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It has been a truism of the literature for at least half a century that Leonardo’s writings, as important as they are now to the history of art, played no significant role in the advancement of art or science before their publication in the late nineteenth century, when anthologies excerpted from the original manuscripts and facsimiles of those manuscripts began to appear in print.¹ At a certain point in the mid-to-late twentieth century, thanks to the research of scholars such as Luca Beltrami, Gerolamo Calvi, Kenneth Clark, Carlo Pedretti, Martin Kemp, and many others, this sober revision of Leonardo’s contribution to history and the careful research into the historical sources of his thought that accompanied it, served as a welcome corrective to grandiose claims — still central to the popular understanding — about Leonardo’s prescient genius.² However, like most truisms, the reservations regarding Leonardo’s intellectual legacy before the nineteenth century were also overly simplistic. Leonardo da Vinci’s most significant theoretical contribution was his interpretation of painting as a science grounded in geometry and direct observation of nature. His so-called treatise on painting, excerpted from his notes and known almost exclusively in its abridged form, was one of the most famous books on art ever published.³ Before modern author-centered standards of textual criticism were imposed on his literary corpus, the abridged treatise on painting occupied a place unrivalled by any other art book in the history of Western art. Before the twentieth century, at least twenty printed editions in the major European languages were published after the first edition appeared in 1651, not including reprints or manuscript copies, both of which also circulated in significant numbers.⁴ The *Trattato della pittura*, as the text is most famously known, was a major teaching resource, and it was studied by collectors and amateurs before and after it appeared in print, serving also as the basis for many other writings, some of which bear Leonardo’s name, others of which do not, for reasons that will be discussed throughout this study.⁵
Yet study of the historical impact of Leonardo’s abridged treatise on painting has barely begun. In an age when Leonardo’s cult status in the public imaginary is unprecedented, and scholarly studies of the artist flourish, it seems incredible that such an important aspect of his actual historical heritage could be largely overlooked. The Treatise remains the neglected stepchild of Leonardo’s corpus – to state the case in the barest terms possible – because the discipline of art history is structurally oriented toward the producer rather than the receiver. The artist and the patron have always been the art historian’s principal units of study. The existing state of scholarship on Leonardo’s writings is a very clear example in this regard: we know quite a lot about the contents and dating of his manuscripts, their provenance, their interrelationships, and their relationships to Leonardo’s projects. Determining the authenticity of the passages excerpted from Leonardo’s original manuscripts and their role in the formation of the artist’s professional identity have been the prime factors motivating research on the Treatise on Painting. Much less is understood about the past readers of the Treatise – who they were, how they construed what they read, and what they produced. In large part, focus on the authenticity of the text and on Leonardo’s accomplishments has superseded attempts to understand the changes that others introduced and the historical consequences of their engagements with his writings. The value of copies is still gauged almost exclusively by their philological accuracy.

To the present day, misgivings about the coherence of Leonardo’s Treatise on Painting have fundamentally shaped the history of this influential text. Must we always assume that the test of a text is its ‘accuracy’ determined by its closeness to authorial intention? To address this question, we should first ask what justifies the art historical study of messy compilations whose authorship may always remain in question, and copies that may be excluded from the genealogy of an authoritative text. Long before Umberto Eco coined the phrase open work, long before Michel Foucault, Roland Barthes, and others called for the birth of the reader, students of Leonardo’s Treatise on Painting noticed incongruities, redundancies, and non sequiturs. The Treatise on Painting was compiled, edited, and originally published during a period when editorial practices maximizing authorial intention did not yet dominate. Leonardo’s authority in the Treatise on Painting was posthumously constructed by his editors and readers. Today, textual criticism again offers alternatives to editorial practices that attempt to reconstruct the author’s original intentions. The present volume participates in a broad shift of attention in literary studies to the role of the reader and the reception of ideas.

Re-Reading Leonardo is the first comprehensive attempt to understand Leonardo’s Treatise on Painting from the standpoint of its active reception across a variety of cultural and institutional settings. In the past two decades, important studies have appeared on Leonardo’s most famous artist/reader Nicolas Poussin, documenting his illustrations for the first edition and his
creative reinterpretation of central ideas in the Treatise. Yet theories of art are by nature dialogic – that is, they are discourses addressing other discourses. Active engagement with the Treatise on Painting took place in many different locations under many different circumstances. For every Poussin there were dozens of other readers whose names are not so well known, but whose activities left traces in the historical record worthy of study. The Treatise itself is the product of an active engagement with pre-existing ideas, which is one of the reasons that readers who did not necessarily share Leonardo’s agenda for painting could still find it useful. The sheer variety of response will surprise readers of the present volume. One of the most salient aspects of Leonardo’s Treatise – and one which can only be addressed through a cross-cultural approach to the material – is that, when it was read, it contributed to the formation of different collective identities. One of the major contributions of this anthology concerns its documentation of the various ways in which the Treatise helped define different understandings of pictorial representation, particularly differently nuanced definitions of naturalistic painting.

Not that these writings all bear Leonardo’s name – far from it: another reason that the Treatise ‘went missing’ in the historical record is that its ideas were appropriated without being credited to Leonardo. The complex reasons for this constitute another unifying theme of the present volume. Ultimately, this study traces the transmission of ideas at the supra-individual level while simultaneously identifying and historically and culturally locating the individual agents who transmitted them. The surviving manuscripts and printed editions of the abridged Treatise enable us to track the unfolding history of the modern idea of the artist and his art on the scale of individual readers. What made Leonardo’s advice to painters collected in the abridged treatise on painting – a text largely ignored by modern scholars because it is a ‘corrupt’ and compromised version of the master’s ideas – capable of being inflected in so many diverse and productive ways?

Bearing in mind that no text ever remains the same, not even for the same reader, the use and re-use of the ‘same’ text can also lead to a certain homogenization of the debate on art. Equally important to consider, therefore, given art history’s distinctively European origins, is the process that enables culturally specific ideas to be mis-recognized as universal.9 Focusing on the reception of Leonardo’s ideas on painting as an historical phenomenon (as opposed to focusing on the artist as the phenomenon) leads to many questions about the history of the history of art. It is not often, certainly not routine, for early modern studies of European art to be organized in transnational terms, as is the present volume.

This volume presents a variety of different perspectives about the institutionalization of art in Europe from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century. Leonardo insisted that painting was a form of natural philosophy, a sentiment taken up at the French Academy that also resonated in art theories published by Dutch and English writers, as contributions by J.V. Field, Thijs
Weststeijn, and Richard Woodfield respectively demonstrate. Yet Spanish
writers commenting on Leonardo’s Treatise stressed the practical nature of
painting, as both Charlene Villaseñor Black and Javier Navarro de Zuvillaga
argue, while one of the least expected readers of the Treatise, an eighteenth-
century Greek icon painter who wanted to Latinize his heritage, insisted that
producing illusionistic effects was still a spiritual calling, as Chrysa Damianaki
explains. And other chapters also suggest that there were many epistemological
commonalities in the ways that artists were taught, representational practices
evaluated, and publics developed for art in early modern Europe.

Studying a text – in this case involving a set of ideas as well as diverse
material objects (books, manuscripts, paintings, drawings, prints) – in terms
of the discussions and debates on art it engendered demands refractive
methodologies. The abridged Treatise on Painting provides an ideal case study
to examine the institutionalization of art in Europe and beyond for nearly four
centuries. It can also help foreground our own contemporary practices as art
historians because this text was fundamentally involved in the transformation
of a field of studies into a ‘discipline’ or – to use a term Hayden White coined
to discuss the politics of interpretation – ‘disciplinization.’ Fields of study in
the human and social sciences, White argued, address and co-produce the
context of modern social institutions designed for the regulation of knowledge
production. How history considered as a recovery of the facts of the past is
linked to ideology requires an epistemological criticism because “[t]he politics
of this disciplinization ... consists in what it marks out for repression for those
who wish to claim the authority of the discipline itself for their learning.”
An historical practice that focuses on the author’s identity without attending
to the construction of identity per se, is blind to its own modes of knowledge
production. Yet, as important as interrelationships are between the aesthetics
we contemplate and the institutions that support our work, rarely has
Leonardo been studied from the standpoint of how or for whose benefit his
identity was constructed.

What do we know about Leonardo’s Treatise on Painting?

The text that came to be known as Leonardo’s Trattato della pittura is an
abridged version of a compilation excerpted in the mid-sixteenth century
from the artist’s holograph writings by his student and heir, the Milanese
aristocrat and painter Francesco Melzi. Fortunately, the parent manuscript
survives, in a unique copy housed in the Biblioteca Vaticana since 1657, but
little is certain about Melzi’s reasons for compiling a set of notes on painting,
collectively called ‘Il Libro della pittura’ in the original manuscript. Internal
evidence suggests a publication was planned from the start, but no direct
documentation of such a venture has ever been found.

A second editorial campaign resulted in a drastically abridged version
of Melzi’s original project – a shorter text with different aims, more clearly
pedagogical, which also took place in the sixteenth century, sometime before 1582, the earliest dated manuscript of the abridged treatise (Belt 35). These efforts are preserved in a number of manuscript copies, but the purpose and occasion of these editorial efforts are even more poorly understood at present than Melzi’s original project. The editors who were involved, the place where the work was undertaken, and the purpose of the abridgement are unresolved, and may never be resolved due to the lack of documentation and the ambivalent relationships of the surviving manuscripts to one another, as my own chapter elaborates.

A third editorial campaign, eventually resulting in the publication of a treatise on painting whose authorship was attributed solely to Leonardo da Vinci, is far better understood. Elizabeth Cropper and Charles Dempsey concisely summed up the events directly leading to the first edition of the Treatise on Painting in 1651, based on several abridged copies of Melzi’s text:

It was [Cardinal Francesco Barberini’s librarian] Cassiano [dal Pozzo]’s purchase of a manuscript copy of Leonardo’s treatise for the Barberini (Vat. Bar. Lat. 4304) that led to his inquiries about other manuscripts in Milan, especially the Codex Pinellianus (which had been given to the Ambrosiana [Library] by its founder, Cardinal Federico Borromeo), as well as the original notebooks of Leonardo that [Galeazzo] Arconati gave to the Ambrosiana in 1636. The exchange of texts for detailed critical comparison between Cassiano and Arconati that followed came to an end with the death of the Barberini pope in 1644. The plan to publish the [Matteo] Zaccolini treatises failed, but Cassiano’s hopes for the publication of the Trattato della Pittura were fulfilled. Edited by Raphael Trichet Du Fresne, with whom Poussin was in close contact in Rome during the 1640s when Du Fresne was head of the Imprimerie royale before going on to become librarian to Queen Christina [of Sweden who moved her court to Rome in 1662], the Italian version was printed in Paris by the royal printer Langlois in 1651, with a dedication to the Swedish Queen herself. As Du Fresne recounts in the introductory letter to Pierre Bourdelot (then the Queen’s doctor, and also a friend of Poussin), the published text was based on several manuscripts. Especially precious was the one that Cassiano dal Pozzo had given to [Richelieu’s art agent in Rome, Paul Fréart de] Chantelou, because it included the figures drawn by Poussin that were then followed in the engravings illustrating the text. A French translation by Fréart de Chambray, also based on a copy of Cassiano’s illustrated manuscript, bearing a dedication to Poussin, was printed by Langlois in the same year.

Lately, the location of Codex Barberini 4304 in the sequence of manuscripts as given in this summary has been questioned and the independence of Zaccolini’s manuscripts has been emphasized. The manuscript evidence is discussed at several points in the present volume (especially in the chapters by Bell, Farago, and Barone). In most if not all respects, Cropper and Dempsey’s narrative still holds. As far as the larger picture is concerned, it is important to note that the 1651 publication edited by the bibliophile Trichet Du Fresne was a luxurious compilation of several texts (as discussed by Catherine Soussloff in this volume) that included letters of dedication, a new biography of Leonardo by Du Fresne, a biography of Leon Battista Alberti along with his treatises on painting and sculpture, and what is perhaps
the first art bibliography ever published.\textsuperscript{17} Leonardo's abridged \textit{Treatise} was republished many times, including translations into Spanish, English, German, Dutch, and Polish.\textsuperscript{18} The first edition of Melzi's unabridged original compilation, known in a single copy penned in his own hand, appeared in 1817, while new anthologies excerpted from Leonardo's holograph manuscripts and facsimiles of those manuscripts began appearing in the late nineteenth century, supplanting the abridged treatise on painting that had served as the principal means by which ideas attributed to Leonardo circulated for three centuries.\textsuperscript{19}

The collective focus of the present volume is the historical reception of the abridged treatise on painting from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries. It must be emphasized that the research collected here is driven by the individual interests of the authors and is in no way intended to provide a comprehensive account of the subject of Leonardo's readers, nor of a more narrowly conceived topic such as the history of printed editions of Leonardo's \textit{Treatise on Painting}.\textsuperscript{20} Because the formation of national styles and critical attitudes is central to many of the chapters, it was imperative that the volume be organized in a way that does not presuppose the existence of (subsequently formed) modern nation-states during the period under discussion. The language in which the treatise or writings derived from it appeared provided a straightforward and pragmatic solution. Within these subdivisions, the chapters are organized roughly chronologically, as much as possible. The volume as a whole is also chronologically organized; that is to say, Italian and French texts are the earliest and Greek and Polish the latest translations considered. Spanish translations precede Dutch, German, and Flemish responses, generally speaking, but the earliest published record in Spanish that credits Leonardo, Pacheco's \textit{El arte de la pintura}, also precedes the \textit{editio princeps} by three years, so it is important to regard the table of contents as only a provisionally chronological index. In keeping with the dialogic nature of all art theory, this study emphatically rejects the assumption that art theory or art history developed progressively: instead, it studies the circumstances that produced historical ideas of the canonical and the normative, locating the included and the excluded historically, in terms of enunciative positions.

It did not seem appropriate to divide the volume into studies before and after the first edition of 1651. The reasons for avoiding this distinction are complex, and are argued in the individual chapters. But it should be said here by way of introduction that, since the abridgement is itself a form of historical reception of Leonardo's writings, such a division would privilege ideas of certain authorship centered on the artist as producer, obscuring the role of Leonardo's editors and interpreters, and undercutting the purpose of the volume as a whole. Indeed, questioning the modern concept of authorship that has been imposed on the writings attributed to Leonardo under the title '\textit{Treatise on Painting}', is one of the principal reasons for undertaking this collaborative project in the first place.
Main themes of this volume

The exchange of ideas enabled by this collaboration brings a number of shared themes to the foreground. These include some that have already been introduced above: the role of the editors in shaping Leonardo's manuscripts, the deliberate suppression of his authorship, the multifaceted nature of responses to the Trattato, the historical importance of changes introduced by copyists, the social context of reception and production central to understanding the texts, the formation of national and local collective traditions glimpsed in the reception of the Treatise in various settings, and the rise of the modern idea of the artist. In turning to the individual chapters, it is worth mentioning several recurring themes in the volume as a whole that concern the ways in which art achieved its early modern institutional status. Resonances among the case studies exist either because similar situations existed in different places and times or because different situations evolved regarding the same text. Among the salient recurring subjects are: (1) debates over the definition of naturalistic painting, especially the role of perspective; (2) the status of painting as a form of knowledge; (3) direct and indirect modes of textual transmission; (4) the paratexts that frame the treatise in various compilations; (5) relationships between the visual and the verbal components of the text; and (6) institutional structures and practices involving the treatise, especially its recurring presence in institutional reform.

THE ITALIAN RECEPTION

The six chapters devoted to the Italian reception of Leonardo's treatise cover a variety of topics including the interrelationship of text and images, the importance of printed books and manuscripts in the dissemination of Leonardo's ideas, the limited extent to which Leonardo's art was known to readers of his treatise, the pluralistic picture of response to the manuscript copies before the printed edition, and the tensions in collaborative efforts to fabricate the treatise that goes by Leonardo's name.

In the first chapter, Martin Kemp and Juliana Barone emphasize the pluralistic response to Leonardo's treatise, overlooked by interpreters of the first edition, by asking how the treatise transmitted in various manuscripts looked like in the eyes of different beholders. Their analysis concentrates on the illustrations of human figures for the chapters on balance and motion. We know that Leonardo planned to write a treatise on painting. For Leonardo, the visual image was the prime vehicle for incontestable knowledge, so one aspect to consider is how Leonardo envisaged his treatise passing from manuscript to printed form. Judging from the page formats of the Codex Urbinas compiled and illustrated by Melzi, he (and Melzi) must have had a certain kind of printed book in mind, with marginal or in-text illustrations similar to sketches in the autograph manuscripts that probably would have rendered simple line drawings in woodcut form. It is puzzling to consider why Melzi overlooked
relevant passages in manuscripts he used for his compilation, such as the analysis of the mechanics of human motion in MS A and elsewhere of such great interest to the compiler of the Leonardesque Codex Huygens. And why was so much perspective theory omitted? Yet Melzi's compilation conveys the gist of Leonardo's teachings about balance and motion, and it conforms to the spirit and letter of Leonardo's categories of knowledge, reflective of the organization of types of things in the created universe. His modular approach to the organization of knowledge (for example, three types of faces, three basic types of motion), is entirely in keeping with Leonardo's known practices.

The authors also examine the interrelationship of the verbal and visual components of the treatise in two important manuscript copies, both dating from the 1630s, which provide further insight into changes in meaning due to the different aesthetic orientations of its readers. Poussin's figure drawings, probably prepared at Cassiano dal Pozzo's request for the first printed edition, omit figures depicting the disruption of balance and lack the sense of potential motion or inherent dynamism typical of the Codex Urbinas and autograph Leonardo drawings. Poussin's drawings render the continuous quality of motion as discontinuous. His engagement with the Antique and his working methods provide clues for understanding how he viewed Leonardo: in opting for a single set of proportions, Poussin endowed the Treatise on Painting with a strong sense of aesthetic consistency. In a later chapter, Juliana Barone explores Poussin's working methods in detail. In this opening chapter, the authors contrast Poussin's dramatic reorientation of the relationship of text and images with a manuscript copy made for personal use by Stefano della Bella, who remains much closer to the spirit of Leonardo's own illustrations.21

More than twenty abridged manuscripts and an impressive body of supporting evidence exists for a sustained interest in Leonardo's writings in the sixteenth century, especially in Florence, yet as Carlo Pedretti maintains, there appears to be a deliberate suppression of Leonardo's authorship until the early seventeenth century. The next two chapters weigh the possible reasons for eliding Leonardo's name from the historical record and present evidence to support the hypothesis that his Treatise was abridged in Florence.

Citing Leonardo's Adoration of the Magi and other visual examples available to artists, Robert Williams begins by noting that there were two distinct moments during his lifetime when Leonardo exerted an influence on Florentine artists: the periods before 1482 and after 1500, when his living presence in the city would have outweighed interest in whatever writings were available. Williams presents visual evidence of a multifaceted response to Leonardo over the following decades, which he characterizes as attempts to fuse the outstanding qualities of Leonardo and Michelangelo. Vasari characterized Raphael, who formed his style in this manner, as the first great example of the synthetic, self-fashioning artist and the foundation of modern artistic identity. In the 1560s and 1570s, Williams finds solid evidence for the circulation of Leonardo's writings made for and owned by literary men with
close ties to painters, including the owners of five early copies of the abridged Treatise. Williams tentatively attributes a lecture addressed to the Accademia del disegno, datable after 1569, to Lelio Torelli, a formidable scholar who wrote the Accademia’s charter and served as Cosimo I’s chief legal advisor. The lecture, which mentions Leonardo as the ‘philosopher of painters’ and the author of ‘subtle discourses,’ aimed to demonstrate how painting defined naturally might make use of scientific or philosophical knowledge. Williams characterizes these Aristotelian ideas as entirely in keeping both with Leonardo and the Accademia’s didactic aims, but in sharp contrast to Vasari’s Lives.

Williams also considers Francesco Bocchi’s Discorso in praise of Andrea del Sarto, dated 1567 when Bocchi was 19. Although his language suggests that he did not have direct access to Leonardo’s writings, Bocchi makes several important points that derive from Leonardo’s precepts: he demonstrates a good understanding of key features of Leonardo’s considerations of painting including relief, shadow and light. Raffaello Borghini (Il Riposo, Florence, 1584) quotes the abridged Treatise without mentioning Leonardo, giving a brief summary of its principal ideas on perspective and figurative decorum. These surviving literary efforts to explore the philosophical dimension of painting are in line with the naturalism advocated by the youngest painters who cultivated the more naturalistic styles sometimes referred to as the ‘reform’ of painting, including Maso da San Friano whose student Gregorio Pagani painted the frontispiece for the earliest dated copy of the abridged Treatise (MS Belt 35, frontispiece dated 1582). The same themes of painting’s status as natural philosophy and its primary purpose to represent the natural world as it appears to the eye, will be raised elsewhere – at the French and Spanish academies, in writings by Dutch interpreters of the Treatise – as other chapters in this volume attest.

My own chapter examines the social function of the abridged Treatise to aid in a hypothetical reconstruction of its significance. What function did the construction of Leonardo’s literary identity serve in the earliest abridged versions of his Treatise? Past studies have been concerned primarily with the authenticity of the parent manuscript and the first edition, whereas the abridged text published in 1651 was almost entirely in existence by the early 1580s. Therefore, renewed attention to the original abridgement process is warranted, even if the evidence is incomplete. Internal evidence in a cluster of four manuscripts signals a publishing project that never succeeded: these are MSS Concini, Giacomini, Gaddi, and Pinelli, all associated with literary men who had interests in the visual arts. In two of the three Florentine manuscripts, Leonardo’s abridged text, beginning with the second part of the original, is compiled with pre-publication manuscripts of Vignola’s Due Regole, edited by the mathematician Ignazio Danti. Danti also lectured on topics in a Leonardesque vein while in the employ of Cosimo I (d. 1574). Such a combination of texts would have effectively updated Leon Battista Alberti’s Treatise on Painting. The abridged manuscripts, one of which prominently
features Leonardo as the author, appear to be intended for students, in keeping with the role of the arts in Cosimo's Florence.

To explain the elimination of the sections dealing with light, shadow, color, and other scientific aspects of naturalistic painting otherwise of interest at Cosimo's court, as examined by Robert Williams in the preceding chapter, it is noteworthy that the abridged *Treatise* (combined with Vignola's clear explanation of linear perspective) would have been particularly useful as an instructional manual to Vasari's assistants in the Palazzo Vecchio. Moreover, Niccolò Gaddi and Lorenzo Giacomini, owners of the abridged *Treatise* manuscripts conjoined with Vignola's *Regole*, held important positions in Florence after Cosimo's death and can be connected with reviving Cosimo's program for the arts. The combined evidence, though fragmentary, suggests that Leonardo's *Treatise* was abridged in Florence during the 1560s or 1570s. The abridgement had begun to outlive its usefulness by the 1580s, when additional steps toward publication involving Danti, Giacomini, and the Paduan collector Pinelli, are documented. Where Melzi's original manuscript was during this time remains a mystery, but Federico Barocci seems to have had access to it (the manuscript was documented in the Urbino in 1631).

Interests in the most practical aspects of Leonardo's *Treatise* and disagreements over the role of empirical perspective in naturalistic painting, characterize other institutional settings discussed in later chapters, particularly regarding French, Spanish, and Dutch understandings of naturalistic painting.

The next chapter, by Janis Bell, continues the reconstruction of events leading from the abridgement of the *Treatise* by Italians to its eventual publication in Paris in 1651. Bell focuses on Matteo Zaccolini's *Prospettiva del colore*, the most dependent of his four treatises on Leonardo's writings – although, according to the prevalent custom of citing only ancient authorities or influential contemporaries, he does not cite his source. As Cropper and Dempsey summarize the circumstances in the passage cited above, Zaccolini was engaged by Cassiano dal Pozzo, but his treatises, intended for the use of artists, were never published in printed form. Zaccolini's ability to study, integrate, and reframe Leonardo's ideas at a time when the *Treatise on Painting* was unpublished, raises new questions about the seventeenth-century access to his writings. Bell argues that if Zaccolini wrote his extensive commentary between 1605 and 1618, there must have been a copy of the *Treatise* available to him for study in Rome or Naples, where he lived. Possibly he had access to Danti's copy, which might be identified with Casanatense MS 968, an abridged version that contains an intriguing marginal reference, 'domanda Zaccolini' (fol. 188r). There must have been other Leonardo manuscripts in Rome: Mazenta, writing for Cassiano dal Pozzo in 1631, describes the person who visited Vasari in the 1560s with Leonardo manuscripts as the Melzi family tutor Lelio Cavadini. Mazenta relates that the manuscripts Cavadini took to Rome were returned in 1588 to Milan, where Pompeo Leoni acquired 46 notebooks and 2,000 loose sheets, beginning in 1604. However he had access to Leonardo's writings, Zaccolini left out most of the humanist
concerns with moral philosophy that had engaged late sixteenth-century theorists (the meaning of painting, the way its message is conveyed, the education of artists). Instead, Zaccalini explicated the scientific principles of nature underlying representation, which he organized into a coherent treatise proceeding in logical order from theory to practice, from general precepts to specific applications. That is to say, Zaccalini's editorial activities were the inverse of the Florentine editors who eliminated passages on judging the accidental conditions of nature associated with the science of color and vision. Since the version of his treatise that survives is not the original, but Cassiano's copy in the initial stages of editing, it is not certain what is by Zaccalini. Yet it is clear that Zaccalini was a master at expounding one idea without getting derailed. And, although he rarely contributed new information, he was not always in agreement with Leonardo, as for example in his discussion of acuity perspective where his defense of finish suggests the intensity of debates in early seventeenth-century Rome.

The first four chapters dealt with a series of events and problems directly related to publication of the abridged Treatise on Painting in 1651. It is important to bear in mind, however, that only retrospective vision allows us to construe these particulars as stages in that narrative: in their original context, they are more simply evidence of the pluralistic response to Leonardo's writings by readers with varying interests. In chapter 4, Michael Cole further explores the implications of the way in which philologically 'corrupt' versions nonetheless elicit significant art historical information about the varied interests of individual artist/readers. Cole takes as his case study a small notebook compiled by Giovannfrancesco Susini, an early seventeenth-century sculptor in the circle of Giambologna. Through a close examination of the notebook, Cole finds that Susini first copied the figures, then returned to seek the words that accompany them. His notebook is, among other things, a document of the unorthodox ways in which it was possible to read Leonardo's Treatise in the late sixteenth or early seventeenth centuries. Susini saw it first as a collection of figures, perhaps even figural inventions.

Cole insists, rightly, that it is difficult to know what it would mean for an illustration to be 'accurate' apart from the text, given that one of the basic issues that copies of the Treatise raise is how word and image come together. The evidence examined here indicates that artists did not regard the Treatise just as a primer on how to paint – rather, the Treatise could help to justify something they were already doing – in this case, providing materials for invention. The format of early versions of the abridged Treatise meant that illustrations lost more than their symbolic centrality when the text stopped 'making room' for images: it also stopped anchoring them to specific places. Reformattting the illustrations into the margins had immediate consequences not just for the look, but also for the meaning of various sections. The images began to drift in a way that suggests the active engagement of copyist, not simply a series of mistakes as Pedretti's stemma codicum of the illustrations would have it. What is important is the active association between text and
image: one thing that changes most dramatically from copy to copy is the way individual figures are read. The illustrations to the Concini manuscript, placed first in Pedretti's *stemma*, indicate that their amateur artist did not fully understand the relation of images to the text, while Stefano della Bella's figures of motion are among the most beautiful and most instructive (though his illustrations of optics frequently miss the point). Cole echoes conclusions drawn by Kemp, Barone, and Damianaki, when he laments what has been lost in the age of the critical edition and the standard translation, namely a sense for the importance of small but telling variations on ideas that characterize a culture of manuscripts.

Thomas Willette brings the history of Italian reception into the eighteenth century with his study of the first edition printed in Italy, the Naples edition of 1733, in the context of Neopolitan publishing and its political implications. The (legitimate) Naples edition is the first version of Du Fresne's book published in Italy and the only edition in Italian between the *editio princeps* and the Bolognese reprint of 1786. Therefore the Naples edition should have been an important and influential book with a significant role in the dissemination of Leonardo's ideas in Italy for roughly the first half of the eighteenth century. It is, moreover, not simply a reprint because it provides a significantly different setting for Leonardo's writings in its selection of framing texts that mediate the reader's engagement with the book. Cultural politics in Naples in the first three decades of the eighteenth century is the setting for Willette's analysis of the 1733 edition of the *Trattato*. When Naples was ruled from Vienna by viceroy's in service of the Austrian Hapsburgs (1707–34), it was the second most important Italian center of clandestine publishing after Venice due to the lack of cooperation between the local authorities of church and state in the matter of regulating books. The new *Trattato* was born of a remarkable combination of editorial entrepreneurship and pro-Republican cultural activism in which Francesco Ricciardi's well-known press played a central role.

The growth of a local collective identity through print culture is clearly demonstrated in Naples. The most ambitious art historical publishing venture during this period was also undertaken by Ricciardi: Bernardo De Dominici's *Vite de pittori, scultori, ed architetti napoletani*, begun in the 1720s, which effectively refuted Vasari's claim that Renaissance art never took hold in Naples. Another Ricciardi project involving risk was the printing of the first edition of Cellini's autobiography, coinciding with the Florentine reprinting of Cellini's *Due trattati*.

Leonardo's writings were received in Naples without much direct knowledge of his paintings (though Lombard artists were drawn by the patronage of Cardinal Olivero Carafa and the so-called Doria panel of the *Battle of Anghari*, believed to be the work of Leonardo, was recorded there in 1651). So when Ricciardi created an edition of the *Trattato* for his Neapolitan audience, he retained the main text with illustrations after Poussin, but eliminated Du Fresne's bibliography, and added a new dedication honoring the Neapolitan Ercole d'Aragona (relative of the Cardinal Luigi d'Aragona who had returned
from seeing Leonardo in France with a [now lost] Leonardo manuscript). Most importantly, Ricciardi added Poussin’s Osservazioni on painting reprinted from Bellori’s Vite of 1672, so that Poussin appears as Leonardo’s heir. Willette explains the purpose of Ricciardi’s addition, with reference to the Poussins in the local collection of Cardinal Ascanio Filmarino, as a ‘stroke of critical intelligence’ because it created an expansive European context to reconsider the modern history of Neapolitan painting. The Treatise is comparable to De Dominici’s Lives of Neapolitan artists in its numbing description of local art and its praise for the revival of arts and letters under the Aragonese. These books on art echo the humanist ideals of civil society found in the writings of Neapolitan reformers. Ricciardi helped to create a culture for such books among the city’s elites as part of an attempt by enlightened cultural activists to educate citizens, to teach them to recognize, respect, and converse about the material basis of their shared historical identity.

For other Italian editions, including the first edition of the Codex Urbinae 1270 (ed. Guglielmo Manzi, Rome, 1817), the reader is referred to Mario Guffanti’s bibliography at the end of this volume.

**The French Reception**

The repositioning of Leonardo as a French cultural hero, importing the concept of the learned artist from Italy, is a striking aspect of the French history of the abridged treatise on painting. The publication of the editio princeps nearly coincided with the inauguration of the Académie royale du peinture e sculpture, which officially opened in 1648, just three years before the Treatise appeared in deluxe French and Italian editions, both edited by Trichet Du Fresne with engravings after Poussin and both issued by the Parisian publisher for the king, Langlois. The transfer of manuscripts and development of a new editorial campaign from Cassiano dal Pozzo’s failed plan to publish an enlarged edition in Rome under the papacy of Urban VIII (d. 1644), with supplementary material on empirical perspective, is well established. The six chapters included here discuss the interpretation of the abridged treatise from its first appearance in print until the end of the eighteenth century.

Catherine Soussloff examines the way in which Trichet Du Fresne’s book positions Leonardo, his art, and his theory as French, presenting the artist as the transmitter of the Italian art tradition. She frames Du Fresne’s endeavor in the terms described by Roger Chartier, as bridging an older humanist practice of compiling the texts of ancient authors, on the one hand, with a distinctly proto-modernist position as author, tied to a press, on the other hand. The 1651 publication, it should be emphasized, helped to create the distinct national traditions that Soussloff discerns in her descriptions of the biographies of Leonardo and Alberti and their accompanying portraits. Trichet’s biography of Leonardo is the primary focus of her analysis, which she understands as Du Fresne’s own contribution to a multi-author format indebted to Paolo Giovio (who lived near Melzi and thus may have had direct knowledge of
Leonardo) and especially Bartoli’s edition of Alberti’s works, *Opuscoli morali* (Venice, 1568), another lavish production with 15 treatises by Alberti and a portrait of the author. Trichet sets in motion a complex form of citation from multiple earlier texts and authors throughout the volume that can be termed recursive and reflexive. He frequently criticizes Vasari’s view of Leonardo by emphasizing his French and Milanese connections (when Milan was under French control) and drawing Leonardesque ideals from Lomazzo.

Trichet himself was a great art collector and an important bibliophile who held the title of Proofreader for the Imprimerie Royale, established in 1640. His unprecedented art bibliography represents a synthesis of earlier literature on art, while his taste in painting made him an important member of Poussin’s circle who shared his taste in art with Cassiano, as Soussloff discusses in detail. Soussloff observes that the biographies in the 1651 edition tell us a great deal about authorial practices of selection and arrangement. Trichet aimed to restore a ‘purity’ that might never have existed in the past and turned out not to be important in the subsequent historiography of Leonardo. Nonetheless, Trichet’s ostentatious iteration of his own name and authorship in the first pages of the volume denotes his presence and his subjectivity in terms that Derrida describes as the ‘performativity’ of the writer in the text as distinct from his subject.

Juliana Barone’s meticulous examination of the role played by an engineering process in Poussin’s interpretation of Leonardo’s teachings continues to examine the making of the 1651 edition. Barone reports that when she compared H 228, Cassiano’s abridged copy of the *Treatise on Painting*, with Barberini 4304, then in the library of Cardinal Francesco Barberini in Rome, some visual references in Cassiano’s manuscript were lacking in its supposed source. Supporting arguments made by Bell in chapter 5, Barone suggests that there must have been some other sources yet to be identified available in Rome before 1657, when Melzi’s original (the Codex Urbinas) was transferred to the Papal library. The main focus of her discussion is Poussin’s manner of operating with proportion, using Antique models with different systems (the Farnese *Hercules* and the Belvedere *Antinous*) that he reduced to a single scale. Poussin evolved a process involving several stages of intermediate drawings related to his known practices elsewhere — and related to practices of figural duplication recognized in the work of Antonio Pollaiuolo in the mid-fifteenth century.24 Dealing with the illustrations attributed to Poussin that are pasted into H 228, probably commissioned by Cassiano dal Pozzo for publication, datable c. 1635, Barone proposes that Poussin’s method of replicating figures through a complex series of planimetric rotations and displacements was theoretically oriented and embodied specific aesthetic meaning. His illustrations act as a way of transmitting visual knowledge and they establish a new order that emphasizes frozen poses intentionally devoid of internal impetus.

Martin Kemp’s classic study on the mixed reception of the 1651 publication of Leonardo’s Treatise at the recently established French art academy follows, reprinted from 1987 because its arguments provide an essential overview of
the main themes of the present volume regarding the institutionalization of art. He frames the historical evidence in an argument about the difficult task of tracing the fortune of a set of artistic ideas. The central problem lies in the relationship between the artistic text we are reading now and the visual image that was its inevitable accompaniment at another time and place: in the case of judging the impact of the French first edition of Leonardo’s treatise at the French Académie, what image of Leonardo did readers bring to the text? What more general assumptions about what a painting should look like did readers of his Treatise have? And how did French artists and theorists view the role of this kind of theoretical writing in the production of art and the status of their profession?

These questions are explored by a number of the chapters in the present volume. The answers vary greatly. Kemp explores the impact of Leonardo’s ideas on a particularly well-documented aspect of French theory, which he summarizes as favoring Charles le Brun, painter to the king and director of the Académie, and leading to the expulsion of Abraham Bosse from the Academy in 1661. Jacques le Bicher’s Traité de Perspective, written in 1657 and published in 1660, was dedicated to Le Brun; followed first by (the translator of Leonardo’s treatise) Fréart de Chambray’s Idea de la perfection de la peinture (1662), used by Le Brun in his attack on Bosse; then by Grégoire Huret’s Optique de portraiture et peinture (1670) which also emphasized the importance of translating the perception of phenomena into pictorial form. Discussions at the Académie royale in the 1660s revolved around problems of representation developed in these texts – the immediate legacy of Leonardo’s writings on perspective, although they were not always recognized as such.

Some aspects of Leonardo’s precepts, like his concerns with the communicative motions of the human figure and the principles of decorum in narrative compositions, were readily absorbed into developing academic ideals. Other aspects entered into disputes centered on the role of geometric perspective rules versus judgement of the eye and intuitive artistry, the latter associated with Leonardo’s precepts. Bosse, a devoted disciple of the mathematician Desargues who was hired by the Académie to teach perspective, disparaged the Treatise’s disorganization and frequently incoherent character, particularly its lack of sustained treatment of geometric or linear perspective. In his Traité des pratiques geometrales et perspectives (1665) published after his expulsion, Bosse detailed his criticism of Leonardo’s Traité and quoted Poussin’s letter disparaging the Treatise. Kemp concludes by stressing that the intellectual and organizational base that the Academicians established for their profession through these debates was made within an institutional structure: Bosse had run against that establishment, controlled by Le Brun and Colbert.

In the next chapter, J.V. Field continues the discussion of the teaching of perspective at the French Academy and the nature of institutional power by providing a broader cultural context for the developing relations between the visual arts and the learned sciences from c. 1450 to 1700. When the Académie
was founded, the sciences and natural philosophy in general were in a state of transition. The rejection of Bosse's work by the Académie can be read as an indication of changes perceived in the relationship of mathematics to the visual arts. In his books on perspective, most notably in his *Manière universelle de Mr Desargues* (1648), Bosse was developing Desargues' work. He accordingly suffered from the polemics directed against Desargues, which extended to his advanced abstract geometrical work (now seen as of great historical importance).

The question is why members of the Paris Academy of painting and sculpture collectively set themselves up as judges of mathematics. Field argues it was due to the history of artists' association with a vernacular tradition of illustrated works addressed to practitioners of specific crafts. Both the French and Italian printed editions of Leonardo's *Treatise* were intended for use as instructional texts, and were considered preferable to Bosse's lectures on perspective. Field suggests that the problem the Académie had in accommodating Bosse's works was that it took its mathematics too seriously. No one had ever declined the award of the increased intellectual status of painting since Alberti (1435) proposed that it has a scientific basis. However, craftsmen trained in workshops could afford to be pragmatic in making things look right – relying upon what we now call the robustness of the illusion. By the mid-seventeenth century mathematics had been used to give successful descriptions of various phenomena, such as the refraction of light. It seems the Académie expected the mathematical art of its teaching to yield exact results, as mathematics did in contemporary natural philosophy, and found it wanting, for instance in appearing to impose unrealistic viewing conditions for pictures. In rejecting Bosse's mathematical teaching of perspective in favor of the largely qualitative maxims provided by Leonardo, the Académie may be seen as in effect recognizing what painters had known for a long time: that a few simple rules would do. At the same time, the Académie was turning its back upon the mathematical style of the natural philosophy of its own time in favor of an older essentially Aristotelian approach. Field suggests that we are seeing here the beginnings of the divide between up-to-date art and current science.

Pauline Maguire Robison's chapter traces the active reception of Leonardo's theory of aerial perspective in Félibien's writings and Poussin's paintings. Félibien's *Entretiens* 5 (1679) containing his exposition of aerial perspective, appeared thirty years after the publication of Leonardo's *Treatise* when this kind of perspective was an established part of French academic theory. His reduction of over 100 chapters of the *Treatise* remains the most concisely crystallized statement of Leonardo's theory, although he does not credit Leonardo with the ideas he presents. Félibien emphasizes the importance of the medieval optical tradition to the artist's understanding and ability to execute aerial perspective correctly. Indeed, the organization of Félibien's discussion of aerial perspective parallels that of medieval optical treatises, beginning with phenomena involving direct radiation, continuing with a
discussion of reflected radiation, and concluding with a discussion of refracted rays. He establishes three basic assumptions derived from natural philosophy that constitute the bedrock of Leonardo’s theory of aerial perspective: namely, that horizontal and vertical gradients have an effect on color. His numerous examples repeat Leonardo’s while also underscoring the importance of the medieval optical tradition to Leonardo’s theory of aerial perspective. At a certain point, Félibien’s dependence on the Treatise ceases and he presents ideas contained in the still unpublished MS H 227 that Cassiano dal Pozzo had prepared to supplement his planned edition of the Treatise.

André Félibien’s fifth Entretiens, or conversations on art, published in 1679, is a cogent compendium of Leonardo’s ideas on aerial (or atmospheric) perspective that the author developed over long years of collaboration with Poussin. In the Preface to Entretiens, Félibien describes how he came to write his book after meeting Poussin in Rome in 1647–49, which led him to read all the books that concerned art, developing a close friendship with the artist. For his part, forty years before Félibien’s publication, ten years before the publication of Leonardo’s Treatise, to which he had access in manuscript form by 1635, Poussin underwent a marked change in his approach to landscape painting. It is apparent that Poussin makes carefully observed differences in the quality of atmosphere in two landscapes one of his principal concerns. Thus, viewed in retrospect, Félibien’s publication belongs to the history of editions of Leonardo’s Treatise, while in Poussin’s painterly experiments with light and color we thus discover a solid historical foundation for the experimentation with complex effects of light and color in nature that have long been noticed in his work. The links between this mid-seventeenth-century project and earlier attempts to publish a treatise on painting composed of Leonardo’s ideas favoring empirical perspective and its painterly emulation, is a shared theme that emerges from the individual chapters dealing with French reception history. The final chapter on the French reception of Leonardo’s Treatise, by Thomas Kirchner, picks up from Kemp’s analysis and provides an overview of academic debates involving Leonardo’s precepts until the end of the eighteenth century.

It should be noted in this connection that in the early eighteenth century, Leonardo’s precepts on painting became widely accessible to French readers thanks to the first pocket-sized edition first published in 1716, edited by Francis Giffart. 26 One of the most significant conclusions that Kirchner draws from his diachronic study concerns the way in which Leonardo’s Treatise helped to lay a foundation for scientific art historical methods – the implications of his findings for the historiography of Kunstwissenschaft, usually conceived as a strictly German contribution, merit further study beyond the framework of this volume. With the rise of classicism, Kirchner writes, philological and art historical concerns gained importance. The Italian physicist Giovanni Battista Venturi, a professor who lived in Paris at the time of the Directory, when the city housed 13 volumes of manuscripts by Leonardo (as it still does), was the first to systematically investigate Leonardo’s scientific studies,
which he approached as a scientist looking for the same in Leonardo. Even though Venturi's grandly conceived editorial project never materialized, his methodology was of crucial importance in being the first to read Leonardo's texts critically by looking for an all-embracing concept. His studies yielded a new edition edited by the painter and art writer Pierre-Marie Gault de Saint-Germain, published in 1803 (based on Cassiano's MS H 228), which applied Venturi's new approach to the *Treatise on Painting*, taking, in Kirchner's words, 'a first step toward an art historical appraisal of the text.'

Until the nineteenth century, Leonardo's treatise was discussed in the context of educating artists, the main responsibility of the Académie. Art theory had become an active pursuit at the French Academy with the onset of conferences in 1667, when Leonardo counted as the first 'French' artist of world fame. The Academicians made use of Leonardo's treatise in the initial stages of their institution to develop a curriculum. Two subjects in Leonardo's treatise were of special interest to Academicians: his explications of the representation of the human body and his discussion of perspective. Academicians used anatomical atlases derived from the work of Vesalius for their teaching, deriving some pivotal suggestions from Leonardo. Most importantly, teaching methods adapted Leonardo's procedure of disassembling the human body into its individual parts to describe their movements, then reassembling them in the manner of building blocks. What they made of Leonardo's ideas on systematization was far removed from his intentions. While Leonardo wanted to develop a system by which the reality of bodily experience could be captured, in the latter part of the seventeenth century, Le Brun developed a procedure for reproducing the passions by increasingly abstracting that experience. The systematization of education in this manner had two advantages for the Academicians: a young artist could approach his task slowly, learning along rational lines; and the process allowed for abstracting from a model satisfying the demands of an idealistic image of art.

The central objections of eighteenth-century critics of the Academy were already formulated in the seventeenth century. Criticisms of Academic methods concentrated on Le Brun's formulations for expressions of the passions. The central issue was the artist's responsibility toward realistic representation. The first critic of the Academy Charles-Alphonse Du Fresnoy suggested following Leonardo's advice to observe people in the streets with their natural expressions. Roger de Piles also referred to the study of nature in the sense that Leonardo meant, calling on the imagination as a supplement to other ways of study. Suggestions on how to master the difficult problem of representing emotions made in the eighteenth century rarely omitted Leonardo's reference to the necessity of studying from nature. Kirchner discusses Compte de Caylus's publication of etchings after Leonardo's drawings of grotesques, which was prefaced by an essay summarizing the state of knowledge about Leonardo written by the distinguished collector and connoisseur Pierre-Jean Mariette. Mariette's central concern was the duty of the artist to follow
nature by studying the movement and coordination of individual body parts. According to Caylus, the fundamental problem was that painting expressed no passion. Leonardo's method was designed to prevent the danger of falling into a mannered style. Kirchner argues that Caylus's ideas developed from his study of Leonardo's *Treatise*. He critiqued the Academic practice of using models who held poses for three hours. However, the importance of the model as a central aid in art education was not raised in any fundamental way until Denis Diderot (1756), who insisted that truth can only be found in real life.

**The Spanish Reception**

Through his reading of both Academic sources and art criticism, Kirchner is able to show that the *Treatise on Painting* was invoked to reform the Academy and its education system from within, but also to question the institution and its work from without. He concludes that both parties could summon Leonardo's observations with equal justification due to the relative open-endedness of Leonardo's argumentation. The next section of this volume consists of two chapters regarding the reception of Leonardo's ideas derived from the *Treatise on Painting* by Spanish writers closely associated with institutions of artistic instruction. Although Charlene Villaseñor Black and Javier Navarro de Zuvillaga treat different authors, they both also find a stress on the importance of artistic practice among Spanish authors. Black interprets this difference from Italian art literature as marking the emergence of a specifically Spanish discourse on art. Navarro, like Kirchner, links the *Treatise on Painting* to ideas about reforming the Academy, founded in 1744, forty years before the publication of a Spanish edition of the *Treatise* (1784).

Navarro's overview of Spanish literature on perspective and art theory in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries notes that Leonardo's ideas were present in discussions of the *paragon*, even though the arguments could not have come directly from Leonardo, but from ancient and other modern authors, because the *paragon* was one of the standard topics for discussing the arts. Navarro cites as examples Juan de Jauregui's *Dialogue between Nature and Painting and Sculpture* (1618) written in verse; Vicente Carducho's *Dialogues on Painting* (1633), which takes many arguments from Leonardo (especially in Dialogue 6) not present in the abridged *Treatise on Painting*; Pacheco's *Art of Painting* (1621–49), discussed at greater length in the next chapter by Black; and Palomino's *Pictorial Museum* (1715–24), the first two volumes of which were dedicated to theory and practice of painting and the third to the lives and works of eminent Spanish painters and sculptors. Navarro focuses more attention on the only two books dealing exclusively with art theory, Francisco Preciado de la Vega's *Pictorial Arcadia* (Madrid, 1789), based on Leonardo and Palomino; and especially Diego Rejón's Spanish translation of the *Treatise on Painting*, the first Spanish language edition, based on the 1651 *editio princeps* and published in 1784. Navarro reinforces assessments made throughout this volume about the historical reception of Leonardo's investigations of the
creative power of the image and the institutionalization of artistic education: the Treatise served as a recipe book of rules and examples to be followed. Rejón was an Academician at the Real Academia de Bellas Artes in Madrid and his edition was a consequence of reforming ideas about the Academy of San Fernando that his friend Raphael Mengs and his followers wanted to carry out in the 1760s. While Mengs had suggested introducing theoretical subjects such as perspective, anatomy, and composition, Rejón provided a collection of instrumental precepts for what Navarro terms ‘academist’ purposes.

Francisco Pacheco’s El arte de la pintura, completed 1638 and published posthumously in 1649, a text widely considered to be the most important art treatise produced in early modern Spain, is also the first text to publish and disseminate excerpts from Leonardo’s Treatise on Painting credited to him. The first two books of the treatise dealing with the paragon or comparison of the arts, published independently of the rest of the book in 1622, is the focus of Black’s chapter. Pacheco assumed leadership of Seville’s humanist academy in 1599 and from 1618 served as Overseer of sacred painting for the Tribunal of the Inquisition. His academy, based on the Italian literary academy, hosted informal gatherings of scholars, writers, and members of the nobility. Like other texts discussed in the present volume, Black describes his treatise as an anthology, a form of compilation rooted in the literary tradition of Sevillian academies, which often produced collaborative works. Pacheco’s stance is clear: practice is as important as theory, and Black finds that an emphasis on practice as opposed to theoretical knowledge reverberates throughout his treatise. He emphasizes practicality, utility, and the universality of painting.

Black focuses on Pacheco’s interpretation of ingenio because it underscores the centrality of practical, even artisanal, values. Pacheco equates ingenio with habilidad, or skill situated in hand and brush – a valorization that parallels ideas in Spanish Golden Age literature. The discourse on ingenio was well established in the seventeenth century – Black cites the widely influential treatise by Juan Huarte de San Juan, Examen de Ingenios par alas Ciencias (1575 and 1595). She argues that the literature demonstrates that major topics that Leonardo had developed in his own paragone written in defense of painting, were widely diffused among the Italian theorists that Pacheco read – topics such as fatica, difficolt, durata, practicality, utility, universality, and so on, that added to a painting’s honor and the painter’s proper compensation, had a particular resonance in Spain. (The question of how Leonardo’s ideas, confined to an inaccessible text, circulated so widely is answered by the availability of intermediate sources such as Castiglione’s Book of the Courtier, with its summaries of Leonardo’s arguments.26) Pacheco’s explanation of a painting’s universality reworked a passage by Vasari, but added genres such as mapmaking and the military arts derived from medieval discussions of the mechanical arts and not usually considered by Italian writers. To better understand how arguments about the value of practice were actually embodied in paintings, Black turns to examples of ‘meta-pictures,’ meaning paintings that deal with the status of painting as a liberal art and the nobility
of the painter. Black compares Pacheco's combining of dibujo and colorado as a specifically Spanish predilection for painterly brushwork—and she discusses Velázquez's representation of himself in Las Meninas as a painter whose hand dissolves into 'blotches and slashes' as a painterly pun. Likewise, she deals with a series of artists' self-portraits linked to the emergence of an 'incipient national consciousness' in art and literature that merits further work.

The Dutch, German, and Flemish Reception

The fourth section of the volume deals with responses to Leonardo's ideas in northern Europe, specifically in Dutch, German, and Flemish sources. As far as actual editions of the Treatise in these languages are concerned, the first German edition was published in Nuremberg in 1724, edited by the painter Johan Boehm and based on the French and Italian editions of 1651, while the first Dutch edition followed a century later, only in 1827. Yet Dutch publications made Leonardo's ideas available in the vernacular much earlier, as the chapters in this section elaborate. As far as printed materials attributed to Leonardo are concerned, in 1682, Willem Goeree, already well known for his compilations of painting manuals, published a compendium on the human figure which included two chapters, amounting to 140 pages of text, of Leonardo’s precepts—and Goeree’s veritable treatise on painting was reprinted three times in the eighteenth century. Focusing on the earlier lines of transmission of Leonardo’s ideas, if any traits could be said to characterize the discourse on art in these sources as a whole, it is the moral tone of discussion and the variety of emphases on painting as a philosophical pursuit and a practical enterprise. The chapters by Michèle-Caroline Heck and Thijs Weststeijn analyze texts published in the seventeenth century which show that Leonardo’s ideas were transmitted directly as well as indirectly in a complex, inter-textual process. The chapter by Juliana Barone also deals with a complex process of citation, in this case in the literary and visual practices of Rubens, one of Leonardo’s greatest artist/readers along with Poussin.

Heck begins with the historiography of northern European art literature, initiated with Vienna School source criticism that failed to take into account the methods used to compile texts or the manner in which source texts were used. The significance—once again—of compilations, a writing technique in its own right as Heck points out, was ignored and therefore the role of Leonardo’s writings has been poorly understood. Karl Van Mander and Joachim Sandrart, the two authors she treats, did not have equal access to his sources. Their borrowings take two forms, often in combination: (1) adapting an idea and making it more general through references to familiar notions; and (2) copying texts almost word for word. The situation of Van Mander in Holland in the early seventeenth century was different from Sandrart in Germany during the third quarter of the seventeenth century. The German theoretician resembles Leonardo more closely, particularly in his view of painting as a science based
on observation. Sandrart's treatise expresses a concern for organization and simplification in teaching the representation of the human body, light, and landscape. He based his work on the re-use, translation, and interpretation of Vasari's *Vite* and Van Mander's *Schilder-boeck*, as discussed at length by Heck. Sandrart also adopted Van Mander's moralizing approach in his discussion of the common human ability to see, analyze, and judge.

Leonardo's influence in northern European art literature manifests itself before 1651. There are many references to him in Van Mander's *Grondt der edel vry schilderconst* (Haarlem, 1604). This introduction to the *Schilder-boeck* (1596-1603) widely diffused Leonardo's work north of the Alps at the end of the sixteenth/early seventeenth century. This compilation is organized like an encyclopedia with chapters on theory, biographies of classical, Italian, Dutch, and German artists, and a Dutch translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and of the *Iconologia deorum*. It is not a handbook but a didactic poem addressed to studious young men, an allegory strongly influenced by Italian art literature that compares art to a mountain that must be climbed. Leonardo's contributions to Van Mander's theory are incontestable, even though Van Mander does not cite his sources, in keeping with contemporary practice. The internal evidence shows that he must have used a version of the abridged *Treatise*, at some distance from the original and not well integrated, in contrast to Sandrart's *Teutsche Academie* (German, 1675, and Latin, 1683).

Sandrart's literal borrowings and their integration into a different literary and artistic context reveal the flexibility and adaptability of Leonardo's text. While he was in Rome in the summer of 1629 and again in June 1635, Sandrart became aware of a group of painters and amateurs whose interests in Leonardo's manuscripts was growing. (This would have been the group associated with Cassiano dal Pozzo.) From his new friend Poussin, he received an early manuscript copy of the abridged *Treatise*. His discussion of the human figure refers to Leonardo but, like Poussin, he based his knowledge of the figure on classical sculpture, profoundly modifying Leonardo's approach by not referring to direct observations of the human body in nature. Sandrart never quotes Leonardo and probably did not know his drawings or paintings. Heck concludes that whether he was a literal copyist or just close in spirit to Leonardo, his borrowings testify to his reflection on and understanding of the idea that art is a science.

Navarro and Heck are both concerned with texts that reframe Leonardo's considerations of painting defined as a science into a set of rules for training painters — in fact, the original abridgement project operated on a similar set of assumptions and institutional considerations. Thijs Weststeijn, on the other hand, writes about a text that was intended to raise the intellectual status of painting, Samuel van Hoogstraten's *Introduction to the Academy of Painting, or the Visible World* (Rotterdam, 1678). Hoogstraten, one of the most learned painters of the Dutch Republic, was an active citizen of the 'republic of letters.' Weststeijn argues that Leonardo's writings played an exemplary role in Hoogstraten's exploration of the art of painting as not just a set of
rules, but a philosophical, contemplative activity. The references to the Trattato in overviews of art theory, as well as the borrowings by van Hoogstraten's contemporary Willem Goeree, suggest that the book was commonly known in the Netherlands.

Van Hoogstraten trained in Rembrandt's workshop, one of the most theory-oriented studios in the Netherlands; it had also attracted Sandrart during his visit to Amsterdam from 1637 to 1645. In addition to using Van Mander's paraphrase of Vasari, van Hoogstraten may have had access to Du Fresne's edition of Leonardo's Treatise. In any case, his virtual academy of painting was inspired directly by Le Brun's Parisian example. Echoing Leonardo, van Hoogstraten defined painting as a science; moreover, adapting formulations from the paragone tradition, he stressed the universality of the painter. Like Leonardo, who extolled the painter's ability to depict all aspects of the visible world, van Hoogstraten claimed that the reflection on visible reality can be seen as a tribute to its Creator. Since the artist studies God's works, painting may be construed not only as a liberal art, but even as one of man's most important intellectual pursuits. This assumption resounds in the admonition that the painter's methods should reflect the laws of nature, which van Hoogstraten shares with Leonardo. This shared ideology lies at the heart of the parallels in the two authors' remarks on painting practice. Van Hoogstraten's terminology is at times very similar to Leonardo's, but the authors disagree on the issue of visible brushwork: contrary to his predecessor, van Hoogstraten describes the relief of the paint layer as an aid in pictorial illusionism. Leonardo's ideas on acuity perspective, in particular his views on the gradual blurring of the edges of objects over distance, are reflected in the Dutch concept of 'rounding' which is also elaborated in Franciscus Junius's treatise The Painting of the Ancients (Middelburg, 1641).

Completing the northern reception of Leonardo's Treatise, Juliana Barone in the next chapter investigates the importance of Leonardo's visual works and theoretical studies to Rubens. Rubens's concerns encompassed both the study and the depiction of motion consistently over a wide range of literary and visual sources. The creative re-use of earlier models is a constant in Rubens's art. Rubens knew the autograph Leonardo material in Pompeo Leoni's collection, and he could have also known Leonardo's writings from early manuscript copies of the Treatise on Painting, perhaps through his friend Sandrart. Barone studies the MS Ganay illustrations on human motion that Rubens derived from Leonardo's Treatise, concluding that they find no correspondence in the other transcripts – therefore they could not be based on the 1651 edition as others have argued. Although the Ganay figures are based on Poussin's re-drawings, they are characteristically reworked to show much more dynamic and expressive qualities. The texts were not copied from the corresponding chapters of the 1651 edition that the figures illustrate. In particular, Barone argues, the connections Rubens drew between mental and corporeal motion is entirely consistent with the Ganay manuscript definitions of mental and mixed motions. Barone concludes that
the combination of chapters in the Ganay manuscript is more in keeping with Rubens's reworking of sources than with the work of a copyist. Echoing Cole's study of the sculptor Susini in chapter 4, Barone emphasizes the importance of Rubens's drawings for revealing aspects of Leonardo's legacy that were not shaped by the seventeenth-century academic tradition.

**The English Reception**

Turning to the English reception of Leonardo's *Treatise on Painting*, Richard Woodfield and Geoff Quilley provide contrasting interpretations of the first English translation published in 1721 by John Senex and William Taylor, who probably provided the financial support. Senex was not only a bookseller who published maps but also an accomplished cartographer, engraver, globemaker, and publisher of scientific books who was made a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1728 for his work on globes. Woodfield argues that the *Treatise* edition was part of Senex's project to promote Newtonian culture and advance the cause of speculative Freemasonry engaged in the observation and experimentation communicated by images and texts. Quilley describes a different audience of gentlemen for Senex's edition—following John Barrell's study of the rise of a bourgeoisie for whom study of the art of painting was central to the conception of an ordered society, Quilley describes the patrician world of virtuoso collectors and men of letters associated with the 1721 edition. Significantly, unlike the Spanish and Dutch texts discussed in other chapters, the English edition of the *Treatise* was not employed as a standard teaching text.

Turning first to Woodfield's argument, he stresses the public interest in demonstrating the mechanical and theological consequences of Newtonian science by putting theory into practice. The translator's preface to the 1721 edition commended the study of Leonardo to contemporary painters in the context of the new experimental philosophy, and Senex placed Leonardo in the pantheon of heroes of the experimental method. While English authors had concerned themselves with pattern and recipe books and French academicians concerned themselves with establishing a poetics of painting equivalent to Ancient treatises, Senex promoted science in its practical form of technology. Leonardo's treatise was unlike any other publication on painting in England before 1721 as the first of a number of philosophical or scientific/technological works published for the benefit of visual artists. Senex himself published other works on architecture, anatomy, perspective, and mathematical instruments. The publishing climate that Woodfield describes is reminiscent of mid-sixteenth-century Florence when literary academies were numerous and actively engaged in publishing treatises on art. In fact, the second editorial campaign to print an edition of Leonardo's treatise was probably associated with the Florentine literary academy, as I describe the situation in chapter 3. In the British case, Senex promoted Newtonian culture through the Freemasons who developed an egalitarian movement where social classes could mix and
discuss matters of common interest. The significant audience for the Treatise would have been Masonic, Woodfield concludes, but the publication also had wider appeal to readers interested in applied science such as painters, whose concept of the artist was associated with the allied trades (not the fine artist of the nineteenth century when Leonardo’s text became incorporated within the institutionalization of art).

Quilley refers the Senex and Rigaud editions of 1721 and 1802 respectively, to the proclamation of painting as a liberal art, and the painter as a gentleman, not a mere ‘mechanic.’ The discourse on painting in early eighteenth-century England centered on the contrast between its being theoretically a liberal art, but socially deprecated in its material production. Even before the appearance of an English translation, Leonardo’s reputation and status as an artist and theoretician were steeped in the Italophilia that pervaded eighteenth-century British culture. The text of the Treatise, in Quilley’s view, occupied an influential but largely peripheral position in the aesthetic debates which selectively appropriated it. Quilley compares the Treatise’s appeal with Joseph Addison’s Spectator essays on the pleasures of the imagination. The most important aspect of novelty is variety — and while lack of structural organization made the Treatise difficult to understand, the same quality linked it firmly and positively with the Addisonian aesthetic of private pleasure. Quilley also compares the Treatise’s appeal to individualism to William Hogarth’s Analysis of Beauty (1753), which makes an early reference to the Treatise, criticizing its lack of system; meanwhile Hogarth’s pictorial aesthetic of composed variety based on direct observation of the real world is clearly sympathetic to Leonardo’s scientific empiricism. The place of the Treatise on Painting in eighteenth-century British aesthetics is uneasily poised on the cusp between public and private spheres, Quilley concludes, from which the 1721 translation had to be redeemed by the senior Academician John Francis Rigaud. His new translation of 1802 placed each chapter under the proper heading or branch of art to which it belongs, annotating the text by reference to the most recent research — and providing a scientific model for subsequent English anthologies of Leonardo’s writings up to A.P. McMahon and Martin Kemp.

The Greek and Slavic Reception

The Greek translation of Leonardo’s Treatise is a rare case of the dissemination and active reception of Italian Renaissance theory by a Byzantine icon painter who desired to revolutionize Greek art. Panagiotis Doxaras’s translation survives in two illustrated manuscripts, one in Venice considered to be a copy made by his son, and the other in Athens, an autograph manuscript. The Greek translation of the Treatise is practically unknown to scholars anywhere outside of Greece. Both manuscripts are checklisted in the standard study of printed editions and manuscript copies of the Trattato della pittura, published by Kate Trauman Steinitz in 1958. Chrysa Damianaki is the first to describe the two Doxaras manuscripts accurately in English, and her study of these
precious documents focuses on the reception of Western-style painting by artists trained in the Byzantine tradition. Damianaki shows how the reception of Leonardo, as exhibited in the two Greek copies of the 1651 edition that are associated with Doxaras, informed the effort to redefine a Greek style in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This effort at redefinition took place against the backdrop of a religious struggle between Orthodox forces who supported traditional Byzantine style and the elite classes in places like Corfu, whose ties to Venice were culturally strong, and who increasingly defined themselves in terms of a kind of Mediterranean cosmopolitanism.

Damianaki argues that Doxaras’s manuscripts are very interesting compilations historically because they include additional texts that document the interest of Byzantine artists in Western painting styles and because the Athens version includes a sermon by a Jesuit priest Paolo Segneri, well known in his time and influential among Greek Orthodox ecclesiastical writers in Venice and the Ionian Islands. On the basis of these subsidiary texts also translated by Doxaras, Damianaki has reconstructed the intended audience of the translation: a community of Greek artists and an upwardly mobile, politically liberal class of Orthodox and Catholic Greeks. Her study also locates this audience in a longer historical continuum emerging from the so-called Cretan–Venetian style of painting – the same cultural background from which El Greco emerged.

Through a close reading of the interrelationships between image and text, Damianaki establishes Doxaras’s ambition to Westernize – or Latinize – Byzantine painting. Doxaras was not only trying to persuade his contemporaries by attending to the technical aspects of art (he provided Byzantine icon painters with a list of humanistic technical terms and their approximations in the Byzantine manner of rendering), but also by attending to their Orthodox religious convictions. Damianaki concludes that the Athens manuscript was intended for publication with engraved illustrations. Had the manuscript been published in Doxaras’s lifetime, it would have appeared contemporaneously with other translations that contributed to the formation of modern national styles in England, Germany, Spain, France, and elsewhere. Even though the manuscript was not published, she is able to suggest that it circulated widely among artists in Corfu, Lefkada, Zakynthos, and elsewhere sympathetic to Venetian Renaissance culture. The cultural context that emerges from this study locates the texts in a genre of instructional manuals used in Greek schools. The Greek text is sympathetic to Venetian interests when Greece was under Turkish occupation. More specifically, it was directed toward (and emanated from) an upwardly mobile, liberal middle class that contested a conservative Greek Orthodox social sector. These tensions were integral to the formation of the modern Greek nation-state. Damianaki’s work corroborates other case studies of artists who learned the Italian style through a process of copying engravings – what she finds to be the case in the Ionian Islands is also the case in Paris, where Poussin used similar techniques,
studied by Juliana Barone in chapter 8, to produce the figure illustrations to the *editio princeps* of 1651.

The capacity of Leonardo’s teachings to be inflected with a Byzantine accent is of the utmost historical significance. Doxaras’s translation is the first of many famous European books translated into Greek. The translation of Italian art treatises became an important component in the cultivation of artists and art experts. Damianaki describes the treatise of the Zakynthian monk Stratoulis, published in 1856, that deals with Leonardo and the *paragone*, translated from other Italian treatises and emphasizing the neoplatonic ideal of moral beauty. Mount Athos was a center for the promotion of Byzantine art and culture, and it had close contacts with Orthodox Balkan countries. Damianaki continues with a brief discussion of the monk, painter, and theorist Dionysius of Fourna (a.1670–c.1733), who spent most of his career in monasteries at Mount Athos. Dionysius of Fourna and Doxaras represent two opposing social groups armed with religion as the main point of contention.

Damianaki concludes with the Greek reception of Leonardo’s ideas in the Balkan states, specifically its reinterpretation initiated by the artist Christopher Zepharović of Doyran (Scopia) (active 1736–53), who also wrote a treatise influenced by Leonardo’s ideas and was the first Slavic artist to adopt the Italian Renaissance style. Damianaki argues persuasively that the only line of transmission was via Doxaras’s Greek translation of the *Trattato della pittura* (1651). Leonardo’s ideas became known to the Balkan nations through Zepharović’s treatise.

The final chapter, by Marcin Fabiański, describes the reception of Leonardo’s *Treatise* in Poland, where there was little interest in art theory until the early nineteenth century because the visual arts had long been considered to rank among the mechanical arts and because there was a lack of art instruction. Fabiański recounts the Polish adaptation of Castiglione’s *Book of the Courtier* by the Renaissance writer Lukasz Gornicki, who did not have the courtier learn painting because he believed it to be of little use. Yet Fabiański located 16 copies of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century editions of the *Treatise on Painting* in Polish libraries, including a copy of the *editio princeps* with a seventeenth-century provenance. The first successful attempt to place the arts at a university took place at Cracow in 1745, while the first regular art school was organized at the University of Warsaw in 1818. Thus it was only in the early nineteenth century that painting could be regarded as a discipline in need of a theory. In 1831 a painting professor named Wojciech Stattler developed a plan to create an academy of fine arts supported by the University, and he encouraged studies from nature and comparisons of the arts derived from Leonardo. In 1876 Wojciech Gerson, a leading painter and a teacher, published his own Polish translation of the *Treatise*, based on the 1651 edition, at a time when Polish was strictly banned from the schools. In his preface, Gerson describes how he first heard rumors about the *Treatise* and then learned Italian in order to translate a copy he bought in 1868, checking his translation against the first German edition of 1724. Printed at his own
expense, Gerson’s book was a remarkable achievement at a time when teaching in Polish was considered a subversive activity. Later publications exist – such as the erudite book published in 1885 by Maria Straszewska, who followed the most current scholarship of J.P. Richter (1883) – but it could not match the importance of Gerson’s edition. In 1867, when permission was given in Cracow to substitute Polish for German as the medium for lectures, it was also a victory for personal commitment rather than corporate or institutional encouragement.

In recounting the local circumstances of Polish reception, it is especially important to avoid projecting a model of belatedness onto the situation. What seems more relevant to compare with other settings are the associations between Leonardo’s understanding of painting as the freedom to study nature directly and the right to an education in Polish – in other words, an emerging sense of modern collective identity and the association of Leonardo’s treatise with institutional reform.

Current state of the issues

A poststructuralist understanding of the text as a ‘multi-dimensional space’ where a variety of sources blend and clash – to borrow the words of Roland Barthes – may be closer to describing the diverse historical continuities associated with Leonardo’s Treatise on Painting than an interpretive model which emphasizes authorial intent. These continuities, moreover, raise broader questions about the institutionalization of art. Can we rely on models for reading texts alone, even in their most current poststructuralist formulations, to reconstruct their impact over time? Or is it necessary to develop a framework of interpretation that emphasizes the socio-political functions of texts and images? Twenty years ago, Martin Kemp, in his study of the reception of Leonardo’s Treatise at the French Academy reprinted here, called for such an approach to the historical reception of the Treatise on Painting. The field has developed in this direction, as the studies collected in this volume attest, locating disjunctions as well as deep continuities in the gradual fabrication and simultaneous effacement of Leonardo’s authorial identity.

The questions pursued in this volume often circle around the fundamental issue of what constitutes a community of shared interests. What Pierre Bourdieu calls the ‘field of cultural production’ applies to the Treatise on Painting before and after its initial publication as a printed text. Bourdieu’s concept is much broader than a community because he takes into account differential power relationships manifest in social actions. In other words, interests that individuals do not literally share may still draw their actions together in a socio-cultural network that produces concrete effects. In the seventeenth-century French state, for example, where Leonardo’s Treatise on Painting in its published form had a phenomenally important and direct effect, Desargues and Bosse, Le Brun, Chambray, and Colbert, among others,
were all interested in defining a ‘universal science’ of pictorial representation. The oppositions in their views and the differences in their social positions cast a much wider net than the Academy itself. They define a new institutional setting for the function of art that might well be called a ‘field of cultural production.’ And to focus again on the role of the abridged Treatise in this network, ‘the fact remains,’ as Richard Turner put it, ‘that essentially private writings probably addressed to a circle of students ended up becoming one of the cornerstones of a public, national art policy.’

To understand the rich and enormously complex historical significance of Leonardo’s Treatise on Painting, Bourdieu’s sense of the ‘field of cultural production’ needs to be broadened to encompass transformations that take place over long durations in time and in numerous cultural settings. The function of Leonardo’s Treatise in the French and other institutional settings over three centuries is the subject of the present volume. Yet this volume is hardly intended to be the last word on the subject—many more studies deserve to be undertaken, and from many different points of view. The author’s role in this complex ‘tissue of signs’ was (and still is) continuously being remade.

Notes

Warm thanks to Pauline Maguire Robison for her scrupulous reading of this essay in draft form. I remain solely responsible for any remaining errors.

It is difficult to assign an exact date, or even range of dates, but following the initial critical editions of the Codex Urbinas, parent manuscript of the Treatise on Painting, and initial facsimile publications of Leonardo's autograph writings, came important publications dealing with his sources and the organization of his fragmentary literary remains: Luca Beltrami, Documenti e memorie riguardanti la vita e le opere di Leonardo da Vinci in ordine cronologico (Milan, 1919), is the fundamental work on the documents; and Gerolamo Calvi, I manoscritti di Leonardo da Vinci dal punto di vista cronologico storico e biografico (Bologna, 1925), is the fundamental study on the chronology of the manuscripts. Among the most important contributions in the next generation of scholarship are Kenneth Clark's monograph, Leonardo da Vinci: an Account of his Development as an Artist, 1939 (rev. edn 1967; repr., with intro. by Martin Kemp, 1988); and Clark's studies of the drawings, beginning with The Drawings of Leonardo da Vinci in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen at Windsor Castle (2nd rev. edn, with the assistance of Carlo Pedretti, 3 vols, London, 1968). On this solid foundation, the next generation of scholarship developed interpretive studies, key among them the ongoing work of Martin Kemp, whose monograph, Leonardo da Vinci: the Marvellous Works of Nature and Man (Cambridge MA, 1981), published on the basis of Kemp's extensive studies of Leonardo's optics since the early 1970s, is a key contribution encompassing all sides of Leonardo's career. The development of contemporary Leonardo studies is also unimaginable without the ongoing work of Carlo Pedretti on the manuscripts, beginning with his reconstruction of a lost notebook used to compile the Codex Urbinas: see Leonardo da Vinci on Painting: a Lost Book (Libro A), Reassembled from the Codex Vaticanus Urbinas 1270 and from the Codex Leicester (Berkeley CA and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1964). The equally important work of Italian scholars, including Enrico Carusi, Augusto Marinoni, A.M. Brizio, Amalia Pierantonii, and many others, needs to be noted. It is beyond the capacity of the present study to offer a historiography of the scholarship that contributed to a more historical understanding of Leonardo's legacy, but the essential point in the present context is that Leonardo's writings, focused on their authenticity, have played a central role in defining the artist's identity on the basis of historical information, in contrast to the mythic claims made for Leonardo in biographies and art criticism since the sixteenth century. There are many general bibliographies available: the most systematic is Ettore Verga, Bibliografia vinciana 1493–1930 (2 vols, Bologna: N. Zanichelli, 1931). See, most recently, M.V. Guffanti, ‘La fortuna di Leonardo nelle edizioni a stampa del Trattato della Pittura,’ in Leonardo: Dagli studi di proporzioni al Trattato della Pittura, exh. cat., ed. P.C. Marani and M.T. Fiori (Milan: Electa, 2007), and the bibliography of printed editions prepared by Guffanti in the present volume. I have edited a series of five volumes, Leonardo da Vinci: Selected Scholarship (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1999), focused on scholarship in English (except for the first volume, on biographies and art criticism, which treats other languages), arranged to provide an historiographical introduction to Leonardo studies on various subjects.

when the Codex Urbinas was published; see n. 19 below. It was also one of the earliest large format art books (as distinct from books on art), as discussed in this volume by Catherine Sousslof; see also her 'The Trouble with Painting, the Image(less) Text,' *Journal of Visual Culture* 4/2 (2005): 203–36. The bibliography on art books has recently burgeoned, but an early study that articulated important issues in a single lecture is Francis Haskell, *The Painful Birth of the Art Book* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1987). The present study contributes to ongoing interest in the nature of the book in the early modern period, most centrally in the attention given to the nature of compilations by many of the authors; and the interrelationship of image and text by others. Again, scholarship in this field is growing rapidly; among the most relevant in relation to finds published here are: Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1998); and *The Treatise on Perspective: Published and Unpublished*, ed. Lyle Massey, *Studies in the History of Art* 59, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, Symposium Papers 36 (Washington DC: National Gallery of Art, 2003).


5 Turner, *Inventing Leonardo*, advances the argument, corroborated by the studies presented here, that Leonardo's authorship was effaced in the early modern literature on art. Nowhere is this more obvious than in the first publications that incorporate material from the abridged *Treatise on Painting* but without crediting Leonardo as their source. Early modern notions of authorship were not our own, and a number of reasons are advanced by authors of the present study who deal with these texts, which include publications by Lomazzo (1584), Raffaello Borghini (1584), Pietro Accolti (1625), Girolamo Cardano (1630), and Matteo Zaccolini (1608–22, unpublished but in circulation). See especially the chapters here by Robert Williams, Claire Farago, Janis Bell, Martin Kemp, Pauline Maguire Robison, Charlene Villasenor Black, Michele-Caroline Heck, and Thijs Weststeijn. The ways in which Leonardo's ideas were appropriated by others without crediting their source is known in the specialist literature, although the implications have been explained in various ways — which is one reason for reconsidering the phenomena here in the framework of reception. Outside the specialized field of Leonardo studies, these circumstances are far less recognized or taken into account. See, for example, Thomas Puttffarkan, *The Discovery of Pictorial Composition: Theories of Visual Order in Painting*, 1400–1800 (New Haven CT and London: Yale University Press, 2000), who never discusses Leonardo's literary contribution to seventeenth-century discussions of composition, even though he deals with sources such as Alberti, Lomazzo, Raffaello Borghini, and Félibien, among others, who were either Leonardo's sources for his ideas on composition (Alberti) or were fundamentally indebted to Leonardo's writings on pictorial composition in the terms that Puttffarkan uses to define his subject, as contributions in the present volume by Pauline Maguire Robison, Robert Williams, Martin Kemp and others discuss. Compare Puttffarkan, p. 47: 'there is no word about composition in Leonardo's Trattato.' Puttffarkan, p. 71, discussing the compositional role of perspective in Leonardo's *Last Supper*, writes that Renaissance treatises did not acknowledge compositional effects such as this, yet French seventeenth-century critics understood such 'masterpieces of the Italian Renaissance as compositional paradigms.' Again, see p. 237: in the preface to his *conférences* delivered in 1667 and published in 1668, Félibien clearly stated the principle that the composition in the mind must be completed
before the work is executed. The problem to which I wish to call attention is not Puttfarken’s reading of the sources, but the difficulty of discerning the manner in which Leonardo contributed to the discussion. His name is not mentioned by those who used his ideas. Further, this is not intended as a criticism to shore up Leonardo’s identity, but as an observation about the way in which ideas are transmitted. On Leonardo’s use of the word ‘compositio’ and his writings in relation to Alberti, see further, my ‘Leonardo’s Prospeziva Composta in the History of Pictorial Composition,’ in I mondi di Leonardo. Arte, scienza e filosofia, ed. Carlo Vecce (Milan: Edizioni Università IULM, 2003), pp. 107–29.

6 This point is emphasized by Michael Cole in his contribution to this volume.


10 Hayden White, ‘The Politics of Historical Interpretation: Discipline and De-Sublimation,’ Critical Inquiry 9/1 (September 1982): 119–43, citing p. 121. White reviews a debate on the difference between ‘professionalization’ in the physical and social sciences established with the publication of Thomas S. Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1962). The following points taken from White’s argument relevant in the present context in no way represents its full complexity, which is aimed at conceiving of a new ‘historical sublime.’ Empirical art history – by which White meant the gathering of facts without asking what constitutes a ‘fact’ – acts like a discipline in the physical sciences, but without having developed their characteristic theoretical and methodological regimentation.


12 See Carlo Vecce, ‘Nota al testo,’ in Pedretti and Vecce, Libro di Pittura, p. 85. The early history of the manuscript is obscure. It was first reported in an inventory of the library of the Della Rovere in Castel Durante, when the books were transferred to Urbino at the time of the death of Francesco Maria, last duke of Urbino, in 1631. As part of the bequest of the duke’s library to Urban VIII, the manuscript was transferred to the Vatican in 1657, during the pontificate of Alexander VII. In 1797 it was rediscovered and given the catalogue number 1270 by the librarian Guglielmo Manzi, who published the editio princeps: Trattato della Pittura di Leonardo da Vinci tratto da un Codice della Biblioteca Vaticana ..., ed. G. Manzi (Rome: de Romanis, 1817).

13 Pedretti and Vecce, Libro di Pittura, p. 22, dates the manuscript c. 1546, based on internal evidence and analysis of Melzi’s handwriting.
For the abridged copies, see Steinitz, Leonardo da Vinci’s Trattato, pp. 45–70, and additional articles in Raccolta Vinciana, cited in n. 1; and Carlo Pedretti, The Literary Works of Leonardo da Vinci Compiled and Edited from the Original Manuscripts by Jean Paul Richter: Commentary (2 vols, Berkeley CA and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1977), vol. I, pp. 14–36. The editors retained three out of eight sections of Melzi’s compilation: the Parte secunda collects statements of all dates dealing with nonlinear perspective and also includes some perceptive statements about the arrangement of figures in narrative painting (chapters 173 to 189 of the Codex Urbinas). The remainder of Leonardo’s lifetime of neo-Albertian observations on the expression and arrangement of figures in narrative paintings comprise the Parte terza, which is the only other major section of the abridged Treatise. The fourth section, on draperies, consists of four short passages only. Parts 1 (comparison of the arts), 5 (light and shadow), 6 (trees and greenery), 7 (clouds), and 8 (the horizon) were not included in any abridged copies of the Treatise. I am currently editing an edition of the Italian abridged Treatise on Painting in collaboration with Carlo Vecce, Anna Sconza, Juliana Barone, Pauline Maguire Robison, and Janis Bell. In addition to the printed edition, the editorial team is collaborating with Francesca Fiorani at the University of Virginia on an electronic archive that compares all the manuscript copies of the abridged Treatise on Painting.

Although the issues are not completely resolved. Donatella Sparti has proposed that Barberini 4304 was copied from Codex Pinellianus, making it the link between the earliest copies in Florence and the printed edition: see Donatella Livia Sparti, ‘Cassiano dal Pozzo, Poussin, and the Making and Publication of Leonardo’s Trattato,’ Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 66 (2003): 143–88. See commentary in Chapter 5 of this volume by Janis Bell.


In this volume, see the chapter by Soussloff; on art bibliography, see K.T. Steinitz, ‘Early Art Bibliographies: Who Compiled the First Art Bibliography?’ The Burlington Magazine 114 (1972): 829–37.

See n. 1.

Mario Guffanti's bibliography of printed editions at the end of this volume also provides a guide to bibliographies of interpretive studies of what is known as 'The Book on Painting' in the Codex Urbinas 1270, parent manuscript of the *Treatise on Painting*. These resources include Carlo Pedretti, 'The Book on Painting: a Bibliography,' *Achademia Leonardo Vinci* 9 (1996): 165–99. As useful as Pedretti's bibliography is, I take exception to his misrepresentation, at p. 165, of my 'Consolidated Bibliography' (not 'Conglomerate Bibliography,' as he reports) included in my own book, *Leonardo da Vinci's 'Paragone'* (Leiden, 1992), pp. 428–51. As clearly stated on p. 428, only references directly cited in short form in the chapters and notes are included in that bibliography. It was never intended to function as a comprehensive bibliography of either editions or interpretations of the *Paragone*.


See also Janis Bell, 'Cassiano dal Pozzo's Copy of the Zaccolini Manuscripts,' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 51 (1988): 103–25, and additional bibliography in Bell's chapter in this volume.

In addition to the sources of bibliography already cited, see most recently, *Poussin et Rome*, ed. Bonfait et al.

The relationship between techniques for generating new poses and their theoretical implications has been discussed at length; see David Summers, *Figure come fratelli: a Transformation of Symmetry in Italian Renaissance Painting*, *Art Quarterly* 1, new series (1977): 59–88; and most recently, Carmen Bambach, *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop* (Cambridge NY: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

See more recently Francesca Fiorani, 'Abraham Bosse e le prime critiche al Trattato della Pittura di Leonardo,' *Achademia Leonardo Vinci: Journal of Leonardo Studies and Bibliography of Vinciana* 5 (1992): 78–95. As Fiorani emphasizes,
despite his criticism of Leonardo's Treatise, Bosse drew heavily on Leonardo's writings.

26 Reprinted in Paris in 1796 and 1803, Giffart's edition of the Traité served as a reference for the first Dutch edition (ed. S. De Grebber, Amsterdam, 1827) and the first English edition of 1721, discussed elsewhere in the present volume by Richard Woodfield and Geoff Quilley, and summarized later in this Introduction. See 'Bibliography of Printed Editions' by Mario Guffanti at the end of this volume.


28 This edition was reprinted in Madrid in 1827 and served as the basis for the Argentine edition (Buenos Aires, 1942; Guffanti 'Bibliography,' T.31).


30 Guffanti, 'Bibliography of Printed Editions,' in this volume, T.6 and T.15.

31 Guffanti, 'La fortuna di Leonardo,' p. 124 and cat. n. 38; and 'Bibliography of Printed Editions' in this volume, E.12.


33 Guffanti, 'Bibliography of Printed Editions' in this volume, T.4, based on the 1651 edition; reprinted in 1796. Other English editions include the 1802 edition edited by John Francis Rigaud (member of painting academies in London, Bologna, and Stockholm), which was reprinted with changes in 1835 (T.10). A revised edition of Rigaud's translation was published by George Bell & Sons in 1877, with more extensive notes, and reprinted many times (see T.19).

34 The research and publications of another Greek art historian working on Doxaras came to my attention only as this volume was going to press. I would like to thank Denise Alevizou for generously sharing her expertise with me. Her publications are cited and briefly discussed in the chapter by Chrysa Damianaki, n. 6.


36 Pierre Bourdieu, The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature, ed. and intro. Randal Johnson (New York, 1993). I am especially sympathetic to Bourdieu's insistence that the explanation of artistic works, including texts, is to be found in the history and structure of the cultural field itself, in relation to the field of power.


Among the most crucial areas of study are: (1) the situation in early seventeenth-century Rome, for we do not currently know when and what Leonardo manuscripts were available; and (2) the whereabouts of the Codex Urbinas before 1631 (did it pass through Florence in 1566? when and with whom did it go to Urbino?). An interesting context that has only recently received attention is provided by the presence of Paragone arguments at the Academy of San Carlos in Mexico City in the mid-eighteenth century: see Miguel Cabrera, *Maravilla Americana* (Mexico City: Real y Más Antiguo Colegio de San Ildefonso, 1756). See Clara Bargellini, ‘Originality and Invention in the Painting of New Spain,’ in Donna Pierce, Rogelio Ruiz Gomar, and Clara Bargellini, *Painting a New World: Mexican Art and Life 1521–1821*, intro. Jonathan Brown (Denver CO: Denver Art Museum, 2004), pp. 79–91.