



XXXII

the hope of Salvation, and the deer in the background as a symbol of the Baptism), Arasse (1999) sees the painting sooner as a pagan or Dionysian understanding of the divine as current at the papal court in Rome under Leo X. The picture looks back in many of its details to an earlier compositional type, as represented by Jacopo del Sellaio's *St John* in the National Gallery in Washington, DC, for example; echoes of this same type can also be seen in the *Baptism of Christ* (Cat. IV).

A damaged and reworked red chalk drawing of *St John*, attributed to Leonardo on very weak grounds, was housed in the Museo del Sacro Monte in Varese until 1974 (Pedretti, 1973, p. 173). It is now lost and is occasionally cited as a preparatory study for the present painting. A copy attributed to Cesare da Sesto or Bernardino Luini hangs in the National Gallery in Edinburgh. Further copies, which have yet to be studied in depth, are named in Suida (1929) and Ottino della Chiesa (1967).

LITERATURE: Poggi, 1919, pp. XXXIV–XXXVI; Suida, 1929, pp. 153–155; Hours, 1954, pp. 22–23; Fritz, 1960; Ottino della Chiesa, 1967, no. 36; Marani, 1989, no. 25; Arasse, 1999, pp. 470–471.

XXXII

Leonardo da Vinci and Workshop (?)
Christ as Salvator Mundi, after 1507
Oil on walnut, 65.5 x 45.1–45.6 cm
Private collection

The panel is made of walnut wood and possesses an intact painting edge. Probably towards the end of the 19th century it was reinforced with struts on the back; following its restoration between 2008 and 2011, it is today in a stable condition. This restoration has made it clear that the top paint layer of the *Salvator Mundi* in its present state no longer consists of original substance in some places. In particular the background as a whole and the area of the forehead and hair contained imperfections that are now

no longer visible with the naked eye. The eye areas also had to be partially remodelled. No underdrawings have been detected to date with the aid of technical investigations, although these have brought to light incised lines along the upper contour of the head and a number of pentimenti, for example in the fingers of the left hand and the thumb of the right hand. Further details on these findings are found in a short report by conservator Dianne Dwyer Modestini (2014), which also discusses parallels in technique between *Salvator Mundi* and Leonardo's works and artistic theory.

That Leonardo executed at least one design for a *Salvator* painting is evidenced by numerous paintings of the same subject by his school (Heydenreich 1964; Snow-Smith 1982), two autograph drawings by Leonardo himself (Nathan/Zöllner 2014, Cat. 40–41) and a 1650 etching by the Bohemian artist Wenzel Hollar. There are nevertheless gaps in the *Salvator Mundi's* provenance even from an early date. Since Hollar was

based between 1644 and 1652 in mainland Europe, Heydenreich (1964) suspects that his etching was produced prior to this date in England, and that it was based on a corresponding painting in the collection of Thomas Howard, 21st Earl of Arundel (1585–1646), for whom Hollar had previously worked. This theory has so far failed to find verification and contradicts other pieces of evidence concerning the painting's provenance (Modestini 2014). It would appear that the *Salvator Mundi* copied by Hollar is documented in the estate of King Charles I (Tudor, r. 1625–1649) at the latest in 1651 and is in the possession of Charles II (Stuart, r. 1660–1685) at the latest in 1666. It afterwards entered the collection of John Sheffield, from whose estate it was sold in 1763 for a relatively low sum by Sheffield's illegitimate son Charles Herbert Sheffield (Syson/Keith 2011, p. 302).

No reliable information has yet been uncovered regarding the fate of the painting in the 18th and 19th century. The *Salvator*

Mundi is only documented again at the start of the 20th century, when it appears in the collection of Sir Francis Cook (1817–1901), who bought the painting in 1900 from his advisor Sir John Charles Robinson (1824–1913; Cook 1913, p. 123, where it is catalogued as a “copy after Boltraffio”). After the death of Sir Francis in 1901, it passed to his son Sir Frederick Cook (1844–1920). On 25 June 1958 the *Salvator Mundi* changed hands again at the Cook Collection sale at Sotheby’s. In 2005 the New York art historian and art dealer Robert Simon purchased the painting (Simon, press release, 7 July 2011; Brewis 2011). The New York *Salvator Mundi* subsequently underwent its above-mentioned restoration by Dianne Dwyer Modestini prior to its publication in summer 2011 and presentation at the major London Leonardo exhibition that same year (Syson/Keith 2011, pp. 300–303). The painting was exhibited once again in 2012 by the Dallas Museum of Art. It was then sold for a sum markedly lower than the

estimates of up to US\$ 200 million that had been proposed earlier.

Alongside the conservation report already mentioned, the most important studies on Leonardo’s *Salvator Mundi* to date are an essay by Ludwig Heydenreich, published in 1964, a monograph by Joanne Snow-Smith (1982) and a text by Luke Syson in the catalogue of the London Leonardo exhibition. Syson attributes the painting unreservedly to Leonardo and argues for a dating in the period before 1500. Snow-Smith puts forward a different hypothesis, namely that a *Salvator Mundi* in the collection of the Marquis de Ganay in Paris is the actual original painting by Leonardo. She also suspects that the French king Louis XII commissioned a *Salvator Mundi* from Leonardo and that the painting was executed between 1507 and 1513. While the idea that the commission came from Louis XII seems entirely plausible, the attribution of the Ganay version to Leonardo has failed to find acceptance.

The contribution by Heydenreich remains enduringly significant. Taking an in-depth look at the *Salvator Mundi* pictorial tradition, he examines the numerous surviving variants of the *Salvator Mundi* and the differences in their details. From this he concludes that Leonardo must have created not necessarily an original painting of the subject, but a cartoon that then served as the basis for several *Salvator Mundi* pictures by his pupils. This would place the New York *Salvator Mundi* among those works that were produced in a serial fashion in Leonardo’s workshop, and to which Leonardo may have personally contributed in individual cases (see Preface).

With regard to the position of the *Salvator Mundi* design within the chronology of Leonardo’s oeuvre, Heydenreich refers to the two known preliminary drawings for the subject, which are dated on stylistic grounds to around 1504 (Nathan/Zöllner 2014, Cat. 40–41). According to Heydenreich, Leonardo must therefore

only have begun exploring the motif as from this point in time. Heydenreich also presents another argument in support of his suggested dating, however: on the basis of detailed analyses, he is able to make a plausible case for the proposal that Leonardo oriented himself in his design towards a *Salvator Mundi* by Melozzo da Forlì in Urbino (ill. p. 16). Since documentary sources show Leonardo spending time in Urbino only as from 1502 (RLW 1034, 1038, 1041), Heydenreich considers it unlikely that Leonardo addressed the *Salvator* subject before this date. With the discovery of the New York *Salvator Mundi*, Heydenreich’s argument can be taken further. The New York painting does indeed come very close to Melozzo da Forlì’s *Salvator Mundi* in several details. This can be seen most notably in Christ’s blessing hand, for example in the positions of the index finger, middle finger and thumb, and the creases in the skin of the palm. None of the other possible visual sources proposed so far (Syson

in Syson/Keith 2011, p. 303; Modestini 2014) exhibit comparable formal parallels. Another similarity between the New York *Salvator Mundi* and the painting by Melozzo da Forlì is the air of transported reverie that characterizes Christ's expression.

The New York *Salvator Mundi* surpasses all the other known versions of the subject from Leonardo's circle in terms of its quality. Details such as the modelling of Christ's blessing hand and the crystal orb, the execution of the filigree embroidery border around the neckline, and above all the suggestive handling of light and the *sfumato* all testify to a very high standard of technical accomplishment. The fingernails outlined with fine shading, which recall similar features in the *Mona Lisa* (Cat. XXV) and *St John the Baptist* (Cat. XXX), also argue in favour of an attribution to Leonardo, as do the shadowy eyes and heavy eyelids. The *Salvator Mundi* nonetheless also exhibits a number of weaknesses. The flesh tones of the blessing hand, for

example, appear pallid and waxen as in a number of workshop paintings. Christ's ringlets also seem to me too schematic in their execution, the larger drapery folds too undifferentiated, especially on the right-hand side. They do not begin to bear comparison with the *Mona Lisa*, for example. It is therefore not surprising that a number of reviewers of the London Leonardo exhibition initially adopted a sceptical stance towards the attribution of the New York *Salvator Mundi* (Bambach 2012; Hope 2012; Robertson 2012; Zöllner 2012). In view of the arguments put forward to date and the above-mentioned weaknesses, we might sooner see the *Salvator Mundi* as a high-quality product of Leonardo's workshop, painted only after 1507, on whose execution Leonardo was substantially involved. It will probably only be possible to arrive at a more informed verdict on this question after the results of the painting's technical analyses have been published in full (Dalivalle/Kemp/Simon 2017).



XXXIV

LITERATURE: Heydenreich 1964; Snow Smith 1982; Syson/Keith 2011, pp. 300–303; Bambach 2012; Robertson 2012; Zöllner 2012; Modestini 2014.

Further paintings by Leonardo mentioned in the sources

In the earlier biographies, writings on art and inventories of the 16th and 17th century, numerous attributions are made to Leonardo whose authenticity it is often no longer possible to verify. Indirect evidence of the former existence of paintings based either on an idea or even an original design by Leonardo may nevertheless be found in drawings and works in a Leonardesque vein by other artists. The most comprehensive overview of such works is found in Heydenreich (1953, pp. 197–203), Ottino della Chiesa (1967) and Marani (1989, pp. 122–148) and in the anthology *Leonardo: La pittura* (1985, pp. 222–227 [Marani]). The most important of these derivatives, which go back to ideas, drawings or car-

toons by Leonardo, are summarized as follows:

XXXIII

A head of the Medusa painted by Leonardo is mentioned by the Anonimo Gaddiano and by Vasari, and in a Medici inventory of 1553 (Poggi, 1919, p. 11). This work is now considered lost. What it might have looked like remains the subject of pure conjecture.

XXXIV

After Leonardo

Madonna with a Cat

Savona, Collection of Carlo Noya

The *Madonna with a Cat* is known from several sketches by Leonardo (Nathan/Zöllner 2014, Cat. 110–113, 115–117, 119; ills. pp. 52, 229) and from a painting last documented in the collection of Carlo Noya, Savona (Ottino della Chiesa, 1967, no. 123). A detailed investigation into this picture has yet to be conducted.