of analytical approaches are the result of a collaboration between the editors and, following the studies of Paolo Sambin and Francesco Liguori, art historians Vittoria Camelliti and Manlio Leo Mezzacasa, as well as dottorandi Elena Cera (Università di Padova) and Marco Scansani (Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa).

The book opens with the donation’s discovery and its consequences (Benucci), followed by research on the three sculptural works (Camelliti), chronologies (Cera/Scansani), the baptismal font (Calzone) and its former version in the Romanesque cathedral (Calzone/Benucci), the reliquary (Mezzacasa), the column between Padua and Montepeloso (Franco Benucci), the technical analysis (Trabace) including non-invasive diagnostics such as UV fluorescent and microphotographic imagery and multispectral analysis of the crucifix (Laquale/Kala) and of the statues of Saint Euphemia (Improta/Avogadro), investigating the restoration process as a cognitive instrument.

The attribution to Mantegna submitted by Clara Gelao (director of the Provincial Pinacoteca of Bari) was supported by art critics such as Vittorio Sgarbi, but contested by others who rather suggest Pietro Lombardo (on attribution, see in particular 49 and 66). One reason for this hesitation is the uncertainty inherent in the lack of comparanda. Another deeper reason might be the dilemma of moving from heated, seemingly irreconcilable debates around “Mantegna incisore” to the possibility that the truth is in a third position with Mantegna planning, designing, but also outsourcing parts of his commissions on the plates. (See Suzanne Boorsch, “Mantegna and Engraving: What We Know, What We Don’t Know, and a Few Hypotheses,” in Rodolfo Signorini, Viviana Rebonato, and Sara Tammaccaro, eds., Andrea Mantegna: Impronta del genio, [2010], 415–38.)

Mantegna’s important links to sculpture are documented in his earliest education in Squarcione’s workshop, often credited for his own stone-like, sculptural, and monumental registers of style in painting. A drawing such as Mantegna’s “Project for a Monument to Virgil” from around 1500 (Musée du Louvre, Paris) demonstrates that he was planning and thinking sculpturally. Yet “Mantegna scultore” might also be too vague for a similarly multifaceted production process that is unknown in its details and the number and identities of hands. Regardless of where the full or partial attribution to Mantegna falls for the reader, the book makes a convincing case for the entire donazione de Mabilia to be worthy of this extensive, and further, study.

Henrike Christiane Lange, University of California, Berkeley
doi:10.1017/rqx.2022.14


2020 was a very good year for seventeenth-century artist Artemisia Gentileschi: there was a major exhibition at the National Gallery (London), its first ever dedicated to a
woman artist, with accompanying scholarly catalogue; other publications such as Jonathan Jones’s *Artemisia Gentileschi* (Lives of the Artist series); and yet another work of biographical fiction on the artist, Linda Lafferty’s *Fierce Dreamer*. Culminating, as well as cultivating, this interest in the artist is Garrard’s fascinating volume, part of the well-produced and well-illustrated Renaissance Lives series from Reaktion Books. Garrard is well known for first asserting Artemisia into the art historical canon some thirty years ago with her substantial monograph, *Artemisia Gentileschi: The Image of the Female Hero in Italian Baroque Art*. In this new publication she had the unique opportunity to more comprehensively discuss paintings newly attributed to Artemisia, as well as to revisit interpretations made by herself and other scholars in the intervening years.

Yet fundamentally this study goes well beyond a refreshed monograph; rather, it takes on the demanding task of situating Artemisia’s innovative interpretations of the female experience within a broader network of early modern feminist writings, theatrical performances, and political maneuverings. As Garrard notes in the preface, a recurring criticism of her 1989 monograph was the apparent anachronism of her feminist readings *avant la lettre*. Since that time a virtual goldmine of scholarly works by or about early modern feminists have been published, and it is this context that Garrard deftly weaves into her art historical interpretations to further substantiate and expand on prior claims.

The first chapter sets the stage by providing a survey of early modern feminist history and literature as understood at present, merged with an updated biographical portrait of the artist. These are unwieldy, albeit necessary, subjects to address, and they profitably raise a plethora of questions, such as that of why feminist writers “almost never mentioned artists” (33) while their contemporary male counterparts would. A reasonable explanation is given for why writer Lucrezia Marinella did not discuss Artemisia, but establishing more securely the matriarchal matrix proposed by Garrard may require further research. One issue brought into sharper focus by means of associations with feminist writings is Artemisia’s baffling changes in style in the 1640s. Although she acknowledges the possible influence of patrons, Garrard argues that just as Artemisia turned to representing women with greater refinement and less agency, so too feminist writers in Italy had to adapt to external pressures and promote more conservative views of the role of women. Albeit disappointing, this representational shift does heighten the power of their prior feminist positions; Garrard suggests this was not lost on contemporaneous viewers and readers.

The subsequent six chapters address more specific topics pertaining to seventeenth-century women, such as education, political power, agency, and identity, through an examination of selected paintings by Artemisia in relation to ideas expressed in feminist literature of the period. The subject matter of her artworks is clearly explained, which reveals that the book is not solely directed at scholars. There is an emphasis throughout on recently discovered or newly attributed works, such as the National Gallery’s...
Self-Portrait as Saint Catherine of Alexandria, while also relating these paintings stylistically and conceptually to the artist’s oeuvre. While some readers might question or qualify Garrard’s assertion that paintings in which Artemisia has used herself as a model “are always about her” (124), what this book clearly demonstrates is that her work is also about breaking through barriers faced by early modern women, and that are still with us today. Garrard’s savvy connections between early modern and contemporary feminist thought and actions effectively demonstrate this continuum of concerns, and help to explain why Artemisia’s art resonates so strongly with viewers today. We can only hope that the Renaissance Lives series will bring more female subjects to the forefront so as to demonstrate that Artemisia Gentileschi was not the exception.

Julia K. Dabbs, University of Minnesota, Morris
doi:10.1017/rqx.2022.15

Piero di Cosimo: Painter of Faith and Fable. Dennis Geronimus and Michael W. Kwakkelstein, eds.

The often-overlooked Florentine painter Piero di Cosimo (1462–1522) was finally given his due in 2015 with several major events devoted to his distinctive career, including the presentation of the first major monographic shows on this eccentric and splendid artist. While by no means unknown, Piero was usually considered a well-kept secret in the shadow of such artists as Botticelli and Leonardo da Vinci. Organized jointly by the National Gallery of Art in Washington, DC, and the Galleria degli Uffizi in Florence, the 2015 Piero exhibitions nevertheless had different curators, separate catalogues, and a somewhat differing focus (the Florence venue included paintings by Piero’s fellow Florentines, while the Washington project included Piero’s work only). Together the exhibitions garnered praise for reuniting Piero’s works that had been separated for centuries, in particular his mythological scenes created for the wealthy Florentine Vespucci and Pugliese families, for the presence of innovative technical and conservation material, and above all for showcasing the artist’s fantasia, wit, and ability as a storyteller.

Near the end of the Florentine run, a two-day symposium, titled Piero di Cosimo: Painter of Faith and Fable, took place at the Dutch University Institute for Art History (NIKI) in Florence. The conference papers were published in 2019, and include material originally given at the March 2015 Berlin RSA session devoted to Piero, and two other technical papers from conservators who treated Piero’s work for the exhibitions. Edited by Dennis Geronimus and Michael W. Kwakkelstein, these