Bartolomeo Maranta’s ‘Discourse’ on Titian’s *Annunciation* in Naples: introduction
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Figure 1 Titian, *The Annunciation*, c. 1562. Oil on canvas, 280 x 193.5 cm. Naples: Museo Nazionale di Capodimonte (on temporary loan). Scala/Ministero per i Beni e le Attività culturali/Art Resource.

**Overview**

The ‘Discourse’ on Titian’s *Annunciation* is the first known text of considerable length whose subject is a painting by a then-living artist. The only manuscript of
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1 The author must acknowledge with gratitude the several scholars who contributed to this project: Barbara De Marco, Christiane J. Hessler, Peter Humfrey, Francesco S. Minervini, Angela M. Nuovo, Pietro D. Omodeo, Ulrich Pfisterer, Gavriel Shapiro, Graziella Travaglini, Raymond B. Waddington, Kathleen M. Ward and Richard Woodfield.

this text is held in the Biblioteca Nazionale of Naples. The translated title is: ‘A Discourse of Bartolomeo Maranta to the most ill. Sig. Ferrante Carrafa, Marquis of Santo Lucido, on the subject of painting. In which the picture, made by Titian for the chapel of Sig. Cosmo Pinelli, is defended against some opposing comments made by some persons’. Maranta wrote the discourse to argue against groundless opinions about Titian’s Annunciation he overheard in the Pinelli chapel. Expert judgement, in his view, requires that the viewer understands the artist’s intentions as they are conveyed in the painting.

The Annunciation was painted by Titian (Tiziano Vecellio, c. 1480, Pieve di Cadore – 27 August 1576, Venice) for the altar of the Pinelli chapel in the Neapolitan church of San Domenico Maggiore. Maranta’s ‘Discourse’ appears to be the only sixteenth-century consideration of this painting, and the circumstances of obtaining Titian’s painting, the date of its installation in the chapel, and even the date of Maranta’s ‘Discourse’, can be determined from texts relating to the author.

According to Maranta, Cosimo desired to have the Annunciation painted by ‘the hand of Titian’, and Cosimo’s son Gian Vincenzo began the process of procuring it for the chapel after his relocation to Padua (that is, some time after 3 August 1558). On 11 October 1558, Ferrante Carafa inherited the noble rank of the ‘Marchese di Santo Lucido’, and Maranta refers to him as such in the title of his ‘Discourse’, so the year 1558 can be firmly established as the terminus post quem for both the commission of the painting from Titian and the composition of the ‘Discourse’. The relation of the Pinelli Annunciation to the painting by Titian in the Venetian church of San Salvador that bears the same title (though it lays emphasis on the Incarnation) establishes August 1563 as a terminus ante quem for the creation of this work for the Neapolitan church. It is most likely that the painting was installed in the Pinelli chapel by March 1562. The similarities of style between the

5 See the date in Bartolomeo Maranta, Methodi cognoscendorum simplicium libri tres, cum indice copioso, Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1559, vi.
Angelo Gabriel in this painting and the Goddess Diana in the Death of Actaeon
(London: National Gallery), whose terminus ante quem is 1559, enable this date to be
given as a terminus post quem for the Pinelli altarpiece, a date that fits neatly with
other works Titian painted in the early 1560s.

This essay suggests that a more precise terminus post quem for the ‘Discourse’
is April 1562. The ‘Discourse’ originated as a consequence of a heated debate on the
painting between Maranta and Scipione Ammirato that probably took place on 25
March 1562 after they had heard Mass – as Maranta himself reports – in the Pinelli
chapel, consecrated to the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary: 25 March is the
Feast of the Annunciation. Maranta describes an uncommon event in his life,
because he usually attended Franciscan services and rarely came to San Domenico
Maggiore to celebrate major feasts.

The text of the ‘Discourse’ is catalogued in the Brancacciana section of the
Biblioteca Nazionale, whereas all his other manuscripts are held in the Biblioteca
Ambrosiana in Milan. It was almost certainly included in the collection of Don
Camillo Tutini (1594–1670), given to his patron, Cardinal Francesco Maria
Brancaccio. The son of the governor of Apulia, Brancaccio collected texts relevant
to the Kingdom of Naples and bequeathed his library to the church of Sant’Angelo
in Nilo, which stands opposite San Domenico Maggiore. Tutini was on familiar
terms with Francesco Imperato, a son of Ferrante who collaborated with Maranta
in the 1560s. Tutini’s notes accurately refer to Titian’s painting in the Pinelli chapel.
After Maranta’s ‘Discourse’, these notes are the earliest reference to the painting.
The latest date of a terminus ante quem for the composition of the ‘Discourse’ must be
before 24 March 1571, when Maranta was buried in the Franciscan church of San

8 See Francesco Valcanover’s detailed entry to Le Siècle de Titien: l’âge d’or de la peinture à
Venise, exhib. cat., eds, Michelle Laclotte and Gilles Fage, Paris: Réunion des Musées
Nationaux, 1993, 668 (no. 251).
9 Bernard Weinberg, ‘Bartolomeo Maranta: nuovi manoscritti di critica letteraria’, Annali della
Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, 24, 1955, 121 at 115-25. On the Pinellian library see, in
particular, Massimo Rodella, ‘Fortuna e sfortuna della biblioteca di Gian Vincenzo Pinelli: la
10 Bernardo de Domenici, Vite de’ pittori, scultori, ed architetti Napoletani, Naples: Ricciardi,
1743, 4 vols, 1:51, 78, 97, 240, mentions that Tutini’s collection of manuscripts was given to
Brancaccio.
11 Stefano De Mieri, Girolamo Imperato nella pittura napoletana tra ’500 e ’600, Naples: Arte
tipografica, 2009, 16-7. In 1595, Girolamo, their distant relative, frescoed the chapel bought in
1591 by Maranta’s brother Pomponio in the Neapolitan church of Santi Severino e Sossio.
12 Ottavio Morisani, Letteratura artistica a Napoli, Naples: Fausto Fiorentino, 1958, 144: ‘la cona
dell’Annunciata nella cappella di Cosmo Pinelli in S. Domenico è opra di Titiano’ (Ms. Branc.
II A 8). Opposite the first page of Maranta’s ‘Discourse’ someone added this notation in two
lines: ‘Discorso di B. Maranta; l’icona dell’Annunziata’.
13 Alabiso, ‘L’Annunciazione di Tiziano’, in Tiziano, 24, cites two seventeenth-century
witnesses: Pompeo Sarnelli (1688) and Carlo Celano (1692), but does not mention Tutini.
Bernardino in Molfetta.\textsuperscript{14} In light of documents relating to the author, a scrutiny of certain passages in the ‘Discourse’ suggests that after April 1562, Maranta left the text in the present form – notwithstanding some stylistic lapses. It was written on the eve of the Tridentine inquiry into the artist’s liberty to create images for family chapels.

The ‘Discourse’ offers insights into several topics: Neapolitan patronage and court etiquette, the meaning of the figures’ postures and gestures, the comparison of painting to poetry and music, anatomy and physiognomy as aids to understanding the message of a painting, the concept of beauty as an objective criterion in judging a specific work. Further, the citations from Luke 1.28–38 are pertinent for determining the precise moment of the sacred story Titian portrays.\textsuperscript{15} The ‘Discourse’ may also be appreciated as an historical document on cultural life in mid-sixteenth-century Naples. It reports Ferrante Carafa’s highly refined courtliness in life and poetry; relates the artistic taste of the chapel owner, Cosimo Pinelli, a silk merchant and banker; and adds a biographical note about the broad interests of his illustrious son Gian Vincenzo, bibliophile and intellectual. It mentions musicians: ‘Filippo di Monte’ (Philippe de Monte, employed by Cosimo Pinelli from c. 1540 to 1554), ‘Nolano’ (Giovan Domenico Del Giovane da Nola, 1545), ‘Lando’ (Stefano Lando, from 1559 to 1571) and ‘Pietro Vinci’ (c. 1560), who, as the dates indicate, then worked in Naples.\textsuperscript{16} It praises Ludovico Ariosto’s ‘unfinished’ cantos.\textsuperscript{17} It recounts Giorgio Vasari’s activity in Naples (1544–45); criticizes the paintings of Leonardo Grazia, called il Pistoia (1502–c. 1548); and commends the Neapolitan painter and sculptor Giovan Bernardo Lama (1508–79). Maranta’s ‘Discourse’ is perused by art historians interested in Vasari, il Pistoia and Lama,\textsuperscript{18} but it is barely mentioned by scholars of Titian. One possible reason for this neglect may be that the text provides no biographical data about Titian, nor does it mention his other
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\textsuperscript{16} On Maranta’s list and for information on each of the mentioned musicians, see Keith Austin Larson, ‘The unaccompanied madrigal in Naples from 1536 to 1654’, PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 1985 (1229 pages), 260-2, 43-4 and 85; 170, 232 and 382n405.


paintings. Several art historians nonetheless recognize that Maranta provides significant points of sixteenth-century criticism, thanks precisely to his meticulous attention to the use of gesture,\(^9\) his adaptation of metaphorical device in discussing painted figures,\(^{20}\) his interpretation of Titian’s particular colour range,\(^{21}\) his interest in the relation of portraiture to religious art,\(^{22}\) and his mention of the Pinellis as patrons of Titian.\(^{23}\) For these and other reasons, Maranta’s ‘Discourse’ merits closer study. The present essay purposefully offers an introduction to the text and an English translation to call the attention of a wider audience.

---


Bartolomeo Maranta: his activities, trial and publications

In his ‘Discourse’, Maranta proudly declares himself a compatriot of Horace. He mentions this not only because he was a native of Venosa, but also because his mother, Viva Cenna, belonged to one of the city’s most ancient, though not most aristocratic, families. Her family boasted that they could trace their origins back to ancient Rome to the time of the author of Ars poetica, on which Maranta lectured before Neapolitan men of letters. Giacomo (Iacopo) Cenna (1560–after 1640), a chronicler of Venosa, records that Lodovico Dolce (1508–68) – the prolific Venetian writer, translator and editor – spoke of Horace as a poet-philosopher, whose natal city is ‘Venusio’ [sic]. Maranta was born c. 1504 (probably after the bubonic plagues that ravaged the city in 1501 and 1503). Together with his three younger brothers – Pomponio (future lawyer), Lucio (future Bishop of Lavello in 1561) and Silvio (future soldier) – Bartolomeo began his education at home where all four brothers were schooled by their father, Roberto (1476–1539), an eminent lawyer, the author of basic treatises on jurisprudence, a Neo-Latin poet of regional repute and a founder of the law school in Salerno in 1524. Bartolomeo continued his education in Naples, where he studied medicine, as had the grandfather in whose honour he was named. According to Cenna, Maranta was an extraordinary physician who could assess a patient’s health even before checking his pulse, just by looking at his face. He was appointed medical doctor to the court of Charles V in Spain, possibly after 1535 (when Charles V visited Naples) and some time before 1539. Cenna does not give the dates for Maranta’s medical service in Spain but records that afterwards
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25 Cenna, **Cronaca**, 330. Dolce’s biographical sketch of Horace prefaces his translation of Horace’s poetry, published in 1559; the biography mentions Ariosto as the only contemporary poet who is compared with Horace and Ovid. The message of the biography differs from the message of the dedication Aretino prefaced to Dolce’s publication of Ars poetica, printed in 1535, in which Ariosto is mentioned along with Jacopo Sannazaro and Pietro Bembo as the poets worthy of Horace. See Bernard Weinberg, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961, 2 vols, 1:101-2, and 143-4, for the preface to the Ars poetica.


27 Nigro, **Poeti**, 61; the book cites Roberto Maranta’s Latin poetry and praises addressed to him by local poets; hence by studying his writings Nigro reconstructs the Lucanian culture.

28 Cenna, **Cronaca**, 347.


30 Cenna, **Cronaca**, 343: ‘fu chiamato in Spagna per medico di Sua Maestà’. Aurelio Espinosa, *The Empire of the Cities: Emperor Charles V, the Comunero Revolt, and the Transformation of the Spanish System*, Leiden: Brill, 2009, 184, mentions that by 1539, Charles V had the services of twelve medicos, one of whom could well have been Maranta.
he returned to Naples, where he helped establish an academy.\textsuperscript{31} By 1555 Maranta had been employed for some time in the ‘ancient academy of Salerno’ (according to Pietro Andrea Mattioli’s epistle to Cardinal Cristoforo Madruzzo).\textsuperscript{32} It is not clear when he started his lectureship in Salerno, nor it is known how long Maranta taught medicine there. In 1568, Nicola Andrea Stigliola (also Stelliola), a medical doctor, was reported to be a pupil of Maranta at this university.\textsuperscript{33}

From c. 1550 to 1554, Maranta was at the University of Pisa, where he furthered his studies of medical plants with Luca Ghini, the first appointed professor of medicinal botany and founder of the university botanical garden.\textsuperscript{34} In July 1554 Maranta returned to Naples. It is likely that at this time he established the botanical garden on the Pinelli estate, which became the prototype for the future botanical garden at the University of Naples.\textsuperscript{35} Based on this garden, Maranta wrote \textit{Methodi cognoscendorum simplicium libri tres}, which he dedicated to Gian Vincenzo in 1558 and published in 1559 in Venice. However, Maranta’s stay in Naples was interrupted by a call to serve (from early autumn 1556 to late spring 1557) as physician to Vespasiano Gonzaga, a favourite of Philip II, during the Ostia campaign. Later, Maranta complained to Ulisse Aldrovandi that his real work had remained neglected for an entire year.\textsuperscript{36} As Maranta’s second letter to Gabriele Falloppio suggests, in early August 1558 he accompanied Gian Vincenzo to Padua. During December 1558, in Naples, Maranta finished writing an epistle on some local thermal sources and on medical treatment with mineral waters, \textit{De aquae Neapoli, in

\textsuperscript{31} Cenna, \textit{Cronaca}, 343.
\textsuperscript{32} Pier Andrea Mattioli, \textit{I Discorsi (...) ne i sei libri della materia medicinale di Pedacio Dioscoride Anazarbeo}, Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1557, ‘messo con honoratissima conditione à leggere & insegnare nella antica academia Salernitana’ (n.p.; the letter to Madruzzo is dated 20 January 1555; in this letter Mattioli calls Maranta ‘medico Pugliese’).
\textsuperscript{36} De Toni, ‘Nuovi documenti’, 1525 (30 January 1557) and 1528 (6 March 1558; ‘La mia opera ha dormito per uno anno intiero per li travagli del Regno’).
Luculliano scaturientis (quam ferream vocant) metallica materia, ac viribus (published February 1559 in Naples).

On 20 April 1561 Maranta informed Aldrovandi that he had been delighting in writing a book on Virgil for the past three months: he had already finished four parts and would complete the fifth in twenty days. He had embarked on this enterprise because law and medicine did not reveal the world to him in the same way as did poetry.37 Between 1561 and 1563, except for the summer of 1562, Maranta remained in Naples, writing on poetry and art. In July and August 1561, he delivered five lectures in Italian on Horace’s *Ars poetica* at the meetings of the Accademia Napoletana, which were held in the monastery of San Pietro a Maiella,38 near San Domenico Maggiore. On 4 March 1562 he expressed his hope of publishing these lectures by Easter of that year, but, as Cenna states, the hefty volume was never sent to a publisher.39 In the same month, following the feast of the Annunciation, while he was occupied by ‘cose poetiche’, Maranta must have started writing on Titian’s altarpiece because his ‘Discourse’ mentions the fact that two days later, he and Ammirato visited Carafa in his house as he was lying in bed, suffering from ‘serious catarrh’: in winter and early spring of 1562, an epidemic of catarrh afflicted Naples.40 The mention of Carafa’s illness strengthens the hypothesis for April 1562 as the date of the ‘Discourse’. Maranta reports that the discussion of the painting with Carafa prompted him to write down his thoughts to address ‘some other people who, it seems to me, speak about it [the painting] more from a certain habit than from true and firm reasoning’.

In the summer of 1562 Maranta’s life suddenly changed. The Inquisition returned to the city on the orders of Pope Pius IV, who convened the conciliar meetings in Trent on 18 January 1562. On 13 June 1562 Maranta was transferred from Naples to Rome, where he was incarcerated, together with ten other persons, all of whom were accused of attending the gathering at which Giovanni Francesco Alois had recited Francesco Maria Molza’s poem about Christ, interpreted as having
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37 De Toni, ‘Nuovi documenti’, 1558: ‘Io per tre mesi continui sono stato impacciato in una fatica piacevole, perché ho composto infino a hora quattro Dialoghi di poesia tutti in discorso di poesia tutti in discorso di Virgilio Marone (…) ho fatto questa fatica senza dir punto delle cose sue, ma tutte cose nuove per far conoscere al mondo, che i Legisti non sono da più nella poesia, che i Medici’. Maranta was inspired by the publication of Virgil’s poetry in two volumes by the lawyer Nicolò Erythreo in 1555–56. See Vladimiro Zabughin, *Vergilio nel Rinascimento Italiano da Dante a Torquato Tasso: fortuna, studi, imitazioni, traduzioni e parodie, iconografia*, Bologna: Zanichelli, 1923–25, 2 vols, 2:111n97.

38 Weinberg, ‘Bartolomeo’, 115. See also Minervini, *Didattica*, 57 and 57n111.


Lutheran sympathies. In the trial it became clear that the Bishop of Montepeloso, the Pontifical Vicar in Naples, believed Maranta had written an oration for his brother Lucio, who, having arrived in Trent in February 1562 as Bishop of Lavello, participated in the twenty-first session of the Council’s meeting (convened on 16 July 1562), which opened to question the way bishops performed their duties. The lawyer Vincenzo Mancini succeeded in convincing the tribunal judges that the Bishop of Montepeloso harboured a prejudice against Maranta, because he suspected that Lucio’s oration would put him in a bad light. Maranta was released from prison, having left a security payment of 500 ducats, with the agreement that he would undergo an additional trial. Cenna, however, presented a different version of Maranta’s entrapment by inquisition. According to Cenna, Maranta had composed an impresa for a gentleman enamoured of a lady, and the rivalry between their families brought him, slandered as a heretic, before the Office. Cenna was convinced that Maranta escaped punishment thanks to his brother’s intervention. Yet the documentation on Maranta’s trial makes no mention of his brother acting on his behalf (see Appendix). The trial document reports that at some time Alois confessed torture had caused him to libel Maranta. Others in attendance at Molza’s recital, including Alfonso Cambi and ‘the Provincial of San Pietro a Maiella’ (under whose auspices Maranta lectured on Horace), gave contradictory evidence. At the additional trial, sixty-five witnesses attested to the fact that the Pontifical Vicar was afraid of the decisions (and the consequences of those decisions) to be reached at the conciliar meeting, and their testimonies enabled the lawyer to prove that Maranta was imprisoned unjustly. He returned to Naples certainly before 3 October 1562.

The records surrounding the Council of Trent provide additional clues that confirm Maranta’s association with Neapolitan men of letters, his interest in poetry and even the date (April 1562) of his reflection on Titian’s painting.

Between the autumn of 1562 and the autumn of 1563, Maranta was engaged in the study of Aristotle’s Poetics, lecturing and writing Latin paraphrases; in December 1562 he engaged in polemics with Pietro Vettori, a Florentine aristocrat and authority on Aristotle. The year 1563 was dedicated to four lectures,

41 Luigi Amabile, Il Santo officio della inquisizione in Napoli, Città di Castello: S. Lapi, 1892, 265. Minervini, Didattica, 19-21, discusses Molza’s poem recited by Alois.
42 Cenna, Cronaca, 361, stresses that Lucio was the only author of all the orations. See also Giovanni Caserta, Storia della letteratura lucana, Venosa: Edizioni Osanna, 1995, 77-8.
43 De Toni, ‘Nuovi documenti’, 1560 (Maranta mentions, on 4 March 1562, being busy with his brother on the eve of his departure).
45 Cenna, Cronaca, 343. See, for example, the reference to Cenna in Solimene, Umanista, 10, repeated in Minervini, Didattica, 16.
47 Amabile, Santo officio, 266 and 266n2.
influenced by Aristotle, including one in Italian on the *Aeneid* and one in Latin on the distinction between the poet and the philosopher. Maranta might have met with Joannes Sambucus in Naples before he left the city on 18 January 1563. The following year, in Antwerp, Sambucus published *Emblemata*, in which he dedicated an emblem to Maranta with the title ‘Virtute duce’ (‘Under the guidance of virtue’). Also in 1564, Maranta published with an eminent printmaker, Johannes Oporinus of Basel, his *magnum opus* in the field of literary criticism, *Lucullianae quaestiones*, a discussion in five books of the poetic quality of Virgil’s *Aeneid*, written in the form of colloquy with other gentlemen (including Ammirato and Cambi, both of whom are mentioned in his ‘Discourse’).

After the autumn of 1563 there is no certain record of Maranta in Naples; it is unlikely that he witnessed the shocking beheading of Alois on 4 March 1564 in the Piazza del Mercato. Maranta was in Rome, quite possibly in 1565, but most definitely in the summer of 1568, when he established a botanical garden, probably for Cardinal Castilioni della Trinità; his service to the cardinal was interrupted in the autumn of 1569. In a letter to Aldrovandi, on 9 April 1570, Maranta explained he had planned to remain in Rome permanently, but at the behest of his brothers he had returned to his native region. At the request of the protophysician Gianantonio Pisano, and inspired by the Neapolitan apothecary Ferrante Imperato, Maranta wrote *Della Theriaca e del Mithridato*. It earned him fame as a specialist on antidotes. Written on 30 October 1570, the book was published posthumously in Venice on 9 October 1571. Maranta moved to Molfetta, where his brother Pomponio could provide for his care, not least because he had been raised to nobility by his marriage to Beatrice Monna. That Maranta meant to be buried in Venosa is attested

49 See Weinberg, ‘Bartolomeo,’ 115, for the list of texts and their dates, and 124-5, for the chronology of his works. See also Weinberg, *History*, 2:1135. The latter lecture was published by Francesco S. Minervini, “‘Imitazione narrative perfetta’: una lezione accademica di Bartolomeo Maranta’, *Annali della facoltà di lettere e filosofia*, 46, 2003, 415-43.


51 Johannes Sambucus, *Emblemata: cum aliquot nummis antiqui operis*, Antwerp: Christopher Plantin, 1566, 156; Visser, *Joannes Sambucus*, 270 (this emblem appears in all the editions, whereas the emblem dedicated to Mattioli is not included in the edition printed in 1564).

52 De Toni, ‘Nuovi documenti’, 1514 and 1514n5.

53 De Toni, ‘Nuovi documenti’, 1563: ‘io pensava di dovere starmene per sempre in Roma, e poi a esortazione de miei fratelli venni a queste parti, donde spero partirmi, e con far quanto sono obligato a fare’.


55 Romano, *Saggio*, 133-4. Beatrice was a daughter of the lawyer Gasparo, a distant relative of Isabella of Aragon.
by his purchase of the chapel in the Franciscan church of San Andrea after its consecration as the local cathedral in 1531; he dedicated the family chapel to the Nativity and adorned it with its beautiful Presepe.\footnote{Cenna, \textit{Cronaca}, 165, on the cathedral consecration, and 176, on the chapel embellishment.} The chapel served, in the autumn of 1571, as the burial place for Silvio, who fought at Lepanto.\footnote{Cenna, \textit{Cronaca}, 362.}

The Pinellis as patrons of Titian

Cosimo Pinelli, born in Genoa into a noble Ligurian family,\footnote{Uberto Foglietta, \textit{Clarorum Ligurum elogia}, Rome: Antonio Bladio, 1573, 259. In the title of the ‘Discourse’ his name is spelt ‘Cosmo’, but in the rest of the text he is called ‘Cosimo’; ‘Cosmò’ is a variant in the Genoese dialect.} followed the path of his business partner and future father-in-law, Germano Ravaschieri, who by marriage and purchase of property (c. 1520) had become a citizen of Naples.\footnote{Alfonso Leone, ‘Il commercio estero in Italia meridionale dal Quattro al Cinquecento’, in \textit{La fortuna dei Borgia: atti del convegno (Bologna, 29-31 ottobre 2000)}, ed. Ovidio Capitani, Rome: Roma nel Rinascimento, 2005, 59 at 57-62.} Cosimo took up residence in Naples in 1523, became a prominent citizen and was appointed one of the governors of the Annunziata church in 1530.\footnote{Giovanni Brancaccio, ‘Nazione genovese’: consoli e colonia nella Napoli moderna, Naples: Guida, 2001, 52; Larson, ‘Unaccompanied madrigal’, 44n102.} Most of the information about Cosimo pertaining to Titian’s altarpiece is drawn from Maranta’s dedicatory letter to his book on the methods of recognizing simples (1559) and from the ‘Discourse’. Cosimo is described as a deeply pious man, devoted to the Virgin Mary, and as someone who appreciated art. Maranta’s comparison of Luke’s dialogue between the Angel and the Virgin and its representation by Titian is intended to gratify the devout Cosimo, who is mentioned as admiring this work of art and asserting ‘that nothing can be added to it or taken away from it’. Even if this statement is possibly Maranta’s rhetorical addition,\footnote{Compare Leon Battista Alberti, \textit{On the Art of Building in Ten Books}, trans. Joseph Rykwert \textit{et al.}, Cambridge, MA, and London: The MIT Press, 1988, 302: ‘I myself believe that form, dignity, grace, and other such qualities depend on it, and as soon as anything is removed or altered, these qualities are themselves weakened and perish’.} the phrasing is typical of that used to praise crafted objects, and for this reason fits Cosimo, who owned the magnificent palace across from San Domenico Maggiore,\footnote{Pinelli’s palace is mentioned as early as 1560 by Pietro de Stefano, \textit{Descrittione}, 43.} designed in 1544 by the Neapolitan architect Giovanni Francesco di Palma. In 1547 Cosimo bought a chapel in San Domenico Maggiore and in 1557 obtained its consecration to the Annunziata, recorded thus on the portal.\footnote{Alabiso, ‘L’Annunziazione di Tiziano’, in \textit{Tiziano}, 13.} Maranta’s ‘Discourse’ attests that Cosimo assigned the chapel decorations to the care of Lama.\footnote{Zezza, ‘Giovanni’, 2.} The four ceiling pictures showing scenes
from the Virgin’s life can therefore be securely attributed to him.\textsuperscript{66} Cosimo, whom Maranta describes as an admirer of Lama, could easily have chosen him to paint the Annunciation for the chapel altar, yet he preferred Titian. Lama was a well-established painter in Naples, but in 1557 he did not have Titian’s status as official painter to Philip II, King of Spain and also of Naples and Sicily. The royal connection was of great importance to Cosimo for at least two reasons: in 1557 he was appointed by Philip II to serve as Chancellor of the Kingdom, and from a young age his firstborn son Galeazzo had been on several battlefields with the imperial armies.\textsuperscript{67} This may explain why the Virgin Titian painted in the Pinelli chapel closely resembles her figure in his Annunciation of 1537, which he offered to Charles V, who decided to give it as his gift to his Isabella; it became known outside Spain from Jacopo Caraglio’s engraving.\textsuperscript{68} (Maranta’s awareness of this similarity might have provoked his more intense focus on Gabriel. As he remarks: ‘it is not our intention to discuss the Madonna, but only the Angel’.)

![Image of Jacopo Caraglio's The Annunciation](https://example.com/annunciation_caraglio.png)

Figure 3 Jacopo Caraglio (1500/5–26 August 1565), The Annunciation, c. 1538. Engraving, 45.3 x 34.4 cm. London: The British Museum © The Trustees of the British Museum

The Pinelli chapel served as the burial place for Cosimo who died in 1568, in Padua, as noted on his tomb in the chapel.\textsuperscript{69} His death most probably occurred

\textsuperscript{66} Zezza, ‘Giovanni’, 5, fig. 8 on 6 and 26n20.

\textsuperscript{67} Biagio Aldimari, Raccolta di varie notitie historiche non meno appartenenti all’istoria del Summonte, che curiose …, Naples: Antonio Bulifon, 1675, 104 (in 1557 Cosimo senior could not be the Duke of Acerenza). On Galeazzo, see Foglietta, Clarorum Ligurum elogia, 260; Paolo Gualdo, Vita Ioannis Vincentii Pinelli, Patricii Genuensis, in qua studiosis bonarum artium, proponitur typus viri probi et eruditi, Augsburg: Markus Welser, 1607, 7-9.

\textsuperscript{68} Valcanover, in Siècle de Titien, 668, observes the similarity between the works.

\textsuperscript{69} Raffaello Causa, IV mostra di restauri, catalogo, Naples: Palazzo Reale, 1960, 59. The epitaph attests to Cosimo’s frequent dealings with the Veneto.
during a visit to Gian Vincenzo, who lived in Padua from 3 August 1558 until his death on 3 August 1601. Gian Vincenzo fulfilled his father’s wish to have Titian’s Annunciation for his family chapel; the painting was meant ‘to heighten its grace and decoration’. According to Maranta, Gian Vincenzo was pleased with the work as he confirmed that ‘he likes the invention and the art and all that can be considered in this painting immensely’.

From his childhood in Naples, where he was born in 1535, Gian Vincenzo showed great passion for his studies. In Padua, he created a library so encyclopaedic that it gave rise to a kind of academy. Of a fragile constitution, he hardly travelled, so he hosted visitors from all over Europe and encouraged them to discuss matters of language, scientific discoveries and natural sciences, with a special emphasis on botany. He also copied Leonardo’s notes on painting in 1575. No doubt Maranta’s lengthy discussions on physiognomy, on the language of gestures and, especially, on the anatomy of the Angel’s right arm were directed to Gian Vincenzo. Maranta’s first letter to Falloppio describes Gian Vincenzo as a man of acute judgement, erudite in the Greek and Latin languages. The ‘Discourse’ characterizes him as ‘learned and competent no less in painting than in philosophy, law and other sciences’. In August 1558 Gian Vincenzo went to Padua to please his father, who insisted on his reading law. Titian had painted portraits of two illustrious lawyers, Sperone Speroni from Treviso and Marco Mantova Benavides from Padua. Speroni, a frequent visitor to Pinelli’s library, was in Padua from 1558 to 1560. Benavides encouraged Pomponio – in 1545 – to publish his father’s treatise on procedural jurisprudence, written between 1520 and 1525. This book became the standard manual for jurists dealing with prosecutions for libel at the Inquisition trials. These two lawyers may well have helped the twenty-three-year-old Gian

70 Gualdo, *Vita*, 11, cites both Maranta’s introductory letter and his dedication to Pinelli.
75 There is no doubt about Pinelli’s acquaintance with Speroni; on Pinelli’s collections of manuscripts labelled ‘Sperone’, see Angela Nuovo, ‘Manuscript writings on politics and current affairs in the collection of Gian Vincenzo Pinelli (1535–1601)’, *Italian Studies*, 66, 2011, 203 at 193-205. For Speroni’s visits to Padua at the time of Pinelli’s early sojourn, see Francesco Cammarosano, *La vita e le opere di Sperone Speroni*, Empoli: R. Noccioli, 1920, 132-3.
Vincenzo persuade Titian to paint the *Annunciation* for the family chapel in Naples. This painting is the only work that Titian made for a Genoese-Neapolitan nobleman.

**Poets, critics and painters**

Maranta mentioned several persons in the ‘Discourse’, discussing their taste in art, as it related to aspects of Titian’s painting. Ferrante Carafa (1509–87), the addressee of the ‘Discourse’, was a scion of a Neapolitan family of ancient origins. Proud of his noble ancestry and his native city, he used his wealth and connections to foster studies of poetry. In 1546 he established the academies of the Sereni and of the Ardentí, both of which continued the tradition of the Accademia Pontaniana. In 1547, however, following a confrontation with the viceroy, who was intent on introducing the Roman Inquisition into the Kingdom of Naples, the academies were closed. Discussions of literary topics continued outside the academy framework. Carafa not only patronized poets, he also wrote poetry himself. His poems are included in Dolce’s *Rime di diversi illustri signori napoletani*, whose third and fifth editions, published in 1552 and 1555, were dedicated to Carafa. He also published thirty-one sonnets under the rubric of *Lode della santissima Vergine Madre della vittoria e Reina del Cielo*. His memoirs, the epic poem *Dell’Austria* celebrating the victory of John of Austria (the illegitimate son of Charles V) at Lepanto, and even his Italian paraphrases of books Nine and Ten of the *Odyssey* – all express Carafa’s chivalric ideals of virtue. In his ‘Discourse’, therefore, Maranta mentions love poetry, accentuates the Virgin Mary’s humility and links the Angel’s deportment to the ideal conduct of a young nobleman. All of these issues were dear to Carafa. Maranta’s playful tone in several passages of his ‘Discourse’ and his praise of Ariosto’s ‘unfinished’ cantos and innovations in Neapolitan music are ideally matched to Carafa’s poetic style with its play on words and sounds. This wittiness

---


79 Solimene, *Umanista*, 9n1.


81 Dola, ‘Parole’, 247 (the description of the collection) and 260-1 (the analysis of two sonnets).

82 Scipione Volpicella, ed., ‘Memorie di Ferrante Carrafa, Marchese di San Lucido (secolo XVI)’, *Archivio storico per le Province Napoletane*, 5, 1880, 236-7 at 235-61, stresses his commitment to chivalry.

83 Dola, ‘Parole’, 270.
creates an auditory effect, not unlike the impression produced by Maranta’s description of the Angel’s voice.

Carafa is said to have always talked ‘honourably both about that painting and about Titian’. His praise of Titian’s Annunciation is far from incidental, as Dolce, Titian’s long-standing friend, was responsible for publishing Carafa’s poems with Gabriele Giolito de’ Ferrari in Venice. In 1561, a year before Maranta wrote his ‘Discourse’, Carafa contributed to the anthology of poems mourning the untimely death of Irene di Spilimbergo (1540–59), a poet and painter who had been trained by Titian. This anthology was published by Dionigi Anatagi, a colleague of Dolce’s.

The ‘Discourse’, written in defence of Titian’s Angel, was primarily an expression of Maranta’s debates with Scipione Ammirato (1531–1601), who claimed to voice Carafa’s own criticism of the painting. Ammirato descended from a noble Florentine family on his father’s side and from the aristocratic Caracciolo family of Naples on his mother’s. Ammirato, born in Lecce, was sent by his father to Naples to study jurisprudence, but instead followed his own literary inclination and chose to write about poetry. He published his first work, Il Dedalione, overo, del poeta dialogo, in 1560. Two years later, he published Il Rota, overo, delle imprese dialogo, once again in Naples. This work had been begun on ‘the beautiful day’ of 10 April 1561 and is constructed as a Platonic dialogue: a sequence of provocative questions and objections. He names Maranta and Cambi among the interlocutors in this discussion of imprese. The style of Ammirato’s two books may explain Maranta’s decision to address his defence of Titian’s Annunciation not so much to Carafa as to those individuals of the Neapolitan public who boorishly commented on this painting in the chapel after Mass. Ammirato had stayed for six months in 1554 in Padua and Venice, where he had met Speroni and Pietro Aretino.

---

84 Carlo Dionisotti, ‘Tiziano e la letteratura’, in his Appunti su arti e lettere, Milan: Editoriale Jaca, 1995, 117-27, at the end of his article singles out Dolce’s dedication to Titian of his paraphrases of Latin authors, in which he addresses the artist as ‘messer Titiano pittore e cavaliere’ (1538).


88 Umberto Congedo, La vita e le opere di Scipione Ammirato (notizie e ricerche), Trani: V. Vecchi, 1904, 10 and 15. See Nigro, Poeti, 9-10, on the Caracciolo family as patrons of Roberto Maranta.


'Discourse', Maranta comments on the similarity of Ammirato’s opinion of Titian’s painting to Carafa’s. Ammirato knew Carafa’s way of thinking quite closely, because on several occasions Carafa allowed him to use his house across from San Domenico Maggiore for his literary studies. Ammirato spent most of 1563 in Lecce at his father’s request; in August he visited Genoa at the invitation of Galeazzo Pinelli, but in September, he briefly visited Rome on his way back to Lecce. A letter from Annibale Caro in Rome to Cambi in Naples (8 April 1562) documents that both Ammirato and Cambi were then residing in Naples. It praises Ammirato’s book on the imprese to Cambi, and Caro asks Cambi to show the letter to Ammirato.

Little documentation is available on Alfonso Cambi (1535–70). His father, Tommaso (1492–1549), a Florentine merchant and banker, was a patron of Tuscan artists in Naples. In 1533 Tommaso settled near San Giovanni Maggiore, where he bought a family chapel for which, c. 1550, Francesco Salviati painted an Annunciation. In this painting the Angel is shown in the manner typical of this artist: a lean youth. This circumstance helps clarify the objections to Titian’s presentation of more corpulent Angel. The presence of Salviati’s painting in Naples could explain why, in the ‘Discourse’, Maranta repeatedly mentions the lack of consensus regarding Titian’s depiction of the Angel. Tommaso, as fiscal manager of the d’Avalos court, could foster important commissions for Tuscan artists in Naples; he is praised by Vasari for his love of paintings.

Tommaso’s close relations with distinguished scholars are documented in his son’s correspondence with Paolo Manuzio, with whom he discusses his family collection of letters, several of which were selected for the third volume of the anthology, Lettere volgari di diversi nobilissimi huomini, et eccellentissimi ingegni, scritte in diverse materie (1564). Cambi’s letter of 3 October 1562 to Manuzio, then in Rome, records his own presence in Naples and relays Maranta’s regards. Between 1562 and 1564 Cambi exchanged letters with Luc’Antonio Ridolfi, then in Lyon, centring...
on a discussion about the precise day and hour when Petrarch fell in love with Laura.\(^99\) Cambi’s focus on this issue can be better understood in the light of his sonnet of 1563 addressed to the ‘Astrologo eccellente’, Giovanni da Bagnuolo, and of a sonnet by an anonymous poet addressed to Cambi, in which the author jokes about the latter’s penchant for astrology.\(^100\) Cambi’s predictive interpretation of nature’s influence on human life is reflected in Maranta’s description of Titian’s psychological contact between the two characters of Luke’s Gospel.

In his ‘Discourse’, Maranta mentions Cambi as especially competent in the analysis of paintings. The reason for this assertion lies in Cambi’s Florentine origins, for in that city ‘more than in any other this art has always flourished’. Hence Cambi’s praise of Titian’s painting is particularly valuable. Maranta emphasizes that Cambi ‘gives a detailed reasoning about it, highlighting quite minutely each single aspect on which the artist has focussed’. He praises Cambi for showing that the work can be understood only after considering those details that express the artist’s intention. Cambi’s attitude to works of poetry, as his letters on Petrarch’s sonnet attest, is inevitably transferred to his discussion of Titian’s painting. The ‘Discourse’ intimates that Maranta is prone to argue that an artist’s work should be appreciated as representative of both the individual and the region. This stance merits closer attention, for art historians usually compare Florentine and Venetian artists strictly according to Vasari’s frame of reference, based on the binary opposition of disegno and colore. A few words of explanation then need to be offered about Maranta’s discerning criticism of Lama, il Pistoia and Titian.

When Maranta says that Lama is ‘felicitously versed in anatomy and perspective’, he reveals his familiarity with the major artistic criteria accepted in Florence. For Vasari, as stated in the Proemio to his Vite, only those artists who were experts on anatomy and perspective excelled in disegno, but Maranta shows that Vasari’s application of these criteria is too general. In his view, Titian exhibits an expertise in the anatomical structure of the arm by his correct depiction of it in the Angel’s gesture of greeting, which ultimately derives from the Roman adlocutio seen on imperial reliefs and coins.\(^101\) Maranta might have known about Titian’s experience in depicting this type of gesture, as it features in the portrait-istoria of Alfonso d’Avalos, so enthusiastically described by Aretino in 1540.\(^102\) This same gesture was adopted by Titian’s Flemish pupil Jan Stephen van Calcar in one of his

\(^{99}\) On publication of this epistolary exchange, see Brian Richardson, Print Culture in Renaissance Italy: the Editor and the Vernacular Text, 1470–1600, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, 146.


engraved illustrations for Andreas Vesalius’s *De humani corporis fabr*ica *libri septem*, based on the lectures he gave at the University of Padua. Maranta’s praise of Titian’s use of perspective was probably influenced by Paolo Pino’s comment on Titian’s innovation in representing his settings (*paesi*, which foreshadow the modern *paysage*). In his comment on the background in Titian’s Neapolitan painting, Maranta attributes to perspective the same significance it has in Pino’s *Dialogo di pittura* (Venice: Paolo Gherardo, 1548). Maranta thus differentiates between Titian’s methods of assimilating the sciences of anatomy and perspective, judging the first to accord with the arts of Florence and the second – quite strangely in view of Alberti’s exposition – with the arts of Venice. He thus reconciles Florentine *disegno* and Venetian *colorito*.

Aretino and then Dolce praise Titian for the *colorito* of his paintings, or for his skill at mixing and distributing the range of hues. Maranta extends their praises, examining the reasons for Titian’s mixture of red and white in the Angel’s vestments and the rainbow range of colours in the plumage of his wings. He sees Titian’s mode of laying colours on the Angel’s figure not as an acclaimed aspect of his art, but as an expedient for highlighting the painting’s meaning – the theological message, in this case. By contrast, Maranta disparages the use of colours by il Pistoia, which are devoid of any meaning whatsoever.

Information on the work of il Pistoia in Naples is found in Vasari’s biography of Gianfrancesco Penni. Maranta could not have been familiar with Vasari’s *Vite* of 1568, where il Pistoia is characterized as a good colourist but a bad draughtsman. (He is not mentioned in the *Vite* of 1550.) This opinion cannot be interpreted as a positive judgement from Vasari, in view of the artist’s Tuscan origins and his Roman education under Penni, a pupil of Raphael. Vasari refers to il Pistoia in his *Vite* because this Tuscan artist received commissions from Tommaso Cambi and his circle.

In the early 1560s, when il Pistoia’s painting, *The Stoning of St Stephen* (now lost), was to be seen in San Domenico Maggiore, Maranta could contrast its colours with those of Titian’s *Annunciation*. Notwithstanding the patronage given to il Pistoia, Maranta finds his works appealing only to ‘the mob merely because he had a certain charm in his colours’. He further claims that the artist’s paintings convey no profound meaning, nothing beneath the surface, so that ‘once seen, his works did not leave the viewer with any desire to see them again’. The artist, who

---

103 Panofsky, *Problems*, 75, thinks that this resemblance indicates the close cooperation of Calcar and Titian.
104 Barocchi, ed., *Scritti*, 899n3.
106 Leone De Castris, *Pittura*, 88 and 95.
108 Leone De Castris, *Pittura*, 86.
invested no thought in his art, surely used ‘ritratti dal naturale’ (‘portraits from life’) for his saintly figures. Maranta cites an example of il Pistoia’s art, The Circumcision of Christ, painted for the Benedictine abbey of Monteoliveto, which portrays Antonio Barattuccio in the character of Simeon.\textsuperscript{110} The abbot and monks removed the painting and commissioned a new one from Vasari, who completed it during his sojourn in Naples. Maranta explains the reasons for the decision to remove this painting and to commission a new work. Vasari merely mentions that he painted The Presentation in the Temple ‘with new invention’ (‘con nuova invenzione’).\textsuperscript{111} Maranta disapproves of il Pistoia’s recourse to ‘ritratti dal naturale’, not only because Barattuccio was a reprehensible tax attorney in his view, but primarily because using the artist’s contemporaries as models was a discreditable practice in itself. Similarly he disapproves of another painter, whom he does not name, for rendering his contemporaries in The Adoration of the Magi (also in the same abbey), including the Count of Oppido, even though he considered the count a good man. Maranta’s disapproval was possibly influenced by Girolamo Savonarola’s sermons, in which the Dominican friar spoke vehemently against those people who, while hearing Mass, looked at the paintings and took delight in recognizing familiar faces in the figures of the Magdalene or St John.\textsuperscript{112} Maranta is of the firm opinion that familiar faces in church paintings deprive the images of their main function, which is to inspire devotion. He admits that Titian had recourse to this practice but only upon the request of his patrons, remarking that this practice facilitates the painter’s task. However, the painter abstained from it when he was working on the Pinelli altarpiece, as he wished to bring out ‘the personality of the one he depicts according to the mystery’. Titian’s Angel, therefore, ‘will occasion more devotion since he was formed only by an idea in his mind’.

The way Maranta spells the names of Vasari, Michelangelo and Titian – painters whom he never met – points to his conversations about them with Cambi, Aldrovandi and Carafa. He calls Vasari (whose first name was Giorgio and who was born in Arezzo) ‘Giorgino di Arezzo’, an affectionate appellation that he could hear.

\textsuperscript{110} Antonio Barattuccio (1486 – 9 May 1561) is an interesting historical figure. See Michele Broccoli, Teano Sidicino antico, e moderno, Napoli: Pasquale Tizzano, 1822, 2 parts, part 2:235-6. It would be worth investigating Maranta’s reason for characterizing him merciless. In any event, the year of his death serves as more evidence suggesting that Maranta’s ‘Discourse’ could not have been written long before 25 March 1562.


from Cambi, whose father was one of the painter’s most important patrons. Writing the name of Michelangelo, Maranta is not consistent in its spelling. He calls the artist ‘Michel’ Angelo’, ‘Michelagnolo’ or ‘Michelagnelo’. This lack of consistency has its own logic when the contexts of these references are considered. Maranta uses the first form when he refers to the statues in the Medici chapel; this may indicate that he is deriving information from Aldrovandi, as he often corresponded with him. In his book about ancient statues seen in Rome in 1550, Aldrovandi uses only this form to spell Buonarroti’s given name. The second form suggests a Tuscan influence, though it might have been used by Carafa, as Maranta indicates by his statement about St Michael in the Last Judgment. He says that the saint is often represented as holding ‘a balance or steel yardstick’ (stadera), laying emphasis on the object because it stirred up associations with the ‘Stadera’ branch of the Carafa family, to which Ferrante belonged. However, in Michelangelo’s fresco, St Michael is holding the Book of the Chosen Ones, and not the balance. Hence Maranta’s emphasis on this object might have been intended as a cautious plea to Carafa for a balanced judgement of Titian’s painting. This plea was heard as Maranta’s statement at the end of the ‘Discourse’ indicates. Maranta uses the third form – ‘Michelagnelo’ – twice, both in reference to his allegorical interpretation of the youthful Christ. In contemporary writings on Michelangelo, this rare spelling is found in Vincenzo Borghini’s comments to Cicero’s De oratore (c. 1560–64). The comments characterize the artist as one who surpasses nature, indicated by the resourcefulness of the art so fully demonstrated in the Sistine Chapel. Through Cambi, Maranta could be familiar with Borghini’s opinion of Michelangelo, because in defending the Pinelli Angel – in the section on ‘disposition’ – he applies Borghini’s judgement of Michelangelo to Titian.


115 See Barocchi, ed., Scritti, 878n1.

116 For the dates of these notes, see Eliana Carrara, ‘Il discepolato di Vincenzo Borghini presso Pietro Vettori’, Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, 4:2, 1999, 534 at 519-37.


118 See Congedo, Vita, 168, for the letter and the reference to the source.
In his uniform spelling of Titian’s name as ‘Titiano’, Maranta followed Dolce,\textsuperscript{119} rather than Vasari, who adheres to using the spelling ‘Tiziano’ in the two versions of his Vite printed in 1550 and 1568. More likely, however, Maranta paid attention to the artist’s signature on the Pinelli painting bearing the Latinized form of the name – ‘Titianus’. His ‘Discourse’ acclaims Titian as one who knows how to give ‘charm to colours’, adding that this is ‘especially apparent in his portraits from life (of which, more than any other, he made a particular profession)’.\textsuperscript{120} Maranta points out Titian’s fame as the astonishing portraitist, so widespread outside Venice, aiming to put additional emphasis on Titian’s Gabriel as a figure shaped conceptually, rather than as a figure drawn from real life.

The tradition of description

Maranta’s detailed description of Titian’s Annunciation (c. 1562) follows epistolary precedents of letters dedicated to a discussion of just one work of art but these earlier discussions are never as exhaustive as is his in the ‘Discourse’.\textsuperscript{121} In his published letters, as early as 1531,\textsuperscript{122} Aretino describes in detail certain contemporary works – not only Titian’s, though they hold central place in his writings. By contrast, only one letter of Dolce describes an artwork: Titian’s Venus and Adonis, seen in the painter’s studio before it was sent to England in 1554.\textsuperscript{123} Although the descriptions written by Aretino, Dolce and Maranta share a common vocabulary, Maranta is the only author who raises the question of the critical approach to an artwork, setting assessments in the context of the contemporary culture of Naples, thus anticipating a modern-day trend in art criticism.

After Maranta, Francesco Bocchi wrote (1571) and published (1584) his thoughts on Donatello’s statue of St George, commissioned by the Florentine armourers’ guild (c. 1416) for their niche in the façade of Or San Michele.\textsuperscript{124} The remarkable difference between the two texts, both devoted to a single artwork, is

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{119} For the numerous references to ‘Titiano’ in Dolce’s writings, see Lodovico Dolce, \textit{Diálogo de la pintura, titulado Aretino, y otros escritos de arte}, ed. Santiago Arroyo Esteban, Madrid: Ediciones Akal, 2010, 218, 220, 224, 226, 230, 234, 236 and 242.
\item \textsuperscript{120} Luba Freedman, \textit{Titian’s Portraits through Aretino’s Lens}, University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 1995, 12, points out the disproportion between the number of portraits and other types of paintings, in the period between 1537 and 1557.
\item \textsuperscript{124} Robert Williams, \textit{Art, Theory and Culture in Sixteenth-Century Italy. From teche to metateche}, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, 201-12.
\end{itemize}
reflected in the choice of discourse versus exposition of arguments. In his
*Ragionamento sopra l’eccellenza del San Giorgio di Donatello*, Bocchi mentions the
location of the statue but does not describe any particular feature of Donatello’s
sculpted image of the saint. His goal was to present the saint to his Florentine
contemporaries as an *exemplum virtutis*. His text leaves the impression that Bocchi
never looked at the statue. This is in stark contrast to Maranta’s description of
Titian’s painting. Even Maranta’s text does not escape a certain lack of precision, for
example, in his description of the Angel’s legs, as he claims: ‘it even seems that the
distance between the pubis and the knee may be a little less than twice as long as the
distance from knee to heel’. Bocchi’s *Ragionamento* contains rhetorical exclamations
to convey the excellence of Donatello’s figure of St George as expressive of the
warrior’s virtues. Maranta’s ‘Discourse’ transmits his experience of the work when he
viewed it in the chapel. Maranta’s criticism was novel in that his description both
renders the painting visible and raises pertinent questions about what constitutes a
critic’s expertise, as he suggests to ‘make the most accurate study and subject our
doubts to people who are competent in this matter’.

Maranta seems to be the only sixteenth-century writer who requires a critic
to have a firm grounding in the theory of art prior to evaluating a painting, as he
sets as his goal the understanding and explanation of Titian’s intentions. For this
purpose he not only familiarized himself with Dolce’s *Dialogo della pittura intitolato
dl’Aretino. Nel quale si ragiona della dignità di essa Pittura, e di tutte le parti necessarie che a
perfetto Pittore siaconvengono: con esempi di pittori antichi e moderni; e nel fine si fa
menzione delle virtù e delle opere del Divin Titiano* (Venice: Gabriele Giolito de’ Ferrari,
1557), but also sought advice from experts who could help him to judge Titian’s
painting, among them Lama, who frescoed the Pinelli chapel 1557–58. Unlike Dolce,
whose interlocutors did not include any artists, Maranta wants to learn about art
from a painter of repute in Naples. Maranta’s appeal to Lama may have been
influenced by Aretino’s letters on works of art, which demonstrate that their author
learned from Titian and other artists mentioned in the letters which aspects of the
paintings should be highlighted. Moreover, unlike Aretino and Dolce, Maranta
lacks first-hand acquaintance with Titian’s paintings and thus relies on others when he
says, for example, that ‘in giving charm to colours […] Titian, according to all
those whom I have heard reasoning on this, is awarded the palm in our day’. The
sentence reflects Maranta’s emphasis on ‘reasoning’ rather than relying upon
groundless opinion. Many passages in Dolce’s book (dedicated to Aretino) and in
Maranta’s oration reflect the contemporary principles of art criticism as they were
articulated not only in the Venetian but also in the Florentine milieu. His text

125 Luba Freedman, ‘Bartolomeo Maranta on a painting by Titian’, *Hebrew University Studies
in Literature and the Arts*, 13, 1985, 199 at 175-201.
126 Charles Hope, ‘The audiences for publications on the visual arts in Renaissance Italy’, in
*Officine del nuovo; sodalizi fra letterati, artisti ed editori nella cultura Italiana fra Riforma e
Luba Freedman

Bartolomeo Maranta’s ‘Discourse’ on Titian’s Annunciation in Naples: introduction

illustrates how a description, the purpose of which is to interpret a painting, integrates knowledge of the theory that was current in the artist’s ambience.

Innovations in discussing Titian’s Annunciation

Maranta’s invocation of contemporary art to justify his praise of Titian’s painting was unusual for his time, when it was more common to consider only examples from ancient art to judge the achievements of living artists. Maranta juxtaposes the fleshy Angel Gabriel in Titian’s Annunciation and the youthful Christ in Michelangelo’s Last Judgment. In so doing he brings a new perspective to Titian’s Angel, one which makes clear the artist’s intentions.

Maranta might have seen Michelangelo’s Last Judgment in 1556/7, while he was at Ostia in the service of Vespasiano Gonzaga (grandnephew of Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga, future papal legate to the Council of Trent). Or he might have had a chance to see an engraving of it. Notwithstanding his familiarity with the fresco, Maranta directs attention to a few bearded figures, one of whom represents a bishop who so annoyed the artist that he placed him in hell. This character is identified as Biagio da Cesena, the papal master of ceremonies from 1518 to 1544, not a bishop and clean-shaven. (Bishops customarily wore beards in Maranta’s time.) This description shows that rather than caring for accuracy with regard to Michelangelo’s fresco as the work that does not hold the central place in his ‘Discourse’, Maranta uses references to it – which left none of his contemporaries indifferent – for all kinds of purposes. In another passage of the ‘Discourse’, Maranta observes that painters usually show St Michael holding a steel yardstick, even though this object is absent in the Vatican fresco. The remark may have served as an oblique reference to Carafa. Here he mentions a bearded bishop, perhaps a veiled reference to the events that had agitated him in the spring of 1562. His notice of a condemned bishop, in light of the Pontifical Vicar’s accusation of his having written a speech directed against ecclesiastical officials, strengthens the hypothesis that his ‘Discourse’ was written before he was summoned by the Holy Office (June 1562) and that his experience with the Inquisition caused him to leave the text in its present condition.

The focus on Michelangelo’s Christ reveals Maranta’s attention to the figure in the fresco, central as it is, that gave rise to heated debates on the decorum of images in churches. Michelangelo’s fresco was criticized shortly after it was unveiled on 31 October 1541, just before the Feast of All Souls, on 2 November.129

127 Bernadine Barnes, Michelangelo in Print. Reproductions as Response in the Sixteenth Century, Farnham and Burlington: Ashgate, 2010, 106, refers to Giulio Bonasone’s print, 57.2 x 44.2 cm, dated c. 1546.
Responding to Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga’s request for a copy of the fresco, his secretary, Nino Sernini – an admirer of Michelangelo’s work – felt compelled to caution the cardinal that it contained more than five-hundred figures. He also pointed out that there was ‘no lack of those who condemn it’. Among the criticisms levelled was that the Christ appeared to be so young that ‘He does not possess the majesty that [should] become Him’.130 Although the biographers of Michelangelo, Ascanio Condivi (1553) and Vasari (in both versions of the *Vite*, 1550 and 1568), passed silently over this critical feature, the youthful, beardless Christ continued to disturb Maranta’s contemporaries. The clergyman Giovanni Andrea Gilio considered this detail to rank among the most troubling errors in the fresco. In the winter of 1561, he wrote down his thoughts on painters’ errors with a focus on Michelangelo’s *Last Judgment*;131 these were published in 1564 as *Dialogo nel quale si ragiona degli errori e degli abusi de’ Pittori circa l’istorie. Con molte annotazioni fatte sopra il Giudizio di Michelagnolo et altre figure, tanto de la nova, quanto della vecchia Capella del Papa. Con la dechiarazione come vogliono essere dipinte le Sacre Imagini*. Shortly thereafter, in a letter to the Archbishop of Milan (6 September 1561), Scipione Saurolo (nephew of Ercole Severoli, future Procurator of the conciliar proceedings) remarked that no painting and no sculpture had ever represented Christ in such a youthful aspect.132 These critics reproved Michelangelo for representing Christ as beardless or exceedingly young. However, except for Saurolo, who wished to see Christ portrayed exactly as he appeared while living on earth, they offered no justification for their discomfort. Maranta dares to offer his own interpretation of the detail to justify Michelangelo’s choice.

Maranta makes the provocative statement that because this detail in Michelangelo’s fresco is so unusual it is impossible to consider it an error; rather, it should be treated as a wonder. Maranta makes the point that of those who reproved the artist for Christ’s looks being ‘much younger (…) than would be appropriate for his age of thirty-three years’, no one actually called the artist’s choice a mistake. Apparently, at the time Maranta wrote his ‘Discourse’, he was not aware of Gilio’s austere critique. He expresses his conviction that Michelangelo’s central figure was a deliberate choice of the artist, arguing that ‘famous painters very often do this sort of thing in order to provoke people’s thought’. He claims that Michelangelo ‘did what he did because in that way he wanted to express a glorified body and make it appear somewhat different from the body as it was when it lived among us in hardship’. This deviation from artistic convention, strange and novel, causes him to

---


131 Barocchi, ed., *Scritti*, 866n1, quotes Gilio’s enraged statement.

132 Saurolo’s letter is cited by Barocchi in *Vita*, 1264-5.
warn against any literal interpretation of the youthful appearance of Christ, and, by implication, of Titian’s Angel. Just as Michelangelo could not have believed Christ to be as young as he is represented in the Last Judgment, so Titian could not have believed angels to be as plump as Gabriel is represented in the Pinelli altarpiece. Maranta here expresses an implicit disapproval of the rhetorical exclamation in Dolce’s Dialogo della pittura intitolato l’Aretino: ‘What mystical meaning can one extract from his [Michelangelo’s] having depicted Christ without a beard (…)’? The scepticism of Dolce’s Aretino prompted Maranta to consider a deviation from the established canons of representation as a basis for proposing symbolic interpretations of unusual details in paintings. He explains that the youthful look of Christ signifies ‘perpetual youth with the force of glory and grace’. In the same manner, he interprets the plumpness of Titian’s Angel as indicating ‘the abundance of the house of God’.

In his exposition, Maranta introduces the pseudo-science of physiognomy and the art of reading gestures as critical to understanding the link between the original narrative and the selected scene. Although Pomponio Gaurico introduced a chapter on physiognomy in his De sculptura, paraphrasing the pseudo-Aristotelian Physiognomonica, Maranta is the only author at the time who applies the general discussion of physiognomy to the analysis of a figure in a specific painting. Departing from established convention, he does not rest his observations on the Aristotelian theory of physiognomy, which is founded on the resemblance of human beings to animals and birds, but rests them on the principles of Salernitan medicine, which, in the tradition of Hippocrates and Galen, based itself on the system of relationships between four humours and the corresponding four seasons, four elements, four qualities and four ages. The characteristics of the four temperaments could be easily memorized thanks to the verses known as the Regimen sanitatis Salernitatum. The distich on the sanguine temperament – ‘Largus, amans, hilaris, ridens, rubiceisque coloribus, / Cantans, carnosus, satis audax atque benignus’ (‘Generous, loving, joyful, merry, of ruddy complexion, singing, fleshy, rather daring and friendly’) illustrates, among other matters, that medical doctors commonly used the word coloris in the meaning of ‘complexion’.

Maranta interprets the Angel’s figure as full and fleshy, a body type corresponding to a person of the sanguine humour. His account of his appearance – ‘the colour of the whole body is between white and red, yet a little more red than white; the hair is thick and blonde, with a medium curliness’ – fits the image of a

sanguine. So well does the painter transmit all the proper qualities of this temperament, Maranta concludes, that one may think that the Angel is acting under the planetary influence of Jupiter. He finds a correspondence between people who are jovial by nature and Titian’s Angel, as he is sure it was the jovial type of person ‘whose nature and complexion Titian had in his mind while he was painting him’. Through this association, Maranta sees the Angel as an ideal youthful courtier, a characterization he develops at length. The Angel bears himself so gracefully and reverently in relation to the Virgin that Maranta advises that a Neapolitan youth ‘imitates angels’ to improve his manners so that these might become ‘more moderate and less impetuous’. He then explains by negation why Titian could not represent the Angel as a lean person of the melancholic temperament, influenced by the planet of Saturn. A notion circulated long before Maranta is that man before corruption was of a sanguine temperament. As Maranta knew well, every discussion of angelology stresses that an angel appears before a virtuous person in the image of the perfect man. So the connection between the angel and a man of the sanguine humour is realized in Titian’s Gabriel, who then could serve as an example to the well-bred young man of the sixteenth century.

In his judgement of the painting, Maranta applies the science of physiognomy, auxiliary to him in his daily medical practice, to justify the fleshiness of Titian’s Angel. He strives for the maximum of precision in establishing the components of the painted figure – age, temperament, colour of hair, facial expression – all of which belong to the image of an incorporeal being, the Angel Gabriel. Titian’s rendition of the Angel was so precise that Maranta could imagine even the melodious timbre of his voice, and Maranta validates his claim by describing the position of the head in relation to the neck, the wavy line of the throat and the slightly open mouth. In his view, the timbre of the Angel’s voice fits his sanguine temperament and jovial nature. He creates a verbal image of the Angel from his observation and examination of Titian’s painting even if he seems to read too much into it.

Equally striking is Maranta’s analysis of the Angel’s arm raised to announce the great mystery to the Virgin. In describing the Angel’s arm, Maranta makes deliberate use of anatomical terms to illustrate how the surface figure contains hidden elements. His account of the right arm – bare from the elbow to the back of the palm – is medical in its detail. He specifies that the muscle of the elbow is firm and that of the radius soft. This is an important point for Maranta: only if the radius muscle is soft does it avoid the impression of fatigue, which the arm may express in this suspended position, flung forward with its radius stretched upwards. Titian shows the radius muscle to be soft by hiding the thumb, and Maranta extols Titian for this contrivance, calling it a ‘wonder’ that Titian performs. Maranta underscores

136 Panofsky, Klibansky and Saxl, Saturn, 103.
137 Indeed, not even Celsus’s description in his De medicina (VIII.i.18–21) is as accurate and detailed as Maranta’s.
the precise position of the arm as a whole, suspended neither too high so as to express inappropriate pride, nor too low; but rather, decent and appropriate in its location relative to his body. The imperial gesture of forceful allocution is transformed into one that expresses the mystery of the Annunciation. Although writers dealing with painting consider the question of gestures, only Maranta offers a detailed description of just one gesture. He bases his observations on Quintilian’s *Institutio oratoria* and is aware of the difficulty in finding the perfect gesture to articulate both the figure’s character and its role. In Titian’s painting, Maranta observes, the Angel’s arm looks energetic and, at the same time, sensitive and delicate, appropriate to his mission of revealing the sacred words.

Maranta is able to speak authoritatively about Titian’s *Annunciation* not only because he is familiar with the methods of the contemporary criticism, but also because he uses a wider selection of theoretical tools (among them the five-fold concept of beauty) to produce an objective judgement of an artist’s mastery as expressed in a specific work. Maranta proceeds logically, first establishing general tenets, then applying them to a particular example. This thread of Maranta’s thought makes his ‘Discourse’ a meaningful guide on how to look at and judge a painting. Maranta, however, is aware of the difference between general discussions of paintings, as contained in Dolce’s *Dialogo della pittura intitolato l’Aretino*, and the specific discussion of one particular painting. He pleads for different approaches to works made by artists of different statures. He stresses the necessity of taking into account the fact that the painting discussed is known *a priori* as the work of the great master, whose fame will last forever and who preserves ‘the reputation that he and his talent acquired many years ago’. Titian’s fame singles him out from among contemporary painters and adds authority to his representation of the Annunciation in the Pinelli altarpiece. His emphasis on the singular genius of Titian is a central feature of the ‘Discourse’, for he pioneers the consideration of a painting in relation to its artist. The artist, in turn, knows its determined location. Maranta applies the concept of beauty as the objective criterion of judgement to the examination of the painting, once visible to those who entered the church of San Domenico Maggiore, one of the most important religious institutions of Naples. And yet, he describes the painting, encased by Lama’s marble frame and seen above the altar, from various aspects: visually artistic, poetic, musical, theological, medico-anatomical, physiognomic, social and aesthetic. He evidently considered Titian’s altarpiece as involving the many-faceted expertise of an urbane gentleman.

**The text as a document on sixteenth-century aesthetics**

The term ‘aesthetics’ in reference to the perception of beauty in general and the virtue of an artwork in particular was not used before 1750, when Alexander
Gottlieb Baumgarten gave the title *Aesthetica* to his book.\(^{138}\) And yet by 1562, Maranta had already offered the reasons he judged Titian’s Angel Gabriel to be beautiful, applying tools of critical evaluation to the concept of beauty. He knew, from Leon Battista Alberti’s highly influential *De pictura*, that the human figure was at the centre of a well-composed painting.\(^{139}\) For his part, Alberti was following Pliny (*Naturalis historia*, XXXV.64) when he advised contemporary artists to learn from Zeuxis the device of creating a beautiful figure.\(^{140}\) Alberti believed that this could be achieved only by a painter who has ‘the idea of beauty’.\(^{141}\) However, Alberti did not consider the philosophical concept of beauty for its own sake;\(^{142}\) rather, he said that in any attempt to create a beautiful figure, a contemporary painter should emulate the ancients. Writing a century later, Maranta focussed on the beauty of the human figure and defined it by examining a particular figure in a specific painting. This special feature of his exposition – the recourse to the concept of beauty to justify the appearance of the painted figure – was motivated by the criticisms of Titian’s painting overheard in the chapel. Maranta uses the definition of beauty – an objective criterion for the evaluation of the human figure – as the tool for refuting subjective criticisms of Titian’s Angel, based simply on personal tastes and preferences. He repeats several overheard statements expressing some speaker’s displeasure about the painting: the dullness of colour, the partial concealment of the face and the wrong proportions of the Angel’s figure. Maranta advises the viewer to ponder the traits of the figure and base his judgement on well-grounded reasons. In his opinion, the philosophic concept of beauty is the only objective criterion by which to judge the figures in Titian’s painting.

Maranta argues the figure of the Angel is not only as beautiful as it should be, but it embodies the very ideal of beauty. Beauty, in Maranta’s judgement, is based on five conditions (‘condizioni’), a successful blend of which is found in the figure of Titian’s Angel: (1) ‘proper proportion’ (‘debita proporzione’); (2) ‘proper quantity’ (‘debita quantità’); (3) ‘appropriate vividness of colour’ (‘convenevole vivacità del colore’); (4) ‘grace’ (‘grazia’); and (5) ‘posture’ (‘disposizione’). His ‘Discourse’ applies the general concept of beauty to the particular form of the
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\(^{141}\) Alberti, *On Painting*, 78 (3.56): ‘This idea of beauty, that is scarcely perceived by the best, eludes incompetents’.

beautiful figure – hence his stress on the adjective ‘proper’ to underline the particularity of his application. Here Maranta draws from several philosophical schools: the first three conditions were developed by scholastic thinkers; the fourth was supplied by the Platonists; and the fifth is Maranta’s own concept, resulting from his awareness that his subject is the figure in the painting. He discusses each condition separately and shows how it is embodied in the depicted Angel. Herein lies the ingenuity of his ‘Discourse’: although Maranta’s predecessors and contemporaries discussed the concept of beauty, they had never applied it to a particular painted figure.

Before expounding upon his judgements of how the Angel’s figure responds to the concept of beauty, Maranta reviews the first condition – the figure’s proportions. This beginning shows the influence of Thomistic aesthetics, according to which proportion, the properly determined relation of one member to another, is the major condition without which no figure can be considered beautiful.\(^{143}\) He states that a well-proportioned body ‘is divided, among many other divisions, into four equal parts’. The number four is chosen by Maranta as the clue to the figure’s proportions because its symbolic significance was known in his time,\(^{144}\) as he casually credits the recipient of his ‘Discourse’ with this knowledge. His system of proportions starkly contrasts with the Varronian and Vitruvian systems, mentioned in treatises on visual arts that applied them chiefly to figures standing upright.\(^{145}\) In Maranta’s view, the quaternary system of proportions fits the painted Angel all the more because his figure is shown inclining towards the kneeling Virgin.

The second condition of beauty is ‘quantity’ – the size of the figure, which makes it visible to the audience. The source is Aristotle’s Poetics (1450b), but Maranta does not limit his discussion to Aristotle, for whom the ‘magnitude’ of the figure signifies perceptible Beauty. Maranta suggests that the visual figure must justify its actual form. The figure of the Angel has a child-like quality, prompting enquiry about the age of the human figure chosen to represent the Angel Gabriel. According to a long-standing tradition, the Virgin was a fourteen-year-old maiden at the time of the Angel’s salutation.\(^{146}\) The similarity in age between Gabriel and Mary strengthens the visual correspondence of the two painted figures and implies
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the angelic nature of the Virgin. Maranta refutes the critics to whom the Angel looks like a seventeen-year-old boy, as if his figure were similar to Mercury’s. Ancient theologians spoke of Mercury as a more mature youth ‘and made him the father of wisdom and eloquence’. Maranta appeals to the authority of Dionysius the Areopagite (De coelesti hierarchia) whose relevant statement about an age range of angels is ‘pubescentem vero aciuuenilem etatem’ (‘of pubescent or juvenile age’). He concludes that the Angel does look like a fourteen-year-old boy because his reverential demeanour is associated with purity and obedience – qualities not to be expected from seventeen-year-old boys, midway between pubescence and adolescence.

While Maranta is familiar with Thomistic considerations of colour as the third condition of beauty, he is mindful that his account of colours should relate to a specific painting, and so reflects contemporary discussions, influenced by Alberti. Maranta focusses on colour as the artist’s tool to designate the separation of light and shadow and to imitate the texture of flesh and cloth. He praises Titian’s ability to achieve the golden mean in applying colours to the painting, remarking on this artist’s selection of colours as imbued with significance relevant to the sacred scene it represents.

In the tradition of ancient ekphraseis adapted by Aretino, who flamboyantly describes the Annunciation received by Empress Isabella, Maranta notes the mixture of white and red colours but, unlike Aretino, who sees the cheeks trembling ‘under the flesh-tints of milk and blood’, Maranta interprets the two colours in the
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147 Besides Maranta, only Giovan Maria Tarsia, Trattato della natura de gl’Angeli, Florence: Bartolomeo Sermartelli, 1576, 163-4, mentions Mercury in the discussion of angelology, but he does so in the context of winged figures. These sixteenth-century scholars anticipate Franz Cumont, ‘Les anges du paganisme’, Revue de l’histoire des religions, 72, 1915, 159-82.

148 Dionysius the Areopagite, Theologia vivificans, cibus solidus; Dionysii celestis hierarchia; Ecclesiastica hierarchia, trans. Ambrose Traversari, Paris: Jacobus Faber Stapulensis, 1498, 17v. Compare with the translation of the same phrase by Johannes Scotus Eriugena, Expositiones in ierarchiam coelestam, ed. J. Barbet, Turnhout: Brepolis, 1975, 198: ‘iuvenilem vero et adultam aetatem’. The commentary to De coelesti hierarchia by Thomas Aquinas was treasured by the particularly good library which was housed in the monastery of San Domenico Maggiore; see Pietro de Stefano, Descriptione, 136.


150 Tatarkiewicz, History, 2:252 and 261, nos, 19 and 20.

151 Alberti, On Painting, 31-2 (1.9).

Angel’s clothing as the agency for creating the illusion that ‘the light does not seem to come from the outside, but rather to be born from within and from the Angel’s illuminated person’. This description illustrates that Maranta observed the painting in the chapel, and not in the painter’s studio, as did Aretino. Maranta mentions the light coming from the Angel’s figure, whereas Aretino’s extraordinary selection of descriptive words evokes ‘the refulgent light shed by the rays of Paradise’ and calls attention to the Holy Spirit ‘surrounded by the light of his glory’ – standard feature of any painting on this subject. Whereas Aretino notes the texture of plumage in the Angel’s wings, Maranta’s account of the colour range in the Angel’s wings contains allusions to the ancient forerunners of the Christian messengers. Maranta recalls Iris, the daughter of Thaumas, ‘whose name, as Plato says, means precisely “wonder”’. (He cites Plato’s *Theaetetus* [155d].) The Angel’s wings are the visible reflection of the concept of ‘meraviglia’ (‘wonder’) so often discussed in treatises on poetics. For contemporary literary critics, the inclusion of novel figures and unexpected actions that evoke ‘meraviglia’ constitutes the essence of epic poetry, with its combination of the real and the imagined.\(^\text{153}\) His perception of the blush on the Angel’s cheek leads him into the discussion of the nature of fire and its theological relation to angels, a discussion which is poetically beautiful and particularly fascinating in light of Titian’s depictions of fire in several of his paintings.\(^\text{154}\) Maranta believes that colour has, at the least, a three-fold function: the presentation of an image that is in essence incorporeal, though angels are conventionally given human form, the accentuation on the fiery nature of angels, and the connection of the visible figure, by means of wings radiating like the rainbow, to the upper spheres of the celestial abode.

‘Grace,’ the fourth condition of beauty, is the ineffable quality that must be included in all other conditions for the human figure to be defined as absolutely beautiful. Maranta may have borrowed the function of this concept from Marsilio Ficino’s *De amore* (V.6), wherein beauty is identified with ‘a certain lively and spiritual grace infused by the shining ray of God, first in the angels, and thence in the souls of men, the shapes of bodies, and sounds’.\(^\text{155}\) In his application of the concept of grace to Titian’s Angel, Maranta defines it as ‘elegance’ (‘leggiadria’). This suggests Albert the Great’s qualification of the relation of beauty to proportion


by the adjective ‘elegans’, meaning that the form is legible to the eye. Maranta combines the Thomistic qualification of beauty with Ficino’s addition of the Platonic concepts of divine beauty and Aristotle’s discussion of the perfect type of beautiful human figure. For Maranta, grace is visibly present when the figure is created from ‘an idea formed in his [Titian’s] mind’. In his opinion, this precious quality of grace is conveyed in the aura (aria) of the Angel’s expression, which lies ‘between joy and astonishment’. Grace, then, is the mysterious quality that, as ‘the Platonists say’, is received from God alone. For Maranta, it is revealed in God’s messenger through the expression of his countenance, appropriate to the message brought by the Angel to the Virgin: ‘Spiritus Sanctus superveniet in te’, rather than the salutation ‘Ave gratia plena’, usually transmitted in art, and Maranta explains at length the reasons for his conclusion.

The fifth condition is ‘posture’, which Maranta sees as a specific trait of a painting since it has the ability to condense an entire narrative into one episode, centering on one action or scene. To illustrate his statement, he cites Albrecht Dürer (‘Alberto Durero’) whose series of prints representing the mysteries of Christ’s Passion illustrate that one print (Maranta calls it a ‘picture’) could show only one action. Similarly, Maranta claims, a viewer knows the scene rendered in Titian’s altarpiece by describing the figures’ postures and gestures.

The ‘Discourse’ sets an example of just such a diligent description: from reviewing each figure’s posture in relation to each other, Maranta moves to the account of their mutual interaction, which is the core of the composition. He examines the relation of the swiftly moving Angel to the kneeling Virgin (the general composition) and the gesture of Gabriel as he communicates the divine message (the specific composition of one figure). The ‘posture’, or ‘disposizione’, aspires to bridge the disparity between the absolutely beautiful human figure and the specific beauty of a human figure set in the context of the rendered subject. He explains that it means ‘the placement, or the position or the attitude of the body in which the artist has shown the man he has depicted’. He cites an example of Michelangelo, who in the Last Judgment took care that ‘every figure had a different placement and posture’, not an example of the ancient artist from Pliny. This condition, therefore, is the crowning quality of the beautiful painting fulfilled by the artist in representing the subject in gracefully related human figures.

Thus, when each of the five conditions of a beautiful figure is applied to a specific figure in the painting – here, the Angel in Titian’s painting of the Annunciation – the meaning of the work is clearly illustrated: (1) ‘proper proportion’ refers to the four equal divisions of the figure as the units which can be
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156 Tatarkiewicz, History, 2:240 and 242-4, no. 8.
assessed by the viewer, who, like Maranta, is familiar with the symbolic
connotations of its four-fold division; (2) ‘proper quantity’ signifies the physical
appearance of the Angel, shaped to accord with a pubescent boy; (3) ‘the
appropriate vividness of colours’ reveals the luminescent nature of the Angel and
his sanguine temperament; (4) ‘grace’ is conveyed by the appropriate expression of
the face (aria) and the lifelike impression (leggiadria) of the figure’s movements; and
(5) ‘posture’ relates to the interaction between the two figures as revealed by their
respective positions and their gestures. Maranta links the concept of beauty to the
careful viewer’s informed examination of the specific painting in general and of the
Angel Gabriel in particular. He states, ‘if one is capable of producing only one
beautiful thing, when this reaches its perfection, he is seen by everyone many times
with great pleasure and is admired. And this is one of the main reasons why
painting, like poetry, is required to have extreme perfection, and mediocrity in them
is nowise acceptable’.

*ut pictura poesis* as a tool in judging Titian’s Gabriel

Claiming that judging a painting is not his profession, Maranta, who is a physician,
botanist and literary critic, takes recourse to the ancient authority of his compatriot
by recalling the famous dictum, *ut pictura poesis* (Horace, *Ars poetica*, v.361). Horace’s
dictum is evasive (not least because of ambiguous use of one conjunctive – ‘ut’),158
with his disapproval of the idea that poetry should resemble painting, made clear
from subsequent (usually not cited) verses of his poem. In Maranta’s time, as
Dolce’s translation indicates, the dictum was understood as the straightforward
comparison between poems and paintings.159 To add a positive flavour to the
Horatian dictum, Renaissance humanists appealed to the equally famous precept of
Simonides: ‘A poem ought to be a painting that speaks; a painting ought to be a
silent poem’.160 Rather than citing Horace or Simonides directly, Maranta states:
‘And it is already perfectly clear to everyone that poetry and painting, despite the
speaking nature of the one and the mute exterior of the other, are one and the same
thing, and that what is said of the one may be applied to the other’.161 He thus
proposes this comparative analogy as the guiding principle that can justify Titian’s
choice to depict the Angel as having a fleshy figure. ‘The essence of analogy’, as
Quintilian defines it in the *Institutio oratoria* (I.vi.4), ‘is the testing of all subjects of

158 Wesley Trimpi, ‘The meaning of *ut pictura poesis*, Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld
Institutes, 36, 1973, 1-2 at 1-34.
159 See Lodovico Dolce, *I dilettevoli sermoni, altrimenti satire, e le morali epistole di Horatio, illustre
poeta lirico, insieme con la poetica*, Venice: Gabriele Giolito de’ Ferrari, 1559, 303: ‘Qui voglio
comparer nostri Poemi / A le Pitture’, which is the translation of the ‘ut pictura poesis’.
160 See Trimpi, ‘Meaning’, 31, about the Renaissance application of Simonides’s precept for
understanding Horace’s dictum.
161 See Barocchi, ed., *Scritti*, 259-63; the excerpts illustrate that, in contrast to Equicola and
Varchi, Maranta looks only for similarities between the arts of poetry and painting.
doubt by the application of some standard of comparison about which there is no question, the proof that is to say of the uncertain by reference to the certain’.¹⁶² Maranta applies concepts from the field of poetics to the field of visual art. His interpretation of the Angel’s figure in metaphorical terms (a concept incomparably rich in connotations) suggests that he defends Titian’s painting as if it were a poem. His defence is based on the method of allegorical interpretation, which, from the fourteenth-century apologetics of Giovanni Boccaccio and Colluccio Salutati, had been exerted to protect poetry against accusations that it tells lies and has a corrupting influence on the audience.

While arguing with critics of Titian’s Gabriel, Maranta turns to the unusual depiction of Christ in Michelangelo’s Last Judgment. In this discussion he intentionally blurs the distinction between metaphor and allegory, writing that the painter transforms Christ’s glorified body into ‘a kind of metaphor, or should we say allegory, tacitly identifying perpetual youth with the force of glory and grace’. In this, Maranta, like other humanists of the time, shows the influence of Cicero, who, in discussing different figures of speech – all of which he calls ‘transferred words’ – remarks in the Orator (xxvii.94) that ‘Aristotle, however, classifies them all under metaphor’.¹⁶³ Maranta adapts Cicero’s approach when he analyses Titian’s Annunciation as illustrating the artists’ use of these figures of speech, considering allegory as an extended metaphor precisely for its play with visual images.

Maranta proposes viewing Titian’s Angel as ‘a certain pictorial metaphor’ (‘una certa metafora pitturale’).¹⁶⁴ None of the contemporary writers on art, not even Varchi and Dolce in their discussion of the affinities between the two arts,¹⁶⁵ ever had recourse to metaphor (or any figure of speech) as the key to interpreting figures in religious paintings. Maranta does not aim at transferring the metaphor to the painted figure, but suggests that its form veils the meaning that has its place in the artist’s intent to make the viewers go beyond the surface of his painting. Maranta’s

¹⁶⁴ Francisca Pérez-Carreño, ‘Looking at metaphors’, The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 58, 2000, 373-81, draws attention to the concept of ‘metaphorical paintings’ with reference to Richard Wollheim’s Painting as Art and his rejection of linguistic interpretations of paintings. However, no mention has been made of the concept of ‘pictorial metaphor’; a special study should be given to Maranta’s reading of Aristotelian interpretations of metaphors, especially when he relates Aristotle’s Poetics to his Rhetoric. Graziella Travaglini, ‘La metafora, l’analogia e le figure dei sensi in Aristotele’, Rivista di estetica, 49, 2009, 121-48, comes close to the Aristotelian emphasis on putting ‘things before the eyes’, primarily by reason of her polemic with Paul Ricoeur’s La Métaphore vive. The author confirms in private correspondence that she has not yet seen mentioned the concept of ‘una metafora pitturale’.
¹⁶⁵ For references to their work, see the name index to Rensellaer W. Lee, ‘Ut pictura poesis’: The Humanistic Theory of Painting, New York: W. W. Norton, 1967.
appeal to ‘metaphor’ as justifying Titian’s choice to render the Angel as a corpulent figure becomes clearer in light of his discussion of artistic error and the effect of wonder, two points that were raised in his lectures on Aristotle’s Poetics and Lucullianae quaestiones. Metaphor is most easily subject to error, because it may so easily be misread. As Aristotle writes in Metaphysics (IX.10, 1052a), only ‘about unchangeable things there can be no error’, and he underscores, in his Poetics (22, 1459a), the difficulty with which a poet finds an adequate metaphor, because ‘[i]t is the one thing that cannot be learned from others’. By appealing to metaphor, Maranta hopes to prove that the unusual appearance of this figure will elicit admiration, once the viewers become aware of the theological meaning, as it shows forth ‘in his face the abundance of heavenly food; that is to say, of love, grace, splendour and the other supreme gifts in which others participate in greater or lesser measure’. The theological message is the key to the corpulent figure of the Angel.

Maranta considers the artistic licence of the poet and the artistic licence of the painter, in inquiring about the degree of liberty accorded to works of art. This is an important point not least because the very concept of artistic licence was challenged in the course of the sixteenth century. At the Council of Trent, debates over the degree of liberty to be allowed to painters were preceded by discussions on visual arts by literary critics. In 1557, Dolce had cautiously remarked that a painter may enjoy a certain liberty, akin to a poet’s, on condition that ‘he does not fall into iniquity’. Maranta, however, does not consider the question of whether a painter may be permitted artistic licence. Rather, he asks where in the painting of the Annunciation such licence can be expressed.

Classical antiquity bequeathed to Renaissance humanists the concept of the poet as a maker. In his notes on Aristotle’s Poetics, addressed to Vettori, Maranta probes the question of whether the poet is making or simply imitating. Maranta offers a rare interpretation of the painted figure as the result of a series of changes made by the artist during the creative process. Maranta reminds the critics that ‘Titian chose to portray the Angel with such a full face, since he could have decided to make it just middling or thin’. In this way Maranta says unequivocally that the figure’s visual aspect in the discussed artwork results from the painter’s own choice. He stresses the point by repeating and expanding his observation: ‘He may, in fact, choose to show the Announcing Angel still suspended in the air, or he may make the Angel’s feet rest on the floor of the room; he may change his figure and make it
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166 See Weinberg, History, 493, and Maranta, Lucullianae quaestiones, 89.
either full, or gaunt or middling or some other way’. Titian’s choice causes the viewer to ponder his Angel rather than permitting the viewer’s hastening to rebuke the figure for its fleshy look. Maranta warns against groundless opinions by demonstrating that Titian invested thought in every aspect of the figure – fleshiness, childlikeness, colouring, posture, gestures – because each could be changed at the artist’s will and each is rendered the way he thought right.

Literary critics and artists of the time customarily cast their theories of istoria as treatises on art in general, and not as accounts of specific works. Accustomed to Pliny’s presentation of ancient works to illustrate his tenets, they regard the figures from a theoretical point of view, and do not consider the figures as a unique product of a unique artist working in response to unique circumstances. Maranta, however, unlike Aretino and Dolce, sees the figures in Titian’s Annunciation as coming into being by virtue of the painter’s own method of working. Maranta boldly reconstructs the painter’s creative process, seeing him as a maker, or a ‘poet’ in the ancient sense of the word, rendering the comparison explicit by saying that Titian ‘may vary the manner, as this is analogous to episodes in poetry’. He then discusses a traditional distinction between the fable (‘favola’), or plot, and the episodes (‘episodi’), or sections, which explain and expand the main action of the plot. Relating the notions of ‘fable’ and ‘episodes’ to Titian’s painting, Maranta specifies that it was not in the artist’s power to change anything in the representation of his main subject of the Annunciation as it is stipulated by the theme of the Pinelli chapel: he was obligated to show the Angel in the act of announcing the mystery to the Virgin. Possibly for Maranta, ‘fable’ has the same connotation as Alberti’s historia, but with regard to ‘episodes’, he relates them to the implied movement of the Angel, that is, he hovers over the ground or swiftly enters the room. The same notion of ‘episodes’ applies to the changeable aspect of the Angel: whether he is plump or lean. Maranta concludes: ‘these features, because of their variety, differ from painter to painter, as do the episodes from poet to poet’. According to Maranta, the painter’s poetic licence may be expressed by introducing variations only in the ‘episodes’, which, in this context, are interpreted as minor details of pictorial composition. Maranta’s discussion of variations in a picture has nothing to do with Alberti’s request for variety, which is advocated as an important condition for the well-made historia (the fundamental purpose of which was to imitate nature). According to Maranta, the Angel belongs to an invented representation rather than to a portrayal born of imitation of nature – even if, being an ethereal entity, the Angel is conventionally pictured in the form of the perfect man. This convention does not preclude artists from individual conjecture of this form, thus inevitably admitting variations in representations of the Announcing Angel from
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172 The relation of the episodes to fabula or favola is discussed in every literary treatise. For Maranta’s discussion in his lectures on Ars poetica, see Weinberg, History, 1:471-2.
173 Alberti, On Painting, 59-60 (2.40). Alberti relates variety to food and music, which please by new and extraordinary things. Maranta, too, mentions food and music in this respect.
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painting to painting. In this sense, variety, as Alberti promotes it, is not relevant to Titian’s painting, Maranta, therefore, has every justification for changing the requirement of variety in the painter’s methods to the question of the extent to which variation may be admitted in the representation of the traditional subject.

Maranta’s exposition of the notions of ‘fable’ and ‘episodes’ is intended to show where precisely in the altarpiece artistic errors may be permitted. An ‘error’ is permissible on condition that it is the outcome of the painter’s quest for an effect of wonder, resulting from his search for new modes and forms. So Maranta underlines that the ‘accidental’ error occurs in the episodic part of the painting, that is, in the physical portrayal of the figure, and results from the painter’s wish to diversify his forms. To quote Dolce, ‘without it [diversity] beauty and artistry become cloying’.

The need to diversify, which Maranta associates with artistic licence, allows him to justify Titian’s rendering a plump Angel of the Annunciation. Aware of the temptations for an artist to think only about the glory of his art and thus to overlook the necessity of conveying the significance of the sacred subject, Maranta draws constant attention to the meaningful messages that Titian allotted to colours and postures of the figures. Only ignorant viewers fail to ‘realize that everything is done with great art on purpose’.

**The *occultatio* in poetry, music and painting**

In his consideration of another severely scrutinized detail, Maranta contemplates the objection that ‘a good painter should not have shown only half of the Angel’s face, when he could have made him in such a way that the full face were visible, thereby filling the eyes of the viewers much more’. This so-called error results from Titian’s decision to render the Angel’s face in what Theophile Gautier felicitously called ‘profil perdu’.

Maranta sees Titian’s device in terms of Quintilian’s figure of ‘occultatio’, or ‘concealment’ (IX.iii.98), which creates a moment of suspense, whose task it was to draw the viewer further into the painting. He approves the artist’s choice, because it induces him to see beyond the surface of the painting. Titian employs this device to convey the idea that the Angel’s visible image lies between the visible and the invisible realms. Maranta’s fascination with ‘occultatio’ reveals itself in a marginal note, in which he states: ‘if sometimes it happens that in painting a certain thing is obscure, this is so in order that it may eventually speak as poetry does’. Maranta evidently planned to incorporate these observations into his text at some future date. Responding to the critics, Maranta exclaims: ‘I do not see how one can blame the fullness and fleshiness of that Angel’s face, or the position that shows
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174 Roskill, Dolce’s ‘Aretino’, 145.

175 For an example of application of Gautier’s phrase to paintings, see Peter Humfrey, ‘Fra Bartolommeo, Venice and St Catherine of Siena’, *The Burlington Magazine*, 132, 1990, 481 at 476-83: ‘Very daring is the way in which Fra Bartolommeo shows his principal saint not frontally or in a three-quarter view, but with her face virtually in profil perdu’. 
only half of it, since a very cautious artist made all this with so much care’. He sees how Titian created the persuasive image of Gabriel by combining in his face the features of fullness, fleshiness and contrivance in showing only half of the face. However, the painter does not simply exhibit the Angel with his face partially obscured, ‘but in such a beautiful way did he emphasize the mouth in the act of speaking that, even if we see just that half, it causes us to see also all that is hidden’. The more Maranta is engaged in describing Titian’s Angel, the more he is moved to see that the figure ‘show[s] the greatness of his [Titian’s] talent’.

Maranta recognizes a similar device at play in the apparent fragmentation of Ariosto’s cantos and in the evaded cadences of musicians who were then working in Naples: Philippe de Monte, Nola, Lando and Pietro Vinci. These poetical and musical compositions all appeal to the listeners’ imagination, causing them to complete in their minds some part of the work that, intentionally, has been left unfinished. Maranta’s juxtaposition of Ariosto and Titian may seem quite conventional: Ariosto praises Titian in Canto 33.2 of the Orlando furioso, and Dolce remarks that in colouring Alcina’s cheeks (7.11–15) Ariosto becomes a Titian.176 Ariosto was reprimanded by literary critics for the discontinuity in his narration of chivalrous tales and for creating suspense in the readers by sudden interruptions in his cantos. Yet, just as some literary critics were blaming Ariosto for using the rhetorical device of ‘occultatio’, composers in Venice, and especially in Naples, set to music several of Ariosto’s stanzas from the Orlando furioso, employing the evaded cadence. In 1558 Gioseffo Zarlino explains this device in his treatise on music, Le istitutioni harmoniche: ‘a cadence is evaded (…) when the voices give the impression of leading to a perfect cadence, and turn instead in a different direction’.177 The message of his exposition is that the ‘evaded cadence’ is required when the composer needs to make a transition and avoid harsh tones, while arresting the listener’s attention. Among the composers whom Maranta mentions, Lando and Nola created madrigals based on the verses from Ariosto’s romance.178 In poetry and in polyphony, interrupted cantos and evaded cadences caught the listener’s mind. By analogy with poetry, the partially obscured face of Titian’s Angel has the same effect. In Maranta’s eyes, the invisibility of half of the Angel’s face not only leads the viewer to see his corpulent figure as a pictorial metaphor of God’s abundance, but also to imagine his voice.

Maranta does not confine himself to examples of ‘occultatio’ from poetry and music. He also recalls the effect of partially hidden faces in some ancient paintings.


178 Larson, ‘Unaccompanied madrigal’, 233 (Lando) and 281 (Nola).
He has three such pictures in mind. Two of them were often recommended to contemporary painters; the third is mentioned in the post-classical period only by Maranta, attesting to his first-hand knowledge of Pliny’s notes on artists.

The first picture is Apelles’s Portrait of King Antigonus, in which the artist, contriving not to show the king’s wounded eye, presents him in profile (Pliny, Naturalis historia, XXXV.90). The inclusion of the description in Alberti’s book on painting caused this work to become the standard example of an artist’s recourse to ingenious expedients. Maranta observes that Apelles hid the king’s deformity by portraying him in a pure profile, insightfully commenting that the resulted portrait resembles an ancient medal. (It is worth noting that Maranta does not apply the word ‘profile’ to the position of the Angel’s face.)

The second picture is Timanthes’s Immolation of Iphigenia (Pliny, XXXV.74), in which the suffering father is shown with a veiled face. Alberti and subsequent authors refer to it: among them are Pino, Dolce and Gilio, who mention it in their discussions on the art of painting. This is not truly an example of a partially hidden face, since Iphigenia’s father, Agamemnon, had his face fully covered, but it is recalled here by Maranta because of the different responses it provoked: was Agamemnon’s face covered to express the intensity of his paternal grief, or was it covered because Timanthes had reached the limits of pictorial expression? Maranta suggests that Timanthes ‘wanted his [Agamemnon’s] moan to be heard rather than seen’. He obviously trusts the intelligent viewer’s ability to perceive the drama and to imagine hearing the protagonists of the familiar tragedy, Ifigenia, which Dolce set to verse, based on the plays by Euripides and Sophocles. In turn, Maranta creates a poetic description, allowing the audience to imagine the protagonists’ emotions. Considering painting to be akin to poetry, he triggers the technique of synaesthesia.

The third picture is Apelles’s Averted Hercules, which Pliny (XXXV.95) praises as a difficult achievement because it shows the nude hero from the back but in such a way that the viewer can ‘see’ the figure’s face. This picture is explicitly referred to in post-classical times only by Maranta. It is possible that Jacopo Sannazaro had the picture in mind when, in his pastoral romance Arcadia (Prosa 3, 78; Venice: Pietro Summonte, 1504), he had Sincero describe a painting of Venus that displayed the

179 Alberti, On Painting, 63 (2.42); see Barocchi, ed., Scritti, 1:891n2.
181 Lodovico Dolce, Ifigenia. Tragedia, Venice: Gabriele Giolito de Ferrari, 1551, 33r and 50r.
183 Sarah Blake McHam, Pliny and the Artistic Culture of the Italian Renaissance, London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013, 325, lists cited works of Apelles, among which she mentions the Portrait of King Antigonus but not the Averted Hercules, which further attests to Maranta’s original approach to the use of classical sources. This painting, however, is reconstructed in Caraglio’s print [B.38], c. 1524/25.
goddess from the back, because her beauty was so perfect that the artist found it impossible to represent her figure in full face.\textsuperscript{184} Apelles’s \textit{Averted Hercules} is the only work known from antiquity that shows the figure with its face intentionally turned completely away from the viewer. As in the case of Timanthes’s \textit{Immolation of Iphigenia}, Maranta suggests a positive interpretation of the \textit{Averted Hercules}. He praises Apelles for the courage to represent Hercules in a novel way, one requiring viewers to engage faculties of imagination. He goes as far as to suggest that this is the artist’s achievement, ‘which [when it] was not appreciated by the crowd roused the greatest wonder in the most famous painters of that century’. The painting merited the attention of Pliny, who praised it highly. Thus this work became a model for future generations of artists, a fact noticed only by Maranta, even if implicitly, in a note he left on the margin:

So, as in Tragedies not all the events take place on the stage but between one act and the other, one sometimes imagines much more than what can be done in an act; and this makes the poem more solemn and dense; likewise in painting the highest minds always considered it a greatly desirable thing that many things should be hidden, but in such a way that they might be understood easily and with wonder.

The reference to Apelles’s painting of Hercules allows Maranta to distinguish between artists who avoid erring because they fear censure and therefore create works that satiate most of viewers and those artists who, being ‘indifferent to pleasing the mob, make all their compositions in accordance with the dictates of art’. Maranta approves the latter category of artists, among whom are Titian, Ariosto and the musicians of Naples who aimed at deepening emotional sense of their compositions by using elided cadence.\textsuperscript{185} Maranta observes that an artwork, be it painting, poetry or music, meets with harsh criticism when its significance is not immediately accessible. He blames critics for a lack of interest in cogitation. Titian’s \textit{Annunciation}, Ariosto’s \textit{Orlando furioso} and madrigals based on Ariosto’s stanzas were of course accessible to all the more-or-less educated public in Naples, but this does not mean that these works could be equally appreciated: appreciation depends on cultural taste, knowledge of artistic, literary and musical devices and awareness of works created by ancient and modern artists.

Subsequently, Maranta distinguishes between viewers who, like himself and his addressee, enjoy the works that engage their imagination and those viewers who want the works to give them immediate satisfaction. Competent viewers savour the details of works, longing to understand the artists’ intentions, whereas unsophisticated, even if relatively educated, viewers tend to form an opinion of works facilely, without considering the artists’ reasons and without respecting the


\textsuperscript{185} Larson, ‘Unaccompanied madrigal’, 255-61, with a citation from Maranta’s ‘Discourse’.
taste of these artists’ patrons, who turned to them specifically to commission works on the desired subject. The ‘Discourse’ contrasts amateurish and sophisticated viewers, and these are not equal in number, for ‘those who enjoy real craftsmanship are few indeed’. Whereas Alberti and then Dolce claim that painting can be understood equally by the ignorant and the educated as each finds something attractive in this art, Maranta objects to the idea of equal perception of art between the distinct groups, and raises questions about what makes a viewer a competent critic.

**The proper way to judge a painting**

Maranta’s approach to the theme of critical assessment is innovative and unusual. Even when he cites the familiar anecdote of Apelles’s remark to the cobbler, he interprets it in a new and sophisticated way. The opinion, prevalent in Naples, that Titian’s altarpiece contains faults – the most prominent of which were the fleshy figure and the partially obscured face – resulted from the lack of the viewers’ wish to ponder the details of Titian’s work. Maranta admonishes people who boorishly criticize the painting to be more cautious in voicing their opinion lest someone – not necessarily the artist – repeat to them what Apelles said to the cobbler. This saying: ‘Ne sutor ultra crepidam’ (‘Let a shoemaker stick to his last’) in the form of the proverb became common in post-classical times thanks to Giovanni Battista Gelli’s inclusion of it in _La Circe_, published in 1549. Maranta addresses this anecdote to critics, because he knew that those whom he overheard in the chapel were familiar with its story, _inter alia_, from Pliny (XXXV.85). Similarly, in his _Dialogo della pittura intitolato l’Aretino_, Dolce pleads to distinguish ‘between the learned and the ignorant’ and, like Alberti, implicitly refers to Cicero’s _De officiis_ (I.47). He interprets Cicero’s instructions to his son Marcus (I.65) as a caution to distinguish among opinions so as not to fall into traps set by ignorant critics. In this context Dolce mentions Apelles as the exemplary painter who exposed ‘his figures to the criticism of all comers’ in the hopes of getting some expert opinion. Dolce realizes that not all critics are professionals; he is clearly suggesting that a painter is not required to pay attention to every judgement.

186 Alberti, _On Painting_, 48 (2.28); Barocchi, ed., _Trattati_, 1:156.
189 Compare with Cicero, _De Officiis_, 67: ‘he who depends upon the caprice of the ignorant rabble cannot be numbered among the great’. For the different reading of Dolce, see Roskill’s note in _Dolce’s ‘Aretino’_, 244.
190 Roskill, _Dolce’s ‘Aretino’_, 103.
Dolce believes that, notwithstanding the pitfalls, a painter should learn from the critics of his works. Maranta does not even raise this question; rather, he questions the critics’ qualifications. He takes at face value Aristotle’s statement in the *Nicomachean Ethics* (I.3, 1094b) that it is necessary for a good critic to be educated in a subject, for ‘each man judges well things he knows’. Maranta warns his readers against a petty and narrow approach to art. In this, Maranta’s attitude differs drastically from that of Gilio, who praises Apelles’s prudence in accepting the cobbler’s remark, but who, significantly, omits any mention of the artist’s reprimand. Maranta explains that for the proper judgement of Titian’s work, one should consider it from many different angles. For his part, Maranta uses several resources: the comparison between painting and poetry, the comparison between Titian and Apelles, the juxtaposition of Titian’s Angel and Michelangelo’s Christ as most controversial figures discussed c. 1562, the interpretation of Titian’s Angel according to the canon of the beautiful figure, the rules of physiognomy and the rhetorical art of gestures. He also searches out the advice and opinion of the people who know about Titian and appreciate his art. Among them are Cosimo Pinelli, a cultivated patron; his son Gian Vincenzo, a philosopher-scientist; Cambi, an esteemed gentleman, who was Florentine in culture; and Lama, a Neapolitan painter, who was chosen by Cosimo to fresco his family chapel. At the end of his ‘Discourse’, Maranta concludes that, to judge a work of art properly, it is necessary to obtain the judgements of experts from diverse fields. Thus, the old question of the importance for a painter to consider the opinions of his public receives a new twist, centring on a critic’s capacity to assess a painter’s work.

Maranta brings together the opinions of experts in diverse fields, helping him form a composite judgement of Titian’s painting which, Maranta believes to be an objectively correct evaluation of the work. He then has recourse to his own medical background when he considers the Angel’s complexion and assesses, from the standpoint of anatomical structure, the appropriateness of the speaking hand’s gesture to the scene represented. In his wish to communicate admiration for Titian’s *Annunciation*, he also calls on his experience as a literary critic to highlight similarities between poetry and painting.

The ‘Discourse’, then, argues that the painting can be correctly judged only if the critic aims at a comprehensive consideration of all its aspects. The points he emphasizes are worthy of repetition as statements of Maranta’s credo: valid criticism evaluates artwork according to tenets found in contemporary writings on the art of painting; it takes into account other contemporaneous works of art; it goes beyond the commonplace recitation of ancient examples from Pliny; it considers the subject represented in the painting; it studies the painting in relation to its specific
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location; it strives to explain the artist’s intentions. Only when Titian’s Annunciation is studied in relation to the context for which it was created – a family chapel in a church – and through the comprehension of reasons that influenced it aesthetically and theologically, can this painting be evaluated objectively.

**Art historians and Maranta’s ‘Discourse’**

The manuscript of the ‘Discourse’ was first noticed in 1902 by Angelo Borzelli, a literary scholar and art historian, who summarized its contents in a small book of twenty-four pages. His objective was to use the text as a way to focus on mid-sixteenth-century Neapolitan culture. Borzelli’s initiative was taken up in 1952 by Giuseppe Solimene, a historian of Basilicata, who paraphrased the ‘Discourse’ in forty-two pages, with annotations on historical figures, offering biographical information on the Pinelli and Maranta families and adding reproductions of Maranta’s portrait and Titian’s painting (then located in the Pinelli chapel). When, in 1956, Tommaso Pedio, also a historian of Basilicata, reviewed Solimene’s publication, he corrected the information on the Maranta family. Both Solimene and Pedio missed some inaccuracies concerning the Pinelli and Maranta families, primarily the result of a confusion of grandfathers with their namesake grandsons. This current essay corrects those mistakes to the extent possible and attempts to establish more precisely the circumstances surrounding the production of Maranta’s ‘Discourse’ and the date of its composition.

The ‘Discourse’ received new life in 1971, with its publication in Paola Barocchi’s monumental collection, *Scritti d’arte del Cinquecento*. Barocchi deliberately used Solimene’s annotations and made clear that the questions raised by Maranta were familiar to his contemporaries. The spellings of the names of Italian artists (e.g., ‘Titiano’ for ‘Tiziano’, ‘Michel’ Angelo’ for ‘Michelangelo’) as well as some Greek and Roman names (e.g., ‘Orazio’ for ‘Horatio’, ‘Omero’ for ‘Homero’ and ‘Ercule’ for ‘Hercule’) were changed for the sake of consistency within the three volumes of the *Scritti*. In the current translation of the text, the names of Michelangelo, Giorgio Vasari and Albrecht Dürer (as well as the word ‘Angel’, spelled with capital ‘A’) accord with the original spellings of the manuscript. The rest are given in the standardized English form, including of course ‘Titian’.

Barocchi overlooked Maranta’s marginal note (c. 262r), which sheds light on his interpretation of the paragone between poetry and painting. The note in the present transcription and translation is appended to the text of the ‘Discourse’ translated by Viviana Tonon. A paperback reprint of the *Scritti* followed in 1978, published in separate sections: the section ‘Pittura’ contains the ‘Discourse’. In 1985, the present author, then working on the topic of Titian’s portraiture, took note of Maranta’s ‘Discourse’. Her published study sets Maranta’s art of description in the
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193 The review is published in *Archivio storico pugliese*, 9, 1956, 167-72.
194 The handwriting and syntax leave no doubt that this note is Maranta’s.
context of the ancient and modern ekphrastic tradition, suggesting to see the ‘Discourse’ as pioneering in its descriptive interpretation of Titian’s painting. Some imprecision of facts regarding the circumstances that led Maranta to discuss Titian’s Annunciation have been corrected in the present essay.

In 2002, Ulrich Pfisterer brought together a series of excerpts from treatises on art to form a history of Kunstliteratur. For the introduction Pfisterer chose to discuss Titian’s two Annunciation paintings. In “‘Fleischwerdung’: Tizians Verkündigungs-Bilder und die Macht des Wortes’, Pfisterer presents the first Annunciation, reporting some historical facts – its price, its initial commission and its final destination – and recalls the relief of the Annunciation related to by Dante in the mode of the ‘visibile parlare’. Pfisterer then discusses the second Annunciation and draws attention to Maranta’s ‘Discourse’, familiar to him from Barocchi’s edition. He is particularly impressed by Maranta’s expression ‘una certa metafora pitturale’, which leads him to recall salient points of the topic of ‘ut pictura poesis’. In his view, Titian’s Neapolitan Annunciation does much to enrich discussions of the beholder’s perception of the painting, for artworks are rarely perceived through the lens of their contemporaries. Ulrich Rehm’s review of Pfisterer’s book concentrated on the expression ‘pictorial metaphor’ as applied to the interpretation of the Angel’s corpulent figure; this shows Rehm’s admiration for both sixteenth- and twentieth-century authors in their use and exposition of this attractive concept.195

In 2007, Caroline van Eck concentrated on Maranta’s description of gestures, which converted the flat plane of the picture into the three-dimensional stage of the theatre. This is in keeping with the theme of her book, Classical Rhetoric and the Visual Arts in Early Modern Europe, a discussion of the tangible devices borrowed from rhetoric by visual artists to transform a painting into the representation of a mental image. In drawing an analogy between the works of poets and painters, Maranta, as van Eck claims, applies the orator’s art of gesticulation, described by Cicero and Quintilian, to the analysis of depicted postures, seeing its expressive power as the link between the two arts.

In 2008, Marcel Grosso found Maranta’s ‘Discourse’ on Titian’s painting attractive, as a consequence of his interest in Titian’s connections with the Neapolitan milieu under the rule of the Spanish viceroy. He later expanded this article, based on his dissertation research, into the book (Per la fama di Tiziano), but the original article, first published in 2004 and reprinted in 2008,196 remains the most detailed study of the background that shaped Maranta’s aesthetic evaluation of Titian’s painting. According to Grosso, Maranta’s attention both to Titian’s use of
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the rainbow colours in the Angel’s wings and to the artist’s representation of vivid and lifelike figures was indebted to Bernardino Telesio’s philosophical doctrines. Grosso, independently of Freedman and van Eck, suggests that Maranta’s ‘Discourse’ may be read as a response to Dolce’s analysis of Titian’s art. In 2008, the Pinelli painting was shown in an exhibition that focussed on Titian’s late style. In the entry on this painting to the exhibition catalogue, Late Titian and the Sensuality of Painting,197 Grosso mentions Maranta’s text as evidence of the history and provenance of the painting; he also updates the information about some earlier literature that questioned the attribution of the painting to Titian, arguing for the workshop intervention. Grosso, highlighting Titian’s innovative approach to the representation of the sacred scene, is convinced that this Annunciation is indeed by the master himself.

Grosso’s use of Maranta’s text, in his study of Titian’s fame in Spanish Naples, stimulated an interest in both the painting and the ‘Discourse’. Grosso’s article (2004) provided the background for Marco Ruffini’s exposition of a sixteenth-century document on the provenance of Titian’s Neapolitan Annunciation.198 Ruffini came across a copy of Vasari’s Vite of 1550 (in the Beinecke Library at Yale University) that had been annotated by an anonymous reader sometime between 1560 and 1568. As Vasari mentions Titian in several passages of his book, the annotator, most likely of Paduan origin, decided to add a biographical note on Titian. This note contains precious information about the painter’s works, though not without some imprecision. For example, regarding the Neapolitan Annunciation, the anonymous author writes that it was located in Santa Maria Maggiore (which incidentally houses the Pontano chapel and, for this reason, would have been more familiar to him). It also says that the painting was commissioned by the King of Spain, Philip II, as the only altarpiece ever made for him by Titian. Ruffini makes use of Maranta’s text to explain that the work was actually commissioned for the family chapel in San Domenico Maggiore by Gian Vincenzo Pinelli, who, as Ruffini learns from Grosso, moved to Padua in 1558. Ruffini confuses Cosimo senior and junior, thinking wrongly that Cosimo senior was granted the noble rank of the Duke of Acerenza. It was Galeazzo who, in 1563, purchased the feudality of Acerenza,199 and received the title of Duke of Acerenza on 12 April 1593;200 his eldest son, Cosimo, inherited it in 1600. Ruffini supports his information with a reference to a

197 See Marsel Grosso’s detailed entry to Late Titian and the Sensuality of Painting, exhib. cat., ed. Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, Vienna and Venice: Marsilio, 2008, 254 and 256, no. 3.3.
200 For the document regarding the conferment of the dukedom on Galeazzo Pinelli, see ‘Secretarías Provinciales, Libro 152, folios 90 vº y ss’, Departamento de Referencia, Archivo General de Simancas (Valladolid).
text by Carlo De Lellis that cites a sepulchral epitaph in the Pinelli Chapel. The Cosimo mentioned in this epitaph, however, is the grandson, not the founder of the chapel. Ruffini mentions that Cosimo senior was Great Chancellor of the Kingdom of Naples in 1557; but it was Cosimo junior who, in March 1601, acquired the office of Great Chancellor. Ruffini perceptively notes that the Paduan annotator knew well that Titian’s painting of the Annunciation was familiar to Philip II, because in 1537 this work belonged to the king’s mother, and for this reason the annotator states that Philip II commissioned Titian’s Annunciation. At the same time he indicates Naples as the location of the painting on this subject, to be identified, as Ruffini observes, with the altarpiece in the Pinelli chapel.

By 2010, the Pinelli Annunciation had been fully restored, revealing the colours as they undoubtedly were intended to look by Titian. This is noted by Grosso in his catalogue entry as the restoration was begun prior to the exhibition of 2008. The book on the Pinelli Annunciation, edited by Anna Chiara Alabiso, though dedicated primarily to the restoration of the work, includes a brief account of the historical and artistic context that led to the creation of the painting. Bruno Arciprete gently corrects Valcanover, Freedman and Grosso in pointing out that Titian’s signature on the base of the Virgin’s lectern reads ‘Titianus P’, and not ‘Titianus F’. Arciprete’s description of the painting after its restoration indirectly highlights Maranta’s accuracy in writing his impressions about the Angel’s hair, face, arm and wings. Arciprete and the painting’s restorers, Marco Cardinali and Maria Beatrice De Ruggieri, date the work to the early 1560s.

In her study, Alabiso derives most of her information on the Pinelli family from Grosso’s article of 2004 and his entry to the catalogue of 2008, using Maranta’s ‘Discourse’ merely as testimony to the commission of Titian’s work for the altar in

202 Jacopo M. Paitoni, Lettere d’uomini illustri, che fiororono nel principio del secolo decimosettimo, Venice: Baglioni, 1744, 1n1, includes the letter from Lorenzo Pignoria in Padua, dated 8 October 1602, to Paolo Gualdo in Venice, and Paitoni mentions in the note Cosimo Pinelli, the Duke of Acerenza, Marquis of Galatina and Great Chancellor of the Kingdom of Naples, who was the eldest son of Gian Vincenzo’s brother Galeazzo (Gualdo wrote Gian Vincenzo’s biography). See Rodella, ‘Fortuna’, 91 and 91n29.
203 Bruno Arciprete, ‘Il restauro dell’ Annunciazione di Tiziano a San Domenico Maggiore’, in Tiziano, 50 at 49-60. In this regard, see E. H. Gombrich’s useful observations on the inscriptions in paintings indicating the patron who makes the work by commissioning the painter or giving him an idea of his work, and the painter who paints it. See his ‘The early Medici as patrons of art’, in Norm and Form. Studies in the Art of the Renaissance, London: Phaidon, 1978, 40 at 35-57. Maranta notes that Gian Vincenzo is ‘Egli che di far fare quell quadro ha avuto il pensiero’ (Gian Vincenzo is ‘He, who had the thought of having this picture made’). See Michele Polverari, ed., Tiziano. La pala Gozzi di Ancona. Il restauro e il nuovo allestimento espositivo, Bologna: Grafis Edizioni, 1988, 100, for the inscription which states that this work is made by Alvise Gozzi and painted by Titian.
the chapel. Alabiso speculates that it was through Fulvio Orsini that Gian Vincenzo became acquainted with Titian. Pierre Nolhac, whose classic study on Orsini Alabiso cites, suggests that their connection could not have existed before 1565. Gian Vincenzo would have needed a mediator to facilitate the task of procuring the painting, given Titian’s social standing. As shown here, it was the lawyers Benavides and Speroni who could help him in fulfilling this task. Only Benavides, who had connections with the Spanish court and the Maranta family, and Speroni, who was a friend of Aretino, could have assisted Gian Vincenzo in urging Titian to find time to paint the Annunciation for his family chapel. It is sufficient to recall the Venetian case of the Massola chapel, in which the altarpiece of the Martyrdom of St Lawrence was installed in 1559 – almost ten years after it was commissioned on 18 November 1548 – to appreciate the relative efficiency with which Titian completed the painting for the chapel of the Pinelli family. Alabiso mentions an important fact relating to the presence of the painting in the city: when Pietro de Stefano described the sacred places of Naples in his book, published in 1560, he mentioned neither the Pinelli chapel, nor the presence of Titian’s painting in San Domenico Maggiore. He did, however, mention Cosimo Pinello [sic] as the magnificent nobleman from Genoa in front of whose garden stood the Franciscan monastery of San Girolamo (on the Pinelli botanical garden, see above).

In 2014, Isabelle Bouvrande, in a short separate chapter of her book on Venetian colour, emphasizes that Maranta includes ‘the appropriate vividness of colour’ as a necessary characteristic of a ‘beautiful’ painting. Bouvrande lays stress on Maranta’s medical profession and his Aristotelian background. Maranta, however, was no less a Platonist than he was an Aristotelian, as his literary studies confirm. She links the notion of the celestial rainbow, mentioned in Aristotle’s Meteorology and discussed by Anne Merker, to Maranta’s analysis of the Angel’s wings. Bouvrande suggests that his mention of the celestial rainbow is meant to underline the ‘spiritual and incorporeal nature’ of Titian’s Angel. Inspired by his ‘Discourse’ and Barocchi’s annotations, Bouvrande names Maranta in several passages of her book – for example, in the passage about the fleshiness of Titian’s figures, previously noted of course first by Aretino and then by Dolce. She draws attention also to Maranta’s pairing the two terms ‘complexion’ and ‘physiognomy’. Her book demonstrates how Maranta’s text can be used to enhance understanding the contemporary assessments of Titian’s art. It is quite likely that other art
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historians will follow suit, for the ‘Discourse’ is an exemplary text, not just for the commentary on Titian’s Annunciation, but for the analysis of the aesthetics of painting in general.

For the translation please click here.

Appendix: Maranta’s Trial

… Alois mentioned Maranta’s name ‘because of an impious sonnet by Molza that was recited in front of him by the above-mentioned Alois and that contained the justification of Christ made in the Lutheran fashion, and also because he was suspected of some other similar matters concerning Religion: some time later they recanted their depositions spontaneously, saying they had been made for fear of the torture, with which they were threatened by the Ministers of the Inquisition, and the Provincial of San Pietro a Maiella, as well as the other witnesses, Don Bernardino de Bernardini, Alfonso Cambi, Gabriele Mercurio, De Blasio, Raimo and Paduano were considered unreliable and false in their depositions. And the Roman Congregation of the Holy Office admitted that it was on account of some personal resentment that the Bishop of Montepeloso, then Vicar of our city, had proceeded against Maranta, appropriating this case on the strength of only one suspicion that he had, namely that Maranta had possibly written an Oration, which was read at the Council of Trent by the Bishop of Laviello (sic), against the ecclesiastical Officials of the Kingdom and, consequently, against the Vicar himself, for which reason Maranta was taken here by order of the said Congregation with his own assent and a security payment of only five hundred ducats: and when the trial was repeated with the examination of a number of witnesses up to sixty-five, it revealed the excessive zeal of the denouncer, the resentment of the Vicar and the unreliability of the witnesses, as testified in a deed drawn up already in that year MDLXII by the lawyer Vincenzo Mancini in favour of the said Maranta, in which information is given about the reported facts, and the names of the above-mentioned witnesses are published’.
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