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2. ARCHITECTURE, DECORATION AND TYPOLOGY OF THE PALAZZETTO FARNESE

Architecture of the Palazzetto

Sources on the decoration of the Camerino are silent on the spatial and architectural context of Lanfranco's decoration. Since the room was hardly accessible during Farnese's lifetime, was partially dismantled soon after his death, and finally destroyed in 1732, later descriptions primarily repeated the facts about the Camerino as gleaned from Bellori's publication - Passeri's biography remained unpublished until the eighteenth century. ¹ Although Bellori's account was based on first-hand experience of the room in its original state, it was not written with the aim of recording the factual situation, but intended to analyse the works of art. Later references, even while the Camerino was still in existence, become more and more unreliable; in 1725, the Camerino was even mentioned by Rossini as being a work by Domenichino, confusing it with other works in the Palazzetto.² Only the original contract of 1611 between cardinal Farnese and the brotherhood, a plan of the Church of Santa Maria dell'Orazione e Morte drawn around 1598 by the architect Giovanni Maggi (fig.28), and a number of contemporary plans of the city of Rome provide more insight into the historical context of the Camerino, in particular its architectural situation within the Palazzetto and the buildings of the Confraternity.³

Today, the Palazzetto Farnese still stands along the Via Giulia behind the Palazzo itself, but consecutive interventions have destroyed the garden and most of its interior disposition. The original appearance and situation of Palazzetto and garden can be partly deduced from contemporary depictions in maps and plans of Rome. It was located on via Giulia, between Palazzo Farnese and the Tiber, and consisted of a building with a three-arched loggia opening onto an adjacent garden. A bridge spanned the road, to provide a private access to the Palazzetto from the Palazzo proper. In the 1625 map made by Giovanni Maggi some details of the complex were overemphasised: the bridge was given extravagant proportions and on this map it even led right up to the river-bank, on the left-hand side of a building which does not show the arcades of

¹ Passeri's text was written around 1672-1678 but appeared in print only in 1772; Hess published the first critical edition in 1934; see Passeri 1678 1995.
² Rossini 1725, p.30: 'Nel Palazzetto detto il piccolo Farnese vicino alla Chiesa della Morte vi è un Camerino, detto del Romito, dipinto dal famoso Domenichino.' In the earlier edition of this Mercario errante of 1693, no mention was made of the Camerino.
³ Hager 1964, p.13 fig.2, first published Maggi's plan of Santa Maria dell'Orazione e Morte; see also Schiecler 1983, p.23 and Witte 2000. The plan is in the Royal Library in Stockholm, MS 45, fol.76; it was purchased by Nicodemus Tessin the Younger, as is testified by the 1712 inventory of the holdings of his library; see Tessin 2006, pp.(5)-(6), no.13: 'Architettura Civile di tutti li ordini ... di Giovanni Maggio Romano, 1614, Manoscritto in fol. con molte figure'. Reconstructions of the Palazzetto were published by Bourdon Laurent-Vibert 1909 and Uginet 1980. Both suggested a corridor to the Camerino, but without including Maggi's plan of the church.
a loggia but still has the appearance of stables (fig.28). In Greuter's map of 1618, the Palazzo and Palazzetto seem to be correctly drawn, but the giardino segreto or private garden behind is only given schematically. In a later map produced by Goffredo van Schayck the bridge was not depicted at all and the buildings of the Palazzetto consisted of two somewhat irregular pavilions connected by a single wall along the Via Giulia, with a gate in the middle. The façade along the road was highly irregularly drawn, which is inconsistent with the present situation that seems to reflect the Seicento-situation. In Van Schayck's illustration, its garden here seemed just a piece of barren land sloping towards the river, without the buttressing wall protecting it. The 1663 map of Johan Blaeu seems closer to the original situation during the time of cardinal Odoardo. It showed the Palazzetto as consisting of two separate parts: on the left side the Palazzetto proper, on the right side stables and other functional buildings.

Drawings and etchings from the seventeenth century offer little more than the information drawn from the maps. The relatively unimpressive façade of the Palazzetto was never recorded in prints before the reconstruction of the church of Santa Maria dell'Orazione e Morte in 1732, and views of this part of Rome taken from the viewpoint of the river from that period are equally rare. Only eighteenth-century prospects such as the series of etchings with views on the Tiber, from the Magnificenze di Roma by Giuseppe Vasi, published in 1754, depict the situation of the Palazzetto. The 'Fianco della Strada Giulia dalla parte del Tevere', plate 88 of this series, indicated a garden with trees behind it (see fig.33). Detailed information on its layout cannot be obtained from it: the only accurate indication of the garden-design might be obtained from Nolli's preparatory design for his 1748 Map of Rome (fig.32).

No contemporary designs have been found that inform on the disposition of the rooms inside the Palazzetto. Archival sources indicated that the building was the result of alterations to an existing structure of stables. Attached to these original stalls was a storage for hay (a Jenile); an inventory of 1644 still mentioned these stalls on via Giulia, so a part of the structure remained untouched during the rebuilding of the Palazzetto. On a nineteenth-century plan of the buildings this division is still visible: the right side contained larger spaces in which 'scuderie e rimesse'
was written. Between 1601 and 1604, a part of this structure, adjacent to Santa Maria dell'Orazione e Morte, was altered to contain five medium-sized rooms on the first floor; on the ground floor a loggia with niches for sculptures and two further vaulted rooms were constructed. The building-accounts of these years mention external and internal walls torn down or erected, as well as ceilings being vaulted.

There were two entrances to this Palazzetto: one at ground level by means of a centrally positioned door from the via Giulia, but the access route was a bridge built over the road, still standing today (fig.30). This arched bridge surmounted by a terrace was planned in conjunction with the refurbishing of the building but it was only constructed afterwards. The permission for its construction was given in 1603, and the accounts prove that it was erected in 1604. The bridge extended from an annex to the actual palace; it joined the Palazzetto on the roof-terrace. An inventory made up after the death of cardinal Odoardo also mentioned the presence of antique statues on this terrace, and probably on the bridge as well.

The garden was laid out behind the Palazzetto in the same period; the mention of the 'giardinetto nuovo' in the accounts of 1601-1603 indicated that there had been no preceding horticultural organisation of these grounds. This giardino segreto extended to the bank of the river Tiber and was protected on that side by a wall. A post-mortem inventory of the Farnese gardens in Rome contained a meticulous description of this garden, drawn up with assistance from the gardener himself. The grounds were divided into two sections, each subdivided into four flowerbeds. The section next to the premises of the Orazione e Morte, and overlooked from the newly furnished rooms, was centered around a fish-pond with central fountain; the latter was embellished with sculptures of four shells, four putti with vases on their shoulders, and four

---

9 Ugine 1980, p.89f.
11 See the inventory of 1626 in ASN Fondo Farnesiano 1853.III-XII nr.4, 'Elenco delle statue di proprietà del serenissimo Duca di Parma, esistente nel Palazzo, e Luoghi assianno Villa di Roma. Forse del 1626, o 1650.' This inventory was dated to 1642 by Riebesell 1989, p.80.
12 Ugine 1980, p.93f.
13 The inventory was made with the assistance of the gardener, Giovanni Ganizia, and can be found in ASP, Carte Farnese, Raccolta Manoscritti, Busta 86: 'Descrizione de Giardini di Campo Vaccino, Trastevere, Vignola e Vigna di Madama 6 April 1626, and was published in Benedetti 1973, pp.479-480.
14 Benedetti 1973, p.479; 'Nel giardino segreto di detto palazzo contiguo alli suddetti Camerini al quali si può andare con descendere dal detta area per una scala fatta per servizio di detti Camerini pure sotto la custodia di detto Garzia, et compartoio in quattro parti principali, ciascuna de quali è poi partita in diversi quadrettì tutti piani parte di cipolle di diversi fiori, et parte di radici di semplicì diversi et tra detti quattro quadri un arbore di Castagno Aquino, che fà fiori, un arbore di lauro Amaniano, et un altro chiamato la grana tintora et da due parti le più longhe di tutte le dette parti principali sono arbore 48 in tutto daranci alti egualmente cioè circa polmi 12 ecetto uno piccolo vicino alla peschiera. Il resto de detto giardino consiste in altri 4 quadretti piccoli ...' In the inventory of 1644-1650, there is a
tortoises, positioned around a central spout with five nozzles. On its *peperino*-balustrade stood three vases with the Farnese-lilies and balls on them. The second part of the garden consisted of four larger beds with precious bulbs and medicinal plants, at the crossing of which grew a large flowering horse chestnut. The garden was decorated with pots with 48 orange- and lemon-trees, and other vases with roses and other flowers.

From these documents it can be deduced that, the Palazzetto formed an architectural extension to Palazzo Farnese itself and was connected to the main building by means of a bridge, offering its owner a direct and private access to the newly laid out Tiber-garden. In 1611, the Palazzetto was extended with an additional room: by means of a direct passage, cardinal Farnese could reach the Camerino degli Eremiti. The use of the verb *ritirarsi*, used by Bellori with respect to the Camerino when he wrote 'the cardinal being in the habit of retiring to this room...,' fits the general impression of this autonomous architectural complex and adjacent ground as well. How was the Camerino connected to this Palazzetto?

**Camerino and Palazzetto: a reconstruction**

The recently discovered contract between Farnese and the Orazione e Morte adds significant information for a new reconstruction of the Palazzetto and Camerino. First of all, the contract indicates that the room was part of the buildings that belonged to the brotherhood; before 1609 it served a cleric, presumably their priest, as his living quarters. It should thus be located within the premises of the church as drawn by Maggi. Since the contract of 1611 mentioned that the two windows were already constructed and gave onto the church and the oratory of the brotherhood, the room must have been situated in between these two spaces. The only possible location would then be above the room in the plan inscribed as the 'spogliatore' or cloakroom. According to the measurements on Maggi’s plan (fig.28), this room measured 20 by 39 *palmi romani*, which is a shorter description of the ‘giardinetto segreto della Morte’ that largely corresponds with the situation as described in 1626; see Jestaz 1994, p.161.

Benedetti 1973, p.480: 'in mezzo de quali è una peschiera lunga circa quattro canne, larga cfrca 3,5 tutta circondata di balaustrati di peperino piena d'acqua con una fontana in mezzo di 4 conchiglie, 4 tartarughe, 4 puti con vasi mediocri in cima et una meta di pilon[i]bo con 5 buchini che gettano acqua. Et sopra il balaustrato d'essa peschiera sono tre vasi di creta lavati con mascheroni piantati[?] palle e gigi con piede di peperino pieni [di] terra senza piante con suoi manici di capacita d'una somma luf[no] dico. The similarity of this fountain with the *fontana* dell’Ercola in Rome, and the fountain with two *putti* in the Sala del Ercole in the Palazzo Farnese at Caprarola is striking.

Bellori 1672-2000, p.367: ‘essendo solito il Cardinale Farnese ritirarsi in quella camera...’

ASN, Fondo Farnesiano b.1346 f.ase 37, fol.1r: 'stantua, seu cubicula dicta, Archiconfraternitis, in quo per prius inhabitabant Clericos dictae Ecclesiae...’
approximately 4.4 by 8.6 meters. Secondly, the location of the Camerino above the 'spogliatore' in Maggi's plan also facilitated the construction of a new access from the recently finished Palazzetto Farnese, as it was directly adjacent to it. A new reconstruction of the seventeenth-century situation of Palazzetto and Camerino (figs. 34 and 35) indicates that it consisted of a building with two levels: a lower floor and a first floor. On ground-level, there were two vaulted rooms with grated windows giving onto the via Giulia. These rooms were located on either side of the corridor leading from the main entrance on via Giulia directly to the three-arched loggia (no.5 on fig.34). From here the garden could be accessed by means of a number of steps between the building and the lower level of the garden.

The connection between the lower and upper floor was through a circular stairwell, accessible from the ground-floor-room on the left-hand side. This spiral staircase ran to the top of the building where the roof-terrace provided passage to the Cardinals' private apartment in the Palazzo proper by means of the arched bridge over the Via Giulia. According to the 1644 inventory of the Palazzetto, on the first floor there were four camerini and one additional space (see fig.35). Two of those looked onto via Giulia; the others were located over the loggia and overlooked the garden by means of three windows. In 1610, the corridor to the Camerino degli Eremiti (no.1 on fig.35) was constructed from this upper floor. The most probable location for this passageway was in the angle between the south-western room overlooking the garden, the only place where the buildings of the brotherhood (nos.2 and 3 on fig.35) immediately bordered on the complex of the Palazzetto.

---

18 The measurements in the Maggi-plan were presumably given in palmi romani; according to Dourscher 1965, p.375, the palmo romano measured 223 mm; Letarouilly 1840-1858 vol.1, p.141 gave the palmo as being 0.22342 cm.
19 Ugine 1980, p.98, nr. 935: 'Per haver rotte et fatte tre finestre mezzanine fatte spallette et archi et messo li conci et ferrate di vano palmi.'
20 Ugine 1980, p.98, n.942: 'Per haver messo lo scalino della loggia lungo palmi 51 3/4'. This is corresponding with the width of the loggia's three arches.
21 Ugine 1980, p.93, nrs.810-812, 816 referred to the construction of this 'lumaca', that according to ibidem, p.94, nr.841 was situated next to one of the ground-floor rooms: 'Muro che divide la scala dalla stanza acanto'. In this case, 'scala' probably refers to the 'lumaca'. A further entry could refer to the door constructed next to this stairwell, providing an access to the stairwell and room from the side of the Vicolo della Morte, see ibidem p.97, nr.900: 'Mettiubri della porta di tevertino che entra allo stanzino a piedi alla lumaca.' The second stairwell on the side of the Via Giulia, drawn in the reconstruction of Ugine 1980, was probably a later alteration after the fire occurring in the Palazzetto in the seventeenth century. I wish to thank Dr. Ugine for discussing this reconstruction with me.
22 This reconstruction is based upon Ugine 1980, p.91, which was in turn partly based on the earlier reconstruction as made by Bourdon Laurent-Vibert 1909. The change in arrangement of the rooms, and possibly the stairwell, was probably the result of a fire which occurred in the Palazzetto in 1700; see Ugine 1980, p.113 note 81.
23 Ugine 1980, p.99, nr 964: 'Per haver messi 3 mezzanini de tevertino sopra la loggia di vano.'
24 The reconstruction published in Ugine 1980, p.91, fig.2 suggested that the circular stairwell was located towards the back of the building, between the Palazzetto and the buildings of the Orazione e Morte, and made to provide access to the Camerino degli Eremiti. As has been argued above, this stairwell cannot have been constructed for this purpose in 1601-04, as the Camerino was not available at that moment. Moreover, there was no space for the
Decoration of the Palazzetto

The Palazzetto contained one of the largest coherent collections of painted landscapes in early Seventeenth-century Rome, a fact that was noted by the occasional contemporary visitor able to enter these premises. Richard Symonds, an English traveller who visited Rome around the middle of the seventeenth century, recorded this impression in his Diary, where he stated that 'In a little building toward the River ... 3 or 4 rooms with ... quadros of Annibale Carracci's on the flat Roofe which is of board and about 11 or 12 foot high is in all quarters with rare paeses of that incomparable master.' The coherence of the subjects in each room, and the thematic and formal analogies between the various spaces suggest that an iconographic and functional unity underlies the Palazzetto programme. The fact that it was planned and realised in the space of approximately four years underlines this conceptual coherence.

The inventory of 1644 - considered to be a reasonably accurate reflection of the situation during the lifetime of cardinal Odoardo - presented the interior arranged as private picture-gallery. The information of this document allows for a virtual walk through the original situation, which greatly enhances the understanding of the architectural disposition as well. Here the different schools of painting preferred by Farnese - the Bolognese, Venetian and Flemish schools - were hung according to theme. Within the allocation in the Palazzetto, no sign of stylistic preference can be found: Dutch, German, Roman and Bolognese paintings were shown next to one another. Several inventories of Farnese property during the seventeenth century listed among these works by Paul Bril, Carlo Saraceni, Annibale Carracci, his pupils and a number of other painters. These pictures were for the greater part acquired by cardinal Odoardo himself as most works dated from the turn of the sixteenth century, and some were expressly commissioned stairwell on this spot, as the dividing wall between the Farnese-premises and the buildings of the brotherhood was not perpendicular to the Via Giulia, but located at an angle of 80 degrees; the side of the loggia bordered immediately onto the wall towards the Vicolo della Morte. This must be concluded from the post in Uginet 1980, p.94, nr. 822: 'Muro della nicchia nella loggia fatta nel muro vecchio verso la Morte.' That this wall was not perpendicular but at an angle can be deduced from Fuga's plans for the church for Orazione e Morte and the present situation (see Salerno Spezzaferro Taturi 1973, ill.385, 386; and Buchowiecki 1967-1974 vol.3, p.63): an aerial photograph (in Le Palais Farnèse, vol.2, pp.24-25) of the modern situation also points out that the dividing wall is at an angle.

Whitfield 1981, p.313: 'Elles sont cependant d'un interet tout particulier pour l'histoire de la peinture du paysage, car le palazzetto reunissait le plus grand ensemble qui soit de paysage 'carrachesques'.'

R. Symonds, Diary, cited after Whitfield 1981, p.316 n.12. Symonds was probably able to enter the Palazzetto after the sequestration of Farnese property by the papal authorities during the War on Castro in 1641. The use of the Italians term paese in this citation suggests that the English language had no regular word for landscape painting in the Seventeenth century.

This inventory has been published in Jestaiz 1994 where it is dated to 1644. It was probably drawn up during the war on Castro. See Whitfield 1981, Robertson 1988, p.49, and Robertson in The Genius of Rome 2001, pp.124-125.

Jestaiz 1994, pp 136-138 and Bertini 1987, p.???
for this environment. The conscious effort to bring them together in the Palazzetto indicates the existence of a coherent decorative programme for this building – whether this was the product of an artistic advisor or not. In allocating paintings according to subject, Farnese followed the tendency of the early seventeenth century of combining paintings with regard to their subject, as for example Giulio Mancini had advised his readers in the Considerazioni sulla pittura. But the combination of themes and subjects indeed suggests a further level of meaning, in which the spatial arrangement of the Palazzetto becomes a signifying element of its own.

On the groundfloor, the Palazzetto contained three painted landscapes with mythological subjects, executed in fresco on the ceilings of the main rooms around 1603. In the vault of the loggia opening onto the giardino segreto (no.5 on fig.34) and on the ceilings of the two groundfloor-rooms giving onto via Giulia, Domenichino painted three mythological tales: the Death of Adonis, the Dying Narcissus and Apollo and Hyacinth (figs.36-38). The source for all three was Ovid's Metamorphoses. The continuing popularity of these stories for the subject of floral themes in art at the beginning of the seventeenth century is attested by an amorous poem in the Rime by Giambattista Marino. In a complicated play between the myth of origin of these three flowers, he compared the beauty of the beloved with both that of Narcissus, Adonis and Hyacinth and the flowers they had turned into, and gave the palm to the subject of his own adoration. In other words, nature had surpassed itself.

Marino's poem probably inspired the subject of the three frescoes. Around 1600, the

\[\text{\textsuperscript{24}}\text{The hanging of paintings in other rooms of the Palazzo presented a random mixture of subjects and artists, with a predominance of historical subjects. See Robertson 1988, Robertson 1995, pp.70-79, and Jestaz 1994.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{25}}\text{Whitfield 1981, p.316 doubts that all the paintings were especially commissioned, as they could have been taken from elsewhere in the palace to fit into the wooden ceilings, but he does assume some kind of iconographic coherence.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{31}}\text{Mancini 1956-1957 vol.1, p.143. This treatise was composed between 1614 and 1621, almost contemporary to the construction of the Palazzetto.}\]


\[\text{\textsuperscript{33}}\text{Ovid 1986, pp.61-66 for the story of Narcissus, p.248 for the death of Adonis, and pp 230-231 for the episode of Apollo and Hyacinth. See Pigler 1956 vol.2, pp.175-178 for the death of Narcissus, ibidem p.244-247 for Venus lamenting Adonis, and pp.29-30 for the iconography of Apollo and Hyacinth, which was painted a second time by Domenichino in the Villa Aldobrandini in Frascati, now in the National Gallery in London. On the Cinquecento discussions on the depiction of Ovidian themes in painting, see Thimann 2002, esp. pp.33-88.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{34}}\text{Marino 1609, p.75: 'Ogni prato, ogni fior ride al tuo riso. Ment'Elpina fra lor movi le piante. Nel tuo leggiadro aspetto il suo sembiante Vago di vagheggiar scorge Narciso. In te si specchia Adon, ch'espresso il viso Haver di Citherea gli sembra avante; l'Alita, quasi volta al suo Levante, Nel sol del movi negli occhi il guardo ha fisso Vinta in bellezza, e dal tuo pie calcata, D'amorosa vergogna il volto tinto. Inchina a te la Rosa innamorata. Fossi anch'io fiore, e per poter dipinto Mostarrei sospirandi aura dorata. Melo fogli e il mio dual, fossi Giancinto.' It is interesting to note in this poem the act of colouring red, and the fact that Marino alluded to painting in this poem. Spear 1965, p.71 held Agucchi responsible for the adaptation of the myths to this particular setting. Whitfield 1981, p.322}\]
 poet was affiliated to Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini, with whom Farnese remained in close contact during most of his life. But the subject of the poem did not reflect upon the intentions of Domenichino’s frescoes. In this case, the painter’s works referred to the patron and his family. In the seventeenth century, all three flowers into which these mythological figures turned were taken as a reference to the lily, the flower found sixfold in the escutcheon of the Farnese family. Also recurrent in all stories was the colour purple, a particular reference to the status of cardinal for which in Italian the word ‘porporato’ was used both as adjective and noun. Apart from the lily as a reference to the family and its ecclesiastical ties, the personal *imprese* of Cardinal Odoardo, devised by Fulvio Orsini, also showed the motif of the purple lily with the Greek motto ‘ητοτε μαξαυμοι’, or ‘I grow with God’s help’ (see fig.39).

All three flowers thus referred both to the colour purple and the species of the lily. According to Ovid, Hyacinth became ‘a flower ... in form a lily, save that a lily wears a silver hue, this richest purple’: and Adonis became ‘a blood-red flower’, which is often taken as a reference to the anemone. In *Seicento* treatises on gardening, the very popular anemone was often considered to be a subspecies of the lily, and of course it repeated the colour red. Also the lily and the narcissus were considered botanically related, as the mention of a certain ‘Narciso Italiano gigliato, sferico’ in a description of a garden near the Colosseum. The colour of this flower was not, however, mentioned. The narcissus had been described by Ovid as white or yellow, without any reference to the lily, but the Bible and classical sources such as Pliny the Elder and Virgil mentioned purple with reference to this flower.

A more specific link between the narcissus, the lily, and the colour purple was provided in a 1625 botanical description of rare plants in the Horti Farnesiani, the Farnese-gardens on the Palatine Hill (see fig.90). Pietro Castelli, lecturer of medicine at the University of the Sapienza in Rome, in 1625 published the *Exactissima descriptio rariorum quarundam plantarum que...* suggested on the basis of Malvasia 1841 vol.2, p.222, calling them ‘di sua invenzione’, that Domenichino conceived the program by himself to show off his intellectual capacities. Bellori supposed Agucchi to have cooperated on the program of the Camerino Farnese by Ammable Carracci; see Martin 1965, pp.38-38. On Agucchi’s activities as artistic advisor in relation to the Carracci-school, see Ginzburg 1996 and Mambrò Santos 2001.


Ovid 1986, pp.231 and 248 respectively. For a seventeenth-century discussion of the species of anemones, especially the purple variety, see Ferrari 1646, p.178.

On the popularity of the anemone in early seventeenth-century gardens, see Masson 1972, pp.72-73, 75-76, and Holthouse 1992, pp.128-129.

Masson 1972, p.79, described this flower as present in the garden of a certain Tranquillo Romauli.

Spearin 1967, p.173, referred to Virgil’s *Eclogue* 38, where the narcissus is described as ‘suave rubens narcissus’, and Pliny the Elder 1938-1962 vol.6, p.254 (BK.21, ch.73), who refers to two varieties: Narcissi duo genera in usum medicin recipiant, purpureo flore et alterum herbaceum ...'; and elsewhere, BK XXI, 12, of a lily that is purple and similar to the narcissus.
continentur in Rome in horto farnesiano, under the pseudonym of his friend Tobia Aldini, physician and Odoardo’s gardener. Castelli labelled one particular species in this garden as ‘Lilionarcissus rubeus Indicus’, indicating the close resemblance observed by seventeenth-century botanists between the two species and this one flower, which in modern taxonomy is known as Amaryllis Belladonna (fig.40). As Castelli noted in his description of the plant, the roots and leaves resembled the narcissus, and the flower was identical to the lily. In the Palazzetto, the three flowers depicted in the frescoes of the ground-floor - and also present in vases in the real garden - were thus all purple and referred to the lily in some way; they were thus intended as a reference to the escutcheon and ecclesiastical dignity of the owner.

The upper storey of the Palazzetto contained an apartment of four small rooms, camerini, and a provisional chapel (fig.35, no.5). These rooms were all similarly arranged, with ceilings consisting of a wooden structure into which canvases were inserted, and further paintings hung on the walls. The first room described in the inventory, ‘primo camerino a canto la Morte’, was primarily filled with works by Annibale Carracci. Odoardo Farnese favoured the artist from 1595 until the untimely death of the painter in 1609. The walls were hung with the Sleeping Venus with playing putti by Annibale Carracci (fig.41), a Rinaldo and Armida ‘con boscaglia’ (fig.42) and a Diana taking a bath by the same painter, and a Europa on the Bull (probably by Agostino Carracci) - all of these pastoral or mythological subjects, set within conspicuous landscape-settings. Another particular painting found in this room was the Arrigo Peloso, ascribed to


43 Aldini/Castelli 1625, p.83: ‘Lilionarcissus, seu Narcissolirion aptius haec planta dictur, quam Tulipa: flos enim vere lilium emulatur, radix, & folia narcissi sunt.’ Later on, this plant was also found in the garden of Cardinal Antonio Barberini and indicated with the same name; Ferrari 1646, pp.115-118 followed Aldini’s account and described the plant as follows: ‘Narcissus Indicus latro folio narcissino, flore rubeo lilicaceo, album scilicet lilium imitante...’ See also Hobhouse 1992, pp.128-129 and Blair McDougall 1994, p.236.

44 Le Palais Farnèse vol.1, p.131 ill.1.

45 Zapperi 1986, pp.203-205.
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Agostino Carracci, and depicting a hairy man, a monkey, a dwarf and a madman (fig.43). All of these characters were present at the court of Odoardo Farnese, and have been identified respectively with the *uomo selvaggio* Arrigo Gonzalez, the *nana* Rodomonte, and the *buffone* Pietro. Because of their abnormality and rarity, they were considered beasts, types of 'natural wonders' appertaining to the cardinal's collections.

The ceiling of this first room provided allegorical and real images of the time of the day, as the inventory of 1653 recounted: 'nineteen paintings with perspective views, landscapes and animals and one in the middle of larger size, with Apollo crowned with laurel with the lyre, all with gilded cornice, which represent the Day, and forming the ceiling of the said Camerino.' Although the names of the painters were omitted, on account of later Farnese inventories the central painting, now lost, has been attributed to Annibale Carracci. On the same basis it can be assumed that these landscapes were by Paul Bril, Pieter Breughel or one of their Flemish assistants or followers. It may even have been an instance of jointly authored works, in which the landscape was done by the one, and the animals by the other. In this respect, the Palazzetto constitutes one of the first instances in Rome where Flemish painters might have cooperated not only with their native colleagues, but also with Italian painters.

Following this first *camerino* was a space called 'camerino primo a mano manca', which functioned as a chapel, given its furnishing with an altar, probably a portable one, consisting of a wooden table on a stand, with a wool covering. Two small cabinets serving as storage for religious utensils were illuminated on the outside with painted landscapes: 'two cupboards for the service of the altar decorated with landscapes.' The room also contained another object, a *segettare* or close-stool, which seems strangely out of place in this context, and was probably not an original piece of furniture from the early seventeenth century.

---

58 On the identification of the persons with members of Farnese's court and their status as natural curiosities, see Zapparri 1985. The identification of the person at the far right as Ulisse Aldrovandi has been tentatively proposed by Findlen 1998, p.311.
59 Bertini 1987, p.221, citing the inventory of 1653. ASP.Rac.Ms 86: 'dicinque quadri a prospettiva di paesi animali et uno di mezzo più grande con Apollo laureato con il Pietto tutti con cornichetta dorata che rappresentano il giorno, et formano il sottotto di detto Camerino.' Bertini 1987, p.100 nr.42. On the iconography of Apollo and the times of the day, or accompanied by the Hours, see Ripa 1603, pp.203-214. ‘Hore del giorno’ and ‘Hore della notte’, where a direct quote is given from the story of Phaethon by Ovid; see also Pigler 1956, vol.2, pp.26-27 and pp.499-500.
60 These landscapes have not been identified thus far. An instance of direct cooperation between Bril and other figure-painters is described in Pijl 1998. For the panel-paintings by Bril, see Berger 1993.
62 Jestaz 1994, p.136: '3805. Due armarietti per servizio dell'altare dipinti a paesi.'
At the centre of the ceiling of the second camerino, a representation of another cosmological theme, Aurora spreading flowers, was surrounded by prospettive - meaning either architectural perspectives or landscape-paintings, and unspecified figural themes.54 Also in this case, the names of painters were not mentioned in the inventory; reconstructions have linked the centrepiece with a painting by Annibale now in Chantilly, that shows Aurora crowned by flowers, seated on a cloud, and dispersing flowers over the awakening earth with the help of two putti (fig.44). This depiction utilised one element from the description of this theme in Cesare Ripa's Iconologia, namely the basket with flowers, but in all other aspects diverged from the traditional iconography of Aurora on a chariot with a torch in her hand to drive away the darkness.55 The surrounding paintings of the four putti scattering petals of flowers were painted di sotto in su (fig.45).56 The room also included a set of fourteen portraits of 'various Princes and Princesses of Portugal', according to the inventory executed by a Flemish master; these images formed a gallery of cardinal Odoardo's maternal ancestry - his mother had been princess Maria of Portugal.57

In the third camerino, the theme of Night painted by Annibale Carracci formed the focal point of the ceiling's decoration.58 It depicted a female personification of the nighttime, flying with sleeping putti in her arms above a moonlit landscape (fig.46). This iconography accorded quite accurately with the prescriptions of the Night given by Ripa, as a woman with large wings holding two sleeping children.59 Around this central panel, eight depictions of sleeping amorini

54 Jestaz 1994, p.137; 'Nove quadri con cornicetta dorata attorno, parte a prospettive e parte a figure, con uno più grande in mezzo dell’Aurora, che formano il soffitto di detto camerino'. For the diverse meanings of prospettiva, see GDLI vol.14, pp.710-712. Symonds in his *Diary* (see Whitfield 1981, p. 319) wrote 'In one room in the roof is Aurora flat as if flying in the aire spreading flowers; but he did not mention the prospettive. For the painting of Aurora, see Bertini 1987, p.133, nr.125; and De Boissard Lavergne-Durey 1988, pp.70-72, cat.no.23.
55 Ripa 1603, p.34: 'Aurora. Giovinetta, alata ... nel braccio sinistro un cestello pieno de vari j flori'. An example of the more traditional iconography of Aurora is in the Stanza dell'Aurora in Palazzo Farnese at Caprarola; likewise a room in which the thematic reflected the cosmological cycle of the day; see Acidini Luchinat 1998 vol.1, pp.204-208 and Pierguidi 2002b, p.287. For the general iconography of Aurora in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see Pigler 1956 vol.2, pp.40-42 and Seznec 1972, p.261.
56 For these putti-paintings, identified with four canvases in the Musée Condé in Chantilly, see Bertini 1987, pp.90-93, nrs.20-23 and De Boissard Lavergne-Durey 1988, pp.72-73, cat.nos.24-27.
58 Jestaz 1994, p.137, nr.321: 'Nove quadri, quattro d’Amorini, quattro più grandi a prospettive di paesi illuminati dalla luna, in mezzo uno grande della “Notte che vola.” The central painting of the Night is now in Musée Condé in Chantilly, see De Boissard Lavergne-Durey 1988, pp.69-70, cat.no.22; one of the amorini was identified with a copy after Annibale in the Museo di Capodimonte; see Bertini 1987, p.94 nrs.26-29, p.133 no.153, and La scuola Emilianana 1994, p.139. Whitfield 1981, p.319 erroneously identified these paintings of amorini with the four ‘Amors' now in Chantilly.
59 Ripa 1603, p.360: ‘Notte. Donna vestita d’un manto azzurro tutto pieno di stelle, & habbia alle spalle due grande ali in atto di volare, sara di carnaggione fosca, & haverà in capo una ghirlanda di papavero, & nel braccio destro terra un
and four nocturnal landscapes were inserted. This was a relatively new topic in the genre of landscape, which was pursued by a number of northern painters then working in Rome. Four works ascribed to Paul Brill in the inventory of 1662 probably referred to the landscapes from this room, as they all depicted moonlit scenes; one painting of a sleeping putto with a torch in his hand might also be identified as a former part of this decoration. Most appropriate, a lettera or daybed made of inlaid ebony was one of the pieces of furniture, pointing to the use of this room as a place to rest.

The fourth room - 'ultimo Camerino', which according to Symonds in 1650 was a 'little closet' - of this enfilade contained a ceiling for which the general theme of playing putti was chosen. According to the description of 1644, there were paintings with 'diverse plays and games of putti and other figures painted in yellow.' In a later inventory of 1662-1680, one of these paintings was described as 'a painting on canvas with various putti throwing the javelin, others that swim, painted in yellow chiaroscuro.' The inventory of the collection in 1728-1734, after its transferral to Naples, described five other similar paintings: 'A painting on canvas with various putti throwing apples and perspectives painted in yellow chiaroscuro ... A painting on canvas with diverse putti that work in a forge and a fountain ... A painting on a horizontal canvas with dancing putti, and others that play ... A painting on a horizontal canvas of small putti that play diverse games, some flirt ... A painting on canvas with putti that play gatta cieca with a pergola ...'.

The putto was a popular subject in art during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and fanciullo bianco, & nel sinistro un'altro fanciullo nero, & haverà i ppiedi storti, & ambidue detti fanciulli dormiranno.'

See Howard 1992 for representations of the night-sky in Flsheimer's work, and the relative influence of Galilei's discoveries on this subgenre of landscape.


Jestaz 1994, p.137: 'Un lettera d'ebano intersiata d'argento con profilii e folgiami, colonne quadre senza vasi, con ciclo e pendenti dentro e fuori, coperta e torneto intime e dette coperta ...'.


Jestaz 1994, p.138: 'diversi scherzi e balli di putti e altre figure dipinte in giallo.' See also Bertini 1987 p.222.

Bertini 1987 p.223: 'quadro in tela con diversi putti che tirano dardi, altri che manovano, dipinto in giallo chiaroscuro. '

Jestaz 1994, pp.137-138, citing from the inventory 1728-1734, in ASN. Fondo Farnesiano 1853 III (X): 'Un quadro in tela con diversi putti che si tirano mele e prospettive di colonne dipinte di giallo scuro ... Un quadro in tela con diversi putti che lavorano alla lucina ed una fontana di giallo scuro ... Un quadro in tela traverso con putti che ballano, e fanno altri giochi ... Un quadro traverso in tela con putti che fanno diversi giochi, alcuni fanno il gioco della civetta ... Un quadro in tela con putti che fanno la gatta cieca con pergolata di giallo scuro ...'. See also Whittfield 1981, p.320. See Dabb's 1995 and Weddigen 1999 for later series of putti engaged in children's games.
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was often depicted as engaged in diverse human activities. One of the connotations of this theme was that of the 'aetas aurea', the Golden Age that was linked with the theme of Arcadia - and thus the garden. The subject of the annual seasons was another implicit reference transmitted by representations of putti - they often referred to autumn and harvest of grapes. 'Bacchanals of putti picking grapes and playing among each other, which signifies Autumn' was the phrase used to describe a series of tapestries woven on commission of Ferrante Gonzaga in the mid-sixteenth century. The plucking of apples in the last camerino could in this case refer to this same time of year, while the putti in the forge probably constituted a reference to winter, while the playing and sporting putti indicated spring, and the dancing figurines stood for the summer. Thus, even though the subject of landscape was not explicitly present in the last room, like the other subjects in the preceding rooms it did refer to the times of the day and the cycle of the seasons, and thus of nature.

The last room integrally counted among the spaces in the Palazzetto, was the Camerino degli Iremiti. As already mentioned in the first chapter, it was described in mid-seventeenth-century inventories as the last of the flight of rooms, as the 'Oratory that corresponds to the Morte'. It was only accessible from the preceding spaces, not through any other entrance. The decoration, also discussed above, deviated from the rest of the Palazzetto in the staffage of hermits, which finds no precedent in the preceding camerini. On the other hand, its decorative scheme prolonged that of the preceding four rooms by means of the landscapes, and the insertion of canvases into its coffered ceiling. Considering that it only had been added to this complex in 1610-1616, almost a decade after the project of the Palazzetto, these two facts indicates that a deliberate decision had been made to assimilate this new addition into the existing apartment.

The giardino segreto as 'theatre of nature'

The theme of the times of day and the seasons, as already observed in the decoration of the diverse camerini, was extended in the organization of the secret garden. The denomination of the grounds behind the Palazzetto and the Tiber as giardino segreto implied that it was only accessible to Farnese and his guests. Often, giardini segreti contained rare and expensive

---

2 Colantuono 1989, Leuschner 1997, and Dempsey 2001, pp.64-70 for the significance of putti in the Bacchic context and the harvest of the grapes and the season of Autumn, derived from classical sarcophagi.
3 Brown Delmarchi Lorenzon 1996, p.184: 'Bacchanali di Puttini che distaca uva e che scherza tra loro, indica l'autunno.'
4 Ripa 1603, p.473 proposed to paint the seasons of Spring and Summer as 'giovani', and identified Spring with the activity of playing animals.
5 Jesta 1994, p.138: 'Oratorio che risponde nella Morte.'
specimen of flowers, imported from overseas.\(^7\) The care for such a garden was intimately tied to the cycle of the seasons, as the flowering of the various species accumulated there was to be regulated so as to bring them to blossom at the exact same moment.\(^7\) These secret gardens regularly also contained other plants and herbs, not for beauty's sake, but for their of medicinal qualities.\(^7\) The garden thus combined the knowledge of the cosmological cycle with the qualities of the individual specimen, as well as pointing out the social status of its owner.

The collection of rare flowers also alluded to the function of the Palazzetto as a private museum. Farnese was an avid collector of botanical curiosities, as was attested by the extensive holdings of rare species in the Horti Farnesiani on the Palatine Hill and the flower-garden at the far end of the Villa Farnese in Caprarola.\(^2\) Castelli's *Exactissima descriptio* of 1625, mentioned above, described exotic specimens in the gardens on the Palatine, and for this reason the preface presented the book as an encyclopaedic accumulation of knowledge, going beyond mere factual botanical knowledge.\(^7\) In a number of chapters, always accompanied by engravings of the flowers, leaves and fruits, Castelli discussed examples from the Far East and the Americas that had been planted there, such as the 'Acacia Indica Farnesiana' imported from Santo Domingo in the West Indies, the Passionflower, the Yucca, and the already discussed species of 'Lilium-narcissus rubeus Indicus' (fig.40), which was probably also to be found in the garden behind the Palazzetto, in beds or in pots. Of each of these specimens Castelli gave the region of origin and the chemical, medical and mythological details.

He not only owned rare plants and flowers: Farnese also played a conspicuous role in the sociable culture of collecting them.\(^7\) In a letter of March 1604, Cardinal Francesco Maria del Monte (1547-1626) explained to Ferdinando de' Medici (1549-1609) that the beans sent to him came from Farnese, who had obtained them from the Portuguese Indies; they were very rare

---

\(^7\) Blair McDougall 1994, pp.221-222; see also Coffin 1991, pp.244-257 for a discussion of the terminology and definition of the *giardino segreto*.

\(^1\) This is argued in Blair McDougall 1994, pp.237-238 on the basis of a manuscript treatise on gardening for the Barberini secret garden next to the Palazzo near the Quattro Fontane.

\(^4\) The link between the secret garden and the garden of medicinal simples is discussed in Blair McDougall 1994, p.21; for the meaning of *simplici* or 'simples' and its use in early modern Roman gardens, see Coffin 1991, p.208.


\(^6\) Aldini Castelli 1625, p.1: 'Add e nos non simplicem hic plantarum quadratdam dirc Historiam, sed Philosophicam, Medicaeque simul Historiam, que paucis verbis comprehendit nequit. Verum cum simplices, nec controversas Plantas tradimus, nos quaque breves benignus repertet lector.'

\(^7\) Federico Borromeo expressed his particular interest in rare flowers in a manuscript with notes entitled *Lista de varii florii*, a description of the botanical holdings of the Medicean gardens; see Jones 1993, p.82. See further Masson 1972.
indeed and should continue to remain special.  Farnese’s connections with Jesuit missionaries on other continents were an important source for such rare botanical species, and the special relations between the cardinal and this religious order secured him a privileged treatment. The contacts between members of the Farnese-family and learned men such as Ulisse Aldrovandi (1522-1605), first professor of natural history at the University of Bologna, were another source for samples of rare plants and flowers and information on these species. In return for the learned man’s services, in 1598 Odoardo Farnese helped Aldrovandi to obtain a privilege from the Venetian Senate for his *Ornithologia*, which appeared in 1599.

Apart from botany, also astronomy, medicine and natural philosophy were of interest to Farnese and his fellow cardinals in the early seventeenth century. Del Monte was known to correspond with Galileo Galilei (1564-1642), just like his fellow-cardinals Roberto Bellarmino (1542-1621; see fig.74) and Francesco Barberini (1597-1679) did later; all of them collected natural and artificial objects. Private and semi-public museums of natural history emerged at the end of the sixteenth century in Rome, in which all kinds of botanical and zoological specimen, minerals, metals, monsters, and every other rarity were brought together for the pursuit of knowledge, forming a ‘theatre of nature’. By accumulating everything that the earth provided and man produced, the understanding of this world could be furthered. Arranging the objects in an intellectual and physical structure according to the Aristotelian order, investing it with the knowledge of Pliny the Elder, Albertus Magnus and other authors on plants and animals, would turn the collection into a microcosm mirroring the macrocosm. Such a *musaeum* offered its...
visitor the whole world to behold and comprehend.\footnote{For the use of the word \textit{museacum} with reference to encyclopaedic collections, see Findlen 1994, pp.48-50.}

Interior and exterior of the Palazzetto expanded these notions of macrocosm and microcosm, man-made and natural objects.\footnote{Besides the paintings allocated to the Palazzetto according to the inventory, a number of other commissions by Farnese point to his interest in landscape. The series of six small oils on copper by Carlo Saraceni (ca.1580-1620), executed before 1608, paired natural settings with mythological themes; they contained episodes of the story of Icarus, Ariadne, Hermaphodite and Ganymede. Although we do not know the location of these works during the lifetime of the cardinal, they could well have been enjoyed in the context of the Palazzetto.} The architectural form, the furniture and decoration of the Palazzetto indeed provided a place for study of the arts, letters, and nature. On the basis of the mythological stories from Ovid, especially the history of Phaeton in which Apollo was described as surrounded by the Hours of the Day and the Seasons, the cosmological theme was adapted to the realm of painting as found in the coffered ceilings of the \textit{camerini}.\footnote{Ovid 1986, p.25; on the general iconography of the Hours of the Day and the Seasons in the arts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see Cappelletti 1995, Pierguidi 2002a and Pierguidi 2002b. The complexity of the Ovidian reception in artistic treatises is discussed in Thimm 2002, pp.54-79, where it is stated that the Tridentine Council restricted the applicability of mythological themes in art between 1570 and 1600. It will be upheld here, in accordance with Seznec 1972, pp.269-278, that putting the Italian translations and explanations of the \textit{Metamorphoses} on the Index in 1559, and the critical discussion of these themes in art by Gilio and others did not prevent Ovidian themes to carry plural iconographic meanings to early \textit{Seicento} beholders. The use of mythological subjects in art as reflecting the 'secrets of nature' was described by Conti in 1551; see Seznec 1972, pp.249-249.} And in the fifteenth and concluding book, Ovid recapitulated the everchanging cycle of nature as the main theme of the \textit{Metamorphoses}, touching upon the course of the days, seasons and years.\footnote{Ovid 1986, pp.357-358: 'You see how day extends as night is spent, and this bright radiant succeeds the dark; when, bright harbinger of day, Aurora gilds the globe to greet the sun.'} These works of art were at the same time a reflection of the natural order, and man-made objects. The Library of Palazzo Farnese was furnished with books on the subjects of botany and zoology; a list of works acquired in 1603 for Cardinal Farnese contained a number of publications on the natural sciences as well.\footnote{Ovid 1986, pp.357-358: 'You see how day extends as night is spent, and this bright radiant succeeds the dark; when, bright harbinger of day, Aurora gilds the globe to greet the sun.'}

In short, the Palazzetto was a \textit{studiolo} where Farnese could study both treatises on nature and the real objects, a \textit{galleria} where he could admire artistic creations and the reality it emulated and reflected; and the virtual accumulation of this was the \textit{museacum} where knowledge, nature
and art were stored, studied and discussed. As a rule, such places were private to a certain degree; they were open to a select public of studiosi and conoscenti at the invitation of the patron himself. In the sixteenth century, the current architectural form for this kind of function was often denoted with the word studiolo, that could either refer to one room, or an apartment. The Palazzetto seems to belong to that tradition in a very particular way, by the inclusion not only of representations of nature, but also the reality of the garden. As the Camerino degli Eremiti was considered to be an integral part of the Palazzetto in the seventeenth-century accounts, this also raises the question how this particular later addition fitted into that tradition of studies. Was the Camerino, as comparison with the Stanze at Caprarola suggests, a type of studiolo?

**The tradition of studioli**

The Renaissance studiolo was a conflation of three different traditions that had their roots in Antiquity and the Middle Ages, and that were turned into a particular architectural type during the Renaissance. The influence of each of these traditions was however dependant upon a number of factors, such as space, money and patronage. Requirements and thus forms changed over time. Already during the Renaissance, but especially during the Baroque, this resulted not in uniformity but in an architectural and functional tradition with an extraordinary breadth, until in the course of the seventeenth century, the form gradually became outmoded. The question is where the Palazzetto fits into this tradition.

The first precursor of the early modern studiolo was that of the small and secluded room mentioned in antique sources. This kind of study - often denoted with other words such as gymnasmum, xystus, or library - was used for reading and writing during the night. Complete isolation from daily activities, in both a spatial and temporal sense, was considered a prerequisite for the necessary focus upon study, as Pliny the Younger mentioned on Pliny the Elder in a letter. In this case, nature in any form was seen as opposed to concentration, as it distracted from thought. The study should, according to Quintilian, who was still approvingly cited in the fourteenth century by Petrarch, thus be located next to, or even be part of the bedroom.

---

88 Ferrari 1646, p.437 referred to herbaria with dried plants and flowers in the collection of Ferdinando Imperato as musaeo.
89 Whitfield 1981: the function as studiolo for the Camerino degli Eremiti was suggested by Bernini 1985, p.20.
90 Thornton 1997, pp.31-32.
91 Pliny the Younger 1972, Bk.3, nr.5, p.175: 'He always began to work at midnight when the August festival of Vulcan came round, not for the good omen's sake, but for the sake of study; in Winter generally at one in the morning, but never later than two, and often at midnight.'
92 Quintilian 1920-1922, vol.4, book X,3,22-25: 'Everyone, however, will agree that the absence of company and deep silence are most conducive to writing, though I would not go so far as to concur in the opinion of those who
connection with a garden or opening towards an outdoors space was thus antithetic to this type of room. It was even objected to by Quintilian, as he considered woods, the open skies and the beauty of the countryside to be a distraction from the necessary intellectual concentration.  

A second precursor of studioli was the medieval monks’ cell. Monastic rules indicated the kinds of activities for which this cell was meant, as well as giving particular prescriptions on its location and furniture. In the Rule of Benedict, no particular place was yet allocated for reading and writing, but the combined necessity of a writing-pad, a slate-pencil and a (grafting) knife for studious activities in their own cells were mentioned. Often, Benedictine monasteries contained a scriptorium, in which the copying of manuscripts was done as a communal activity. In the later Middle Ages, Carthusian monasteries contained a separate cell which functioned as private study for each religious, where the Bible and the Churchfathers should be read, and where the scribal duties were accomplished as well. According to the Carthusian Rule, each monk had to have a writing-desk in his own cell, as well as a set of writing-utensils including ink, a ruler, pens, grafting knives, and other instruments to work the parchment. It was also prescribed that each monk should keep two books from the library to read in the private cell, indicating that the production of codices but also the study of the texts themselves was done there.

Parallel to the monk’s cell as a space for reading and writing was the development in medieval times of the archive and treasury-chamber, which architecturally resembled the small space intended for reading and writing, but was often linked to liturgical spaces. This kind of room housed the documents and valuables of monastic communities, and ecclesiastical or secular rulers. For example, the Sainte Chapelle in Paris, built for Louis IX of France, contained a room above the sacristy where books and treasures were kept. Relics were also stored there, and taken out for display in the central chapel on particular occasions. This kind of storage for valuables was often found in secular dwellings as well. In the fifteenth century, the castles of Pavia and
Milan had their treasuries located in towers to secure their valuables from ransacking; the keeper’s room was located immediately beneath it and constituted its only way of entrance, to protect it from intrusion by outsiders. In both cases, it consisted of a small apartment in a secluded and safe position within the building, comparable in type, but not in function, to the later requirements for a *studiolo*.

During the later Middle Ages and the early Renaissance, growing literacy among secular citizens inspired them to adopt the monastic example of the cell as place for study. This led to a new kind of furniture for the specific use of writing, reading, and storing books. Items such as the writing desk, formerly only to be found in monasteries, were now also made for the layman. It would consist of a desk with shelves and candles or another means of lighting for the illumination of nightly activity. This wooden construction could actually define the space itself: accounts from the fifteenth century for carpenters constructing a *studiolo* clearly indicate that this was a permanent fixture, attached to the wall, and encompassing a desk with storage and its own walls. As a result, the word *studiolo* also became associated with a specific type of furniture, an expanded form of writing desk.

These writing-desks, chests, treasuries and monks' cells were the predecessors of the Renaissance architectural type of the *studiolo*, in which the man of letters kept his books, ancient coins, small works of art and other treasures. Where the monk’s cell was reserved for religious activity, literary and artistic interests became the primary activity in the secular form. Other than the literary activity that was deemed an appropriate function in ancient times, the occupations engaged in in the study could also be of a commercial or scientific nature. This can also be followed through the changing form of the *studiolo* as piece of furniture. The simple desk of the medieval *scriptorium* developed into a cabinet containing valuables, instruments and works of art. From a place to read and write, the *studiolo* became the place where different sorts of objects could be stored, shown, read or admired.

On the basis of these precursors, the Renaissance *studiolo* was typically located in the city dwelling, at the back of the building or looking onto a quiet courtyard, and in proximity to the private quarters of its owner. Apart from the bedroom, a location near a private stairwell or a

---

78 Liebenwein 1977, p.15.
79 Thornton 1997, p.53.
80 Thornton 1997, pp.53-54.
81 Thornton 1997, pp.69f described the substitution of the writing-desk with the cabinet in the second half of the sixteenth century, and its use in the Roman setting.
bathroom would be convenient. Its size would be small to moderate.\(^1\)\(^2\) This type can be observed in many early Renaissance paintings and drawings, often in the depictions of Jerome in his study (fig.47). It can be assumed that these depictions reflected the habitual place for study found in the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century urban dwelling. In early Cinquecento Rome, this type was recommended by Paolo Cortesi in a chapter on the ideal palace for a cardinal, in his treatise *De Cardinalateau of 1510:*

> The same should be said about the arrangement of the room used for study at night (*cubiculum lucubratorium*) and the bedroom, the which should be very near to each other: because they serve closely related activities. Both these rooms should be especially safe from intrusion and so we see why they should be placed in the inner parts of the house.\(^3\)^\(^4\)

At the end of the sixteenth century, the ideal pictorial decoration of this kind of spaces was described by Giovanni Battista Armenini, in his *De veri precetti della pittura* of 1586 as mainly consisting of oil-paintings with *Poesie,* by which he intended classical and mythological subjects. This accorded with the objects contained in this kind of *studio,* being portrait-busts of famous persons, medals, cameos, glass-paintings and *intarsia,* and last but not least, books and mathematical instruments. These again concentrated on the classical arts and sciences.\(^\text{15}\)^\(^\text{6}\) In this respect, the Palazzetto resembled this tradition, except for the fact that it also contained religious themes in the Camerino degli Iremiti, and it extended beyond the space of one room to comprise a separate wing of the palace.

**Pliny's diaeta and its Cinquecento imitations**

In its interior organisation, size and the intimate link with the private garden behind it, the Palazzetto followed a third antique example for the *studiolo,* called *diaeta.* The precedent for this building-type was provided by Pliny the Younger in the description of his own villa in

\(^1\) Frommel 1973, vol. 1, p.73.
\(^2\) Cortesi 1510, cited after the translation by D’Amico Weil-Garris 1980, p.85.
\(^3\) Armenini 1587 1971, pp.200-201: ‘Ma circa l’adornar i studij, questi usarono quasi le medesime pitture, le quali dimostrarono quando si disse delle logge, se non vi si annuncesse i quadri a oglio, o i ritratti di naturale di persone illustri, i quali fossero dipinti per mano di eccellentissimi maestri, & che i scompartimento dessi studij fossero fatti con gli ordini, & con gli disegni loro: Conosciuta che le cose che sono rareissime, & di gran pregio son quelle, che da i Signori si cercano per i loro studij, per farli adorni, & massimamente di cose antiche, che sono per lo più, com’a dir medaglie d’oro, di bronzo, & d’argento, così teste, & figurine di marmo, & di bronzo, o di altre pre职ose materie scultpice. O sono poi i Diaspri Camei, le Gene, le Smalti, & i Cristalli in forma di cose variè, & di artificio mirabile, si com’e di tarsia, o di commessi le tavole, i banci, le cornici, & gli armari, con l’altrè cose più minute, nelle quali poco si vagliono dell’ Pittori, o com’è per uso, & per bellezza la moltitudine de’libri loro, insieme con gli’instrumenti mathematici, & altri, secondo le scienze in che essi sono più inclinati.’
\(^6\)
Laurentium.¹⁰⁷ According to the literary evocations in his letters, this villa was situated between the shore of the Mediterranean sea and the inland woods, and was visually and physically attuned to its natural surroundings. Pliny described that the architectural plan of the villa had been partially dictated by the geographic circumstances of the site, and that a view of the countryside was gained by having many windows and openings towards the exterior.¹⁰⁸ Gardens with flowers were planned around the building. A separate pavilion, which he called diaeta, was linked to the main body of the villa by means of a cryptoporticus or covered archway, and consisted of three rooms and a terrace. In his literary evocations of this annex, Pliny stressed the omnipresence of nature as perceived from this location:

Here begins a covered arcade, nearly as large as a public building. It has windows on both sides, but more facing the sea, as there is one in each alternate bay on the garden side... In front is a terrace scented with violets... At the far end of the terrace, the arcade and the garden is a suite of rooms [diaeta], which are really and truly my favourites, for I had built them myself. Here is a sun-parlour facing the terrace on one side, the sea on the other, and the sun on both. There is also a bedroom that has folding doors opening onto the arcade and a window looking out on the sea. Opposite the intervening wall is a beautifully designed alcove... it is large enough to hold a couch and two arm-chairs, and has the sea at its foot, the neighbouring villa's behind, and the woods beyond, views which can be seen separately from its many windows or blended into one.¹⁰⁹

The word diaeta was derived from the Greek word οίκεια, which literally meant dwelling. In the classical world, especially by Statius and Pliny, this term was most often used to denote autonomous garden-pavilions which were so situated as to offer views over the surrounding countryside.¹¹⁰ This was a feature especially apt for the villa, not the urban dwelling: and the natural surroundings played a major role in its concept. It seems that many classical villas disposed over such additions.¹¹¹ Again according to Pliny, the effect of this architectural addition to the main building was one of ultimate solitude, being completely isolated from the inhabited world:

¹⁰⁸ On the importance of the view from the villa for its concept, see Ackerman 1990, esp. pp.26-28.
¹⁰⁹ Pliny the Younger 1972 vol.1, pp.139-141 (Bk.2.XVII,16-23).
¹¹° For the meaning of the word διαείδω in the classical world, see PRE vol.5, cols.307-308, where also a list of classical examples is given; see also DVP vol.3, col.506, Rostowzew 1990, pp.60-63 and MacDonald Pinto 1995 pp.71, 80, 112; see Sherwin-White 1966, pp.193-198, 325, Littlewood 1987, pp.23-24, and Förtsch 1993, pp.48-53 for the Plinian definition and use of the term.
¹¹¹ Rostowzew 1990, pp.60-63.
This profound peace and seclusion are due to the dividing passage which runs between the room and the garden so that any noise is lost in the intervening space ... When I retire to this suite I feel as if I have left my house altogether and much enjoy the sensation: especially during the Saturnalia when the rest of the roof resounds with festive cries in the holiday freedom, for I am not disturbing my household's merrymaking nor they my work."

This extended study offered its inhabitant a quiet place for reading and study, and at the same time integrating with the surrounding landscape. Nature became a literary topic connecting the study of arts and letters with its ideal setting of the villa. Contrary to the studio-l tradition as described above, this special architectural complex was not exclusively focused on writing and reading; aesthetic pleasure was an inseparable part of the villa-life and this third kind of study. It comprised objects of art and literature as well as the beauty of nature, as Pliny himself alluded to painted landscapes when looking at the reality of nature from the setting of his Tuscan villa. He even seems to place the artificial representation above real nature:

It is a great pleasure to look down on the countryside from the mountain, for the view seems to be a painted scene of unusual beauty rather than a real landscape, and the harmony to be found in this variety refreshes the eye wherever it turns.

Not only the difference between real and imaginary landscape was cancelled in this description: in a passage further on in the same letter also the garden was considered equal in its aesthetic beauty to the real landscape in which the villa was located. By hiding the stone boundary that fenced off his formal garden from the surrounding countryside, Pliny the Younger manipulated both domesticated and untouched nature to create an illusion of unlimited extension and aesthetic variety. The same could be said about the visual effect of the landscape-setting in the context of the Villa Laurentina, where the gardens gradually merged with the sea on the one side, and the mountains on the other side of the building.

According to the description in Pliny's letter, the Laurentine villa was an extension to the townhouse - 'It is seventeen miles from Rome, so that it is possible to spend the night there after

---

1 Pliny the Younger 1972 vol.1, pp.141-143 (bk.2,XII.22-24).
3 Pliny the Younger 1972 vol.1, p.344 (bk.5.VI.13); see also Tanzer 1924, pp 108-135 and Littlewood 1987, p.23.
4 Pliny the Younger 1972 vol.1, p.343 (bk.5.VI.17): 'The whole garden is enclosed by a dry-stone wall which is hidden from sight by a box hedge planted in tiers; outside is a meadow as well worth seeing for its natural beauty as the formal garden I have described, then fields and many more meadows and woods.'
5 Littlewood 1987, p.123.
necessary business is done, without having cut short or hurried the day's work..." The proximity of the villa to Rome was paralleled by the nearness of the *diaeta* to the building itself; the function of the entire complex could be summarised as offering its owner suburban solitude.

In the Renaissance, the reception of the Plinian texts also effected an interest in the particular form and function of the *diaeta*. In literary form, this concept became widely discussed. The medieval example set by Petrarch in his own villa and the descriptions given of it in his own writings was fused with the Plinian type by Erasmus in his *Convivium Religiosum* of 1522, where he described the suburban dwelling of the main character Eusebius. It contained a flight of rooms on the first floor, of which one was denoted as the library, adjacent to which were a number of *cubicula* for resting, and a *museion*, which will have harboured an encyclopaedic collection of objects, about which the reader was not further informed. A balcony and two rooms with windows all around opened from this apartment to offer views over the garden and the surrounding landscape. Erasmus had the owner Eusebius state that this ensemble of spaces was especially made for study and seclusion.

In the sixteenth century, antiquarian reconstructions of the Plinian example were made by philologists such as Paolo Giovio, a courtier in the household of Alessandro Farnese, and antiquarians such as Pirro Ligorio. Pliny's literary descriptions continued to function as main source, but these were now confronted with scarce, but real, architectural remains. In Ligorio's *Descrittione della Superba & Magnificentissima Villa Tiburtina Hadriana*, written between 1550 and 1568, the word *diaeta* is used a number of times. Ligorio's suggestion is that these apartments in Hadrian's villa in Tivoli were used for the study of the arts - whether the literary, visual or theatrical. The emperor's villa contained quite a number of these retreats, to be found primarily in the vicinity of the large octagonal courtyard. All the Plinian elements recurred here: the connection to *loggie* or *cryptoportici*, the closeness to either the countryside or private courtyards

---

117 For Petrarch's villa in Arqua, see Helleniati Fontana 1988, and Blason-Gallo 1990.
120 See Coffin 1979, pp.241-244 for the importance of written material in confrontation with the archaeological remains.
and gardens, and the vicinity of a library. Next to this part of the palace, and obviously related to the *diaeta* was a large courtyard in which fountains and sculptures were arranged; and a part of these were now, as one is informed by Ligorio, in the collection of Ippolito d'Este and, in this context more importantly, the Farnese palace in Rome.

In 1615, Vincenzo Scamozzi published an architectural reconstruction of the Plinian Villa Laurentina in his *Idea dell'Architettura Universale*. The term he used for the *diaeta* was Italianized into *diette*, which suggests that the term had become accepted in architectural theory. Scamozzi supposed on the basis of the Plinian letters, that there was a 'tower, in which the *diette* were; that is a place for concentration, and other places for rest, because they have light from every angle, but are in complete silence, and with beautiful vistas over the sea, and over the villas.' Scamozzi's text suggested that a second *dietta* was found on the opposite side of the building, above the second entrance. The woodcut of the plan inserted into his book (fig.48) supports this, as the façade above the central door was elevated in a kind of rooftop-pavilion. Mirroring this façade also meant projecting a second *dietta*. On either side of these *diette* terraces offered extended views over the sea.

What Scamozzi pointed out with his description and reconstruction is that the tradition of the *diaeta* and the idea of enjoying the vista and the arts in a place of seclusion and quiet enjoyed a revival in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The double intention of study and relaxation, that Pliny had alluded to, were consciously taken up in these publications. They also show, that the form was taken in the Renaissance and Baroque to be a real possibility, not as a

---

11 Ligorio 1723, col.11: 'Dalle teste di queste due Piazze verso l'Oriente sono più cose edificate: Bagni, luoghi delle Diete, Branco, e Bibliotheca, con diverse Piazzette avanti a ciascun luogo, le quali gli servono per Atri, e per Vestibuli allo scoperto. Nella testa delle Portici di mezzo, che corrispondono scavalcivamente alle due gran Piazze, che fanno il Povile, e una gran Cavea, per le cui entrate si v'ha in un Tempio accomodato alla dieta delle Storie, dove erano negli angoli colonne & altri luoghi accomodati alli Dei Propiti di tali studii.' Ligorio's description was echoed in 1601 by Del Re without reference to the *diaeta*'s function; see Del Re 1723, cols.68-69.

12 Ligorio 1723, col.11: 'A lato alla dieta è un altro luogo ornato di un Portico Ovato, nel mezzo della Piazza ssa è un edificio Ottagono, che per ogni lato ha porte e nicchie, & altri ripostigoli di Statue, dove di dentro, e di fuori erano molte Immagini de Dei; e vi scaturiscono Fonti; dentro per loro fregio erano intagliati Mostri Marinii, tanto di forma humana, come d'ogni animale terrestre, e marino con code de Delphino, con Donne & Amori à cavallo, in altri ci erano intagliati carri tirati da diversi animali, & Angeli guidati da certi Cupidini alati, o vogliamo dire Intelligenze, che fanno un giuoco Circese; alcuni de carri hanno per suoi cavalli Struzzi, altri Arieti, altri Cavalli proprii. Tigri, e Colombi, quasi mostrando, che ogni specie corre ad un fine terminato, o alla Morte, o alla Generazione. Queste cose, parte sono state portate a Roma nell'Horto dell'Cardinale Farnese, parte ridotte in Tivoli murate per le case, e parte sono in potere di V.S.;III;ustissima.'


14 Scamozzi 1615, vol.1, p.267: 'Ad alto, e nel mezzo era una torre, nel quale erano le diette, cioè luoghi da veggiare, & altri luoghi da riposare, e perché havevano lume da piu parte, pero erano in gran silenzio, e di bellissime viste del Mare, e delle Ville.'

15 Scamozzi 1615, vol.1, p.268: 'e parimente sopra all'ingresso era una Torre, e diette, e stazze da dormire, con bellissime vedute di Mare, e molto piu ancora di terra.'
mere literary conceit of the author Pliny the Younger.

As a result of these discussions on the form and function of the diaeta, this building-type became considered a most apt environment for the conversations of courtly society, and for that reason most attractive for patrons of higher circles. Due to complex requirements, spatial dimensions and the presence of the private garden, the realisation of such plans for diaetai was moreover limited to these circles. In the sixteenth century a small number of apartments was created in this tradition, all in the direct vicinity of the city of Rome, or even within its walls, in accordance with the suburban location of Pliny's example.126

One of the earliest recreations of a diaeta was built on the third floor of the Vatican Palace for Julius II dell Rovere (1503-1515).127 It comprised a number of rooms indicated in the sources as bibliotheca segreta, and a roof-terrace; it also contained an uccelliera or aviary, that was not mentioned by Pliny in his descriptions of the Villa Laurentina or Tusculana, but which was a feature that also had its roots in the villaculture of classical antiquity.128 Before 1509, artists like Sodoma and Baldassare Peruzzi were hired to execute the painted decoration of Julius' roof-apartment in the Vatican; ample use of grotesques indicated a wilful adaptation of the antique;129 the project also included a number of frescoes depicting the seasons and the months, which obviously referred to the seasonal rhythm of life in the countryside.130 It has been supposed that part of the collection of antique marbles was originally on display here, before being transferred to the Cortile del Belvedere.

A second project for a diaeta as part of a (sub)urban architectural complex was proposed by Raphael for the complex of the Villa Madama, begun in 1518 - which later in the sixteenth century became property of the Farnese family - but this edifice was never completely realised.131 The plans for the building had been heavily influenced by the excavations undertaken at Villa Adriana and by the letters of Pliny the Younger; the terminology used by Raphael to

127 A nearly contemporary description of this apartment is in Vasari’s life of Baldassare Peruzzi; see Vasari 1876 vol.4, p.317: ‘Avendo intanto papa Giulio Secondo fatto un corridore in palazzo, e vicino al tetto un’uccelliera, vi dipinse Baldassare tutti i mesi di chiaro secco, e g’essercizii che si fanno per ciascun d’essi in tutto l’anno ...’ See also Kempers 1996b, pp.6-9.
128 A description of an aviary had been given by Varro in his Res rusticae; it had become an element in Italian Renaissance villa’s as well, and could be found for example in the Medici Villa in Pratolino.
129 This accords with Armenini’s description of the ideal studiolo’s decoration; see Armenini 1587 1971, p.200.
130 For a description of the present-day situation of this section of the palace, see Il Palazzo Apostolico Vaticano 1992, pp.116-117; see Hochrenaissance im Vatican 1998, cat.no.323 and Vasari’s citation given above in note 123 for a description of frescoes probably coming from this Uccelliera.
describe it to his patron - Giuliano de'Medici, the later Clement VII (1523-1534) - was consciously derived from the latter source. The word *diaeta* itself was used by the artist in the letter to the patron in which he discussed the plans for the villa, and in which he expressed the use and significance of this kind of apartment for the nobility: 'the diaeta is a most delightful place to be in the winter to converse with gentlemen.'

Raphael's plans even foresaw two different *diaetai* in this complex: one for summer use and another for winter. The latter was situated on top of a tower on the east-side of the villa, directly accessible from the cardinal's apartment, and the former comprised a room with a central fountain, in an *exedra* off a huge garden loggia. Thus the winter *diaeta* was protected from the cold wind and open to the warmth of the sun. Both recreations of the concept freely translated the Plinian concept into architecture, adhering to the principle that the particular space should be fit for repose and intellectual conversation, being detached from the villa's main building, and offering a direct vista onto the surrounding countryside, or in the other case, onto a walled-in garden.

Although the influence of the Plinian concept on the practice of building in sixteenth-century Rome might have been relatively small, its literary and architectural ideal influenced the concept of the *studiolo* in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. This resulted in an extension of its function from being a place to read and write into a complex dedicated to the collection, display and study of diverse kinds of objects. This included both the arts and natural history, and led to a new ideal in which the garden, whether real or imaginary, became an important element.

**Studiolo, garden, and the genre of landscape-painting**

As a result of the various influences on the *studiolo*, the actual form these rooms were given was dependent on the circumstances, requirements and available space, and varied over time. However, the access to or sight onto a garden or landscape was often incorporated into the scheme. Especially the *diaeta* ought to be physically or visually related to the surrounding landscape - Pliny's words strongly emphasised this, and Erasmus followed this in his the adaptation of the theme in his *Convivium Religiosum*. All reconstructions took this to be one of...
its main characteristics. When a direct view onto landscape could not be achieved, however, landscape-painting could be used as a replacement, as Armenini’s comparison of the decoration of loggias with landscapes with the interior decoration of the *studiolo* suggested.** Examples show that the use of landscape-painting became a set-piece of the interior decoration of early modern *studioli*, whether a view onto a garden or the landscape was possible or not. Particular reasons for this phenomenon were derived from a contemporary discussion on spiritual and physical health.

The *studiolo* of Isabella d’Este in the Palazzo Ducale in Mantua, begun in 1515 and finished around 1522, was part of an apartment in the Corte Vecchio, comprising also a *grotta* and a hallway. Adjacent to these was a secret garden with a small loggia, the private character of which was stressed by the fact that its only entrance was through the study.** For this reason, Isabella’s retreat appeared to be more a *diaeta* than a *studiolo*. The function of the additional garden was stressed in a description made by Alberto Cavriani in 1525 of Isabella’s *giardino*, in which he drew upon several *topoi*:

> your small garden, which is so beautiful and lush that it seems like paradise ... Everything brings happiness; this divine grotto and rooms give light and joy to the inferno, the beautiful loggia with cheerful garden ornamented with new sorts of fruit invite each soul to put aside his melancholy humour and dress in gladness...**

In his praise Cavriani used references to the *hortus conclusus* and Paradise on earth, and in his last remark on melancholy drew upon the medical theme of the four humours as developed in Galen. Several humanists pointed at the function of the garden as counterbalancing the health-risks brought about by studious activities employed in the *studio*.** In an exposition about Quintilian’s remarks on the beauty of the landscape as distracting from concentration, Petrarch had already suggested that intellectual work should be alternated with walks in the woods to provide the necessary relaxation.**

The argument of alternating concentration in private seclusion with relaxation in the open

---

4. Letter of 6 May 1525 from Cavriani to Isabella d’Este, Archivio Storico Lombardo 35, 1908, 16, quoted by Liebenwein 1977, p.220 n.460: “il vostro giardino piccolo, quale è tanto bello e verdeggianti che pare il paradiso... ogni cosa invita ad alegria; quella divina grotta et camarini dariano luce et gaudio a lo inferno, la loggia bella cum giardino zolioso ornato di novi fructi invitano ogni animo mesto a deponere lo humore malanconico et vestirse de letitia...”
5. For the reception of this idea in the sixteenth century, see Schmitz 1972, pp.139-141, 159-162.
air was given a medical background by the fifteenth-century Florentine philosopher Marsilio Ficino; the view over clear waters, passages in gardens, and long walks in the woods or boat-trips on the water would help the studious person to relax and avoid the risks of the melancholic or saturnian temperament that threatened his health. Thus the study, which carried the risk of too much concentration, should also have as an antidote a view over gardens or the surrounding landscape.14 Also the plants and flowers in the garden itself could relieve the melancholic. According to Ficino, the sight and smell of flowers was also salubrious; here he mentioned the rose, the garofano or carnation, the orange-tree and the violet, whose smell would activate the nostrils and thus stir the melancholic mind. In particular, the hyacinth was supposed to relieve bad fluids, when held in the mouth.14

Such medical considerations were discussed in architectural treatises, in which the health of the inhabitants was thought to be the direct result of the location and organisation of the edifice. Leone Battista Alberti in his De re aedificatoria had recommended the reader to place his suburban villa within a landscape on hilltops for the availability of fresh air, as doctors recommended, and because it would offer a view on natural beauty all around: 'Meadows full of flowers, sunny lawns, cool and shady groves, limpid springs, streams, and pools, and whatever else we have described as being essential to a villa - none of these should be missing, for delight as much as for their utility.'142 The latter argument referred to the medical theory, as the following sentence made especially clear: 'I would not have it overlooked by anything whose melancholy shade would cause offence.'143

A connection between study and garden was also alluded to in Palladio's treatise on architecture of the late sixteenth century, where he recommended that a study should be located on the first floor and offer a view eastwards over gardens or trees with an eye on the course of the
Eastward orientation of the room meant sun in the morning only, not during the hot and thus unhealthy afternoon. Examples of studioli situated on upper floors illustrate the application of this medical principle of procuring wide vistas over the countryside to inspire their owners to reflection and protect them from melancholia.

An early architectural example of such a connection between studio and the landscape was in the house of Petrarch at Arqua, where the study had a window on the north with a view onto his garden and it was annexed to a loggia that ran along the entire westside of the building, looking out over the countryside. The situation at Eusebius' house as described by Erasmus in his Convivium Religiosum seems to have been inspired by such examples; it also offered an elevated view over the landscape from a first-floor loggia. One of the studioli in Palazzo Medici-Riccardi in Florence provided, albeit only optically, an entrance to the garden by means of a terrace. This was copied in Palazzo Vecchio, in the study that had loggie on either side from which the view over Florence and its surrounding hills could be enjoyed.

In other cases, the planning of, or even the vista onto a real garden or the landscape, was impossible. In the fifteenth and sixteenth century, studioli in urban dwellings were often located at the end of the private apartment in accordance with the tradition of locating this room next to bedrooms, on the interior of the building. In these cases, painted landscapes were a substitute for the view onto real countryside and could thus be applied to counterbalance the negative effects of studying. Already Pliny the Younger had equated the beauty of the landscape with that of paintings, underlining the importance of the pleasure of looking at them. Again, Alberti praised the positive effects of landscape paintings of the observer: 'Our minds are cheered beyond measure by the sight of paintings depicting the delightful countryside...The sixteenth-century philosopher and medical scholar Girolamo Cardano stated that paintings and literary descriptions of landscapes relieved the mind of the melancholic just as well as real nature. In 1584, Gian Paolo Lomazzo recommended that 'luochi di piacere' meaning loggias looking onto gardens, be decorated with antique themes, 'giochi amorosi' and 'istorie di gioia e d'allegrezza, che non tutto

111 Palladio 1997, p.78: 'But those [rooms] we would want to use in the spring and autumn will be oriented to the east and look out over gardens and greenery. Studies and libraries should be in the same part of the house because they are used in the morning more than at any other time.'
115 Liebenwein 1977, pp.47-49.
118 Cardano 1663 vol.2, p.217: 'Vigilias letis cogitationibus, studiis, colloquis, picturarumque amoenarum aspectu compensabis...' See also Schmitz 1972, p.162.
The Palazzo Vecchio in Florence, which contained a number of cortili but no garden, was embellished during the inhabitation by the Medici rulers with more than one studiolo. One of those, the Scrittoio del Terrazzo, was planned and executed from 1565 onwards. It was located between the Salone dei Cinquecento and the Cortile della Dogana, on the floor where the apartments of the Duke and his wife were, and could be reached only from either side by a terrace. The walls of these terraces were frescoed with motives of idealised landscapes and gardens, framed by architectural fantasies of a feigned loggia. These panoramas transported the viewer to the open countryside, with a pergola and a statue of Apollo or Orpheus on a fountain. Real architectural elements, in the form of stone benches underneath these vistas, expanded this illusion of outdoor refuge.

In studioli bordering on real gardens, depictions of landscapes served as a link between inside and outside. Antique precedents were described by Pliny the Elder and Vitruvius. The former celebrated the painter Ludius or Studius for introducing the genre as a suitable decoration for cryptoporici, loggie, and the walls surrounding open terraces. Vitruvius especially advised

---


15 Mancini 1956-1957 vol.1, p.142: ‘Onde il Ficino nel Convito al capitolo 9, regressando questa distinzione delle pitture e dell’esser viste, disse: ‘Reliqui enim sensus cito replentur, visus autem et auditorius divitius voculis et pictura pascuntur innani, neque solum horum sensuum firmores sunt voluptates, verum etiam umanae complusiones cognationes, quid enim humani corporis spiritibus convenienties est quam voces hominum et figurae eorum praesertim qui non modo naturae similitudines, sed etiam pulchritudines gratia placent. Quamobrem celeric et melancholici homines tanquam unicum remedium et solamen modestitarum ipsorum complusionis cantis et formae oblectamenta servant.’ Onde, secondo il Ficino, non solamente dovrà esser distinzione di luogo, ma in farle vedere da questa o quell’altra sorte d’huomini, secondo la composizione e passion d’amor, etc. essa, costume, genere di vita che si desidera conservare o aumentare, o veramente sminuire e corregger al contrario. Mancini cited from Ficino’s commentary on Plato’s Convivium Platonis, De Amore, VI.9. The same argument of looking at nature as remedy for melancholy was alluded to by the English painter and courtier Edward Norgate, who travelled to Rome in 1622 and met Paul Brill, in his theory of painting written around the middle of the seventeenth century. See Norgate 1627-1628, note 179 for the interpretation of this remark. With respect to landscape-painting around 1600 in the Netherlands, this argument has been put forward as valid for this context in Bakker 1983, pp.29-30.

16 Allegri Cecchi 1980, p.351 cited the payment for this work in 1581: ‘per h. 14’ pittura fatta su dua terrazzini di S.A.S.’ in Archivio di Stato, Firenze, F.M.11, c. 151x. Author of these frescoes was Tommaso del Verrocchio; see Thiene Becker 1907-1950 vol.34, p.298. See also Liebenwein 1977, p.153.

17 Pliny the Elder 1936-1936 vol.9, p.347 (Bk.XXV,116): ‘Nor must Spurius Ladius also, of the period of the late lamented Majesty Augustus, be cheated of his due, who first introduced the most attractive fashion of painting walls.
the application of painted landscapes in promenades in his treatise *De Architectura.* Some antique examples suggest that this was contemporary practice. For example, the cryptoporticus in the Domus Aurea in Rome contained painted landscapes to suggest to the visitor an outside location.

In the Renaissance, landscape-paintings that offered an illusionistic view onto the countryside could be found in the *studiolo* of Isabella d'Este, where paintings by Perugino, Lorenzo Costa and Mantegna depicted related mythological themes in landscape settings. Three of the paintings in this *studiolo* were hung so as to align their backgrounds into one continuous horizon. The *scalaerica* or serving-room of her Appartamento della Grotta also contained lunettes with representations of hunting-scenes in landscapes, painted in 1522 by Leonbruno. This set an example: Isabella's son Alfonso II Gonzaga ordered mythological landscapes for his own *studiolo* in the Castello at Ferrara. The subjects of these paintings were the *Feast of the Gods, Bacchus and Ariadne,* the *Worship of Venus,* and the *Andrians,* the first one executed by Giovanni Bellini and finished by Titian, and the latter three painted by Titian himself.

These examples illustrate the phenomenon of combining works of art with iconographic or thematic coherence together in the *studiolo,* and the importance of the element of landscape in this tradition since the Renaissance. It was no coincidence that Farnese chose to have mythological subjects depicted in the frescoes and paintings in the Palazzetto, set within conspicuous natural settings. However, at the end of the sixteenth century the tradition of studies began to take a turn towards a virtual existence: the significance of the term *studiolo* shifted from the denomination of a room to an expression for the collection of objects it housed. In the early seventeenth century important changes occurred in the organization of the generic Roman palace as a result of new ceremonial and social exigencies. This effected both interior organization with pictures of country houses and porticoes and landscape gardens, groves, woods, hills, fish-ponds, canals, rivers, coasts, and whatever anybody could desire... and p.349: 'He also introduced using pictures of seaside cities to decorate uncovered terraces, giving a most pleasing effect at a very small expense.' See Mansuelli 1990, pp.344-345.

Vitruvius 1962 vol.2, p.103: 'in covered promenades, they used for ornament the varieties of landscape gardening, finding subjects in the characteristics of particular places; for they paint harbours, headlands, shores, rivers, springs, straits, temples, groves, hills, cattle, shepherds.'

Peters 1982.

On the written sources concerning these commissions with regard to Giovanni Bellini, see Brown 1982, pp.149-167; on the iconography of Isabella's commission to Perugino, see Hope 1981, pp.293-294 and 310-311.

Verheven 1971, p.54 referred to a letter by Carlo Ghisi to Isabella d'Este in which this suggestion was made. For Titian's paintings for Isabella's *studiolo,* see Wethey 1975, pp.29-41.


On the written sources concerning these commissions with regard to Giovanni Bellini, see Brown 1982, pp.149-167; on the iconography of Isabella's commission to Perugino, see Hope 1981, pp.293-294 and 310-311.

Verheven 1971, p.54 referred to a letter by Carlo Ghisi to Isabella d'Este in which this suggestion was made. For Titian's paintings for Isabella's *studiolo,* see Wethey 1975, pp.29-41.

and the functions of spaces, also leading to profound alterations in the concept of the studiolo. The very size of studies limited the dimension of objects, while collections and their objects began to grow in size: larger paintings and voluminous sculptures required more space. To this was added the growing interest in natural history and the knowledge of the order of the world, of which artefacts also formed part. Such encyclopaedic collections attracted more and more public attention, to the detriment of the smaller works of art and antiquarian culture. To meet these new demands, and as a new phenomenon of social distinction as well, the galleria developed into the space where works of art of greater dimensions, botanical and zoological specimens would be placed on public display.

As a result of growing collections and the increasingly large-scale format of paintings and sculpture, a specific architectural building-type was developed to house the visual and plastic arts. From around 1600, the galleria or gallery would take the place of the studiolo as the main location in the urban palazzo to hang paintings. and in 1620 Mancini proposed to put landscapes and cosmografie on view in this kind of space as they did not offend the average visitor to these galleries as paintings with more erotic content might do. From this it can also be gauged that new social requirements meant a shift from a predominantly private to a more public display of paintings; and landscapes were best fitted to this new situation for their undisputedly acceptable subject matter.

At this turning-point, the two ideals of the studiolo that had developed in the Renaissance - the space for the Muses set within nature, and the secluded room for the study of the arts, letters and natural history - were conflated for a period before they would take opposite directions and dissolve into other forms. While the studiolo became outmoded, the galleria lacked the intimate contact with the works of art, which the real collector praised so highly. The result of this tension was the dica, which can describe the type of private gallery prior to the introduction of more

---

161 On the decline of the sixteenth-century antiquarian culture, see Herklotz 1999, p.22f. An example of such a growing collection including the arts and natural wonders is that of the d'Este in Ferrara and later in Modena; see Olmi 1998.

162 Prinz 1970; for the hypothesis of the galleria as a phenomenon linked to the aspiring classes of nibot in Roman society, see Strunck 2001, pp 208-215 for the Galleria Colonna and Ehrlich 2002, pp 186-190 for the galleria at Villa Mondragon.

163 Mancini 1956-1957 vol. 1, p.144: 'Ma se questa pittura fosse piccola ed abber essere collocata in luoghi piccoli, allora si potra mettere negli studioli, come si è detto di vasti sassi.'

164 Mancini 1956-1957 vol. 1, p.143: 'Onde, stando che se deve essere gran riguardo nel lasciar vedere le pitture et in collocarle ai lor luoghi... Dopo si consideraranno le pitture, che per i paesaggi e cosmografie si metteranno nelle gallerie e dove può andare ognuno...' This is echoed in Norgate 1997, p.83: 'this harmless and honest Recreation, of all kinds of painting the most innocent. On the location of landscape-paintings in noble collections see p.85: 'landscape ... which I find of honest extraxion and gentile parentage, and now a privado and Cabinet Companion for Kings and Princes.'
public collections divided according to the material characteristics of the objects on display. It is at these crossroads that the function and decoration of the Palazzetto were conceived.

The typology of the Palazzetto Farnese

At the turn of the seventeenth century, when antiquarian and architectural authors had researched literary sources and antique remains for the characteristics of the Plinian *diaeta*, the Palazzetto *Farnese* represented a conscious attempt to recreate this classical ideal. Its form, a flight of rooms, linked by means of a loggia to a *giardino segreto*, separated from the main building (in this case by a street) but connected to it by a private entrance (via a bridge, see fig.30), corresponds completely with Pliny’s description of the *diaeta* of the Villa Laurentium. Its function was intended along the same lines: as a place for intellectual repose. The Palazzetto continued a sixteenth-century tradition of conscious recreations of the Plinian prototype, but in contrast to the earlier examples realised it more perfectly.

The general comparison between the *diaeta* of the Plinian villa and the Palazzetto can also be traced to the details of the latter project. All the elements of the architecture might have had their precedents in the sixteenth century; their combination was a conscious reference to elements in the description of the Villa Laurentina. Some circumstances, however, necessitated alterations for the new situation in early modern Rome. This applies especially to the mode of entrance to the Palazzetto. The connection to the Palazzo Farnese proper was constituted by a stairwell and the bridge over the Via Giulia. Permission for constructing this private passage was obtained from the *cardinale camerlengo* Pietro Aldobrandini on 4 April 1603; work started soon afterwards.\textsuperscript{165} There existed other examples of such walkways providing access to a private suite of rooms or even outright *diaetae*. Alfonso d’Urbino had a covered passageway constructed between 1507 and 1518 between the castle and the palace at Ferrara, housing five *camerini* that can be understood as *studioli*:\textsuperscript{166} Paul III Farnese initiated a similar project in 1534 to link Palazzo Venezia in Rome with the tower on the slope of the Capitol hill, next to the convent of the Aracoeli.\textsuperscript{167} Odoardo followed the example of his great-grandfather in linking the ancestral palace to a private garden by means of an elevated walkway. His original plan was, however, closer to Pliny’s concept of the *cryptoporticus*, as the building accounts indicate. It was to consist of an underground passageway that turned out to be too complicated, too expensive, and thus was

\textsuperscript{165} Uginet 1980, p.113 gives the papal consent and building-accounts for the arch spanning the Via Giulia. Hibbard 1964, p.104 published the full text of the permission for the bridge.

abandoned. It's actual form as a bridge was only a second choice; and it was for this reason that the elevated passage was only built in 1604 when the Palazzetto itself had already been finished.

Other details of the building of the Palazzetto that at first sight seem trivial were copied from ancient prototypes and Pliny in particular. The 'gioco della palla' mentioned in the licence for the arch over the Via Giulia seems out of place, until the importance of ballgames in ancient times, especially in the context of the villa, is considered. Horace and Pliny the Younger named it as one of their favourite physical exercises to maintain their health while staying at their country seats. For this ballgame special courts had been constructed in Roman villas. Discussions of the game of *pallacorda* in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries also referred to its antique prototype. The form of the court and its internal arrangement was discussed in these publications in connection to the rules of the game. A treatise of 1555, written by Antonio Sciano and entitled *Trattato del giuoco della Palla*, subdivided these spaces according to the existing variants. The variety played at Palazzo Farnese will have been a kind of indoor tennis close to the modern game, as in the inventory of 1644 this was called 'gioco della palla a corda'.

This tennis-court was added during the lifetime of cardinal Odoardo, as the architectural plans of the Palazzo of the late sixteenth century still projected in the place of the 'gioco della palla' an open loggia related to the back of the palace (see fig.27). The south wing of the Palazzo had however not been built during the lifetime of Alessandro Farnese, and when Odoardo continued the construction, he was free to alter the planned garden-loggia into a location for the popular ball game. Comparable examples of special halls for the *pallacorda* appeared in Rome and in villas in the campagna only after 1610, which shows that Odoardo kept up with the current trends. The Tempesta map of 1593 indicated the building of the *pallacorda* on the left side.
side of the garden behind the Palazzo, which suggests that year as a *terminus ante quem* for its construction.\(^{178}\)

That the loggia of the Palazzetto opened towards the private garden was another explicit reference to the Plinian example of *villa and diaeta*, where the *cryptoporticus* gave onto a terrace scented by an abundance of violets. This floral theme was, as discussed above, also given a medical interpretation by Ficino. He enumerated most of the flowers to be found in the Farnese garden on the Tiber bank, and stated that they applied to the senses of smell and taste and through these would relieve the melancholic temperament. That the hyacinth was chosen as a subject for one of Domenichino’s frescoes (figs.36-38) seems no coincidence; the link provided by Ovid between the species of that flower and the lily suggested the extension of the salubrious effects to the flower of the Farnese escutcheon.

This floral theme was also extended to include other details of the Palazzetto’s embellishment, in which the sense of sight was added to that of smell. Farnese had a statue installed under his loggia, described in a later inventory as ‘A statue of Flora, the torso of light grey stone; the head, hands and feet made of white marble’.\(^{179}\) The Dutch artist Hendrik Goltzius drew this statue in red chalk during his stay in Rome around 1600, probably prior to its relocation in the loggia of the Palazzetto (fig.49). Four niches in the walls of this space were made to contain an equal number of ancient sculptures. This embellishment of the garden and the Palazzetto with antique marbles was modelled on antique and Renaissance prototypes - the sculptures were allocated there for their aesthetic beauty. At the same time, these works of art enhanced nature in these gardens with appropriate mythological themes. They became the *staffage* for the real landscape, analogous to the figures in the painted landscapes.\(^{180}\)

---

178 p.74 for the court constructed for Cardinal Atemps at the *gioco della palla* in the Villa Mondragone in Frascati, during the papacy of Gregory XIII, with a special ‘casa del gioco della palla’ adjacent to it, and p.129 for the new space at ground-level provided for that function after 1615. Also the Palazzo Farnese in Caprarola seems to have had a ‘gioco della palla’; this is suggested by Centroni in *Vignola e i Farnese* 2003, pp.109-117, figs. 14-17.

179 When the Farnese *pallacorda* was rented to Pierre Legros to execute sculptures for the Gesù in March 1696, it was clearly no longer in use for sports; after the termination of the contract with Legros in 1720 its entrance from the Farnese property was closed, and a porch was opened in the wall along the Via della Morte to provide an entrance for the carriages of Alessandro Falconieri. See Michel 1981, pp. 572-574.

180 \(^{167}\) Jestaz 1994, p.199: ‘Una statua d’un a Flora, il torso bianco biscio, la testa, mani e piedi di marmo bianco.’ This statue is now in Museo Nazionale, Palermo.

180 \(^{168}\) Riebesell 1988, pp. 386-417 for the allocation of sculptures during Odoardo’s lifetime; and Mielsch 1987, p.112 for antique examples of sculpture-gardens. An interesting and slightly later example of the combination of antique sculpture and garden-scapes can be found in the engravings of the classical sculptures made by François Perrier and published in 1638 under the title *Segmenta nobilium signorum et statuarum*, where the statues were all represented in idealised garden-settings. See Palma 1997, p.272, who stated on the relation between those two visual elements of the statue and the landscape: ‘in contesto paesaggistico adatto a suggerire l’idea dell’azione e della narrazione mitologica. Lo sfondo, formato da alberi e da edifici...’
The loggia had been the most important aspect incorporated in all later villas and diaetae, which, as Pliny described it, was a place from which to enjoy the view onto the garden and the surrounding landscape, and subsequently it had also become an almost obligatory extension of the urban studiolo to which the Palazzetto belonged.\(^{181}\) Also in this case, however, a direct link can be traced from the Plinian example to the Palazzetto; both Pliny and Odoardo Farnese looked out from their garden-loggia over the water – the sea in the former case, and the river Tiber in the latter. The second source of water, the fountain in Farnese's giardino segreto, can be traced to the descriptions of Pliny's Villa Tusculana, where the surrounding garden was furnished with several artificial fountains with basins made of precious marble.\(^{182}\)

Architectural plan and surroundings of the Palazzetto should be considered the epitome of sixteenth-century humanistic attempts to reconstruct Pliny's villa in Laurentium, and the antique precedent of the diaeta in particular. It should be concluded that the Palazzetto was not a chance addition to the Palazzo Farnese, but a meticulously planned new wing. The complex of the Palazzetto recreated the ancient literary ideal of the villa, integrating the study of the arts and sciences with the enjoyable view on the garden and landscape, in the densely populated heart of early Seicento Rome.

**Camerino and Palazzetto - decorative or functional relations?**

Although the Camerino was located within the premises of the brotherhood of the Orazione e Morte, and was rented from them, it was integrated within the existing Palazzetto through architectural adaptations and the application of the same style of decoration. The inclusion in inventories of this sequence of camerini, the choice for landscape-decoration, and the identical display of paintings in the coffered wooded ceiling indicate that it was deliberately inserted into the pre-existing private apartment where arts and learning were combined. Does this imply that the Camerino was a studiolo in the functional sense?

There are two reasons that tend to discount such an interpretation. Firstly, circumstantial evidence excludes the traditional function of a studiolo for the Camerino; there already were several rooms dedicated to studious activities such as reading, writing and the storage of small treasures in the Palazzo Farnese. A private studiolo furnished for Fulvio Orsini and a flight of three rooms denoted with the term studio, housing antique coins and gems in decorated


cupboards, served the antiquarian interests of the palace’s occupants. Alessandro Farnese had gathered the riches contained in them, and also had these spaces organised; Odoardo seems not to have altered their disposition nor their content, so the need for a replacement of these spaces seems to have been absent. There was thus no obvious need to create another space with the same function as the *studiolo* elsewhere in the Farnese palace.

Secondly, the religious function of the room and the theme of its decoration do not accord with sixteenth-century reconstructions, either in treatises or in actuality, of the Plinian *diaeta*. Although the presence of individual religious works was not uncommon in sixteenth-century *studioli*, it never constituted a dominant theme of decoration either. In that case, such a room would sooner be denominated as a private chapel, not a *studiolo*. Contemporary descriptions and inventories of the Camerino use neither one of these terms, as has been discussed above. Neither does the furniture of the room offer a means of positive identification of its function. The objects and utensils described in the inventories preclude that the Camerino was a place used either to read, write or study, nor was it arranged as a place to officiate Mass, for which an altar would have been necessary. Apart from velvet cushions to kneel upon, the Camerino was virtually empty.

Even if the Camerino cannot be termed a *studiolo*, does the thematic of Lanfranco’s paintings and frescoes expand the classical and humanistic view of nature? Does the Palazzetto indeed provide the contextual explanation for the use of landscape painting in the Camerino degli Eremiti? On the one hand, the persistent use of painted landscapes suggests that the decorative programme of the Palazzetto was deliberately continued in the Camerino by means of the landscape theme. Lanfranco’s paintings and frescoes visually prolonged the decorative whole that had been created around 1604 in the first four *camerini*. On the other hand, such an explanation for the frescoes and paintings in the Camerino can only be built on the hypothesis that the landscape provided merely a non-signifying element that functioned as the background to the anchorite iconography. The latter element of the hermit, however, does not relate to the

---

183 Late 1981, p.229 mentioned that according to the inventory of 1566 there was a flight of *studioli* and a separate *studio* on the *piano nobile*; see also Liebenwein 1977, p.35.

184 Robertson 1992, p.140.

185 The inventory of 1644 listed the following objects in this room (Jestaz 1994, p.138): ‘Oratorio che risponde nella Morte. 3328. Due padeletti di legno a scalino. 3329. Un tappeto. 3330. Tre cuscini di velluto cremesino da ingombrare longhi e stretti. 3331. Una sediola bassa coperta di broccatello verde.’ The inventory of 1650 seems more precise on the furniture itself, while the paintings were not listed. In ASN.Fondo Farnesiano b.1853 III-IX, fol.94v-95r: ‘Una sediola di velluto verde, e rossa. Un’altra sediola bassa colli piedi tornite coperta di broccatello verde, e giallo tutto straviato. Due cuscini di velluto cremesino bislunghio col paria mano, perette colli flocchi di setta alle
programme of the Palazzetto. The answer to this question regarding the *studiolo*-pretext for the Camerino’s decoration should thus be negative.

If taken as a coherent idea, the decoration and furnishings of the Camerino degli Eremiti cannot be clarified with recourse to either the *studiolo* or *diaeta*; nor can they be situated within the context of the Palazzetto as theatre of pre-scientific natural philosophy. What distinguished the room from all other examples, both the Stanze in Caprarola and the *studioli* and *diaetai* as discussed above, is the visual relation between the room and the adjacent church and oratory of the Santa Maria dell’Orazione e Morte. What could Farnese observe through these windows and what does that signify for the function and the decoration of the Camerino?