Art and Reform in the Late Renaissance: After Trent. Jesse M. Locker, ed. Visual Culture in Early Modernity. New York: Routledge, 2019. xii + 330 pp. $155.

The essays in this collection address recurring questions: What were the effects of the Council of Trent (1545–63) on art and architecture, and how, exactly, can they be seen in the paintings, sculptures, and buildings of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries? Can one perceive clear and systematic differences between what artists and architects produced before 1563 and what they produced after the council's conclusion? In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, brilliant scholars focused their attention on these questions, and produced masterful studies that presented a dizzying array of interpretations intended to define the art of the Tridentine church and explain the relationship between conciliar decrees and artistic production. So which interpretation was correct? Were none of the studies accurate, or did more than one have a degree of validity? Jesse Locker's introductory essay contains a literature review that makes apparent the contradictions and opposing viewpoints. He and other contributors examined the specific conciliar decree on sacred images; they found an affirmation of traditional justifications for religious art and a reference to scriptural sources. The decree condemned lascivious and overly complicated depictions with profane content, and gave responsibility for evaluating works to the local bishop.

Considered in the historical context, these criteria could represent critiques of Michelangelo's *Last Judgment* and the compositional excesses of mannerism, but the decree neither censured nor promoted any contemporary artist, work, or style specifically. It appears that the desired results were clear depictions of identifiable scenes from scripture and hagiography, all with a sense of decorum for the sacred spaces in which the art might be displayed, and respect for the artwork's devotional and educational purposes. Given the general nature of these directives, artistic responses varied.

The fifteen contributors to this volume—most of them established scholars—investigated those responses. They produced engaging essays that provide evidence of profound research and thorough consideration of the pertinent issues. Their essays focus on sculptures, paintings, engravings, and art theory, with some discussion of architecture. The scope of these essays extends from a few works by a single artist to programs and cycles, with geographic settings ranging from particular cities to diverse locations in a vast empire. In addition, Katherine Rinne examined water supply to the city of Rome, by which infrastructure provided a physical metaphor for the spiritual act of reforming.

The artists responded to the Tridentine decree from diverse backgrounds, with differing criteria, and for various reasons. The essays present matrices of religious, political, artistic, and cultural considerations that were added to, or overlaid on, the Tridentine guidelines. Iara Dundas's essay on French religious art during the Wars of Religion, and Gauvin Bailey's investigation of hagiographic paintings for the Jesuits in Rome and Peru, seem to have the most complicated contexts, but every author discussed

https://doi.org/10.1017/rqx.2022.121 Published online by Cambridge University Press

circumstances that affected the artists' interpretation and implementation of the Tridentine guidelines. What emerges is the understanding that to produce art that would serve the religious goals refined and promoted by the council, artists altered how they depicted sacred subjects, yet they continued to experiment. As Stuart Lingo succinctly stated, "artists confronted real and pressing challenges between the developing discourses of 'art' . . . and imperatives to produce works that served the needs of an embattled Church persuasively and with decorum" (154).

Collectively, these essays demonstrate that Trent did have an effect on the visual arts; there was certainly no Tridentine style, but all of the artists studied in this collection shared at least one goal—namely, producing work that was appropriate for the post-council church. The nature of the conciliar decree—consisting of affirmations and critiques, guidelines but few if any prescriptions—almost invited artists, patrons, prelates, and theorists to explore its significance; in doing so, they were able to respond to the most pressing ills of a particular situation, time, or place with an individual antidote. With such diverse results, the best way to understand the art and architecture of the age is with collections of excellent essays, such as these.

John Alexander, *University of Texas at San Antonio*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2022.121

Artistic Circulation between Early Modern Spain and Italy.
Kelley Helmstutler Di Dio and Tommaso Mozzati, eds.
Visual Culture in Early Modernity. New York: Routledge, 2020. xii + 246 pp. $160.

A number of recent academic endeavors, including a 2013 conference at the Prado Museum ("Artistic Relations between Spain and Italy in the Renaissance: New Approaches") and the project "Spanish Italy and the Iberian Americas" (2016–20), have sought to reformulate, or at least probe, how we think about cultural intersections between the two great peninsulas of Southern Europe. Among and after these, *Artistic Circulation between Early Modern Spain and Italy* will stand as a weighty and impactful contribution.

Starting in the early sixteenth century—and especially after the Treaty of Cateau-Cambresis in 1556—and until 1700, the Spanish monarchy held hegemonic control in Italy. Despite this overwhelming evidence of a Spanish presence in Italy, the way in which this political reality might have conditioned artistic production in both territories has received relatively scant attention from art historians. In contrast, this book attends to the fluid, nonlinear nature of artistic exchange between early modern Mediterranean cities and invites us to consider cultural relations through the lens of a circuit of courts and artists on the move. It also shows that the study of art produced in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries cannot be viewed through the prism of contemporary nation-states (Spain and Italy).