INTRODUCTION

This volume is based on the papers presented at the London international conference on 25–27 May 2016, which brought together a group of twenty-six scholars across four London venues – Birkbeck College, the National Gallery, the Warburg Institute and the British Museum. Both the conference and this volume are devoted to the study of the historical reception of Leonardo’s artistic works and theoretical writings in Britain. This volume aims at making available to a wider audience the new materials presented at the conference and further developed into thematic chapters.

In recent years, we have been fortunate to witness major Leonardo exhibitions and publications. Among them, worthy of particular mention are the drawings exhibitions at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (2003), and the Musée du Louvre, Paris (2003), as well as the three exhibitions focusing on Leonardo’s paintings at the National Gallery, London (2011–12), the Louvre, Paris (2012) and the Palazzo Reale, Milan (2015). These events have instigated important discussions on Leonardo as an artist, not least on issues concerning attribution, dating, technique and workshop procedures. The paintings exhibitions, in particular, were underpinned by the new findings revealed by the restoration and scientific investigation of The Virgin of the Rocks in the National Gallery and the St Anne in the Louvre. Moreover, the series of twenty-four thematic exhibitions of selected sheets from the Codex Atlanticus at the Biblioteca
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Ambrosiana in Milan (2009–15) offered new insights into Leonardo’s theoretical, technological and scientific studies, and the Queen’s Gallery exhibition in London (2012) brought together a comprehensive selection of Leonardo’s anatomical drawings. With respect to recent publications, those more closely related to the questions addressed in this volume include the book edited by Claire Farago on the historical reception of Leonardo’s treatise on painting across Europe (2009), the facsimile edition of the drawings by Leonardo and artists of his circle in British collections by Martin Kemp and Juliana Barone (2010), the study by Pietro C. Marani of the copy of The Last Supper at the Royal Academy (2016) and the multi-authored volume organized by Claire Farago on the 1651 Italian edition of Leonardo’s treatise on painting (2018). On the other side of the spectrum, we must single out the seminal studies by earlier scholars, notably Carlo Amoretti, Gustavo Uzielli, Edmondo Solmi, Luca Beltrami and Gerolamo Calvi on Leonardo’s life and works; by Jean-Paul Richter, Augusto Marinoni, Carlo Pedretti and Carlo Vecce regarding the transcription and dating of Leonardo’s writings; and by Arthur Ewart Popham, Philip Pouncey and Kenneth Clark on Leonardo’s drawings. These fundamental works either


underlie several discussions in this volume or are the object of direct scrutiny and contextualization.

An innovative feature of this volume is its focus on the British context. In contrast to the increasing interest in Leonardo’s historical reception in continental Europe, especially in the Italian and French milieux, the study of Leonardo’s legacy in Britain has received little attention. This volume discusses selected examples from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries regarding the reception of Leonardo’s artistic, theoretical and scientific legacy in Britain. At stake is what role (or roles, as will become increasingly apparent) Leonardo played in British art, aesthetics and scientific thought. Were particular aspects of his legacy favoured? What was actually known of his work? At the same time that this volume provides focused discussions regarding the location, awareness and reception of Leonardo’s paintings, drawings and manuscripts in Britain, it also looks at the mediations of artists, agents, collectors and intellectuals in the transmission and transformation of knowledge across cultural boundaries. Additionally, by addressing Leonardo’s artistic, art-theoretical and scientific legacy, this volume attempts to foster renewed links between these fields of historical enquiry.

The long-established appreciation of Raphael’s art – associated with the influential seventeenth-century classicizing orientations in Italy and France formulated around Giovan Pietro Bellori’s Idea del bello – has largely contributed to overshadowing the legacies of other Italian Renaissance artists. More specifically in the British context, while Leonardo’s paintings were not held in higher regard than those of Raphael, Michelangelo or Titian, the polymath and head of experiments at the Royal Society, Robert Hooke (1635–1703), has been dubbed ‘London’s Leonardo’ (2003) and even ‘England’s Leonardo’ (1996). If the Hooke-Leonardo association reveals a recent reading of Leonardo, it also raises broader historical considerations.


Bellori’s Idea was delivered as a lecture at the Accademia di San Luca in 1664, and published in 1672 as a preface to his biographical account of selected artists. Bellori’s Idea became known in English through John Dryden’s ‘A Parallel between Poetry and Painting’, published as a preface to his translation of C.-A. Dufresnoy’s De arte graphica, London 1695. For Bellori, see also G.P. Bellori: Le vite de’ pittori, scultori e architetti moderni, ed. E. Borea, intro. G. Previtali, Turin 1976.

In seventeenth-century France, it was the Poussin-Leonardo relationship that set the tone for the afterlife of Leonardo’s art theory across the European continent until the early nineteenth century. Such an affiliation harks back to the editions of the *Traité de la peinture* and *Trattato della pittura* in 1651, when Leonardo’s text was published with illustrations based on Poussin’s classicizing drawings of the human figure. However, such was not the case in the British context. To what extent have geographical issues, including those relating to the varying kinds and levels of mediation, favoured, impaired or reshaped the knowledge and reception of Leonardo’s art and thought? Did his paintings, drawings and manuscripts become known and collected in Britain around the same time as they did on the European continent? Were they appreciated in Britain at different moments and in distinct circles?

The contributions in this volume offer for the first time evidence of a range of interests, perceptions and engagements with Leonardo in Britain at different moments in time, and in a variety of settings: private, public and institutional, as well as artistic, literary and scientific. Within this enlarged context, our approach to provenance tends to be made with a view to owners’ collections and activities, conjuring up their social milieu, networking and intellectual aspirations. Provenance is regarded as contributing first-hand evidence for gauging historical processes of mediation and transmission. In a similar vein, the making and collecting of manuscripts and printed editions are addressed here as significant conduits of aesthetic ideals and cultural values. Translations, copies and versions of written texts and their illustrations are examined alongside testimonies transmitted through travel diaries, reports and letters by agents, collectors and diplomatic envoys. In addition, this volume brings to the fore the complex discussion of the notion of the original. What was considered to be an autograph work by Leonardo and what is now regarded as such, in the light of our ever-increasing connoisseurial knowledge and understanding of his techniques and workshop procedures, is a crucial question addressed here and which requires further attention, as does the related question of the construction of a view of Leonardo through the lenses of copies and workshop paintings, some once believed to be originals and others actually known or commissioned as substitutes. In this respect, issues of attribution
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and misattribution are here seen as especially telling, as they offer first-hand testimonies to historical attitudes.

Given the complexities inherent in Leonardo’s legacy and the novelty in studying his historical reception in Britain, some preliminary considerations are needed. In what follows, key aspects concerning the early dispersion of his works and the particularities of their British reception, including what and when works by him entered British collections, will be addressed in order to provide a frame of reference for the questions subsequently discussed in the individual chapters.

I. Early dispersion

Leonardo’s will was registered in Amboise on 23 April 1519. He bequeathed to Francesco Melzi (c. 1491–1568/70), his pupil and friend who had accompanied him to France, all his ‘books’, instruments and drawings relating to the art of painting.\(^9\) However, Leonardo makes no specific reference to his paintings. Understandably, there has been much speculation about their early owners and movements.

One of the main views regarding their whereabouts following Leonardo’s death is based on an inventory compiled in Milan in 1525. The inventory in question concerns the possessions of another of Leonardo’s close pupils, Gian Giacomo Caprotti (1480–1524), known as Salai. The high prices ascribed in Salai’s inventory to four paintings – *Mona Lisa*, *St Anne*, *St John the Baptist* and *Leda* (lost) – have led scholars to suggest that these paintings (unlike others listed in the same inventory) were Leonardo originals that Salai had owned and taken back to Milan.\(^10\) However, another view has more recently emerged in the light of a document from 1518 referring to a payment that was to be made to Salai for paintings he had sold to Francis I.\(^11\) Although there is no mention in the document of either the attribution or the subject-matter of those paintings, the notable sum of money it mentions as due to Salai has been regarded as evidence that
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the paintings were Leonardo originals. If this interpretation is correct, some of Leonardo’s paintings entered the French royal collection by 1518. Even if acquired later, the paintings that Francis I owned included the *Mona Lisa*, *The Virgin of the Rocks* (first version), a *Leda Standing* (lost) and the *St John in the Desert* (later repainted as a *Bacchus*).

Chronologically, the next major documentary reference concerning the early whereabouts of Leonardo’s paintings is that by Cassiano dal Pozzo, secretary to Cardinal Francesco Barberini. In his travel diary of a trip to France in 1625, Cassiano claims to have seen five paintings considered to be by Leonardo in Fontainebleau. They can be identified as the *Mona Lisa*, *The Virgin of the Rocks* (first version), a *Leda Standing* (lost), the *St John in the Desert* (*Bacchus*) and *The Rape of Proserpine* (lost). Of these, the *Mona Lisa* and *The Virgin of the Rocks* have retained their status as fully autograph. To Cassiano’s account can be added the inventory of paintings in the Cabinet du Roi compiled by the painter Charles Le Brun in 1683, which lists no fewer than ten paintings as Leonardo originals: the *Mona Lisa*; *The Virgin of the Rocks* (first version); *The Virgin and Child with St Anne*; the *St John the Baptist*; *La Belle Ferronnière*; the *Bacchus* (formerly the *St John in the Desert*); *The Virgin and Child with St Elizabeth, St Michael and the little St John* (also known as *The Virgin with Scales*); a *Portrait of a Woman in Profile*; a *St Catherine between Two Angels* and a tondo showing a *Madonna and Child with other figures*. Only the first five have retained their Leonardo attributions.
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12. The price paid was of ‘2604 livres 4 sols 4 deniers tournois’; see Jestaz, 1999, p. 69.
15. Cassiano’s travel diary is in Rome, Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Codex Barberinus Latinus 5688. For his references to Leonardo’s paintings, see Barone, 2013, esp. pp. 8–9.
16. For the inventory, see Charles Le Brun: *L’inventaire Le Brun de 1683: La collection des tableaux de Louis XIV*, ed. A.B. de Lavergnée, Paris 1987; and Barone 2013, pp. 10–12. The five Leonardo paintings are in Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. 779, 777, 775, 776, 778. The other paintings are also in Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. 780, 785, 786, except for the *St Catherine between Two Angels*, which is in Compiègne, Musée du Châteaux, inv. 783. The tondo is untraced.
Nevertheless, the references by Cassiano and Le Brun combined indicate that at least twelve paintings regarded at the time as Leonardo originals had entered the French royal collection by the 1680s.\(^{17}\)

By contrast, the path of Leonardo’s manuscripts was rather different. Directly inherited by Francesco Melzi in 1519, as we have seen, the manuscripts were taken back to Italy and treasured in Melzi’s residences in Milan and Vaprio d’Adda. Around 1570, they passed into the hands of Francesco Melzi’s son and heir, Orazio, and through his tutor, Lelio Gavardi, they became the subject of several attempted and actual sales. New owners included brothers of the Milanese architect Giovanni Ambrogio Mazenta (1565–1635), Guido, Giovanni and Alessandro; the Milanese sculptor Pompeo Leoni (1533–1608); his sons Leon Battista and Michelangelo, and subsequently Leoni’s daughter, Vittoria, and her husband Polidoro Calchi. It was through Pompeo Leoni, sculptor to King Philip II of Spain, that most of Leonardo’s manuscripts were transferred to Madrid; at least two volumes were acquired by Juan de Spina, and later entered the Spanish royal library (MSS Madrid I and II). The majority, however, made their way back to Italy. Several were sold by Polidoro Calchi, in 1622, to the Milanese collector Gaelazzo Arconati (1592–1648), who donated them in 1637 to the Biblioteca Ambrosiana. They are currently known as MSS A, B, E, F, G, H, I, L, M, the Codex Atlanticus and Codex Trivulzius.

In 1796, all the Ambrosiana manuscripts were transferred to Paris under Napoleon, with the exception of the Codex Trivulzius, which had earlier been exchanged with a manuscript now known as MS D, and is currently in the Biblioteca Trivulziana in the Castello Sforzesco, Milan. The Codex Atlanticus was returned to the Ambrosiana, but the other manuscripts remained in Paris in the Bibliothèque de l’Institut de France. Additional Leonardo manuscripts passed into other hands, including the manuscript given by Guido Mazenta to Cardinal Federico Borromeo and donated by him, in 1609, to the Biblioteca Ambrosiana; this manuscript is now referred to as MS C. Similarly, the manuscript that belonged to Orazio Archinto and is currently called MS K passed to the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in 1647. These three manuscripts likewise went to Paris in 1796 and are now in the Institut de France.\(^{18}\) Other manuscripts remain
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\(^{18}\) For the manuscripts, see in particular A. Corbeau: Les manuscrits de Léonard de Vinci: Examen critique et historique de leurs éléments externes, Paris 1968; and more recently C. Bambach:
lost, such as that referred to as the ‘Trattato dei mulini’ (‘Treatise on Watermills’), which had been owned by the painter Giovanni Ambrogio Figino, and later seems to have been acquired by British Consul to Venice, Joseph Smith (c. 1682–1770).

Thus the dispersal of Leonardo’s manuscripts began around the 1570s with Francesco Melzi’s son, Orazio, while that of the various paintings that Leonardo had kept himself seems to have begun with Salaì, either around 1518 or 1525. If the movement of the manuscripts encompassed various collections in Italy and Spain in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and was extended to France only at the end of the eighteenth century, Leonardo’s main portable paintings had reached French soil by 1683. The divergence between the routes taken by his paintings and his manuscripts accounted for an early disjunction in the reception of his visual and written works. This separation was to have far-reaching implications for the ways in which his paintings, drawings and manuscripts became known, collected and perceived, not least in Britain.

II. The British context: paintings, drawings and visual imagery

The dearth of major paintings by Leonardo in early British collections is reasonably well known. Although a considerable number of pictures by the most celebrated old masters began to enter British collections in the seventeenth century, none of the four main collectors at the time – Charles I (1600–1649); Thomas Howard, 14th Earl of Arundel (1586–1646); George Villiers, 1st Duke of Buckingham (1592–1628); and James Hamilton, 1st Duke of Hamilton (1606–1649) – held individually as distinguished a group of Leonardo originals as that in the French royal collection.

In the particular case of Charles I, we know from the Commonwealth Sale inventory of 1649 that there were four paintings considered to be by Leonardo. But only one of them is now indisputably attributed to Leonardo, the St John the Baptist. Recorded in Charles I’s collection in 1639, the painting seems to have been obtained from an exchange with Roger du Plessis de Liancourt for a Titian and a Holbein, which can be seen as an indication of its high status in the Stuart court of Charles I and his wife Henrietta Maria. However, it was sold at the Commonwealth Sale, entering the French collection of Everard Jabach and later, in 1662, joining
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19 See G.P. Lomazzo: Scritti sulle arti, ed. R.P. Ciardi, Florence 1973–74, II, p. 564. For this manuscript, see the chapter by Juliana Barone in this volume.
the French royal collection. Another painting listed as a Leonardo in the Commonwealth Sale inventory of 1649 is the now famous Salvator Mundi, following its blockbuster auction at Sotheby’s on 16 November 2017, but its attribution remains controversial. As for the two remaining paintings listed in 1649, there is consensus today that they were made by followers of Leonardo. One can be identified with Giovanni Antonio Boltraffio’s portrait of Girolamo Casio (Chatsworth, Devonshire collection), and the other might be Bernardino Luini’s Boy with a Puzzle (private collection).

It is from around the last decades of the eighteenth century that we witness an increasing interest by British artists and collectors in going to see paintings by or related to Leonardo in private and public collections in Britain and Europe. For instance, the Irish painter and Royal Academician James Barry (1741–1806) not only saw Leonardo’s Last Supper but also encouraged Grand Tour travellers and aspiring artists to visit less traditional sites of interest like Milan in order to view the mural. Again, the Scottish painter and art dealer Gavin Hamilton acquired in Milan, in 1785, The Virgin of the Rocks (second version). The painting is documented in the same year in England, where it entered the collection of William Henry Petty, 2nd Earl of Shelburne and 1st Marquess of Lansdowne. The painting was later purchased by John Howard, 15th Earl of Suffolk, and subsequently displayed in no fewer than three public exhibitions (1818, 1851, 1858).
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22 For a discussion of the Leonardo and Leonardesque paintings in seventeenth-century England, see the chapter by Margaret Dalivalle in this volume. For the paintings thought to be by Leonardo that were displayed in Arundel’s house, see in particular M.F.S. Hervey: The Life, Correspondence and Collections of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, Cambridge 1921, p. 483.

before entering the National Gallery in 1880. Further examples of the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century British acquisition of paintings associated with Leonardo include one of the two prime versions of *The Madonna of the Yarnwinder*, which joined the Lansdowne collection in 1809; it is now in a private collection in New York. Interestingly, the other prime version of this painting also reached Britain’s shores. Now known as *The Buccleuch Madonna* and still in family ownership in Scotland at Drumlanrig Castle, the painting was acquired in Paris in 1756, apparently on behalf of George Montagu, 4th Earl of Cardigan.

Further examples of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century British acquisitions of works by, or related to, Leonardo gravitate around Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723–1792) and Sir Thomas Lawrence (1769–1830). It was during Reynolds’s presidency that the *St Anne* cartoon (‘Burlington House Cartoon’) entered the Royal Academy, where it was first recorded in 1779. In addition, Reynolds not only bought a copy of the *Mona Lisa*, considered to be the original and initially in the possession of Francis Osborne, 5th Duke of Leeds, but also put it on public display in an exhibition in 1791. Also as part of his private collection, Reynolds had at least three Leonardo drawings that are still regarded as autograph. Lawrence, in turn, is known to have had no fewer than twenty-one drawings that remain attributed to Leonardo, as well as a series of cartoons of the heads of the Apostles for *The Last Supper* considered during his day to be originals. Moreover, it was under his presidency that a full-scale copy of *The Last Supper* was acquired by the Royal Academy in 1821. This important purchase clearly testifies to the ascent in the reception of Leonardo’s pictorial work in a broader institutional setting. However, it should be noted that the rise in the appreciation of paintings by Leonardo and his followers does not seem to have passed unchallenged. For instance,
we learn from the 1874 English biography of Leonardo by Mrs Charles W. Heaton that: ‘it has been found impossible to obtain a photograph of Marco Oggione’s celebrated copy of the Last Supper’, because it was ‘kept rolled up and stowed away somewhere at the Royal Academy’. Nevertheless, the appreciation of Leonardo’s art certainly gained force from the 1850s, when the National Gallery fostered under its first director, Sir Charles Eastlake, a new acquisitions policy of buying works not only by esteemed masters but also by their pupils, followers and contemporaries, thereby opening a new front for the reception of Lombard art and Leonardesque painters, as well as setting in motion new ideas regarding their display.

When we look more closely at the British acquisition of Leonardo drawings, it is important to draw attention to the fact that their collecting was already substantial in the seventeenth century and not restricted to royal collectors or prominent aristocrats. Roger North describes the drawings collections both of Lord Arundel and of the art dealer Nicholas Lanier (1588–1666) as the first in England. In the particular case of Leonardos, we know that Arundel owned not only the album of drawings that is now in the Royal Collection, Windsor, but also the comprehensive compilation of scientific studies currently known as Codex Arundel in the British Library, London. Arundel seems to have owned further works by Leonardo, some of which are now at Chatsworth House, Derbyshire, presumably entering that collection with William Cavendish (1672–1729), 2nd Duke of Devonshire. As for the art dealer Lanier, even if he does not appear to have kept any drawings by Leonardo in his own collection, he may have mediated their acquisitions by others. Moreover, other seventeenth-century dealers, such as Peter Lely (1618–1680), treasured them in their collections. Among Lely’s Leonardo drawings, two are now in the Fitzwilliam Museum, one in the British Museum, and possibly two others in the collection of the Dukes of Devonshire.
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29 M.M. Heaton: Leonardo da Vinci and his works, consisting of a life of Leonardo da Vinci by Mrs. Charles W. Heaton, an essay on his scientific and literary works by Charles Christopher Black, and an account of his most important paintings, London 1874, p. vii. I would like to thank Martin Kemp for this reference.

30 For the acquisition of Leonardesque pictures by the National Gallery, see the chapter by Susanna Avery-Quash and Silvia Davoli in this volume.


32 The album of drawings in the Royal Collection will be referred to here as the ‘Leonardo-Leoni’ album. Both this album and the Codex Arundel are discussed below.

33 For the Leonardo drawings now at Chatsworth, see Kemp and Barone, 2010, nos. 41–72, pp. 95–106 (with bibliography).

34 For these drawings, see Kemp and Barone, 2010, no. 1, p. 43; no. 2, p. 44; no. 20, p. 65;
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With respect to the shaping and transmission of the visual imagery of Leonardo’s work, we should acknowledge the role of the Bohemian artist Wenceslaus Hollar (1607–1677). While in the service of Arundel, Hollar made numerous copies of Leonardo’s drawings. Consisting mainly of copies of head types, especially ‘grotesque heads’ (teste bizarre), but also including beautiful heads and anatomical studies, Hollar’s copies served as models for several groups of etchings published in his lifetime. Those of the ‘grotesque heads’ were additionally used as the basis for various eighteenth-century publications, and became well-known both in England and on the European continent.\(^{35}\) As a major vehicle for the dissemination of a certain type of visual message of Leonardo’s works, Hollar’s copies also had a long-lasting impact on a different, but related matter – that of attribution. Drawings with head types similar to those in Hollar’s visual repertoire tended to be regarded as Leonardo originals, in spite of the lack of what we now consider a crucial connoisseurial element, that is, indications of left-hand draughtsmanship.\(^{36}\) As for the question as to whether Leonardo was known as a left-handed artist, we can say that his use of the ‘mano mancina’ had been acknowledged in print since Vasari’s Vita of 1568, a text which in addition to circulation in the original also became known in Britain through Aglionby’s translation of 1685.

The movement of Leonardo drawings across British collections increased significantly during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Several private collectors joined the scene, among whom the following are especially worthy of note: Jonathan Richardson the Elder (1677–1745),


III. The British context: manuscripts, treatises and editions

Leonardo’s manuscripts were little known before the end of the nineteenth century, when they were first reproduced in printed editions. Their contents range from discussions on painting, architecture and engineering to mechanics, anatomy, geometry, optics, astronomy, geology and botany. A number of reasons may have accounted for their late publication; the peculiarity of the way in which Leonardo registered his thoughts is one. He adopted a ‘mirror’ script, from right to left, as is natural for left-handers but which poses obvious barriers to legibility. He also worked on the pages adopting a right-to-left pattern, that is, from the ‘end’ to the beginning of his notebooks, in reverse of common practice. In addition, Leonardo constantly revisited his thoughts. It is not uncommon to find many versions of the same passage in different manuscripts, as well as a single page containing thoughts on various subjects. Insofar as his manuscripts are wonderful testimonies to the richness and fluidity of his thinking process, they are not finished treatises in our sense. Moreover, some had their pages arranged by followers or later collectors, according to their own principles and priorities. The most striking case of re-assemblage of Leonardo’s studies is that by Pompeo Leoni, who compiled and bound two new volumes: the Codex Atlanticus (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana)
and the ‘Leonardo-Leoni’ album (Windsor, Royal Collection). The other manuscript that resulted from a later gathering, even if its compiler is unlikely to have been Leoni, is the Codex Arundel (London, British Library).

In spite of the challenges inherent in Leonardo’s idiosyncratic writings, a number were used as quarries for early compilations and transcriptions. In the sixteenth century, Francesco Melzi composed a treatise on painting – the *Libro di pittura* – by selecting and faithfully copying texts and drawings from eighteen of Leonardo’s manuscripts. This compilation has been regarded as Leonardo’s treatise on painting, but as such remained relatively unknown until 1817. What was known and considered to be Leonardo’s treatise, from the late sixteenth century to the early nineteenth century, was an abridged text of the *Libro di pittura*. This abridged version enjoyed considerable circulation through manuscript copies from the late sixteenth to around the middle of the seventeenth century in Italy, and to some extent in France. In the eighteenth century, some were collected by British artists and diplomatic envoys. Other attempts at thematic compilations of Leonardo’s writings date back to the third and fourth decades of the seventeenth century. Under Cassiano dal Pozzo in Rome and Galeazzo Arconati in Milan, transcriptions were made of Leonardo’s texts relating to painting and also to scientific subjects. They formed an important part of a publication project which, although not fully realised in Italy, provided the basis for the editiones principes of Leonardo’s treatise on painting in Paris in 1651 – the *Traité de la peinture* and the *Trattato della pittura*. By contrast, the first English edition, entitled the *Treatise of Painting*, appeared only in 1721. Accompanied by an anonymous ‘Preface’ and a ‘Life’, this edition was reprinted in 1796. A new English edition, by John Francis Rigaud, appeared in 1802. It was called the *Treatise on Painting* and included a biography by John Sidney Hawkins.
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40 For a listing of the manuscript copies, see K.T. Steinitz: *Leonardo da Vinci’s ‘Trattato della pittura’: A Bibliography of the Printed Editions, 1651–1956*, Copenhagen 1958; for an updated listing, see Farago et al., 2018, pp. li–liii. For British collectors, see the chapter by Juliana Barone in this volume.

41 See Leonardo da Vinci: *A Treatise of Painting*, by Leonardo da Vinci. Translated from the original Italian, and adorned with a great number of cuts. To which is prefixed, the author’s Life; Done from the last edition of the French, ed. J. Senex and W. Taylor, London 1721; and Leonardo da Vinci: *A Treatise on Painting*, by Leonardo da Vinci. Faithfully translated from the original Italian, and now digested under proper heads, by John Francis Rigaud, Esq., to which is prefixed a new Life of the author, drawn up from authentic material till now inaccessible, by John Sidney Hawkins., ed. J.F. Rigaud, London 1802. For the 1721 and 1802 editions, see the chapters by Juliana Barone
With respect to the early collection of Leonardo’s manuscripts, the key figure that emerges in the British context is the aforementioned Lord Arundel. There is written evidence that Arundel attempted to acquire the Codex Atlanticus from Galeazzo Arconati in 1630, presumably claiming that it was intended for the King of England. Although the transaction failed, Arundel did manage to collect other materials. We know that visitors to Arundel’s London residence saw a book of drawings that can be identified with the ‘Leonardo-Leoni’ album now in Windsor. Arundel also acquired the manuscript now known as the Codex Arundel. It was donated by his grandson, Henry Howard, to the Royal Society in 1666–67, sold to the British Museum in 1831 and is currently housed in the British Library.

Arundel was not alone in his interest in Leonardo’s manuscripts. During their visit to Madrid in 1623, the Prince of Wales and the Duke of Buckingham enjoyed direct access to some of Leonardo’s works and were most impressed with what they saw. What is not clear, however, is whether


43 ‘... et ci trattene anche un pezzo il Conte te con mostrarei [sic] alcune sue belle cose, et in parti[solare] tre libri grossi come Calepini, uno tutto di disegni origina[l]e di Michelangelo, l’altro di Rafaelo, et l’altro di Leonardo da Vinci, oltre piu di duecento simili libri pieni di vari disegni esquisitissimi ...’. There has been some debate about the sender and the date of the letter. The traditional assumption is that it was sent on 6 January 1636 by the papal agent in London, Gregorio Panzani, to Cardinal Francesco Barberini in Rome. For the letter, which is in Rome, Città del Vaticano Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Codex Barberinus 8636, ff. 43–44, see D. Howarth, ‘Lord Arundel as an Entrepreneur of the Arts’, Burlington Magazine CXXII (1980), pp. 690–92; D. Howarth: Lord Arundel and his Circle, New Haven-London 1985, pp. 114, 116, 239 note 15. The identity of the letter’s sender was later corrected to George Conn, which makes it likely that the visit took place in 1637. See J.G. van Gelder and I. Jost, Jan de Bisschop and his Icones and Paradigmata, Doornspijk 1985, p. 198, n. 16.
they made any acquisitions. Some ten years later, a note from a Milanese editor working on the transcription of Leonardo’s manuscripts informs us that two of his treatises, one on anatomy and the other on colour, were in the ‘hands of the King of England’. The treatise on anatomy is linked in subject-matter to material contained in the ‘Leonardo-Leoni’ album, but there were other anatomical books composed by Leonardo that have not reached us. Similarly, the treatise on colour is currently lost. Whether the British owner of both treatises was indeed the King of England remains disputed. Given that Arundel had employed the strategy of evoking the King’s name when attempting to acquire the Codex Atlanticus, he may well have used a similar approach in related negotiations.

Other Leonardo manuscripts made their way to British collections at different times and by different means. They include the Codex Leicester, bought around 1716 by Thomas Coke (1697–1759), 1st Earl of Leicester, and currently in the private collection of Bill and Melinda Gates; and the Forster Codices (Forster I, II, III) supposedly acquired by Edward Bulwer-Lytton, sold to John Forster (1812–1876) and donated to the Victoria and Albert Museum in 1876. In addition, Lord Ashburnham had portions of MSS A and B (Ashburnham 2184 and 2185), which he had purchased from Guglielmo Libri, who, in the early 1840s, had illicitly extracted material from their parent manuscripts in Paris. When in England, they were assiduously studied by Jean-Paul Richter for his English edition of Leonardo’s notebooks (1883). Ashburnham’s manuscripts were returned to Paris by his heirs in 1890. Additional signs of British interest in Leonardo’s writings can be found in a letter of 1776 by the Neoclassical history painter Gavin Hamilton (who was to acquire The Virgin of the Rocks in 1785), where he mentions that he had seen a ‘curious manuscript of Leonardo da Vinci’ in the collection of the ‘Abbate Corazza’ in Naples. The manuscript, however, did not reach British collections, and is here identified with the Codex Corazza in the Biblioteca Nazionale in Naples. Last but not least,
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45 The provenance of the Forster Codices is under study by Antonio Becchi.

Leonardo’s treatise on watermills seems to have belonged to British Consul Joseph Smith, whose library was acquired by George III in 1762, though the manuscript is yet to surface.47 Together with the collecting of Leonardo’s manuscripts, evidence of the British attention to his written legacy can be seen in transcriptions and publications that extend beyond the first English editions of the treatise of painting in 1721 and 1802. In the early eighteenth century, Thomas Coke not only bought the manuscript now known as Codex Leicester, but also had it transcribed.48 The rendering of Leonardo’s text into ‘normal’ script, from left to right, clearly reveals Coke’s interest in grasping its scientific content. Also dating to the early decades of the eighteenth century are two publications, by Edward Cooper and by John Bowles, of a selection of texts and drawings relating to the movements of the human body from the Leonardesque Codex Huygens. The Codex was at the time considered to be by Leonardo, but is now recognised as the work of Carlo Urbino.49 Also, towards the end of the eighteenth century, the anatomist William Hunter (1718–1783), fellow of the Royal Society and Professor of Anatomy at the Royal Academy, is known to have envisaged a publication of Leonardo’s anatomical drawings. Although not executed in Hunter’s lifetime, etchings from the ‘Leonardo-Leoni’ album seem to have been produced under the initiative of the Royal Collection’s librarian, Richard Dalton (now untraced),50 with related etchings appearing in John Chamberlaine’s *Imitation of Original Designs by Leonardo da Vinci*, published in London in 1796.

The first publication addressing the scientific content of Leonardo’s manuscripts appeared in France, authored by Giovanni Battista Venturi, in 1797.51 It was also in France that Leonardo’s manuscripts were first...
published. All twelve manuscripts now held at the Institut de France were reproduced by Charles Ravaisson-Mollien in facsimile, accompanied both by a transcription of Leonardo’s Italian text and a French translation (1881–91). In Britain, by contrast, Jean-Paul Richter produced the first English edition of selected passages from Leonardo’s manuscripts, newly arranged in thematic sections and accompanied by related drawings (1883). Italian initiatives, in turn, led to the publication of facsimile editions with diplomatic and critical transcriptions, starting with that of the Codex Atlanticus (1894–1904), and followed by others that included the Codex Arundel (1923–28) and Codices Forster (1930–35). In spite of the differences in methodology, these pioneering editions can be seen as complementary and to have laid the main foundations for the study of Leonardo’s writings.

IV. INDIRECT KNOWLEDGE AND WRITTEN MEDIATIONS

The early separation of Leonardo’s paintings from his manuscripts, followed by their dispersal throughout various collections on the European Continent and in Britain, accounted for the formation of fragmentary views of his legacy. In the British context in particular, due to limited direct access to his works, indirect knowledge acquired through written mediations – especially art treatises and biographies – played a considerable role in the construction of Leonardo’s reception.

The initial cluster of translated writings on the arts into English facilitated access to some of the most fundamental texts published in Italy and in France. They included translations from the following authors: Lomazzo (1598), Chambray (1664), Alberti (1664), Chambray (1668), Vasari (1685), Testelin (1688), Dufresnoy (1695), Le Brun (1701), de Piles (1706) and de Piles (1711). Interesting, however, is the absence of Leonardo. John Evelyn (1620–1706) would have been a suitable candidate for translating either Leonardo’s Traité or the Trattato. Not only did he translate Alberti’s treatise on sculpture (1664) and Chambray’s treatises on architecture (1664) and painting (1668), but he also had direct access to some of Leonardo’s paintings and manuscripts as a result of his travels on the Continent and through Lord Arundel’s guidance and Arundel’s collection.52 However, Evelyn never embarked on such a project. While

52 See in particular T. Howard, Earl of Arundel: Arundel’s remembrances. Remembrances of things worth seeing in Italy given to John Evelyn 25 April 1646 by Thomas Howard, 14th Earl of Arundel, ed. J.M. Robinson, London 1987; and footnotes 22 and 42, above. The fact that Evelyn did not translate Leonardo’s treatise on painting has been perceptively seen as a
Leonardo’s text became pivotal to seventeenth-century French academic debates on the principles of the art of painting, it failed to achieve a similar impact on British art theory. A collector of Leonardo drawings, Jonathan Richardson the Elder, while praising Leonardo for his rendering of expression in his *Theory of Painting* (1715), considered Raphael to be the modern Apelles. Reynolds, who as we have already noted, possessed a number of Leonardo drawings and a copy of the *Treatise*, made only a few references to Leonardo. In his second *Discourse* (1769), Reynolds’s mention of Leonardo’s ideas on invention, as triggered by accidental stains on walls or images formed in the fire, was most likely derived from de Piles’s commentaries. And, although this aspect of Leonardo’s art theory resonated in certain British texts, such as those by Alexander Cozens (1717–1786), it was Michelangelo whom Reynolds held in the greatest esteem.

Where we witness for the first time in published form open recognition of Leonardo’s ideas is in the circle of the essayist Joseph Addison (1672–1719). More specifically, it was in *The Spectator* issue of 5 December of 1712 that Leonardo was praised for the power of his mind and the breadth of his knowledge, ranging from painting, sculpture and architecture to anatomy, mathematics and mechanics. *The Spectator* text has been perceptively linked to the anonymous ‘Preface’ published in the 1721 English edition of Leonardo’s *Treatise of Painting*. Neither publication, however, seems to have accounted for the insertion of the *Treatise* in mainstream British art


56 For Cozens, see the chapter by Francesco Galluzzi in this volume.

theory and aesthetic thought, as their orientation was more in tune with the experimental philosophy associated with the Royal Society.\textsuperscript{58}

Biographical accounts translated into, or composed in, English became other conduits of information on Leonardo’s works, although attitudes both reflecting and leading towards a wider British appreciation of his legacy began to emerge more powerfully around the turn of the eighteenth century. The earliest publication in English of a Leonardo ‘Life’ was the translation of Vasari’s text by William Aglionby in 1685. However, it was published together with other biographies in a volume in which Leonardo’s name did not appear on the title page, while those of Raphael and Michelangelo did.\textsuperscript{59} It is in the anonymous ‘Life’ that accompanies the 1721 Treatise edition that a more sustained British interest in Leonardo’s legacy first appears. Notably, the biographer made use of, in addition to Vasari, at least two other sources: the 1651 biography by Raphael Trichet du Fresne and that of 1716 by Pierre-François Giffart.\textsuperscript{60} Moreover, the biographer favoured certain pieces of information, especially regarding Leonardo’s rendering of expression and anatomy, in order to highlight the breadth of his achievements in both art and science. Nevertheless, the 1721 ‘Life’ fails to offer any information on Leonardo’s paintings, drawings and manuscripts in British collections.\textsuperscript{61}

The first British biographer to undertake a comprehensive account of Leonardo’s life and works was Hawkins in 1802. His ‘Life’ was drawn from a range of sources, a crucial reference for information on Leonardo’s scientific work being Venturi’s essay of 1797. In addition, Hawkins included not only detailed references to earlier editions of Leonardo’s treatise on painting, as well as to two manuscript copies that were then in Britain, but also to paintings, drawings and sculptures considered to be by Leonardo in British collections.\textsuperscript{62} Hawkins mentions Hollar’s engravings after Leonardo’s works in the Arundel collection and the British publications by Cooper, Dalton and Chamberlaine relating to Leonardo’s studies of human motion and anatomy. He also refers to the St Anne cartoon in the Royal Academy and to a painting of ‘A Christ with a Globe in his hand’ that

\textsuperscript{58} For the lack of resonance in British art theory, see the chapter by Harry Mount; for the Royal Society, see the chapter by Domenico Laurenza, both in this volume.

\textsuperscript{59} Aglionby’s 1685 title page reads: ‘... from Cimabue, to the Time of Raphael and Michelangelo ...’.


\textsuperscript{61} For the 1721 ‘Life’, see the chapter by Juliana Barone in this volume.

\textsuperscript{62} One of the manuscript copies is acknowledged by Hawkins as with ‘Mr Edward of Pall Mall’ and the other as having belonged to ‘P. Orlandi’. For the manuscript copies, see the chapter by Juliana Barone in this volume. For Hawkins, see ‘Life’, 1802, pp. xiii–xcv, lxii–lxxv.
Hollar had engraved and which was in the possession of a contemporary, ‘Richard Troward, Esq. of Pall Mall’.\footnote{See Hawkins, ‘Life,’ 1802, pp. lxxxi, xciii.} He acknowledges, too, James Barry for having supplied him with direct information on *The Last Supper*, not simply stating that ‘the true value of this picture could be seen’, but also enumerating no fewer than thirteen of its copies.\footnote{See Hawkins, ‘Life’, 1802, p. xxxii.} To this account we can add that, following a temporary loan to Magdalen College, Oxford, the Royal Academy copy of *The Last Supper* is now back in its London site, proudly displayed in their new gallery of treasures.

V. Structure of this volume

Containing a number of contributions, this volume has been organized thematically in three main sections. The first centres on British collections of Leonardo’s drawings and paintings. It offers new information concerning the reconstruction of the provenance of certain key works and considers their significance for the formation of private and public collections. It also addresses the question as to what was considered to be an original work by Leonardo, encompassing related discussions on the roles of versions and copies as well as of access and display.

In the first chapter, special attention is given to the Royal Collection and the ‘Leonardo-Leoni’ album, which was most likely in Britain by 1626, and in Arundel’s collection by 1629. The precise date it reached British soil and the identity of its first British owner remain fascinating and open questions, which centre around not only Arundel, but also George Villiers, William Cecil and their immediate circle. Also under discussion is the long-standing issue of when the album entered the Royal Collection (Martin Clayton).\footnote{In addition to Clayton’s comprehensive study offered in this volume, Margaret Dalivalle has recently found evidence of the presence of the album in the collection of Charles II at Whitehall in the 1680s; this will be published in a forthcoming article.} A different case is examined in the second chapter, which concerns the eighteenth-century collection of General John Guise. Bequeathed to Christ Church, Oxford, in 1765, Guise’s drawings can be shown to have been purchased both in London and on the European continent, and at different times. His choices seem to have been predominantly based on visual records offered via prints, as well as on knowledge of historical texts. Many of the attributions, however, have now been rejected (Jacqueline Thalmann). Discussed in the following chapter, the British Museum Leonardos were acquired considerably later, the first acquisitions dating to
1824, and they took place at times by sheer chance or thanks to the tactical shrewdness of its curators. Some had been owned by Richardson the Elder, Reynolds or Lawrence, others had less illustrious historical status. Not unexpectedly, however, over-optimistic attributions can be seen even in the case of drawings that had passed through prestigious collections (Sarah Vowles and Hugo Chapman).

Three major works are addressed in individual chapters: the St Anne cartoon, formerly in the Royal Academy and now in the National Gallery (Carmen Bambach), the version of The Virgin of the Rocks in the National Gallery (Caroline Campbell and Larry Keith), and the copy of The Last Supper in the Royal Academy (Pietro C. Marani). As crucial references for our gauging of the appraisal of Leonardo’s artistic works in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, these works are newly addressed here not only in terms of their historical provenance and status as original, version and copy, but also with respect to dating, function, workshop methods, display, restoration and conservation initiatives. Both the St Anne cartoon and the copy of The Last Supper are additionally discussed in this volume in the context of the reception of Leonardo’s art and theory in the Royal Academy (Charles Saumarez Smith).

This section concludes with two chapters that look more specifically at the formation of the British image and changing reception of Leonardo’s paintings. One focuses on seventeenth-century Britain. It explores the important issue of the transmission of visual knowledge via textual sources, and also offers a list of references to paintings considered to be by, or related to, Leonardo in early British inventories (Margaret Dalivalle). The other chapter examines the nineteenth-century construction of the National Gallery’s collection and the curatorial choices of its first director, Sir Charles Eastlake, towards the acquisition of Lombard school paintings. Eastlake’s choices and criteria for eligibility were seminal in shaping the British reception of Leonardo’s followers, as well as for assessing Leonardo’s own visual works within a broader historical context (Susanna Avery-Quash and Silvia Davoli).

The second section of this volume is devoted primarily to the reception of Leonardo’s scientific studies and theoretical works. It opens with a discussion of the state of scientific culture in seventeenth-century Britain, especially in relation to astronomy and anatomy, based on a poem by John Donne (J.V. Field). The subsequent contribution considers the Codices Leicester and Arundel, as well as the Leonardesque Codex Huygens, which are newly set in the context of the emergent Royal Society and the interests of Newtonian scientists and collectors (Domenico Laurenza). Attention then turns to Leonardo’s treatise on painting. Its publication in English in 1721 is initially examined in relation to what is perceived as a lack of – and reason for – its direct impact on eighteenth-century British art
theory. The view expressed in the 1721 anonymous ‘Preface’ to the *Treatise* is understood in relation to the involvement of its editor, John Senex, with the world of natural philosophy advocated by the Royal Society, and at odds with all three main art theoretical and aesthetical models proposed by Jonathan Richardson the Elder, the 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury and Joseph Addison (Harry Mount). The study of Leonardo’s English *Treatise* is then addressed in two contributions, one focusing on the 1721 *editio princeps* and the other on the 1802 edition. Text and illustrations of the 1721 edition are analysed in relation to earlier versions (1651 and 1716), in order to determine their sources and to explore the written and visual messages conveyed to British readers. This study is complemented by an examination of key manuscript copies of, or related to, Leonardo’s treatise on painting owned by British artists, diplomatic envoys and antiquarians (Juliana Barone). A telling counterpart to the 1721 initiative is that of 1802, which is discussed in terms of the reasons behind the radical re-organization of its contents, and links with accepted categories in British and Continental art theory (Janis Bell).

Responses to Leonardo’s artistic and theoretical work in and around the Royal Academy in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries are addressed in the final two chapters of this section. One discusses the complex reception of Leonardo’s legacy under two of the Academy’s most illustrious presidents, Reynolds and Lawrence. Although during their presidencies two major works of art by, or associated with, Leonardo were bought – the *St Anne* cartoon and the painted copy of *The Last Supper* – the appreciation of Leonardo’s art gained momentum only from around the time of the acquisition of the latter (Charles Saumarez Smith). The other chapter looks at the reception of Leonardo’s art theory in Alexander Cozens’s artistic practice and theoretical ideas on landscape painting, especially in Cozens’s *New Method* of 1785 and ‘blot’ technique. Cozens’s responses are further examined with respect to William Beckford’s pre-Romantic writings and art collection (Francesco Galluzzi).

In the final section of this volume, the study of the historical reception of Leonardo in Britain is complemented by four chapters that delve into some of the most crucial contributions to Leonardo scholarship produced in the British context from around the mid-nineteenth to the twentieth century. These address the several ‘Leonardos’ that have emerged from the writings of Water Pater (1839–1894), Jean-Paul Richter (1847–1937), Edward MacCurdy (1871–1957), Kenneth Clark (1903–1983) and John Shearman (1931–2003). The insightful analyses by Ernst Gombrich on Leonardo’s water studies and compositional methods have been recently discussed elsewhere by Martin Kemp, and homage is paid to the latter’s own groundbreaking work on Leonardo in a forthcoming
Of the various re-readings of Leonardo, Pater’s is examined in relation to his first Leonardo essay (1869) and its changing emphasis in the context of the various editions of his book entitled, from its second edition onwards, *The Renaissance* (1873, 1877, 1888, 1893) (Lene Østermark-Johansen). Although both admired and criticized by Bernard Berenson amongst others, Pater’s Leonardo and his powerful description of the *Mona Lisa* were evoked not only by contemporaries such as Oscar Wilde, but also, later, by other scholars, from Kenneth Clark to Martin Kemp.

The subsequent re-readings of Leonardo by Richter, MacCurdy, Clark and Shearman are mainly discussed from a methodological perspective. The first to publish Leonardo’s manuscripts in English (1883), Richter’s approach to Leonardo’s writings is understood as being indebted to Giovanni Morelli’s earlier studies on comparative anatomy and their application to art historical studies. Richter was regarded as a pioneer following his direct and comparative analysis of the various versions of Leonardo’s texts across different manuscripts, which led him newly to arrange them thematically and chronologically. Richter’s work proved hugely influential, not least in relation to both MacCurdy’s thematic compilation of Leonardo’s writings and Carlo Pedretti’s fundamental studies on the manuscripts and their dating (Claire Farago). On the other hand, Clark’s Leonardo (1939, 1940, 1952, 1957, 1988, 1989) can be understood in the light of his ‘methodological eclecticism’, in which the works of both Bernard Berenson and Aby Warburg played significant roles. His scrutiny of the Windsor drawings, as well as his new visual comparisons and thematic juxtapositions, fostered fresh insights into dating and encouraged a holistic understanding of Leonardo’s work, though falling short in relation to Leonardo’s scientific writings (Francesca Fiorani). By contrast, Shearman’s interest in Leonardo is newly discussed by means of a comparative analysis between his unpublished dissertation (1957) and his seminal article on Leonardo (1962), which reveals much of Shearman’s methodology with respect not only to his assessment of Leonardo’s use of colour, but also to what he sees as a wider pictorial development from ‘absolute colour’ to the achievement of ‘tonal unity’. In spite of his teleological approach, Shearman’s Leonardo unveils a crucial aspect of the artist’s legacy (Alessandro Nova).

The contributions in this volume on the British reception of Leonardo are underpinned by sustained and new historical study of both his visual and written works, as a means to address his modes of expression and
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his thinking on the arts and science, as well as to provide elements of comparison for the plurality of responses that they have engendered. It is hoped that this volume will not only lead to further research on Leonardo’s work and legacy, their artistic and scientific interfaces, but also stimulate further discussions on cultural interchanges and, more broadly, on the ways in which knowledge has been transmitted and transformed.

Juliana Barone