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AN EPISODE: WAS MRS. FOSTER A PLAGIARIST?

Perhaps not as universally known in Anglo-Saxon lands as is Mrs. Jameson (viz. Anna Brownell Jameson, the authoress of the series Sacred and Legendary Art), Mrs. Foster, is instantly recognized in England by art historians and collectors as the ‘famous’ first translator of Vasari’s Lives (1850-1852). In 1896, in an edition of a selection from the Lives by Mrs. Foster, it was affirmed that “in few instances have author and translator become more closely identified” (ed. Blashfield-Hopkins, New York 1896, vol. 1, preface, pp. vi-vii). Our Mrs. Foster was presumably married to a Mr. Jonathan Foster, behind whose name she almost always hid, her Christian name ‘Eliza’ being disclosed only by the chance survival of a single signed letter that has recently come to light. Otherwise, about Mr. and Mrs. Foster, essentially nothing is known – who they were, where and when they lived, what they did – and they appear to number among the countless souls who have faded into oblivion, with only the Vasari translation keeping the name ‘Jonathan Foster’ alive.

Title page, Henry Peacham, The Compleat Gentleman, London 1622
The definitive edition of Vasari’s *Lives*, initially published in Italian in three volumes (2nd ed., 1568) and by Mrs. Foster in five (1850-1852), is a very long work, and its extraordinary length means that it is rarely ever read from beginning to end. When Mrs. Foster’s translation was first published in 1850, Vasari was not new to England and her present and former colonies, but there had never been a full translation of the entire series of the *Lives*. Mrs. Foster’s principal virtue appears to be, if we may anticipate, her determination, which enabled her to complete this gargantuan task. Long after Mrs. Foster had begun her work on the Vasari translation, there appeared in London, a book, *The Life of Giovanni Angelico da Fiesole*, Vasari’s ‘life’ translated by Giovanni Aubrey Bezzi, accompanied by 21 plates and issued by the Arundel Society (1850; cf. Schlosser-Kurz, ed. 1964, p. 339), an event which doubtless fed Mrs. Foster’s ambition to finish her translation and to shrink “from no amount of labour required for the due performance of her task” (*preface*).

In England, Vasari was mentioned in print very early. In 1570, John Dee, in his preface to Euclid’s *Elements of Geometrie*, cites the *Lives* of Vasari (Salerno, 1552). It is further often said that William Shakespeare knew Vasari, for he calls Giulio Romano a “sculptor”, apparently misled by Giulio’s epitaph as quoted in the first edition of Vasari (1550: “Videbat Juppiter corpora sculp ta pictaque spirare, et aedes mortalium aequarier Coelo; Julii virtute Romani (…)”; 1550, pp. 893-894 / *The Winter’s Tale*, perhaps ca. 1610, Act 5, scene 2). In 1598, in the preface to his English translation of Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo (*A Tract containing the Artes of curious Paintinge, Carvinge and Buildinge*, London 1598), Richard Haydocke claims he would need Vasari’s pen to enable him to draw a parallel between the painters of England and those of Italy and to compare the miniaturist Nicholas Hilliard with Raphael. Stuart England saw the inclusion of extracts in English from some of Vasari’s lives (based on Van Mander’s Dutch translations) in Henry Peacham’s *The Compleat Gentleman* (London 1622; online at EEBO). Other passages from Vasari were cited in Edward Norgates’s *Miniatura or the Art of Limning* (written between 1648 and 1650; Oxford 1919). William Aglionby’s *Painting Illustrated* (London 1685) contains a selection of summaries of eleven of the lives in English, and, according to Mrs. Foster, “in our own language, no translation has appeared; but an abridgement of a few of the lives was published in a thin 4°, London, 1719” (*preface*). Here she appears to refer to a re-edition of Aglionby’s *Painting Illustrated* (cf. Schlosser-Kurz, 1964, p. 646). John Evelyn’s *Sculptura* (1662), a history of engraving, is largely based on Vasari. It would be nearly impossible to list all the early references to Vasari in early English printed books, but many are noted in Johannes Dobai’s *Die Kunstliteratur des Klassizismus und der Romantik in England* (4 vol., Bern: Bentelli Verlag, 1974-1984; vol. 4, *Registerband, ad vocem ‘Vasari’*), among them Shaftesbury, Addison, Gray, Jones, Shute, Aglionby, Elsum, the Richardsons, Buckeridge, Vertue, Walpole, Peacham, Norgate, Evelyn, Symonds, Lassels, and many others, especially among later writers. Doubtless a careful sifting through the digital facsimiles at ‘Early English Books Online’ (EEBO) would reveal even more names.
Much of this is familiar, but almost overlooked, among these early English texts, in accounts of Vasari in England is Henry Wotton’s *Elements of Architecture* of 1624, which contains passages that belong to the earliest historiographic and critical assessments of Vasari’s methods. Thus Wotton’s small book constitutes, in the history of *Vasari-Rezeption*, a notable juncture, the significance of which extends beyond England. A first passage is found in Wotton’s preface to his *Architecture*. Here he notes that there are two ways he might approach his material, the ‘historical’ and the ‘logical’, by which latter term he means ‘theoretical’, or, in modern terms, ‘art-theoretical’: by proposing a useable method through rules. The historical approach is identified with “Giorgio Vassari in the lives of the Architects”, where the author describes the “principall workes” of architecture. These ‘complete’ examples of architecture do, however, exemplify the rules, and as concrete, almost ‘perfect’ exemplars, each enjoys the credit of a rule. Wotton relies again on Vasari in other sections of his treatise, but it is in his last, short chapter on method, on how to judge existing buildings, where his most significant contribution to the critical reception of Vasari’s *Lives* is found. Here he recalls Vasari’s advice to pass a running examination over the whole edifice, according to the properties of a well-shaped man. Is the building well-footed (i.e., on solid foundations), of a beautiful stature, with the parts aligned and balanced, and the rooms usefully arranged? Here Wotton is referring to chapter 7 of Vasari’s introduction to architecture as one of the “tre arti del disegno”: “Come si ha a conoscere uno edificio
proporzionato bene, e che parti generalmente se li convengono” (Vasari-Milanesi, vol. 1, pp. 145-148). Wotton views this method as a metaphorical one that relies on an anthropomorphic analogy (which he labels an “Allegorical review”). But the qualities of grazia, misura, ordine, distribuzione, proporzione, simmetria, varietà, etc. underlie Vasari’s discussion of judging buildings, and they greatly resemble the “second way” of judging architecture that Wotton proposes, following Vitruvius. It entails applying “six considerations, which accomplish [encompass] the whole art”, and these are the Vitruvian categories of ‘Ordinatio’, ‘Dispositio’, ‘Eurythmia’, ‘Symmetria’, ‘Décor’, and ‘Distributio.’

But at the outset of his discourse on architectural criticism, Wotton had already proposed a preliminary first step in this process. He observes that “by all means [the critic shall] seek to inform himself precisely, of the age of the work upon which he must pass his doom”, or ‘censure.’ That is, to pass judgement within a historical perspective. Is the “apparent decay” of the building proportionate to its age? If it bears its years well, then let the critic review the “ornaments” first, and then the “more essential members”, asking if the form of a building is commodious, firm and delightful. Thus Wotton adopts Vasari’s position of judging works of art with regard to the time in which they were made, a critical view espoused especially in Vasari’s concluding remarks “agli artefici del disegno”: “se non che intendo avere sempre lodato non semplicemente, ma come s’usa dire, secondo che et avuto rispetto ai luoghi, tempi ed altre somiglianti circonstanze (...)” (1568, II, 1002-1004, et passim). Johannes Dobai has also seen in this passage by Wotton an exceedingly early example of a “historische Betrachtungsweise” (vol. 1, p. 373), one derived ultimately from Vasari. The same systematic critical circumspection is reflected in Wotton’s approach to ‘choosing’ [judging] painting and sculpture, when he advises not to ask first after the name of the maker, or artist, but after the qualities of the making, and to proceed “logically”, with order. Wotton’s reading of Vasari is not concerned with anecdotes and curious stories, but with Vasari’s thought and methods, and thus Wotton draws Vasari into the English tradition of art criticism.

Where does Mrs. Foster fit into this panorama of English response to Vasari? In her preface Mrs. Foster calls Vasari “our distinguished critic and biographer”, but she is really only concerned about Vasari as a biographer and especially as a chronicler of works of art, although even here the depth of her interest is open to question. The principal claims advanced in the preface are those of the translator of and the commentator to Vasari’s text.

MRS. FOSTER AND VASARI IN ENGLAND: THE TRANSLATION

Considering Mrs. Foster’s five volumes first as a translation, we may note that she writes, “in our own language, no translation, previous to the present has appeared” – “but an abridgement of a few lives was published in a thin 4to, London, 1719”, neglecting, perhaps intentionally, to note that this publication originated in 1685, as has been seen above, and where the Vasari lives extended over 250 pages. Mrs. Foster’s translation is not complete, for Vasari’s technical prefaces to painting, sculpture, and architecture are omitted, nor is there found Giovambattista Adriani’s letter on the art of the ancients, nor the description of the apparato for Prince Francesco’s wedding in 1565.

If Mrs. Foster’s friends at The Art Journal liked her translation of the Lives, it nevertheless did not wear well. By the turn of the century the need for a new translation was acutely felt. In 1900, A. B. Hinds published, in the series ‘Temple Classics’, his translation of Vasari’s Lives (London: J. M. Dent & Co., 1900, 8 vol.), although it is not clear that this translation represented an improvement. And in 1911 there appeared the Lives of the most eminent
Already in the 1890s, Mrs. Foster’s translation had drawn the ire of the British student of human sexuality, Havelock Ellis (1859-1939), who, as a fairly young man, issued *Vasari’s Lives of Italian Painters, selected and prefaced by Havelock Ellis*, London: Walter Scott Publishing Company [undated, but circa 1895]. Havelock Ellis comments upon Mrs. Foster’s work in an extensive note. Having written that, “On the whole his [Vasari’s] is a good style, without research, somewhat careless perhaps, flexible and easy, conversational or rhetorical, at times piquant, following his moods”, Ellis observes (note 1 at page xii):

I am a little doubtful whether the reader of the present volume will accept this statement. Unfortunately I have had to use a very unsatisfactory translation, that of Mrs. Foster in Bohn’s Series. It is a diffuse and long-winded translation, almost a paraphrase sometimes. Mrs. Foster constantly throws in additional clauses, and Vasari’s single adjectives are tripled, so that by chance one rendering may hit the mark. She seems to have sought to use as many words and as long words as possible, and succeeds in producing certain ponderously pompous effects of the “verily and forsooth” order. Moreover, Vasari – the decorous, respectable Vasari – is here and there not quite sufficiently decorous for Mrs. Foster, and must be toned down; even the incidental mention of a flea has to be introduced by a footnote of apology, breaking the shock to the genteel reader’s nerves. I have cleared away much of Mrs. Foster’s superfluity of verbal naughtiness, and have brought many of the more important passages nearer to Vasari’s simpler and more vivid original. Still the translation here given is in the main Mrs. Foster’s. The time has fully come for a new English translation of Vasari.

Gaston De Vere, the “new” translator, was more restrained, but he follows the same line (1911):
In Mrs. Foster’s familiar English paraphrase – for a paraphrase it is, rather than a translation – all Vasari’s liveliness evaporates, even where his meaning is not blurred or misunderstood. Perhaps I have gone too far towards the other extreme in relying upon the Anglo-Saxon side of the English language rather than upon the Latin, and in taking no liberties whatever with the text of 1568 (...)


As De Vere notes, Herbert Percy Horne, the British architect, typographer, collector, and art historian (1864-1916), had printed his Vasari’s Life of Leonardo da Vinci in London in 1903 (published at the Sign of the Unicorn, VII Cecil Court, London, MCMIII, with a dedication to “Bernhard Berenson”). Horne writes:

In the present volume, I have attempted to convey something of the literary charm of Vasari’s narrative, and to illustrate its value as a piece of biographical criticism. His Lives have still to be adequately translated into English; for, in spite of a recent attempt [A. B. Hinds], Mrs. Foster’s [sic] version, such as it is, remains the best, and in a sense the only complete rendering (p.7).

Horne appears to reflect the universal opinion that Mrs. Foster’s translation had no lasting value. In 1896-1897, when an extensive selection of the lives, somewhat abridged, was issued by Charles Scribner’s Sons in New York (1896) and George Bell and Sons in London (1897), Mrs. Foster’s translation was used again. To recommend it could be identified only its “quaint archaism”, and the reader is told that it first made Vasari known to the English-reading public (p. vi), which, of course, was not quite true: “It is Mrs. Foster’s work that is quoted, cited, and referred to by English writers. In few instances have author and translator become more closely identified” (p. vi), failing to mention that no other translation really came into question since Bell and Sons had acquired the ‘libraries’ and copyrights of the publisher Henry George Bohn in 1864. The text continues, treating the deficiencies of Mrs. Foster’s translation:

A careful reading of Mrs. Foster’s rendering shows that it is in part, at least, cabinet-work. Sometimes misinterpretations of the author arise from the fact that she had not seen and examined the picture or relief described; occasionally there is a misreading of some technical term; sometimes, too, she mistranslates, and some score of textual corrections have been added as foot-notes in the present volumes; but on the whole her work was admirable, and the editors regret that through lack of space they cannot say more of this English lady who, half a century ago, had the courage and enthusiasm to attempt such a task, and having attempted, accomplished it with so much thoroughness, sincerity, and felicity.

The editors’s regrets are somewhat disingenuous, for they simply know nothing to say about the pauvre Mrs. Foster, by now totally forgotten. What they did do is to jettison a part of her commentary in light of the “great changes that have taken place in the methods of art study and investigation during the last forty years (...).” The editors continue with their overly optimistic view of the present:

Since 1850 the literature of art has been revolutionized; criticism has become sceptical and scientific, works of art are no longer admired with the eye of faith, but are scrutinized with the magnifying-glass of inquiry (...). Minute observation, close reading, and documentary evidence have replaced dithyrambic raptures, and the fierce invectives of the early school of art critics; intensity of emotion is no longer accepted as a substitute for exact knowledge, or fervid eloquence as an equivalent for study (...).

But Mrs. Foster was one, she wrote (in The Art Journal, January 1857, p. 335; online at ‘Electronic Journals Library’ /ZBD [via Nationalizenz], Google Books, and JSTOR; cf. Rubin, p. 321), who “looked at paintings with the eyes of their hearts rather than those of the learned head.” Thus “scientific research has profoundly modified the value of the notes to Mrs. Foster’s Vasari” (1896/1897, p. vii).
THE PROBLEM OF MRS. FOSTER’S COMMENTARIES

We come now to the central question of Mrs. Foster’s commentary, and its often not acknowledged sources. Mrs. Foster herself alludes to the long tradition of “Annotations, Commentaries, or Criticisms” that Vasari’s text has elicited, most or much of it embodied in the editions of the text of the Vite. She reviews the merits of various editions (Bottari: 1759; Della Valle: 1791-1794; Passigli: 1832-1838; Società di Amatori/Le Monnier: 1846 […]; Schorn-Förster: 1832-1849), and then she declares: “From the vast amount of notes and commentaries accumulated in the different editions of our author, the translator has selected carefully, according to the best of her judgement.” She states further that she has contributed “such additions of her own as frequent visits to the principal galleries have enabled her to offer” (preface; the gallery visits leave “little trace in the notes”: Rubin, p. 321). She has, she maintains, shrunk “from no amount of labour required for the due performance of her task” (preface).

Mrs. Foster’s footnotes are marked on each page where they occur, first by a star, or an asterisk (*), followed by a dagger, or a cross (†), and then by a double dagger, or two-arm cross (‡), and by a section sign (§), and finally by two vertical parallel bars (║). A casual perusal of Mrs. Foster’s footnotes yields the impression that she has consulted a vast array of books and printed sources in Italian, French, German, and English, and that she has visited countless churches and galleries, informing herself about the condition of works of art and copying the inscriptions she has seen. She would appear to be the inexhaustible, indomitable Mrs. Foster whom we encounter in a recent study of her and her translation of Vasari by Patricia Lee Rubin.

Having taken only two lives as case studies – the life of Michele Sanmicheli and that of Giotto, which lies closer to the beginning of Mrs. Foster’s engagement with Vasari – I have come to a conclusion that is the exact opposite to what Patricia Lee Rubin maintains is true, and to the conclusion that Mrs. Foster, in addition to being an inadequate translator, is, when it comes to her commentary to the lives, essentially a copyist, a copyist, who, while acknowledging some of her sources, is at pains to conceal the extent of her copying and the systematically derivative character of her strategy of annotation, which to a great extent duplicates that of the Vasari edition published by David Passigli in Florence in 1832-1838, that is the commentary conveniently found in the then newest complete Vasari edition, by the time Mrs. Foster began, and usually bound as a single volume of dimensions that rather closely resemble those of today’s (or yesterday’s) very inexpensive Newton Compton edition of Vasari in one volume. The Passigli edition, if not quite tascabile and if a little heavy, can still be carried about.

Firstly, there is no question of a “careful selection” of commentary; the only element of selection in Mrs. Foster’s choices is that she does not copy all the notes found in Passigli’s edition. Secondly, she does not in any way “mediate between competing authorities about his [Vasari’s] history of the artists” (Rubin, p. 321). Mrs. Foster was also not “constant in exercising her judgement throughout the 2661 pages of the edition” (p. 321). There is, further, no evidence that she was “practiced in analysing sources” (p. 321). Finally, “common sense” (p. 321) can find no arena to come into play, when copying reigns – and it cannot “mediate as fairly as possible between the opinions and precedents of her continental experts” (p. 321). It is wrong to speak of her “unwearied patience in research.” All of Patricia Rubin’s claims on Mrs. Foster’s behalf are baseless. The “vast array of books and printed sources in Italian, French, and German”, mentioned above and which Mrs. Foster appears to have consulted, are
doubtless works with which Mrs. Foster was almost entirely unfamiliar; most of them she had probably never seen.

To an extent Patricia Lee Rubin appears aware of this circumstance, but she draws a veil before it and presents her Mrs. Foster as a heroine.

Here as elsewhere Mrs. Foster relied on a cumulative tradition of commentary, whose structure rested largely on Bottari’s annotations. These were assimilated (sometimes acknowledged and sometimes not) by Montani and Masselli, whose extensive notes are found at the core of both the subsequent German and Italian editions (p. 324).

[The literature cited by Patricia Lee Rubin reports nothing about Montani and Masselli, but Giuseppe Montani (editor for pp. 1-224), of whom the Christian name Mrs. Foster is unaware [because it is not mentioned in Masselli’s preface] is included in the Dizionario biografico degli Italiani [online]; for Giovanni Masselli (editor for pp. 224-1496), consult library OPACs and search engines.]

Patricia Lee Rubin concludes: “carefully weighing evidence”, Mrs. Foster’s approach resembles that of Ludwig Schorn. “As a collation of these sources (…) her notes represent a culmination of the scholarly tradition and the application of the latest critical techniques to Vasari’s text” (p. 324). This statement may somewhere, somehow be true, but it can only be true in a make-believe world, largely based on wishful thinking, that one constructs around Mrs. Foster. To liken Mrs. Foster to Ludwig Schorn is absurd.

Caricature of Ludwig Schorn in Munich.
Pen and ink, washes, 1829/33. 28.8 x 20.4 cm.
Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett

Giorgio Vasari,
Leben der ausgezeichneten Maler, Bildhauer
und Baumeister (…), tr. Schorn and Förster,
Stuttgart-Tübingen 1832-1849, 6 vol.
Below is a detailed and complete tabular examination of the sources of Mrs. Foster’s commentaries to the life of Michele Sanmicheli (vol. 4, pp. 418-452; see Appendix IV, infra). There may be some mistakes in this rapidly assembled table, but, if so, these cannot change the general picture that emerges so clearly.

**The Vasari editions referred to by Mrs. Foster are:**

- **Passigli** = *Le Opere di Giorgio Vasari pittore e architetto aretino*, Firenze: Per David Passigli e Soci, 1832-1838 *(the editor for Mrs. Foster’s fourth volume was Giovanni Masselli)*


**Note also:**

- **Lanzi** = *The history of painting in Italy*, translated from the Italian of the Abate Luigi Lanzi by Thomas Roscoe, London: Bohn, 1847, 3 vol.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annotation of Mrs. Foster</th>
<th>Source of the Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 419:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* identified as Förster.</td>
<td>= an abbreviated translation of Schorn-Förster, vol. 4: 306 n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>† identified as Bottari.</td>
<td>= translation of Passigli, 853 n. 1 (with reference to Bottari)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‡ unattributed</td>
<td>= abbreviated transl. of Passigli, 853 n. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ reference to Ronzani-Luciolli, Fabbr. di Sanmicheli 1831</td>
<td>= translation of Passigli, 853 n. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 421:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* long quotation attb. to a “compatriot” of Vasari</td>
<td>= Passigli, 853 n. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>† Ed. Flor., 1832-8</td>
<td>= Passigli, 853 n. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‡ Ibid.</td>
<td>= Passigli, 853, n. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 422:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* a 12-line unattributed annotation.</td>
<td>= translation of Passigli, 853 n.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>† a 9-line annotation referred principally to Della Valle, with</td>
<td>= partial translation of Passigli, 853 n. 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
additions not in Passigli, probably opinions of Mrs. F.

p. 423:
* unattributed = transl. of Passigli, 853 n. 10

p. 424:
* unattributed = transl. of Passigli, 853 n. 11
† ‡ § are all unattributed; they consist of 3 brief comments by Mrs. F., without historical content

p. 426:
* another unattributed observation by Mrs. Foster:
“Alas for the ears of the unhappy cannoneers!”

p. 427:
* unattributed = transl. of Passigli, 853 n. 12
† Venetian Edition of Vasari. = transl. of Passigli, 853 n. 13 (there attb. to Ediz. di Venez.)
‡ Förster. = transl. of Schorn-Förster, vol. 4: 314 n. 14

p. 428
* “Horizontally that is to say.”, Förster. = Förster, vol. 4: 315 n. 16:
“Nämlich horizontal.”

† Förster. = transl. Förster, vol. 4: 315 n. 17
‡ unattributed = transl. of Passigli, 853 n. 14

p. 430:
* Förster. = transl. of Förster, vol. 4: 317 n. 19
† attributed to a “compatriot of Vasari” = transl. of Passigli, 854 n. 15
‡ “German translation of Vasari” = transl. of Schorn-Förster, vol. 4: 318 n. 21

p. 431:
* unattributed = abbr. transl. of Förster, vol. 4: 318 n. 22
† “pietra … bronzo”: “Very probably from the word Brontolio, a murmuring or roaring, as of the sea, for example.” This idea is Mrs. F.’s alone.

p. 432:
* long unattributed quotation, from “an upright commentator of our author” = transl. of Passigli, 854 n. 17
† unattributed = translation of Passigli, 854 n. 18
p. 433:
* unattributed  = transl. of Passigli, 854 n. 19
† attributed to Temanza  = trans. Passigli, 854 n. 20 (Temanza)
‡ Förster.  = Schorn-Förster, vol. 4: 321 n. 25

p. 435:
* attributed to Masselli and Förster  = Passigli, 854 n. 21; Förster, vol. 4: 322 n. 21
† unattributed  = transl. from Schon-Förster, vol. 4: 323 n. 27
‡ unattributed  = transl. of Passigli, 854 n. 22
§ unattributed  = transl. of Passigli, 854 n. 23

p. 436:
* “Bayeux that is to say.” (unattributed)  = Passigli, 854 n. 24: “Ossia di Bajeux.”
† unattributed  = transl. of Passigli, 854 n. 25
‡ unattributed  = transl. of Passigli, 854 n. 26, with a mistake of date. (Here Förster copies, too, but with the correct date.)

p. 437:
* Ed. Flor., 1832-8  = transl. of Passigli, 854 n. 27
† Ibid.  = transl. Passigli, 854 n. 28
‡ unattributed  = transl. Passigli, 854 n. 29
§ unattributed  = transl. Passigli, 854 n. 30
l cites Venetian ed. and German transl.  = combines Passigli, 854 n. 31 (citing Venet. ed.) and Förster, vol. 4: 325 n. 36

p. 438:
* cites Ronzani and Luciolli (supra)  = Passigli, 854 n. 32: “Vedi l’opera citata sopra nella nota 3.”
† unattributed  = transl. of Passigli, 854 n. 33
‡ unattributed  = transl. of Passigli, 854 n. 34
§ unattributed  = transl. of Passigli, 854 n. 36

p. 442:
* Ed. Flor., 1832-8  = Passigli, 854 n. 38

p. 443:
† Ibid.  = Passigli, 854 n. 39

p. 444:
* unattributed  = transl. Passigli, 854 n. 40

p. 445:
* unattributed  = Passigli, 854 n. 41
† reference to Panvinio (unattributed)  = translation of Passigli, 854 n. 43
‡ reference to *Persico* (unattributed) = transl. of Passigli, 854 n. 43
§ reference to *Persico* and to an engraving of 1791 (unattributed) = transl. of Passigli, 854 n. 44

p. 446:
* Masselli. = Passigli, 854 n. 45

p. 447:
* Masselli. = Passigli, 854 n. 46
† Lanzi. = not in Passigli or Förster
This appears to be a substantive annotation derived by Mrs. F. from Lanzi, relative to the painter Eliodoro Forbicini.
‡ Lanzi. = not in Passigli or Förster
Again a substantive comment relative to Battista Fontana, from Lanzi.

p. 448:
* references to Zanetti, Ridolfi, and Lanzi = This follows Förster, vol. 4: 337 n. 53. Ridolfi is Mrs. F.’s addition. The bulk of the note translates, without acknowledgement, Passigli, 855 n. 48
† unattributed = transl. Passigli, 855 n. 49
‡ unattributed = follows Passigli, 855 n. 50
§ cites Venetian edition of Vasari = translates Passigli, 855 n. 51 (with Ven. Ed.)

p. 449:
* unattributed = translates Förster, vol. 4: 338 n. 58
† cites Venetian Edition of Vasari = translates Passigli, 855 n. 52 (ediz. Ven.)
‡ cites “certain commentators” = translates Förster, vol. 4: 339 n. 60

p. 450:
* unattributed = follows Förster, vol. 4: 339 n. 61
† unattributed = follows Förster, vol. 4: 339 n. 62
‡ mentions Lanzi = Passigli, 855 n. 54, with an additional reference to Lanzi
§ cites Venetian edition of Vasari = transl. of Passigli, 855 n. 55 (citing ed. Ven.)

p. 541:
* long note, unattributed = transl. of Passigli, 855 n. 56
† *Ed. Flor.*, 1832-8 = Passigli, 855 n. 57 (translation)
‡ *Ibid.* = Passigli, 855 n. 58 (translation)
§ *Ed. Flor.*, 1832-8 = Passigli, 855 n. 59 (abbreviated translation)

p. 452:
* *Ed. Flor.*, 1832-8 = Passigli, 855 n. 60 (abbreviated translation)
What we see is that Mrs. Foster follows rather blindly in the footsteps of Passigli’s editor, Giovanni Masselli. When he annotates, she annotates, although occasionally demurring. Her annotations are nothing more than translations of his, sometimes abbreviated, and with only a very, very occasional reference to Luigi Lanzi’s *History of Painting in Italy* (1847), which was part of the Bohn Library. Mrs. Foster sometimes acknowledges her source in Passigli’s 1832-1838 Florentine edition of Vasari, with Masselli’s commentaries, but she does this in a variable fashion (allowing many readers to understand the references as referring to different works). All in all, in the Sanmicheli *vita*, the Passigli edition is acknowledged only about 14 or 15 times. It might seem that the editor prefers to cite the “Edition of Venice” (an edition about which she gives no further particulars, but which is that issued by the publisher Giuseppe Antonelli in 19 volumes in 1828-1830), a work which Mrs. Foster doubtless never held in her hands, for all her references to it occur in notes in which she has copied the commentary found in the Passigli edition, which explicitly refers to the “edizione di Venezia.” Sometimes she refers elliptically to a “compatriot of Vasari”, or an “upright commentator of our author”, when she has just copied the passage found in Passigli’s edition. The unattributed or falsely attributed notes cribbed from Passigli are numerous: they number well over 40, in a universe of only around 70 annotations in the Sanmicheli life.

The second book that Mrs. Foster sacked is treated with far greater circumspection, the more recent edition of the lives by Schorn and Förster in German. Förster’s notes to Sanmicheli’s *vita* are regularly cited, but they are also simply translated, just as those taken from the Passigli edition. Only rarely does Mrs. Foster refer vaguely to the “German translation”, and only once is Förster’s name avoided by a reference to “certain commentators.”

It is no exaggeration to state that Mrs. Foster’s own contribution to the commentary in her translation is inexistent. She does, as mentioned earlier, add a very few references to Lanzi (a work found in Bohn’s Library), and on page 447, depending upon Lanzi, she identifies Eliodoro Forbicini, a Veronese youth talented in painting decorative grotesques. But her contribution ends here, unless one counts a very few brief and fatuous opinions, without historical content, that she offers (*e.g.*, pp. 424, 426, 431).

The very few substantive points where Mrs. Foster comments and Passigli’s editor does not comment are all copied from Förster, so it is not only the content and the formulation of the annotations that are copied, but also the *loci*, and, taken all together, this can scarcely be called by any other name than that of plagiarism, in a modern sense. Mrs. Foster’s awareness of the problematic nature of her massive reliance on a single volume, the Passigli edition of Vasari of 1832-1838, becomes completely apparent in her transparent attempts to disguise it by referring to other sources, ones which she doubtless did not consult directly. For the *vita* of Sanmicheli she basically used only two books, two editions of Vasari, that of 1832-1938 and the German translation of 1832-1849. Her occasional recourse to Lanzi may possibly be another subterfuge aiming to camouflage her methods, while publicising volumes her publisher was offering for sale.

But, beyond the question of plagiarism, we must recognize that Mrs. Foster’s art historical consequence amounts to nothing. She has made no contribution to art studies. She is simply a paid translator, as the disparateness of the three authors she translated for Henry George Bohn suggests: Ranke (1847-1848), Vasari (1850-1852), Condé (1855) – three different languages, three different subject matters, but all in three volumes. It is perhaps worth considering her annotations to J. A. Condé’s *The Dominion of the Arabs in Spain* (1854), which she must
have begun translating as soon as Vasari was finished, in 1852: nearly 1500 pages in three volumes. In her “Translator’s Preface”, Mrs. Foster criticises the German and French translations of these works, and she praises the author, while saying nothing about her own translation. But in the translation of Condé, Mrs. Foster signs her commentaries as the “Tr.”, thus distinguishing her notes from those of Condé himself. The notes are, in contrast to the Vasari edition, rather sparse, with many pages entirely free of annotation. The notes signed by the translator are almost invariably inconsequential, and they display no deep knowledge of the material and no research on the part of the translator. They would possibly be compared with those of the earlier French and German translations with profit. It would seem that the translation of Condé was made to earn a living, which was probably the primary motive behind the Vasari translation as well.

It is possible, if not likely, that the Sanmicheli vita is atypical. It was chosen as a test case almost at random, and because it belongs to a series of lives that interests the present writer, but he has also examined closely the annotations of the vita of Giotto, choosing it because it belongs to an early phase of Mrs. Foster’s work, when she was possibly less pressed for time. A tabular description of the sources of the commentaries will not be presented here, but a detailed examination of the relevant texts lies behind the conclusions that follow.

Two circumstances differ from those that surrounded the annotations to Sanmicheli: (1) Giuseppe Montani, and not Giovanni Masselli, was the annotator for Giotto in the Passigli edition of 1832-1838, and (2) the first volume of the Le Monnier—‘Società di amatori delle Arti belli’ edition of Vasari’s Vite had appeared at Florence in 1846 (Carlo Milanesi, Gaetano Milanesi, Carlo Pini, Vincenzo Marchese), and Mrs. Foster also used this work.

Mrs. Foster’s Giotto bears 64 annotations. Although she makes references to the “Ed. Flor., 1846”, there is no single explicit reference to the Passigli edition of 1832-1838, although there are two isolated references to an “Ed. Flor.”, without indication of a year. Also in note § on p. 115, the annotator indicates an observation owed to “Masselli”, who is Giovanni Masselli, the editor responsible for most of the annotations in the Passigli edition (although Giotto is annotated by Giuseppe Montani). As we shall see, in the Giotto Vite, Mrs. Foster also relies heavily upon the Passigli edition, but she cites the “Ed. Flor., 1846” fairly often, in all 11 times. The 1846 edition also draws some of its commentary from the Passigli edition, and it is not always clear from which of these two editions Mrs. Foster is translating annotations. Certainly there are several instances, beyond the 11 she cites, where she copies from the 1846 edition without mentioning a source. At least 25 notes, and probably more, are derived directly from the Passigli edition; most are simply translated, that is, copied. Occasionally there is some additional information, only very rarely an additional source. For the Giotto vita Mrs. Foster also relied on the annotations to Schorn’s German translation, which is explicitly cited 3 or 4 times, but Schorn is also the source of some of the several citations of Rumohr’s “Ital. Forsch.”, citations that sometimes derive from the 1846 Florentine edition. The situation with the life of Giotto appears slightly more complex than with that of Sanmicheli, and Mrs. Foster may have taken a little more time with her work, as the greater number of her own opinions and asides – as usual, thin on content – in the notes may indicate. But still she has again basically used only three books, about one of which, the most important one, i.e., the edition of Passigli, she is completely silent. Mrs. Foster’s connection with and knowledge of art scholarship in German appears also to have been much exaggerated, and most of it was probably had second-hand, as are nearly all of her citations of German sources in the Vasari annotations.
The insufficiency of Mrs. Foster’s commentaries is underlined by the publication, in 1885, of Jean Paul Richter’s volume of commentary to Mrs. Foster’s English edition of Vasari in a continuation of Bohn’s Standard Library by George Bell & Sons in London, a sixth volume, where Mrs. Foster is passed over in silence; her name never appears in any form. An art dealer, art scholar, and collaborator of Giovanni Morelli, Jean Paul Richter (1847-1937), sought to bring the commentary in line with the new art criticism based on “sound scientific methods”, and the title page of his “Notes on Vasari’s Lives” states that his commentary contains “notes and emendations from the Italian edition of [Gaetano] Milanesi and other sources.” It is also noteworthy that as early as 1857, only five years after Mrs. Foster’s translation and commentary was completed, the publisher John Murray commissioned an annotated version of the Lives from Giovanni Battista Cavalcaselle, a project which was for a while carried forward with the support of prominent men such as Charles Eastlake, Tom Taylor, and Henry Layard. At the least, this suggests that it was widely felt that Mrs. Foster’s annotations left much room for improvement, and that a new translation was needed.

A more comprehensive study of the sources of all of Mrs. Foster’s annotations, both acknowledged and not, might modify the picture I have drawn, although it seems unlikely that it would alter it significantly. It is not a study that I am inclined to undertake, nor do I believe that, among all the possible inquiries one might make, this is an especially important or interesting one. Whether Mrs. Foster was a woman or a man is not perhaps of great interest, since nature has divided the human species fairly evenly between the two kinds. Whether Mrs. Foster actually existed is possibly a more interesting question. Maybe more than one person hides behind her pen name, although I suspect that she did exist and that she worked, in a brief period of need, as a translator, but even this is little more than a guess.

Whether or not one considers Mrs. Foster a plagiarist may depend on the point of view. Viewed in an historical perspective, everyone copied. But even Vasari, as he was copying, was indignant at Luca Pacioli’s expropriation of Piero della Francesca’s work. Certainly Mrs. Foster was a plagiarist by modern standards, which she seems to share, and indignation and righteousness are among her favourite poses. Perhaps she was misled by the example of Schorn and Förster, who often translate the notes from Passigli’s edition, without a mention. Her defenders might want to invoke the redundant nature of the “commento secolare” to Vasari’s Vite. But this tradition of commentary was also a locus of art historical research, and the notes to Vasari often contained new research results and new insights. Mrs. Foster is not participant in this process.

But Mrs. Foster and her publisher had a vision of what the commentary to Vasari was, and this conception appears to evolve slightly in the title pages of the 5 volumes of the Lives:

I. WITH NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS, CHIEFLY SELECTED FROM VARIOUS COMMENTATORS
II. WITH NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS, CHIEFLY SELECTED FROM VARIOUS COMMENTATORS
III. WITH NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS, CHIEFLY SELECTED FROM VARIOUS COMMENTATORS
IV. WITH NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS, CHIEFLY SELECTED FROM GERMAN AND ITALIAN COMMENTATORS
V. WITH NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS, CHIEFLY SELECTED FROM GERMAN AND ITALIAN COMMENTATORS
The additional qualification, “from German and Italian” commentators, may suggest a growing awareness that the sources of the annotations needed to be specified.

Some may object that Mrs. Foster was making no claims to originality, but certainly she was laying claim to an operation of selection that she did not perform. Her partisans have claimed far more for her. As others like her, Mrs. Foster doubtless believed that she was doing nothing wrong. But she had not dutifully assembled her research notes in advance, to make use of them as she compiled her commentaries. She has simply followed the pages of her translation in one or two editions of Vasari and translated some of the commentaries to successive points in the lives, that is to text passages already identified by earlier scholars as needing commentary. Beyond paraphrasing, she has translated, or copied, references to secondary literature in a vast number of instances without naming the source.

Mrs. Foster’s activities as a writer – children’s book (as co-author), translator, and contributor to a monthly magazine – place her within the ranks of the aspiring amateurs and partisans who contributed the largest part of Victorian journalism. By 1850 British periodicals had seen an extraordinary proliferation. The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals, 1824-1900 (ed. Walter E. Houghton, 5 vol., Toronto 1966-1989) identified over 12,000 authors. For Victorian journalism, anonymity was natural. Most articles and stories in periodicals were anonymous or pseudonymous: before 1870, estimates range around 97%. Mrs. Foster’s series of articles in The Art Journal (1856-1857) are all signed “An Old Traveller”, following a widespread pseudonymic formula often encountered in quarterly and monthly English periodicals in pieces bearing signatures such as the ‘Old Bachelor’, ‘Old Boy’, ‘Old Contributor’, ‘Old Fogy’, ‘Old Gallery Reporter’, ‘Old Hand’, ‘Old Sailor’, ‘Old Tramp’, etc. The editor of The Art Journal identifies the “Old Traveller”, in her first contribution, simply as the lady who has recently translated Vasari’s Lives. There is no mention of a ‘Mrs. Jonathan Foster’, nor is any other name given to identify the anonymous author, which would indeed be in contradiction to the rationale, with both liberating and protective functions, that lay behind the universe of pseudonymous writers, a rationale especially valued by Victorian women. Thus it seems more than legitimate to ask if Mrs. Jonathan Foster is a real person or if this name is not simply the pen name of someone else. ‘Mrs. Foster’ has no birth place and no tombstone. ‘Mrs. Foster’ is just possibly the pseudonym that someone used while translating for Bohn’s Standard Library, in 1847-1855, a pseudonym used consistently for three works to gain authority for the successive translations and to testify to ‘her’ skills and experience as a translator. After that ‘Mrs. Foster’ effectively disappears, reappearing, perhaps, in other guises that have escaped detection.

NOTE: This text was completed at the end of 2012, and, owing to the Winterpause of arthistoricum.net and other delays, first placed online in 2013.

Addendum: An Eliza Foster with the spouse Jonathan may be found in online English census records for 1851 and 1861 (Yorkshire and Essex), but a detailed view of these records is available only to subscribers. There are many Eliza and Elizabeth Fosters.
A NOTE ON RELEVANT LITERATURE:

The following are references to sources used in compiling the above text and useful in following topics treated here further. The Wikipedia articles cited provide a first information and contain references to further sources.

*Lives of the most eminent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects: Translated from the Italian of Giorgio Vasari.* With notes and illustrations, chiefly selected from various commentators, by Mrs. Jonathan Foster, London: Henry G. Bohn, 1850–1852

*Bohn’s Standard Library*

vol. 1: 1850. – viii, 511 pp.
vol. 3: 1851. – iv, 526 pp.
vol. 4: 1851. – 548 pp.

Mrs. Foster’s volumes may be read online at [www.archive.org](http://www.archive.org).


Henry Wotton, *The Elements of Architecture*, London 1624 (online at arthistoricum.net: FONTES 68 [Part 1])


EEBO = Early English Books Online: http://eebo.chadwyck.com
From the first book published in English through the age of Spenser and Shakespeare, this collection now contains more than 125,000 titles listed in Pollard & Redgrave’s *Short-Title Catalogue (1475-1640)* and Wing’s *Short-Title Catalogue (1641-1700)* and their revised editions, as well as the *Thomason Tracts (1640-1661)* collection and the *Early English Books Tract Supplement*.
In Germany accessible through the Nationallizenz-Program of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG); see Wikipedia: ‘Nationallizenz’ (Diese Datenbanken stehen allen vorwiegend öffentlich geförderten Hochschulen und Forschungseinrichtungen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland zur Verfügung. Die Freischaltung läuft mittels IP-Nummernkreis. Seit Mai 2005 können für wissenschaftliche Zwecke diejenigen Personen mit Wohnsitz in Deutschland, die nicht über eine wissenschaftliche Bibliothek Zugang zu den Datenbanken haben, bei den dafür vorgesehenen Universitätsbibliotheken individuelle Zugänge beantragen, soweit die Verträge mit den Datenbankanbietern dies zulassen. Dieser Zugang erfolgt dann mittels Benutzernamen und Passwort.).
ARUNDEL SOCIETY AND GIOVANNI AUBREY BEZZI: see the brief entry ‘Arundel Society’ at Wikipedia (en).


HENRY GEORGE BOHN (1796 – 1884): A British publisher. He is principally remembered for the Libraries which he inaugurated; these were begun in 1846 and comprised editions of standard works and translations, dealing with history, science, classics, theology, and archaeology. See Wikipedia (en).

GEORGE BELL AND SONS: A book publishing house located in London, from 1839 to 1986. It was founded by George Bell as an educational bookseller, with the intention of selling the output of London university presses, but became best known as an independent publisher of classics and children’s books (Wikipedia).


APPENDIX I:

TRANSLATOR’S PREFACE, BY MRS. JONATHAN FOSTER


Vol. I, pp. iii-vi:

P R E F A C E.

A German writer has remarked that, “No man exhibits his own character so effectually as when engaged in pourtraying that of another.” The justice of this observation is not unfrequently exemplified in the Biographies written by Vasari; and how charming is the character of himself thus unconsciously revealed! It is always pleasant to find that an author who has obtained your attention, is deserving also of your esteem; a book may amuse, or may inform, but if it fail to command respect for the writer, how serious a drawback is this on the pleasure derived from it. To such disadvantage the reader of Vasari will not be exposed: for he cannot but esteem his author.

Three hundred years have now elapsed since our distinguished critic and biographer first enriched the world with the work before us; and from that time to the present his compatriots and admirers have continually employed themselves in writing Annotations, Commentaries, or Criticisms upon it. His statements are sometimes impugned, and his dates are not always strictly accurate; but he has never wanted able and zealous defenders. He may not have attained perfection, but in him later writers have generally found their best resources. On his book almost every subsequent performance in the same department is based; nor do we open a work on the Arts in any language without finding his authority extensively cited.

Of the many Italian editions of Vasari published from time to time, the most important are the first and the second, which appeared in 1550 and 1568 respectively, both under the superintendence of the author himself; and the fourth, published at Rome, in the year 1759, embellished with portraits, and enriched with elaborate annotations by the learned ecclesiastic, Giovanni Bottari.

The sixth edition, published at Siena, was superintended by the Padre Della Valle, whom Cicognara accuses of having “rendered Vasari more voluminous, with no better result than an increase of bulk, coupled with a decrease of value.”* The many original documents presented in this edition may, nevertheless, be consulted with advantage; especially those relating to the School of Siena.

The tenth Italian edition, that published by Passigli, of Florence, 1832-38, is perhaps, upon the whole, the most valuable. It was edited, first by the laborious and accurate Montani, of Cremona, and, on his death, by that highly competent authority, and most impartial critic, Giovanni Masselli. The latest edition of Vasari, commenced in 1846, is still in course of
publication. It is superintended by an association of learned Italians, and has great value, as giving the most recent intelligence respecting the locality and condition of many of the works of art described by the author: but for its \[v\] best notes this new edition is indebted to that superintended by Montani and Masselli.

There is, besides, a German translation; and here as elsewhere, the Germans have brought their unconquerable patience of research, and conscientious minuteness of investigation, to the work before them. The world has, consequently, to thank them for an admirable version, and for annotations which are invaluable. The French have also given what they call a translation; but this is an impertinent travesty, of which no more need be said.

In our own language, no translation, previous to the present, has appeared; but an abridgement of a few of the lives was published in a thin 4to, London, 1719.

Of the mode in which the present attempt has been performed, the reader will form his own judgment. The object of the translator has been to give Vasari as he is, without the slightest deviation from the letter of the text. In doing this, certain sacrifices have not unfrequently been called for in respect to style. The reader whose taste has been formed on the more polished models of the present day, will, doubtless, be frequently reminded that Vasari wrote three hundred years since, and, even with this qualification, may sometimes think him rendered in too homely a manner; but the excellent Giorgio was a man of plain words, and we would not have him say to us, as Donato said to Duke Cosmo, “This mantle, that thou hast given me, is too dainty for my wear.”

From the vast amount of notes and commentaries accumulated in the different editions of our author, the \[vi\] translator has selected carefully, according to the best of her judgment; contributing such additions of her own as frequent visits to the principal galleries of Europe have enabled her to offer. A profound sense of what is due to her author, and a firm conviction that no writer should presume to place before the public anything short of the best that he can produce, have impressed on her the necessity of shrinking from no amount of labour required for the due performance of her task. The result she begs the reader, in the words of Vasari himself, to accept: “Not as what I would fain offer, but as what I am able to present.”

* Catalogo ragionato de’ Libri d’Arte, 2 vol. 8vo., Pisa 1821.
** Spicilegium Romanum, “Vita di Cosmo.” See also p. 489, note, of the present work.
APPENDIX II:

MRS. FOSTER’S TABLES OF CONTENTS, VOLUMES I-V

The Tables of Contents contain a discrete number of mistakes. The titles of the lives do not always correspond to Vasari’s, and they appear to attempt to convey a fuller picture of the single artists treated. The forms of the artists’s names are sometimes Mrs. Foster’s.

Vol. I, Table of Contents.

[the page numbers have been omitted.]

Dedication to First Edition (1550)
Dedication to Second Edition (1568)
Dedication to the Artists in Design
Introduction to the Lives

PART FIRST

Cimabue
Arnolfo di Lapo
Niccolo and Giovanni Tafi
Gaddo Gaddi
Margaritone
Giotto
Agostino and Agnolo
Stefano and Ugolino
Pietro Laurati
Andrea Pisano
Buonamico Buffalmacco
Ambruogio Lorenzetti
Pietro Cavallini
Simon Cavallini
Simon and Lippo Memmi
Taddeo Gaddi

Andrea Organga
Tommaso, called Giottino
Giovanni dal Ponte
Agnolo Gaddi
Berna
Duccio
Antonio Viniziano
Jacopo di Casentino
Spinello Aretino
Gherardo Starina
Lippo
Don Lorenzo
PART SECOND.

Introduction to Second Part.
Jacopo della Quercia
Niccolo of Arezzo
Dello
Nanni d’Antonio di Banco
Luca della Robbia
Paolo Uccello
Lorenzo Ghiberti
Masolino dal Panicale
Parri Spinelli
Masaccio
Filippo Brunelleschi
Donato
Michelozzo Michelozzi

Vol. II, Table of Contents.

PART SECOND—continued.

Antonio Filarete and Simone
Giuliano da Maiano
Piero della Francesca
Fra Giovanni da Fiesole
Leon Battista Alberti
Lazzaro Vasari
Antonello of Messina
Alesso Baldovinetti
Vellano of Padua
Fra Filippo Lippi
Paolo Romano and Maestro Minio
Chimenti Camicia
Baccio Pontelli
Andrea dal Castagno
Gentile da Fabriano and Vettore Pisanello
Pesello and Francesco Peselli
Benozzo Gozzoli
Francesco di Giorgio and Lorenzo Vecchietti
Galasso Galassi
Rossellino and Bernardo
Desiderio da Settignano
Mino da Fiesole
Lorenzo Costa
Ercole Ferrarese
Introduction to Third Part
Leonardo da Vinci
Giorgione
Antonio da Correggio
Piero di Cosimo
Bramante
Fra Bartolommeo di San Marco
Mariotto Albertinelli
Raffaellino del Garbo
Torrigiano
Giuliano and Antonio da San Gallo

PART THE THIRD—continued.

Raphael Sanzio
Guglielmo da Marcilla
Il Cronaca
Domenico Puglio
Andrea da Fiesole
Vincenzo of San Gimignano, and Timoteo of Urbino
Andrea del Monte Sansovino
Benedetto da Rovezzano
Baccio da Monte Lupo, and Raffaello his Son
Lorenza [sic] di Credi
Lorenzetto and Boccaccino
Baldassare Peruzzi of Siena
Giovanni Francesco Penni and Pellegrino da Modena
Andrea del Sarto
Madonna Properzia de’ Rossi
Alfonzo Lombardi, Michelagnolo, Girolamo Santa Croce, Dosso, and Battista
Giovanni Antonio Licinio
Giovanni Antonio Sogliani
Girolamo of Treviso
Polidoro and Maturino
Rosso
Bartolommeo da Bagnacavallo
Francia Bigio
Morto da Feltro and Andrea di Cosimo de’ Feltrini
Marco Calavrese
Francesco Mazzuoli (Parmigianino)
Jacopo Palma and Lorenzo Lotto
Fra Giocondo, Liberale, and others
Francesco Granacci
Baccio d’Agnolo
Valerio Vicentino, Giovanni of Castel Bolognese, Matteo dal Nassaro, and others
Marcantonio of Bologna, and others

Vol. IV, Table of Contents.

Antonio da San Gallo
Giulio Romano
Fra Sebastiano del Piombo
Perino del Vaga
Domenico Beccafumi
Giovan-Antonio Lappoli
Niccolò Soggi
Niccolò, called Tribolo
Pierino da Vinci
Baccio Bandinelli
Giuliano Bugiardini
Cristofano Gherardi, called Doceno of Borgo-a-San Sepolcro
Jacopo da Puntormo
Simone Mosca
Girolamo Genga and Battista San Marino
Michele San Michele
Giovan-Antonio Razzi, called Sadona, Sodone, or Sogdona
Bastiano, called Aristote da San Gallo
Benvenuto Garofalo and Girolamo da Carpi, painters of Ferrara, and other Lombard masters
Vol. V, Table of Contents

Ridolfo Ghirlandajo, and David and Benedetto Ghirlandajo
Giovanni da Udine
Battista Franco
Giovan Francesco Rustici
Fra Giovan’ Agnolo Montorsoli
Francesco Salviati
Daniello Ricciarelli
Taddeo Zuccherio
Michelagnolo Buonarroti
Francesco Primaticcio
Titian
Jacopo Sansovino
Lione Lioni
Don Giulio Clovio
Divers Italian Artists
Divers Flemish Artists
The Academicians of Design, Painters, Sculptors, and Architects
Description of the Works of Giorgio Vasari, Painter and Architect of Arezzo
APPENDIX III:

MRS FOSTER’S TRANSLATION OF VASARI, TO THE ARTISTS OF DESIGN

[vol. 1, pages 6-8]

Dedication to the Artists in Design

In a text such as this, where there is no narration of concrete events, the translator appears to reach beyond her abilities, and she is unable to render the dedication in a readily understandable English.

TO THE ARTISTS IN DESIGN.

GIORGIO VASARI.

Most dear and excellent Brother Artists,— the delight, as well as the honour and profit that I have derived from labouring as I have best been able in these most noble arts, has ever been so great, that I have not only felt an ardent wish to exalt, to celebrate, and to honour them by every means in my power, but have also been ever most affectionately disposed towards all who take similar pleasure in them, or who have distinguished themselves more happily in the pursuit of them than I, perchance, have been able to do. And from this, my good will and fullness of most sincere affection, it appears to me, that I have hitherto gathered the due and proper fruits, having been constantly beloved and honoured by all of you; and the intercourse between us having always been of a cordial intimacy, if I might not rather say of the most perfect brotherhood, — for we have mutually laid open to each other our various works,— I to you, and you to me, — assisting one another whenever the occasion presented itself both with council and with aid. Wherefore, moved by this our affection, and much more by your excellent talents, but also by my own inclination, by nature, and by a most potent instinct and attraction, I have always felt deeply bound to gratify and serve you, in every manner, and by all means, that I have judged likely to contribute either to your enjoyment or advantage. To this end it was, that in the year 1550, I put forth the lives of those most renowned and esteemed among us, moved thereunto by a cause recounted elsewhere, and also (to declare the truth) by a generous indignation that so much talent should remain concealed for so long a time, and still continue buried. Nor does this my labour appear to have been unwelcome; on the contrary, it has been so well accepted, that, — besides the many things that have been said and written to me from many parts, — of the very large number that was printed of my book, there does not remain one single volume in the hands of the booksellers.

Accordingly, daily receiving requests from many friends, and knowing, too, with equal certainty, the unexpressed wishes of many others, I have once more addressed myself to my former labours, (although occupied in most important undertakings) with the intention, not only of adding the names of those who [7] having passed in the interim to a better world, thus give me the opportunity of writing their lives at more length, but also of supplying what may have been wanting to the perfection of the first work. For I have had opportunities in the meanwhile of attaining a clearer comprehension respecting many things, and of re-examining others; not only by the favour of those my most illustrious lords (whom I serve), the refuge and protection of every subject of virtù; but likewise by the facilities which they have
supplied of making new researches throughout Italy, and of seeing and examining many things which had not before come under my notice. Thus, it is not enough to say that I have corrected these lives; since they have received such large additions that many of them may be said to be written anew; while many, even of the older masters, which were not before included, have now been added to the number. Nor have any labour, cost, or pains appeared to me too great for the better restoration of the memory of those whom I so greatly honour, or for the discovering of their portraits, and the procuring them, to place before their lives. And, for the more perfect satisfaction of many friends, devoted lovers of art, though not within our ranks, I have brought into a compendious form the greater part of the works of those artists who are still living, but whose talents render them worthy to be held in constant remembrance; for that consideration which formerly restrained me, need have no influence here, if the matter be well weighed, since I propose to speak of nothing that is not good and worthy of praise. And it may be, that these my words shall serve as a spur, moving each to continue labouring worthily, and to seek to advance himself perpetually from good to better; insomuch, that he who shall write the remainder of this history, may be able to treat his subject with increased grandeur and majesty, as having to enumerate those more rare and perfect works, which, in the lapse of time, inspired by the longing for immortality, and worked out by the efforts of exalted minds, the future world shall behold, proceeding from your hands. Then the youth who pursue these studies, incited by the love of glory (when the love of gain has not so strong an influence) may perchance become inflamed by the example, and in their turn attain to excellence.

And that this book may be complete in all its parts, so that the reader shall not need to seek anything beyond it, I have added great part of the works of the most celebrated ancient masters, as well Greek as of other nations, the memory of whom has been preserved even to our own days by Pliny, and other writers; but for whose pens that memory must have been buried in eternal oblivion, as is the case with so many others. And perhaps this consideration also may increase our desire to labour truly; for, seeing the nobility and greatness of our art, and how, by all nations, but especially by the most exalted minds, and the most potent rulers, it has ever been honoured and rewarded, we may all be the more influenced and impelled to adorn the world with works, infinite as to number and surpassing in their excellence, — whence, embellished by our labours, it may place us on that eminence which it has maintained those ever admirable and most celebrated spirits.

Accept these my labours, therefore, with a friendly mind; whatsoever they may be, I have anxiously conducted the work to its close, for the glory of art, and to the honour of artists; receive it then as a sure token and pledge of my heart, which is of nothing more desirous than of your greatness and glory. In the which, I being received by you into your Society (wherefore I am both thankful to you, and rejoiced no little as for mine own part), it appears to me that I always, in a certain sort, participate.
Sforza, last Duke of Milan, those Signori did at length give San Michele permission to attend the Prince, but for three months only. Having repaired to Milan accordingly, he inspected all the fortresses of that state, ordering everything which he thought it necessary to have done in each place, and not only obtaining much honour thereby, but giving such entire satisfaction to the Signor Duke, that after sending his acknowledgments and thanks to the Venetian Signori, his Excellency presented San Michele with five hundred crowns.

Our architect then availed himself of the opportunity offered by his return to Venice, and went to Casale di Monserato, there to inspect the beautiful and very strongly defended city and fortress, which had been constructed after the plans and under the direction of the excellent architect Matteo San Michele, who was a kinsman of his own.* Michele also went to see a very magnificent sepulchre in marble, erected in the church of San Francesco in the same city, and also by the above-named Matteo.†

These things done, San Michele returned home, but had no sooner arrived in Venice than he was despatched by the Signoria to accompany the Signor Duke of Urbino, who was then proceeding to inspect La Chiusa, a pass and fortress of much importance above Verona, with all the strong towns of

* Vasari does not appear to have derived his intelligence respecting Casale from the best sources, that fortress having been commenced in the thirteenth century, and enlarged by Theodore, Marquis of Montserrat, in the fourteenth (1320), receiving its present form from the Marquis Guglielmo VIII. in 1476. In later times, the Dukes of Mantsia and Montserrat, Guglielmo and Vincenzo, made additions respectively in the years 1560 and 1590. That Matteo San Michele was employed to repair these works at the period indicated in the text, is however not to be doubted, since, deriving his intelligence as he did from the Padre Marco de' Medici, and personally acquainted with Michele San Michele as Vasari was, it is not probable that he would give any relation which had not some foundation in truth.

† According to the Padre Della Valle this is the Sepulchral Monument of Maria, daughter of Stephen, King of Servia, and Marchioness of Montserrat. But Michael Angelo, and not Matteo San Michele, is the more probable author of this work, or at least of the sculptures with which it was decorated: was, for the barbarous injuries inflicted on the tomb in 1746, when the church was turned into a military hospital by the French and Spanish armies, were unhappily followed by its total destruction, when the building came once more to be set in order, the condition of the monument causing its restoration to be then considered a hopeless attempt.
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p. 418:

THE VERONESE ARCHITECT, MICHELE SAN MICHELE

p. 419:

* The Altar of the Three Kings in the Cathedral of Orvieto is one of San Michele’s works, and with respect to this performance he is said to have had a dispute with Antonio San Gallo, wherein he chose Pope Clement himself for umpire. — Förster.

† The Cathedral of Monte Fiascone is an octagonal building of exceedingly beautiful form, with a very elegant and graceful cupola. — Bottari.

‡ For the works of San Michele in the Cathedral of Orvieto, see the Storia del Duomo d’Orvieto by the Padre Della Valle, Rome, 1791.

§ A sepulchral chamber constructed beneath the earth: for details respecting this and other fabrics of San Michele, our readers may consult the work of Ronzani and Lucioli, entitled Fabbriche civili ecclesiastiche e militari di Michele Sammichele Architetto Veronese, &c. Venice, 1831.

p. 421:

* “This,” observes a compatriot of our author, “is the Maddalena; it was erected in 1527, and was the first angular bastion ever constructed. San Michele is thus to be considered the restorer of art in the fortification of towns, nor should he even be postponed to the celebrated Marchi, still less to the over-praised Vauban: even Antonio Colonna, though senior to the above-named architects, is not to be placed before San Michele, since Colonna, who was not born until the year 1513, could not have constructed fortifications, whether circular or angular, in 1527.”

† Many new works have been since added to these defences. — Ed. Flor., 1832-8.

‡ The walls and Bastions of Orzinuovo were demolished some few years since. — Ibid.
* Vasari does not appear to have derived his intelligence respecting Casale from the best sources, that fortress having been commenced in the thirteenth century, and enlarged by Theodore, Marquis of Montserrat, in the fourteenth (1326), receiving its present form from the Marquis Guglielmo VIII. in 1470. In later times, the Dukes of Mantua and Montserrat, Guglielmo and Vincenzio, made additions respectively in the years 1560 and 1590. That Matteo San Michele was employed to repair these works at the period indicated in the text, is however not to be doubted, since, deriving his intelligence as he did from the Padre Marco de’ Medici, and personally acquainted with Michele San Michele as Vasari was, it is not probable that he would give any relation which had not some foundation in truth.

† According to the Padre Della Valle this is the Sepulchral Monument of Maria, daughter of Stephen, King of Servia, and Marchioness of Montserrat. But Michael Angelo, and not Matteo San Michele, is the more probable author of this work, or at least of the sculptures with which it was decorated: was, for the barbarous injuries inflicted on the tomb in 1746, when the church was turned into a military hospital by the French and Spanish armies, were unhappily followed by its total destruction, when the building came once more to be set in order, the condition of the monument causing its restoration to be then considered a hopeless attempt.

p. 423:

* The fortress of Candia resisted all the assaults of the Ottoman armies during a period of twenty years.

p. 424:

* Now called Sant’Andrea del Lido, from being near the Church once dedicated to the above-mentioned Saint in that place, but now demolished.

† The question as to how much of ebb and flow those waters present, would not here be in place.

‡ A most admirable recipe for securing failure on the part of the exhortee.

§ An act of no small courage in the master, when the lecture above described, with the despotism of those “Signori” who read it in his ears, are taken into the account.
p. 426:
* Alas for the ears of the unhappy cannoneers!

p. 427:
* San Michele had also made provision for the more ready dispersion of the smoke from the Gallery, which then passed along the entire front of the building. This Gallery was demolished by a foreign engineer in the commencement of the last century.

† This should be Marano, a fortress on the coast of the Adriatic, and not Murano, which is an island close to Venice, well known for its manufacture of glass beads, called Conterie. — Venetian Edition of Vasari.

‡ The date on this Portal is 1533. The roof is a subsequent addition. — Förster.

p. 428:
* Horizontally that is to say. — Förster.

† This description is not accurate; there are no escutcheons among the decorations of this gate, and Vasari must have become confused between the description of this and of the Porta Nuova, where there are escutcheons. — Ibid.

‡ It is the opinion of our author’s Italian commentators that he had seen a model only of this gate, one too which San Michele did not put into execution. It is indeed manifest that the architect did not intend the structure to serve as a gate and as a platform for artillery at the same time, nor had he the purpose of placing a pediment over the Doric cornice.

p. 430:
* These works of San Michele were for the most part destroyed in the operations of 1801. — Förster.

† “Vasari is the first writer,” observes a compatriot of his own, “who has claimed for our Italy the honour of having originated the modern manner of fortifying cities.”

‡ Of this work but few traces now remain. — German Translation of Vasari.

p. 431:
* Guareschi is the family name of the House of Raimondi, but the chapel is now called De’ Pellegrini, from the foundress, Margherita Pellegrini, widow of Benedetto Raimondi, by whom it was commenced about
the middle of the sixteenth century. Being left unfinished, it was re-
stored at her death in 1557, and was completed by the Marshal Carlo Pelli-
grini, in 1793; this was done by the architect Giuliani, whose finely-illus-
trated work on the subject, entitled Cappella de’ Pellegrini, &c., Verona, 1816, our readers may consult with advantage.

† Very probably from the word Brontolio a murmuring or roaring; as that of the sea for example.

p. 432:

* “Now this,” declares an upright commentator of our author, whose pro-
test in the cause of justice we gladly reproduce, “is not to be understood
as in reproach of the good Margherita Pellegrini, the foundress; since she,
knowing she could not live to complete the work, took care to recommend
that office to her heirs. Vasari must therefore be understood here to be
speaking of an avaricious woman among those heirs to whom the com-
pletion of the work had been committed, and it is certain that the chapel
was finished in a manner so unworthy of its commencement, that the
architect Giuliani found his task of restoring it to anything like what San
Michele designed, to be a very difficult one.”

† Situate [sic] on the high road to Venice, and at the distance of about a
mile and a half from Verona.

p. 433:

* The first stone was not laid until the year 1559, which was that in
which San Michele died.

† Temanza, Vite degli Architetti Veneziani, informs us that Don
Cipriano was not a native of Verona, but of Nona.

‡ The façade has never been completed. — Förster.

p. 435:

* The building is octagonal, but the altar, which is in a very bad manner,
is certainly not by San Michele. — Masselli. Förster adds that there is a
tomb of the Counts Della Torre in the Church of San Francesco at
Verona, which is said to be by that architect.

† This work is attributed to Agostino Zeno by some authorities. See
Compendiosa Narrazione di Padova, Venice, 1706.

‡ They are those on the left of the spectator. The sculptor, Alessandro
Vittoria, was a native of Trent, and is mentioned again by Vasari, in the
Life of Jacopo Sansovino.
§ Mentioned in other places, as our readers will remember, and to be further named in the Life of Jacopo Sansovino.

p. 436:

* Bayeux that is to say.

† Canobio, *Origine della Famiglia Canossa*, affirms that Galeozzo, the nephew of the Bishop, erected this palace.

‡ Few traces of San Michele’s work now remain, vast additions having been made to this building in the seventeenth century.

p. 437:

* It now belongs to the noble family of the Pompei. — *Ed. Flor.*, 1832-8.

† Now the Palazzo Mocenigo. — *Ibid*.

‡ This is now called the Palazzo Spinelli.

§ In this very beautiful palace the Post Office is now established.

|| The Palace of the Soranzi has been demolished, but the Venetian Edition of our author informs us that the frescoes of Paolo Veronese and his school, which formed the most valuable part of his decorations, have been preserved from destruction. The German translator of Vasari adds, that they were presented to the church of San Liberale by Filippo Balbi, by whose care it was, as the Venetian Edition of our author assures us, that they were saved from destruction.

p. 438:

* See Ronzani and Luciolli, *Fabbriche di San Michele*, &c., as before cited.

† Or Prefects sent by Venice. The courts of justice are now held there.

‡ On the Piazza de’ Signori.

§ Delfini, that is to say, was anxious to retain the previous arrangement of the floors, and more particularly the range of windows as they then existed. San Michele could therefore not give increased height, or an air of greater lightness to the gate.
p. 442:

* Monsignore Barbaro is the translator and commentator of Vitruvius, — *Ed. Flor.*, 1832-8.

p. 443:

* In the year 1814 a discourse in praise of San Michele was composed by Antonio Silva, and was published in Rome. — *Ed. Flor.*, 1832-8.

† The life of this illustrious architect by Temanza, *Vite*, &c., as before cited, will well repay perusal. — *Ibid.*

p. 444:

* Fra Marco was one of the correspondents of Vasari, who obtained the greater part of what he has given in relation to the Veronese artists from his hand.

p. 445:

* Mentioned in the Life of Valerio Vicentino. See vol. iii. p. 467.

† An engraving of this part of the work here in question will be found in Panvinius, *Antiquitates Veronensis*, lib. vii. p. 204.

‡ Persico, *Descrizione di Verona*, has given an exact description of these works, and to him our readers are referred for details which cannot here find place.

§ This work also is described in *Persico*, as above cited, and was engraved, with some omissions, in the year 1791, by command of the Cardinal Carrara.

p. 446:

* The son of Tullio India, who was also a painter, and of no mean repute. — *Masselli.*

p. 447:

* Bernardino painted two rooms in the Palazzo Canossa. — *Masselli.*

† Lanzi calls Forbicini “an assistant of India, and of many other artists,” doubtless meaning that he was employed by them to execute the grottesche, in the production of which, as Vasari observes, his ability principally consisted.
‡ Battista Fontana of Verona, who, according to Lanzi, was much engaged at the Imperial Court of Vienna: other authorities speak of him as a good engraver.

p. 448:

* This is the renowned Paolo, Cagliari or Caliari, better known as Paul Veronese. The author of the bitter remarks attributed to Agostino Carracci, reproaches Vasari for having said so little of this master, but the great abundance of good artists at that time in Verona renders it highly probable that Cagliari had not then been able to make it evident that he possessed the right to more distinction than has here and hereafter been accorded to him by Vasari, whose impartiality is manifest. See Zanetti, *Della Pittura Veneziana*, and Ridolfi, *Maraviglie dell’Arte*. See also Lanzi, *History of Painting*, vol. ii. p. 206, 213.

† The brother of Giovanni Francesco Caroto, mentioned in the Life of Fra Giocondo, which will be found in vol. iii. p. 385.

‡ The removal of these works has been already alluded to. See ante, note ‖, p. 437.

§ This Palace is now in the possession of the Counts Manin, and is much visited by strangers. — *Venetian Edition of Vasari*.

‖ The Supper of Simon is no longer in the Monastery of San Nazzaro, which is now become a soap manufactory. — *Ibid*.

p. 449

* This picture is still in its place, but it is by an Angel, and not by Jupiter, that the Vices are driven forth.

† The Church of San Sebastiano may be considered a perfect gallery of Paolo’s works. The tomb of the master is also there, with his bust, by Matteo Carmero. — *Venetian Edition of Vasari*.

‡ Certain commentators enumerate the “Return of the Doge Contarini” after his victory over the Genoese, with “Venice received among the Gods,” in the ceiling of the Great Hall of the Council, among the works of Paolo, but attribute “the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa” to Federigo Zucchero.

p. 450:

* Other works by Paolo Veronese, beside those here mentioned, adorn the apartments in question.

† It has accordingly now perished utterly.
† This, which Lanzi considers one of the finest of the master’s works, was taken to Paris in 1797, and has not been returned.

§ The work here alluded to is the ceiling of what was formerly called the Library of San Marco, which now makes part of the Palace, the Library having, been transferred to the ex-ducal Palace. — Venetian Edition of Vasari.

p. 451

* Vasari has returned to the subject of Paolo’s works nevertheless, in the Life of Battista Franco, and in any case has said quite sufficient to render the attack of those who reproach him for not having written a separate biography of a painter then so young, wholly unjustifiable.

† Said to have been a scion of the family of the celebrated Farinata degli Uberti. On his large picture, in San Giorgio Maggiore at Verona, he gives his age as seventy-nine, in 1603; he was consequently born in 1524 — Ed. Flor., 1832-8.

‡ This should be Niccolo Giolfino, a painter of Verona. — Ibid.

§ These works are still in existence. — Ed. Flor., 1832-8.
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Giotto, Painter, Sculptor, and Architect, of Florence.

94:

* For the sum of all that the many commentators have given us in extenso, as to the claims of Giotto, see Lanzi, History of Painting, vol. i, book 1. See also Rumohr, Ital. Forsch. Part ii, No. 10.

95:

* The Chapel of the Podesta was taken to make one of the offices of the Florentine prisons, and the paintings of Giotto were barbarously whitened over, in which state they remained until 1841, when the Government, desiring to repair so disgraceful a wrong, and yielding to the wishes of those who were zealous for the glory of art and of their country, caused them to be restored; this has been done with great care by Professor Antonio Marini, and we have now the portraits of Dante, Brunetto to Latini, and Corso Donati, from the hand of him who had the opportunity of painting them from nature. — Ed. Flor., 1846.

† But all unhappily lost. — Ed. Flor., 1846.

‡ This picture was afterwards removed, but as Vasari has not named the subject, it becomes difficult to trace it.— Ed. Flor.

96:

* Or rather of her daughter.

† All the paintings of these four chapels were whitened over at no very distant period, but the Dance of Herodias’s daughter, in the chapel of the Peruzzi, has been lately brought to light: let us hope that its beauty, and the success of this first essay, will cause the restoration of the whole. — Ed. Flor.
‡ This picture is still to be seen in the Chapel of the Baroncelli. The inscription is OPUS MAGISTRI JOCI; there is no date. — Ibid.

97:

* These pictures have long been hidden under whitewash.

† The pictures of the old Refectory, now unhappily reduced to a carpet manufactory, are white-washed over, with the exception of the Last Supper; but Rumohr assigns many reasons for doubting their being by Giotto. — See Ital. Forsch., vol. ii, p. 57, note 1.

‡ “Tree of the Cross” (Albero di Croce). This is a crucifix, from which proceeds the genealogical tree of the Saviour, with the prophets and patriarchs, on medallions. — Schorn.

§ These paintings on the presses were in all twenty-six, twelve belonging to the life of Christ, the remaining fourteen to that of St. Francis. The first series, and ten of the second, are still preserved in the Academy of the Fine Arts of Florence; the four wanting have passed into the hands of dealers in exchange for other pictures.

‖ The church of the Carmine was nearly destroyed by fire in the year 1771; but six of these stories, with five heads from others, remained uninjured, and came into the hands of the engraver, Patch (see Bryan’s Dictionary of Painters and Engravers, London, 1849), by whom they were published. Waagen informs us, that two of these fragments are now in Liverpool: one is in the collection of Mr. Rogers, and other fragments of the frescoes are preserved in the Campo Santo of Pisa.

98:

* The use which Vasari makes of this phrase “taken from nature,” makes it evident that he uses the words in a very extended sense, and is not to be understood literally, since St. Dominick died in 1221, and St. Francis in 1226.— Ed. Flor. 1846.

99:

* See Lanzi, History of Painting, vol. i. Florentine School, Epoch 1.

† It appears that Giotto painted this allegorical fresco under the instruction or influence of Dante; the passage describing the espousals of St. Francis with “Holy Poverty”, occurs in the Paradiso, c. xi.

‡ St. Francis was represented in this dress because he would never enter the priesthood, but remained always a deacon from pure humility.
These paintings cannot now be said to have retained their freshness, either in the upper or lower church; those of the latter are perhaps, upon the whole, less injured than those of the upper church.

† Late events have made the word “Stigmatae” familiar to English readers, and few will now, perhaps, require to be told, that this word signifies the five wounds of the Saviour, impressed by himself on the persons of certain saints, male and female, in reward for their sanctity and devotion to his service.

‡ Della Valle is doubtful whether these pictures really be by Giotto. Rumohr and Förster declare them to have been painted a century later than the time of Giotto.

§ This picture was removed from the church of St. Francis to that of St. Nicholas, and afterwards to the principal chapel of the Campo Santo, where it was seen by Morrona, who discovered the name of Giotto on it much injured by restorations. It is now at Paris, in the Louvre, whither it was transported by Napoleon; the name of the painter is on the cornice, in letters of gold, thus: “OPUS JOCTI FLORENTINI.”

* For the long discussions to which the question as to the date of the Campo Santo has given rise, the reader is referred to Lanzi and other writers, who treat the subject at great length.

† Only two of these paintings remain visible, and these are not wholly uninjured; the other four have perished.

‡ Commander of the Ghibelline forces at the Battle of Arbia, and to whose interposition it was owing that Florence was not after the battle razed to the ground; hence his frequent commemoration in Florentine poetry and works of art, though Dante has placed him in hell, c. x.

¶ Here Vasari evidently meant to say, Benedict XI; but Baldinucci shows that it was Boniface VIII who summoned Giotto to Rome.— Schorn.

§ For the many good artists then flourishing in Siena, see Lanzi, History of Painting, vol. i, School of Siena.
* Rumohr tells us that certain fragments of a painting in the sacristy of St. Peter’s at Rome, the subjects of which were Christ, the Madonna, figures of the Apostles, and the decapitation of St. Paul, are attributed to Giotto; but the assertion does not seem to be supported by any authentic testimony: still, they are certainly in the manner of Giotto, and though displaying more beauty than is common to his works, may be from his hands. — *Ed. Flor.*, 1846.

* Lanzi tells us that there are specimens of this master in the Malvezzi Gallery of Bologna; see also Malvasia. — *Felsina Pittrice*.

† “O!” I exclaimed,
   “Art thou not Oderigi? art not thou
   Agobbio’s glory, glory of that art
   Which they of Paris call the limner’s skill?”
   “Brother!” said he, “with tints that gayer smile,
   Bolognian Franco’s pencil lines the leaves.
   His all the honour now; my light obscured.” — *Cary*.

* This picture, as well as those preceding it, have all perished — as have those of St. John of the Lateran, excepting only the portrait of Pope Boniface VIII, which is preserved under glass in the church, with an inscription placed beneath it, in 1776, by the Gaetani family. — *Ed. Flor*.

† For the many dissertations on this mosaic — its restorations, changes of locality, etc., see Lanzi and other writers. It is at present placed within the portico of St. Peter’s, over the centre arch and opposite the principal door, where, unless sought for, it must escape attention.

* The church of St. Anthony, of Padua, is so called *par eminence* — St. Anthony being the patron saint of that city.

† Of these paintings there remains only a miserable relic, which scarcely suffices to give an idea of its composition. — *Ed. Flor*. 1846.

‡ The Can grande della Scala, famous in Dante. — Par. c. xvii.

§ These pictures, as well as those painted in Verona, have all perished. — *Ibid*.
44

107:

* In the time of Bottani [sic], this picture was still in existence, though much decayed; but the latest Florentine edition of Vasari declares it to have perished.

† This work is still in good condition.

‡ Properly called Augusta, and corrupted to Gosta or Giusta. — *Ed. Flo.*, 1846.

§ Vasari has here omitted to mention, that Giotto, in his way to Naples, went to see the sculptures in Orvieto, — and what resulted from that visit, which is afterwards alluded to in the lives of Agostino and Agnolo of Siena,— *Ed. Flor.* 1846.

108:

* All these works have since been whitewashed. — Roman ed. 1759.

† These paintings are also lost.

‡ For the many controversies to which these paintings, which are for the most part in tolerably good preservation, have given rise; see Waagen, Kestner, Kugler, Rumohr, Nagler, Forster, Count Vilani XIV, and others, who maintain that these works are by Giotto; see also Aloe, of Berlin, and Domenico Ventimiglia, on the same side. Riccio, on the contrary, *Saggio Storico*, &c., Naples, 1845, denies them to be by Giotto — and his opinion he supports by arguments to which the reader is referred.

109:

* The story of the Beata Michelina has been whitewashed; but is supposed to have been by a pupil of Giotto, rather than by himself, since Michelina lived twenty years after Giotto, who is thus not likely to have painted her history. — See Marcheselli, *Pitturi* [sic] di Rimini, Rimini, 1754.

111:

* Other frescoes by Giotto are still to be seen in Ravenna; in the chapel of St. Bartholomew, in the church of San Giovanni della Sagra, for example, where are the Holy Evangelists, with their symbols, together with the doctors of the church — St. Gregory, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and St. Jerome. These pictures were restored by Francesco Zanoni, of Padua, towards the close of the last century. There are,
besides, others in the convent of Santa Chiara, near the palace of Theodoric, and in the presbytery of Santa Maria in Porto.

† The admirable crucifix of St. Mark’s, as well as that in Santa Maria Novella, are still in good preservation.

‡ The fate of this St. Louis is not known; but it is supposed to have been destroyed in repairing the church.

112:

* See the lives of Agostino and Agnolo, of Siena.

113:

* Nothing is now known of this work.

† This crucifix still remains; it may be seen on the wall of the chapel belonging to the Gondi-Dini family. The picture of the Virgin with the Child and Angels, was removed to the Gallery of the Florentine Academy.

‡ Dante, Paradiso, —

“Come Almeone, che di cio pregato
Dal padre suo la propria madre spense.
Per non perder pieta, si fè spietato.”

“E’en as Alcmæon, at his father’s suit,
Slew his own mother; so made pitiless,
Not to lose pity.” — Cary.

This picture reappeared at a later period, and after various vicissitudes, became the property of Mr. N. Ottley, where I (Schorn) saw it in 1826.

114:

* See Lanzi, History of Painting, vol. i. Florentine School, Epoch 1, Section 1.

115:

* This picture, which Ghiberti declares to have been perfect, was still existing in Cinelli’s day, but cannot now be found. — Ed. Flor. 1846.

† This picture is also lost. — Idem.

‡ For a minute description of these works, see Baldinucci, Cicognara,
etc.; see also a small work by the Marquis Selvatico, *Sulla Cappellina degli Scrovegni e su i freschi di Giotto*, Padua, 1836.

§ The pictures painted in Milan by Giotto, who was invited thither by Azzo Visconti, were unworthily destroyed; the only one now known to exist there is a Virgin and Child in the Brera, and which bears the name of the painter, written thus: — “OPUS MAGISTRI IOCTI FLORENTINI.” But Masselli [sic] tells us, that this is but a portion of the original work, the two remaining parts of which are now in the Gallery of Bologna: on these are depicted St. Peter, St. Paul, the archangels Michael and Gabriel, with the figures of the Redeemer, the Virgin, and three other saints on the socle.

|| Villani, book ix, chap. 12, has registered his death in the following words: — “Maestro Giotto, having returned from Milan, whither our commune had sent him for the service of the signore of Milan, departed this life on the 8th of January 1336.”

117:

* The pictures painted by Capanna, in Assisi, are in good preservation, but those in the chapel of the Strozzi are lost.

† The pictures in San Francesco were whitewashed, with the exception of a Santa Maria Egyptiaca, which is still in one of the presses of the church. Those of San Lodovico, are still well preserved.

‡ Or rather over the door of San Francesco.

118:

* Vasari does not say in what church, but it may be conjectured to be San Francesco.— *Ed. Flor.* 1846.

119:

* Lanzi tells us that he saw a figure of the Virgin in the church of the Templars, which was pointed out to him as a work of Pace. See *History of Painting.*

† He was a poet also. — See Rumohr, *Ital. Forsch.*, vol. ii, p. 51.

121:

* The “Novelle” of Sacchetti were not printed in the time of Vasari, whose version differs from that of Boccaccio, which is much more to the credit of Giotto; — compare Baldinucci with Rumohr for other relations concerning Giotto.

† Stories of this kind are related of most celebrated painters. — *Ed. Flor.* 1846.
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PREFACE.

The biographies of Italian artists compiled by Vasari will always be considered the principal source of literary information concerning the numerous great painters who flourished in Italy during the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries. Amongst all the works treating of the same subject, including even those which are based on the most recent researches, there is perhaps none which can claim to be so original and just in its criticisms, so reliable in its accounts, and, before all, so classical in its literary qualities as these biographies from the pen of the Aretine painter, whose imperfect skill as an artist contrasts strangely with his first-rate literary achievements.

We may trust Vasari unhesitatingly in his general accounts of those artists, especially of the Florentine school, who were his contemporaries and personal friends, and also in most cases where he describes works of art examined by himself. But even here we must make allowance for slight inaccuracies in details. They were perhaps inevitable in a work for which the materials had to be collected under great difficulties, the painter being at the same time engaged in multifarious works by which he sought to win the admiration of his contemporaries.

In reading these lives we must always bear it in mind that, with the exception of a few cases, the writer had no recourse to documents. With regard to earlier artists he had often to rely on tradition, which is always liable to exaggeration, and seldom trustworthy in questions of chronology. The blunders committed by Vasari in this respect are perhaps those most frequently to be met with, but fortunately the strenuous labours of learned Italian archivists have rendered it possible to correct most of such errors. The new Italian edition of Vasari by Signor Gaetano Milanesi abounds in notes and discourses on such and similar questions, the results of which have been embodied in this volume of Supplementary Notes. Many of the pictures described by Vasari have of late changed hands; others, which left Italy years ago have found a resting-place in various collections, especially in Great Britain; but the compiler of the new Italian edition seems to have had little or no opportunity of becoming personally acquainted with such works, and he is therefore sometimes at fault in his accounts of them. In the present volume I have endeavoured to make good these shortcomings of the Italian annotator from my own notes and from the writings of competent critics.

Vasari’s statements as to the authorship of the pictures described by him have certainly a great weight, but it would be rash to follow him blindly in matters of such importance whenever disputes on their authenticity have arisen, and when these are founded on reasonable grounds. Vasari has the less claim to be looked upon as an indisputable authority in this respect inasmuch as he has himself occasionally ascribed the same work to different hands. Such contradictory statements may have been the result of mere inadvertence, but at the same time indicate the necessity of caution on the part of the reader. In some instances documentary evidence is against him, and in others a close examination of the style of the works of art has led to results which deviate more or less from the opinion pronounced by him. They may be comparatively few in number, but the mere possibility of their occurrence has enhanced the difficulties in the preparation of this commentary to the popular English edition of Bohn’s Standard Library. Only of late years has art criticism undertaken to study
pictures on the basis of sound scientific methods, and it is to be presumed that future researches may thus throw a fuller light on several points than has been found possible here. On the other hand, I venture to hope that this volume of Supplementary Notes, partly derived from various literary resources, and partly collected during repeated personal inspection of works of art in Italy as well as in England and elsewhere, will prove a useful guide to the readers of Vasari’s biographies.

JEAN PAUL RICHTER.

VERONA, November, 1884.
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