

could have met on several occasions in Rome or Mantua.²⁸ Alberti's use of constructed Roman lettering might be, then, attributable to this ambience. Other north Italians who contributed to the revival of antique lettering are Fra Giocondo da Verona and Damianus Moyllus, as well as the Venetian sculptor Andrea Bregno, whose Roman-style epitaphs on tombs in the city of Rome from the 1460s onwards were probably the first in that city.²⁹ The letters and the layout of the pages in Paduan manuscripts from the mid-Quattrocento onward, such as that of the *Chronica* by Eusebius, c. 1450, in the Biblioteca Marciana in Venice, further demonstrate the keen observation of Roman epigraphs at this time.³⁰

As the study of ancient Rome's remains formed an increasingly important component of the antique revival, northern Italy, especially Padua, and the city of Rome took from Florence her position at the forefront of this movement. The inscriptions on Alberti's Holy Sepulchre illustrate the new, archaeologically correct appearance of Renaissance epigraphs in the mid-Quattrocento; their geometric construction, which idealises and perfects the Roman prototypes in a characteristically Renaissance fashion, attaches Alberti still more firmly to antiquarian studies outside Florence.

CHRISTINE M. SPERLING

BLOOMSBURG UNIVERSITY, PENNSYLVANIA

Leon Battista Alberti, Mantua 1974, pp. 205-07; Lightbown (as in n. 8), p. 122.

²⁸ Evidence toward this, particularly in the form of copies of rare written works by Alberti (*Hippolito e Lamora*, *Ecatomfla*, and *Egloga nomine Tyrsis*) included among Felice's manuscripts, appears in Marderstein (as in n. 2), pp. 302-03.

²⁹ C. Sperling, 'Roman Lettering in Renaissance Rome', unpublished paper delivered at the Renaissance Conference at SUNY Binghamton, New York, October 1987.

³⁰ The role of northern Italy, particularly Padua, in the revival of Roman lettering was discussed by James Wardrop, *The Script of Humanism: Some Aspects of Humanistic Script 1460-1560*, Oxford 1963, pp. 7-17. On Eusebius's *Chronica* (Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, Class. 9, 1), written by an unknown Paduan scribe in 1450, see Wardrop (as above), p. 7 and pl. 3.

WHEN WAS MICHELANGELO BORN?*

THERE ARE four slightly varying accounts of Michelangelo's birth date. The earliest is drawn from the *Ricordanze* of Michelangelo's father, Lodovico di Leonardo Simoni, who was then *podestà* of Caprese and Chiusi in Casentino:

Ricordo come ogi questo dì 6 di marzo 1474, mi nacque uno fanciullo mastio: posigli nome Michelagnolo, et nacque in lunedì matina, innanzi di 4 o 5 ore, et nacquemi essendo io potestà di Caprese, et a Caprese nacque ... (nota che addì 6 di marzo 1474 è alla Fiorentina ab incarnatione, et alla Romana, a nativitate, è 1475).¹

The second appears in Condivi's *Life of Michelangelo*:

Di tal casata adunque nacque Michelagnolo, il cui padre si chiamò Lodovico di Leonardo Buonarroti Simoni, huomo religioso e buono e più tosto d'antichi costumi che nò. Il qual essendo Potestà di Chiusi e di Caprese nel Casentino, hebbe questo figliuolo, l'anno della salute nostra 1474, il dì sesto di Marzo, quattro hore inanzi giorno, in lunedì. Gran natività certamente, e che già dimostrava, quanto dovesse essere fanciullo, e di quanto ingegno, perciocchè havendo Mercurio con Venere in seconda, nella Casa di Giove ricevuto con Benigno aspetto, prometteva quel che è poi seguito. Che tal parto dovessi essere, di nobile ed alto ingegno, da riuscire universalmente in qualunque impresa, ma principalmente in quelle arti, che diletano il senso, come Pittura, Scultura, Architettura.²

The third is contained in Benedetto Varchi's funeral oration, delivered on 14 July 1564, the final event of the memorial service which took place in San Lorenzo nearly five

* This note was written while I was based at the Warburg Institute as a J. Paul Getty Postdoctoral Fellow in the History of Arts and the Humanities. I thank both the Warburg Institute and the Getty Foundation for their generous support of my research. I also wish to thank Stefano Caroti, Germana Ernst and Charles Burnett for their advice and suggestions.

¹ See A. Gotti, *Vita di Michelangelo Buonarroti*, 2nd edn, Florence 1876, i, pp. 3-4 and K. Frey, *Michelagnolo Buonarroti. Quellen und Forschungen zu seiner Geschichte und Kunst. I. Michelangelos Jugendjahre*, Berlin 1907, pp. 3-4. The original document has been lost. A seventeenth-century copy exists in Florence, Archivio Buonarroti, cod. xii, no 26.

² A. Condivi, *Vita di Michelagnolo Buonarroti*, Rome 1553, fol. 2^{rv} (sig. Aii^{rv}).

months after Michelangelo's death. Varchi's version of Michelangelo's auspicious birth nativity reads:

... devemo risolutamente tenere nobilissimi, e religiosissimi Ascoltatori Michelagnolo essere stato eletto in cielo, e mandato in terra da Dio, per dare l'ultimo compimento, e l'estrema perfezione alle tre arti piu belle: cosa che con ciò sia cosa che Lodovico suo padre, il quale era dall'antichissima e nobilissima famiglia de' Conti di Canossa disceso, essendogli sotto felicissima stella nato d'honesta e horrevole [sic] moglie, nel Casentino, dove egli era allora Podestà; questo benedetto figliuolo, la domenica notte del sesto giorno di marzo, d'intorno à otto hore; l'anno della nostra salute mille quattrocento settanta-quattro.³

Finally, in the 1568 edition of his *Vite*, Vasari, plagiarizing both Condivi and Varchi, offered the following:

Nacque dunque un figliuolo sotto fatale e felice stella nel Casentino, di onesta e nobile donna, l'anno 1474 a Lodovico di Lionardo Buonarruoti Simoni, disceso, secondo che si dice, della nobilissima et antichissima famiglia de' Conti di Canossa. Al quale Lodovico, essendo podestà quell'anno del castello di Chiusi e Caprese, vicino al sasso della Vernia, dove san Francesco ricevè le stimate, diocesi aretina, nacque, dico, un figliuolo il sesto dì di marzo, la domenica, intorno all'otto ore di notte, al quale pose nome Michelagnolo, perché, non pensando più oltre, spirato da un che di sopra, volse inferire costui essere cosa celeste e divina oltre all'uso mortale, come si vidde poi nella figure della natività sua, avendo Mercurio e Venere in seconda nella casa di Giove con aspetto benigno riceuto: il che mostrava che si doveva vedere ne' fatti di costui, per arte di mano e d'ingegno, opere maravigliose e stupende.⁴

³ B. Varchi, *Orazione funerale di M. Benedetto Varchi* ..., Florence 1564, p. 11. Cited from G. Vasari, *La Vita di Michelangelo nelle redazioni del 1550 e del 1568*, ed. P. Barocchi, Milan and Naples 1962, ii, pp. 52 n. 36 and 58 n. 43. See also R. and M. Wittkower, *The Divine Michelangelo: The Florentine Academy's Homage on his Death in 1564. A Facsimile edition of Esequio del Divino Michelagnolo Buonarruoti, Florence 1564*, London 1964.

⁴ G. Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori e architettori*, eds R. Bettarini and P. Barocchi, Florence 1987, Testo vi, pp. 4-5. In the 1550 edition of the *Vite*, Vasari's information concerning Michelangelo's birth is limited; the location of his birth is incorrect: 'Nacque dunque in Fiorenza l'anno MCCCCLXXIIII un figliuolo a Lodovico Simon Buonaroti, al quale pose nome al batesimo Michele Agnolo, volendo inferire costui essere cosa celeste e divina più che mortale ...'. See also Frey's parallel transcription of Condivi and Vasari's 1550 and 1568 versions of the *Vite* in Frey (as in n. 1), pp. 10-12.

The variance in these testimonies raises two questions: when was Michelangelo born and what are the implications of his natal chart?

As Frey pointed out, Condivi's 'il dì sesto di marzo, quattro hore inanzi giorno, in lunedì' and Varchi's 'la domenica notte del sesto giorno di marzo, d'intorno a otto ore' actually indicate the same thing.⁵ He failed, however, to explain why. Each notation records a different way of calculating the time of day. For Lodovico Buonarroti and Condivi, 6 March 1475 was a Monday.⁶ Michelangelo's birth occurred four or five hours before dawn (approximately 6:00 a.m.) at 1:00 or 2:00 a.m. on Monday. Vasari and Varchi reckoned that 6 March began at sunset on the previous Sunday. The birth time, calculated forward from this moment (approximately 6:00 p.m. on Sunday, 5 March) would also be about 2:00 a.m. The day, however, remained Sunday until the dawn of Monday morning.

Condivi suggests that arrangement of the planets at the time of Michelangelo's birth was the cause of his genius in every sphere, but especially in 'those arts which delight the senses, such as painting, sculpture and architecture'.⁷ But the exact meaning of his description of Michelangelo's natal chart has yet to be correctly deciphered. It seems that the phrase should be read as if there were an additional implied 'casa' after the word 'seconda'. A rough translation would read: 'because, having Mercury (conjunct) with Venus in the second house (place), received with benign aspect in the house of Jupiter, promised that which subsequently followed'.⁸ This means that at the moment of Michelangelo's birth, Mercury was conjunct with Venus in his second astrological *domus* and that these planets were benignly received by the 'house of Jupiter'.

⁵ Frey (as in n. 1), p. 3.

⁶ In fact, 6 March 1475 was a Monday. It was Julian Day 2259866 (see W. D. Stahlman and O. Gingerich, *Solar and Planetary Longitudes for Years -2500 to +2000 by 10-day Intervals*, Madison WI 1963, p. 486). This astronomical information is supported by the Paschal calendar. See A. Cappelli, *Cronologia, cronografia e calendario perpetuo*, Milan 1969, p. 44.

⁷ Condivi (as in n. 2), fol. 2^r (sig. Aii^v).

⁸ An alternative reading of 'in seconda' as 'following' makes no astrological sense. Caroti and Ernst have suggested to me that the additional 'casa' was probably deleted on stylistic grounds.

There are several problems with Condivi's horoscopic chart. In the first place, on 6 March 1475—Michelangelo's proposed birth date—Mercury and Venus were not conjunct. Both fifteenth-century and modern planetary tables show the planets were separated by nearly 25°. Furthermore, at no time during the morning of 6 March 1475 were Mercury and Venus both located within the second house—regardless of whether one calculates according to Placidus, Regiomontanus or the Equal-House system.⁹ But, whereas none of these stipulations seems appropriate for 6 March 1475, on 6 March 1474 Mercury and Venus were within three degrees of each other.¹¹

Also, between approximately 2:00 a.m. and 3:00 a.m. on the morning of 6 March 1474, both planets were in the second astrological house using all three house-division systems.¹² Finally, Pisces is considered the nocturnal domicile of Jupiter.

⁹ Regiomontanus's *Ephemerides anni 1475* provide the following information:

Saturn	18° 26' Cancer (retrograde)
Jupiter	3° 26' Aquarius
Mars	19° 52' Pisces
Sun	24° 50' Pisces
Venus	35° 21' Aries
Mercury	28° 50' Aquarius
Moon	10° 1' Sagittarius
Caput draconis	15° 12' Libra

(J. Regiomontanus, *Ephemerides ab anno 1475-1506*, [Nuremberg] 1474, s.v. 'Martius'. Reprinted in *Joannis Regiomontani Opera collectanea*, ed. F. Schmiedler, Osnabrück 1972, p. 544.) Tuckerman's *Tables* offer similar results (calculating -5h):

Saturn	16° 55' Cancer (retrograde)
Jupiter	3° 50' Aquarius
Mars	19° 51' Pisces
Sun	25° 25' Pisces
Venus	34° 38' Aries (retrograde)
Mercury	29° 19' Aquarius
Moon	28° 54' Scorpio

(B. Tuckerman, *Planetary, Lunar, and Solar Positions A.D. 2 to A.D. 1649 at Five-Day and Ten-Day Intervals*, Philadelphia 1964, p. 755.)

¹⁰ For a discussion of the different house systems, see J. D. North, *Horoscopes and History*, London 1986.

¹¹ At noon on 6 March 1474 in Caprese Michelangelo, 43° 38'N and 11° 59'E, the planets were arranged as follows:

Saturn	2° 51' Cancer
Jupiter	5° 6' Capricorn
Mars	1° 15' Leo
Sun	24° 41' Pisces
Venus	0° 1' Pisces
Mercury	27° 31' Aquarius
Moon	27° 33' Libra

¹² Using a tropical zodiac, Michelangelo's Ascendant would be 17° 45' Sagittarius at 2:00 a.m. Using sidereal co-ordinates, his Ascendant is 00° 21' Sagittarius.

Venus and the Sun, both in Pisces on 6 March 1474, would have been considered 'guests' in Jupiter's house.¹³ Mercury, due to his conjunction with Venus, would have been pulled into the orbit of Jovian beneficence as well.¹⁴ Both Mercury and Venus, then, were 'in seconda [casa], nella casa di Giove ricevuto con benigno aspetto' on 6 March 1474. In short, the evidence suggests that Condivi's astrological reading of Michelangelo's personality was perfectly accurate—for the wrong year.¹⁵

¹³ The laws of 'reception' are rather liberal. Note al-Kindi's definitions in his *De iudiciis*, iv, 91-92: 'Sciendum tamen coniunctionem pre ceteris efficacitorem atque commodiorem quam receptio comitatur. Cum itaque receptio sit quadripartita, primus modus ex v locis effectuum et dignitatum planetarum egreditur, secundum quem quisque sui coniunctionis socii dignitatem aliquam optinere dicitur, velud Sole loveque coniunctis, uterque domicilium alterius optineat, sique recepti, commoditates et facultates in suis effectibus, velud a se invicem hospitati, quod affectant in peccuniis, sive prole, ceterisque rebus, absolvunt'. Passage taken from a forthcoming edition of *De iudiciis* by C. S. F. Burnett, following the orthography of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 51. I thank him for letting me see the text prior to publication.

¹⁴ The combination of a Sagittarian Ascendant and the Sun in Pisces means that Michelangelo was doubly a 'child of Jupiter' (Sagittarius being the day-house of Jupiter). This fact may account for his inclusion in the print of the *Sphera di Iove* in Sigismondo Fanti's *Trionfo di Fortuna*, Venice 1526, sig. Fi^r. See R. Mortimer, *Harvard College Library Department of Printing and Graphic Arts, Catalogue of Books and Manuscripts*, Cambridge MA 1974, i, p. 259, no. 180. I thank Charles Robertson for this reference.

¹⁵ The two other proposed nativities for Michelangelo are calculated according to dates or times different from Lodovico Buonarroti's notice. Lucas Gauricus publishes a chart for 3:50 a.m. 4 March 1475 (= Friday, 3 March: 9h 50m horol./ 2 March: 15h 37m p.m.) See L. Gauricus, *Tractatus astrologicus*, Venice 1552, p. 85^r. Mercury is located 24° 10' Aquarius and Venus is 24° 56' Aries. Neither is placed in the second house. The accompanying text reads: 'Mercurius eous a Sole 27. gradibus elongatus, in Falciferi hospitio, ab ipsa Venere irroratus exagona radiatione plastica, effecerunt ipsum Michaellem Angelem sculptorem, et pictorem eminentissimum, Phidia, et Praxitele clariores cum opibus affluentissimis, quam laetiam affirmare videtur Iuppiter secundae domus hospitator in horoscopo plasticae supputatus, et a Venere feliciter irrigatus. Ex sui genij dotibus thesauros affluentissimos cumulavit, et a Principibus ecclesiasticis honores clarissimos'. Francesco Giuntini claims to present a chart for 10:00 p.m. 6 March 1474 (= die 6 Martij hora 17. mi.; and 10 post meridiem). See F. Giuntini (F. Iunctinus), *Speculum astrologiae ... Accesserunt etiam commentaria absolutissima in duos posteriores Quodrispartiti Ptolemaei libros ...*, Lyons 1583, i, p. 369 (Book iii, chap. 12). The chart is slightly strange as it shows an Ascendant of 0°

How could this have happened? It is generally assumed that Condivi's source for the details of Michelangelo's birth was Lodovico Buonarroti's *Ricordanze*. On 14 April 1548 Michelangelo had written to his nephew, Leonardo, from Rome asking him to send a second copy of his birth record:

Vorrei che mi mandassi la mia natività, come mi mandasti un'altra volta, a punto come sta in su' libro di nostro padre, perché lo perduta.¹⁶

Art historians have assumed that this rather odd request indicates Michelangelo's participation in the composition of Condivi's biography. The argument is to some extent supported by the fact that Condivi's description of Michelangelo's birth coincides so closely with Lodovico's notations. Milanese had suggested that the *natività* requested by Michelangelo was more than just a birth

record, and that Lodovico's original notes may have contained a rudimentary horoscopic diagram (or *natività*), from which Condivi drew his astrological 'reading'.¹⁷ But if Lodovico Buonarroti's original document contained an accurate horoscopic diagram indicating a conjunction between Mercury and Venus in Michelangelo's second house, it must have been calculated for 6 March 1474 *nuovo stile*.

The source of the problem seems to be the parenthetical notation added to Lodovico's note stating that the date 6 March 1474 was 'alla Fiorentina ab incarnatione'. Since the document exists only in a seventeenth-century copy, there is no way of knowing when this parenthetical phrase was added.

I suggest that the original document sent to Michelangelo/Condivi in Rome contained neither the added phrase, nor an astrological diagram. Condivi, a native of Ripatransone near Ascoli Piceno in the Marche, was accustomed to calculating dates according to the Roman tradition *a nativitate*. Thus he accepted the birth record at face value and calculated Michelangelo's natal chart for approximately 2:00 a.m. 6 March 1474.¹⁸ He failed to check his Paschal calendar, which would have informed him that that 6 March 1474 was not a Monday, but a Sunday.¹⁹ Condivi merely copied the information sent him without much thought about its content.²⁰

If Michelangelo's birth record contained a horoscopic diagram, it was either disastrously inaccurate or Michelangelo was actually born in 1474 *nuovo stile*. If, on the other hand, Condivi himself is the source of the error, Michelangelo's birth in 1475

¹⁶ 47° Pisces, conjunct with Mercury (0° 47' Pisces) and Venus (2° 18' Pisces). This configuration would have occurred about an hour before dawn and not at 10:00 p.m. The chart records neither the time Giuntini advertised, nor the 'four to five hours before dawn' recorded by Lodovico Buonarroti. The planets' positions in the zodiacal signs seem relatively accurate, but the Ascendant is miscalculated. It is unclear whether Giuntini's chart is based on an edited version of the Condivi/Vasari/Varchi descriptions or on some additional, unknown source. It is worth noting that he has made his calculations for 1474 *nuovo stile*.

Interestingly, despite the major differences between their charts, Giuntini arrives at virtually the same astrological conclusions as Gauricus about the importance of Michelangelo's chart: 'Hec genitura est Pictoris, seu sculptoris eminentissimi Phidia et Praxitele clarioris: ut insinuant Venus et Mercurius ambo conjuncti in horoscopo. Quapropter ex sui ingenij dotibus thesaurus affluentissimos cumulavit, et à principibus Ecclesiasticis honores clarissimos obtinuit: quam felicitatem affirmare videtur Iupiter in undecima caeli domo, dominus regiae domus et horoscopi. Dixit enim Ptolomaeus sententia 37. suorum ditorum. Qui Pisces horoscopum habent, hi potestates sortientur. Verum obiit senio confectus anno 1563 Romae die 18. Martij, et eius corpus sepultum est Florentiae cum honore maximo, ut legitur in exequiis factis ex publico aereo. Fuitque Mors ultima linea vitae, sed tamen ipsius nomen in orbe viget.'

'In Italia enim fuerunt Pictores eminentissimi, Leonardus Vincius Florentinus, Donatellus pictor, et sculptor eximius, Raphael Urbinas [,] Titianus, Andreas Mantegna Mantuanus, Franciscus Strozza, Georgius de Aretio et plerique alij, quorum geniturae non circumferuntur. Excellentissimus omnium est Michael Angelus Florentinus. Horoscopus ergo ad corpus Saturni per directionem, vitam cum Morte sigillavit anno aetatis eius 89. Venus et Mercurius cum Sole in horoscopo bene affecti, dederunt ei vitam decrepitam et longaeuam.'

¹⁶ *Il carteggio di Michelangelo*, eds G. Poggi, P. Barocchi and R. Ristori, Florence 1980, iv, pp. 296-97.

¹⁷ G. Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori ed architettori*, ed. G. Milanesi, Florence 1881, vii, p. 137.

¹⁸ In 1445, Pope Eugenius IV had issued a decree that all official documents in the Papal states would be dated *ab incarnatione*, but that all letters were to be dated *a nativitate*. See Cappelli (as in n. 6), p. 15.

¹⁹ *ibid.*, p. 74.

²⁰ The fact that 6 March 1474 was a Sunday raises the slight possibility that Vasari and Varchi also believed that Michelangelo had been born in that year. Since both Vasari and Varchi were Tuscan, a misunderstanding of the Florentine calendar seems unlikely. Nevertheless, their heavy dependence on Condivi's biography could mean that they copied his text without any first-hand knowledge of Michelangelo's real birth date and without having seen the original *Ricordanze* of Lodovico Buonarroti.

remains unassailed. Either way, it seems rather ironic that the astrological configuration supposedly responsible for Michelangelo's universal genius could have been calculated for the wrong year. But it is more ironic still that the desire for celestial confirmation of Michelangelo's divine status is so powerful that this major astronomical error has hitherto gone unnoticed.

KRISTEN LIPPINCOTT

LONDON

AN UNNOTICED DESCRIPTION OF ISABELLA D'ESTE'S GROTTA

IT is well known that Isabella d'Este moved from her rooms in the Castello San Giorgio to apartments in the *Corte Vecchia* after the death of her husband, Francesco Gonzaga Marquis of Mantua, in 1519. The new quarters included a replacement for her 'cavernous' tunnel-vaulted first *Grotta* by a room more rectangular in design.¹ The panegyric or short description edited here (see Appendix) refers to the first *Grotta* and can be related—in part—to the circumstances of Isabella's removal; it appears in the autograph manuscript of the *Libro de natura de amore* composed by Mario Equicola, Isabella's tutor (1508–19) and secretary (1519–c. 1522).² The manuscript

is datable to the years 1509–11, and the passage in question was struck out in the autograph, so that it comes as no surprise to find it missing from the first printed edition (1525).³

Equicola's purpose was generally to enhance Isabella's reputation as a woman of learning, by using his classical erudition in her service and to her praise, so it is understandable that he had first included in the *Libro* a description of her *Grotta*. He seems to have viewed it as a place of greater significance than any other of Isabella's rooms (implicitly including her *Studiolo*) which likewise housed her collections of paintings and antique statuary;⁴ in part, too, he may have wanted to associate it with his own special contribution to her projects. Although the first use of the term *Grotta* in this context is attributable to Niccolò da Correggio in 1498, Isabella's *Grotta* does not appear to have gained special prominence until about 1507–08,⁵ and it may be

Biographical Reappraisal, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London 1981 and idem, 'The good servant': Mario Equicola. Court and courtier in early sixteenth-century Italy', *The Italianist*, vi, 1986, pp. 34–60.

³ On the manuscript see R. Renier, 'Per la cronologia e la composizione del *Libro de natura de amore* di Mario Equicola', *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* (hereafter *GSLI*), xiv, 1889, pp. 212–35; I. Rocchi, 'Per una nuova cronologia e valutazione del *Libro de natura de amore* di Mario Equicola', *GSLI*, cliii, 1976, pp. 566–85; G. Castagno, 'L'autografo del *Libro de natura de amore* di Mario Equicola', *Lingua Nostra*, xxiii, 1962, pp. 74–77; idem, 'L'autografo del *Libro de natura de amore* di Mario Equicola', in *Arte, pensiero e cultura a Mantova nel primo Rinascimento in rapporto con la Toscana e con il Veneto*, Florence 1965, pp. 133–43; M. Pozzi, 'Mario Equicola e la cultura cortigiana: appunti sulla redazione manoscritta del *Libro de natura de amore*', *Lettere italiane*, xxxii, 1980, pp. 149–71. The manuscript, which is definitely autograph, is Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, Turin, cod. N.III.10; the passage with which we are concerned is on fols 197^v–98^r. It is difficult to determine with any degree of certainty when Equicola eliminated the passage from his manuscript. For the reasons I outline below, however, it would seem most likely that he removed it after 1519 when Isabella had changed rooms.

⁴ Cf. Brown, 1976 (as in n. 1), p. 349, n. 48, who considers it 'disconcerting' to find Margherita Canelmo making a distinction between the *Studiolo* and *Grotta*. This was probably under the direct influence of Equicola who was anxious to maintain their separate identities. If there was a blurring, it was possibly more obvious after his death in 1525 or when he could not be so influential.

⁵ Cf. Brown, 1976 (as in n. 1), pp. 331–32. See also A. Luzzo and R. Renier, 'Niccolò da Correggio', *GSLI*

¹ On the *Grotta* see G. Gerola, 'Trasmigrazioni e vicende dei Camerini di Isabella d'Este', *Atti e Memorie della Reale Accademia Virgiliana di Mantova*, n.s., xxi, 1929, pp. 253–90; A. Martindale, 'The patronage of Isabella d'Este at Mantua', *Apollo*, lxxix, 1964, pp. 183–91; C. M. Brown, 'Lo insaziabile desiderio nostro de cose antique': New documents on Isabella d'Este's collection of antiquities', in *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance. Essays in Honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller*, ed. C. H. Clough, Manchester 1976, pp. 324–53; idem (with A. M. Lorenzoni), 'The Grotta of Isabella d'Este', *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, lxxxix, 1977, pp. 155–71 and lxxxix, 1978, pp. 72–82; idem, *La Grotta d'Isabella d'Este. Un simbolo di continuità dinastica per i duchi di Mantova*, Mantua 1985; J. M. Fletcher, 'Isabella d'Este, patron and collector' in *Splendours of the Gonzaga*, [cat. exh.], eds D. Chambers and J. Martineau, London 1981, pp. 51–63.

² On Equicola see D. Santoro, *Della vita e delle opere di Mario Equicola*, Chieti 1906. Other bibliographical references are given in S. D. Kolsky, *Mario Equicola: A*