solaire and *Oiseau lunaire* of 1946 into the monumental versions of 1966, through to a fascinating selection and display of his source material and studies in the Project Space at the end. In a way this should be seen first. Such was Miró's complete transformation of found objects through scale, media and colour that I would never have otherwise noticed that *Personnage* (Fig.49) originated in the balancing of a pebble on an almond, that *Femme monument* of 1970 began life as a hole-worn bar of soap, and that the immense *Personnage gothique, oiseau éclair* of 1976 (Fig.52), appropriately placed to straddle the view from the summit of the Park's Bothy Garden, started from a donkey saddle.

Collage suited Miró. Endlessly inventive, playful and iconoclastic, in his hands the process generated an anarchic energy in the bringing together of divergent elements and diverse realities. Olfactory puns were part of his arsenal. His humour was earthy, frequently scatological. Cast in bronze and coloured, the collaged elements gained a unity, a new anatomy, their own quirky identity. The crusty green stick figure, *L'Oiseau au plumage rougeâtre annonce l'apparition de la femme éblouissante de beauté* of 1972 (Fig.50), cast a cabbage for the buttocks, a cobbler's lathe for the hand, a bizarre missing link between man and nature, and is tellingly sited in nearby undergrowth. The exhibition reveals how Miró, ever alive to the expressive possibilities of surface, employed different foundries: Susse for smooth finishes, the Bonavicini Foundry in Verona for more traditional dark and black patinas, the Parellada Foundry in Barcelona for a more 'untreated' look and rougher textures. What I had not quite appreciated before was the extent to which he responded to developments in contemporary art and popular culture. The brightly coloured *Jeune fille s'évadant* of 1967, wittily constructed out of four disjointed elements – dumb-blond yellow head, 'turned on' by a cast of a real tap (which is an exhibit in the Project Space), tiny rectangular blue torso with miniscule white breasts, and a pair of gyrating, bright red mannequin legs – parodies a Pop art icon.

The exhibition presents us with a tougher, nastier Miró for the recession years of the twenty-first century: an iconoclastic artist, ever mindful of human violence and instability. He has been given back his *cohones*.

The choice of Anthony Caro for the first solo exhibition of an artist to be held at **Chatsworth, Derbyshire** (to 1st July),[2] comes as a surprise. Earlier in his career Caro felt that his work would be lost if placed in the landscape. He was only able to break free of Henry Moore's influence by adopting a radically different, quasi-industrial way of working inspired by David Smith and, like a contemporary Post-Painterly Abstractionist, he intuitively balanced brightly coloured elements in a push–pull hermetic space. His decision to take on the palatial setting of Chatsworth was a concomitant of his realisation that he had the freedom to group his sculptures around the most obviously man-

51. *Goodwood steps*, by Anthony Caro. 1994. Steel, 300 by 3200 by 600 cm. (Collection of the artist; exh. Chatsworth House).

made area, the Pond Lake, where they could either interact with the landscape and with each other, or hold their own through silhouette and sheer scale. His sculptures are brilliantly sited to exploit the lie of the land. *Goodwood steps* of 1994 (Fig.51) is strung out at the end of the lake like giant architectural sluice gates controlling the view through to the magisterial pedimented façade of the house and its reflection in the water. The highly original *Scorched flats* (1974), with its overlapping rectangles, picks up on the emphatic shape of the lake. The rusted and varnished steel of both sculptures further separates them from the grass, but the bottle-green *Sculpture seven* of 1961 is sensibly tucked away out of immediate sight. What emerges from this exhibition is a recognition of the theatricality of Caro's constructions, his courage in insisting that sculpture be taken on its own terms. However, when it comes to the staged framing of the landscape on a vast scale through massive architecturally balanced elements, even Caro's most ambitious sculptures can but make us more aware of the achievements of Capability Brown and his successors at Chatsworth.

52. *Personnage gothique, oiseau éclair*, by Joan Miró. 1976. Bronze, 450 by 200 by 160 cm. (Fundació Pilar I Joan Miró a Mallorca; exh. Yorkshire Sculpture Park).

[1] Catalogue: *Miró: Sculptor*. With contributions by Clare Lilley and Helen Phely. 47 pp. incl. several col. ills. (Yorkshire Sculpture Park, Wakefield, 2012), £5. ISBN 978–1–871480–98–6.

[2] Catalogue: *Caro at Chatsworth*. With contributions by Stephen Feeke and Martina Droth. 40 pp. incl. 23 col. ills. (New Art Centre, Chatsworth, 2012), £10. ISBN 978–0–9558440–1–0.

Leonardo da Vinci's 'St Anne'

Paris

by SCOTT NETHERSOLE

WRITING FROM BLOIS on 12th January 1507, the Florentine ambassador to the French court informed his government that Louis XII was keen that the '*buon maestro*' Leonardo da Vinci should provide him with '*alchune cose di mano sua*'.[1] From the number of recent Leonardo exhibitions, it would seem that public appetite for 'some things by his hand' (or often 'anything by various hands') has remained unchanged across the centuries. The current exhibition *La 'Sainte Anne' l'ultime chef-d'œuvre de Léonard de Vinci* at the **Musée du Louvre, Paris** (closed 25th June), was, however, a celebration of the recent cleaning and restoration of his *Virgin and Child with St Anne and a lamb* (cat. no.66; Fig.53), around which were assembled a felicitous group of works, and was a profound meditation on its iconography, making and influence.[2]

Despite the inevitable complaints of a vocal minority, the restoration is a triumph.

The painting has emerged from beneath layers of yellowed varnish and discoloured restorations in remarkably good health. Such previously troubling areas as the Virgin's ultramarine robe have been transformed. Flat and seemingly unmodelled, it was so pock-marked by previous interventions that it distracted attention from the remainder of the picture, so much so that Oskar Pfister was able to interpret it as an independent avian form. That it has suffered is beyond doubt, but not nearly as much as might have been feared. Through restoration her mantle has regained its forms, light, shade and movement, as well as a gentle tonal difference between that part which wraps around the Virgin's knees and the swathe of fabric which hangs from her shoulder. Importantly, too, it no longer fights with the rest of the composition.

Correction of the Virgin's mantle was, perhaps, to be anticipated. But other, unexpected passages – some of consummate subtlety – are now plain to see after centuries of illegibility. Most remarkable among these are the distant mountains. They give the semblance of having been painted with great freedom, although they are executed with the precision and confidence of the red-chalk landscape studies (such as nos.44 and 46), and were revisited with Leonardo's characteristic reluctance to finalise a design.[3] For the highlights, or the frothing water that cascades into a pool to the left of the Virgin's head, the brush was loaded with lead white mixed with varying quantities of lapis lazuli, yet, despite the opaque medium and thick handling, the blue mountains achieve a misty transparency and atmospheric imprecision never realised in the workshop copies (compare them, for example, with those in the most accomplished of the copies from Los Angeles, no.50). Between St Anne's feet, two pebbles are rendered carefully, almost obsessively, to show each coloured vein. They have always been visible, even if under murky varnish. But now, since the restoration, they are balanced by limpid grey strokes that evoke, rather than define, water. Her left foot just touches it, as if to point to a tension between the conflicting demands of description and representation that bind Leonardo's works and which must have made them almost impossible to finish. This paradox of Leonardo's practice is everywhere evident in the restored picture, from the remote panorama to the foreground outcrop, from the Virgin's sleeve to the veils of the two women.

Kenneth Clark used the *St Anne* to epitomise Leonardo's abhorrence for the 'abrupt transition'. There was, in his eloquent words, 'no more complete and complex demonstration of the continuous flow' that characterised his *œuvre*.[4] It is tempting to speculate that Clark would have found the harsh contrast that now marks the transition between the mid-ground and background alarming. This results from the fact that the picture is evidently, and visibly, unfinished and should not be cause for concern. But the difference between the painting as revealed through restoration and our conception of Leonardo developed through centuries of examining uncleaned paintings should give us pause. As with the conservation of the *Virgin of the rocks* in London, the restoration of Leonardo's *St Anne*, and the technical evidence which has been made available as a consequence of it, demand that we reassess Leonardo, as well as his workshop, without preconceptions about his style, his 'genius' or a vested interest in his critical fortune.

53. *The Virgin and Child with St Anne and a lamb*, called *St Anne*, by Leonardo da Vinci. c.1503–19. Panel, 168.4 by 112 cm. (Musée du Louvre, Paris).

54. *Study for the Virgin's mantle* in Fig.53, by Leonardo da Vinci. c.1507. Black chalk with grey wash and white highlights, 23 by 24.5 cm. (Musée du Louvre, Paris).

The Louvre exhibition did just this. Divided into four broad and uneven sections, it examined the iconography of St Anne, the planning and execution of the picture, its location in Leonardo's career, and its reception from the early sixteenth century up to Odilon Redon (no.129) and Max Ernst (no.131). While the latter half of the show contained exceptional loans – Michelangelo's Pitti *tondo*, for instance (no.85) – some rarely seen treasures, such as the cartoon for a portrait of *Isabella d'Este* (no.76), and new revelations, including the newly restored Prado version of the *Mona Lisa* (no.77; Fig.55), as well as works of staggering beauty, such as Degas's drawing after the heads of the Virgin and St Anne (no.126), it was in the second section, which culminates in the *St Anne* itself, that the most coherent and original arguments were advanced. Here, systemically and methodically, the curators presented the case for a revised understanding of the genesis of the painting, presenting as many of the preparatory drawings, painted copies and documents as it was feasible to

borrow, in conjunction with the results of the scientific investigation. It is this section, accompanied by its hefty catalogue, that will constitute the exhibition's enduring legacy to scholarship.

The organisers of the show argue for the existence of three cartoons, all executed before 1503, the date of the annotation to Agostino Vespucci's *Cicero*, where St Anne's head is mentioned as if it were already underway (no.30). According to this line of reasoning, the composition developed from the Burlington House Cartoon, dated in the exhibition to around 1500 (National Gallery, London; no.11), to a second lost example that is described in the famous letter of 1501 from Fra Pietro da Novellara to Isabella d'Este. According to Fra Pietro's ambiguous wording, the lamb was '*verso la man sinistra*' (no.17). The version ultimately transferred onto the Louvre panel was different again, this time with the lamb on the right (assuming Fra Pietro meant 'on the left-hand side' not 'at the left hand' of St Anne or the Virgin). This third cartoon is again lost, but – the curators suggest – is known through various copies, among them one formerly in the collections of Padre Resta and the Esterházy family that has also been lost since the early twentieth century (illustrated as no.25 in the catalogue). Thereafter, it is argued that Leonardo worked on the panel intermittently until his death, with moments of increased activity during the second Milanese period and his last years in France, possibly prompted by the opportunity of a new patron for the panel. Preparatory drawings, such as the black-chalk study for the fabric of the Virgin's mantle bunched around her upper thigh (no.55; Fig.54), not only suggest which areas were subject to revision, but also a date for these campaigns based on the style of the drawings. In many cases, such alterations are confirmed by pentiments and reworkings hidden beneath the current surface (see, for example, the changes to St Anne's veil).[5] But, in establishing a new chronology as much for the panel as for the cartoons, the greatest emphasis in terms of evidence has been placed on copies. What is most striking about this extended period of evolution, which also characterises the other picture mentioned by Vespucci, the *Mona Lisa*, tellingly represented in the exhibition by the Prado copy, is that it was being completed in copies produced by the workshop, whether from the unfinished painting itself or from preparatory drawings, both of which were reproduced by his pupils and followers. These copies are used to good effect in the exhibition as evidence of the development of the *St Anne*, although whether the drawings functioned in the same way as the paintings is unclear. The presence of these copies also makes some fundamental points about the *bottega*. It would seem that Leonardo used his pupils and assistants to try out potential solutions in advance of committing them to the panel himself. If so, then these apparently derivative compositions completely reverse

55. *Mona Lisa*, from the studio of Leonardo da Vinci. Panel, 76.3 by 57.6 cm. (Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid; exh. Musée du Louvre, Paris).

our traditional understanding of the relationship between 'primary version' and 'copy', as well as our idea of the '*non finito*'. Far from never achieving a final form, the *St Anne* appears to have been completed on multiple occasions. Naturally, the problem remains of Leonardo's exact involvement in these pictures – do these panels reflect Leonardo's own ambitions for the *St Anne*, or the fantasy of a pupil? – but perhaps to ask such questions of authorship is to miss the point of the Louvre show.

Of course, the exhibition presented a clear chronology and ordering of the material. Those suggestions which do not conform to the narrative, such as Vasari's (possibly confused) suggestion that Leonardo's SS. Annunziata cartoon was preparatory to a commission for the high altarpiece there, find little place in the narrative presented to the gallery-going public (although, in fairness, it is discussed in the catalogue, p.331). This is in the nature of a public exhibition. But the very fact that as much evidence – visual, textual and scientific – as it is possible to assemble in a single location was collated at the Louvre is an open invitation to scholars to arrange, and re-arrange, the scattered fragments in whatever configuration makes most sense to them. It was a gift of rare generosity.

[1] Document exhibited at no.31.

[2] Catalogue: *La 'Sainte Anne' l'ultime chef-d'œuvre de Léonard de Vinci*. Edited by Vincent Delieuvin. 446 pp. incl. 320 col. + 80 b. & w. ills. (Musée du Louvre, Paris, 2012), €45. ISBN 978–2–35031–370–2.

[3] See a detail from the infra-red reflectogram, illustrated *ibid.*, p.146, fig.102. The painting was exhibited with its lateral additions, made in the eighteenth century, which enlarge its breadth to 129.9 cm.

[4] K. Clark: *Leonardo da Vinci*, rev. ed., London 1993, p.38.

[5] Delieuvin, *op. cit.* (note 1), p.118, fig.95.

The ideal Renaissance city

Urbino

by FRANK DABELL

THE DUCAL PALACE in Urbino endures as one of the architectural glories of Europe, and there could be no better venue (in rooms adjacent to its sublime courtyard) for an intellectually stimulating exhibition on the 'Ideal City'. Indeed *La Città Ideale. L'utopia del Rinascimento a Urbino tra Piero della Francesca e Raffaello* at the **Galleria Nazionale delle Marche, Urbino** (to 8th July), is partly about the palace, itself an extension of Federico da Montefeltro (reg. 1444–82), who channelled a vast military income into his small city-state, creating a metaphor for good government. Beyond the local luminaries – Piero della Francesca, Fra Carnevale, Bramante and Raphael, all present – it is the spirit of Federico himself that guides one through the works assembled here, principally furniture, architectural decoration and painting. The heart of the exhibition is the well-known *Ideal city* in Urbino (cat. no.1.1; Fig.57), still anonymous but unquestionably involving an architect, displayed opposite its putative mate (no.1.2; Fig.58); regrettably their companion in Berlin (no.1.3) is not exhibited.

Castiglione's much-quoted remark that what the late Duke had created resembled 'not a palace but a city in the form of a palace' should properly be preceded by earlier views (a guest of Federico's, Mabilio da Novate, had called it '*non domus ista sed urbs*' – 'not a house, this, but a city'). The handsome catalogue[1] discusses both domestic decoration and urban planning during the quattrocento, addressing the theories of Filarete and Alberti; the latter's *concinnitas* (harmony) is emphasised throughout, and his *De re aedificatoria* is displayed (no.7.1) in the copy made for Federico. When Alberti re-clothed the church of S. Francesco in Rimini in *all'antica* dress (reflected here in a drawing of the Tempio Malatestiano under construction; no.7.4), he used the local Arch of Augustus not only as a source of classical

56. *Miracle of St Zenobius*, by Domenico Veneziano. 1442–48. Panel, 28.6 by 32.5 cm. (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge; exh. Galleria Nazionale delle Marche, Urbino).