
THE LOCAL EYE: FORMAL AND SOCIAL DISTINCTIONS IN LATE QUATTROCENTO NEAPOLITAN TOMBS

TANJA MICHALSKY

The importation of 'foreign' artists is a familiar and much discussed art-historical phenomenon, but one that – at least in the Neapolitan context – is often discussed in narrow discipline-based terms: in discussions of stylistic classification, the aesthetic categories meaningful to a given client, and the history of the art market.¹ The recognition of the value of a comprehensive study to contextualize this phenomenon has been slow to emerge. The following discussion will focus on an examination of the broader historical sensorium through which fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Neapolitans drew distinctions between local traditions and imported innovations when choosing artists, types and decorative styles for their monuments. Naples is a particularly good focus for such an investigation. The city was home to several foreign imperial and royal dynasties between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries with the result that the amalgamation of divergent artistic forms of expression reached a particularly high level of sophistication. That Neapolitans had the ability to make refined distinctions can be demonstrated through a study of their tomb monuments as each one alludes – by virtue of its memorial function – to both the past achievements and future aspirations of a commissioning family. By reference to several particularly eloquent late fifteenth-century examples, this article will investigate the possible intentions of clients, the prototypes in relation to which they oriented their decisions, and the degree to which they chose artists, forms and types for their ability to embody and represent social status. In order to develop this argument, and to examine the ability to make local and specific distinctions, it is useful to move past Michael Baxandall's concept of the 'period eye' to a 'local eye', for, in the end, it is within local, urban society that these 'fine distinctions' came to be made, and where they were exemplified in public monuments.² Since, as one would expect, these distinctions are not registered in textual form, we must rely on formal analyses of, and comparisons between, the monuments themselves.

Beginning in the fourteenth century, when the Angevin rulers brought the Sienese Tino di Camaino to Naples and commissioned him and his workshop to construct their monuments, Neapolitan tomb sculpture began to be dominated by foreign sculptors.³ This process of importation may be demonstrated with



1 (Left) Tino di Camaino, *Tomb of Catherine of Austria*, 1325. Naples: San Lorenzo Maggiore. Photo: Luciano Pedicini.

2 (Right) Tino di Camaino and Gagliardo Primario, *Tomb of Mary of Hungary*, 1326. Naples: Santa Maria Donnaregina, Photo: Luciano Pedicini.

reference to the oldest surviving Neapolitan dynastic tombs, those of Catherine of Austria in San Lorenzo Maggiore (plate 1) and of Mary of Hungary in Santa Maria Donnaregina (plate 2). For the freestanding tomb of Catherine of Austria, whose husband Charles of Calabria (d.1328) was to have succeeded Robert of Anjou to the throne, Tino di Camaino worked for the first time in mosaic, collaborating with southern Italian mosaicists to create a new version of the baldachin tomb.⁴ The problematical character of this type of structure, which mingles various decorative traditions, was counterbalanced by means of a subtly conceived iconographic programme designed to fuse the client's Franciscan piety with demands for dynastic sanctity.⁵ Unprecedented for the tomb of a woman – recognized neither for her outstanding religious or political deeds – were the caryatids of the virtues, derived from contemporary tombs of saints, whose function was to honour the deceased as the representative of her family. In this case, both the tomb type and the principal artist were imported and adapted to specifically local conditions. Just one year later, the inconsistencies of Catherine's tomb were eliminated in the monument to Queen Mary of Hungary (the wife of Charles II of Anjou) where Tino di Camaino is documented as collaborating with the Neapolitan sculptor Gagliardo Primario.⁶ The result was an unusually well-proportioned, elegant architectural ensemble with reliefs which are now more clearly accented by a few mosaic elements. Iconographically the tomb represents a highly concentrated version of elements usually contained in Tuscan monumental wall tombs containing the figure of the Virgin Mary being honoured by her son. The result is an especially successful artistic solution based on local traditions. In particular, the sarcophagus relief, with its genealogical message, becomes a principal



3 *Tomb of Ladislas of Anjou, 1420s. Naples: San Giovanni a Carbonara. Photo: Luciano Pedicini.*

element of Angevin sepulchral sculpture from this point on.

Despite the obvious changes in iconography and decoration observable in the ensuing decades, this imported and modified type of monument became the symbol of Angevin power in all the mendicant churches of Naples.⁷ The final example of this Neapolitan-Angevin tradition is the tomb which Joanna II of Naples erected for her brother Ladislas toward the end of the 1420s in San Giovanni a Carbonara, the church of the Augustinian Hermits (plate 3).⁸ Almost



4 Donatello and Michelozzo, *Tomb of Rinaldo Brancaccio*, 1426–33. Naples: Sant'Angelo a Nido. Photo: Luciano Pedicini.

filling the entire rear wall of the presbytery, this tomb – whose crowning equestrian figure represents the king as *'Divus Ladislaus'*, and whose caryatids of the Virtues and enthroned figures monumentalize the dynastic program in a way far transcending familiar dimensions – impressively demonstrates the power of this typology. Once again Tuscan sculptors contributed although, in contrast to those monuments associated with Tino di Camaino, they were permitted minimal latitude.⁹ Simply to identify this monument's anachronisms and weaknesses would thus be to miss both its message and its aspirations. Instead, a clear distinction should be drawn between local formal prescriptions for Angevin royal monuments, on the one hand, and attempts to modernize this form by relying on imported artists, on the other. While recognizing familiar elements and simultaneously assessing the tomb's novel stylistic appearance, contemporaries would have regarded this monument less as disconcerting than as a reassessment of strict traditions.¹⁰ In 1688, however, Pompeo Sarnelli wrote in his guide to the city as follows: '... The sumptuous sepulchre of King Ladislas is the summit of magnificence, and although done in the gothic manner ... is nonetheless a highly elaborate and superb work.'¹¹ Here, he played off the gothic style (from the perspective of the baroque) against the monument's vast scale: his perception of a formal discrepancy was crucial.

The tomb of Rinaldo Brancaccio in S. Angelo a Nido (plate 4) was erected around the same time as the tomb of King Ladislas. In this monument to a Neapolitan nobleman, traditional and innovative accents have been reversed



5 Pietro da Milano, Domenico Gagini and Francesco Laurana, (Detail of) Triumphal Arch, 1440s–1470s. Naples: Castel Nuovo. Photo: Author.

when compared to the tomb of King Ladislas: the format is traditional while the style is innovative. The various components were shipped to Naples after production in Florence in 1426–33 by Donatello and Michelozzo.¹² Beneath the canopy, there is a typical ensemble including caryatids bearing the sarcophagus and angels holding curtains. The tomb still follows the structure of Angevin prototypes. It is in the details, however, that the idiom of the artists who executed the work becomes conspicuous. Deprived now of their attributes, the caryatids no longer represent the Virtues, as in Angevin tombs; consequently, they no longer embody specific moral qualities. Donatello's delicate low relief, *rilievo schiacciato*, at the centre of the sarcophagus displays far greater artistic skill than many tombs then existing in Naples, but its symbolism remains within the boundaries of Christian hopes for salvation. This tomb exemplifies how the imperative to represent social status necessitated the choice of a famous foreign sculptor while, at the same time, it shows how a local monument type might be adapted in an artistically splendid yet iconographically weak manner.

In the decades following 1442 there was a shift to new forms of public representations of royal power under the Aragonese kings, as well as to a different and highly diverse group of sculptors whose members arrived from both southern and northern Italy. The best-known example is the workshop which produced the triumphal arch at Castel Nuovo, where Pietro da Milano, Domenico Gagini of Sicily and Dalmatian-born Francesco Laurana worked together (plate 5).¹³ The

frieze on the lower arch displays the famous scene of Alfonso of Aragon entering Naples in the guise of an emperor of antiquity. The upper arch must once have featured an equestrian statue.¹⁴ Above, the Virtues recall Angevin tomb iconography. The form and decoration of the triumphal arch, whose construction extended into the 1470s, must have been perceived by the Neapolitans as a sign simultaneously of artistic renewal and renewed occupation. Given its status as a public and royal structure, the choice of both forms and artists had a profound impact on all subsequent projects undertaken during the second half of the fifteenth century. When analysing this arch, modern scholars have without exception identified a wide-ranging network of allusions to ancient and medieval monuments such as the Roman arch in Pula (first century BCE) and the gateway of Frederick II in Capua (1230s). Such allusions were not merely elements of an erudite humanistic dialogue; they were also perceptible and comprehensible to a wide range of the inhabitants of Naples. The arch was intended (and regarded) as an extravagant masterpiece, one capable of competing with antique prototypes – even if such a double structure, with one arch set above the other, hardly appears antique to modern eyes. It epitomizes the innovative tendencies arriving from abroad that initiated changes in the visual habits of the lower nobility as its members adopted the new forms and yet employed the same local artists.

Not surprisingly, the local culture was dominated to a considerable extent by the artistic choices of the sovereigns of Naples. Given the perpetual change of rulers and their artistic preferences, the Neapolitan elite was well schooled in analysing visual modes of representation and artistic styles, which functioned as codes indicating regional and social affiliations. In short: the existing Neapolitan culture of public and private monuments determined the ways in which the nobility was expected to enact social status by subscribing to a system of significant types and perhaps even of styles as well.

A spectacular example of the orientation towards Tuscan forms is the Cappella Piccolomini in S. Anna dei Lombardi (plate 6) from the 1470s, designed almost entirely after a Florentine prototype. In terms of architecture and materials, as well as the iconographical program, it reflects the Chapel of the Cardinal of Portugal in San Miniato al Monte in Florence (1461–66).¹⁵ Although the specific reason for this copy has yet to be clarified, it demonstrates the precision with which chapel décor from other regions was imitated. The importation of whole chapel types, together with the artists who executed them, must have been perceived by contemporaries as the emulation of foreign models. As will be shown in the case of another tomb dating from the 1490s, it was precisely such extraordinary monuments that would, in turn, influence later projects.

Observable alongside references to contemporary tendencies in other cities is a recourse to local monuments. Social status was determined by, among other factors, the age of the family line, its *anciennité*, expressed by allusions to older monuments. With its combination of Renaissance and baroque elements, the chapel of the Sangro family in the Cappella del Crocifisso in San Domenico Maggiore (plate 7) clearly demonstrates this approach. A guide to the church dated 1828 fittingly captures the difficulty involved in disentangling the identities of the various individuals commemorated by the tomb: ‘The mausoleum of the Sangro family, richly decorated with statues and military trophies, and by many souvenirs of the various heroes of that noble family . . .’¹⁶ By adding his



6 Antonio Rossellino and Benedetto da Maiano, Cappella Piccolomini, 1470s. Naples: S. Anna dei Lombardi (formerly S. Maria di Monteoliveto). Photo: Luciano Pedicini.

own bust, his trophies and an enormous plaque with an inscription, Nicolao de Sangro, who died in 1750, not only expanded and embellished the monument of his ancestors, but also, so to speak, burst its frame with the force of a baroque formal vocabulary.¹⁷ The fifteenth-century triumphal arch that once served as a setting for the tomb of his forefather, Placido Sangro, who died in 1480 and was interred according to the customs of the time, now retreats into the background.¹⁸ Also dating from the fifteenth century are the statues of Peter and Paul, housed in the lateral niches, as well as one representing the Archangel Michael. The reclining figure of a man wearing armour should probably be assigned to the sixteenth century and may have represented the other Placido Sangro referred to in the inscription on the left-hand base.¹⁹ The surviving ensemble shows that even two hundred and seventy years after its original decoration, the chapel's patronage remained in the hands of the family, whose youngest successor deemed it appropriate to invoke his ancestors while inserting his own tomb into a far older one. Unfortunately, Nicolao de Sangro's precise motives for choosing this



7 Tomb of the De Sangro family, 1480s/1750s. Naples: San Domenico Maggiore.
Photo: Luciano Pedicini.

solution can no longer be traced, although the rather banal possibility that it represented an economical alternative to decorating a new chapel should not be excluded. It is striking – and apparent even in the absence of documentation – that, despite the recklessness of the baroque interventions, the older monument has been preserved, that the elder *eroi* are not invoked merely through the inscriptions which name each and register his deeds, and that, even at first glance, the age of the family and of the chapel are manifest. Here a much older monument has been ostentatiously exploited so as to testify to family history at the cost of relegating earlier generations and their inscriptions to a subordinate position. Neglected, for example, is the identification of the reclining figure who

is now pressed into service as a representative of various deceased individuals. The superimposition of diverse, formally distinct layers in a single tomb monument has been utilized to stress an historical pedigree.

Considerably more complex than these cases of direct imitation or the utilization of existing tombs are the webs of formal allusions found in various aristocratic monuments of the late fifteenth century. A variety of factors should be taken into account when studying these tombs. First, there are the wishes and associated visual expectations of the respective client; second, there are the models and forms introduced by the artists; and last, but not least, there is the vast network of relationships governing the local culture of remembrance.

The settings and formal attributes of Neapolitan Renaissance tombs become comprehensible only against the background of the social institution of the *seggi*. The five *seggi* represented the well-established noble families that, for centuries, had defined the individual urban districts.²⁰ They demanded a say at court and were often successful. The term *seggio* also referred to a seat or a place of assembly for the nobility of a given quarter, whose origins could, according to legend, be traced all the way back to antiquity.

Beginning in the later middle ages, the *seggi* were characterized in architectural terms by loggia-style assembly rooms that served to convey the claims to power of the various noble groups living within the city. These buildings have virtually disappeared from contemporary Naples. Little more than remnants survive, including those of the *Seggio di Capuana* found in the street bearing the same name and located behind the cathedral. A brief description of the city dating from 1444 demonstrates the importance of these assembly places for the organization of the city and for the aristocracy affiliated with them:

The city mentioned is subdivided into five parts, the first of which is the Seggio di Capuana, [after which follow] the Seggio di Montagna, the Seggio di Portanova, the Seggio di Porto, and the Seggio di Nido: these buildings are elaborate and decorated loggias where all of the nobility of the respective districts of the city gather, just as the nobility of other cities assemble in public squares and palaces. The Neapolitan nobility gather in the Seggi after attending Mass, and remain until it is time to dine.²¹

The *Seggio di Capuana* and the *Seggio di Nido*, both especially influential, interred their members primarily in the cathedral, in San Giovanni a Carbonara, and in San Domenico, churches which also accommodated the tombs of some members of the Angevin and Aragonese dynasties. The *seggi* and their corresponding sepulchral churches were set in close proximity to one another, so that structures of political and familial representation spatially interlocked. This allowed the *seggi* representation alongside royal burials.

Maria Antonietta Visceglia and Giuliana Vitale have dealt exhaustively with the composition of the rival Neapolitan noble families, their legacy strategies and memorial practices, and the political and social functions of the *seggi*.²² Their examination of wills and testaments and of the guide literature to Naples shows that the political system of the *seggi* is reflected in interment practices, so that several churches were almost entirely in the hands of families who shared membership in a single *seggio*. This system – which itself underwent changes as a result of altered political circumstances – offers a faithful image of the social and



8 Jacopo della Pila, *Tomb of Tommaso Brancaccio*, 1492. Naples: San Domenico Maggiore.
Photo: Luciano Pedicini.

political order.²³ Beginning in the later fifteenth century, the noble families of the city – who found themselves drawn into the court’s orbit – found it necessary to finance increasingly elaborate funeral obsequies and interment rituals to lend proper expression to their social status.²⁴ Family chapels became indispensable status symbols. The *seggi* mediated in practical terms between social relationships and specific localizations within the urban sphere, as was made manifest not only in their loggia architecture, but also through the noble monuments planned and erected under competitive pressure. It is this precarious relationship between rivalry and collective affiliation that is demonstrated to some extent in the hybrid forms of these memorials.

Just prior to the 1480s, when the majority of the nobility had finally exhausted the potential for social propaganda and class representation offered by the erection of increasingly numerous tombs, new monuments were commissioned primarily from foreign sculptors, among them the Florentine Antonio Rossellino and his pupil Benedetto da Maiano, Pietro da Milano, Pietro Belverte from Bergamo, Tommaso Malvito from Como and Jacopo della Pila, also from Lombardy.²⁵ In 1492 Iulia Brancaccio signed a contract with Jacopo della Pila for the tomb of her husband, Tommaso, in San Domenico Maggiore (plate 8).²⁶ After the usual clauses regarding materials and dimensions and mention of a preliminary drawing, the text reads: ‘Iacopo della Pila promises to arrange the lower part of the monument to be like the one designed for Cardinal Brancaccio in Sant’Angelo a Nido.’ The document refers to the tomb sculpted by Donatello and Michelozzo in the 1420s and discussed above (see plate 4). This approach was customary since, from the client’s perspective, comparison with existing monuments, in combination with drawings, was the most reliable method for cementing the terms of a commission. To modern eyes, nonetheless, it is astonishing how little correspondence exists between the two monuments.

A direct comparison between these tombs offers us only the insight that Jacopo della Pila sculpted three caryatids identifiable as Justice, Temperance and Prudence. Understandably Iulia Brancaccio wanted an explicit allusion to the tomb of a well-known relative, a monument that stood just a few steps away across the road in a nearby church in the same *seggio*.²⁷ A comparison with this earlier Brancaccio monument facilitates an understanding of the contemporary capacity for making formal distinctions, and demonstrates that concerns with formal relationships were aimed mostly at introducing restrictions. The similarities between the figures of the two groups are confined to their function as caryatids, while Donatello’s style is neither cited nor imitated. A comparison with another contemporary tomb in the same important church offers additional clues. The tomb of Antonio Carafa, called Malizia (plate 9), sculpted in part by Jacopo della Pila’s workshop, demonstrates the customary inclusion of the trio of Virtues bearing the sarcophagus, and shows that this motif is not necessarily restricted to tombs of one specific family. In order to provide a visual framework for her husband’s tomb, Iulia Brancaccio simply seized upon a concrete and familiar example.²⁸

That the artists who executed the monument, with their own interests in engaging in competition, took advantage of the existence of other locally prominent monuments in designing this tomb is clearly shown by a comparison with the tomb of Mary of Aragon (d. 1469) in S. Maria di Monteoliveto (plate 10).²⁹ Although it is not mentioned specifically in the contract between Iulia Brancaccio



9 Workshop of Jacopo della Pila, *Tomb of Antonio Carafa (called Malizia)*, 1440s/1480s. Naples: San Domenico Maggiore. Photo: Luciano Pedicini.

and Jacopo della Pila, this monument was the model for the upper tier of the tomb of Tommaso Brancaccio. It imitates a celebrated Florentine tomb – that of the Cardinal of Portugal in San Miniato al Monte – and re-introduces the motif of the partially drawn curtain, along with that of the tondo of the Virgin Mary borne aloft by angels. Jacopo della Pila also appropriated, although on a smaller scale, the back of the *camera funebris*, or funeral chamber, and translated it into his own stylistic idiom. To the familiar, rounded arch of the *camera funebris* bearing heads of angels, which was adopted from the tomb of Diomedea Carafa in San Domenico Maggiore (plate 11), he added a distinctive superimposed, densely folded curtain, and set the family crest of the deceased in place of the Lamb of God. The result of this cut-and-paste method is a form that is as elegant as it is hybrid, but which was, at least in the



10 *Tomb of Mary of Aragon*, 1470s. Naples: Cappella Piccolomini, S. Anna dei Lombardi (formerly S. Maria di Monteoliveto). Photo: Luciano Pedicini.



11 (Left) Jacopo da Pila, Tommaso Malvito da Como and Domenico Gagini, *Tomb of Diomedede Carafa*, 1480s. Naples: San Domenico Maggiore. Photo: Luciano Pedicini.



12 (Right) Tommaso Malvito da Como, *Tomb of Mariano D'Alagno and Caterinella Ursina*, 1506. Naples: San Domenico Maggiore. Photo: Luciano Pedicini.

eyes of the daughter of the deceased who made the final payment on the contract in 1500, 'not perfect, but instead defective'.³⁰ Exactly to what this criticism was intended to refer remains unclear as is the question of whether it might have been aimed, as so often in such cases, at reducing the agreed price.

More instances of citation, imitation and affiliation of the type discussed above could easily be offered. But the fundamental methodological issue remains the same: namely, that those who interpret these monuments do not only demonstrate the similarities between them, but, in effect, construct these similarities in the first place. On the typological, stylistic and decorative levels, such similarities are always a question of an implicit system of references dependent upon a conjectural plane of comparison that is based on extrapolations from actual objects. Such formally and semantically coded relationships must be recognized as historical phenomena. The formal similarities – whether they were requested by patrons or created by artists – established a network of regional and supra-regional links between tombs. However, what remains to be determined is how far the Neapolitans, who were regularly exposed to tombs which were similar to one another, were capable of distinguishing such subtleties and of construing regional and historical stylistic contrasts.

Would the beholder of the 1490s have perceived the tomb of Tommaso Brancaccio as a combination of a Neapolitan tomb type with caryatids executed by a northern Italian artist under the influence of innovations found in imported Florentine prototypes? Did style matter? Even in the absence of documentary evidence establishing such an understanding, the network of simultaneously divergent yet related tombs alone gives us reason to believe that both form and style were deliberately chosen and not simply dictated by the restricted supply of artists on site.

This assumption can be substantiated by referring to the tomb of Malizia Carafa. The atypical assembly of this tomb – set in the second left-hand side chapel of San Domenico Maggiore – becomes comprehensible only in terms of the fusion of local traditions (see plate 9). The most recent components must have been added in the 1480s, and if Francesco Abbate's stylistic arguments are accepted, then Jacopo della Pila was the sculptor responsible for planning it.³¹ Multiple temporal layers are united in this monument: the sarcophagus dates from the fourteenth century, and is quite probably a remnant of the workshop production of one of Tino di Camaino's successors.³² Upon close examination, the sarcophagus reveals a small praying figure of Malizia Carafa, which presumably once (i.e. in the fourteenth century) represented a different person. It seems to have been altered, but only additional detailed analyses will show whether it has been modernized – for example, by giving the figure a different hairstyle.

It is not yet known when the body of Malizia was interred in this sarcophagus nor when the inscription was engraved in clumsy Roman capitals. This inscription reads: 'The great knight Malizius Carrafa died on October 10 1438 (2nd indiction)'.³³ According to custom, the date of death appears on the sarcophagus, while the lines of text directly below the reclining figure celebrate the deeds of the deceased – a diplomat in the service of Alfonso of Aragon:

Thanks to me [Malizia], Alfonso [of Aragon] arrived on our coasts in order to bring peace to the Italians. Only the piety of his [Malizia's] descendants is responsible for this tomb, and it is offered as a gift to Malizia.³⁴

Based on formal criteria, the surrounding triumphal arch can be dated to the period following Carafa's death, ie. the early 1440s, and should be understood as a decidedly modern element. There is a compelling comparison with the tomb of Rinaldo Brancaccio (see plate 4), found in the immediate vicinity in the church of Sant'Angelo a Nido. It is conceivable that the arch was erected jointly with the tomb chamber and the caryatids of the virtues. According to Abbate, the virtues can be plausibly ascribed to Jacopo della Pila, who seems also to have been responsible for the *camera funebris*, the recumbent figure and the lengthier and more recent inscription.³⁵ The usual fifteenth-century formal conceptions are disregarded in the *camera funebris* in order to create a tomb chamber appropriate to a fourteenth-century sarcophagus, on the ceiling of which the Carafa coats of arms are prominently displayed.³⁶

It is tempting to ascribe to Diomedes Carafa (1404–1487), a connoisseur of antiquity and a humanist courtier, the ambition of associating his father's tomb with long bygone times, thereby alluding to his family's longevity.³⁷ Fourteenth-century Neapolitan sarcophagus fronts can also be found on other fifteenth-century tombs, demonstrating that this was a widely employed solution.³⁸ This phenomenon was not widespread elsewhere in Italy in the fifteenth century; in Tuscany it was antique sarcophagi that were routinely reused or copied. The reuse of late medieval sarcophagi then, was confined to Naples, where the use of a fourteenth-century insertion in the tomb of Malizia Carafa may have been intended as an allusion to the glorious past – to which he had contributed significantly by ensuring the peaceful surrender of power by Joanna II of Naples to Alfonso of Aragon in 1420.³⁹ In any event, the inscription stresses both Malizia's political service and the services to society of his children, who had endowed the tomb, thereby simultaneously ensuring their father's memory while beautifying the city. As the inscription says, it was through the good offices of Malizia Carafa that Alfonso of Aragon arrived in Italy, even if it would later fall to his descendants (and not to the ruling Aragonese dynasty) to erect a tomb for him.⁴⁰ The text reaches consciously into past and future to bring the generations together. This is mirrored in the monument's formal attributes which are indebted to a local network of references. Based on these considerations, it seems reasonable to suggest that the fourteenth-century sarcophagus was integrated into a contemporary fifteenth-century monument designed by Jacopo della Pila and commissioned by Diomedes Carafa to commemorate the reputedly peaceful transition to a new ruling dynasty that had been facilitated by Carafa's father.

That Jacopo della Pila was entrusted with the execution of such a project was due to his status as a well-known artist and to Carafa's aspirations to compete with other noblemen and with their tombs. Despite the lack of documentary evidence to corroborate this hypothesis, it is possible to identify strategies of visualization. To substantiate these observations concerning conscious citations from the monuments of older dynastic houses, more wide-ranging comparative studies are necessary: grouping together monuments by client, artist and style and attempting to identify those formal attributes that had the significance of visual status symbols for the nobility of the period. It is important to recall the omnipresence and monumentality of tombs in Naples, in particular those of the Angevin royal family. In contrast, the late fifteenth-century coffins of the Aragonese kings, which stood in the choir of San Domenico, were given a far more

ephemeral design: covered with brocade rather than being carved from marble.⁴¹ The petrification of local social memory and its localization within urban space are easily underestimated. However, as a result of this entrenchment, Neapolitans seem to have had an historical perceptiveness capable of registering and differentiating the formal details encompassed within a closely woven network of references. The proper investigation of this phenomenon presupposes the establishment of a formally, and simultaneously semantically-oriented art-historical method. Following this method, these analyses would be undertaken not solely to identify historical settings and dates, but also to shed light on the historical capacities of contemporaries for making distinctions that were visually legible in affiliations between monuments (if not recorded in the available documentation), abilities that can be isolated only in the context of local traditions. In determining the significance of these monuments for contemporary beholders, it is less a question of identifying specific historical protagonists than developing methods capable of determining the relevance of visual references.

One final example: the tomb of the highly-regarded humanist Diomede Carafa (c. 1406–1487 – mentioned earlier as the presumed commissioner of his father’s tomb), today located to the right of the altar in the Cappellone del Crocifisso in San Domenico (see plate 11), may be understood as an especially ambitious project, demonstrated by its prestigious location. In the absence of textual documentation, attributions – whether to one or more artists – remain controversial. Francesco Abbate attributes various portions to Jacopo da Pila, Tommaso Malvito and Domenico Gagini.⁴² These observations are helpful in reconstructing workshop conditions, although the current appearance of the tomb may also be the result of later alterations. A Neapolitan contemporary from the same social sphere might, in this author’s view, have been capable of distinguishing individual hands, and going beyond this, would probably also have been cognizant of the modernity of the smooth, idealized reclining figure, of the novelty of the virtues distributed across the containing arch, and especially of the bench, its backrest decorated with a coat of arms. Perception is always guided by interest and, here, it may be assumed that at the time of its execution, the main accent was on socially relevant elements and attributes.

In this case, the historical interest of the benches – which can probably be interpreted as a sign of political representation in the *seggi*⁴³ – is documented by a contract concluded between Margherita Poderico and Tommaso Malvito da Como in 1506 for the double tomb of Mariano d’Alagno and his wife Caterinella Ursina (plate 12) in the same chapel.⁴⁴ Unlike the first design for this tomb, mentioned in the contract, which envisioned several figures (presumably virtues) for the lower register, the artist was compelled to place a bench there, with a panel bearing the family coat of arms set into the floor. The solution of the d’Alagno monument is unsatisfactory to the modern eye, with the elements set one above the other so as to suggest a lack of feeling for space or proportion. Here, in one of the most famous chapels of the period – the *cappellone* housed a miraculous crucifix said to have spoken to Thomas Aquinas – competition between families, enacted via the emulation of specific tomb elements, clearly took precedence over aesthetic decisions.

The following conclusions may be drawn from the examples discussed above: the importation of foreign sculptors to Naples had its roots in royal commissions

and sponsorship. The nobility, accustomed to distinguishing between different styles and forms, was able to assimilate new and imported standards of representation. Given the specific memorial function of tombs, it was rarely possible to build strictly modern monuments, which meant a marked reliance on local and familial traditions. One result of compelling foreign artists to conform to local expectations was the creation of hybrid monuments. To refer to hybridity may seem exaggerated, but the term does bring into focus the layers of tradition and innovation that would have been evident to contemporaries. Hybridity is a term familiar from post-colonial theory, where it is associated with a positive appreciation for the amalgamation of heterogeneous elements drawn from a variety of cultures.⁴⁵ In this broader sense, the term is relevant for the recognition of the localized development of forms, since, in Naples as elsewhere, a real appreciation of the phenomenon of the synthesis of diverse traditions has not yet been established. Both the network of visually related monuments and the surviving contracts testify, on the one hand, to the rigour of typology and decorum given to the visual frameworks and, on the other, to the potentiality inherent in reinterpretations of earlier formulae.

Notes

A version of this article was presented in the sessions, *Import/Export: Painting, Sculpture and Architecture in the Kingdom of Naples 1266–1568*, at the Renaissance Society of America Annual Conference in San Francisco in 2006. I wish to express my gratitude to the Italian Academy for Advanced Studies in America at Columbia University in New York for the fellowship in 2004–2005 which enabled me to conduct part of the research for this article. Thanks are extended to Luciano Pedicini (<http://www.pedicinimages.com>) for the provision of images.

1 For the Neapolitan sculpture of the Renaissance, see Ferdinando Bologna, 'Problemi della scultura del Cinquecento a Napoli', *Sculture lignee nella Campania. Catalogo della mostra*, Naples, 1950, 153–82; Oreste Ferrari, 'Per la conoscenza della scultura del primo Quattrocento a Napoli', *Bollettino d'arte*, ser. 4, 39, 1954, 11–24; Ottavio Morisani, 'La scultura del Cinquecento a Napoli', *Storia di Napoli*, 5, 2, 1972, 721–80; Francesco Abbate, 'Problemi della scultura napoletana del Quattrocento', *Storia di Napoli*, 4, 1, 1974, 447–94; Roberto Pane, *Il Rinascimento nell'Italia meridionale*, 2 vols, Milan, 1975–77; Arnaldo Venditti, 'Testimonianze brunelleschiane a Napoli e in Campania. Evidence of the influence of Brunelleschi in Naples and Campania', in Giovanni Spadolini, ed., *Filippo Brunelleschi: la sua opera e il suo tempo*, Florence, 1980, vol. 2, 753–77; Francesco Abbate, *La scultura napoletana del Cinquecento*, Rome, 1992; Francesco Negri Arnoldi, *Scultura del Cinquecento in Italia meridionale*, Naples, 1997. New approaches are found in Luciano Migliaccio, 'I rapporti fra Italia meridionale e penisola iberica nel primo Cinquecento attraverso gli ultimi studi: bilancio e prospettive, pt. II: la Scultura', *Storia dell'arte*, 64, 1988, 225–31; Luciano Migliaccio, "'Consecratio' pagana ed

iconografia cristiana nella cappella Caracciolo di Vico a Napoli. Un manifesto dell'umanesimo napoletano e gli esordi di Bartolomé Ordóñez e Diego de Siloe', *Ricerche di storia dell'arte*, 53, 1994, 22–34; Riccardo Naldi, 'Nati da santi. Una nota su idea di nobiltà e arti figurative a Napoli nel primo Cinquecento', *Ricerche di storia dell'arte*, 53, 1994, 4–21; Riccardo Naldi, 'Rapporti Firenze-Napoli tra Quattro e Cinquecento: la cona marmorea di Andrea di Pietro Ferrucci per Maria Brancaccio', *Prospettiva*, 91/92, 1998, 103–114. Dealing explicitly with the import of foreign sculptors is Francesco Abbate's 'Appunti su Pietro da Milano scultore e la colonia lombarda a Napoli', *Bollettino d'Arte*, 69, 1984, 73–86.

2 Michael Baxandall's term 'period eye' has already been established. See Allan Langdale, 'Aspects of the critical reception and intellectual history of Baxandall's Concept of the Period Eye', in Adrian Rifkin, ed., *About Michael Baxandall*, Oxford, 1999; Adrian Randolph, 'Gendering the period eye: "Deschi da parto" and Renaissance visual culture', *Art History*, 27, 2004, 538–62, in which 'fine distinctions' is an allusion to Pierre Bourdieu, *La distinction. Critique sociale du jugement*, Paris, 1979.

- 3 A historical interpretation of the Angevin tombs is provided by Lorenz Enderlein, *Die Grablegen des Hauses Anjou in Unteritalien. Totenkult und Monumente 1266–1343*, Worms, 1997; Tanja Michalsky, *Memoria und Repräsentation. Die Grabmäler des Königshauses Anjou in Italien*, Göttingen, 2000.
- 4 See Julian Gardner, 'A princess among prelates: A fourteenth-century Neapolitan tomb and some northern relations', *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 23/24, 1988, 31–60. The original setting is still under discussion. Most recently, and based on new assumptions, see Francesco Aceto, 'Le memorie angioine in San Lorenzo Maggiore', in Serena Romano and Nicolas Bock, eds, *Le chiese di San Lorenzo e San Domenico. Gli ordini mendicanti a Napoli*, Naples, 2005, 67–94, with further bibliography. There was a long tradition of mosaic inlay in Naples from the twelfth century onwards. For this, and Tino's introduction to mosaic in Naples, see Tanja Michalsky, 'Das Grabmal Katharinas von Österreich. Sein Programm, seine Stellung in der Grabmalplastik des frühen Trecento und sein Ort unter den Anjou-Gräbern Neapels', unpublished MA thesis, University of Munich, 1990, 37–44.
- 5 For the iconographical arguments of *sainteté de lignage*, see Tanja Michalsky, 'Die Repräsentation einer Beata Stirps. Darstellung und Ausdruck an den Grabmonumenten der Anjous', in Andrea von Huelsen Esch and Otto Gerhard Oexle, eds, *Die Repräsentation der Gruppen. Texte – Bilder – Objekte*, Göttingen, 1998, 187–224. For the programme's spiritualistic background, see Tanja Michalsky, 'Sponsoren der Armut. Bildkonzepte frankisch orientierter Herrschaft', in Tanja Michalsky, ed., *Kunst zur Zeit der Anjous in Italien. Ausdrucksformen politischer Macht und ihre Rezeption*, Berlin, 2001, 121–48, esp. 124–30. See also Michalsky, *Memoria*, cat. no. 21, 281–9.
- 6 For the tomb, see Enderlein, *Die Grablegen*, 92–8; Michalsky, *Memoria*, cat. no. 22, 289–97; Tanja Michalsky, "'MATER SERENISSIMI PRINCIPIS': The tomb of Queen Mary of Hungary", in Janis Elliott and Cordelia Warr, eds, *The Church of Santa Maria Donna Regina: Art, Iconography and Patronage in Fourteenth-Century Naples*, Aldershot, 2004, 61–77.
- 7 See in detail Michalsky, *Memoria*, 41–153. On Angevin architecture in Naples, see most recently Caroline Bruzelius, *The Stones of Naples: Church Building in Angevin Italy 1266–1343*, New Haven and London, 2004.
- 8 See Antonio Filangieri di Candida, *La chiesa e il monastero di San Giovanni a Carbonara*, ed. Riccardo Filangieri, Naples, 1924, 33–43; Ottavio Morisani, 'Aspetti della regalità in tre monumenti angioini', *Cronache di archeologia e storia dell'arte*, 9, 1970, 88–122; Roberto Paolo Ciardi, "'Ars marmoris". Aspetti dell'organizzazione del lavoro nella Toscana occidentale durante il Quattrocento', in Enrico Castelnuovo, ed., *Niveo di marmo. L'uso artistico del marmo di Carrara dall'XI al XV secolo*, exhib. cat., Genoa, 1992, 341–9; Francesco Abbate, 'Il monumento a Ladislao di Durazzo', in *Le vie del marmo. Aspetti della produzione e della diffusione dei manufatti marmorei tra Quattrocento e Cinquecento*, Florence, 1994, 17–22. The monument was completed in 1431 at the earliest. See Nicolas Bock, 'Antiken- und Florenzrezeption in Neapel 1400–1500', in Klaus Bergdoldt and Giorgio Bonsanti, eds, *Opere e giorni. Studi su mille anni di arte europea dedicati a Max Seidel*, Venice, 2001, 241–52, esp. 243. For the historical background, see Alessandro Cutolo, *Re Ladislao d'Angiò-Durazzo*, 2 vols, Milan, 1936–44; Nunzio Federico Faraglia, *Storia della regina Giovanna II d'Angiò*, Lanciano, 1904, 11ff. For the accession to power of Joanna II and the conflict between Joanna II and the wife of King Ladislao, Maria d'Enghien, see Alessandro Cutolo, *Maria d'Enghien*, Naples, 1929, 143ff.
- 9 For the arguments concerning attribution to the workshop and its organisation see Ciardi, 'Ars marmoris'.
- 10 Taking into account that historical cityguides are not known for their objectivity, see the impressive description of the monument in 1535 by Benedetto Di Falco, 'Più oltre è la regal chiesa di San Giovanni a Carbonara, dove in un eminente sepolcro di marmo gentile sta seppellito Re Ladislao, con tal titolo latino fatto dal Sannazaro', in Ottavio Morisani, ed., *Descrittione dei luoghi antiqui di Napoli e del suo amenissimo distretto*, Naples, 1972, 32.
- 11 'Suntuoso sepolcro del Re Ladislao di somma magnificenza, anchorche di maniera Gotica ... opera molto ricca, e superba', Pompeo Sarnelli, *Guida de' forestieri, curiosi di vedere, e d'intendere le cose più notabili della Regal Città di Napoli, e del suo amenissimo Distretto*, Naples, 1688, 164.
- 12 Ronald Lightbown, *Donatello and Michelozzo*, 2 vols, London, 1980, 83–127; James Beck, 'Donatello and the Brancacci tomb in Naples', in K.-L. Selig and R. E. Somerville eds, *Florilegium Columbianum. Essays in honor of Paul Oskar Kristeller, Kristeller*, New York, 1987, 125–40; Joachim Poeschke, *Die Skulptur der Renaissance in Italien*, 2 vols, Munich, 1990, vol. 1, 121. The precise date of completion is not known; in July 1427 the register taken for the Florentine *catasto* indicates the completion of the main elements. Lightbown, *Donatello*, 88. The monument was brought from Pisa to Naples no earlier than 1429. See Ciardi, 'Ars marmoris', 342. On Brancaccio's *vita*, see Dieter Girgensohn, 'Brancaccio, Rinaldo', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, Rome, 1960–, vol. 13 (1971), 797–9.
- 13 George L. Hersey, *The Aragonese Arch at Naples, 1443–1475*, New Haven and London, 1973; Hanno-Walter Kruff, 'Francesco Laurana, beginnings in Naples', *Burlington Magazine*, 116, 1974, 9–14; Hanno-Walter Kruff and Magne Malmanger, 'Der Triumphbogen Alfonsos in Neapel: das Monument und seine politische Bedeutung', *Acta archaeologica et artium historiam pertinentia*, ser. 4, 6, 1975, 213–305; Abbate, 'Appunti'; Vladimir P. Goss, 'I due rilievi di Pietro da Milano e di Fran-

- cesco Laurana nell' Arco di Castelnuovo in Napoli', *Napoli Nobilissima*, 20, 1981, 102-114; Anna Alabiso, *L'arco di trionfo di Alfonso d'Aragona e il restauro*, Rome, 1987; Andreas Beyer, '... i pensamiento e invencion ... : König Alfonso I. von Neapel triumphiert als Friedensfürst am Grabmal der Parthenope', *Georges Bloch Jahrbuch des Kunstgeschichtlichen Seminars der Universität Zürich*, 1, 1994, 93-107; Arnaldo Venditti, 'Presenze catalane nell'architettura aragonese, 1442-1501, a Napoli e in Campania', in Cesare Cundari, ed., *Verso un repertorio dell'architettura catalana: architettura catalana in Campania: province di Benevento, Caserta, Napoli*, Rome, 2005, 145-64.
- 14 See Alan Ryder, *Alfonso the Magnanimous. King of Aragon, Naples and Sicily, 1396-1458*, Oxford, 1990. For the historical event, see Ellen Callman, 'The Triumphant Entry into Naples of Alfonso I', *Apollo*, 110, 1979, 24-31; Marzia Pieri, "'Sumptuosissime pompe"'. Lo spettacolo nella Napoli aragonese', in *Studi di filologia e critica offerti dagli allievi a Lanfranco Caretti*, Salerno, 1985, 39-82; Grazia Distaso, *Scenografia epica. Il Trionfo di Alfonso-Epigono Tassiani*, Bari, 1999. For the related illustrated manuscript, see Fulvio delle Donne, 'La Historia Alphonsi primi regis di Gaspare Pellegrino: il ms. IX C 22 della Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli', *Archivio storico per le Province di Napoli*, 118, 2000, 89-104. For another tournament of 1423, see Hope Maxwell, "'Uno elefante grandissimo con lo castello di sopra": il trionfo aragonese del 1423', *Archivio storico italiano*, 150, 1992, 847-75.
- 15 George L. Hersey, *Alfonso II and the artistic renewal of Naples, 1485-1495*, New Haven and London, 1969, 111-15; Martina Hansmann, 'Die Kapelle des Kardinals von Portugal in S. Miniato al Monte', in Andreas Beyer and Bruce Boucher, eds, *Piero de' Medici 'il Gottoso' (1416-1469). Kunst im Dienste der Mediceer*, Berlin, 1993, 291-316; Francesco Quinterio, *Giuliano da Maiano 'Grandissimo Domestico'*, Rome, 1996, 510-26; Erminia Pepe, 'Le tre cappelle rinascimentali in Santa Maria di Monteoliveto a Napoli', *Napoli Nobilissima*, 37, 1998, 97-116; For the attribution to Antonio Rossellino and Benedetto Maiano, see Doris Carl, *Benedetto da Maiano. Ein Florentiner Bildhauer an der Schwelle zur HochRenaissance*, 2 vols, Regensburg, 2006, vol. 1, 381-92. For the Florentine Chapel, see Frederick Hartt, Gino Corti and Clarence Kennedy, *The Chapel of the Cardinal of Portugal (1434-1459) at San Miniato al Monte in Florence*, Philadelphia, 1964; Linda A. Koch, 'The Early Christian Revival at S. Miniato al Monte. The Cardinal of Portugal Chapel', *Art Bulletin*, 78, 1996, 527-55.
- 16 'Il mausoleo della Famiglia Sangro, ricco di statue, e di trofei militari, e con molte memorie di varij Eroi di questa nobilissima Famiglia.' Vincenzo Maria Perrotta, *Descrizione storica della chiesa e del monastero di S. Domenico Maggiore di Napoli*, Naples, 1828, 54.
- 17 See Giuseppe Sigismondo, *Descrizione della città di Napoli e suoi borghi*, 3 vols, Naples, 1788, vol. 2, 21: '... i depositi della famiglia di Sangro; ed ultimamente vi fu aggiunto quello di Nicola di Sangro che servì il nostro Monarca Carlo Borbone, nel quale vedesi il suo mezzo busto espresso al vivo fra le militari bandiere, e i guerrieri trofei, sotto de'quali si legge: "Ad memoriam nominis immortalis/Nicolai de Sangro/e Sancto Lucidensium Marchionibus/Fundorum et Princibus Marsorum Comitibus/Philippi V. Hispaniarum Regis a cubiculo/ab eodem aurei velleris honore insigniti/a Carolo utriusque Siciliae Rege/inter Sancti Ianuarii Equites adlecti/& Campanæ Arci Praefecti/per gradus omnes clarissimæ militiae/in Hispaniis Adlegati/Neapoli ad summi Ducis dignitatem evecti/Viri avita religione/et rebus domi forisque praeclare gestis/posteris admirandi/Dominicus & Placidus fratres/pietatis officique memores P./Vixit ann. LXXII. Obiit ann. MDCCCL.'.
- 18 See the inscription in Cesare D'Engenio Caracciolo, *Napoli sacra*, Naples, 1624, 275, and Carlo Celano, *Delle notizie del bello, dell'antico e del curioso della città di Napoli*, ed. Giovanni Battista Chiarini, Naples, 1856-1870, 5 vols (1st edn 1692, 3 vols), vol. 3.2, 528: 'Placito (sic) Sangrio Equiti optimo/Ob fidem in gravissimis rebus Domi militiaeque/probatum Alfonso et Ferdinando/Nepolitanorum Regibus/Inter primos maxime accepto/Berardinus Filius Officii et Debitae pietatis/non immemor/Obiit M CCCC LXXX.' On the family, see B. Candida Gonzaga, *Memorie delle famiglie nobili delle province meridionali d'Italia*, Naples, 1875, vol. 3, 206-217.
- 19 'Placitus (sic) Sangrius Ber. F./Difficillimis, ac pene desperatis Patriae temporibus/Pro communi bono/Ad Caesarem Carolum V. Legatus Hic quiescit/Vir certe animi constantis et Semper invicti/Ac suis magis quam sibi natus/MDLXX', in Celano/Chiarini, *Notizie*, vol. III.2, 527. See also D'Engenio Caracciolo, *Napoli sacra*, 276.
- 20 The fundamental essay, containing historical documents, is still Camillo Tutini's *Dell'origine e fondazione de' seggi di Napoli*, Naples, 2nd edn, 1754. See Benedetto Croce, 'I seggi di Napoli' in Benedetto Croce, ed., *Aneddoti di varia letteratura*, Naples, 2 vols, 1942, vol. 1, 239-46; Maria Antonietta Visceglia, 'Corpo e sepoltura nei testamenti della nobiltà napoletana (XVI-XVIII)', *Quaderni storici*, 17, 1982, 583-614; Maria Antonietta Visceglia, *Identità sociali. La nobiltà napoletana nella prima età moderna*, Naples, 1998; Christoph Weber, *Familienkanonikate und Patronatsbistümer. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte von Adel und Klerus im neuzeitlichen Italien*, Berlin, 1988, 279ff.; Giuliana Vitale, 'La nobiltà di seggio a Napoli nel basso Medioevo: aspetti della dinamica interna', *Archivio per le province napoletane*, 106, 1988, 151-69; Giuliana Vitale, 'Uffici, militia e nobiltà, processi di formazione della nobiltà di seggio a Napoli: il casato dei Brancaccio fra XIV e XV secolo', in Giuliana Vitale, ed., *Identità nobiliari in*

- età moderna*, Naples, 1993, 22–52; Elisa Novi Chavarrá, 'Nobiltà di seggio, nobiltà nuova e monasteri femminili a Napoli in età moderna', in Maria Antonietta Visceglia, *Identità nobiliari in età moderna*, Naples, 1993, 84–111. Helpful but falling below scholarly standards is Luigi De Lutio di Castelguidone, *I Sedili di Napoli (Origini, azione politica e decentramento amministrativo)*, Cremano, 1973. See also, Bianca de Divitiis, *Architettura e committenza nella Napoli del Quattrocento*, Venice, 2007, 137–69.
- 21 'La ditta citade se parte in cinque parti e cinque sedie; la prima e la Sedia de Capuana, la Sedia di Montagna, la Sedia di Portanova, la Sedi de porto, la Sedia de lo Nido: le qual Sedie sono lozie lavorate e ornate, dove se reduce tuti i zentilhuomini delle ditte contrade e parte deladicta citade, dove se reduce nele altre citade i zentilhuomini ale piace e palaci, li napoletani zentilhuomini se reduce ala dicta Sedia, la mattina da può la messa per fina a ora de manzare.' Cesare Foucard, 'Fonti di storia napoletana nell'Archivio di Stato di Modena. Descrizione della città di Napoli e statistica del Regno nel 1444', *Archivio storico per le province napoletane*, 2, 1877, 725–57, esp. 732.
 - 22 See Visceglia, 'Corpo e sepoltura', 597–600; Giuliana Vitale, 'Modelli culturali nobiliari a Napoli tra Quattro e Cinquecento', *Archivio storico per le province napoletane*, 105, 1987, 27–103; Giuliana Vitale, 'La nobiltà di seggio'; Giuliana Vitale, 'Uffici'.
 - 23 It is a 'controllo degli spazi sacri', as Giovanni Muto put it in "'Segni d'honore". Rappresentazione delle dinamiche nobiliari a Napoli in età moderna', in Maria Antonietta Visceglia, ed., *Signori, patrizi, cavalieri in Italia centro-meridionale nell'età moderna*, Rome and Bari, 1992, 171–92, quotation at 187.
 - 24 For the funeral pomp, see Visceglia, 'Corpo e sepoltura', 586ff. For the growing building activity of the nobility and its aggressive political symbolism, see Gerard Labrot, *Baroni in città. Residenze e comportamenti dell'aristocrazia napoletana 1530–1734*, Naples, 1979.
 - 25 Tanja Michalsky, 'Tombs and chapel decoration', in Andreas Beyer and Thomas Willette, eds, *Art and Historical Consciousness in Renaissance Naples*, New York, forthcoming.
 - 26 Gaetano Filangieri, *Documenti per la storia, le arti e le industrie delle province napoletane*, 6 vols, Naples, 1883–91, vol. 3, 15–20. The contract was concluded in 1492 with the widow of the deceased, Julia Brancatia. Iacopo della Pila promises, 'eidem domine Julie presenti infra menses octo a presente die in antea numerandos facere et laborare seu fieri et laborare facere Cantarum unum seu sepoltura de lapide gentili et de carrara in quo sit sculptus idem quondam dominus Thomasius ut armiger dictumque cantarum facere longitudinis palmorum octo in fructu et altitudinis palmorum quatuor in fructu manco tre data. Et quod vacuum ibi dictum cantarum sit palmorum novem intercluso dicto cantaro in fructu. Itaque largitudo ubi erunt columpne seu venit lo diricto dell'arco sit palmi unius et terzii pro qualibet banda. Ipsumque cantarum infra dictum tempus facere et laborare ut supra ad laudem bonorum magistrorum in taliubus expertorum cum altitudine cendecenti et cum omnibus illis figuris ac eo modo et forma prout in quodam dissigno facto per ipsum magistrum Jacobum et consignato coram nobis eidem domine Julie ac etiam in eodem cantaro fecere arma seu insigna de domo de brancatii prout voluerit ipsa domina Julia videlicet in uno capite dicti cantari arma dicti quondam domini Thomasii et in alio capite ispius domine Julie. Nec non promisit dictis magister Jacobus facere in ipso cantaro inbassiammentum inferiorem adornatum prout est in cantaro domini Cardinalis brancatii posito intus ecclesiam sancti Angeli ad Nidum.' In return he is to receive, 'ducatos centum quatradinga de carlenis argenti de quibus ducatis centum quatradinga prefatus magister Jacobus coram nobis presentialiter et manualiter recepit et habuit ac dicta domina Julia sibi dante ducatos quindecim de carlenis argenti residuum ipsa domina Julia promisit solvere singulis duobus mensibus a presenti die in antea ratam partem in pace.' See also Catherine E. King, *Renaissance Women Patrons. Wives and widows in Italy c. 1300–1500*, Manchester and New York, 1998, 84–7, with an interpretation of the widow's role given in the inscription: 'Magnifico militi thomasio brancatio de/Neapoli qvi cvm mo/riens de sepoltvra/nihil excogitasset/ivlia brancatia co/nivgi dilectissimo/ac benemerenti faci/vndam cvravit/mcccclxxxii.' See Celano/Chiarini, *Notizie*, vol. 3.2, 565.
 - 27 Giuliana Vitale interprets the choice of S. Angelo a Nido (and not San Domenico Maggiore) for the erection of Rinaldo's tomb as clear evidence of the intention of family autonomy. See Vitale, 'Uffici', 39.
 - 28 On the tomb and its attribution to Jacopo della Pila, see Abbate, *La scultura napoletana*, 23ff.
 - 29 For the building of the chapels in S. Maria di Monteoliveto (today S. Anna dei Lombardi), see Quinterio, *Giuliano da Maiano*, 510–26; Erminia Pepe, 'Le tre cappelle'; Arnoldo Venditti, 'La fabbrica nel tempo', in *Il complesso di Monteoliveto a Napoli: analisi, rilievi, documenti, informatizzazione degli archivi*, Cesare Cundari, ed., Rome, 1999, 37–116, with references and good new illustrations. For the foundation of the church, see Francesco Strazzullo, 'La fondazione di Monteoliveto di Napoli', *Napoli Nobilissima*, 3, 1963, 103–111. For the tomb, see Hersey, *Alfonso II*, 111–15.
 - 30 '... non perfectum sed defectivum', in G. Filangieri, *Documenti per la storia*, vol. 3, 20.
 - 31 See Abbate, *La scultura napoletana*, 22. De Divitiis, *Architettura e committenza*, 161–65. Antonio Carafa (called Malizia) had an important position at the court of Joanna II, and later at the court of

- Alfonso of Aragon. He managed some of the negotiations related to Joanna's adoption of Alfonso. In the end, he stood on the side of the Aragonese, and in his last will, he requested that his children remain loyal to Alfonso. Tommaso Persico, *Diomedes Carafa uomo di stato e scrittore del secolo XV*, Naples, 1899, 9–11; Franca Petrucci, 'Carafa, Antonio', in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, Rome, 1960–, vol. 19, 1976, 476–8; see also Faraglia, *Storia della regina Giovanna II*, 181ff.
- 32 See as a prototype the tomb of Catherine of Austria in San Lorenzo Maggiore (plate 1). See also the references in note 5. The large number of fourteenth-century tombs for the Neapolitan nobility has not been explored in detail. See some examples in Francesco Aceto, "'Status" e immagine nella scultura funeraria del Trecento a Napoli: le sepolture dei nobili', in Arturo Carlo Quintavalle, ed., *Medioevo: immagini e ideologie*, Milan, 2005, 597–607; Valentino Pace, 'Morte a Napoli. Sepolture nobiliari del trecento', in Wolfgang Schmid, ed., *Regionale Aspekte der Grabmalforschung*, Trier, 2000, 41–62; and especially the works of Nicolas Bock, 'Honor et Gratia. Das Grabmal des Lodovico Aldomoresco als Beispiel familiärer Selbstdarstellung im spätmittelalterlichen Neapel', *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 24, 1997, 109–13; Bock 'Antiken- und Florenzrezeption'; Nicolas Bock, *Antonio Baboccio. Abt, Maler, Bildhauer, Goldschmied und Architekt. Kunst und Kultur am Hofe der Anjou-Durazzo (1380–1420)*, Munich and Berlin, 2001.
- 33 'Magnificvs dns Malicia carrafa miles obiit an di. mccccxxxviii die x octobris ii' ind'.
- 34 'Auspice me latias Alfonsus venit in oras// rex pius ut pace redderet au son (ie)// natorum hoc pietas struxit mihi sola sepulcrum Carrafe// dedit hec munera Ma (licie).' The letters in brackets stand at the right and are not visible in the illustration.
- 35 Abbate, *La scultura napoletana*, 22.
- 36 See the double tomb of Joanna of Anjou-Durazzo and Robert Artois in San Lorenzo Maggiore, a late example of the Angevin type. Bock, *Antonio Baboccio*, 131, ill. 70.
- 37 Diomedes Carafa, *Memoriali*, ed. Franca Petrucci Nardelli, Naples, 1988. For Carafa's Neapolitan palace, see Andreas Beyer, *Parthenope. Neapel und der Süden der Renaissance*, Berlin, 2000, chap. 2; Fiorella Sricchia. Santoro, 'Tra Napoli e Firenze: Diomedes Carafa, gli Strozzi e un celebre "lettuccio"', *Prospettiva*, 100, 2000, 41–54. For Carafa's political theory, see Lucia Miele, *Modelli e ruoli sociali dei 'memoriali' di Diomedes Carafa*, Naples, 1989, esp. 40ff., for his recognition at the Aragonese court.
- 38 For another example of the tendency in fifteenth-century Neapolitan tomb sculpture to incorporate or imitate fourteenth-century sarcophagi, see the tomb of Niccolò Tomacelli. Michalsky, *Memoria*, ill. 157; King, *Renaissance Women Patrons*, 119–20.
- 39 As a typological reference to foreign tombs, see the tombs of cardinal Asciano Sforza and cardinal Girolamo Basso della Rovere in the choir of S. Maria del Popolo in Rome, which draw on famous tombs of the doges in Venice. Philipp Zitzlsperger, 'Die Ursachen der Sansovino-Grabmäler im Chor von S. Maria del Popolo', in Arne Karsten and Philipp Zitzlsperger, eds, *Tod und Verklärung. Grabmalskulptur in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Cologne, 2004, 91–113. For the transfer of power from Joanna II to Alfonso of Aragon, see Petrucci, 'Carafa, Antonio', 476–8; Faraglia, *Storia della regina Giovanna II*, 181ff.
- 40 See the Latin text in note 34.
- 41 See *Le arche dei re Aragonesi*, exhib. cat., Naples, 1991.
- 42 Abbate, *La scultura napoletana*, 18–20, dates it to the 1470s.
- 43 Tanja Michalsky, 'La memoria messa in scena. Sulla funzione e sul significato dei "sediali" nei monumenti sepolcrali napoletani intorno al 1500', in Nicolas Bock and Serena Romano, eds, *Le chiese di San Lorenzo e San Domenico. Gli ordini mendicanti a Napoli*, Naples, 2005, 172–91.
- 44 The contract between Margherita Poderico and Tommaso Malvito is dated 7 November 1506 (10th indiction). See G. Filangieri, *Documenti per la storia*, vol. 3, 583: 'Maestro Tommaso da Como contratta colla Rev.da D.a Margherita Poderico ... Die VII novembris ... in monasterio Sancti Sebastiani et Petri ordinis predicatorum in gratis fereis dicti monasterij Reverenda domina Margarita pulderica ... ex una parte et magistro thomasio de como marmorario ex altera prefata domina priorissa dedit ... dicto tomasio ducatos quatragenta et in alia manu confexa fuit ducatos undecim consistentes in vino et legnaminibus et sunt ... in partem ducatorum octuaginta olim depositorum penes dictum monasterium per quondam dominam Caterinellam ursinam Comitissam de vochianico et penes ducissam susses olim priorissam dicti monasterii pro faciundo uno cantaro marmoreo in venerabili ecclesia et monasterio Sancti dominici de neapoli in cappella Sancti ... [Cappella del Crocifisso] ... in dicta ecclesia ... quod cantarum thomasius ipse promisit facere et complere hinc et per totas festivitates pasce resurrectionis domini primo venture cum figuris marmoreis videlicet uno arco et figuris quinque marmoreis videlicet una virgine maria cum filio duobus angelis et cum figura de relevo quondam comitis armati et alia figura a facie cantari mulieris videlicet dicte comitisse et alia secundum designationem factam et signatam inter eos quod designum conservatur penes dompnum petrum S ... quod cantarum predictum sit altitudinis xvii palmorum et largitudinis a parte inferiori x palmorum et quia in dicto designo sunt figure a parte inferiori dicte figure non debent ibidem fieri et loco ipsarum est faciendus unus sedialis et una lapis in terra cum scuto armorum ursini et de lagni ...'. See also Pane, *Il Rinascimento*, vol. 2, 156.
- 45 Homi K. Bhaba, *The Location of Culture*, London, 1994.