BARTOLI, GIAMBULLARI AND THE PREFACES TO VASARI'S *LIVES* (1550)*

Thomas Frangenberg

One of the most stimulating insights in recent Vasari scholarship is the observation that Vasari's *Lives*, first published in 1550, is a far less monolithic text than has generally been assumed.[1] Already Wolfgang Kallab, in his extremely detailed book on the *Lives* published posthumously in 1908, had pointed out that other writers contributed both to the artists' biographies and to the accompanying texts.[2] The present article, on the introductory texts of the *Lives*,[3] aims to provide evidence to suggest that the notion of authorship in an undertaking as colossal and innovatory as Vasari's deserves some further consideration.[4] I shall argue that one of the prefaces was certainly written by more than one author, and that Vasari is not likely to have been among these, and that all other introductory texts, with the exception of parts of the technical introduction, contain evidence to suggest that Vasari was not their author.

Giorgio Vasari (1511–74) completed his text with the help of a group of Florentine men of letters. Their contributions fundamentally affected the scope, and the perception, of Vasari's enterprise, and went well beyond what would today be referred to as editing.[5] Different stages

* I thank Charles Hope, Claire Farago and Phillip Lindley for their comments on this paper.

1. C. Hope, 'Can You Trust Vasari?', *The New York Review of Books*, 5 October 1995, pp. 10–13.

2. W. Kallab, *Vasaristudien*, ed. J. von Schlosser, Vienna and Leipzig 1908, pp. 147–48, 270, 444–47. In his autobiography Vasari himself admits his debt to others: G. Vasari, *Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori nelle redazioni del 1550 e 1568*, ed. R. Bettarini and P. Barocchi, Florence 1966ff. (hereafter VBB), VI, p. 396: 'Intanto, disiderando il signor duca Cosimo che il libro delle Vite, già condotto quasi al fine con quella maggior diligenza che a me era stato possibile e con l'aiuto d'alcuni miei amici, si desse fuori et alle stampe, lo diedi a Lorenzo Torrentino, impressor ducale, e così fu cominiciato a stamparsi. Ma non erano anche finite le Teoriche, quando, essendo morto papa Paulo Terzo, cominciai a dubitare d'avermi a partire di Fiorenza prima che detto libro fusse finito di stampare. Perciò che andando io fuor di Fiorenza ad incontrare il cardinal di Monte, che passava per andare al Conclavi, non gli ebbi sì tosto fatto riverenza e alquanto ragionato, che me disse: "Io vo a Roma, et al sicuro sarò Papa. Spediscili, se hai che fare, e subito, avuto la nuova, vientene a Roma senza aspettare altri avvisi o d'essere chiamato". Né fu vano coral pronostico, però che essendo quel Carnovale in Arezzo, e dandosi ordine a certe feste e mascherate, venne nuova che il detto cardinale era diventato Giulio Terzo.' On this passage see also n. 16 below. On Vasari's editors see VBB, I, pp. XI–XII, XVII–XX; A. Rossi, 'Vasari, i suoi amici e la stampa delle *Vite*', *Polianea*, V–VI, 1986, pp. 173–93. For discussions of 16th-century editorial practices see P. Trovato, 'Notes on Standard Language, Grammar Books and Printing in Italy, 1470–1550', *Schifanoia*, II, 1986, pp. 81–95; and N. Maraschio, 'Gradia e ortografia: evoluzione e codificazione', in *Storia della lingua italiana*, 3 vols, Turin 1993, I, pp. 137–227, esp. 183–205.

3. Four prefaces are found in the published version of the *Lives*; to avoid confusion, they will be referred to as follows:
— preface of the entire work = the 'Proemio', in the 2nd edition 'Proemio di tutta l'opera' (VBB, I, pp. 9–30);
— first preface = the 'Proemio delle vite' (VBB, II, pp. 3–32);
— preface of the second part = the 'Proemio della seconda parte delle vite' (VBB, III, pp. 3–19);
— preface of the third part = the 'Proemio della terza parte delle vite' (VBB, IV, pp. 3–13).

4. Hope's current research greatly increases the number of passages in the biographies that he argues Vasari did not write. This issue lies outside the scope of this paper.

5. For a discussion of 16th-century texts in which the precise borders of individual authorship cannot be delineated see I. D. Rowland, 'Raphael, Angelo Colocci, and the Genesis of the Architectural Orders', *Art Bulletin*, LXXVI, 1994, pp. 81–104. Perhaps the most prominent text displaying the effects of multiple authorial agencies is the *editio princeps* of Leonardo's *Treatise on Painting* (Paris 1651), a work attributable jointly to Leonardo, the compiler of the Codex Urbinas, the 16th-century compiler(s) of the abridged *Treatise* from the Codex Urbinas, and the editors active in the 17th century. This work is the subject of research currently undertaken by Claire Farago and myself.

6. VBB, I, p. 10 (preface of the entire work; see the list of prefaces above, n. 3).

7. VBB, II, p. 32 (first preface). For further comments on this shift in emphasis see below.

8. For recent accounts of Vasari's life see P. L. Rubin, *Giorgio Vasari: Art and History*, New Haven and London 1995; and J. Kliemann, 'Giorgio Vasari', in *The Dictionary of Art*, XXXII, London 1996, pp. 10–25.

9. See Rubin (as in n. 8), pp. 67–70.

10. Prior to 1550 Vasari built an organ loft in Arezzo Cathedral and a rustic villa outside Monte San Savino, and completed a house he had acquired in an unfinished state in Arezzo; see C. Conforti, *Vasari architetto*, Milan 1993, pp. 125–26; L. Satkowski, *Giorgio Vasari: Architect and Courtier*, Princeton, NJ 1993, pp. 7–15.

11. VBB, VI, pp. 389–90.

12. See Hope (as in n. 1), p. 11. A letter Paolo Giovio wrote to Vasari on 2 April 1547 (K. Frey, *Der literarische Nachlass Giorgio Vasaris*, I, Munich 1923, pp. 196–97, esp. 197) rather ungenerously states that Time consumes [the beauty of] the faces of wives within a year, and that Vasari will have proof to this effect 'hauanij che finisca la prima parte del libro'. Here 'la prima parte' may be understood as 'the first bit' of the book, but even if this phrase is intended to refer to actual subdivision of the text into parts, it indicates that Giovio expected the text to be subdivided, and not necessarily that Vasari intended to do so.

in the conceptualisation of the *Lives* have left traces within the text. An early statement reflecting Vasari's ambitions in compiling the biographies presents a chronological arrangement of the artists, 'secondo i tempi', as the guiding principle of his work.[6] The assertion contrasts with another, written in the light of insights probably arrived at during the editorial process, that the artists' lives are grouped together according to the artists' styles, rather than according to their chronological sequence: 'l'ordine delle maniere loro più che del tempo'.[7] This adjustment in the definition of the work's content is symptomatic of the way in which the assumptions embedded in Vasari's biographies were rethought when the introductions were written. The re-definition does not appear to have resulted in any revisions to the text of the biographies, nor can it be documented that their sequence was altered; it did, however, cast a different light on what the biographies could be seen as achieving. In their published form, the *Lives* in their entirety give expression not only to Vasari's admiration for the achievements of his fellow artists, but also to the literary and cultural ambitions of a group of *letterati* closely associated with the Florentine state.

Vasari's education in Arezzo and Florence[8] qualified him for the careers of courtier (he had a basic grasp of Latin) and artist, not for that of a man of letters.[9] After the expulsion of the Medici in 1527 he was forced to seek employment as a painter. From the mid-1530s he designed pieces of architecture, which were initially very modest.[10] His more ambitious building projects post-date the publication of the *Lives*. From 1554 he worked as court artist in the service of Cosimo I de' Medici in Florence, for whom he created some of the most powerful symbols of Medici rule, such as the interior decoration of the Palazzo Vecchio and the Uffizi.

Inspired by a conversation in Rome, as Vasari himself recounts,[11] he wrote the artists' biographies in a surprisingly short period, between autumn 1546 and autumn 1547, drawing on notes—probably not systematic or comprehensive—which he had collected, a small number of earlier texts, information provided by his contemporaries, his memory and his imagination. There is no indication that during this time Vasari wrote anything other than the biographies; intended to commemorate and evaluate his fellow practitioners' lives and works, the focus of the text was initially not a theoretical one. There is, furthermore, no strong evidence to suggest that the lives were at this point meant to be subdivided into three sections.[12] A fragment of a

manuscript of 1546/47 on which Vasari arranged artists by dates of death[13] does not, because of its fragmentary state, prove or disprove the plan of subdividing the text; what the sheet does document is a linear, chronological arrangement of artists as crucial in the preparation of the *Lives*. Clearer evidence is provided by the observation that subdivisions of the text are not referred to in the biographies themselves, nor in the title or text of the first preface. References to subdivisions of the text occur only in the prefaces of the second and third parts[14]—which were, as we shall see, written after the texts of the artists' lives had been largely completed.[15]

Vasari was resident in Florence between autumn 1546 and autumn 1547, the period of the writing of the biographies, and from March until autumn 1549, a period when crucial editorial decisions may have been taken. Most of the time between late November or December 1549 and early February 1550 he is likely to have lived in Arezzo with his new wife,[16] and printing progressed rapidly without requiring his supervision.[17] Vasari's presence in Florence during important periods of the work's genesis, writing and editing, deprives us of the documentary evidence that his exchanges with his friends and editors might otherwise have generated. None the less, the letters that were written allow us some conclusions. During his periods of residence in and outside Florence between 1546 and 1548, matters relating to the publication of the *Lives* were addressed in letters to Vasari from Paolo Giovio, Don Miniato Pitti and Annibale Caro.[18] When the *Lives* are again discussed in Vasari's correspondence from early 1550 onwards, the situation had fundamentally changed. Four distinguished men of letters, all of whom held positions in Florentine state institutions, were now involved in proof-reading, indexing and publishing the text. Three were leading members of the Florentine Academy, founded in 1540 as the Accademia degli Humidi, which from 1542, re-named the Accademia Fiorentina, controlled matters linguistic and literary in the Florentine state.[19]

By 1548/49 the political and propagandistic potential of Vasari's undertaking is likely to have become apparent, particularly in the light of Cosimo de' Medici's efforts to promote the Florentine state through culture—initially, predominantly literary culture. Vasari's text, in tracing the development of art from Cimabue and Giotto to the unsurpassed heights of Michelangelo's achievements, was suited to document or perpetuate the notion of Florentine cultural superiority no less effectively than the Florentine Academy's studies of Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio. In light of this considerable propagandistic scope, Vasari's monumental collection of artists' lives must have seemed deficient in literary terms. It was presumably for this

13. See J. Kliemann, 'Giorgio Vasari: Kunstgeschichtliche Perspektiven', in *Kunst und Kunsttheorie 1400–1900* (Wolfenbütteler Forschungen, XLVIII), ed. P. Ganz et al., Wiesbaden 1991, pp. 29–74, esp. 65–74; Rubin (as in n. 8), p. 180.

14. VBB, III, pp. 3–19; IV, pp. 3–13. For references to the second and third manner in two sections of the biographies which can be identified as additions written after the prefaces were completed, see nn. 102 and 105 below.

15. This conclusion was drawn already by Hope (as in n. 1), p. 11.

16. The encounter between Vasari and del Monte near Florence (cf. n. 2 above) occurred between 17 and 19 November 1549 (Frey, as in n. 12, p. 258). The artist left Florence for Arezzo at some point after this meeting. Giambullari's letter of 7 January 1550 complaining about Vasari's 'long silence' (ibid., p. 247) was sent to Arezzo. Vasari travelled to Rome after 10 February 1550 (ibid., p. 259).

17. Frey (as in n. 12), pp. 247–53.

18. Ibid., pp. 174–75, 196–202, 206–13, 215–19.

19. See M. Plaisance, 'Une première affirmation de la politique culturelle de Côme I^{er}: La transformation de l'Académie des "Humidi" en Académie Florentine (1540–1542)', in *Les Écrivains et le pouvoir en Italie à l'Époque de la Renaissance*, 2 vols, Paris 1973–74, I, pp. 361–438, and 'Culture et politique à Florence de 1542 à 1551: Lasca et les *Humidi* aux prises avec l'Académie Florentine', ibid., II, pp. 149–242.

reason that his text was enriched with ambitious introductory texts, clearly intended to give a more polished literary form to the undertaking.

In a succession of distinct stages, the biographies were furnished with two tiers of prefaces, three for sections of the text,[20] and one for the entire work. Thus Vasari's collection of lives was made into one of the most influential books ever written in Italy. In establishing a synthesis of historiography in the easily accessible form of biography, and of a wide-ranging theory of art and art history presented in the prefaces, Vasari's *Lives* has perhaps done more to guarantee the presence of Florence in European thinking than any other publication.

At least initially the editorial work was in the hands of three close friends,[21] all members of the Academy. The historian and language theorist Pier Francesco Giambullari (1495–1555)[22] had the overall editorial responsibility[23] and acted as an intermediary between publishing house and author. As we shall see, he also provided sections of one of the prefaces. Also involved were the language theorist Carlo Lenzoni (1501–51)[24] and the historian, polymath, translator and amateur architect Cosimo Bartoli (1503–72).[25] Whereas Lenzoni's input appears to have been limited (presumably he was involved in proof-reading),[26] Bartoli will emerge as Vasari's most prolific co-author. By January 1550 the historian Vincenzio Borghini (1515–80), the director of the Ospedale degli Innocenti (Foundlings' Hospital),[27]

20. See Hope (as in n. 1), p. 11. We know from a letter Giovio sent to Vasari on 29 January 1548 (Frey, as in n. 12, pp. 215–16, esp. 215) that Giovio had enclosed a model dedication for Vasari to follow: '... lo dedichiate al Signor Duca Cosimo con fargli un stringato et semplice proemio, verbi gratia fratello di questo, che vi mando per modello.' The fact that Giovio refers to the dedication to be written by Vasari as 'proemio', in the singular, may suggest that by early 1548 the other prefaces were not yet envisaged.

21. The ties of friendship between Giambullari, Lenzoni and Bartoli are confirmed repeatedly. They are called 'cordialissimi amici' in G. Lenzoni, *In difesa della lingua fiorentina, et di Dante. Con le regole da far bello et numeroso la prosa*, Florence 1556, p. 3. In Bartoli's 'Orazione' at the end of this volume (sig. CCiii^{v}) he writes of Lenzoni: 'che io piu che la propria vita amava'.

22. On Giambullari see Frey (as in n. 12), p. 248.

23. A similar leading position can be documented regarding Giambullari's and Bartoli's posthumous edition of Lenzoni's *In difesa*; in his dedication to Cosimo I Bartoli writes: 'havevo non dimeno lasciato a lui [i.e. Giambullari] tutto il peso, et il carico del mandarli huora: come a quello che era et piu di me esercitato in simile sorte di studij, et in simile officio piu affaticatosi.' (Lenzoni, as in n. 21, p. 3.) Giambullari did not share all of Vasari's art-historical assumptions. In the dedication to Michelangelo that he wrote for *In difesa* he doubts that Michelangelo outdid ancient artists: 'Et voi, se non gli havete forse passati; pareggiando nientdimanco tanto gli Antichi' (ibid., p. 6).

24. On Lenzoni see Frey (as in n. 12), p. 248.

25. See G. Mancini, 'Cosimo Bartoli (1503–1572)', *Archivio storico italiano*, LXXVI, 2, 1920, pp. 84–135; J. Bryce, *Cosimo Bartoli (1503–1572): The Career of a Florentine Polymath* (Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, CXCI), Geneva 1983; for a discussion of his contribution to the *Lives* see pp. 52–55.

26. For references to Lenzoni's interventions see Frey (as in n. 12), pp. 247–53, 267–68, 272–73. Lenzoni may have been critical of aspects of Vasari's text. In his *In difesa* he writes: 'Or non mi terreste voi per huomo di poco giudizio, se volendo esser dipintore, imitassi piu tosto Giotto, che Rafael da Urbino? Tutto che Giotto sia così stranamente lodato, dal vostro Giorgio Vasari.' (Lenzoni, as in n. 21, p. 10.) A foreigner speaks; Lenzoni's fictitious Gello replies that a comparison between Michelangelo and Raphael would have been more appropriate, as both of them are perfect masters. Since he does not address the criticism of Vasari's praise of Giotto, Lenzoni's own misgivings may find an expression here. His disagreement may concern not only claims that Giotto restored painting 'ad una forma da chiamar buona' and that through him 'disegno' 'ritornasse del tutto in vita' (VBB, II, p. 93), but perhaps more importantly the fact that Giotto is portrayed as mastering 'ordine, proporzione, vivezza e facilità' (ibid., p. 100), and 'disegno', 'ordine' and 'perfezzione' (p. 101), achievements which the prefaces of the second and third parts locate in the second and third periods of the development of art.

27. See A. Legrenzi, *Vincenzio Borghini. Studio critico*, Udine 1910; G. Folena, 'Borghini, Vincenzio Maria', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, XII, Rome 1970, pp. 680–89; *Vincenzio Borghini. Filologia e invenzione nella Firenze di Cosimo I*, ed. G. Belloni and R. Drusi, Florence 2002.

can be shown to have had considerable importance. He advised Vasari on the postscript and compiled extremely detailed indices.

Probably the first addition to Vasari's collection of biographies to be decided upon was the first preface, written as an introduction to all of the lives (as distinct from the entire work).[28] Its title, 'Proemio delle vite', suggests that at this point a subdivision of the biographies was not yet planned, and the text of the preface nowhere alludes to any such subdivision. Numerous indications in the text document that it was not written by one single author. Furthermore, in contrast to any other part of the first edition of the *Lives*, several sections of the first preface boast an abundance of reference to classical texts which make Vasari's authorship of at least these sections of the preface intrinsically unlikely.

A first section of the 'Proemio delle vite'[29] cursorily refers to theories that the arts originated with the Egyptians, Chaldaeans or Greeks, but then maintains that the ultimate starting point of painting and sculpture is the Lord's Creation of the world. For reasons which will be addressed below this section can be ascribed to Cosimo Bartoli. The account of mankind's earliest artistic practices presented in a second section of the preface[30] must have been written by Giambullari.[31]

Giambullari in his *Il Gello* of 1546 argues that the Tuscan language derives from Etruscan rather than from Latin, and that Etruscan shares its origins with Hebrew and Aramaic. He bases his argument mostly on (pseudo-)historical and linguistic considerations, but he also adduces sculpture and other Etruscan artefacts to support his claim that Etruscan culture is closely connected with the early cultures of the eastern Mediterranean.[32] In his historical model no less than in his interpretation of four statues found in Viterbo in the presence of Pope Alexander VI (he sees them as specific historic characters, the Etruscan King 'Iasio', his wife 'Cibele', his mother 'Ele[c]tra' and his sister 'Armonia'),[33] he follows Annius of Viterbo's *Institutiones Etruscae*, found in a volume most famous for also containing Annius's commentaries on Pseudo-Berosus's *Antiquitates* and other pseudo-antique texts forged by Annius.[34] Even though he admits that the authenticity of Berosus is debatable,[35] Giambullari draws on Annius's texts throughout *Il Gello*. What Berosus, the other texts and the commentaries appeared to provide was an extremely detailed account of the early Mediterranean cultures, establishing chronologies by counting both from the Creation of the world and from the Flood onwards.

28. VBB, II, pp. 3–32. (For the four prefaces see above, n. 3.)

29. VBB, II, pp. 3–4.

30. VBB, II, pp. 4–6.

31. Hope (as in n. 1), p. 11, sees Giambullari as the main author of this preface, assuming that someone else provided the information on medieval architecture.

32. P. F. Giambullari, *Il Gello*, Florence 1546, pp. 17–19, 24, 34, 35, 45. See E. N. Tigerstedt, 'Ioannes Annius and *Graecia mendax*', in *Classical, Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies in Honor of Berthold Louis Ullman*, ed. C. Henderson, 2 vols, Rome 1964, II, pp. 293–310; G. Cipriani, *Il mito etrusco nel rinascimento fiorentino*, Florence 1980; A. d'Alessandro, 'Il mito dell'origine "aramea" di Firenze in un trattatello di Giambatista Gelli', *Archivio storico italiano*, CXXXVIII, 1980, pp. 339–89; P. Simoncelli, *La lingua di Adamo. Guillaume Postel tra accademici e fuoriusciti fiorentini*, Florence 1984.

33. Giambullari (as in n. 32), p. 34.

34. *Commentaria fratris Ioannis Annii Viterbensis … super opera diversorum auctorum de antiquitatibus loquentium …*, Rome 1498; for the statues see above all sigs dii[r] and [div[r]]; on Annius's repeated references to these statues (e.g. sigs Y[v], [dvi[r]]; eii[r]) see W. E. Stephens, 'Berosus Chaldaecus: Counterfeit and Fictive Editors of the Early Sixteenth Century', Ph.D. thesis, Cornell University 1979, pp. 157–59; R. Weiss, 'An Unknown Epigraphic Tract by Annius of Viterbo', in *Italian Studies presented to E. R. Vincent*, ed. C. P. Brand et al., Cambridge 1962, pp. 101–20, esp. 103. See also C. R. Ligota, 'Annius of Viterbo and Historical Method', this *Journal*, L, 1987, pp. 44–56.

35. Giambullari (as in n. 32), pp. 13–14.

Nothing suggests that Vasari carefully read lengthy ancient texts and Annius's commentary on pseudo-antique sources in search of the pieces of information required for the first preface, such as statements about the Mesopotamian ruler Belus, son of Nimrod, who around 200 years after the Flood erected a statue that gave rise to idolatry.[36] The text draws on Diodorus Siculus[37] in a discussion of sculptures set up by Semiramis. The preface furthermore claims that Mesopotamia influenced the Chaldaeans. The Old Testament evidence adduced in support of this theory of cultural transmission is a reference to Rachel's idols, in fact a short excerpt from Polydore Vergil,[38] enriched with chronological information in the tradition of Annius of Viterbo: Rachel fled Mesopotamia 150 years after Semiramis had erected her statues in Babylon.[39] The contention that the Egyptians likewise produced paintings and sculptures is supported with Diodorus's description of the tomb of Osymandyas[40] and diverse Old Testament references.

Given that Giambullari had addressed Mesopotamian and other early cultures in *Il Gello*, it seems to me the most economical assumption that rather than handing scattered references to obscure sources to Vasari or one of his fellow editors, he should be seen as the sole author of this section of the text.

For the period before the Flood the author of the second section of the preface does not have precise information, but points to the likely existence of all sorts of artistic practices.[41] The first sentence of the third section,[42] therefore, does not fully reflect what had gone before when it asserts: 'Thus human pride learned from things seen before the Flood to make statues …'[43]—suggesting that the sentence is someone else's; in fact, this section, briefly addressing the Greek theory of the origin of the arts, is at odds with the historical theory of Giambullari, who in *Il Gello* not only disqualifies Greek historiography as mendacious[44] but specifically objects to the Greeks' claims of being the originators of cultural achievements.[45] The third section traces sculpture from the Ethiopians to the Egyptians and then to the Greeks, who had perfected both sculpture and painting by the time of Homer. Incorporating acknowledged excerpts from Diodorus, Pliny and Lucian and partly based on Polydore Vergil,[46] it then provides an account of Greek art. Since parts of the discussion contrast with Giambullari's interests and beliefs, and no reference is made to the Creation, neither Giambullari nor Bartoli is likely to have written this part of the preface. I see no clear indications regarding the authorship of this third account of the origin of the arts.

36. A possible source of this contention is Annius of Viterbo (as in n. 34), sigs [Riv[v]–Rv[r]], who in turn adduces Lactantius, *Epitome Institutionum divinarum*, ch. 24, in support of his somewhat different claim that statues erected by Ninus to his father Belus, his mother Juno and his grandmother Rhea were the cause of idolatry.

37. Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica*, II.8.7; II.9.5.

38. Polydore Vergil, *De inventoribus rerum libri tres*, II, ch. 23, in the edition Strasbourg 1509 fol. XLII[v]. Rubin (as in n. 8), p. 169, already pointed out that Polydore Vergil is among the sources employed in this preface.

39. VBB, II, p. 5.

40. Diodorus Siculus (as in n. 37), I, 46–49.

41. VBB, II, p. 4.

42. VBB, II, pp. 6–9.

43. VBB, II, p. 6: 'Da le cose, dunque, vedute innanzi al Diluvio, la superbia degli uomini trovò il modo di fare le statue …'

44. Giambullari (as in n. 32), p. 38: '… tutti quegli altri, che per acquistar' gloria, et riputatione alle cose loro; hanno guasto le historie del mondo … come nel primo accenna Lattantio, dicendo. Questo male è nato da' Greci: la leggierezza de'quali, ornata et copiosa nel dire, non si può credere appena quante nebbie di bugie, habbia eccitate.' He quotes, freely and out of context, Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones*, I.15. Cf. the literature given in n. 32 above.

45. Giambullari (as in n. 32), p. 48: '… i Greci, i quali vogliono essere stati sempre il quinto elemento, et che ogni cosa venga da loro …'

46. Polydore Vergil (as in n. 38), II, chs 23, 24, fols XLI[v]–XLII[v].

A fourth section[47] construes the early history of the arts in a way distinctly different from sections two and three. It opens with the statement that the originator of the visual arts is not known, and a different configuration of peoples is brought into the discussion, in a sentence that presents itself as a summary of what had gone before.[48] Here, the Chaldaeans, Ethiopians and Greeks are adduced; as in the first section, however, the reference to Ethiopians and Greeks presents itself as a summary of literary opinions that do not necessarily deserve credence.[49] The text then moves on to suggest that the arts may have originated among the Tuscans; but all such theories are characterised as doubtful.[50] Finally, the discussion explicitly returns to the suggestion made in the first section that the world itself is the ultimate source of the arts.[51] Such circumspection in handling historical data conforms with the historical method of Cosimo Bartoli. There cannot be any doubt that Bartoli knew the theories of Annius of Viterbo, at least second-hand, for example through Giambullari; there can likewise be no doubt that he treated such theories, when he did so at all, with great caution. The clearest instance of a line of argument written by Bartoli showing some similarity with Annius's historical model is found in one of his Academy lectures, published in 1547; this passage, however, also reveals the care with which he distinguishes between belief and ascertainable fact, and his lack of interest in the chronologies devised by Annius and adopted by Giambullari:

> One believes that the Chaldaeans were the first inhabitants of the world … But leaving aside what is being believed, that we know for certain, that after the Flood they were the first who lived in that place, [and] then the Tuscans, the Hebrews, the Egyptians, the Phoenicians, lastly the Greeks, and then the Romans originated from them.[52]

The passage on the contribution of the Tuscans further supports Bartoli's authorship of the fourth section. To provide evidence for the claim that sculpture was invented by the Tuscans a passage in Leon Battista Alberti's *De re aedificatoria* is adduced, a text of which Bartoli published his translation in 1550.[53] Two of the examples of Tuscan works mentioned in this section of the preface do not appear in Giambullari's *Il Gello*, the tomb of Porsenna in Chiusi and Aretine vases in red and black. Even a reference to the statues found in Viterbo, which are discussed in *Il Gello*,[54] supports an attribution of the fourth section to Bartoli; characteristically, the author here considers these figures 'extremely old', but asserts that it is unknown when they were made.[55] This statement revealingly contrasts with Giambullari's interpretation

47. VBB, II, pp. 9–13.

48. VBB, II, p. 9; see next note.

49. VBB, II, p. 9: 'Ma con tutto che la nobiltà di questa arte fusse così in pregio, e' non si sa però ancora per certo chi le desse il primo principio, perché, come già si è di sopra ragionato, ella si vede antichissima ne' Caldei, certi la dànno alli Etiopi, et i Greci a se medesimi l'attribuiscono.'

50. VBB, II, p. 11: '… le antichità delle cose nostre come de' Greci e delli Etiopi e de' Caldei sono parimente dubbie, e per il più bisogna fondare il giudizio di tali cose su le coniecture …'

51. Ibid.: '… di sopra io dissi il principio di queste arti essere stata la istessa natura e l'innanzi o modello la bellissima fabrica del mondo …'

52. *Lettioni d'Academici fiorentini sopra Dante. Libro primo*, Florence 1547, pp. 69–81, esp. pp. 73–74: 'I Caldei si crede che fussino i primi habitatori del mondo … Ma lasciando star da parte quel che si crede, questo sappiamo noi di certo che doppo il diluvio essi furono i primi che habitorono [sic] in quel luogo, da quali poi hebbero origine i toscani, gli hebrei, gli egitii, i fenicii, ultimamente i greci, et poi i Romani.' Also quoted and discussed by d'Alessandro (as in n. 32), pp. 262–64.

53. VBB, II, p. 9; Leon Battista Alberti, *L'architettura*, tr. Cosimo Bartoli, Florence 1550, p. 262; this passage is also referred to by Giambullari (as in n. 32), p. 35.

54. See n. 33 above.

55. VBB, II, p. 10; for a comparable expression of doubt that ultimate certainty can be achieved regarding matters of chronology see the preface of the entire work, most of which I likewise ascribe to Bartoli (see below); VBB, I, p. 15.

of the same figures in *Il Gello*, where, based on Annius, they are seen as historical, and thus datable, individuals. Giambullari understood the statues as contemporary with the sitters; 'Cibele' was shown at the age of fifteen, and 'Iasio' was represented as triumphant king, having been acclaimed as ruler at the age of thirty-eight.[56] In his discussion of Tuscan kings Giambullari provides sufficient dates to allow his reader to calculate that Iasio reigned from 2413 to 2463 after the Creation of the world.[57] Thus Giambullari's argument suggests that the statues date from shortly after the year 2413 after the Creation. By contrast, the discussion of the statues in the *Lives* displays no such commitment to a precise chronology; instead, it is comparable to the contention repeatedly found in sections here ascribed to Bartoli, that the earliest history of the arts is shrouded in uncertainty.

Both the first and the fourth sections insist that the search for the human originators of the arts is not only dangerous but also ultimately unnecessary; this close relation between the two sections, and the repeated references in one to the other, show that they were written by the same author, who, as I think, was Bartoli.

The text of the fourth section then moves on to what is characterised as firmer ground, the relatively more recent history of the arts from the perfection reached in antiquity to their downfall and final restoration.[58] Some of the historical model here presented corresponds with the main features of Ghiberti's account in his *Commentarii*, one of the principal sources of Vasari's biographies,[59] of which Bartoli owned a copy.[60] Both Ghiberti and the author of this section of the preface agree that Christianity and its fight against heresy was a main reason for the downfall of ancient art; both agree that the Greeks were important mediators; for Ghiberti, they feebly gave a new beginning to the art of painting; for the author of this section, they brought painting to Italy. Both use the term 'rozzo' (unrefined) to characterise the Greeks' achievements. Lastly, both agree that painting began to flourish again in Tuscany. Ghiberti's short text, however, is much expanded in the preface, and there are changes in emphasis; for example, the preface attaches great importance to the incursions of the barbarians, not commented upon by Ghiberti. Furthermore, the use of the notion of rebirth, employed a few years earlier by Giovio in the context of literary history,[61] sets this passage apart from Ghiberti's historiographic model.

It is very likely that Giambullari provided the text of the fifth section,[62] which contains some perfunctory comments on Roman art but provides an extremely detailed account of the loss of ancient art during the migration period. Giambullari is the author of a history of the early Middle Ages from 800 to 913, published sixteen years after the *Lives*;[63] his authorship would account for comments on Visigoth and Vandal incursions and the kings involved, detailed information that is of interest to the historian rather than the historian of art. This

56. Giambullari (as in n. 32), p. 34.

57. Ibid., p. 22.

58. VBB, II, p. 13.

59. *Lorenzo Ghibertis Denkwürdigkeiten (I Commentarii)*, ed. J. von Schlosser, 2 vols, Berlin 1912, I, p. 35; on Vasari's use of Ghiberti's text see Kallab (as in n. 2), pp. 151–57 (without references to the preface), and Rubin (as in n. 8), pp. 171–74; on the currency of developmental models in Florentine art literature see Kallab, p. 408.

60. Bryce (as in n. 25), p. 135. The two texts are not close enough linguistically to allow an assessment of whether the author of this section used Bartoli's (still extant) or another manuscript of Ghiberti's text.

61. *Elogia veris clarorum virorum imaginibus apposita*, Venice 1546, p. 7; in the life of Boccaccio Giovio speaks of 'renatae literae latinae'; see Hope (as in n. 1), p. 11.

62. VBB, II, pp. 13–21.

63. P. F. Giambullari, *Historia dell'Europa*, ed. C. Bartoli, Venice 1566.

section ends with a narration of the sacks of Rome by Totila and Constans II, Emperor of Constantinople.

The sections we have discussed, making up the major part of the first preface, suggest that two of the editors provided texts which nobody saw the need to rework so as to eliminate discontinuities and contradictions. The fact that such inconsistencies are rare in the rest of this preface, and in the prefaces written later, may indicate that these texts are based on collaboration to a lesser extent.

The last substantial section of the first preface comments on medieval art.[64] In statements about architecture and its shortcomings, the text employs theoretical terms such as 'ordine', 'misura' and 'ragione',[65] pointing to Bartoli, an expert in architectural terminology. The preface proceeds to discuss the buildings 'called German'; not making any distinction between the styles today called Romanesque and Gothic, it characterises the cathedrals of Pisa and Milan as built in the same style.[66] That Bartoli provided this, and a similar discussion in the second preface, is suggested also by the wording, which is comparable to that found in Bartoli's *Ragionamenti accademici*, published in 1567 but written between 1550 and 1552.[67] The comments on architecture are followed by a discussion of the 'Greek manner' in painting, mosaic and sculpture. The first preface ends with the notion of rebirth (*rinascita*), which is analysed in terms of the life cycle of humankind, birth, growth, ageing and death, and with an expression of the hope that the *Lives* may contribute to the longevity of the arts.[68]

Our discussion of the first preface has suggested several conclusions. This text cannot have been written before Vasari had contact with Giambullari and Bartoli; much of it cannot have been written by Vasari, some of it cannot have been written by Giambullari, and some of it cannot have been written by Bartoli. Vasari points out that writing was not his principal skill,[69] and he appears to have been happy to leave to others the writing of the first preface, which displays both literary ambition and knowledge of a range not easily accessible to himself.

The preface of the entire work, placed before the first preface,[70] was written after the latter since it refers to its content.[71] Much of the preface of the entire work is taken up by the *paragone* debate,[72] characterised by a clarity of structure and exposition that is entirely unlike a letter on this subject which Vasari had sent to Benedetto Varchi on 12 February 1547.[73]

64. VBB, II, pp. 21–30.

65. Cf. n. 114 below.

66. VBB, II, pp. 25, 27.

67. VBB, II, p. 22: '... non edificavano cosa che per ordine o per misura avesse grazia né disegno né ragion alcuna.' Compare the second preface, VBB, III, p. 9: 'non vi è cosa che abbia ordine o fattezza buona.' C. Bartoli, *Ragionamenti accademici ... sopra alcuni luoghi difficili di Dante. Con alcune inventioni et significati, et la tavola di piu cose notabili*, Venice 1567 (for the dating of this text see C. Davis, 'Cosimo Bartoli and the Portal of San'Apollonia by Michelangelo', *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*, XIX, 1975 pp. 261–76, esp. p. 266), fol. 2v: '... quella maniera'cia vecchia Todesca, che da un cinquecento anni adietro, confusa senza ordine o regola alcuna che buona fusse ...' A further discussion of medieval architecture in the technical introduction on architecture (VBB, I, pp. 67–68; on the technical introduction see below) differs from the passages in the first preface and the preface of the second part in providing an extremely perceptive description of the style 'one calls German' in terms of what is today called Gothic architecture, revealing that this term did not imply a stylistic distinction between the styles now referred to as Romanesque and Gothic.

68. On a last sentence apparently added to this preface at a later stage see nn. 7 above and 108 below.

69. See, for example, the dedication, VBB, I, p. 3: '... la pura mia intenzione, la quale è stata non di procacciarmi lode come scrittore, ma, come artefice ...'

70. VBB, I, pp. 9–30.

71. VBB, I, p. 15.

72. VBB, I, pp. 11–27.

73. For an easily accessible edition see P. Barocchi, *Scritti d'arte del Cinquecento*, 3 vols, Milan and Naples 1971–77, I, pp. 493–99.

Vasari's letter shows that he had a rich vocabulary and acute understanding of pictorial phenomena, but was not a thinker with strong theoretical inclination or talent. Following a long and obsequious *captatio benevolentiae*, Vasari presents his defence of painting in a colloquial, repetitive and disorganised manner. Largely drawing on arguments relating to painting's ability to portray the variety of the visual world, he does not even aim to engage with the alternative arguments in favour of sculpture. This haphazard text, written when Vasari was engaged in writing the *Lives* and deemed suitable by its author as a response to one of the most highly respected intellectuals of his day, strongly suggests that Vasari cannot be the author of the discussion of the *paragone* in the *Lives*.

The author of the *paragone* debate in the *Lives* knew Vasari's letter, and incorporated several arguments into his own text, amongst numerous others. Vasari's scattered comments on invention, foreshortening, and perspective[74] are concisely taken up, as are his remarks on intangible objects accessible only to the art of painting.[75] Vasari's repeated exercises in Albertian *varietà* are recast into tight groups of objects grouped together according to the four elements.[76] The text boasts classical learning throughout. Sculpture is discussed at considerable length and a hugely increased arsenal of arguments in favour of painting is provided. That it was not Vasari himself who wrote the *paragone* debate is further supported by two observations. First, there is a major conceptual divergence: *disegno* is the mother of the arts in the letter,[77] in the *Lives* more properly their father.[78] Second, a linguistic peculiarity points to the author of the *paragone* text. Cosimo Bartoli, usually in introductory sections of his publications, refers to the objects of discussion as 'secrets' ('segreti'),[79] a usage occurring only in sections of the *Lives* containing further indications that Vasari did not write them, and not found elsewhere in the works of Vasari's other editors. In a sentence introducing the *paragone* debate, the writer states that before turning his attention to 'the secrets of the arts' (i.e. the

74. Barocchi (as in n. 73), I, pp. 495–97, 499; VBB, I, p. 15.

75. Barocchi (as in n. 73), I, pp. 495–96: '... ci fa vedere gli spiriti e sensi nelle figure e le vivezze di quelle, oltre contrafà perfettamente i fiati, i fiumi, i venti, le tempeste, le piogge, i nuvoli, le grandini, le nevi, i ghiacci, i baleni, i lampi, l'oscura notte, i sereni, il luccr della luna, il lampeggiar delle stelle, il chiaro giorno, il sole e lo splendor di quello. Formasi la sottizia e la saviezza in elle teste di pittura, et in esse si fa le morbezze e vivezze di quelle; variasi il color delle carni, cangiansi i panni, fassi vivere e morire, e di ferite coi sangui si fa vederi morti, secondo che vole la dotta mano e la memoria d'un buono artefice. Ma dove lascio i fuochi che si dipingano, [la] limpidezza dell'acque? Et in oltre veggiamo dare anima vivente di colore alla immagine de' pesci, e vivi vivi le piume degli uccegli apparire. Che dirò io della piumosità de' capegli e della morbidezza delle barbe, i color loro si vivamente stilati e lusti, che piu vivi che la vivezza somigliano?'

76. VBB, I, pp. 23–24: 'Affermano oltra di ciò che la pittura non lascia elemento alcuno che non sia ornato e ripieno di tutte le eccellenzie che la natura ha dato loro, dando la sua luce o le sue tenebre alla aria con tutte le sue varietà et impressioni, et empiendola insieme di tutte le sorti degli ue[e]lli; alle acque la trasparenza, i pesci, i muschi, le schiume, il variare delle onde, le navi e l'altre sue passioni; alla terra i monti, i piani, le piante, i frutti, i fiori, gli animali, gli edifizii, con tanta moltitudine di cose e varietà delle forme loro e de' veri colori che la natura stessa molte volte n'ha maraviglia; e dando finalmente al fuoco tanto di caldo e di luce che e' si vede manifestamente ardere le cose e, quasi tremolando nelle sue fiamme, rendere in parte luminose le più oscure tenebre della notte'. The discussion of intangible objects accessible only to painters may, in both versions, take up Pliny's praise of Apelles (*Historia naturalis*, XXXV.36.96).

77. Barocchi (as in n. 73), I, p. 497: '... il disegno è madre di ognuna di queste arte ...'

78. VBB, I, p. 26: '... la scultura e la pittura per il vero sono sorelle, nate di un padre, che è il disegno ...'

79. Alberti/Bartoli (as in n. 53), p. 4: 'aperse ... ascosi segreti'; C. Bartoli, *Discorsi historici universali*, Venice 1569, dedication, sig. *2v: 'essendo la historia una memoria di infiniti segreti'; and Bartoli's dedication in Giambullari's *Historia dell'Europa* (as in n. 63), sig. *2v: 'scrivendo allargati, et fatti più chiari, et palesi gli ascosi sensi, et segreti che negli scritti, o di Aristotile, o degli altri Autori Antichi si truovano ...'

technical introduction) and the 'history of the artists' (i.e. the lives), he will discuss the dispute regarding the primacy of painting or sculpture.[80] It thus seems reasonable to conclude that it was Bartoli who gave the discussion of the *paragone* in the *Lives* its polished form and conceptual completeness.

Bartoli's contribution includes comments on the place of the text in the *Lives*. Occasionally he speaks in the first person singular on behalf of Vasari, only rarely giving away the artificiality of his rhetorical strategies: once he refers to the task of writing the *Lives* as still ahead of him, even though shortly before he had alluded to the content of individual biographies.[81]

If the *paragone* discussion was written by Bartoli, as I think it was, then the reference in its opening passage to the technical introduction (which follows just after this section),[82] and its excursus on pictorial techniques,[83] are the first indications that Bartoli was involved in the writing of the technical introduction as well. The word 'secret' also occurs in a passage at the end of the *paragone* text,[84] clearly written as an opening statement to the technical introduction although separated from it by short general reflections on history and vocabulary.[85] A comment that history is the true guide and mistress of our actions is similar to statements found in other works written by Bartoli.[86] Both Bartoli[87] and Lenzoni[88] expressed concern with the vocabulary appropriate for individual arts, and a statement about terminology in the *Lives*[89] may well be due to the former.

Whereas Vasari had no expertise in technical writing, and at the time of writing the *Lives* still largely lacked experience in the practice of architecture, Bartoli was eminently suited to the challenge presented by the technical introduction. Active as an amateur architect, he had erected a small palace for Bishop Giovanni Battista Ricasoli in Florence;[90] and he had translated Alberti's treatise. Bartoli's *Ragionamenti accademici* provide further evidence of his

80. VBB, I, p. 11: '... prima che io venga a' segreti di quelle [arti] o alla istoria delli artefici, mi par giusto toccare in parte una disputa ...' For further instances where the use of the word 'secret' points to Bartoli's authorship see below.

81. VBB, I, pp. 26, 28.

82. VBB, I, p. 11; see above, n. 80.

83. VBB, I, pp. 15–16.

84. VBB, I, p. 28.

85. VBB, I, p. 29.

86. Ibid.: '... la storia, vera guida e maestra delle nostre azzioni, ...' Bartoli discusses the notion that history is the mistress of life in *La Vita di Federigo Barbarossa, Imperator Romano*, Florence 1559, sig. Aiii^{r}; and in his *Discorsi historici universali* (as in n. 79), sig. *2^{v} ('una maestra di essa vita'). On this saying, which goes back to Cicero, *De oratore*, II.9.36, see R. Koselleck, '*Historia Magistra Vitae*. Über die Auflösung des Topos im Horizont neuzeitlich bewegter Geschichte', in *Vergangene Zukunft. Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten*, Frankfurt am Main 1979, pp. 38–66 (I thank Elizabeth McGrath for this reference).

87. Bartoli, *Ragionamenti accademici* (as in n. 67), fol. 12^{v}: '... perdonatemi prima se voi sentissi che io mi servisse di alcuna voce o nome, non così ricevuta dallo uso comune della lingua nostra, ancor che giusto il mio potere, io ne userò pochi, et solamente quegli che hoggidì, usano continovamente i vostri Medici ...'

88. In a portion of Lenzoni's *In difesa* which was added by Giambullari after Lenzoni's death we find a section of text characterised as by Lenzoni himself, stating: 'i nomi delle Proporzioni recati in Fiorentino volgare; Non come nomi fatti di parole nuove, o forestieri; ma da me ritrovate, parte insieme, et parte da per sè in bocca di tutti gl'artefici nostri, dove si tratta di misure, o di numeri corrispondenti ...' Lenzoni (as in n. 21), p. 79.

89. 'Resterebbemi a fare scusa de lo avere alle volte usato qualche voce non ben toscana, de la qual cosa non vo' parlare, avendo avuto sempre più cura di usare le voci et i vocaboli particulari e proprii delle nostre arti, che i leggiadri o gli suelli della delicatezza degli scrittori. Siami lecito adunche usare nella propria lingua le proprie voci de' nostri artefici ...' VBB, I, p. 29.

90. O. Poli, A. Piccini and M. Brunetti, *Il recupero di un monumento a Firenze*, Florence 1973; Bryce (as in n. 25), pp. 268–70.

knowledge of building practices and materials.[91] References not only to Vitruvius, but also to Alberti's *De re aedificatoria*, are found in the opening lines of the section on architecture at the beginning of the technical introduction;[92] the text betrays thorough familiarity with Vitruvius's and Alberti's treatises,[93] which would be as surprising in Vasari as it is unsurprising in Bartoli; and linguistic parallels exist between the discussion of architecture in the introduction and Bartoli's translation of Alberti's work.[94] Vitruvius and Alberti are not the only sources employed in the technical introduction: the section on the architectural orders[95] is an (unacknowledged) excerpt from Sebastiano Serlio's treatise,[96] documenting skilful use of the most convenient source texts. These observations suggest that Bartoli did more than just provide Vasari with scattered information, and that he should be considered as the author of the discussion of architecture in the technical introduction.[97]

There are no such reasons to suggest that the intellectual substance of the introductions to painting and sculpture should also be ascribed to Bartoli alone. Vasari may well have collaborated with Bartoli[98] in compiling technical information on these two arts, information that was presumably given its literary form by Bartoli. Vasari's intellectual involvement with at least sections of the technical introduction is witnessed by his request to reprint one page in the section on sculpture, since, at a place he did not recall, he had found the 'construction and sense corrupted'.[99]

The 1568 edition, appearing in both Vasari's and Bartoli's lifetime, identifies Vasari as the author of the technical introduction, whereas in the same edition Giovanni Battista Adriani's letter on ancient art is printed under Adriani's name. This foregrounding of Vasari may be taken to give expression to Bartoli's devoted friendship with Vasari; his very major contributions to the re-writing of the second edition of the *Lives* likewise remained unacknowledged.[100] Bartoli may furthermore have felt that the attribution of the technical introduction to a practising artist added credibility to the information provided.

The art-historical importance of these findings lies in the evidence they provide that one of the most influential historiographic innovations of the *Lives*—the subdivision of art history after the rebirth of art into three periods with their respective manners—was a late addition to this text.[101] Vasari did not think of three periods or manners when he worked on the biographies, where the notion appears only twice and each time in sections that can be identified as later additions, at the beginning or the end of individual lives. A reference to the 'seconda maniera' is found in a history of oil painting at the beginning of the life of Antonello da

91. Bartoli, *Ragionamenti accademici* (as in n. 67), fols 2^{v}–3^{r}.

92. VBB, I, p. 31.

93. I. G. Satkowski, *Studies on Vasari's Architecture*, New York, London 1979, pp. 150–53.

94. See, for example, VBB, I, p. 31: 'le calcine, le arene, i legnami, i ferramenti'; Alberti/Bartoli (as in n. 53), p. 10: 'Calcine, Legnami, Rene, Pietre, oltra queste Ferro'.

95. VBB, I, pp. 56–68.

96. Satkowski (as in n. 93), pp. 154–55.

97. A letter by Anton Francesco Doni to Francesco Revesla, written on 10 March 1547, states that Doni planned to publish Vasari's *Lives*, including a technical introduction by Vasari; see A. F. Doni, *Lettere del Doni. Libro secondo*, Florence 1547, fols 61^{r}–62^{r}, esp. 61^{v}; and idem, *Disegno*, ed. M. Pepe, Milan 1970, pp. 14–15. This statement documents no more than the fact that a technical introduction was planned, not that it was already written.

98. See n. 104 below.

99. '... si faccj rifare una carta nel capitolo della scoltura; che non mene ricordo, dove [*dov'è*] guasto la costruzione et il senso'; Frey (as in n. 12), p. 257, letter of 11/12 February (?) 1550 to Vincenzio Borghini; see Rubin (as in n. 8), p. 111.

100. See Bryce (as in n. 25), pp. 132–36.

101. See Hope (as in n. 1), p. 11.

Messina,[102] which was certainly written after the technical introduction, to which it contains a reference;[103] this history was probably also authored by Bartoli, as the use of the word 'segreto' suggests.[104] A reference to the 'terza maniera' is included in a paragraph on Titian at the end of the life of Giorgione.[105] Nor did the authors of the preface of the entire work and of the first preface mention three period styles. The subdivision of the enormous bulk of the text of the biographies, presumably decided upon only after they, the first preface and the preface of the entire work were largely completed, appears to have been prompted by the insight that the art works of any given period could be seen as sharing certain characteristics. This notion, arrived at in the prefaces of the second and third parts, changed the perspective on the scope and purpose of Vasari's *Lives*, resulting in the shift in emphasis from chronology to the grouping of artists by their manner referred to at the beginning of this article. Chronological order is presented as the principal criterion near the beginning of the preface of the entire work, in which a subdivision of the *Lives* is not yet envisaged,[106] in line with Vasari's list of artists arranged in order of the dates of their death.[107] In the preface of the second part, on the other hand, and in the last sentence of the first preface, which must have been added when the preface of the second part was being written or later, emphasis on artistic manner documents the degree to which Vasari's work was redefined during the editorial process.[108] Vasari's succession of artists' lives is recast as art history governed by periodisation.

The definition of the manners of the three periods is presented, somewhat awkwardly because in retrospect, in the preface of the second part, and is explained more fully in the preface of the third. The superimposition of this historiographic model upon the biographies is sometimes only imperfectly correlated with the artists discussed. The preface of the second part acknowledges that Donatello's stylistic achievements should make this sculptor an exponent of the third, not of the second manner.[109] The introduction of the prefaces of the second and third parts created a tension between individual manner and period style.

The prefaces of the second and third parts do not exhibit the patchwork of partly conflicting ideas found in the first preface. Even though their relative homogeneity suggests that each of the two texts is due to one writer, not to collaboration, the question of authorship becomes extremely fluid here. The very fact that the prefaces were written, and thus at least to some extent their content, was due to collaboration.

Since all the introductory texts we have discussed so far contain strong evidence to suggest that they were delegated (whether by Vasari or his editors) to writers other than Vasari, there is little reason to assume that Vasari should have wished to write the last two prefaces himself. It is likely, however, that Vasari, who by the time these texts went to press was not resident in Florence, was aware of their existence, and presumably their content. When Giambullari, in a letter of 7 January 1550,[110] conscientiously sought Vasari's permission to publish the *Lives* in

102. VBB, III, pp. 301–05 (301).

103. Ibid.: 'che io dissi già nel capitolo XXI dove si ragionò del colorire a olio nelle cose della pittura …'

104. Ibid., p. 304; in the light of Bartoli's probable involvement in this instance the possibility of his authorship of other sections of the biographies concerned with architectural or technical matters deserves further study.

105. VBB, IV, p. 47.

106. See n. 6 above.

107. See n. 13 above.

108. VBB, III, p. 13: 'che per la similitudine delle maniere ho messi insieme nella Prima Parte'; ibid. p. 19: 'seguitando l'ordine delle maniere'; and, perhaps most tellingly, VBB, II, p. 32 (see above, n. 7).

109. VBB, III, p. 18; regarding Giotto cf. n. 26 above.

110. Frey (as in n. 12), p. 247.

two volumes, he assumed that Vasari was aware of the subdivision of the work into parts. In the light of such concern it is unthinkable that he would not have consulted Vasari on the issue of including prefaces, or would have published them without Vasari's approval. It is therefore likely that these texts were written before Vasari left Florence for Arezzo in late November or December 1549.

Given Bartoli's apparent predominance in the writing of the other introductory texts, his authorship of the last two prefaces deserves to be considered.[111] Reflections on the usefulness of history accord with Bartoli's interests;[112] a paraphrase of a passage in Cicero's *Brutus* on the development of ancient art displays literary learning one has no reason to expect of Vasari.[113] The prefaces of the second and third parts, arguably the most famous texts of the *Lives*, are a monument to the intellectual horizons of their author; if this was indeed Bartoli, he deserves to be counted among the most influential art theorists of the sixteenth century.

One logical break suggests that Bartoli, if he was the author, addressed a problem from the vantage point of his own principal area of expertise. At the beginning of the preface of the third part, the terms 'regola, ordine, misura, disegno e maniera'[114] are introduced as categories documenting the progress of the second manner beyond the first. In the definitions of the first two, the author focuses entirely on architectural practice.[115] Disregarding these initial definitions, a few lines further down, he uses the terms 'regola' and 'ordine' in a context in which the architectural definitions of the terms are useless. The discussion begins with a reference to Giotto and is concerned with figurative art.[116]

As Vasari was resident in Florence during much of the editorial work on his *Lives*, the collaboration between author and editors has scarcely left a paper trail outside the completed book itself. This situation changes with Vasari's departure from Florence in autumn 1549. Henceforth we are well informed about the progress of the printing, and of texts that were not yet with the publisher at that time, i.e. the dedication, the beginning of the preface of the entire work, and the postscript. At this very last stage in the preparation of the *Lives* for print, Vincenzio Borghini can be shown to have had a leading role, and not only as author of the indices to the *Lives*.[117] In a letter of 24 January 1550 Borghini assisted Vasari in the writing of the postscript, a text Vasari did compose himself. He provided Vasari with subjects that deserved to be included and offered to revise the text after its completion, before it was sent to Giambullari for his approval. The topics suggested are the general usefulness of Vasari's efforts, the honour of art and artists, a focus on the principal things and necessary omissions, and the diligence of the research methods employed, based on visual and verbal enquiry.[118]

111. Hope (as in n. 1), p. 11, tentatively ascribes these prefaces to Giambullari, on the grounds that he assumes most of the first preface to have been written by him.

112. VBB, III, p. 4; see n. 86 above.

113. VBB, III, pp. 7–8; see E. H. Gombrich, 'Vasari's *Lives* and Cicero's *Brutus*', this *Journal*, XXIII, 1960, pp. 309–11.

114. VBB, IV, p. 3; four of the five terms are prominently used on the first page of Alberti/Bartoli (as in n. 53), p. 9).

115. VBB, IV, pp. 3–4: 'Fu adunque la regola nella architettura il modo del misurare delle anticaglie, osservando le piante degli edificii antichi nelle opere moderne. L'ordine fu il dividere l'un genere da l'altro, si che toccasse ad ogni corpo le membra sue, e non si cambiassero più tra loro il dorico, lo ionico, il corintio et il toscano; …'

116. VBB, IV, pp. 4–5.

117. Vasari was very close to Borghini by 1549 when he charged the Priore degli Innocenti to negotiate his wedding arrangements on his behalf; see Kallab (as in n. 2), pp. 444–45, and Frey (as in n. 12), pp. 233–39.

118. Frey (as in n. 12), pp. 255–56, Don Vincenzio Borghini in Le Campora to G. Vasari in Arezzo, 24 January 1550: 'Quanto poj all'epilogo … Et i capj, che

The impact of Borghini's suggestions on Vasari cannot be doubted; he drew on them in particular in his statements about the efforts he put into careful research,[119] thus giving expression to ideals that are more Borghini's than his own. He then took up Borghini's offer to read the text again. Borghini subtly insinuated that Vasari was responsible for the text, and able to fulfil the role of the author; at the same time, his guidance as to how to conceptualise what the *Lives* had achieved suggests that he thought Vasari might not successfully do so without some assistance. He introduced his list of suggested topics with the remark: 'you know better than I that it is these [topics] or similar ones'.

In the light of the discussion of the introductory texts, Vasari's comments regarding, and within, his postscript can now be read in a new light. Writing to Borghini about this text, Vasari insistently asks for the help of his editors.[120] In the postscript itself, he states that his main aim is not the teaching of Tuscan writing: he wishes only to give an account 'of the lives and works of the artists I have described'.[121] In this statement, Vasari defines the purpose of his work in very narrow terms; he revealingly does not comment on the effort the introductory texts had required of their writers.

There is no indication that his editors saw Vasari's authorship as compromised by their contributions. The initial text of the *Lives* was by Vasari, and he probably collaborated on the technical introduction; his too was the ultimate responsibility for the entire work, as letters written by the editors to him reveal. In the *Lives*, authorship may have taken the form of presiding over a group of collaborators, rather like a master painter in his workshop. Vasari put his name to the *Lives* with the same justification as a painter would have to a work in which only the figures, but none of the background details were his.

University of Leicester

havete à toccare, gli sapete meglio di me, che sono questi ò simili: Però che uoj havete fatto questa opera per utile comune et honor del' arte et artefici, et che ui siate ingegnato dusare ogni diligentia in ricercare queste cose. Et se pure e [*e'*] fussi chi pensassi, che molte cose o non fussino così (et questo sara il 2.º) o non fussino dette tutte, ma lasciatene in dietro assaj (et questo sara il 3.º), che uoj rispondete, che sapete molto bene, che i giuditij son varij, ma che uoj seguite sempre il piu certo et ueduto etc. [*sic*] et domandato etc. [*sic*]; quanto à l altro, che e [*e'*] non è possibile, che uno sappia ogni cosa, ma che siate ben certo, che si è detto la importanza delle cose principalj, et poj metter anche, ogni cosa era una cosa da generar fastidio etc. [*sic*]. Nel ultimo luogo pregare ognuno, che pigli queste uostre fatiche in grado et con quell' animo che uoj fate l havete etc. [*sic*] Questo mi occorre così adesso alla sprouueduta. Voj saprete meglio fare che io dire ...'

119. Bartoli, in his *Vita di Federigo Barbarossa* of 1559, expresses similar concerns for careful research methods (see Bartoli, as in n. 86, sig. Aiiiv), and he might have talked to Vasari about his interests before 1550. None the less, the chronological proximity with Borghini's letter makes it very likely that Vasari in the postscript drew on Borghini's ideas.

120. Vasari asked Borghini to correct the postscript (Frey, as in n. 12, pp. 257–62, esp. 257): '... rineggiate questo epilogo et lo mozziate et cancellate et aggiugniate et superite in quel che auessi mancato io; et acconcio, si mandi al Giambullarj.'

121. In the postscript he confirms that someone made linguistic revisions, but insists that the content was not to be affected by such interventions. See VBB, VI, pp. 412–13: 'Molte meno ho curato ancora l'ordine comune della ortografia, senza cercare altrimenti se la Z è da più che il T, o se si puote scriver senza H: perché rimessomene da principio in persona giudiziosa e degna di onore, come a cosa amata da me e che mi ama singularmente, le diedi in cura tutta questa opera, con libertà e piena et intera di guidarla a suo piacimento, pur che i sensi non si alterassino et il contenuto delle parole, ancora che forse male intessuto, non si mutasse. Di che (per quanto io conosco) non ho già cagione di pentirmi, non essendo massimamente lo intento mio lo insegnare scriver toscano, ma la vita e l'opere solamente degli artefici che ho descritti'.

Notes

DIOSCORIDES IN UTOPIA*

J. B. Trapp

Like most of their European contemporaries, Thomas More's Utopians appear to have learned Greek by the Berlitz method. It is not apparent that, though Latin speakers had been washed up on Utopia long ago, the inhabitants had retained a knowledge of that language, or that they picked it up again *all' improvviso* from Hythlodaeus, who is reported by Pieter Gillis to have known Latin but to have been an enthusiast for Greek.[1] In the second book of *Utopia*, Hythlodaeus tells More, Gillis and John Clement how the inhabitants of the imaginary commonwealth, fired by his description of the riches of Greek literature and philosophy, begged him for lessons in the language. Predisposed, perhaps, to study that now more prized of the ancient tongues by a natural affinity resulting from their Greek origins, to which their place-names and official titles bore witness, they were perfect Grecians in three years. Hythlodaeus had fed their appetite with most of Plato, a good deal of Aristotle and an imperfect text of Theophrastus *On Plants*. They also had Plutarch, Lucian, Aristophanes, Homer, Euripides, the Aldine Sophocles, Thucydides, Herodotus and Herodian. To these, Hythlodaeus's companion Tricius Apinatus added certain *opuscula* of Hippocrates and the *Microtegni* of Galen. For grammar Hythlodaeus, not having Theodore of Gaza in his baggage, could provide only Constantine Lascaris; and their only dictionaries were Hesychius and Dioscorides.[2]

When a history of the book in Utopia comes to be written, the precise form in which Hythlodaeus satisfied the Hellenic yearnings of its inhabitants will need attention, along with his and Apinatus's sources of supply and Hythlodaeus's well-informed, up-to-the-minute predilection for the Venetian editions of Greek texts printed by Aldus Manutius the Elder. When they left Lisbon with Vespucci on 7 May 1503 most of what they gave the Utopians was already available in Aldines.[3] Hythlodaeus actually specifies the Aldine Sophocles (1502), for example, and the Theophrastus mutilated during the voyage by an ape could only have been the text in the fourth volume of the Aldine

* For corrections and information I am grateful to the Editors and, particularly, to Paul Botley and Martin Davies.

Abbreviations:

Goff = F. R. Goff, *Incunabula in American Libraries: A Third Census*, Millwood NY 1973

GW = *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*, Leipzig 1925–38; Stuttgart 1968–

Index Aureliensis = *Index Aureliensis: Catalogus librorum sedecimo saeculo impressorum*, Baden-Baden 1965–

1. An old article has been helpful to me: L. C. Stevens, 'How the French Humanists of the Renaissance learned Greek', *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, LXV, 1950, pp. 210–18. See, however, the much better informed contribution by P. Botley, 'Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1471–1516', in *Literacy, Education and Manuscript Transmission in Byzantium and Beyond*, ed. C. Holmes and J. Waring, Leiden 2002, pp. 199–223.

2. Thomas More, *Utopia*, ed. E. Surtz S.J. and J. H. Hexter, New Haven CT and London 1965, pp. 180–83; ed. G. M. Logan, R. M. Adams and C. H. Miller, Cambridge 1995, pp. 180–83.

3. For these and for Aldus as fosterer of the study of Greek, not only with single-language texts but with bilingual Greek and Latin aids, as well as by more direct advocacy, see R. Hexter, 'Aldus, Greek and the Shape of the "Classical Corpus"', in *Aldus Manutius and Renaissance Culture. Essays in Memory of Franklin D. Murphy* (acts of an international conference, Venice and Florence 1994), ed. D. S. Zeidberg, Florence 1998, pp. 156–57; and L. Balsamo, 'Aldo Manuzio e la diffusione dei classici greci', in *L'eredità greca e l'ellenismo veneziano*, ed. G. Benzoni, Florence 2002, pp. 171–88. Both before and after More wrote *Utopia* he and Erasmus, with Froben in Basel playing Aldus's part, were active in the transalpine campaign on behalf of Greek.