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Notes

Introduction

2. Ibid., 24–25.

3. The related genre on physiognomy also exemplifies this faith. See, e.g., Lemnius, *De habitu et constitutione corporis*; Lemnius, *Touchstone of Complexions*; Porta, *De humana physiognomia*; and, for discussion, Porter, “Making Faces,” 385–96. On the relationship of these concerns to ontological and empirical forms of knowledge in the period, see Hillman, “Visceral Knowledge,” 81–105.


11. Gouma-Peterson and Matthews, “Feminist Critique,” 347–48. characterize the shift from first- to second-generation feminist art history as a move from an essentialist interest in “the condition and experience of being female” to a constructionist emphasis on gender differences. See also Broude and Garrard, intro., in *Expanding Discourse*, 15–17. In literary criticism, see Fuss, *Essentially Speaking*; Butler, *Gender Trouble*; and Belsey, *Subject of Tragedy*. 

12. See Spear, “Artemisia Gentileschi,” 575, on the struggles between traditional connoisseurship and attributions based on “gendered expression” in recent approaches to Gentileschi; and see Garrard, Artemisia Gentileschi; Bissell, Artemisia Gentileschi and the Authority of Art; and Spear’s review of Bissell, 571–75. Pollock, Differencing the Canon, 97–127, has offered a critique of Garrard’s approach; and Garrard responds in Artemisia Gentileschi around 1622, xix–xxi.


14. See the essays included in Johnson and Grieco, Picturing Women in Renaissance and Baroque Italy; Pollock’s Differencing the Canon; and Hyde, “‘Makeup’ of the Marquise,” 453–76. Exemplary literary studies include Dolan, Whores of Babylon; Wall, Staging Domesticity; and Ferguson, Dido’s Daughters. My project is aligned with that of Melchoir-Bonnet, Mirror, insofar as we both address the development of early modern subjectivity in relation to specific cultural attitudes and material practices.

15. See Parker and Pollock, Old Mistresses, 25.

16. This assumption underlies the helpful anthology by Prescott and Travitsky, eds., Female and Male Voices in Early Modern England.

17. Despite the cultural and historical differences separating early modern women from twenty-first century critics, it is not anachronistic to attribute to these women’s works a feminist sophistication when confronting questions of gender and subjectivity. For a different view, see Mueller, “Feminist Poetics of Aemilia Lanyer’s Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum,” 208–36.


22. Many instructional manuals address women readers and/or include dedications to female patrons. At least three published texts were written by women: Cortese, I secreti de la Signora Isabella Cortese; Meurdrac, La Chymie des dames; and Evelyn, Mundus Muliebris. Other instructional manuals include Ruscelli, Alexii Pedemontani De secretis sex, trans. into Italian as De’ secreti and into English as The Secretes of the Reverende Maister Alexis of Piemount; Piccolomini, Raffaella, extant in English as Raffaella of Master Alexander Piccolomini; Le Fournier, La Decoration d’humane nature (Lyon: Claude Veycellier, 1532); Marinello, Gli ornamenti delle donne; Liébault, Trois livres de l’embellissement et ornement du corps humaine, based upon Léibault’s Latin translation of Marinello, De cosmetica seu ornatu et decoratione; Plat, Delightes for Ladies; Wecker (or Culpeper), Cosmeticks, or the Beautifying Part of Physick; Shirley, Accomplished Ladies Rich Closet of Rarities; Fioravanti, Dello specchio di scienza universale, 305v–310v, trans. into French by Gabriel Chappuy as Le Miroir universel des arts et sciences, 512–20, and into English in Haydocke, Tracte Containing the Artes of Curious Paintinge, 129–33; Porta, Io. Bapt. Portae magiae natvralis libri XX, trans. into Italian as Della magia naturale del Sign. Gio. Battista Della Porta Napolitano libri XX, partially trans. into French as La Magie naturelle: qui est, les secrets & miracles de nature, mise en quatre liures, and into English as Natural Magick.
23. Evelyn, *Mundus Muliebris*, 22–23. While Evelyn’s recipe may be in jest, earlier manuals include similar recipes: e.g., Bate, *Mysteries of Nature and Art*, 177, recommends, “Take Snailes, beat them shels and bodies together: steep them a night in new milke: then still them with the flowers of white Lillies,” for a lotion to whiten the face.


31. Ibid., 78–79.


33. Alberti, *Family*, 82; *Della famiglia*, 352.


40. Quoted in Tuke, *Treatise Against Painting*, B4v. The idea of deformity is central to instructional manuals and invectives, since women use cosmetics, the former argue, to
veil physical deformities, while the latter claim that cosmetic use itself constitutes women’s moral deformity.

41. Garner, “Let Her Paint,” 134. Women writers, such as Cavendish, “Of Painting,” offer this argument, but their voices are greatly outnumbered by male-authored invectives.

42. Hall, Appendix, 102.


46. The Victoria and Albert Museum owns several of these boxes. Museum no. box W.24-1953 (Italian, c. 1500) depicts the Judgment of Paris; no. W.23–1953 (Northern Italy, 1500) depicts the Rape of Lucretia; and no. W.21–1953 (Italian, c. 1500) (fig. 1) is decorated with a series of figures in chariots recalling Petrarch’s *Trionfi*.


58. I follow theorists such as Joan Riviere and Judith Butler, who view makeup as one of the many “masquerades” through which femininity is performed. See Riviere, “Womanliness as a Masquerade,” 35–44. For discussion, see Heath “Joan Riviere and the Masquerade,” 45–62; and Butler, *Gender Trouble*, 61–73.


65. Armenini. *De veri precetti della pittura*, 190. For discussion, see Jacobs, *Defining the Renaissance Virtuosa*, 44.


68. Sohm, “Gendered Style,” 800.

69. Woods-Marsden, *Renaissance Self-Portraiture*, 189, notes that Vasari’s second edition (1568) includes thirteen women, suggesting increased opportunities for women artists in the interim.


72. Ibid., 64–84.

73. See Lichtenstein, “Making Up Representation,” 77–87; and *Eloquence of Color*.

74. I rely upon the period’s frequent discussions of the “sister arts” of painting and poetry and the conflation of painting and rhetoric that pervades humanist theories of oratory to link the works of women writers and painters. Thus, one meaning of *painting*, in my usage, refers to poetic and rhetorical works that understand themselves as verbal painting. See Lichtenstein, “Making Up”; Lichtenstein, *Eloquence of Color*; Dolan, “Taking the Pencil Out of God’s Hand,” 224–39; and Gent, *Picture and Poetry*.

75. Bartky, “Foucault,” 70.

76. Ibid., 72.


78. Koelb and Noakes, *Comparative Perspective on Literature*, 11. In that volume Ferguson, “Room Not Their Own,” 93–116, provides an interdisciplinary model for this study.


81. For exemplary studies of Renaissance *imitatio*, to which my work is greatly indebted, see Greene, *Descent from Heaven*; Light in *Troy*; and Vulnerable *Text*.

82. See Traub, Kaplan, and Callaghan, intro., in *Feminist Readings*, 5–6; and Hunt, afterword, in *Queering the Renaissance*, 359–64.


84. See Spencer, *Readings in Art History*, vol. 1.


86. See Tuke, *Treatise Against Painting*, B3–B4v and 42.


88. Vickers, “This Heraldry in Lucrece’s Face,” 218.

**ONE: Painting Women**


2. Richards, *Celestiall Publican*, H3. Richard’s invective is typical in that it occurs within a poem, “The Vicious Courtier” (G2–H3v), but mainly censures the painted court lady.


5. Cohen, “Trials of Artemisia Gentileschi,” 65–66, argues that the period saw the female body as less bordered and less gendered than in current views.

6. Tuke, *Treatise Against Painting*, B3. Arnold’s translation is not extant, but the fact of a female translator underscores the relevance of cosmetic texts to women.
7. Ibid., B4v.
8. Ibid., 11.
10. Ibid., 230.
25. Sirani’s mother and aunt testify that they believe Tolomelli was employed by a jealous rival: see Marnesi, *Il processo*, 24 and 29. The perforations of the stomach found during Sirani’s autopsy suggest a prolonged ulcerous inflammation, rather than poisoning, as the cause of death. See ibid., v; and Ragg, *Women Artists*, 287.
27. My thanks to Lael Parish for her helpful gloss of Malvasia’s title and its implications.
Ghirardi, “Women Artists of Bologna,” 43, attributes the portrait to Lucia Casolini Torelli. The latter attribution seems more likely.

29. See Bohn, “Female Self-Portraiture,” 249–71, on the Bolognese tradition of depicting female artists at work.


31. Lomazzo, Trattato dell’arte de la pittura, 191; Haydocke, Tracte Containing the Artes of Curious Paintinge, bk. 3, 99 and 130.


33. See Harley, Artists’ Pigments, esp. 8–9 and 17.

34. Fialetti, Whole Art of Drawing, 21. On procedures for making lead white, see Harley, Artists’ Pigments, 166–72.

35. Porta, Della magia naturale, 407; Natural Magick, 242–43.

36. See Woods-Marden, Renaissance Self-Portraiture, 17, for a similar interpretation of the performance of gender in early modern self-portraits.

37. On the portrait, see Rossi, Jacopo Tintoretto, 154; and Bereman, Italian Pictures of the Renaissance, 1:189.

38. Franco, Lettere, 69, 72, and 76; Poems and Selected Letters, 37, 38, and 40. I am indebted to Bianca F. C. Calabresi for calling my attention to Franco’s comments on painting.

39. Franco is not alone in condemning the arts by which her career flourishes. Gaspara Stampa’s canzone “Felice in questa e piu ne l’altra vita” (no. 298 in Salza’s edition and those following his reordering of the poems) complains, “quella con acque forti il viso offende,/ de la salute sua propria nimica” (“One spoils her face with acids and bleaches,/ Injuring in this way her own good health”). See Stampa, Gaspara Stampa–Veronica Franco, 173; and Stampa, Selected Poems, 208–9. The poem was not published in first edition of the Rime (1554) but in Christoforo Zabata, Nuova scelta di rime di diversi begli ingegni (1573), 196; it was reprinted in subsequent editions of Stampa’s work. The poem’s recantatory language must have appealed to readers such as Salza, who insisted upon and largely invented Stampa’s penance.

40. Alberti, Della pittura, 55 and 77–78; On Painting, 43 and 64. On Alberti’s use of the myth, see Baskins, “Echoing Narcissus in Alberti’s Della pittura,” 25–33.

41. See Pallucchini and Rossi, Jacopo Tintoretto, 1:43–44 and 2:418–20; Bereman, Italian Pictures, 1:177 and 182; and Vecchi, Tout l’ouvre peint de Tintoret, 99. Pallucchini dates both paintings from 1555–56. The dimensions of the two canvases suggest that they were conceived as a pair: Susanna measures 146.6 x 193.6 cm; and Narcissus 147 x 190 cm.

42. Smith, Wonder of Wonders, A2v.

43. Smith, Wonder of Wonders, A2v.

44. Finke, “Painting Women,” 360.


46. Tuke, Treatise Against Painting, A4v.


49. The equation between moral and physical poisoning is spectacularly displayed in Barnes, Divels Charter, when Lucretia Borgia is poisoned by makeup which she ap-

52. Anguissola’s and Sirani’s extant works demonstrate that neither was limited to portraiture. On the former, see Ferino-Padgen and Kusche, *Sofonisba Anguissola;* Perl-lingieri, *Sofonisba Anguissola;* Garrard, “Here’s Looking at Me,” 556–621; and Woods-Marsden, *Renaissance Self-Portraiture,* 191–213.
57. For a similar view of Lavinia Fontana, see Murphy, *Lavinia Fontana,* 85–116.
58. Jacobs, *Defining the Renaissance Virtuosa,* 86.
63. Picinardi, *Il Pennello Lagrimato,* n.p.; and Malvasia, *Felsina pittrice,* 2:465, identify the creator of the catafalque as “Sig. Matteo Borboni Pittore de più Celebri della Città” (Signore Matteo Borboni, one of the most Celebrated Painters of the City).
69. Vickers, “This Heraldry in Lucrece’s Face,” 218.
70. Ibid., 213.
71. Ibid., 214. See also Fineman, “Shakespeare’s Will,” 35–36.
73. Shakespeare, “Rape of Lucrece,” l.1367. All subsequent citations appear paren-thetically.
74. Vickers, “This Heraldry in Lucrece’s Face,” 217, notes that the word color is more frequent in “The Rape of Lucrece” than in any other Shakespearean work.


76. Fineman, “Shakespeare’s Will,” 36, 37, and 44.

77. Lomazzo, Trattato, 188; Haydocke, Tracte, bk. 3, 94.


79. Ibid., 2.
80. Ibid., 3.

81. Ibid., A3v.

83. Jacobs, Defining the Renaissance Virtuosa, 133–34, notes that the myth of Zeuxis was often used to describe the female artist by enumerating her body parts, creating a blazon within which male intellect gave shape to female matter.


86. Alberti, Della pittura, 91; Alberti, On Painting, 75.

87. Camden, Elizabethan Woman, 176.

88. Bartas, La Judit, 65; Historie of Judith, 73.

89. Jeamson, Artificial Embellishments, A4–A4v.
90. Ibid., 3.
91. Quoted in Tuke, Treatise Against Painting, A3v.
92. Quoted in ibid., B2v–B3.
93. Quoted in ibid., A3v.
94. Stubbes, Anatomie, F2. See also Cognet, Politique Discourses, 183.

96. Ziegler, “My Lady’s Chamber,” 78–82.

97. Jed, Chaste Thinking, 16.


99. Chadwick, Women, Art and Society, 102. See also Bohn, “Antique Heroines,” 66–70. Images of Portia’s wounding were relatively rare in the period: see Bohn, “Antique Heroines,” 63; and Harris and Nochlin, Women Artists, 150.

100. Morselli and Sones, in Collezioni e quadriere nella Bologna, report that the library included “le Vite de Plutarco in due tomi” (414). See also Bohn, “Antique Heroines,” 68. I include passages in Italian from Plutarch, Vite, 2:177–201, probably the edition in question. The other contender is Plutarch, Le Vite gli buonimi, published in the same year as Fioravanti’s Dello specchio, by the same publisher. English translations are from Plutarch, Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes, 1053–1078, the source for Shakespeare’s Julius Caesar, 2.1.234–308.


103. The conflation of the chamber and the female body, both violated by the rapist
in Shakespeare’s poem (Ziegler, “My Lady’s Chamber,” 78–79), exposes Sirani’s Portia to a similar violation by the viewer.

104. Wyke, “Woman in the Mirror,” 139, notes the classical view (expressed by Livy’s Cato, e.g.) that cosmetics symbolize the submission of the state to luxury and require women’s submission to men’s rule. Thus, the feminine adornment of Sirani’s Portia and her masculine act may challenge masculine domestic and aesthetic hegemony.


106. Shakespeare, Julius Caesar, 2.4.40.


109. Parker and Pollock, Old Mistresses, 27.

110. Ibid.

111. Jed, Chaste Thinking, 68, describes a similar feminist intervention in which the material text of Lucretia is an analogy for the female body.

112. Bohn, “Antique Heroines,” 67–68, compares Sirani’s image to Reni’s Portia (c. 1625–26), now in Genoa, arguing that Sirani “eschew[s] the sensuality and emotionality typically assigned to women by male artists” (78).

113. See Gwilliam, “Cosmetic Poetics,” 151.


116. Shakespeare, Julius Caesar, 2.4.8–9.


118. Ibid., A4.

TWO: Public Women

1. “Testimony of the Rape Trial of 1612,” in Garrard, Artemisia Gentileschi, 447. All further citations in English are to this source and appear parenthetically. Italian from Menzio, Atti di un processo per stupro, 91; and from app. 1 in Christiansen and Mann, Orazio and Artemisia Gentileschi, 432–45, each of which provides only partial transcripts. Citations to these two sources appear parenthetically, identified as Atti or “Appendix.”


3. The image occurs six times in the transcript; see “Testimony,” 450, 455, 457, 480, and 485; Atti, 95–96, 106; and “Appendix,” 434 and 435.


5. Cohen, “‘Courtesans’ and ‘Whores,’” 205.


7. Quoted in Garrard, Artemisia Gentileschi, 519 n. 240.

8. This polarization marks the querelle des femmes, which typically presents pro- and antifeminist arguments in extremes. See, e.g., Castiglione, Il libro del cortegiano, 207–82; Book of the Courtier, 87–198.


13. I see the play as more feminist and less restrictive than much contemporary criticism holds it to be. See, in particular, Matchinske, “Legislating ‘Middle Class’ Morality”; Carlson, “‘Fond Fathers’ and Sweet Sisters,” 13–31; and Adelman, “Bed Tricks,” 151–74.


16. Woods-Marsden, “Portrait of the Lady,” in 64–87, notes that brides’ gifts (donore), containing items for women’s adornment, were regulated by sumptuary laws for six years following the marriage; thus, portraits recording them would ordinarily fall within this time frame. Because sumptuary laws governed wives’ adornment in public, the portrait records the penetration of public codes into the domestic space. On the probable distinction between what women wore in public and in private, see Woods-Marsden, “Portrait of the Lady,” 65; and, on women’s clothing, see Landini and Bulgarella, “Costume in Fifteenth-Century Florentine Portraits of Women,” 90–97; and Frick, Dressing Renaissance Florence.

17. It has been suggested to me that this is an oeil-de-boeuf window. The oeil-de-boeuf, however, which becomes current in seventeenth-century French architecture, is by definition circular or oval.


20. Alberti, Della pittura, 70; On Painting, 56; and Woods-Marden, “Portrait of the Lady,” 71. See also Alberti, Della pittura, 65; Alberti, On Painting, 51; and Brown, Virtue and Beauty, 106–8 and 172–75.


22. Margherita from Milan, Orazio’s laundrywoman for twenty years, testified at Tassi’s trial for the Gentileschi, and Fausta Cicacconi, Agostino’s landrywoman, appeared on his behalf. See “Testimony,” 480, 483, and 485; and “Appendix,” 434, 436, and 439.

23. Maidservants in Italian paintings of the period do not always function in this manner: consider, e.g., Titian’s Venus of Urbino. The imagery and implications of the window in Prospero’s painting, however, make the issue of surveillance central to the portrait’s meaning and its subject’s identity.

24. Fortunati, Lavinia Fontana, 187, calls Prospero’s portrait “a fundamental model for Lavinia.”


26. Woods-Marsden, Renaissance Self-Portraiture, 216. Murphy, Lavinia Fontana, 41, notes that red was the traditional color of wedding dresses in sixteenth-century Bologna.

27. On Fontana’s impressive education, see McIver, “Lavinia Fontana’s Self-Portrait,” 3; and Cantaro, Lavinia Fontana, 5–6.
28. The easel has been interpreted alternatively as figuring Lavinia’s ambivalence toward her art and as showcasing her virtuosity. For the former view, see Woods-Marsden, *Renaissance Self-Portrait*, 217; for the latter, see McIver, “Lavinia Fontana’s Self-Portrait,” 4–5.


30. As Murphy, *Lavinia Fontana*, 43–44, points out, the marriage contract indicates that both families intended for Lavinia to continue to paint. She did so through eleven pregnancies.


32. See Alberti, *Della pittura*, 100; *On Painting*, 83. See also Cheney, “Lavinia Fontana,” 39, for a similar reading of Fontana’s Uffizi *Self-Portrait in the Studio*.

33. See Brown, intro., in Brown, *Virtue and Beauty*, 12, on Renaissance portraiture’s adoption of Petrarchan ideals.


35. On the virginal as a symbol of women’s virginity, see Garrard, “Here’s Looking at Me,” 588–89; and, on the cassone as an emblem of marriage, see Murphy, *Lavinia Fontana*, 43.


37. McIver, “Lavinia Fontana’s Self-Portrait,” 5 and 8 n. 24, notes that one copy is now in the Uffizi and the other is known only through a photograph. See also Cantaro, *Lavinia Fontana*, 74. I disagree that the first version was also conceived as a public relations tool, as McIver argues.

38. On the different career options available to Lavinia and Artemisia, resulting from Prospero’s relative wealth and Orazio’s relative penury, see Cavazzini, “Artemisia Gentileschi,” 283–84.


41. A witness recalls having chastised the thief in terms that echo the etymology of *raptus*: “You should also be ashamed of taking a painting . . . from this girl, just as if she were obliged to pay you for [not] having given you a copy of her naturale” (“doveresti vergognarvi di pigliare da questa fanciulla una quadro di quellla sorte come proprio ella sia anco obbligato pagarvi per havervi data copia del suo naturale”) (437; *Atti* 76). Christiansen and Mann, *Orazio and Artemisia*, 85, identify the painting in question as *Judith and Her Maid servant*, now in a private collection.


43. Cavallo and Cerutti, “Female Honor,” 76.


47. Hayne, “Performing Social Practice,” 5. See also Amussen, *Ordered Society*, 103–4, on early modern confusion on marriage; Matchinske, “Legislating ‘Middle Class’ Morality,” 162–63, on English marriage law and *Measure for Measure*; and Lever’s introduction to *Measure for Measure*, liii–lv, for the implications of this confusion in the play.
49. See Brucker, Giovanni and Lusanna, esp. 26–33, 35–36, and 72–74.
50. Tassi claims that a “desperate” (“disperatissimo”) Orazio “had brought the said Tuzia to live in the same house” as “a remedy for the many troubles his daughter was causing him by being wild and leading a bad life” (“ch’haveva messa a stare la detta Tutia in sua compagnia nell’istessa casa . . . di posser riparare a molti disguidisti, che detta sua figliola gi dava con essere sfrenata e tenere cattiva vita”) (“Testimony,” 446; Atti 90).
53. Artemisia’s “open marriage” to Pierantonio Stiattesi may imply a similarly troubled relationship to the patriarchal household. Although few domestic scenes are included in the Gentileschi’s oeuvre, with the exceptions of Orazio’s Annunciation (1623; Galleria Sabauda, Turin) and Artemisia’s Birth of Saint John (c. 1633–35; Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid), this fact reflects the drama of their Caravaggesque style rather than a position on domesticity per se.
54. Cohen, “No Longer Virgins,” speculates that Artemisia’s testimony may have been prepared in advance, given its conformity to the standard patterns of trials for stupro violente. See also Spear, “Artemisia Gentileschi,” 570.
55. Alberti, Della pittura, 59; On Painting, 55.
56. ffolliott, “Learning to Be Looked At,” 111, argues that the velo utilized by Artemisia in Merlet’s film renders the female artist a spectacle.
58. Ibid., 52. See also Cropper, “Life on the Edge,” 264.
60. Garrard, Artemisia Gentileschi, 208 and 311.
61. Bissell, Artemisia Gentileschi, exemplifies the former; Pollock, Differencing the Canon, 97–127, the latter. For a measured review of Bissell’s book, see Spear, “Artemisia Gentileschi,” 571–75; and Garrard’s response to Pollock in Artemisia Gentileschi around 1622, xix–xxi.
62. For Garrard’s negative assessment of the Metropolitan exhibit, see Garrard, “Painting with Crude Strokes,” 56.
63. See Ciletti, “Patriarchal Ideology,” 35–70.
65. This is more clearly the case in Artemisia’s earlier version of the scene, painted around the time of the trial, now in Naples. On the two versions, see Garrard, Artemisia Gentileschi, 307–13 and 321–27; Christiansen and Mann, Orazio and Artemisia, 308–11 and 147–49; and Wagstaff, “Weltering in Blood,” 194–97.
69. Greer, Obstacle Race, 189.
70. Quoted in Ciletti, “Patriarchal Ideology,” 68.
71. Bartas, La Judit, 49; Historie of Judith, 51. Early modern versions of Judith’s story emphasize her role as an artist and orator: Bartas, La Judit, 52–53 (Histoire of Judith, 56–57), includes an ekphrasis of Judith’s tapestries, while the anonymous La Rappresentazione di Judith Hebra, A5–A5v, presents Judith’s speeches to the Israelites. See also Bohn, “Antique Heroines,” 66. Judith’s associations with the colors of cosmetics and rhetoric and with the art of painting made her an attractive model for female artists.
72. Bartas, La Judit, 57; Historie of Judith, 63.
73. Bartas, La Judit, 65; Historie of Judith, 73. Holofernes names Semiramis and Helen as painted counterfeits of Judith’s beauty.
74. Bartas, La Judit, 50; Historie of Judith, 52.
75. Stocker, Judith, Sexual Warrior, 29. For discussion of these genres, see 28–35.
76. Ibid., 9.
78. Stocker, Judith, 17–18.
79. On the painting, see Garrard, Artemisia Gentileschi, 8–9, 39–41, 200, and 313–19; Christiansen and Mann, Orazio and Artemisia, 330–33; Bissell, Artemisia Gentileschi, 198–203; Greer, Obstacle Race, 189–91; and LaPierre, Artemisia, 144–47 and 445–48.
80. Garrard, Artemisia Gentileschi, 320.
82. On the painting, see Christiansen and Mann, Orazio and Artemisia, 82–86; Bissell, Artemisia Gentileschi, 12–13 and 198–201; and Spike, “Review of Florence 1991,” 733.
83. Christiansen and Mann, Orazio and Artemisia, 85–86.
85. Stocker, Judith, 18. On the painting, see Garrard, Artemisia Gentileschi, 67–72 and 328–35; Christiansen and Mann, Orazio and Artemisia, 368–70; and Bissell, Artemisia Gentileschi, 219–20.
87. Berdini, “Woman under the Gaze,” 585–86, argues that the Detroit Judith destabilizes the humanist regime of vision and displaces the male gaze, effects he describes as typically Baroque.
89. On the work, see Garrard, Artemisia Gentileschi, 15–18 and 182–209; Christiansen and Mann, Orazio and Artemisia, 297–99; Pollock, Differencing the Canon, 111–14; Greer, Obstacle Race, 191; Bissell, Artemisia Gentileschi, 187–89; Cropper, “Artemisia Gentileschi,” 195–202; Cropper, “Life on the Edge,” 276–78; and Spike, “Review,” 723.
90. Aylet, Susanna, 16–18, typifies literary treatments of Susanna, which usually anatomize her in lengthy blazons. Like Bartas’s Judith, Aylet’s Susanna is an artist; thus, he includes an ekphrasis of her needlework (13–14).
91. Pollock, Differencing the Canon, 114.
93. See Matchinske, “Legislating ‘Middle-Class’ Morality,” 174, for a similar argument about Sowernam’s Ester Hath Hang’d Haman.

95. See Friedman, “O let him marry her!” 454–64.

96. See, e.g., Whetstone, *Promos and Cassandra*, E2, F1, F4v, and H2.


99. See Herbert, *History of the Twelve Great Livery Companies*.

100. On Fontana, see McIver, “Lavinia Fontana’s Self-Portrait,” 3; and Murphy, *Lavinia Fontana*, 45; and, on Artemisia, see Cropper, “Life on the Edge,” 268. See also Barzman, *Florentine Academy*. Levina Teerlinc may have offered Shakespeare a local example of a female painter, but she was regularly identified as a “gentlewoman” rather than as a member of the London Painter-Stainers Company. On Teerlinc, see Auerbach, *Tudor Artists*, 75–77 and 104; McManus. “Queen Elizabeth,” 43–66; and Cheney, Faxon, and Russo, *Self-Portraits*, 35–36.


103. Tuzia testifies that Orazio “warned me not to speak to his daughter about husbands, rather that I should persuade her to become a nun” (“avvertita e non dir alla sua figliola né parlarli di mariti, ma che li persuadessi il farse monaca”), a suggestion that Artemisia refused (“Testimony,” 421; *Atti* 59).

104. Thus, Aylet, *Susanna*, B4v, describes women’s face painting.


108. The boy’s presence in the grange plays upon what Jankowski, “Pure Resistance,” 232, calls “the Protestant imagination of the Catholic nunnery as place of woman’s erotic autonomy.”
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