which only consist of buildings with perfectly regular shapes. With the exception of Alessi's S. Maria Assunta in Carignano (XXII) begun in 1552, the four churches included at the close of the series date from the end of the sixteenth century. Two of them were built for new religious orders created during the Counter-Reformation: S. Siro (XX) for the Theatine Order, and SS. Ambrogio e Andrea (XXIII) for the Jesuits. The plates for the churches appear at first sight to be incompatible with the title and conception of Rubens's publication. But it should be recalled that in the foreword, Rubens gives particular emphasis to the significance of the new Jesuit ecclesiastical architecture in the Netherlands for the spread of Renaissance forms north of the Alps. In addition, Rubens had painted two altarpieces for the Jesuits in Genoa, and one of these, the high altar painting of the Circumcision (1605) is among the most important commissions he received during his stay in Italy.

In spite of the wider typological range seen in the Palazzi Moderni, here too it is the buildings of the Strada Nuova period that form the core of the series.
Eight of the palaces date from the third quarter of the sixteenth century, and five of these are on the Strada Nuova itself. In the two series, the Palazzi di Genova thus includes the plans of all of the ten palaces that were built along the new street during the sixteenth century. Several of the later buildings can also be attached to this group, since the standard plan and elevation schemes of the Strada Nuova palaces are further developed in them with new variations, or on a larger scale. These include two palaces designed by Bartolomeo Bianco on the Via Balbi, which was laid out at the beginning of the seventeenth century—the Palazzo Balbi Senarega (III) and the Palazzo Durazzo Pallavicino (VII).

Measured in terms of the large numbers of villas and palaces that were constructed in Genoa during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the 35 buildings included in the Palazzi di Genova can only represent a small selection. However, almost all of the outstanding buildings are included. An exception to this is Andrea Doria’s famous villa in Fassolo. This building, with fresco and stucco work (begun 1528) by Perino del Vaga and gardens designed in 1545-47 by Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli, was an example of Roman-style decorative art, which had a guiding influence on subsequent commissioning patrons among the Genoese patriciate. The most influential element was not the formal type that the villa represented, but the decorative system and the conceptual programme underlying the paintings. Another essential element in the villa was the way in which it linked its functions as a private dwelling and as a formal public building for the republic, designed to receive and accommodate distinguished guests. However, the villa was not suited to serve as a model in the same way as the Palazzi Antichi, since it simply developed from adaptations and extensions of older buildings. The arrangement of the rooms and the external appearance derive from the Genoese villa architecture of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, and have little in common with later, more modern solutions, such as the Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B). This may explain why there are no plans of

2. The Strada Nuova originally ended as a cul-de-sac at the gardens of two Grimaldi palaces below the church of S. Francesco. The palace of Girolamo Grimaldi (c. 1540) appears in the second series (Palazzo della Meridiana, VIII), but Luca Grimaldi’s palace is not included in the book. It was replaced in 1712 by the Palazzo Bianco, which today marks the eastern boundary of the Strada Nuova palaces on the hill side of the street. However, the two Grimaldi palaces did not form part of the original ensemble of the Strada Nuova. On Luca Grimaldi’s palace, see Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, pp. 81ff.


4. Gorse, op. cit., pp. 33ff. In 1533, the Emperor Charles V disembarked in front of Andrea Doria’s villa on arriving in Genoa, and was received with a triumphal procession. In 1548, the Crown Prince of Spain—later King Philip II—resided there.

this villa among the *Palazzi di Genova*, in spite of it being the most widely known *cinquecento* building in Genoa.

Among the buildings produced in Alessi's wake around 1560, two villas in Sampierdarena are omitted that would have deserved a place among the *Palazzi Antichi* as immediate successors to the Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso: the Villa Lercari Sauli 'Semplicità' (begun in 1558 for Giovanni Battista Lercari) and the Villa Imperiale Scassi 'Bellezza' (begun in 1560 for Vincenzo Imperiale; text ill. 11). Among the urban palaces not included in the second series were the Palazzo Imperiale on the Piazza Campetto (built for Vincenzo Imperiale beginning in 1560) and the Palazzo Spinola on the Salita S. Caterina (built c. 1558–60 for Tommaso Spinola). Both of these are important buildings, with Giovanni Battista Castello having contributed to their architecture and decoration. The sequence of four churches at the end of the volume presents a selection from the considerable numbers of ecclesiastical buildings or alterations to churches dating from the second half of the *cinquecento*. The most significant and ornate examples have been selected in a way that is obviously deliberate here. Two smaller, although prominent, buildings were not included: the church of S. Pietro in Banchi (completed in 1585) on the Piazza Banchi, which was expanded into a centre for trade and business in the final quarter of the sixteenth century; and S. Matteo, the family church of the Dorias, the interior of which was redecorated in two phases by Montorsoli (1543–45) and by Luca Cambiaso and Giovanni Battista Castello (1557–59). A similar case of modernization of a late medieval church with new decoration, the church of SS. Annunziata del Vastato (XXI), is included in the collection.

In spite of these limitations, the 139 plates included in the two series provide a representative survey of building activities in Genoa over eight decades, between 1540 and 1620. The selection of the *Palazzi Moderni* seems to be less consistent, but is nevertheless logical to a certain extent in the way that it expands and supplements the contents of the first series. The two series share the same period emphasis, focusing on the architecture of the third quarter of the sixteenth century. In the second series, this is supplemented

---


with buildings from the preceding decade, between 1540 and 1550, and buildings immediately contemporary with the publication. The topographical emphasis in both series is clear: the five villas are situated outside the city walls, and eighteen of the total of twenty-six urban palaces are in the area of the strade nuove, the newly assigned residential districts on the northern outskirts, above the old town (text ill. 4).

In 1550, representatives of the leading families of the Genoese patriciate succeeded in overcoming the segmentation of urban development into alberghi and carrying through a development scheme for a distinguished residential area on the slopes of the Castelletto hill. The smallholders on the land there were expropriated, and a sequence of planning steps divided the area into nine more or less equally sized and regularly proportioned properties. The properties were then sold at two auctions in 1551 and 1558, and building on them took place between 1558 and 1588. In planning and realization, the Strada Nuova, named Via Garibaldi since 1884, counts among the greatest urban projects of sixteenth-century Europe (text ill. 2). The patrons who commissioned the nine palaces came from a total of only four of the most influential families of the nobiltà vecchia, including the Spinola di Luccoli family with four palaces, the Lomellino and Pallavicino families with two each and the Lercari with one. The Strada Nuova branches off from the Piazza Fontane Marose, which, like the Piazzze della Zecca and della Nunziata further west, was a focus for the building of prominent palaces. At the beginning of the seventeenth century the Via Balbi was laid out, branching off to the west from the Piazza della Nunziata, and by the end of the century seven large palaces, as well as the Jesuit College, had been built along it (text ill. 3). The conception and execution of the street were modelled on the Strada Nuova. However, the newly assigned properties were distributed exclusively to members of the Balbi family. This second large-scale town planning operation after the Strada Nuova is represented among the Palazzi Moderni by two of the Balbi palaces. Together, the distinguished palaces between the Piazza Fontane Marose in the east and the Piazza della Nunziata and Via Balbi in the west forms the core of the Palazzi di Genova (see text ills. 1 and 4).

The patrician palaces, and particularly the ensemble of the Strada Nuova, fulfilled representational functions for the republic as well. A central square had not developed in Genoa within the structure of the medieval city. It was only in the fourteenth century that a central administrative headquarters


developed in the form of the Palazzo Ducale, but up to the end of the sixteenth century this still lacked a suitably prestigious appearance. The republic mainly used the private palaces of its leading families for ceremonious occasions. When Vincenzo Gonzaga, the Duke of Mantua visited Genoa in 1592, he stayed at the Palazzo Agostino Pallavicino (Cambiaso; see No. 68), and his retinue were accommodated in the Strada Nuova palaces in the vicinity. A ball was given in the duke’s honour in the Palazzo Ambrogio Di Negro (XVII), and a tournament was held on the Piazza Fontane Marose. The palaces were thus not merely private dwellings, but at the same time provided the formal setting in which the republic presented itself to the world. Contemporaries who were familiar with conditions in Genoa would certainly have been aware of the palaces’ civic importance when examining the engravings in Rubens’s book.

Just as the buildings themselves are concentrated in only a few areas of the city, the patrons and owners represent a small group of aristocratic Genoese families. Three of the four churches are also linked to the name of a specific family, through patronage and financial support. The building of S. Maria Assunta di Carignano (XXII) was initiated by an endowment from Bendinello Sauli; the Lomellino family financed the redecoration of SS. Annunziata (XXI); and the Pallavicino family gave active support to the building of the Jesuit Church (XXIII). The names that are by far the most frequent are those of the Pallavicino family, the Spinola family (various branches) and the Grimaldi family (various branches), with six occurrences each, as well as the Lomellino family (various branches) with five occurrences. The Centurione, Doria, Sauli and Balbi families are named twice each. For 29 of the 35 buildings presented in the Palazzi di Genova, the patrons, the donors or the current owners at the time of publication thus all belong to only eight Genoese families.

Rubens and Genoa

The question thus arises to what extent the families who commissioned or owned buildings in the Palazzi di Genova coincided with Rubens’s circle of Genoese acquaintances. Rubens’s connections with individual Genoese fami-

12. This example is given in Poleggi, Documento, 1977, p. 111. On this aspect, see also Grossi Bianchi—Poleggi, Città, 1987, pp. 281–283.
13. These figures include both the builders and owners of the palaces at the time at which the two series of engravings were published. Consequently, two palaces are counted twice due to early changes in ownership: the Palazzo Doria Tursi (see No. 67), which was built by Nicolo Grimaldi and sold to the Doria family towards the end of the 16th century; and the Palazzo Podestà (IX), which passed from the Lomellino family to the Centurione family at the beginning of the 17th century. For details see the list of the buildings with the names of patrons and later owners in the introduction to the catalogue, pp. 113–116.
ilies, however, can only be reconstructed sketchily. In a letter to Pierre Dupuy of 19 May 1628, he remarks in retrospect—in connection with a discussion of the latest political disturbances in Genoa—that he had visited the city several times, and had close relations with several of the leading figures there. The identity of the eminent persons to which Rubens refers in this letter remains unclear. Presumably, they were the same as those from whom he received commissions for paintings. But only some of Rubens’s patrons in Genoa are known. There are no clear statements about them by the artist himself. In addition to the early biographies, which are not very informative in this regard, the main sources of information available here are those works by Rubens that have documented evidence of a Genoese patron, works in which a patron is identified by the subject (in the case of portraits), or whose provenance makes an association with a Genoese patron at least probable.

The early biographers put a great deal of emphasis on the outstanding importance for Rubens of commissions from Genoa, however they provide virtually no details of them. Baglione emphasizes a group of equestrian portraits, which he claims Rubens painted for Genoese patricians. Soprani even states that people were competing to have paintings done by Rubens. Although he is a local writer, the only individual works he mentions are the two altar paintings in the Jesuit Church. Only Bellori, in addition to mentioning the paintings for the Jesuit Church and several portraits, also


15. The few documents that are available provide only incomplete information concerning when, how often and for how long Rubens stayed in Genoa. The only dates that can be established are his return from the mission to Spain in the spring of 1604 (unusually, the journey to Spain had been made via Livorno); the unveiling of the high altar painting of the Circumcision in the Jesuit Church, which probably took place on 1 January 1606; the dates given in the inscriptions on two portraits in 1606; and the inscription recorded in a 19th-century inventory of a lost portrait of Agostino Doria with Rubens’s name and the date 3 November 1607. Müller Hofstede suspects there may have been other visits, for which documents have not survived, during the period between the late summer of 1602 and the winter of 1602–3, and with Vincenzo Gonzaga’s retinue in the summer of 1607. Although the duke’s visit to Genoa is well documented, there is no evidence that Rubens was with him. It is rather improbable, since during the period in question Rubens was busy carrying out the Vallicella commission in Rome. In addition, in the protocols of the visit, which note among other things a visit by the duke to the newly built Jesuit Church, Rubens’s name does not appear. See Müller Hofstede, Bildnisse, 1965, pp. 100–104; idem, in [Cat. Exh.] Peter Paul Rubens, 1577–1640, 1, Rubens in Italien (Kunsthalle, Cologne, 1977), Cologne, 1977, pp. 17–19 (chronological table) and pp. 324f.; L. Tagliaferro, ‘Di Rubens e di alcuni Genovesi’, in Cat. Exh. Rubens e Genova, 1977, pp. 31–57; and C. Van de Velde, ‘L’itinéraire italien de Rubens’, Bulletin de l’Institut Historique de Rome, XLVIII–LI, 1978–79, pp. 238–259. On the probable date of the unveiling of the Circumcision, see Cat. Exh. Rubens e Genova, 1977, no. 5, pp. 221–229, esp. p. 225. On the inscription on the Doria portrait, see G. de Vito, ‘The Portraits of Giovan Carlo Doria by P.P. Rubens and S. Vouet’, The Burlington Magazine, CXXIX, 1987, pp. 83f. On the documents concerning the visit of Duke Vincenzo Gonzaga in Genoa see Labò, Palazzi di Genova, 1970, pp. 12ff., and Tagliaferro, op. cit., p. 41.
names a patron among the Genoese patriciate, Gian Vincenzo Imperiale (1582–1648), for whom he says Rubens painted two mythological subjects—*Hercules and Omphale* (Paris, Louvre) and *The Death of Adonis* (Paris, private collection). On stylistic grounds, the two paintings are regarded as belonging to the first phase of Rubens’s period in Italy, and at some time after Imperiale’s death they found their way to Rome, along with his complete collection. Bellori saw them there in the collection of Queen Christina of Sweden, in whose service he was employed as a librarian. Apart from these two paintings, Rubens does not seem to have received any other commissions from this patron.

The banker Nicolò Pallavicino (1563–1619) is a central figure in Rubens’s relations with Genoa. Rubens may have come into contact with him through Vincenzo Gonzaga, since he had business links with the Duke of Mantua. The reverse scenario is also conceivable: Rubens, equipped with recommendations from a Genoese businessman active in Antwerp, went first to Genoa upon arrival in Italy. Genoese connections, perhaps Nicolò Pallavicino, then arranged a position for him in the service of Vincenzo Gonzaga. Rubens and Pallavicino may have met in the spring of 1604, when Rubens probably returned from Spain via Genoa. Towards the end of 1605, the high altar


17. F. Baudouin, ‘Deux tableaux de Rubens de la collection de la Reine Christine. “Hercule et Omphale” et “La Mort d’Adonis”’ in *Analecta Reginensia. 1. Queen Christina of Sweden. Documents and Studies*, Stockholm, 1966, pp. 20–32. In the inventory that was made after Gian Vincenzo Imperiale’s death in 1648, both paintings are listed; see Martinoni, op. cit. in n. 7, pp. 303f., nos. 92–93.

18. The identification of two large-format portraits of ladies, which Gian Vincenzo Imperiale has repeatedly been thought to have commissioned, is controversial, and they do not appear in the inventory of the Imperiale collection: the portrait of *Marchesa Bianca Spinola Imperiale with her Niece* (?) (Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie; *Huemer, Portraits*, 1977, pp. 174f., no. 45) and the portrait of *Caterina Grimaldi* (?) (Kingston Lacy, Bankes Collection; *Huemer, Portraits*, 1977, pp. 131f., no. 19). See Martinoni, op. cit. in n. 7, pp. 176–178. Nor was the portrait of *Brigida Spinola Doria*, which is validated by an inscription and dated 1606 (Washington, National Gallery, Samuel H. Kress Collection; see below, n. 29) produced on commission from Gian Vincenzo Imperiale, since he and Brigida Spinola Doria were only married in 1621. The painting probably only came into the Imperiale collection after their marriage. See Martinoni, op. cit., pp. 178f. and 305.

painting of the *Circumcision* was installed at the Jesuit Church. Nicolò’s older brother, Marcello Pallavicino SJ, instigated the building of the church, and along with other members of the family played an important part in financing it. He held the patronage rights to the high altar, and commissioned Rubens to provide the altar painting.  

Fifteen years later, Rubens supplied a second altar painting for the Jesuit Church from Antwerp, the *Miracle of St Ignatius*. The painting was intended for the altar of the chapel in the north transept, for which Nicolò Pallavicino held the patronage rights, and for which he set aside a large annual sum in his will in 1612 to finance its completion and decoration. It is not certain when Rubens received the commission. Nicolò Pallavicino was godfather to Rubens’s second son, Nicolaes, in March 1618, and died in 1619. The painting arrived in Genoa in 1620, and was installed at the altar of the chapel.

It is remarkable that Rubens’s links with Genoa continued after he settled in Antwerp, and even intensified towards the end of the second decade of the century. In about 1617, Rubens produced a series of cartoons depicting the *Deeds of the Roman Consul Decius Mus* for patrons among the Genoese patriciate. The cartoons served as models for two tapestry cycles produced by a manufacturer in Brussels. The series of eight paintings, now in the collections of the Principality of Liechtenstein in Vaduz, is also based on these cartoons. The mediator for the commission was the Genoese merchant Franco Cattaneo, who lived in Antwerp. The contract with the tapestry dealers was signed in November 1616. In May 1618, Rubens had already finished the sketches, and mentions them in a letter to Dudley Carleton. It is not known whether

---

22. See H. Vlieghe, *Saints* (Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard, VIII), II, Brussels—London—New York, 1973, pp. 78ff.; Cat. Exh. *Rubens e Genova*, 1977, pp. 232ff. Rubens may possibly have accepted a commission for a third altar painting for the Jesuit Church. In view of its iconography, the painting of *St Ambrosius and the Emperor Theodosius* (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum) was probably produced for a northern Italian context. In the Jesuit Church in Genoa there is a chapel dedicated to the patron saint of the previous building, S. Ambrogio, who is represented on the chapel’s altarpiece. The patronage rights in the chapel were held by Paolo Battista Spinola, who also financed its decoration. In 1640, Rubens’s painting was among the works found in his studio after his death. It seems possible that Rubens carried out a commission from Genoa, but that the painting was never delivered, for reasons unknown. This view is proposed by H. Vlieghe, ‘National Gallery Flemish Pictures’, *The Burlington Magazine*, CVI, 1974, pp. 42ff. See [Cat. Exh.] Peter Paul Rubens 1577–1640, Vienna, 1977, pp. 77–79, no. 21 (W. Prohaska); Biracci, *Recupero*, 1977, pp. 165–168.  
Franco Cattaneo only acted as an intermediary for the two cycles, or whether he himself purchased one of them. Nor is it clear what the original purpose of the tapestries was. They may have adorned the walls of the sala in one of the city’s palaces or villas, such as those shown in the Palazzi di Genova.

Apart from the altar paintings for the Jesuit Church and the Decius Mus cycle, Rubens’s links with the Genoese aristocracy are principally attested to by a number of large-format portraits of patricians. The attribution to Rubens of at least half a dozen works from among a larger group of related portraits is not disputed. A further four portraits mentioned in written sources have either been lost, or were never painted. So far as can be determined, these portraits were produced in 1606-7. The only certain attribution of a male portrait is the life-size equestrian portrait of Giovan Carlo Doria (Genoa, Galleria Nazionale di Palazzo Spinola). Michael Jaffé has attempted to extend the range of male portraits by including portraits of Nicolò Pallavicino and Cardinal Giovanni Doria. However, both of these identifications must be regarded as hypothetical. The five other portraits that are definitely by Rubens are portraits of women. The subject of the portrait is identified by an inscription in only one case—the portrait of Brigida Spinola Doria (Washington, National Gallery, Samuel H. Kress Collection). Brigida Spinola married Giacomo Massimiliano Doria, the oldest son of the former doge, Agostino Doria, in 1605. Rubens painted another of Agostino’s sons, Giovan Carlo Doria, in the equestrian portrait mentioned above. Agostino

24. Max Rooses (op. cit. in n. 21, p. 160) expressed a suspicion that Nicolò Pallavicino might have been one of the commissioners of the Decius Mus cycle. However, there are no convincing reasons to justify this. On the cycle and the problem of identifying who commissioned it, see J. Duverger, ‘Aantekeningen betreffende de patronen van P.P. Rubens en de tapijten met de geschiedenis van Decius Mus’, Gentse bijdragen tot de kunstgeschiedenis, XXIV, 1977-1978, pp. 15-42; J.S. Held, The Oil Sketches of Peter Paul Rubens: A Critical Catalogue, Princeton, N.J., 1980, I, pp. 21-30; [Cat. Exh.] Liechtenstein: The Princely Collections, New York, 1985, pp. 338-353, nos. 210-217 (R. Baumstark); S. Tauss, ‘Dulce et decorum?’ Der Decius Mus-Zyklus von Peter Paul Rubens, Osnabrück, 2000, esp. pp. 226-229, and 254-263 (with the conjecture of Giovanni Battista Brignole being one of the commissioners). The cycle was clearly a very popular one during the 17th century. According to Baumstark, in addition to the two documented originals which he believes to have survived in the cycles in Vaduz (Sammlung Liechtenstein) and Madrid (Patrimonio Nacional), more than twenty other sometimes incomplete series are known. See R. Baumstark, [Cat. Exh.] Peter Paul Rubens: The Decius Mus Cycle, New York, 1985, p. 4.


Doria himself, who held the office of doge from 1601 to 1603, was portrayed in two paintings by Rubens, for which there is only documentary evidence: in a group portrait with his family, and in what was probably a life-sized portrait. Rubens also received another commission from the Doria family, for a double portrait of Paolo Agostino Doria and his wife Ginevra Grillo. However, there is no evidence that these two portraits were ever actually painted.

Piero Boccardo has suggested new identifications for two of Rubens’s other portraits of women. The Lady in a White Dress in the painting in Kingston Lacy (Bankes Collection) is most likely Maria Serra Pallavicino, the sister of Cardinal Giacomo Serra and wife of Nicolò Pallavicino. Giacomo Serra held the office of papal treasurer under Pope Paul V from 1608 to 1615, and was created a cardinal in 1611. Serra appears to have been the influential prelate, not mentioned by name in the documents, who in 1606 used his private means to ensure that Rubens received the commission for the painting of the altar in the choir of the Oratorian Church of S. Maria in Vallicella. This provided his protégé with one of the most high-profile commissions that was awarded in Rome at the time. The arms of the Serra family also appear on the portrait of a lady held by the Staatliche Kunsthalle in Karlsruhe. The figure is probably a relative of the later cardinal.

30. Ratti refers to a portrait ‘del Senatore Agostino’ by Rubens in the Palazzo Giuseppe Doria (Ratti, Instruzione, 1780, p. 311; Huemer, Portraits, 1977, pp. 114f., no. 8). The whereabouts of this painting are not known. In the same palace, Ratti and others saw ‘una miniatura assai celebre, che si crede, del Rubens nella quale sta espresso il Doge Agostino D’Oria con tutta la sua numerosa figliuolanza’ (Ratti, Instruzione, 1780, p. 312; Huemer, Portraits, 1977, p. 115, no. 9). This ‘miniatura’ is now identified with a painting in a French collection attributed to Giovanni Battista Poggi or Guilliam van Deynen (Deynum); see Boccardo, Ritratti, 1997, p. 33. According to Giuseppe de Vito, an 1831 inventory of the Neapolitan line of the family lists a portrait of Agostino Doria, bearing the following inscription: Illmo Augustini D’Oria perpetui Procuratorij Huius Serenissime Republicae vera effigies per manu Petri Rubenij Beige Antwerpie facta Genua anno salutis MDCVij die iij novembri actatis vero sua divina favente clementia LXXiii. Cf. de Vito, op. cit. in n. 15 above, p. 83, n. 8. This may have been the same painting that Ratti had seen a few decades earlier in the Palazzo Giuseppe Doria.


32. Due to a certain resemblance in the physiognomy to the portrait in Washington (see n. 29), the painting has up till now mainly been identified as Brigida Spinola Doria. However, in a 1660 inventory of the collection of Gian Filippo Spinola, the painting is mentioned as ‘un quadro ritratto di M. Pallavicina di Rubens figura intera alto p. 10 e largo sei senza cornice’. The coat of arms in the background, and the more or less corresponding measurements, suggest that the painting in Kingston Lacy is identical with that in the inventory. See Boccardo, Ritratti, 1994, p. 92; [Cat. Exh.] Van Dyck a Genova. Grande pittura e collezionismo (Genoa, 1997), eds. S.J. Barnes et al., Milan, 1997, p. 194, no. 20 (P. Boccardo). The painting has a fragmentary and restored inscription, naming Rubens as the painter and giving the date 1606 (?). Cf. Huemer, Portraits, 1977, pp. 171f., no. 42.

A number of other paintings by Rubens found their way into Genoese collections. In most cases, the provenance cannot be traced further back than the mid eighteenth century. Only in the case of Juno and Argus (Cologne, Wallraf-Richartz-Museum) is there at least a possibility that Rubens personally sold the painting to a purchaser in Genoa. In 1611, the painting was still in Rubens’s possession, as he mentions it in a letter to the art dealer Jacob de Bie, informing him that he will now be selling it at a favourable price. Rubens does not mention the person who had shown interest in it. The purchaser may have been Giovanni Agostino Balbi, the son of Bartolomeo Balbi and Lucrezia van Santvoort, the daughter of an Antwerp burgher. Giovanni Agostino Balbi resided in Antwerp from 1608 to 1617 and served as consul of the nazione genovese there in 1610–11. After his return to Genoa, he emerges again as the commissioner of the Palazzo Durazzo Pallavicino in Via Balbi (VII). Rubens’s painting is mentioned there in an inventory of the collection of Giovanni Battista Balbi in 1658 and remained at the palace until the beginning of the nineteenth century.

When the names of Rubens’s Genoese patrons and business partners are listed—so far as this is possible without resorting to speculation—it can be seen that in most cases, although by no means all, the names coincide with those of the patrons and owners of the Palazzi di Genova. The Pallavicinos are the family most prominently represented in Rubens’s book: the palace of Tobia Pallavicino (Carrega Cataldi) begins the first series as Palazzo A, and the series closes with the palace of Agostino Pallavicino (Cambiaso; see No. 68). Nicolo and Marcello Pallavicino, with whom Rubens was in close contact, were sons of Agostino and nephews to Tobia. The villa of Tobia Pallavicino is also included in the first series as Palazzo E, and the Palazzi Moderni includes two more Pallavicino palaces (XII and XV). The palace of Francesco Grimaldi on the Piazza di Pellicceria (XVI) also belongs to the Pallavicino patrimony, since Francesco Grimaldi, the son of Maddalena Pallavicino from her marriage to Giovanni Battista Grimaldi, was a cousin of Marcello and Nicolo, and in addition was married to their sister Lelia. Finally, another clear reference to the Pallavicino family is seen in the Jesuit Church at the end of the second series (XXIII), which had been built at the family’s instigation.

35. See Boccardo, ritratti, 1994, p. 87; Boccardo, Ritratti, 1997, p. 45.
37. This and other marriage ties among the leading families are drawn from the overview in Grossi Bianchi—Poleggi, città, 1987, p. 273.
and with substantial financial support from it. By contrast, none of the residences of the Serra or Imperiale families are included in Rubens’s book. This is particularly surprising in relation to Gian Vincenzo Imperiale, who owned two of Genoa’s most famous buildings, the villa in Sampierdarena and the urban palace on the Piazza Campetto. In comparison with their political importance, the Doria are also sparsely represented by only two palaces: the Palazzo Doria Tursi (See No. 67), owned by the Doria since 1593, and the Palazzo Doria Spinola (XIV). The leading members of the family, however, preferred to remain in the medieval palaces near the church of S. Matteo and none of the commissioning patrons of the Strada Nuova belonged to the Doria family. It must be emphasized here, however, that Rubens had only limited influence on the selection of buildings. There is no indication that Rubens had more drawings at his disposal than those that he finally had engraved; in other words, he did not select particular buildings out of a larger collection of drawings. The order of buildings in the book, however, was determined by Rubens. Here, above all, the preferential placement of the Pallavicino buildings seems to be the result of careful consideration.

Rubens’s reasons for dedicating the *Palazzi di Genova* to Carlo Grimaldi are not known. Whether, and to what extent, he carried out commissions for the various branches of the Grimaldi family is not clear. Despite the complimentary remarks Rubens makes about him in the dedication, Carlo Grimaldi does not seem to have played any very remarkable role in the public life of the republic. Even his identity is not absolutely clear. He is probably a son of Luca Grimaldi (doge in 1605–7) and Maria Spinola.38 He was a close relative of Giulia Grimaldi, whose villa in Sampierdarena (D) was the residence of the Duke of Mantua, Vincenzo Gonzaga, while he was staying in Genoa for a health cure in the summer of 1607.39 However, it has not been conclusively proved that Rubens was in Genoa along with the duke’s retinue during this visit. The book’s dedication was certainly based on considerations other than personal reminiscence. The Grimaldis were extremely important bankers, and were among the main creditors of the Spanish monarchy. The role of Nicolò Grimaldi as banker to Philip II is particularly noteworthy here. The palace that he built in the Strada Nuova (see No. 67), using his income from this business connection, concludes the first series, along with Agostino Pallavicino’s palace (see No. 68). In addition, various branches of the Grimaldi family, as well as members of other Genoese families, were resident in Antwerp and ran branches of their merchant firms there.40

CHAPTER ONE

Editing: Palazzi Antichi

The process of editing the drawings was clearly different for the two series of engravings. The collection of drawings, which Rubens had acquired in Italy in person and later formed the *Palazzi Antichi*, where basically ready for the press. The pen-and-ink drawings were transferred directly to the copper plate, and reproduced on a scale of 1:1. The sheets all have varying numbers of pinpricks, which derive from the draughtsman. The draughtsman used these perforations, made with compass, to fix the corner points of corresponding depictions on the *recto* and *verso* of one or more sheets; the engraver, Nicolaes Ryckemans, used the holes to transfer the main dimensions of a drawing to the plate. Ryckemans also carried out the rest of the process in the same way as the draughtsman, creating a framework of auxiliary lines using compass and ruler, within which he subsequently entered the image.41 The drawings were then reproduced with all their details and inscriptions. A number of the drawings include corrections made on pasted-down paper. The corrections were incorporated into the engraving. By contrast, additional decorative details such as window frames, which were only sketched in pencil, were not included in the engraving.

In the drawings for four of the buildings (C, D, F and I), the draughtsman used a special procedure to distinguish between the mezzanine storeys and other room levels. He mounted paper flaps onto the plans (as well as onto some of the sections), extending and supplementing the arrangement of the rooms on the main storey with the plan of the mezzanine above it. For example, in the drawings for the Palazzo Spinola (F), the plans for both of the main storeys (Nos. 36a, 37a) also include plans of the corresponding mezzanines in the side sections, containing the service areas and servants' quarters (Figs. 77-78 and Figs. 82-83). The internal organization of the palace, and the way in which rooms with different functions in the various sections and levels were linked, are thus made directly visible. The editor and the engraver treated these supplementary plans with special care. They were collected in two plates at the end of the volume, forming a kind of appendix (Nos. 71-72, Figs. 152-153). The individual details are carefully labelled, and given a reference system of letters and symbols, ensuring that they are clearly assigned to the corresponding plan. A contemporary user of the book would have been able to cut the two plates and paste the individual pieces onto the appropriate plans. He would then have had authentic reproductions, true to scale, of the drawings in Rubens's possession.

When the draughtsman noted compass points and the function of specific

41. The auxiliary lines can be seen in good prints, such as the copy in the British Library (54.i.15).
rooms, the information is included in the engravings in full and without change. Six façade elevations include more or less complete information on the material quality of the façade decoration (A–E and H; Nos. 6a, 11a, 16a, 23a, 31a and 52a). These texts were not engraved. Instead, each of the engravings was given a caption precisely identifying the object depicted. The sections were labelled according to the position of the section levels. These captions were not included in the drawings, and derive from the editor, Rubens. The identification of the section sequences, which is correct throughout, required precise study of the drawings.

For the edition, Rubens marked the buildings alphabetically (excepting two) with the letters A to K. In the foreword, he justifies this anonymous presentation by pointing to the speed at which ownership changes.\(^4^2\) Admittedly, it helped to enhance the claim of the engravings series to be a collection of standard patterns, which was his editorial intention. However, the palaces in the second series all appear under the names of their owners. Different conditions applied here, of course, since the drawings also included this information. The anonymous presentation of the buildings in the first series was not so much an editorial step as simply a necessity resulting from the fact that Rubens did not know all of the owners' names, and could not find them out while preparing the book for press.\(^4^3\) Peiresc, to whom Rubens sent one of the first copies of the *Palazzi di Genova*, immediately asked for a list of names of the owners of the palaces. Rubens only acceded to this after repeated requests. However, the list that he finally sent to Peiresc was incomplete, as his correspondent's answer implies.\(^4^4\)

In the engravings in the first series, there is only one slight correction, which is characteristic of the care taken by the engraver and the editor. In the plan of the ground floor of the Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (No. 9), the two pairs of round pedestals at the sides of the steps, which are entered in the corresponding drawing, have been eliminated in the engraving (Figs. 16–17). The drawing of the elevation is not exact here, and only indicates the outer pair of pedestals (Fig. 21). The editor and engraver noticed this subtle discrepancy between the plan and the elevation, and decided to eliminate it by removing the pedestals altogether. However, in the building itself, the pedestals are in fact as they were in the drawing. All of the other engravings in the *Palazzi Antichi* correspond exactly to the drawings.

---

42. '... perché ogni cosa... "Permutat dominos, & transit in altera iura" si come alcuni de questi Palazzi sono già alienati d'ali primi loro possessori... ' See Appendix 1.2, p. 254.
43. '... à dire il vero, appresso li disegni non c'erano i nomi... ' (ibid.).
CHAPTER ONE

Editing: Palazzi Moderni

The group of plans forming the Palazzi Moderni is several decades later in date than those that make up the Palazzi Antichi. The collection does include buildings from the 1540s and 1560s, but there is nothing to indicate that the drawings concerned were made much earlier than around 1600. In the plans of the Palazzo della Meridiana (VIII, c. 1540), an annexe appears which was probably only built around 1590 (Figs. 199, 201). The façade elevation of the Assunta in Carignano (XXII), started in 1552, shows the state of the building around 1620 (Fig. 281). With regard to the technique and methods used in the illustrations, the plans of the most recent buildings and the oldest ones are too similar to make it likely that an extended period of time lay between them. The inscriptions with the names of the owners, which derive from each draughtsman, reflect the ownership status after 1600 for the older buildings as well. Exceptions to this rule are the drawings of the Palazzo Doria Spinola (XIV) and Palazzo Doria (I), which bear the names of the commissioning patrons Antonio Doria (d. 1577) and Giovanni Battista Spinola (d. 1590). Rubens normally copied the information given in the drawings, only occasionally altering the spelling of the names. In only two cases did he require an alteration. He cites the Palazzo Doria (I) under the name of Nicolò Spinola, in whose possession it had been since 1590. The draughtsman had entered Giovanni Battista Spinola. The Palazzo Spinola (XVI) appears under the name of Francesco instead of Tommaso Grimaldi. In the first case, Rubens replaced the name of the commissioning patron with that of the current owner, so that the labelling would correspond to the practice in the rest of the plans. However, in the second case the reverse applies—perhaps due to incorrect information.

The 23 sets of drawings are executed using various scales, but apart from minor variations, they fall into three groups: 1:95 (XII–XIII, XV–XVIII), 1:107 (II–VIII) and 1:127 (I, IX–XI, XIV, XX–XXIII). Within these groups, there are elements shared by individual sets that suggest a common origin. For example, it is probably no accident that four of the five Strada Nuova palaces belong to the same group in terms of scale (I and IX–XI). The drawings of the Palazzo Cipriano Pallavicino (XII) and Palazzo Centurione (XIII) are probably both by the same draughtsman, who not only used the same scale for both, but also used the same freedom in representing the various parts of the building in both cases. The group of four churches (XX–XXIII) is also represented in the same scale.

The sequence of the buildings finally chosen by Rubens was established by numbering them from I to XXIII. The drawings include corresponding numbers, although these have been corrected—in some cases, several times. After
an initial preliminary numbering, the sequence was completely rearranged, and the order was subsequently altered several times again. Four sets of drawings had already been marked with alphabetical letters at an earlier stage—continuing the principle of the first series. Several editorial stages can therefore be reconstructed, reflecting the step-by-step acquisition of the drawings. If the 23 buildings are arranged according to this early labelling, which was later deleted, the following groupings emerge (the final numbering is given in brackets):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L (A)</td>
<td>Palazzo Campanella (XI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (B)</td>
<td>Palazzo Podestà (IX)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (C)</td>
<td>Palazzo Doria (I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O (D)</td>
<td>Palazzo Doria Spinola (XIV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (?)</td>
<td>Palazzo Durazzo Pallavicino (VII)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Palazzo Gambaro (II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Palazzo Cattaneo Adorno (X)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIII</td>
<td>Palazzo della Meridiana (VIII)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V (?)</td>
<td>Palazzo Franzone (IV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Palazzo Balbi Senarega (III)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII (?)</td>
<td>Palazzo Lomellini Patrone (XVIII)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Palazzo del Melograno (V)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIIIII</td>
<td>Palazzo di Cipriano Pallavicino (XII)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X (?)</td>
<td>Palazzo Di Negro (XVII)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI (?)</td>
<td>Palazzo Centurione (XIII)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Palazzo Rovere (XIX)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>SS. Annunziata del Vastato (XXI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>S. Maria Assunta in Carignano (XXII)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV (VII)</td>
<td>Palazzo di G.B. Grimaldi (VI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>Palazzo Spinola (XVI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>Palazzo dell’Acquedotto De Ferrari Galliera (XV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>S. Siro (XX)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII</td>
<td>SS. Ambrogio e Andrea (XXIII)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first four sets of drawings were initially given not Roman numerals, but letters. Two editorial stages can be distinguished here. In the first step, the sets were given the letters L to O, and in the second they were marked as A to D.\(^45\) Formally, this group is closely related to the palaces in the *Palazzi Antichi*. The first three buildings belong to the ensemble of the Strada Nuova.

---

\(^{45}\) Mario Labò, who was the first to recognize the importance of these marks, thought they stood for the initials of the draughtsmen (Labò, *Palazzi di Genova*, 1970, p. 18). On the significance of the labels for the editorial process, see *Cat. RIBA*, 1976, pp. 170f.
The fourth is the most important Renaissance palace in Genoa, together with the Palazzo della Meridiana (VIII), before Alessi’s Villa Giustiniano Cambiaso (B). All four sets of drawings use the same small scale—1:127, similar to the scale used in the first series—and they stand out from the bulk of the others by their slightly greater accuracy and more detailed execution. These four palaces were apparently intended to form a direct continuation of the first series, which ended at the letter K. Rubens would then have decided, perhaps because of their clear qualitative difference from the older plans, to treat them as the core of an analogously structured sequel. He may already have purchased the twelve drawings of these four buildings together with the older collection of plans. The other buildings were added later, apparently in two groups. These were given Roman numerals from the start. The initial group may have included twelve palaces and two churches. These buildings were given the numbers I to XIII. Slightly later, a second group of four buildings was added, again with a church at the end. The numbering was now continued up to XVIII. This first labelling sequence is characterized by the style of the Roman numerals IIII, VIII and XIII. It is highly doubtful whether Rubens entered this numbering himself. It may have been added by the middleman who obtained the drawings in Genoa on Rubens’s behalf, and then sent them to Antwerp carefully arranged, with preliminary labelling. Rubens then completely rearranged the sequence of the buildings. To begin with, he added the four sets of drawings he already had in his possession. He took the opportunity at the same time to rearrange all of the buildings and number them from I to XXII. In the final phase, the plans for the Jesuit Church (XXIII) were added. This editorial rearrangement of the material has no obvious system underlying it. Only the opening of the series with two Spinola palaces on the Strada Nuova and its conclusion with the Jesuit Church, linked with the name of the Pallavicino family and with two altar paintings by Rubens hanging in it, seem to be deliberate.

The terminus post quem for the latest purchase of drawings must be the dates of the most recent buildings included in them. In the group of six palaces built during the first two decades of the seventeenth century, two were already under construction in 1610. Construction of the four others began in the years around 1620. Since the draughtsmen were copying from design drawings and did not record the finished buildings, the date of the planning is decisive. The following dates are available here:

- The contract between Giovanni Agostino Balbi and Bartolomeo Bianco for the erection of the Palazzo Durazzo Pallavicino (VII) in February 1618.46

• The permission given for the alteration or expansion of the Palazzo Lomellini Patrone (XVIII) by the city authorities in June 1619.47

• The application by Giacomo and Pantaleo Balbi to add balconies to the façade of the Palazzo Balbi Senarega (III) in October 1619.48 The building of the palace must have commenced at least one year before this. Since the balconies already appear on the façade elevation, the plans must have been compiled later than this.

• The application by Tommaso Pallavicino in December 1621 to have the level of the street lowered along the property on which he would ‘va fab­ricando la sua casa’.49 The Palazzo dell’Acquedotto (XV) must therefore already have been under construction at this date.

The Palazzi Moderni therefore does not include any buildings that were projected later than c. 1620. Rubens could have been in possession of all the drawings when the first series of engravings (Palazzi Antichi) was completed in the early summer of 1622. This assessment is supported by the fact that a number of important buildings that were planned or constructed in Genoa during the second half of the 1620s were not considered. These include the churches of S. Luca (1626) and SS. Vittore e Carlo (planning began in 1629), and the Jesuit College on Via Balbi (first plans from 1621, building commencing before 1630).50

The drawings may have been acquired by various means. Rubens himself was in direct contact with members of the Genoese patriciate around 1620 through various commissions. He may also have been acquainted with Genoese merchants active in Flanders, for example with Giovanni Agostino Balbi, who was mentioned above as the probable purchaser of Rubens’s painting Juno and Argus. Balbi was the owner of the Palazzo Durazzo Pallavicino (VII) in Via Balbi, which was begun in 1618 and presented by Rubens among the Palazzi Moderni. However, there was also a colony of Flemish artists in Genoa, to which Cornelis and Lucas de Wael, Goffredo Wals and Jan Roos belonged. Soprani mentions a Michele Fiammino, who had completed an apprenticeship with Rubens prior to his arrival in Genoa.51 In November 1621, Anthony van Dyck, who had been active in Rubens’s workshop before,

47. Poleggi, Documento, 1977, p. 120, n. 39.
49. Poleggi, Documento, 1977, p. 120, n. 41.
arrived in Genoa. He remained until the February of the following year, lodg­
ing with the de Wael brothers. Additional visits, although lasting only a few
months, took place in the following years, and a second more extended stay
followed from 1626 to 1627.52 The German sculptor Georg Petel was also in
Genoa for a considerable time during the period that would be relevant to
the purchase of the drawings. Soprani reports that Petel reached Genoa in
1622 from Rome.53 Rubens was probably in contact with Petel even before
he travelled to Italy, and so he might also have been the person who made
the arrangements for the drawings. In addition, Joachim von Sandrart
expressly emphasizes Petel’s role as an art agent for Rubens.54

For the graphic reproduction of the drawings Rubens followed the same
principle as in the Palazzi Antichi. Any qualifications that needed to be made
here result from the poorer quality of the source material. The drawings were
reproduced on a scale of 1:1 when possible. The poorer quality of the draw­
ings, however, meant that the engraver had to use more of his own initiative.
He was forced not only to redraw the depictions, but to reconstruct them
completely in many cases. The results consequently differ from the drawings
throughout in their details (such as figures indicating measurement), and
occasionally also in terms of the formal contents. Among the minor correc­
tions are adjustments to make plan and elevation conform to each other, as
seen in the first series in the case of the Villa Giustinian Cambiaso (B).
Among the Palazzi Moderni, this applies to the plans of the Palazzo Doria (I)
and the Palazzo del Melograno (V). In these cases, the portico and balconies,
respectively, were added to the plans as they are shown on the correspond­
ing elevations (Figs. 155–156 and 182–183). The positions of the door open­
ings in the storerooms in the plan of the ground floor of the Palazzo di
Cipriano Pallavicino (XII) were apparently changed for the same reason.
However, the discrepancy between the plan and the elevation was not com­
pletely eliminated, as the elevation shows windows instead of doors (Figs.
222–223 and 226, 228).

Some of the plans show substantial differences from the source, so that
the engravings are actually more or less new. The plates for the Palazzo Di
Negro (XVII) differ particularly widely from the drawings. On the ground
floor, the principal rooms on the façade have different measurements and
different proportions (Figs. 257, 258). On the first floor, the arrangement of the

53. Soprani, Vite, 1674, p. 320.
p. 159. On Petel’s links with Rubens and Genoa, see N. Lieb, ‘Lebensgeschichte Georg Petels’ in K.
rooms has been changed. In the engraving there are only three rooms, corres­ponding exactly to the shape of the rooms on the ground floor below, instead of the four rooms shown in the drawing (Figs. 259–260). The draughtsman’s plans of the Palazzo Di Negro were produced rather carelessly. The engraver would immediately have noticed (as in other cases as well) that it is not possible to reconcile the façade elevation here with the two ground plans. The window bays on the ground floor differ, and above all the width of the façade varies (the width of the façade on both ground plans is 306 mm, while on the elevation it is 325 mm). The plans and elevation were therefore based on a different scale. The engraver was forced to produce a completely new depiction. He started from the width of the façade elevation, which he used in his illustrations. But he based the scale on that used in the slightly smaller ground plan drawings (which can be calculated from the measurements given there: $10 \text{ palmi} = c. 26 \text{ mm. or c. 1:95}$). The building is consequently wider in the engravings than it is in the drawings (c. 121 palmi versus c. 115 palmi).

This procedure provided the engraver with several extra palmi for the inte­rior arrangement, which in fact he needed. To begin with, he had to increase the distance between the windows in the vestibule in order to make the dis­tances between the window bays equal, so that they would correspond to the elevation. The vestibule and courtyard consequently had to be widened. All of the rooms in the engravings thus have different measurements and proportions from those in the drawings. At the same time, the engraver took the liberty of converting the arrangement of rooms on the first floor into a regular sequence. The result of these manipulations is a plan that has very little to do with the actual state of the building (from which the drawings already dif­fered in several respects). However, unlike the drawings, it is internally con­sistent. Neither the editor nor the engraver were in a position to check the plans against the building itself, but any obvious discrepancies had to be eliminated before printing.

Less substantial, although still perceptible, are the differences between the drawings and the engravings in the case of the Palazzo Podestà (IX). The peculiarity of this building is its oval vestibule. In the drawing, the measure­ments given for this are $34 \text{ p} \times 26 \text{ p}$ (Fig. 203). But the execution of the draw­ing is unclear and imprecise. Using the scale set by the draughtsman, the room measures only $32 \text{ p} \times 26 \text{ p}$. The oval shape thus also has a rather round­ed effect. It was clear to the engraver that he could not simply copy this plan onto the plate. He widened the vestibule beyond the measurement given, from 34 palmi to 36 palmi, giving the room a pronounced oval shape (Fig. 202). He obviously based the measurement on the width of the central bay of the courtyard loggia (12 p), which he used as a module. He then set the width of
the entire central section at 36 *palmi*, widening the two lateral bays of the courtyard loggia to the same size as the central one. In order to avoid altering the total width of the building, he then had to make the side sections correspondingly narrower. The plan of the main floor was also made to correspond with this. The engraved plans of the Palazzo Podestà thus follow the drawings, so far as the arrangement of the rooms is concerned; due to the redrawing, the proportions of almost all of the rooms are changed, sometimes with substantial deviations. Of course, such changes rarely increased the accuracy of the plans in relation to the actual building. Here again, the engraver was mainly concerned with producing images that were architecturally consistent and, if possible, regularly structured.

Not every set of drawings in the *Palazzi Moderni* was so thoroughly reworked as those of the Palazzo Di Negro (XVII) and Palazzo Podestà (IX). However, minor corrections are found throughout. In almost every set, the measurement figures differ, and consequently the proportions of the rooms and sections are affected. This needs to be borne in mind when the engravings in the *Palazzi di Genova* (as opposed to the drawings) are used uncritically as documents for a building’s history. The engraver probably carried out these minor changes on his own, although the principle had probably been approved by the editor (Rubens). The regularization of the façade of the Palazzo Spinola (XVI) was initiated by the editor himself. The engraving presents a regular, axially symmetrical façade, which does not in reality exist (Fig. 254 and cat. ill. 52). The alteration is explicitly noted in an inscription added on the lower margin of the engraving. Yet the two plans were reproduced without change, and reflect the actual situation correctly. Consequently, the elevation and the plan do not correspond—an exception among the buildings included in the book.

A similar difference between the ground plans and a regularized façade elevation is found in two other buildings: the Palazzo Lomellini Patrone (XVIII) and the Palazzo Rovere (XIX). The regularization of the façades probably does not derive from the engraver in these cases, but from the draughtsman. This can no longer be checked, since the two drawings have not survived. In both cases, the draughtsman was faced with the same problem: how to reproduce a façade with an irregular course. In the one case, the façade contains an oblique angle, and in the other it is twice interrupted at right angles. Both façades appear in the engravings as regular surfaces, although the plans accurately reflect the irregular shapes of the properties (Figs. 263–267 and 268–272). This type of problem was not treated in the same way in all of the plans. In the case of the Palazzo Centurione (XIII), an oblique corner of the façade is shown both in the drawing and in the engraving—rather clumsily, but spatially accurate (Figs. 233–234). In these three cases, the
The engraver has obviously reproduced accurately what he found in the drawings, and he did not attempt corrections in order to make the ground plan and elevation correspond.

The editorial principles are therefore not consistent in the *Palazzi Moderni*. In some of the plans, discrepancies between the plan and elevation are eliminated, while in others they are left unchanged (e.g. in the Palazzo di G.B. Grimaldi, VI). In one case a discrepancy was actually created as a result of an attempt at regularization. Generally, however, as in the first series, there is a clear effort to work with care. An important example of this is the treatment of the plan of the Jesuit Church (XXIII; Figs. 284–285). The draughtsman had not entered measurement figures here, but simply entered a scale. The engraver calculated all of the measurements and entered them on the engraving.

Proof impressions of eleven plates in the second series have survived (Prentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam). These include prints of the following façade elevations:

- **Figura 3** Palazzo Doria (I, No. 75b; Fig. 160)
- **Figura 30** Palazzo Cattaneo Adorno (X, No. 102b)
- **Figura 33** Palazzo Campanella (XI, No. 105b; Fig. 220)
- **Figura 36** Palazzo di Cipriano Pallavicino (XII, No. 108b; Fig. 227)
- **Figura 39** Palazzo Centurione (XIII, No. 111b)
- **Figura 42** Palazzo Doria Spinola (XIV, No. 114b; Fig. 241)
- **Figura 45** Palazzo dell'Acquedotto De Ferrari Galliera (XV, No. 117b; Fig. 249)
- **Figura 48** Palazzo Spinola (XVI, No. 120b; Fig. 255)
- **Figura 51** Palazzo Di Negro (XVII, No. 123b)
- **Figura 54** Palazzo Lomellini Patrone (XVIII, No. 126b)
- **Figura 57** Palazzo Rovere (XIX, No. 129b; Fig. 73)

This is all that remains of a possibly complete set of façade prints. From the Palazzo Cattaneo Adorno (X) to the Palazzo Rovere (XIX), the last of the palaces, the sequence is complete. The sheets were printed when the engraving of the images had been completed. All of the inscriptions, however, are lacking. The names of the owners have been entered by hand on eight of the sheets. The handwriting of these inscriptions varies and is not by Rubens (Figs. 160, 220, 227, 249, 255, 273). The other changes were slight. Care was taken that all the details on the drawings appeared in the engravings. In the case of the Palazzo Centurione (XIII), the coat of arms above the portico was retouched, so that the engraving also shows it the right way round, with the

55. The existence of the proofs was revealed by Mario Labò (*Labò, Palazzi di Genova, 1970*, p. 10).
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bar sloping down to the left (No. 111b). Not all of the coats of arms were given this degree of attention. Most of them appear reversed on the engravings. In the case of the Palazzo Doria Spinola (XIV), the roof area was slightly simplified in comparison with the drawing. Instead of five chimneys, only four are shown, with both pairs in an orthogonal perspective (Figs. 239–241). Hatching is occasionally supplemented, in order to enhance the plastic effect of individual elements of the buildings.

The date at which the 67 plates of the Palazzi di Genova were finally engraved is difficult to establish. Following Mario Labò, 1626 is usually given as the date of the expanded edition.57 The editorial process, as evident from the analysis of the drawings, suggests a much shorter period between the two series.58 And it is unlikely that Rubens would have returned to this project, which reflects his interests and artistic ambitions in the period around 1620, after an interval of several years. The first edition, with 72 plates (the Palazzi Antichi), is extremely rare in a separate contemporary binding.59 Copies of the book in contemporary binding including both series with 139 plates are much more frequent. Thus, much evidence suggests that the second series of engravings followed the first within a short interval of time. However, there are noticeable differences in quality of paper used for the two series. Early issues of the first series are printed on fine paper, whereas the engravings of the second series, as a rule, are printed on a thicker, more card-like paper.60 The earliest evidence of the existence of the second series of engravings dates from 1642. The appendix to an edition of Vignola’s Regola published in Amsterdam includes four plates with copies of façades from the Palazzi di Genova,

57. Labò, Palazzi di Genova, 1970, p. 9. Labò adopted this suggested date in turn from E.S. de Beer’s commentary on Evelyn’s Diary, where de Beer mentions it in a note without providing further evidence: The Diary of John Evelyn, 1955, II, p. 173, n. 1. Labò considered that a period of four years for the preparation of an expanded edition would be appropriate.

58. Alan Tait has speculated that the ‘doppio esemplare dei Palazzi de Genoa’, which Rubens sent to Peiresc in late 1622 might already have been the expanded edition of the Palazzi di Genova, with almost double the number of engravings (see Tait, Introduction, 1968, p. 8). An extract from the text of the letter is given below, Appendix II.9, p. 262.

59. Cf. Labò, Palazzi di Genova, 1970, p. 9, who was aware of only four such copies. In the biographies and guides of the 17th and 18th centuries, no distinction is made between the two early editions of the Palazzi di Genova. The first to distinguish between them was L. Cicognara, Catalogo ragionato dei libri d’arte e d’antichità posseduti dal conte Cicognara, II, Pisa, 1821, p. 252, nos. 4084–4085.

60. The early issues of the Palazzi di Genova all use types of paper that were common over extended periods, so that no evidence for the dating of the editions can be drawn from this. The early prints of the Palazzi Antichi use paper with the following watermarks (references are to Briquet, Filigranes, 1923; Heawood, Watermarks, 1981): horn with countermark, as in Heawood, no. 2625; coat of arms similar to Heawood, nos. 655–680 (particularly nos. 655, 661, and 678); crown and countermark, not in Heawood; cockatrice similar to Heawood, nos. 842 and 844–845, with letters RP. Early prints of the Palazzi Moderni use paper with the following watermarks: crown and countermark, not in Heawood; grapes with the letters AIR, similar to Heawood, nos. 2226–2230; fleur de lys similar to Briquet, nos. 7210–7212 and Heawood, nos. 1761–1770; letters CV with countermark, not in Heawood. I am not aware of one copy with both series printed on the same type of paper before Meursius’s edition of 1652.
three of which are from palaces in the second series (text ills. 5, 6). There is no clear caesura between the first, original edition and the second expanded edition of the *Palazzi di Genova*, nor was any such division apparently intended by the editor. Precise bibliographical data concerning the history of the book begin only in 1652, twelve years after Rubens’s death, when the first edition issued by a publisher was brought out by Jacob Meursius in Antwerp.

**Conceptual Framework: Presentation and Foreword**

Rubens’s editorial approach is marked by an effort to achieve as authentic a reproduction of the plans as possible. As a whole, the engravings are not idealizing and exemplary in quality, but descriptive and documentary. Rubens may have had little interest in the many discrepancies between the drawings and the buildings, which mainly resulted from the fact that the draughtsmen were copying design drawings, and not documenting the actual buildings. In Rubens’s own terms from the contemporary point of view, the *Palazzi di Genova* was a publication depicting the contemporary architecture of Genoa with the utmost of documentary accuracy and detail. As an editor, Rubens was able merely to restrict himself to arranging the drawings and giving them numbers and titles. Ryckemans, the engraver, only needed to copy the drawings onto the plates. However, by publishing graphic reproductions of the Genoese plans as a complete series of engravings, and by describing them in the text as being capable of serving as models, Rubens was placing them in competition with renowned earlier publications. With his knowledge of art literature, Rubens in his editorial capacity was surely aware of this effect of his approach, and it must have been an intentional one. However, the concept underlying the *Palazzi di Genova* transcends its function as a mere collection of models. The book moves within various typological traditions, without being completely subsumed by any of them. At first sight, the collection of engravings, with a short introductory text, lies in the tradition of publications such as Serlio’s *Extraordinario libro* (1551) and Ducerceau’s *Livres d’architecture* (1559, 1561, 1582). A comparable shift in emphasis towards the illustrations—although with engraved texts accompanying the individual

---

61. *Regola de’ cinque ordini d’architettura, di M. Giacomo Barozzi da Vignola etc., Amsterdam, 1642.* Cf. *The Fowler Architectural Collection of The John Hopkins University*, catalogue compiled by L.H. Fowler and E. Baer, Baltimore, 1961, pp. 289ff., no. 362. The four plates in the appendix to this volume are simplified, rather carelessly engraved copies of one half of the façade of the Villa Pallavicino (E) and the Doria (I), Franzone (IV) and Doria Spinola (XIV) palaces. The engraved copies show reverse images of the illustrations in comparison with the original engravings, and were therefore copied from these, not from the drawings. There is a reference to these plates in Tait, *Introduction*, 1968, p. 20, n. 12, but it erroneously refers to them as original *Palazzi* engravings.
plates—is seen in Labacco’s Libro appartenente all’architettura (1552) and Vignola’s Regola (1562). Like Vignola (‘Il resto si vede’), Rubens also refers to the illustrations rather laconically at the end of a short foreword: ‘Delresto vi rimetto alle figure’.

With regard to its contents, Rubens claims that his book may serve as a collection of models for residential buildings. There are several precedents for this among the architectural publications of the second half of the sixteenth century. In contrast to Ducerseau’s Livre d’architecture (1559) and Serlio’s manuscript of Book VI (Delle habitationsi di tutti li gradi degli homini), the Palazzi di Genova do not contain idealized plans for various socially classified types of residence, but precise reproductions of the plans of a homogeneous group of existing buildings. The principal aim of Ducerseau’s two-volume publication on French châteaux (Les plus excellents Bastiments de France, 1576, 1579), illustrating existing and mostly contemporary buildings, was to proclaim and perpetuate a tradition of French chateau architecture that was independent of Italian influence. A work that is closer to the Palazzi di Genova in its conception is Palladio’s Secondo Libro (1570). Palladio offers various ideas in connection with villas and urban palaces, illustrating them with his own designs. However, the book is concerned not with the objective recording of existing buildings, but with an idealized reproduction of his own oeuvre. The woodcuts make irregular plans regular, omit the reproduction of older parts of the buildings and include side wings that have never been actually built. In his treatise, Palladio presents his buildings as ideal solutions in approaching various problems. Rubens, by contrast, mostly left his Genoese plans as they were, without carrying out this type of correction, and reproduced them with as much accuracy as possible.

The Palazzi di Genova differs from all the other publications mentioned here in the detail with which the individual palaces are shown. In the Secondo Libro, Palladio presents his buildings with only one plan and one elevation each. Ducerseau allots up to six illustrations for each individual project (plans and elevations, as well as sections), but these are combined on a single plate, reducing the reproduction quality to such an extent that only the general scheme of the site and arrangement are recognizable. The documentation of patrician residences with their entire complex of rooms in the seven, eight or even nine plates that are devoted to the buildings of the Palazzi Antichi had never been seen before—nor was it repeated for a considerable time afterwards. Comparable extravagance in the presentation of existing buildings is seen in very few publications in the field of courtly and aristocratic architec-

ture. In 1589, five years after the completion of the Escorial, twelve large-format engravings were published by the architect, Juan de Herrera, including three plans and four elevations, four sections and two perspective views of the complex, with explanations provided in a small, separate octavo booklet. Partly due to the publication of this monumental series of engravings, the Escorial was thus set in competition with St Peter's in Rome. The plans of Antonio da Sangallo's large model of St Peter's had already been publicized in 1548-49 in four engravings by Antonio Salamanca. At around the same period as the Palazzi di Genova, in 1620, Salomon de Caus published his Hortus Palatinus, illustrating the palace gardens in Heidelberg in 30 plates, including plans of the individual garden areas, and plans and elevations of the buildings.

In terms of the book's typological arrangement, Rubens was therefore presenting the palaces of the Genoese patricians in a way that was bound to remind contemporaries of publications illustrating the residences of princes. In his foreword, Rubens does proclaim the existence of a burgher palace type, which he distinguishes clearly from the aristocratic palace. The challenge of building private residences is seen as being a significant one from two points of view. In the first place, prestigious private buildings make a substantial contribution to improving the appearance of a city, simply because of their large numbers. Secondly, well-designed houses provide their occupants with a better quality of life. Rubens is clearly drawing on widely familiar topoi here. His treatment of the concept of commodità, as a central category in private residential architecture also corresponds to the traditional approach. However, Rubens treats the functional aspect of the concept as being independent, releasing it from the aesthetic component that closely linked it to the idea of decorum. Palladio, for example, defines commodità, in a strictly humanistic tradition, as being an aspect of decorum. The text discussing the
individual examples in Palladio’s *Secondo Libro*, however, indicate an effort to achieve a synthesis between the aesthetic and functional requirements that confront the architect in a particularly complex fashion in palace architecture. Scamozzi’s equally rhetorical definition of the concept does involve functional points of view, but these are subordinated to the conventional aesthetic justification. In Rubens’s short essay, however, *commodo* stands only for the functional aspects of private residential architecture that derive from an approach based on the classical principles of antiquity. The aesthetic dimension is thereby partly suspended, since a good formal solution and comfort are mutually implicit. Rubens integrates the aspect of decorum into a ‘typology’ of palace architecture, but taking a very pragmatic approach, he reduces this exclusively to economic and functional criteria. It is not social status that determines the size of a house, but the economic situation of the person commissioning it and his requirements for space. As examples of aristocratic residences, Rubens mentions the Pitti and Farnese palaces in Rome and Caprarola, the Cancelleria and the Palais du Luxembourg, and then remarks that in terms of size and cost, these buildings would be well beyond the reach of a private person. Patrician houses are distinguished from the palaces of princes not by a different formal vocabulary, but by their smaller range of rooms.

For purposes of typological distinction, Rubens introduces a criterion of formal arrangement, the *cortile*. Palaces with a central court—four-winged buildings—have a complex range of rooms, as required by the household of a prince, and can therefore be termed princely residences. By contrast, the palace type without a courtyard is suitable for private patrons. Of course, the description of the central courtyard as being a distinctive characteristic of princely palaces overlooks the historical facts. In making this distinction, though, Rubens does touch on a specific element in Genoese palace architecture: the derivation of the various types of urban palace from the compact scheme of the villa. Rubens does not explain the inexpensive, but still prestigious, architectural style of the palace in terms of topographical situation such as a shortage of building ground, but by reference to the political system. It is, he claims, a reflection of republican values.

The significance of private buildings for the appearance of the city, which Rubens mentions several times, is therefore given an additional dimension. It is not merely a matter of outward splendour, but of the self-representation of

67. ‘Il fine del fabricare privatamente, dee esser per comodo dell’abitare, secondo, che si conviene al grado, & alla riputatione, e qualità d’ogn’uno, & anco per poter ricever gli amici, e forastieri, secondo le occorenze’ (V. Scamozzi, *L’idea della architettura universale*, Venice, 1615, pp. 221ff.).
68. ‘Oltra che la commodità degli edificii quasi sempre concorre colla bellezza e miglior forma di quelli’.
This contrasts with Cornaro’s observation, ‘et oltreaccolo io laudero sempre più la fabrica onestamente bella, ma perfettamente commoda, che la bellissima et incommoda’ (Cornaro, op. cit. in n. 64, p. 3135).
69. For the full text of Rubens’s foreword with an English translation see Appendix 1.2, pp. 254–256.
the political community through its architecture, in which the principles of the community’s form of social organization are made visible. In Genoa, the families of the ancient patriciate, the nobili vecchi shared power among themselves during the sixteenth century. The influential patrician families were in competition with one another, but were nevertheless pursuing common economic and political interests. This oligarchical system of government was given architectural expression in the exclusive complex of buildings along the Strada Nuova, with a series of ten palaces of equal rank, whose owners without exception belonged to four of the most powerful nobili vecchi families. The link between this architectural ensemble and the structure of Genoese society has often been emphasized in more recent sociologically oriented research by architectural historians. The modernity of Rubens’s thinking is demonstrated in the way in which he uses sober phrasing to describe the relation between architecture and its political and economic preconditions, while at the same time postulating the possibility of transferring the solution to other geographical and social conditions, such as those pertaining to Antwerp.

The restriction to the ‘model’ of Genoa sets the publication within a further frame of reference. Confining the contents of the book to the buildings of a single city is an approach that has only one parallel among comparable collections of engravings during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, those on the architecture of ancient Rome. Rubens owned two antiquarian and scholarly publications dealing with the historical evidence of ancient Rome: Johannes Rosinus’s Romanarum antiquitatum libri decem (1583, often reprinted) and Jean-Jacques Boissard’s Romanae urbis topographiae & antiquitatum (six parts, published between 1597 and 1602). Increasingly systematic research into the architecture of antiquity was being carried out in the period around 1500 and later encouraged the further development and elaboration of a rationalized method of illustrating such materials in the medium of drawing. The survey of the Colosseum, for example, that was undertaken in 1513 was reflected in the drawn copies of the Codex Coner, illustrating the building in four plans on various levels, four sections along various axes and other details. With their accurate and true-to-scale reproduction of the actual architecture, these records of the monuments of antiquity were still unsurpassed a century later. Printed publications on antiquity, however, seldom achieved a high standard of architectural illustration. A rare exception to

this rule was Antonio Labacco’s *Libro appartenente all’architettura* (1552), which made use of record drawings made by Peruzzi and Antonio da Sangallo.

Ultimately, the plates in the *Palazzi di Genova* lie in the tradition of illustrations of ancient architecture such as the Codex Coner’s depictions of the Colosseum. This applies not only to the book’s range of documentation and illustrative technique, but also to its presentation in sections forming a coherent sequence of architectural illustrations. In addition to presenting records of the architecture of antiquity, the Codex Coner also includes Bramante’s Roman buildings, some of which were still not yet completed. The Codex was compiled at the instigation of Giuliano da Sangallo for Julius II, Rome’s most important commissioner of architectural work, and according to Hubertus Günther, the Bramante buildings are included in it to demonstrate the contemporary renewal of architecture in Rome based on ancient Roman models. In his third book (1540), devoted to the ancient monuments of Rome, Serlio also shows Bramante’s Tempietto alongside the plans for St Peter’s, as an example of modern architecture that is closely related to the ancient tradition. Other publications on Rome similarly include modern buildings on an equal footing alongside the ancient ruins. Rubens would certainly have been familiar with Antonio Lafreri’s *Speculum romanae magnificientiae*, and he may even have owned some of Lafreri’s engravings himself. In his 1573 catalogue, covering 107 items, Lafreri presents eight engravings of contemporary buildings. They include elevations of the façades of the Alberini, Farnese, Caprini and Paolo Statio palaces. These examples of modern Roman palace buildings were regarded as belonging to the sights of Rome in the same way as the ancient buildings, engravings of which could be purchased as souvenirs. At the same time, they emphasized a sense of artistic and topographical continuity.

In the foreword, Rubens praises the renewal of modern architecture on the basis of antiquity. The Genoese palaces, which Rubens accordingly treats as providing models of patrician residences, were presented in the form of exact plans, reflecting the actual situation as accurately and completely as possible. At the same time, the range and quality of the illustrations correspond to the high standards that had been established in the field of architectural publications in works about the buildings of ancient Rome. This close relationship between form and content would have been crucial for Rubens’s decision to publish his Genoese drawings as an ambitious book of engravings.

73. Ibid., pp. 201f.
II. The Drawings of the *Palazzi di Genova* and Genoese Renaissance Architecture

*Drawings and Buildings: A Comparison*

The 139 plates in Rubens’s book are based on 137 drawings,1 of which survive (RIBA, London). Of the 70 drawings for the *Palazzi Antichi*, 66 have survived. These cover 53 sheets, as 13 of the sheets have drawings on both sides. The four missing illustrations were the sources for the following plates:

- **Figura 1** Palazzo Carrega Cataldi (A), plan of the cellar (No. 1; Fig. 1)
- **Figura 67** Palazzo Doria Tursi, façade (No. 67; Fig. 147)
- **Figura 68** Palazzo Cambiaso, façade (No. 68; Fig. 148)
- **Figura 69** Plans of the vestibules of these last two palaces (No. 69; Fig. 149).

Of the drawings for the 67 plates in the *Palazzi Moderni*, 56 have survived. The drawings for the following nine façade elevations are missing:

- **Figura 6** Palazzo Gambaro (II, No. 78; Fig. 166)
- **Figura 12** Palazzo Franzone (IV, No. 84; Fig. 178)
- **Figura 21** Palazzo Durazzo Pallavicini (VII, No. 93; Fig. 196)
- **Figura 24** Palazzo della Meridiana (VIII, No. 96; Fig. 197)
- **Figura 45** Palazzo dell’Acquedotto De Ferrari Galliera (XV, No. 117; Fig. 248)
- **Figura 54** Palazzo Patrone (XVIII, No. 126; Fig. 267)
- **Figura 57** Palazzo Rovere (XIX, No. 129; Fig. 272)
- **Figura 61** SS. Annunziata (XXI, No. 133; Fig. 280)
- **Figura 63** S. Maria Assunta in Carignano (XXII, No. 135; Fig. 281).

Among the plans for the Jesuit Church (XXIII), the following are also lacking:

- **Figura 65** Façade elevation (No. 137; Fig. 286)
- **Figura 67** Longitudinal section (No. 139; Fig. 287)

All of the 35 buildings these 139 plates illustrate are still in existence today, although only a few without later alterations. In most cases, the London

---

1. Two of the plates (Nos. 71–72; Figs. 152, 153) are based on information contained in flaps mounted onto the drawings.
drawings are the only pictorial documentation available on the early history of the buildings. Drawings of existing buildings were only rarely based on measurements of the building itself. When possible, any plans that were already available—usually design drawings—were used, in order to save time and effort. This basically applies to the London drawings as well, and is true of both collections equally. If one compares the drawings with the buildings it emerges that in many cases the London plans reproduce preliminary designs and do not show the appearance of the buildings after completion.

Four of the ten sets of drawings for the Palazzi Antichi indicate a planning phase that was not carried out, or details that were not executed. For example, the open loggias on the piano nobile of the Villa Pallavicino (E) were never built, probably for practical reasons. They are shown closed in Gauthier (1832) and Reinhardt (1886), and there is no evidence that any alterations were made shortly after the building was completed (Fig. 67 and cat. ill. 10). The differences seen in the drawings of the Palazzo Spinola (F) are more far-reaching. They show a compact building with an oblong main block, with side sections of rooms adjoining at the rear around a square courtyard (Fig. 77). Giovanni Spinola, who commissioned the building, died in 1560, two years after construction work began. The palace was not yet finished, and was probably never completed in the form shown in the plans. Building work was resumed only after an interruption of several years, and the illustrations by Gauthier (1818) and Reinhardt (1886) indicate the final form of the building as it may have been around 1600 (cat. ill. 13). The London drawings document the original project, which provided the basis for construction work during the initial phase.

The façade elevation of the Palazzo Interiano Pallavicini (G; Fig. 103) indicates an architecturally structured decoration. The intention was probably that this should be painted on, but it was ultimately abandoned in favour of figurative fresco decoration by the Calvi brothers (cat. ill. 14). Similarly clear differences are seen in the drawings for the Palazzo Lercari Parodi (K), where different solutions were adopted for the shape of the vestibule connecting the courtyard and the staircase (Fig. 136), and for the façade design on the street side (Fig. 142). These divergences do not result from later alterations, but came about simply because the original plans were abandoned during construction. This is confirmed by the architectural records made by Gauthier (1818) and Reinhardt (1886), and above all by the drawing of the street façade.

3. As was conjectured by Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, p. 189. See also Cat. RIBA, 1976, pp. 160f.
elevation made by Rubens’s contemporary Heinrich Schickhardt (cat. ills. 23–25).

Among the drawings of the Palazzi Moderni, there are fewer of these marked differences unequivocally demonstrating that the sources were preliminary designs. The best evidence for such discrepancies is seen in the group of churches. Of the four sets of drawings, only that of the Jesuit Church (XXIII) more or less completely corresponds to the existing building. However, in the seventeenth century, the façade was finished only as far as the main entablature; it was completed only in the late nineteenth century according to the elevation shown in Rubens’s book (Fig. 286 and cat. ill. 61). In the case of the former Theatine church, S. Siro (XX), the façade project shown in the drawing was never begun (Fig. 277). The extant façade, in a classicist form, was erected in 1821 according to a design by Carlo Barabino. The shape of the side chapels, which were built during the early decades of the seventeenth century, also differs from the design on which the London drawing was based (compare Fig. 274 and cat. ill. 55). The present-day shape of the former Discalced Carmelite church of SS. Annunziata del Vastato (XXI) derives from rebuilding and elaborate redecoration that were carried out in the first half of the seventeenth century. Neither of the depictions in the Palazzi di Genova corresponds to the ultimate appearance of the building after these alterations. The ground plan was extended (compare Fig. 279 and cat. ill. 57), and the façade, by contrast, reduced (compare Fig. 280 with cat. ills. 51 [left] and 58). As in the case of S. Siro, the drawings—one of which is missing—reproduce early designs that were created when construction work was only just starting. The draughtsman who prepared the drawings for S. Assunta in Carignano (XXII) used various sources. The ground plan (Fig. 283) is based on early or alternative designs, with notable divergences from the final project (cat. ill. 59). Although poorly executed in terms of its graphic reproduction, the elevation (see the engraving, Fig. 281) correctly reflects the state of the façade around 1620 (see cat. ill. 60). The draughtsman obviously compiled information from various planning documents he was able to locate in the construction office.

In the drawings of some of the Palazzi Moderni, there are peculiarities resulting from reworking of the source designs by the draughtsman concerned. Most of these interventions were made so as to eliminate site-specific characteristics and standardize the designs, giving them wider interest and allowing them to serve as models. In the case of the two palaces in the immediate vicinity of the Piazza Fossatello, Palazzo Cipriano Pallavicino (XII) and Palazzo Centurione (XIII), the draughtsman deliberately omitted
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reproducing the shops on the ground floor—in one case only in the elevation (compare Fig. 228 with cat. ills. 45 [left] and 46), and in the other case in both the plan (Fig. 230) and the elevation (compare Fig. 234 and cat. ill. 45 [right]). These changes were carried out in order to show the two buildings as prestigious domestic palaces, instead of indicating their dual function, both residential and commercial. The free rendering of some of the irregular façades in the second series was mentioned above. The façades of the Lomellini Patrone (XVIII) and Rovere (XIX) palaces appear on the engravings (Figs. 267 and 272; the drawings have not survived) as straight, regular flat surfaces. In fact, however, their outlines fit the peculiar, obliquely angled shape of the two sites. The plans (Figs. 264 and 269) show the irregular outline of the buildings, and are therefore irreconcilable with the façade elevations—an effect that the draughtsman was apparently prepared to accept in order to produce a prestigious view of the exterior.

In relation to the original function of the collection of drawings forming the Palazzi Antichi, it is important to observe that here, too, one set—that of the Palazzo Rostan Raggio (I)—does not faithfully reflect the building, but has been regularized. The actual arrangement of the palace appears in one sheet with a plan of the piano nobile that was submitted to the Padri del Comune in connection with a disagreement over the question of the property’s boundaries. The Genoese sheet (cat. ill. 21) and the corresponding London plan (Fig. 121) undoubtedly both refer to the same building. The building is depicted on exactly the same scale in both of them. The two drawings even have the same pasted-on flap, recording the plan of the servants’ quarters above (cat. ill. 22 and Fig. 122). The measurements on the two drawings also correspond, with slight deviations (± 1 palmo). However, the labelling is more detailed in the London drawing. Gauthier’s later architectural record confirms the identification, although he already shows the annexes at the rear of the palace (cat. ill. 20). The original Genoese drawing and Gauthier’s documents indicate that the palace had an asymmetrical ground plan, which was redrawn in the London sheets to create a regular oblong. The copyist thus altered the plans to allow them to serve as models, in which the qualities of the ground plan arrangement that were capable of imitation were of more interest than the actual building itself. Comparable alterations are not seen in any of the other sets of drawings in the first series, which are regularly structured buildings on oblong sites.

Few of the plans can be classified as record drawings (or measured draw-

5. See Chapter I, pp. 48f.
6. Ennio Poleggi, who published the Genoese drawing, cautiously ascribed responsibility for the discrepancies between the building and the engravings to Rubens as the editor, as he was not aware of the existence of the London drawings (Poleggi, Palazzo I, 1967, p. 21, n. 9). These discrepancies are not noted in Cat. RIBA, 1976, pp. 161f.
ings), and the term can basically only be applied to the depictions of the two final buildings in the first series, the Palazzo Doria Tursi (Nos. 67, 69) and Palazzo Cambiaso (Nos. 68, 69). The presentation of these two palaces alone—showing an elevation of half of the façade and the plan of the vestibule—differs from the others substantially, and in addition the plates bear the names of the original patron or current owner, relieving them of the anonymity in which the others are left (Figs. 147, 148, 149). The drawings for the three plates have not survived. The reproduction is based on a scale of 1:88, while the scale in the other sets ranges between 1:112 and 1:130. The two façades of the palaces looking onto the Strada Nuova have been preserved without any loss of their original substance, and correspond to the elevations in the *Palazzi di Genova* down to the details of the way in which the masonry joins are formed. Evidence for the dating of the lost drawings is provided by the elevation of the Palazzo Doria Tursi, showing the loggias at the sides (Fig. 147 and cat. ill. 27). The loggias were only added in 1596, some two decades after the palace was completed. This suggests that the sources of the engravings were record drawings specifically produced for the purpose. What is certain, however, is that the original material for these two palaces was quite different in character from the material on which the other ten sets of drawings were based.

A vital element of Genoese architecture in the decades around 1600 is the close relationship between architecture and painted decoration. In this context it is remarkable that the London drawings—and therefore also the engravings in Rubens’s book—depict the buildings in a manner that is strictly limited to purely architectural forms. Figurative decorations are not shown. This applies to both the earlier and the later series of drawings. This restriction is particularly noticeable in the first series, which otherwise conveys a comprehensive impression of the buildings. The sections here offer numerous insights into the interiors of the palaces, the walls and ceilings of which, at least in the principal rooms—the vestibule, loggia and sala—were usually furnished with stucco and fresco decorations. In some cases, such as that of the Villa Tobia Pallavicino (E), the architecture is merely the backdrop for an unfolding display of this type of decoration, which courses in varying degrees through all the rooms on the main floor and most of those on the ground floor. The sectional illustrations show nothing of this, although the building and its decoration were planned and executed as a unit. However, the window and portico frames, which were also painted in fresco, and the entire architectural structure of the walls, are included in the drawings (Figs. 69, 71).

A glance at the façade decorations yields comparable results. None of the total 31 façades in the *Palazzi di Genova* shows a single figurative decoration,
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with the exception of the stucco decoration on the Palazzo Podestà (IX) with its herms and trophies (Fig. 207). In Genoa, figurative façade frescos had enjoyed tremendous renown ever since Perino’s paintings at Andrea Doria’s residence, and were consequently in widespread use. Several of the buildings among the Palazzi di Genova also had façade frescos, remnants of which survive. However, these do not appear in the corresponding elevations. This applies particularly to the façades of the Palazzo della Meridiana (VIII) and the Palazzo Doria Spinola (XIV; see cat. ill. 50), where the painted decorations with historical subjects were added immediately after the buildings were completed, around 1540. The drawings and the engravings here give only the framing structure and the architectural elements of the painted decoration, suppressing all figurative and scenic elements (Figs. 197, 240, 241). The draughtsmen were apparently using planning materials that only contained the architectural parts of the façade decoration.

Of the thirteen façade elevations among the Palazzi Antichi, eight display an architectural articulation made of hewn stone, mortar or stucco, which was then also executed in this or a similar form on the buildings themselves (A, B, E, H [2], K, Doria Tursi and Cambiaso; Figs. 11, 21, 67, 113, 115, 142, 147 and 148; and compare cat. ills. 2, 5, 10, 19, 24, 27 and 29 [right]). Two elevations have painted architectural structures. No traces remain of these on the buildings today, although they must have existed in that form (C and D; Figs. 31 and 51). Two other elevations show evidence of planned architectural decoration that was not actually carried out (F and G; Figs. 87 and 103, and compare with cat. ills. 12 and 15 [left]). In one case, no reliable conclusions regarding the decoration can be drawn (I; Fig. 126). The drawings themselves do not reveal whether the decorations shown were intended to be executed in relief or fresco. The only exception to this is seen in the drawings for B, where the relief decoration on the façade (Fig. 21, and see cat. ill. 5) is also included in the plans (Figs. 17, 19). However, inscriptions provide information on the material and colouring of the decorations in six of the façade elevations, which Rubens did not include in the engravings.

Of the nineteen palace façades in the second series (the Palazzi Moderni), seven are almost completely lacking in decoration (I–VII), and are given a remarkably bare, plain appearance (Figs. 161, 166, 173, 178, 185, 191, 196). Only a few relief elements, such as cornices, balconies and door frames are included. Although the walls give the impression that they would be ideal for painted decoration, not one of these seven palaces gives any hint that such

8. See Chapter I, p. 41.
painting ever existed, or was even planned. The elevations therefore proba-
bly provide an authentic image of the original appearance of these palaces,
and are not copies of designs that have been stripped down to purely archi-
tectural forms. Three other façades in the second series have relief decoration
that still survives on the buildings, and which largely corresponds to the
reproduction in the plans (IX, XII and XIII; Figs. 207, 228, 234; and compare
cat. ills. 43, 45 [right] and 46). Four façades (VIII; X: cat. ill. 44; XIV: cat. ills.
48 and 50; and XVII: cat. ill. 53) have architectural decoration executed mostly
in fresco, remnants of which survive, and at least some of which appears
in the drawings (Figs. 197 [engraving, drawing lost], 213, 240 and 262). The
five other palaces probably also had painted decoration in the form shown in
each of the elevations (XI, XV, XVI, XVIII and XIX; Figs. 219, 248, 256, 267,
272). However, this can no longer be confirmed using evidence from the
buildings themselves.

*Palazzi Antichi: A Collection of Models*

Of the two collections of plans that Rubens used for the *Palazzi di Genova*, the
older one, the *Palazzi Antichi*, is by far the more original and interesting. The
drawings are characterized by their strict design and complex representa-
tional technique. Although the plans give a unified impression, they were
prepared by various draughtsmen. The care with which they were made, and
the handwriting in the inscriptions, consequently vary. The most subtly
drawn are sets B and H, and it seems possible that these two sets may have
been the models which the others were designed to follow. It is probably no
accident that these are the two Alessi villas, which have formal qualities that
make them the focus of the collection. The extent to which they differ from
the other drawings is minor, however, and only sets F and I seem to be slight-
ly less carefully drawn and labelled. Nevertheless, all the sets share the same
precise, dry and impersonal drawing style.9

The technical execution is the same in all of the drawings. Each draughts-
man first measured the large-scale relationships and the position of the main
axes using a set of compasses. The points pricked through by the compass
provide the intersections and corner points for a framework of incisions set-
ting the vertical and horizontal axes of the depiction. In some of the draw-
ings, this network of guidelines is quite dense. The draughtsman then
entered the actual image within this co-ordinate system, using pen and ink.

9. Mario Labò, who was the first to examine the London drawings, had already concluded that the sheets
provide no evidence that would allow significant distinctions to be made between different hands
(*Labò, Palazzi di Genova, 1970, pp. 18–20*).
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The drawings demonstrate none of the characteristics of casual sketches; rather, they are designed and executed in a deliberate fashion down to the smallest detail. They are also extremely economical in conception. Since all the depictions in each set of drawings are based on the same scale, the plans and each of the various longitudinal and transverse sections are geometrically congruent with regard to the outlines, the course of separating walls and the position of window openings. The draughtsman took advantage of this by tracing the principal measurements made on the first sheet through to the sheets underneath.

Another characteristic of the economical way in which the drawings were designed is the method used to combine two geometrically congruent images on the recto and verso of the same sheet. These double-sided sheets occur in all of the sets apart from A and H. The following sheets bear illustrations on both sides (in each case the catalogue number recto/verso is given):

- No. 12a / No. 13a (B, longitudinal sections).
- No. 19a / No. 17a (C, transverse sections).
- No. 24a / No. 25a (D, transverse sections).
- No. 26a / No. 27a (D, longitudinal sections).
- No. 31a / No. 32a (E, façade/transverse section).
- No. 33a / No. 34a (E, longitudinal sections).
- No. 38a / No. 39a (F, façade/transverse section).
- No. 41a / No. 42a (F, longitudinal sections).
- No. 46a / No. 47a (G, façade/transverse section).
- No. 57a / No. 56a (I, façade/transverse section).
- No. 58a / No. 59a (I, longitudinal sections).
- No. 65a / No. 66a (K, longitudinal sections).

The pairs of drawings that appear on both sides of a sheet are related in content—the transverse or longitudinal sections on each side show different sides of the same wall. In the case of the two longitudinal sections of the Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B), the wall is the one separating the central part of the building from the left (more westerly) lateral part. In section No. 12a (Fig. 23), the elevation of this wall is seen from the central section of the building, with the loggia, vestibule, and sala. In section No. 13a (Fig. 25), by contrast, the elevation of the wall is seen from the rooms along the side. The procedure is easier to understand in the cases where the elevation of the façade is combined with a transverse section. The third sheet of the Villa Pallavicino (E), for

10. Drawing nos. 11a and 70a (B, façade elevation and details of the staircase) were only mounted together later.
example, shows an elevation of the façade on the *recto* (No. 31a), while on the *verso* (No. 32a) there is an elevation of the façade seen from the interior (Figs. 67 and 69). In all of these cases, the paper—as the medium on which the drawing is recorded—is treated as if it represented a wall, the elevation of which is displayed on each side of the page. The plans are thus given a spatial quality that is otherwise only found in three-dimensional building models. However, in the published version Rubens had each of the depictions printed on a separate page (Figs. 66 and 68), so that this physical relationship between the individual pairs of drawings was lost.

The technical method used to present the complexity of the palace interiors was the orthogonal projection, depicting the architecture without foreshortening. This method makes it possible to produce illustrations that are true to scale and complete, although it does involve a high degree of abstraction. The orthogonal projection, combined with the idea of showing transverse and longitudinal sections of the buildings, forms the conceptual basis of the *Palazzi* drawings. Each building is conceived as a body, the internal arrangement of which can be displayed at various levels, with the ground plans on the horizontal plane and the transverse and longitudinal sections on the vertical plane. The individual illustrations surpass the illustrative capabilities of ordinary architectural plans, since the sections in particular are conceived as diagrams with their own pictorial value. An important element in this is that the sections are not cut along a single plane, but rather occasionally include discontinuous jumps from one plane to another. This procedure makes it possible to show a synopsis of the vertical structure of the rooms in different parts of the building, which would not be possible using a geometrically exact section.

The way in which this type of sectional image works can be seen from the example of two transverse sections in the Villa Spinola (C). The two drawings Nos. 17a (Fig. 33) and 19a (Fig. 40), which Rubens reproduced as *Figura 17* and *Figura 19*, are (respectively) on the *verso* and *recto* of the same sheet. They show the same wall in the rear part of the building, in which the staircase and—on the main floor—the loggia are located. On the ground floor, the plane of the transverse section of No. 17 runs parallel to the rear façade at the level of the first window bay, looking towards the interior of the building. The two side rooms in the lateral parts, the *androne*, and above all the bathrooms beneath the main staircase, are thus included. The axis of the section does not run in a straight line, but incorporates an interruption that allows the spiral staircase to be included in the elevation as well. The transverse section in No. 19 shows the same wall from the opposite direction, looking from interior to exterior. The course of the section here jumps between the second window bay on the side of the building and the level of the main staircase and spiral
staircase in the centre. The same procedure is followed in the upper storey. It is also remarkable that the courses of the same transverse section differ on the two floors. Although the drawings provide elevations that are true to scale, therefore, the sections are not geometrically consistent. Instead, they are organized in an markedly diagrammatic way, allowing a synoptic view of various spatial levels with the important architectural elements of each. The procedure recalls the combination of various types of depiction that Palladio, for example, used in the woodcuts in his *Quattro Libri*. Obviously, this type of depiction was not intended for the practical architect, or for the craftsmen carrying out the work. It was aimed at connoisseurs who wanted to learn more about the internal structure of the buildings, and who were capable of appreciating the technical perfection and sophisticated illustrative effect of this type of illustration.

With their technical characteristics, such as the careful composition using compass and straight-edge, and the detailed measurements, the drawings show typical features of clean copies made of designs and intended to serve as presentation sheets. The composition of the individual sets of drawings would fit in well with such a classification. For example, Giacinto Vignola sent a similarly composed bundle of plans to the patron, Duchess Margaret of Parma, for the Palazzo Farnese in Piacenza in 1561. The drawings included three plans, two elevations, one section and two sheets with details of the architectural orders employed. In the accompanying letter, Vignola expressed a hope that the drawings would allow his project to be visualized as easily as with a model. When the individual *Palazzi* sets of drawings are looked at in isolation, and their possible role in the history of the planning


12. In the catalogue of the RIBA Drawings Collection the drawings are qualified as the original presentation sheets for ten of the villas and palaces (Cat. RIBA. 1976, p. 172). In addition to the technical execution, and the fact that some drawings show preliminary designs, the author further argues that corrections were made on some drawings by means of pasted-on paper strips. The corrections are only found on a few of the sheets, with alterations pasted down on a few, usually small, areas of the drawings: No. 9a (B), No. 16a (C), No. 26a and No. 27a (D). In the ground plan drawing of the Villa Giustiniani Cambiasso (No. 9a), the whole upper third of the drawing was pasted over. The new version leaves the arrangement of rooms as it was, however, and only the exterior wall at the rear is moved upwards by precisely the thickness of one wall (10 mm.), so that it corresponds to the size of the second plan. The most serious correction was carried out on the façade elevation of the Villa Spinola (No. 16a), where the rusticated arcade on the entrance loggia is raised. The height of the impost of the three arches on the arcade was originally at the same level as the window pediments. However, these and other corrections can hardly be regarded as resulting from alterations in the planning concept. The changes are too slight, affecting only secondary elements, and seem rather to be corrections of mistakes made by the draughtsman.

and building of the palace concerned is examined, a classification other than that of presentation drawing is difficult to conceive. However, when the ten sets (A to K; setting aside the drawings of the Palazzi Doria Tursi and Cambiaso, Nos. 67, 68)\textsuperscript{14} are viewed as a coherent sequence, the situation is more complex. In terms of content and formal criteria, the collection is extremely cohesive as a group—a characteristic that can only be explained as the result of intentional editorial work. This needs more detailed analysis.

To begin with, the drawings have a smaller format than would be normal for design or presentation drawings. The absolute sizes of the individual depictions (as different from the size of the sheets) vary between 200 mm. and 300 mm. along the edges. All of the drawings in each set are based on the same scale, which is recorded on one drawing per set in the form of a scale bar.\textsuperscript{15} The scale only varies within narrow limits—between 1:130 and 1:112 (10 \textit{palmi} = 19–22 mm.; 1 Genoese \textit{palmo} = 247 mm.). The drawings can be classed into four groups according to the scales used: 1:112 (C, D); 1:118 (A, B, G, H); 1:124 (E, F, K); and 1:130 (I). Sets C and D are on the same type of paper, and the handwriting is also similar, so that both probably derive from the same draughtsman. The scale of set I is obviously derived from the sources, which the draughtsman copied true to scale as far as possible, although he retouched them in the way described above.\textsuperscript{16} The remaining seven sets are almost identical in scale. From the modern point of view, this may not seem unusual. However, a sixteenth-century observer would surely have perceived this type of standardization in architectural depiction as an innovation, particularly since the use of a standard scale was exceptional, even in drawings referring to the same project.\textsuperscript{17}

Further evidence for a coherent making of the plans is provided by watermarks, which show that the same sorts of paper are used for drawings of different buildings.\textsuperscript{18}

It is also remarkable that the collection has such a markedly didactic impulse. This characteristic is seen in the procedures mentioned above that

\begin{itemize}
\item For drawings with scale bars, see Figs. 3 (No. 2a), 17 (No. 9a), 27 (No. 14a), 44–45 (No. 21a), 63 (no. 29a), 77–78 (No. 36a), 97 (No. 43a), 115 (No. 52a), 119 (No. 54a) and 136 (No. 61a).
\item See above, p. 60.
\item Twelve of the 53 sheets have watermarks, which fall into four groups (references are to Briquet, Filigranes, 1923): Type 1 (Briquet no. 6092) appears on two sheets in sets A (No. 4a) and E (Nos. 33a–34a); Type 2 (similar to Briquet nos. 5254 and 5265) appears on four sheets in sets A (No. 8a), G (Nos. 44a and 48a) and K (No. 61a); Type 3 appears on five sheets in sets C (Nos. 14a and 18a) and D (Nos. 23a, 24a–25a and 28a); Type 4 (similar to Type 3) appears on one sheet in set H (No. 51a). The dates given by Briquet for similar types vary, of course, spreading over the whole of the second half of the 16th century. The exception to this is Type 1, which corresponds precisely to Briquet's example dated '1562/67'. See also Cat. RIBA, 1976, p. 172.
\end{itemize}
are used to make the section illustrations as informative as possible. The numerous flaps that are mounted on the drawings, which Rubens placed together in two separate plates at the end of the series (Nos. 71–72; Figs. 152, 153), complete the vertical representation of the buildings and show the effort that has been made to provide the observer with a concept of the palace as a spatial organism. The inscriptions, most of which derive from the draughtsman, with supplementary information only rarely being added later on, are so complete and detailed that they give the drawings a documentary quality. Ennio Poleggi calculated that some fifty different terms are used to label the parts of the buildings and the functions of the rooms. This information allows an almost complete reconstruction of the sequence of functions which take place behind the façade of a palace. Individual peculiarities of the inscriptions, such as rare terms or abbreviations, are found in drawings throughout the different sets. Another aspect common to all the drawings is the use of lettering for a reference system relating the individual parts of each set to one another. For example, the letters on the plan show the positions of the individual sections, and the sections in turn also have corresponding markings. This procedure gives a highly didactic impression, recalling, for example, the inscriptions on the plates in Sebastiano Serlio’s manuscript on domestic architecture, the unpublished sixth book of his treatise.

In addition to these more technical qualities, the formal characteristics of the plans also reveal an approach to architecture that has been filtered by specific interests. The relationship between the interior layout and exterior decoration of the buildings and their treatment in the drawings is indicative of this. The twelve buildings in the first series, as was emphasized above, are mostly in the tradition of Alessi’s Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B). This applies to the interior layout, with the division into three sections of rooms, as well as to the elevations. With regard to the façade decoration, however, the buildings are more varied than their homologous architectural structure might lead one to expect. Of the four villas of the Cambiaso type, only one, the Villa Grimaldi (D), bears an accurate—although painted—imitation of the Cambiaso façade decoration. The elevations of the other villas, the Villa Spinola (C) and Villa Pallavicino (E), included traditional elements of Genoese villa architecture in the form of the loggias at the sides. The urban palace façades are also articulated with architectural elements. A further decorative element used here is rustication. Among the Palazzi Antichi, rusticated façades or façade sections are found in the Cambiaso (cf. No. 68) and Carrega Cataldi (A) palaces on the Strada Nuova, which were the models for the façade projects of the Spinola (F), Interiano Pallavicini (G) and Rostan Raggio (I) palaces.

20. See below, p. 84 n. 64.
It is remarkable that the choice of decorative scheme by no means determined the technique in which it was executed. The articulation on the Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso façade consists of mortar and plaster. The inscription accompanying the drawing (No. 11a; Fig. 21) reads: ‘tutto l’ornamento di questa facciata è di calzina’. The same applies to the Villa Pallavicino (E), the architectural decoration of which was given the colouring of natural stone: ‘La facciata di rilievo de calzina tinta di color de pietra di finale’ (No. 31a; Fig. 67). The façades of the Villa Spinola (C) and Villa Grimaldi ‘Fortezza’ (D) were painted. By contrast, the façade of the Palazzo Carrega Cataldi (A), like those of the Palazzo Cambiaso (cf. No. 68) and Palazzo Doria Tursi (cf. No. 67), basically consists of hewn stone. The façades of the Palazzo Spinola (F) and Palazzo Interiano Pallavicini (G), which deviate from the original designs, ultimately used figurative painting. Variable, but compatible, decorative schemes were produced for the interior layout and for the exterior decoration, offering a variety of potential combinations. The variations in the plans are evidence of an effort to explore fresh solutions. An impressive example of this is the development of the inner courtyards and staircases which reached a climax in the Palazzo Doria Tursi and the seicento palaces on the Via Balbi. Characteristically, however, the elevation system used in the courtyards did not noticeably develop any further for decades. Interest focused on the arrangement of the rooms, and it was here that innovative solutions were developed. The design of the elevations—both the façades and the inner courtyards—was not subject to any pressure for change.

The façade decorations show more of a tendency towards simplified repetition of earlier models. Symptomatic of this is the reception of the Cambiaso façade reflected in some of the later villas. The distinguishing characteristic of Alessi’s façade is its complex relationship with the body of the building. Interior and exterior correspond in such a way that the form of the ground plan is visible in the façade. Structurally, however, the façade is placed as a decorative screen in front of the actual body of the building. While the south façade is fully articulated, the remaining exterior walls have only reduced articulations. Window aedicules are present, but the other architectural elements are abstracted into simple recesses (cat. ill. 6). Only the bulging socle runs all the way round. Also characteristic is the combination of the Tuscan order on the ground floor and Composite order on the upper floor, with the omission of the intermediate order, the Ionic. The Ionic order seems to have been transferred from the façade to the rear of the building, however, where it is found in the articulation of the loggia on ascending to the main floor.21

One of the two longitudinal sections shows this distribution of the orders on

21. This was noted by Zeitler, Alessis Villen, 1993, pp. 187–190.
the façade and the loggia (Fig. 23). The exterior decoration of the Villa Imperiale Scassi in Sampierdarena (text ill. 11) is directly derived from Alessi's façade. Due to the resemblance, the building was traditionally ascribed to Alessi himself. The concept of providing the façade wall with its own autonomous structure is here apparently given even greater emphasis by the way in which the base is rusticated only on the front of the building (text ill. 12). The other exterior walls, however, are also decorated with an architectural articulation, corresponding precisely to that of the main façade, with slightly less decoration. The presence of decoration on all sides is explained by the building's spatial environment. Originally, the villa stood in the centre of its gardens, and was visible from all sides. In the case of the Villa Gius­

...
and two others probably do. In only one case, however, is this decoration also included in the plans: those for the Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B). However, only the exterior articulation of the south façade is shown in simplified form in the plans (Figs. 17 and 19). This is indeed the only side of the building decorated with a complete architectural articulation. The other exteriors are articulated, as mentioned above, with a system of pilaster strips, niches and blind windows. This abstract method of articulating the wall ought to be evident from the plan as well. For an appreciation of the building's exterior, with its contrast between main and subsidiary façades, it is certainly an essential element. However, the plans show only smooth, straight walls.

This generally negligent treatment of the exterior architecture in the drawings reflects the special interests of the buildings' patrons. They were primarily interested in an economical, comfortable and impressive interior layout, while the exterior of the building was regarded as a set of surfaces that could be decorated at will.

The theoretical basis for the method of illustration with orthogonal projection, used with rare consistency in the Palazzi Antichi drawings, was provided by Alberti, and in more detail by Raphael. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, theoretical considerations grew out of efforts to survey and illustrate the remnants of ancient architecture in a form that would meet historical and critical requirements, with the results being made available in a practical form. Changes in the building industry encouraged such developments, since drawings were becoming more important on the building sites as a medium for information during the planning and construction processes. The development of rationalized systems of illustration reflects a rationalization of the processes of planning and construction, which in Rome was above all pioneered by Antonio da Sangallo the Younger. Galeazzo Alessi was of crucial importance for the transmission of modern planning methods from Rome to Genoa. Little is known about Alessi's years in Rome, but there is no doubt that he must have had close relations with the Sangallo circle in particular. He regarded the profession of the architect as being a form of planning activity based on scientific principles, which was to be distinguished from the purely construction aspect of building. In the correspondence with

24. See drawing nos. 6a (Fig. 11), 11a (Fig. 21), 31a (Fig. 67), 38a(?) (Fig. 87), 46a(?) (Fig. 103), 51a (Fig. 113), 56a (Fig. 126) and 64a (Fig. 142).

25. This was already noted by Tail, Introduction, 1968, p. 21, n. 24. The reproduction of the exterior decoration in the drawings for the Palazzo Spinola (F) is contradictory. The sections indicate relief decoration on the principal façade and both side façades. In the plans, however, this architectural articulation is not shown.

the craftsmen in the *cantiere* of *S. Maria Assunta di Carignano (XXII)*, Alessi gives the basic information about the planning required, but tries to delegate the construction tasks as much as possible.\(^{27}\) The correspondence repeatedly mentions various *modelli*, but none of these has survived, and one can only speculate as to what they were. Most likely, however, a large three-dimensional model would have provided the basis for construction work, with information on the requirements for the individual construction phases being supplemented by working drawings and verbal explanations, both on the site and in letters. After his departure for Milan, Alessi was only present on the building site personally for brief periods, which led to repeated disputes with the patrons.

In the case of *S. Maria Assunta di Carignano*, little of the planning material can be reconstructed, but parts of it survive for one of Alessi’s Milan commissions: the design for the façade and parts of the interior of *S. Maria presso S. Celso*. This material can be supplemented from written sources.\(^{28}\) The existence of wooden models is documented here, and there were also drawn *modelli*, as well as a large number of detailed drawings. Some of these planning documents are preserved in a group of drawings in the Ferrari Collection in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana. Aside from the question of whether these drawings are in Alessi’s own hand, it is probable that they were among the designs for which Alessi received large payments. The sequence of 112 sheets chiefly consists of design details, most of them including figurative elements, and are supplemented by several elevations, including the entire façade and the interior façade wall.\(^{29}\) The planning documents for Alessi’s Genoese buildings, which have not survived, are likely to have resembled this material.

Alessi was undoubtedly the originator of two of the buildings among the *Palazzi Antichi*: the Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B) and the Villa Grimaldi Sauli (H). The corresponding sets of drawings are likely to have formed the core of the London collection. However, Alessi would not have produced the drawings in his own hand, and the conceptual contents are also clearly very

---

Text. ill. 5. *Elevation of the Façade of a Palace* ('facciata del palazzo del Sig. Astolfo Rodi in Genova'), drawing. Florence, Uffizi, Gabinetto dei Disegni, 2174A.


Text. ill. 7. Sebastiano Serlio, *Project for a Villa*, drawing, fol. 9r of his MS *Delle habitationi di tutti li gradi degli homini fuori delle città*. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek.

Text. ill. 10. Palazzo Doria Spinola (XIV), elevation of one half of the façade, engraving after Figura 42 of Palazzi di Genova (2nd series), in Regola de cinque ordini d'architettura, di M. Giacomo Barozzo da Vignola etc., Amsterdam, 1642
Text. ill. 11. Villa Imperiale Scassi
'Bellezza', view from the south-east

Text. ill. 12. Villa Imperiale Scassi
'Bellezza', socle at the south-eastern corner of the façade
different from the planning materials of Alessi’s Milan workshop discussed above. The London plans (Nos. 9a, 10a, 11a, 12a, 13a; Nos. 49a, 50a, 51a, 52a) omit drawings of details, show no interest in figurative decoration and are conceived in such a way as to make a three-dimensional model seem superfluous. The collection focuses on Alessi, as indicated by the close relationship between all the other buildings and Alessi’s prototypes, as well as by the rationalized form of the architectural depiction. However, it is also unmistakable that the design of the collection articulates different interests—interests that had a visible influence on the history of Genoese architecture after the mid sixteenth century.

The often homologous formal structures and the apparent affinities between Alessi’s villas and numerous other villas and palaces of the third quarter of the sixteenth century led to problems of attribution for art historians. A group of buildings and decorative projects that set pioneering standards was constructed during the second quarter of the century. This group includes the Villa Andrea Doria in Fassolo (begun c. 1529), the Doria Spinola (XIV) and Meridiana (VIII) palaces (both dating from c. 1540) and the Alessi projects around 1550. Later developments are marked by a conservative approach on the part of the patrons, based on established, tried-and-tested models. The numerous repetitions and variations on the Cambiaso scheme are the most obvious example of this. The guidebooks and older historical literature looked for the simplest explanation of this phenomenon, and attributed all the buildings to Alessi. These sweeping attributions, however, did not stand up to more sophisticated stylistic criticism and increasing knowledge of the archival sources. Intensive documentary research, begun by Federigo Alizeri and continued by Mario Labò for a number of villas and palaces, along with Ennio Poleggi’s fundamental work on the architecture of the Strada Nuova period, showed that Alessi had nothing to do with any of the villas or palaces directly, with the exception of the Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B). With regard to the Strada Nuova, the whole of which Vasari attributes to Alessi, there is no evidence of his involvement in the planning either of the street or of any of the individual palaces. Instead, the documentary evidence names local architects and craftsmen who were responsible for the construction work.

Responsibility for the typological homogeneity of this group of buildings and their decoration was apparently due less to the people who carried out the work, than to the patrons—although the role they played is difficult to assess in most cases. It must be presumed that they had a decisive influence on the planning. This is evident above all in the otherwise barely explicable formal relationship between buildings that were constructed by different

groups of artists and craftsmen. In the London collection of drawings, the interests of the patrons are clearly evident. Alessi's designs are made to serve as models fully meeting the expectations of Genoese patrons for comfortable and prestigious residential palaces with a rationalized arrangement of rooms and a richly orchestrated exterior design. On this basis, the interior layout and façade decoration were developed into varying but mutually compatible schemes, allowing rationalized planning and construction by local labour. The demand for prestigious villas and palaces increased during the third quarter of the sixteenth century in proportion to the ever greater profits flowing into the city from its lucrative financial business with Spain. The patrons who commissioned the buildings played a decisive part in establishing formal standards, and it also appears that they determined the formal programmes, in addition to selecting the artists.

Patrons as Planners and Collectors

In the documents about individual buildings, it is not difficult to find indications to show that the patrons had a say in the planning. Imitations of specific models were not due to independent decisions on the part of the artists executing projects, but were requested by patrons. Several contracts between patrons and artists explicitly refer to prototypes on which the fittings and decorations being ordered should be based. In a contract of August 1552, Giangiacomo della Porta agreed to produce a portico for the villa of Domenico Centurione in Bisagno, which was to correspond precisely to another that had been earlier supplied to Leonardo Cibo. Another revealing example is the contract agreed between Agostino de Franchi and Bernardo Cantone in December 1565 concerning the interior decoration of his family palace on the Piazza della Posta Vecchia. The items agreed on concerned the stucco and marble work for the ceilings and floors, the decoration of the staircases and also the provision of individual fittings such as portals and mantelpieces. In the contract, all of these items are listed separately, and almost every single detail refers to corresponding models in the palaces of Geronimo de Franchi, Nicolò de Marini and above all Nicolosio Lomellino on the Strada Nuova (IX).

References to other Strada Nuova palaces, particularly those of the Pallavicino brothers, appear frequently in these contracts. When Vincenzo Imperiale ordered three marble pilasters from the sculptors Pompeo Bianchi and Antonio

31. The text of the document is given in Alizeri, Notizie, 1870-80, V, 1877, pp. 242f., n. 1.
da San Fedele in August 1560, he mentioned corresponding parts of the
castle (Cambiaso, cf. No. 68) of Agostino Pallavicino as models.33 Again,
when Vincenzo Imperiale commissioned marble work from the sculptor Gia­
como Giudetti in December 1563 for the sala of his villa in Sampierdarena, he
referred to prototypes in Tobia Pallavicino’s palace (A).34 Tobia Pallavicino’s
buildings in particular seem to have been considered exemplary and worthy
of imitation in their architecture and decoration. As early as March 1560, Vincen­
zo Imperiale ordered materials from Giacomo Giudetti for several
unspecified decorative items in his palace on the Piazza Campetto. These
were to correspond to items in the loggia of Tobia Pallavicino’s villa (E),
which had just been finished.35 Again, Tobia’s urban palace (A) provided the
model for the grotesque decoration that Paolo Spinola ordered in October
1563 from Alessandro de Brignoli for his villa in Cornigliano.36 It was even
explicitly requested that these paintings should be finer than the models in
Pallavicino’s Strada Nuova palace on which they were based.

In March 1563, Paolo Spinola commissioned the fresco painter Ottavio
Semino to carry out the exterior decoration of his villa, stipulating that he
should use another specific model. The chiaroscuro decoration, for which the
construction supervisor Giovanni Ponzello had produced a design, was to
correspond to that in Giovanni Battista Lercari’s villa in Sampierdarena.37
The Villa Lercari (Sauli ‘Semplicità’), in turn, was one of the buildings that had
been constructed in particularly close imitation of the Villa Giustiniani Cam­
biaso (B).38 As in other villas in Sampierdarena, the façade decoration was a
free adaptation of the architectural articulation of its model.39 Paolo Spinola
was therefore ordering for his villa, the appearance of which is otherwise
unknown, a façade decoration in the style of the Villa Giustiniani Cambia­
sio—although in a painted version, the model for which at this period might
have been the façade decoration of Giovanni Battista Lercari’s villa.40

34. Cited in Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, p. 144, n. 13, and in the selected documents on Giovanni Ponzel­
lo, ibid., p. 508.
35. Mentioned in Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, p. 140, and cited in the selected documents on Bernardo Can­
tone, ibid., p. 494.
36. Cited in Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, p. 144, n. 13. The Villa (Villa Muratori; Via Rizzolio 27) was built
beginning in 1559 under the direction of Giovanni Ponzello; Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, p. 227. On the
villa, see also Ville genovesi, 1967, pp. 217f. (L. Grossi Bianchi); Ville del Genovesato, 1984–87, III, 1986,
pp. 156f. (P. Falzone).
38. The villa, commissioned by the Doge Giovanni Battista Lercari, was built beginning in 1558 under the
direction of Bernardo Cantone and with the participation of Bernardo Spazio; Poleggi, Strada Nuova,
1972, p. 358, n. 16.
39. An elevation is given in Gauthier, Édifices, 1818–32, II, 1832, pl. 15. Margarethe Kühn was still able to
identify on the building remaining fragments of the decoration documented by Gauthier (Kühn, Alessi,
1929, p. 166).
40. The façade painting of the Villa Grimaldi ‘Fortezza’ (D), almost identical to its model in the Alessi
façade, was only carried out several years later.
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Not only do the same names from the city’s patrician circles recur again and again in these documents, but also names from the group of craftsmen and artists supervising the work. Bernardo Cantone, who was given charge of the extension work on the de Franchi palace, and served as an appraiser in the case of the materials delivered for Vincenzo Imperiale’s palace in March 1560, was one of the most sought-after local architects of the period. The same is true of Giovanni Ponzello, who in two of the documents referred to above is mentioned as carrying out appraisals for Vincenzo Imperiale between August 1560 and December 1563, and was employed as construction supervisor for Paolo Spinola’s villa. The same two architects were also apparently responsible for the construction of most of the palaces on the Strada Nuova. Although documentation concerning the leading figures involved is only available for six of the ten palaces, Bernardo Cantone is mentioned in as many as three cases: the palaces of Agostino Pallavicino (Cambiaso) (see No. 68), Giambattista Spinola (I)—in these two he is explicitly identified as capo d’opera—and Angelo Giovanni Spinola (F). Giovanni Ponzello was responsible for at least two further palaces. Together with his brother Domenico, he is mentioned as magister or architectus in the building of the Palazzo Doria Tursi (see No. 67), and there is evidence of his work as an appraiser and in preparing some detail drawings for the construction of Baldassare Lomellino’s palace (XI). In addition to the Strada Nuova buildings mentioned, it is also documented that Bernardo Cantone was in a supervisory position in the building of Bartolomeo Lomellino’s palace (I) and, after the death of Bernardo Spazio, in Giovanni Battista Grimaldi’s villa (D). All of these buildings are included in the Palazzi di Genova, mostly in the first series (Palazzi Antichi). Apart from the cases mentioned above, Cantone’s name also occurs beyond the sphere of the Palazzi buildings in the documents concerning the villas of Giovanni Battista Lercari (Sauli ‘Semplicità’), as capo della fabbrica, and Vincenzo Imperiale (Imperiale Scassi) as appraiser. All of these buildings were constructed around 1560.

Examination of this evidence reveals a network of connections and dependencies between artists and craftsmen on the one side, and patrons on the other, which links the leading figures on each side and consequently most of the outstanding buildings of the 1560s. And this network can be seen drawing together more closely in a number of contracts in which individual patrons served as appraisers for works of art by their own protégés which were

42. This is only a small selection from a much larger number of projects on which Cantone—sometimes in his capacity as architetto camerale—was consulted. See the selected documents on Bernardo Cantone in Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, pp. 492–498. For an attempt to reconstruct the oeuvre of an architect on the basis of this information, see ibid., pp. 108–111.
produced for their friends or relations—a capacity that was usually reserved for members of the professional group concerned. However, laypersons belonging to the class of patrons in Genoa claimed authority in artistic questions to a degree that was unique in comparison with other artistic centres in Italy. The members of the patriciate who acted as appraisers in individual cases almost all had credentials as connoisseurs, because of their own high-quality buildings. They also belonged to the patrician circle that initiated the building of the Strada Nuova.

Tobia Pallavicino, whose villa (E) and urban palace (A) are repeatedly referred to in contracts between third parties as standards and reference points for palace fittings and decorations, served as appraiser for a marble mantelpiece which Vincenzo Imperiale ordered for his urban palace in March 1562. The commission went to Giovanni Battista Castello, whose career, according to Soprani, had already been promoted by Tobia Pallavicino years earlier. Pallavicino paid for the artist’s visit to Rome so that he could familiarize himself with contemporary Roman decorative art, demand for which was rapidly increasing in Genoa. This personal protection apparently extended as far as evaluating pieces that Castello produced for patrons who were among Pallavicino’s friends. Vincenzo Imperiale, for his part, frequently referred to Tobia Pallavicino’s buildings when ordering decorations and fittings. Tobia’s brother, Agostino Pallavicino, commissioning patron of the Palazzo Cambiaso (see No. 68), is named in a contract of September 1564 along with Daniele Spinola as appraiser for a delivery of sixteen Doric columns for the cortile of the palace of his brother-in-law, Giambattista Spinola (I: Doria). Giambattista Spinola (from the Spinola di Luccoli branch of the family) was related to Adamo Centurione, Vincenzo Imperiale and Orazio Di Negro, as well as to the Pallavicino brothers. In addition, he acted as an agent for the Di Negro and Pallavicino families in Antwerp and elsewhere. He called on the services of Bernardo Cantone as capo d’opera for the construction of his palace (I) on the Strada Nuova—the same architect who had been responsible for the building of Agostino Pallavicino’s palace. The designs of the cortile columns, however, were not prepared by Cantone as construction supervisor, but by Giovanni Battista Castello, Tobia’s protégé. The columns were then produced by the stonemasons Giovanni Lurago and

44. Soprani, Vite, 1674, p. 289.
45. Labò, Palazzo D’Oria, 1926, pp. 54f. See Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, p. 254; the text of the document, ibid., pp. 470f., doc. XXII.
46. Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, pp. 249 and 102 respectively.
47. Cantone is mentioned as capo d’opera or architetto in a total of four documents in 1563 and 1565; Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, pp. 255, 259f., n. 15 (documents of 30 August 1563, 26 November 1563 and 14 November 1565).
Pietro Maria de Nove. The same artists had previously executed the hewn stone façade in Agostino Pallavicino’s palace, and were renowned for their earlier work for Alessi.\textsuperscript{48}

In 1565, two years after Giambattista Spinola began his palace, his brother-in-law, Bartolomeo Lomellino, began the construction of his palace west of the Strada Nuova, in Vallechiara (I in \textit{Palazzi Antichi}: Rostan Raggio). When Lomellino commissioned columns for the cortile in May and June 1566, Giambattista Spinola appeared in turn as appraiser. The same two artists who had played leading roles in the building of the Spinola palace (I in \textit{Palazzi Moderni}: Doria), Bernardo Cantone and Giovanni Battista Castello, were present as witnesses at the signing of the contracts.\textsuperscript{49} The columns were commissioned from the sculptors Giacomo Carlone, Giacomo Guidetti and Giovanni Lurago, the latter two also appear several times in the other documents mentioned above. A glance at the ground plans of the two palaces shows that they are also related in their formal arrangement (Figs. 119 and 156). In both cases, the buildings form compact three-winged complexes around a small, off-centre courtyard. Bartolomeo Lomellino apparently appointed Cantone to manage the project with the intention of producing a solution similar to that of the Spinola palace. At the same time, however, the decisive role played by Giambattista Spinola as appraiser is clear from the documents relating to the building history of the Lomellino palace. The formal relationship between the two buildings is obviously not merely the result of the choice of the same artists, but also of consultations between the patrons. Giambattista Spinola is mentioned as appraiser on another occasion, when in December 1566 Giovanni Andrea Doria commissioned a large number of columns for an extension to the Andrea Doria villa in Fassolo (Palazzo Doria Pamphilj). Here again, the stonemasons who were to supply the columns were Giacomo Carlone and Giovanni Lurago.\textsuperscript{50}

Another member of the Lomellino family, Baldassare, appears along with Antonio Spinola in December 1564 as appraiser of two large sarcophagi

\textsuperscript{48} The full text of the contract of February 1559 for the façade of Agostino Pallavicino’s palace is given in \textit{Poleggi, Strada Nuova}, 1972, pp. 464f., doc. XVI. Giovanni Lurago was commissioned, along with Taddeo Orsolino, to carry out stonemasonry work on the Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso; \textit{Labò, Palazzi di Genova}, 1938–39, XVIII, no. 10, p. 32. In a contract of June 1559, Pietro Maria de Nova was commissioned to produce the marble floor for the nave of S. Matteo and other work, for which Galeazzo Alessi was to carry out the final appraisal; \textit{Alizeri, Notizie}, 1870–80, V, 1877, p. 341, n. 1.

\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Poleggi, Palazzo I}, 1967, p. 15. The second document is also cited in the selected documents on Giovanni Battista Castello in \textit{Poleggi, Strada Nuova}, 1972, p. 500, and in \textit{Rossi del Brenna, Castello}, 1976, p. 388. Both contracts have a sketch with the dimensions of the pieces attached to them, although neither includes the name of the designer. The parallels with Giambattista Spinola’s palace, where the sketch of column designs of September 1564 is signed by Castello, and the fact that Castello was present as a witness at the signing of the second contract in June 1566, suggest that these two working drawings are also by him.

\textsuperscript{50} Cited in the selected documents on Giovanni Lurago in \textit{Poleggi, Strada Nuova}, 1972, p. 502.
which Giovanni Orsolino and Giovanni Carlone were to deliver within a period of a year to Don Luis de Requesens in Spain. The design for the sarcophagi was once again based on drawings by Giovanni Battista Castello.\textsuperscript{51} In this case again, the artists who received the commission were linked to Lomellino by employment ties, while he in turn was able to offer them protection through his activities as appraiser. Giovanni Orsolino had carried out all of the stonemasonry work, and Giovanni Battista Castello some of the fresco decoration, for the building of Lomellino's palace (XI) on the Strada Nuova.\textsuperscript{52} Here, Giovanni Ponzello acted as construction supervisor.\textsuperscript{53}

In these contracts, the laymen from the Genoese patriciate took on the task of assessing and appraising individual fittings and decorations when they were completed. It is not possible on the basis of these source materials to determine how much say they had in the planning of the overall design. The sources are notaries' files, exclusively dealing with agreements between the patrons, on the one hand, and the artists and craftsmen who were to carry out the work, on the other. Responsibility for the overall planning—at least in the case of buildings of the Strada Nuova period—seems never to have been a matter of contractual agreement. This type of understanding was apparently arrived at in oral agreements between the patrons and the chosen architect. The patron himself usually co-ordinated the work that was required, allotting tasks to the artists who were to carry them out. It is difficult to assess in each case who was ultimately responsible for the design. However, the documents referred to above reveal a situation in which the participation of the patrons was decisive during the planning stage.

It was in this context that the collection of plans presented in Rubens's \textit{Palazzi di Genova} came about. The period during which the drawings of the first series (\textit{Palazzi Antichi}) were produced can be narrowed down by the dates of the buildings. The latest building in the series is the palace of Franco Lercari (K) on the Strada Nuova. Lercari purchased the site in August 1571, and seems to have begun construction the same year. In March of the following year, work on the lowest zone of the façade to the street is documented.\textsuperscript{54} However, the façade was not ultimately carried out in the form shown in the drawing (Fig. 142; compare cat. ill. 24). The original project, on which the


\textsuperscript{52} The contract on the execution of the stonemasonry work is dated February 1565; Poleggi, \textit{Strada Nuova}, 1972, p. 222. Castello's frescos are mentioned in \textit{Soprani, Vite}, 1674, p. 290.

\textsuperscript{53} Ponzello appears in documents of February 1565 and June 1566 as an appraiser or designer of stonemasonry work; Poleggi, \textit{Strada Nuova}, 1972, p. 222; cited in the selected documents on Giovanni Ponzello, ibid., p. 509.

\textsuperscript{54} The documents are cited in Poleggi, \textit{Strada Nuova}, 1972, p. 357, nn. 9, 10.
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London drawings are based, must therefore have been produced by the summer of 1571, but already by the following year was no longer valid for the actual building work. The Palazzi drawings include façade projects that were not actually carried out in two other cases as well: for the palaces of Angelo Giovanni Spinola and the Interiano brothers. Construction of the Spinola palace (F) had already begun in 1558, and it continued after the original patron’s death in 1560, but was apparently not fully completed. The documents break off in 1564, and further construction and the ultimate completion of the building only follow after 1589. Ultimately, a façade decoration completely different from that of the original project (cf. Fig. 87) was realized (cat. ill. 12). The Interiano palace (G) was under construction in the period between 1565 and 1567, and in this case as well, the façade decoration was only executed two decades later, during the mid 1580s, and with marked differences from the original project (cf. Fig. 103; compare cat. ill. 14). If one assumes that the draughtsmen compiled the plans from the most recent designs in each case, then the most probable terminus ante quern is at the beginning of the 1570s, around the time when building of the Lercari palace started. In the case of the three façades, the draughtsman would hardly have used the project version if the building itself had already existed in a form differing from this. The date at which the earliest sets of drawings in the series were produced cannot be stated with certainty, since the planning of the oldest buildings (B) goes back to the mid 1540s. The unified conception of the collection, and the personal connections and links evident in the documents cited above, which mostly date from after 1560, suggest that the sets of drawings were probably produced in the decade between 1560 and 1570—the majority of them during the second half of that decade.

The inscriptions on the drawings confirm this conclusion. The details of the technique and colouring of the façade decoration on six of the elevations (A–E and H; Nos. 6a, 11a, 16a, 23a, 31a, 51) are not by the draughtsman, but are added slightly later. However, all six façades had been completed at the latest by the mid 1560s, while the four façades for which such information is lacking were all created much later on, and (in at least three of the four cases) in a different form.

The specific qualities of the drawings narrow down the collection’s range of possible users. The drawings were not intended for those involved in practical building tasks, and did not serve as working drawings or construction plans that could be used on the building site. In their capacity to depict complex spatial structures, the plans were even superior to three-dimensional

---

55. The various documents are cited in Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, pp. 203, n. 9, p. 204, n. 22.
models. The abstract illustrative technique and the complex relationships between the sectional images and the ground plans, however, required a highly skilled eye. The collection would have been an excellent tool in the process of planning during discussions between patrons, who were experts in architectural questions, and architects, to whom fell the major tasks of actually constructing the buildings. In addition, the superb illustrative qualities and skillful technical realization of the drawings made them a collector's item of the first rank. So it seems very probable that the Palazzi Antichi drawings were produced for a connoisseur, or a group of collectors, who belonged to the Genoese patriciate. Members of the same circle were the patrons of many of the residential buildings based on the prototypes of the Alessi villas and Strada Nuova palaces.

Collections of architectural drawings such as the London bundles appear to have been quite common in Genoa. Ennio Poleggi drew attention to a letter of May 1594 from the Savonese writer and art dealer Gabriello Chiabrera to the Genoese painter Bernardo Castello. Chiabrera expresses a desire to have copies made of drawings of several Genoese palaces in the collection of a friend of Castello's, and asks him to act as intermediary. Not only architects and building craftsmen, therefore, but also laymen, were the owners of collections of plans. Nor was it unusual to have such drawings copied. The merchant and art writer Joseph Furttenbach, of Ulm, assembled parts of such a collection of drawings at around the same time as Rubens. During the second decade of the seventeenth century, Furttenbach spent his travelling years in Italy, mostly in Genoa, as part of his training to become a merchant. Alongside his professional interests, he studied the architectural history of the cities he visited. The practical and theoretical knowledge he acquired in the process was the foundation for his later work as the author of numerous treatises on various aspects of architecture and engineering. In Italy he also laid the foundations for the later architectural collection, consisting mainly of building models, which he published in works concerned with civic architecture and fortification. In the discussion of his art cabinet, published in 1641 as part of Architectura Privata (a description of his private house in Ulm),
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and later separately, he presents six façade elevations of Genoese palaces, as well as other Italian architectural drawings.60

Furttenbach did not own original plans of any of the buildings. His drawings are probably copies made in the early seventeenth century, similar to those used by Rubens for the Palazzi Moderni engravings. Furttenbach gives the following owners' names for the six palaces: 'Gio: Carlo D'oria' (Palazzo Doria Tursi, cf. No. 67), 'Gio: Giacomo Imperiali' (Villa Imperiale Scassi), 'Fabrizio Paravicino' (Palazzo Cambiaso, cf. No. 68), 'Giacomo Saluzzo' (Villa Saluzzo Bombrini in Albaro) 'Gio: Francesco Saluzzo' (probably one of the other Saluzzo villas in Albaro) and 'Signor Balbi' (probably Villa Gropallo). The spelling of the names 'D'Oria' and 'Paravicino' is Genoese, and probably derives from the draughtsman who made the drawings. Three of the six buildings date from the third quarter of the sixteenth century. On these drawings, it is not the patrons who are named, but the owners at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Like Rubens, Furttenbach used the drawings as the basis for illustrating his books on architecture as well as collector's items. The ground plan and façade elevation of the Palazzo Cambiaso appear in his Itinerarium of 1627 (cat. ill. 32). The façade elevation of the Villa Imperiale Scassi and Villa Saluzzo Bombrini served as models for grand domestic residences in his Architectura Civilis of 1628.61

Parts of a similar, but later, collection are preserved in 24 façade elevations in the Gabinetto dei Disegni of the Uffizi in Florence. They present the façades of Genoese urban palaces and several villas.62 The façades have widely varying dimensions, and are mostly irregularly structured. The quality of the drawings varies, but in most cases it is rather poor. The purposes for why the drawings were produced, and which buildings they show, are mostly unclear. Ennio Poleggi was able to identify three façade elevations as buildings on the Ripa (Piazza Caricamento).63 These particular drawings all reproduce painted façade decorations, the remnants of which can still be seen on the buildings in old photographs. Only one of the three façades can be dated approximately, the Palazzo Tobia Negrone, which was built before 1659. Most of the other drawings probably also represent designs for painted façade decorations. As there is little stylistic variation, the sketches are diffi-

60. J. Furttenbach, Architectura privata etc., Augsburg, 1641, pp. 47f.
61. J. Furttenbach, Nerves Itinerarium Italiae, Ulm, 1627, pl. 10, and Architectura civilis etc., Ulm, 1628, pls. 5, 6.
THE DRAWINGS AND GENOISE RENAISSANCE ARCHITECTURE
cult to date. The formal vocabulary of the façade decorations is largely still
that of the late cinquecento, but the drawings are likely to be from the seicento,
mostly after 1650. The drawings have belonged to a collection since at least
the eighteenth century, as the inscriptions on them indicate. A later owner
added attributions to Alessi on a few of the sheets, but these are without foun-
dation.
Some of the drawings in the Uffizi appear to be originals, while others
seem to be copies from designs. The plans and elevations are mostly fairly
simple in layout. A pencilled outline provides a few construction points,
while the strong use of wash aims for a broad decorative effect. Some of the
plans use a slightly more elaborate initial design, with incisions and numer­
ous compass pricks. The execution is detailed, showing the programme of
figurative decoration for the façade, as in the case of the ‘Palazzo del Sigr.
Astolfo Rodi’ (?) (text ill. 9). In addition, there are also some that show vari­
ations in the form of the façade decoration using flaps for alternative designs.
These probably served, therefore, as presentation drawings. In the façade ele­
vation of the (later so labelled) ‘Palazzo di Giulio Sauli’, this method is used to
develop two alternative pilaster arrangements on the main storey (text ill. 10).
In the illustrative methods they use, the Florence drawings are related to the
façade elevations in Rubens’s Palazzi Moderni. The façades are presented in an
orthogonally projected elevation, with some elements of the façade appear­
ing foreshortened. The cornices are viewed from below, and the embrasures
of the portals and windows are shown obliquely from a point of view in front
of the palace’s central axis. The technique is also similar. In both groups, the
pen-and-ink drawings are executed over a usually simple initial sketch using
incised or pencilled lines. The use of wash not only reproduces the various
spatial depths, but also different material qualities and intended colouring
effects with light and dark tones.
A glance at these later collections of Genoese plans corroborates the excep­
tional quality of the earlier of the London bundles, the drawings for Rubens’s
Palazzi Antichi. The collection indicates the desire of the palace owners to
enhance their own personal renown not only through the buildings them­
selves, but also by means of copies of the plans, which were circulated to
others to be used as models. At the same time, the London drawings clearly
document the fact that the functional qualities of Genoese palace architec­
ture—which were later extolled by Rubens and other admirers—resulted
from detailed planning and consideration. The practical and economic
aspects of modern domestic architecture, typically in many cases from the
point of view of a patron who would later be the user of the building, were
often the subject of deliberate theory and planning, particularly during the
mid sixteenth century. In this connection mention can be made of the manu-
scripts of Giangiorgio Trissino and particularly Alvise Cornaro, whose ideas Palladio later took up in the second book of the Quattro Libri (1570)—although in Palladio’s treatise such ideas were seen from the point of view of a planning architect, illustrated with examples from his own work. The roots of the Secondo Libro reach back to the 1550s. As early as the 1540s, Sebastiano Serlio had completed a treatise on the architecture of private houses. There are two manuscript versions of this, entitled Delle habitazioni di tutti li gradi degli homini fuori delle città, and it was originally to have been published as Book VI of his treatise on architecture (text ills. 7–8). With nearly two dozen model designs for country houses of varying sizes and standards, Serlio was attempting to respond to the lively discussion that was taking place among patrons at the time, and to meet the apparently rising demand for architectural solutions in this area.

These various initiatives in the field of contemporary domestic architecture seem to have been paralleled in north-western Italy by the collection of pattern sheets carefully compiled by Genoese patricians—a collection with pretensions that clearly went beyond those of mere design drawings. For his part, Rubens had the good fortune to come across these drawings when he was collecting examples of the artistic achievements of the Renaissance. In view of the unified conception of the drawings of the Palazzi Antichi and their careful editing, the idea of making them the basis for a publication on Genoese palace architecture seems an obvious one, almost a necessity. The amount of work Rubens needed to do to prepare the edition was therefore minimal. Nevertheless, the book of engravings gives the impression of being a carefully planned, mature publication. Were it not for the numerous pasted-down flaps, which make simple graphic reproduction of the drawings difficult, one would be tempted to conclude that the plans that Rubens published in 1622 as Palazzi di Genova had already originally been designed for publication during the 1560s.

III. Rubens 1622: The *Palazzi di Genova* and its Artistic and Historical Context

*Rubens as Architect and Collector*

Even during his years in Italy, Rubens had been interested in architectural matters. His purchase of the Genoese collection of plans is the best evidence of this. It would be surprising if he had not tried to acquire architectural drawings in Mantua and Rome as well. However, this must remain speculative, since Rubens’s collection of drawings was later scattered, and only fragments of it can now be reconstructed.\(^1\) The dominant view among researchers has been that Rubens purchased the drawings with the intention of publishing them as engravings.\(^2\) There are no convincing grounds for this assumption. On the contrary—it was only around 1620 that technical and artistic conditions prevailed that would justify such a project and make it practicable. These external circumstances and personal motives that may have led Rubens to publish the book is the subject of this final chapter.

In the first decade after he settled in Antwerp, Rubens became increasingly concerned with architectural matters. As a producer of altar paintings, he was occasionally also able to influence the way in which his paintings were integrated into their architectural settings. For the Jesuit Church in Antwerp, Rubens produced a wide range of paintings between 1615 and 1621: the cycle of paintings on the ceilings of the side aisles and galleries (destroyed when the church was burned in 1718), and two paintings for the high altar (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum). But he also designed the architecture of the retable of the high altar, including the sculpted figures, which—as Frans Baudouin has noted—is the earliest example of a High Baroque porticus altar.\(^3\) Rubens also contributed to the architectural planning of the church, and designed parts of its architectural sculpture. Autograph drawings in his own hand have survived for the relief angels and the cartouche of the main portal, as well as for the stucco decoration of the Lady Chapel. The numerous Italianate elements in the tower probably derive from Rubens’s collaboration.

---

1. See below, p. 89 n. 12.
Among the designs for the church, the one that is closest to the actual building (London, Sir John Soane’s Museum) was drawn by Rubens in collaboration with the church’s architect, Pieter Huyssens. The artist played a similar role in furnishing and equipping the newly built Court church in Neuburg on the Danube, which Wolfgang Wilhelm von Pfalz-Neuburg donated to the Jesuits in 1617. Rubens produced the three altar paintings and discussed the problems of arrangement and framing in letters to the patron. Designs were also provided by Rubens for the two large stucco reliefs of the Birth and Ascension of the Virgin on the west wall of the side aisles. In addition, Rubens sent drawings for parts of the exterior decoration to Neuburg (‘li esteriori ornamenti di questa nuova chiesa’), and Wolfgang Wilhelm confirmed receipt of these in January 1619. It is unclear for which architectural elements Rubens sent designs to Neuburg.

Rubens’s growing interest in architecture was also reflected in the additions he made to his library during this period, which included a number of architectural books and theoretical treatises. Between 1613 and 1615, he purchased Vignola’s treatise on perspective, Guillaume Philandrier’s commentary on Vitruvius, the translation of and commentary on Vitruvius by Daniele Barbaro and Juan Bautista Villalpando’s commentary on Ezekiel. In 1616, he sent his edition of Serlio for binding. In 1617, two up-to-date publications were added with Vincenzo Scamozzi’s Idea della architettura universale (1615) and Jacques Francart’s Premier livre d’architecture (1616). This list of titles can


6. Rubens’s library can be reconstructed, at least in part, on the basis of the account books of the publisher Balthasar Moretus. The most important extracts were published by Rooses, Moretus, 1882–83. The book invoices are presented in the final part of this study, 1883, pp. 176–211; on the works on the theory of art mentioned, see pp. 179f., 187–190. 192. See also P. Arents, De bibliotheek van Pieter Pauwel Rubens’, De Noordgouw, 1, 1961, pp. 145–178; and E. McGrath, Rubens: Subjects from History (Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard, XIII.1), 1, London, 1997, pp. 55–67. The unpublished M.A. thesis by S. von Hoyningen-Huene McRae, Rubens’s Library, Columbia University, 1971, was not available to me for consultation. The list of architectural publications in Rubens’s library is also given in A. Blunt, ‘Rubens and Architecture’, The Burlington Magazine, CXIX, 1977, p. 621, n. 43.
hardly be seen as representing a painter’s collection of source works. Instead, it indicates a very deep-seated interest in questions of architectural theory. Rubens’s detailed knowledge of this field of art literature is likely to have played a substantial part in motivating him to produce his own publication on private architecture.

Rubens regarded his volume of engravings as a collection of patterns for use by architects and patrons in his home country, but in his own planning work he was not dependent on the Genoese models. This is particularly clear in the building project for which he had full responsibility for design and execution: his own house, which he had extended in the period around 1618 to create an artist’s residence following Italian models. As a burgher’s domestic palace situated on the outskirts of the city, his house corresponded in type to the buildings shown in the Genoese plans. However, these models did not play any recognizable part in the planning of the house at any point.

As early as 1610, Rubens had acquired an older estate on the outskirts of the town, and subsequently purchased several additional adjoining plots. On the enlarged site he erected a studio, which was connected to the existing domestic building via the entrance hall on one side and via an arcaded wall on the garden side. This arrangement created a closed, quadrilateral courtyard, which the visitor from the street initially entered through the main portal (text ills. 13, 15). The decoration of the studio façade and the arcaded wall gave the courtyard a formal quality, while the façade on the side of the square towards the Wapper remained comparatively simple (text ills. 14 [lower centre] and 17). On the other side of the arcaded wall lay the garden, with a loggia marking the end of the central axis of the courtyard and garden, which would catch the eye of a visitor entering through the main portal (text ills. 14, 19). Some of the work must have been carried out by around 1618, since Rubens states in a letter to Dudley Carleton that he had already used up several thousand guilders in building work that year. It is evident from the report by Otto Sperling, who visited Rubens in 1621, that the building had already been completed by then.

Later alterations to the house and garden destroyed the original fabric and interior decoration. The original state of the building is recorded in two engravings made for a later owner by Jacobus Harrewijn, half a century after Rubens’s death (text ills. 13–14). The form of the Rubens house today is the

result of reconstruction carried out in 1937-46 on the basis of these engravings. Since Harrewijn's engravings are primarily exterior views of the various parts of the building, and do not contain any ground plans, the original interior arrangements remain hypothetical. For example, it is not certain where precisely the famous rotunda with the collection of antique sculptures was situated. The only parts of the estate that still contain original structures are the wall separating the courtyard and the garden, and the garden loggia. The elaborate decoration of the studio façade, on the other hand, can only be reconstructed from the engravings. It remains debatable to what extent these decorations were either painted or executed in relief.

The complex as a whole did not follow any specific model in terms of its type, but resulted from the particular conditions in which it arose. The residential building already existed, and may have had its interior renovated. On the opposite side of the courtyard, a studio section was constructed, arranged to suit Rubens's large workshop operations and extensive painting production. According to visitors' reports, the rooms included a large hall lit from windows above. The hall rose to the full height of the building, and the apprentices worked there. In addition, there was a smaller room for drying canvases, and a private studio for the master. The architectural forms that Rubens chose for the façades, arcade walls and loggia, however, were genuinely Italianate, as was the arrangement of courtyard and garden. The figurative programme, extending to the façade decoration and garden sculptures, gave expression to Rubens's view of himself as a patrician and painter who, in terms of his education and the artistic tradition he represented, was referring to antiquity and the Renaissance. The façade decoration of the studio wing, with its luxuriant architectural and figurative embellishments, is not directly based on a specific model, either (text ill. 17). Only the basic articulation, with the large arcade windows over the rusticated ground floor and the central portal with the pediment above it, recalls the façade of Giulio Romano's house in Mantua, which also originally had five window bays (text ill. 18). The arcaded wall, marking the transition from the courtyard to the garden, combines the motif of the triumphal arch with architectural language borrowed from garden structures such as grottoes. The structure of the aedicule framing the central passageway is based on the shape of Michelan-


10. The connection between the architecture, programme of decoration and artistic pretension is emphasized by J. M. Muller, Rubens: the Artist as Collector, Princeton, N.J., 1989, pp. 25-47.

Text ill. 14. Jacobus Harrewijn (after J. van Croes), *The Rubens House*, engraving (1692), garden with pavilion (left) and studio wing (right).
Text ill. 15. *The Rubens House*, Antwerp, arcaded wall between courtyard and garden

Text ill. 16. *Porta Pia*, Rome

Text ill. 17. *The Rubens House*, Antwerp, façade of the studio wing

Text ill. 18. *Giulio Romano's House*, Mantua, façade
Text ill. 19. The Rubens House, Antwerp, garden pavilion (photo c. 1914)

Text ill. 20. Nymphaeum of the Villa Giulia, Rome
gelò's Porta Pia in Rome (text ill. 16). A number of precedents can also be listed for the garden pavilion (text ill. 19). A comparable serliana, with oculi containing sculptures, is encountered as a loggia on the second floor of the Nymphaum of the Villa Giulia in Rome (text ill. 20). The upper part of the pavilion, with the niche flanked by herms, seems to owe something to Vignola.

The Genoese pattern sheets thus played no part in the derivation of the architectural and decorative forms used in the house. Rubens drew his inspiration principally from Rome and Mantua. An examination of the pictorial architecture, the title-page designs, and the later projects (1634) for the ephemeral decorations for the entry of Archduke Ferdinand in Antwerp in 1635 yields a similar conclusion. Rubens's architectural language has its point of reference in Roman work of the third quarter of the sixteenth century, and above all in the late work of Michelangelo. Especially in several of the title-page designs of the 1620s, Rubens developed from these precedents ornamental forms which, as Anthony Blunt observed, anticipated corresponding phenomena in the work of Pietro da Cortona and Borromini.11 These observations by no means call into question the role of the Palazzi di Genova as a source of models. The engravings were intended to serve this purpose for architects and patrons who lacked Rubens's wide knowledge of Italian art. But his editorial remarks about the function of the engravings need to be set in a further context.

During his period in Italy, Rubens laid the foundations for his extensive collection of drawings, with its well-known thematic focus on the art of antiquity and the High Renaissance. He collected original drawings by Italian artists, as well as graphic reproductions.12 To these were added his own drawings, which he produced either from the originals or from copies made by others. It was with the same degree of interest that Rubens sought to purchase works of ancient art, mainly coins and cameo pieces. This stock of drawings and ancient gems was to form the core of his later art collection. Around 1620, the collection also included a substantial number of ancient sculptures and selected paintings of the Italian Renaissance. It was exhibited in several

CHAPTER THREE

rooms of Rubens’s house. The collection of ancient art was displayed in a round room lit from above, in which the objects were presented in a fashion that would today be described as museum-like.

The collection primarily served as an instrument which Rubens used to promote himself as a scholarly artist. Unlike many other collectors who belonged to the bourgeois class, Rubens did not have a cabinet of curiosities aiming for an encyclopaedic range. Instead, his collection was a purely artistic one, featuring selected works of European sculpture, painting and miniature pieces. The choice of the objects, concentrating on the art of antiquity and the High Renaissance, legitimized his own artistic creativity, which he saw as continuing the tradition of the great masters of these two periods. This artistic programme was also reflected in the figurative elements of the façade decoration in the studio wing. The grisaille frieze above the large studio windows showed reconstructions of masterpieces of Greek painting (knowledge of which had survived only in literary sources) and presented famous topoi from the art literature of antiquity.13 On the entrance wing, the decorations were supplemented by illusionistic façade painting, where—in a trompe-l’oeil as if partly covering the grisaille work—a canvas by Rubens was seen hanging up to dry (text ill. 14). The fictional painting imitated an original that Rubens had painted in 1620: a depiction of Perseus and Andromeda, corresponding to the version of the subject now in St Petersburg.14 Rubens’s painting was to be seen by viewers as continuing and perfecting the ancient art evoked in the grisailles.

The architectural drawings which Rubens had brought with him from Italy were, above all, constituent parts of this collection. And as such, the Genoese plans shared the purpose of the collection described above: they were a status symbol for an artist who was highly educated, and whose expertise extended to the field of architecture. The publication of the drawings provided Rubens, as the editor, with a means of demonstrating his expertise in architectural matters to a wider public. Rubens spent comparatively little time on the editing of the drawings, and he delegated the actual reproduction work.15 His own tasks consisted only of writing the captions for the drawings, checking the proofs and writing the introductory text. For the second series of engravings, he had to ensure that additional plans were received from

14. J.M. Muller, ‘The “Perseus and Andromeda” on Rubens’s House’, Simiolus, XII, 1981-82, pp. 131–146. The exterior decoration of the studio wing and the neighbouring entrance hall can be seen in Harrewijn’s engraving. The principal source for the interpretation of this part as an illusionistic fresco decoration is Filippo Baldinucci. In his life of Rubens (1681), Baldinucci mentions a painted ‘loggia con prospettive, architetture, e con bassi rilievi di ricca invenzione’ and a false painting hanging up to dry in the sun. See Muller, op. cit., p. 131, n. 2.
15. See above, pp. 40f.
THE ARTISTIC AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Genoa. In view of Rubens's well-known rational way of working and economical use of his time, the total amount of time he spent on the book can be reckoned at most in days. This rather casual way of carrying out the editorial work, however, can by no means be taken to suggest that the book is little more than an incidentally produced occasional work thrown off by a versatile artist. There is good reason to believe that the publication of the book of engravings at this particular time did not spring merely from a spontaneous whim, but was based on deliberate calculation.

Artistic Ambitions: Rubens and his Prints

In his surviving correspondence, Rubens himself only mentions the *Palazzi di Genova* on a single occasion—in the letter to Pieter van Veen of 19 June 1622, in which, among other matters, he announces the book's publication. No details of the circumstances surrounding publication can be deduced from this letter. The same is true of the series of eight letters from Rubens's correspondent in Paris, Nicolas Claude Fabri de Peiresc, sent to Antwerp between July and December 1622—each of which mentions the *Palazzi di Genova*, among other matters. However, the letters do allow us to see the way in which the Genoa publication was intertwined with other projects that Rubens had in mind at the beginning of the 1620s. These interconnections can be reconstructed initially by examining the roles of Pieter van Veen and Peiresc, with whom Rubens corresponded about the publication.

Pieter van Veen was the brother of Rubens's former teacher, Otto van Veen. He lived in the northern part of the then divided Netherlands, and was a lawyer with the States-General in The Hague. Rubens had been corresponding with him since January 1619 in connection with his plan to acquire printing privileges in the northern Netherlands for engraved reproductions of his paintings. He was attempting to acquire this privilege in order to protect his planned publications of engravings from illegal reprinting, which was damaging to business as well as to his reputation. Rubens asked Pieter van Veen to represent him at the States-General in the matter. At the same time, he was also trying to acquire similar privileges for France and the southern Netherlands. In July 1619, Rubens received the privilege for France, limited to ten years. In the same month, the government in Brussels granted the printing privilege for Brabant, which was extended to the southern Nether-

16. See above, pp. 45f.
17. The full text of the letter appears in Appendix II.1, pp. 258f.
18. See Appendix II.2–9, pp. 259–262.
lands in January 1620, and in 1630 finally to all the dominions under the Spanish crown. There were problems with the privilege for the northern Netherlands, however, nothing is known of the background to these. In spite of van Veen’s intervention, the application was dismissed in May 1619. Rubens then approached Sir Dudley Carleton, the English ambassador to the States-General, with whom he had had business dealings between March and June 1618. Rubens had purchased antique marble sculptures from Carleton, in exchange for his own paintings. Carleton’s influence was then finally able to turn the affair around. As early as May 1619, Rubens replied to Carleton’s announcement of a decision in his favour, and thanked him for intervening. In January 1620, the privilege was granted for seven years. Rubens dedicated one engraving each to van Veen and Carleton in the same year, 1620, in recognition of their efforts on his behalf.

The letter to Pieter van Veen of 19 June 1622, mentioned above, is basically still referring to this affair. In it, Rubens lists a series of engravings that are currently in progress or have just been published, and which he intends to send to van Veen in order to complete his collection. The letter also contains Rubens’s well-known reference to problems with his engraver Lucas Vorsterman, which led to a violent quarrel between the two men. The mention of the Palazzi di Genova in this particular letter to van Veen points to a connection between the publication of the book of architectural engravings and the reproduction of his paintings that is more than a mere temporal coincidence.

Rubens had already prepared drawings and designs for engraved book illustrations while in Italy. He continued this practice in Antwerp with numerous title-page designs for the publishers Plantin-Moretus. Rubens was soon also commissioning individual engravers to produce prints from his paintings. Cornelis Galle’s Large Judith, the earliest authorized reproduction of a Rubens painting, was produced around 1610. However, regular and extensive reproduction work only began after Rubens had been granted the publication privileges and had found, in Lucas Vorsterman, an engraver who met his


requirements for converting his paintings into graphic form. Both of these pre-
conditions had been met since 1619. Reproductions that were authorized by
Rubens himself and engraved under his artistic supervision need to be singled
out from the large numbers of engravings after paintings by Rubens. Konrad
Renger numbers around one hundred of them. Of these, 57 engravings are
marked with the privileges.23 The reproduction process, which can be recon-
structed on the basis of the numerous preparatory drawings that have sur-
vived, as well as from a series of proofs, was supervised by Rubens at every
stage. Although members of the workshop produced the preparatory draw-
ings, and the engraved reproductions were assigned to a small number of
capable engravers, Rubens corrected and retouched both the preparatory
drawings and the proofs. He thus took full responsibility for the technical and
artistic quality of the engravings. By checking the reproduction process, and
as a result of the privileges that were to protect his engravings from inferior
pirate copying, Rubens was able to guarantee high quality in the reproduction
engravings that he authorized. The sometimes extensive retouching work
shows that Rubens did not intend to produce authentic reproductions of his
paintings, but regarded the engravings as autonomous products.24 He often
elaborated the contrast to a greater extent than in the source painting, and occa-
sionally simplified the pictorial structure, in order to adapt the colour values
and the composition to the graphic medium. He reworked earlier componen-
tions to correspond to his now different stylistic approach.

Various considerations may have motivated Rubens to have his paintings
reproduced as engravings. Financial reasons probably played a minor role.
Little is known about the sale of the engravings, but Rubens apparently pub-
lished only a dozen sheets himself. By far the largest part of the production
was sold by the engravers or by other publishers.25 It seems more likely that
Rubens was hoping to satisfy the immense demand for his paintings—which
he was not able to meet in spite of running a large and well-organized work-
shop—by producing graphic substitutes for them. More deep-seated motiva-
tions, however, may be traced to his view of his role as an artist. Rubens was
aware of the significance of the medium of graphic reproduction for the
exchange of artistic ideas. He himself used graphic sources for study pur-
poses, as is seen in his early copies of reproductions of the work of Mantegna
and Raphael, as well as of woodcuts and engravings by Hans Holbein, Tobias
Stimmer and Hendrik Goltzius.26 For Rubens, who regarded himself as fol-

23. Cf. Renger, op. cit. in n. 20 above, p. 127; Pohlen, op. cit. in n. 20 above, pp. 170ff.
26. See the various examples, e.g. in [Cat. Exh.] Peter Paul Rubens, 1577–1640, i, Rubens in Italien (Kunst-
halle, Cologne, 1977), Cologne, 1977, nos. 1, 2, 4, 13, etc.; A. Séruillaz, [Cat. Exh.] Rubens, ses maîtres, ses
Following in the tradition of the great Renaissance painters, it must have seemed an obvious step to use graphic reproductions to make his own pictorial inventions available to succeeding generations of artists. Rubens's attitude to traditional art can be described by the concept of imitatio. In the short fragment De imitazione statuarum, he emphasizes the importance for an apprentice painter to study ancient sculpture.27 At the same time, however, it was important to follow the correct models in one's own studies. The models which an artist selected to guide him were a reflection of his own greatness and significance. Ultimately, Rubens's policy of having his works reproduced in engravings indicates that he thought them sufficiently accomplished to be used as models by other artists.

In addition to Pieter van Veen, Rubens's other correspondent who received a copy of the Palazzi di Genova as soon as it appeared was Nicolas Claude Fabri de Peiresc. Rubens and Peiresc had been in contact since at least 1619, when Peiresc had assisted him in acquiring printing privileges in France. They met personally when Rubens was in Paris at the beginning of 1622 to sign the contract for the cycle of paintings for Marie de' Medici. Further agreements between artists in Paris, above all Salomon de Brosse, and Rubens were mainly negotiated by Peiresc, who was a member of Louis XIII's administration as secretary to his chancellor, Du Vair. Peiresc's letters to Rubens—whose own side of the correspondence is only preserved from August 1623 onward—say little about the business of the printing privileges, however. Peiresc was recognized by his contemporaries as one of the century's leading scholars, and he shared with Rubens an interest in ancient art and culture. Discussions of archaeological problems, in which Rubens was an equal partner with Peiresc given his familiarity with the artefacts, take up a large part of the correspondence. When they met in January 1622, Rubens and Peiresc made definite plans to produce a collaborative publication on ancient gems, which would combine the archaeological expertise of each. Rubens offered to prepare materials for the illustrations, and to have the reproductions made by his engravers. Peiresc was to supply the text.28

The core of the publication was to consist of two principal works of ancient engraved gems: the Gemma Tiberiana ('Grand Camée de France') and the Gemma Augustaea—the two largest and most famous ancient cameos. Peiresc had

27. The brief fragment of text was apparently part of Rubens's sketchbook, the earliest known owner of which after Rubens's death was Roger de Piles. De Piles published the text in its original Latin, and in a French translation in Cours de Peinture par Principes, Paris, 1708, pp. 139–148. See note 38.
rediscovered the Gemma Tiberiana in 1620 in the treasury of the church of Ste Chapelle in Paris. Problems in deciphering what it depicted led him to consult Rubens for advice in October 1621. Rubens owned a drawing of the Gemma Augustae, which was interesting as a comparison due to its iconographic similarities. During his visit to Paris in 1622, Rubens for his part made a drawing of the Gemma Tiberiana (Antwerp, Stedelijk Prentenkabinet), which later served as the source for an engraving. In all, the publication was intended to illustrate some thirty pieces, including, in addition to the two central imperial gems, several gems from the collection of the Duke of Mantua, of which Rubens had drawings, and several pieces from Rubens's own collection. Contacts between Peiresc and Rubens concerning the project continued up to 1628, but the book was never published. The reasons for its failure apparently lay on both sides. Peiresc's textual contributions, like all of his other numerous studies, never seem to have reached a conclusive stage. Rubens, on the other hand, seems to have been dissatisfied with the conception of the book and the quality of the engravings.

It is difficult to assess what place the planned book of engravings would have taken among contemporary publications on antiquity if it had been completed. The few surviving fragments, however, suggest that the text and illustrations would have met very high standards. Peiresc's iconographic decipherment of the two state cameos was based on modern methods—he drew on historical sources and compared iconographic types. He interpreted the Gemma Augustae as representing the apotheosis of Augustus. This interpretation was corrected by Albert Rubens, who in his own studies analyzed the materials in his father's possession, and who read the piece as an apotheosis of Tiberius—the interpretation which has been considered the correct one ever since. The Gemma Tiberiana had been interpreted by a medieval tradition as depicting Joseph in Egypt. Here, too, Peiresc regarded the piece as showing an apotheosis of Augustus and was probably correct. But even


30. On the Gemma Augustae, see Furtwängler, op. cit., II, pp. 257f.; W.-R. Megow, Kameen von Augustus bis Alexander Severus, Berlin, 1987, pp. 155-163, no. A10. Albert Rubens wrote commentaries on the two large state cameos, which were based on the research included in Peiresc's letters to Rubens. The studies of the two cameos were illustrated by engravings after Rubens's drawings. The texts were only published posthumously, together with a study of ancient costume: Albertus Rubenius Petri Pauli F., De Re Vestiaria Veterum, praecipue de lato clavo. Libri duo et alia eiusdem opuscula posthuma etc., Antwerp, 1665, pp. 195-211 (Dissertatio De Gemma Tiberiana), and pp. 212-219 (Dissertatio De Gemma Augustae). The latter study was reprinted in: Alberti Rubeni Dissertatio de Gemma Augustae (Monumenta Artis Romanae, IX), newly edited and translated, with commentary, by H. Kähler, Berlin, 1968.
in modern archaeological research, there is no consensus on the correct decipherment of its complex iconography.\textsuperscript{31}

Only the outlines of Rubens's intentions with regard to the illustrations can be reconstructed. The graphic quality of the nine surviving engravings, depicting eighteen gems, that can be linked to the project is well above the average for comparable reproductions.\textsuperscript{32} Nevertheless, Rubens was not satisfied with these detailed, but perhaps all in all insufficiently painterly depictions, and in the end he did not pursue the plans for the book.\textsuperscript{33} He had apparently hoped to achieve a hitherto unheard of graphic quality in the engraved reproductions of the cameos. The colour transitions between the layers of the gems, which give the cameos their particular aesthetic attraction, were to be made visible in the engravings, for example. The drawing of a cameo showing \textit{Claudius and Messalina}, which Rubens probably made during his visit to Paris in January 1622 (Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett), bears inscriptions indicating the colour values, which suggests that he intended their variations to be reproduced.\textsuperscript{34} As is well known, Rubens was interested in the technical potential of copperplate engraving at this time, mainly in order to take advantage of it for the graphic reproduction of his paintings. For the graphic reproduction of the gems, he seems to have been aiming for the same painterly qualities that Lucas Vorsterman, above all, had achieved in his engravings of Rubens's paintings. However, the illustrations not only had to be satisfactory from the aesthetic point of view, they also had to meet historical and scholarly requirements. As Matthias Winner noted, one section of the cameo is marked in the Berlin drawing as being a modern addition.\textsuperscript{35} The engraving was therefore probably also intended to indicate the distinction between the original state and later additions—an approach that would have represented an extraordinarily high standard in the historical-critical presentation of ancient works of art. If the planned publication to these standards had actually taken place, it would have been outstanding among publications on antiquity because of its artistic and documentary qual-


\textsuperscript{33} When he sent a number of engravings to Pierre Dupuy in April 1627, Rubens complained of their quality and said they were unsuitable for publication (Magurn, \textit{Letters}, 1955, pp. 175–178, no. 106, esp. p. 178). See \textit{Van der Meulen, Antiquarius} (op. cit. in n. 28), pp. 41f.


\textsuperscript{35} See Mielke and Winner, op. cit., p. 89.
ity, as indeed the Palazzi di Genova was in the field of architectural engraving.

The initiative for the project at first came from Peiresc, but previously Rubens had also independently considered publishing the gems in his own collection. From 1623 on, statements by Peiresc suggest that Rubens had taken over the conception of the joint publication project entirely, and had extended it on his own initiative. In addition to cameos and intaglios, portrait busts, coins and reliefs were also to be included. A series of engravings of twelve ancient marble portraits of emperors, generals and philosophers dates from a later period, around 1638. At least a few of the sculptures shown also belonged to Rubens’s art collection. The engravings are in various formats, but their inscriptions and approach are uniform. It is possible that this series had already been conceived in connection with the project for the publication on works of antiquity, and that at least the preparatory drawings for it were executed as early as the 1620s. The question remains of whether any of the textual fragments from Rubens’s lost sketchbook, in connection with his numerous drawings of ancient sculptures that are mostly preserved in copies, may have represented the core of a larger treatise that was planned.

36. See Van der Meulen, Antique, 1994–95, I, pp. 136f.
38. Rubens’s sketchbook was destroyed by fire in 1720 in the workshop of its then owner, André Charles Boulle in Paris. The so-called Johnson manuscript (London, Princes Gate Collection, Courtauld Institute Galleries) is a posthumous compilation of materials from the sketchbook. See H. Braham, [Cat. Exh.] Rubens: Paintings, Drawings, Prints in the Princes Gate Collection, Courtauld Institute Galleries, London, 1988, pp. 50–53, nos. 58–59. Two further codices with sketches and fragments of text on the theory of art are based on Rubens’s lost sketchbook: first, the so-called Antwerp sketchbook (Chatsworth), which was published by Michael Jaffé with an attribution to Anthony van Dyck. M. Jaffé, Van Dyck’s Antwerp Sketchbook, I–II, London, 1966; critical remarks on the question of the ascription in J. Müller Hofstede, ‘Neue Beiträge zum Oeuvre Anton van Dycks’, Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch, XLVIII–L, 1987–1988, pp. 123–186, esp. pp. 125–131. The second is the so-called De Ganay manuscript (formerly in the De Ganay collection, Paris), which in addition to fragments of text and sketches deriving from Rubens also includes six drawings after Poussin’s illustrations in the 1651 edition of Leonardo’s Trattato della pittura, and which was therefore probably compiled by a follower of Rubens after the mid-17th century. The text fragments and drawings in the De Ganay manuscript in turn served as the basis for a book by Charles Antoine Jombert, who published all of the material in it under Rubens’s name: Pierre-Paul Rubens, Théorie de la figure humaine, Paris, 1773, reprinted: Paris, 1990 (Les recueils d’emblèmes et les traités de physiognomie de la Bibliothèque Interuniversitaire de Lille, XI). See A.-M. S. Logan, ‘Leonardo, Poussin, Rubens, and the Ms. De Ganay’ in Essays in Northern European Art Presented to Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann on his Sixtieth Birthday, Doornspijk, 1983, pp. 142–147; J. Bolten, Method and Practice: Dutch and Flemish Drawing Books 1600–1750, Landau, 1985, pp. 107–116, 237–239 and 268–271. Anne-Marie Logan established that the three codices all derive from different hands. A reconstruction of the contents of the lost sketchbook on the basis of these scattered materials, which also include two single sheets in Berlin and London containing fragments of text and figure sketches, is being prepared by Arnout Balis for the corresponding volume of the Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard. The question of the dating of the fragment De imitatione statuarum remains open. Justus Müller Hofstede considers that it was written as early as immediately after Rubens’s return from Italy (J. Müller Hofstede, ‘Rubens und die niederländische Italienfahrt. Die humanistische Tradition’, in [Cat. Exh.] Peter Paul Rubens, op. cit. in n. 26, pp. 21–37, esp. p. 34, n. 58). On the implementation of these theoretical premises in Rubens’s artistic practice, see J. M. Muller, ‘Rubens’ Theory and Practice of the Imitation of Art’, The Art Bulletin, LXIV, 1982, pp. 229–247.
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Rubens regarded the art of antiquity as forming the basis for his own artistic production, and saw his work as perpetuating the achievements of the painting of antiquity and of the Renaissance. The publication of his own compositions shows that he regarded them as functioning as models in this respect. Parallel to this, he also planned to publish reproductions of ancient works of art. A significant proportion of these belonged to his own collection, while others were masterpieces that were of general interest, both due to their intrinsic beauty and their value as historical sources. It is in this context that the publication of the Genoese drawings in the form of the *Palazzi di Genova* belongs. In the foreword, Rubens describes the buildings in the book as being models for a form of modern domestic architecture based on the principles of antiquity.39

These activities in the field of graphic reproduction are concentrated in the period around 1620. At this time, Rubens had consolidated his artistic and social position. The commissions he was receiving were not only increasing in number and scale, but also in prestige. In supplying paintings to the Habsburg and Wittelsbach courts, to Genoa and above all to Paris, Rubens had established himself as an artist of European significance, capable of meeting requirements at this level both artistically and organizationally. Rubens's own statements leave no doubt that this was also his own attitude. His publications were undoubtedly directed at an audience ranging across all of Europe—even if Rubens pretends in the foreword to the *Palazzi di Genova* only to wish to influence the architecture of the more northern parts of it.40 The foreword, after all, was written in the *lingua franca* of Europe's art connoisseurs—Italian. With this book, as well as with these publication projects, Rubens was able to present his credentials as a connoisseur to a European audience. At the same time, however, he was also staking a claim to be an artist holding in trust the legacy of the great masters of antiquity and of the Renaissance, and one who was the equal of such illustrious predecessors.

**Political Connotations: Brussels – Madrid – Genoa**

Hardly any documents have survived that might provide information about the book's contemporary influence. The letters from Peiresc in Paris to Rubens in Antwerp between July and December 1622 are therefore all the more valuable.41 They provide a glimpse of the way in which the book was

39. Appendix I.2, p. 254; and see above, pp. 53–56.
40. ‘... di fare una opera meritoria verso il ben publico di tutte le Provincie Oltramontane'; see Appendix I.2, p. 254.
41. See the excerpts given in Appendix II.2–9, pp. 259–262.
presented at court in Paris immediately after its publication. Only a few months before, in January 1622, Rubens had signed the contract for a cycle of paintings on the life and deeds of Marie de’ Medici—the most important commission of his career. Peiresc had accepted a role as mediator in arranging the commission, and he also ensured the distribution of the *Palazzi di Genova* in Paris on Rubens’s behalf. The book circulated among the group of artists and art connoisseurs at the Parisian court with whom Rubens was linked through the Medici commission. In his initial response, Peiresc announced that he would be showing the book to Sr Abbate at once—i.e. to Claude Maugis, the Abbé de St Ambroise.42 Claude Maugis had been the queen regent’s spokesman in negotiations over the cycle of paintings, and had played an influential part in agreements regarding the cycle’s programme of contents. When the completed cycle was presented in May 1625, the abbé acted as interpreter, showing skill in concealing the ‘true meaning’ of the paintings from the king, Louis XIII, as Rubens noted in the famous passage from his letter to Peiresc.43 Three weeks after Peiresc had received the first copy of the *Palazzi di Genova*, he asked Rubens to send more copies to Paris. Rubens did so, and by the beginning of December had sent six copies in all to him. The two men with whom Rubens had collaborated on decorating the Palais du Luxembourg received one copy each—the architect Salomon de Brosse and the sculptor Guillaume Berthelot.44 Another copy of the book went to Henri-Auguste de Loménie, who had been secretary of state since 1620 and since 1622 had held the office of ‘Capitaine du Château des Tuileries’.45 He also made a name for himself as the author of an *Apologie de la reine mère*. Like the Abbé de St Ambroise, Loménie was a member of the inner circle around the queen regent, Marie de’ Medici. It is not evident from Peiresc’s letters who the recipients of the other copies were.

With the commissions from the queen mother—the decorative programme of the gallery in the Palais du Luxembourg was supposed to be continued and supplemented with a cycle showing the life of Henri IV—Rubens was to be linked to the French court for several years. It was in his own interest, therefore, to reinforce his position in this foreign, and to a certain extent hostile, territory by disseminating a publication proving his wide-ranging

42. 1 July 1622; see Appendix II.2, pp. 259f.
44. Appendix II.3–5; on de Brosse, see R. Coope, *Salomon de Brosse and the Development of the Classical Style in French Architecture from 1565 to 1630*, London, 1972. Coope (p. 11) considers that the presentation of the *Palazzi di Genova* to de Brosse ‘was intended as an incentive to the architect to comply with the painter’s request about the Luxembourg Gallery’. After returning from Rome, Berthelot had been occupied with work on the Palais du Luxembourg since 1620. In 1622, he received a commission for eight bronze figures for the dome of the entrance pavilion. On Berthelot, see ibid., pp. 118, 262f.; Allgemeines Künstlerlexikon, X, Munich–Leipzig, 1995, pp. 62f. (G. Bresc-Bautier).
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artistic authority. Not least, it was also opportune for political reasons at this point in time to present the Genoa publication at court in Paris. The awarding of the important commission for paintings to the Flemish artist was hardly accidental during a (brief) phase of rapprochement between France and Spain. After all, Genoa had close ties with the Spanish monarchy through its role in the financial market.

This economic and political significance of the republic of Genoa has occasionally given rise to speculation regarding whether Rubens’s central concerns with the publication at this precise time were not in fact political and diplomatic. The activities as a diplomatic negotiator, which Rubens began to engage in from the mid 1620s onward, have their origins during this period. Alan Tait suggested that the conflicts over securing the supply route for Spanish troops through the territory of the republics of Genoa and Milan, as well as the Swiss canton of Grisons, provided the immediate historical background for the publication. More comprehensively, John Rowlands considered the publication of the Palazzi di Genova ‘as a piece of elaborate and courtly political propaganda in support of Spain’. Such an assessment appears to presume, however, that Rubens and Spanish policy were pursuing the same interests. This did not apply precisely in connection with the question of a peace agreement between the southern and northern provinces.


47. The beginnings of Rubens’s activities as a negotiator can only be reconstructed in outline. It appears, however, that personal relationships put him in a position to act as an informant in the negotiations over a renewal of the cease-fire between The Hague and Brussels. The cease-fire agreement between the United Provinces and the Spanish Netherlands, set at a period of twelve years, expired in the spring of 1621. The Spanish decision to continue the war was preceded by negotiations between The Hague, Brussels and Madrid that began as early as 1619. Since the two parts of the country had no diplomatic relations, the negotiations were informal, and took place at an unofficial level. The two earliest letters by Rubens containing political and diplomatic material date from September 1623 and January 1624 (Rooses—Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887–1909, III, 1900, pp. 253–260, doc. CCCL; Magurn, Letters, 1955, pp. 94–96, nos. 55–56, and pp. 419–420, no. 56). Both were addressed to Petrus Pecquius, Chancellor of Brabant, a high-ranking minister in the Brussels government. Rubens reports on discussions he had had with Jan Brant, a confidant of Maurice of Orange, on renewing the cease-fire. It emerges from the letter that Rubens had already been involved in such exploratory talks for a considerable time. In other letters to Pecquius, Rubens also reports on his contacts with Brant. Rubens had personal relations linking him to both of these partners in the talks. He was distantly related to Pecquius, and friendly with him through his father. Jan Brant was the nephew of his wife, Isabella. On Rubens’s diplomatic activities, see K.L. Klose, ‘Rubens im Wirkungsreise des Staatsmannes’, Historisches Taschenbuch, ed. F. von Raumer, 3rd series, VII, Leipzig, 1856, pp. 175–267; M.I.= L.P.] Gachard, Histoire politique et diplomatique de Pierre-Paul Rubens, Brussels, 1877; Evers, op. cit. in n. 2 above, pp. 279–305; F. Baudouin, ‘L’activité diplomatique de Rubens’, [Cat. Exh.] Rubens diplomatique, Elewijt, 1962, pp. 23–39, reprinted in an expanded version in F. Baudouin, Pietro Paolo Rubens, Antwerp, 1977, pp. 209–245. Rubens reached the peak of his diplomatic career in 1629, when Philip IV appointed him a secretary to the privy council and gave him powers to agree to a cease-fire with England and conduct negotiations on a peace treaty.


of the Netherlands. The historical situation in the period around 1622 therefore requires more detailed analysis.

In 1598, when the Archduke Albert and the Infanta Isabella, were installed as regents, Philip II had granted the southern provinces of the Netherlands sovereignty. Formal independence, however, was linked to certain conditions, and it ended with the death of Albert in 1621. The most influential advisers at court in Brussels were Spaniards, representatives of the Spanish king. The sovereignty of the Brussels government was above all restricted in the areas of military and foreign policy. The important posts in the financial and military administration were occupied by Spaniards. The large sums of money sent to Flanders from Madrid to pay for the war and provisioning of the troops were directly administered by the Spanish financial council. On the question of whether the war should end or continue, therefore, the administration in Brussels, where the majority were in favour of a peace settlement, was in a position to mediate, but had no power to make a decision.

Agreement between the northern and southern provinces formally failed because Philip III demanded unacceptable conditions from the Dutch: opening of the mouth of the Scheldt, recognition of Spanish sovereignty and relinquishment of trade with the Spanish and Portuguese colonies. The northern States-General were only prepared to make a new agreement on the basis of the previous conditions: recognition by Spain of the United Provinces as ‘free lands, states and provinces’ and abandonment of all further Spanish claims. In 1621, the new king, Philip IV, confirmed the decision to continue the war against the northern provinces. In Brussels, attempts were still continuing to

---

50. One of the conditions was that both regents must remain loyal to the Catholic faith throughout their lives. If the marriage remained without children, the provinces would return to Spain after the death of one of the two partners. This took place after Albert’s death in 1621. From 1621 until her death in 1633, Isabella merely served as governor on behalf of the Spanish king. The decisive factor in relation to the country’s economic potential was the fact that the provinces were excluded from trading with America and the East Indies. See H. Pirenne, *Geschichte Belgiens*, IV, Gotha, 1913, p. 300.

51. These included the Genoese condottiere Ambrogio Spinola, who in 1604 was appointed commanding officer of the Spanish forces in Flanders by Philip III. In this capacity, he had a position equivalent to prime minister at court in Brussels, and acted as intermediary with Madrid (see Pirenne, op. cit., IV, pp. 324f., 334). Up until 1627, when he resigned his command due to the obstinate attitude of the Spanish government over the question of a peace settlement, Spinola was responsible for the military success of the Spanish troops. Rubens initially regarded the Genoese commanding officer with reserve, but later counted him as one of his friends, after their positions had drawn closer.
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achieve some movement through negotiations, but Spain was nevertheless preparing for a fresh military offensive. The chances of success were assessed realistically at the court in Madrid. No one believed any longer that the renegade provinces could be completely vanquished by military means and returned to Spanish sovereignty. The critical aspect, however, was mainly the burgeoning Atlantic trade by the Dutch, which it was hoped could be reined in by a military offensive. In addition, Spain hoped to improve its own position in advance of the final peace negotiations.

Finally, the decision to continue the war against the United Provinces represented an attempt to win fresh validity for the claim of the monarquía española to be the principal Catholic power in Europe. In the previous year, in the autumn of 1620, Spain had intervened in the conflict between the Emperor Ferdinand and the Protestant estates in Bohemia by occupying the Palatinate. This decision contributed substantially to the escalation of this regional conflict within the Holy Roman Empire into a continental war. After the replacement of the Duke of Lerma in 1618 and the death of Philip III in 1621, Spanish foreign policy was formulated by the pro-Austrian Balthasar de Zúñiga and his protégé, the Duke of Olivares. Its aim was to restore the Spanish reputation in Europe that had prevailed in the time of Philip II. On the one hand, this implied the conclusion of a peace agreement with the States-General, without any Spanish loss of face. On the other hand, it also meant that Protestant influence in the Empire had to be driven back, and the position of the Austrian Habsburgs needed to be strengthened. However, these Spanish great-power policies lacked the requisite economic basis. The country's financial power was not adequate to maintain the presence and strength of Spanish troops in various theatres of war all over Europe. A programme of economic reforms introduced by Olivares, aiming to improve productivity in Castile and make trade more efficient, was too protracted and difficult to implement to achieve quick results. Although it was recognized that the financing of the country's military operations was a problem, the financial aspects hardly impinged at all on the foreign-policy argument for restoring the monarchy's reputation.

In the final years of Philip III's reign, annual state expenditure totalled nine million ducats, eight million of which were spent on military affairs. Since the stationing of Spanish troops in Flanders in 1567, the war against the rebellious Dutch provinces had been the largest single expense in the Spanish state budget. Maintaining the armed forces alone was costing some three million ducats annually. The high cost and the length of the war can be explained by particular conditions.54 There were no open field battles capable of producing a decisive outcome quickly. The territory of the Netherlands was densely populated,

54. The standard work on the following is G. Parker, The Army of Flanders and the Spanish Road 1567–1659: The Logistics of Spanish Victory and Defeat in the Low Countries' Wars, Cambridge, 1972.
and vital economic and political functions were scattered throughout different cities. The war could only be decided by the capture of the most important cities, but these were well protected by fortifications. Besieging well-fortified towns, however, was a protracted undertaking that required large numbers of mercenaries who needed to be in position for an extended period, together with a well-organized supply system. A siege war was costly in terms of time and materials, and therefore involved massive expense. The decisive factor for success in such an undertaking was not so much strategic preparation, but above all secure financial resources. The Spaniards had to abandon promising positions on several occasions and accept serious defeats because payments were interrupted and their mercenaries mutinied. A lack of money in the spring of 1607, for example, forced the Spaniards to agree to an eight-month cease-fire in spite of previous successes. In November of that year, the Spanish government declared the state bankrupt because no new credit could be acquired. In 1609, finally, it had to agree to an armistice treaty for a period of twelve years on conditions equivalent to an admission of defeat.

The armistice brought substantial financial relief, since military expenditure in Flanders could be reduced by half. When Philip IV decided to continue the war in April 1621, there was no money to pay for it in the Spanish treasury. Archduke Albert was therefore hoping for a continuation of the cease-fire, and in June 1621 he gave the king an estimate of the additional expenses that would be required to conduct a military offensive campaign, amounting to the alarming sum of 3.6 million ducats per year. In July 1621, the Spanish council of state nevertheless decided in favour of war, for the reasons mentioned above, and approved the vast sums required. In the medium term, it was intended to cover the additional expenses by pursuing an inflationary financial policy in Castile. In the short term, however, credit needed to be acquired, and as in the previous decades, this came from Genoa.

Throughout the sixteenth century, Spanish great-power policy pushed state expenditure incessantly upwards as a result of the country’s military engagements against the Turks, against England and in the Netherlands. The constantly increasing demand for credit could soon only be met by the banks, which were able to provide the gigantic sums required even at short notice. The short-term credit agreements, the asientos, committed the bankers to take on the foreign debts of the Spanish crown. At the end of each year, the Spanish financial council normally produced a budget plan for the coming year, and attempted to reach agreement with German and later mainly Genoese bankers for the payment of specific sums at set times in Madrid, Flanders or Italy. Security for the creditors consisted of the silver deliveries from America.
and of tax revenues in Castile, which still had to be raised, or even still had to be agreed by the Cortes. In recompense for this risky business, the foreign bankers received export licences for the American silver, trading monopolies and also feudal rights in Spanish crown estates in southern Italy.

From the mid sixteenth century up to the end of the 1620s, Genoese banks dominated the asiento business, practically without competition. The Spanish monarchy's credit requirements increased to such an extent that they were soon no longer capable of being covered by corresponding increases in taxes and silver imports. With their undisputed dominance, the Genoese bankers were able to dictate the conditions on which credit was assigned. But the Spanish government also had a means of pressure to keep its business partners at bay: the declaration of state bankruptcy. Between 1550 and 1630, it used this instrument five times (1557, 1575, 1596, 1607 and 1627), preceded on each occasion by negotiations on acquiring credit for the following fiscal year that broke down due to the fact that the Spanish government's securities—silver supplies and taxes—were already mortgaged for years to come. The declaration of insolvency forced creditors to agree to the re-scheduling of older outstanding debts. These were converted from short-term asiento contracts, to be paid in silver, into long-term credit contracts (iuros), which could be paid for in the Castilian copper currency that was virtually worthless in terms of international currency payments. The expected silver supplies could then once again be mortgaged against new asiento contracts. The declarations of bankruptcy were all aimed at breaking the predominance of the Genoese in the asiento business. But it was only in 1627 that the Spanish government succeeded in this. Olivares had established contacts with a consortium of Portuguese merchants who were financially powerful and much less expensive than the Genoese bankers. During the 1630s and 1640s, in addition to several German and Genoese banks, it was principally the Portuguese who made it possible for Spain to continue its war efforts at such great expense.


57. In 1619, a Spanish ministry official calculated for Philip III that he was losing 38% from interest and other expenses to the Genoese banks on money transferred to Flanders. Cf. Correspondance de la Cour d’Espagne sur les Affaires des Pays-Bas au XVIIe siècle, II, Brussels, 1923, p. 551, doc. 1447.

58. On the role of the Portuguese merchants, who from the 1590s onwards began to play an increasingly important role in financial business with the Spanish monarchy, see H. Pohl, Die Portugiesen in Antwerpen (1567–1648). Zur Geschichte einer Minderheit (Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Beihefte, LXIII), Wiesbaden, 1977, esp. pp. 218–239.

The importance of Genoa in Spain’s conduct of the war in the Netherlands between 1568 and 1627 was immediately obvious to Rubens’s contemporaries in two ways. Firstly, Genoa was a crossroads in the supply route from Spain to the Netherlands, the *camino del Imperio*. The sea route via the Atlantic and the English Channel was closed to the Spaniards due to the hostility of England and as a result of Dutch maritime supremacy. Troops, supplies and money had to be transported to the Netherlands with difficulty and loss of time via the land route. Goods were sent by ship from Barcelona or Naples to Genoa. From there, the route ran through northern Italy, across the Alps and along the Rhine valley through territories which, like the Republic of Genoa and the Duchy of Milan, were dependents or allies of Spain. This logistical role of Genoa was overshadowed, however, by the function of the Genoese banks in providing finance to maintain Spanish troops. For Rubens’s contemporaries in Flanders, this must have made an even more direct impression, since the vast amounts spent in this way were paid out directly via the Antwerp branches of the Genoese banks. Business links between Genoa and Antwerp, the most important stock exchange in northern Europe, were traditionally close. But the immense sums that began to flow into Flanders through these channels after the start of the war of independence gave the connection between the two cities a new quality. The Genoese banks were directly financing the war being waged by the Spaniards on the territory of Flanders and Brabant against the Dutch States-General.

Against the background of this conflict of interests, it seems inappropriate to ascribe any clear political message to the publication of a book of engravings such as the *Palazzi di Genova*. There is no evidence that Rubens shared the views of those in power in Madrid regarding the role of Spain in the European balance of powers. On the contrary—like the regents and most of the Brussels administration, he was attempting to bring an end to the war by means of negotiation. The negotiations carried out by Rubens later in London on behalf of the Spaniards were also motivated by the hope of reaching a peace agreement in the Netherlands through a settlement between Spain and England. The effects of the continuing state of war touched Rubens personally as well as professionally. To friends, he expressed his desire for peace and complained of the foreign influence on Brussels politics and the ineffectiveness of his own efforts.60 The late painting *Allegory of War* (Florence, Palazzo Pitti) can be regarded as a personal confession of faith. War, Rubens complained in an accompanying letter to the Florentine court painter Justus

60. See e.g. in letters to Pierre Dupuy of 6 and 28 May 1627 (Rooses—Ruebens, Correspondance, 1887–1909, IV, 1904, pp. 251–254, doc. XDVIII, pp. 264–267, doc. DII; Magurn, Letters, 1955, pp. 178f., no. 107, pp. 184f., no. 111).
Sustermans, destroyed the foundations of human life—not only its material foundations, but also its spiritual foundations. The political content of the Palazzi di Genova thus remains ambivalent. Rubens could hardly have intended to influence political decisions with such a publication. Nevertheless, Genoa’s fame was based primarily on its role as a market for capital, and less on its meaning as an artistic centre. In any case, a contemporary in Antwerp or Brussels, in Paris or Madrid, would have first thought of these political and economic links when he picked up a copy of Rubens’s book.

Belgicae Nostrae Apelles

Artists and courtiers were the intended audience for the book—further distribution of the Palazzi di Genova were probably similar to that in Paris, as far as Rubens himself was responsible for it. The volume of engravings was an exclusive product which the artist could offer to persons on whose benevolence and favourable assessment he depended. Consequently, the distribution of the work was small. His contemporary John Evelyn noted (1644) that the book was ‘rare’. Even in Genoa, it does not seem to have been widely disseminated during the seventeenth century. Raffaele Soprani does not mention it at all in his biography of Rubens. It is not astonishing, therefore, that there was no real reception of the book in the field of architecture itself. As far as we can assess it today, it left no immediate traces on the architectural history of the southern Netherlands. Mario Labò searched in vain for any borrowings from Genoese palace architecture in the burgher houses of Antwerp. Traces of any use of the book for study purposes, or as an aid in solving specific architectural problems, can at best be found in the northern Netherlands and in England.

The standard for the reception of Italian Renaissance forms in the northern Netherlands was set by the Mauritshuis in The Hague, which was erected for Johan Maurits van Nassau-Siegen beginning in 1633. In addition to models in


63. Soprani, Vite, 1674, pp. 301f. Carlo Giuseppe Ratti was the first to refer to the book, in his new edition of Soprani’s collection of biographies (Soprani—Ratti, Vite, 1768, p. 401).

64. Labò, Palazzi di Genova, 1970, p. 26. However, Frans Baudouin has pointed out to me that due to the economic decline in Antwerp during the 17th century, no more prominent urban palaces were built, and that in any case the Genoese models did not correspond to the traditional design of patrician houses in Antwerp.
the work of Palladio and Scamozzi, the information about Genoese palaces provided by Rubens may have had some influence in the planning of the building.\(^{65}\) The engravings of the Assunta di Carignano (XXII) in Rubens’s book may also have played a part in the planning of the Nieuwe Kerk in Haarlem as a centralized building in the form of a Greek cross, by Jacob van Kampen (1645).\(^{66}\) In England, John Webb studied the distribution scheme of various villas and palaces using Rubens’s ground plans.\(^{67}\) Roger Pratt analyzed the illustrations for his discussion of a typology of Italian palace architecture.\(^{68}\) Inigo Jones also owned a copy of the \textit{Palazzi di Genova}, although traces of any direct involvement with Genoese architecture are not evident in his work.\(^{69}\) Rubens’s volume of engravings thus has its place among the architectural books and collections of models on which northern architects and patrons who had no direct access to Italian Renaissance buildings drew for their inspiration. Yet there are too few definite or conjectural examples of the book having an influence on actual buildings for its function to be restricted to that of a pattern book. The book was received at a quite different level, as a statement by Constantijn Huygens makes startlingly clear. Huygens invited Rubens to visit The Hague in November 1635 to view his newly built house, and to discuss architecture with him, ‘vous ... qui excellez en la cognoissance de ceste illustre estude, comme en toute autre chose et m’en pourriez faire des leçons’.\(^{70}\) In this and other letters from Huygens to Rubens,


\(^{66}\) Huisken et al., op. cit., pp. 184f.


\(^{69}\) A. Cerutti Fusco, \textit{Inigo Jones Vitruvius Britannicus. Jones e Palladio nella cultura architettonica inglese 1600–1700}, Rimini, 1985, p. 157. Inigo Jones cannot have purchased the book in Italy as Cerutti Fusco believes, however. It is more probable that Rubens gave the architect a copy of it when he was in London for an extended period in 1629–30, and painted the ceiling of the Banqueting House, which had been built according to plans by Inigo Jones.

the *Palazzi di Genova* is not mentioned explicitly. Huygens’s view of Rubens as a connoisseur of architecture, however, must have been based not least on the volume of engravings, as he had demonstrated his expertise in the field as its editor.

The *Palazzi di Genova* proves Rubens’s claim to be able to extend his role as an artistic preceptor from the field of painting to that of architecture. The Genoese plans had an intrinsic potential to serve as a collection of models, and in his editorial capacity, presenting himself as a teacher of architecture, Rubens took advantage of this. He may also have owned drawings of ancient ruins and modern Roman and Florentine buildings. But it was only from the Genoese planning materials that he was able to produce a book such as this. The volume presents models drawn from the late Italian Renaissance, the stylistic phase that had already provided models for numerous church buildings built in Flanders and Brabant in the spirit of the Counter-Reformation. As an artist with an international reputation, Rubens made a decisive contribution to the way in which the art of the southern Netherlands, by reverting to Roman and Italian references, developed its own unmistakable appearance. As in the case of Rubens’s paintings, the programme in the field of architecture also involved a return to antiquity and the Renaissance.71

The *Palazzi di Genova* emerged from a collection of art whose stature declared Rubens’s claim to be continuing and completing the traditions of the great art of the past. His house and collection were visited by numerous travellers, including high-ranking figures. The collection thus already had a public quality, but publishing part of his collection of drawings enhanced this even further. The publication occurred at a time when Rubens was extending his sphere of influence beyond the immediate boundaries of his native country, through his commissions and reproduction engravings, and was increasingly reaching out to an international audience. The expensive reproduction of the Genoese drawings as a luxurious volume in folio format must have cost Rubens several thousand guilders for engraving and printing expens-

71. It should be mentioned in this context that Albert and Isabella made efforts to attract to their court other Netherlandish artists who had experience of Italy. In 1604, Wenzel Cobergher was appointed court architect, and a few years later, between 1608 and 1613, Jacques Francart was also employed in this capacity. Both were artists who had worked in Rome for an extended period, and were familiar with contemporary architecture there. On Cobergher, see J.H. Plantenga, *L’Architecture religieuse dans l’ancien duché de Brabant*, The Hague, 1926, pp. 16–19. On Francart, loc. cit., pp. 47–56. On the art policy of the regents, see M. De Maeyer, *Albrecht en Isabella en de Schilderkunst. Bijdrage tot de Geschiedenis van de XVIIe-eeuwse Schilderkunst in de zuidelijke Nederlanden* (Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Schone Kunsten, IX), Brussels, 1955. A list of the artists, craftsmen, and scholars who were appointed to official posts at court or were paid by the court, is given in P. Saintenoy, ‘L’Art architectural sous Albert et Isabelle et les règles du Concile de Trente’, available to me as an unpaginated offprint from *Revue latine*, 1922.
es—a substantial sum. As an entrepreneur, accustomed to measuring costs in time and money from a business point of view, however, Rubens surely made a precise calculation of the profits to be expected from this investment. These did not lie at the material level. As a presentation item, which was Rubens's main use for the book, it did not bring in any financial profit. Rather, the publication of the book on architecture was designed to enhance his artistic renown.

Rubens was regarded by his contemporaries as the 'Apelles of his time'. Admittedly, it was a widespread label, which was also applied to less important artists. But Apelles, the court painter of Alexander the Great and the artist who brought painting to perfection in antiquity, must for Rubens in particular have prefigured his own artistic position. Just as Apelles was influential on the development of art through his writings, Rubens, in his own view, also owed it to himself to signify the elevated status of his art by publishing a textbook. Rubens's intention to publish works of some sort on the theory of art, whether it was a treatise on antique sculpture or sculpture in general, or a study on the theory of colour, can only be partially reconstructed. There is as yet no clear conception of these projects in the various phases of their planning, and none of them seems to have reached a definitive stage. The Palazzi di Genova is the only one of these projects that Rubens actually completed—and in fact it is the only book that was ever published by one of the great European artists of the seventeenth century.

72. For comparison: for the engraving of the four plates for Philip Rubens's Electorium libri II from Rubens's drawings, including two smaller jobs, Theodor Galle 1608 charged a total of 170 guilders. For the printing of the four plates in an edition of 1000 each, Moretus charged a total of 40 guilders (Rooses, Moretus, 1882–83, 1883, pp. 51f.). The engraving of the Genoese plans is likely to have been less expensive, as far as the cost per item is concerned, since they did not involve figurative representations. Instead, it was the large number of engravings, totalling 139 plates, which would have driven the price up.

INTRODUCTION TO THE CATALOGUE

A FIRST SERIES of seventy-two engravings with the title *Palazzi di Genova* was published by Rubens in 1622. Twelve palaces and villas were covered there, in sets consisting of up to nine plates. Next to floor plans, sections were also included, as well as façade elevations. Some time later sixty-seven more plates were brought out, illustrating nineteen further Genoese palaces and four churches in sets of about three plates. In a later edition (1652) the first series was called *Palazzi Antichi*, the second *Palazzi Moderni*.

The present catalogue follows the sequence as established in Rubens’s publication as well as the system adopted there. The first series lists the buildings under the letters A to K, with two extra palaces without any identification letter, and it closes with four plates with a combination of additional information (Figs. 149, 150, 152, 153). Then follows the second series, the buildings there identified with the Roman numerals I to XXIII. Within each series the plates were given a continuous numbering: *Figura* 1–72 in the first series (here numbered Nos. 1–72); *Figura* 1–67 in the second (our Nos. 73–139).

Under each catalogue number the engravings, by Nicolas Ryckemans, are treated first, since they represent the product as intended by Rubens; then follow the drawings: authorship unknown, annotated in various ways, with some of the inscriptions in Rubens’s hand (see below); finally the few preserved proof impressions of the engravings (Nos. 75b, 102b, 105b, 108b, 111b, 114b, 117b, 120b, 123b, 126b, 129b). The latter are in the printroom of the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam. The collection of drawings, except for a few which are missing (Nos. 1a, 67a, 68a, 69a, 78a, 84a, 93a, 96a, 117a, 126a, 129a, 133a, 135a, 137a, 139a), has also been kept together throughout its history (see pp. 20f. for the history of the provenance). The drawings are now in the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) in London, bound into a volume (in the present catalogue they are numbered as No. 1a to 139a). The engravings render the drawings on the same scale, but in reverse.

The measurements given for the drawings refer to the size of the sheet, whereas in the case of the engravings and proof impressions it is the size of the plate that is indicated. In the technical descriptions, the catalogue entries are somewhat restrictive, especially regarding the inscriptions. In the case of the engravings, only the reference to the *Figura* number (top right) is given, as well as the inscription identifying the illustration (building, floor, section or façade); in the reference to the scale (where provided) the actual measurements of the units (standing for *palmi*; 1 Genoese *palmo*=247 mm) is given in millimetres. Not recorded are indications as to the individual rooms, measurements (see below) or orientation (only on the floor
INTRODUCTION TO THE CATALOGUE

plans in the *Palazzi Antichi*, with counter-clockwise *Tramontana, Levante, Mezzogiorno* and *Ponente*).

In the case of the drawings, however, almost complete transcriptions of the inscriptions are provided. Only detailed measurements such as wall thickness and the measurements of door and window openings are not included. Most of these dimensions also appear in the engravings. In the first series (the *Palazzi Antichi*), the measurements are mostly in agreement with the drawings. In the second series (the *Palazzi Moderni*), however, they are usually different. Basically, four types of inscription can be distinguished:

1. In both series, the dimensions, room descriptions, and the names of the owners of the buildings, usually derive from the draughtsman. In the first series, in addition, the individual sheets were also marked by letters indicating their place in the sequence of each set. However, these symbols on the upper margin of the drawings are now only visible in a few cases, since the sheets were later trimmed. An exception to this is set A in which these marks are still almost completely readable. All of these inscriptions, like the drawings themselves, were executed in a dark ink that now has a red tinge.

2. Four drawings in the first series are marked with the names of the owners of the palaces. Some of these additions derive from the draughtsman, but others are from a later hand, probably from the owner into whose collection the drawings came before they were purchased by Rubens. Three drawings bear the names of the commissioning patrons: *Lucca Giustiniano* (B), *Battista Grimaldo* (D) and *Franco Lercharo* (K). In the case of Palazzo H, the name *Lazzaro Ciba* (Lazzaro Grimaldi Ceba) is not that of the founder, but perhaps of a later owner. The description of Palazzo G as *casa del spagnuolo* is puzzling.

3. The editorial inscriptions, added in preparation for the publication of the drawings, are largely by Rubens himself. On the drawings in the first series, the sets were marked by letters of the alphabet, and the sequence of the drawings was established by the numbering that appears in the engravings as the *Figura* number. Some drawings, however, bear more extensive inscriptions. All these editorial inscriptions were made in red and black chalk and stem from the editor himself. The more detailed editorial inscriptions and corrections on the drawings in the second series are also partly in Rubens's own hand. This applies less to the numbering of the sets of drawings in roman figures than to the various additions and corrections to the owners' names (see for example the inscriptions on drawings of the Balbi Senarega and Spinola palaces and the church of S. Siro, Figs. 290a–c). Rubens also corrected the numerous Genoese dialect forms (*portico* instead of *portigho*, *palazzo* instead of *palacio*, etc.). All these inscriptions were made in black ink.

4. Finally, a later owner added captions and numbered the sheets in words and in the same sequence as the engravings. This was probably done at the beginning of the eighteenth century, when the drawings were bound into a volume.
The bibliographical information on the individual buildings is not intended to be complete. The older guidebooks are mainly cited so that the owners' names noted there can indicate the sometimes frequent changes of ownership which took place. Bibliographical references referring exclusively to the pictorial or sculptural decoration are only included when relevant to the present context. For those interested in such matters, and the importance they have for any iconological interpretation, reference may be made to the two fundamental surveys by Ezia Gavazza, *La grande decorazione a Genova* (1974) and *Lo spazio dipinto. Il grande affresco genovese nel '600* (1989), and, for a broader context, to the study by Julian Kliemann, *Gesta dipinte* (1993), esp. pp. 131–158. The relevant sections in the two volumes of *La pittura a Genova e in Liguria* (second edition 1987) provide further fundamental information.

For ease of reference, a short list is added in which all thirty-five buildings are included in the sequence and with the labelling given by Rubens in his volume of engravings. With the palaces in the second series, it should be remembered that Rubens, with a few exceptions, gives not the names of the commissioning patrons, but those of the current owners around 1600.

First series: the twelve palaces and villas of the *Palazzi Antichi*:

A. **PALAZZO CARREGA CATALDI** (Via Garibaldi 4; Nos. 1–8). Built beginning in 1558 for Tobia Pallavicino. From 1704 Carrega, from 1830 Cataldi, since 1922 Camera di Commercio.

B. **VILLA GIUSTINIANI CAMBIASO** (Via Montallegro 1 [Albaro]; Nos. 9–13 and 70). Built c. 1548 for Luca Giustiniani according to designs by Galeazzo Alessi. From 1787 Cambiaso, since 1921 the premises of university institutes.

C. **VILLA SPINOLA DI SAN PIETRO** (Via all'Istituto Tecnico 1 [Sampierdarena]; Nos. 14–19 and 71). Built c. 1560 for the Spinola di San Pietro family. Now owned by the city of Genoa and used as a school.

D. **VILLA GRIMALDI ‘FORTEZZA’** (Via Palazzo della Fortezza 14 [Sampierdarena]; Nos. 20–28 and 71). Built beginning in 1559 for Giovanni Battista Grimaldi q. Girolamo. Now owned by the city of Genoa and used as a school.

E. **VILLA PALLAVICINO DELLE PESCHIERE** (Via San Bartolomeo degli Armeni 5; Nos. 29–34). Built c. 1556 for Tobia Pallavicino.

F. **PALAZZO SPINOLA** (Via Garibaldi 5; Nos. 35–42 and 71–72). Built beginning in 1558 for Angelo Giovanni Spinola. Since 1926 Banca d’America e d’Italia.
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H. VILLA GRIMALDI SAULI (Via Colombo 7; Nos. 49–52). Built before or around 1554 for Giovanni Battista Grimaldi q. Girolamo Cardinale. Later Sauli.

I. PALAZZO ROSTAN RAGGIO (Largo della Zecca 4; Nos. 53–60 and 71). Built beginning in 1565 for Bartolomeo Lomellino. Since 1875 premises of the Istituto Tecnico Commerciale ‘Vittorio Emanuele II’.


PALAZZO DORIA TURSI (Via Garibaldi 9; Nos. 67, 69 and 72). Built beginning in 1565 for Nicolò Grimaldi. From 1596 Doria, since 1848 Municipio.

PALAZZO CAMBIASO (Via Garibaldi 1; Nos. 68–69). Built beginning in 1558 for Agostino Pallavicino. Since 1921 Banco di Napoli.

Second series: the nineteen palaces and four churches of the Palazzi Moderni:

I. Palazzo del Sig'. Niccolo Spinola: PALAZZO DORIA (Via Garibaldi 6; Nos. 73–75). Built beginning in 1563 for Giambattista Spinola ‘Il Valenza’. Later Doria, since 1924 Associazione Industriali.

II. Palazzo del Sig'. Andrea Spinola: PALAZZO GAMBARO (Via Garibaldi 2; Nos. 76–78). Built beginning in 1558 for Pantaleo Spinola. Later Cambiaso, Giustiniani, from 1844 Gambaro, since 1923 Banco di Chiavari e della Riviera Ligure.


IV. Palazzo del Sig’. Daniel Spinola: PALAZZO FRANZONE (Via Luccoli 23; Nos. 82–84). Built before 1560 for Nicolò Spinola. From 1606 Franzone, later Bertollo.

V. Palazzo del Sig'. Ottavio Sauli: PALAZZO DEL MELOGRANO (Piazza Campetto 2; Nos. 85–87). Built between 1586 and 1589 for Ottavio Imperiale. Later Sauli, De Mari and Casareto.

VII. Palazzo del Sig'. Giovan Augustino Balbi: PALAZZO DURAZZO PALLAVICINI (Via Balbi 1; Nos. 91–93). Built beginning in 1618 for Giovanni Agostino Balbi.


IX. Palazzo del Sig'. Luigi Centurione: PALAZZO PODESTÀ (Via Garibaldi 7; Nos. 97–99). Built beginning in 1563 for Nicolosio Lomellino. Later Centurione, Pallavicino, Raggi, since 1865 Podestà.

X. Palazzo del Sig'. Giacomo Saluzzo/del Sig'. Giovan Battista Adorno: PALAZZO CATTANEO ADORNO (Via Garibaldi 8/10; Nos. 100–102). Built c. 1585 for Lazzaro and Giacomo Spinola.

XI. Palazzo del Sig'. Henrico Salvago: PALAZZO CAMPANELLA (Via Garibaldi 12; Nos. 103–105). Built beginning in 1562 for Baldassare Lomellino. Later Salvago, Spinola, Serra, since 1917 Campanella.


XIII. Palazzo del Sig'. Battista Centurione: PALAZZO CENTURIONE (Via del Campo 1; Nos. 109–111). Built after 1611 for Battista Centurione. Later Cambiaso.

XIV. Palazzo del Sig'. Antonio Doria Marchese de S. Steffano: PALAZZO DORIA SPINOLA (Largo Lanfranco 1; Nos. 112–114). Built beginning in 1541 for Antonio Doria. From 1624 Spinola di San Pietro, since 1879 Prefettura.


XVI. Palazzo del Sig'. Francesco Grimaldo: PALAZZO SPINOLA (Piazza di Pellicceria 1; Nos. 118–120). Built c. 1593 for Francesco Grimaldi. Later Pallavicino, Spinola, since 1959 the location of the Galleria Nazionale di Palazzo Spinola.
XVII. *Palazzo del Sig'. Horatio de Negro: PALAZZO DI NEGRO (Via San Luca 2; Nos. 121–123).* Built after 1568 for Ambrogio Di Negro.

XVIII. *Palazzo del Sig'. Giacomo Lomellino: PALAZZO LOMELLINI PATRONE (Largo della Zecca 2; Nos. 124–126).* Built c. 1619 for Giacomo Lomellino. From 1855 Patrone, owned by local government since 1898.

XIX. *Palazzo del Sig'. Giulio della Rovere: PALAZZO ROVERE (Piazza Rovere 1; Nos. 127–129).* Built 1580–1581 for Clemente della Rovere.

XX. *Chiesa de S. Ciro de gli Padri Theatini: S. SIRO (Via San Siro; Nos. 130–131).* Built beginning in 1584 for the Theatine Order.

XXI. *Chiesa della Annunciata de Padri Zoccholanti: SS. ANNUNZIATA DEL VASTATO (Piazza della Nunziata 4; Nos. 132–133).* Built beginning in 1520 for the Franciscans, and altered beginning in 1591 for the Discalced Carmelites.

XXII. *Santa Maria de Carignano de Sig'. Sauli: S. MARIA ASSUNTA IN CARIGNANO (Piazza Carignano; Nos. 134–135).* Built beginning in 1552 as an endowment of the Sauli family according to designs by Galeazzo Alessi.

XXIII. *Chiesa de Padri Iesuiti: SS. AMBROGIO E ANDREA (Piazza Matteotti; Nos. 136–139).* Built beginning in 1589 for the Jesuits according to designs by Giuseppe Valeriano.
FIRST SERIES: PALAZZI ANTICHI

A. PALAZZO CARREGA CATALDI
(Nos. 1–8)


1. Plan of the Cellar: Engraving
(Fig. 1)

196 × 253 mm.

Inscribed Figura .1.; Pianta prima di sotto terra del seguente Palazzo .A. Privilege mark on the lower edge Cum priuilegijs, Regis Christianissimi, / Principum Belgarum, & Ordinu(m) Batauae; on lower right edge inscribed Nicolaes Ryckemans sculp.; in one of the rooms Le misure di questa pianta si/vedranno nella pianta seconda.

1a. Plan of the Cellar: Drawing

Whereabouts unknown; presumably lost

2. Plan of the Ground Floor:
Engraving (Fig. 2)

356 × 253 mm.

Inscribed Figura .2.; Pianta seconda del Palazzo .A.

Scale 10 palmi = 21 mm.

2a. Plan of the Ground Floor:
Drawing (Fig. 3)

395 × 280 mm.; trimmed at top.

Scale on the lower edge of the sheet 10 palmi = 21 mm.

Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section camera; recamera; alta 25; in the rooms of the central section Portico, 46½/44½, alto 27½; salotto, p 50/38 p 10; in the rooms of the right-hand section recamera; camera, alta 25; giardino; below the illustration pianta .2.; in pencil on the upper edge E, trimmed; also in pencil on the lower edge, faint, A; by Rubens in red chalk above 2; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 2.

3. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving
(Fig. 4)

195 × 249 mm.

Inscribed Figura .3.; Pianta terza del Palazzo .A.
3a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 5)

395 × 280 mm.; trimmed at top.

Inscribed in one room in the left-hand section *camera*; in the rooms in the central section *loggia*, 47 3/4/24 3/2; *sala*; in one room in the right-hand section *camera*; below the illustration *pianta* -4-, cancelled by Rubens in red chalk and corrected to 3; in pencil on upper edge *f*, trimmed; further down *A*; by Rubens in red chalk above 3; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 3.

4. Plan of the Mezzanine: Engraving (Fig. 6)

196 × 248 mm.

Inscribed *Figura .4.; Pianta quarta del Palazzo .A.*

4a. Plan of the Mezzanine: Drawing (Fig. 7)

400 × 270 mm.; trimmed at top.


Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section *camera p s(er)uitori*; *scuola*; *p s(ere)uitori*; in the rooms in the central section *luogo da far il pane; dispensa; dispensa; forno*; in the rooms in the right-hand section *scala; dispensa; cuocciina alta, focolare*; underneath the illustration *pianta* -3-, cancelled by Rubens in red chalk and corrected to 4; in pencil on upper edge *C (?),* trimmed; further down *A*; by Rubens in red chalk above 4; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 4.

5. Plan of the Attic: Engraving (Fig. 8)

192 × 250 mm.

Inscribed *Figura .5.; Pianta quinta cioè delli Granari del Palazzo .A.*

5a. Plan of the Attic: Drawing (Fig. 9)

400 × 270 mm.; trimmed at top.

Inscribed in one room each in the left-hand and right-hand sections *alto 14*; underneath the illustration *pianta* -5-; in pencil on the upper edge *A*, left alongside it *teerste blat*, both trimmed; also in pencil underneath the illustration *A*; by Rubens in red chalk at top 5, at bottom *Granari*; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 5.

6. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 10)

242 × 260 mm.

Inscribed *Figura .6.; Facciata del Palazzo .A. ò vero L’alsato delle piante precedenti.*

6a. Façade Elevation: Drawing (Fig. 11)

395 × 270 mm.; trimmed on right.

Inscribed on the right edge of the image 34 3/4; 36 1/4; underneath the illustration *Le bugne rustiche sono di pietra de fina. Le finite et la porta e di marmaro/Li pilastri ionichi sono di pietra di finale il cornicione di calzina tinto di color di pietra di fina(le)/il parapetto di color di finale; in pencil on the upper edge *B*; by Rubens in pencil below this *Palazzo D* (cancelled), with *A* below it; in red chalk above 6; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 6.

7. Cross Section: Engraving (Fig. 12)

260 × 264 mm.

Inscribed *Figura .7.; Il taglio per mezzo del Palazzo .A./in largezza paralello alla facciata.*

7a. Cross Section: Drawing (Fig. 13)

395 × 280 mm.; trimmed at top.
Inscribed on the left edge of the illustration pianta .1.; pianta .2.; pianta .3.; pianta .4.; pianta .5.; in pencil on upper edge G (?), trimmed; also in pencil on lower edge, faint, A; by Rubens in pencil at top Palazzo D, with A below it; in red chalk above 7; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 7.

8. Longitudinal Section: Engraving
(Fig. 14)

254 × 201 mm.

Inscribed Figura .8.; Il taglio del Medesimo Palazzo .A. per longezza da tramontana verso mezzo giorno.

8a. Longitudinal Section: Drawing
(Fig. 15)

395 × 280 mm.; trimmed at top.

Watermark: circle with the letters AR and crowning cross; examples with comparable structure in Briquet, Gênes, 1888, nos. 220–222: Genoa 1549–1589/93.

Inscribed in two rooms on the upper floor B; tinello; in pencil on upper edge H (?), trimmed; by Rubens in pencil Palazzo D (cancelled), with A below it; in red chalk above 8; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 8.

The palace was among the first four buildings constructed on the Strada Nuova, beginning in 1558. The commissioning patron, Tobia Pallavicino, was one of the first Genoese aristocrats to invest his vast wealth, largely earned from the alum trade, in systematic patronage of the arts. At the same time as he was building his city palace, he also built a villa, which had fresco decoration that set a new standard of artistic display for the Genoese aristocracy. Rubens included Tobia Pallavicino’s villa in his volume of engravings as Palazzo E. The formal language of the architecture of both villa and city palace reflect the influence of Alessi, but is also linked to local formal traditions.

Tobia Pallavicino had a protégé, Giovanni Battista Castello il Bergamasco, who was entrusted with the decoration of the rooms in both buildings. Earlier, Pallavicino had provided Castello with funds to enable him to visit Rome to continue his artistic training, and in his biography of Castello, Soprani writes: ‘essendo stata più volte osservata dal Sig. Tobia Pallavicino la virtuosa inclinatione del povero studente, s’indusse a riceverlo sotto la sua protettione; e soccorrendolo di ciò che bisognava l’invìò a Roma, nella qual Città à sue spese lo mantenne fin’à tanto ch’ei s’acquistò nome di ben fondato Disegnatore’.1 According to Soprani, Castello was not only a decorator and painter, as he appears from the documents known today, but also an architect. In addition to the palace of Vincenzo Imperiale, Soprani explicitly mentions the ‘palazzo architettato nella Strada Nuova per habitazione del Signor Tobia Pallavicino suo generoso mecenate’ as a work by the architect Castello.2 The extent to which Castello was really responsible for the architectural design remains questionable, however. Modern research has attempted to support Soprani’s attribution with stylistic arguments. As in many comparable cases, the sparse documents do not offer any clear answers. The patron, who played the role of an arbiter elegantiae for his contemporaries, seems to have participated in the planning of his buildings and their decoration to a greater extent than merely selecting the artists. Castello played a central part in the realization of his buildings, but the surviving evidence indicates that this was related more to the decoration than to the architectural design.

Very few building dates are available. In February 1558, Tobia Pallavicino secured two properties diagonally opposite each other on the newly marked-out street, and shortly afterwards gave the one on the slope side to his brother Agostino. In the same year, Agostino began building his
Cat. ill. 1. *Palazzo Carrega Cataldi* (A), façade elevation and plan of the ground floor (from Gauthier, *Édifices*, 1818–32, I, pl. 66)
CATALOGUE NOS. 1–8

Tobia also probably started building work immediately after purchasing the property. When he wrote his will two years later, in April 1560, the palace is mentioned as being currently under construction. Work on the two Pallavicino palaces apparently took place in parallel, since workers seem to have been exchanged. The names of the artists responsible for design and execution are not known, with the exception of Castello. Alizeri records that the hewn stone façade was executed by Antonio Roderio, Bartolomeo Riccio and Giovanni Domenico Solari. However, the document concerned has not been located since. When the doors, windows and shutters were commissioned from the carpenter Gaspare Forlani in January 1561, Giovanni Battista Castello was to provide the designs for these elements. Bartolomeo Riccio is named as the appraiser for the finished work on them. The building was apparently ready for use the same year. The decoration of the principal rooms with stucco and frescos was probably carried out by Castello immediately after construction was completed. In 1563, the decoration work seems to have been sufficiently advanced for references to the decoration of the rooms in the Pallavicino palace to be made in contracts for the decoration of other palaces.

The palace remained in the possession of the Pallavicino family up to the beginning of the eighteenth century. In 1704 it was sold to Giacomo Filippo Carrega, who added another floor in 1710–14. Between 1727 and 1746, the palace was extended southward by the addition of a wing in the area of the former garden. On the piano nobile of this wing stands the Galleria Dora ta, completed in 1744, with stucco and frescos by Lorenzo de' Ferrari. Gauthier's illustrations document the state of the building after these extensions (cat. ill. 1). In 1830, the palace came into the possession of the Cataldi family, and in 1922 it was purchased by the Camera di Commercio.

The set of drawings includes eight illustrations. The façade elevation (No. 6a; Fig. 11) includes a detailed record of the materials used. The rustication on the ground floor and the pilaster structure on the main floor are executed in hewn stone (pietra di finale), and the window frames and door frames consist of marble. The original cornice and the crowning parapet were lost when the extra storey was added in the eighteenth century (cat. ill. 2). The drawings are marked with the letters A to H. These were very likely made by the draughtsman or an early owner, and their sequence does not correspond to that later chosen by Rubens.

2. Ibid., p. 290.
4. In the February 1559 contract for the supply of the façade of Agostino's palace, a passage that is not entirely clear mentions that several of the craftsmen...
should be made available for the building of the palace of his brother Tobia. See the text of the document given in Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, pp. 464f., doc. XVI.

5. Alizeri, Guida, 1875, p. 200.


7. For the programme of the painted decoration see Höltge, Freskenprogramme, 1996, pp. 153ff.

8. See Chapter II, p. 75.

B. VILLA GIUSTINIANI CAMBIASO (Nos. 9–13)\(^1\)


9. Plan of the Ground Floor: Engraving (Fig. 16)

298 × 253 mm.

Inscribed Figura 9.; Prima pianta del Palazzo .B.

Scale 10 palmi = 21 mm.

The four round pedestals on the steps in front of the loggia have been eliminated.

9a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Fig. 17)

390 × 280 mm.; the upper third of the plan has a strip of paper pasted down over it (110 × 255 mm.), on which the drawing is continued almost without interruption; the arrangement of the rooms on this is left almost unchanged, but the plan has been extended upward by the width of one wall (10 mm.) in order to correspond with the measurements on the following drawing (No. 10a); not all of the measurements and room labels have been transferred to the pasted-down strip.

Scale on the lower edge of the sheet is 10 palmi = 21 mm.

Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section camera, 26/37\(\frac{1}{4}\), alto 34; salotto, 26 corrected further up to 28 p 5 (??)/35 p scored through with 38 p above; 28\(\frac{1}{4}\), alto 22; in the rooms in the central section 121 p 4; loggia, 49/24; portichio, 47/30; alto 20; in the rooms in the right-hand section camera, 23/\(\frac{1}{3}\)/26, alto 34; salotto, 26, alto 34; beneath the plan mezzo giorno, further right Prima pianta del S" with the following words entered above:
lucca giustiniano de villa; in pencil at the bottom W (?), trimmed; at the top in Rubens's hand in pencil B, in red chalk 9; in darker ink by a later hand above right Fig. 9.

10. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving
(Fig. 18)
244 x 253 mm.
Inscribed Figura .10.; Seconda pianta del Medesimo Palazzo .B.

10a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing
(Fig. 19)
395 x 280 mm.; trimmed at top.
Inscribed in the rooms of the left-hand section luogo da banchette; recamara; galaria; in the rooms of the central section secondo piano, sala, 48; loggia; terrazza scop(era)ta; in a side room in the right-hand section luogo da banchette; above tramontana, right levante, below mezzo giorno; on the right under the illustration del ser lucca giustiniano de villa; by Rubens in pencil above B, in red chalk 10; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 10.

Verso inscribed by the draughtsman (?) in ink Lucha giustiniano de villa.

11. Façade Elevation: Engraving
(Fig. 20)
202 x 263 mm.
Inscribed Figura .11.; Facciata del Medesimo Palazzo .B.

11a. Façade Elevation: Drawing
(Fig. 21)
390 x 280 mm.; trimmed at top.
Inscribed beneath the illustration tutto l'ornamento di que(sta facciata e di calzina; in pencil above R (?), trimmed; by Rubens above in pencil B, in red chalk 11; by a later hand in darker ink on the left and right above Fig. 11 and above right at the Back of this is Fig. 70.

Verso: see No. 70a.

12. Longitudinal Section: Engraving
(Fig. 22)
300 x 255 mm.
Inscribed Figura .12.; Taglio per longezza del Palazzo .B.

12a. Longitudinal Section: Drawing
(Fig. 23)
395 x 285 mm.; trimmed above and right.
Inscribed in individual rooms A; B; C; sala; in pencil on the upper edge N, trimmed; by Rubens in pencil above B, in red chalk alongside 12; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 12.

Verso: see No. 13a.

13. Longitudinal Section: Engraving
(Fig. 24)
297 x 253 mm.
Inscribed Figura .13.; Taglio per fianco del istesso Palazzo .B.

13a. Longitudinal Section: Drawing
(Fig. 25)
395 x 285 mm.; trimmed above and left.
Verso of No. 12a. Both longitudinal sections are designed as precisely congruent.

Inscribed in the rooms on the cellar level stanza p(s)ervitori; cucina; luogo da lauare, troglio; bocca de cisterna; in the rooms on the ground floor recamara; camerino; salotto, O; camera; in the rooms on the main floor stocho di scala; recamara; camera, R; camera; in the
Cat. ill. 3. Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B), façade elevation and plan of the ground floor (from Gauthier, Édifices, 1818–32, II, 1832, pl. 26)
Cat. ill. 4. Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B), plan of the ground floor (from Reinhardt, Palastarchitektur, 1886, pl. 29)
attic storey stanza p s(er)uitori; on the left edge (tra)montano, trimmed; in pencil on the upper edge O (?), trimmed; by Rubens above in pencil B, in red chalk 13; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 13.

Palazzo B is the villa which Luca Giustiniani had built around 1548 in Albaro, lying to the east of Genoa. It is the earliest building in the first series, as well as the most famous. In addition, it is the only Genoese villa or palace building for which there is documentary proof of Galeazzo Alessi’s involvement in the planning. The document concerned, dating from July 1548, commissions the stonemasons Giovanni Lurago and Taddeo Orsolino to supply the marble parts for the loggia. They are instructed to carry out the marble work ‘iuxta ordinem eis dandum’ and ‘secundum voluntatem et modum Galeacii’.

This contract apparently refers to the production of the marble balustrade and marble columns for the loggia in the piano nobile. Construction of the building was apparently well advanced at this time, nearing completion. Slightly later, in August 1548, Galeazzo Alessi and Agostino Sauli agreed a credit arrangement, which was signed in Luca Giustiniani’s villa. According to Alizeri, Bernardino Solari da Carona was also among the artists carrying out the work, in addition to the stonemasons named above. He produced consoles and cornices.

Luca Giustiniani (1512–83) was connected with the Sauli family through his marriage to Mariettina Sauli. The commission for the design of a villa may have gone to
Alessi through these family connections. In its type, the building follows the pattern of the suburban villa, without a working section or agricultural buildings. In a compact, square plan in two full storeys and two mezzanines, a programme of rooms is achieved that allows the villa to be used as a permanent residence. The formal rooms are situated in the central section. It is laid out in such a way that the visitor, after coming into the entrance loggia, passes through the central vestibule via the main staircase and from there into the sala, traversing the entire depth of the building on both floors each time. The articulation of the façade has a richness and plasticity that is unusual for a villa.5

The plan and elevation combine elements of varying origin. The elevation system is seen in Rome in the Palazzo della Valle Capranica (c. 1530) and in other examples from the Sangallo circle. The complex relationship between the body of the building and the façade is modelled on Michelangelo's façade project for S. Lorenzo (1515/1520). The combination of engaged columns on the lower storey with pilasters on the upper storey, and the doubling of the elements, are also seen there. The plasticity of the façade's decoration recalls Veronese palace façades by Sanmicheli, such as the Palazzo Bevilacqua (c. 1530), which has a magnificently developed full Corinthian entablature, with dentils and consoles. The interior arrangement with access and formal rooms placed in the central section and the secondary rooms in the lateral sections is developed in a series of plans of domestic buildings by Antonio da Sangallo the Younger (Florence, Uffizi 960A, 1235A, 1308A). Reference may also be made to the early villa designs of Palladio, such as the project for the Villa Valmarana in Vigardolo (1541, RIBA XVII/2r) and for the Villa Pisani in Bagnolo (1539-40, RIBA XVII/16). In the latter project, a similarly rhythmic structure is given to the façade through the doubling of the lateral elements.6

These formal parallels with the work of Palladio are given emphasis by a remark of Vasari's. In his life of Palladio, he mentions that 'in Genova ha fatto M. Luca Giustiniano una fabbrica con disegno del Palladio, che è tenuta bellissima'.7 A few pages further on, however, Vasari also mentions a 'palazzo in villa di M. Luca Iustiniano' in his life of Alessi, among the private commissions in Genoa.8 Palladio's name is not mentioned by the Genoese authors. Soprani lists the villa alongside Alessi's other putative palace and villa projects: 'perloché divolgendosi sempre più la virtù del Perugino Architetto, fu scelto da molti Signori per modellare le fabbriche de’loro palazzi, che numerosi torreggiano, così dentro la Città, come in Albaro, Sanpier d'Arena, e Multedo Ville da essa non molto distanti; tra quali principalissimi sono quelli, che ei fabbricò a Signori Luca Giustiniano, Tobia Pallavicino, & Ottaviano Grimaldi'.9 Ratti notes that the building was attributed to Palladio by Vasari, and to Alessi by others, and goes on: 'Ma si ha notizia che fosse eseguito dall'Alessi nel 1537 con disegno di Michelangiolo suo maestro'.10 The statement is wrong in point of fact, as the earlier one by Vasari, but it nevertheless touches

Cat. ill. 6. Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B), view from the south-east
the core of the problem of stylistic dependency.

The villa's design seems so homogeneous that it must be assumed that Alessi was comprehensively responsible for it. For the decoration of the loggia, Giovanni Battista Castello and Luca Cambiaso carried out two frescos in the lunettes, depicting Apollo and Diana. In contrast to other later Genoese villas, further painted decoration does not seem to have been carried out. Luca Giustiniani apparently owned the villa until his death in 1583. As late as August 1573, he was planning to enlarge the property through additional land purchases. Bernardo Cantone surveyed the site for this purpose. In 1787, the villa passed from the Giustiniani family to the Cambiaso family. In 1921, it came into the ownership of the city of Genoa, and has since then housed university institutes. In 1938, according to Labò, it was still 'assolutamente inalterata ed intatta'.

1. See also Nos. 70 and 70a.
5. For a more detailed discussion of the place of the villa in Genoa's architectural history, see Zeitler, Alessis Villen, 1993, pp. 72ff.
8. Ibid., p. 847.
10. Ratti, Instruzione, 1780, p. 378. This information is absent from the first edition of the guide, where all that is said of the villa is 'fabbricato tutto di pietra con disegno del celebre Alessi' (Ratti, Istruzione, 1766, p. 369).

C. VILLA SPINOLA DI SAN PIETRO (Nos. 14-19)


14. Plan of the Ground Floor: Engraving (Fig. 26)

250 × 249 mm.

Inscribed Figura .14.; Pianta prima del seguente Palazzo C.
Scale 10 palmi = 22 mm.

14a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Fig. 27)

395 × 285 mm.

Watermark: circle with crown and crowning cross, with the letters na (?) below; comparably structured examples in Briquet, Gênes, 1888, nos. 220–222: Genoa 1549–1589/93.
Scale on the lower margin of the sheet 10 palmi = 22 mm.

Inscribed in the centre of the sheet Pianta Prima; in the rooms in the left-hand section camera, 28/20; salotto, 28/24\ ½; camera, 19; 22, P; in the rooms in the central section loggia, 40/19; portico, 40 (?), corrected to 38/37; androne, 14/29, G, D; 10/22, E; bagno; 10/17\½; in the rooms in the right-hand section salotto, 28/39\½; camera, 28/24, H; recamera, 28/17\½; above tramontana, right leuante, 100, below 110; by Rubens in pencil above Palaz(zo) C; also by Rubens in red chalk on the upper edge V, below it 14, at bottom pianta prima; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 14.

15. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 28)

232 × 251 mm.

Inscribed Figur .15.; Pianta seconda del Palazzo C.

15a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 29)

395 × 285 mm.

Inscribed in the centre of the sheet Pianta Seconda; in the rooms in the left-hand section loggia, 29/13; camera, 29/35; recamera, 17/19, L; tinello, 11/14, M; de pedana, 22\½; 29/12; in the rooms in the central section sala, 39/59, B; loggia, 38\½/24, N; 10/9; in the rooms in the right-hand section loggia, 29; camera, 29/26\½; camera, 36\½, corrected to 30\½, B; recamera, 18\½; below 110, left 100; by Rubens in pencil above Palaz(zo) C; also by Rubens in red chalk on the upper edge P, below it 15; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 14.

16. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 30)

268 × 268 mm.

Inscribed Figura .16.; Facciata del Palazzo C. The consoles of the cornice, only weakly indicated in the drawing, have a more plastic appearance in the engraving due to the strong shadowing.

16a. Façade Elevation: Drawing (Fig. 31)

395 × 275 mm.; trimmed at top. The upper third of the entrance loggia has a correction (28 × 83 mm.) glued down over it; the correction involves the height of the three arcades, which were originally placed lower. To judge by the traces on the building, the arcades were also originally built in
the form of the corrected version. The frames of the mezzanine windows, only sketched in pencil, were not included in the engraving (No. 16).

Inscribed on the left edge 34; 32; in the left wing 12; 34; 20/11; 32; in the entrance loggia 9/27/1; below 110; in ink on the lower edge l’ornamento della facciata di sopra e di pittura; in pencil on the upper edge of the sheet Q, trimmed; below that in red chalk 16; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 16.

17. Cross Section: Engraving (Fig. 32)
270 × 263 mm.
Inscribed Figura 17.; Taglio del lato settentrionale del Palazzo .C./ da ponente verso Leuante.

17a. Cross Section: Drawing (Fig. 33)
390 × 280 mm.; trimmed at top. Verso of No. 19a. The two sections are designed to be congruent, and show the situation in the rear part of the building from respectively opposite directions.

Inscribed in individual rooms bagno; antibagno, P; N; O; in pencil on the upper edge of the sheet I (?), trimmed; by Rubens in pencil above and below the illustration C, in red chalk above 17; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 17.

18. Longitudinal Section: Engraving (Fig. 34)
263 × 243 mm.
Inscribed Figura 18.; Taglio per fianco del medesimo Palazzo .C./ da mezzo giorno verso tramontana.

18a. Longitudinal Section: Drawing (Figs. 35–36)
395 × 285 mm. Watermark as No. 14a.

At the bottom right margin of the illustration there is a glued-down strip (72 × 84 mm.), which shows the way to the rear entrance (Androne) instead of the staircase (see Fig. 38; this strip is engraved separately in No. 71, Fig. 152; see Fig. 37).

Inscribed in the rooms on the ground floor loggia, 19/32, F; Porticho, 37/1/23, C; E, with H in pencil alongside it; on the glued-down strip Androne, 29/15, D; in the rooms on the upper floor SALA, B, segnata C, 59/1/231/2; loggia, 23/1/231/2; in pencil on the upper edge of the sheet R (?), trimmed; in red chalk below it 18; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 18, and below it Fig. 17 at ye Back of Fig. 19.

19. Cross Section: Engraving (Fig. 39)
265 × 272 mm.
Inscribed Figura 19.; Taglio interiore del lato sententrionale del Palazzo .C. da leuante verso ponente.

19a. Cross Section: Drawing (Fig. 40)
390 × 280 mm.; trimmed at top.
Inscribed in the rooms on the ground floor 24, I; 24, C; 18, H; in the rooms on the upper floor 17/14/1/2, L; 17/13/; M, testa della sala segnata B; 20, K; by Rubens in pencil above the illustration C, in red chalk alongside it 19; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 19.
Verso: see No. 17a.

This villa in Sampierdarena is the building among the Palazzi Antichi about which the least is known. The arrangement of the rooms presupposes as a model the Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B), the plan of which is reproduced almost without change. The design of the façade, by contrast, incorporates older local traditions. Loggias in the wings at the sides had been more or less a constant aspect of Genoese villa architecture.
Cat. ill. 7. Villa Spinola di San Pietro (C), plan of the ground floor and garden (from Gauthier, Édifices, 1818–32, II, pl. 10)
since the fifteenth century. A date of origin in the 1550s or towards 1560 is likely. The commissioning patron was a member of the di San Pietro branch of the Spinola family.

The villa’s external appearance, as documented by the London drawings and the engravings in Rubens’s book, appears to have survived only for a few decades. As early as the beginning of the seventeenth century, alterations and extensions were carried out. These are usually dated to around 1625, based on the inscription on the portal arch. During these alterations, the building, along with its gardens, probably received the form that Gauthier records in the early nineteenth century (cat. ills. 7–8). The fully preserved fresco decoration by Giovanni Carlone and Giovanni Andrea Ansaldo in the rooms on the piano nobile was also created during the 1620s, giving the building a special renown. The cycle with the Deeds of Megollo Lercari in the salone, the Deeds of Ambrogio Spinola in the sala and a Perseus cycle in the remaining rooms were intended to glorify the family.

The commissioning patron, Giovanni Battista Spinola, was married to Maria, one of Ambrogio Spinola’s sisters. Two more rooms on the ground floor had already been decorated with frescos by Bernardo Castello around 1611.

The alteration of the façade probably removed its original decoration, which was painted, as the draughtsman notes on the elevation. Gauthier shows a decoration that was probably also painted, varying details of the original version (cat. ill. 8). The wall surfaces of the lateral wings were painted with figures in niches. Alizeri was still able to recognize the remains of this painting, which he described as ‘poche figure di chiaroscuro’ and connected with Ansaldo. Further alterations and extensions, which severely affected the building’s exterior, apparently took place towards the end of the nineteenth century. The interior, particularly the suite of rooms on the piano nobile, however, remained largely intact. The villa is used as a school building today.

In the second half of the sixteenth centu-
ry, Sampierdarena, originally a medieval settlement on the Riviera del Ponente to the west of Genoa, rose to become a favoured villeggiatura for the Genoese aristocracy. In the immediate vicinity of the Villa Spinola lies the Villa Grimaldi ‘Fortezza’, which Rubens places as the subsequent Palazzo D.

1. See also No. 71.

D. VILLA GRIMALDI ‘FORTEZZA’ (Nos. 20–28)


20. Plan of the Cellar: Engraving (Fig. 41)

300 × 267 mm.


20a. Plan of the Cellar: Drawing (Fig. 42)

400 × 275 mm.; trimmed on all sides.

Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section camera p seruitori; dispensa; dispensa; cucina, lauello, focolare, tinello, forni; trogli da laure; in the rooms in the central section stalla; cisterna, pianta sotterra; dispensa; tinello; in the rooms in the right-hand section fenera; uolta di legno; stanza p seruitori; above ponente, right tra(montana), trimmed; in pencil on the upper edge W (?), trimmed; by Rubens in pencil above D, in red chalk alongside 20 and in red chalk beneath the illustration Pianta prima; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 20.

21. Plan of the Ground Floor: Engraving (Fig. 43)

320 × 266 mm.

Inscribed Figura 21.; Pianta seconda del medesimo Palazzo .D.

Scale 10 palmi = 22 mm.

21a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Figs. 44–45)

390 × 285 mm.; a flap (110 × 80 mm.) covers the bathrooms (Fig. 45) and shows the ground plan of the staircase (Fig. 44; engraved in No. 71, Fig. 152; see Fig. 46).

Scale at the lower edge 10 palmi = 23 mm.

Inscribed in the centre of the sheet Pianta seconda; in the rooms in the left-hand section camera, 25½/28; salotto, 29/46; camera, 25½; recamera, 16; in the rooms in the central section poggiolo, 10/12; loggia, p 40/24; portico, 40/46; bagno; in the rooms in the right-hand section camera, 25½/28; salotto, 29; 25½; recamera, 16; on the right edge of the illustration 35, 43, 35; on the upper edge of the illustration LII (?); by
Rubens in pencil above D, in red chalk alongside 21, and on the lower edge Pianta seconda; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 21.

22. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 48)

277 × 265 mm.
Inscribed Fuga .22.; Pianta terza del Palazzo .D.

22a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 49)

390 × 285 mm.
Inscribed in the centre of the sheet Pianta terza; in the rooms in the front section camera, 261/2/29; salotto, 40/27; camera, 261/2/29; in the rooms in the central section SALA, p 72/461/2; loggia, p 25/461/2; in the rooms in the rear section camera, 261/2/29; camera, 32/26; tinello, 20/17, A; de pedana, 19, 12/12; the following inscriptions by Rubens: in pencil above D; in red chalk alongside 22; on the lower edge facciata; Pianta terza; in the central room Questa scrittura va posta al rovescio (?)/come questa per accompagnarla/col porfilo (cancelled); by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 22.

23. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 50)

316 × 279 mm.
Inscribed Fuga .23.; Facciata del Palazzo .D.

23a. Façade Elevation: Drawing (Fig. 51)

400 × 280 mm.; trimmed on all sides; watermark: circle with crown and crowning cross, with the letters nd (?) underneath; examples with comparable structure in Briquet, Gênes, 1888, nos. 220–222: Genoa 1549–1589/93.
Inscribed beneath the illustration l’ornamento di detta facciata e tutta di pittura; on the upper edge R (?) or K (?), trimmed; by Rubens in pencil above D, in red chalk alongside 23; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 23.
Verso: inscribed by a Genoese collector (?) in ink PIANTA · DEL · S° · BATT · GRIMALDO · DE · VILLA.

24. Cross Section: Engraving (Fig. 52)

308 × 284 mm.

24a. Cross Section: Drawing (Fig. 53)

395 × 270 mm.; trimmed on all sides. Watermark as No. 23a.
Inscribed in the rooms on the ground floor camera; faccia della loggia; camera; in the rooms on the upper floor camera, 261/2; faccia del salotto, 40/211/4; camera, 261/2/19; by Rubens in pencil above D, in red chalk alongside 25, corrected to 24; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 24.
Verso: see No. 25a.

25. Cross Section: Engraving (Fig. 54)

311 × 281 mm.
Inscribed Fuga .25.; Taglio interiore del medesimo Palazzo .D. parallelo alla facciata mostrando/per fianco il salone grande da mezzo giorno verso tramontana.
25a. **Cross Section: Drawing**  
*(Fig. 55)*

395 × 270 mm.; trimmed on all sides. *Verso* of No. 24a; the two cross sections are designed to be congruent.

Inscribed in the rooms on the ground floor: salotto, 29; porticho, p 40/25½; salotto, 29/22½; in the rooms on the upper floor: loggia, 30; sala, p 72/p alto 34½; by Rubens in red chalk above 24, corrected to 25; by the engraver (?) in pencil on the upper edge of the sheet: *het tweede dat vervolcht*, partly trimmed; by a later hand in darker ink, above left *Fig. 25.*

26. **Longitudinal Section: Engraving**  
*(Fig. 56)*

315 × 277 mm.

Inscribed: *Figura 26.; Taglio da ponente à leuante mostrando la loggia oue è contigua alla sala/levata sola la muraglia del lato settentrionale del Palazzo D.*

26a. **Longitudinal Section: Drawing**  
*(Fig. 57)*

390 × 285 mm. *Verso* of No. 27a; the two longitudinal sections are designed to be congruent. In the two smaller rooms on the ground floor, the form of the vaulting has been altered by a pasted-down correction; in the sala, a mounted strip adds the three small windows; originally, the wall was closed here.

Inscribed in the rooms on the ground floor: camere, 28; in a room on the upper floor: 17; salotto; by Rubens in red chalk above 26; by a later hand in darker ink, above left *Fig. 26.*

27. **Longitudinal Section: Engraving**  
*(Fig. 58)*

310 × 281 mm.

Inscribed: *Figura 27.; Taglio per fianco della parte Interiore dal altro capo della/sala grande verso la loggia et tramontana/del Palazzo D.*

27a. **Longitudinal Section: Drawing**  
*(Fig. 59)*

390 × 285 mm; trimmed on all sides. In the staircase (left), two flaps (84 × 23 mm. and 84 × 65 mm.) with sections through the bathrooms (below) and several side rooms (above); engraved separately in No. 71 (Fig. 152). The upper third of the sala has a strip (105 × 72 mm.) pasted down on it, which, like the longitudinal section on the other side of the sheet, also adds the three small windows that were not originally present here.

Inscribed in the rooms on the ground floor: porticho, A; loggia; in the rooms on the upper floor: sala; camera; on the pasted-down strip: bagni (below); tinello, A (above); by Rubens in pencil under the folding strips S (below) and K (above), above D, in red chalk above that 27; by a later hand in darker ink, above right *Fig. 27.*

*Verso*: see No. 26a.

28. **Longitudinal Section: Engraving**  
*(Fig. 60)*

310 × 281 mm.

Inscribed: *Figura 28.; Taglio per fianco da ponente à leuante mostrando il/capo della sala grande del Palazzo D.*

28a. **Longitudinal Section: Drawing**  
*(Fig. 61)*

395 × 280 mm.; trimmed at top.  
Watermark as No. 23a.

Inscribed in the rooms on the ground floor: camere, 28; in the mezzanine storey above it: cuocina; salotto, largo 29, lungo 46, alto 37,
This villa, which was built starting in 1559, commissioned by Giovanni Battista Grimaldi in Sampierdarena, is one of the closest imitations of Alessi’s Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B). Both villas have virtually the same sequence of rooms. In the Villa Grimaldi, however, the two storeys are rotated 90° in relation to one another. The central section with the entrance loggia, vestibule and staircase runs in an east-west direction on the ground floor, but on the upper floor with the loggia and sala, it runs north-south. The windows of the sala provide a view of the gulf of Genoa, while the arrangement of the rooms on the ground floor was apparently made necessary by the accessibility of the site. The elevation shown in the Palazzi di Genova documents the decoration of the entrance façade, and looks almost identical to that of the Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso. The forms in the Villa Grimaldi are supplemented only by the rustication of the ground floor and the addition of fluting on the Tuscan order. According to the accompanying note (No. 23a; Fig. 51), this architectural articulation was all painted, and this has been confirmed by evidence on the building itself. The painting itself has been lost without a trace, but the colonnade in the entrance loggia, only intended as an abstract profile, fits precisely the decoration documented in the drawing (cat. ill. 9). In contrast to Alessi’s façade, which was conceived as a sculpturally tooled interposed decorative wall, these decorations were painted on all four exterior sides of the villa using the same scheme.

The building of the villa took a comparatively long time, and is well documented. The traditional attribution to Alessi, which goes back to Vasari, is unsustainable in the light of documents. Alessi, who had mainly been living in Milan since 1557, is not mentioned at all in the numerous documents from the decade between 1559 and 1569. Construction work was apparently carried out hesitantly during the first three years after building work commenced. In February 1559, March 1560 and December 1561, only sporadic deliveries of building materials, bricks and hewn stone are documented. Between September 1562 and October 1563 alone, however, seven contracts for the delivery of lime and various stone materials were signed. The actual construction of the villa apparently took place largely during this one year. Bernardo Spazio is mentioned as architectus and capo d’opera in all of the documents from the early years, and his task was to check deliveries and set prices for them. The document from October 1563 mentions Bernardo Cantone in addition to Spazio. Cantone’s task was to evaluate the work carried out. In February and May 1564, Antonio di Carabio received two orders for the delivery of slate for steps on the staircase and door lintels. After Spazio’s death in 1564, Giovanni Ponzello seems to have temporarily taken over the position of clerk of works. In March 1564, he checked a large delivery of clay pipes, probably intended for the villa’s water supply. According to further documents of August 1564 and February and May 1567, he was also involved in organizing work on the site and in laying out the garden.

The decoration of the interior, which was restricted to decorative sculptural elements such as door frames, balustrades and the stucco decoration of the upper loggia, was apparently carried out under the direction of Giovanni Battista Castello. When Antonio da Carabio was commissioned to produce the portal for the sala in August 1565 and Agostino Agiscalo was commissioned to supply marble for a balustrade in September 1565, it was Castello in each case who was responsible for accepting the finished product. Castello was present as a witness during the awarding of commissions for marble work on the north façade, i.e. for the loggia balcony, in August 1566. 
In March 1567, Andrea and Battista Carona were commissioned to carry out the stucco work in the loggia of the piano nobile. They were given a drawing on which to base their work. The name of its designer is not known. Most likely, however, this would have been Castello, although he had left for Spain at the end of 1566. The two lunettes were each to have a ‘historieta di relevo’ by Luca Cambiaso added to them. Cambiaso had designed two reliefs with sea gods, which were executed by Andrea and Battista Carona.

The exterior decoration of the villa, mentioned above, was assigned to Battista Peroll in March 1566. He agreed to decorate the four façades with a ‘pintura chiamata chiaro et scuro, de la forma e modelo ... designato per esso maestro Baptista’. The ordering of two portals in May 1567 seems to have concluded work on the interior. In January and September 1568, contracts for work on the grounds were assigned, now once again under the direction of Bernardo Cantone. A further delivery of marble, for which Antonio Carabio received a down
payment in May 1569, was also to be assessed and appraised by Cantone. Architecture and decoration of Giovanni Battista Grimaldi’s villa thus were the product of a large number of artists and craftsmen. Direction of the building work was assigned to an architect whose reputation was based on his connection with Alessi via the cantiere at Assunta di Carignano (XXII), and who was responsible for coordinating the work. The designs drew on tried and tested patterns, and were implemented to high technical standards. Specialists were used for the decorative furnishings, and they used designs by others as the basis for their work.

The commissioning patron, Giovanni Battista Grimaldi, was one of the outstanding Genoese patrons of the period. In addition to this villa in Sampierdarena, he also owned the Palazzo della Meridiana (VIII), which had been built by his father Geronimo Grimaldi q. Giorgio. In parallel with the building of the villa, he had the palace extended and decorated during the 1560s, for which he called on the same artists: Giovanni Battista Castello, Luca Cambiaso and Battista Perolli. He should not be confused with the patron of the arts and collector Giovanni Battista Grimaldi—of more or less the same age—whose father Girolamo Grimaldi q. Benedetto rose to become a cardinal after his wife’s death, and who, as the nephew of Ansaldo Grimaldi, inherited his fortune. This second Giovanni Battista Grimaldi q. Girolamo Cardinale, who has been identified through Anthony Hobson’s research as the owner of an extensive library, is also present in the Palazzi di Genova as the commissioning patron of the Villa Grimaldi Sauli (H).

After its completion in the sixteenth century, the substance of the villa remained largely intact, although its condition deteriorated severely. During the nineteenth century, it formed the premises of a canning factory. Today, it serves as a school building. It is the building in the Palazzi di Genova that is documented in the greatest detail, with nine plates.

1. See also No. 71.
5. Labò, Villa Grimaldi, 1925, p. 272, docs. VI-VII.
8. Labò, Villa Grimaldi, 1925, p. 272, doc. XI.
9. Ibid., pp. 272f., doc. XIV.
10. Ibid., p. 272, doc. X.
11. Ibid., p. 273, doc. XV.
E. VILLA PALLAVICINO DELLE PESCHIERE (Nos. 29-34)


29. Plan of the Ground Floor: Engraving (Fig. 62)

280 x 254 mm.
Inscribed Figura.29.; Prima pianta del Palazzo .E.
Scale 10 palmini = 20 mm.

29a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Fig. 63)

395 x 270 mm.; trimmed at top.
Scale 10 palmini = 20 mm.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section camera, 27/23, B; salotto, 31½/22, T; bagno; camera, 26/24; camera, 26/20; in the rooms in the central section loggia, 43½/20½; portico, 41/33½, F; 20½½; in the rooms in the right-hand section camera, 27/23, A; salotto, 31½/33½; camera, 26/24; recamera, 26/20; below faccia principale di mezzo giorno, 120, above faccia di tramontana, right 115; in pencil on the upper edge O (?), trimmed; by Rubens in red chalk below Prima Pianta/del Palazzo E; above 29; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 29.

30. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 64)

240 x 253 mm.
Inscribed Figura .30.; Seconda pianta del Palazzo .E.

30a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 65)

395 x 265 mm.; trimmed at top.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section loggia; camera; tinello; dispensa; camera; in the rooms in the central section sala; loggia; in the rooms in the right-hand section loggia; camera; camera; camera; by Rubens in red chalk below Seconda Pianta/del Palazzo E; above 30; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 30.

31. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 66)

241 x 263 mm.
Inscribed Figura .31.; Facciata del Palazzo .E.
31a. Façade Elevation: Drawing (Fig. 67)

395 x 280 mm.; trimmed on three sides.

Inscribed beneath the illustration La facciata di rilievo de calcina tinta de color de pietra di finale, in pencil on the upper edge h (?), trimmed; by Rubens in red chalk above Palazzo E, above that 31; by another hand in pencil below N1 L^+22; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 31.

Verso: see No. 32a.

32. Cross Section: Engraving (Fig. 68)

190 x 259 mm.

Inscribed Figura 32.; Taglio della parte anteriore del Palazzo E./ parallelo alla facciata levata sola/la muraglia di quella.

32a. Cross Section: Drawing (Fig. 69)

395 x 280 mm., trimmed on three sides.

Verso of No. 31a; the cross section represents the interior view of the façade wall and is precisely congruent with the façade elevation on the recto of the sheet.

Inscribed in the rooms on the ground floor camera, on the mezzanine floor above it p s(er)uitori; loggia; camera, on the mezzanine floor above it p s(er)uitori; in the rooms on the upper floor loggia; sala; loggia; left levante, right pon(ente), trimmed; by Rubens in pencil above E, in red chalk above that 32; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 32.

33. Longitudinal Section: Engraving (Fig. 70)

245 x 252 mm.

Inscribed Figura 33.; Taglio per fianco della parte Interno da tramontana verso/mezzo giorno che diviude tutto il Palazzo E. in due parti uguali.

33a. Longitudinal Section: Drawing (Fig. 71)

395 x 280 mm.; trimmed at top.

Watermark: circle with sun and crowning cross, beneath it the letters TMA; cf. Briquet, Filigranes, 1923, no. 6092: Genoa, 1562–1567.

Inscribed in the rooms on the ground floor loggia; portico, E; loggia; in the rooms on the upper floor sala; loggia; by Rubens in red chalk above Palazzo E, above that 33; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 33.

Verso: see No. 34a.

34. Longitudinal Section: Engraving (Fig. 72)

243 x 255 mm.

Inscribed Figura 34.; Taglio per fianco del Palazzo E. da mezzo giorno verso tramontana/scoprendo tutte il lato di ponente levata sola la muraglia esteriore.

34a. Longitudinal Section: Drawing (Fig. 73)

395 x 280 mm.; trimmed at top. Verso of No. 33a; the two longitudinal sections are designed to be congruent.

Inscribed in the rooms on the ground floor camera; camera; scala; salotto; camera; in the rooms on the mezzanine floor cucina; dispensa; dispensa; p s(er)uitori; in the rooms on the upper floor camera; stoco di scala; tinello; camera; loggia; in the rooms on the second mezzanine floor cucina e forno; p s(er)uitori; p s(er)uitori; by Rubens in pencil above E, in red chalk above that Palazzo and 34; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 34.

Due to its richly painted decoration and the garden, only small parts of which are preserved, Tobia Pallavicino’s villa was among
the most renowned villa complexes of the *cinquecento* in Genoa. The building was constructed before or around 1556 in the north-east, outside the ring of the medieval city walls. There is virtually no documentation regarding work on the building and on its decoration. In January 1556 surveying took place on the plot, on which a retaining wall was already in place. It is not clear to what extent the building itself had been started or was already finished at this time. In November of the following year, the access road to the villa had apparently already been paved. The building was sufficiently complete in 1560 for reference to be made to it in other places as a model or pattern. The villa near S. Bartolomeo degli Armeni is already mentioned in Tobia Pallavicino’s will of April 1560. After his death, its use was to be assigned to his wife Battina.

The laying out of the garden, at least, seems to have been in progress at the beginning of the 1560s. Alizeri mentions documents according to which Gian Giacomo Paracca da Valsoldo was busy with sculptural work for the grottoes in April 1562. This work was apparently supervised by Giovanni Battista Castello, who also mediated in a dispute between Valsoldo and his patron. Castello’s direction of work on the building, which Alizeri mentions, apparently also included the villa’s interior decoration. Soprani mentions Castello as being responsible for the frescos in the sala, at least: ‘perciò habiamo di sua mano le Pitture della Sala nel Palazzo del già detto Sig. Pallavicino posto nella Villa di Multedo’.
Cat. ill. 11. Villa Pallavicino delle Peschiere (E), plan of the ground and main floors (from Gauthier, Édifices, 1818-32, II, pl. 2)
The decoration of the rooms, which was entirely concerned with themes from ancient mythology (Assembly of the Gods, Odysseus and Perseus cycles, Apollo and Diana), was conceived by Castello and largely executed by him as well.6

With its date in the mid 1550s, the villa is among the earliest buildings in the Palazzi Antichi. The dependence on Alessi's Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B) is apparent. This close relationship provided the basis for the traditional attribution of the project to Alessi, which goes back to Soprani, but it cannot be convincingly verified with stylistic arguments.7 The elevation of the garden façade with the side loggias corresponds to the older tradition of Genoese villas. The loggias, however, are only found in the drawings and engravings. On the building itself the walls were closed from the very beginning, undoubtedly for practical reasons (cat. ills. 10, 11).

The villa is illustrated with six plates. There are difficulties in relating the plans and sections to one another. The longitudinal section cutting through the west wing of the building in a north-south direction with a view towards the east (No. 34) reproduces the room situation inaccurately at several points. Several wall openings and dividing walls are missing. The plane of the section is inconsistent, but not in order to display the rooms in greater detail, as in similar cases. Either the source was already inaccurate in this case, or it was copied carelessly.

The villa's interior is intact. The bathrooms, which are situated underneath the staircase and are also recorded there in the ground plan, are one of the few examples of this type that have survived. The extensive gardens, which can still be seen in Gauthier's record drawings were substantially reduced in size when the Via Peschiera with its adjoining buildings was laid out between 1855 and 1858.


2. In March 1560, Vincenzo Imperiale commissioned a floor surface for his palace on the Piazza Campetto that was to correspond to a model in the loggia of Tobia Pallavicino's villa. Cf. Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, p. 140.

3. Alizieri, Guida, 1875, p. 200; Labò, Palazzo Carrega, 1922, p. 70.


5. Soprani, Vite, 1674, p. 289.


F. PALAZZO SPINOLA
(Nos. 35-42)

35. Plan of the Cellar: Engraving  
(Fig. 74)  
292 x 243 mm.  
Inscribed Figura 35.; Pianta prima del Palazzo F.

35a. Plan of the Cellar: Drawing  
(Fig. 75)  
395 x 275 mm.  
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section camera, 29/33, alte tutte p 12; volta di legno; cucina, 45/33, trogli da lauare; stalla, 28/1; in the rooms in the central section cisterna, 42/2; 12; cisternotto d'acqua, 14/16; terrapieno, below that in darker ink three illegible (Flemish?) words; in the rooms in the right-hand section camera, 29/33; volta di legna, 23; cosina, 45/33, trogli da lauare, focolare; stalla, 28/1; above tramontana, right levante, below mezzodi, left ponente, partly covered by the glued fold; by Rubens in red chalk on the lower edge Pianta prima del Palazzo F, on the lower edge 35; by a later hand in darker ink, below right Fig. 35.

36. Plan of the Ground Floor:  
Engraving (Fig. 76)  
312 x 245 mm.  
Inscribed Figura 36.; Pianta seconda del Palazzo F.  
Scale 10 palmi = 20 mm.

36a. Plan of the Ground Floor:  
Drawing (Figs. 78-79)  
395 x 270 mm.; trimmed at the bottom. Two flaps (the left one L-shaped, 175 x 135 mm., the right one square, 265 x 130 mm.) show the ground plan of the mezzanine floor (Figs. 79-80; engraved separately in No. 72, Fig. 153).

37. Plan of the Main Floor:  
Engraving (Fig. 81)  
283 x 237 mm.  
Inscribed Figura 37.; Pianta terza del Palazzo F.

37a. Plan of the Main Floor:  
Drawing (Figs. 82-83)  
395 x 280 mm.; trimmed at top. Two flaps (left 280 x 95 mm., right 280 x 90 mm.) show the plan of the mezzanine floor (Figs. 84-85; engraved separately in No. 71, Fig. 152).  
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section camera, 31/34, alte p 29; recamera, 20/34; alta 29; camerine, 14/21, alte 18/12; camerine, 20/12; 25/4, alta 24/12; on the staircase 11/41/4, alte 26/1; in the rooms in the central section sala, p 44/60, alta 50; loggia, 48/20; Cortile, 48/48, pianta terza, cancelled in pencil; in the rooms in the right-hand section camera, 29/34, alte tutte p 12; nuit di legna; cucina, 45/33, trogli da lauare, focolare; stalla, 28/1; above tramontana, right levante, below mezzodi, left ponente, partly covered by the glued fold; by Rubens in red chalk on the lower edge Pianta seconda del Palazzo F, trimmed, above it 36; in black chalk in the lower left room P, in the upper right room O; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 36.
31/34, alte 29; recamera, 23; camere, 36; camere, 331/2; in the rooms on the mezzanine floor on the left flap camere sotto il tetto, alto 14; camere sotto il tetto, alto 14; camere p il bagno, alto 10; camere p il bagno, alto 10; bagno, 81/2; caldo, freddo; antibagno, 13, alto 10; terrazza, 331/2/36; on the right flap p servitori sotto il tetto, alto p 14; camera p servitori; dispensa; terrazza, 331/2/36; above tramontana, right levante, below mezzodi, left ponente; by Rubens in red chalk on the lower edge Pianta terza del Palazzo F, above it 37; in black chalk in the two rooms above N (left) and M (right), trimmed; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 36.

38. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 86)
232 × 260 mm.
Inscribed Figura .38.; Facciata del Palazzo F.

38a. Façade Elevation: Drawing (Fig. 87)
395 × 280 mm.; trimmed on three sides.
Inscribed on the left edge of the illustration ponente; 441/2; 43; 211/2; right levante, trimmed; by Rubens in red chalk above facciata del Palazzo F, above that 38; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 38.

Verso: see No. 39a.

39. Cross Section: Engraving (Fig. 88)
227 × 257 mm.
Inscribed Figura .39.; Taglio paralello alla facciata della parte anteriore del Palazzo F./guardando dal Cortile de due loggie l’una sopra l’altra.

39a. Cross Section: Drawing (Fig. 89)
395 × 280 mm.; trimmed on three sides. Verso of No. 38a; the façade elevation (No. 38a) and elevation of the interior façade wall (No. 39a) are designed to be congruent.

Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section caneua, 12; camera, 29; 111/2; 20/21; terrazza; in the rooms in the central section cisterna; portico, 411/2/41; sala, 441/2/50; in the rooms in the right-hand section caneua; camera, 29/20; p (ser)uitori, 111/2; 30; 14; terrazza, 331/2; on the left edge (levante), trimmed, on the right edge ponente, trimmed; by Rubens in red chalk above Palazzo F, above that 39; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 39.

40. Cross Section: Engraving (Fig. 90)
252 × 257 mm.
Inscribed Figura.40.; Taglio paralello alla facciata della parte inferiore del Palazzo F./guardando dal Cortile de due loggie l’una sopra l’altra.

40a. Cross Section: Drawing (Fig. 91)
395 × 270 mm.; trimmed on three sides.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section caneua; 251/2/191/2; camera p (ser)uitori, 111/2; camera, 29/21; 14; in the rooms in the central section troglio da lavare; 121/2; 30; p far il pane; cosina; 12/27, 10; in the rooms in the right-hand section caneua; 113/4/28; cosina; 113/4; recamera, 141/2/181/2; camere p il bagno, 141/2/10; 14/14; on the left edge (levante), trimmed, on the right edge ponente, trimmed; by Rubens in red chalk above Palazzo F, above that 40; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 40.

41. Longitudinal Section: Engraving (Fig. 92)
266 × 295 mm.
Inscribed Figura.41.; Taglio di tutto il Palazzo F. per mezzo da tramontana/verso mezzo giorno insieme con il Cortile.
Cat. ill. 12. Palazzo Spinola (F), view from Via Garibaldi
Cat. ill. 13. *Palazzo Spinola* (F), plan of the ground floor (from Reinhardt, *Palastarchitektur*, 1886, pl. 95)
41a. Longitudinal Section: Drawing (Fig. 93)

285 x 395 mm.

Inscribed in the rooms in the cellar 12; 12; terra pieno; in the rooms on the ground floor portico, 41\(\frac{1}{2}\)/31; 10\(\frac{1}{2}\)/27\(\frac{3}{4}\); in the rooms on the upper floor sala, 60/34\(\frac{1}{2}\); 12/27; on the left edge mezzodi, on the right edge tramontana; in pencil on the upper edge n; by Rubens in red chalk above Palazzo F, left above that 41; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 41. Verso: see No. 42a.

42. Longitudinal Section: Engraving (Fig. 94)

264 x 295 mm.

Inscribed Figura 42.; Taglio in lungo del lato verso Levante guardando per di dentro/Contra la muraglia esteriore di tutto il Palazzo F.

42a. Longitudinal Section: Drawing (Fig. 95)

285 x 395 mm. Verso of No. 41a; the two longitudinal sections are designed to be congruent.

Inscribed in the rooms in the cellar stalla; cuocca; volta di legno; caneva; in the rooms on the ground floor camera del stalero; 12; 18\(\frac{1}{2}\)/20; loggia; reccamera, 23\(\frac{3}{4}\); camera; in the staircase and in the rooms on the upper floor galaria, 25\(\frac{1}{2}\); de peane, 41/20; stocho di una saleetta; reccamera, 20\(\frac{1}{2}\); camera, 34; in the side rooms and in the rooms on the mezzanine floor granaro, 25\(\frac{1}{4}\)/24\(\frac{1}{2}\); scoudatchio; antibagno, 10; bagno; dispensa, 37; 20\(\frac{3}{4}\); presititor, 35/14; on the left edge tramontana, on the right edge mezzodi; by Rubens in red chalk above Palazzo F, alongside 42; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 42.

The palace on the hill side of the Strada Nuova was built for Angelo Giovanni Spinola beginning in 1558. The plot of land, which was slightly larger than those of the three others on this side of the street, was purchased in May 1558, and rapid building began shortly afterwards. Several deliveries of materials are documented between December 1558 and October 1559. The commissioning patron died in 1560, before the palace was completed. In his will, written shortly before his death, he decreed that the building should be completed following the plans of the architect—not named—and that it should remain in the family's possession. The executors of the will were to be Baldassare Lomellino, Nicola Doria and Tomaso Spinola.

It is not clear to what extent his wishes were met. Up to 1564, however, agreements document deliveries of materials that provide evidence for continuing construction of the palace. In March 1561, a substantial delivery of bricks was ordered. In May 1562, the stonemasons Giacomo Giudetti and Antonio Carabio were commissioned to supply cornice parts for the portal of the sala. Carabio, again, was to supply stone materials for the vestibule, loggia and several other rooms in November 1563; these were probably for the floor surfaces. In January 1564, finally, another agreement was made with Giudetti and Carabio for the supply of balusters for a loggia facing the garden.

The documents do not mention the name of a designer or artistic director. The construction work may have been directed by Bernardo Cantone, who is named in two of the documents. He was present as a witness to a contract for the supply of lime in December 1558, and he was to be the appraiser for a delivery of hewn stone agreed to in November 1563.

The arrangement of the rooms adapts the scheme used in the Alessi villas in response to the increased need for space and formality in urban palaces. The principal rooms—the vestibule, loggias, court-
yard and sala—are all positioned in the central section. The two side sections flank the courtyard and provide additional residential rooms and service areas. The body of the building thus acquires the form of a three-winged complex. Within the ensemble formed by the Strada Nuova, the palace of Agostino Pallavicino (Cambiasso; cf. No. 68), begun at the same time, and the neighbouring palace of Nicolosio Lomellino (IX), begun in 1563, use similar schemes. There is also evidence of Cantone’s involvement in the building of the Pallavicino palace.

The drawings and engravings reproduce the original project on which the initial construction phase beginning in 1558 may have been based. However, it is not entirely clear whether the palace was actually completed in this form by 1564, or whether only part of it was built. In 1572, the heir of the first patron, Giulio Spinola, took possession of the palace on his return from Flanders. In 1589, he commissioned an extension involving the lengthening of the side wings and a redesigning of the garden. The soiling of the streets and neighbouring properties by the new building and excavation work was the subject of two warnings by the Padri del Comune in July 1591 and December 1596. The decoration of the façade was also only carried out during this second building phase. The original project involved a façade with purely architectural decoration, using rustication and articulation of the storeys with Tuscan and Corinthian pilasters. As the section illustrations show, this decoration was intended to be in relief on all four exterior sides of the palace. Instead of the costly work in hewn stone, however, a painted façade decoration was executed, which is attributed to Lazzaro Tavarone and the brothers Lazzaro and Pantaleo Calvi and which partially survives on the building today (cat. ill. 12).

The extensive painted decoration of the interiors with frescos by Bernardo Castello, Andrea Semino, Lazzaro Tavarone and the Calvi brothers was also not carried out until the building campaign of the 1590s. The programme for the most important parts of the fresco decoration was discussed in correspondence between Castello and Gabriello Chiabrera between February 1593 and June 1594. A fresco by Andrea Semino in one of the smaller rooms on the piano nobile shows in the background a garden view of the palace, including the extensions. Semino died in 1594, so the building and the fresco must have already been in existence at that time. The final form of the complex is documented in Gauthier’s and Reinhardt’s record drawings (cat. ill. 13).

The palace remained in the possession of the Spinola family until 1919, and since 1926 it has been the seat of the Banca d’America e d’Italia. The change of use made alterations necessary, during which the rear part of the palace was extended further, with the courtyard receiving a glass roof.

1. See also Nos. 71-72.
2. See evidence in Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, p. 204, n. 22.
3. Ibid., p. 192.
4. All of the documents are referred to in Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, p. 204, n. 22.
5. Ibid., pp. 190 and 203, n. 8.
6. The addition of the projecting parts of the façade led to disagreements with the neighbours and with the Padri del Comune. The size of the stairs leading up to the portal was criticized, as was the size of the balcony in front of the windows on the piano nobile. These documents from June 1590 and January and April 1592 are referred to in Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, p. 203, n. 9.

G. PALAZZO INTERIANO PALLAVICINI (Nos. 43-48)


43. Plan of the Ground Floor: Engraving (Fig. 96)

186 × 208 mm.
Inscribed Figura 43.; Prima pianta del Palazzo G.
Scale 10 palmi = 21 mm.

43a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Fig. 97)

395 × 270 mm.; trimmed at top.
Scale on the lower edge of the sheet 10 palmi = 21 mm.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section camera, 24 1/13; reccamera, 14/14, alta 15; cassetta, alta 15; in the rooms in the central section portico, 34/38 1/13, alto 23 1/12, sotto la cisterna; 10, 10; volta di legno e soprà la cucina, 16, alta 131/12; in the rooms in the right-hand section camera, 24 1/13, alto 23 1/12; reccamera, 17, alta 16; 23 1/12 alto 24 1/12; above terra pieno; below prima pianta; right casa del spagnuolo, cancelled in pencil; by Rubens in red chalk above 43, below that Palazzo G; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 43.

44. Plan of the First Floor: Engraving (Fig. 98)

181 × 206 mm.
Inscribed Figura 44.; Seconda pianta del Palazzo G.

44a. Plan of the First Floor: Drawing (Fig. 99)

395 × 280 mm.; trimmed at top.
Watermark: circle with the letters AR and crowning cross; structurally similar examples in Briquet, Gênes, 1888, nos. 220–222: 1549–1589/93.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section mezani, 25 1/13; remezano, granaro, 14 1/12; in the rooms in the central section salotto, 35/39, alto 22 1/4; loggia, 38/18, 22 1/4, B; in the rooms in the right-hand section mezani, 27, alti 22 1/4; remezano, 17 1/12; salotto, 26; above giardino; below seconda pianta; by Rubens in red chalk above 44, below that Palazzo G; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 44.

45. Plan of the Second Floor: Engraving (Fig. 100)

181 × 206 mm.
Inscribed Figura 45.; Terza pianta del Palazzo G.

45a. Plan of the Second Floor: Drawing (Fig. 101)

395 × 275 mm.; trimmed at top.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section camera, 25 1/13; alte 24; 19 1/12, alte
16; tinello, 10; alta 19; in the rooms in the central section sala, 36/55, alta 37; C; 38/19½; in the rooms in the right-hand section camera, 25½/27½, alte 24; 18, alte 16; 26½, alte 24; below terza pianta; by Rubens in red chalk above 43, corrected to 45, further down Palazzo G; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 45.

46. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 102)
244 × 212 mm.
Inscribed Figura 46.; Facciata del Palazzo G.

46a. Façade Elevation: Drawing (Fig. 103)
395 × 285 mm.; trimmed at top.
Inscribed by Rubens in red chalk above 46, below that Palazzo G; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 46.
Verso: see No. 47a.

47. Cross Section: Engraving (Fig. 104)
209 × 210 mm.
Inscribed Figura 47.; Taglio della parte anteriore del Palazzo G./ paralello alla facciata levata sola la/muraglia di quella.

47a. Cross Section: Drawing (Fig. 105)
395 × 285 mm.; trimmed at top. Verso of No. 46a; the cross section (No. 47a) and the façade elevation (No. 46a) are designed to be precisely congruent.
Inscribed in the rooms on the ground floor camera; portico; camera, 24½/23½; in the rooms on the first floor salotto; camera, 25½/22½; in the rooms on the second floor camera, 24; sala, 36/37; camera, 25½/23½; by Rubens in red chalk above 47, below that Palazzo G; by another hand, probably the engraver's, in pencil on the upper edge of the sheet het, with the following word crossed out eerste (?) tweete dat verfolcht, trimmed at top; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 47.

48. Cross Section: Engraving (Fig. 106)
242 × 215 mm.
Inscribed Figura 48.; Taglio del Palazzo G. pur paralello alla facciata/mostrando il capo interiore della Sala grande.

48a. Cross Section: Drawing (Fig. 107)
390 × 280 mm.; trimmed at top.
Watermark as No. 44a.
Inscribed in the three rooms positioned above each other in the central section A; B; C; by Rubens in red chalk above 48, below that Palazzo G; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 48.

Cat. ill. 14. Palazzo Interiano Pallavicini (G), view from Piazza Fontane Marose (from Labò, Palazzi di Genova, 1970)
At the eastern end of the Strada Nuova lies the Piazza Fontane Marose, on the northeastern side of which the brothers Paolo Battista and Nicolò Interiano had this palace built, beginning in 1565. The building has three full storeys, and the design and distribution of the residential and formal rooms is based on models in the neighbouring Strada Nuova palaces. Without giving more detailed references, Alizeri mentions that construction work started in 1565 under the direction of Francesco Casella.\textsuperscript{1} Several deliveries of materials do in fact seem to have taken place in March and November 1565.\textsuperscript{2} However, the generally sparse documentation does not allow a clear picture of the stages involved. It is also unclear to what extent the construction involved the alteration of an older structure or a new building. The regular arrangement of the interior that is documented in the Palazzi di Genova makes the latter assumption more probable. In April 1565 (or 1566?) a petition to the Senate by the Interiano family states that they had ‘acquistato certi siti apreso fontana amorosa per fabricarvi una casa per loro habitazione’, and they applied for the property to be rounded off through the acquisition of four palmi of public land, which they were granted.\textsuperscript{3} Further documents dating from March and November 1567 provide evidence of a conflict caused by the constricted situation of the area between the square and the neighbouring houses.\textsuperscript{4}

The façade decoration shown on the drawing apparently reproduces the original project, but was not executed in this form. The remnants of painted decoration can be seen on the building and are more clearly recognized in a photograph dating from the beginning of the last century (cat. ill. 14). Giolfi’s view of the northern part of the square in the eighteenth century, with the Interiano palace (left) and the Negrone palace (right), already shows this later
façade decoration (cat. ill. 15). The painted illusionistic architecture is similar to that in the drawing, but different architectural elements were chosen, and the solid wall segments between the outer window bays are painted with allegorical figures placed in niches. Iustitia, Fortitudo, Prudentia and Temperantia are still identifiable. Soprani mentions that Aurelio, Benedetto and Felice Calvi ‘dipinsero vicino alla Strada Nuova il Palazzo & altre case de’ Signori Interiani’. Alizeri notes the contents of a document
according to which the Interiano family commissioned Pantaleo and Benedetto Calvi to paint six rooms in December 1585. The Calvi brothers were probably commissioned to carry out the façade decoration at around the same time.

During the seventeenth century, the façade was altered by the installation of balconies and a new portal, and the façade painting was damaged in the process. In the nineteenth century, the building was extended towards the north. Interior alterations were also carried out at the time, the extent of which cannot be assessed. Gauthier’s illustrations document the state of the building before the nineteenth-century alterations, and largely correspond to the presumed stage of the project preserved in the London drawings (cat. ill. 16).

It is notable that the eastern exterior wall is thinner than the others. The building immediately abuts upon the palace of Francesco de Ugarte on this side. The façade decoration has a correspondingly asymmetrical design, and closes there with a half-pilaster. This reflects the reduction in the thickness of the wall at this point, made possible structurally through the connection with the adjoining building. However, in the drawing the cornices continue round the corner, as if it was a free-standing building.


H. VILLA GRIMALDI SAULI
(Nos. 49–52)

49. Plan of the Ground Floor: Engraving (Fig. 108)

381 × 277 mm.

Inscribed Figura 49.; Prima pianta del Palazzo .H.

49a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Fig. 109)

390 × 275 mm.; trimmed on all sides.

Inscribed in the courtyard CORTILE, 73; in the rooms in the left-hand section 24 3/4; 13 1/2;
28/27; in the rooms in the central section Porticho, 31 1/2, P; SALA, 59/37; in the rooms in the right-hand section recamera, 19 1/2, 19; camere, p 28/25, U; in the courtyard del s° lazar ciba de villa, scored through and crossed out in pencil; in pencil on the upper edge of the sheet D (?), trimmed; by Rubens in red chalk above 49, in the courtyard Prima Pianta del Palazzo H, thinly cancelled in pencil; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 49.

50. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 110)

380 × 275 mm.
Inscribed Figura .50.; Seconda pianta del Palazzo .H.

50a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 111)

390 × 270 mm.; trimmed on all sides.
Inscribed in each of the two side wings terrazze scop(ere)te; loggiette; discop(ere)te; in the lower wing discop(ere)to; in a room in the left-hand section camera; in the rooms in the central section loggia; sala; in the right-hand section capella; in the centre of the courtyard seconda pianta del s° lazar ciba de villa, with the ownership note scored through and crossed out; by Rubens in red chalk above 50, trimmed, in the courtyard Palazzo H; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 50, trimmed.

51. Elevation of the Courtyard Façade: Engraving (Fig. 112)

215 × 294 mm.
Inscribed Figura .51.; Facciata del Palazzo .H.

51a. Elevation of the Courtyard Façade: Drawing (Fig. 113)

395 × 285 mm.; trimmed on all sides.
Watermark: circle with crown and crowning cross, below it the letters ID; examples with comparable structure in Briquet, Gênes, 1888, nos. 220–222: 1549–1589/93.
Inscribed below the central portal P, and on the right alongside it del s° lazar ciba de villa; by Rubens in red chalk above 51, below that Palazzo H; also in red chalk below in the centre P, in pencil underneath, a weak 4; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 51.

52. Elevation of the Street Façade: Engraving (Fig. 114)

160 × 256 mm.
Inscribed Figura .52.; Facciata dinansi il Cortile/del medesimo Palazzo .H.

52a. Elevation of the Street Façade: Drawing (Fig. 115)

395 × 285 mm.; trimmed on the left and right.
Scale 10 palmi = 21 mm.
Inscribed on the right il 2° ordine segnato a e di stucco/ il p° ordine q(ue)lo dei quadri sono di stucco/ l'ordine rusticho e di pietra de finale/l'ordine ioniicho è di stucco eccetto / q(ue)lo della porta segnato T che è di marm(aro)/ li busti sono di stucco, l'arma della / porta e di marmaro; below the illustration p 117 a 10, left alongside it, facciata del s° lazar ciba de villa; by Rubens in red chalk above 52, further down facciata del Palazzo H; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 52.
Verso: inscribed il Magco Lazaro ciba de villa.

The history of this villa complex, which was one of the most prominent and well-known buildings in Genoa until it was mutilated during the nineteenth century, has not been
adequately clarified. The villa lies to the south-east, outside the ring of the medieval city walls, in the Bisagno valley. The commissioning patron was Giovanni Battista Grimaldi q. Girolamo Cardinale. It was probably erected in the early 1550s. More detailed information about when it was built is not available. Several documents dating from 1552 to 1554 refer to the laying out of a network of streets in the area of the villa. In December 1554, Antonio Roderio was commissioned by the Padri del Comune to lay out a new street in Bisagno, which was to pass by Giovanni Battista Grimaldi’s newly erected villa. Even before this, agreements seem to have been made between Grimaldi and the Padri del Comune concerning an access route to Grimaldi’s property.1 The building had apparently been finished and occupied in 1557, since a contract was signed 'in domo cum terra dicti Magnifici D. Jo. Baptitae sita in bisanne'.2 Years later, in March 1567, there is evidence of work being carried out on the villa under the direction of Giovanni Ponzello, although it is not stated what type of work was involved.3

The commissioning patron, Giovanni Battista Grimaldi, was the son of the later Cardinal Girolamo Grimaldi q. Benedetto and nephew of Ansaldo Grimaldi, whose fortune he was to inherit along with his brother Luca. In his early years, he was a pupil of Claudio Tolomei, whom he had met in Rome in 1543 and corresponded with in subsequent years. He was also a pupil of Jacopo Bonfadio, who had been employed by the Republic of Genoa since 1544 as a teacher of rhetoric and historiographer. Grimaldi regarded himself as a patron of the sciences and arts, and Bonfadio recommended young literary talents to his patronage. He had had a library of some two hundred volumes compiled by his teacher Claudio Tolomei in Rome, representing the ideal educational programme for a young aristocrat. It contained more or less equal proportions of classical and modern authors, and in addition to poetry there were theoretical treatises, such as Philandrier’s commentary on Vitruvius. In addition to the villa in the Bisagno valley, Grimaldi owned an urban palace in the Via San Luca, which he had inherited from Ansaldo Grimaldi.4

'Lazzaro ciba' is referred to on the drawings as being the owner of the building. Poleggi attempted to identify this name with Lazzaro Grimaldi Cebà, who died during his period of office as Doge in February 1599. According to Poleggi, the villa is mentioned in his will, written shortly before his death, and is assigned to his nephew Gio. Domenico Spinola.5 However, the commissioning patron Giovanni Battista Grimaldi was still alive in 1610. It is not clear when and in what circumstances he may have sold the villa during his lifetime. These data are contradicted by the contents of Grimaldi’s will dating from 1610, as given by Melai, in which the villa still appears among his possessions and is to be inherited by the family.6

The complex is unusual in its type. In front of the oblong two-storey body of the building there is a large courtyard, which is bounded on three sides by an open arcade, like an antique portico. Access was through the portal on the south wing of the courtyard. After crossing the courtyard, the visitor entered a vestibule, from which a sala on the ground floor was reached, and from which a two-flight staircase led to the upper floor. The large loggia was open to the courtyard via three large serlianas. At the rear there was access to another sala. The terrace-like gallery over the courtyard arcades was reached from the rooms in the side sections, one of which is marked as a chapel.

The building found no imitators in Genoa, with the exception of the rather superficial adaptation of the scheme in Franco Lercari’s palace in the Strada Nuova (K), which was only built during the 1570s. A similar arrangement is seen in the project for a villa complex in Book VI of Serlio (MS Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, cod.
CATALOGUE NO. 49-52a

The attribution of the building to Alessi, which has been regarded as valid since Vasari and Soprani, is also supported by formal criteria. A similar arrangement of the walls with serlianas in the courtyard of the Palazzo Marino, and corresponding formations and richly decorated entablature forms in the Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B), however, represent rather superficial connections. It is the spatial structure of the courtyard façade that is characteristic. The building’s exterior wall, which is hollowed out by the openings for doors and several niches, gives the appearance of being the base of a relief, in front of which the architectural articulation is stretched out like a thin curtain. A similarly differentiated relationship between the body of the building and the façade placed in front of it was created by different means in the Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso.

A passage in Vasari’s *Vite* is of primary interest as a contemporary source attributing the building to Alessi. However, Vasari does not discuss the villa itself, but only its bathing facilities, ‘che [Alessi] ha fatto in casa del signor Giovan Batista Grimaldi in Bisagno’. The detailed description of the bath is placed in the context of the ‘diverse maniere di fonti’ that Alessi designed for Genoese aristocrats, and it is given almost as much space as the rest of his biography. Vasari describes a vaulted central room with a large pool in the centre and four additional smaller basins let into the walls. All of the basins could be supplied with hot and cold water. The size of the central pool was such that it could accommodate eight to ten people. Around the pool there was a broad gallery, from which three steps descended into the pool. The remaining rooms included an *antibagno*, a changing room and a small bathroom, all of which were decorated with stucco and paintings. Bathing facilities of this type are not indicated on the London drawings. To judge by their size, it would have been impossible to accommodate them in the space underneath the staircase, where the bathrooms are located in the other villas. If such bathing facilities did in fact ever exist in this villa complex, they can only have been in a separate, free-standing building on the property. This would also provide the only possible explanation for Vasari’s assertion that the large bathing room had windows on three sides. However, none of the later writers witnessed this bath complex. In 1674, Soprani tersely states that they were no longer in existence: ‘ma essendo stato a di nostri distrutto il sito, e convertito in altr’uso; stimo meglio di deplorarne la perdita, che di raccontarne l’artificio veramente stravagante’. Soprani does not discuss the villa itself either. Soprani’s information about Alessi is based almost exclusively on Vasari. It is not entirely clear whether he actually succeeded at all in identifying the complex that Vasari describes.

The different locations for Giovanni Battista Grimaldi’s villa given by different guidebooks—in Bisagno, Borgo San Vincenzo and near the Porta Romana—all refer to the same area and the same building. In the second edition of Soprani’s lives, Ratti erroneously distinguishes between a Palazzo Grimaldi in Borgo San Vincenzo and a Villa Giovanni Battista Grimaldi in Bisagno, with the bathing facilities described as follows: ‘Egli [Alessi] edificò nel borgo di S. Vincenzo il palazzo Grimaldi di struttura cotanto magnifica, e di sì artificiosi stucchi fregiato, che può gareggiare con le fabbriche più belle, che vanti l’Architettura. [...] Chi vuol distinta notizia d’un altra suntuaosa fabbrica dell’Alessi in Bisagno per il Sig. Gio. Battista Grimaldo, legga il Vasari nella Vita del soprallegato Leoni; ov’è minutamente descritta. Ella consiste in un superbissimo bagno. Ma io non ne dico davvantaggio; perciocchè essendo stata a’giorni nostri distrutta tal fabbrica, e ridotta in altr’uso quel sito; non voglio più oltre amareggiare me stesso, e gli Amatori delle cose buone con la dolorosa considerazione di questa gran perdita’. In the *Instruzione*, however, Ratti states a few years later that at least the ground plan and the foundation
Cat. ill. 17. Villa Grimaldi Sauli (H), longitudinal section and plan of the ground floor
(from Gauthier, Edifices, 1818–32, 1, pl. 76)
Cat. ill. 18. Villa Grimaldi Sauli (H), view of the courtyard (from Gauthier, Édifices, 1818–32, l, pl. 79)

Cat. ill. 19. Domenico Pasquale Cambiaso, Villa Grimaldi Sauli (H), view of the courtyard, painting. Genoa, Collezione topografica del Comune
walls (piantato) of the bathing facilities in the Palazzo già Grimaldi were still recogniz­able near the Porta Romana.10 Milizia also claims to have seen remnants: ‘non si vede che la semplice forma assai bella, ma nuda di que’ tanti lodatissimi ornamenti e giuochi d’acqua, che l’adornavano un tempo’.11 There is no later confirmation for these observations by Ratti and Milizia.

After a long period of decay in the nine­teenth century, the main building was con­verted into a dwelling-house with several storeys. The courtyard was almost com­pletely destroyed in this process. Milizia already records numerous substantial alter­ations that had been made by 1781, result­ing from changes in the building’s use: ‘Quest’opera è stata la più maltratta da’pos­sessori, che tuttavia la godono.... Il piano superiore son già molti anni, che è stato ridotto ad uso di fabbrica di veli; e nella bella antisala la più fornelli da seta vi sono disposti, che col loro fumo l’hanno ormai annerita. Una parte del loggiato è chiusa ad uso di magazzeno. Li terrazzi, il loggiato, e la facciata principale cascano a pezzi, e per le non riparate umidità son già molto sdru­scite e piene di fessure’.12 The author of Nou­velle description des beautés de Gênes notes in 1819 that the villa was among the finest in Italy, ‘mais il tombe en ruine’.13 Finally, Burckhardt states that during earlier visits he had seen the building in a dilapidated state, but ‘still essentially preserved’. In the spring of 1853, he witnessed the start of demolition work.14

The drawings and engravings of the Palazzi di Genova are the primary source for reconstructing the original appearance of the villa. The four drawings comprise the plans of the two main floors, and elevations of the courtyard and street façades. Addi­tional visual documents include Gauthier’s record drawings—he must have found the outlines of the complex still intact (cat. ills. 17–18) and an anonymous elevation of the courtyard façade, probably made shortly before it was destroyed (Genoa, Gabinetto Disegni, Palazzo Rosso).15 A watercolour sketch and a corresponding painting by Domenico Pasquale Cambiaso dating from after 1850 and giving a perspective view of the courtyard (cat. ill. 19), and Robert Rein­hardt’s record drawings, already represent reconstructions. The illustrations in the Palazzi di Genova and earlier visual sources are basically in agreement. There are differ­ences in the lower floor of the courtyard façade. The London drawing, as well as Cambiaso and Reinhardt (probably basing their work on the engraved reproduction in Rubens’s book), shows large, rectangular window openings at the side of the court­yard portal. Gauthier and the anonymous elevation, by contrast, show niches with figures in them in this position. The form of the niches on the upper storey also dif­fers between the Palazzi drawing and the anonymous elevation.

Reinhardt based his reconstruction, according to his own information, on mea­surements of the surviving fragments, older architectural drawings at the Accademia Ligustica di Belle Arti and an old pho­tograph of the garden façade. The remains of the original fabric at that time included the enclosing walls, the separating wall of the sala, the cornice of the garden façade, part of the cornice of the courtyard façade, three enclosing walls from the courtyard with the springing of the vault and the street façade as high as the ground floor.16 According to Reinhardt, the architectural articulation in the courtyard and on the façades consisted of white marble and red limestone. The draughtsman notes that the decoration of the street façade consisted of stucco, with the exception of the marble portal and the hewn stone window frames (see Fig. 154).
At least a few rooms on the ground floor had fresco decoration by Luca Cambiaso and Bernardo Castello. Ratti apparently saw these room decorations still intact in 1766, while the author of the *Nouvelle description* complained in 1819 that they had already been lost.


**I. PALAZZO ROSTAN RAGGIO**

(Nos. 53–60)


53. Plan of the Cellar: Engraving (Fig. 116)

213 × 247 mm.

Inscribed *Figura 53.; Prima pianta di sotto terra del Palazzo I.*

53a. Plan of the Cellar: Drawing (Fig. 117)

395 × 265 mm.; trimmed on three sides.

Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section 22 1/2; q(u)e)ste stanze p(er) servitori, 27; 16 1/2; 27/20; in the rooms in the central section stanza p servitori, 24 1/2; alto 12; volta di legnia, alta 11; in the rooms in the right-hand section dispensa p far pane, 22; cucina, 26/17 1/2, alta 11, forno, tinelli, foghoni, troglio; tinello, 23, alta 11; dispensa, 12 1/2; stanza p servitori, 26/30, alta 11; above tramontana, right le(vante), below mezzodi, le stanze sotto terra, left (p)onente; by Rubens in red chalk above 53, below that *Prima Pianta del Palazzo I*; by a later hand in darker ink, above left *Fig. 53.*

54. Plan of the Ground Floor: Engraving (Fig. 118)

246 × 248 mm.

Inscribed *Figura 54.; Seconda pianta del Palazzo I.*

Scale 10 palmi = 18.5 mm.

54a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Fig. 119)

395 × 280 mm.; trimmed on all sides. Four small flaps, which are engraved separately in No. 71 (Fig. 142).

Scale 10 palmi = 19 mm.

Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section camera, 29/23, alto 27; salotto, 28/27 1/4, alto 17; ricamera, 15 3/5, alta 11; stanci p
seruioti, 26/19/12, alta 12; in the rooms in the central section PORTICO, 34, alto 27; recamara, 11/19, alta 16; on the flaps 22, alta 9/13, and 19/13, alta 9/15; primo piano, cortile, 32/13, logia; in the rooms in the right-hand section camera, 27/14/23; 19/11/15, alta 15; salotto, 26, alto 27; camera, 26/22 p 9; bagnio, 7; ricamera, 13/14/12; above tramontana, right levante (te), giardino, 10/9/13, below (mez)zo giorno, left ponente; by Rubens in red chalk above 54, further down Seconda Pianta del Palazzo H, cancelled, below it del Palazzo I; in pencil at various points in the ground plan R, S, T, V; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 54.

55. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 120)

213 × 247 mm.
Inscribed Figura .55.; Terza pianta del Palazzo I.

55a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Figs. 121–122)

390 × 265 mm.; trimmed on three sides. A large flap (155 × 175 mm.) covers the rooms in the left section and the courtyard and presents the ground plan of the mezzanine storey above (engraved separately in No. 71, Fig. 152; see also Figs. 123–124).

Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section camera, 27/24, alta 27/14; camera, 18/13/11, alta 12/14; on the flap tinello, 17/23, alto 13; cuocina, 29/27, alta 13, foco(lare); terza, 16/11; despensa, 15/11, alta 13; terazza, fondegga; in the rooms in the central section sala, p 56/36, alta p 38; logia, CORTILE; in the rooms in the right-hand section camera, 25; camera, 28; ricamera, 19/4a, letto reto (?); camera, 26 p 10; above tramontana, right lev(ante), below mezzodi, left (ponte)nte; by Rubens in red chalk above 55, below that terza pianta del Palazzo I; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 55.
CATALOGUE NOS. 53–60a

58a. Longitudinal Section: Drawing
(Fig. 130)

395 × 275 mm.; trimmed at top.

Inscribed in the rooms on the upper floor la testa della sala, 36, alta 38; terazza, 111/4; on the left edge of the illustration mezzodi, on the right edge tramontana; by Rubens in red chalk above 58, below that Palazzo I; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 58. Verso: see No. 59a.

59. Longitudinal Section: Engraving
(Fig. 131)

196 × 209 mm.

Inscribed Figura 59.; Taglio di un fianco solo verso ponente del Palazzo I.

59a. Longitudinal Section: Drawing
(Fig. 132)

395 × 275 mm.; trimmed at top. Verso of No. 58a; the two longitudinal sections are absolutely congruent.

Inscribed in the rooms on the ground floor p seruatori, 191/11; dispensa p frutta, 141/5; de peana, 131/5; salotto, 271/4/17; 23/19; in the rooms on the upper floor granaro, 12; terazetta; dispensa; cucina, 23/13; tinello; camera, 24/191/4; by Rubens in red chalk above 58, corrected to 59, below that Palazzo I; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 59.

60. Cross Section: Engraving
(Fig. 133)

193 × 259 mm.

Inscribed Figura 60.; Taglio del Palazzo I. trauersando tutto L'edificio insieme il Cortile da leuante verso ponente.

60a. Cross Section: Drawing
(Fig. 134)

390 × 280 mm.; trimmed on all sides.

Inscribed in the rooms in the cellar stanza p servitori; caneua; volta di legnio; tinello; in the rooms on the ground floor de pana, 21/20; salotto, 26/19; in the rooms on the upper floor dispensa; cucina; terazza; camera, 19/191/5; on the left edge of the illustration ponente; on the right edge leuante; on the upper edge of the sheet in pencil F (?), trimmed; by Rubens in red chalk on the upper edge 60, below that Palazzo I; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 60.

During the decades around 1600, five palaces were built for the Lomellino family in the area of Vallechiara on the north-western outskirts of the city walls. Two of the larger palaces in this ensemble are included in the Palazzi di Genova. In addition to Bartolomeo Lomellino’s palace (1565), the other is Giacomò’s (c. 1619), which appears among the Palazzi Moderni (XVIII). A third Lomellino palace, the property of Bartolomeo’s brother Nicolò on the Strada Nuova, is also included in the second series (IX).

When planning the building, Bartolomeo Lomellino apparently based his decisions on the project that his brother-in-law Giambattista Spinola had begun two years earlier on the Strada Nuova (Palazzi Moderni, I). The two ground plans are arranged in similar ways, and the interior disposition is also developed similarly. The names of the same contractors appear in the documents concerning the two buildings. Even more importantly, the commissioning patron of the older palace, Giambattista Spinola, took an active part in the construction of his brother-in-law’s later one, acting as final arbiter for some of the deliveries.

Work probably began in 1565. Deliveries of materials are documented in January, March and April. However, there was an interruption when the neighbours filed suit
Cat. ill. 20. Palazzo Rostan Raggio (I), façade elevation, longitudinal section and plan of the ground floor (from Gauthier, Édifices, 1818–32, 1, pl. 65)
Cat. ill. 21. Palazzo Rostan Raggio (I), plan of the main floor, drawing. Genoa, Archivio storico del Comune

Cat. ill. 22. Palazzo Rostan Raggio (I), plan of the main floor and the mezzanine storey above, drawing. Genoa, Archivio storico del Comune
in April 1565 concerning an infringement of property boundaries. The accusation was that Lomellino had illegally rounded off the property by incorporating public land. In May 1566, Giacomo Carlone was commissioned to supply twelve marble Ionic columns, including pedestals and capitals. One month later, in June 1566, a commission to Giacomo Guidetti and Giovanni Lurago to supply fourteen more Doric columns followed. Both contracts have drawings with the precise measurement data attached. Bernardo Cantone and, in the second case, Giovanni Battista Castello were present at the signing of the contracts. Giambattista Spinola was to serve as appraiser for the deliveries. Castello was probably also the author of the two drawings, since he provided a similar design for the columns in the courtyard of the Spinola palace in September 1564. Further deliveries of lime are documented in November 1566 and May 1567. In July 1568, frames for the portal and the windows were commissioned.

The palace was substantially affected by later alterations and extensions. Its state after alterations around 1780, in which Andrea Tagliafichi was involved, is documented by Gauthier’s record drawing (cat. ill. 20). The interior arrangements were apparently left largely intact, but the building was significantly extended towards the north. The neighbourhood underwent profound changes during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, permanently affecting the appearance of the palace. Around 1820, the street level was lowered on the south side of the palace and part of the Piazza della Zecca, and steps were built to connect Via Vallechiara with the new Via Cairoli, which was some seven metres lower. A century later, the Piazza della Zecca was rearranged. The zecca had to make way for an opening into the Galleria G. Garibaldi, and the level of the whole square and the streets was lowered. The palace, which had been the premises of the Istituto Tecnico Commerciale ‘Vittorio Emanuele II’ since 1875, was extended at the rear with two large wings, and received a new façade which now has three storeys, due to the lowering of the ground.

The set of drawings includes eight illustrations, and is therefore among the most extensive in the collection. The façade elevation shows the south view of the palace (different today). A comparison between the ground plans and Gauthier’s later record drawings reveals profound differences. In the Palazzi drawings, the palace has an almost square ground plan, while Gauthier shows two obliquely angled exterior walls. A contemporary drawing proves that the building was in fact constructed with oblique angles, and the London drawings represent a regularized rendering.

The documents concerning the disputes of April 1565 over the property boundaries include a drawing of the plan of the piano nobile. The absolute size, arrangement of the rooms and—with slight deviations—the measurement details agree precisely with the corresponding sheet of the Palazzi set of drawings (No. 55a). The Genoese drawing even has the same folding strip mounted on it, showing the plan of the kitchen and service areas on the mezzanine floor above (cat. ills. 21–22). The draughtsman of the London set of drawings has regularized the oblique ground plan of the two wings. This is clearly seen, for example, from the form of the northern exterior wall, the western part of which has an unusual thickness that would otherwise be hard to explain. The draughtsman used this thickening of the wall to absorb the difference resulting from the differing lengths of the east and west wings caused by the shape of the property. The Genoese drawing may well have formed part of the planning material used by the draughtsman to produce his set of drawings. However, he apparently also had additional sources of information, since the labelling is more detailed and the measurement data differs, though minimally. The copyist’s intention in carrying out this change was apparently to provide model
plans, not to document the uniqueness of a building. The regularization of the asymmetrical ground plan does not, therefore, derive from Rubens as the editor, since it was already present in the drawings when he purchased them, and he was probably not even aware that the alteration had been made.

1. See also No. 71.
3. Ibid., p. 12.
4. Ibid., p. 15; illustrations of the two drawings on p. 20.
5. All references in ibid., p. 22, n. 16.

**K. PALAZZO LERCARI PARODI**
(Nos. 61–66)


**61. Plan of the Ground Floor:**
**Engraving (Fig. 135)**

312 x 251 mm.
Inscribed Figura 61.; Pianta prima del Palazzo .K.
Scale 10 palmi = 20 mm.

**61a. Plan of the Ground Floor:**
**Drawing (Fig. 136)**

395 x 270 mm.
Watermark: circle with the letters AR and crowning cross; examples with similar structure in Briquet, Gênes, 1888, nos. 220-222: 1549-1589/93.
Scale 10 palmi = 21 mm.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section p s(er)uitori, 13; p s(er)uitori; stantia p s(er)uitori, 13; volta di legne, 36; in the rooms in the central section cortile p s(er)uitori, 32; portico, 32½/37, alto p 23½; in the rooms in the right-hand section p s(er)uitori, 13; p s(er)uitori, 13; stanza p s(er)uitori; cantina, 24, 35½; by Rubens in red chalk on the upper edge 61, below that Pianta Prima del Palazzo K; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 61.
Verso inscribed in ink weakly by the draughtsman or collector del S° franco lercharo.
62. Plan of the First Floor: Engraving (Fig. 137)

337 x 250 mm.
Inscribed Figura 62.; Pianta seconda del Palazzo K.

62a. Plan of the First Floor: Drawing (Fig. 138)

390 x 270 mm.; trimmed at top.
Inscribed in the rooms in the central section loggie; cortile; salotto; loggia; in a room in the right-hand section salotto; by Rubens in red chalk above 62, below that Pianta seconda del Palazzo K; by a later hand in darker ink, above left Fig. 62.

63. Plan of the Second Floor: Engraving (Fig. 139)

308 x 241 mm.
Inscribed Figura 63.; Pianta terza del Palazzo K.

63a. Plan of the Second Floor: Drawing (Fig. 140)

395 x 280 mm.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section loggia; camera; camera; tinello; in the rooms in the central section salone; loggia; in a room in the right-hand section salotto; by Rubens in red chalk on the upper edge 63, below that Pianta terza del Palazzo K; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 63.

64. Elevation of the Street Façade: Engraving (Fig. 141)

198 x 252 mm.
Inscribed Figura 64.; Facciata del Palazzo K. dinansi il Cortile.

64a. Elevation of the Street Façade: Drawing (Fig. 142)

395 x 280 mm.; trimmed at top.
Inscribed by Rubens in red chalk on the upper edge 64, below that Palazzo K; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 64.

65. Longitudinal Section: Engraving (Fig. 143)

236 x 319 mm.
Inscribed Figura 65.; Taglio trauersando per mezzo tutto il Palazzo K.insieme col Cortile da Tramonta verso mezzo giorno.

65a. Longitudinal Section: Drawing (Fig. 144)

275 x 395 mm.
Inscribed in the rooms on the ground floor portico, 233; in the rooms on the first floor loggia, 233; cortile; salotto; scale; in the rooms on the second floor sala; loggia; by Rubens in red chalk on the upper edge 65, below that Palazzo K; in pencil on the upper edge i; by a later hand in darker ink on left and right above Fig. 65.
Verso: see No. 66a.

66. Longitudinal Section: Engraving (Fig. 145)

235 x 309 mm.
Inscribed Figura 66.; Taglio del lato solo di Leuante del Palazzo K.Levandone sola la murall<i>a esteriore.

66a. Longitudinal Section: Drawing (Fig. 146)

275 x 395 mm. Verso of No. 65a; both longitudinal sections are designed to be congruent.
Inscribed in the rooms on the mezzanine floor cusina, dispensa da far il pane; dispensa; saluarobe; in the rooms on the courtyard façade block tinello; dispensa; tinello; tinello; cusina e forno; in the rooms on the mezzanine floor

The property on the hill side of the Strada Nuova was already marked out and sold in 1551, but no building was carried out on it for another two decades. In 1569, Nicolò Grimaldi purchased the building site, but further sold it to Franco Lercari in August 1571. Lercari seems to have begun building work immediately. In March 1572, he applied for permission for the socle and other façade elements to project half a palmo onto public land. Work on the façade was therefore already in progress at this point. No other direct information about the history of the construction is available. It seems to have come to a halt temporarily, since the extension and the interior decorations were apparently only begun at the end of the 1570s. In June 1578, Lercari applied for permission to use water from a public spring for the house, as well as for fountains and waterworks in the garden.

Again in 1578, Ottavio Semino dated and signed the Gigantomachia fresco in the antisa on the second floor. In 1580, according to Alizeri, Taddeo Carlone was commissioned to carry out the sculptural work, beginning with the two herms on the portal. The two busts of Franco Lercari and his wife, which Taddeo Carlone created for the loggia on the first floor, bear the date 1581.

Luca Cambiaso was employed, in addition to Semino, for work on the interior. Among other items, Cambiaso decorated the sala on the second floor with a fresco illustrating the Deeds of Megollo Lercari. Lazzaro Calvi provided biblical stories for two reception rooms (salotti) on the same floor.

Built in the 1570s, Franco Lercari’s palace is the latest among the Palazzi Antichi. The names of the artists responsible for planning the building and constructing it are not given in the few documents presently known. In its type, the building recalls the model of Alessi’s Villa Grimaldi Sauli (H). However, that had been built two decades earlier, and the two buildings have nothing in common in terms of their stylistic characteristics. The programme of rooms in the palace is much larger in comparison with the villa. The main block includes three full storeys, each with a mezzanine. The wings of the courtyard arcade have a superstructure, and contain the service areas and servants’ quarters. The palace does not have a real façade. The street front on the Strada Nuova is the exterior side of the south wing of the courtyard, developed into a decorative wall. In the Palazzi set of drawings, an elevation of this wall takes the place of the obligatory façade view.

There are substantial differences between the London drawings and the state of the building documented by Gauthier and Reinhardt. These mainly involve two points: firstly the form of the vestibule and its connection to the courtyard, and secondly the elevation of the street front.

On the ground plan drawing, as in the Villa Grimaldi Sauli, the vestibule is treated as a closed room, which is entered from the courtyard via a portal in the central bay of the arcade. At the back of the room is the entrance to the staircase. What was actually constructed, however, was a more modern conception of the room. The vestibule is open to the courtyard over its entire breadth via a colonnade, and a second colonnade at the rear of the room separates off the access to the staircase (cat. ill. 23). This solution can hardly be the result of later alterations, but must have been due to a change of plan. The crucial factors behind this were probably structural as well as aesthetic. The colonnade at the rear of the vestibule was required by the arrangement.
Cat. ill. 23. Palazzo Lercari Parodi (K), plan of the ground floor and plan of the first floor (from Gauthier, Édifices, 1818–32, 1, pl. 72)
of rooms on the upper floors. It supports the heavy separating walls in the rooms and loggias. The original idea shown in the London drawings seems impractical in contrast to this, purely for structural reasons. The visual link between the vestibule and the courtyard may also have been modelled on the spatial connection of these two spaces used in several buildings from the 1560s, such as the palaces of Giambattista Spinola and Bartolomeo Lomellino.

The difference between the drawings and the actual building is particularly noticeable with regard to the street façade. The façade section was later altered, with the central part being raised and the originally open loggias being closed. Nevertheless, the façade shown in the elevation in the Palazzi di Genova probably never existed in that form. The lateral belvedere-like structures in the actual building are not formed as a tripartite arcade but as a serliana, the intercolumniation of which corresponds to that of the wall divisions on the two lower floors (cat. ill. 24). Instead of the portal frame with diamond-rusticated pilasters, Taddeo Carlone’s herm portal was constructed. Around 1600, only two decades after the building was completed, Heinrich Schickhardt drew the façade of the Palazzo Lercari (cat. ill. 25). Schickhardt’s drawings are usually a fairly free reproduction of the buildings, as in the cases of the Cambiaso and Doria Tursi palaces (see Nos. 68 and 67). The present drawing also contains elements that have no equivalent in the building. For example, the half-column articulation on the ground floor is probably Schickhardt’s own invention. The wall divisions on the upper storeys of the lateral superstructures seem to have been suggested by the Villa Grimaldi Sauli (H), where a serliana is similarly placed in front of a wall with niches and aedicules. But Schick-
hardt’s drawing shows both the two belvederes with serliana divisions—albeit in a form based less on actual conditions in the Palazzo Lercari than on the courtyard façade of the Grimaldi villa—and also the herm portal. It is unlikely that the façade section would have been substantially altered almost as soon as it was finished. The façade elevation and the ground plan apparently reflect a stage of the planning that was not actually executed.

1. The documents regarding purchases of the property are referred to in Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, p. 357, n. 9.
2. Reference in ibid., p. 357, n. 10.
3. Reference in ibid., p. 357, n. 11.
9. Soprani, Vite, 1674, p. 73; Soprani—Ratti, Vite, 1768, pp. 47f.

PALAZZO DORIA TURSI (No. 67)'


67. Elevation of one Half of the Façade: Engraving (Fig. 147)

290 × 411 mm.

Inscribed Figura 67; La Meta della facciata del Nobilissimo Palazzo in strada noua de Don Carlo Doria / duca de Tursi.

Scale above right 10 palmi = 28 mm.
Inscribed above *La lunghezza de questo Palazzo senza le loggie è Palmi .148./ e le loggie sono Palmi .60. luna compreso/ quell poco di terazza senza pilastro.*

67a. Elevation of one Half of the Façade: Drawing

Whereabouts unknown; presumably lost

The first series concludes with two palaces whose presentation differs from the others: they are both illustrated only with engravings of a façade elevation (Nos. 67 and 68; Figs. 147 and 148) and a ground plan of the vestibule (see No. 69; Fig. 149). In addition, the names of the owners are given. In the foreword, Rubens notes that these are the two most famous palaces in the Strada Nuova. As a massive three-wing complex built into the slope, the Palazzo Doria Tursi also transcends the dimensions of a bourgeois palace defined by the editor in the foreword. This has often been seen as the reason for the brevity of the building’s presentation among the *Palazzi di Genova.* But the Palazzo Cambiaso, which follows, does indeed correspond to the specified type, although it too is only given minimal treatment. Apparently, Rubens did not want to omit these two famous palaces, but had to make use of planning material that was meagre, in contrast to the comprehensive sets of drawings he had for the first ten buildings. The drawings for the two final palaces in the series have not survived. However, the engravings show that they must have belonged to design materials of another, later provenance, differing from that of the other palaces.

The commissioning patron, Niccolò Grimaldi, was banker and principal financier to Philip II. The site, on the hill side of the Strada Nuova, lay outside the original development plan, and was purchased in successive sections by Grimaldi beginning in April 1564. Grimaldi did not purchase the land for it at public auctions, but from private sellers. He bought the main part in April 1564 from Luca Grimaldi, who had purchased a large area below S. Francesco from the monks there as a speculative investment even before the official establishment of the building area. The sloping situation of the property required extensive ground work before actual construction could be started. In March 1565, Grimaldi commissioned Domenico and Giovanni Ponzello to carry out excavation and removal of masses of earth. The Ponzellos entrusted the work, which took until the autumn of 1567, to other subcontractors. A plan had already apparently been made when the excavation work started, since the contract with the Ponzellos already refers to the ‘forma modelorum de dicto edificio factorum vel faciendorum’. The actual building work seems to have begun only in 1568, since deliveries of materials only start during the summer, and essential parts of the building were only commissioned then. In June 1568, Gioanetto Carlone and Giovanni Lurago were commissioned to supply all of the hewn stone (*pietra di finale*) required. Several deliveries of lime and bricks are documented between July 1568 and March 1571.

In the meantime, Nicolò Grimaldi, looking for suitable artists, had apparently made inquiries to Duke Cosimo I regarding the reputation of the sculptor Francesco Moschino, whom the duke had recommended as a capable artist. However, Moschino was not included in the subsequent allocation of work.

In August 1568, twelve Doric and twelve Ionic columns were ordered from Carrara from Loto Guidi and Donato Vanelli for the two storeys of the courtyard. The façade also seems to have been started that year. Again in August 1568, permission was sought for the rusticated blocks of the socle to project by three-quarters of a palmo onto public land. Between March 1569 and June 1571, four more deliveries of marble were ordered, some of them large ones. Occasional further documents suggest that work
was still continuing until after the mid 1570s.

Nicolò Grimaldi’s palace was begun at a time when most of the palaces on the Strada Nuova had already been built. In scale, it went well beyond the original ideas for the development of the area, which was intended to be a line of buildings of more or less equal size along the street. In a sense, the building’s exposed position within the ensemble of palaces reflects the patron’s financial position as the richest banker in Genoa. Soprani expressed his appreciation for the palace as the most magnificent in Genoa, and attributed the design to Rocco Lurago, ‘che ne inventò la pianta’.1 However, Rocco Lurago seems in fact to have been merely an ordinary stonemason, who did not distinguish himself by producing architectural designs. His name does not appear in the documentation concerning the palace. Instead, several established architectural specialists are mentioned in the documents, among whom Giovanni Ponzello apparently had decisive importance. Together with his brother Domenico, he organized the preparations for building work on the site, beginning in March 1565. In June 1568, he specified the requirements for the deliveries of hewn stone. When the supply of columns for the courtyard was agreed in August 1568, it was once again Domenico and Giovanni Ponzello who prepared the measurement specifications. In September 1574, when work was being carried out on the fountains, Giovanni Ponzello is explicitly named in the city council minutes referring to the matter as capo d’opera.2 In addition to the Ponzellos, however, Grimaldi also appears to have employed other specialists in leading positions. When he ordered a supply of marble from Antonio
Cat. ill. 27. *Palazzo Doria Tursi*, view from Via Garibaldi (photo c. 1900)
da Carabio in March, he entrusted Giovanni Domenico Solari da Chiona and Battista Perolli, in addition to Domenico Ponzello, with setting the price. And in July 1569, when he commissioned a further supply of marble from Carrara from Giacomo de Diana, the measurement specifications for it were to be provided by Giovanni Domenico Solari ‘seu per alium architectum prefati ill.mi domini Nicolai’.¹³

This background of complex planning and construction procedures means that there was no one person who had sole responsibility for the overall design of the building. In the plan and elevation, the design combines elements from different sources. The façade is a simplified adaptation of models from the Alessi circle, such as the façades of the Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B) and Palazzo Carrega Cataldi (A). The plan, by contrast, with its strictly axial quality, goes back to buildings older than those of Alessi, such as the Palazzo Doria Spinola (XIV) and the Palazzo della Meridiana (VIII). In addition to these rather eclectic qualities, the palace also has a pioneering, innovative side. The perspectival use of a double staircase at the rear of the courtyard has typological relations with the so-called ‘imperial staircases’ (cat. ill. 26). Examples in Spanish palaces such as the Alcázar in Toledo, or the more or less contemporary complex in the Escorial, would have been known only to the patron, not to the architects and workers employed by him.¹⁴

Nicolò Grimaldi sold his palace in November 1593 to G. Battista and G. Stefano Doria. In 1596, it was purchased by Giovanni Andrea Doria, the son of Gianettino and great-nephew of Andrea Doria, the Pater Patriae. In September that year, the new owner had the two side loggias built as extensions of the façade, employing Taddeo and Battista Carbone, as well as Battista Orsolino.¹⁵ According to Soprani, the portal and the masks crowning the windows are by Taddeo Carbone.¹⁶ This would imply that the palace remained without further alterations right up to the nineteenth century. In 1820–26, it was extended by the block at the rear, behind the staircase. After the palace became the seat of the municipio in 1848, further extensions were added at the rear, but these did not affect the original complex.

The Palazzi di Genova shows the elevation of one half of the nine-bay façade and the ground plan of the vestibule (No. 69, top). The façade elevation includes the side loggia that was added in 1596, and names the owner as Carlo Doria, who probably took over the palace after the death of his father Giovanni Andrea in 1606.¹⁷ The state of the building and the ownership note thus reflect conditions at the time of publication. The elevation, including the figurative and decorative details on the portal and windows, corresponds precisely with the existing building (cat. ill. 27). While the other, much more complex sets of drawings for the preceding buildings were based on planning and design materials, Rubens seems in fact in this case to have had an up-to-date record drawing at his disposal.
Schickhardt’s drawing is more or less contemporary, and shows the right half of the façade (cat. ill. 28). However, Schickhardt reduces the number of window bays both on the façade and on the loggia. Oddly, he places winged female figures in the crowning element of the portal, instead of the armoured warriors supporting the coat of arms.

1. See also Nos. 69 and 72.
2. For a discussion of this question, see Chapter II, pp. 60f.
4. The text of the document is given ibid., pp. 471f., doc. XXIII.
5. Ibid., p. 324, n. 17.
6. The text of the document is given ibid., pp. 477f., doc. XXVI.
8. The figure of 12 columns per storey would give a courtyard measuring 3 × 3 arcades, while the palace actually has a courtyard of 3 × 5 arcades. Labò consequently linked the document to the neighbouring palace of Luca Grimaldi (Labò, Palazzi, 1922, pp. 23ff.). Poleggi, by contrast, concludes that there was a change of plan, with the initial project having a more modest format with a square cortile without the dynamic extension of its depth; cf. Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, p. 304. The text of the document is also given there, pp. 478–480, doc. XXVII.
10. In the final document of June 1571, columns of various sizes are mentioned, and according to Poleggi this suggests a second stage of planning, now using an extended oblong courtyard. Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, p. 304.
13. The text of the document is published ibid., pp. 480–482, doc. XXVIII.

**PALAZZO CAMBIASO (No. 68)**


**68. Façade Elevation: Engraving**

(Fig. 148)

283 × 350 mm.

Inscribed Figura 68.; Facciata del Palazzo del Sig’. Augostino Palauicino/Ultimo di Strada noua.

Scale 10 palmi = 28 mm.
The series concludes, as it began, with a palace belonging to the Pallavicino family. Agostino's palace was built at the head of the Strada Nuova on the hill side of the street, beginning in 1558. The history of its construction and the question of its designer have always been closely linked to the problem of the master plan of the Strada Nuova. Corresponding to its exposed position, the palace has two equally important façades—one facing onto the Via Garibaldi and the other facing Piazza Fontane Marose—which are among the few examples of a hewn-stone façade revetment within the Strada Nuova ensemble (cat. ills. 29, 30). In their structure and formal repertoire, the façades appear to be modestly sized, simplified variants of Alessi’s first commission in Milan, the Palazzo Marino, for which the foundation stone was laid in the same year, 1558. The windows are incorporated into the façade framework of rusticated pilaster strips and smooth entablatures in a similar way. Individual motifs such as the open-topped pediment with masks inserted are also common to the two buildings.

According to Vasari, it was Alessi who had the overall responsibility for the planning of the Strada Nuova: ‘Il medesimo ha
fatto la strada nuova di Genova, con tanti
palazzi fatti con suo disegno alla moderna,
che molti affermano in niun'altra città d'Italia trovarsi una strada più di questa magnifica, e grande, né più ripiena di ricchissimi palazzi, stati fatti da que' Signori a persuasione, & con ordine di Galeazzo'. The prominent position of this palace at the beginning of the street, and its stylistic similarity to the façade decoration of the Palazzo Marino, seem to support the attribution to Alessi. However, Poleggi's fundamental research on the Genoese architecture of the Strada Nuova period, which brought a multitude of documents to light, led to a conclusion that was almost the contrary of this. Alessi's name does not appear either in the documents on the planning of the street, or in any of the information regarding the construction history of individual palaces. In the case of the Palazzo Cambiaso, it was Bernardo Cantone who directed the building work, and in addition he was responsible as caput operis under commission from the Padri del Comune for the project of marking out the Strada Nuova itself. However, neither Cantone nor any of the local architects directing work on the other palaces seem to have had the status of independent artists capable of conceiving and realizing such an ambitious project on their own. They appear to be the mere implementers of projects that were carried out expressly and with precise ideas by their patrons. Alessi is present in the background through his ambitions to plan on an urbanistic scale, which are also tangible elsewhere, and through his villa designs, which served as paradigms for the Genoese architecture of the Strada Nuova period.

The property was first purchased by Agostino's brother Tobia Pallavicino, when he acquired two building sites on the newly laid out street in February 1558. On one of

Cat. ill. 30. Palazzo Cambiaso, doorway to Via Garibaldi
these sites, on the valley side, he built his own palace (A). He sold the building site obliquely opposite on the hill side to Agostino slightly later, in March 1558. The two brothers seem to have begun building on their properties the same year. In October 1558, Agostino purchased an additional strip of land 'propter fundamenta palacii' from his neighbour Simone Grimaldi. Between November 1558 and December 1559, a total of seven deliveries of lime and bricks are documented. Work seems to have progressed quickly, since the stonemasons Pietro Maria de Nove and Giovanni Lurago were commissioned to supply hewn stone for the two façades as early as February 1559. This document explicitly names Bernardo Cantone in his capacity as caput operis. Cantone was also present as a witness at the signing of two of the contracts for materials mentioned, in November and December 1558.

Two years after building started, the palace seems to have been nearing completion. In April 1560, materials supplied included roofing and iron bars, probably intended for gratings on the ground floor windows. The interior decoration also seems to have been completed quite soon. As early as August 1560, Vincenzo Imperiale refers to models in Agostino Pallavicino's palace when ordering three marble pilasters from the sculptors Pompeo Bianchi and Antonio da San Fedele. In Agostino Pallavicino's will of April 1565, his palace on the Strada Nuova is mentioned as '[domus] nuper fabricata'. The painted decoration of the principal rooms by Andrea and Ottavio Semino, including a Feast of the Gods in the vaulting of the sala and Roman histories in one of the smaller salotti, immediately followed the completion of the building work.

The building's principal rooms and the façade on the Via Garibaldi escaped alterations. However, the opening of the Via Interiano between the Piazza Fontane Marose and Piazza Portello in 1864 brought a substantial loss. The building was shortened on the north-west corner, and the façade on the Piazza Fontane Marose was reduced by two window bays. In the interior, the courtyard was also affected by alterations. Gauthier's and Reinhardt's ground plans agree in showing a rectangular shape with three by two arcade bays. Originally, however, the courtyard had a square shape with three arcades on each side, and according to Labò this was proved by identifying existing socle foundations. After the palace was taken over by the Banco di Napoli in 1921, the courtyard was converted into a counter hall by adding a glass roof, and the original square shape was restored.

Like the Palazzo Doria Tursi (No. 67), the Palazzo Cambiaso is only given one and a half plates in the Palazzi di Genova, showing the façade and the ground plan of the vestibule. The façade elevation corresponds precisely to that of the existing building, while the ground plan shows differences in the shape of one of the side rooms. Two
other contemporary reproductions of the façade take substantially more liberties. Heinrich Schickhardt sketched the left half of the façade during his visit to Genoa in 1599–1600 (cat. ill. 31). He eliminates the tension of the vertical elements and omits a window bay in order to give the façade the calm effect produced by the horizontals. The illustration of the palace façade in Joseph Furttenbach’s *Itinerarium*, probably based on Genoese drawings, is also unreliable (cat. ill. 32). Although Furttenbach reproduces the articulation of the wall in full, he adds an attic storey. In addition, the façade is equipped with an assorted mixture of window and portal forms borrowed from other Genoese palaces.

1. See also No. 69.
3. See also above, Chapter II, p. 73.
4. See above, p. 72 n.28.
6. Ibid., p. 113, n. 15.
7. References in ibid., p. 113, n. 16.
8. The text of the document is given ibid., pp. 464f., doc. XVI.
9. References in ibid., p. 113, n. 16.
10. Reference in the selected documents on Giovanni Ponzello, ibid., p. 508.
11. Ibid., p. 113, n. 21.
DETAILS OF PLANS AND ELEVATIONS OF VARIOUS PALACES (Nos. 69–72)


69. Plans of the Vestibules of the Palazzo Doria Tursi (top) and Cambiaso (bottom): Engravings (Fig. 149)

160 × 133 mm. and 158 × 121 mm.
(two plates)

69a. Plans of the Vestibules of the Palazzo Doria Tursi (top) and Cambiaso (bottom): Drawings

Whereabouts unknown; presumably lost

70. Plan and Elevation of the Staircase of the Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B): Engraving (Fig. 150)

316 × 144 mm.
Inscribed Portollo della Scala del Palazzo .B./Figura .70./Alzato della Loggia del Palazzo .B.

70a. Plan and Elevation of the Staircase of the Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B): Drawing (Fig. 151)

390 × 280 mm.; trimmed at top.
Verso of No. 11a.
Inscribed scala che discende giù nel portico; scala che va in loggia piano di sala; galleria, 32 p 3½/11 p 2; 11 o p/18 a 4; above left scala che va in loggia al piano della sala; in pencil above 1 (?), trimmed; by Rubens in pencil above B, in red chalk alongside 70.

The illustration shows the plan and elevations of the two opposite walls of the landing (galleria) halfway between the ground floor and upper floor; cf. plan No. 10a (Fig. 19), above left.

71. Details of the Plans and Elevations of the Villa Spinola di San Pietro (C) and Villa Grimaldi ‘Fortezza’ (D) and of the Palazzo Spinola (F) and Palazzo Rostan Raggio (I): Engraving (Fig. 152)

294 × 395 mm.
Inscribed Figura .71. (sheet in normal position, one third down).

The following description follows the alphabetical order of the palaces, but the arrangement of the plans on the plate is somewhat haphazard. Seven plans are given with the plate in an oblong position, two with the plate in vertical position but upside down and two last ones with the plates in normal position (in some instances the orientation of the inscriptions is again different):

Sopra il taglio del Palazzo C./Figura 18/in littera H. (oblong: left, below top);
Sopra la seconda/pianta del Palazzo .D./Figura 21/in littera .I. (oblong: left, top);
Sopra il taglio del Palazzo .D./Figura 27/in littera .K. (oblong: top centre);
Sopra la terza pianta del Palazzo .F./Figura .37./in littera .M. (oblong: right from centre);
Sopra la terza pianta del Palazzo .F./Figura .37./in littera .N. (oblong: far right);
Sopra la seconda/pianta del Pala .1./Figura .54. in littera .R. (vertical position, upside down: top, third from right);
Sopra la seconda/pianta del Palazzo .1./Figura .54./in littera .S. (same position: third from left);
Sopra la seconda/pianta del Palazzo .1./Figura .54. in littera .T. (oblong: left bottom corner, second up);
The last two plates (Nos. 71–72) gather up all the plan details that are mounted on the drawings in the form of flaps. These mostly refer to mezzanines or other levels, completing the presentation of the spatial organization of the palaces. For further explanations of this procedure, see above, Chapter I, p. 40. As in all other instances, the engravings reproduce the drawings in reverse. The references for No. 71 are as follows:

**Palazzo C** (Villa Spinola di San Pietro): one reference to the engraving No. 18 (Fig. 34), reproduced is the flap on drawing No. 18a (Fig. 36).

**Palazzo D** (Villa Grimaldi ‘Fortezza’): one reference to the engraving No. 21 (Fig. 43), reproduced is the flap on drawing No. 21a (Fig. 45); two references to the engraving No. 27 (Fig. 58), reproduced are the two flaps on drawing No. 27a (not illustrated here).

**Palazzo F** (Palazzo Spinola: see also below): two references to the engraving No. 37 (Fig. 81), reproduced are the two flaps on drawing No. 37a (Fig. 83).

**Palazzo I** (Palazzo Rostan Raggio): four references to the engraving No. 54 (Fig. 118), reproduced are the four flaps on drawing No. 54a (Fig. 119); one reference to the engraving No. 55 (Fig. 120), reproduced is the flap on drawing No. 55a (Fig. 122).

The references for No. 72 are:

**Palazzo F** (Palazzo Spinola, and see also above): two references to the engraving No. 36 (Fig. 76); reproduced are the two flaps on drawing No. 36a (Fig. 78).

**Palazzo Doria Tursi**: no drawing for this ‘appendice’ is extant (see No. 67a).
I. PALAZZO DORIA (Nos. 73–75)


73. Plan of the Ground Floor: Engraving (Fig. 155)

378 × 261 mm.

Inscribed Figura 1.; I. Prima Pianta del Palazzo del Sig. Niccolo Spinola
Scale 10 palmi = 19 mm.

The main portal, missing in the corresponding drawing, is entered on the engraving.

73a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Fig. 156)

390 × 290 mm.; trimmed at top.

Scale 10 palmi = 20 mm.

Inscribed by the draughtsman (dimensions) and by Rubens (room labels) in the rooms in the left-hand section Camera, 38/28; 20/22; 26/17; Camera, 26/30; in the rooms in the central section Portico, 25; 9; Cortile, 36/5/36/5; 9; Loggia, 9; in the rooms in the right-hand section Camera, 38/28; 20/25; 10; Camera, 26/32; in the garden 50; in the nymphaeum 12/14; in the room at the top right 26/19; below S’ batesta spinola valencia in Strada nova; with a broader pen below to the right of centre C, alongside it N; in darker ink on the outside left Ill, cancelled, above it I; by a later hand in darker ink on the lower edge Prima Pianta del Palazzo del Sig. Nic. Spinola; on the left and right above Fig. 1.

74. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 157)

230 × 254 mm.

Inscribed Figura 2.; I. Pianta Seconda del Palazzo del Sig. Niccolo Spinola

74a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 158)

395 × 290 mm.; trimmed at top.

Inscribed by the draughtsman and by Rubens in the rooms in the left-hand section Camera, 27/27; 20/21; 27/17; Camera, 27/29; in the rooms in the central section Sala, 62/38; 36/5; 10; Loggia, 62/19; in the rooms in the right-hand section 27/17; 15/24; 10/17; 15/20; Camera, 27/32; with a broader pen below to the right of centre C, alongside it N; in darker ink on the outer left Ill, cancelled, below it I; by a later hand in darker ink on the lower edge Pianta Seconda; left and right above Fig. 2, trimmed.

Verso: inscribed by the draughtsman or a collector on the right edge S’ Gio Battista...
Spinola, the word Valencia added later in a lighter ink, partly covered by the pasted fold.

75. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 159)

255 × 272 mm.

Inscribed Figura 3.; I. Facciata del Palazzo del Sig. Niccolò Spinola
Scale 10 palmi = 19 mm.

75a. Façade Elevation: Drawing (Fig. 161)

395 × 290 mm.; trimmed at top.
Scale 10 palmi = 20 mm.

Inscribed above del s°r. Nicolò Spinola; with a broader pen below and to the right of centre C, alongside it N; in darker ink below left III, cancelled, above it I; by a later hand in darker ink on the lower edge Facciata dell Palazzo del Sig'. Nic. Spinola; above right Fig. 3.

75b. Façade Elevation: Proof Impression (Fig. 160)

255 × 280 mm.

Inscribed by hand on the lower edge in brown ink Facciata del Palazzo del Sig°. Nicolò Spinola.

The semicircular step in front of the portal (see No. 75) is lacking.

Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Prentenkabinet

The palace of Giambattista Spinola 'Il Valenza' opens the Palazzi Moderni. He had it built on the Strada Nuova beginning in 1563. The property formed part of the original planning for the street, and in April 1551 was one of the first four lots to be sold, being purchased by Leonardo Gentile. In May 1563, the brothers Giambattista and Andrea Spinola purchased the still undeveloped site, paying twice the original price. In 1566, Andrea Spinola transferred his share to his brother. Construction work began immediately after purchase of the property in 1563. Between May 1563 and February 1566, a total of eleven deliveries of lime and bricks are recorded. In August 1563, the Padri del Comune issued a warning that a certain distance had to be kept from neighbouring buildings during the laying of the foundations. In September 1564, sixteen Doric columns intended for the cortile were ordered from Giovanni Lurago and Pietro Maria de Nove. Giovanni Battista Castello supplied the design for these, and his drawing specified precise measurements. Castello also seems to have provided the design for the marble chimney in the sala, which was executed by Gian Giacomo Paracca da Valsoldo.

Bernardo Cantone was in charge of the construction work, and is described in documents of August and November 1563, and also November 1565, as capo d'opera or architetto. Cantone seems to have been responsible for carrying out the building work, while Castello was responsible for the design of individual decorative elements. The documents do not indicate who was responsible for the design of the entire building. Andrea Semino was commissioned to carry out decorative painting of individual rooms, including a cycle in the sala illustrating the history of the Spinola family. Another room was decorated with mythological scenes painted by Luca Cambiaso.

The arrangement of the plan was repeated in a similar form in the palace of Spinola's brother-in-law, Bartolomeo Lomellino (Palazzi Antichi, I). Cantone and Castello were also actively involved in that building—probably on Spinola's recommendation. Spinola himself also took an active part in the planning and construction of his brother-in-law's palace. He served as the final arbiter when important architectural elements were delivered.

The Spinola palace was originally open to the garden on both floors, with a loggia
PALAZZO DORIA (I)

Cat. ill. 33. Palazzo Doria (I), view of the courtyard with garden and nymphaeum

on each. There is a noticeable emphasis on the longitudinal axis, which provides a view from the portal through the vestibule, courtyard and loggia as far as the nymphaeum at the southern end of the garden (cat. ill. 33). The palace was severely damaged during the bombardment of Genoa by French troops in 1684, and was rebuilt with alterations. The loggia on the upper floor was closed, the building was raised an additional full storey, and the façade was replaced. Gauthier's illustrations show the state of the building following these alterations, while the three plates in the Palazzi di Genova probably document its original appearance. The façade appears to be an almost undecorated surface, only articulated by cornices. The frame of the main portal and the balconies on the windows of the piano nobile, which are not included in the ground plan, were the only sculptural elements. It is doubtful whether an additional painted façade decoration was planned or executed. The documents provide no information about this.

On the first sheet in the set, the draughtsman has entered the name of the building's original patron, Giambattista Spinola—an exception among the drawings in the second series, almost all of which name con-
temporary owners in the early seventeenth century. For the book, Rubens replaced this name with that of the son and heir, Nicolò Spinola, who inherited the palace on his father’s death in 1590.

2. References in Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, pp. 259f., n. 15.
4. Labò, Palazzo D’Oria, 1926, pp. 54ff. The full text of the document is given in Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, pp. 470f., doc. XXII. The drawing is also illustrated there, p. 253, fig. 148.
5. Alizeri, Guida, 1875, pp. 192f.

II. PALAZZO GAMBARO (Nos. 76–78)


76. Plan of the Ground Floor: Engraving (Fig. 162)

246 × 262 mm.
Inscribed Figura 4.; II. Prima Pianta del Palazzo del Sig’. Andrea Spinola.
Scale 10 palmi = 22 mm.; lacking on the drawing (No. 76a).

76a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Fig. 163)

395 × 290 mm.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section 30/24; 25/15; 30/24; in the rooms in the central section portigho, cancelled by Rubens and corrected below to Portico, 41/33; Saloto, cancelled by Rubens and corrected below to Salotto, 41/33; in the rooms in the right-hand section 30/24; 10; 15; 30/24; in the garden giardino, 22; below prima pianta del palacio del s’. andria corrected by a later hand in darker ink to Andria Spinola in strada noua; with a broader pen next to this on the right II; by the engraver (?) in pencil below gesneden (?) by a later hand in darker ink above right Fig. 4.

77. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 164)

200 × 265 mm.
Inscribed Figura 5.; II. Seconda Pianta del Palazzo del Sig’. Andrea Spinola

77a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 165)

395 × 290 mm.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section Saloto, cancelled by Rubens and corrected below to Salotto, 30/24; 25/15; 30/24; in the rooms in the central section loggia (cancelled), below it loggia, 41/16; Sala, 41/49; in
the rooms in the right-hand section 25/15; 30/24; with a broader pen below, to the right of centre II; by a later hand in darker ink in the centre Seconda Pianta; above right Fig. 5.

78. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 166)

320 × 275 mm.
Inscribed Figura 6.; II. Facciata del Palazzo del Sig. Andrea Spinola.

78a. Façade Elevation: Drawing

Whereabouts unknown; presumably lost

The palace was built beginning in 1563 for Pantaleo Spinola, and it opens the row of palaces on the valley side of the Strada Nuova. Its plain, sparsely articulated exterior forms a marked contrast to the Palazzo Cambiaso (see No. 68) standing opposite, which responds to its prominent site with two magnificent hewn stone façades on the Via Garibaldi and Piazza Fontane Marose. Nothing is known of any painted façade decoration, and the Palazzi di Genova also shows the façade in the smooth, plain form that it still displays today.

Pantaleo Spinola acquired the building site at the second auction in February 1558. The contract of sale was signed in March 1558. Building work seems to have started immediately. Of the total of eleven known documents referring to the provision of building materials such as hewn stone, bricks and lime, dating from the period March 1558 to March 1563, five are from the year in which building started. Although the documents suggest that work on the building was continuous, delays must have occurred, since in November 1561 Pantaleo Spinola was fined the sum of 200 scudi. He had contravened the conditions in the contrada nuova contracts to complete the building work speedily and without interruption. In three supply contracts of March 1558, November 1561 and March 1563, Bernardo Spazio is commissioned to take delivery of materials and assess them. On another occasion, Spazio is mentioned in a contract for the supply of window shutters, commissioned in November 1562. Here too, he was to take delivery of the materials. Spazio is not explicitly referred to as the site manager in the documents, but he seems to have been acting in this capacity.

The palace had not yet been completed on the death of the patron, Pantaleo Spinola, in 1563. In September that year, Pantaleo’s heir, Lorenzo Spinola, commissioned Giovanni Pietro Orsolino to carry out final jobs on the palace, including stucco work, plaster and floors. These were to have been completed by May of the following year. In January 1568, an inventory was made of movable fittings in the palace, which at that time was occupied by the original patron’s widow Battina Spinola and their daughter Aurelia. In 1614, the palace was owned by Andrea Spinola, who is named on the drawings and engravings.

The Palazzi plans show a rectangular building mass, with the interior arrangement representing a simplified imitation of the Alessi villa scheme. The decoration of the façade is restricted to the portal, with a figurative and sculptural pediment (Fig. 167). The central coat of arms and the figures of Prudentia and Vigilantia on each side are reproduced in detail in the drawing and the engraving. The form of the entablature at the eaves, with a cushioned frieze, is notable. This architectural form is rare in Genoa, and is only seen in villa façades by Alessi or his immediate circle. However, the Palazzo Cambiaso opposite has the same type of entablature. Possibly, a façade decoration may have been planned for the Spinola palace that would have provided a counterpart in a simpler, painted form to the lavish hewn stone façade of the Palazzo Cambiaso opposite.

Alterations were carried out at some time, not precisely known, before the mid
Cat. ill. 34. *Palazzo Gambaro* (II), façade elevation, plan of the ground floor and longitudinal section (from Gauthier, Édifices, 1818–32, I, pl. 81)
seventeenth century. The extent of this can be seen in Gauthier’s illustrations (cat. ill. 34). On the south side, a walled octagonal courtyard was constructed, with a nymphaeum completing it. Pierre Puget created the Paris and Helen group for the nymphaeum in about 1680. However, the main building block itself was also apparently extended. The Palazzi drawings show a rectangular plan, with a ratio of 3:2 between the sides. The main façade on the Strada Nuova has five window bays, but the side façades only have three. The alterations gave the palace a square plan. The side façades were extended to five window bays, and correspond to the arrangement of the main façade. The enlarged sala on the piano nobile had a monumental vault decoration added, with an Allegory of Peace by Domenico Piola. Fresco painting by Giovanni Battista Carlone was added in other rooms. After the building was taken over by the Banco di Chiavari in 1923, minor alterations to the interior were carried out, and the octagonal courtyard was covered with a glass roof.

1. Reference in Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, p. 177, n. 3.
2. Ibid., pp. 177ff., n. 12.
3. Ibid., p. 170.
4. Ibid., p. 171.
5. The text of the document is given in ibid., pp. 468-470, doc. XXI.
6. The text of the inventory is published in ibid., pp. 475-477, doc. XXV.

79. Plan of the Ground Floor: Engraving (Fig. 168)

360 x 263 mm.
Inscribed Figura 7.; III. Prima Pianta del Palazzo de gli Sigù. Giacomo e Pantaleo Balbi. Scale 10 palmi = 23 mm.; lacking on the drawing (No. 79a).

79a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Fig. 169)

390 x 300 mm.
Watermark: circle with scissors, with trefoil above and the letter H below.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section salato, cancelled by Rubens and corrected above to Salotto, p 31/p 26; p 19/p 30; p 25; p 23; in the rooms in the central section portico (cancelled), above it Portico, p 36/p 38; Cortile, p 35/p 35; in the rooms in the right-hand section salato (cancelled), above...
The palace was built on the valley side of Via Balbi for the brothers Giacomo and Pantaleo Balbi around 1618–19. On the initiative of the Padri del Comune, the street was planned from 1602 as a prestigious residential area, modelled on the Strada Nuova. In contrast to the Strada Nuova, however, it was designed to be a traffic route from the start, providing a link between the city, the harbour and Porta S. Tomaso in the west. Work on marking out the street began in 1606. The Balbi family, which already owned properties in the Guastato area, divided amongst themselves the building sites that were newly established after expropriations and redistributions. By the
end of the seventeenth century, seven Balbi palaces ran along both sides of the street (cat. ill. 35). On the hill side, with its unfavourable building conditions, the Jesuits were persuaded through skilful negotiations and offers of finance to build their college (today the university). The college’s street façade was given typological links with the rest of the palace façades, and the Balbi coat of arms was placed over the portal.2

Few documents survive concerning the palace’s construction history, and these give no hints regarding the building’s designer. According to Labò, the property had already been sold to the Balbi family in October 1605.3 However, construction work only took place fifteen years later. In Panta-leo Balbi’s will dated 1644, 1618 is given as the year of construction.4 In October 1619, the patrons Giacomo and Pantaleo Balbi applied for permission to put up a balcony 'alla sala della loro casa che al presente fabricano nella strada nova del guastato per
Cat. ill. 37. Palazzo Balbi Senarega (III), longitudinal section and plan of the ground floor (from Gauthier, Édifices, 1818–32, 1, pl. 25)
ornamento di essa'. The application is accompanied by a façade elevation by Giovanni Aicardo, showing balconies on the two upper storeys (cat. ill. 36). Aicardo's elevation basically corresponds to that in the Palazzi drawing. The drawing also includes the balconies, although there are differences of detail. The set of drawings sent to Rubens in Antwerp, therefore, can not have been produced before October 1619. Soprani assigns comprehensive responsibility for the building's design to Bartolomeo Bianco. In 1618, Bianco had already been in charge of site management for Giovanni Agostino Balbi's palace on the opposite side of the street. The alterations directed by Pietro Antonio Corradi that Soprani mentions concerned an extension of the palace with the garden and west wing, which must have taken place between 1644 and 1674. The situation after the alterations is documented in Gauthier's illustrations (cat. ill. 37).

The two plans in the Palazzi di Genova probably show the original state of the building. Since the building was designed for two households, there are two main floors, each with its own formal rooms. However, the inflexible scheme of having only two plans per building only allowed reproduction of the first main floor. The façade today still resembles that shown in the Palazzi, even down to the details. The draughtsman apparently had access to the original plans. It seems there was never any painted or stucco façade decoration. The drawings and engravings give the names of the two patrons. Giacomo Balbi died in 1630, and Pantaleo Balbi died after 1644. After Pantaleo's death, the palace passed to Giacomo's son Francesco Maria Balbi (1619–1704). He not only carried out the alterations mentioned above, but also commissioned extensive decorations of the rooms by Valerio Castello, Domenico Piola and Gregorio de Ferrari.

6. ‘Ma più d'ogn'un'altro, se ne vede uno [palazzo] di tutta bellezza, costruito à uso del fù Signor Panta­leo Balbi, quale è ornato di tutte le qualità che si ricercano ad una perfetta fabrica, sia per la sua prima pianta disegnata da Bianchi, come per le aggiunte fatte ad esso di gusto, e commodo del Signor Francesco Maria Balbi nipote, che di pre­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­…”
82. Plan of the Ground Floor: Engraving (Fig. 174)

233 x 233 mm.
Inscribed Figura 10.; IV. Prima Pianta del Palazzo del Sig' Daniel Spinola.
Scale 10 palmi = 23 mm.; lacking on the drawing (No. 82a).

82a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Fig. 175)

390 x 285 mm.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section 21/16; 21/22; in the rooms in the central section portigho, cancelled by Rubens and corrected below (Fig. 179) to Portico, 26/1/21; 9; Cortile, 26/1/26/15; fondicho, 10; in the rooms in the right-hand section 31/21; 21/p 18; 21/16; 21/23; below, prima pianta del followed by space valencia a locheri; clumsily entered into the space later s' Daniel Spinola; with a broader pen on the right V, supplemented to IV; by a later hand in darker ink left alongside it Prima Pianta del Palazzo del Sig' Daniel Spinola; above right Fig. 10, trimmed.

83. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 176)

245 x 231 mm.
Inscribed Figura 11.; IV. Pianta Seconda del Palazzo del Sig' Daniel Spinola.

83a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 177)

390 x 290 mm.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section 18; Salotto, 26/1/26/15; 32/18; 24/12; in the rooms in the central section Sala, p 46/32; Cortile p 26/1/26/15; teraza, above it terraza, 9; fondicho (cancelled), above it Fondicho, p 26/10; in the rooms in the right-hand section p 24/p 26; p 19/15; 31/26; 15/12; with a broader pen below in the centre V, supplemented to IV; by a later hand in darker ink left alongside it Pianta Seconda; above right Fig. 12.

84. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 178)

347 x 285 mm.
Inscribed Figura 12.; IV. Facciata del Palazzo del Sig' Daniel Spinola.

84a. Façade Elevation: Drawing

Whereabouts unknown; presumably lost

The palace lies to the south-west of the Piazza Fontane Marose, which formed the centre of the medieval albergo of the Spinola di Luccoli. The details of its construction history are not known. The palace is already mentioned in the will of its patron, Nicolò Spinola, dated 1560, and can not have been built very long before this date. The plans show an effort to achieve a regularized arrangement of rooms. On the ground floor are the vestibule, the large courtyard and a room marked as fondicho along the building's longitudinal axis. From the vestibule, a broad staircase leads to the piano nobile, where the sala is situated in the façade section.

Daniele Spinola, the patron's son, purchased further properties in the neighbourhood in 1587 in order to create the square on the south side of the palace that is still there today. At the same time, he applied for permission to add balconies on the mezzanine and main floors of the façade. The balconies are not shown in the Palazzi plans. The drawings are therefore based on older design materials. In 1606, Tomaso Franzone purchased the palace from Daniele Spinola's heirs, and made it over to his son.
Agostino in his will of 1625. However, Rubens does not give the name Franzone for the palace, but indicates Daniele Spinola as the owner. A note by the draughtsman on the first plan suggests that the drawings already existed when ownership changed hands in 1606. Instead of an owner’s name, the draughtsman notes that the palace is available for rent (valencia a locheri). The name of the previous owner Daniele Spinola was later added to the drawing (No. 82a; see detail Fig. 179).

Under the Franzones, the palace was altered in several stages. The Palazzi drawings document its probable original state. The building later had a full storey and an attic storey added. In the façade section on the ground floor, four shop units were incorporated, and the windows on the first main floor were enlarged. It is not known when these various alterations took place. However, the first work seems to have been carried out as early as 1615 under the direction of Bartolomeo Bianco. Building activity at the fabrica of Tomaso Franzone in Via Luccoli is mentioned in documents dating from December 1615. Bianco commissioned several deliveries of building materials and work on doors and windows. In one of the documents, the purpose of the deliveries is described as the ‘redificazione domus M.ci D.ni Thoma Fransoni in contrada lucculi’. See Di Raimondo—Müller Profumo, Bianco, 1982, pp. 155f.

During the eighteenth century, the façade was covered with stucco decoration, and fresco painting was carried out by Domenico Parodi in several rooms.

1. This and the following documents are cited in Poleggi, Documento, 1977, p. 119, n. 34.
3. Building activity at the fabrica of Tomaso Franzone in Via Luccoli is mentioned in documents dating from December 1615. Bianco commissioned several deliveries of building materials and work on doors and windows. In one of the documents, the purpose of the deliveries is described as the ‘redificazione domus M.ci D.ni Thoma Fransoni in contrada lucculi’. See Di Raimondo—Müller Profumo, Bianco, 1982, pp. 155f.

V. PALAZZO DEL MELOGRANO
(Nos. 85–87)


85. Plan of the Ground Floor:
Engraving (Fig. 180)

341 x 274 mm.
Inscribed Figura 13.; V. Prima Pianta del Palazzo del Sig. Ottavio Sauli.
Scale 10 palmi = 23 mm.; lacking on the drawing (No. 85a).

85a. Plan of the Ground Floor:
Drawing (Fig. 181)

390 x 290 mm.
Inscribed in one of the shops p 14; in the rooms in the left-hand section p 15/p 26; p 28; in the rooms in the central section portiglio, cancelled by Rubens and corrected above to Portico, p 34/p 43; p 23; Cortile, p 34/p 34; in the rooms in the right-hand section p 24/p 26; p 23 /14; p 19/p 36; p 21; below, to the right of the portal prima pianta del palacio s’ottavio sauli; with a broader pen to the left of the portal VIII (cancelled), below it V; by a later hand in darker ink on the lower edge Prima Pianta del Palazzo del Sig’. Ottavio Sauli; above right Fig. 13.
86. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 182)

322 × 275 mm.
Inscribed Figura 14.; V. Pianta Seconda del Palazzo del Sig. Ottavio Sauli.

In the engraving, the balconies on the windows in the façade, lacking in the drawing (No. 86a), have been added. This also corrected a discrepancy between the plan and the elevation, since the balconies can be seen on the façade drawing. Another slight element of retouching: the position of one of the windows on the side façade (on the right of the engraving) has been changed in comparison with the drawing in order to create a symmetrical distribution of the window bays.

86a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 183)

390 × 290 mm.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section p.31/p 26½; p 28/p 24; p 26/p 24; p 24/p 22; p 22½/p 12; in the rooms in the central section Salotto, p 34/p 43; loggia, below it Loggia, p 23; p 34/p 34, in the gallery p 10; in the rooms in the right-hand section p 24/p 26; p 14/23; p 18/p 14; fondigio; p 9/p 24; p 15/p 27; p 22; with a broader pen below, to the left of the centre VIII (cancelled), above it V; by a later hand in darker ink below in the centre Pianta Seconda; above right Fig. 14.

87. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 184)

355 × 303 mm.
Inscribed Figura 15.; V. Facciata del Palazzo del Sig. Ottavio Sauli.

A third chimney, which can be seen in the drawing (No. 87a) on the slope of the roof on the left, was omitted from the engraving.

87a. Façade Elevation: Drawing (Fig. 185)

390 × 305 mm.
Inscribed underneath the portal faciata (cancelled: del palacio del s' ottavio sauali); left of that VIII (cancelled), below it V; by Rubens (?) on the upper edge del s' Ottavio Sauli; by a later hand in darker ink on the lower edge Facciata del Palazzo del Sig'. Ottavio Sauli; above right Fig. 15, trimmed.

The palace was built for Ottavio Imperiale between 1586 and 1589 on the Piazza Campetto at the corner with the Piazza Soziglia. Its location at one of the business centres of the medieval city explains the presence of shops on the ground floor. These are not connected to the residential and formal rooms of the palace, and form separate rented units. Various Strada Nuova palaces served as models for the arrangement of the rooms and the façade design. The open transition from the vestibule to the large, square courtyard, marked only by a row of columns, was modelled on two palaces of the 1560s, the Palazzo Doria (Palazzi Moderni, I) and Palazzo Rostan Raggio (Palazzi Antichi, I). After the Palazzo del Melograno, the Palazzo Balbi Senarega (III), built thirty years later, also adopted this arrangement.

Due to the formal parallels with the Balbi palace—with regard to the design of the elevation—the Palazzo del Melograno was traditionally attributed to Bartolomeo Bianco and dated around 1620. However, the entry in the annals of Giulio Pallavicino establishes that work on the building began in September 1586. Other documents published by Poleggi set the construction of the palace in the years leading up to 1589: in July 1587 and April 1588 there was a dispute over the boundaries of the property. The Padri del Comune banned continuation of the work because the building site had illegally included a strip of public land. Jacopo de Aggio was referred to as the site
manager responsible. In 1589, the patron commissioned the erection of balconies on the façade, indicating that construction work was nearing completion.²

The palace was apparently transferred to the Sauli family soon after it was completed. Ottavio Sauli is referred to in the bussolo of 1614, and he is also named as the owner in the drawings and engravings of the Palazzi di Genova. Ottavio Sauli died in 1663. After 1684, the palace was inherited by the De Mari family, in whose possession it remained until the mid nineteenth century. The painted decoration of the gallery and the sala on the second floor by Domenico Piola was carried out during the last quarter of the seventeenth century. Other rooms on the same floor were painted around 1730 by Giacomo Antonio Boni and Domenico Guidoboni. For the courtyard, Filippo Parodi produced a figure of Hercules with the Apples of the Hesperides.³

The ground floor and first floor of the palace have been used as a department store since 1937. This change of use prompted alterations involving the removal of the shops along the side and roofing over the courtyard so that the ground floor forms a single unit.⁴ The exterior, apart from the addition of an attic storey, still corresponds to the illustration in the Palazzi drawing. The smooth façade is only divided by the portal, the balconies and the cornice—the only sculptural elements. Traces of painted decoration can no longer be identified.

---

4. The state of the rooms on the ground floor before and after alteration is recorded in the photographic documentation A Genova nel palazzo del Melograno la nuova sede ‘UPIM’, Genoa, s.d. [1937].
the note of ownership are repeated in a later hand in darker ink and corrected to Batista Grimaldo; below right Fig. 16.

89. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 188)

171 x 350 mm.
Inscribed Figura 17.; VI. Seconda pianta del Palazzo del Sig'. Giovan Battista Grimaldo.

89a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 189)

290 x 390 mm.
In the two rooms at the top left several separating walls were entered, which have been eliminated using pasted-down strips of card.

Inscribed in the rooms in the façade section, starting at the left p 20/p 20; 25/p 20; Salotto, above it Salotto, p 36/p 23; p 25/p 23; p 20; in the rooms in the rear section, starting at the left 25; logia, cancelled, on the right along­side it Loggia, p 36/p 20; 11/20; 13/p 20; in darker ink below left XV (cancelled), below it VII (cancelled), below that again VI; by a later hand in darker ink in the centre Pianta Seconda; below right Fig. 17.

90. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 190)

373 x 388 mm.
Inscribed Figura 18.; VI. Facciata del Palazzo del Sig'. Giovan Battista Grimaldo.

90a. Façade Elevation: Drawing (Fig. 191)

390 x 410 mm.; trimmed above and below.
Inscribed on the lower edge with the owner's name, almost completely trimmed; by Rubens (?) on the upper edge del S Giovan batta Grimaldo, partly trimmed; on the lower edge XV (cancelled), trimmed; by a later hand in darker ink above right Fig. 18.

This nearly undocumented palace is situat­ed in the densely built-up albergo of the Grimaldi, opposite the northern long side of the church of S. Luca. The building was commissioned by Giovan Battista Grimaldi, who is also noted as the owner on the drawings. The time and circumstances of its construction are not entirely clear. There is a plan of the area dated 1610 showing the outline of the palace. Nearly ten years later, in July 1619, a suit was filed against the patron regarding the form and size of the cornice. At the same time, Grimaldi applied to have the street surfaced ‘davanti alla sua casa che ha fabricato in S. Luca’ and to build a poggiolo in front of the main portal.

There is no information concerning the designer of the building. Alizeri considered that Andrea Vannone or another Lombard architect was probably involved. A drawing by Giovanni Aicardo dated 1620, probably produced in connection with the suit concerning the cornice, shows the façade of the palace, apparently with a new version of the cornice. The drawing corresponds to the façade elevation in the Palazzi di Genova, probably produced at around the same time, in the arrangement of the window bays and the form of the cornice. Since Aicardo was principally concerned with depicting the cornice, his drawing lacks details such as the balconies at the win­dows, the two coats of arms and the roof area with its balcony, which are all shown on the Palazzi drawing.

With regard to the arrangement of the interior, there are profound differences between the plan and the elevation. On the ground floor, the palace has a series of storerooms and shops, which were accessi­ble directly from the street through their own entrances. The vestibule with the
adjoining staircase formed the connection to the residential and formal rooms, both on the two upper floors. The ground plan drawing correctly indicates the dual function of the ground floor, and shows each of the shops with its own entrance. The façade elevation, however, shows only one entrance to the palace—the central main portal—and omits the shop entrances at the sides. The elevation thus shows the building as a purely residential palace. This discrepancy was not eliminated by Rubens. He had the drawings reproduced without change.

1. Illustrated in Grossi Bianchi—Poleggi, Città, 1987, p. 227, fig. 205.
2. Reference in Poleggi, Documento, 1977, p. 120, n. 40.

VII. PALAZZO DURAZZO PALLAVICINI (Nos. 91–93)


91. Plan of the Ground Floor:
Engraving (Fig. 192)

415 × 547 mm.
Inscribed Figura 19.; VII. Prima Pianta del Palazzo del Sig. Giovan Augustino Balbi.
Scale 10 palmi = 23 mm.

The engraving differs from the drawing (No. 91a) at the left edge (the right edge on the drawing): the drawing breaks off in the reproduction of the garden and the rear wing, or has been trimmed there. Both parts of the complex continue further towards the southeast. The engraving instead gives the complex an imaginary end, corresponding to that on the opposite page.

91a. Plan of the Ground Floor:
Drawing (Fig. 193)

415 × 570 mm.; folded in the centre and on the lower edge; the illustration is trimmed at the right edge.

Scale at the lower left edge 10 palmi = 23 mm.

Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section saloto (cancelled), above it Salotto, p 39/p 37; 26/p 25; 26/p 25; 26/p 30; in the rooms in the central section portighi (cancelled), below it Portico, p 39/p 37; Corte, p 41/p 41; in the rooms in the right-hand section saloto, above it Salotto p 39/p 37; 26/p 25; 26/p 25; 26/p 30; on the lower right edge prima pianta del palacio del s' [... aghostino balbi; with a broader pen right alongside
that I, supplemented to VII; by the engraver (?) in pencil below that gesneden (?); the note of ownership is corrected by a later hand in darker ink to Gio Aghostino; above right Fig. 19.

92. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 194)

400 x 541 mm.
Inscribed Figura 20.; VII. Seconda Pianta del Palazzo del Sig' Gioan Augustino Balbi.

Minor retouching is evident in comparison with the drawing (No. 92a): the final balustrade on the loggia at the rear left (right on the drawing) has been added. In addition, the corner pillars of the loggias, which are flush with the foundation walls in the drawing, are set back in the engraving.

92a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 195)

415 x 565 mm.; folded in the middle and on the lower edge; trimmed at right.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section saloto, above it Salotto, p 39/p 30; p 26/p 30; p 26/p 25; p 26/p 30; in the rooms in the central section Sala, p 41/p 50; Cortile, p 41/p 41; in the rooms in the right-hand section saloto, below that Salotto p 39/p 30; p 26/p 30; p 26/p 25; p 26/p 30; on the lower edge seghonda pianta; with a broader pen right alongside that I, supplemented to VII; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 20.

93. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 196)

365 x 534 mm.
Inscribed Figura 21.; VII. Facciata del Palazzo del Sig' Gioan Augustino Balbi.

93a. Façade Elevation: Drawing

Whereabouts unknown; presumably lost

In February 1618, Giovanni Agostino Balbi commissioned the architect and entrepreneur Bartolomeo Bianco to build his palace 'in via nuova magnifici Balbi'. As early as March 1618, Bianco in turn placed orders with Andrea Origone and Battista Valletbona for surveying and excavation work on the property on the hill side of the street. Joseph Furttenbach gives 1619 as the year in which building commenced. Construction proceeded rapidly, and was apparently largely completed by 1621, when the patron died. Soprani also includes the palace in the work of Bartolomeo Bianco. Bianco based his design on the palaces of the Strada Nuova. As in the Palazzo Doria Tursi (see No. 67), which was also built on a steeply sloping site, the vestibule and courtyard are separated by a difference in level. The original two-armed staircase at the base of the vestibule was based on a model in the Palazzo Carrega Cataldi (A),
although on a smaller scale. The square building mass is supplemented at each of the four corners by two-storey extensions with loggias, similar to those that had existed since 1596 on the façade of the Palazzo Doria Tursi (cat. ill. 38).

Beginning in 1780, the palace was altered by Andrea Tagliafichi under commission from Marcello Durazzo. The changes affected the portal, vestibule and the entire staircase. Tagliafichi’s plans for a new stucco decoration of the façade were not carried out. Gauthier’s and Reinhardt’s record drawings document the extent of these changes, but contradict each other at several points in their reproductions of the arrangement of the other rooms. The façade was apparently never decorated. The London drawing shows only the sculptural elements (portal, window balustrades and console cornice). Gauthier’s elevation also only shows the undecorated façade surface, and omits the lavish crown of Tagliafichi’s portal.

A drawing of the ground plan by Bianco attached to the contract of February 1618 shows the ground floor, with extensive notation of the dimensions (cat. ill. 39). Bianco’s drawing and the drawing of the ground plan in the *Palazzi di Genova* correspond in terms of the overall arrangement. However, the proportions of the courtyard and the rooms in the façade section differ, as well as the corresponding dimension notes. The draughtsman apparently had a further project of Bianco’s to hand, which he used for his set of drawings.

8. Soprani, Vite, 1674, p. 300.
9. For details of the changes, see Profumo Müller, Bianco, 1968, p. 48, n. 11.

VIII. PALAZZO DELLA MERIDIANA (Nos. 94–96)


94. Plan of the Ground Floor: Engraving (Fig. 198)

305 × 515 mm.

Inscribed Figura 22.; VIII. Prima Pianta del Palazzo del Sig’. Geronimo Grimaldo Principe de leraci.

Scale 10 palmi = 23 mm.; lacking on the drawing (No. 94a).

94a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Fig. 199)

420 × 560 mm.; folded in the middle.

Inscribed in the rooms in the façade section 12; 12/24; 23/24; 23/24; 45/25½; 30/25½; 24½/25½; in the atrium 35/35; in the courtyard 35/35; in the garden 50/58; in the nymphaeum 13/23; on the right edge prima pianta del palazzo del signor (supplemented to deli signori) grimaldi a Sto francesco (cancelled through its whole length); alongside it III, altered to VIII; by a later hand in darker ink below Prima Pianta del Palazzo del Sig’. Geronimo Principe de leraci; below left Fig. 22.

95. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 200)

313 × 463 mm.

Inscribed Figura 23.; VIII. Seconda Pianta del Palazzo del Sig’. Geronimo Grimaldo Principe de leraci.

95a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 201)

390 × 555 mm.; folded in the middle; trimmed at top.

Inscribed in the rooms in the façade section 18/18; 24/24; 27/p 24; 24/24; Sala, p 60/p 40; 29/p 27; p 13; in the atrium cortile, p 35; in the courtyard cortile, in the galleries p 14/p 12; in the rooms in the rear section 24/p 24; 15; 39/24; 30/24; 20/24; in the rooms in the left-hand section cucina 24; tinello (cancelled), below it tinello, 27; unreadable word (cancelled), alongside it fontana; in darker ink on the right edge III, altered to VIII; by a later hand in darker ink on the right Seconda Pianta; above right Fig. 23, trimmed.
The palace lies on the slope of the Castelleto hill, diagonally below the church of S. Francesco, which was demolished at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Probably constructed in the late 1530s, the palace is one of the oldest and most architecturally outstanding buildings included in Rubens’s book. The London drawings show a building on a more or less square plan, with a wing on the south-western corner that was apparently added later. On entering the palace through the portal on the Salita S. Francesco, one comes first into the vestibule, originally in the form of an atrium, enclosed by arcades and open above. A second portal leads into the central square, arcaded courtyard. Already at the entrance portal, the eye is led through both courtyards towards the nympheum that concludes the western end of the main axis. From the central cortile, the main staircase, set in an extension of one of the wings, leads to the upper floor. The southern sides of the loggias of the vestibule and courtyard are cut off to provide space for the large sala. The different levels of the entrances—the main portal is on the ground floor, and the entrance to the rear garden is on the upper storey—are due to the steep slope of the site (cat. ill. 40).

The sparse documents provide no indication of the author of this unusual design. The square plan, with the unusual three-part vestibule and atrium complex, recalls reconstructions of Roman domestic build-
the same period. In March 1560, he com-
misioned carvings from the wood sculptor
Giuseppe Forlano to furnish a studiolo. This
room, with fresco decoration by Luca Cam-
biaso, seems to have disappeared during
alterations in the seventeenth century. The
plans in the Palazzi di Genova do not reveal
which room this may have been.
In July 1565, Grimaldi commissioned the
stucco work on the vaulting of the sala from
Antonio da Lugano, who was to carry out
the work 'conforme a le sagome' of Giovanni
Battista Castello. The painted decoration
of the sala was assigned to Luca Cambiaso,
who did a fresco of the Return of Odysseus
in the vaulting. Cambiaso also provided the
designs for a tapestry cycle on the walls
illustrating the Deeds of Odysseus. The
painting of two salotti by Lazzaro Calvi,
with depictions of the Phaeton myth, was
probably also carried out during the same
period. In May 1567, Grimaldi ordered
seven portals; five were apparently for his
city palace and two for his villa.
The person who had a decisive artistic
influence on this decorative work was Gio-
vanni Battista Castello. With his designs for
the stucco work in the sala, he established
the decorative system, and he also served as
the appraiser for the completed work. At
the same time, Castello also served in the
same capacities during the decoration of the
Grimaldi's villa in Sampierdarena.
The palace is situated today on the west-
ern extension of Via Garibaldi. Like the
neighbouring palace of Luca Grimaldi,
which was probably built slightly earlier in
the 1530s (where the Palazzo Bianco, built
in 1718, now stands), it did not form part of
the later Strada Nuova plan. The new street
originally ended west of the Palazzo Doria
Tarsi as a cul-de-sac at the gardens of the
two Grimaldi palaces. The continuous east-
west link from the Strada Nuova through
Via Cairoli to the Piazza della Nunziata and
Via Balbi was only opened up after 1778.
When this connecting route was estab-
lished, the Piazza della Meridiana was cre-
ated in place of the gardens on the south
side of the palace. At the same time, the
south façade was redesigned. The entrance
was moved to what was originally the cel-
lar, which had been exposed by the lowering
of the ground level and the removal of the
garden. The building's state after these
alterations is documented by Gauthier (cat.
ill. 42).
There are no other early visual sources
apart from the drawings in London. A
description of the palace dating from the
mid eighteenth century indicates that it had
already lost its original appearance by that
time. The atrium had been roofed over in
order to create additional rooms on the
upper floor. An initial extension seems to
have been added between 1589 and 1594,
when the formerly square building mass
was lengthened by the short wing on the
south-west corner. The Palazzi plans,
which already show this wing, can there-
fore only have been produced after this
alteration.
Remnants of the original façade decora-
tion, articulated with herms on both
Cat. ill. 42. Palazzo della Meridiana (VIII), longitudinal section and plan of the ground floor
(from Gauthier, Édifices, 1818–32, I, pl. 58)
storeys, survive on the east and north façades. They correspond to the engraving, although it shows the south façade, later completely renovated, on the Piazza della Meridiana. On the mezzanine storey of the north façade, three sections of a Hercules cycle can be recognized, which probably belonged to the original decoration by Aurelio Bussi. It is questionable whether other figurative depictions were also included in the empty wall sections on the south façade in addition to the herm articulation. Ratti mentions decoration of this type only in relation to the north façade, and this information corresponds to the findings on the building itself.1 However, the fact that the engraving of the south façade shows no signs of any other figurative decoration is no evidence that it could never have existed. In the case of the more or less contemporary palace of Antonio Doria (XIV), the draughtsman also indicated only the architectural and decorative framework of the façade, while omitting all the painted figurative and scenic elements.

2. Soprani, Vite, 1674, p. 281.
4. In 1674, Soprani remarks concerning this: ‘A giorni nostri, nel palazzo del Signor Duca Grimaldi erano una piccola stanza, o sia studio, nel quale oltre le bellissime pitture ad oglio di Luca Cambiaso, & alcuni finissimi lavori di tarsia, erano di mano di Gasparo [recte: Giuseppe Forlani] certe cornici, & altri lavori di noce sottilmente intagliati; ma con occasione di far servire quel sito ad alt’uso, non è gran tempo, che ella fu demolita (Soprani, Vite, 1674, p. 283).”
8. Mentioned in Soprani, Vite, 1674, p. 73.
11. Ibid., p. 79, n. 32.

IX. PALAZZO PODESTÀ
(Nos. 97–99)

The positions of two windows in each of the side sections, and the three windows in the sala in the façade section, have been changed. In the plan of the garden in the upper third of the engraving is the note Questa parti si doveva aggiungere [sic] alla Prima pianta. The addition may derive from the editor or engraver, who judged the site incorrectly and could only imagine the garden being on the level of the ground floor. However, the reproduction corresponds to the drawing and the actual situation before the extension in the eighteenth century.

98a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing
(Fig. 205)

390 × 280 mm.; trimmed at top.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section 20/24; 23; 20/25; 17; in the rooms in the central section 34/35; 33/42; 42\(\text{d}\); in the rooms in the right-hand section 20/24; 11; 20/25; 20/25; 20/17; with a broad pen below, to the right of centre ·M·, left alongside that ·B·; below left IX; by a later hand in darker ink in the centre Pianta Seconda; above right Fig. 26, trimmed.

99. Façade Elevation: Engraving
(Fig. 206)

273 × 202 mm.
Inscribed Figura 27.; IX. Facciata del Palazzo del Sig'. Luigi Centurione Marchese de Morascho.
Scale 10 palmi = 19 mm.

99a. Façade Elevation: Drawing
(Fig. 207)

390 × 280 mm.; trimmed at top.
Scale 10 palmi = 20 mm.
Inscribed below s' luisio centurione (cancelled); with a broader pen to the right of that ·M· and ·B·; by Rubens (?) above del S'.
Luiggi Centurione, in darker ink added later marchese di morsasco; by a later hand in darker ink on the lower edge Facciata del Palazzo del Sig'. Luigi Centurione Marchese de/Morsasco; above right Fig. 27, trimmed.

Nicolosio Lomellino commissioned this palace on the hill side of the Strada Nuova. The property changed ownership several times after 1551. Lomellino purchased the site in April 1563 from the estate of Leonardo Gentile. A plan for the new building already seems to have existed at this time, since Lomellino commissioned a supply of hewn stone that same month. In June 1563, a neighbour, Luca Grimaldi, ceded a narrow strip of his garden area on the west in order to create a passage between the two properties. A delivery of bricks is also documented in June of that year. No more direct information regarding the construction history is available, but building work and interior decoration seem to have gone on rapidly. Two years later, in December 1565, Agostino De Franchi was able to refer to the corresponding models in the Lomellino palace for alteration work on the entire decoration of the sala and the staircase in his palace on the Piazza della Posta Vecchia. At this time, the building must therefore have been mostly complete, including the interior decorations.

The palace seems to have been a product of the network of artists and patrons of the 1560s whose co-operation is documented in a number of other buildings. The patron, Nicolosio Lomellino, was the brother of Bartolomeo, who employed Bernardo Cantone and Giovanni Battista Castello to work on his palace in Vallechiara (Palazzi Antichi, 1) at the same time. Nicolosio was married to the daughter of Vincenzo Imperiale, who was one of Castello's most important patrons. Alizeri also mentioned Castello in connection with Nicolosio's palace, describing him as being named as the designer of the palace in a document in the atti del Comune of 1563.

The original elements in the design are the main evidence for Castello's involvement. The stucco decoration of the façade is paralleled in the palace of Vincenzo Imperiale on the Piazza Campetto, the interior and exterior decoration of which was by Castello, according to Soprani (cat. ill. 43). The façade decoration and the unusual oval shape of the vestibule also both presuppose direct contact with Roman developments in the second quarter of the sixteenth century. Castello had such qualifications, since, as Soprani reports, he had been sent to Rome to pursue his artistic education by his patron and later client Tobia Pallavicino. In the documents, however, Castello appears exclusively as the designer of individual architectural and decorative elements, and is never mentioned as the site manager; he apparently had nothing to do with the technical implementation of the design. Instead, Bernardo Cantone often appears—particularly in the buildings for which Castello designed individual elements—in leading capacities, as in the case of the palaces of Giambattista Spinola, Vincenzo Imperiale and Bartolomeo Lomellino. Agostino De Franchi, who selected Nicolosio's palace as the model for work on his own palace, also employed Cantone as site manager. Collaboration between Castello and Cantone also appears probable in Nicolosio Lomellino's palace. The eclectic quality of this and other buildings of the period suggests that the overall planning was certainly influenced by the patrons concerned, while the design of individual elements that were important for the overall appearance was delegated to specialists.

In 1600, the palace was still owned by the patron's heirs. In 1614 Luigi Centurione is named as the owner, as he is in the drawings and engravings of the Palazzi di Genova. It was probably between 1743 and 1748 that the palace passed to the Pallavicino family, and in the nineteenth century from them to the Raggio family. In 1865, it was purchased by Andrea Podestà. Alterations during the first quarter of the eighteenth century primarily affected the rear of the
palace towards the garden, while the façade section did not undergo any significant changes. The altered situation is documented by Gauthier.

The two plans in the Palazzi di Genova record the probable original state of the palace, but they are not reliable in detail. For example, the plan of the upper floor shows the three windows of the sala closer together, while the façade elevation shows an equal distance between all five window bays—corresponding to the real situation. During copying, the engraver altered the obviously careless proportioning of the room in the façade section, and in the process also corrected this divergence between plan and elevation. The façade is decorated in stucco with a figurative repertoire of herm pillars, garlands of arms and fruit, and cartouches (cat. ill. 43). The drawing correctly reproduces the structure of this façade decoration, but it differs in its details from the version actually executed. For example, on the building, the fruit garlands over the ground floor windows are lacking, and the form of the trophies on the first floor does not correspond to the highly detailed reproductions in the drawing. In addition, the proportions of the herms differ. On the building they are set on pillars that are longer in comparison with the body. The frame of the portal and the enlargement of the windows, however, are the results of later alteration.

1. All references in Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, p. 284, n. 1.
2. Ibid., p. 284, n. 2.
3. Reference in ibid., p. 284, n. 2.
5. On this grouping, see Chapter II, pp. 76–79.
7. Verbatim: ‘abbelli di marmi, stucchi, e piture tanto di dentro, quanto nella facciata di fuori’ (Soprani, Vite, 1674, p. 290; cf. also ibid., p. 38). However, only the contract for the chimney of the sala in March 1562 is documented. See the reference in the selected documents on Giovanni Battista Castello in Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, p. 499.
10. For a detailed discussion of this question, see Chapter I, pp. 47ff.

X. PALAZZO CATTANEIO ADORNO (Nos. 100–102)


100. Plan of the Ground Floor: Engraving (Fig. 208)

350 × 227 mm.
Inscribed Figura 28.; X. Prima Pianta del Palazzo del Sig. Giacomo Saluzzo./del Sig. Giovan Battista Adorno.
Scale 10 palmi = 19 mm.; lacking on the drawing (No. 100a).

100a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Fig. 209)

390 × 285 mm.
Inscribed in the rooms on the left half of the palace, in the left section 22/25; 18; 20–6; 22/26; in the right section portigho (cancelled), alongside it Loggia, 12/20–6; salotto (cancelled), alongside it Salotto, 30/26; in the rooms on the right half of the palace, in the left section Sala, 30/p 46; loggia (cancelled), alongside it Loggia, 12/20–6; salotto (cancelled), alongside it Salotto, 30/26; in the right section 22/25; 18; 20–6; 22/26; with a broader pen on the right III (cancelled), above it X; by a later hand in darker ink in the centre Pianta Seconda; above right Fig. 29.

101. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 210)

220 × 235 mm.
Inscribed Figura 29.; X. Pianta Seconda del Palazzo del Sig'. Giacomo Saluzzo./del Sig'. Giovan Battista Adorno.

101a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 211)

390 × 285 mm.
Inscribed in the rooms on the left half of the palace, in the left section 22/25; 18; 20–6; 22/26; in the right section sala, 30/p 46; loggia (cancelled), alongside it Loggia, 12/20–6; salotto (cancelled), alongside it Salotto, 30/26; in the rooms on the right half of the palace, in the left section Sala, 30/p 46; loggia (cancelled), below it Loggia, 12/20–6; salotto (cancelled), alongside it Salotto, 30/26; in the right section 22/25; 18; 20–6; 22/26; with a broader pen on the right III (cancelled), above it X; by a later hand in darker ink in the centre Pianta Seconda; above right Fig. 29.

102. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 212)

312 × 262 mm.
Inscribed Figura 30.; X. Facciata del Palazzo del Sig'. Giacomo Saluzzo./et del Sig'. Giovan Battista Adorno.

102a. Façade Elevation: Drawing (Fig. 213)

390 × 280 mm.
Inscribed under the left half of the palace s' giacomo salucca (cancelled), under the right half of the palace s' gian battista adorno (also cancelled); with a broader pen on the right alongside it III (cancelled), on the left edge X; by Rubens (?) above, over the left half of the palace del S'. Giacomo Saluzzo, over the right half of the palace del S". Gio: battista Adorno; by a later hand in darker ink on the
lower edge Facciata del Palazzo del Sig'. Giac. Saluzzo, e del Sig'. Gio. Battista Adorno; above right Fig. 30, trimmed.

102b. Façade Elevation: Proof Impression

312 x 262 mm.

A label, no longer legible, in brown ink on the lower edge of the sheet, trimmed.

*Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Prentenkabinet*

The double palace for Lazzaro and Giacomo Spinola was constructed, as the last building in the original Strada Nuova ensemble, beginning in the mid 1580s. The property had already been marked out and sold in 1551. It changed ownership again in 1568, and was still described as undeveloped in a document of May 1583.¹ The two patrons purchased the property at a time not precisely known, but between May 1583, when it was still owned by the heirs of Stefano Lomellino, and April 1585, when one of the patrons received permission to acquire hewn stone and building work was therefore already in progress.² No other information regarding the construction process is available. The palace is already entered in the second *bussolo* of June 1588, and at this time was probably at least habitable.³

The two halves of the palace are accessed separately. The plans, however, follow a strictly symmetrical arrangement around the axis of the wall separating the two halves. The building’s division into two halves is visible on the façade only through the existence of two portals. The decoration and the distribution of the window bays on the upper storey give the impression of a unified and coherent structure in the interior.

The drawings and engravings in the *Palazzi di Genova* give the names of Giacomo Saluzzo and Giovanni Battista Adorno as the owners. The exact time at which the ownership changed is not known. In 1599, the building was still owned by its two patrons. In 1612, when Giacomo Saluzzo wrote his will, he owned the left half of the palace. The right half, which had formerly belonged to Giacomo Spinola, was at this time owned by Filippo Adorno. Some time later, this half must then have passed to Giovanni Battista Adorno, the son-in-law of the building’s patron, Giacomo Spinola.⁴ The drawings must therefore have been made at an unknown time later than 1612. It was also Giovanni Battista Adorno who had painted decoration of the principal rooms in his half of the palace carried out by Lazzaro Tavarone.⁵

In the nineteenth century, the Saluzzo half of the palace passed to the Scassi family, and around 1875 to the Cattaneo family, while the right half remained in the posses-
sion of the Adornos. The palace has largely preserved its original appearance, except for the addition of a storey. The façade decoration did in fact exist on the building in the form shown in the elevation. The rustication of the base and corners, and the frames of the two portals, were executed sculpturally, while the remainder of the decoration was painted. A photograph dating from the end of the nineteenth century shows the façade as it appeared after restoration by Giacomo Varese, which is mentioned by Alizeri (cat. ill. 44).^6

1. All references in Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, pp. 373 and 381, nn. 2-4.
2. Ibid., p. 381, n. 5.
3. Ibid., p. 381, n. 10.
4. Reference ibid., p. 381, n. 11.
6. Alizeri, Guida, 1875, p. 185.

XI. PALAZZO CAMPANELLA
(Nos. 103–105)


103. Plan of the Ground Floor:
Engraving (Fig. 214)

316 × 200 mm.
Inscribed Figura 31.; XI. Prima Pianta del Palazzo del Sig' Henrico Salvago.
Scale 10 palmi = 20 mm.

103a. Plan of the Ground Floor:
Drawing (Fig. 215)

390 × 285 mm.
Watermark: letters TA.
Scale on the lower edge 10 palmi = 20 mm.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section 25/30; 9/25/31; in the rooms in the central section 33/28; 10; 10; 9/10/22; 33/20; in the rooms in the right-hand section 25/37; 10; 9/10/22; 25/20; in the garden 87/61; with a broader pen below, to the right of centre A (cancelled), to the right underneath that L; outer right XI; by a later hand in darker ink Prima Pianta del Palazzo del Sig'. Henrico Salvago; above right Fig. 31.

104. Plan of the Main Floor:
Engraving (Fig. 216)

307 × 197 mm.
Inscribed Figura 32.; XI. Seconda Pianta del Palazzo del Sig'. Henrico Salvago.

104a. Plan of the Main Floor:
Drawing (Fig. 217)

390 × 285 mm.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section 25/28; 20/16; 25/24; in the rooms
the central section 32/18; 32/50; in the rooms in the right-hand section 6; 9/11; 20/16; 25/24; in the garden 61½; with a broader pen below, to the right of centre A (cancelled), on the right alongside it L; in the lower left corner XI; by a later hand in darker ink Pianta Seconda; above right Fig. 32.

105. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 218)

341 × 222 mm.
Inscribed Figura 33.; XI. Facciata del Palazzo del Sig'. Henrico Salvago.
Scale 10 palmi = 20 mm.

105a. Façade Elevation: Drawing (Fig. 219)

385 × 290 mm.
Scale on the lower edge 10 palmi = 20 mm.
Inscribed below, to the right of centre S. Arigo Salvago (cancelled); below right L, below left XI; by Rubens (?) on the upper edge del s', the next word cancelled and illegible Henrico Salvago; by a later hand in darker ink below Facciata del Palazzo del Sig'. Henrico Salvago; above right Fig. 33.

105b. Façade Elevation: Proof Impression (Fig. 220)

341 × 220 mm.
Inscribed by hand in brown ink Facciata del Palazzo del Sig''. Henrico Salvago.
Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Prentenkabinet

The palace, which was built for Baldassare Lomellino beginning in 1562, lies on the valley side of the Strada Nuova, and originally formed the western end of the palace ensemble on this side of the street. The area lay outside the first development plan, and was purchased by Francesco Lomellino, Baldassare's brother, in March 1559. In October 1563, Baldassare Lomellino purchased other adjoining sites in order to expand the property. However, building work appears already to have started with excavation work in December 1562. Another document directly relating to the building work is a contract of February 1565 in which Giovanni Orsolino undertook to supply all the stonework in pietra di Promontorio and pietra di Lavagna for the windows and stairs, etc. In June 1566, Bartolomeo Carzolo was commissioned to supply a portal in pietra rustica di Finale for the garden. Giovanni Ponzello is mentioned in both documents in a management capacity. In the first case, he was to assess the delivery and set the price, and in the second Ponzello's drawings formed the basis for the work. During the same period, Ponzello was also responsible for the construction of the palace of Nicolò Grimaldi, Lomellino's father-in-law and business partner (see the Palazzo Doria Tursi; No. 67).

The palace was already inhabited in April 1567, when the patron wrote his will there. Work on the interior decoration, however, continued in subsequent years. In October 1568, Gian Giacomo Paracca da Valsoldo was commissioned to supply a marble chimney. A contract with Andrea Semino for fresco painting in two rooms on the piano nobile is dated December 1569. In addition to Semino, Luca Cambiaso and Giovanni Battista Castello were also involved in the decoration of other rooms. Baldassare Lomellino sold the palace to Enrico Salvago as early as 1587, and the latter is still named as the owner in the drawings and engravings. In the period after 1770, Cristoforo Spinola, who had recently taken over the palace from the Salvago family, carried out comprehensive alteration and extension work, employing Andrea Tagliafichi and Charles de Wailly. Spinola, a former Genoese ambassador to Paris, invited de Wailly to Genoa in 1772. The designs for the staircase and the Salone del Sole on
the piano nobile were by de Wailly. The classicist alterations, which brought the palace international renown, were destroyed by bombing in October 1942. Gauthier’s illustrations provide an impression of the arrangement of the rooms in the palace after the alterations. Little remained after the bomb damage except for the building’s enclosing walls.

The drawings and engravings in the Palazzi di Genova document what was probably the original appearance of the palace. The plan, with its tripartite arrangement, is based on the scheme used in the Villa Giustiniani Cambiaso (B). It shows an unusual axial quality in the plan, in which the vestibule, main staircase, loggia and garden all lie on the longitudinal axis. The façade probably had a painted decoration, as in the neighbouring Palazzo Cattaneo Adorno (X), with the frames of the portal and windows and the rusticated corners as sculptural elements (Fig. 221). The façade elevation shows the balconies on the windows of the piano nobile, which were apparently only added afterwards. Permission for this was granted in January 1592.7

The wall enclosing the garden does not seem to have the original form seen in a site plan dating from June 1565, but must already reflect later alteration. The London plans show a thick wall with its platform formed as an open gallery on three sides at the level of the piano nobile. This gallery was accessed from a stair in the south-east corner and from the sala. This arrangement apparently resulted from the alterations for which Lelia Salvago requested permission in March 1605 to erect poggioli on the house and on the south and west sides of the garden.8 The drawings were apparently only made at a later date than this. Unlike the majority of the drawings, therefore, they do not show a projected stage, but the actual state of the building at the beginning of the seventeenth century.

2. Ibid., p. 233, n. 2.
3. Ibid., p. 222. References to both documents are also given in the selected documents on Giovanni Ponzello, ibid., p. 509.
5. Soprani, Vite, 1674, pp. 48 and 290; Soprani—Ratti, Vite, 1768, pp. 94 and 405.
8. The site plan from 1565 is illustrated ibid., p. 222, fig. 122; reference to the document ibid., p. 234, n. 23.

XII. PALAZZO DI CIPRIANO PALLAVICINO (Nos. 106–108)


106. Plan of the Ground Floor: Engraving (Fig. 222)

180 x 290 mm.
Inscribed Figura 34.; XII. Prima Pianta del Palazzo del Sig’. Babilano Pallavicino.
Scale 10 palmi = 26 mm.

In comparison with the drawing (No. 106a), the proportions of the commercial rooms in the façade section and the positioning of the entrances have been regularized.
106a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Fig. 223)

390 x 295 mm.

Inscribed in the shop premises in the façade section, starting at the left p 17; p 14/p 22; p 16/p 22; p 16; in the rooms in the rear section, starting at the left portigho, p 21/p 30; p 14; p 25/p 29; p 24; below pianta del palazzo s'. babilano praecino; with a broader pen to the left alongside it VIII (cancelled), below it IX (cancelled again), further left XII; by the engraver (?) in pencil below that gesneden (?); by a later hand in darker ink Prima Pianta del Palazzo del Sig'. Babilano Pallavicino; above right Fig. 34.

107. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 224)

175 x 280 mm.

Inscribed Figura 35.; XII. Seconda Pianta del Palazzo del Sig'. Babilano Pallavicino.

107a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 225)

395 x 295 mm.

Inscribed in the rooms in the façade section, starting at the left p 30/P 22; p 20/p 16; p 30/p 22; in the rooms in the rear section, starting at the left sala, p 40/p 30; p 14/p 7; p 9/p 18; fondiglio; p 24/p 18; p 13; with a broader pen below VIII (cancelled), on the right alongside it IX (cancelled again), below that XII; by a later hand in darker ink Pianta Seconda; above right Fig. 35.

108. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 226)

355 x 301 mm.

Inscribed Figura 36.; XII. Facciata del Palazzo del Sig'. Babilano Pallavicino.

108a. Façade Elevation: Drawing (Fig. 228)

395 x 300 mm.

Inscribed on the lower edge faciata del palazzo del s' babilano praecino, corrected in a later hand to Pallavicino; with a broader pen left alongside that VII (cancelled), below it IX (cancelled again), below it XII; by Rubens (?) on the upper edge del S'. Babilano Pallavicino; by a later hand in darker ink on the lower edge Facciata del Palazzo del Sig'. Babilano Pallavicino; above right Fig. 36.

108b. Façade Elevation: Proof Impression (Fig. 227)

355 x 301 mm.

Inscribed by hand in brown ink on the lower edge Facciata del Palazzo del Sig°. Babilano Pallavicino.

Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Prentenkabinet

The palace stands on the west side of the Piazza Fossatello, directly beside the Palazzo Centurione (XIII). The form in which the building is shown in the drawings and engravings in the Palazzi di Genova is the result of alterations carried out in the period after 1540. During these changes, the palace was given a new, prestigious decorative façade on the Piazza Fossatello, the elevation of which is shown in the Palazzi di Genova. The core of the building is older. The rear section is separated into two independent units, each with its own entrance, as is seen from the ground plan drawing. In 1503, Cipriano Pallavicino commissioned from Michele and Antonio Carlone a sculptured marble doorway for the main entrance on Via Ponte Calvi (on the upper left in the drawing). This portal remained where it was even after 1540, since the arrangement of the rear section and the internal state of the palace were not affected by the alterations. In 1828, Berlendis showed an illustration of the portal still in
place. Slightly later, it was moved to the vestibule. Between 1875 and 1877, the portal was purchased by the Victoria and Albert Museum.¹

The renovation of the façade was apparently carried out in connection with the redesigning of the Piazza Fossatello, which had been decided on by the Padri del Comune in 1539.² In May 1540, the owners announced their intention to create a new façade on the square.³ The following month, the Padri del Comune gave their agreement to the straightening of the façade’s irregular course.⁴ Details of the subsequent alterations are not known. It is also unclear who commissioned the work involved. In the document of May 1540 published by Alizieri, the cleric Cipriano Pallavicino and his unnamed brother appear as the applicants. Grossi Bianchi and Poleggi state that the heirs of Babilano Pallavicino commissioned the alterations. In the drawings and engravings, the palace appears under the name of Babilano Pallavicino.

Cat. ill. 45. Antonio Giolfi, View of Piazza Fossatello with Palazzo di Cipriano Pallavicino (XII) and Palazzo Centurione (XIII), engraving

Cat. ill. 46. Palazzo di Cipriano Pallavicino (XII), view from Piazza Fossatello (from Labò, Palazzi di Genova, 1970)
The new façade on the Piazza Fossatello was a purely decorative wall aimed to create an effect on the square. The articulation consists of a rustication of the two lower storeys and a pilaster order joining the main storey and the mezzanine above it. The architecture of the façade appears to have been inspired by Roman models such as Bramante’s Palazzo Caprini and the illustrations of palace façades with several storeys in Serlio’s Book IV. A different approach was taken in two other buildings of the 1540s, the della Meridiana (VIII) and Doria Spinola (XIV) palaces. The arrangement of the ground plan in both of these refers back to Roman models, but their painted façade decorations have a northern Italian character. The façade of Cipriano Pallavicino’s palace, by contrast, is one of the earliest examples in Genoa prior to Alessi of a Renaissance façade with a purely architectural articulation.

The discrepancy between the façade articulation and the arrangement of the interior is clear from the ground plan drawings. On the ground floor, premises for five shops were installed, but these are isolated from one another and are also not linked to the residential section. On the main floor, the large windows did not open onto the sala, as one would expect, but only onto a few smaller rooms. The sala was still in the western corner above the old main entrance with the 1503 portal. The traditional arrangement of the interior was thus preserved, while the building’s exterior was improved with the modern façade on the Piazza Fossatello.

The ground plan drawing shows the shops on the ground floor in the same form in which they are shown in the engraving by Antonio Giolfi (cat. ill. 45). However, the façade elevation includes elements that must probably be regarded as inventions by the draughtsman. He suggested the façade of a purely residential palace without business premises by replacing the shop entrances on the ground floor with windows and by placing, at the centre of the façade, an entrance marked out as the main portal by its frame and pediment. The building itself never had a doorway of this type, and nothing comparable is seen in Giolfi’s view. The façade elevation was engraved without change, and therefore does not correspond to the real situation. The plan was simply adapted to match the elevation by adding the main portal.

Alterations to the palace were carried out towards the end of the eighteenth century, when two storeys were added. Giolfi’s view shows the exterior of the building before this extension, and thus corresponds to the situation that can be reconstructed from the plan drawings in the Palazzi di Genova. The balconies on the windows of the main floor are probably a later addition (cat. ill. 46).

4. The text is given in Alizeri, Notizie, 1870–80, V, 1877, pp. 29f.
5. Regole generali di architettura di Sebastiano Serlio Bolognese sopra le cinque maniere de gli edifici [1537], 3rd edn, Venice, 1544, tols. xxxiii recto and xxxiii verso.

XIII. PALAZZO CENTURIONE
(Nos. 109–111)


109. Plan of the Ground Floor: Engraving (Fig. 229)

196 × 260 mm.
Inscribed Figura 37.; XIII. Prima Pianta del Palazzo del Sig’. Battista Centurione.
Scale 10 palmi = 26 mm; lacking on the drawing (No. 109a).

109a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Fig. 230)

390 × 300 mm.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section p 27/22; 18/12; 10; in the rooms in the central section Salotto, p 34/p 35; in the rooms in the right-hand section p 25/22; 20/22; 18/p 11; on the lower edge of the illustration XI, supplemented to XIII; by a later hand in darker ink Prima Pianta del Sig’. Battista Centurione; above right Fig. 37.

110. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 231)

190 × 265 mm.
Inscribed Figura 38.; XIII. Pianta Seconda del Palazzo del Sig’. Battista Centurione.

110a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 232)

390 × 285 mm.
Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section p 27/22; 18; 10; in the rooms in the central section Salotto, p 34/p 35; in the rooms in the right-hand section p 25/22; 20/22; 18/p 11; on the lower edge of the illustration XI, supplemented to XIII; by a later hand in darker ink Pianta Seconda; above right Fig. 38.

111. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 233)

406 × 312 mm.
Inscribed Figura 39.; XIII. Facciata del Palazzo del Sig’. Battista Centurione.

111a. Façade Elevation: Drawing (Fig. 234)

395 × 300 mm.; the illustration is trimmed at the top and on the lower right edge.
Inscribed above right Fig. 39.

111b. Façade Elevation: Proof Impression

406 × 312 mm.
The coat of arms above the portal shows traces of retouching to make the heraldic image appear the right way round after being reversed in the engraving.
Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Prentenkabinet

The palace was built beginning in 1611 for Battista Centurione on the north side of the Piazza Fossatello, and stands next to the Palazzo di Cipriano Pallavicino (XII). Adamo Centurione, one of the wealthiest Genoese bankers of the sixteenth century and one of Emperor Charles V’s major lenders, had a palace erected on this site in 1511.¹ This earlier building, along with a neighbouring one, was apparently absorbed into Battista Centurione’s new building.

No details of its construction history are
known. In 1611 there were disputes over the question of the property's boundaries. The patron had apparently attempted to round off the irregularly outlined site at the expense of public land, probably in order to create straight lines and produce a prestigious external appearance. In the documents, Battista Cantone and his son Pietro Filippo are named as the architects. Between April and June 1611, several site plans of the property were produced during this affair by Stefano Storaglio and Giovanni Aicardo. An inscription on the entablature, which is also cited in the patron's will, gives 1612 as the year of construction. In March and July 1615, Battista Centurione commissioned supplies of marble and hewn stone from the stonemasons Alessandro Ferrandino and Andrea Compareti. In May 1619, Ferrandino was paid by Filippo Centurione for the delivery of white marble and other stone materials. The palace owes its fame to its extensive room decorations with frescos by Domenico Piola, Gregorio de Ferrari and Bartolomeo Giudobono, but these were only produced in the last quarter of the seventeenth century.

The building has been preserved without substantial alterations. However, there are differences between the drawings and the actual building, primarily affecting the façade. Due to its exposed position in the angle between Via del Campo and Via Lomellini, the palace has two equally important façades. The façade elevation in the Palazzi di Genova shows the longer façade with seven bays facing onto Via del Campo and the Piazza Fossatello, which also includes the entrance. On the ground floor of the actual building, only the two outside wall openings on each side are capped by rusticated arches, while the two windows on each side of the portal have rectangular heads. The draughtsman indicated a regular arcade here, and also suppressed—both here and in the plan—the fact that the shops had their own entrances in the two outer bays. Antonio Giolfi's 1769 illustration depicts the situation as it still remains today (cat. ill. 45).

Other details also indicate the draughtsman's fairly free treatment of the building. The distances in the actual building between the windows and the mezzanine windows are larger on the first upper storey and smaller on the second upper storey than they are in the drawing. The distances between the window bays vary in the actual building. Between each of the two outside windows there is a slightly wider strip of wall, giving the façade a rhythmic articulation. The plans reproduce this correctly. The façade elevation, however, shows a monotonous sequence of windows at equally narrow distances. The relationship between the wall surface, the wall openings and the architectural articulation in the actual building is much more balanced, while the drawing gives an impression of monotony and 'horror vacui'. The rusticated corner of the building on the south-east stands at an angle, and is shown in the drawing clumsily in a foreshortened oblique view.

2. Reference in Poleggi, Documento, 1977, p. 120, n. 38.
3. The text of this inscription is given in De Negri, Palazzi, 1966, pp. 59f. See also Labò, Palazzi di Genova, 1970, p. 203; Gavazza, Spazio, 1989, p. 238, n. 111.
5. Ibid., p. 82.

XIV. PALAZZO DORIA SPINOLA (Nos. 112-114)

LITERATURE: Schickhardt, Handschriften, 1901, pp. 103f. ('Johan Batista Dorio'); Furttenbach, Itinerarium, 1627, pp. 186f. ('deß Sig. Marchese Spinola Pallast'); Ratti, Istruzione, 1766, pp. 262f. ('Palazzo Spinola Sanpietro'); Description... de Gênes, 1768,

113. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 237)

310 × 300 mm.
Inscribed Figura 41; XIV. Seconda Pianta del Palazzo del Sig'. Antonio Doria Marchese de S. Steffano.

113a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 238)

340 × 415 mm.
Inscribed in the rooms in the façade section 40; 62/40; 27/40; 22/31; in the rooms in the right wing 30/29; 24/26; 30/43; in the wing at the rear 33/23; 22/23; 19/11; in the chapel 13/10; in the rooms in the left wing 30/23; 13; 30/18; 30/15; 28; in the courtyard 12 and 48/48; with a broader pen below right, in the centre D, altered to O; in the lower left corner XIV; by a later hand in darker ink above right Pianta Seconda; above right Fig. 41.

114. façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 239)

285 × 351 mm.
Inscribed Figura 42.; XIV. Facciata del Palazzo del Sig'. Antonio Doria Marchese de S. Steffano.
Scale 10 palmi = 19 mm.
The central of the five chimneys (see drawing, No. 114a) was omitted from the engraving.

114a. Façade Elevation: Drawing (Fig. 240)

290 x 390 mm.

Inscribed below s' antonio doria, another word (cancelled), below it added later Marchese di San Steffano; with a broader pen D, altered to O; by a later hand in darker ink Facciata del Palazzo del Sig' Antonio Doria Marchese de S. Steffano; below right Fig. 42.

114b. Façade Elevation: Proof Impression (Fig. 241)

286 x 348 mm. (plate size).

The inner pair of chimneys is still shown in an orthogonal view as on the drawing (No. 114a), while in the final state (No. 114) it is supplemented by the perspective foreshortening of the sides.

Antonio Doria was the patron of this palace on the north-eastern edge of the walled city. It is one of the first of the Renaissance palaces in Genoa that were planned as grand and spacious new buildings outside the densely built-up city centre, and which had a regular plan unaffected by irregularly shaped sites. The drawings show an almost square building with a central inner courtyard that is also square (cat. ill. 47). As in the palace of Girolamo and Giambattista Grimaldi (VIII), built at more or less the same time, an axial complex is created that places the portal, vestibule, courtyard and garden along a central axis closing with the nymphaeum as its focus. The staircase and position of the sala in the main façade section can also be traced back to Roman models. The close relationship between the building and the garden, as recorded in the plan of the ground floor, is also characteristic of these. However, the design of the façades (decorative painting, lunette cornice) was based on Lombard influences.

The patron, Antonio Doria, acquired the area between the convent of S. Caterina and the Porta dell'Acquasola by successively purchasing several smaller properties between February and May 1541. Purchase of two more parcels followed in 1543 and 1546. There is no real information about the construction process. The inscription on a commemorative plaque said to have been originally mounted in the sala states that building began in 1541.

It is not certain who the author of this ambitious design was. Two documents of May 1541 and December 1543 refer to Bernardo Cantone. However, these both concern surveying work and property evaluation and not the commissioning of work involving the planning or construction of the building. Ascribing the design to Cantone on the basis of these documents, as
Poleggi did, is therefore just as hypothetical as the earlier attribution to Giovanni Battista Castello by Rotondi. Any explanation of the palace's typological innovations must take into account the ambitions of the patron, who as an admiral in the Spanish fleet had a prominent position within the Genoese aristocracy.

Benchmarks for dating the building's construction are provided by the dates for the purchase of the site in the spring of 1541 and the data in the document mentioned above of December 1543, which was signed 'in contrata olim Aquasole, videlicet in caminata dicta domus', i.e. in the new Doria palace that must have been at least partly completed. As early as March 1543, Antonio Doria applied to the Padri del Comune to have two squares laid out in front of his palace.

The painted decoration of the two façades, as Soprani records, was by Lazzaro and Pantaleo Calvi. Antonio Doria employed Luca Cambiaso to carry out fresco decoration of individual rooms inside the building, and in addition to painting several smaller rooms he painted a fresco in the vaulting of the sala depicting the Niobe myth. A considerable portion of the interior decoration was carried out in the period around 1584 by a younger generation of painters from the Calvi family. In 1624, the palace came into the possession of the Spinola di San Pietro family. The balconies were added to the windows on the main floor immediately afterwards. The Spinola coat of arms was set underneath the lunette cornice. The London façade elevation shows the state of the building before these alterations: there are no balconies, and the Doria coat of arms is present in the pediment of the main portal (cat. ill. 48). Under the Spinola family, two annexes were also built: the library on the north-west, and the gallery on the south-east housing their collection of paintings. This is the situation shown in a plan of the whole site dating from 1768, in which the palace and the garden still show no other changes compared with the state shown in the Palazzi di Genova.

Extensive alterations were carried out from the late eighteenth century onward. In 1793–97, the palace had one storey added, and the range of rooms was extended by building over part of the garden. Gauthier's illustrations document the state of the building after these changes (cat. ill. 49). In 1816–17, the street level was lowered. The portal and vestibule consequently had to be set lower and linked to the courtyard by a stairway. In 1876, the city of Genoa acquired the palace from the Spinola di Lerma family, and in 1879, it passed to the provincial administration. Its new use as an administrative building involved further alterations to the interior. The opening up of Via Roma and the creation of the Piazza Corvetto fundamentally altered the surroundings of the palace, as well as involving losses to the substance of the building. In 1877, the block was disfigured by bevelling on the south-east corner, and

Cat. ill. 48. Palazzo Doria Spinola (XIV), façade: detail (from Reinhardt, Palastarchitektur, 1886, pl. 60)
Cat. ill. 49. Palazzo Doria Spinola (XIV), plan of the ground floor (from Gauthier, Édifices, 1818–32, l, pl. 88)
the gallery annexe was demolished. In 1938, a reconstruction of the façade painting was carried out.

An elevation of the south side of the palace, including the adjoining gallery, dating from the period around 1800 shows the building, now raised by one storey, with the whole of the façade as then painted (cat. ill. 50). In terms of the articulation of the wall and the painted architectural decoration, this later record drawing corresponds precisely to the London façade elevation. However, the Palazzi elevation suppresses the entire figurative fresco decoration, with the exception of the floral and armorial garlands on the ground floor mezzanine. According to Soprani, the fresco decoration by the Calvi brothers was extensive, including among other things ‘molte Historie concernenti alla Famiglia Doria’.11 There was a frieze with chained captives underneath the lunette cornice. There was another frieze of putti under the windows of the piano nobile, which was destroyed when the balconies were added in 1624. Other sections of the wall were filled with depictions of Roman triumphs, which Lomazzo praised as being exemplary of this genre of painting.12 None of this is reproduced in the London drawing.

2. Ibid., p. 111, nn. 15 and 16.
3. For the text of the inscription, see Cappellini, op. cit. 1932 (see Literature), p. 73; Rotondi, op. cit. 1958 (see Literature), pp. 71–73. The text of the plate, later lost, was already cited by Alizeri from a copy made by Domenico Piaggio: Alizeri, Notizie, 1870–80, V, 1877, pp. 308ff., n. 1.
4. In May 1541, Cantone was commissioned by the Senate to survey several sites that Antonio Doria had purchased near S. Caterina shortly before. In December 1543, Cantone, along with the magistri antelami Giacomo and Bernardo Spazio, Pietro de Muggio and Antonio de Cabio, was involved in assessing another property, which Antonio Doria also intended to purchase. The text of both documents is given in Poleggi, Palazzo Doria, 1957, p. 112, n. 38 and n. 40. References also in the selected documents on Bernardo Cantone in Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, p. 492.
5. For his biography, see Dizionario biografico degli Italiani, XLI, Rome, 1992, pp. 280–286 (R. Savelli).
7. See Soprani, Vite, 1674, p. 72; Soprani—Ratti, Vite, 1768, pp. 46f.
8. Mentioned in Soprani, Vite, 1674, p. 36.
XV. PALAZZO DELL'ACQUEDOTTO DE FERRARI GALLIERA
(Nos. 115–117)


115. Plan of the Ground Floor: Engraving (Fig. 244)
219 × 348 mm.
Inscribed Figura 43.; XV. Prima Pianta del Palazzo del Sig'. Thomaso Pallavicino.
Scale 10 palmi = 26 mm.

115a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Fig. 245)
285 × 390 mm.
Inscribed in the rooms in the façade section, starting at left p 23/p 241/2; p 35/p 281/2; p 23/p 281/2; p 30/p 20; in the rooms in the rear section portico (cancelled), above it p 32/p 25; piazza (cancelled), above it piazza, p 30/p 441/2; in each of two other rooms 10; on the lower edge prima pianta del palazzo del s’. tomaso prae cino (last word cancelled); left of that XVII (cancelled), below it XV; the name corrected by a later hand in darker ink to Tomaso Pallavicino; below right Fig. 49.

116. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 246)
218 × 330 mm.
Inscribed Figura 44.; XV. Seconda Pianta del Palazzo del Sig’. Thomaso Pallavicino.

116a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 247)
285 × 390 mm.
Inscribed in the rooms in the façade section, starting at the left p 221/2/p 26; salotto, p 34/p 36; p 24/p 271/2; 30/p 20; in the rooms in the rear section fondiglio (cancelled), above it Fondiglio, p 17/p 17; p 22/p 15; p 22/p 20; on the lower edge segnonda pianta; on the left alongside that XVII (partly cancelled), below it with a broader pen XV; by a later hand in darker ink, below right Fig. 44.

117. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 248)
320 × 357 mm.
Inscribed Figura 45.; XV. Facciata del Palazzo del Sig’. Thomaso Pallavicino.

117a. Façade Elevation: Drawing
Whereabouts unknown; presumably lost

117b. Façade Elevation: Proof Impression (Fig. 249)
325 × 357 mm.
Inscribed by hand in brown ink Facciata del Palazzo del Sig’. Thomaso Pallavicino.
Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Prentenkabinet

The palace, built for Tommaso Pallavicino around 1621, lies in the Guastato area in the north-west, above the medieval city centre. The area rose to become a prestigious residential district in the early decades of the seventeenth century, principally through the laying out of Via Balbi, which opens diagonally across from this Pallavicino palace on the Piazza della Nunziata. In this area, the uneven terrain was once again an obstacle to building. A petition by the patron that reflects these difficulties repre-
sents the only information available about the palace's construction history. In December 1621, Tommaso Pallavicino applied to have the level of the streets lowered on two sides of his palace, which was still being built, in order to provide better light for the rooms on the ground floor and easier access to the palace. Building work was obviously already well advanced at this point, and the planning material on which the London drawings were based had probably been available for some time. Nevertheless, with its planning and construction phases around 1621, this is one of the latest buildings included in the Palazzi Moderni.

The architect's name is not known. The arrangement of the plan shows an effort to achieve an axial alignment of the two portals, the vestibule and the main staircase. The layout of the small, walled forecourt is unusual. On entering the palace from the street, one stepped first into this small courtyard. A second portal led from the courtyard into the vestibule. The façade elevation in the Palazzi di Genova does not show the narrow entrance side of the place, but the broader, more prestigious façade on the Piazza della Nunziata. An engraving by Giolfi shows this view of the palace, although the façade is heavily shadowed in it (cat. ill. 51).

The building was later altered beyond recognition. In 1815, however, the arrangement of the interior was still sufficiently intact for a stocktaking list drawn up that year, with a description of the sequences of rooms, to allow the palace to be identified with the engravings in the Palazzi di Genova. The exterior was disfigured by a redecoration of the façade in 1837–38 and by the introduction of an arcade on the ground floor in 1930.

1. Poleggi, Documento, 1977, p. 120, n. 41.
XVI. PALAZZO SPINOLA (Nos. 118–120)


118. Plan of the Ground Floor: Engraving (Fig. 250)

242 × 323 mm.

Inscribed Figura 46.; XVI. Prima Pianta del Palazzo del Sig’. Francesco Grimaldo. Scale 10 palmi = 26 mm; lacking on the drawing (No. 118a).

118a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Fig. 251)

290 × 395 mm.

Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section p 15; p 15; p 32/16; p 32/21; p 30/9; in the rooms in the central section 7/15; Cortile, p 47/p 28; portiglio (cancelled), above it Portico, p 33/p 33; in the rooms in the right-hand section p 13; 12; p 23/p 15; p 24/18; p 25/p 25; on the lower edge prima pianta del palazzo del s. tomaso (last word cancelled) grimaldo, entered by Rubens (?) above that Francesco; weakly in pencil below it D; left alongside the note of ownership XVI; by a later hand in darker ink, below right Fig. 46.

119. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 252)

228 × 320 mm.

Inscribed Figura 47.; XVI. Seconda Pianta del Palazzo del Sig’. Francesco Grimaldo.

119a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 253)

290 × 390 mm. At the left end of the narrow arcaded passage, a strip has been pasted down to conceal a stair that had been entered there.

Inscribed in the rooms in the left-hand section p 32/15/p 22; p 25/15/p 24; p 19/p 33; in the rooms in the central section 7/15; Cortile (cancelled), below it Cortile, p 47/p 28; Salotto (cancelled), above it Salotto, p 33/p 33; in the rooms in the right-hand section p 23/p 19; p 24/p 24; p 25/p 25/15; on the lower edge seghonda pianta; left alongside it XVI; by a later hand in darker ink, below right Fig. 47.

120. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 254)

347 × 428 mm.

Inscribed Figura 48.; XVI. Facciata del Palazzo del Sig’. Francesco Grimaldo.

The façade has been regularized in the engraving. The alteration is noted on the
The building of the palace is only documented by a single archive note. In July 1593, the patron Francesco Grimaldi, applied for permission to add balconies to the windows on the piano di sala and the mezzanine floor. According to Poleggi, the document indicates that Francesco Grimaldi had two older buildings demolished in order to build the palace. The different widths of the two side wings show that the existing older structures were not completely removed, but integrated into the new building. Medieval materials have been identified in the masonry. The exterior of the palace was originally painted, and remnants of the façade decoration survive in the courtyard. In their use of abstract architectural decorative motifs, these correspond to the mural decoration shown in the Palazzi drawing. However, there are differences of detail.

The palace is accessible from two sides, with entrances on the Piazza Pellicceria Superiore (at the bottom in the drawing) and from the Piazza Pellicceria Inferiore (top). As the position of the vestibule and sala indicate, the main entrance was the portal on the Piazza Pellicceria Inferiore. The façade elevation in the Palazzi di Genova shows the façade on the Piazza Pellicceria, i.e. a rear view of the building. The U-shaped building mass has a small courtyard in front of it on this side, which is closed off from the square by a narrow, two-storey transverse structure, which was later raised (cat. ill. 52). The two plans in the Palazzi di Genova only show the lower two of the palace’s four full storeys. The open arcade linking the two side wings can be seen on the plan of the first main floor. This open arcade was closed and raised by one storey around 1650. The famous Galleria degli Specchi, decorated by Lorenzo De Ferrari, is located on the upper floor of this narrow section with windows on both sides.

The drawings give the name of Tommaso Grimaldi, the son of the commissioning patron, who succeeded to the property. He is already mentioned as the owner in the bussolo of 1614. For the book publication, however, Rubens replaced Tommaso’s name with that of the patron, Francesco Grimaldi. While the palace was still in the possession of the Grimaldi family, several rooms on the two main floors were painted with scenes from the history of the Grimaldi dynasty, by Lazzaro Tavarone. In 1650, the building passed to the Pallavicino family, and around 1720 came into the possession of the Spinolas. Alterations were carried out in 1732–36, during which the façades also received a new stucco surface. The palace has been owned by the Italian state since 1958, and since 1959 it is the seat of the Galleria Nazionale di Palazzo Spinola.

The façade elevation in the Palazzi di Genova was thoroughly revised when it was transferred from the drawing to the engrav-
The central section of the façade was widened by one bay, to five. This made it possible to place the portal in the middle bay and thus at the centre of the façade. In addition, the front of the right wing (left in the engraving) was widened, creating a completely regular façade structure. These regularizations were confined to the façade, however; the two ground plans were reproduced with their asymmetrical form unchanged, and it is therefore not possible to reconcile them with the façade. These alterations were undoubtedly requested by the editor himself. A short note on the lower right edge of the engraving draws this to the viewer's attention.

1. Reference in Poleggi, Documento, 1977, pp. 119f., n. 37. The application is accompanied by a site plan by Giovanni Ponzello, who had produced it in his capacity as architetto di camera. The drawing is illustrated in Palazzo Spinola a Pellicceria, 1987, op. cit. (see Literature), p. 88.

**XVII. PALAZZO DI NEGRO (Nos. 121–123)**


**121. Plan of the Ground Floor:** Engraving (Fig. 257)

248 × 335 mm.

Inscribed Figura 49.; XVII. Pianta prima del Palazzo del Sig'. Horatio de Negro.
Scale 10 palmi = 26 mm; lacking on the drawing (No. 121a).
In comparison with the drawing, all the proportions in the plan have been changed. The central section has been widened; the vestibule has an almost square shape in the drawing, while in the engraving it is clearly oblong. The side sections, by contrast, have been narrowed. The distribution of the windows has also been changed; the room to the right of the courtyard (left in the drawing) has one window more in the engraving than it does in the drawing, and the side façade thus has five window bays instead of four.

121a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Fig. 258)

290 × 390 mm.

Inscribed in the rooms in the façade section, starting at the left p 39/p 24\(\frac{1}{2}\); portico (cancelled), above it Portico, p 30/p 24\(\frac{1}{2}\); p 36/p 24\(\frac{1}{2}\); in the rooms in the rear section, starting at the left 26\(\frac{1}{2}\)/p 30; Cortile, p 29/p 20, 10; p 23/p 14\(\frac{1}{2}\); on the lower edge pianta del palacio del s' oracio de negro; left alongside it X, supplemented to XVII; the note of ownership supplemented or corrected in darker ink prima ... Oratio de Negro; by a later hand in darker ink, below right Fig. 49.

122. Plan of the First Floor: Engraving (Fig. 260)

250 × 338 mm.

Inscribed Figura 50.; XVII. Pianta seconda del Palazzo del Sig'. Horatio de Negro.

In comparison with the drawing (No. 122a), basic aspects of the illustration have been altered. As in the plan of the ground floor, the room to the right of the courtyard (left in the drawing) has had another window added. The arrangement of the rooms in the façade section has been completely changed. Instead of four irregularly spread rooms more or less equal in size, the engraving shows only three rooms grouped in a strictly symmetrical way, with a larger sala in the centre and two smaller camere at the sides.

122a. Plan of the First Floor: Drawing (Fig. 260)

285 × 395 mm.

Inscribed in the rooms in the façade section, starting at left p 26\(\frac{1}{2}\)/p 24\(\frac{1}{2}\); p 32/24\(\frac{1}{2}\); 20/p 24\(\frac{1}{2}\); 23/24\(\frac{1}{2}\); in the rooms in the rear section, starting at left p 26\(\frac{1}{2}\)/30; p 29/20, 10; 23/p 14\(\frac{1}{2}\); on the lower edge X, supplemented to XVII; by a later hand in darker ink on the right edge Pianta Seconda; above left Fig. 50.

123. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 261)

353 × 380 mm.

Inscribed Figura 51.; XVII. Facciata del Palazzo del Sig'. Horatio de Negro.

123a. Façade Elevation: Drawing (Fig. 262)

400 × 395 mm.

Inscribed in the centre below faciata del palazzo del sig' oracio de negro (cancelled); below left X, supplemented to XVII; by Rubens (?) in the centre at the top del S'. Horatio di Negro; by a later hand in darker ink on the lower edge Facciata del Palazzo del Sig'. Horatio de Negro; below right Fig. 51.

123b. Façade Elevation: Proof Impression

357 × 382 mm.

Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Prentenkabinet

The palace was built in the period after 1568 on the north side of the Piazza Banchi. The square, one of the main business centres in the fabric of the medieval city, was enlarged.
in the late sixteenth century by the demolition of two loggias. At the same time, it was enhanced to serve as a municipal centre by the building of the Loggia dei Mercanti (approved 1570, built 1589–95) and the new church of S. Pietro in Banchi (designed 1572, completed 1585). The palace was commissioned by Ambrogio Di Negro (1519–1601), who had made immense profits as a banker in asiento trade with the Spanish crown, and who became a leading political figure after his return from Spain in 1559. He served as doge in 1585–87. Little is known of the details of the building's construction history. In 1568, Ambrogio Di Negro announced his intention of erecting a palace on the northern side of the square in place of older buildings. In July 1569, he received permission to round off the property towards Via San Luca in order to create a regular façade. In return, Di Negro conceded a few palmi of land to regularize the façade on the Piazza Banchi.2 In October 1574, Ambrogio Di Negro had a dispute with the city council and the owner of the neighbouring building in Via San Luca regarding the size and shape of the balcony above the main portal. The palace appears already to have been completed at this time.3

The painted decoration of the two façades on the Piazza Banchi and Via San Luca was probably carried out immediately after the completion of the building during the last quarter of the sixteenth century. Orazio Di Negro, Ambrogio's son born in 1566, is named as the owner on the London drawings. The palace passed to him on his father's death in 1601, and he was its owner until 1618.4

The palace was later raised by the addition of an attic storey, and alterations to the interior were carried out. The façade view in the Palazzi di Genova shows the seven-bay façade on Via San Luca, including the entrance. The ground floor is rusticated, and the rest of the mural structure was apparently painted. The remnants of the painting that survive on the Piazza Banchi façade basically correspond to the decoration shown in the drawing (cat. ill. 53). The ground plan drawings, however, differ from the surviving building, for example in the shape of the vestibule. It is not clear to what extent this may be due to later alterations, with the drawings documenting the original state.

There are noticeable differences between the two plan drawings and their reproduction in the engravings. As in all the illustrations in the second series, the engraver had to redraw the source, carrying out the usual corrections with regard to the measurements and proportions of the individual rooms. In the case of the Palazzo Di Negro, however, these changes are much more extensive than in any of the other engravings in the second series. For example, the façade on the Piazza Banchi is extended to five window bays. The drawings show four bays here, corresponding to the actual build-
ing. The alteration of the structure of the rooms in the façade section indicates a desire to create a regular, symmetrical grouping here, with a large sala in the centre. 5

2. The text of the document is given in De Negri, Palazzi, 1966, p. 62, doc. II.
3. Ibid., pp. 50–52. The text of the documents is also given there, pp. 62f., doc. III–IV.
4. Ibid., p. 53, n. 11.
5. On the procedures used by the engraver, see the analysis in Chapter I, pp. 46f.

**XVIII. PALAZZO LOMELLINI PATRONE (Nos. 124–126)**

**LITERATURE:**

124. Plan of the Ground Floor: Engraving (Fig. 263)

185 x 398 mm.

Inscribed Figura 52.; XVIII. Prima Pianta del Palazzo del Sig'. Giacomo Lomellino.

Scale 10 palmi = 26 mm; lacking on the drawing (No. 124a).

124a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Fig. 264)

290 x 395 mm.; the illustration has been trimmed by about 30 mm. on the left side.

Inscribed in the rooms in the façade section, starting at the left p 27/p 25; portigho, above it Portico, p 47/p 30; p 23/25; 23/25; in the rooms in the rear section, starting at the left 27/p 20; p 10; Cortile, p 24/23, 8; p 23/22; on the lower edge pianta del palacio del sig' giacomo lomellino; with a broader pen left of that VII, supplemented to XVIII; the note of ownership supplemented or corrected by a later hand in darker ink Prima ... S'. Giacomo Lomellino; below right Fig. 52.

125. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 265)

186 x 395 mm.

Inscribed Figura 53.; XVIII. Seconda Pianta del Palazzo del Sig'. Giacomo Lomellino.

125a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 266)

290 x 395 mm.; the illustration has been trimmed by about 30 mm. on the left side.

Inscribed in the rooms, starting at the lower left 27/p 25; Salotto (cancelled), below it Salotto, p 47/p 30; 23/p 25; 23/p 25; 23/p 22; 8; Cortile, p 24/p 23; p 18/p 22; p 21/p 21; 18½/p 11; with a broader pen on the lower edge VII, supplemented to XVIII; by a later hand in darker ink Pianta Seconda; below right Fig. 53.

126. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 267)

345 x 423 mm.

Inscribed Figura 54.; XVIII. Facciata del Palazzo del Sig'. Giacomo Lomellino.
Giacomo Lomellino’s palace is one of five Lomellino palaces in Vallechiara, to the north above the old city. Only one other of these five buildings, Bartolomeo’s palace (Palazzi Antichi, I), is included in the Palazzi di Genova. The palace was apparently not newly built from scratch, but resulted from alterations carried out on earlier buildings. In May 1619, Giacomo Lomellino announced his intention of incorporating a neighbouring building into his palace, and applied to round off the property in order to create a unified frontage.¹ No other details are known about the history of the building’s construction.

There is a famous and extensive fresco decoration by Domenico Fiasella in the rooms on all three floors, showing scenes from the Esther story.² The palace remained in the possession of the original patron’s family until 1855. After it passed into public ownership in 1898, alterations to the interior were carried out. The south-west corner on Via Bensa and Via Sant’Agnese was cut back in order to create space to widen the link street to the Piazza della Nunziata.

To judge by the plans, the originally nine-bay main front of the palace on the Largo della Zecca was at an obtuse angle to the outer south-west window axis. In the Palazzi elevation, however, the outer left bay (right in the engraving) appears to turn in at the plane of the main façade. This not only circumvents the problem of spatial depiction, but also creates a symmetrical and regular façade arrangement. The source of the engraving has not survived, but this manipulation is certainly already the work of the draughtsman and not that of the engraver or editor.

¹. References to this and several additional documents of uncertain content in Poleggi, Documento, 1977, p. 120, n. 39.
127a. Plan of the Ground Floor: Drawing (Fig. 269)

400 x 480 mm.; folded in the middle.

Inscribed in the larger right half of the palace in the rooms in the left section p 25/p 27; p 25/p 20; p 25/p 321/2; in the rooms in the central section portigho (cancelled), above it Portico, p 36/p 271/2; p 36/p 261/2; in the rooms in the right section p 25/p 27; p 25/p 25; p 25/p 261/2; in the smaller left half of the palace in the rooms in the left section p 23/p 32; p 23/p 18; in the rooms in the central section portigho (cancelled), above it Portico, p 20/p 321/2; p 30/p 18; in the rooms in the right section p 20/p 18; p 13; p 20/p 18; on the lower edge pianta del palacio del s' giulio the following word illegible; with a broader pen on the left alongside it XII (cancelled), below it XIX; the ownership note supplemented or corrected by a later hand in darker ink Prima ... palatio ... della Rovere; above right Fig. 55.

128. Plan of the Main Floor: Engraving (Fig. 270)

484 x 460 mm.

Inscribed Figura 56.; XIX. Pianta Seconda del Palazzo del Sigr. Giulio della Rouere.

The engraver has added two niches on the façade in order to make the plan and elevation correspond.

128a. Plan of the Main Floor: Drawing (Fig. 271)

465 x 495 mm.; folded on the left of centre and in the lower third.

Inscribed in the larger right half of the palace in the rooms in the left section p 25/p 27; p 25/p 20; saloto (cancelled), below it Salotto, p 361/2/p 321/2; in the rooms in the central section p 36/27; 12; logia, p 36/26; in the rooms in the right section p 25/p 27; p 25/p 25; p 25/p 261/2; in the adjoining garden giardino, p 110/p 82; in the nymphaeum fontana, p 25/p 22; in the smaller left half of the palace in the rooms in the façade section, starting at the left logia (cancelled), below it loggia, p 23/p 22; p 30/p 22; in the rooms in the rear section p 33/p 18; p 22; p 20/p 18; in the adjoining garden giardino, p 80/p 70; on the lower edge XII; further left XIX; by a later hand in darker ink Pianta Seconda; above right Fig. 56.

129. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 272)

368 x 469 mm.

Inscribed Figura 57.; XIX. Facciata del Palazzo del Sig'. Giulio della Rouere.

129a. Façade Elevation: Drawing

Whereabouts unknown; presumably lost

129b. Façade Elevation: Proof Impression (Fig. 273)

368 x 469 mm.

Inscribed by hand in brown ink on the lower edge Faciata del Palazzo del sig'. Giulio della Rouere; above right I.

The chimney is shown in a side view with perspective foreshortening, which is retouched in the final version to give a purely orthogonal view.

Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Prentenkabinet

The Palazzo Rovere stands on the northeast outskirts of the city walls, formerly opposite the Benedictine convent of S. Caterina, which was demolished at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The commissioning patron was Clemente della Rovere. Giulio della Rovere is named as the owner in the drawings. The palace appears to have been
S. SIRO (XX)

built around 1580–81. The Piazza Rovere in front of it was created in 1587 by the demolition of older buildings. No details of the construction history are known.

The plans show a double palace with separate entrances. Only one room on the ground floor was accessible from both wings. The upper storeys were completely separate from one another. The façade decorations shown in the engraving were probably painted. The two plan drawings and the engraved façade elevation—for which the drawing has not survived—show that the draughtsman has treated his sources fairly freely. The depiction of the façade feigns a rectangular building block with a single façade plane. In fact, however, the two wings of the palace are spatially staggered, and each has its own decorative façades on the Piazza Rovere and Via San Sebastiano. The draughtsman has projected the two façade surfaces, which are parallel but in different planes, to position them alongside one another, and has omitted the section of wall that runs at right angles to them. The plans, however, show the correct situation.

The plan of the first upper floor shows the position of the two gardens, stretching towards the east, which were lost when the Via Roma was laid out in 1874. The difference in level between the entrances on the ground floor and the access to the gardens on the first floor resulted from the sloping site. The drawings suggest that the rooms on the ground floor have windows towards the back in the rear section. Due to the sloping site, windows on that side are not really possible. However, in this position there is no other way in which the rooms could have received light. It is puzzling how the draughtsman could have arrived at such a depiction.

2. The decree and site plan of June 1587 are given in De Simonis, op. cit. (see Literature), pp. 359–361, doc. CCXLVI, and reprinted in Romby, op. cit. (see Literature), pp. 58f. Reference also in Grossi Bianchi—Poleggi, Città, 1987, p. 320, n. 42.

XX. S. SIRO (Nos. 130–131)


130. Ground Plan: Engraving
(Fig. 274)

540 × 304 mm.

Inscribed Figura 58.; XX. Pianta de la Chiesa de S. Ciro de gli Padri Theatini.

Scale 10 palmi = 19 mm; lacking on the drawing (No. 130a).

130a. Ground Plan: Drawing
(Fig. 275)

580 × 395 mm.; folded in the middle.

Inscribed in each of the chapels in the aisles 10/15; in one bay in the left aisle p 24/p 24; in the nave p 36/p 175; in each of the two chapels at the side of the choir p 21/p 21; in the western bay of the choir p 29, in the eastern bay of the choir p 48/p 39; below pianta dela giesia de Sº Siro; alongside it XVIII (cancelled); below it XX; added by a later hand in darker ink towards the right de gli Padri Theatini; below right Fig. 58.
Cat. ill. 54. *S. Siro (XX)*, interior looking east (photo c. 1900)
Cat. ill. 55. S. Siro (XX), ground plan (from Gauthier, Édifices, 1818–32, 1, pl. 102)
131. Façade Elevation: Engraving
(Fig. 276)

302 × 252 mm.
Inscribed Figura 59.; XX. Facciata della Chiesa di S. Ciro de gli Padri Theatini.

131a. Façade Elevation: Drawing
(Fig. 277)

395 × 295 mm.
Inscribed on the lower edge faciata dela giesa di S° Siro; alongside it XVIII; in the lower left corner XX; by Rubens (?) underneath the above inscription, correcting it Chiesa, and further right de Padri Teatini; also by Rubens (?) above Facciata della Chiesa di S° Siro de Padri Teatini; by a later hand in darker ink, above right Fig. 59.

The former Theatine church of S. Siro was built beginning in 1584 on the site of an early Christian cemetery outside the oldest of the city walls. During the Middle Ages, there had been a Benedictine monastery with a Romanesque church here. Until the establishment of the Archbishopric of Genoa in 1133, the earlier building served as the bishopric's church.

The Theatine Order, which had had a community in Genoa since 1572, took over the deserted and badly dilapidated monastery complex in 1575. In 1580, the south aisle collapsed. Plans for a new building were initially postponed due to a lack of funds, but thanks to contributions from private donors, they came to fruition only slightly later. In his annals, Giulio Pallavicino gives June 1584 as the date for the start of work on the church. In the Annali, Andrea Sottani relates that the new building was started in 1586 with the construction of a braccio—probably the south transept, in which the first chapel was installed slightly later. The high altar was consecrated in 1610. In 1613, the shell of the building was complete. The dome was finished in 1619.

The fresco decoration by Giovanni Battista Carlone was largely carried out only after the middle of the century. In July 1670, the high altar with sculptures by Pierre Puget was consecrated.

Unlike the three following churches, S. Siro did not receive financial support exclusively from a single family. Instead, contributions by several families from the Genoese aristocracy enabled the church to be completed. The construction and decoration of the individual chapels and the corresponding parts of the aisle decoration were commissioned by individual private donors. The other parts of the decorative work were also financed privately. For example, the painting of the dome was sponsored by Claudio Spinola, and the decoration of the nave by Ansaldo Pallavicino.

In its type, the building as a basilica with a nave and two aisles and with the arcades of the nave set on coupled columns, served as a model for a series of other churches in Genoa and Liguria (cat. ill. 54). It is not certain who was responsible for the design. The Annali do not name an architect. Alizeri and Da Prato attributed the authorship of the overall design to Vannone. Vannone drew up the plans for the first chapel, the architectural forms of which were followed in the subsequent ones. Colmuto, finally, suggested that the author of the design was the Theatine priest Andrea Riccio.

The ground plan drawing largely corresponds to the actual building (cat. ill. 55). The two chapels at the side of the choir are also correctly reproduced; the south one was planned in 1588. However, differences are seen in the form of the aisle chapels. The draughtsman was apparently using a preliminary design from the period shortly after building began around 1586, which did not include the chapels that were constructed later. The façade elevation also reflects this stage of the project. But construction of the façade shown here was never even begun. Instead, the building was given a plain frontage only articulated by the window and doorway openings, as
shown in a view in Piaggio’s *Monumenta Genuensia*. Today’s façade, with classicising forms, was built in 1821 according to a design by Carlo Barabino.

The only surviving part of the medieval church building, the Romanesque bell tower, was demolished in 1904 as it was in danger of collapsing. The bombing of Genoa during the Second World War caused substantial damage to the building, including complete loss of the decoration of two chapels in the north aisle.


**XXI. SS. ANNUNZIATA DEL VASTATO (Nos. 132–133)**


132. Plan: Engraving (Fig. 278)

586 x 320 mm.

Inscribed Figura 60.; XXI. Pianta della Chiesa dell’Annunziata de Padri Zoccholanti.

Scale 10 palmi = 19 mm.; lacking on the drawing (No. 132a).

The articulation of the façade, which is only faintly indicated in pencil in the drawing, is supplemented in the engraving.

132a. Plan: Drawing (Fig. 279)

580 x 400 mm.; trimmed at top and bottom; folded in the middle.

Inscribed in the chapels in the left aisle p 20/p 21; in one bay each in the left and right aisles p 25; in the nave p 42/p 165; in a chapel in the right aisle p 20; in each of the two outer chapels on the transept p 20/p 30; in each of the inner chapels p 23; in the choir
This former church of the Discalced Carmelites stands in the area called Guasta­
to, outside the northwest city wall of the twelfth century. The earliest settlers on the site were Franciscans, who founded a com­munity here between 1215 and 1219. Slight­ly later, in 1228, they were followed by the Humiliate Order, who built a small mon­astery with a church (S. Marta del Prato). In 1508, Franciscans who had to temporarily vacate their settlement on Castelletto hill moved into the abandoned monastery and began to build a large church, the founda­tion stone of which was laid in July 1520 (S. Francesco del Guastato). In its type, the building followed the style of the churches of the medieval mendicant orders. In 1537, the Minorites of SS. Annunziata di Portoria took over the complex, enlarged the monastery building, and continued work on the church. However, a lack of funds apparently prevented it from being com­pleted quickly. In 1549, one of Genoa's most financially powerful bankers, Adamo Centurione, was persuaded to donate funds for the choir. However, Centurione withdrew from these commitments again in 1567. The report of a visitation in 1582 shows that the church building and decorations had still not been completed due to the shortage of funds.4

This situation changed decisively when, beginning in 1591, Lorenzo Lomellini and his brothers (Filippo and Stefano initially, and from 1616 onward mainly Giacomo Lomellino) became involved as patrons of the church, financing an extension and complete redecoration of the building.5 The church thus came to serve as a family church for the Lomellini di Tabarca. Work on construction and decoration continued over several decades. The church was lengthened, and the interior was redecorated with stucco, marble revetment, and extensive fresco cycles. Domenico Scot­icone and Giovanni Giacomo Porta were in charge of the building work. Giovanni Andrea Ansaldo (dome), Giulio Benso (choir vaulting) and Giovanni and Giovani Battista Carlone (vaulting in the transept and nave) were involved in the fresco deco­ration, most of which was completed by 1638.7 An English traveller, John Raymond, described the effect that this magnificent decoration had on contemporaries: 'But that which surpasseth all, and is of most admiration, is the Chapell of the Annunci­ade, begun to bee built not many yeares since at the expense of one Family, (whose Palace joynes to it) yet is of so incredible richnesse for the red and white Marble Pil­lars, and other ornaments, that one would imagine the revenues of a whole City would not be enough to raise so glorious a Worke as that will be when tis finisht' (cat. ill. 56).8 The building was severely dam­aged during the bombing of Genoa in 1943–44. The decoration of several chapels and parts of the decorated vaulting in the aisles were destroyed.

The representation in the Palazzi di Genova does not correspond to the actual building either in the plan (cat. ill. 57) or in the façade elevation. The nave has six bays. The drawing, however, shows only five, corresponding to the state of the church before the extension work was carried out.9 The chapels at the sides of the choir, with
the simple, oblong shape shown in the ground plan drawing, probably also derive from the building's original state. Instead of the pairs of chapels, a single domed space was ultimately placed on each side. The ground plan drawing therefore does not correspond to the design on which the alterations were finally based, but reflects
an earlier stage of planning, when the existing building was apparently to have been left without extensive changes.

To judge by the elevation in the Palazzi di Genova, the façade was planned as a two-storey decorative screen, crowned with a pediment and articulated with pilasters. The design is the same type of façade, deriving from Roman models, that Taddeo Carlone built between 1609 and 1611 in the church of Nostra Signora della Misericordia near Savona. Ceschi suggested that Carlone was also involved in the planning of SS. Annunziata, and that the set of drawings in the Palazzi di Genova was based on a project of Carlone’s. Scorticone, who later shared responsibility for the alterations, was a pupil of Carlone. However, the façade was ultimately only built in a provisional, very much simplified form. The wall articulation was reduced, and the portal and windows were simply framed. A bell tower was set over each of the two outer façade bays.

The problem of the façade appears to have continued throughout the seventeenth century. Ratti mentions a wooden model of it by Pierre Puget, which was not executed. In 1867, the plain seicento façade finally had a six-columned Ionic portico placed in front of it, based on designs by Carlo Barabino (1834) and G.B. Resasco (1841) (cat. ill. 58).

7. On the programme, see Gavazzi, Decorazione, 1974, pp. 120–130.
S. MARIA ASSUNTA IN CARIGNANO (XXII)


134. Plan: Engraving (Fig. 282)

502 × 400 mm.

Inscribed Figura 62.; XXII. Pianta de Santa Maria de Carignano de Sig'. Sauli.

Scale 10 palmi = 19 mm.; lacking on the drawing (No. 134a).

134a. Plan: Drawing (Fig. 283)

575 × 415 mm.; folded in the centre and on the left edge.

Inscribed in the ground floor of the towers in the four corners of the building 20; in the four smaller domed spaces 35; in the oblong spaces in the four arms p 44; along the longitudinal axis p 170; in the choir p 38/p 51; in the two sacristy rooms at the sides of the choir p 41/20; on the lower edge pianta de la giesa di s° maria de caregnano; left alongside it XIII (cancelled), below it XXII; by a later hand in darker ink on the lower edge Pianta de Santa Maria de Carignano de Sig'. Sauli; below right Fig. 62.
135. Façade Elevation: Engraving
(Fig. 281)

605 x 433 mm.
Inscribed Figura 63.; XXII. Facciata de Santa Maria de Carignano de Sig. Sauli.

135a. Façade Elevation: Drawing

Whereabouts unknown; presumably lost

The church of S. Maria Assunta in Carignano, the most famous post-medieval church building in Genoa and the major work of Alessi’s Genoese period, was founded by a private endowment. In his will of 1481, Bendinello Sauli specified that a church was to be built with earnings from the fortune he had invested with the Compère di S. Giorgio. The church was to provide space for twelve chapels, and it was to be dedicated to the patron saints Santa Maria et Sancti Fabianus et Sebastianus.1 In September 1549, the trustees of the endowment commissioned Galeazzo Alessi to develop designs for the church, the foundation stone of which was laid in March 1552. In April 1552, Alessi was paid ‘pro modellis fabrice ecclesie’.2 In addition to design drawings, a three-dimensional model was probably also prepared. Alessi’s plans were executed under the management of local architects. Bernardo Cantone, Domenico Ponzello and Bernardo Spazio acted as capi d’opera.

Due to commitments in Milan, Alessi was in Genoa only sporadically after 1557, and he supervised the continuing work through an extensive correspondence, in which Cantone was his principal contact.3 The patrons repeatedly expressed their displeasure over the architect’s constant absence, and threatened to discontinue the work. In June 1565, a new contract was signed in which Alessi agreed to be present at the building site from March to October for the next three years.4 Alessi had already received an advance payment in August 1564 for a wooden model of the church. However, he seems never to have supplied the model, since in 1575, three years after his death, the sum still appears in the ledgers as owed by Alessi.5 It was probably a model of the dome, construction of which began in 1567–68.

Alessi’s correspondence ends in 1569. The piers of the dome and the enclosing walls had apparently been completed at this point up to the height of the rafters, and the side domes were finished. Work on the main dome was only completed in 1602. Completion of the interior decoration took several decades. Pierre Puget provided a design for a central baldachin altar, which was not used. Two figures by Puget in the niches of the dome piers were set up in 1668. The Baroque additions to the façade decoration, with a splendid portal frame and two niche figures at the sides, date from 1722.

The two illustrations of the Assunta di Carignano in the Palazzi di Genova show obvious technical weaknesses. Caution is therefore advisable with regard to conjectural sources. Other comparable contemporary drawings are available, but it is difficult to place these in the chronology of the building’s construction.

The ground plan drawing shows several irregularities and asymmetries due to careless draughtsmanship, which were corrected by the engraver. However, the illustration differs from the actual building in several points, as an eighteenth-century drawing shows (cat. ill. 60). The closed semicircular choir is flanked by two oblong sacristy rooms, one on each side. On the exterior of the building, this group of rooms appears as a uniform rectilinear mass. In the drawing, by contrast, the sacristy rooms are set perpendicular to the longitudinal axis, leaving the end of the choir projecting as an apse on the exterior. A similar solution, staggering the choir and the adjoining rooms in a way that makes them readable from the exterior, is found in a drawing of the plan by Alessi accompanying a letter of
In Alessi’s sketch, however, the adjoining rooms lie along the longitudinal axis. Gauthier’s plan is based here on the engraving in the Palazzi di Genova, and not on the actual building. Another significant difference is seen in the shape of the four dome piers. The Palazzi drawing shows the four piers with an almost square shape. In the building, however, the corners of the piers are more bevelled towards the five domed spaces, and the niches are much larger. This difference creates a different spatial impression; the domed areas are more clearly distinguished from the rectangular spatial compartments with coffered barrel vaulting.

In the façade elevation, the weaknesses of the draughtsmanship in the drawing,
which in this case has not survived, are still apparent in the engraving. The elevation combines an orthogonal projection with perspective views of individual parts of the building such as the steps and the upper storeys of the towers. The drum of the dome is shown partly unrolled. It would appear that the draughtsman did not copy the façade view from a single coherent design, but compiled it from various sources. The upper storeys of the towers in particular seem to have been drawn from a three-dimensional model or from the building itself, with the draughtsman having great difficulty in transferring the three-dimensional situation to the two-dimensional surface.

Despite its weaknesses of draughtsmanship, the façade elevation reproduces the exterior as it actually existed at the beginning of the seventeenth century. The draughtsman omitted the four side domes, although he included them in the plan. Otherwise, the façade elevation and the shapes of the dome and towers correspond to the actual building (cat. ill. 59). However, there is a noticeable absence of figurative or sculptural decoration on the façade, and niches for figures are not provided. Whether Alessi intended any sculptural decoration, and if so in what form, can not be conclusively deduced from the planning material that has survived. A façade elevation of uncertain date in the Kunstbibliothek in Berlin, which may be based on a design by Alessi, shows four figures in niches and a framed doorway, the pediment of which is crowned by figures. This form of decoration was not carried out, however. Nor were the finials of the towers and side domes carried out in the form shown in the Berlin drawing. It cannot have been a source for the representation in the Palazzi di Genova.

Rubens’s draughtsman obviously had access to planning material from the Carignano cantiere, and compiled both the ground plan and the elevation from various sources, one of which may have been a three-dimensional model by Alessi. The façade elevation was consequently much closer to the actual building that the plan, which differs in important details.

1. H. Sieveking, Studio sulle finanze genovesi nel medioevo e in particolare sulla casa di S. Giorgio (Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria, XXXVII), Genoa, 1905, pp. 232ff. The text of Bendinello Sauli’s will is also given there, pp. 355-358. The specification of twelve chapels played no part in the later planning.
2. Varni, Spigolature, 1877, p. 3, doc. I.
3. Published ibid., passim.
4. Ibid., pp. 28ff., doc. XVI.
5. Ibid., p. 28, doc. XV. Cf. Saginati, op. cit. (see Literature), p. 335.
6. Illustrated in Varni, Spigolature, 1877, pl. II, and in Alessi e l’architettura, 1975, p. 414, fig. 241. The drawing has been lost.
7. Illustrated in Alessi e l’architettura, 1975, p. 371, fig. 171, and Jacob, op. cit. (see Literature), fig. 43.

XXIII. SS. AMBROGIO E ANDREA (Nos. 136–139)

LITERATURE: Furtenbach, Itinerarium, 1627, p. 195; Ratti, Istruzione, 1766, pp. 31–38; Description... de Gênes, 1768, pp. 13–16; Ratti, Instruzione, 1780, pp. 62–67;

136. Ground Plan: Engraving (Fig. 284)

423 × 265 mm.

Inscribed Figura 64.; XXIII. Pianta de la Chiesa de Padri Jesuiti.
Scale 10 palmi = 19 mm.

The drawing (No. 136a) does not bear any inscriptions giving dimensions. The dimensions were calculated by the engraver using the scale, and entered in the engraving. The ground plan of the façade, which is lacking in the drawing, has also been added.

136a. Ground Plan: Drawing (Fig. 285)

420 × 290 mm.; trimmed at top.
Scale 10 palmi = 19 mm.

Inscribed at bottom secondo questa scala bisogna mettere gli the following word illegible delle misure in questa pianta; below right XXIII; by a later hand in darker ink on the right edge Pianta de la Chiesa de Padri Jesuiti; above right Fig. 64.

137. Façade Elevation: Engraving (Fig. 286)

360 × 285 mm.
Inscribed Figura 65.; XXIII. Facciata de la Chiesa de gli Padri Jesuiti.
Scale 10 palmi = 19 mm.

137a. Façade Elevation: Drawing

Whereabouts unknown; presumably lost

138. Cross Section: Engraving (Fig. 288)

275 × 270 mm.
Inscribed Figura 66.; XXIII. Altar maggiore de la Chiesa de Padri Jesuiti.

138a. Cross Section: Drawing (Fig. 289)

395 × 295 mm.
Inscribed at bottom XXIII, trimmed; by a later hand in darker ink under the image Altar maggiore (Facciata: cancelled) de la Chiesa de gli Padri Jesuiti; above right Fig. 66.

139. Longitudinal Section: Engraving (Fig. 287)

440 × 373 mm.
Inscribed Figura 67.; XXIII. Taglio per fianco de la Chiesa de Padri Jesuiti.
139a. **Longitudinal Section: Drawing**

*Whereabouts unknown; presumably lost*

The former church of the Jesuits in Genoa is documented in greater detail than any other building in the second series, with four plates. In addition to the plan and façade elevation, the set of drawings also includes the only two sectional illustrations in the *Palazzi Moderni*. The cross section looking towards the choir and the longitudinal section towards the north transept each show the position of the two altar-pieces that Rubens painted for the Jesuit church: the *Circumcision of Christ* on the high altar (installed in 1605) and the *Miracle of St Ignatius* on the north transept altar (installed in 1620). The sections both show the architecture of the altar, including the figurative and sculptural decoration. The paintings themselves are not reproduced.

The building was constructed beginning in 1589, replacing an earlier medieval building, the church of S. Ambrogio. Plans had already been made in 1537 to replace this church, which had apparently been dilapidated for some time. Further activity is documented in 1549, but the extent of this is not clear. It does not appear that very much was done, and the documentation ceases at the end of the year. A new building was only begun when the Jesuits took over S. Ambrogio in 1582—the fundamental prerequisite was the financial involvement of the Pallavicino family, primarily Marcello Pallavicino, who was really the church's patron. He had been a member of the Society of Jesus since 1580, working in Rome, and in 1588 he entered the college in Genoa. In November of that year, the decision was taken at his initiative to rebuild the church and the *casa professa*. In 1596, Pallavicino reserved a sum, the annual interest on which, amounting to 8000 lire genovesi, was to finance the completion and decoration of the church and the *casa professa*. In detailed *disposizioni*, he specified that he and his brothers Francesco, Giulio, Cesare and Niccolò, as well as his mother Maddalena Spinola, were to have the status of founders and should be entitled to burial in the choir of the church. The Pallavicino coat of arms was to be displayed on the church and the *casa professa*. The coat of arms is visible in the façade elevation in the *Palazzi di Genova* above the two side doors.

Demolition of the old church began in 1589, and in August of the same year the foundation stone for the new church was laid. The first phase of building lasted until 1592, when the crossing, the transept and part of the nave was consecrated. Difficulties in purchasing additional building land led to delays, and it was only in 1599 that it was possible to start building the choir. The high altar was consecrated on 26 October 1604. In 1606, sufficient progress had been made in building the western portion for construction of the façade to be started. However, the façade was then only constructed as far as the main cornice. It was only in 1621–22 that the dome above the crossing was completed. The painting of the dome and vaulting by Giovanni and Giovanni Battista Carlone took place immediately after building work was finished. The four smaller domes were painted by Lorenzo De Ferrari in the eighteenth century.

Alterations were made to the church's exterior during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The façade decoration was altered after 1848, when the church was rededicated as the parish church of SS. Andrea e Ambrogio. The Jesuit coat of arms was removed, and the figures of St Ignatius and St Francis Xavier were replaced by those of the new patrons. In 1891–92, the upper storeys of the façade were finally completed, following the original design that survived in the elevation in Rubens's book (cat. ill. 61). In the early twentieth century, the area around the church was restructured, leading to the loss of the old sacristy in 1923.

The designs for the church were by Giuseppe Valeriano, the architect of the
Collegio Romano and of the Gesù Nuovo in Naples. Valeriano himself only visited Genoa briefly on a few occasions between the start of building in 1589 and his death in 1596. The design repeats the basic elements of the ground plan arrangement in the Gesù Nuovo. The basic shape of a Greek cross has a square choir added to it in the east and a façade bay in the west, giving the building a longitudinal axis. The basis for the construction, in addition to drawings, may have been a *modello* that is mentioned in a letter of 1592. This was probably the large three-dimensional model of the church, part of which is seen in the left background of a portrait of Marcello Pallavicino. According to Negroni, it was also Marcello Pallavicino who commissioned Rubens to paint the *Circumcision* for the high altar. Pallavicino had the patronage rights for the high altar, which was consecrated in 1604. Rubens’s painting was installed in late 1605. The altar wall received its final appearance only between 1615 and 1617, when the second pair of black marble columns and the crowning pediment were installed (cat. ill. 62). The drawing more or less conforms to the extant building fabric of the choir chapel, differing only in details. The other painting by Rubens, the *Miracle of St. Ignatius*, was ordered by Marcello’s brother Niccolò Pallavicino for the chapel in the north transept. Niccolò had acquired the patronage rights for this altar in 1605. In his will in 1612, he set aside an annual sum of 2000 lire genovesi to complete the decoration of the chapel. Work on decorating it was apparently already in progress at this time. It is not certain when Rubens received the commission. The painting was finally delivered to Genoa from Antwerp in 1620. The remainder of the decoration had still not been completely finished in 1639.

The extent and quality of the documentation of the Jesuit church surpasses that of any of the other buildings in the second series. Rubens had a direct connection with the Pallavicino family, providing him with immediate access to the planning material from the *cantiere*. In addition, the regulated planning procedures for Jesuit buildings ensured the existence of comprehensive planning materials. Every plan for a Jesuit building was prepared in duplicate and presented to the General of the Order in Rome for approval. A set of drawings intended for presentation in Rome probably served as the basis for the copies that were sent to Rubens in Antwerp.

1. In the course of the same year, Bernardo Cantone and Martino da Valmaggia prepared a design, including an estimate for repairs. See Podestà, op. cit. (see Literature), p. 55; Labò, op. cit. 1932 (see Literature), p. 8.

2. In February 1549, Bernardo Cantone and his colleagues, including Giacomo Lurago and Antonio Roderio, contracted to rebuild the church, and during the course of the year received several payments for their work. In May of the same year, Domenico Ponzello received 25 lire ‘pro mercede
modelandi modelum fabrice dicte eclesie'. Cf. Labò, op. cit. 1932, pp. 8f. Reference to the documents in Poleggi, Strada Nuova, 1972, p. 79, n. 34, and in the selected documents on Bernardo Cantone, p. 493, and Domenico Ponzello, ibid., p. 505.


4. See Podestà, op. cit. (see Literature), p. 54; Monti, op. cit., I, pp. 61ff.
6. The priests applied for this purpose to the Padri del Comune, for permission to build on a strip of public land: Podestà, op. cit. (see Literature), p. 54.
7. Pirri, op. cit. (see Literature), pp. 151f.
8. On the programme for the painting, see Gavazza, *Decorazione*, 1974, pp. 112–120.
10. Valeriano is already named as the designer in Giulio Negrone’s *Historia Domus Professae Societatis Jesu Genuae;* cf. Monti, op. cit. (see Literature), I, p. 62. Shortly after acquiring the site of S. Ambrogio in 1582, the Genoese priests had already contacted Valeriano, initially in connection with designs for the building of a college. However, a college building was only constructed several decades later on the hill side of Via Balbi.
11. Pirri, op. cit. (see Literature), pp. 144f.
12. In the sacristy; illustrated in Labò, op. cit. 1932 (see Literature), frontispiece.
17. The arrival of the painting in 1620 is documented both in a note by Negrone in the *Historia* and by a note in the Carrega family archive mentioned by Baschet, which can no longer be located (see A. Baschet, ‘Pierre-Paul Rubens, peintre de Vincent Ier de Gonzague, duc de Mantou: Le séjour à Gênes’, *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, XXIV, 1868, p. 334; *Cat. Exh. Rubens e Genova, 1977*, pp. 232f.).
18. As suggested in *Cat. RIBA, 1976*, p. 170. The drawings of Jesuit buildings held in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris do not include any overall plans for this church in Genoa. There is only a drawing of the chapel of Francis Xavier, which was built north of the choir in 1635. See J. Vallery-Radot, *Le recueil de plans d’édifices de la Compagnie de Jésus conservé à la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris* (Bibliotheca Instituti Historicis S.I., XV), Rome, 1960, p. 103, no. 395.
APPENDIX I

Texts published in the first edition of Palazzi di Genova, 1622

I.1 Rubens's Dedication

AL ILLUSTRISS. SIGNOR ET PADRON MIO COLENDISS.
IL SIGNOR DON CARLO GRIMALDO

ILLUSTRISSIMO SIGNORE, mi parerebbe di far torto à V.S. Ilustrissima, se mandando io in luce questa poca racolta d'alcuni Palazzi più famosi della bellissima città di Genova sua Patria, ciò non facesi sotto il Titolo i Padrocinio di V.S. Illustrissima, ch'è tanto universale e curiosa d'ogni sorte de virtù e scienza, ch'à punto pare ch'ella habbia una capacità d'ingegno tanto felice che lei sola possa intendere, quanto tutti gli altri bei spiriti insieme. I perciò la supplico, sia servita d'agradire questa mia divotione verso lei, & di dare mediante il favor suo qualche reputazione à questa operetta: la quale ancor che minima, ha però questo à proposito ch'ella tratta di cose concernenti à l'honor della sua Patria; & farà fede al mondo della singoiar affettion mia verso di quella. Alla qual in genere, si come à V.S. Illustrissima in particolare, mi professò per sempre

D'Anversa, alli 29. di Maggio, 1622

Humilissimo servitore

Pietro Paolo Rubens

Translation of Appendix I.1:

TO THE MOST ILLUSTRIOUS GENTLEMAN AND MY MOST ESTEEMED PATRON
SIGNOR DON CARLO GRIMALDO.

Most illustrious Sir, it seems that I would do you a wrong, if, in publishing this small collection of a few of the most famous palaces of your exceedingly beautiful native city Genoa, I would not do so under your noble patronage. You are so universal and interested in every kind of artistic skill and science; you seem to have such a felicitous endowment of intellect, that you alone can comprehend as much as all the other great minds together. I therefore beg of you to accept this sign of my devotion to you and to give, by means of your favour, some repute to this little work: which, though a small matter, nonetheless, appropriately enough, deals with subjects concerning the honour of your native city; and it will bear witness to the world of my special affection for it. To your city in general, as well as to yourself in particular, I declare myself for always

Antwerp, the 29th of May 1622

Your most humble servant

Peter Paul Rubens
APPENDIX 1.2

1. The addressee of the dedication, Carlo Grimaldi, cannot be identified with any certainty, and the nature of his connection to Rubens is also unclear. The genealogical tables of Natale Battilana indicate two members of the Grimaldi family with this name: a son from the marriage of Giovanni Battista Grimaldi q. Giovanni Giacomo with Maddalena Spinola q. Andrea, as well as a son from the union of Luca Grimaldi q. Luca with Maria Spinola Grimaldi q. Giacomo (N. Battilana, Genealogie delle famiglie nobili di Genova, II, 1826, carta 17 and carta 20). The former was the grandnephew of Giovanni Battista Grimaldi q. Girolamo Cardinale, whose famous villa in Bisagno appears as Palazzo H of the first series of engravings.

I.2 Rubens’s Foreword

AL BENIGNO LETTORE

vediamo che in queste parti, si vâ poco à poco invecchiando & abolendo la maniera d’Architettura, che si chiama Barbara, o Gothica; & che alcuni bellissimi ingegni introducono la vera simmetria di quella, conforme le regole de gli antichi, Graeci e Romani, con grandissimo splendore & ornamento della Patria; come appare nelli Tempij famosi fatti di fresco dalla venerabil Società di IESU, nelle città di Bruselles & Anversa. Li quali se per la dignità del Ufficio divino meritamente doveano essere i primi à cangiarse in meglio; non però perciò si devono negliger li edificij privati, poi che nella quantità loro subsiste il corpo di tutta la città. Oltra che la commodità dell’edificij quasi sempre concorre colla bellezza e meglior forma di quelli. Mi è parso donque di fare una opera meritoria verso il ben publico di tutte le Provincie Oltramontane, producendo in luce disegni da me raccolti nella mia perergrinatione Italica, d’alcuni Palazzi della superba città di Genova. Perché sì come quella Republica è propria de Gentilhuomini, così le loro fabbriche sono bellissime e commodissime, à proporsione più tosto de famiglie benche numerose de Gentilhuomini particolari, che di una Corte d’un Principe assoluto. Come si vede per esempio nel Palazzo de Pitti in Fiorenza, & il Farnesiano in Roma, la Cancellaria, Caprorola, & infiniti altri per tutta l’Italia, si come ancora la famosissima fabbrica della Regina Madre nel borgo di S. Germano à Parigi. Li quali tutti eccedono di grandezza, di sito e spesa, le facoltà de Gentilhuomini privati. Mà io vorrei servire al uso commune, e più tosto giovare à molti ch’à pochi. Et perciò faremo la distinzione de questa maniera, che chiamaremo Palazzo di un Principe assoluto, quello che haverà il Cortile in mezzo, & la fabbrica tutta attorno, di capacità competente ad allogiar una Corte: & in contrario sarà detto da noi Palazzo à casa privata, pur grande e bella ch’ella sia, quella che haverà la forma di un cubo solido col salone in mezzo, à vero repartito in appartamenti contigu i senza luce fra mezzo, come sono la maggior parte tutti li Palazzi Genovesi. E ben vero che tra questi edificij ch’io vi rappresento, sono alcuni ch’anno de Cortilotti particolarmente di villa, mà non sono di quella maniera che sì è detta di sopra. Se daranno donque in questa mia Operetta le piante alzati e portili con li loro tagli in croce, d’alcuni Palazzi da me raccolti in Genova, con qualche fatica e spesa & alcun buon rincontro di potermi prevalere in parte delle altrui fatiche. Ho posto li numeri & misure di ciascun membro, non per tutto, mà dove si hanno potuto havere: li quali quando tal volta non corrispondessero così à punto alle misure del Sesto, bisognarà in ciò usar della discrezione, & iscusar il disegnatore & intagliatore, per esser le figure alquanto minute. Sarà ben ancora d’adverire, che le quattro Reggioni non sono poste d’ordine consueto, girando di Levante verso Ponente, ansi al roverscio, derivando questo inconveniente dalla stampa. Egli è però un scrupolo di poca conseguenza. Non habbiamo posti li nomi de Padroni, perchè ogni cosa in questo mondo

Permutat dominos, & transit in altera iura.

si come alcuni de questi Palazzi si sono già alienati d’alli primi loro possessori, & à dire il vero, appresso li disegni non c’erano i nomi, eccetto di due che si sono posti, come io credo à caso,
per esser notissimi in strada nova. Del resto vi rimetto alle figure; le quali si forse pareranno poche, saranno però lodovoli, per esser le prime che siano fin adesso comparse nella luce pubblica: e si come ogni principio è debbole, daranno forse animo ad altri di far cose maggiori.

Pietro Paolo Rubens

Translation of Appendix 1.2:

TO THE KIND READER

We observe in these parts, that the manner of architecture that is called Barbaric or Gothic is gradually becoming obsolete and being abolished; and that a few outstanding talents are introducing the true symmetry of that which conforms to the rules of the ancients, Greeks and Romans, to the great splendour and ornament of our native land. This is evident, for instance, in the famous, newly constructed churches of the venerable Society of JESUS in the cities of Brussels and Antwerp. It becomes the dignity merited by the Divine Office that the churches should be the first buildings to change for the better; one must not, however, neglect private buildings, because in their quantity they constitute the fabric of the entire city. In addition, the commodiousness of buildings almost always contributes to their beauty and good design. It seemed to me, therefore, to be performing a meritorious deed for the kind public in all of the transalpine provinces, in publishing the designs of some of the palaces of the splendid city of Genoa which I collected during my journeys through Italy. For as this republic belongs to the gentlemen, thus their buildings are most beautiful and commodious, in proportion, however, to the households of private gentlemen, even if they be large, rather than to the court of an absolute prince. One sees the latter, for example, in the Pitti Palace in Florence, and the Farnese Palace in Rome, the Cancellaria, Caprarola, and infinite others all across Italy, as well as in the extremely famous building of the Queen Mother in the Faubourg St. Germain in Paris. All of which exceed in grandeur, situation, and expense the means of private gentlemen. But I would like to serve the commonweal, and be useful to many rather than to few. And for this reason we shall make the distinction between the type of building which we will call that of an absolute prince, which has a courtyard in the middle and the building all around, of a size able to house a court: and, on the other hand, we will call a private palace or house, as grand and beautiful as it may be, that which has the form of a solid cube with a large hall in the centre, or else is divided into contiguous apartments without light coming from the middle; as are the vast majority of Genoese palaces. It is true that among these buildings that I depict here there are some which have a small courtyard, particularly among the villas, but these are not of the kind discussed above. This little work of mine, therefore, will give the plans, elevations, longitudinal and cross sections of some palaces which I collected in Genoa; this involved some trouble and expense, yet some fortunate encounters allowed me to take advantage, in part, of others' efforts. I have recorded the numbers and measures of the individual building parts: not in every case, but where they were to be had. If they occasionally do not correspond exactly to the actual measures, it will be necessary to show some consideration and excuse the draughtsman and engraver, since the figures are rather small. It will also be good to note that the four compass points are not placed in their usual order, going from east to west, but rather reversed, this inconvenience deriving from the printing. This is, however, a drawback of little consequence. We have not indicated the names of the owners, because everything in this world

Permutat dominos, & transit in altera iura.

Thus, some of these palaces have already been transferred from the possession of their first
owners. And to tell the truth, the names were not on the drawings except for the two where the names are noted; by chance, I believe, since they are very well known in the Strada Nuova. For the rest I refer you to the figures; these may perhaps seem few, but they are praiseworthy for being the first that have been published up until now. And since all beginnings are weak, they will perhaps inspire others to do greater things.

Peter Paul Rubens

1. For the commentary regarding the theoretical positions of the foreword, see above, Chapter I, pp. 53ff.
2. The cornerstone for the Jesuit church in Brussels was laid in 1606 by the regents Albert and Isabella. After interruptions, construction resumed in 1616 under the direction of Jacques Francart, and the church was consecrated in 1621. The building was demolished in 1812. The Jesuit church in Antwerp, where Rubens himself played an important role in the design and decoration, was begun in 1615 and, with the exception of the two side chapels, was also consecrated in 1621. Both churches are indebted to Roman models, particularly in elevation. The facades with stacked orders are among the earliest examples of this type north of the Alps.
3. Rubens had probably personally seen all four of the aristocratic Italian palaces mentioned here. The Palazzo Pitti in Florence, begun in 1458 for Luca Pitti, came into the possession of the Medici in 1549 and was subsequently enlarged to become the residence of the Dukes of Tuscany. Beginning in 1560, two rear wings were added toward the garden under Ammanati's direction. As a three-winged complex with a large, three-storied courtyard, it corresponded to the type that Rubens cites as that of a princely residence. The Roman examples also correspond to this pattern, even if the patrons here were by no means princes, but rather cardinals and papal favourites: the Palazzo della Cancelleria (begun around 1485 for the cardinal camerlengo Raffaele Riario) and the Palazzo Farnese (begun in 1514 for Cardinal Alessandro Farnese) as four-winged complexes with large central courtyards, the Palazzo Farnese in Caprarola (begun in 1559 according to plans by Vignola for the younger Cardinal Alessandro Farnese) as a pentagonal complex with a round central courtyard.
4. The Palais du Luxembourg was constructed beginning in 1615 under the direction of Salomon de Brosse on the Left Bank as a residence for Marie de' Medici. The model for the design of the palace was, according to the wishes of the regent, the residence of her family in Florence, the Palazzo Pitti. In 1622 Rubens received the commission for the painting cycles decorating the two galleries in the side wings of the palace. Only the first portion of the commission was fully executed. The 24 paintings with the life and deeds of Marie de' Medici hung in the west gallery of the Palais du Luxembourg until 1815 (since then in the Louvre).
5. Horace, Epist. II, 2, 170-174:
Sed vocal usque suum, qua populus adsita certis/limitibus vicina refugit iurgia: tamquam/sit proprium quicquam, puncto quod mobilis horae/nunc prece, nunc pretio, nunc vi, nunc morte suprae/permuet dominos et cedat in altera iura. (Yet he calls it all his own, up to where the poplars, planted beside fixed boundaries, prevent the wrangling of neighbours: just as though anything were one's own, which in a moment of flitting time, now by prayer, now by purchase, now by force, now - at the last - by death, changes owners and passes under the power of another. [Translation: H. Rushton Fairclough]).
6. Rubens here means the two last palaces, Palazzo Doria Tursi (see No. 67) and Palazzo Cambiaso (see No. 68). These are the only engravings of the first series in which the names of the original patrons or current owners are given.

I.3 Imprimatur

CENSURA

QUOD praesenti Libro sumptuosa Aedificiorum fastigia, & ad miraculum stupendae Fabricarum moles, quibus SUPERBA hoc nomine Ligurum civitas GENUA ornatur, arte & ingenio Excellent. V. PETRI PAULI RUBENII, Belgiae nostrae Apellis, in imagine repraesententur: eaque ratione non modo ipsius urbis alia celebrissimae magnificentia, & notus orbi splendor magis innotescat; sed & omnibus Architectae cultoribus & admiratoribus, ad nova & illustria operum miracula patrand in imagine repraesententur: eaque ratione non modo ipsius urbis alia celebrissimae magnificentia, & notus orbi splendor magis innotescat; sed & omnibus Architectae cultoribus & admiratoribus, ad nova & illustria operum miracula patrand in imagine repraesententur: eaque ratione non modo ipsius urbis alia celebrissimae magnificentia, & notus orbi splendor magis innotescat; sed & omnibus Architectae cultoribus & admiratoribus, ad nova & illustria operum miracula patrand in imagine repraesententur: eaque ratione non modo ipsius urbis alia celebrissimae magnificentia, & notus orbi splendor magis innotescat; sed & omnibus Architectae cultoribus & admiratoribus, ad nova & illustria operum miracula patrand in imagine repraesententur: eaque ratione non modo ipsius urbis alia celebrissimae magnificentia, & notus orbi splendor magis innotescat; sed & omnibus Architectae cultoribus & admiratoribus, ad nova & illustria operum miracula patrand in imagine repraesententur: eaque ratione non modo ipsius urbis alia celebrissimae magnificentia, & notus orbi splendor magis innotescat; sed & omnibus Architectae cultoribus & admiratoribus, ad nova & illustria operum miracula patrand in imagine repraesententur: eaque ratione non modo ipsius urbis alia celebrissimae magnificentia, & notus orbi splendor magis innotescat; sed & omnibus Architectae cultoribus & admiratoribus, ad nova & illustria operum miracula patrand in imagine repraesententur: eaque ratione non modo ipsius urbis alia celebrissimae magnificentia, & notus orbi splendor magis innotescat; sed & omnibus Architectae cultoribus & admiratoribus, ad nova & illustria operum miracula patrand in imagine repraesententur: eaque ratione non modo ipsius urbis alia celebrissimae magnificentia, & notus orbi splendor magis innotescat; sed & omnibus Architectae cultoribus & admiratoribus, ad nova & illustria operum miracul
Cum Privilegio Regis Christianissimi, Serenissimorum Belgicae Principum, & Ordinum Bataviae.

Translation of Appendix 1.3:

IMPRIMATUR

In the present book, thanks to the artistic skill and the intellectual power of the excellent Peter Paul Rubens, the Apelles of our land of Belgium, the splendid facades and wonderful complexes of those buildings that are the ornament of the Ligurian city Genoa, that bears the name Superba, come to be represented in illustrations; and since in this way not only the great esteem of this city, exceedingly famous even beyond its own borders, and the splendour known to the entire world might be spread still farther, but also all cultivators and admirers of architecture might receive examples placed in front of them with the purpose of bringing about new and illustrious works of wonder, I deem the publication as most worthy. Antwerp, the 28th of April 1622.

LAURENT BEYERLINCK, Canon and Archpriest of the cathedral of Antwerp, book censor.¹

1. Laurent Beyerlinck (1578-1627) belonged to the chapter of the cathedral of Antwerp and appeared as author of a number of historical and theological works. As early as 1607 he had issued the imprimatur for Philip Rubens's Electorium libri duo. In 1621 Rubens dedicated the engraving of the Martyrdom of St. Lawrence to him. Beyerlinck thus belonged to the small circle of people to whom Rubens would afford such an honour: people who not only enjoyed the trust and friendship of the artist, but who also wielded political influence.
APPENDIX II

Extracts from Rubens's Correspondence

II.1 Letter from Rubens to Pieter van Veen, 19 June 1622

(Published by Rooses—Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, II, 1898, doc. CCLXIV, pp. 444-445; Cotta, Lettere, 1987, no. 42, pp. 111-112.)

Molto Illus" Sign' mio Osser"mo.

Ho tardato tanto di rispondere a V.S. per certi impedimenti de viaggi et altro. Adesso intendo dalla sua amorevolissima del 12 di maggio quali siano delle mie stampe che li mancano; che mi dispiacque esser poche non havendo noi qual'anni in qua fatto cosa alcuna per il disviamento del mio intagliatore; pur quelle poche che sono le mandarò molto volatieri, le quali sono un S. Francisco che riceve li stigmati, che fu intagliato alquanto rozzamente per esser la prima prova, il ritorno della Madonna col figliuolo Jesù d'Egitto, una Madonna picciola che baccia il Bambino che mi par buona, et ancora una Susanna che stimo tra le megliori, et una imagine grande della caduta di Lucifero che non è riuscita male, et ancora la uscita di Loth colla moglie e figliuoli di Sodoma, che fu intagliata da principio ch'egli venne a star meco. Ho ancora una battaglia d'Amazoni di sei pezzi alla quale manchano pochi giorni di lavoro, che non posso cavare delle mani di costui, benché sono tre anni che l'opera è pagata. Vorrei poterla mandare a V.S. insieme colle altre ma c'è poca apparenza di poterlo fare così presto. Ho pubblicato ancora un libro d'architettura de più belli palazzi di Genoua de qualche 70 foglie insieme colle piante, ma non so se V.S. se ne dilettà; mi sarebbe caro d'intendere la sua mente circa questo, et che la desse ordine a qualche barcarolo messaggero suo amico al quale io potessi consigniar queste cose, altrimenti costaranno troppo di porto. Ho caro che la habbia trovato quel segreto di disegnare sopra il rame in fondo biancho sì come faceva il sig' Adamo Elzehamer; per incavarlo poi co l'acqua forte lui metteva come una pasta biancha sopra il rame, et poi scalpendo col ago sino sopra il rame, essendo quello un poco rossiccio di natura pareva ch'egli dessignasse col lapis rosso in carta biancha. Io non mi ricordo delli ingredienti di quella pasta, benché mi li disse amorevolmente. Intendo ch'el Sigr Ottavio Veen suo fratello ha messo in stampa un'operetta anonima della "Teoria universale" o simil cosa, il quale io desidererei summanente di vedere et se V.S. fosse servita di communicarmela, dovendo lei senza dubbio haver un esemplare, io l'haverei summanente caro et l'accettarei sotto parola di buono da bene di tenere questo suo favore secretissimo senza parlarne con buono vivente se così è necessario.

Et per fine baccio a V.S. con tutto il cuore le mani et le prego del cielo ogni felicità e contentezza.

[Date and complimentary close]

Translation of Appendix II.1:

Most Illustrious and Honoured Sir

I have been delayed so long in answering you because of travelling and other hindrances. I now learn from your very kind letter of the 12th of May which of my prints you lack. I am sorry I have so few; for some years we have done almost nothing, on account of the mental disorder of my engraver. However, what few there are I shall gladly send you.

These are: a St. Francis receiving the stigmata, engraved somewhat coarsely, since it is a first
attempt; the Return from Egypt of the Madonna with the Child Jesus; a little Madonna kissing the Child – a plate that seems good to me; and also a Susanna, which I count among the best; a large print of the Fall of Lucifer, which did not turn out badly; and the Flight of Lot with his wife and daughters from Sodom, a plate made when the engraver first came to work with me. I have also a Battle of the Amazons in six sheets, which requires only a few more days' work, but I cannot get it out of the hands of this fellow, although he was paid for the engraving three years ago. I should like to be able to send this to you with the others, but there is little likelihood that I can do it so soon.

I have also published a book on architecture, of the most beautiful palaces of Genoa - about 70 folios, together with the plans, but I do not know whether this would please you. I should like very much to know your opinion on it. I beg you to give orders to some boatman or messenger of your acquaintance, to whom I could entrust these things. Otherwise the transportation will cost too much.

I am glad that you have found that method of drawing on copper, on a white ground, as Adam Elsheimer used to do. (As I imagine, but perhaps you have a still better method than that.) Before he etched the plate with acid, he covered it with a white paste. Then when he engraved with the needle through to the copper, which is somewhat reddish by nature, it seemed like drawing with a red chalk on white paper. I do not remember the ingredients of this paste, although he very kindly told me.

I hear that M. Otto van Veen, your brother, has published a little anonymous work on the Universal Theory, or something of the sort, I should like very much to see this, and if it should be possible for you to lend it to me (for doubtless you have a copy), this would be very agreeable to me. I should accept it on my word of honor to keep this favor a complete secret, without speaking of it to a living soul, in case secrecy is necessary.

In closing, I kiss your hands with all my heart, and pray heaven to grant you every happiness and contentment.
Your affectionate servant,

Peter Paul Rubens.

II.2 Letter from Peiresc to Rubens, 1 July 1622 (extract)

(Published by Rooses—Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, II, 1898, p. 453, doc. CCLXVIII.)

... Rendo gratie a V.S. della raccolta de'Palazzi di Genoa, giudicando che non possa essere se non cosa nobilissima, poi che V.S. n'a fatto la scelta. Non mancherò d'avisarne il Sr Abbate,1 et con tal occasione premer la speditione deli suoi memoriali et misure, dispiacendomi assai di non havere potuto attendere si come ne anco alli negozii del Sr P' Parente e del pitture, ma la mia lite non mi lascia vita, spero per la settimana prossima che V.S. n'havera qualche miglior riuscita . . .

Translation of Appendix II.2:

... I thank you for the collection of the Palazzi di Genova, that I judge to be a very fine thing, which indeed cannot be otherwise, since you made the selection. I will not neglect to tell the Monsieur Abbot of it, and on this occasion urge him to send his memorandum and the dimensions to you. I regret very much that I have not been able to attend to this affair, nor
to the business with Monsieur Paul Parent and the paintings, but my lawsuit leaves me no time. I hope that you will obtain better results in the matter next week...

1. Claude Maugis, the Abbé de St Ambroise; see above, Chapter III, p. 99.

II.3 Letter from Peiresc to Rubens, 21 July 1622 (extract)

(Published by Rooses—Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, II, 1898, pp. 468-469, doc. CCLXXIII.)

... Io non so se V.S. trovarebbe a proposito di far presentare al S'r Brosse un esemplare del suo libro de' Palazzi di Genoa, et quando non le fosse grave di mandarne uno ancora al S' di Lomenie, io credo che sarebbe molto bene perció che gli diletta di cose tali; poiché il libro non e vecchio anzi da V.S. nuovamente dato in luce par ch'ella habbia certo obiigo di presentare a qualche amico di qua si come alli suoi di là.

Del resto, se V.S. mi degnasse mandare un pollicina dove fossero i nomi de' padroni de' Palazzi di Genoa, ella mi farebbe gran piacere, m'imaginationi, che se ben ella per buoni rispetti non gli ha voluto nominare ne suoi rami, nulladimeno poi ch'ella e stata in Genoa con quel disegno, havera havuto la curiosità di sapere gli padroni per suo gusto particolare, si come gli vorei saper anch'io.

Translation of Appendix II.3:

I do not know if you would find it appropriate to have a copy of your book of the Palazzi di Genova presented to Monsieur Brosse, and if it is not too much to send one also to Monsieur de Loménie. I believe that this would be very good, since he enjoys such things. For as the book is not yet old but rather just recently published by you, it seems to me that you have a certain obligation to present it to a few friends here, as well as to your friends there.

For the rest, if you would deign to send me a list with the names of the patrons and owners of the Palazzi di Genova, it would please me very much. I imagine that, although you had good reasons for not wanting to name them on your engravings, nonetheless when you were in Genoa working on this project you would have been curious to know the names of their owners for your personal pleasure, as I too would like to know them.

1. Salomon de Brosse; see above, Chapter III, p. 99 n. 44.
2. Henri-Auguste de Loménie; see above, Chapter III, p. 99 n. 45.

II.4 Letter from Peiresc to Rubens, 8 September 1622 (extract)

(Published by Rooses—Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, III, 1900, pp. 32-33, doc. CCLXXXVIII.)

... J'ay receu en fagot les trois exemplaires des Palais de Gênes et en ay présenté un a M' de Loménie qui vous en scâit tout bon gré. M. Brosse est à Vernueil; à son retour je lui enverray le livre et à M. Berthelot.

Translation of Appendix II.4:

I have received the three copies of the Palazzi di Genova in a bundle and given one of them to Monsieur de Loménie who is very grateful to you for it. Monsieur Brosse is in Verneuil; when he returns I will send the book to him, and to Monsieur Berthelot.

1. Guillaume Berthelot; see above, Chapter III, p. 99 n. 44.
II.5 Letter from Peiresc to Rubens, 15 September 1622 (extract)
(Published by Rooses—Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, III, 1900, p. 38, doc. CCLXXXIX.)

... Il S' Bertelotto ha havuto il suo essemplare de' Palazzi di Genoa et lene rende infinite gratie.

Translation of Appendix II.5:
Monsieur Berthelot received his copy of the Palazzi di Genova and expresses his infinite thanks to you for it.

II.6 Letter from Peiresc to Rubens, 30 September 1622 (extract)
(Published by Rooses—Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, III, 1900, p. 50, doc. CCXCI.)

... Un amico mio venendo da me in absenza mia et trovando su la tavola il libro di V.S. de' Palazzi me lo prese et mi disse poi che non me lo voleva più rendere di maniera che V.S. n'havera da perdere ancora un essemplare, ma la prego di aggiungervi li nomi de fondatori et padroni che saranno della sua notizia, et di gratia mi scusi la troppo gran liberta.

Translation of Appendix II.6:
... A friend of mine came to my house in my absence and found your Palazzi book on the table. He took it with him and later told me that he does not intend to return it to me. So you will have to part with another copy of it. I beg of you, however, to add the names of the original patrons and current owners to it, insomuch as you know them, and graciously excuse the all too great liberty of my request.

II.7 Letter from Peiresc to Rubens, 1 December 1622 (extract)
(Published by Rooses—Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, III, 1900, p. 85, doc. CCIC.)

... La ringratio delli nomi delli authori de' Palazzi di Genoa, et quando ella sapra gli altri che mancano mi fara gratia di nominarmeli...

Translation of Appendix II.7:
... I thank you for the names of the originators of the Palazzi di Genova, and when you come to know of the others that are missing, please be so good as to tell them to me

II.8 Letter from Peiresc to Rubens, 8 December 1622 (extract)
(Published by Rooses—Ruelens, Correspondance, 1887-1909, III, 1900, pp. 94-95, doc. CCC.)

[Salutation]
Sonno venute molto tardi questa volta le lettere di V.S. di 2 del corrente et ormai hieri l'altro era gionta la cassetta con duoi esemplari de suoi Palazzi di Genoa... 
Nella cassetta ne furoi non si trovò alcuna lettera di V.S. e V.S. non m'ha scritto che me ricorde, che le piace che si faccia dell'uno di quei esemplare, l'altro ritenendolo per me, poi che così ella l'ha voluto: n'aspetterò dunque il suo ordine et in tanto le renderò mille gratie del mio et della briga toltasi per quel roetto de S' des Granges, si come anco deli cortesiss' officii usati a favor di suo serv' con li SS'd du Maurier et Regensberg...
Translation of Appendix II.8:

Your letters from the 2nd of this month arrived very late this time, and now the day before yesterday the box got here with two copies of your *Palazzi di Genova*.

There was no letter from you along with the box, and I do not remember that you wrote telling me what you would like done with the second copy. I will keep one copy for myself, since this is what you wished, and accordingly I will wait for your further instructions. Meanwhile, I thank you very much for my copy and also for the troubles you took with the gun of Monsieur De Granges, as well as for the most courteous services which you employed in my favour with Monsieurs Du Maurier and Regensberg.

II.9 Letter from Peiresc to Rubens, 22 December 1622 (extract)
(Published by Rooses—Ruelens, *Correspondance*, 1887-1909, III, 1900, p. 101, doc. CCCII.)

... Et la ringratio del suo doppio esemplare dei Palazzi de Genoa, vergognoso ch'ella ecceda de tanta cortesia verso di me, che hò poco facoltà di far lo scambio dovuto...

Translation of Appendix II.9:

... And I thank you for the two copies (or double copy) of the *Palazzi di Genova*, ashamed that you overwhelm me with such courtesies, while I have little means to return the favour...
APPENDIX III
Editions of the *Palazzi di Genova*

*Palazzi di Genova* [Antwerp, 1622]
Contains dedication, foreword, imprimatur and the 72 plates of the first series of engravings.

*Palazzi di Genova* [Antwerp, after 1622]

*Palazzi antichi (moderni) di Genova raccolti e designati da Pietro Paolo Rubens*, Antwerp: Jacob Meursius, 1652

*Palazzi antichi (moderni) di Genova raccolti e designati da Pietro Paolo Rubens*, Antwerp: Jacob Meursius, 1663

*Palazzi antichi (moderni) di Genova raccolti e designati da Pietro Paolo Rubens*, Antwerp: Hendrik and Cornelius Verdussen, 1708
Contains foreword, imprimatur and the 139 plates of both series of engravings in reversed order.

*Architecture italienne, contenant les plans et elevations des plus beaux palais et edifices de la ville de Genes levé et dessiné par le celebre P.P. Rubens, troisieme edition augmenté d’un abregé de la vie de l’auteur*, Amsterdam-Leipzig: Arkstée and Merkus, 1755
Contains dedication and foreword, both translated into French, Rubens’s biography by Jean Baptiste Descamps and the 139 plates of both series of engravings in reversed order.

MODERN REPRINTS

*Palazzi moderni di Genova raccolti e designati de Pietro Paolo Rubens*, Genoa, 1955


Peter Paul Rubens, *Palazzi di Genova*, Unterschneidheim, 1969


1. See also above, Introduction, pp. 18–20
This complete edition of the works of Rubens discusses and reproduces all his paintings, sketches and drawings, as well as the woodcuts and prints executed for and supervised by the master. The Corpus is based on the material assembled over several decades by Ludwig Burchard, who was universally recognized as the foremost scholar in this field. After Dr Burchard's death in 1960, his material was handed over to the city of Antwerp and is now being edited by the 'Centrum voor de Vlaamse Kunst van de 16' en de 17' Eeuw', under the direction of Carl van de Velde, President of the Centre.

The Corpus consists of twenty-seven parts, each of which deals with a particular commission or group of subjects (see back of this jacket). Each part is edited by a well-known scholar, who, while basing himself on the material accumulated by Ludwig Burchard, also contributes the result of his own studies and incorporates any information which has come to light since 1960. The Corpus may thus be considered as the completion of Burchard's unfinished work by a younger generation of scholars. Their collaboration will help to ensure that the series will remain true to Burchard's intention of embodying all present-day knowledge of the work of Rubens.

Some Reviews:

Part XIII(1): Subjects from History
Winner of The Mitchell Prize for the History of Art
"... the latest contribution to the most scholarly enterprise of our time devoted to that artist ... Elizabeth McGrath is one of those exceptional writers who combine wide learning with tact and acute visual sensitivity and convey the results of their research with clarity and wit ... It is rare to come across a scholarly monograph in which erudite discussions of attribution and iconography enhance one's pleasure in pictures. This one does." Francis Haskell in The Burlington Magazine

Part XXIII: Copies after the Antique
'Marjon van der Meulen's monumental three-volume study of Rubens' drawings after the antique is published and illustrated according to the lavish standards of the series.' The Burlington Magazine

"The real contribution of the volumes is the encyclopedic gathering of all the evidence. It is the assembly of images and sources that renders these three volumes the key reference for a topic that was of fundamental importance for the painter." The Art Newspaper

Part XXIV: The Costume Book
'Kristin Belkin's edition of the Costume Book is exemplary. Her introduction is thoughtful, careful and clear, even the complicated matter of the pagination. Her entries on individual pages are comprehensive and well arranged.' Journal of the Royal Society of Arts
The Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard

is divided into the following twenty-seven Parts:

I. THE CEILING PAINTINGS FOR THE JESUIT CHURCH IN ANTWERP*
II. THE EUCHARIST SERIES*
III. THE OLD TESTAMENT*
V. THE LIFE OF CHRIST BEFORE THE PASSION: THE INFANCY OF CHRIST
VI. THE PASSION OF CHRIST*
VII. THE LIFE OF CHRIST AFTER THE PASSION*
VIII. SAINTS*
IX. THE DECORATION OF THE TORRE DE LA PARADA*
X. THE ACHILLES SERIES*
XI. MYTHOLOGICAL SUBJECTS
XII. ALLEGORIES AND SUBJECTS FROM LITERATURE
XIII. SUBJECTS FROM HISTORY (1)*
XIV. THE MARIA DE MEDICI AND HENRI IV SERIES
XV. THE WHITEHALL CEILING
XVI. THE DECORATIONS FOR THE POMPA INTROITUS FERDINANDI*
XVII. GENRE, STILL LIFE AND INTERIORS
XVIII. LANDSCAPES AND HUNTING SCENES I* & II*
XIX. PORTRAITS I*, II* & III
XX. HEADS AND ANATOMICAL STUDIES
XXI. BOOK ILLUSTRATION AND TITLE PAGES*
XXII. ARCHITECTURE AND SCULPTURE (1): PALAZZI DI GENOVA*
XXIII. COPIES AFTER THE ANTIQUE*
XXIV. THE COSTUME BOOK*
XXV. COPIES AND ADAPTATIONS FROM RENAISSANCE AND LATER ARTISTS
XXVI. DRAWINGS NOT RELATED TO THE ABOVE SUBJECTS
XXVII. ADDENDA, CORRIGENDA AND INDEXES

*Already published