The numerous quotations in French are conveniently translated in the text. The twenty-two-page bibliography, printed in small font, is a rich source for scholars—as this finely argued and original study will also prove to be.


Urquízar-Herrera’s well-researched book strikes deep into vital questions about the art history of Early Modern Spain. To date, the issues he addresses remain the conundrums facing experts who think along the lines: To what extent did the Visigothic past shape the identity of Christianity in Spain? How much borrowings did exist between Morisco architecture, the mosque, and the Spanish Cathedral? Was Early Modern Spanish historiography truthful to the state of an Iberian Peninsula deeply entrenched in a multi-layered society of Christian, Jewish, and Moorish ethnicities? Can we speak of classical antiquity in Early Modern Spain and thus formulate a more articulate framework for assessing the similarities between early modern Spain and Italy (similarities that appear to have been the focus of some original research developed over the past decade)? Remarkably, Urquizar-Herrera maps out alternatives and debates, leaving art historians and historians alike with the opportunity to walk on firmer ground. At the same time, Urquizar-Herrera provokes debates and revisionist methods, rather than pretending to hold the undeniable in writing on these topics.

The book consists of an introduction, three parts, and concluding ideas. At every step, Urquizar-Herrera presents his argument in the form of fact, argument, and reception, a strategy that makes this text all the more valuable. We learn in Part I about the worn-out slogan of the “loss of Spain” (30–49) identified with a time of a crisis allegedly inflicted on a society that lost significantly less than it gained from the Moorish conquest. The history of art over the centuries uncovers a variety of similar situations, triggered by both internal and external factors. In the realm of art history literature, for example, Hans Sedl-
Mayr’s *Verlust der Mitte* (1948) potently emphasized on the definition of “loss” as self-generated by the decline of Western civilization, which waned because its modern developmental character surpassed the manifestations of decay, weakness, hypocrisy, and degeneracy that struck at the foundations of the art of previous centuries. Part II of Urquizar-Herrera’s *Admiration and Awe* tackles the antiquarian model as a pervasive mode of reassigning the Islamic architectural heritage and appropriating historical evidence to the imperatives of a smooth alignment with the Italian model, so popular in early modernity, and, implicitly, with the rise of Rome as a fabrication of the universal cult of the pope. To discuss the Spanish historiographical model as the kindred approach to the Italian effort is an extremely important discussion, which Urquizar-Herrera frames through citations and contextualization from Alexander Nagel and Christopher S. Wood’s *Anachronic Renaissance* (2010). Nagel and Wood have examined the plural temporal character of artifacts, the notions of citation and spoliation, as well as the implications of the manipulation of visual evidence as forces the hindered the natural definition of the historical self. Urquizar-Herrera takes up these ideas in early modern Spain, analyzing through art and historiographical evidence the outcome of the antiquarian appropriation of Islamic monuments, an appropriation that converged with the construing of robust antiquarian literature on Islamic architecture. Part III engages with the use of the antiquarian model in establishing visual proof for demonstrating the endurance of Christian worship in the Iberian Peninsula, namely, the existence of a pre-Islamic past of Christianity. The arguments that Christian images, either icons or sculpted artifacts, predated the advent of Islam, and that Spanish ecclesiastical theorists only shed light on the rediscovery and unearthing (from the main mosques, known as *Aljama Mosques*) of the sacred imagery are key facts in this concluding chapter. Finally, Urquizar-Herrera ends by way on an epilogue in the form of another rhetorical, thought-provoking examination of the fallacies that Spain adopted when designing an archetypal model that refused to endorse the presence of other ethnicities. Worse, a model that attempted to align itself with the West as a place of origin, but without having proved any palpable argument to deny a Semitic (both Jewish and Arabic) past.
In Córdoba-based humanist Ambrosio de Morales’s *Las antigüedades* (1575), the mosque was not damaged by the construction of a Christian cathedral inside. Instead, Morales’ arguments provide one important stream for the justifications for demolition and substitution, as well as for the idea of monuments as trophies (25–26). Urquízar-Herrera frames the discussion through the analogies he establishes with Pierre Nora’s *Les lieux de mémoire* (1984–1992), which offers a framework for understanding how early modern historiography actively intervened to change the symbolic content of Islamic mosques so as to make these serve the architectural memory of a Christian past that predated the Islamic period. The building of Gothic and Renaissance cathedrals was not perceived as a major alteration, but rather as an act of Christian restoration that once more justified the earlier demolition of the mosques of Zaragoza, Toledo, Valencia, and Seville. A recurring name in Urquízar-Herrera’s book is Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada (c. 1170–1247), Archbishop of Toledo, a major driving force behind the construction of Toledo’s Gothic cathedral and the writer of *Historia Gothica*, an account of the extraordinary deeds of Christian kings who stood up against the Muslims. Focused on the Christian conquest of Toledo and Córdoba, Jiménez de Rada’s *Historia Gothica* was responsible for a historiographical vision based on the capturing of the mosques, their conversion to Christianity, and transformation of Islamic religious architecture into victory trophies. As Urquízar-Herrera tellingly sums up, “the inclusion of Islamic monuments in the medieval restoration discourse is based on two premises: that the remains belonged to the infidels who had interrupted Spain’s naturally Christian journey, and that, after the Christian conquest, they were left standing to bear witness to Christian efforts to recover their religious continuity. Immediately after they were taken, the buildings were seen as memorials to Islamic defeat and Christian triumph” (28).

All approaches to Early Modernity weighing the influence of classical antiquity on Christianity have been focused solely on Italian Renaissance art, yet Urquízar-Herrera broaches the matter in Spain fearlessly. The loss of classical antiquity may not have happened, had it not been the Moors who destroyed the Roman antiquities in the Iberian Peninsula. This lament rings true in Pedro de Medina’s *Libro de la grandezas y cosas memorables de España* (1548), in which the
Moors are to be blamed for “many things from Roman times [that] were destroyed and ravaged, so that no trace of them remains.” (57). A successful historiographical strategy emerged to attribute the lack of classical ruins to Islamic destruction, and to incriminate Islamic violence that ensured the incorporation of Roman capitals in the Córdoba mosque and the presence of Roman inscriptions at the base of Seville’s Giralda tower, a minaret and a remnant of a destroyed mosque, which had been transformed into a Christian belfry. After the conquest of Granada in 1492, the Catholic monarchs shared a positive reception of the Alhambra, which emerged in Charles V’s Renaissance palace that may be seen as a response to the Islamic sumptuary model of the Nasrid construction. To emphasize on Charles V’s palace as an extension of the Nasrid complex still leaves questions about the Spanish past unanswered: Was Alhambra a Christian triumph or the expression of Andalusian cultural achievements that preserved Christianity from the pre-Islamic age? Urquizar-Herrera provokes us to think critically about the issue of hybridity in relation to the Spanish past. If classical antiquity was not an unmediated criterion for assessing earlier liaisons with Rome, a look into the materials used by Roman architects throws into question the matter of Spain’s exposure to classicism. We learn that the use of regular stone ashlars, a defining feature of Roman architecture, was not employed in the building of Islamic monuments. Moreover, Iberian Peninsula humanism, including Ambrosio de Morales’s _Las antigüedades_, discriminated between Roman and Islamic masonry because of the use of either ashlars or bricks and mortar (89).

Because Islam enjoyed a “low status” in the views of Spanish humanists, an entire culture of Semitic recollections was denigrated by inference. Disapproval and disdain extended back as far as early Christianity and to the interaction with the Jews who inevitably lived side by side with the Christians in the Apostolic past. Constantinople, an archetypal case in point, became “the quintessence of political and moral chaos.” Spanish historians labeled Constantinople as “an urban metaphor [responsible] for the loss of order and classic regulation that had once characterized the Roman Empire” (115). Taking in earnest the objective to find roots in classical sources and to disparage all Islamic aesthetics, books such as Alfonso García Matamoros’s
Pro aderenda Hispaniorum eruditione (1553) put forward that being perceived as an anti-Vitruvian was more inappropriate and undignified than being anti-Christian (116).

The thesis of historical continuity, which the Spanish historiographical adopted primarily, sought to create new links with pre-Islamic and Mozarabic religiosity. The recovery of relics and the arrival of the remains of saints had a momentous role in the reorganization of the Spanish church. To early modern Spanish historiographers, restoration meant the restitution of Christianity as a natural feature of the Spanish nation. Urquizar-Herrera discerns in this context the unique role of Granada, which could not but contradict the idea that Christian worship endured or was preserved through a material culture of artifacts. When the Catholic monarchs conquered the kingdom of Granada, the absence of Christians at the time of the capturing of the city precluded all thesis of pre-Islamic Christianity. In Urquizar-Herrera’s words, “Granada never severed its ties with its Islamic past” (167). Nevertheless, the Moriscos of Granada fabricated a collection of martyrs’ relics, known as the Lead Books, with the aim of enlisting support for their practices of cultural and religious hybridity (168).

The local histories of Granada argued that the Lead Books proved the archeological links among Granada, Iliberris (the site of the ancient Roman settlement of Elvira), and the martyred St. Caecilius, the first bishop of Iliberris and disciple of St. James the Great, who evangelized Roman Spain in the first century. Yet, despite the approval of archbishop of Granada Pedro de Castro, the Lead Books were taken to Rome to be examined in 1648. Whereas the church condemned the books as an Islamic forgery, the relics of the martyrs were approved out of respect for tradition.

Urquizar-Herrera wrote a book that advances the study of dissemination and reception of historiographical narratives. He brings in support of his claims both visual and written arguments that provide an extensive approach to the relationship between the manipulation of images and ideological appropriation. However, Urquizar-Herrera considers various sources, including those on the popular reception of the cult of martyrs. Even though all the sources were enlisted in a heavy historiographical apparatus to ensure religious and cultural homogenization, Urquizar-Herrera eloquently reveals that the interest
in, and acceptance of, hybridity remained the characteristic features of the Italian Peninsula.


This handsomely produced volume is the catalog to the exhibition organized by the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna, shown between October 17, 2017 and January 21, 2018, before its travel to the second venue, the Städel Museum, Frankfurt am Main, between February 8 and May 21, 2018.

The principal theme of the exhibition and this publication was Ruben's relationship to the visual tradition—from Italian and Northern European painters of the Renaissance, to those of ancient Greece and Rome, whose works he was able to study both during his sojourn to Italy (1600–1608), and in various private collections he got to know in the course of his prolific career.

The curatorial team—Gerlinde Gruber (Kunsthistorisches), Stefan Weppelmann (the director of the Picture Gallery in the Kunsthistorisches) and Jochen Sander (Städel)—set for themselves a rather ambitious goal: to present the varied ways in which Rubens absorbed, mastered, emulated, and transformed his sources in drawings, oil sketches, modelli, cartoons, as well as fully finished paintings. In pursuing this goal, they gathered a remarkable range of over one hundred and twenty works by the artist and his “models”, including some of the best-known ones from antiquity, such as the Belvedere Torso (Vatican), the Centaur tamed by Cupid (Louvre), and the Crouching Venus (Naples). Even when they could not secure a loan of the original—most notably in the case of the Laocoön—they managed to showcase those models through plaster casts or other replicas. Artists closer to Rubens’s time include an equally impressive roster of Italians and Northerners, from Titian and Tintoretto, to Goltzius, Elsheimer