Recent and forthcoming events

The Annual General Meeting and Annual Lecture 2016

Professor Andrew Gregory (University College, London), will offer the Annual Lecture on Friday, 13 May at 6 pm. The lecture, entitled, ‘Art and Anatomy in the 15th & 16th Centuries’ will be at the Kenneth Clark Lecture Theatre of the Courtauld Institute of Art (Somerset House, The Strand). Before the lecture, at 5:30 pm, the annual general meeting will address matters arising with the Society.

Professor Gregory provides the following abstract for his talk: Developments in art in the 15th and 16th centuries brought with them a new interest in proportion, perspective and the accurate depiction of the human body. How did this affect the science of anatomy? This talk discusses the work of Leonardo da Vinci, Vesalius and Fabricius and looks at how the nature of the new art inspired and shaped a new wave of research into the structure of the human body and how such knowledge was transmitted in visual form. This ultimately led to a revolution in our understanding of anatomy in the late 16th and early 17th centuries.

Lectures and Conference Proceedings

Leonardo in Britain: Collections and Reception

Date: 25-27 May 2016
Organisers: Juliana Barone (Birkbeck, London) and Susanna Avery-Quash (National Gallery)

With a focus on the reception of Leonardo in Britain, this conference will explore the important role and impact of Leonardo’s paintings and drawings in key British private and public collections; and also look at the broader British context of the reception of his art and science by addressing selected manuscripts and the first English editions of his Treatise on Painting, as well as historiographical approaches to Leonardo. The conference was initially conceived as a collaborative project between the late Romano Nanni, former director of the Biblioteca Leonardiana, and Juliana Barone at Birkbeck College, University of London, and has developed into a wider collaboration with the National Gallery, the Warburg Institute, and the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence. This event has received support from the Paul Mellon Centre for British Art, the British Museum and the Leonardo da Vinci Society in London.
The conference will begin with a keynote lecture given by Professor Martin Kemp at Birkbeck on the evening of 25 May. It will continue over the following two days at the National Gallery and the Warburg Institute.

Programme (provisional)

Day 1:

25 May 2016, Birkbeck College, London

Keynote lecture

4.45pm Registration
5.15pm Welcome and introduction: Juliana Barone (Birkbeck College) and Susanna Avery-Quash (National Gallery)
    Chair: Kate Retford (Birkbeck College)
5.30pm Martin Kemp (Oxford University) – ‘Spinning a yarn or two: Leonardo’s two matching Madonnas’
6.30pm Q&A and drinks

Day 2:

26 May 2016, National Gallery

London Collections

10am Registration
10.30am Welcome and introduction: Juliana Barone (Birkbeck College) and Susanna Avery-Quash (National Gallery)
10.45am Panel 1: Drawings collections
    Chair: Francis Ames-Lewis (Birkbeck College)
    Martin Clayton (Royal Collection Trust, Windsor) – ‘The ‘Windsor’ Leonards after Arundel’
11.15am Jacqueline Thalmann (Christ Church Picture Gallery, Oxford) – ‘Leonardo in the collection of General John Guise (1682-1765)’
11.45am Hugo Chapman and Sarah Vowles (British Museum, London) – ‘Leonardo drawings in Bloomsbury and beyond’
12.15pm Discussion and Q&A
12.45pm Lunch (not provided)
1.45pm Panel 2: Originals, versions, and copies
    Chair: Gabriele Finaldi (National Gallery)
    Carmen Bambach (The Metropolitan Museum, New York) – ‘The St Anne Burlington cartoon: function, provenance and dating’
2.15pm Caroline Campbell and Larry Keith (National Gallery) – ‘Some observations on the provenance and conservation history of the London Virgin of the Rocks’
2.45pm Pietro Marani (Università Cattolica, Politecnico, Milan) – ‘Clarifications and novelties on the issue of the copy of the Last Supper at the Royal Academy and its reception in England in the first half of the 19th century’
3.15pm Discussion and Q&A
3.45pm Refreshment break

4.15pm Panel 3: What was thought to be a Leonardo?
Chair: Juliana Barone (Birkbeck College)
Margaret Dalivalle (Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Oxford University) – ‘Said to be of Leonard de Vinci: Or out of his Scoule: Appraising Leonardo in 17th-century England’

4.45pm Susanna Avery-Quash (National Gallery) – ‘Sir Charles Eastlake at the National Gallery (1843-1865): towards a clearer picture of Leonardo as an artist’

5.15pm Discussion and Q&A

Day 3:

27 May 2016, The Warburg Institute, London

Reception

10am Registration

10.10am Welcome and introduction:
Juliana Barone (Birkbeck College) and
Susanna Avery-Quash (National Gallery)

10.15am Panel 1: Leonardo on art and science
Chair: Matthew Landrus (Oxford University)
J.V. Field (Birkbeck College) – ‘Leonardo’s after-life in the world of new philosophy’

10.45am Domenico Laurenza (Museo Galileo, Florence) – ‘Leonardo’s science in 17th-18th-century England’

11.15am Discussion and Q&A

11.30am Refreshment break

12pm Panel 2: Around the Treatise on Painting
Chair: Susanna Avery-Quash (National Gallery)
Juliana Barone (Birkbeck College) – ‘The Treatise on Painting: British collectors’ manuscript copies and the first English printed edition’

12.30pm Harry Mount (Oxford Brookes, Oxford) – ‘Leonardo’s Treatise and the empirical undertow in British art theory’

1pm Discussion and Q&A

1.15pm Lunch (provided)

2.15pm Panel 3: Teaching and theoretical knowledge
Chair: Paul Taylor (Warburg Institute)
Charles Saumarez Smith (Royal Academy, London) – ‘Leonardo’s legacy in London: The teaching programme at the Royal Academy’

2.45pm Francesco Galluzzi (Accademia Belle Arti, Carrara) – ‘Alexander Cozens, Leonardo da Vinci and landscape painting in England between the 18th and 19th century’

3.15pm Discussion and Q&A

3.30pm Refreshment break

4pm Panel 4: Re-reading Leonardo
Chair: Martin Kemp (Oxford University)
Francesca Fiorani (University of Virginia, Virginia) – ‘Kenneth Clark’s Leonardo’

4.30pm Alessandro Nova (Kunsthistorisches Institut, Florence) – ‘John Shearman’s Leonardo’

5pm Claire Farago (University of Colorado at Boulder, Colorado) – ‘Re-reading Richter and MacCurdy: lessons in translation’

5.30pm Discussion and Q&A, concluding remarks
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Renaissance Society of America
Berlin, 26-28 March 2015

The Renaissance Society of America Annual Meeting in Berlin was an impressive event, involving 3070 participants in 2324 panels. Attendees chose from among 166 panels per time period, and could thereby develop a highly selective programme for the three days, though of course all of those panels were of some interest to a Renaissance scholar. This is the nature of the expanding RSA, which arranged 1938 panels at the 2012 meeting in Washington, D.C., whereas there were 413 panels at the 2004 RSA meeting in New York City. The 2016 RSA meeting in Boston will mark the 45th year of annual meetings, the past ten of which have seen a 563% increase in the number of panels. It would seem that a fourth day at the meeting is now required, so that attendees are less likely to miss a large number of impressive presentations that are concurrent with presentations they must also attend.

As a record of Leonardo-related talks at the RSA, here below is a list of most, if not all of them. This was the second RSA meeting at which Leonardo Studies organised three panels. As noted in the May 2014 Society Newsletter, Leonardo Studies arranged panels for the San Diego RSA meeting in 2013, in honour of Carlo Pedretti. Some of those papers will now join a selection of essays that are in Illuminating Leonardo, the inaugural volume of the Leonardo Studies series. This first issue, a Festschrift honouring Carlo Pedretti, was published by Brill in January 2016: www.brill.com/products/series/leonardo-studies. See pages 20-21 of the present Newsletter. Volume two of Leonardo Studies will focus primarily on architecture and on nature. Editors of this series welcome contributions to this second volume. If you should like to contribute an essay that addresses architecture and Leonardo or the topic of nature, please contact Dr Constance Moffatt (Pierce College), aritalia@ca.rr.com, and Dr Sara Tagliialagamba (Ecole pratique des hautes etudes, Sorbonne), saraart77@yahoo.it. The editors welcome collaborative projects and cross-disciplinary studies. On a related topic, Drs Moffatt and Tagliialagamba organised the following panels at the 2015 RSA meeting:

**Leonardo Studies I: Architecture**
Chair: Sabine Frommel (École Pratique des Hautes Études, Sorbonne)

- Damiano Iacobone, (Politecnico di Milano): To Live in a House Designed by Leonardo da Vinci
- Sara Tagliialagamba, (Ecole pratique des hautes etudes): Leonardo’s ‘edifci d’acqua’
- Francesco Paolo Di Teodoro, (Politecnico di Torino): Leonardo Architect?
- Constance Joan Moffatt, (Pierce College): Leonardo’s Modularity

**Leonardo Studies II: Leonardo by Design**
Chair: Damiano Iacobone (Politecnico di Milano)

- Marie Frank (University of Massachusetts Lowell): Leonardo’s Legacy in Early Twentieth-Century American Design Theory
- Diane Ghirardo (University of Southern California): Idea and Authorship in Renaissance Architecture
- Catherine H. Lusheck (University of San Francisco): Leonardo’s Afterlife in Rubens’s Studies of Nature

**Leonardo Studies III: Science**
Chair: Constance Joan Moffatt (Pierce College)

- Paolo Cavagnero, (Independent Scholar): The Weight of Water
- Andrea Bernardoni (Museo Galileo): La ‘rota che si muove di moto circonvolubile ventilante’
- Michael Simonson (Ecole pratique des hautes études)
etudes): Leonardo and the Landscape of Hunting in the Early Sixteenth Century

**Additional Leonardo-related papers in other sessions:**

- Rosanna di Battista (Università IUAV di Venezia): Leonardo da Vinci’s Paintings for the Confraternity of the Immaculate Conception in Milan
- Charles H. Carman (SUNY, University at Buffalo): Landino, Ficino, and Leonardo: How to Paint the Mind
- Fabiana Cazzola (Freie Universität Berlin): Evidence-Lines as Imaging Method in Leonardo da Vinci’s Drawings
- Emanuela Ferretti (Università degli Studi di Firenze): Vasari, the Sala Grande of Palazzo Vecchio, and Leonardo’s Decorative Project
- Michael Willem Kwakkelstein (Dutch University Institute for Art History in Florence and Utrecht University): The Role of Life Drawing in Leonardo da Vinci’s Milanese ‘Workshop’
- Chen Liu (Tsinghua University): Leonardo Unveiled by Chinese Writers: The Reception of Renaissance Art in Twentieth-Century China
- Anna Pegoretti (University of Warwick): Leonardo and Dante
- Matthias Wivel (National Gallery): The Seen and the Not Seen: Leonardo and Titian ex Milano
- Kasia Wozniak (Independent Scholar): La Bella Principessa: Alterations of Perception

More information on the RSA meetings here: http://www.rsa.org/?page=Pastmeetings

---

**LV Lettura Vinciana**

**Biblioteca Leonardiana, Vinci, 11 April 2015**

On 11 April, Andrea Bernardoni offered the 55th Lettura Vinciana, in Vinci, on ‘Del colpo cagion del foco’ (Codex Atlanticus, f. 973v). Un dialogo tra filosofia naturale ed arti meccaniche nei manoscritti di Leonardo’, (A dialogue between natural philosophy and mechanical arts in the manuscripts of Leonardo.)

**Andrea Bernardoni writes:** In Leonardo’s natural philosophy, percussion is the final effect of force, the cause of mechanical changes in bodies. Instead, of the four natural elements, fire is the one that has the power to transform ‘quasi tutti i corpi di suo essere in un altro’ (‘almost all bodies from their own nature into another’, Codex Atlanticus f. 1033r). Leonardo offers various examples of the causal link between these two ‘potenze di natura’ (‘powers of nature’) that put the physics and chemistry of the four elements on the same plane. Hammer blows on an anvil bring about an imbalance in the structure of the material being percussed, producing heat to the point at which a match can be lit. In the heart, blood beats against the walls of the ventricles, heating up to the point of transforming everything into fire if, that is, fresh air from the lungs were not to intervene to maintain the thermal balance (RL 19081r). In metallurgical blast furnaces the smelting of metals depends on the ‘moti trivellanti’ (‘drilling motions’) of fire and the speed of their impact with the metal (Codex Atlanticus f. 87r, Codex Arundel P 29r: f. 149v). Tracing a path through themes in natural philosophy intertwined with technical processes, an attempt will be made to shed light on Leonardo’s physics and technology of fire. He first began to engage with such issues while training in Verrocchio’s workshop in Florence. In his time in Milan, especially during the 1490s, he conducted important experiments in internal ballistics, trying to understand the physical and chemical dynamics of the explosion, and took an interest in foundry work in order to grasp artillery production techniques and to develop the method for casting the monument to Francesco Sforza, on which he was then working. Between 1502 and 1508, in the mature phase of his studies of the four elements, Leonardo even reached the point of trying to rethink the notion of the element, attempting to move beyond the merely qualitative dimension of the Aristotelian tradition and conceiving of the element as having physical properties, measurable, at least in principle, in terms of weight.

Pietro C. Marani writes:
The international symposium, sponsored by the ‘Politecnico di Milano’ in collaboration with the ‘Centro Beni Culturali di Ateneo’ and the ‘Ente Raccolta Vinciana’, took place in conjunction with the exhibition, ‘Leonardo da Vinci 1452-1519. The Design of the World’ – a leading cultural event of EXPO 2015. The initiative brought together some of the most renowned international scholars in the field of Leonardo studies; it addressed methodological issues of how Leonardo saw and understood nature and how this is reflected in his artistic practice. Leonardo famously translated his observation of natural phenomena into his graphical process. He reinterpreted the act of drawing and painting as an act of scientific inquiry of the world around him. The conference covered a wide set of theoretical and technical issues concerning the analogical approach and the comparative method which – in Leonardo’s view – linked together seemingly diverse fields of knowledge. The symposium was open to the public and was aimed to attract an audience from academia, museums, and other cultural institutions. They were all offered a unique opportunity to be apprised of the state of research of Leonardo studies from the leading experts, while at the same time the works of the master were assembled at the Palazzo Reale in the most comprehensive exhibition ever dedicated to him in Italy.

Wednesday 13 May
9.30 - Saluti: Giovanni Azone (Rettore del Politecnico di Milano); Luisa Collina (Responsabile per i rapporti con EXPO 2015); Arturo Dell’Acqua Bellavitis (Preside della Scuola del Design); Silvia Piardi (Direttore del Dipartimento del Design); Lucia Toniolo (Presidente del Centro Beni Culturali di Ateneo)

10.00 - Pietro C. Marani (Politecnico di Milano, Ente Raccolta Vinciana), Presentazione del convegno

First session - L’unità del sapere. Metodi di indagine fra arte e scienza.
10.30 - Martin Kemp (Oxford University, Emeritus Professor), Leonardo and the History of the Earth: from Fossils to the Mona Lisa
11.30 - Alessandro Nova (Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz - Max-Planck-Institut), Valore e limiti del metodo analogico in Leonardo
12.00 - Frank Fehrenbach (Universität Hamburg), The Dark Eye

Second session - Il disegno come strumento d’indagine e costruzione dell’immagine dipinta.
14.30 - Carmen C. Bambach (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York), An Unexpected Source for Leonardo’s Biography
15.00 - Marzia Faietti (Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe degli Uffizi, Firenze), Naturalismo e astrazione nel disegno a Firenze prima di Leonardo
15.30 - Bruno Mottin (Centre de Recherche et de Restauration des Musées de France, Musée du Louvre, Parigi), Approche du dessin sous-jacent de Léonard de Vinci
16.30 - Antonio Natali (Galleria degli Uffizi, Firenze), La guerra, il tempio, il virgulto: una trama per l’Adorazione dei Magi
17.00 - Marco Ciatti (Opificio delle Pietre Dure, Firenze), Restaurare Leonardo: complessità di un progetto fra scienza e mito
17.15 - Cecilia Frosinini, Roberto Bellucci, Patrizia Rittano (Opificio delle Pietre Dure, Firenze), L’Adorazione dei Magi di Leonardo da Vinci: la costruzione dell’immagine e dello spazio

Thursday 14 May

Third session - La pittura come scienza: pratica e teoria.
9.00 - Larry Keith (The National Gallery, Londra), The National Gallery Virgin of the Rocks revisited
9.30 - Vincent Delieuvin (Département des Peintures, Musée du Louvre, ed Elisabeth Ravaud, C2RMF, Parigi), Pentimenti o ritocchi: un’opera finita o incompiuta? Sul restauro de La Belle Ferronnière
10.00 - Pinin Brambilla Barcilon (Milano), Recenti indagini sul Cenacolo
11.00 - Claudio Salsi, Francesca Rossi, Francesca Tasso (Musei Civici del Castello Sforzesco,
Fourth session - I metodi dell’indagine scientifica.

14.30 - Martin Clayton (The Prints and Drawings Room, The Royal Library, Windsor Castle), Leonardo’s Anatomical Drawings and his Artistic Practice

15.00 - Maria Teresa Fiorio (Ente Raccolta Vinciana, Milano), Dalla pratica alla teoria: la rappresentazione della natura

15.30 - Andrea Bernardoni (Museo Galileo - Istituto e Museo di Storia della Scienza, Firenze), Leonardo e lo studio dei quattro elementi: la fisica del fuoco e le sue applicazioni tecnologiche

16.00 - Rodolfo Maffei (Andrew W. Mellon Fellow, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York), Il cielo di Leonardo e uno zodíaco daneseco

Leonardesque News

Exhibitions: The Mind of Leonardo - Drawings by Leonardo from the Codex Atlanticus 23 & 24 Biblioteca Ambrosiana and the Bramante Sacristy of the Santa Maria delle Grazie

10 March – 12 July, 14 July – 31 October 2015

In the sixth year of research and exhibitions on the recently unbound Codex Atlanticus, the Biblioteca Ambrosiana’s twenty-third exhibition of the series took place in the Ambrosiana and in the Bramante Sacristy at the Santa Maria delle Grazie. Twenty-two drawings by Leonardo were in each venue. These drawings, as well as forty-four drawings for the twenty-fourth exhibition later in the year are in a single catalogue: The Mind of Leonardo by Pietro C. Marani. This assessment of the impressive range of Leonardo’s intellectual interests contributes to research in the entire series of catalogues, which have been edited by Professor Marani, prefaced by Monsignor Franco Buzzi (Prefect of the Biblioteca Ambrosiana), and written by fifteen Codex Atlanticus specialists. Here below are the catalogues of the series, Drawings by Leonardo from the Codex Atlanticus, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, published in Novara by DeAgostini:

1) Pietro C. Marani, Fortezze, bastioni e cannoni; Fortresses, bastions, and cannons, 2009
2) Edoardo Villata, La Biblioteca, il tempo e gli amici di Leonardo; Leonardo’s Library, times and friends, 2009
3) Paola Cordera, L’architettura, le feste e gli apparati; Architecture, festivities, and ephemeral displays, 2010
4) Marco Versiero, Leonardo, la politica e le allegorie; Leonardo, politics and allegories, 2010
5) M. Landrus, Le armi e le macchine da guerra, il De re militari di Leonardo; Weapons and machines of war: Leonardo’s De re militar, 2010
6) Pietro C. Marani e Paola Cordera, Macchine per l’architettura e il territorio, 2010, (out of print)
7) Pietro C. Marani e Furio Rinaldi, Leonardo e la sua bottega: disegni di figura e di animali, 2011, (out of print)
10) Maria Teresa Fiorio, Botanica, intrecci e decorazioni, 2011
11) Edoardo Villata, Il volo degli uccelli e il volo meccanico, 2012
12) Rita Capurro, Leonardo scienziato della Terra, 2012
13) Mauro Pavesi, Anatomia dell’uomo e anatomia della Terra, 2012
14) Marco Versiero, I diluvi e le profezie, 2012
Exhibition: Leonardo da Vinci, 1452-1519: il disegno del mondo

Milan, Palazzo Reale, 16 April – 19 July 2015

Marco Versiero writes: In 2009, Massimo Vitta Zelman, the president of Skira ‘Grandi Mostre’ editions, together with the Comune of Milan, conceived an ambitious plan for an exhibition devoted to the figure and myth of Leonardo, to coincide with Expo Milano 2015. The immense task of organizing this prestigious event was assigned to two Leonardo scholars living in Milan, whose combined knowledge of Leonardo was unquestioned: Prof. Pietro C. Marani (Politecnico of Milan) and Dr. Maria Teresa Fiorio (University of Milan), respectively the president and vice-president of Ente Raccolta Vinciana, the Milanese academic institution founded in 1905, with its seat at the tower of the Sforza Castle. For more than five years, they worked tirelessly to bring to fulfilment the dream of representing the breadth of Leonardo’s intellectual interests, through his drawings and artworks, to chime with the aspirations of the Expo Fair. This concept replaced an initial idea of contextualizing Leonardo’s pictorial activity in Milan, a goal already achieved by the National Gallery in London with ‘Leonardo, Painter at the Court of Milan’ (2011-2012). The almost concurrent exhibition at the Louvre in Paris, following the restoration of The Virgin and Child with Saint Anne (2012), persuaded Marani and Fiorio to choose a more conceptual and multidisciplinary approach. They identified a series of significant and pivotal themes to exemplify Leonardo’s complexity.

The curators took advantage of their relationships with colleagues from museums, galleries and libraries all over the world to create an exhibition that has exceeded their original expectations. Day by day their team of scholars brought about a successful compromise with the actual loans allowed by the financial budget. As Massimo Vitta Zelman pointed out at the press conference to launch the exhibition, the organisers had received no support from local or national government. The enormous investment of about 4.5 million euro was furnished almost entirely by the Skira group, with minor backing from SNAM enterprises and Bank of America Merrill Lynch (an indication of the parlous state of Italian cultural politics). Three collections have been the primary partners: the Royal Collection, Windsor generously offered 30 important drawings; the Louvre loaned three paintings and a group of drawings; the Ambrosiana loaned the Portrait of a Musician and some 40 sheets from the Codex Atlanticus. Other contributions came from the Uffizi, including a body of drawings from the first Florentine period. The Accademia, Venice lent the Vitruvian Man (exhibited away from its home for the first time), together with other famous drawings. The British Library provided some double-sheets from the Codex Arundel (though fewer than initially expected). Single drawings came also from the Pierpont Morgan Library and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the British
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The range of the exhibition is well described by its subtitle – ‘il disegno del mondo’ – chosen to underline the all-encompassing nature of Leonardo’s pursuit of knowledge, his deep investigation of life’s secrets and their visual representation. During the press conference, Pietro Marani brilliantly reminded us that the word disegno can be translated as ‘design’ rather than simply ‘drawing’. It can be taken as referring to Leonardo’s unique graphic facility in observing and assimilating reality and presenting his visual understanding in a precise aesthetic recreation. Leonardo’s whole naturalistic conception, his personal interpretation of nature in all its complexities and correspondences, resulted in a unique organic and metamorphic vision. It was as if the natural world could be perceived as one gigantic living organism. This is reflected in the organisation of the more than 200 items on display. They are allocated in twelve thematic sections that take us on a guided tour through Leonardo’s mind and career, not only as an artist, but also as a thinker, scientist and technician.

I - DRAWING AS THE CORNERSTONE

This introductory section stresses the importance of Leonardo’s rigorous and meticulous drawing practice, a lifelong dedication that began with his apprenticeship in Verrocchio’s Florentine workshop from 1464. The influence of his talented master’s teachings is one of the main characteristics of the exhibition. Among the elements of this training were: developing geometric skill in reproducing three-dimensional objects; the depiction of monochrome draperies using brush on linen; the invention of fabulous female heads with elaborate hairdos and headdresses. All Verrocchio’s circle would have practised these techniques; the artworks exhibited here show the subtlety of Leonardo’s approach to them. The so-called mazzocchi (bizarre geometric bodies, based on typical Florentine male headgear) are represented here not only by later sheets from the Codex Atlanticus (cat. I.2, I.3), compared to a faint prototype by Paolo Uccello from the Uffizi (cat. I.1), but also by two drawings from the Codex Atlanticus, from the early 1480s. These give us a clear idea of Leonardo’s virtuoso application of this geometric practice. The perspective studies on f. 520 r (cat. I.4) show an extraordinary metamorphosis of a mazzocchio in a sort of corkscrew body, developing in curvilinear shapes and sinuosity. Unlike anything in nature or human construction, it is a creation of pure intellectual abstraction, albeit derived from empirical observation. Leonardo proudly declares himself a ‘disciple of experience’ in the adjacent annotation. There is also a tiny representation of a man sighting an armillary sphere through a perspectograph on f. 5 r (cat. I.5) which could be considered a kind of self-portrait. Elsewhere, Leonardo records a precise optical procedure that reveals his deep interest in the scientific attempt to manage and control the rules of perspective. Two outstanding drapery studies from London and Paris (cat. I.11, I.12) and a female head from the Uffizi (cat. I.17), though conceived as independent highly finished works of art, establish an ideal correspondence with two intriguing and much debated paintings. Their attribution to the young Leonardo under Verrocchio’s influence is made more convincing by direct comparison with Lorenzo di Credi’s relatively less accomplished Virgin and Child from London (cat. I.8). The drapery studies are done in a subtle combination of different media, including ink worked with brush and white heightening on linen, and metalpoint over prepared paper, with colour washes for the female head. The Madonna and Child with a Pomegranate from the National Gallery of Art, Washington (cat. I.7), and Leonardo’s Annunciation from the Louvre (cat. I.18), both dating from Leonardo’s time with Verrocchio, show a departure from Lorenzo’s conventional manner. The small panel from Washington (not much bigger than a miniature) reveals the utmost delicacy in the shadows in the features of the Virgin’s head, in the suggestion of her emotion and in the atmospheric treatment of the hair. These characteristics may presuppose an acquaintance with Venetian paintings from Bellini’s circle, made possible by Verrocchio’s trip to Venice in 1469. Leonardo’s vision of the landscape is a delightful adumbration of his later aerial perspective. Similarly, the Louvre panel, from the predella of the Madonna di Piazza (c. 1478-80), by Verrocchio and Lorenzo di Credi, expresses a stylistic maturity in the evocation of the crepuscular atmosphere, the sentimental description of the figures and the shaping of the draperies that shows its closeness to Leonardo’s artistic identity.
II - NATURE, SCIENCE AND PAINTING focuses on Leonardo’s inimitable talent for understanding the scientific structure of natural forms and representing them. He compiles an inventory of models and prototypes from the empirical observation of rocks, waters, plants, animals. This careful attention to the natural world distinguishes him from other contemporary artists. In Verrocchio’s Tobias and the Angel from the National Gallery, London (cat. II.9), some scholars see the hand of the young Leonardo, specifically in the small dog and perhaps in the fish. The dog’s fur is evidently overpainted with white brush on the pre-existing landscape, with the fluent locks and curls so typical of Leonardo. The dead fish is defined with a meticulous accuracy, not seen in the work of other members of the Verrocchio workshop, as witness the relative superficiality of the landscape in this panel. These interventions are eloquent evidence of Leonardo’s supremacy in assimilating and transfiguring nature according to his unique personal vision. Some of his drawings, including the superb lily from Windsor (cat. II.5), the bear from New York (cat. II.6) and the crabs from Köln (cat. II.7) demonstrate, in a variety of graphic techniques (respectively: stylus reworked with pen and ink, brush and watercolour, on paper pricked for transfer; metalpoint on brownish pink prepared paper; pen and ink), his ability to capture the inner life of organisms by his observation of their external appearance. Two fine landscapes, one - the earliest of Leonardo’s drawings - from the Uffizi (cat. II.8) and one from Windsor (cat. II.3) show his ability to conceive imaginary visions of nature, by assembling realistic elements in a unified ensemble.

III - THE DIALOGUE OF THE ARTS offers an opportunity to compare two masterpieces painted by Leonardo with examples of Verrocchio’s sculpture, attesting to the persistence of his master’s influence. By incorporating sculptural values in the pictorial representation, he seems intent on resolving the theoretical (and ideological) paragone among the arts. The bust of an old man from the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (cat. III.2) can be admired for the very first time here next to the unfinished Saint Jerome from the Pinacoteca Vaticana (cat. III.4), now dated to the beginnings of Leonardo’s Milanese period (c. 1482-83). The comparison confirms how Verrocchio’s physiognomic types and anatomical accuracy could materialize in a painting possibly derived from a plastic model. The exhibition enables us to reflect on the dialogue between the marble Lady with Primroses (cat. III.5) and the newly restored Belle Ferronnière (cat. III.6). The latter has been brought back to its original brilliance (by recovering, for instance, the marvellous optical and chromatic effect of the pale reddish light reflected on the shaded cheek). The lateral viewpoint makes evident the similar construction of the figures in space. The sense of a three-dimensional figure is achieved by Leonardo through the captivating diagonal gaze of the lady, which takes the viewer’s eye and forces it around the painting, as if it were a sculpture.

IV - THE DIALOGUE WITH ANTIQUITY is divided into seven related topics. It starts with classical profiles: with the sculpted copies from Verrocchio’s lost bronze reliefs of Darius and Alexander the Great placed side by side (cat. IV.1.1-IV.1.3) and compared with Leonardo’s later profile of a man in a laurel wreath from Turin (cat. IV.1.4). Nonetheless, the impossibility of obtaining the early drawing from the British Museum – the silverpoint Profile of a warrior wearing an elaborate helmet and cuirass, c. 1480, that is similar to these four exhibited examples – makes the confrontation between all of them less meaningful. The following room illustrates four themes, focusing on Leonardo’s passionate study of horses for two sculptures (the Sforza horse and the Trivulzio monument) and for his painting of equestrian combat (the Battle of Anghiari). Leonardo’s powerful drawings from Windsor and Turin, in metalpoint and white chalk over blue-prepared paper (cat. IV.2.3, IV.2.4, IV.3.9, IV.3.10, IV.3.11), are displayed alongside antique and contemporary bronzes, drawings and engravings. Of particular interest is the renewed attribution to Leonardo of two small bronzes, the more famous one from Budapest (cat. IV.4.5) and the less well-known one from a private collection in Palermo (cat. IV.4.9). Direct comparison of these establishes the superior quality of the latter, for which Leonardo himself may have undertaken not just the wax modelling but also the casting. The lack of subtlety in the surface definition of the Budapest piece (for which Leonardo perhaps produced only the wax) emphasizes the greater accuracy in the rendering of the anatomy and movement in the other piece, directly attributed to
Leonardo in collaboration with Giovan Francesco Rustici around 1508-11. For the Battle of Anghiari, a charcoal study of a rearing horse from the Codex Atlanticus (cat. IV.5.4) can be compared with pen-and-ink sketches from Venice (cat. IV.5.5). They provide visual demonstrations of Leonardo’s skill in transforming a classical iconography (in this case, the cameo of the Fall of Phaeton from the Medici collection, cat. IV.5.1). In the drama and dynamism of the human and animal bodies, we may gain a more faithful impression of Leonardo’s original composition than from, say, the Tavola Doria (cat. IV.5.7) and the extensively retouched Oxford fragment of a full-scale cartoon, supposedly after Leonardo’s lost one (cat. IV.5.6). Two other rooms complete the display of Leonardo’s relationship with the antique. They include: drawings for the head and headdress of Leda from Windsor (cat. IV.6.3) and Milan (cat. IV.6.6), this latter here re-attributed to him after its latest restoration; a little known Greek female torso from Padua (cat. IV.6.1) which makes clearer the classical derivation of the naked and twisting body of Leda, as witness the best of the surviving copies, from Florence (cat. IV.6.4). The dynamic Neptune from Windsor (cat. IV.7.2) and the powerful Hercules from Turin (cat. IV.7.1), which conclude this section, highlight Leonardo’s profound awareness of the importance of ancient models in the early sixteenth century, in overt challenge to the young Michelangelo.

V - ANATOMY, PHYSIOGNOMY AND MOVEMENTS OF THE MIND starts with a selection of Leonardo’s sketches on the theme of the Benois Madonna (cat. V.4) and the Madonna and Child with a Cat, from Venice (cat. V.1) and London (cat. V.2, V.3), c. 1478-81. These can be compared with the later study for a first idea of the Saint Anne composition, from Venice (cat. V.5), c. 1501. In the following room, Leonardo’s Musician (cat. V.7) is in company with the smiling man by Antonello da Messina (cat. V.6) and Giovanni Bellini’s portrait of a laureled poet (cat. V.8). The juxtaposition exemplifies, on the one hand, Leonardo’s indebtedness to the Sicilian painter (whose male portraits were circulating in Milan at the time of Leonardo’s arrival in the town), and on the other, his familiarity with Venetian portraiture, and specifically with Bellini’s works. In place of Leonardo’s Lady with an Ermine, which could not be secured for the exhibition, is the sonnet written by the poet Bellincioni in its celebration (cat. V.11) and the metalpoint study of hands from Windsor (cat. V.12), now dated c. 1486-88 and recognized as a plausible preparatory drawing for the Cracow portrait. The intriguing panel of La Scapiliata from Parma (cat. V.10) and the metalpoint female head from the Louvre (cat. V.9) establish an ideal dialogue with two fine drawings of male heads for the Last Supper, from Windsor (cat. V.14, V.15). Now, for the very first time, we can see the Five grotesque heads (cat. V.16) side by side with the Codex Trivulzianus (c. 1487-90), opened at a page of analogous caricatures. This manuscript was a last-minute inclusion in the exhibition, so it has no catalogue entry. Finally, a group of anatomical drawings from Windsor, Venice, Milan and Turin (cat. V.18, V.19, V.20, V.21) serve to underline the deep grounding in physiological study, which enabled Leonardo to represent so surely the ‘moti mentali’.

VI - INVENTION AND MECHANICS explores Leonardo’s astonishing designs for machines and mechanisms (mainly from the Codex Atlanticus and the Codex Arundel). These are compared and put in the context of earlier and contemporary theoretical sources: the military treatises by Frontinus, Vegetius and Valturio (cat. VI.1, VI.2, VI.3, VI.4), as well as some rare manuscripts by Giovanni Fontana and Bonaccorso Ghiberti (cat. VI.12, VI.5). These are set in order beside Leonardo’s drawings of the so-called ‘carri falcati’ from Turin (cat. VI.14), his ‘carro semovente’ (cat. VI.13) and the fabulous mortars from the Codex Atlanticus (cat. VI.17). Another sheet with a study of winches (cat. VI.8) shows Leonardo applying the same visual investigation that he deployed in his anatomical dissections to take apart the machinery, its gears and moving parts.

VII - DREAM Leonardo was not alone or merely fanciful in envisaging human flight and survival under water. His practical designs for the surface-supplied diver (cat. VII.2, VII.4) and the mechanical wings (cat. VII.7, VII.8, VII.9) are compared with almost contemporary drawings from manuscripts by anonymous Sienese authors (cat. VII.1, VII.6).

VIII - REALITY AND UTOPIA The architectural treatises of Filarete, Alberti and Francesco di Giorgio Martini (cat. VIII.4, VIII.5, VIII.6) are apparent sources of Leonardo’s inspiration as an
urban planner, as witness his maps of Florence and Milan (cat. VIII.8, VIII.9). The utopian concept of the Ideal City by Laurana, from Urbino (cat. VIII.1), is put in dialogue with both Leonardo’s interest in centralized architecture inspired by classical and antique buildings, such as the magnificent Etruscan temple from the Louvre (cat. VIII.10), and his design for a star-shaped fortress from the Codex Atlanticus (cat. VIII.12), which conforms to a sort of heliocentric idea of the settlement of the ruler in the centre of the city-structure.

IX - THE UNITY OF KNOWLEDGE Arguably the most meaningful section of the whole exhibition, this deals with the core subject of the visual and conceptual exchanges operated by Leonardo among the different languages displayed by his mind in observing and interpreting reality. His anatomical drawings from Windsor are compared with the corresponding architectural sheets from the Codex Atlanticus. The human legs are dissected to show their inner structure of bones, nerves and muscles (cat. IX.4), while the fortified towers are cut away to reveal their contents (cat. IX.5). Vertical sections of the human skull, called by Leonardo ‘la cupola del cranio’ (cat. IX.6), are shown beside his design for the dome of Milan cathedral (cat. IX.7), equating the work of the architect to that of the physician. In the notes beside his drawing of whirlpools, a parallel is made with the movement of hair locks (cat. IX.12), the cascade of curls in Saint John the Baptist from the Louvre (cat. IX.14) perfectly exemplifying the statement.

X - HEAVEN AND EARTH This section illustrates Leonardo’s interest in the cosmos. We compare his acknowledged sources on the subject (Aristotle, Ptolemy, Ovid; cat. X.1, X.2, X.3, X.4) with his remarkable but little known drawing of the moon (cat. X.8), together with other studies of the earth and the sun (cat. X.9, X.11). A selection of his Deluges from Windsor and the Codex Atlanticus starts with a drawing in red chalk of a storm over an alpine valley (cat. X.15), a naturalistic view that precedes Leonardo’s scientific study of a particular hydrodynamic effect (cat. X.10). Following this is his exercise with a possible ekphrasis of an antique and mythological iconography (cat. X.17). Both are indispensable preludes to the ultimate vision of the last drawing on display (cat. X.16), whose stylised patterns trace the lines of a vortex, producing a purely intellectual expression, a final personal testament by Leonardo.

XI - LEONARDO’S LEGACY This section is devoted to Leonardo’s impact on his assistants and followers, and to his posthumous theoretical legacy, particularly that represented by the editions of the Libro di Pittura compiled by his pupil Francesco Melzi (‘I leonardeschi: la diffusione dei modelli di Leonardo e del Trattato della Pittura’).

XII - THE MYTH OF LEONARDO The final room addresses the myth of Leonardo, the birth of the legend. It concentrates on a series of curious copies and variations on the iconography of the world’s most famous painting, the Mona Lisa (or La Gioconda), from the 16th to the 19th century.

The exhibition is accompanied by a superb catalogue, edited by Pietro C. Marani and Maria Teresa Fiorio (who both produced also some invaluable introductory texts, concerning, respectively, Leonardo’s dealings with the antique and his engagement with sculpture practice) and published by Skira. Its publication was made possible thanks to the contributions of a group of international scholars: Marzia Faietti (Uffizi) and Carmen C. Bambach (Metropolitan Museum of Art) investigate Leonardo’s Florentine drawing practice; Andrea Bernardoni (Museo Galileo) discusses the technical aspects of Leonardo’s planned equestrian monuments; Martin Clayton (Royal Library, Windsor) examines the physiological foundations of Leonardo’s representation of the ‘moti mentali’; Paolo Galluzzi (Museo Galileo) and Claudio Giorgione (Museo Nazionale della Scienza e della Tecnologia ‘Leonardo da Vinci’, Milan) explore the conceptualisation of his mechanical devices; Edoardo Villata (Università Cattolica, Milan) considers Leonardo’s visionary approach to the projects of flying and walking underwater; Richard Schofield (Università IUAV, Venice) evaluates the conjunction of reality and utopia in the architectural and town-planning studies; Martin Kemp (University of Oxford) traces a conceptual unity in Leonardo’s different languages; Frank Fehrenbach (Harvard University, Cambridge) discusses his study of water movements; Rodolfo Maffeis (Kunsthistorisches Institut, Florence) and Marco Versiero (Scuola Normale Superiore - Istituto Italiano di Scienze Umane, Florence-Naples) detail the scientific approach and the literary inspiration of Leonardo’s late cosmology and
naturalism; Furio Rinaldi (Metropolitan Museum) and Juliana Barone (University of London) consider Leonardo’s pictorial and intellectual legacy; Roberto Paolo Ciardi (Accademia dei Lincei, Rome) offers some interesting examples of Leonardo’s posthumous myth. In compiling the huge corpus of the catalogue entries, these scholars were assisted by other experts and/or curators/keepers from all over the world.

Marignan 1515-2015
Romorantin and Amboise, 23-27 July

The cities of Romorantin and Amboise hosted festivals during July 2015 that commemorated the first military victory of King François I in 1515, and the wedding festivities for thousands of participants that were coordinated by Leonardo da Vinci and Domenico da Cortona in 1518. One festivals took place in Romorantin on 24-25 July, and the other in Amboise on 26-27 July. In September 1515, François I’s troops defeated Venetian and Swiss troops at Marignano, near Milan. For the royal wedding of Madeleine de la Tour d’Auvergne and Lorenzo de’ Medici in Amboise in May 1518, Leonardo created a symbolic re-enactment of the battle of Marignano with cannon that fired blanks at a model castle, made of wood and fabric. The festivals, noted at www.marignan2015.fr, were arranged with the help of Professor Pascal Brioist, of the Centre d’Etudes Supérieures de la Renaissance in Tours.

Leonardo & gli altri/Leonardo in Dialogue. An international conference of the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz – Max-Planck-Institute, organized by Francesca Borgo, Rodolfo Maffeis and Alessandro Nova, Florence, 17-19 September 2015.

Francesca Borgo (Harvard University/KHI) writes:
In 1973, Leo Steinberg opened his book on Leonardo’s Last Supper with two questions: ‘Is there anything left to see? And, is there anything left to say?’ When embarking on a project on Leonardo, the fear of exhausted interpretation, after decades of unrelenting publications, seems to be a common scholarly concern, one that is often found among the first lines of many Leonardo volumes. Daniel Arasse, to quote just one other example, begins his 1997 monograph with an equally daunting note: ‘With the exception of God, Leonardo da Vinci is undoubtedly the most written about of all artists’. Indeed, no other artist from Western culture appears to have received so much systematic and widely disseminated attention. Following Leo Steinberg’s statement forty years ago, an avalanche of literature has been accumulating at an overwhelming speed. Since then, roughly three thousand new publications have appeared, at an average rate of forty monographs per year. To this intimidating bibliographical corpus, one must add the exceptional amount of writing produced by Leonardo himself, adding up to the largest written legacy of any Renaissance artist. The quantity of this material discourages extemporaneous approaches: it promotes specialization, and also, inevitably, inhibits exchange with the outside.

In designing the conference Leonardo & gli altri/Leonardo in Dialogue, Rodolfo Maffeis, Alessandro Nova, and the present writer, aimed at directly engaging with this issue: the exceptionality, not of Leonardo himself, but of this specific field of research. We thought that the rich and challenging nature of Leonardo studies demanded a moment of collective consideration, irrespective of methodological training, and across geographic and institutional boundaries. Drawing from the expertise of specialists in the history and theory of painting, print culture, sculpture and architecture, both North and South of the Alps, the conference sought to provide a look at Leonardo originating from outside the field of Leonardo studies, fostering a dialogue with the broader field of Renaissance art history and theory.

Many leonardisti in the past few years have been productively looking at Leonardo’s contexts. This is the direction in which the contributions offered by the speakers of this conference proceeded, seeking to re-contextualize Leonardo’s artistic oeuvre within the broader culture of his time. In emphasizing Leonardo’s surroundings, these papers did not intend to underplay the extent of his novelty and originality, nor were they aimed at producing mechanical or forensic reconstructions of his ‘contexts’—the factual account of his peregrinations and encounters.
across Italy and France. Rather, the conference sought to take a more direct route into the figural and rhetorical structures of the works themselves, hoping that the reconstruction of Leonardo’s period eye will contribute to a better understanding of the art of his time. By forcing Leonardo’s cumbersome figure into a comparative perspective, the conference intended to resist the reductive approach that centres exclusively on his authorial presence. Because this is more easily done in studies of Leonardo’s reception, his followers or afterlives were not our primary concern. On the contrary, while focusing on Leonardo, we sought to develop more general hypotheses on his contemporaries; to use Leonardo’s exceptionally large corpus of writing to look at the broader—and often oral—culture of his times.

By inviting scholars who are not, strictly speaking, Leonardo specialists, my co-organizers and I intended to extend our comparative approach beyond our object of study, to the field’s own structure and methodology. Our aim was to counterbalance the distance that traditionally separates the field of Leonardo studies from the many methodological turns that, time and again, have encouraged art historians to rethink the discipline: upheavals that, while sometimes ephemeral, often helped to fundamentally and productively challenge art history’s central notions and assumptions. This dialogue, we believe, has the advantage to better assess and elucidate the field of Leonardo studies through comparison and contrast with other fields; to hone its methodological acuity by exploring the methods of others; to identify questions and issues that resonate beyond its borders; to initiate a theoretical conversation able to both validate and enrich its highly-specialized approach.

The conference opened with a map of Leonardo’s direct and indirect interactions: in Mantua, Parma, Milan, Florence, Rome—with Isabella D’Este, Correggio, Fra’ Bartolomeo, Bramante, Michelangelo and Raphael. This predominantly geographic focus was combined with four panels that looked at Leonardo’s dialogues both thematically (through notions such as nature, the grotesque and the non-finito) and by media (sculpture, architecture). The program included a visit to the Opificio delle Pietre Dure, where Cecilia Frosinini and Roberto Bellucci brought the participants up to date on the last stages of the restoration of Leonardo’s Adoration.

The polyphony of voices, approaches and themes that characterized the event makes a summary of these three days an impossible task: for an overview, I refer the reader to the abstracts provided below. Several of these papers outlined new problems and issues, pointing to some aspects of Leonardo that had so far escaped the attention of other specialists. Other contributions proposed novel approaches to long-standing questions: these new directions of research were developed, for example, by either a shift in perspective (i.e., from Italian to Northern design procedures; from the single commissioner to a network of patrons; from the individual master to the larger workshop practice), by a broadening up of traditional notions (i.e., allegory, or academy), or by a radical rethinking of a few key ideas brought forward by a close re-reading of texts (i.e., the non-finito, the universality of the painter).

We are aware that many other voices could enrich this conversation. As we work towards the publication of the proceedings, and to build on the spirit of openness that characterized this event, I invite the readers of the Leonardo da Vinci Newsletter to contact the organizers of the symposium with proposals and suggestions about artists, contexts and issues that should be brought into the discussion to productively rethink Leonardo’s dialogues.

Contact: borgo@fas.harvard.edu

NORTH ITALIAN COURTS
Chair: Pietro C. Marani (Politecnico di Milano)

Guido Rebecchini (The Courtauld Institute of Art) Leonardo, la corte di Mantova e il ritratto di Isabella d’Este. Indagini su un’opera contesa

Perché e a chi Francesco I Gonzaga abbia ‘donato via’ il ritratto di profilo eseguito da Leonardo per Isabella d’Este già prima del marzo 1501, appena un anno dopo la sua esecuzione, è sempre rimasto un interrogativo insoluto. Purtroppo non è stato finora possibile dare un volo al destinatario del dono su basi documentarie, tuttavia è possibile interrogarsi sulle motivazioni che determinarono la decisione del marchese e cercare di ricontestualizzarle nella logica del momento. Il mio intervento si propone quindi di mettere a fuoco questo
gesto sorprendente nell’economia dei difficili rapporti tra Isabella, Francesco, Leonardo e la Francia a cavallo del secolo. Grazie a una rilettura delle corrispondenze di quei mesi di Isabella, di Francesco, e dei loro ambasciatori, l’intervento ripercorre in dettaglio i delicati rapporti della corte mantovana con quella francese e individua in via d’ipotesi il contesto esatto in cui appare più verisimile che sia stato effettuato il dono.

Maddalena Spagnolo (Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II)

Destini incrociati: Leonardo e Correggio

Questo contributo intende analizzare il dialogo che la ricerca artistica di Antonio Allegri (1489 c. – 1534) instaurò con il magistero di Leonardo in una maniera solo apparentemente affine a quella che caratterizzò il rapporto dei cosiddetti ‘leonardeschi’ con il maestro. Sebbene esplicitamente riconosciuto nella letteratura artistica solo a partire dal Seicento, e più compiutamente nel Settecento, questo dialogo si attuò attraverso molteplici aspetti che vanno da affini inclinazioni stilistiche a simili predilezioni tecniche, fino a condivise scelte iconografiche. Sarà quindi opportuno inquadrarlo non solo alla luce degli interessi di ricerca comuni ai due, o entro la cornice di un’analoga concezione di intendere e di fare l’arte, ma nella trama più ampia e complessa che lega i diversi agenti che operano nel campo artistico – artefici, committenti, pubblico – cercando di cogliere i nessi in cui invenzione e ricezione si valorizzano vicendevolmente.

RECEPTION IN MILAN AND FLORENCE

Chair: Rodolfo Maffeis

Jill Pederson (Arcadia University)

Leonardo, Bramante, and the Academy in Sforza Milan

Scholars of the late Quattrocento often have assumed that Leonardo da Vinci and Donato Bramante knew one another during their mutual years in Milan under Sforza patronage. Yet, while such an acknowledgement has led to a general theorization of their connection—and even sometimes rivalry—isolated approaches to both artists in the scholarship have prevented their relationship from being examined in a more profound way. My paper situates Leonardo and Bramante in the broader context of the humanist and literary circles that helped shape the artistic culture of Ludovico il Moro’s court. By looking at the interaction of both artists, along with other figures in the informal academy known as the Academia Leonardi Vinci, this paper explores the role that this network played in promoting dialogue at the court. It aims to deepen our understanding of the collaborative enterprises taken on by both artists in their drawings, architectural designs, and large-scale wall paintings such as the Uomini d’arme and Sala delle Asse. In doing so, this paper not only helps to remove both Leonardo and Bramante from their scholarly containment, but also considers how their networks played a role in transferring ideas beyond the Milanese court into the next decade during the development of Vasari’s Terza Maniera.

Tommaso Mozzati (Università degli Studi di Perugia/ KHI)

Devozione per Leonardo: Fra’ Bartolomeo e il magistero fiorentino dei Vinci

ad una lezione tanto autorevole, sottolineandone originalità e autonomia; allo stesso tempo riscontrare, nelle sue curiosità, appigli nuovi e termini inediti per la cronologia di Leonardo.

**BETWEEN MICHELANGELO AND RAPHAEL**  
Chair: Alessandro Nova

Joost Keizer (University of Groningen)  
*Leonardo and Michelangelo on Allegory*

How does a picture do referential work? Around 1500, the question provoked both Leonardo and Michelangelo to produce a remarkable set of personifications. Leonardo made drawings loosely connected to the court of Milan; Michelangelo carved his four times of day for the New Sacristy. Leonardo overloaded his personifications with attributes; Michelangelo stripped them. Leonardo converted art into a system of signs; Michelangelo explored an art of embodiment. In my presentation, I will contrast their approaches. But I will also make a broader claim about how a culture of Mimesis around 1500 put pressure on artworks as carriers of allegorical meaning.

Christian Kleinbub (Ohio State University/ Villa I Tatti)  
*Leonardo, Raphael, and the Theory of Painting*

For Giorgio Vasari, Leonardo was not the only artist who attempted to make painting a ‘universal’ medium, depicting everything in the visible world. Indeed, Vasari tacitly designates Raphael as a painter who followed Leonardo in this ambition. In this talk, Vasari’s implicit comparison of the two artists is taken seriously as evidence for the influence of the older artist on the art-theoretical ideas on the younger one. Although Raphael’s thinking about art is only recorded in a few documents, most having been lost, this talk reconstructs aspects of Raphael’s theory of painting in order to show Leonardo as Raphael’s touchstone for much of it.

**THE NON-FINITO AND THE GROTESQUE**  
Chair: Marzia Faietti (Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe degli Uffizi)

Wolf-Dietrich Löhr (Freie Universität Berlin/KHI)  
*‘Morosus’: La disciplina di Leonardo secondo la critica di Giovio*

È ben noto come nella sua *Leonardi Vincii Vita* e nel *Fragmentum trium dialogorum* Paolo Giovio tracciasse un’immagine influente dell’artista, che mette in rilievo sia la sua ambizione intellettuale che le sue attività scientifiche e offre persino la possibilità di una valutazione positiva del non-finito. La profusione e la sveltezza delle indagini di Leonardo non sono solo considerate come il tentativo dell’espansione di una ‘arte limitata’ (*ars angusta*) sul livello tecnico e scientifico, ma anche svelate come difetto della personalità. La critica del Giovio, che mira nella sua terminologia a categorie etiche e giuridiche, apre così una tesa dinamica fra esplorazione e divagazione, fra versatilità e improduttività, controbilanciando, come similmente nella vita di Michelangelo, l’eccellenza artistica con una carenza sociale. Il presente contributo cerca di rintracciare il fondo storiografico e la tipologia biografica dell’argomentazione gioviana e di chiarirne gli stimoli per la seguente letteratura artistica.

Diane Bodart (Columbia University)  
*Il gioco del grottesco: Leonardo e i pittori veneti di primo Cinquecento*

Tracce del soggiorno di Leonardo a Venezia sono state individuate dalla critica nell’apparizione intorno al 1505-1510 di profile grotteschi in alcuni dipinti riconducibili a Giorgione e Tiziano, quali il cosiddetto *Ritratto di Girolamo Marcello* proveniente dalla collezione di Giovanni Antonio Venier e il *Cristo portacroce* della chiesa di San Rocco. Tali opere suggeriscono la circolazione a Venezia di modelli leonardeschi con composizioni di teste grottesche, simili al celebre foglio con *Cinque teste grottesche* di Windsor Castle. Il presente contributo si propone di analizzare la ricezione delle teste grottesche di Leonardo a Venezia alla luce di una più diffusa pratica del disegno grottesco, di cui si trovano testimonianze sui margini dei fogli o sul retro delle tavole nell’ambito delle botteghe di Bellini e...
di Tiziano. Tale produzione grafica si faceva gioco non solo del soggetto rappresentato ma anche del medium stesso del disegno. In tal senso l'esame incrociato delle pratiche del grottesco in Leonardo e nei pittori veneti di primo Cinquecento permetterà di riconsiderare sotto nuova luce le origini della caricatura, tra derisione e diletto, regola e licenza.

**LANDSCAPE AND NATURE**
Chair: Francesca Borgo

Geoff Lehman (Bard College Berlin)
**Leonardo, Van Eyck and the Epistemology of Landscape**

Leonardo’s earliest known drawing, dated with documentary precision ‘5 daghossto 1473,’ proclaims a relationship to the temporal and topographical specificity of the Arno valley landscape it depicts. And yet its clearest point of reference is not a topographical but a pictorial one: a type of bird’s-eye view developed a half-century earlier by Jan Van Eyck that had become the dominant paradigm for landscape representation in the Florentine workshops of the 1460s and 1470s. The synoptic vision of landscape characteristic of Van Eyck is, however, only a starting point for Leonardo, who adopts the Eyckian vision of unbounded space, with all its epistemological implications (vision as desire for knowledge; its power and its limits defining the epistemic horizon), but transforms it into a means of exploring the dynamic processes of nature and the underlying geometry of natural laws. In Leonardo’s chalk drawing of a storm in the mountains, W12409, the perspectival structure of the Eyckian bird’s-eye view organizes the composition as a whole, but within it Leonardo’s fluid drawing articulates a thinking through of the movement of clouds, air and falling water. In the deluge series, his lifelong preoccupation with the dynamic geometry of water and air finds its culmination: there, the bird’s-eye view still provides an underlying structure, but is utterly transformed in the representation of nature as a continuum of moving elements and interlocking forces. In the deluge drawings, a synoptic and geometrically-structured vision of nature continues to function as a reflection on the means and the limits of knowledge, just as in Van Eyck.

However, the rectilinear grid and fixed viewpoint of perspective are no longer adequate to the pursuit of natural laws that dominates Leonardo’s late work, which moves in the direction of a genuinely scientific inquiry and which demands a new geometry, that of the spiral and the helix.

Christopher P. Heuer (The Clark Art Institute/Williams College)
**Without A Master: Fossils, Force and Leonardo**

Leonardo’s interest in geology is legion: fossils and minerals constellate his manuscripts, cliffs and caves dot his religious paintings. While historians of science have long ascribed such observations to a singular, precocious mind, there was in fact considerable writing in Leonardo’s moment concerned with the matter and processes of the earth. What does Leonardo owe the natural history of his era, such as it was? And how might these intellectual debts be contextualized within the broader art and theology of Renaissance Europe, rather than some secular, heroic subjectivity? At stake here might be the ways that Leonardo’s uniqueness within (say) nineteenth century art historiography, his Romantic inurement from his culture, runs counter to the idea of creativity itself as a kind of force from above - akin to precisely those processes of wind, water, and gravity which so entranced Leonardo himself.

Rebecca Zorach (Northwestern University)
**Nature, Imagination, and Authority: Leonardo in Seventeenth-Century France**

I will use the dispute between Abraham Bosse and the academicians of the French Academy (in which Bosse also mobilized Poussin's opinions) over the authenticity of Leonardo's *Treatise on Painting*, via its French translation in 1651, as my starting point to talk about changing ideas about the place of nature as model and inspiration in painting. This dispute has mostly been discussed in terms of the question of perspective, but Bosse is also particularly dismissive of several closely related passages in the text that deal with nature as model: for him, the famous passage about seeking inspiration in stained walls and patterned stones, and several chapters that follow on the importance of direct encounter with nature, could not possibly be the work of the great Italian master. The incomprehensibility of these passages to Bosse
reflects not only the geographic and temporal divide between artistic practice but also, I think, changing notions of the role of nature in relation to art in a broader sense. I will use this academic controversy—and close readings of select passages in the 1651 and 1716 French translations of the treatise—as a jumping-off point to think about the agency of nature in relation to art across the sixteenth and seventeenth century.

PRESENCE AND MATERIALITY
Chair: Jessica Richardson (KHI)

Jeanette Kohl (University of California, Riverside)

Verrocchio. Immanence and Evidence in Quattrocento Sculpture

This paper attempts a look into the workshop production of Leonardo’s master Andrea del Verrocchio and the ways in which it relates to both traditional ‘object culture’ and the thrust of aesthetic innovation so characteristic of the fifteenth century. In discussing such objects as the Lady with a Posy in the Bargello, the Christ and Saint Thomas Group at Orsanmichele, and the tomb for Piero and Giovanni de’ Medici in San Lorenzo, the referential ‘intelligence’ and the physical presence of sculptures produced in the experimental climate of Florence in the second half of the fifteenth century will become evident. These sculptures—all of them ‘liminal objects’—reflect in astounding ways concepts of reproduction and imagination, they reformulate the viewer-image-relation and the dialectic of showing and viewing, of evidence and immanence—thus providing fertile points of departure for fresh views on the ‘phenomenon Leonardo’, both historically and methodologically.

Mira Becker (Freie Universität Berlin)
Leonardo’s Figures, the Materiality of Lombard Sculpture & the Aesthetics of the ‘Moti’

My paper aims to detect interrelations between Leonardo’s rendering of figures in painting on the one hand and on the other hand the figuration of bodies and faces in artworks in terracotta and marble produced within the artistic scenery of Milan and Pavia—including artists such as G. A. Amadeo, A. de’ Fondulis, il Bambaia or B. Briosco. I will observe correlations and transfers of compositional and chromatic structures as well as agonal aspects of evoking moti and rilievo to focus on the respectively genuine qualities of terracotta, marble, drawing materials like red chalk and paint as media and matter of dialogues. By comparing and interweaving the distinctive aesthetics of materiality and of effect, the paper will take into account different facets of a ‘paragone as comradeship’ and its historical reflections by balancing the observations with conceptualisations and terminologies of the Early Modern art theoretical discourse. One of the paper’s case studies will be the comparison of Leonardo’s Cenacolo and its preparatory drawings in red chalk with Agostino de’ Fondulis’ figures in terracotta. Joining methodically the conference’s approach with the perspective of the collaborative research center Episteme in Motion, Leonardo’s art will not be analysed as an isolated phenomenon, but as inserted within a specific and peculiar artistic and intellectual context, coined by reciprocal transfers of knowledge and subcutaneous changes.

ARCHITECTURAL INVENTIONS
Chair: Alina Payne (Harvard University/ Villa I Tatti)

Matteo Burioni (LMU München)
Leonardo and Northern Geometries. Iterations of the Centrally Planned Church

This paper focuses on a series of architectural studies for centrally planned buildings executed by Leonardo during his first Milanese period, between 1487 and 1490. In cosmopolitan Milan, Leonardo could familiarize himself with the northern, Late Gothic idiom as well as with the newest developments of Italian architectural theory, thanks to the presence of Donato Bramante, Luca Fancelli and Francesco di Giorgio Martini. Analyzing previously overlooked materials, this paper explores Leonardo’s appreciation for northern design principles that were first set in print by Matthäus Roritzer in 1486, during the Tuscan artist’s stay in Milan. The geometrical speculations that northern design techniques inspired Leonardo to pursue are also evident in his centrally planned building designs. On these sheets he abstracted existing buildings—antique,
medieval, or gothic—and sought, through his drawings, to ground a logical genesis of the centrally planned building in theoretical terms.

Carolyn Yerkes (Princeton University), Michael Cole (Columbia University)

Leonardo on the Stairs

The architectural topic that interested Leonardo more than any other was the staircase. And while architectural historians today regard stairs as means of ‘circulation,’ Leonardo’s work encourages us to think about them in a categorically different way. Though Leonardo drew scores of staircases, seldom if ever did he dwell on their role in providing passage between spaces. Instead he approached the problem of stairs with a pictorial sensibility, experimenting with them primarily as a means to pose the human body. This paper considers Leonardo's staircase designs in the context of his paintings and his machine drawings. Additionally, it contributes to the debate about the central staircase at Chambord, maintaining that it is consistent in conception with the ideas that Leonardo pursued during his long engagement with the form.

24h Avec...
A series of events by the Artes Mechanicae research team in 2015

Andrea Bernardoni writes:
The first session of the series of events ‘24h avec …’, produced by the Auditorium of the Louvre in Paris, was devoted to Leonardo da Vinci. During the day, Professor Pascal Broiost from the University of Tours gave a lecture entitled ‘L’œil de l’oiseau: les extraordinaires machines de Léonard de Vinci’ (The eye of the bird: Leonardo da Vinci’s extraordinary machines). The conference focused on the theme of flight in Leonardo’s studies and presented some recent achievements of the Artes Mechanicae research team: two new interpretations of Leonardo’s parachute and his glider, and some replicas of surveying instruments.

Of particular importance are reconstructions of the two gliding machines, which result from a strict philological interpretation of the manuscripts, and a painstaking avoidance of the incorporation of improbable devices designed to operate such machines with technologies unknown at the time; a trend that often in the past has led many interpreters of Leonardo’s technology to get carried away. Gliding, which is recognised as the least successful area of Leonardo’s mechanical flight studies, was already envisaged by other engineers from the late fifteenth century. The idea of a falling man being slowed down by a sail is clearly shown in the pen-and-ink drawing, largely derived from Mariana Taccola and Francesco di Giorgio Martini, in the British Library (Add. 34113, f.200v). In the sixteenth century, flying was of course impossible for humans, the nearest approach being to jump with a parachute from heights of only about 20-30 metres from the tops of city towers. For this reason, to avoid sudden impact with the ground, a parachute had to be made with a rigid structure that would keep the sail open from the very start of the jump. In the light of this consideration, a new reading of Leonardo’s drawing has led to a revised interpretation of some details.

According to Leonardo’s description, the parachute had to be a pyramid made of waxed flax (pannolino intasato) with a square base about seven metres wide by seven metres high. Leonardo uses the term ‘pavilion’ to indicate the parachute itself, which has led to the design of a free-standing structure and not a sail held open by air resistance as in modern-day parachutes. Though Leonardo’s drawing is small and simply sketched, there are elements that imply the structure. The double line in the middle, drawn between the human figure and the parachute, may suggest a rigid pole extending from the man’s harness and ending at the cusp of the pyramid, keeping it open. The few – but clear – lines drawn on the figure seem to indicate a body harness attached to the pelvis and chest of the man, calling to mind the one of the ‘pianoviola’, which was taken here as a model. Fixed to the four corners of the rectangular base frame are four strings ending at the central pole near the figure’s hands. Unfortunately the design is not clear, making it difficult to understand whether the strings are tied to the pole or whether the ‘pilot’ can operate them to tilt the sail, thereby controlling the trajectory of the
parachute’s descent. In the model the ropes have been anchored to the pole which supports the opened pavilion – the easiest solution – as if it were a huge umbrella.

The glider is another machine that employs a wing to brake an object’s fall; unlike the parachute, its descent is angled and directed by the pilot. The device conceived by Leonardo has a zoomorphic profile much like that of the green shield bug (Palomena prasina). The note beside the picture explains that the glider is designed to fly with the more tapered end forward. The pilot stands on a sort of trapezium and controls the roll with two ropes fixed to the transverse beam of the sail. A hand-operated lever mounted on the vertical beam regulates the pitch. Totally absent from the drawing is any kind of device to control the yaw. On the same sheet of the Madrid Codex is the famous ‘flying sphere’, to be built, Leonardo says, using reeds and sendal (a very fine silken cloth). According to Leonardo’s notes, the glider must be built ‘of the same nature’, that is, the same materials. At first glance it may appear a quite refined drawing, but it actually contains numerous obscurities. Among these the most difficult to interpret is the area which should accommodate the pilot; its position is made clear by Leonardo, but the drawing gives no clue as to the nature of it. The roll is controlled by two ropes fixed to the ends of a short transverse axis. This axis is anchored orthogonally to the central longitudinal axis of the sail, via a joint which inevitably has limited rigidity. Were the two ropes fixed directly to the outer edges of the sail, control would have been much easier and more effective.

At the bottom of the vertical beam, beneath the controls, the drawing shows an arc: a section of a circle, large, very clear, symmetrically placed and facing down. To date no convincing explanation of this feature has been posited. More information: http://www.artesmechanicae.it

A New Series: Leonardo Studies
In January 2016, Dr Constance Moffatt (Pierce College) and Dr Sara Taglialagamba (Sorbonne) established Brill’s new series, Leonardo Studies, which is devoted to research on Leonardo and his context. The book to inaugurate this series is, Illuminating Leonardo, A Festschrift for Carlo Pedretti Celebrating His 70 Years of Scholarship (1944–2014). As noted at Brill (www.brill.com/products/series/leonardo-studies):

Illuminating Leonardo opens the new series Leonardo Studies with a tribute to Professor Carlo Pedretti, the most important Leonardo scholar of our time, with a wide-ranging overview of current Leonardo scholarship from the most renowned Leonardo scholars and young researchers. Though no single book could provide a comprehensive overview of the current state of Leonardo studies, after reading this collection of short essays cover-to-cover, the reader will come away knowing a great deal about the current state of the field in many areas of research.

To begin the series, editors Constance Moffatt and Sara Taglialagamba present an impressive group of essays that offer fresh ideas as a departure point for future studies.

Contents of the book

Introduction, by Constance Moffatt and Sara Taglialagamba

Part 1 Books and Influence
1 One for the Books: A Bibliographical ‘Gleaning’ for CP, by Max Marmor
2 The Codex Corazza and Zaccolini’s Treatises in the Project of Cassiano dal Pozzo for the Spreading of Leonardo’s Works, by Alfredo Buccaro
3 A Copy of Sacrobosco’s Sphaera in Mirror Script Attributed to Matteo Zaccolini, by Domenico Laurenza
Part 2 Dissemination of Knowledge
4 A Short Note on Artisanal Epistemology in Leonardo’s Treatise on Painting, by Claire Farago
5 Leonardo’s Cartonetti for Luca Pacioli’s Platonic Bodies, by Pietro Marani
Part 3 Architecture
6 Giuliano da Sangallo and Leonardo da Vinci: Cross-Pollination or Parallels? by Sabine Frommel
7 Evidence of Leonardo’s Systematic Design Process for Palaces and Canals in Romorantin, by Matthew Landrus
8 Vitruvius in the Trattato dell’Architettura by Luca Pacioli, by Francesco Di Teodoro
9 Notes on Leonardo and Vitruvius, by Richard Schofield

Part 4 Painting and Drawing
10 Why Did Leonardo Not Finish the Adoration of the Magi? by Francesca Fiorani
11 ‘Here’s Looking at You’ The Cartoon for the So-called ‘Nude Mona Lisa’, by Martin Kemp
13 Leonardo’s Followers in Lombardy: Girolamo and Giovan Ambrogio Figino, by Annalisa Perissa Torrini

Part 5 Machines
14 A Machine to Build Artilleries, by Andrea Bernardoni
15 Bombards and Noisy Bullets: Pietro Monte and Leonardo da Vinci’s Collaboration, by Pascal Brioist
16 Leonardo and the Artes Mechanicae, by Romano Nanni

Part 6 Sculpture
17 ‘The Sculptor Says’ Leonardo and Gian Cristoforo Romano, by Carlo Vecce
18 Leonardo and the Trivulzio Monument: Some Questions and Evidence (1507–1518), by Marino Viganò

Part 7 Science and Nature: The Body, the Body of the Earth
19 The Midpoint of the Human Body in Leonardo’s Drawings and in the Codex Huygens, by Paola Salvi
22 Pyramids, Rays and ‘Spiritual Powers’: Leonardo’s Research during the Last Decade of the Fifteenth Century, by Fabio Frosini
23 A Hydraulic System Drawing by Leonardo: Some Evaluations, by Damiano Iacobone
24 Leonardo’s Maps, by Constance Moffatt
25 Sightings, Mistakes and Discoveries al verso, by Alessandro Vezzosi
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