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Well may the Hebrews continue to go there, as they do every Sabbath, both men and women, like flocks of starlings, to visit and adore that statue; for they will be adoring a thing not human but divine.—Giorgio Vasari, Le vite de’ più eccellenti architetti, pittori, et scultori, 1550

The first edition of Le vite de’ più eccellenti architetti, pittori, et scultori italiani appeared in two volumes in 1550, under the name of the painter Giorgio Vasari as author and Lorenzo Torrentino, the ducal printer of Duke Cosimo I de’ Medici of Florence, as publisher. The Lives comprises what we now refer to as a theoretical and a historical part. The introductory, theoretical part discusses the three “sister arts” systematically, in three sections. This is followed by a historical part, also in three sections, that recounts the history of art and architecture from the so-called early Oriental high cultures to Vasari’s time. The Lives opens with the creation of the world and humankind by the Deus arslex of the Hebrew Bible and it closes shortly after the description of Michelangelo’s Last Judgment. Michelangelo embodies the climax and telos of the first edition of Vasari’s Lives: in the Life of Michelangelo, the artist is styled as artista divino and Überfather of the three sister arts.

The Life of Michelangelo contains a description of crowds of Jews making a regular pilgrimage to the Roman church of S. Pietro in Vincoli to “adore” the artist’s sculpture of Moses, the enunciator of the ban on images in the Hebrew Bible (Figs. 1, 2). The veracity of Vasari’s report has not been investigated thoroughly. Nor has the role of Jews and Judaism within the architecture of Vasari’s Lives been explored. Vasari writes that the Roman Jews visited Michelangelo’s sculpture “every Sabbath, . . . like flocks of starlings.” In this passage, Michelangelo is presented as challenging the Mosaic aniconism by means of a Christian image. He had made a Christian icon of the iconoclast, thus overwhelming and transcending the condemnation of images in the Hebrew Bible. The Roman Jews who (allegedly) adored Michelangelo’s Moses were also violating the prohibition on beholding and adoring images that Moses, the very subject of this sculpture, had himself enunciated. In writing about the great power of this major work of Christian art, Vasari was alluding to the theme of the conversion of the Jews. He was making a connection to the theological topos of the “eschatological Jew(s),” that is, those Jews who, according to Saint Augustine, would spontaneously convert on Judgment Day.

Recent scholarship shows that Vasari was not the sole creator of The Lives. (Nevertheless, for the sake of simplicity, I will speak of him as the author of The Lives and of Vasari’s Lives, in the conventional manner.) Pier Francesco Giambullari, humanist and cultural functionary in the service ofCosimo I, was an important co-author of The Lives. According to Charles Hope and Thomas Frangenberg, he is the spiritus recto of the structural organization of the history of art since Cimabue, in three epochs, and the main author of the prologue to the historical part, the “Proemio delle vite” (T 111–25). The latter contains a short art history from Bezalel to Cimabue. Giambullari claimed to be a connoisseur and scholar of the “sapientissimi Cabalisti” (the wisest Cabalists), and the “Dottori ebrei” (Jewish scholars). Yet his description of the Tabernacle of Moses, which the Hebrew Bible attributes to Bezalel, the first Jewish artist, has been overlooked by contemporary scholars.

On the one hand, the historiographical concept of Vasari’s Lives is aligned with the “new” humanist tradition of writing history and its antique pagan models. On the other hand—and so far unremarked—The Lives make use of the patristic theology of history and the history of the world from its creation to the Last Judgment in medieval and early modern universal chronicles. In effect, Vasari and his co-authors tell the history of art in the manner of Christian salvation history as a history of the overcoming of the supposed Jewish aniconism. This overcoming culminates in a Christian image of Moses. Moreover, canonization, conversion, and the cult of art, or Kunstreligion, are dovetailed in the later reception of Vasari’s interpretation of Michelangelo’s Moses up to Sigmund Freud.

The “Biblical” Structure of The Lives

The Lives’ borrowings from the historiography of antiquity have been thoroughly investigated since the turn of the twentieth century, and pagan models for a biological conception of Vasari’s rinascita have been pointed out. The ancient patterns of growth, florescence, fading, and new becoming and of the “ Ages of Man” underlie his Petrarchan triad of antiquity, Middle Ages, and rinascita, or rebirth (T 125 and passim), of the arts since Cimabue. Vasari also relied on the pagan paradigm of “historia magistri vitae,” or history as life’s teacher (see T 223) adopted by humanism and on representational patterns of antique biography. Less explored, but equally important, are Vasari’s resources to Christian theology and medieval and early modern universal chronicles ab orbe condito, that is, telling the history of the world from the Creation. Vasari derives from these sources the eschatological framework of a “grand narrative,” from Adam to Judgment Day. In the case of the Torrentiniana (the first edition of The Lives), the “grand récit” extends to the unsurpassed visual example of Michelangelo’s Last Judgment. The historiography of The Lives also alludes to the traditional six ages of the world of Christian theology. Notably, the subdivision of art history since Cimabue, and with it, the “progresso della . . . rinascita,” or progress of [art’s] second birth (T 125), is divided into three epochs. These offer explicit analogies to the three biblical patristic ages of salvation: ante legem — sub lege — sub gratia (nature, law, grace). Vasari’s “grand narra-
of 1493 received widespread circulation and distribution in Italy. Johannes Carion’s *Chronica*, a Protestant textbook on world history, was read in Florence in the 1540s by Giambul- lari. Carion’s *Chronica*, which follows the so-called *Vaticinium Eliae*, or prophecy of Elijah, a Scripture from the Jewish tradition, divides world history into three periods of two thousand years each.

Vasari placed the history of art of his time in a comprehensive frame of salvation history *ab orbe condito*, and he presented it as a teleological process. This structure, based on a traditional theology of history, informed his work; he does not appear to be heavily indebted to the historiography of early humanism founded in Florence by Leonardo Bruni and Coluccio Salutati, nor by the “modern” historiography of his contemporaries, such as Niccolò Machiavelli and Francesco Guiccardi. Machiavelli, Guiccardi, and his mentor, Paolo Giovio, concentrate mainly on the shorter periods of universal history and on the inherent causalities of historical events. They usually do not adhere to a providential pattern of universal history.

Vasari also concentrates his historiography on a limited span, proceeding to his own time. His “progresso della ... rinascita” (T 125) commences in 1240, the year of Cimabue’s birth, and concludes shortly before 1550. And in the presentation of the achievements of his protagonists, he frequently follows a quite secular ethics of industry (*industria*) and labor (*fatica*) found in the records of Tuscan merchants since the High Middle Ages. Taking his historiographical scheme from universal history, however, Vasari refers to Christian historiography as it was established by Eusebius of Caesarea and canonized by Saint Augustine. Divine providence plays an important role in Vasari’s *Lives*; this is not only the case in single lives—such as at the beginning of Michelangelo’s biography, where his birth is described as an act of God’s grace (T 947)—but also in the way the 133 lives are arranged in the first edition, following the model of a providential history of salvation.

In the early modern age, universal chronicles *ab orbe condito* continued to be the standard working models of historical orientation, especially since they incorporated contents from humanist historiography. However, they integrated these contents into the canonized framework of a history of salvation. In the teleological orientation of their art history (in the prefaces) and in their history of artists (within the three series of biographies), Vasari and his co-authors drew on the structures and topoi of Christian theology of history as these were adapted to universal chronicles. Vasari tells the history of the *rinascita* of the *arti del disegno*—of the visual arts since Cimabue—as one of progression in steps, in which important protagonists refer back to characters in the Bible. The Life of Cimabue alludes to Noah, Giotto’s biography to Abraham, Raphael’s very explicitly to Jesus Christ, and that of Michelangelo, with its stylization of the artist as the father of the three sister arts, to the Trinity, and to the “divine Architect of time and of nature” (T 111).

Vasari made use of single biblical motifs, then, as well as the eschatological frame of the biblical “grand narrative” from Genesis to Judgment. The *Lives* employs, accordingly, Christian theology of history’s traditional succession of the six ages of the world (divided into the epochs ordered by
Adam—Noah—Abraham—David—prophets from the Babylonian captivity—Jesus and the three ages of salvation (nature, law, grace). Vasari’s “historical part” starts, as indicated, with the world’s and Adam’s creation (T 111). Following contemporary hypotheses of Noah as progenitor of the Etruscan-Tuscan culture and language and as founder of Florence, Vasari declares Cimabue to be the initiator of the new Tuscan art after the “Flood” of the Middle Ages and its evils (“l’infinito diluvio de’mali,” T 126). Giotto then appears as progenitor and patriarch of a new school, as a kind of Abraham of a new art, whose pastoral origin refers back to the patriarch’s world of shepherds from the Hebrew Bible (and to the shepherd boys of ancient myth). The “natural art” that Giotto learned “without a teacher” (T 147) assigns him to the epoch of the lex naturalis, or natural law. The first part of The Lives (T 111–222), covering Cimabue, Giotto, and the trecento, finds its parallel in the biblical epoch ante legem (nature). The second part of The Lives (T 223–552) corresponds to the biblical epoch sub lege (law). The artists of the second epoch of the rinascita, namely, “Filippo, Donato, Paulo Uccello c Masaccio” (T 284), set up and canonized the rules of art. Vasari argues that Filippo Brunelleschi reintroduced the classical orders of architecture (T 300), Masaccio founded the “true method” (“vera via,” T 284), and Donatello can be called the “pattern for the others” (T 233). The best masters of the fifteenth century were in excellent command of the laws of the arts—of “rule, order, proportion, craftsmanship, and manner” (T 555)—but they had not yet reached artistic perfection, as they retained “a dry, and crude manner” (T 558). In the third epoch, which is our concern, Leonardo da Vinci established the “third manner” by reaching “a perfected disegno, and... divine beauty, and gracefulness” (T 558), even an “infinite grace” (T 563). Yet the crowning achievements of the third epoch are laid to the works of the “graziosissimo Raffaello da Urbino” (T 559) and, most of all, of Michelangelo, who held sway in the realm (principato) not only of one of the sister arts but also of all three together (T 560). With his “judgment” (T 560) and “grace [grazia]” (T 561), the arts reached their “utmost limit and end [ultimo termine]” (T 560) and “a completely and truly gracious grace” (T 561).

According to Christian understanding, the Mosaic laws are imperfect compared to the revelations of the New Testament, which will lead to the epoch sub graia. Accordingly, only in Vasari’s third epoch is the mastery of the rules accompanied with the freedom (licentia) that enables perfect grace and the exceeding of every measure and prescribed rule (T 556). In the preface to The Lives’s third part (T 555–61), the third and last epoch of the rinascita is charged with the traditional characteristics of the third epoch of salvation history, the final epoch of grace.

The figure of Michelangelo takes up a theme from The Lives’s theoretical section, where disegno is introduced as father (padre) of the three sister arts (T 19). Vasari equates Raphael with Christ and Michelangelo with the Trinity and God the Father. As he puts it, Raphael was born on a Good Friday (T 636) and he died on a Good Friday (T 670), though after a less holy passion (T 670). Michelangelo, though, reached the ultimate stage of the art of all times. He not only depicted the Last Judgment but he also executed a “judgment” (Giudizio, T 982) on all previous art and brought an end to all artistic innovation (T 982–86). In The Lives’s second edition, the Accademia delle Arti del Disegno, founded in 1563, is accorded the role of dispensing and administering the unsurpassable means of art brought forth by Raphael and Michelangelo, just as the Church administers the means of salvation.

Chronologically arranged collections of biographies that were more or less ordered by the ascending death dates of their protagonists, were rather rare prior to Vasari. Pertinent collections of lives from antiquity and early humanism, such as the parallel biographies of Plutarch, Diogenes Laertius’s Lives of Eminent Philosophers, or Vespuccani da Bisticci’s Vite, have a different structuring sequence: they follow the order of typology, “school,” and social rank. De viris illustribus urbis Romae, an anthology of biographies from late antiquity largely forgotten today, was first published in Rome in 1470. This chronologically arranged compilation of lives was well known in Vasari’s time. Vasari also would have been acquainted with the structuring of a collection of lives according to patterns of salvation history from the Legenda aurea by Jacobus de Voragine, one of the most widely read printed books of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Vasari had a different model in the arts. The world history
of Marco Attilio Alessi from Arezzo contains a list of figures in a famous quattrocento fresco cycle from the Roman palace of Cardinal Giordano Orsini that showed *uomini illustri* (illustrious men) in chronological sequence according to the six Augustinian ages of the world. In the headings of the list, Alessi names these six ages, and he assigns to each of them a group of names (Fig. 3). Vasari followed this very principle of a historical progression of biographies, but in three rather than the customary six ages. Here we may note that a “genealogical” succession in *three* rows of historical protagonists was already prefigured in the Gospel of Matthew (1:1–17) and contained in the lists of generations of Joachim of Fiore’s *Liber concordiae.* Vasari’s *Lives* not only inherits single motifs from the Bible, as Paul Barolsky has shown, but it also carries over the basic historiographical structure of the Bible in toto, and it does so according to the patristic theology of history and to the universal chronicles, the *Legenda aurea,* and the “illustrious men” cycles.

**Vasari on the Jews**

The Jews put onstage in *The Lives* come forth as historical agents or as the protagonists of artworks detailed by Vasari. They move partly in a biblical past, they act in Vasari’s historical present, and they allude to an eschatological future. *The Lives’s* narrative of the history of art stems from theological “meta-histories,”42 and it attributes to the Jews and to Judaism the very role that, mutatis mutandis, had been traditionally ascribed by Christian theology of history to the Jews of the Hebrew Bible, to the role of Jewry under Christian control, and to the so-called eschatological Jew. According to traditional Christian salvation history, the covenant with Abraham and especially the Mosaic law were regarded as necessary preconditions for salvation through Christ but also seen as testimonies of an obsolete old faith—“dialectical” promises to be fulfilled in perfection and to be overcome at the end of time.

For Vasari, Bezalel, the first Jewish artist, stands at the beginning of art history in the same way that Moses stands, in the Hebrew Bible, at the beginning of all written Revelation (T 113). Shortly before Vasari gives the description of Michelangelo’s *Last Judgment,* he writes that the Moses of the Hebrew Bible was completely overcome by the form of his “resurrection” in Michelangelo’s sculpture,46 which the artist had accomplished in such perfection “that Moses may be called now more than ever the friend of God, seeing that He has designed to assemble together and prepare his body for the Resurrection before that of any other, by the hands of Michelangelo.”47 This hyperbolic passage alludes to the bodily resurrection of the dead at Judgment Day.48

With the exception of the historical Moses and his collaborator, the artist Bezalel, in Vasari’s narration the Jews of the Hebrew Bible are protagonists of the artworks described rather than participants in the historical process of the development of art. Jews of the New Testament, contemporaries of Jesus, are mentioned repeatedly as figures within the images Vasari mentions. He characterizes them by means of traditional, that is to say, anti-Jewish, Christian stereotypes. In topical expressions he points out their hatred for the Redeemer (T 399, 480), stresses their “rage and anger” (T 399) and their “fury and very terrible revenge” against Jesus Christ (T 266), only to applaud the artist’s outstanding achievement in producing such a striking visualization of all this passionate emotion. The Jews of Vasari’s time are contemporary protagonists of *The Lives,* yet they appear in only two textual passages: as the crowd of Roman Jews who supposedly pilgromed every Sabbath to “adore” Michelangelo’s *Moses* (T 961),
and in the guise of the cultivated and generous Jew Dattero from Bologna, the “friend” of Vasari’s promoter, Ottaviano de’ Medici, who is found only in the second edition of The Lives, within the biography of Cristofano Gherardi. It should be noted that the second edition of 1568 was printed after the Roman Ghetto was established in 1555 and just shortly before Pius V ordered the expulsion of the Jews from Bologna in 1569. Toward the end of his book, in his hyperbolic praise of Michelangelo’s Moses, Vasari invokes the aforementioned topos of the “eschatological Jew(s),” those imaginary Jews of a future end of time who would convert voluntarily at the beginning of Judgment Day, since they would be shown the spiritual exegesis of the Mosaic law they had obeyed until then only in the flesh (carnaliter). From those pages on Michelangelo’s Moses, close to the end of The Lives, we come to the onset of Vasari’s “grand narrative.” At the beginning of the total survey of art history set out in the “Proemio delle vite” (T 111-25), Vasari refers to a double origin of the visual arts: a biblical-theological origin in God’s creation of the world and the first human being as the “first sculpture [prima Scultura]” (T 9, 111), and a historical origin in early Oriental high cultures (T 111-13). Right at the opening of the historical part of The Lives, Vasari and his co-authors also tackle head-on the basic theological problem of all Christian art: the Hebrew Bible and the supposed aniconism of Moses (T 113). Vasari, or more likely his co-author Giambullari, the presumed author of this passage, plays off the account in the Book of Exodus in which God himself inspired and filled the sculptor Bezalel with his spirit, “in wisdom, in understanding, and in knowledge” against the “stern commandment” made by Moses in the Exodus from Egypt “that under the pain of death there should be made to God no image whatsoever” (T 112).

The Book of Exodus and the Books of Chronicles testify that Moses commissioned the Tabernacle and the Ark of the Covenant and that, with the help of Oholiab, Bezalel built them and created their artistic ornaments, including sculptures of cherubim. In the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, these sculptures were generally interpreted as figurative representations. It is stated in Exodus that Bezalel was in his artistic activity “filled . . . with the spirit of God . . .” Vasari could have been familiar with a great many illustrations of the lost objects mentioned here, for in the popular Bibbia vulgare historiata of Nicolo Malermi (Malerbi), one finds rich illustrations of Bezalel’s Tabernacle and its ritual objects, including the cherubim of the Ark of the Covenant. Bezalel and Oholiab are depicted in all four early illustrated editions of this Bible, published since 1490. The third illustrated edition of 1493 is known to have been used by Michelangelo. In Schedel’s Chronicle, woodcuts illustrate both the patristic and the rabbinic reconstructions of Bezalel’s objects. Similar woodcuts had been used before in Anton Koberger’s well-known editions of Nicolaus de Lyra’s Bibbia cum postilla.

In The Lives, the aniconism of Moses effects the renunciation of the idolatry of the Egyptians and of the early Oriental high cultures (T 112). Between idolatry and iconoclasm resides religiously authorized art created by the first artist of the Bible, Bezalel (T 113). For Vasari, Moses’ edict represents religious iconoclasm, the greatest danger to threatened art. Vasari’s grand narrative of art history rests on a twofold overcoming of aniconism: the initial, groundbreaking overcoming of Moses’ aniconism by Bezalel and, later on, the gradual overcoming of the violent iconoclasm of Early Christianity. In accord with Lorenzo Ghiberti, Vasari explicitly criticizes the latter, calling this rage the main cause—apart from the destruction of the Roman Empire by the barbarians—of the decline and loss of ancient art (T 119).

At the beginning of the historical part of The Lives, an antagonism of idolatry versus iconoclasm erupts. The “idolatria” (T 112) of the Israelites is not only punished by Moses with an act of iconoclasm—namely, the destruction of the golden calf—but also with the death of thousands of Israelites (T 113). Immediately thereafter, Bezalel is presented by Vasari as the contemporary, divinely appointed antagonist of Mosaic iconoclasm, as the first exponent of religiously authorized art, and, simultaneously, as the first representative of the arte del disegno.

But because not the making of statues but their adoration was a deadly sin, we read in Exodus that the art of design and of statuary . . . was bestowed by the mouth of God on Bezalel, of the tribe of Judah, and on Oholiab, of the tribe of Dan, who were those that made the two cherubim of gold, the candlesticks, the veil, the borders of the priestly vestments, and so many other beautiful castings for the Tabernacle, for no other reason than to bring the people to contemplate and to adore them.

Here The Lives presents a subtle, contradictory argument. God had not forbidden the production of images by way of Moses, but only their worship (adorare). Whereas just a few lines before, and perfectly in line with Exodus 20:4, Moses forbids not only the “worship [adorare]” but also the production of images (T 112), he then prohibits only the adoration of statues. At this point, a decisive reversal occurs in the line of argument: called by God, Bezalel and Oholiab decorated the Tabernacle’s Ark of the Covenant with images of cherubim and other artifacts, and they did so with the aim—here comes the surprising, anti-Mosaic volte-face—that these artifacts should be “contemplated” and even “adored,” that is, worshipped (“non per altro che per indurvi le genti a contemplarle et adorarle”). The verb adorare was much in use in contemporary theological debates on images and idols. Before the last session of the Council of Trent in 1563 it could denote both legitimate veneration and idolatrous worship.

In spite of Moses’ Second Commandment, his Tabernacle became an important biblical reference for the legitimate right and value of visual art within Judaism and Christianity. The significance of the Tabernacle of Moses was set in the Christian exegetical tradition through its typological interpretation as architectural and artistic anticipation of Christian cosmology and salvation history. Indeed, the early Jewish commentators from antiquity, as well as the Church fathers, avoided an antagonism between Moses, the enunciator of the prohibition of images, and Bezalel, the maker of the first artworks of the Hebrew Bible. Both the classical Jewish and Christian commentaries concentrate on the passage in Exodus 25:8-40, explaining that the “pattern” of the Tabernacle was shown directly to Moses by God, whereas Bezalel (his name literally means “in God’s shadow”) received his direc-
tions for the execution of the artifacts only indirectly, via Moses. In Saint Bede's De tabernaculo, the predominant monograph on the Tabernacle in the patristic tradition, Bezalel is not even mentioned by name.

Vasari and his co-authors do not make use of this argument. Instead, The Lives takes up an old rabbinic position that brings Bezalel—as a chief witness for the justification of the visual arts—into forceful opposition to Moses. Rather than following the traditional relegation of Bezalel as mere helper and subordinate to Moses, then, Vasari and his co-authors allude to those statements from the Hebrew Bible in which Bezalel is accorded a divine inspiration. In the antique-pagan tradition, the divine inspiration of the seer and the poet is only seldom attributed to visual artists, with the exception of Phidias. Bezalel, however, offers a biblical prototype for the artist inspired and called by God, as well as a potential alternative to the subordinate role of the sculptor within the traditional "system of the arts."

Before the sixteenth century, an opposition between Moses and Bezalel rarely surfaced in the Christian tradition. In contrast to the dominant patristic exegesis that saw in Moses, instructed by God, the patron and author of the Tabernacle, Bezalel and his divine inspiration became a topic within manuscript illumination. Bezalel is mentioned in the Libri Carolini and in the preface to the third book of the Schedula diversarum artium, but an antithetical juxtaposition of Moses and Bezalel is not known within the corpus of early modern literature on art other than in The Lives. That Bezalel, as founder of a divinely authorized art, was in any case under discussion in the Rome of Vasari's time is indicated by Francisco de Hollandia in his Diálogos em Roma (1538). Borrowing in part from the passage quoted above in Exodus, de Hollandia has Michelangelo say:

And in the Old Testament it was the will of God the Father that those who had merely to adorn and paint the ark of the covenant (Bezalel and Oholiab) should not only be great and eminent masters but should be inspired with His grace and wisdom [sapientia et intelligencia]; for God said unto Moses that he would fill them with wisdom and understanding of his spirit in order that they might be able to devise and do all that it could devise and do. And if it was the will of God the Father that the ark of His Law should be skilfully adorned and painted, how much more must it be His will that care and judgement should be bestowed on copying His serene countenance and that of His Son our Lord. ...

From 1545 to 1573, Hollanda produced De aeratis mundi imagines, an illustrated chronicle of the world. On the left of a double-page opening, Moses is depicted receiving the Tablets of the Law, while on the right side Aaron is shown envisioning the Tabernacle. Meanwhile, Moses and Bezalel are juxtaposed in two tondi on both sides of the fold, where they appear in the guise of raging iconoclast and visionary artist (Fig. 4). In the passage of the diálogo cited above, Hollanda claims that Michelangelo compared himself with Bezalel. At the end of Vasari's Lives, shortly before the description of the Last Judgment in the Sistine Chapel, Michelangelo appears as the new Bezalel. As creator of the masterwork of Christian sculpture of the Hebrew "iconoclast," the artist finally prevails over Moses' ban on images. For Vasari, the Roman Jews of Michelangelo's time, men and women alike, surely stood as witnesses to the power of his art.

Roman Jews as Admirers of Michelangelo's Moses: Fact or Fiction?

Vasari's description of Michelangelo's Moses brings together several historical threads in which Jews are thematized in The Lives. Recall that his hyperbolic praise of Michelangelo's sculpture, replete with theological allusions, occurs in the Life of Michelangelo, the biography that forms the climax of and crowns the panegyrics of art and artists in the Torren­tiniana. Vasari's report on Roman Jews admiring the Moses is itself tripartite in reference: it alludes to the Jews of the Old Testament at the time of Moses, to the above-mentioned antithetical juxtaposition of Moses and Bezalel, and to an eschatological future.

But does Vasari's report of Roman Jews visiting Michelangelo's Moses each Sabbath in crowds "like starlings" have a factual basis? Until now, the veracity of Vasari's account has been taken for granted in the literature on Michelangelo, and it has remained unchallenged in the literature on the Roman Jews of the Renaissance. Yet eighteenth- and nine­teenth-century connoisseurs had their doubts about whether Roman Jews had visited the papal tomb and whether they would have been allowed within the church of S. Pietro in Vincoli. Giovanni Bottari, the eminent scholar and commen­tator of the classical, eighteenth-century edition of The Lives, took Vasari's "report" to be false, since, he says, Jews could not visit any church without risking severe punishment. In his monograph on Michelangelo's Moses from 1823, Francesco Cancelleri even insinuated that Jews were forbidden to enter the churches by force of law. Both assumptions are untrue—at least, before the release of an edict in 1566. In older historiographical literature on the history of the Roman Jews, however, Vasari's statement is taken as historical fact, while more recent monographs on the history of Roman Jews in the Renaissance do not even mention it. With the exception of a short text by Philipp Fehl, contemporary art historical research on Michelangelo's Moses does not impugn Vasari's report.

As sources prove beyond a shadow of a doubt, in the 1540s it was not forbidden for Jews to visit Catholic churches, and, apparently, it was also not uncommon. Otherwise it would not have been necessary (as we will see in a moment) to prohibit it explicitly, as happened in May 1566. In all its ferocity of detailed restrictions and commands, not even the infamous papal bull Cum nimis absurdatum of 1555, according to which Paul IV ordered the establishment of the Roman Ghetto, contains the prohibition to visit churches. The afore­mentioned anecdote about Cristofano Gherardi, the painter and collaborator of Vasari, the "wealthy Jew" Dattero, and a certain Bolognese catzaiulo (shoemaker and/or hosier), is only to be found in the second edition of the The Lives from 1568, where it is predated to 1539. From the appearance of this anecdote it becomes evident that for readers as late as 1568, it was plausible to assume that in the late 1530s the Bolognese people had considered it possible that Jewish artists had frescoed a monastic refectory in the Papal States.
According to Vasari, the Bolognese shoemaker and/or hosier had visited the monastery of S. Michele in Bosco to hand over a present to Gherardi and his fellow painters from the well-meaning Jew. When asked for directions by the calzeinolo, bystanders on the road obviously assumed that Gherardi and his co-workers were Jewish, and no one seemed to have any problem with their presence in a sacred Christian environment.

Regarding church visits by Jews, the pertinent compendium summing up the elaborate regulations of ecclesiastical law on Jewish matters, Marquardus de Susannis's De Judaeis (first published in 1558), takes issue with contemporary proposals to prohibit Jewish visits to churches apart from the ceremony of the Mass. (It defends their habitual right to visit churches by way of reference to the tradition of the Church.) Nonetheless, only a few years later, an explicit prohibition was enacted. In May 1556, Giacomo Savelli, the cardinal vicar for Rome, released an edict (published here for the first time, App. 1) that forbade the Roman Jews to visit churches, chapels, and monasteries in general. At the same time, Savelli’s edict forbade Christians to frequent synagogues. The edict allowed church visits by Jews only by way of exception, and with explicit permission in writing.

“Hebraei ne de cetero auderent quovis praetextu. . . .” another edict of Savelli issued on May 20, 1556, is partly reprinted or summarized in Lucius Ferraris’s Prompta bibliotheca canonica. Interestingly, it is not identical to Savelli’s edict of the same date in the Archivio Segreto Vaticano (App. 1). In the edict by Savelli presented in Ferraris’s Prompta bibliotheca, the Jews are allowed to sell their merchandise to Roman prostitutes and to negotiate with them about money matters, provided the prostitutes’ doors are open. If they negotiate with them behind closed doors they are threatened with the prohibition of visiting their own synagogues. The connection forged in the edict between the visiting of prostitutes’ apartments and the frequenting of synagogues, on top of the temporal coincidence of the two edicts by Cardinal Savelli, is more than remarkable.

Yet even after these decrees, Jews definitely visited churches. This circumstance is proved by the fact that Giralomo Rusticucci, the cardinal vicar in office from 1588 to 1603, issued an edict forbidding Jewish visits of Roman churches, chapels, and monasteries of nuns. Most likely the edict was issued in 1592–93. Marcello Ferro reports, probably in 1567, that he had previously guided two Jews willing to be converted into a Roman church, to explain to them the basic principles of the Catholic faith and to move them toward conversion. After the second half of the sixteenth century, a considerable number of Roman Jews were forced into churches in order to attend the baptisms of converts.
On Pentecost 1566, in the very year of Savelli’s two edicts, five converts were baptized ceremonially in St. Peter’s, with a magnificent ceremony performed by Pope Pius IV himself. A number of cardinals were present, among them Alessandro Farnese in the role of godfather. By the command of the pope, Roman Jews were brought to St. Peter’s for the occasion. Summarizing the Christian reports of the festivity, Karl Hoffmann remarks that “even the pope himself and all the Christians present bent their knee in front of the ceremonious unveiling and adoration of Christ’s image known as the ‘Veronica.’ The ceremony, conducted at last, was obviously meant to leave the deepest religious impression on the Jewish spectators. . . .” Whether Jews had been forced to attend the baptisms of Jewish converts in the 1540s cannot be ascertained from available sources. It is known that in 1561 Savelli obliged male and female inhabitants of the Ghetto to be present at a solemn baptism ceremony.99 There, again in the basilica of St. Peter’s, they had to stand with “eyes closed, and countenance turned to the floor, in the middle of a crowd of curious Christians” and in the presence of fifteen cardinals and one candidate for baptism.100 On September 1, 1577, and September 1, 1584, compulsory Christian sermons were introduced on every Sabbath for Roman Jews on a regular basis. Previously held on an irregular schedule, these sermons now took place mostly in the oratories (rather than in the churches) of SS. Trinità de’ Pellegrini and S. Maria del Pianto,101 but also, if these oratories were occupied, in S. Lorenzo in Damasso,102 the titular church of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese.103 In 1583, the basilica of S. Croce in Florence conducted sermons for Jews.104

Prior to 1566, then, it was permitted for Roman Jews to visit Michelangelo’s Moses in S. Pietro in Vincoli. We can assume that several Roman Jews voluntarily entered this and other churches occasionally, otherwise Cardinal Savelli’s edicts of 1566 would not have been issued or repeated later (albeit in weaker form) by Cardinal Rusticucci. And yet, there are substantive reasons to doubt Vasari’s claim that Jews “adored” the statue of Moses, and especially that they showed up “each Sabbath in crowds.” The fact is, any piece of objective evidence from the Jewish and Christian sources for such a collective practice appears to be missing. At this point, several questions arise: Why would such a phenomenon have left no trace at all in documents on conversion during the pontificate of Paul III, which Karl Hoffmann has analyzed in detail,105 or in any other sources? Why would these visits en masse not have been seized on for Christian conversion propaganda? On the other side of the coin, to follow Bottari, it remains unclear whether regular visits by entire groups of Jews would have been tolerated in practice by the parochial community.

More important still, we cannot assume that Roman Jews wanted to enter the Roman churches in substantial numbers and that they did so on a regular basis. The Jewish sources, as far as these have been published, remain silent on visits of Jews to the tomb of Julius II, to which the statue of Moses belongs, although this pope was seen as a benefactor to them.106 His tomb could well have been an occasional destination for Jewish church visitors. Against the backdrop of the fact that since the 1560s, Roman Jews were increasingly forced into churches and oratories for baptisms and compulsory sermons, it seems highly implausible that a comparable number of male and female Jews would have voluntarily frequented S. Pietro in Vincoli on each and every Sabbath.107 Nonetheless, Vasari repeats his “report” in the 1568 edition. Even if we do not have proof from the years before the publication of The Lives of voluntary visits to churches by Roman Jews, earlier Roman and contemporary foreign sources about Jewish church visits definitely exist. In the Middle Ages, visits to churches were quite common among Jews, as reports of Jewish travelers show. These reports claim that their attention was explicitly directed toward statues and paintings. From Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela, who journeyed to Rome shortly after 1159, we also know that Roman Jews visited the church of S. Giovanni in Laterano on the ninth of Av, a fast and mourning day in Judaism, to see the “weeping columns” of Solomon’s Temple allegedly kept there.108 Benjamin of Tudela also mentions statues of Samson and Absalom on the church facade and reinterprets ancient Roman bronzes as Jewish protagonists of the Hebrew Bible.109

In early modern times, Jewish church visits are documented in other Italian regions.110 In an interesting source passed down from Alsace in the north, Rabbi Joseph of Rosheim asserts in 1541 that he listened to sermons in Christian churches.111 The famous Venetian Rabbi Leone da Modena (1571–1648) frequented churches.112 Yet it is quite likely, although it cannot be proved directly from our sources, that Roman Jews who visited churches violated rabbinic instructions and rabbinic law.113 Indeed, no responsum by an Italian rabbi from the Renaissance has been published that touches on church visits.114

The idea of an imageless culture of the alleged “artless Jews”115 does not hold true for Italian-Jewish culture of the Renaissance,116 yet Jewish religious communities would hardly have accepted a three-dimensional representation of Moses. Two-dimensional representations of Moses had been handed down since the Middle Ages in Jewish illuminated manuscripts, however.117 A woodcut of the Wise Son from the Mantua Haggadah of 1560, inspired by Michelangelo’s fresco of Jeremiah in the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, clearly documents an interest on the part of Italian Jews in Christian representations of protagonists from the Hebrew Bible (Fig. 5).118 The fact that this woodcut was reused in a later Mantua Haggadah of 1568, and in a Venetian one of 1599, proves an appreciation for the woodcut on the part of its Jewish recipients.119

Two-dimensional representations were not uncommon, but a three-dimensional representation of Moses in full figure could scarcely have been countenanced from a Jewish point of view. According to contemporary rabbinic statements, the Jewish community could not have tolerated or cherished a three-dimensional representation of Moses. Even Rabbi Joseph ben Ephraim Caro (1488–1575), famous exponent of a liberal attitude toward images, turned explicitly against three-dimensional representations.120 In his Riti ebraici, Leone da Modena also prohibited three-dimensional images. “But in Italy,” he remarked, “there are many who have freed themselves of this restriction [that is, the prohibition of pictures], and have paintings and portraits in their homes, although they avoid sculpture, both in relief and in the round.”121 Jewish readers, if any, might not have been the only ones.
surprised by Vasari’s passage in The Lives. Christian readers would have received it against the backdrop of numerous reports of the quattro- and cinquecento that defamed Jews as enemies, destroyers, and desecraters of Christian statuary in Italian towns. In light of this context, contemporary readers must have found the described “aesthetic conversion” of Roman Jews through Michelangelo’s Moses astonishing. Moreover, evidence cannot be furnished for the assumption that the Jews Vasari mentions were catechumens (candidates for baptism) or neophytes (new converts to the religion) to whom the statue of Moses in S. Pietro in Vincoli, itself quite close to the Casa dei Catechumeni, would have been presented for catechetical reasons. The practice of using images for conversion purposes was implemented with the help of a famous icon from St. Peter’s in the aforementioned baptismal service of 1566. It also occurred in 1704 with a well-known miraculous painted image in S. Maria della Vittoria and, in the same church, with Gian Lorenzo Bernini’s Ecstasy of Saint Theresa. The case involving the Bernini concerned the successful conversion of Anna Vesino, a fourteen-year-old Jewish girl. According to a contemporary Christian account, it was not parental will but Bernini’s sculpture that fired Anna’s desire for conversion.

Michelangelo’s Moses, Paul III’s Conversion Policies, and the Eschatological Conversion of the Jews

Vasari’s hyperbolic description of Michelangelo’s Moses finds its historical context in the Rome of the mid-1540s. Until then, the statue had remained in the artist’s studio. Between spring and October 1544, it was set up at the center of the tomb of Julius II. From 1543 to 1546 Vasari worked mainly in Rome, first and foremost at the court of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, grandson of Pope Paul III. As Vasari recounts in his autobiography, he received the impetus for the conception of The Lives at Farnese’s court. The topics of conversion and iconoclasm play preeminent roles in the program of Farnese’s private chapel in the Cancelleria, the so-called Cappella del Pallio, frescoed between 1548 and 1550. Vasari’s report of a flow of Jewish pilgrims to Michelangelo’s Moses refers to the new conversion policy. Yet his assertion is a fiction, as we have seen. Still, the interest of single Roman Jews for the Moses could have served as an empirical basis for the story. To that extent, Vasari’s fiction has its setting in everyday life, in the new conversion policies of Paul III. The theological point of reference for Vasari’s report is the topos of the eschatological conversion of the Jews at the end of time, prevalent since Saint Augustine’s De civitate dei contra paganos.

The pontificate of the Farnese Pope Paul III, particularly his efforts to achieve the “voluntary” conversion of the Roman Jews, marks a turning point in the attitude of the Holy See. Whereas the pontificates of Julius II and the Medici popes had witnessed a comparably benevolent “tolerance” toward the Jews, Paul III’s “voluntary” conversion policies were carried out by dint of pressure and promise of benefits. Indeed, efforts toward conversion of the Roman Jews were massively increased under his pontificate, especially in 1542 and 1543, shortly before the installation of Michelangelo’s Moses in S. Pietro in Vincoli. Whereas Cardinal Alessandro Farnese supported these efforts, they were viewed quite critically at the court of Cosimo I. As it happened, Paul III would soon be considered the last relatively tolerant pope of the sixteenth century. After the Talmud was burned in Rome in 1553, Paul IV established the Roman Ghetto in 1555, the year of his inauguration.

A reversal in the Vatican’s policies toward the Roman Jews can be traced back to the years 1542 and 1543. Paul III issued a bull on March 21, 1542, in which he conferred considerable privileges on the neophytes. One year prior to the installation of Moses in S. Pietro in Vincoli, in a papal bull from February 19, 1543, he approved the establishment of the Casa dei Catechumeni, to be run by the Jesuits. He provided financial support for the institution and placed it under the highest protection. As the godfather of converts, Cardinal Alessandro Farnese was deeply involved in this endeavor, which achieved only modest success: in Easter of 1543 a “great many” (in reality, five) catechumens received baptism in the presence of several cardinals and under the nosy eyes of a vast Roman crowd. In early 1545, shortly after Michel-
angello’s Moses was set up, ten catechumens received baptism at the same time, in the presence of eight cardinals. Between 1542 and 1563, a parish of about three to four thousand Roman Jews saw approximately ten to fifteen baptisms of Jewish converts each year.

The change in climate after the establishment of the Ghetto in 1555 is shown by the unpublished eulogy under the title “De Laudibus Michaelangeli Bonarotti Pictoris, Sculptoris atque Architectoris nobilissimi Oratio” (App. 2). This encomium of Michelangelo, “most famous Painter, Sculptor and Architect,” by the youthful intellectual Francesco Bocchi, was probably conceived in 1564, shortly after Michelangelo’s death. Bocchi takes up Vasari’s report, with its implicit proselytism, but he makes no reference to eschatological hopes of imminent conversion. Instead, he emphasizes the failure and renunciation of conversion. A free translation of the crucial passage in Bocchi reads:

For that reason I have to wonder each and every time about the exceeding perversity and obduracy of the Jews who see almost the very Moses that should have led them into the promised land—I am wondering, as I say, why they can in no way try to soften the hardness of their hearts and shed all their perfidy... they should convert their spirit toward the true and highest God, Jesus Christ, and pin all their hopes on him.

Exasperation over Jews’ unwillingness to undergo conversion had led to the establishment of the Roman Ghetto nine years before. The discourse around conversion exacerbated after 1555. The deepening of the anti-Jewish tone from Vasari to Bocchi proves this. But the description of Michelangelo’s Moses in The Lives is already anti-Jewish in its reference to a widespread anti-Jewish stereotype presuming that the Jews had developed only a literal, “fleshly” understanding of religious truths rather than a spiritual sense of them. In making this claim, Vasari’s depiction of Roman Jews flocking like starlings every Sabbath to worship Michelangelo’s “divine work” incorporates an intertextual reference to Dante, in particular his phrase “a schiera... come gli storni,” which can be translated literally as “in crowds, like flocks of starlings.” Vasari alludes to a passage from the fifth canto of Dante’s Inferno, lines 38–39, which concerns “The carnal malefactors” who “were condemned, /Who reason subjugate to appetite.”

And as the wings of starlings bear them on
In the cold season in large hand and full,
So doth that blast the spirits maledict... 

By intertextual and literal reference to Dante’s infernal circle of the voluptuaries and to Dante’s words “come gli storni” and “a schiera,” Vasari alludes to that sinful pleasure of the eye (“voluptas oculorum”) criticized since the time of the Early Christian authors in regard to the statues of naked pagan gods. According to Jan Assmann, with the eyeing of the idols, the “connection of aniconism with ethics” and of “idolatry with lawlessness, fornication, and violence, is inscribed into the core of Biblical tradition.” Vasari turns the Hebrew Bible’s verdict against idolatry against the Jews of his time, even though they “adore” a major work of Christian art.

The very moment of the Jews’ “aesthetic conversion” through Michelangelo’s artwork carries with it the offense of the voluptas oculorum, which, from a Christian (and Vasari’s) point of view, signals their transgression. At the same time, Vasari varies the topos of the Christian tradition according to which the Jews, against their intentions and without their knowledge, bear testimony to the truth of Christian faith. Yet the Jews would not recognize the spiritual sense and meaning of their own Scriptures in any case, for, as it is claimed here, they supposedly interpret the religious truths only in a literal and “fleshly” manner. For Bocchi, moreover, the Jews are petrified in the “obduracy” of their minds and the “hardness” (durites) of their hearts, whereas the Christian sculpture of Moses appears to be alive and vivid.

Canon, Moses’ Tabernacle, and The Lives’ Tripartite Structure

“Each canon sets in with a dividing line”, canonization, codification, and confessionalization are closely intertwined in European culture from 1542. Compendia, catalogs, and corpora, indicating a desire for completeness and a pretension of totality, exclude the “Other” and all that does not comply with the norm of the canon. From the early 1540s, a boom in the canon-forming compendia was in progress in the Catholic world. The year 1542 marks not only the reversal of papal policies against the Roman Jews but also a decisive hardening of Catholic confessionalization. In 1542 Paul III elected to hold the Council of Trent and with his bull Lilet ab initio of July 4, he established the Roman Inquisition in the form of a permanent commission of cardinals, who met regularly. Also in 1542 Paul III released the papal bull Capitentes judaeos to facilitate the conversion of Jews. From 1541 through 1543, the establishment of a house of catechumens in Rome was in process. Also in the 1540s, the first indexes of banned books were in preparation. All of this occurred around the time that Michelangelo’s Moses was installed and The Lives was being composed.

In 1543 Vasari entered, as mentioned, Alessandro Farnese’s employ. In 1544 the Moses was installed. In 1547 a first version of The Lives, the so-called Riminese manuscript, was finished. On the other side, the Protestants had been busy since the 1530s developing a canonical view of history. Worthy of note in this regard are the Chronica Carionis (first edition 1532, by Carion and Philipp Melanchthon; second revised version by Melanchthon; third version by Caspar Peucer) that Giambullari also used. The Magdeburg Centuries should also be mentioned. During this time, Reformation and Counter-Reformation were both laboring to complete their own biblical canon. In 1545 the final version of Martin Luther’s translation of the Bible came out. In a decree of August 4, 1546, the widespread version of the Vulgate, the Editio vetus et vulgata, was declared authentic by the Council of Trent. Simultaneously, it was decided to produce a revised edition of this text, which finally appeared under Pope Sixtus V (the Editio Sistina). Meanwhile, the Catholic relation to the Jews was codified for the first time. Marquardus de Susanni’s first collection of canonical and church-imposed regulations concerning Jews was published in 1558, after extensive preparations. In 1560, the Shulhan Arukh of Rabbi Joseph ben Ephraim Caro came out, a compilation of Jewish law
considered canonical to this day.\textsuperscript{156} From the middle of the sixteenth century, corpora, catalogs, and compendia that aimed for canonic status, for instance, the \textit{Index librorum prohibitorum} of 1559, the decrees of the Council of Trent, and the \textit{Magdeburgh Centuries}, were compiled by collective authors. Sebastian Münster's \textit{Cosmographia}, a "description of the whole world with all that is contained in it," published in 1550, was the shared endeavor of more than 120 contributors.\textsuperscript{157}

Vasari's \textit{Lives}, the first compendium of the visual arts to sum up the theory of the three sister arts and their history, had the assistance of learned functionaries of the Accademia Fiorentina. In the year of its publication, a few members of the Accademia Fiorentina, including Giambullari, were called on to participate in a newly founded commission (by an initiative of Cosimo I) aiming to formulate and canonize the rules of the Florentine and Tuscan language.\textsuperscript{158} The fruit of these endeavors was the \textit{Difesa della lingua fiorentina}, published in 1556 under Carlo Lenzoni's name. Markings in the dedication to Cosimo I and in the text clearly indicate this to be the collaborative work of Giambullari, Cosimo Bartoli, Giovan Battista Gelli, and Lenzoni.\textsuperscript{159} The earlier collaboration of Paolo Giovio and Annibale Caro, humanists from the Roman circle around Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, in the first edition of \textit{The Lives} was verified by way of Vasari's \textit{Carteggio}. The collaboration of Bartoli, Vincenzo Borghini, and Giambullari during the time the book went to press in Florence, from 1548 to 1550, is also broadly documented in Vasari's correspondence.\textsuperscript{160}

Hope and Frangenberg have named Pier Francesco Giambullari, in the Medici cultural circle, as the formative co-author of \textit{The Lives}. A single preserved sheet of the Torrentinian's Riminese manuscript published by Piero Scapecchi contains far-reaching additions and corrections in Giambullari's own hand (Fig. 6). Indeed, Giambullari turns out to be the reviser of this manuscript.\textsuperscript{161} He was a supporter of Cosimo I, a founding member of the Accademia Fiorentina, and, with Gelli and Guillaume Postel, a chief agent of the so-called Aramei, whose far-fetched speculations about the Near Eastern, Noahian origins of Tuscan culture and language went out of fashion in the 1550s.\textsuperscript{162} Giambullari was also an expert on Dante. First librarian of the Biblioteca Laurenziana, he had been working since the 1540s at his \textit{History of Europe} from the time of the Carolingians to Otto I,\textsuperscript{163} for which he relied heavily on the universal chronicles.\textsuperscript{164} Giambullari’s \textit{History of Europe} was published posthumously in 1566. Hope has named him the author of those passages in the prefaces ("Proemi") and in the sections of several lives that express the three-step progressive motion of the rebirth of the arts.\textsuperscript{165} Through comparison with his authenticated writings, Frangenberg has attributed to Giambullari important parts of the "Proemio delle vite," or preface to the historical part that contains the short art history from Adam to Cimabue (T 111–25).\textsuperscript{166} Accordingly, it seems that Giambullari fitted the abundance of biographies presented by Vasari into a biblical framework from Adam to the Apocalypse and into a succession of three epochs in the traditional Christian scheme of \textit{ante legem—sub lege—sub gratia}. Giambullari's involvement in preparing \textit{The Lives} for the press and his presence in Torrentino's print shop are well documented in letters.\textsuperscript{167}

On this point, we must bear in mind that Frangenberg has already attributed to Giambullari the passage of the "Promio delle vite" that covers Moses' supposed iconoclasm and Bezalel, who overcame it.\textsuperscript{168} Two circumstances not yet considered in the scholarship go far toward establishing that it must have been Giambullari who inserted the figure of Bezalel. To begin with, the canon of S. Lorenzo composed a description of the Tabernacle fabricated by Bezalel. In the 1540s, during preliminary studies for his \textit{History of Europe}, Giambullari concerned himself with Carolingian history and the court school of Charlemagne. In Carolingian historiography, the figure of the first biblical artist, Bezalel, rarely leaves Moses' shadow, yet his name is frequently used as a pseudonym for Einhard, Charlemagne's biographer, among others.\textsuperscript{169} Second, the account of Michelangelo's Moses in \textit{The Lives} displays similarities with Giambullari's statements in the \textit{Difesa della lingua fiorentina} concerning the same statue. With the metaphor of the "starlings" quoted from Dante (T 961), \textit{The Lives} alludes as well to the instinctual behavior of the birds deceived—recall Pliny the Elder—by the grapes of Zeuxis.\textsuperscript{170} In the \textit{Difesa}, Giambullari discusses the "efficiency and obviousness (\textit{efficacia & evidenza})\textsuperscript{171} of Dante's poetry and, implicitly, Michelangelo's sculpting, by way of an allusion to the same anecdote about the ancient painters Zeuxis and Parrhasius. Giambullari mentions not Zeuxis' birds but the painted curtain of Parrhasius. According to Pliny, Parrhasius had deceived the painter Zeuxis and surpassed the perfect mimesis of his grapes, which had eluded only birds and not an experienced painter. In the \textit{Difesa}, Giambullari mentions the "velo di Parrasio\textsuperscript{172} that (again, according to Pliny) had deceived Zeuxis.

In his \textit{Lezzioni}, published in 1547, Giambullari interpreted the "tabernaculo del signore" named in Exodus as the work of the first Jewish artist, Bezalel. He refers to Philo and Josephus, to Paul,\textsuperscript{173} and to the patristic exegesis of the Tabernacle.\textsuperscript{174} Giambullari explained this paradigmatic place of worship along the lines of the Jewish-Hellenistic tradition: as a symbolic representation of the cosmic edifice of the "marvelous machine of the universe\textsuperscript{175} and as the symbolic representation of the truths of the Christian religion, that is, as \textit{figura} of the Trinity and typological announcement of redemptive events revealed, later, in the New Testament. Giambullari's reconstruction of the Tabernacle unites typological and cosmological aspects, and, thus, Christian theology and salvation history. His reconstructed Tabernacle is composed of three parts ("tre parti")\textsuperscript{176} in compliance with the Neoplatonic doctrine of the three worlds and Trinitarian theology.\textsuperscript{177} As Giambullari wrote:

This structure of the three worlds, brought together and enclosed in a single body, fits together so harmoniously that nothing occurs in one of the three worlds [by which is meant one of the three floors of the Tabernacle's architectonic structure] that would not find itself again in another of the three [in one of the other floors]—though in different degrees of perfection.\textsuperscript{178}

The analogy with the tripartite structure of \textit{The Lives} and their progress to perfection is obvious. This statement on the Tabernacle of Moses shows, too, that Giambullari stood in
the tradition of a typological Scriptural exegesis—a tradition that Vasari also knew well. Giambullari may have employed several typological references to the Bible in The Lives. The case for this is made all the more likely by the fact that these references and parallels are found especially in those passages in The Lives in which Giambullari was involved, as Hope and Frangenberg suggest—namely, in the “Proems” and at the beginning and ending of several single biographies.

Giambullari, the presumed architect of The Lives’s master structure, did not simply resort to pagan-antique patterns for the organization of the vast amount of biographical material. He also, and more importantly, reverted to an eschatological framework and to the periodization schemes handed down in the Christian theology of history. Giambullari’s description of the Tabernacle, published in 1547 but composed before his editorial involvement with The Lives, leads back once again to the beginning of the historical part of The Lives, to the point of departure for a religiously authorized art (T 113). It leads to Moses and the first artist, Bezalel, and to their Tabernacle and its triadic structure. In its secularized rhetoric of a tripartite salvation history of art to be fulfilled by Michelangelo in the guise of the new Bezalel and über Moses, Vasari’s Lives reveals affinities with Giambullari’s description of the Tabernacle. Indeed, Giambullari probably introduced to The Lives this particular form of a secularized rhetoric of salvation history.

**Michelangelo as Moses**

As early as about 1600, Federico Zuccaro’s posthumous representations of Michelangelo lent the artist the features of his own sculpture of the lawgiver and leader Moses (Fig. 7). In so doing, they suggest a parallel between the artist and the
lawgiver and leader. Ascanio Condovi, Michelangelo’s biographer, formulated the same parallel when he characterized Michelangelo as “prince of the art of disegno [Principe . . . de l’arte del disegno],” equal to the pope as “prince of Christendom [Principe de la Cristianità].”184 These approximations of artist and leader find their concrete setting in everyday life, in the exceptional power and authority granted Michelangelo at the papal court.185

In the Sistine Chapel frescoes, the commissioning patron Pope Sixtus IV is likened to Moses. In the tomb of his nephew Pope Julius II, the militant religious leader who restored the Papal States is compared with the same religious leader, liberator, and lawgiver. Zuccaro’s representations of “Michelangelo as Moses” established a new tradition equating Moses the lawgiver with Michelangelo, who, according to Vasari, laid down the rules of a new art. This parallel can be linked to an ancient tradition. In the brief history of art in the twelfth book of his Rhetoric, Quintilian reports that Parrhasius was to be called the “legum lator” of painting, since latter-born artists would be forced to mimic the unsurpassable perfection of his imagery.186

Vasari’s justification for the unsurpassed rank of Michelangelo is itself ambiguous. Michelangelo is praised in the typical formula as a master of the imitation of nature. Through new inventions, however, he is said to outdo and surpass both nature and the ancient world. For Vasari, Michelangelo marks a turning point in art history, since, by way of new rules and new inventions, he brings art and architecture to new, unsurpassable perfection.187 In his New Sacristy and Laurentian Library in Florence, Vasari writes,

he departed not a little from the work regulated by measure, order, and rule, which other men did according to a common use and after Vitruvius and the antiquities, to which he would not conform. . . . Wherefore the craftsmen owe him an infinite and everlasting obligation, he having broken the bonds and chains by reason of which they had always followed a beaten path in the execution of their works.188

For Vasari, Michelangelo is that artist of the maniera moderna who breaks the rules of the classical orders and takes liberties, thereby setting new rules of architecture. As he put it, Michelangelo “never consented to be bound by any law, whether ancient or modern, in matters of architecture, as one who had a brain always to discover things new and well-varied. . . .”189

Vasari and his contemporaries could only grasp the equation of artist and lawgiver, artist and leader, in its first inklings. In modernity, these parallels would become a topos with far-reaching consequences, as Friedrich Nietzsche, Sigmund Freud, and Thomas Mann took up and carried forward the intertwining of Michelangelo and Moses.190 Freud picked up a crucial sentence in Vasari’s description that by anticipating the future resurrection of the historical Moses in the flesh at the end of time, Michelangelo had created a better Moses (T 961). For Freud, the statue of Moses is the embodiment of the “superegno.” Whereas the Moses of the Hebrew Bible broke the Tablets of the Law in wrath, destroyed the golden calf, and killed large numbers of people worshipping the idol, in the eyes of Freud the Moses of Michelangelo is “something new and more than human [übermenschlich],” for he exemplifies the “highest mental achievement that is possible in a man, that of struggling successfully against an inward passion for the sake of a cause to which he has devoted himself.”191 Freud puts a new slant on Vasari’s hyperbole. According to Vasari, in Michelangelo’s hands Moses was resurrected in a better, more Christian form. Freud elevates Michelangelo into the creator of a new, more civilized Moses, who masters his affect and marshals it in the service of cultured behavior and postreligious civilization.192 Freud’s account conforms to Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s earlier characterization of Michelangelo as “over-,” or “suprahuman” (übermenschlich). Goethe knew Vasari’s description of the Moses, as evidenced by a letter of 1812 to Johann Heinrich Meyer about his acquisition of a small bronze replica of Michelangelo’s statue.193 In keeping with Vasari’s portrayal of Michelangelo as suprahuman, Goethe refers to his Moses as “overly strong [überkraftig].”194 Following Vasari’s Life of Michelangelo closely, Thomas Mann describes the historical Moses using motifs that he found in Vasari’s biography of the artist Michelangelo quite explicitly.195
Vasari and his co-authors managed to form a canon from a catalog of 133 single lives and from more than two thousand works of visual art and architecture, all listed in an indexed list of places (T *1003–31). According to Julius von Schlosser, by that canon Vasari became “all in all, in the good sense and in the bad, the true church father and founding figure of newer art history.” Indeed, the organization of The Lives derives from the patterns of the Bible and the church fathers. Resorting to them, Vasari and his co-authors envisioned in Christian concepts a synthesis of Providence and progress as the driving forces of a history of the “arti del disegno” (T 112 and elsewhere). At the same time, The Lives defines the “arti del disegno” as an autonomous field of human technē. The sister arts of painting, sculpture, and architecture are conceived in a modern understanding, for they are autonomous—they follow specific rules and a particular developmental logic laid out in condensed form for the first time in the theoretical and historical parts of The Lives.

In that sense, The Lives is modern. By attributing to “art” its own version of a developmental logic, Vasari’s Lives contributed to the differentiation of early modern culture into relatively autonomous realms, each with its own structural and developmental logic. In The Lives, the new, autonomous “arti del disegno” are described using the old analogy between God and artist, world and artwork. At the same time, The Lives forms a new analogy, namely, that between salvation history and art history. Vasari’s Lives relies on the Bible’s historiographical base structure, as it was generally interpreted in the patristic theology of history and in the universal chronicles. This familiar schema allows the history of art in toto to appear as the reflection and analogy of salvation history. Michelangelo, the culminating eschatological figure of Vasari’s “progresso della rinascita” (T 125), achieves at last the conversion of sculpted stone into the transfigured life and flesh of a transfigured body (T 961) and the “conversion” of the Jews to Christian art.

This theological schema provided a clear, structural principle for the organization and arrangement of the vast amount of material collected by Vasari himself. The Lives, published under Vasari’s name, and especially the Life of Michelangelo, would be apprehended in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as the founding text of Kunstreligion, the near-cultic worship of art that took hold in the German-speaking lands. This art religion “converted” Jews and Christians alike, and it placed the “divino artista” and “genius” in the very position of the Deus artifex of traditional theology. Kunstreligion arguably lay outside of Vasari’s and Giambullari’s horizon. Nevertheless, for the modern promotion of “art history” and the secularized redemption through art, Vasari’s invention and presentation of art history after the model of Christian salvation history provided the best preconditions. In the sixteenth century, when the historiography of universal history differentiated itself as “political,” “salvation,” “literary,” and “art” history, this occurred partly in a break with the old Christian universal history and partly as a metamorphosis of theological narratives. As a component of this history, Vasari’s Lives is an expression and an agent of a “secularization of the world” that “became increasingly worldly by the very fact that eschatological thinking about last things was introduced into penultimate matters.”

Appendix 1

A Decree by Cardinal Vicar (for the Diocese of Rome)

Giacomo Savelli from May 20, 1566 (Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Misc. Arm. II, 78, fols. 87v–88r)


Jakobus Sabellus, by divine mercy of the Holy Roman Church cardinal priest with the title S. Maria in Cosmedin, general vicar to the Pope of our Holiest Lord, Order against the Jews, that they must not enter the churches.

To all and to every Jew of both sexes we order and herewith command under [penalty of] deprivation of their synagogue, and of two hundred golden ducats, and under other penalties reserved to our verdict that from the day of this [decree onward] neither a man nor a woman dares or demands to go to any churches, monasteries, or chapels of this town without our written permission, and dares not to enter into them, under whatever pretext, or for whatever fabricated reason[.] In the same manner we order and command under the same penalties that they [the Jews] not allow any Christians, as well as nurses, as well as [other] women, to enter into their seats [=places of worship], synagogues, and temples without our permission[.] and it is so happens, that any Christian believes goes to these very [Jewish] schools, synagogues, and temples, they are obliged to forbid them entrance and access to these very schools, syna­gogues, and temples by all means[.] If this should happen nev­ertheless, we will proceed irrevocably to the mentioned penal­ties, and to other penalties reserved to our verdict, and we will have them carried out[.] By reading out these penalties in the synagogues of the Jews, we want everyone to be bound, and that therefore the execution [of the penalties is carried out], as if
they had been read personally to everyone. Given in Rome in the Palace of our usual residence this 20th day of May 1566. [Alfonso Binarini [vicegerent of the Vicarius] Trifionius Vetrurellus [notary] place + of the seal

Appendix 2


De Mose verò, quò Romae fecit esse marmore, neque multa sanè, neque paucà se esse dicturam confidat quisquam, quin multó minora futura sint, quàm quae cuius artis, dignitati, coelestìq– pulchritudini debentur. Atque optimo quidem iure, ut res ipsa se habeat, est consentaneum. Etenim ut antiquissi­mum ille Moses omni rerum præstantia à Deo referetur est, ita hunc ipsum nostri temporis summæ huius artis perfectione videmus exornatum: et quæmodum verissimum est illum, propiterea quia Deo charissimum fuit, ceteris hominibus praestissita, ita etiam luce clarius est, hunc ipsum, cūm à maximis, nobilissimi­misq– ingenii fuerit laudatus, et probatus, cuncta ceterorum artificum opera superare. Hic, inquam, non solum huius artis studiosos modum, rationemq– ipsius docuit, sed verum, pi­unuq–, iter quòq–, quod nos ad coelum fert, continenter demonstrat: cūm venerationem illam, vultusq– sanctitatem sus­picitis, qui quidem verissimé spirans tantum coelestis maiestatis ostendit, ut ab omnibus huius vitae illecebris animù [animum] vestibrum abducat. Itaque fieri non potest, quin ego saepenumero vehementer mirar tantam esse in Judicis obstinati animi perver­sitatem, ut cūm Romae eundem paenè Mosen videant, cūm auspiciis ad eas terras, quæ Deus pollicitus fuerat, pervenire deberent, mīnor, inquam, quamobrem cordis dūrièm mollire, pravitateq– omnem à se ipsius nullo modo studente reicere. Nam cūm ipsorum optatis nullum unquam tempore respondisse, eis autem omnibus, qui Christi pietatem sequuntur, propitium semper fuisse cognoscunt, damnata vita, repudiatis móribus ad verum, maximunq– Deum Iesum Christum animum suum convertere, omnemq– in eo spem rerum suarum collocare deberent.

Francesco Bocchi, “Speech in Praise of Michaelangelo Bonarroti, Most Noble Painter, Sculptor and Architect” (excerpt)

About the Moses that he [Michelangelo] made of marble in Rome, one will arrive at the firm belief neither to be able to say much nor to say little in order that the words not turn out inferior by far than what is owed to them by his artwork, to its incomparable dignity and celestial beauty. In fact, it has to be approved, and rightly so, that this [that it is better to say nothing] is true. As the [historical] Moses from ancient time had been granted by God with all the advantages, we see the Moses of our time [that is, the statue by Michelangelo] adorned with the utmost perfection of his [Michelangelo’s] art. And how it is absolutely true that [the historical] Moses, because he was the dearest to God, had commanded all the other people, so it is clearer than even the light of day that this Moses here, as he receives praise and is lauded by the most gifted and noble persons, surpasses all the works by all the other artists.

This [statue of Moses by Michelangelo], as I say, not only teaches its modus [manner and measure] and its ratio [prin­
ciples and proportions] to the specialists of this art, but it also consistently demonstrates the true and the pious way that carries us to heaven: if you ever behold the reverence and the sanctity of the face, which, truly breathing, reveals so much of celestial dignity, it would distract your senses from all the allurements of this life. For that reason I have to wonder each and every time about the exceeding perversity and obdurancy of the Jews who see almost the very Moses that should have led them into the promised land—I am wondering, as I say, why they can in no way try to soften the hardness of their hearts and shed all their perfidy.

For since they see that God did not comply with their desires at any time, but was gracious to all those who followed the adoration of Christ, they should, after discarding their life [so far] and their [former] customs, convert their spirit toward the true and highest God, Jesus Christ, and pin all their hopes on him.

Gerd Blum has published a biography of Giorgio Vasari and a monograph on the painter Hans von Maries. In 2011, Blum received the prize of the Aby-Warburg-Stiftung, Hamburg. A book on architecturally framed views, “fenestrae prospectivae,” and concepts of ideal topography from Alberti to Agucchi is forthcoming [Kunstakademie Münster, Leonardo-Campus 2, 48149 Münster, Ger., blum@kunstakademie-muenster.de].
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