
*Inquisition and Metamorphosis: Paolo Veronese and the “Ultima Cena” of 1573*¹

BRIAN T. D'ARGAVILLE

Queen's University

RÉSUMÉ

Depuis la découverte en 1869 du « Verbale del processo » de Paolo Véronese devant l'Inquisition, pour la défense de la toile qu'il avait fait pour le Réfectoire du Couvent de Ss. Giovanni e Paolo à Venise, il y avait un accord général que Véronese n'a changé rien dans sa toile, sauf l'addition de l'inscription indiquant le sujet comme *Le festin dans la maison de Lévi*.

Par contre, Brian d'Argaville, mort en 1987, dans ce discours prononcé au College Art Association en 1976.

In 1573, Paolo Veronese completed the picture for the refectory of the Dominicans of San Zanipolo in Venice,¹ now in the Galleria dell'Accademia (Fig. 86). It was on account of this work that he was arraigned before the Inquisition on the charge of having introduced a crowd too large and too mun-

insiste que le titre donné par Véronese à l'Inquisition, *La Cène dans la maison de Simon*, était exact, et par conséquence du procès, Véronese avait changé la toile profondément en ajoutant deux personnages importants au premier plan dans la zone centrale de la composition.

En plus d'Argaville indique que le sujet original, tout à fait inconnu à l'iconographie chrétienne, offre une justification complète pour la magnifique mise-en-scène architecturale de la toile.

dane to be appropriate to the subject.² During the trial this subject was referred to twice, once by the

about good food and opera. He will be remembered for his remarkable talks at the C.A.A. on the Arena Chapel and the Arnolfini Marriage, which again never reached the point of publication, but his real strength lay neither in the learned article nor in the formal lecture but in the exposition before the work of art. Those who remember him talking in the Arena Chapel or before the great Bellini at Pesaro, often for an hour or more, moving from detailed analysis to generalization and from theological background to particular details, found him a perpetual source of light and understanding. The present article gives an excellent impression of his method. Starting from a careful reading of the trial record, it reviews the theological implications and leads on to a triumphant vindication of Veronese's dramatic imagination. The conventional wisdom he attacked 12 years ago still remains in place today, and since his C.A.A. synopsis has found its way into the literature, it is most appropriate that his full text, lightly edited and with a few footnotes added, should now enter the public domain.

— George Knox, *University of British Columbia*

2 The most accepted transcription of the “Verbale del Processo” is that given by Philipp Fehl, “Veronese and the Inquisition: A Study of the Subject Matter of the So-called *Feast in the House of Levi*,” *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, LVIII (1961), 11, 349-51. N.B. on p. 328: “It is therefore safe to assume that the painting . . . still looks as it did on 20 April 1573, the date of its completion.” It is reprinted in Francesco Valcanover, Giovanna Nepi Scirè, et al., “Il Restauro del Convito in Casa di Lévi di Paolo Veronese,” in *Quaderni della Soprintendenza ai Beni Artistici e Storici di Venezia* (Ven-

1 EDITOR'S NOTE: We here take the opportunity to publish the text of a talk delivered by Brian d'Argaville to the meeting of the College Art Association in Chicago in 1976, as a postscript, one might say, to the volumes of words spoken and printed in honour of the four hundredth anniversary of the death of Paolo Veronese, which we celebrated in 1988. Brian himself died very suddenly in October 1987, before he had been able to complete his work on this great canvas, which had been accepted in principle for publication by Princeton University Press. These studies went considerably beyond the present article, showing how Veronese was essentially caught in the cross-fire of a bitter dispute between the Dominicans of SS. Giovanni e Paolo and the papal authorities, but it now appears to be impossible to recover this work from his papers, which are preserved in the Queen's University Archives. Brian, an Australian by birth, came to art history with a full grounding in philosophy and theology, under the inspiration of Walter Vitthum at the University of Toronto. His career as a teacher was almost entirely centred on Queen's University, and in particular on the Queen's Summer School in Venice, which he directed for many years. His studies covered a very wide field, beginning with a doctoral project on Mattia Preti which, typically for Brian, was never brought to conclusion. He was passionate about great painting, as he was

prosecutor and once by the painter, as a “cena ultima,” and indeed the picture had been commissioned to replace Titian’s *Last Supper*, which had been destroyed by fire two years earlier.³ Paolo described it as the Last Supper which Christ had celebrated with his Apostles in the house of Simon (“Cena ultima, che fece Giesu Christo con li sui apostoli . . . In ca de Simeon”), this latter a disconcertingly novel qualification, otherwise unknown in the long tradition of illustrating the famous scene.⁴ Nor can this reference be treated as a casual inadvertence or a scribe’s error, for Veronese subsequently makes clear that Simon’s social position as a wealthy tax-gatherer had operated as his principal index to the magnificence of scale and richness of effect that his scene could, in terms of the doctrine of decorum, appropriately sustain.

Challenged for having introduced two German *halbardiere*, the painter replied that he had made inquiries from the learned about Simon, and had been told that he was a powerful and rich man—“il patron della Casa era grande e richo secondo che mi e stato detto”—and that consequently such armed servants might reasonably have been seen in his house. When asked to describe the actors that he had introduced into the scene, he again mentioned in pride of place the owner of the house—“E’l patron dell’albergo Simon”—and indeed he seems to have cast himself in the role of Simon, giving him contemporary Venetian dress

ice, 1984), xi, 44-47. I am most grateful to Giovanna Nepi Scirè for making a copy of this publication and a photograph of the painting available to me, together with her permission to publish it. It will be referred to henceforth as “Nepi Scirè 1984.”

3 For a full discussion of the lost Titian, see Brian d’Argaville, “Titian’s *Cenacolo* for the Refectory of SS. Giovanni e Paolo Reconsidered,” in *Tiziano e Venezia* (Venice, 1976), 161-67.

4 The house of Simon is recorded in Scripture (Mark 14:3-5, Luke 7:36-50) as the place where a woman (the Magdalen is indicated in John 11:2) had anointed Christ’s feet. Veronese reported to the Inquisition a request conveyed by the prior of the convent that he should change his canvas by substituting a Magdalen in place of a dog. Only after his refusal to do this was he summoned before the Inquisition. Richard Cocks, in his discussion of the drawing at Kassel (*Veronese’s Drawings* [London, 1984], no. 69) suggests that the sheet includes studies for a *Magdalen Washing the Feet of Christ*, and that these should be considered as studies for the painting under consideration. This suggestion is rejected by W. R. Rearick in the exhibition catalogue *Paolo Veronese: disegni e dipinti* (Venice, Fondazione Giorgio Cini, 1988), 61 (17), who identifies these studies as being for one of the canvases in the Sala delle Quattro Porte in the Palazzo Ducale, *Doge Pasquale Cicogna Receiving the Persian Ambassadors in the Collegio*. This same drawing is also noted by Giovanna Nepi Scirè in the exhibition catalogue *Paolo Veronese Restauri, Quaderni della Soprintendenza ai Beni Artistici e Storici di Venezia* (Venice, Galleria dell’Accademia, 1 June-30 September 1988), xv, 85 (fig. 75), where she appears to follow Cocks rather than Rearick. This publication will be referred to henceforth as “Nepi Scirè 1988.”

and an appearance that has traditionally been thought to be close to the painter’s own likeness.

Faced with this kind of insistence, a group of scholars has preferred to see the picture as a *Feast in the House of Simon* rather than as a *Last Supper*. While both these alternatives are apparently supported by the text of the trial, they are each in turn incompatible with the evidence of the picture itself. Veronese, as is well known, inscribed the balustrade of the painting with the rubric “Fecit D. Covi Magnum Levi/Luca Cap. V.” The text—“And Levi made him a great feast in his own house”—provided a title, *The Feast in the House of Levi*, which three centuries of commentators found appropriate and dramatically coherent, until the minutes of the court hearing were discovered in 1869.

This appearance of there being three plausibly documented but mutually exclusive possibilities for interpreting the painting’s action has involved this important occasion in hermeneutical chaos. The most recent English editors of the trial text, Professors Robert Kline and Henri Zerner, are therefore merely giving radical expression to a generally felt difficulty when they complain that “the subject of the picture does not seem to have been clear either to the painter, the monks or the judges”! This, in effect, reduces the trial to a farce, albeit with Kafkaesque overtones, for its only purpose was to decide whether the picture’s effects were appropriate to its subject matter. It has also seemed to establish the point, at variance with everything that late cinquecento aesthetic theory would lead us to expect, that Veronese was too indifferent to the subject matter of his paintings to care—or even to be properly aware—whether, in painting a great *cena* for a monastic refectory, he was depicting a *Feast in the House of Simon*, or *The Last Supper*, or *The Feast in the House of Levi*. For without exception, modern art historians have held that when Paolo was required by the court to change his painting, he laconically obliged by changing the title only,⁵ without adding or subtracting any element, whether formal or dramatic, in the original composition, as though for him there was no necessary connection between a title and its visual logic. By a merely nominal and empty concession, the painter is held to have preserved his painting intact.

If we are to begin to break the grip of this imbroglio of implications, apparently documented but historically implausible a priori, we must challenge the credentials of the opinion that

5 For the fullest exposition, see “Nepi Scirè 1984,” which is extremely valuable for its mass of details and comparative material. For the most recent repetition of this position, see “Nepi Scirè 1988,” 77.

the painting as we know it today is the same, compositionally and formally, as it was at the time of the trial. The invariable reason given in its support is the fact that none of the figures found objectionable by the prosecutor were removed from the painting. Today we can still study Simon calling his servants; his *scalco*, or steward, still placed, as Veronese described him, to watch how things were going at table; the servant with the bloody nose; the “imbriachi tedeschi”; the dwarf with his parrot; the Apostle who picks his teeth; and so on. As a reason, however, it involves an error of logic, for a painting can be as effectively altered by adding important new figures as by eliminating old ones. And actually it seems possible to prove, from the trial text, that this is what happened, and to plot the steps by which this was effected.

Veronese asserted three times, twice in response to formal questions on the point, that his painting had 13 persons seated at table. The prosecutor asked him who in the picture are seated at table with Christ—“Alla tavola del signor qui vi sono?”—and was told the twelve Apostles (“li Dodedi apostoli”). Again to the question “Chi credete voi veramente che si trovasse in quella Cena?” Paolo replied that one would find there Christ and the Twelve—“Credo che trovassero Christo con li sui apostoli.” Why then, he was asked, did you introduce buffoons and other inappropriate types? All these non-essential persons—“ministri,” as he called them—had, he claimed, been kept outside the area where the canonical action was taking place: “fuori del luoco dove si fa la cena,” as he expressed it. As this repeated claim that only 13 were seated at table was not challenged by the court, and as there are now 15 to be counted, we must conclude that two of these were added in the subsequent mandatory revision of the picture.

One of the two, we can safely infer, is the great scarlet figure seated in front of the table, to the left in the central bay (Fig. 87). Paolo described the Apostle to the right of St. Peter as holding a plate so that the saint could place some lamb on it—“Tha un piato per ricever qualche li dara San Pietro.” As this effect is the only one mentioned at the trial that cannot now be found in the painting, it must surely have been sacrificed during the revision to accommodate the figure seated immediately opposite and in front of him—the red-clad figure whose accession to the scene blocks our view of the Apostle. This is confirmed by the too abrupt way in which this isolated head now juts into our view.⁶ If this dominant figure accrued to the paint-

6 This passage in the trial text (page 3, lines 12-13) raises questions about the role of the eliminated page. It seems

ing at a later stage, the balance of the composition would suggest that his companion, seated in front of the table on the right in the central bay, was also added at this time. They are conceived dramatically as a pair, both turning together to look over their shoulders at the figure of the steward. This is proof enough that they are actors from a different play, as it would be impossible that protagonists in a *Last Supper* would turn away in this fashion from Christ while he initiates the Eucharist in the centre of the composition. Because the great standing figure of the steward (who unites their interested gaze) belongs, as we know from the trial record, to the original conception (and is hence independent of, and prior to their creation), we may expect that his *persona* was changed to integrate him dramatically, and in some significant way, into the new action of the banquet given by Levi. An astonishing and very little noticed effect confirms that this is the case. The steward's left hand rested originally on the balustrade, as is still clear, but now a silver water jug and plate have been introduced. The hand prevents them from resting naturally on the balustrade, and they ride gently in the air above it.⁷

We may ask what subsequent necessity required the introduction of these objects in close juxtaposition with “the steward.” A close look at this figure shows that his mantle has been furnished with tassels at the shoulder, and its edge has been teased into a fringe.⁸ The new libretto required, as *The Last Supper* did not, a Pharisee or Scribe, who could hardly be seated himself, to complain (as the text required), “Why do you eat and drink with publicans and sinners?” The steward was ready made, from his position, for such a conversion. The Pharisees were a sect characterized principally by their ceremonial ablutions prior to eating, as the Law required, and they would have a water jug supplied at a banquet for this purpose.⁹ As a

unlikely that he was eliminated before the painting was examined by the Inquisition, as he would have obscured the right hand of St. Peter, as well as the gesture of the apostle holding the plate to his right. He might even have been handing the plate to the apostle. All this is clearly shown in the “reflettografia” (1984, fig. 28). The best interpretation may be that this was a first attempt to remove an offensive passage, before the more radical restructuring of the picture was undertaken.

7 In the recent restoration it was demonstrated that this area had suffered much distortion and dislocation in the dismemberment and rejoining of the canvas (“Nepi Scirè 1984,” 89-97). However, this does not seem to affect the main point d'Argaville is making here.

8 The disturbance of the paint surface across the midriff of the figure, just above the belt, is very clear (“Nepi Scirè 1984,” 97). It may barely suggest a fringe, but it is very hard to account for otherwise.

9 This is an important issue: see also Matthew 13:1-28; Mark 7:1-8; Luke 11:37-41.

most orthodox Jew, he would be bound by the prescription in Leviticus that his garment be tasselled and fringed at the edge, a convention Veronese apparently observes for orthodox Jews in other contexts. By these minimal adjustments the steward was transformed into a sectarian Israelite. The Scribe, also indicated in the text, may be identified as the figure in scarlet, seated at the table as might be more permissible for a member of a sect notably more latitudinarian than the Pharisees. His headdress and costume are impossible for an Apostle, though his companion to the right, seated so that Christ and St. John are across from him on his right hand, has a brown tunic of classic cut. This figure may be identified as the host, Levi, who later became Matthew the Evangelist, for whom Veronese considered brown to be the canonical colour.¹⁰

Thus in the new scenario, as the curtain rises on the banquet, the Pharisee has already uttered his taunt, and Christ has given his celebrated reply: "They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick. I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." The whole assembly is seen to respond with delighted surprise, while the Scribe turns sardonically to study the response of his colleague to Christ's words, as does also Levi/Matthew, frowning angrily that his guest and Master has been challenged at his table. What they see is the impassive Pharisee, whose malice is being laughingly mocked by a young Moorish servant, having been so appositely checked by the divine reply. With such revisions and additions was one libretto, with great dramatic precision, grafted on to another.

Despite the brilliant economy of these additions, they could not but entail some significant cancellations, some of which are now apparent.¹¹ Zanetti, in the eighteenth century, had already noted some

important revisions—"alcuni pentimenti," as he said, now lost to overpaint. The most significant of these, a victim of the Inquisition's insistence rather than a "pentimento," was a youth in the centre, kneeling at the table in front of St. Peter, with a small dog under his right arm:¹² in Zanetti's opinion, "un paggetto che ingombrarsi troppo . . . il sito principale del quadro."

Thus it is clear that *The Last Supper* of 1573 has survived only as a fossil under the systematic reworking of the *Accademia Feast in the House of Levi*. The basic reason for the incomprehension and dilemmas of interpretation that have impeded our understanding of the painting itself and the legal confrontation it occasioned can be found in the failure to analyze the contradictions between the record of the trial and the painting as we know it.

To recover the shape, both compositional and dramatic, of the original *Cena*, we must trace, in the mind's eye, its formal outline, as Veronese insisted to the court, with Christ flanked symmetrically on either side by the Twelve, set out with an almost quattrocento interval and verticality. We must, in our imagination, delete the two figures seated in front of the table, and the dramatic directions associated with them, and restore to the central area the more gentle presence of Zanetti's page, modifying our direct visual access to Christ's action.

With the Apostles smudged among the excited bustle of many servants, veiled by a line of elaborately characterized figures in front of them, and dwarfed by the monumentality of the great columns beyond which they are further recessed, Veronese clearly never intended *The Last Supper* to imitate the dramatic intensity or the psychological immediacy of those of Leonardo and Titian. Instead, the core of his *invenzione* was the Palladian structure of the *Cenacolo* itself, whose monumental columns attach themselves to our space in the already Baroque deceit of appearing to support the actual cornice of the refectory. This is perhaps most clearly shown in the large and magnificent preparatory drawing by Francesco Guardi at Canterbury, showing the interior of the refectory at SS. Giovanni e Paolo as it was in 1782, with the Veronese still in position (Fig. 88).¹³

10 Fehl ("Veronese and the Inquisition") identifies the figure in red as Levi and the other as Padre Andrea Buoni, who commissioned the work. Ridolfi (*Le meraviglie dell'arte* [Venice, 1648], 314) identifies the bearded apostle in the right arch, with knife and fork, as a likeness of Buoni.

11 D'Argaville's original text reads: "cancellations whose number will only become apparent from a radiograph of the whole central bay." At the time he was writing, he was hoping that such radiographs might become available, and a few years later this work was done. See "Nepi Scirè 1984," 13-53, and "Nepi Scirè 1988," 83-96. The first publication ("Nepi Scirè 1984," 16) considers that the "analisi riflettografiche e stratigrafiche sembrano escludere l'inserimento successivo all'ingiunzione del tribunale" of the two figures seated in front of the table. This position is repeated in "Nepi Scirè 1988" (77), which offers the latest expression of her views. She gives a reference to d'Argaville's synopsis in both texts: in "1984" as p. 16, note 10 (with an additional reference to Teresio Pignatti, *Veronese* [Milan, 1976], 136, who briefly outlines d'Argaville's position), and in "1988" as p. 97, note 9.

12 See "Nepi Scirè 1984," 27-28, and "Nepi Scirè 1988," 37, pl. xi. Though she mentions this figure briefly ("1984," 16; "1988," 77), Nepi Scirè does not appear to consider it an indication that major changes might have occurred in this area of the painting. If one may dare an intervention in so technical a matter, since there is no indication of any underpainting beneath the figure in red, one might suggest that Veronese cleaned this area down to the ground to avoid pentimenti and started afresh.

13 D'Argaville ("Titian's *Cenacolo*," 165) drew attention, I

This bold and uncharacteristic inversion of scale between protagonists and setting, initially prompted (no doubt) by the sheer size of the area to be painted, in effect subordinated the drama of the action to its architectural frame. If this great architectural setting is not to be considered a mere decorative prop, we must find a noble and inclusive dramatic meaning for these Palladian elements: one with which the action itself could, with dramatic sense, be orchestrated, or even subordinated. It is Simon, the great riddle of the trial text, who gave Veronese his lead in this matter.

The traditional confusion—which has led scholars from John Ruskin to Cecil Gould to deny, despite the minutes themselves, that the original version was intended as a *Feast in the House of Simon*—turns in large part on a lack of appreciation of the theological tradition that identified the evangelical owner of the house where the Last Supper was held as Simon the Pharisee. Furthermore, it can be shown that Paolo had purposely chosen an unprecedented Last Supper text that would incorporate reference to this character. He had clearly not illustrated any one of the traditional and canonical moments of the great action. It could never have been a “Communion of the Apostles.” Nor was it an “Announcement of the Betrayal,” as has often been urged, because Judas was still lost anonymously among the Apostles. Nor again was it the traditional “Institution of the Eucharist,” for the Pasch and its symbolic Lamb are only now being distributed, and Christ’s wine glass has not yet been set before him. We find by exclusion only one text that would plausibly allow the Jewish Pasch to be given priority over the Eucharist itself. Luke 22:14-18 reads:

And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him. And he said unto them, “With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.” And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, “Take this, and divide it among yourselves: for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.”

think for the first time, to the record of the picture in its original location, provided by Francesco Guardi in his canvas recording *Pius VI Taking Leave of the Doge in the Refectory of SS. Giovanni e Paolo*. See Antonio Morassi, *Guardi: I dipinti* (Venice, 1975), nos. 266, 267 (295, 296); also “Nepi Scirè 1984,” 11-12, for the preparatory drawing at Canterbury, see J. Byam Shaw, “Some Guardi Drawings Rediscovered,” *Master Drawings*, xv, 1 (1977), 3-15 (5); also exhibition catalogue, *Guardi, Tiepolo and Canaletto . . .* (Canterbury, Royal Museum, 1985 [5]). See also the exhibition catalogue, *Paolo Veronese Restauri*, 98 (70), for a photomontage. I am most grateful to Kenneth Reedic, curator of the City Museums, Canterbury, for providing a photograph of the drawing, together with his permission to publish it.

Paolo has poetically orchestrated this announcement with the actual arrival of Christ’s wine cup.

This text not only specifies the elements of the dramatic action unfolding before us, but also confirms itself as the precise libretto of the first version of the painting by the interesting particular that it also incorporates a reference, three verses earlier, to the mysterious owner of the house, the *patri familias domus* of the Vulgate, of whom there was so much question at the trial. Once this is understood, we need have no more difficulty than the judge and prosecutors of the trial in accepting as the dramatically coherent title of the painting Veronese’s own exact description, that it was a *Last Supper in the House of Simon, an Ultima cena in ca de Simone*.

The precise sense of this qualification about the house of Simon becomes apparent when we understand that it, the *domus Pharisaei*, had a long history in ecclesiastical typology as the figure or type of the Synagogue. Veronese, who had often before used Simon and his house as the subject of paintings, would have surely picked up such theological lore as existed about him, and thus would have known that from patristic times this house had been taken to symbolize the Synagogue’s custodianship of the Law and the Prophets. “*Domus Pharisaei ipsa legis prophetarumque custodia est*” is a typological commonplace. It could thus with deep theological and dramatic point be shown to frame the last celebration of the Jewish Paschal meal, now to give way to the Eucharistic agape of the Christian Church, as the *Cenacolo* is, in its turn, the figure of the Church, just as the house of Simon is the type of the Synagogue. As Christ announces his death, which will transform Israel’s cult into that of the Christian Church, Veronese has the great *genii* of his spandrels stir significantly into life.

If we have correctly identified the *topos* “Synagogue into Ecclesia” as the iconographic coordinate of our vast Palladian loggia, we would expect that this conception would have affected its architectural form: that its order and its proportions would have been determined by its role. This turns out to be exactly the case.

For Palladio it was axiomatic that a temple derived its order and proportions from the antique house. For him, the ideal form of the atria, loggia, and *cortile* of the antique house was the Corinthian tetrastyle, the quadrupled columns of which incorporate the mystical harmonic ratio of the square. Giangiorgio Trissino, in a passage in *L’Italia liberata dai Goti*, describes just such an ancient house, and has its mysteries clarified by none other than the architect’s nominal prototype, the angel Palladio himself. Its columns, according

to this Palladian gloss, were to be as high as the width of the pavement separating them, thus describing a square, and their height, excluding their bases, was to be eight times the width of their diameter; and this in turn was to equal the height of the capitals. Veronese seems to have followed this prescription to the letter. As the house of a patrician, living in a Roman province in the first century, Simon's dwelling, the *domus Pharisaei*, could properly be imagined, given its evangelical and topological vocation, to possess the ideal form of the antique house, and hence of the Temple itself.

This indicates why Paolo had latched onto the entirely discretionary "fact" that the Last Supper was held in Simon's house. Rather than being a nonsense, or a dramatic irrelevance, it lies at the heart of his greatest conception. Veronese himself, with Palladio and their circle, unlike the majority of modern critics, would have seen the architectural frame not merely as a decorative anachronism but as an accurate Vitruvian reconstruction, profoundly in keeping with the doctrine

of decorum: one that clearly expressed its significance.

Undoubtedly, there was much in the painting to confound contemporary expectations, both aesthetically and theologically. Perhaps the transcript of the trial will now begin to outline for us a crucial and informative struggle over the concept of decorum, between the last phase of Renaissance classicism (which Veronese and Palladio represented) and the new spirit of dramatic thaumaturgy favoured by the Counter-Reformation, much in evidence in the work of Tintoretto. However that may be, a demonstration of the picture's dramatic accuracy as *The Feast in the House of Levi*, followed by an understanding of its earlier consistency of form and content as a *Last Supper in the House of Simon*, ought to arrest the slander that has insinuated itself everywhere as a result of Ruskin's entirely mistaken interpretation of it, and of the trial: that Veronese's dramatic imagination was inferior to his sense of colour and form and that he had an incurable tendency to turn noble events into frivolous, merely decorative occasions.



FIGURE 86. Paolo Veronese, *The Feast in the House of Levi*, 1573. Venice, Galleria dell'Accademia (Photo: Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza ai Beni Artistici e Storici di Venezia).



FIGURE 87. Paolo Veronese, *The Feast in the House of Levi*, detail of the central section (Photo: Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza ai Beni Artistici e Storici di Venezia).




FIGURE 88. Francesco Guardi, *The Refectory at SS. Giovanni e Paolo*, 1782. Canterbury, The Royal Museum (Photo: Deborah Scales).