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This dissertation collects and examines thirty-five examples of women’s monumental tombs from fifteenth-century Italy to correct the misconceptions, pervasive in Renaissance studies, that women’s tombs barely existed and that art related to fifteenth-century women—either as patrons or audience—was small, domestic, and private. The first chapter provides an overview of these tombs and establishes the fifteenth-century as a period of experimentation and development for this type of monument across the Italian peninsula. The second chapter organizes tomb patronage into two types, internal and external, with internal divided into three groups, conjugal patronage, familial patronage, and self-patronage. Like monuments for men, women’s tombs were commissioned when financially possible and when the erection of a public sculpture served the needs of the patron. Chapter three addresses the ways women were presented in effigy and proposes a larger role for these figures within the broader discourse of Renaissance portraiture. Effigies, despite their uncommonly secure identifications as actual, specific people, hold only a limited place in that discourse, yet
necessarily complicate the relationship between Renaissance portraits of women and female ideals of beauty. As public sculptures, effigy portraits balance ideals of feminine virtue with recognizable, identifiable likenesses, depicting each woman at the age of her death, whether young or old. Chapter four then analyzes inscriptions on women’s tombs and identifies their six component parts that may appear in any combination. The inscriptions are then linked to contemporary notions of ideal women in poetry, such as Dante’s Beatrice and Petrarch’s Laura, to argue that women’s tombs engaged with broader cultural notions of ideal, dead women.

Though designating these monuments as “women’s tombs” risks marking them as different and separate, this project definitively proves that these monuments were much the same as men’s tombs. Women’s tombs were neither commissioned nor constructed lightly, and they functioned as integral parts of the memorial fabric of fifteenth century churches. Finally, the nuanced public portrayal of women as presented on these tombs—even though it was posthumous—must change our view of fifteenth-century women’s relationships to the civic sphere and communal art.
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Introduction

“A first impression might suggest that the subjects of Renaissance sepulchral art in the center of Italian humanism were all men. Indeed, during the fifteenth and early sixteenth century not a single grand monument to a woman was erected in major centers such as Florence or Venice, not to mention Rome. Smaller towns offer no more than a few isolated examples of feminine sepulchral monuments.”

The notion that no, or extremely few, women’s monumental tombs were constructed in fifteenth-century Italy is so pervasive in the art historical literature that, though Yoni Ascher is one of few scholars to consider women’s commemorative monuments, he is in excellent company with his generalization.2 Correcting this misapprehension is one of the central aims of this dissertation. Not only were monumental tombs for women constructed in Florence, Venice, Rome, and other less prominent centers, they were created by some of the most famous sculptors of the period and in the most prominent locations. This dissertation, though not a comprehensive catalogue of women’s tombs, provides an introduction to the most prominent examples of this type of public, monumental sculpture during a century of broad and dynamic development for this type of monument.

Though tombs have been a focus of art historical analysis of the Renaissance since the beginnings of the discipline, an extremely limited portion of this literature addresses women’s monuments, and much of it inaccurately continues the assumption that large-scale tombs for women did not exist. While there are some studies that

---

2 Catherine King, Jacqueline Musacchio, and Shelley Zuraw have all made similar claims.
examine specific monuments—Jacopo della Quercia’s tomb of Ilaria del Carretto has been written about more than all other women’s tombs combined—and women’s tombs can feature in monographic studies on artists,\(^3\) there is no study of women’s tombs as a sculptural group or within a broader framework of female commemoration and female involvement in the creation of public art.

A trend in tomb studies has been the typological study of monuments based on social status or societal role, a practice initiated by Andrew Butterfield and his seminal article on Florentine tomb typologies, “Social Structure and the Typology of Funerary Monuments in Early Renaissance Florence.”\(^4\) More recently, the Requiem Projekt, which has been running since 2001 under the direction of Prof. Dr. Horst Bredekamp at the Instituts für Kunst- und Bildgeschichte der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin and Jun.-Prof. Dr. Arne Karsten at the Seminars für Geschichte der Bergischen Universität Wuppertal, has been cataloging and analyzing the Roman papal and cardinal tombs of the Early Modern Period.\(^5\) Other projects, including comprehensive approaches to dogal tombs in

\(^3\) Shelley Zuraw provides one of the most thorough discussions of any women’s monuments in her two catalogue entries on women’s tombs for the lost tomb of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni and Costanza Ammannati, in her monographic dissertation on Mino da Fiesole. See: Shelley Zuraw, “The Sculpture of Mino da Fiesole (1429-1484).” (Ph. D diss., New York University, 1993), 952-971 and 1027-1039.


\(^5\) The Requiem Projekt has a number of significant publications including, but not limited to: Arne Karsten ed. _Das Grabmal des Günstlings_ (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 2011); Arne Karsten and Philipp Zitzlsperger eds. _Vom Nachleben der Kardinäle römische Kardinalsgrabmäler der frühen Neuzeit_ (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 2010); Philipp Zitzlsperger ed. _Grabmal und Körper – zwischen Repräsentation und Realpräsenz in der Frühen Neuzeit, kunsttexte.de_ 4 (2010); www.kunsttexte.de; Carolin Behrmann, Arne Karsten, and Philipp Zitzlsperger eds. _Grab- Kult – Memoria_ (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 2007); The latest information on their activities can also be found on their website: http://www.requiem-projekt.de.
Venice⁶ and Barnaby Nygren’s extremely useful study of saints’ tombs from the fourteenth through sixteenth centuries,⁷ indicate how a typological approach based upon social status is a productive method of analyzing tombs.

I am not, however, suggesting that women’s tombs can be categorized as a “type” in the same way that papal, cardinal, or dogal tombs can be. The variety of women commemorated by these monuments—all of whom were elite, but of wildly varying statuses from queens to wives of merchants—precludes suggesting that there was a particular “type” of woman who was honored by a monumental tomb. Though not a precise typological category, gender is a useful criterion⁸ and a frequently utilized method for distinguishing difference in art history; works of art linked to women in the Renaissance—either as patrons or audience—is usually characterized as small, domestic, and private, like painted portraits, birth trays or cassoni. There has been, over the last three decades, an explosion of literature examining women in the Renaissance, but very little of it touches on their death or memory, and most of it ignores important aspects of their relationship to public art. Despite these lacunae, I am indebted to various pioneering scholars in the consideration of Renaissance women and their links to art, including Patricia Simons’ seminal work on gender and portraiture,⁹ Jacqueline Musacchio’s

---

⁷ Barnaby Robert Nygren, “The Monumental Saint’s Tomb in Italy: 1260-1520.” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1999). Nygren’s dissertation has also proved to be an invaluable model for how to organize and conceptualize a large body of information about tombs.
⁹ Patricia Simons, “Women in Frames: The Gaze, the Eye, the Profile in Renaissance Portraiture.” History Workshop 25 (1988): 4-30 and eadem, “Portraiture, Portrayal, and
studies of art connected to women’s various rites of passage, Catherine King’s
evaluations of Renaissance women's patronage, and particularly Sharon Strocchia’s
historical studies of death, which include discussion of women’s funerals and other
rituals connected to their memory, but no analysis of their monuments

I am aware that by separating women’s tombs from their contexts and the men’s
tombs that surround them I am doing them a disservice, which will have to be rectified by
later scholars. Though it is, to a certain degree, the antithesis of my goal for this study, I
am marking these tombs as different and separate, primarily to argue how typical and
integrated these monuments were. The evidence points to how these monuments were
simply “tombs” in the fifteenth-century and needed no gendered modifiers before that

---

10 Jacqueline Marie Musacchio, Art, Marriage, and Family in the Florentine Renaissance
Palace (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008); eadem, “Conception and
Birth,” in At Home in Renaissance Italy, ed. Marta Ajmar-Wollhiem and Flora Dennis,
(London: V&A Publications, 2006), 124-135; and eadem, The Art and Ritual of
Childbirth in Renaissance Italy (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).

11 Catherine King, Renaissance Women Patrons: Wives and Widows in Italy c. 1300-1550
(Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1998); eadem,
“Medieval and Renaissance Matrons, Italian-Style.” Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte 55.3
(1992): 372-393; and eadem, “Women as patrons: nuns, widows and Rulers,” in Siena,
Florence And Padua: Art, Society and Religion 1280-1400 Vol. 2., edited by Diana

12 Sharon T. Strocchia, Death and Ritual in Renaissance Florence (Baltimore: The Johns
Hopkins University Press, 1992); eadem, “Funerals and the Politics of Gender in Early
Renaissance Florence,” in Refiguring Woman: Perspectives on Gender and the Italian
Renaissance ed. Marilyn Migiel and Juliana Schiesari (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University
problematica della donna,” in Palazzo Strozzi Metà Millennio 1489-1989, Atti del
Convegno di Studi Firenze, 3-6 July 1989, ed. Paola Gori, (Rome: Istituto della
Enciclopedia Italiana, 1991), 126-137; and eadem, “Remembering the Family: Women,
Kin, and Commemorative Masses in Renaissance Florence.” Renaissance Quarterly 42.1
word. However, in the first step at reweaving them into the broader fabric of Renaissance art history, it is necessary to first acknowledge that they exist and demonstrate their depth, breadth, and prevailing trends and patterns, as I do here. Though more rare than men’s monuments, women’s tombs in the fifteenth century, and certainly other periods, are dramatically more common than previously acknowledged and corroborate notions of a more public life for Renaissance women that historians have embraced\(^\text{13}\) and which art historians have usually disregarded.

As I will show throughout this dissertation, women’s tombs functioned in much the same way that men’s tombs did. They, like their masculine counterparts, are public, prominent markers of individuals—both the tomb honoree and the patrons—and their family’s prestige in commissioning a large public sculpture. In that consideration, there is no difference between the genders regarding their memorial markers, and as such, women’s tombs should be folded seamlessly into our understanding of Renaissance funerary art. A difference does lie, however, in the way women were commemorated on their tombs. Overwhelmingly, except in the case of saints and other religious women, women were remembered for their roles as wives and mothers and the attendant virtues implied therein. While this is not at all surprising, it is unexpected that what have long

been thought of as ostensibly private roles were addressed so publicly; these roles, so connected to the home and domestic sphere, are ones to which fifteenth-century women have long been thought to have been all but confined. Yet women’s tombs and the imagery and inscriptions attendant upon them publicly laud women and their domestic roles in a way that no other art form, save for poetry, does so concretely. Ultimately women’s tombs necessarily change how we must consider women’s connections to art in the Renaissance. While studying women’s tombs does not dramatically change the landscape with regard to women’s patronage, it does change our idea of how women can be linked to large-scale public art, not simply to birth trays and to cassoni, or nuns with their altarpieces. This dissertation for the first time links women from a wide range of backgrounds to monumental sculptures created by the most prominent artists.

The Function of Tombs

It is necessary to note that, on a fundamental level, women’s tombs functioned precisely in the same way as men’s monuments. For both men and women, tombs were constructed in order to allow the living to actively remember the deceased through prayer for their souls to lessen their length of stay in Purgatory and hasten their eventual resurrection and salvation. By the fifteenth century, Purgatory, which had been codified as a theological concept in the twelfth century, was concretely understood to be a physical place where souls would languish for tens of thousands of years until their eventual hoped-for ascension to heaven. With this sort of prospect for their own and

---

15 Jacques Le Goff, The Birth of Purgatory, trans. by Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 5. For responses to Le Goff’s seminal work and
their loved ones’ immortal souls in mind, tombs were erected for the living to try to intercede on behalf of the deceased.

This intercession came in the form of the commissioning of monumental sculpture, which could often include images of the Virgin and Child to increase its intercessory power, but would also manifest itself in endowments for masses, candles, and prayers that would accompany the commission of any tomb. Often these endowments could be large sums of money that dwarfed the initial amounts paid for the construction of the sepulchers because these outlays would often be made for prayers in perpetuity.\(^{16}\) While not everyone received a monumental tomb, commemorative masses were considered a “cultural imperative” in the fifteenth-century and were not bounded by gender; men and women were the focus or the sponsor of these masses in nearly equal proportions. Furthermore, masses were of such critical consequence that they were the


\(^{16}\) For example, Francesco Sassetti endowed the Sassetti Chapel at Santa Trinità that houses his and his wife, Nera Corsi Sassetti’s tombs with what Patricia Rubin called a “lavish liturgical program.” The program involved daily masses in perpetuity and masses in honor of his onomastic saint, St. Francis, on all feast days. See Patricia Rubin, *Images and Identity in Fifteenth-Century Florence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 129. The chapel of San Felice in Sant’Antonio, Padua, originally commissioned by Bonifazio Lupi and to which Caterina dei Francesi later added her tomb, is another example where Bonifazio endowed lands to the church in order to fund thrice daily masses in perpetuity after his death. See Mary D. Edwards, “The Chapel of S. Felice in Padua as “Gesamtkunswerk” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 47 (1988): 160-176, esp. 162 fn. 9. For more examples of the masses and liturgical programs that were commissioned in accompaniment of tomb sculptures and other memorial markers see: Geraldine A. Johnson, “Activating the Effigy: Donatello’s Pecci Tomb in Siena Cathedral” *Art Bulletin* 77.3 (2995): 445-459.
most common type of commemorative commission.\textsuperscript{17} Notably, Sharon Strocchia points out that it was through these commemorative masses that “women’s ‘private’ memory became a means to public identity.”\textsuperscript{18} Whether through masses or through monumental sculpture, it seems that in death women were able to engage with the public realm much more thoroughly than they were able to in life.

There does remain some documentary evidence related to these concerns for the tombs studied in this dissertation. In the wills of Francheschina Tron Pesaro, she makes no specific requests for her tomb, but does make repeated demands and leaves substantial sums of money for individuals, both religious figures and people of “good conscience,” to go to churches throughout the Italian peninsula to pray for her soul.\textsuperscript{19} Additionally, there is a record of the expenditures outlaid by Giovanni Tornabuoni, husband and tomb commissioner of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni, for the candles and masses he endowed in perpetuity in her honor at Santa Maria Novella.\textsuperscript{20} It can be reasonably assumed that, though documents like this have not yet been uncovered or are no longer extant for the other tombs in this dissertation, similar requests were made for all of them.

\textsuperscript{17} Sharon Strocchia, “Remembering the Family: Women, Kin, and Commemorative Masses in Renaissance Florence.” \textit{Renaissance Quarterly} 42 (1989): 639. Strocchia notes that from 1360-1500 women in Florence sponsored approximately half of the total number of endowed masses in churches in Florence.

\textsuperscript{18} Strocchia, “Remembering the Family,” 651.

\textsuperscript{19} For a transcription of these wills see cat. #21.

\textsuperscript{20} These donations are recorded at Santa Maria Novella in Florence (The Santa Maria Novella, \textit{Book of Wax}, notes in September 1481: “da giovan tornabuno a di 25, libber diciotto di flachole per l’uficio fece fare per mona francescha suo donna – libber 18”). Santa Maria Novella was the Tornabuoni parish church and a site of considerable patronage on the part of Giovanni. It was not however, where Francesca was buried, which was at Santa Maria sopra Minerva in Rome. Though no documents related to such an endowment are currently known, it can be reasonably assumed that Giovanni also endowed masses and candles at the church in Rome as well.
The vital significance of properly remembering and thus praying for the deceased—whether through organized masses or simply through prayers by survivors—helps to determine how women were represented on their tombs through their effigies, but also through their inscriptions, two of the major foci of this dissertation. It is useful to characterize effigies as *Memorialbild*, a term present in German literature, but without a precise analog in English studies.\(^{21}\) A *Memorialbild* has the multivalent function of creating a community between the living and the dead, continuing the presence of the deceased, emphasizing the reciprocal responsibilities of the deceased and their survivors towards one another—meaning masses and prayers—and guaranteeing that these responsibilities were enacted in perpetuity.\(^{22}\) The precise recollections of the deceased provided by effigies, which effectively worked as proxies for the dead, would act as specific visual prompts for liturgical and ceremonial acts like masses that established the broader memorial culture of the period.\(^{23}\) As such, it was necessary for effigies to reflect a recognizable likeness of the deceased, which will be discussed in much greater detail in chapter three,\(^{24}\) and as *Memorialbilder*, or foci for the memory of the deceased and for prayers in their names, effigies served to lessen the deceased’s time spent in purgatory.

Although effigies were perhaps the most efficacious type of *Memorialbilder*, inscriptions, analyzed more fully in chapter four, also assisted in enacting the functions of

\(^{21}\) It is usually translated as “memorial image,” but this translation does not fully encapsulate the shades of meaning of the original.
\(^{22}\) Caroline Horch, *Der Memorialgedanke und das Spektrum seiner Funktionen in der bildenden Kunst des Mittelalters* (Königstein im Taunus: Langewiesche, 2001), 15.
a *Memorialbild*. While none of the inscriptions found on the women’s tombs in this study explicitly tells the reader to pray for the soul of the deceased, by naming the subject of the tomb their memory is invoked and this naming itself was the most basic form of prayer.\(^{25}\) For example, although it does not prescribe prayer for the souls of Agnes and Clemenza Durazzo in Santa Chiara, Naples, the inscription on their tomb does remind the reader of the precarious state of their souls and the necessity of intercessory acts by intoning, “May their souls rest in peace.”\(^{26}\) The repeated reading of this line, by congregants at Santa Chiara or the Clarissan nuns in residence there, would function to eventually make it true for the two sisters and lead their souls to peace.

**Brief Chapter Outlines**

This dissertation is divided into four chapters. The first provides a general introduction to women’s monumental tombs in fifteenth-century Italy. It examines *trecento* antecedents for women’s monuments, setting the context for a broad analysis of tombs in the fifteenth century. Chronological, typological and stylistic analyses are presented, and the locations of these tombs—meaning their locations in the Italian peninsula, as well as in what types of churches and where in those churches—are discussed. Women’s social positions and their familial roles are investigated, as well as family status, to identify commemorative trends. The chapter ends with a contextual case study of Rome in the 1470s and 1480s to understand how women’s tombs fit within the broader context of fifteenth-century tomb construction.

\(^{25}\) Horch, *Der Memorialgedanke und das Spektrum seiner Funktionen in der Bildenden Kunst des Mittelalters*, 16-17.

\(^{26}\) ANIME REQUIESCANT IN PACE AMEN. For the rest of the inscription see cat. #23.
The second chapter takes a closer look at patronage of these monuments to identify trends in who commissioned women’s tombs, an analysis that confounds existing expectations of patronage for this type of monument. Documents, including two extant contracts and tomb inscriptions that refer to the patron, are considered to understand how the patronage of women’s tombs was characterized and whether or not it differed from the characterization of men’s tomb patronage. The motivations for tomb patronage, including a short literature review, are then presented. The chapter identifies two categories of patronage (internal and external) and their subdivisions, delineating trends and patterns, while highlighting differences regarding social standing, geographical locations, and tomb inscriptions within each category of patronage. The second chapter ends by focusing on two exceptional cases of tomb self-patronage: two instances where women commissioned their own monuments. These examples signal changes in commissioning and construction practices for women’s tombs later in the sixteenth century.

The third and fourth chapters switch from broad analysis of the monuments as wholes to begin focusing on two of their most essential parts: effigies and inscriptions. Chapter three argues for the inclusion of effigies into the vast discourse on portraiture in the Renaissance. As the most public and consistently identified depictions of women, tomb effigies are fundamental, but understudied, examples of how fifteenth-century individuals had themselves represented. It begins with an extensive review of the literature on Renaissance portraiture and its complete neglect of effigies. A general overview of effigial representation on women’s tombs is provided, including geographical trends. There is also visual analysis of the sculptures and their major points
of difference. Particular attention is paid to the depicted age of effigies, how they are dressed, if they hold an object in their hands and how their hands are arranged, and if their hair is visible and how it is styled. Some non-effigial representations of the deceased are also considered. The chapter concludes with a consideration of the question of likeness—a major point of contention in portraiture studies—and the unique case of Beatrice d’Este, the most frequently represented woman who is also commemorated by a monumental tomb.

Finally, in chapter four, the inscriptions on women’s tombs are analyzed and categorized. Six components of tomb inscriptions are identified, and the epitaphs are discussed based on their prominence on their respective monuments. Sculptors’ signatures on the tombs are briefly considered, and differences between how the genders are presented on male/female double-tombs precede a discussion of the general function of women’s tomb inscriptions. The chapter then shifts to an analysis of how the inscriptions and the tombs can be linked to contemporaneous poetic discourse of ideal women, concluding this dissertation.

**Methodology**

My focus in this project is women’s “monumental” tombs, which I define as large-scale monuments with multiple sculpted components, or sculpted slab tombs situated within a larger commemorative commission. I have, in a few instances, included broader commissions creating a monumental commemorative environment, even when the tomb itself was a slab. Various challenges confront any scholar attempting to study sculpture that is over five hundred years old, the most central being issues of survival. It
is entirely likely that many more tombs were constructed than currently stand today. A pertinent question about their survival is whether or not women’s generally lesser status affected whether their tombs were destroyed, moved, or damaged with more regularity than those of men’s.\textsuperscript{27} I do not mean to give the impression that women’s commemoration was limited to the monumental; women were, just like men, also memorialized with countless slab tombs and dedicatory plaques. To create the most comprehensive approach to women’s memorialization in the Renaissance, it would be necessary to include these vital monuments, but that was beyond the scope of this dissertation.

As a whole, my project’s methodology is rooted in social history; I focus, as much as possible, on the women commemorated by these tombs, with an emphasis on their status in the world and how that is reflected in their memorialization. I am much less concerned with the artists involved in these monuments, or the various styles they present, other than to suggest that sculptors of the highest prominence created women’s tombs, and that there was no sense of women’s monuments being less significant commissions, or that they necessitated a particularly feminine style. I address the fifteenth century specifically because it is a period of dynamic change for this type of monument: the number of them created and the broader social swath of women they represent expanded from the beginning of the century to the end. Though beyond the scope of this study, the approach to women’s commemoration begins to change in the

\textsuperscript{27} The survival, for example, of Francesco Tomabuoni’s tomb in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, when Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni’s tomb was dismembered raises this question.
sixteenth century, thus the development seen in the fifteenth sets the stage for these later changes.28

The catalogue that concludes this project provides as much information as possible to enable future scholars to build upon my work and to create an even more complete picture of women’s fifteenth-century commemoration. The thirty-five tombs that comprise the general focus of my study each receive individual catalogue entries and they are organized into five sections based on formal types. There are two monuments that append the catalogue at the end; they are memorial chapels for women that do not include sculpted tombs, but still deserve consideration as women’s commemorative monuments. Also included is a much more concise second catalogue; an ever-evolving list of additional tombs: either slabs, dedicatory plaques, or no-longer-extant monuments for which we only have the briefest mention.

A Note on the Tables, Lists, and Figures used in this Dissertation

In an effort to streamline and systemize the large number of objects being analyzed, I have used tables and lists to make the material more readily comprehensible and clearly organized. The dates used to categorize the tombs are the most commonly agreed upon start dates for the construction of the monuments and the locations given are the original locations of the tombs, which are not necessarily the same as their current locations. Unless otherwise specified, the order given to the monuments in the tables is by date. For more thorough discussion of dating and location for the monuments, please

28 On sixteenth-century women’s tombs, see Amy Cymbala’s forthcoming dissertation at the University of Pittsburgh. I would like to acknowledge the many discussions about women’s tombs that I have had with Amy, as they have helped to clarify both my thinking and my purpose.
refer to each tomb’s respective catalogue entry. Figure numbers are provided on the first table(s) of each chapter.
Chapter One. In Plain Sight: An Overview of Women’s Monumental Tombs in Quattrocento Italy

“In response to a need for more permanent commemoration, many funerary monuments were constructed in Italy during the fifteenth century. But most of these honored male merchants, scholars, and politicians; **there were very few significant tombs built for Renaissance women.**”

The above generalization would not be surprising had it originated in scholarly literature from the nineteenth or the twentieth century, prior to the rise of feminist art history in the 1970s. However, it is surprising that, as an art historian who focuses on women’s art history and particularly art within the home, Jacqueline Musacchio published that statement in 1999. Jacqueline Musacchio’s study of art connected to childbirth in Italy in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was a groundbreaking work for gender studies in Renaissance art because it revealed and elevated a vast array of often ordinary objects and rituals connected to a fundamental, but hitherto unremarked-upon, life event. However, as the above quote demonstrates, Musacchio’s study also continued the longstanding tradition in the literature of ignoring the existence and evidence of women’s monumental tombs. Thus, it is the goal of this chapter to illustrate the considerable number and variety of ‘significant’ tombs built for Renaissance women in the fifteenth century. In fact, this period is one of major development for women’s tombs,

---


30 See the review of the literature in the introduction of this dissertation. I do not single out Musacchio because her statement is especially egregious, but rather to show that the idea that there are not very many women’s tombs is so pervasive that it can be perpetuated even in studies of art connected to women.

31 Musacchio does provide a three-page analysis (29-31) of the following monuments: Ilaria del Carretto and Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camponeschi. For these tombs see cats. #15 and 26.
with formal experimentation serving as a hallmark for the century.  

Tombs are the most public examples of art connected to women, and unlike most domestic or vernacular objects such as birth salvers, majolica, cassone panels, panel portraits and portrait busts, which are thus far the most often studied objects in relation to Renaissance women, tombs are examples of so-called ‘high’ art, created by a number of the most famous sculptors from early Renaissance Italy at considerable expense. As my research will establish, women’s tomb monuments are considerably more common than previously acknowledged by any scholar, upending the traditional assumption that there were gender-based modes of representation for memorial monuments. As such, tombs provide a hitherto overlooked window into Renaissance gender relations on the familial and social levels, women’s links to public art, high art, and patronage, and how gender relates to the construction of memory in a tangible and permanent medium.

As I have defined ‘monumental,’ there are, to my current knowledge, thirty-five extant examples of monumental tombs commemorating women constructed in the fifteenth century in Italy. They are spread nearly throughout the peninsula from Venice to Salerno and are more prevalent than, for example, equestrian monuments from the same period, which have long been lauded in the literature for their essential place in the canon

---

32 This will be addressed more thoroughly throughout this chapter and dissertation, but it seems consistent that women’s tombs were frequent sites of formal experimentation. Claire Gittings, who writes on sixteenth and seventeenth century tombs in England has also noticed this phenomenon, which she ascribes to women’s lesser social importance permitting deviance from expected models. See: Claire Gittings, “Sacred and secular: 1558-1660,” in Death in England an Illustrated History, ed. Peter C. Jupp, and Clare Gittings, (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2000), 167.

33 See pages 12-13.
of Renaissance sculpture.\textsuperscript{34} Dario Covi’s thorough survey of equestrian monuments from 1995 examines the creation of that type of sculpture from the antique Roman \textit{Marcus Aurelius} from 161-180 CE\textsuperscript{35} through the centuries to medieval Italy, a period which produced, in his words, a ‘string’ of these types of monuments, which “would have been familiar to Renaissance artists and patrons alike,” and are interpreted as evidence of the rebirth of classical antiquity. Despite his insistence on the familiarity of these types of sculptures, Covi lists only five examples from the entire fifteenth century; all of which are found in the Veneto (Verona, Venice, and Padua) or in Florence.\textsuperscript{36} I refer to these monuments in order to emphasize how tombs commemorating women were at least six times as prevalent as the equestrian sculptures, and are spread much more liberally throughout the peninsula. Yet they are not accorded even remotely the same amount of attention in the literature or any role in our understanding of gender relations in Renaissance culture. Like equestrian monuments, women’s tombs were in a

\textsuperscript{34} Dario Covi, “The Italian Renaissance and the Equestrian Monument,” in \textit{Leonardo da Vinci’s Sforza Monument Horse}, ed. Diane Cole Ahl (Bethlehem, PA: Lehigh University Press, 1995): 40-56. Covi argues that the Italian Renaissance was a formative era for the equestrian monument, a period when the two distinct traditions for this type of sculpture, the classical tradition and the medieval, merged to allow for a third tradition developed in the baroque period.

\textsuperscript{35} Currently in the Capitoline Museum, Rome, formerly in the Piazza del Campidoglio.

\textsuperscript{36} Covi, “The Italian Renaissance and the Equestrian Monument,” passim. These include: the monument for Cortesia Sarego, in Verona; the monument to Paolo Savelli, in Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, Venice; the painted monument to Sir John Hawkwood, by Paolo Uccello from 1436 in the Florence Cathedral; the no longer extant monument to Nicolò d’Este from 1444-51 in Ferrara; Donatello’s \textit{Gattamelata} from 1445-52, in the Piazza del Santo, Padua; and Verrochio’s monument to Bartolommeo Colleoni in Campo di Santi Giovanni e Paolo, Venice. There were also of course, Leonardo’s plans for the Sforza horse in Milan, which were never fully realized. To this list should be added two other monuments, one sculptured and one frescoed, though neither were mentioned by Covi: the \textit{Tomb of Ladislas of Anjou}, 1420s, in San Giovanni a Carbonara, Naples, which features an equestrian monument at its apex, and Andrea Castagno’s frescoed monument to Niccolò da Tolentino from 1456 in the Florence Cathedral.
developmental phase during the fifteenth century, with patronage of the monuments expanding to a broader population. The tombs also served as sites for sculptors to work out formal concerns on a grand and public scale and allowed for changes in how many and which types of people were commemorated.

Unlike equestrian monuments, which are ascribed huge influence in the literature on the development of Renaissance sculpture, women’s tombs have been primarily ignored, either because until recently women have not been considered as part of the canonical historical record, or because scholars have simply underestimated their numbers. Specific sources examining women’s tombs as a group are rare. Though brief, one of the more thorough synthetic examinations can be found in Shelley Zuraw’s catalogue entry on the tomb of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni in her dissertation from New York University from 1993, “The Sculpture of Mino da Fiesole (1429-1484).” Zuraw notes that the number of tombs memorializing women is “not surprisingly” small and that they were overwhelming associated with male patrons. As examples she lists the tombs of: Ilaria del Carretto, Barbara Manfredi, Isotta degli Atti, Medea Colleoni, and notes a “lack” of Florentine examples. She further argues that the Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni tomb, as she has reconstructed it, is formally “highly traditional” perhaps reflecting “the newness of female tombs in general.” But much like Musacchio’s observations,

---

37 The art historical field has also been moving in the last few decades towards social issues and away from formal issues and style, allowing for a gendered approach to tombs like the one I have taken.
39 Zuraw, “The Sculpture of Mino da Fiesole,” 967. For these tombs see cats. #7, 9, 15, and 18.
40 Zuraw, “The Sculpture of Mino da Fiesole,” 968. The forms of women’s tombs and how they fit into “traditional” patterns will be discussed later in this chapter.
Zuraw’s assertions are too generalized, too simplistic, and ultimately incorrect, as will be addressed throughout this chapter.

While Zuraw is rare in her holistic examination of women’s tombs, smaller investigations have been conducted on particular sub-groups of women’s tombs. Tanja Michalsky examined a small group of couples’ tombs constructed near 1500 in Naples in the article “Conivges in vita concorissimos ne mors qvidem ipsa disivnxit”: Zur Rolle der Frau im genealogischen System neapolitanischer Sepulkralplastik.”41 Though studying only a few localized examples, where the husbands are presented on the top of the tomb chest in effigy, while the wives are shown in shallow relief on the front of the tombs,42 Michalsky more directly addresses gender and its roles, considering the special position these wives were allocated in tomb sculpture and why they were represented in this way. Michalsky argues that, generally, women were acknowledged as genealogically essential to dynasty building and the political power that can engender. In the cases of these couple tombs these political power plays were cloaked in the framework of conjugal love.43

Like Michalsky’s article, Holly Hurlburt’s chapter on “Death and the Dogaresse,”44 examines a particular group of women’s monuments, in this case those for the dogaresse of Venice. Hurlburt’s project is to examine the lives and legacies of dogaresse, including

42 Including the tombs of Antonio d’Alessandro and Maddalena Riccia, which will be addressed in this dissertation, see cat. #35, and the tombs of Sanzio Vitaliano and Ippolita Imperata; Giovanello de Cuncto and Lucrezia Filangieri; and Mariano d’Alagno and Katerinella Ursina (Orsini) di Candida, which are from the sixteenth century and are therefore outside the scope of this project.
43 Michalsky, “Conivges in vita concorissimos ne mors qvidem ipsa disivnxit”: Zur Rolle der Frau im genealogischen System neapolitanischer Sepulkralplastik.” 81.
the manner of their commemoration. She situates the memorialization of *dogaresse* within the context of ducal burials, giving primary emphasis to the only extant and independent *dogaresse*’s tomb from the early *quattrocento*, that of Dogaressa Agnese da Mosto Venier. To broaden her analysis, Hulburt provides a brief summation of the wider context of women’s monuments in the Veneto, into which Dogaressa Agnese’s tomb fits, by mentioning the basics of the roughly contemporaneous tombs of Fina Buzzacarini and Caterina dei Francesi. ⁴⁵ The two specialized studies of Michalsky and Hurlburt are therefore useful starting points in constructing the larger picture of women’s commemoration in the fifteenth century, though they only provide limited glimpses into what, as I will show, was a much larger phenomenon. ⁴⁶

This chapter serves as an overview of women’s monumental tombs in order to definitively show that these memorial structures represent a significant category of Renaissance sculpture. I will document thirty-five tombs, a figure which is more than scholars have ever recognized or considered as a group, tracing their development throughout the century in order to show that women’s tombs are a formally diverse group, exhibiting examples of precocious formal experimentation which built—rather than relied—upon the coeval development of male tombs.

---

⁴⁵ Both of these tombs were located in Padua. The tomb of Fina Buzzacarini dates from 1378 and is thus outside the scope of this project, though it is discussed briefly on pages 23-26. For the tomb of Caterina dei Francesi, see cat. #14.

⁴⁶ The essays in the volume edited by Judith Brown and Robert Davis assert that the local particularism of this type of specialized study has characterized most of the scholarly work on women’s history in the Italian Renaissance, and it is necessary to look at a broader picture in order to fully historicize women’s societal position. See Judith C. Brown and Robert C. Davis eds., *Gender and Society in Renaissance Italy* (London and New York: Longman, 1998).
The chapter begins with a brief investigation of the best-surviving and relevant trecento antecedents, with particular emphasis on the tombs of the Angevin royalty in Naples, the dogaresse of Venice, and the surprising case of Fina Buzzacarini in Padua, who commissioned her own tomb. This early context sets the stage for a broad discussion of women’s tombs in the fifteenth century, which will begin by locating the thirty-five extant examples that I have documented within a chronological framework, followed by typological and formal stylistic analyses. The chapter will then investigate the regional distribution of monuments showing that women’s tombs were spread throughout the peninsula and located in all major Renaissance centers. I will discuss the types of churches where women’s tombs were typically found, which were overwhelmingly mendicant. Following these analyses, the chapter moves to an investigation of the familial and social positions of the women commemorated, whether they were married, unmarried, or widowed and their families’ status. A contextual case study of Rome in the 1470s and 1480s will conclude the chapter in order to show how women’s tomb building fit within the larger context of fifteenth-century tomb construction.

_Trecento Precedents_

Despite Shelley Zuraw’s insistence upon the “newness” of women’s tombs, they were demonstrably not a new invention of the fifteenth century.\(^47\) Rather, monumental tombs were constructed for women in preceding centuries,\(^48\) and a number of noteworthy

\(^{47}\) See fn. 40.

\(^{48}\) Women were regularly commemorated in the classical world and their commemoration continued into the Medieval period. See Anita Moskowitz, *Italian Gothic Sculpture c. 1250-c. 1400*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 310 and Nancy Demand,
monuments survive particularly from the trecento. I have limited my survey to the monuments of the Angevin royalty of Naples, Venetian dogaresse, and Fina Buzzacarini of Padua because they provide a broad geographical range and examples from three different types of political systems, a monarchy, republic, and seigneurial rule, respectively.\textsuperscript{49}

Since the beginning of Angevin rule, female members of the family were commemorated with monumental tombs as regularly as males.\textsuperscript{50} Of the forty-one Angevin tombs that Tanja Michalsky examines in \textit{Memoria und Repräsentation. Die Grabmäler des Königshauses Anjou in Italien}, the foremost study on the subject, seventeen commemorate Angevin men, while twenty-three honor women, and one tomb is for a couple, Johanna of Durazzo and her husband, Robert of Artois.\textsuperscript{51} Michalsky argues that the Angevin tombs, in their specific capacity as ruler tombs, served both to commemorate their individual subjects and to mark the position and status of the

\textsuperscript{49}While none of these three cities have clear-cut political situations, Padua in the trecento, while continually under Carrara control, suffered a string of political threats from nearby Verona and Venice, eventually capitulating to Venetian control and becoming a subject city of that republic. For more see Diana Norman ed., \textit{Siena, Florence, and Padua: Art, Society, and Religion 1280-1400}. Vol. 1. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 20-21.

\textsuperscript{50}Female commemoration among the Angevins initiated with the construction of tombs for Beatrice of Savoy, countess of Provence, the mother of Beatrice, queen and wife of Charles I of Anjou. Beatrice of Savoy died in 1267 shortly before her daughter Queen Beatrice died in the same year. For more, see Tanja Michalsky, \textit{Memoria und Repräsentation Die Grabmäler des Königshauses Anjou in Italien}. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 96-110, 241-247.

\textsuperscript{51}Michalsky, \textit{Memoria und Repräsentation}, 239-367. The tomb of Johanna and Robert is included in the Supplementary Catalogue B of additional monuments at the end of this dissertation.
Angevin family,\textsuperscript{52} a typical goal for monuments honoring rulers and ruling families. Based upon the gender parity of memorialization among the group of tombs, women’s tombs were as successful in accomplishing these two goals as men’s.

The Angevin tombs tend to follow stylistic patterns based upon innovations made by the Tuscan sculptor Tino di Camaino and influenced by French precedents.\textsuperscript{53} Tino’s Angevin tombs were characterized by being directly on the ground, rather that on the wall, which was much more typical of contemporaneous Tuscan examples.\textsuperscript{54} The tombs, particularly those constructed during the first half of the fourteenth century, tended to be large-scale, freestanding, and covered by a baldacchino. The repetition of form among the Angevin tombs certainly contributed to their message of dynastic continuity and strength. The same message could also be conveyed through the monuments’ iconography. The tombs of Maria of Hungary, sculpted by Tino di Camaino in 1325-26 in Santa Maria Donnaregina, and Maria of Valois, also sculpted by Tino di Camaino and his workshop in 1335-36 in Santa Chiara, are particularly notable in their emphasis on genealogy, and thus dynastic continuity, as both feature double images of their subjects: an effigy on the tomb chest and the woman enthroned, flanked by her children on the front of the sarcophagus.\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{52} Michalsky, \textit{Memoria und Repräsentation}, passim.

\textsuperscript{53} Moskowitz, \textit{Italian Gothic Sculpture}, 185

\textsuperscript{54} Moskowitz, \textit{Italian Gothic Sculpture}, 181-184.

\textsuperscript{55} Michalsky, \textit{Memoria und Repräsentation}, 312. The form of Mary of Hungary’s tomb became “canonical” for Angevin tombs for individuals of both genders and can be seen in, for example, the tomb of Philipp of Taranto, the fourth son of Mary of Hungary, also by Tino da Camaino and his workshop (1336, San Domenico Maggiore, Naples). Philipp’s tomb also included enthroned depictions of his children, including his three daughters.
On the front of Maria of Hungary’s tomb are seated depictions of her seven sons, with Saint Louis of Toulouse in the central position to emphasize that Maria was the mother of a saint. Similarly, Maria of Valois’ tomb features on the tomb chest five members of her family, except in this instance the central position is held by Maria of Valois herself, and the figures flanking her depict her daughters. At this point in Angevin rule, the lineage was dependent on female heirs, and one of Maria’s flanking figures is identified as Johanna, later queen of Naples and Sicily. Michalsky argues persuasively that these monuments prove the essential role of women in genealogical succession, particularly in helping to establish the legitimacy of a dynasty. Maria of Hungary and Maria of Valois’ tombs are successful in doing just that, by putting the emphasis on each woman’s heirs, a saint and a future queen, respectively. Women’s monumental commemoration was a major component of Angevin patronage throughout their reign and indicates how the messages of political power that have long been described as a function of men’s tombs also worked for women’s tombs. It also indicates that, in fact, it is the genealogical power structure rather than gender per se that is the most important factor. Maria of Hungary even left dictates for her own monument by specifying in her will that Tino di Camaino and Gagliardo Primario were to construct her tomb in Santa

---

56 Michalsky, *Memoria und Repräsentation*, 290 and Moskowitz, *Italian Gothic Sculpture*, 349, fn. 23. Maria had thirteen children, eight were male, but one had died young. For more on this tomb and that of Maria of Valois, see Wilhelm Valentine, *Tino di Camaino, a Sienese sculptor of the fourteenth century*. (Paris: Pegasus Press, 1935).
58 Michalsky, “Conivges in vita concordissimos ne mors qvidem ipsa disvnxit,” 75-76. On page 75, Michalsky eloquently describes the primary function of these tombs as “carrying the memory of their own ancestors, the monumental continuation of the family history in the collective memory of the society and culture of their church as urban space…” (Translation mine).
Maria Donnaregina.\textsuperscript{59} Therefore in Angevin Naples, major precedents were set for both the function and regularity of women’s tombs, as well as for the practice of women—both ruling and not—patronizing their own monuments.

Monumental tombs celebrating women in Naples in the fourteenth century were limited to members of the ruling family, a pattern that continued throughout the rest of the peninsula.\textsuperscript{60} Following this trend, in Venice in the trecento, dogaresse were not honored with their own monumental tombs,\textsuperscript{61} but could be publicly commemorated on the monuments of their husbands. For example, in the panel painting of the enthroned Madonna that comprises part of the tomb of Doge Francesco Dandolo (circa 1340), found in Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, his wife Dogaressa Elisabetta Contarini Dandolo is included in a votive portrait.\textsuperscript{62} Dogaressa Elisabetta had been listed as one of the

\textsuperscript{59} Moskowitz, Italian Gothic Sculpture, 184. It should also be noted that the tomb of Robert I from 1343 in Santa Chiara, Naples (attributed to Giovanni and Pacio da Firenza) also employs they dynastic genealogical depiction on its front. In this instance, it was commissioned by his granddaughter, Queen Joanna, to justify her own rule. The tomb was damaged heavily in bombing from World War II. Robert is depicted enthroned in the center and he is flanked on either side by his first and second wives, Sancia on the left and Violante to the right. Charles of Calabria, Maria of Valois, and the commissioner, Joanna, are also shown. For more see Catherine King, “Women as patrons: nuns, widows and Rulers,” in Siena, Florence And Padua: Art, Society and Religion 1280-1400, ed. Diana Norman. Vol. 2 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 254-55. As King points out, there are actually four women on the front of Robert’s tomb in contrast to only three men.

\textsuperscript{60} While women who were rulers or members of ruling family were the only consistent recipients of monumental tombs in the trecento (a broader study of the trecento is however outside the scope of this project, so I imagine that exceptions could be found) it should be noted that this changed in the following century when a broader range of women began to be commemorated.

\textsuperscript{61} The only extant dogaresse tomb that predates that of Dogaressa Agnese Mosto Venier is that of Dogaressa Felicia Michiel, the wife of Doge Vitale I Michiel (1096-1102). Her tomb is located in the narthex of San Marco, the only dogaresse to be buried there. For Dogaressa Felicia Michiel see Hurlburt, The Dogaresse of Venice, 141.

\textsuperscript{62} The painting is Paolo Veneziano’s Enthroned Madonna and Child with Doge Francesco Dandolo and Dogaressa Elisabetta Contarini Dandolo.
executors of Doge Francesco’s will, and so it is possible that she was involved in the painting’s creation.\textsuperscript{63} And, while many more fourteenth-century dogaresse were not memorialized, Doge Francesco Dandolo’s choice to include his dogaresse on his memorial monument broadly indicated the ducal couple’s joint status as representatives to heaven on behalf of their city.\textsuperscript{64} Because the dogeship was an elected position, there was certainly less of an emphasis on establishing dynastic lineage for political gain with their memorial markers, but the presence of dogaresse on their husbands’ monuments reflected the honor of the state office conferred upon their families.\textsuperscript{65}

While the commemoration of the dogaresse of Venice and the Angevin royal women of Naples was used as part of broader political machinations, an example of a trecento monumental commemoration that was steered perhaps entirely by its female subject was the reconfiguring of Padua’s Baptistery as a mausoleum by Fina Buzzacarini.\textsuperscript{66} Fina, the wife of Paduan lord Francesco ‘il Vecchio’ da Carrara, was

\textsuperscript{63} Hurlburt, \textit{The Dogaresse of Venice}, 129-130. No documents survive from the commissioning of the tomb, so Dogaressa Elisabetta’s participation in its commissioning is strictly conjectural. However, her presence in a votive image on her husband’s tomb is demonstrative of her own public commemoration. While Dogaressa Elisabetta’s votive image is the earliest example of this type of memorialization for a dogaresse, there were at least four other examples of this type of imagery. The first, no-longer-extant example was for the thirteenth-century doge, Jacopo Contarini, which involved a mosaic featuring the votive images of him and his wife and an epitaph that read: “Here lies Jacopo Contarini, renowned doge of the Venetians, and the Dogaressa Jacobina his wife.” Later examples of this type include the tomb of Giovanni Dolfin from circa 1360 in Santi Giovanni e Paolo, Venice; the tomb of Doge Michele Morosini from circa 1382 in Santi Giovanni e Paolo, Venice; and the no-longer-extant tomb of Doge Michele Steno, originally in Santa Marina, Venice?. For more, see Hurlburt, \textit{The Dogaresse of Venice}, 131-39.

\textsuperscript{64} Hurlburt, \textit{The Dogaresse of Venice}, 134.

\textsuperscript{65} Hurlburt, \textit{The Dogaresse of Venice}, 123.

\textsuperscript{66} Benjamin Kohl refers to this structure as Fina’s “mausoleum.” See Benjamin Kohl, “Fina da Carrara, née Buzzacarini: Consort, Mother, and Patron of Art in Trecento Padua,” in \textit{Beyond Isabella}, ed. Sheryl E. Reiss and David G. Wilkins. (Kirksville, MO:
immensely and independently wealthy. Fina was an exceptional example of extensive early female patronage in that, beyond the Baptistery, she was responsible for building a large chapel dedicated to Saint Louis of Toulouse in the convent of San Benedetto, Padua. She began the project of reconfiguring and decorating Padua’s disused Baptistery in 1376, so that it was nearly complete by the time she wrote her will on 22 September 1378. The dramatically painted Baptistery is nearly entirely covered in

Truman State University Press, 2001), 26. The Baptistery also contained the tomb of her husband, Francesco ‘il Vecchio’ de Carrara, a free-standing monument that was destroyed in 1405 when Venice conquered Padua and Carrarese rule in that city came to an end.

Kohl, “Fina da Carrara, née Buzzacarini: Consort, Mother, and Patron of Art in Trecento Padua,” 21. Fina was spectacularly wealthy, primarily from the owner- and stewardship of rural estates. As testament of her immense wealth, on the 16th of June 1371, she loaned the city of Florence 10,000 florins, a loan she later recalled to finance her mausoleum project at the Baptistery.

King, “Women as Patrons,” 249. This chapel, which was severely damaged by bombing in World War II, but has since been reconstructed, was subsequently decorated by Giusto de’Menabuoi under the patronage of Fina’s sister Anna, who was abbess of the convent. The extant inscription regarding the construction of the chapel reads: “FUIT HAEC CAPELLA CONSTRUCTA IN HONOREM BEATISSIMI LUDOVICI PER ILLUSTREM ET GENEROSAM DOMINAM FINAM DE BUZZACARINIA BONAE MEMORIAE OLIM CONSORTEM MAGNIFICI DOMINI FRANCISCI SENIORIS DE CARARIA, ET HISTROIATA PER EIU$ SOROREM GERMANAM DOMINAM BUCACARINAM RELIGIOSAM ET VENERABILEM ABBATISSAM HUIUS SACRI ET COLENDI LOC$ OB DEVOTIONEM ET INTUITUM PRAELIBATA DOMIN[A]$E FIN[A]$E QUONDAM DOMIN[A]$E HUIUS ALM[A]$E EGREGI[A]$E CIVIT[AT]IS. IN MCCCLXXXXIV DE MENSE AUGUSTI COMPLEAT.” (“This chapel was built in the honor of the most blessed Louis by the illustrious and generous lady Donna Fina de’Buzzacarini of worthy memory, once the consort of Don Francesco il Vecchio da Carrara, and adorned with narratives by her full blood sister the lady Donna Buzzacarina, nun and venerable abbess of this sacred and honored place, because of her devotion and her consideration for Donna Fina, erstwhile ruler of this bountiful and good city, who being poured out as the first libation, pre-deceased her.” (Translation, King, “Women as Patrons, 249). Anna’s tomb inscription, which dates from 1398, is also located there.

frescos by the Florentine painter Giusto de’Menabuoi.\footnote{Kohl, “Fina da Carrara, née Buzzacarini: Consort, Mother, and Patron of Art in Trecento Padua,” 26. The elaborate program consists of scenes from Genesis; the lives of the Virgin, Christ, and John the Baptist on the drum; a hierarchical Paradise with a giant image of Christ Pantocrator in the center and a orant Virgin in a mandorla below in the dome scenes from the life of the Virgin on the baptistery’s west wall; and an image of the Crucifixion and Resurrection on its east wall.} Fina’s actual tomb was located above the main entrance door to the cathedral on the west wall, just below her donor image kneeling in supplication to the Virgin, though it is now no longer extant, and no descriptions of any sculpture on the monument are known to exist; the extant sculpted canopy above her tomb contains a cadre of female saints. There is an emphasis in the imagery, particularly in the rows of saints and biblical figures in the Paradise scene in the dome, on local Paduan saints and female saints; interestingly, of 107 saints and biblical figures, twenty-six are women, where, per Catherine King, frequently images of this type show no women at all.\footnote{King, “Women as Patrons,” 253. See also, Margaret King, Le donne nel rinascimento in Italia, 152. In 1300, only one-fourth of officially acknowledged saints in the Church were women. In her interpretation of the image, Catherine King emphasizes how Fina’s gender contributed to the stressing of female saints and biblical matriarchs in the ranks of Paradise, while Claudio Bellinati underscores the Paduan emphasis among the saints. See King, “Women as Patrons,” 253, 255 and Claudio Bellinati, “Iconografia e teologia negli affreschi del Battistero,” in Giusto de’Menabuoi nel Battistero di Padova ed. Anna Maria Spiazzi (Triest: LINT, 1989), 49} As Benjamin Kohl notes, the tomb’s Marian context highlights the roles of bride and mother, emphasizing Fina’s position as consort and as dynastic fulcrum for the Carrara family.\footnote{Kohl, “Fina da Carrara, née Buzzacarini: Consort, Mother, and Patron of Art in Trecento Padua,” 27.} Though outside of a hegemonic royal commemorative tradition, the tomb of Fina Buzzacarini nonetheless emphasizes the female genealogical role in a similar manner to that of the Angevin royals’ tombs. Despite the broadening of the patronal base to include patricians and the wider status of women commemorated, as we shall see, the genealogical and dynastic emphases of trecento women’s monuments...
continued into the fifteenth century and continued to be a primary foci of women’s
tombs. This genealogical emphasis is a means of celebrating women’s accomplishments,
much in the same way men’s achievements are honored on their tombs.

An Overview of Fifteenth-century Women’s Monumental Tombs: Chronological,
Typological, and Formal Analyses

The previous, necessarily brief, overview of trecento monuments indicates that,73
while not altogether common, women’s monumental tombs were certainly not without
precedent at the beginning of the quattrocento. As noted at the start of this chapter, I have
uncovered thirty-five examples of women’s monumental tombs from the fifteenth
century. Of these thirty-five tombs, thirteen were constructed between 1400 and 1450,
while twenty-two were erected between 1450 and 1500. The sharp increase in the number
of tombs created in the second half of the century follows the same pattern as tomb
production in general, and while it could be an accident of survival for the sculptures, it
more likely suggests that women’s tombs were becoming much more common and that
their patronage was spreading to a broader range of the population. As in the fourteenth
century, most of the monumental tombs constructed for women during the years 1400-

73 Because it is beyond the bounds of this study a broader survey of trecento monuments
is not attempted here. For example I have not discussed the early fourteenth century tomb
of Margaret of Luxembourg (Giovanni Pisano, 1311, Genoa) or a number of monuments
honoring female saints. However, for more on these topics see Clario Di Fabio, “Facie ad
faciem. Approfondimenti su Giovanni Pisano e il mausoleo di Margherita imperatrice.”
Giovanni Pisano a Genova.” Conoscere, conservare, valorizzare i beni culturali
(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Barnaby Robert Nygren, “The
Monumental Saint’s Tomb in Italy: 1260-1520.” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1999);
Joselita Raspiti Serra, I Pisano e il gotico. (Milan: Fabbri, 1968); Max Seidel, Padre e
1450 were for the wife of a ruler or a member of a ruling family; specifically, ten of the thirteen monuments built in this period fit those criteria. Table 1 provides a list of these ten monuments and the relationship of the tomb subject to the ruling families of their respective locations:

Table 1.
Tombs from 1400-1450 for Women in Ruling/Aristocratic Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tomb Subject</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Original Location</th>
<th>Relationship to Ruling Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margherita Malatesta – cat. #13, fig. 1 *</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>Chapel of San Bernardino, San Francesco, Mantua</td>
<td>Wife of Ruler of Mantua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterina dei Francesi – cat. #14, fig. 2*</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>Chapel of San Giacomo, Sant’Antonio, Padua</td>
<td>Wife of Marquis of Soragna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilaria del Carretto – cat. #15, fig. 3 *</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>Chapel of Santa Lucia, San Francesco, Lucca</td>
<td>Wife of Lord of Lucca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnese and Clemenza di Durazzo – cat. #23, fig. 4 *</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>Northern Transept, Santa Chiara, Naples</td>
<td>Sisters to the Queen of Naples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogaressa Agnese da Mosto Venier – cat. #24, fig. 5 *</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>Santi Giovanni e Paolo, Venice</td>
<td>Wife of Doge of Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margherita di Durazzo – cat. #1, fig. 6 *</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>San Francesco, Salerno</td>
<td>Queen/Mother of King of Naples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paola Bianca Malatesta – cat. #2, fig. 7 *</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>San Francesco, Fano</td>
<td>Wife of lord of Fano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiara Gambacorti – cat. #3, fig. 8</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>San Domenico, Pisa</td>
<td>Daughter of ruler of Pisa and Abbess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccarda Bueri – cat. #31, fig. 9 *</td>
<td>1433</td>
<td>Old Sacristy, San Lorenzo, Florence</td>
<td>Wife of Republican leader of Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isotta degli Atti – cat. #18, fig. 10 *</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>Chapel of Isotta, San Francesco, Rimini</td>
<td>Mistress/wife of Lord of Rimini</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74 For general purposes of categorization in these tables I have defined “ruling” as aristocratic, despotic, or elected control over a locality. There are, of course, vagaries and complexities to the political situations and statuses of all of these families, which are explored in much more depth in each tomb’s individual catalogue entry.
* Indicates that the women’s tombs were part of larger commemorative schemes for their respective families, either as parts of chapels, or as parts of broader commissions commemorating other family members. See fuller discussion of this on page 23.

Of the remaining three tombs from 1400-1450, those of Sibilia Cetto (cat. #30, fig. 11), Lisabetta Trenta (cat. #29, fig. 12), and Saint Justine (cat. #5, fig. 13), the first two commemorated patrician women, while Saint Justine was an early Christian martyr. In contrast, between 1450 and 1500, only nine of the twenty-two tombs honored the wives of rulers or members of ruling families (Table 2), whereas a plurality of monuments from the second half of the century were commissioned by and for patrician, but not ruling, women (Table 3).

Table 2.
Tombs from 1450-1500 for Women in Ruling/Aristocratic Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of Tomb</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Original Location</th>
<th>Relationship to Ruling Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malatesta Women – cat. #19, fig. --</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>San Francesco, Rimini</td>
<td>Former wives of Ruler of Rimini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vittoria Piccolomini – cat. #32, fig. 14 *</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>San Francesco, Siena</td>
<td>Mother of Pope Pius II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Manfredi – cat. #7, fig. 14</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>Gaddi Chapel, San Biagio, Forlì</td>
<td>Wife of Ruler of Forlì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medea Colleoni – cat. #9, fig. 16</td>
<td>1467</td>
<td>Santa Maria della Basella, Urgnano</td>
<td>Daughter of Ruler of Bergamo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria of Aragon Piccolomini – cat. #20, fig. 17</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>Piccolomini Chapel, Sant’Anna dei Lombardy, Naples</td>
<td>Illegitimate Daughter of King of Naples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsibilia Trinci – cat. #17, fig. 18 *</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td>Oliva Chapel, San Francesco at Montefiorentino</td>
<td>Mother of Count of Piagnano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camoneschi – cat. #26,</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>San Bernardino, L’Aquila</td>
<td>Wife of Count of Montorio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

75 See cats. #5, 29, and 30.
* Indicates that the women’s tombs were part of larger commemorative schemes for their respective families, either as parts of chapels, or as parts of broader commissions commemorating other family members.

Of the remaining thirteen tombs from after 1450, five of them celebrated saints or beate, individuals who were recognized by the community for their holy attributes, but had not been officially canonized, while eight honored women of elite patrician status whose families were, nevertheless, not in a ruling position at the time of their memorialization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.</th>
<th>Tombs from 1450-1500 for Patrician (or otherwise) Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject of Tomb</strong></td>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Villana – cat. #4, fig. 22</td>
<td>1451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Monica – cat. #6, fig. 23</td>
<td>1455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Catherine of Siena – cat. #8, fig. 24</td>
<td>1466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Fina – cat. #22, fig. 25</td>
<td>1468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabetta Geraldini – cat. #34, fig. 26</td>
<td>1477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni – cat. #33, fig. 27</td>
<td>1477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franceschina Tron</td>
<td>1478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesaro – cat. #21, fig. 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nera Corsi Sassetti – cat. #16, fig. 29</td>
<td>1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costanza Ammannati – cat. #10, fig. 30</td>
<td>1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddalena Orsini – cat. #11, fig. 31</td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddalena Riccia – cat. #35, fig. 32</td>
<td>1491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generosa Orsini – cat. #25, fig. 33</td>
<td>1498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Beatrice Rusca – cat. #12, fig. 34</td>
<td>1499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Saint Monica was an early Christian saint who lived in the fourth century; as such she cannot be described as a “patrician” in the same sense as all the other women who lived during the fifteenth century.

Taken collectively, it becomes clear from this data that, as the fifteenth century progressed, women’s monumental tombs were increasingly created to honor women from a broader—but still elite—range of the population that could include the wives of bankers, like Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni; scholars and humanists, like Maddalena Riccia; or the mother of a cardinal, like Costanza Ammannati. A more specific investigation of the patronage of these monuments will follow later in this dissertation in chapter two. Though all patrons of monumental tombs were elite in terms of their financial situations, as noted above, in the second half of the century, women’s tombs began to

---

76 This expansion of tomb construction to a broader range of individuals also occurred with monuments honoring men.
77 King, “Women as Patrons: Nuns, Widows and Rulers,” 243. Per the extant contract for her monument, the artists of the tomb of Margherita Malatesta were to be paid 625 gold ducats in Mantua in 1399, which included the cost of materials. See cat. #13 for this contract and chapter two of this dissertation for a discussion of the document. For
be commissioned by a broader swath of society. The trecento examples discussed in the previous section illustrated that tomb construction for women among ruling families was, like monuments for men, intended to emphasize dynastic continuity and familial strength, messages directed towards their subjects and to the city as a whole. Monuments from the first half of the fifteenth century continue this pattern, as so many of them were commissioned by rulers, particularly as part of programs of broader familial commemoration. Most of the tombs—nine out of thirteen—were part of family chapels or adjacent to monuments commemorating other family members. By the mid-fifteenth century, based perhaps on the growing patrician classes, a desire to highlight dynasty and familial presence spread beyond the ruling class.

Though there is a demonstrable chronological progression in women’s tombs, they varied formally and typologically throughout the fifteenth century. Formally, the division of women’s tombs into types can be achieved through two separate taxonomic models. For the first model, the tombs can be divided into the three basic tomb categories (with the addition of an “unknown” category), which are recognized as the “standard forms” of tomb monuments: floor tombs, wall tombs, and freestanding tombs. Table 4 demonstrates how the women’s tombs fall within this framework.

context, in 1453 in Rome, a house could be rented for two ducats a year, five shops could be purchased for 220 ducats, an entire house could value 100 ducats, or an “extensive” house could be sold for 1000 ducats. All of these figures are from Charles Burroughs, “Below the Angel: An Urbanistic Project in the Rome of Pope Nicholas V,” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 45 (1982): 97, 103, 106
79 Andrew Butterfield, “Social Structure and the Typology of Funerary Monuments in Early Renaissance Florence.” RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics 26 (1994), 50, passim. Butterfield is focusing on Florence as a case study in this article, but as he is among the
Table 4. 
Breakdown of Basic Formal Categories of Women’s Tombs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal Type of Tomb</th>
<th>Number of Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Slab *</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freestanding</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear **</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These floor slabs are part of a larger commemorative chapel, creating a monumental memorial complex, but the tombs themselves are slabs.
** Based upon extant sculpture it is unclear what forms the tombs of the Malatesta Women, Saint Justine and Saint Catherine of Siena took in their original configurations.

Among women’s monumental tombs, wall monuments are in the overwhelming majority. Of these, most include effigies: twenty-six of thirty-five (or 74.2%) of the extant women’s tombs feature effigies, and thirty-two of thirty-five (or 91.4%) include an image of the deceased in some form, effigy, painted portrait, or portrait bust.

Reflecting the general trend of underestimating the number of women’s tombs, Andrew Butterfield in his seminal article on tomb typologies in Florence describes them as “exceedingly rare” and asserts that they were “…constructed only in tandem with similar monuments for the males of the same family. Similarly, in a few examples first to delineate true “typologies” for tombs, it is useful to consider women’s tombs in light of his findings. Butterfield considered all types of tombs, including floor slabs with inscriptions and effigies in his study. Robert Munman declared these three types to be the “standard forms” of Renaissance sepulchers, though he distinguishes between wall tombs on brackets and wall reliefs. See Robert Munman, *Sienese Renaissance Tomb Monuments*. (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1993), 13,

80 If this study were to include slab tombs as well, as in Butterfield’s study, they would be, by a significant margin, the most common type of monument.
women also were depicted in relief lying next to their husbands." To correct his misapprehension, it is perhaps more instructive to group women’s tombs based upon a second typological model: how they were spatially related to other monuments, which will reveal each tomb’s location in regard to other monuments. To this end, I have divided the tombs into five distinct categories: three of the categories represent independent tombs in various configurations, and the remaining two categories delineate couple’s or double tombs. Twenty-two tombs were independent, individual monuments, while thirteen were double or couple’s monuments. The categories are as follows: a woman commemorated in an independent monument by herself; in an independent chapel; in an independent tomb within a couple’s or a family’s chapel; in an independent double or couple’s tomb; or in a double/couple tomb within a couple’s or a family’s chapel.

Twelve of the thirty-five tombs were examples of independent tombs, meaning a monument dedicated solely to an individual woman, located outside the confines of a chapel, typically on a nave or transept wall:

1. Tomb of Margherita di Durazzo, 1412, San Francesco, Salerno
2. Tomb of Paola Bianca Malatesta, 1416, San Francesco, Fano
3. Tomb of Chiara Gambacorti, 1419, San Domenico, Pisa
4. Tomb of Beata Villana, 1451, Santa Maria Novella, Florence
5. Tomb of Saint Justine, 1451, Santa Giustina, Padua
6. Tomb of Saint Monica, 1455, Sant’Agostino, Rome
7. Tomb of Barbara Manfredi, 1466, San Biagio, Forlì
8. Tomb of Saint Catherine of Siena, 1466, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome
9. Tomb of Medea Colleoni, 1467, Santa Maria della Basella, Urgnano
10. Tomb of Costanza Ammannati, 1479, Sant’Agostino, Rome *
11. Tomb of Maddalena Orsini, 1480, San Salvatore in Lauro, Rome
12. Tomb of Beata Beatrice Rusca, 1499, Sant’Angelo dei Frari, Milan

---

* Indicates that the tomb was adjacent or paired with a monument to a husband or male relative.

The following five tombs are independent monuments originally located within a couple’s or a family’s chapels:

13. Tomb of Margherita Malatesta, 1399, San Francesco, Mantua
14. Tomb of Caterina dei Francesi, 1405, Sant’Antonio, Padua
15. Tomb of Ilaria del Carretto, 1405, San Francesco, Lucca
16. Tomb of Nera Corsi Sassetti, 1479, Santa Trinità, Florence
17. Tomb of Marsibilia Trinci, 1484, San Francesco, Montefiorentino, Frontino

The following five tombs are examples of independent chapels dedicated to individual women (with the exception of the Chapel dedicated to the Malatesta Wives, which likely had two honorees):

18. Chapel of Isotta degli Atti, 1447, San Francesco, Rimini
19. Chapel of the Malatesta Women, 1454, San Francesco, Rimini
20. Chapel of Maria of Aragon Piccolomini, 1470, Sant’Anna dei Lombardi, Naples
21. Chapel of Franceschina Tron Pesaro, 1478, Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, Venice
22. Chapel of Saint Fina, 1468, Collegiata, San Gimignano

Thus, as these categories reveal, over a third of monumental tombs (thirteen of thirty-five) that honor a woman commemorate another individual as well. Of these thirteen, eight memorialize a wife with her husband, four honor a mother with her child (two mother and daughter pairs, one mother and son pair, and one instance where the sex of the child is unknown), and one tomb honors sisters. These monuments, which I refer to as ‘double tombs,’ could be situated either independently or within a couple’s or a family’s chapels. Six of the thirteen ‘double tombs’ were independent:

23. Tomb of Agnese and Clemenza di Durazzo (sisters), 1408, Santa Chiara, Naples
24. Tomb of Agnese da Mosto Venier (mother and daughter), 1410, Santi Giovanni e Paolo, Venice
25. Tomb of Generosa Orsini (mother and son), 1498, Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, Venice
26. Tomb of Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camponeschi (mother and daughter), 1490, San Bernardino, L’Aquila
27. Tomb of Beatrice d’Este (wife and husband), 1497, Santa Maria delle Grazie, Milan
28. Tomb of Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola, (wife and husband) 1503, San Benedetto Polirone, San Benedetto Po

The remaining seven monuments were ‘double tombs’ located within a couple’s or a family’s chapels:

29. Tomb of Lisabetta Trenta (wife and husband), 1416, San Frediano, Lucca
30. Tomb of Sibilia Cetto (wife and husband), 1421, San Francesco Grande, Padua
31. Tomb of Piccarda Bueri (wife and husband), 1433, San Lorenzo, Florence
32. Tomb of Vittoria Piccolomini (wife and husband), 1454, San Francesco, Siena
33. Tomb of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni (mother and child), 1477, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome
34. Tomb of Elisabetta Geraldini (wife and husband), 1477, San Francesco, Amelia
35. Tomb of Maddalena Riccia (wife and husband), 1490, Sant’Anna dei Lombardi, Naples

These formal divisions show that, in instances where women were honored with individual monuments or their own chapels, the adjacent presence of a husband or related male’s tomb was not a requirement for the construction of a monument dedicated to a woman. The majority of monuments, however, were situated within familial groupings, nearly always with marital relations. In a few exceptional instances, women were not interred within the bounds of their marital family, notably the tomb of Medea Colleoni, which was originally located in a completely different town than the monument that was later constructed to honor her father, or the tomb for Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni, which was originally in a family chapel, but paired her with a nephew rather than her husband, who was interred in a different town altogether.82 Women who achieved the status of

---
82 See cat. #9 and 33 for more on these monuments.
saint or *beata* would also not be memorialized with any family, whether conjugal, natal or otherwise.\(^{83}\)

With a chronology and typology of monuments thus established, it is useful to consider the extant tombs within a stylistic framework as well. In a general sense, there is a sharp divide between monuments that fall into the broad stylistic categories of “gothicizing” and “classicizing.”\(^{84}\) All ten of the extant monuments made prior to 1433 (table 5) demonstrate these gothicizing stylistic characteristics.\(^{85}\)

**Table 5.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Tombs with “Medieval” Formal Characteristics</th>
<th>Broad Stylistic Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1399</td>
<td>Tomb of Margherita Malatesta</td>
<td>Gothic effigy; Gothic script inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1405</td>
<td>Tomb of Caterina dei Francesi **</td>
<td>Gothic effigy; Gothic script inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1405</td>
<td>Effigy of Ilaria del Carretto *</td>
<td>Gothic effigy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1408</td>
<td>Tomb of Agnese and Clementza Durazzo</td>
<td>Angevin Stylistic Tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1410</td>
<td>Tomb of Agnese da Mosto Venier</td>
<td>Gothic effigy; Gothic script inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1412</td>
<td>Tomb of Margherita di Durazzo</td>
<td>Angevin Stylistic Tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1416</td>
<td>Tomb of Paola Bianca Malatesta</td>
<td>Gothic architectural framework, effigy,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{83}\) Church officials frequently commissioned saints’ tombs. In the cases of *beata*, they might have been commissioned by family members to help further their cult, but the monuments were outside of any familial context. For more see individual catalogue entries. Patronage will also be more thoroughly examined in chapter two of this dissertation. Like female saints, male saints were rarely ever commemorated with family.\(^{84}\) In this discussion, I will use “gothicizing” to mean tombs with architectural frameworks of pointed, tre- or quatrefoil arches; limited or no reliance on the classical architectural vocabulary; effigies with elegant, elongated proportions; and the use of gothic script in inscriptions (if any). “Classicizing,” as I use it here, indicates tombs that utilize a classical vocabulary within their architectural frameworks, including decorations like *putti*, garlands, and bucrania; more naturalistic, less elongated proportions for the effigy; and classical Roman lettering styles for the inscriptions (if any).\(^{85}\) These stylistic characteristics are consistent with broader trends in sculpture style.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tomb Name</th>
<th>Style Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1416</td>
<td>Tomb Lisabetta Trenta</td>
<td>Gothic effigy; Gothic script inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1419</td>
<td>Tomb of Chiara Gambacorti</td>
<td>Gothic effigy; Gothic script inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1421</td>
<td>Tomb of Sibilia Cetto</td>
<td>Gothic effigy; Gothic script inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450</td>
<td>Tomb of Saint Justine **</td>
<td>Gothic effigy?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The effigy, though not the sarcophagus, of the tomb of Ilaria del Carretto is typically characterized as “gothic” in the literature, a point that will be discussed further below.
** The tombs of Caterina dei Francesi and Saint Justine are in such poor condition and so little of them remains that it is difficult to designate their style. However, the effigy of Saint Justine, which postdates 1433, is elongated and curvilinear, leading it to be included in this category.

In most cases for the above monuments, and particularly for the two Angevin tombs, the structures were inserted into already constructed medieval churches. The Angevin tombs maintain stylistic traditions begun in the thirteenth century, which were discussed in brief above. The tombs of Lisabetta Trenta, Chiara Gambacorti, and Sibilia Cetto are all slabs depicting effigies in relief. While these tombs lack the three-dimensional gothicizing architectonic frameworks of the wall monuments, the latter two depict their subjects in two-dimensional pointed and lobed arched tabernacle-like frames. The tomb of Lisabetta Trenta features the effigy in a slightly more realistic draped space, though the curving linearity of her effigy has traditionally been characterized as gothic.86 James Beck even goes so far as to say that the stylistic difference between Lisabetta’s tomb and her husband Lorenzo’s is “better understood as a matter of diverse modes of representing male and female images,” suggesting that he considered gothic to be a more feminine style.87 However, as this dissertation intends to show, there were not gender-

---

based modes of memorialization; rather, women’s tombs fit within the broader goals of fifteenth-century commemoration. Regardless, all three of the slab tombs feature effigies that lack the illusionism and three-dimensionality that became more common later in the fifteenth-century.  

Included in the above table is the monument of Ilaria del Carretto, which proves problematic for stylistic characterization. While its effigy is perpetually discussed as an exemplary gothicizing representation in literature on the tomb, the sarcophagus, by contrast, is typically declared to be classicizing. Ilaria’s effigy is usually described as “gothic” for two reasons. Firstly, the dress she is wearing, called a *cioppa* or *pellanda*, is a particular style of dress likely imported from Flanders or France. Secondly, the view of Ilaria’s effigy from above reveals a particularly curving linearity that is reminiscent of the International Gothic style. However, it is unlikely that any fifteenth-century viewer would have been able to see the tomb from above, and as noted by Beck, the French or Flemish origin of her dress does not necessarily mean that the sculptural style of the effigy as a whole is actually gothic. The close attention to naturalistic detail, particularly in the head of the effigy and the dog at its feet, indicates that the artist was a close observer of nature, a trait typically associated with “Renaissance” art.

---

89 Helen Geddes, “Iacopo della Quercia scultore Sanese: late Medieval or early Renaissance artist?” *Renaissance Studies* 21.2 (2007): 185. This debate is part of the larger ongoing scholarly controversy that swirls around the Ilaria monument. For brief summaries of these concerns as well as bibliography, see the cat. #: 15.
Ilaria’s sarcophagus meanwhile is, as Helen Geddes puts it, a “wholesale appropriation of a classical prototype.”\(^91\) The sarcophagus features ten putti—famously the first reappearance in the fifteenth century of this decorative motif—holding garlands of fruit and flowers between them. The putti were likely meant to recall ancient sarcophagi, relating to the common practice in nearby Pisa of re-using actual antique tomb chests for new burials.\(^92\) The Ilaria monument, because of its perceived reliance on two stylistic approaches, is indicative of how there was not an abrupt break between Medieval “gothic” and new Renaissance “classicizing” styles, but rather a commingling and co-existence that continued for many decades into the fifteenth century.\(^93\)

In women’s tomb sculptures, however, we do see a distinct shift from Gothic to Renaissance in the style of their decorative elements. After the tomb of Piccarda Bueri in 1433, the “gothicizing” elements fall away in tomb construction in favor of more “classicizing” elements, including the so-called humanist tomb type, as shown in Table 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Tombs with “Renaissance” or “Classicizing” Formal Characteristics</th>
<th>Broad Stylistic Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1433</td>
<td>Tomb of Piccarda Bueri</td>
<td>Classicizing: Putti, swags, inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1447</td>
<td>Tomb of Isotta degli Atti</td>
<td>Classicizing: Putti, Inscription,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1451</td>
<td>Tomb of Beata Villana</td>
<td>Classicizing: Inscription</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

91 Geddes, “Iacopo della Quercia scultore Sanese: late Medieval or early Renaissance artist?” 208.


93 Geddes, “Iacopo della Quercia scultore Sanese: late Medieval or early Renaissance artist?” 216.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tomb Description</th>
<th>Style or Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1454</td>
<td>Tomb of the Malatesta Women*</td>
<td>Too little remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1454</td>
<td>Tomb of Vittoria Piccolomini</td>
<td>Classicizing: Half-length bust in a shell, inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1455</td>
<td>Tomb of Saint Monica</td>
<td>Classicizing: inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466</td>
<td>Tomb of Barbara Manfredi</td>
<td>Classicizing: humanist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466</td>
<td>Tomb of Saint Catherine of Siena</td>
<td>Classicizing: inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1467</td>
<td>Tomb of Medea Colleoni</td>
<td>Classicizing: architectural vocabulary, putti, inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1468</td>
<td>Tomb of Saint Fina</td>
<td>Classicizing: architectural vocabulary, inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1470</td>
<td>Tomb of Maria of Aragon Piccolomini</td>
<td>Classicizing: Humanist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1477</td>
<td>Tomb of Elisabetta Geraldini</td>
<td>Classicizing: architectural vocabulary, inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1477</td>
<td>Tomb of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni*</td>
<td>Too little remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1478</td>
<td>Tomb of Franceschina Tron Pesaro</td>
<td>Classicizing: architectural vocabulary, inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479</td>
<td>Tomb of Nera Corsi Sassetti</td>
<td>Classicizing: arcosolium, inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480</td>
<td>Tomb of Costanza Ammannati</td>
<td>Classicizing: architectural vocabulary, inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480</td>
<td>Tomb of Maddalena Orsini</td>
<td>Classicizing: architectural vocabulary, inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1484</td>
<td>Tomb of Marsibilia Trinci</td>
<td>Classicizing: Humanist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1490</td>
<td>Tomb of Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camoneschi</td>
<td>Classicizing: Humanist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1491</td>
<td>Tomb of Maddalena Riccia</td>
<td>Classicizing: architectural vocabulary, inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1497</td>
<td>Tomb of Beatrice d’Este</td>
<td>Naturalistic—only effigy survives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1498</td>
<td>Tomb of Generosa Orsini</td>
<td>Classicizing: architectural vocabulary, inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1499</td>
<td>Tomb of Beata Beatrice Rusca</td>
<td>Classicizing: naturalistic effigy, inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Tomb of Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola</td>
<td>Self-consciously Medieval as a copy of a twelfth century tomb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* For tombs with asterisks, too little of the monuments remain to make stylistic judgments about them.

Of the twenty-four tombs that post-date 1433, four tombs fit the so-called designation of “humanist tomb.” This type consists of a single-arched monument, derived from classical Roman triumphal arches, particularly the Arch of Titus. In tomb sculpture, the first “humanist tomb” was that sculpted for Florentine chancellor and classical scholar, who died in 1444 (fig. 35). Created by Bernardo Rossellino and located in Santa Croce in Florence, it was followed shortly thereafter by that for Carlo Marsuppini by Desiderio da Settignano. Marsuppini was Bruni’s successor as chancellor of Florence and also an avid scholar of Greek and Latin literature. Marsuppini’s tomb, also in Santa Croce, follows its predecessor closely in form (fig. 36). As a formal type, however, Shelley Zuraw rightly notes that it was seldom, if ever, used thereafter to commemorate humanists. Its use for the tombs of four women, none of whom were humanists, thus demonstrates the “humanist tomb’s” flexibility as a type and appropriateness for the memorialization of nearly anyone.

---


97 Zuraw, “The Public Commemorative Monument: Mino da Fiesole’s Tombs in the Florentine Badia,” 459. Zuraw notes that its use for Barbara Manfredi’s tomb is “even
The other twenty tombs utilize *all’antica* vocabulary in their architectural frameworks, like the temple-front appearances of the tombs of Costanza Ammannati and Maddalena Orsini, classical Roman lettering for their inscriptions, *putti* or other classical imagery, including, for example, mythological depictions of sea gods and nymphs on the frame of the tomb of Nera Corsi Sassetti. One final and unusual example, however, is Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola, whose commission of her own tomb will be discussed in greater detail in chapter two of this dissertation, and who requested a self-consciously medieval style for her monument, in that it intentionally copies the appearance of the twelfth-century monument honoring Matilda of Canossa, countess of Tuscany.\(^9\) This intentional copying of an extant woman’s tomb and the selection of distinct medieval type for her monument marks the end of the early development of women’s monumental tombs as a type and, thus, the endpoint of this dissertation. As this statistical and typological information shows, women’s tombs followed the patterns typical of other type of sculpture in the fifteenth century, and there is not a “feminine” stylistic association that can be applied to the monuments. Therefore, it is unlikely that they were considered second-class or second-rate monuments because of the lower social prominence of their honorees. As this dissertation will also argue elsewhere, women’s tombs in the fifteenth century were likely understood simply to be tombs, without any adjectival modifiers before that word.

Women’s Monumental Tombs: Regional Distribution and Locations in relation to the Mendicant Orders

Women’s monumental tombs are, in general, evenly dispersed throughout the Italian peninsula. As shown by Table 7, where the tombs are grouped by their regional distribution, the largest number of extant monuments can be found in Tuscany, though the greater documentation of tombs there might be a result of the long-standing Florentine bias of the literature. The paucity of tombs in the far northern, far southern, and eastern coastal regions of the peninsula might be accidents of survival, but also might indicate the historical tendency in Renaissance scholarship to overlook these regions.

Table 7. Modern Regional Distribution of Women’s Monumental Tombs (based on original locations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern Region</th>
<th>Number of Tombs</th>
<th>Cities in which Tombs were Originally Located</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuscany</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Florence 3; Lucca: 2; Pisa: 1; San Gimignano, 1; Siena: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veneto</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Padua: 3; Venice, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campania</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Naples: 4; Salerno: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

99 For this table I am using the regional divisions of modern Italy in order to make the data easily comprehensible within the framework of historiography. The following table will delineate the locations of tombs within regional divisions contemporaneous to the fifteenth century.

100 The Florentine bias in Renaissance scholarly history began with Giorgio Vasari in the sixteenth century and his overarching emphasis on Florence as the birthplace of the Renaissance artist and continued in the scholarship into the twentieth century. Within the last two decades scholars have particularly been trying to remedy this oversight; for more see Carol M. Richardson ed., Locating Renaissance Art (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007); Patricia Rubin, Giorgio Vasari, Art and History. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).

101 It is possible that, because these regions have been frequently overlooked in the literature, I have missed tombs in these areas in my research. I have attempted to be as thorough as possible, both in my on-site research in Italy and in my research in the literature, but there is, unfortunately, always the possibility of having missed an example.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lazio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rome: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombardy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Milan: 2; San Benedetto Po: 1; Urgnano: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilia Romagna</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rimini: 2; Forli: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marche</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fano: 1; Montefiorentino: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Amelia: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abruzzo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L’Aquila: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilicata</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friuli-Venezia-Giulia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liguria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puglia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trentino-Alto Adige/Südtirol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valle d’Aosta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardinia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though political boundaries were slippery and shifted frequently in the fifteenth century, the peninsula can be divided roughly into sixteen regions based upon the political situations prior to 1494 and the start of the Italian wars.\(^\text{102}\) Table 8 delineates the

regional distribution of tombs based upon political boundaries at the end of the fifteenth century:

Table 8. Regional Distribution based upon Fifteenth Century Political Divisions (in 1494)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Designations in 1494</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>City Locations of Tombs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papal States</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rome, 5; Rimini, 2; Forlì, 1; Fano, 1, Montefiorentino, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Venice</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Venice, 3; Padua, 3; Urgnano, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingdom of Naples</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Naples, 4; Salerno, 1; L’Aquila, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Florence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Florence, 3; San Gimignano, 1; Pisa, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchy of Milan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Milan, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquisate of Mantua</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mantua 1, San Benedetto Po, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Lucca</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lucca, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Siena</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Siena, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchy of Savoy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquisate of Saluzzo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquisate of Montferrat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchy of Ferrara</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Genoa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchy of Modena</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Ragusa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingdom of Sicily</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In every one of the major Renaissance “centers,” meaning Venice, Milan, Florence, Rome, and Naples, there was at least one example of a woman’s tomb, and all of the Greenwood Press, 1973); Thomas F. Arnold, *The Renaissance at War*, (New York: Smithsonian Books/Collins, 2006).
major city-states except for Ferrara and Genoa are represented with examples. The presence of women’s tombs in smaller towns and cities, like Amelia, a small hilltop town in Umbria, or Montefiorentino in Le Marche, indicates that women’s tombs were not restricted to a cosmopolitan locale.

Regional distribution of tombs based upon political divisions in the fifteenth century demonstrates that the Papal States, perhaps because they encompassed a vast band of central Italy, contained the largest number of tombs, followed closely by the Republic of Venice, the Kingdom of Naples, and the Republic of Florence. However, the political designation of a given city-state does not seem to have had much of an effect upon whether or not women were commemorated with monumental tombs. Women’s tombs were found in every type of fifteenth-century government, whether republican, despotic, or monarchic. However, in the literature it is understood that differing political situations affected the type of art commissioned there; Florence and Venice are frequently cited for their differences regarding their republican ethos. 103 For example, Catherine King asserts that geographic location and politics played an important role in what was considered “appropriate” to commission, particularly noting that in the republics of Venice and Florence, effigial representation would have been discouraged as antithetical to republican ideals, especially for female patrons, while it was embraced in the feudal traditions of Naples. 104 Or, for another example, Robert Munman asserts that


104 King, _Renaissance Women Patrons_, 3.
the lavishness of Ilaria del Carretto’s tomb could only have been possible under a despotic regime.\textsuperscript{105}

While different city-states might have had different standards as to what was “appropriate” for tomb monuments, women’s tombs, though they might commemorate individuals of lesser social importance, followed these strictures, just like monuments for men. Although the focus of King’s aforementioned observation is actually men’s tombs commissioned by women, it also stands true for women’s tombs, regardless of the gender of their commissioner; monuments for women in Florence and Venice (except for in the cases of saints and \textit{beate}) do not include effigies.

While the type of government in a location seems to have limited effect on the presence of women’s tombs, the type of church, or more precisely, the religious order in residence in a church where a tomb was located, did seem to consistently affect if women were or chose to be buried there. Of the thirty-five monuments examined in this study, twenty-four of women’s tombs are found in mendicant churches. A majority of these, fourteen, were located in Franciscan complexes, seven in Dominican churches, and three in Augustinian edifices.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Tomb Distribution with Regards to Religious Orders}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|}
\hline
Religious Order: & Number of Tombs: \\
\hline
Franciscan & 14 \\
Dominican & 7 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

The reasons for an emphasis on mendicant burial are manifold. The mendicant traditions have been linked to a reinvigoration of art patronage, and the proliferation of mendicant churches, especially the spread of Franciscanism. The second and third mendicant orders, particularly the Franciscans with the Poor Clares, the second Franciscan order for nuns following the rule of Saint Francis and Saint Clare, were outlets for female sanctity and devotion, and offered avenues for women to engage more publicly in their

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Augustinian</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total for Mendicant Orders:</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictines</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallombrosans</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tombs in churches not connected to Orders:</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

communities and in church life. Abbesses and communities of nuns were some of the most prominent female patrons from the Renaissance, and the leaders of these female religious communities, as in the example of Chiara Gambacorti, prioress of San Domenico in Pisa from 1395-1420, were also monumentally commemorated.

Mendicant churches were also compelling locations for tombs because the presence of additional clergy members could add to the pomp and circumstance of funeral corteges, or increase the number of available clergy members to say masses to honor the dead. For example, Franceschina Tron Pesaro, who was buried in a tomb commissioned by her sons in the Franciscan church of Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari in Venice, specifies repeatedly in her multiple wills the absolute necessity of various religious orders, priests, and even a person of “bona fame,” or another “bona chonsienzia,” to pray and say masses for the eternal benefit, as she puts it, of “l’anema mia.” Franceschina’s requests indicate that a concern for masses and clergy to say them was an overriding preoccupation for those considering their eternal souls; burial in mendicant churches might have helped assuage those anxieties. Men were also

---

108 See cat. #3 and for a broader discussion of Chiara Gambacorti and her convent, see Ann Roberts, Dominican Women and Renaissance Art (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2008).
109 Sharon Strocchia, Death and Ritual in Renaissance Florence. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), 100-101. Men were also buried in mendicant churches, though not in the same proportions as women.
110 She calls on a person of “good reputation” and another of “good conscience” to pray for “her soul.” See cat. #21 for a transcription of Franceschina’s will (ASV, Miani, B. 743, no. 72, dated 2 July 1432).
111 Men were also acutely concerned for the fate of their souls and were frequently buried in mendicant churches.
concerned for the fate of their immortal souls, and in this, the commemorative monuments for both genders shared the same function.

**Women’s Monumental Tombs: Where they are Located in their Respective Churches**

Tomb locations inside of their individual churches varied greatly. As noted above tombs were frequently located, as is also typical of monuments for men, in family chapels, but they could also be situated within the broader fabric of the church itself. For example, the tomb of Costanza Ammannati,\(^{112}\) which was originally located in Sant’Agostino, Rome was likely on the transept wall of that church to the left of the central apse.\(^{113}\) Her tomb was also situated adjacent to the chapel containing the tomb of Saint Monica,\(^{114}\) illustrating the common desire to be buried *ad sanctos*.\(^{115}\) An even more blatant example of a woman being buried in the absolute heart of a church is the tomb of Maria Pereira and her daughter Beatrice Camponeschi.\(^{116}\) Their monument, found in the church of San Bernardino, L’Aquila, is on the left wall of the choir of the church, directly adjacent to the high altar and near the elaborate tomb of Saint Bernardino.\(^{117}\) Chiara Gambacorta’s tomb, before it was moved to a more elaborate canopied space on the north

---

\(^{112}\) Cat. #10
\(^{113}\) Meredith J. Gill, ““Remember Me at the Altar of the Lord”: Saint Monica’s Gift to Rome” in *Augustine in Iconography* ed. C. Schnaubelt and Frederick Van Fleteren, (New York: Peter Lang, 1999), 557.
\(^{114}\) Cat. #6. Her son Jacopo Ammannati’s tomb, which functioned as a pendant for Costanza’s monument was located in the mirror position on the other side of the central apse next to the chapel of Saint Niccolò da Tolentino.
\(^{116}\) Cat. #26.
\(^{117}\) For the tomb of San Bernardino see: Nygren, “The Monumental Saint’s Tomb in Italy: 1260-1520,” 276-280.
wall of the choir, was originally situated in front of and below the high altar of San Domenico, Pisa.\(^{118}\) As these examples show, women’s tombs could be and were located in the most sacred areas of churches.

Other examples of the primacy of locations afforded women’s tombs include the monuments of Piccarda Bueri and Franceschina Tron Pesaro.\(^{119}\) Piccarda Bueri’s monument, which is a free-standing, double-tomb she shares with her husband Giovanni di’Bicci, is situated below the vesting table in the Old Sacristy of San Lorenzo. Similarly, Franceschina Tron Pesaro’s tomb is found in the sacristy of Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, Venice. As sacristies played essential roles in the daily liturgical functioning of their churches,\(^{120}\) they were prestigious and particularly coveted places to be buried. The prominent locations occupied by these women’s tombs indicates that though they honored individuals that were generally less socially prominent or powerful than their male relatives, their monuments were not hidden away in the furthest recesses of their churches. Instead, their tombs displayed their memory along with those of men, in the holiest and most desired locations.

**Women’s Monumental Tombs: Women’s Roles and Familial Status**

Generalizations can be made about the familial status of women who were commemorated by monumental tombs. As demonstrated by Table 10, of the thirty-five examples of monumental tombs, twenty-nine women had been married at least once, with

---

\(^{118}\) Roberts, *Dominican Women and Renaissance Art*, 101.

\(^{119}\) Cat. #31 and 21

five of the married honorees having married twice. Of the remaining six women, four were saints or beate; one, Medea Colleoni, was young, and though a plan was in the works for her engagement, she was not yet married; and one, Clemenza Durazzo, was simply unmarried, for reasons that I have not been able to discover.

Table 10.
Marriage Status of Monumental Tomb Honorees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tomb Honoree</th>
<th>Tomb Date</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Widowed at time of death</th>
<th>Status if unmarried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margherita Malatesta</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterina dei Francesi</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilaria del Carretto</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnese and Clemenza Durazzo</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>1383, 1372</td>
<td>Yes x2, No</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
<td>-, Sister to Queen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnese da Mosto Venier</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margherita di Durazzo</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paola Bianca Malatesta</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>Yes x2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisabetta Trenta</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiara Gambacorti</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Abbess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibilia Cetto</td>
<td>1421</td>
<td>1421</td>
<td>Yes x2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccarda Bueri</td>
<td>1433</td>
<td>1433</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isotta degli Atti</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>1474</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Justine</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Villana</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Beata*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malatesta Women</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>1440, 1449</td>
<td>Yes, yes</td>
<td>No, no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vittoria Piccolomini</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Monica</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Manfredi</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year Married</td>
<td>Year Widowed</td>
<td>Widowed?</td>
<td>Survived?</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Catherine of Siena</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medea Colleoni</td>
<td>1467</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Fina</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria of Aragon Piccolomini</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabetta Geraldini</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franceschina Tron Pesaro</td>
<td>1478</td>
<td>1478</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nera Corsi Sassetti</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>1490?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costanza Ammannati</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddalena Orsini</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsibilia Trinci</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Yes x2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camponeschi</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddalena Riccia</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice d’Este</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generosa Orsini</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Beatrice Rusca</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Beata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>Yes x2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Beata Villana became a Dominican Tertiary after her marriage.

Of the thirty-one women who were married, sixteen were widows at the time of their deaths, while fifteen were survived by their husbands. This proportion is different from what we can generally expect of the population of the time. Based upon census information from 1427 in Florence, twenty-five percent of the adult women in that city
were widows, in contrast to four percent of adult men who were widowers.\textsuperscript{121} Widows, particularly if they had no sons, could be in control of their dowries, giving them a financial power that was not typical in the lives of most Renaissance women.\textsuperscript{122} While many of the tombs were commissioned by surviving husbands or sons, a few of the widows here actually acted as the patrons of their own monuments, including Maria Pereira and Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola, a circumstance that will be discussed in greater detail in chapter two of this dissertation. Regardless of the patron, widows who were monumentally commemorated were connected to a public work of art, meaning that their names, faces, and lives were publicly and prominently honored by a visible, monumental sculpture at an equal proportion to that of non-widowed women.\textsuperscript{123} This parity of commemoration between widowed and non-widowed women indicates that a woman did not need to be in the exceptional position of a power and money-wielding widow in order to receive monumental commemoration. Sharon Strocchia’s assertion that the “fundamental human obligation to bury the dead [which] was inextricably bound up with the social imperative to bury them well” did not just apply to humanistically-inclined Florence, but to the Italian peninsula as a whole and did not, therefore, seem to be bounded by gender biases or concerns such as marriage status.\textsuperscript{124}

\textsuperscript{122} King, \textit{Renaissance Women Patrons}, 30 and 76.
\textsuperscript{123} Again, this study is only based on extant monuments. This proportion might be skewed by accidents of survival, however, the exact parity between monuments honoring widows and non-widows suggests that this ratio was likely not dramatically weighted in one direction or the other.
\textsuperscript{124} Strocchia, \textit{Death and Ritual}, 5-6. Strocchia notes that honor, per Leon Battista Alberti, was “the most important” thing in an individual’s life, and that elaborate or conspicuous death rituals were intent upon distributing and maintaining honor for individuals and their families, even in a republic like Florence.
For the women who were not widowed, their cause of death might have contributed to the desire to remember them with monumental sculpture. While cause of death for many of these individuals is difficult to track, and in many cases is not recorded, in three instances where the wife predeceased her husband—Ilaria del Carretto, Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni, and Beatrice d’Este—each of the women died in or following childbirth. A fourth woman, Maria of Aragon Piccolomini, died while still young and of childbearing age. Childbirth was one of the anticipated dangers of a woman’s life; through an analysis of Florentine registers from the early fifteenth century, historians David Herlihy and Christiane Klapisch-Zuber discovered that nearly 20% of recorded deaths for young, married women in that city were related to childbirth.125 Due to the recognized dangers of childbirth, women frequently wrote their wills during pregnancy.126 In a discussion of the tomb of Ilaria del Carretto, Klapisch-Zuber even suggested that it was the “good wife” who died in childbirth, in that she died in the service of her family, and that it was these women in particular who were considered worthy of tombs.127 As marriage and motherhood provided the raison d’être for Renaissance women,128 when a woman died during this physical manifestation of dynasty-building, publicly commemorating her could enhance the family honor and

125 Herlihy and Klapisch-Zuber, Tuscans and their families: a Study of the Florentine Catasto of 1427, 277.
127 Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, “Les femmes et la mort à la fin du moyen age,” in Ilaria del Carretto e il suo monumento, ed. Stéphane Toussaint (Lucca: Edizioni S. Marco Litotipo), 221.
would have been a tangible way to assert a husband and family’s presence in a church, parish, or city.\textsuperscript{129}

**Context Case Study: the Tomb of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni and Women’s Tombs in the 1470-1480s in Rome**

In understanding the prevalence of women’s commemoration it is essential to remember that individual monuments did not exist in a vacuum. It is therefore useful to consider the context in which women’s tombs were situated, in terms of the churches in which they were located and their numbers within a city, to better understand how they fit within general tomb construction trends and patterns at the time. To that end, this chapter will now present a case study examining the context of women’s tombs constructed in the 1470s and 1480s in Rome, with a particular focus on the tomb of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni. Rome is an especially successful place to locate this case study because of the work of Gerald Davies, whose book *Renascence*  *The Sculptured Tombs of the Fifteenth Century in Rome*, written in 1910, serves as a catalogue of extant monuments at the beginning of the twentieth century, an invaluable resource that does not exist for other

\textsuperscript{129} Though four examples over the span of one-hundred years is statistically meager, precluding the possibility of more definitive conclusions, further study of women’s tombs, including slabs and dedicatory plaques without sculpture, could bear out that the statistically high percentage of women who died in childbirth were also among the most frequently remembered by a tomb. In two of the four monuments commemorating women who died in childbirth there were references to their status as honorable mothers and possibly in one instance to her death in childbirth. On the tomb of Maria of Aragon Piccolomini the inscription refers to her three daughters and how little she deserved to die (for more of a discussion of the inscription, see chapter four and for the tomb see cat. #20). In the second instance, though the surviving elements are debatable (and for this debate, see cat. #33), the dismantled tomb of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni likely made reference to her status as mother and possibly to her cause of death. Her effigy was possibly depicted holding her infant child, and her tomb might also have featured a relief panel showing her death and mourners.
locales. The tomb of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni is a representative example of a late-
quattrocento woman’s tomb, in that it was the first commissioned in Rome that
celebrated a laywoman, honored a patrician woman, was commissioned by a surviving
husband, was originally located within a family chapel, and though no longer extant, the
sculptural elements that are associated with the tomb highlight the experimentation that
characterizes women’s tombs from the quattrocento as a whole.

Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni’s tomb is no longer extant, except perhaps in a few
fragments, but it is known that her tomb was located in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, and
construction began on her monument after her death in 1477. Authorship of her tomb has
long been debated; Vasari first attributed it to Verrocchio, and that artist, his workshop,
and the sculptor Mino da Fiesole are variously given credit for the monument in
subsequent scholarship. The Dominican church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva is one of
the most important churches in Rome and was, in the fifteenth century, the primary
church of the Florentine community in that city, presenting a logical burial site for the
Florentine Francesca. The church was a notable liturgical center for the newly
reemerging città eterna, and by the last third of the century, was a major site of chapel
endowments and burials for prominent families and cardinals.

130 For more on this debate see cat. #33. Also see Zuraw, “The Sculpture of Mino da
Fiesole,” 952-971, for the most thorough discussion of this monument. Zuraw
convincingly argues for Mino da Fiesole’s authorship of the tomb.
131 Gerald S. Davies, Renascence: the Sculpted Tombs of the Fifteenth Century in Rome,
275. Following its commission in 1518 by the Medici Pope Leo X, San Giovanni dei
Fiorentini became the primary church for the Florentine community in Rome.
132 Gail Geiger, Filippino Lippi’s Carafa Chapel Renaissance in Rome, volume V of
Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies, ed. Charles G. Nauert, Jr. (Kirksville, Missouri:
Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, Inc., 1986), 10-11. Two papal conclaves were held
there, those for Eugene IV in 1431 and Nicholas V in 1447.
Francesca’s monument is a challenge to discuss formally because so little, if any, of it survives, but there are two works of art that have a long tradition in the literature of being associated with her monument: a relief currently found in the Bargello Museum, Florence (fig. 27), and a drawing in the *Roman Sketchbooks* of Martin van Heemskerck (fig. 37).\footnote{133 Though it is not definitively proven that these two sculptural elements were part of Francesca’s tomb, the circumstantial evidence has led many scholars to link them. For recent discussions of these considerations, see Andrew Butterfield, *The Sculptures of Andrea del Verrocchio* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 237-239; Jacqueline Musacchio, *The Art and Ritual of Childbirth in Renaissance Italy.* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 28-30; Zuraw, “The Sculpture of Mino da Fiesole (1429-1484),” 933-971.} The relief depicts, on the right, a childbirth scene with a woman sitting upright on a classical-looking bier surrounding by figures, many of whom are clearly in mourning because of their rushing and screaming poses, and a now-headless baby held by a midwife. On the left of the relief, the baby is presented to its father, surrounded by mourning figures.\footnote{134 In 1873 Alfred von Reumont first posited the identity of the depicted as Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni because of the link he recognized between Giovanni Tornabuoni’s letter describing his wife’s and child’s deaths in childbirth, and the iconography of the Bargello relief. See Alfred von Reumont, “Il monumento Tornabuoni del Verrocchio,” *Giornale di erudizione artistica* 11 (1873), 167-68.} The Heemskerck drawing is a small sketch of a woman lying on a bed, atop a sarcophagus supported by acanthus scrolls. Lying on the woman’s chest is an infant, a unique and unprecedented\footnote{135 Christian Hülsen and Hermann Egger, *Die römischen Skizzenbücher von Marten van Heemskerck.* (Soest-Holland: Davaco Publishers, 1975), 22.} depiction on a Renaissance tomb monument. The sketch has been associated with the tomb of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni since 1934, when Hermann Egger linked to the Bargello relief and the circumstances of Francesca’s death.\footnote{136 If Francesca’s tomb was indeed comprised of a biographical relief depicting her}
own death and a double effigy, this combination would be unprecedented in fifteenth-century tomb iconography.\textsuperscript{137} This imagery would put the focus of Francesca’s monument on her cause of death, which is not a typical focus for fifteenth-century tombs,\textsuperscript{138} and indicates that the patron and artists of this monument were interested in working out what imagery was appropriate for public commemoration. Francesca’s sudden death, and the depiction of that death and an inclusion of an effigy of her infant child on her tomb, the choice to commemorate her in the town where she currently lived, rather than the town she was from (and where the bulk of her husband Giovanni Tornabuoni’s patronage was located),\textsuperscript{139} and the lack of precedent for monumental tomb, further convincing many scholars that the effigy sketch depicts the tomb of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni. For more see the catalogue entry on this tomb.

\textsuperscript{137} Musacchio, The Art and Ritual of Childbirth in Renaissance Italy, 30, makes the point that the subject matter of this relief is in fact unique in all contemporary Western art, that death in childbirth is not represented in any other medium, whether medical texts, manuscript illuminations, either sacred or secular, or in monumental art.

\textsuperscript{138} Only one other fifteenth-century secular tomb shows a death scene: in the architectural framework of the tomb of Francesco Sassetti. For this tomb see Eve Borsook and Johannes Offerhaus. Francesco Sassetti and Ghirlandaio at Santa Trinità, Florence (Doornspijk, Holland: Davaco Publishers, 1981) and Enrica Cassarino, La Cappella Sassetti nella Chiesa di Santa Trinità. (Lucca: Maria Pacini Fazzi Editore, 1996).

commemoration of a laywoman in Rome all combined into potentially one of the most innovative and experimental tomb monuments for a woman, or a man, in the entire *quattrocento*.140

Francesca’s tomb was located in the Tornabuoni chapel, which also included the tomb of her nephew, Francesco. The chapel, the first on the left upon entering the church, was originally dedicated to St. John the Baptist and may have been the first of its type to include two large-scale marble tombs, frescoed wall decoration, and a painted

---

140 After Francesca’s death the Tornabuoni family continued, but the focus of her husband Giovanni’s patronage and the Tornabuoni family in general remained in Florence. Francesca’s two children, Lorenzo and Ludovica Tornabuoni, prospered. Lorenzo married Giovanna degli Albizzi in 1486, which resulted in a number of extant artistic commissions including the famous Ghirlandaio portrait of Giovanna and a memorial chapel dedicated in her honor (on Lorenzo’s patronage in general, see DePrano, “The Artworks Honoring Giovanna degli Albizzi: Lorenzo Tornabuoni, the Humanism of Poliziano, and the Art of Niccolò Fiorentino and Domenico Ghirlandaio” and the brief entry on this chapel in the supplementary catalogue (A) of this dissertation. Unfortunately, like her mother-in-law, Giovanna degli Albizzi also died in childbirth. Ludovica Tornabuoni married Alessandro di Francesco di Lutozzo Nasi in 1492. We also know that Francesca’s death was remembered with concern by at least one member of her extended family. Clarice Orsini, the wife of Lorenzo, ‘il Magnifico’ de’ Medici, and Francesca’s niece, was pregnant in 1478 and her recollection of Francesca is recorded in a letter by Angelo Poliziano, the humanist tutor in her household in Pistoia. Poliziano wrote to Lorenzo in September 1478, “yesterday evening Clarice was not feeling well. She wrote to your mother that she hopes she will not miscarry, or suffer in the same way that Giovanni Tornabuoni’s wife did.” [Angelo Poliziano, *Prose Volgari inedite e poesie latine e greche edite e inedite*, (Florence, G. Barbèra Editore, 1867): 62. “Madonna Clarice s’è sentita da ierisera in qua un poco chiocca. Scrive lei a Madonna Lucrezia, che dubita di non si sconsciare, o di non avere il male che ebbe la donna di Giovanni Tornabuoni.” Dated 7 September 1478, the letter continues to describe in great detail Clarice’s concerns. Translation from Musacchio, *The Art and Ritual of Childbirth*, 29.] Luckily for Clarice, her pregnancy ended well, resulting in the birth of her youngest son of ten children, Giovanni di Lorenzo de’ Medici, later Duke of Nemours.
altarpiece,\textsuperscript{141} though it was one of a number of chapels dedicated and consecrated in Santa Maria sopra Minerva in the 1470s and 1480s.\textsuperscript{142} The Tornabuoni Chapel remained under the family’s control until it was sold to Fabrizio Nari in 1588, at which point Francesca’s monument was moved to the sacristy, and then dismembered and dispersed, and Francesco’s was relocated to a nave wall.\textsuperscript{143}

The monuments to Francesca Pitti and Francesco Tornabuoni were, of course, not the only fifteenth-century sepulchers constructed in Santa Maria sopra Minerva. Still extant in the church are eleven tombs from that century, mostly from the last twenty-five years.\textsuperscript{144} Due to extensive renovations and the changing ownership of many of the

\textsuperscript{141} Zuraw, “The Sculpture of Mino da Fiesole,” 937. The chapel might have initially been commissioned by Francesco Tornabuoni, but the sudden deaths of Francesca and Francesco might have forced Giovanni Tornabuoni’s patronage.

\textsuperscript{142} Geiger, Filippino Lippi’s Carafa Chapel Renaissance in Rome, 11.


Below is a list of extant fifteenth-century tombs in Santa Maria sopra Minerva. They are listed by their location in individual chapels, beginning on the right side of the church and moving counterclockwise around the church from the entrance wall:

**The Chapel of Saint Raymond of Peñafort**: a small chapel on the right of the nave, sixth from the contrafacciata:

1. Andrea Bregno, Tomb of Juan Diego de Conca, circa 1465

**The Capranica Chapel**: also called the chapel of the most holy Rosary, the Madonna of the Rosary, originally dedicated to the Annunciation, and also dedicated to Saint Catherine of Siena. It is a larger rectangular chapel located directly adjacent to the high altar chapel on the right side.

2. Andrea Bregno, Tomb of Cardinal Domenico Capranica, circa 1466

3. The remains of Saint Catherine of Siena from the 1430s-40s, though her effigy is located at the high altar today, which will be discussed further below.

**The Vestibule, originally Rustici Chapel**: also called the Chapel of Saint Thomas Aquinas, has functioned as the vestibule for the church’s rear entrance since the seventeenth century. It is located directly adjacent to the high altar chapel on the left side:

4. School of Andrea Bregno, Tomb of Agapiro Rustici, 1488

5. School of Andrea Bregno, Tomb of Paolo Rustici, 1488

6. Isaia di Pisa, Tomb of Beato Angelico, 1455

**The Frangipane Chapel**: a small square chapel located directly adjacent to the vestibule on the left side of the transept and high altar chapel. Also known as the Chapel of Saint
fifteenth-century chapels, few tombs remain in their original locations, nor do they wholly reflect their original appearances.\textsuperscript{145} Included among them is the tomb of Saint Catherine of Siena; her remains have been located in Santa Maria sopra Minerva since her death in 1380.\textsuperscript{146} Saint Catherine, canonized by Pope Pius II on 29 June 1461, was an “archetype of female saintliness,”\textsuperscript{147} one of the most widely known and influential female

Mary Madgalen, and originally dedicated to Saint Michael Archangel and Saint Mary Magdalen.\textsuperscript{144}

7. Roman School, Tomb of Giovanni Alberini, 1494. This tomb was moved to the Frangipane chapel in the early twentieth century. It was originally located in the Chapel of Saint Dominic at the end of the left transept opposite the Carafa Chapel. In its original location, it was likely surrounded by other tombs for Alberini family members, which have since been lost.

The Grazioli Lante della Rovere Chapel: a rectangular chapel on the left of the nave, third from the entrance, and directly adjacent to the Tornabuoni chapel. It is also referred to as the Chapel of the most holy Savior, and originally dedicated to Saint Sebastian.

8. School of Andrea Bregno or Mino da Fiesole, Tomb of Agostino Maffei, 1496

9. Roman School, Tomb of Benedetto Maffei, 1494

The Sacred Heart Chapel: the first chapel on the left of the nave from the entrance. It is also called the Chapel of the Resurrection of our Lord, or Saint Mary Magdalen, and originally dedicated to the Assumption.

10. Mino da Fiesole, Tomb of Francesco Tornabuoni, 1480. This tomb is located on the nave wall on the exterior of the chapel to the left, which was likely moved from the former Tornabuoni Chapel in the late sixteenth century.

11. Andrea Bregno and/or Giovanni Dalmata, Tomb of Cardinal Giacomo Tebaldi, 1466. This tomb is also located on the nave wall on the exterior of the chapel to the left. It is above the tomb of Francesco Tornabuoni on the wall.


\textsuperscript{147} Donald Weinstein and Rudolph Bell, \textit{Saints and Society} (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982), 38.
saints from the late Middle Ages and early Renaissance in Italy\textsuperscript{148} and the only major saint interred in Santa Maria sopra Minerva. Excepting Saint Catherine’s tomb, Francesca’s is the only known or extant monument constructed for a woman in this church during the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{149}

The decade in which Francesca’s tomb was constructed, the 1470s was a period of extensive tomb building in Rome, related, in part, to the growing power, prestige, and patronage of the reemerging papal curia, especially during the pontificate of Sixtus IV della Rovere.\textsuperscript{150} After the violence and chaos of the preceding two centuries, the city at the end of the fifteenth century had begun to regain its footing as the capital of the Christian world, resulting in an explosion of art patronage focused on urban restoration, palace and church building, frescoes, and commemorative commissions.\textsuperscript{151} Cardinals asserted their status in the city with the building of churches and palaces, and there was a flourishing of tomb sculpture when clerical tomb patronage gained a momentum in the city that it had not seen for decades.\textsuperscript{152} There was much repetition of type among the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{148} Karen Scott, “Saint Catherine of Siena, “Apostola”” Church History 61.1 (1992): 34-46 and Nygren, “The Monumental Saint’s Tomb in Italy: 1260-1520,” 395. Saint Catherine’s tomb underwent at least three renovations and transformations and it was moved multiple times, but it was originally in the chapel to the right of the choir. In its present state only the fifteenth-century effigy remains, now located below the high altar.
\item \textsuperscript{149} However, other women were interred there later in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
\item \textsuperscript{150} Gill, “The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries,” 80.
\item \textsuperscript{151} Sixtus IV issued a papal bull in 1480 which conferred powers of expropriation to the maestri delle strade, creating a legal demand for the transformation of Rome’s streets and buildings. Elizabeth Macdougall, “Review of Studies in Roman Quattrocento Architecture by Torgil Magnuson” The Art Bulletin 44.1 (1962), 68.
\end{itemize}
cardinal tombs from the 1470s, characterized by a shallow chamber for the effigy and his heraldic devices, spearheaded by the work of sculptor Andrea Bregno and likely based on Tuscan precedents. But within this context of this intensive construction, it is important to acknowledge that not all of the art was being commissioned by or to honor men. Based on extant evidence, in Rome, there were at least eleven tombs constructed for women in the fifteenth century, of which five were flat slabs either affixed to the floor or the wall and six were monumental structures. Furthermore, at least nine tombs honoring women survived from the previous century, all of which were slabs. Extant examples of fifteenth-century women’s tombs:

1. Tomb of Saint Monica, 1455, Sant’Agostino
2. Tomb of Saint Catherine of Siena, 1466, Santa Maria sopra Minerva
3. Tomb of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni, 1477, Santa Maria sopra Minerva (no longer extant)
4. Tomb of Constanza Ammannati, 1480, Sant’Agostino (now located in the courtyards of the Palazzo dell’Avvocatura Generale dello Stato)
5. Tomb of Maddalena Orsini, 1480, San Salvatore in Lauro (now in the refectory)
6. Tomb of Carlotta of Cyprus, Vatican Grottoes.


Seymour, Sculpture in Italy 1400 to 1500, 161.

This number is based on a thorough review of Gerald S. Davies, Renascence. The Sculptured Tombs of the Fifteenth Century in Rome, (London: John Murray: 1910).

Davies, Renascence. The Sculptured Tombs of the Fifteenth Century in Rome, passim. Counting the tombs listed in Davies reveals a number of extant quattrocento tombs in Rome in 1910 at over 100, accounting for losses over the centuries it would not be surprising if the number of tombs constructed in the city in the fifteenth century were several hundred.

The first four of these monuments are examined in this dissertation, while the fifth, the tomb for Carlotta of Cyprus, can be found in supplementary catalogue (B). Carlotta of Cyprus was a deposed queen in exile in Rome at her death. For more see Ferdinand Gregorovious, History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 267, 707.
In Rome, there were two cases where secular women were buried in the same church as a female saint: Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni in Santa Maria sopra Minerva with Saint Catherine of Siena and Costanza Ammannati in Sant’Agostino with Saint Monica. It is possible that the flourishing cults of these two female saints encouraged or in some manner paved the way for the two monumental tombs honoring secular women that were subsequently constructed in the same churches. Meredith Gill has argued convincingly that in the sixteenth century at Sant’Agostino, the presence of Saint Monica’s relics was the impetus for the construction of many tombs honoring women, and that this trend had begun almost immediately upon the construction of Saint Monica’s tomb in 1455. The presence of a female saint’s tomb marked the church as a locus of women’s religiosity and devotion and acted as a gateway of sorts for other women’s commemoration. This notion is in line with the general trend of women’s tombs being more common in prestigious mendicant churches, which supported orders in which women could officially participate in religious life, possibly opening up space for their public commemoration as well.

In the 1470s and 1480s in Rome, the construction of women’s tombs expanded, right along with the construction of the rest of the city. But this period in women’s tomb development is also a key moment in illustrating the formal experimentation that was a

---

157 Gill, “Remember Me at the Altar of the Lord’: Saint Monica’s Gift to Rome,” 555-556. The choice of Sant’Agostino for her tomb was likely not made by Costanza, or even Jacopo Ammannati, the primary patron of her tomb. Rather, Pope Sixtus IV rejected Jacopo’s request for his own tomb to be placed in Saint Peter’s in favor of the newly constructed church of Sant’Agostino. It is possible that the presence of the cult of Saint Monica and its function as a site of female devotion might have influenced Sixtus’ choice of Sant’Agostino for Costanza’s and Jacopo’s tombs. See Zuraw, “The Sculpture of Mino da Fiesole, 1029.

158 See Table 9 for data on this phenomenon.
major component of women’s commemoration in the fifteenth century. The three tombs constructed for women in the city during this period—the tombs of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni, Costanza Ammannati and Maddalena Orsini—all show how women’s tombs could be sites for innovation with regard to their sculptural components.\textsuperscript{159} Other women’s tombs in different cities also illustrate this phenomenon, for example, the tomb of Ilaria del Carretto with its supposed combination of styles and its pioneering reuse of classical \textit{putti} on the sides of the sarcophagus;\textsuperscript{160} or the tomb of Saint Fina, whose monument unusually combines a tomb, an altarpiece, and a reliquary tabernacle.\textsuperscript{161} Maria of Aragon Piccolomini’s tomb chapel in Naples is a nearly exact copy of the chapel of the Cardinal of Portugal in Florence (fig. 38), providing a fascinating case study of the conscious copying of an earlier monument; even the same artists were involved.\textsuperscript{162} Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camoneschi’s tomb has the unique distinction of including an effigy of a toddler, but the form of the monument as a whole is in a very traditional ‘humanist’ mode.\textsuperscript{163} I focus here on the monument of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni because the sculptural choices that were made emphasize more than any other monument,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{160} See cat. #15.
\item \textsuperscript{161} See cat. #22.
\item \textsuperscript{162} See cat. #20.
\item \textsuperscript{163} See cat. #26. This form of tomb is discussed earlier in this chapter, but in brief, a “humanist tomb” is a monument situated within an arch referring to classical triumphal arches. They originated with the tombs of Leonardo Bruni and Carlo Marsuppini in Florence, and proliferated as a type throughout the peninsula.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Francesca’s specific role as a mother within the wider function of dynastic commemoration that was typical of all tombs.

**Conclusion**

As the above data and analysis show, women’s monumental tombs were much more common than has yet been acknowledged. At the beginning of the fifteenth century, we have evidence for fewer extant women’s tombs, but those that were constructed overwhelming honored the wives or family members of rulers. After 1450, the number of extant tombs sharply increases and a broader range of still elite, but non-ruling women begin to be memorialized in greater proportion. While it is useful to see how women’s tombs fall into the traditional categories of wall, floor, and free-standing monuments, and how they typically follow the ratios set for those categories for male monuments, it can also be instructive to examine whether women’s tombs were independent or double tombs, and where they were located in relation to the tombs of other members of their families. Rarely are extant women’s tombs found within groupings of monuments honoring natal families. They are much more frequently located within the confines of marital memory, consistent with earlier traditions of emphasizing dynastic and genealogical concerns, either in a double tomb, a shared chapel, or adjacent to a husband’s monument. The exceptional instances where this is not the case, particularly the tomb for Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camioneschi, will be examined more thoroughly in a later chapter on patronage. Women’s tombs followed stylistic patterns typical of the fifteenth century and were clearly in dialogue with tombs constructed for men with regard to broader patterns in commemoration. Tombs with “gothicizing” stylistic
elements were constructed until roughly 1433, while tombs that utilized a “classicizing” vocabulary dominated after that year, and in four instances, women were commemorated by the so-called “humanist tomb.”

Women’s tombs are found in every major Renaissance center, with a concentration in the papal states, Tuscany, and the Veneto, but monuments are also located in much more rural areas, demonstrating that functional values of women’s commemoration were not limited to so-called Renaissance centers. There are no known extant monuments found on the fringes of the peninsula, either to the north or south, or on Sicily or Sardinia; this could be a coincidence of survival, or a historiographical problem because biases and limitations in the literature potentially allow tombs to continue to be overlooked. The government of the location where a woman’s tomb was located, whether duchy, republic, theocratic elective monarchy, or political monarchy, does not seem to have had an effect on whether or not women could be publicly commemorated, though women’s tombs followed patterns of “appropriateness” with regard to their appearance in each city-state. Location truly seemed to matter more for women’s tombs in terms of the churches they were located in, with a full two-thirds of monuments located in mendicant churches.

A woman’s marital status does not seem to have had an exclusive effect on whether or not she received monumental commemoration after her death; widows were memorialized in the same proportion as women who predeceased their husbands. Following in the footsteps of ruler commissions, which utilized women’s monuments to the same end as men’s, to demonstrate family genealogy and dynastic continuation—after 1450 and the broadening of women’s tombs to a wider population, patricians seem to
have begun to do the same thing. This development in women’s tomb monuments
follows the same pattern as can be seen in panel portraits and portrait busts, two other
areas in which women were the regular subjects of art, which will be discussed in much
greater detail in chapter three of this dissertation.

Finally, as shown by the contextual examination of the tomb of Francesca Pitti
Tornabuoni, women’s commemoration fell into broader trends of memorialization; as
tombs (and other building) patronized by men increased in Rome, so did the construction
of tombs celebrating women. But within this framework, it also becomes clear that
women’s tombs could be sites for formal experimentation and innovation.

“The Renaissance” has long been associated, both in scholarly discourse and
popular imagination, with monuments that directly and concretely demonstrate the re-
birth of classical antiquity, like equestrian monuments. But there are also categories of
monuments, like women’s tombs, that were actually built in much greater numbers and
all over Italy, which have not only been ignored but believed not to exist. Women’s
tombs are a clear case of another very public and important cultural expression that
reveals as much about cultural norms in the *quattrocento* as their more famous equestrian
counterparts. As my chapter has shown and this dissertation will further develop, contrary
to much of Renaissance scholarship’s insistence, there are a number of *significant* tombs
for women from the fifteenth century.
Chapter Two. Confirming and Confounding Expectations: Patronage of Women’s Monumental Tombs

“The way in which women’s options were restricted, while men’s were free-ranging is evident also in the gendering of funerary and votive portraiture. Laymen commissioned the full range of effigial sculpture for themselves and other men, depending on their status. These sculptures included full-size effigies resting on top of a bier, seated or standing portraits beneath a canopy, portrait busts included niches and portraits in low relief on floor slabs. A few women commissioned these things for men, but not for themselves. A tiny number of laywomen gave themselves an effigy on a floor slab, or on the side of a tomb chest. No laywoman to my knowledge commissioned a portrait bust for herself or another woman at this period, and laywomen paid for a full-length effigy of a woman as if lying on the top of a tomb only when the woman commemorated was regarded as a saint.”

“In general, the number of tombs commemorating women is, not surprisingly, rather small. In almost every case, they are associated with an important male patron unless the woman was a figure of political import. …The only extant large-scale tombs [for women] were commissioned by sons or husbands.”

While Catherine King’s study Renaissance Women Patrons is fundamental in establishing the impact of women’s patronage in Renaissance Italy, she incorrectly generalizes about when and how women commissioned tombs. Though the phenomenon of women patronizing their own tombs or those for other women is rare, it did occur at least twice in the fifteenth century. Margherita di Durazzo commissioned a double-effigy tomb for her sisters Agnese and Clemenza di Durazzo in Santa Chiara, Naples, and

---

164 Catherine King, Renaissance Women Patrons, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), 7 (emphasis mine). That King makes this generalization in a book devoted to women’s patronage in the Renaissance shows how pervasive the lack of understanding of women’s tomb monuments is.
166 See cat. #23.
Maria Pereira commissioned a full-length effigy of herself and her fifteen-month-old daughter Beatrice Campeseschi located directly adjacent to the high altar of the church of San Bernardino, L’Aquila.\(^{167}\) In all, including the previous two cases, there were six instances (out of thirty-five monuments, or 17 percent) where women were involved to some extent in the commissioning of their own tombs of varying types, appearances, and in diverse locations. And while women patronized their own tombs six times, the patrons of other monuments were certainly not limited, as Shelley Zuraw states, to sons and husbands. Two women commissioned tombs for other individuals, so in fact, women were involved in the patronage, whether for their own monuments or that of a relative, in eight examples of the tombs in this study. Among the tombs commissioned by men, patronage was far from limited to sons and husbands. Men who were neither the son nor husband of the deceased patronized tombs in three instances; overall, eleven of thirty-five (or 31 percent) of the tombs in this study were commissioned by an individual who was neither the son nor the husband of the deceased.\(^{168}\)

---

\(^{167}\) See cat. #26.

Monumental tombs were huge undertakings in terms of the cost, labor, and time involved in their creation, in addition to their impact on the interior appearance and space of their church locations. Therefore, understanding the patronage of these monuments is essential to comprehending how they functioned within the broader framework of creating public memory through works of art in the fifteenth century. Because of the breadth and diversity of the monuments studied in this dissertation, crafting a definitive statement about the patronage of all the tombs is not possible, yet patronage of women’s tombs can be divided into two large categories. The first is what I refer to as internal patronage, or patronage that is enacted by family members, and the second is external patronage, or commissions motivated by individuals outside of the tomb honoree’s family. Women’s tombs are overwhelmingly examples of internal patronage: thirty-one of the thirty-five tombs were commissioned internally. Of the six tombs that were commissioned externally, religious or civic institutions or individuals were responsible for all of them.

The broad category of internal patrons can be further divided into three subdivisions, patronage by the tomb honoree’s husband (conjugal patronage), another relative (familial patronage), and self-patronage. In a few instances, a monument had two or more patrons, demonstrating that the boundaries between these subdivisions and categories were permeable. This chapter elucidates the differing approaches to patronage of women’s monumental tombs and outlines the reasons for which they acted as patrons. The analysis begins with a broad introduction to women’s tomb patronage, including an

---

Studies, 1988), 369-377. Suffice it to say that laws varied greatly and that there were frequent exceptional cases.

169 Men’s tombs as well are mainly commissioned by family members.
examination of the sole concrete documentation available for such patronage: tomb inscriptions and, in two cases, the extant contracts for two women’s tombs.\textsuperscript{170} A brief review of how motivations for patronage of women’s tombs have been handled in the scant literature will follow. The chapter then examines the two broad categories of patronage (internal and external) and their subdivisions, including identifying trends and patterns, but also delineating differences regarding the social standing, geographical locations, and tomb inscriptions within each category of patronage. Based on these analyses it can be concluded that women’s monumental tombs were patronized for exactly the same reasons that men’s tombs were created: public recognition and fame for a family through the emphasis on the virtues of one of their members; display of wealth and taste in art through the commissioning of monumental public sculpture; and the crafting of memory of a specific individual.

**General Overview of Women’s Tomb Patronage**

The commissioning of a monumental sculpted tomb is an expensive, time-consuming undertaking. While the precise construction dates of many fifteenth-century women’s tombs are difficult to pin down based on the near-complete lack of specific documentation, it can be assumed that many of these monuments took more than a year to construct. Some of the larger and more complex monuments, like the tomb chapel of

\textsuperscript{170} Though it is almost certain that contracts existed for most, if not all, of these tombs, only two contracts are known today, which will be discussed later in this chapter. However, other documentary evidence relating to these tombs includes letters, wills, requests for masses, and early descriptions, but for each monument the survival rate for these types of documents varies greatly. These documents are listed or transcribed in each individual tomb’s catalog entry.
Maria of Aragon Piccolomini, possibly took decades.\textsuperscript{171} Since tombs could take many years to erect at considerable cost, the decision to commission a monument was not undertaken lightly. The patrons of thirty-three of the thirty-five tombs in this study are known, while it can be reasonably assumed that the occupant’s husband acted as patron for the remaining three tombs.\textsuperscript{172} Table 11 provides an overview of the patronage of women’s monumental tombs.

\textbf{Table 11. Patrons of Women’s Monumental Tombs}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tomb Honoree</th>
<th>Patron(s)</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Internal or External - Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Margherita Malatesta (fig. 1)</td>
<td>Francesco Gonzaga</td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>Internal - Conjugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Caterina dei Francesi (fig. 2)</td>
<td>Caterina dei Francesi</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Internal - Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ilaria del Carretto (fig. 3)</td>
<td>Paolo Guinigi</td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>Internal - Conjugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Agnese and Clemenza Durazzo (fig. 4)</td>
<td>Margherita di Durazzo</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Internal - Familial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Agnese da Mosto Venier (fig. 5)</td>
<td>Agnese da Mosto Venier, Niccolò Venier</td>
<td>Self and son</td>
<td>Internal - Self and Familial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Margherita di Durazzo (fig. 6)</td>
<td>Ladislaus of Naples</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Internal - Familial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Paola Bianca Malatesta (fig. 7)</td>
<td>Pandolfo III Malatesta</td>
<td>Husband?</td>
<td>Internal - Conjugal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{171} There are many reasons why it takes a long time to construct a funerary monument, including practical concerns like the other work that the artist is pursuing at the same time, or waiting for materials. Regardless, tombs are time- and resource-consuming objects to commission.

\textsuperscript{172} This assumption is made based upon the inscriptions on the monuments, which include references to the tomb occupants’ husbands and no reference to a patron. These three assumed cases are indicated by the attribution of patronage to “Husband?” in Table 11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Lisabetta Trenta</td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td></td>
<td>Internal - Conjugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lorezo Trenta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Chiara Gambacorta</td>
<td>Community at San Domenico</td>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(fig. 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Sibilia Cetto (fig. 11)</td>
<td>Sibilia Cetto</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Internal - Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Picarda Bueri (fig. 9)</td>
<td>Cosimo and Lorenzo de’Medici</td>
<td>Sons</td>
<td>Internal - Familial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Isotta degli Atti (fig. 10)</td>
<td>Sigismondo Malatesta</td>
<td>Husband and Self</td>
<td>Internal - Conjugal and Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Husband and Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Saint Justine (fig. 13)</td>
<td>Officials of Santa Giustina, Padua</td>
<td>Unrelated individuals</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Beata Villana (fig. 22)</td>
<td>Villana delle Botte and Fra Sebastiano di Iacopo di Rosso Benintendi</td>
<td>Niece and grandson</td>
<td>Internal - Familial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Malatesta Women (fig. --)</td>
<td>Sigismondo Malatesta</td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>Internal - Conjugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Vittoria Piccolomini (fig. 14)</td>
<td>Eneas Silvio Piccolomini</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Internal - Familial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Saint Monica (fig. 23)</td>
<td>Maffeo Vegio, Giovanna (last name unknown), Maria de Cincis</td>
<td>Unrelated individuals</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Barbara Manfredi (fig. 15)</td>
<td>Pino III Odelaffi</td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>Internal - Conjugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Saint Catherine of Siena (fig. 24)</td>
<td>Saint Antoninus of Florence, Cardinal Angelo Capranica</td>
<td>Unrelated individuals</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Medea Colleoni (fig. 16)</td>
<td>Bartolommeo Colleoni</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Internal - Familial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Saint Fina (fig. 25)</td>
<td>General Council of San Gimignano</td>
<td>Unrelated individuals</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Maria of Aragon Piccolomini (fig. 17)</td>
<td>Antonio Piccolomini Todeschini and Alfonso II of Naples</td>
<td>Husband and half-brother</td>
<td>Internal - Conjugal and Familial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Husband and half-brother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Elisabetta Geraldini (fig. 26)</td>
<td>Giovanna, Angelo, Barndardo, Battista, and Girolamo Geraldini</td>
<td>Sons</td>
<td>Internal - Familial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- **Husband:** The individual is married to another person.
- **Self:** The individual is their own reference point.
- **Unrelated individuals:** The individual is not related to other individuals in the table.
- **Niece and grandson:** The individual is a niece or grandson.
- **Sons:** The individual has at least one son.
- **Father:** The individual is the father of another person.
- **Son:** The individual is a son of another person.
- **Unrelated individuals:** The individual has no direct relationship with anyone else in the table.
- **Niece and grandson:** The individual is a niece or grandson of another person.
- **Sons:** The individual has at least one son.
- **Father:** The individual is the father of another person.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name and Details</th>
<th>Commissioned By</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Patronage Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni (fig. 27)</td>
<td>Giovanni Tornabuoni</td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>Internal - Conjugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Franceschina Tron Pesaro (fig. 28)</td>
<td>Niccolo, Benedetto, and Marco Pesaro</td>
<td>Sons</td>
<td>Internal - Familial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Nera Corsi Sassetti (fig. 29)</td>
<td>Francesco Sassetti</td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>Internal - Conjugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Costanza Ammannati (fig. 30)</td>
<td>Jacopo Ammannati and Pope Sixtus IV.</td>
<td>Son, with directives from the Pope</td>
<td>Internal - Familial and External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Maddalena Orsini (fig. 31)</td>
<td>Rinaldo Orsini di Monterotondo</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Internal - Familial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Marsibilia Trinci (fig. 18)</td>
<td>Carlo Oliva</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Internal - Familial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camponeschi (fig. 19)</td>
<td>Maria Pereira</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Internal - Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Maddalena Riccia (fig. 32)</td>
<td>Alessandro Riccia?</td>
<td>Husband?</td>
<td>Internal - Conjugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Beatrice d’Este (fig. 20)</td>
<td>Ludovico Sforza</td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>Internal - Conjugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Generosa Orsini (fig. 33)</td>
<td>Luca Zen?</td>
<td>Husband?</td>
<td>Internal - Conjugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Beata Beatrice Rusca (fig. 34)</td>
<td>Antonia Rusca</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>Internal - Familial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola (fig. 21)</td>
<td>Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Internal - Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table shows, thirty of the monuments are examples of internal patronage, while six are examples of external patronage, and four tombs span two different types of patronage groups. For the tombs resulting from internal patronage, thirteen were commissioned by the subject’s husband (conjugal patronage), thirteen were commissioned by other family members (familial patronage), and six were examples of...
self-patronage (though sometimes in conjunction with others). The six examples of external patronage were all for monuments to saints or to pious individuals. A closer examination of these groups of patronage will be provided later in this chapter.

Geographically and politically, there are no distinct patterns to the patronage; instead, patterns emerge based upon the life-stage of the tomb honoree. Overwhelmingly, tombs were commissioned for women whose life-stage could be characterized as that of wife or mother, though it bears repeating that this fact does not necessarily mean that husbands and sons were the default patrons for women’s tombs. Twenty-six of the sepulchers studied here commemorated women who could be identified primarily as a wife or mother. Certain further patterns emerge regarding the patronage of these tombs. Those commissioned by the occupant’s husband all tended to commemorate women who died young, nearly all of them predeceasing their husbands.\(^{173}\) This is particularly common for women who died in or following childbirth like Ilaria del Carretto, Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni, and Beatrice d’Este. Generally, the individuals who had other family members as patrons of their monuments were older women, meaning with adult children, or widows when they died. All except one of the women who commissioned their own monuments were widows.\(^{174}\) Only one tomb was commissioned by the occupant’s parent for a young, unmarried laywoman, that of Medea Colleoni.\(^{175}\) She died

\(^{173}\) Isotta degli Atti is an exception, as she died six years after her husband, Sigismondo Malatesta. Isotta was likely involved in the planning and commissioning of her tomb chapel, which will be discussed further below. There is no extant instance where a husband made provision for his surviving wife’s commemoration in his will.

\(^{174}\) Isotta degli Atti is again an exception, and her case will be examined in much greater detail below.

\(^{175}\) The tomb of Maria Pereira, which includes an effigy of her daughter, Beatrice Camponeschi, is, in certain respects, an exception to this statement, which will be examined in more depth later in this chapter.
un-wed in her early teenage years\textsuperscript{176} and her father, Bartolommeo Colleoni commissioned her tomb. Generally, extant monumental tombs for children are exceedingly rare; Although Anita Moskowitz focused on the period preceding the \textit{quattrocento} and expressed surprise that despite high infant mortality\textsuperscript{177} there are not more of them.\textsuperscript{178}

**Patronage in Tomb Inscriptions**

The patronage of a monument is very frequently a feature of the tomb’s inscription and can be considered concrete documentation of the commission in instances where the patron explicitly takes credit for the tomb in the epitaph. For example, on the

\textsuperscript{176} Negotiations for Medea’s marriage to Duke Galeazzo Maria Sforza of Milan were ongoing at the time of her death. For more see cat. #9.


slab tomb for Franceschina Tron Pesaro, located in the chapel dedicated to her memory in the sacristy of Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, Venice, the inscription reads:

Niccolo, Benedetto, and Marco Pesaro, sons of Pietro and Venetian nobles, set up [this monument] for their most pious mother Franceschina Tron, and for themselves and their descendants, in the year of health 1478, on the 2nd of June.\(^\text{179}\)

Franceschina Tron Pesaro’s inscription is informative without many descriptive or laudatory adjectives. It emphasizes straightforwardly the roles of the patrons, Franceschina’s sons, Niccolo, Benedetto, and Marco, in the construction of her tomb, listing them first, and naming their father prior to mentioning the name of the tomb’s occupant. The inscription gives credit to her sons above all, which is not atypical for tomb inscriptions honoring individuals of either gender.\(^\text{180}\)

The tomb of Beata Beatrice Rusca in Sant’Angelo de’Frari in Milan offers another example of a patron taking direct credit for a tomb in the inscription. Beatrice’s daughter claims patronage rights for the tomb, though she saves mention of her involvement for the end of the epitaph, putting the emphasis more squarely on the deceased:

Here lies Beatrice, the shining jewel of the Rusca family, who was married to Count Francino. When she was left a widow, the sacred Franciscan Order sustained her in wonderful chastity under the shelter of your wings, and the Third Order provided her with a regime for living such that she rejoices with God among those on high now that her deeds have been

\(^\text{179}\) FRANCESCHINAE TRO(N). PIENTI / SSIMAE MATRI NICHOLAUSTR BE / NEDICTUS ET MARCHUS PIASU / RI PETRII PATRICII VEN(EI). SIBII / QUE ET POSTERIS / POSUERE / MCCCLXXVIII AN(N)O SALUTI(S) / QUARTO / NONAS IUNII. I thank Benjamin Eldredge for the translation of this inscription.

\(^\text{180}\) A comparison between references to patronage in inscriptions on women’s tombs versus those on tombs for men follows this section.
blessed. Antonia Rusca, wife of Giovanni Maria Visconti, dedicated this to her mother Beatrice in 1499.\textsuperscript{181}

Though here mentioned after the deceased, the patron’s role in the construction of the tomb is in this occasion visually set apart from the rest of the laudatory inscription, for the last sentence is separated from the rest by an empty line and is composed of smaller letters. The arrangement thus succeeds in placing most of the honor of the monument onto the Beata Beatrice, while still permitting Antonia Rusca to reflect glory onto herself by separating out her role in its creation.

The inscription on the tomb of Beata Beatrice Rusca is, thus, unique among those memorializing \textit{quattrocento} female saints and beate in that it does recognize an individual commissioner. The other tombs for holy women focus exclusively on identifying their occupant without listing the patron, as on the tomb for the Beata Villana in Santa Maria Novella, Florence:

\begin{quote}
The bones of the most saintly woman Villana rest in this celebrated tomb.\textsuperscript{182}
\end{quote}

Or, they use even fewer laudatory adjectives in order to remain strictly factual, as on the tomb of Saint Catherine of Siena in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome:

\begin{quote}
Saint Catherine Virgin of Siena of the Saintly Order of Dominican Penitents.\textsuperscript{183}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{182} OSSA VILLANE MULIERIS SANCTISSIME / IN HOC CELEBRI TUMULO REQUIESCINT (Translation mine).
And yet female saints’ tomb inscriptions were not entirely limited to the bare minimum of identification. For example, the longer inscription on the tomb of Saint Fina in the Collegiata, San Gimignano reads:

Pilgrim, in this tomb rest the bones of a Virgin, Protector and the Glory, always a great example to her people. Fina was her name, and this her homeland. Do you seek miracles? See what the walls and lifelike statues teach.\textsuperscript{184}

The inscription rather poetically acknowledges that Saint Fina was a protector of her city and her bones a center for pilgrimage. However, the city officials who commissioned her tomb, which was part of a broader program of civic patronage intended to promote San Gimignano’s local saints and bolster their municipal identity,\textsuperscript{185} do not take credit in any way for its construction. Perhaps patrons were satisfied with the knowledge that their sculptural commemoration of a saint would receive divine approbation, but felt that taking literal, set-in-stone recognition for crafting saintly memory was a step too far.\textsuperscript{186}

In other situations, however, individuals confidently took credit in inscriptions for tombs that they were not wholly responsible for commissioning. For example, on the

\textsuperscript{183} SANCTA CATERINA VIRGO DE SENIS ORDINIS SANCTI DOMINICIDE PENITENTIA (Translation mine).
\textsuperscript{186} For an in-depth discussion of the motivations patronizing a saint’s tomb, see Barnaby Robert Nygren, “The Monumental Saint’s Tomb in Italy,” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1999), 161-219.
tomb of Agnese da Mosto Venier, in Santi Giovanni e Paolo, Venice, her son Nicolo
takes credit for the construction of the tomb, though we know from Agnese’s multiple
extant wills that she made provisions and requests regarding her burial. The inscription
reads:

1410 and 1411. Nicolo Venier, a great man born from the illustrious
Venier lineage, who you, Antonio, famous doge of Venice, begat,
constructed this lofty tomb where your illustrious consort distinguished
dear dogaressa Agnes lies, and now together with Petronilla, generous
former duchess from the archipelago, and wife, with whom also lies her
kind daughter Ursula, whom the ruler of Olympus seized before her time,
and his whole family, completing the travel, will call [him] to the heavens,
these members [of his family] who rest together.

Nicolo likely served as an executor of his mother’s will and might consequently have
been involved in the tomb’s creation, thus perhaps having legitimate grounds to consider
himself a patron or contributor. Holly Hurlburt notes that, despite the active approach
Agnese took to her own commemoration by addressing it in her wills, the epitaph
presents her as, “entirely passive, an object on which her male relatives act.”

---

187 For a discussion of Agnese’s wills, see Holly Hurlburt, “Individual Fame and Family
Honor: The Tomb of Dogaressa Agnese da Mosto Venier,” in Widowhood and Visual
For a partial transcription of her wills see cat. #24.
188 DE MCCCCX E DE MCCCCXI / HUNC NICOLAUS VIR MAGNUS ORIGINE
CLARA / VENERIO GENITUS TUMULUM CONSTRUXIT IN ALTUM / ANTONI
VENETUM DUX INCLITE QUEM GENUISTI / QUO IACET ILLUSTRIS CONUINX
TUA CLARA DUCISSA / AGNES INSIGNINS IAM PETRONELLA SEPULTA EST
ILLIUS ET QUONDAM GENEROSA DUCISSA IUGALIS / EX ARCHIPELAGO
QUA CUM SUA NATA BENIGNA / URSULA IUNCTA IACET QUA MORS
INFUNUS ACERBN / ANTE DIEM RAPUIT CUMQUE ILLUM RECTOR OLIAMI
ET GENUS OMNE SUUM COMPLETO CALLE VOCABIT / AS SUPERUM PATRII
SIMUL HEC SUA MEMBRA QUIESCENT. (Translation, Hurlburt, “Individual Fame
and Family Honor,” 143).
189 Holly Hurlburt, “Individual Fame and Family Honor: the Tomb of Dogaressa Agnese
da Mosto Venier,” 143.
In other instances, the names of the patrons of the tomb are included in the inscriptions without explicitly assigning credit to them for the monument’s construction. In these cases, the inscriptions instead emphasize the patron’s familial relationship to the deceased. In the inscription from the tomb of Maria of Aragon Piccolomini, her relationship to one of the patrons of her monument, her husband Antonio Piccolomini, is listed, as is her lineage, for she was the illegitimate daughter of King Ferrante of Naples:

You who read these words, do so in a low voice lest you wake the sleeper. Mary of Aragon, a child of King Ferdinand, is enclosed within. She married the stalwart Duke of Amalfi, Antonio Piccolomini, to whom she left three daughters as a witness of their mutual love. One can believe she is sleeping, for she little deserved to die. She lived 20 years. In the year of our lord 1470.\footnote{190}

In a few cases, the patron is not mentioned in the inscription at all. For example, take the tomb of Agnese and Clemenza di Durazzo, located in Santa Chiara, Naples, which was commissioned by their younger sister Margherita of Durazzo, who was at the time the Queen Regent of Naples and Hungary:

Here lies the bodies of these illustrious ladies, Lady Agnese of France, empress of Constantinople, and the virgin Lady Clemenza of France, daughter of the erstwhile Prince and illustrious lord, the Lord Carlo of France, Duke of Durazzo, let their souls Rest in Peace.\footnote{191}

\footnote{190} QUI LEGIS SUMMISIUS LEGAS NE DORMIENTEM EXCITES / REGE FERDINANDO ORTA MARIA ARAGONA HIC CLAUSA EST / NUPSIT ANTONIO PICCOLOMINEO AMALFAE DULCI STRENUO / CUI RELIQUIT TREIS FILIAS PIGNUS AMORIS MUTUI / PUELLAM QUIESCERE CREDIBILE EST QUAE MORI DIGNA NON FUIT / VIX AN XX / AD MCCCCLXX. (Translation: George L. Hersey, \textit{Alfonso II and the Artistic Renewal of Naples 1485-1495} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969), 111). Maria’s half-brother Alfonso II, who later became King of Naples can also be credited with patronizing Maria’s tomb.

With this inscription Margherita lauds her sisters and recognizes their relationship to their deceased father, but takes no credit for the monument herself. This potential modesty offers a contrast with her own monument, whose inscription includes the name of its commissioner, her son King Ladislaus of Naples.

Another example of an inscription that gives no credit to the patron, but also does not mention any relationship to male individuals, is that on the tomb of Isotta degli Atti at San Francesco, Rimini. Her inscription reads:

To the deserved Honor of the Divine (or Lady) Isotta of Rimini 1450

This inscription is unique among those from fifteenth-century women’s tombs in that it does not reference anyone or anything else and only functions to laud the deceased. Its economy of words is perhaps surprising in relation to the otherwise excessive references to Sigismondo Malatesta made throughout the rest of Isotta’s chapel and San Francesco. These include Sigismondo’s elephant emblem, which is visible on her tomb, and the “S I” monograms, meaning Sigismondo and Isotta, that also feature prominently throughout the building. Perhaps based on these other references to Sigismondo, it was already obvious

German: Nicolas Bock, Kunst am Hofe der Anjou-Durazzo (Munich and Berlin: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2001), 441. Translation from German to English, mine).

192 Charles, Duke of Durazzo and Count of Gravina, who had died in 1348.

193 See cat. #1. Interestingly, Margherita di Durazzo’s tomb is one of only a few women’s tombs from the quattrocento that is signed by its creator. Antonio Baboccio and his assistant Alessio di Vico claim authorship of the tomb with the following signature: AB[B]AS ANTONIUS BABOSUS DE PI[PE]RNO M[E] FEC[IT] / CU[M] AL[E]SSIO D[E] VICO SUO LABORANTE. See chapter four for a more detailed discussion of artist’s signatures on women’s tombs.

194 D[IVAE or OMINAE]. ISOTTAE. ARIMINENSI. B[ENE]. M[ERENTI]. SACRVM. MCCCCL (Translation Mine). This inscription is actually repeated three separate times on Isotta’s tomb: on the lid, base, and the bronze plaque on the front.
enough that he was involved in her tomb patronage. Regardless, Isotta’s inscription is
distinctively succinct in its laudatory references to her and her alone.

This inscription on Isotta’s tomb is also notable for another reason: Pope Pius II explicitly objected to its phrasing. Pius II was under the impression that the “D.” at the beginning of the inscription could be interpreted as “DIVAE” meaning “divine” rather than “DOMINAE” meaning “lady,” and the pope considered this inappropriate for a woman he later referred to as Sigismondo’s “conubina.” Fritz Saxl suggests that Isotta’s 1450 inscription is so “unchristian” that the pope’s objections to it are completely understandable. Isotta’s inscription from 1450 actually covers an earlier inscription in her honor, which like its later iteration praises her even more extravagantly without reference to anyone else:

To Isotta of Rimini, by her beauty and virtue the honor of Italy. 1446

The extraordinary patronage of Isotta’s tomb chapel will be discussed in more depth later in this chapter, but the two inscriptions on her tomb show that, while the patron(s) of her tomb were not inclined to claim credit for the monument, they were not any more shy or humble than other patrons in proclaiming the extent of her virtue. The content of this and

---

195 ‘edificauit tamen nobile templum Arimini in honorem diui Francisci, uerum ita gentilibus operibus impleuit, ut non tam christianorum quam infidelium demones adorantium templum esse uideretur. atque in eo concubine sue tumulum erexit et artificio et lapide pulcherrimum, adiecto titulo gentili more in hunc modum: DIVE ISOTTE SACRVM.’ Eneas Silvio Piccolomini, Pii II Commentarii rerum memorabilium que temporibus suis contigerunt, ed. A. van Heck (Vatican City, 1984): 154


other inscriptions not relating to the patron will be analyzed with considerably more depth in chapter four of this dissertation.

**Differences Between the Approach to Patronage in the Inscriptions on Tombs for Men and Tombs for Women**

While a comprehensive comparative analysis of inscriptions is beyond the scope of this dissertation, comparing the approaches to patronage on men’s tombs versus women’s tombs in select cases can be instructive. For example, in Rome, there are a number of monuments for both men and women commissioned near the end of the century and created by the prolific sculptor Mino da Fiesole. Mino and his workshop were a popular choice as artists for tombs honoring the papal curia and were likely involved in three of the monumental tombs for women in Rome. An excellent example of Mino’s curial tomb output at this time is the tomb of Cristoforo (and Domenico) della Rovere (fig. 39, 1478-1480, Santa Maria del Popolo, Rome), on which he collaborated with Andrea Bregno. Cristoforo and Domenico were both involved in the patronage of this monument, and one of the three inscriptions on the tomb refers to this patronage. The epitaph reads:

To Cristoforo della Rovere, priest of San Vita and Cardinal, a man of high learning, of excellent character and pious, Domenico, who through Pope Sixtus IV’s goodness soon became the successor of the title and the position, raised this monument to his brother which was well merited and

---

199 For this tomb see: Zuraw, “The Sculpture of Mino da Fiesole,” 977-998.
to himself. He lived 43 years, 7 months and 19 days and he died in the eighth year of Sixtus’ pontificate, the 1st of February.

The wording of this inscription approaches patronage in a similar mode to what we typically find on tombs for women. The patron clearly identifies himself and takes explicit credit for commissioning the monument, while including laudatory adjectives for both the deceased and the commissioner.

On another tomb by Mino da Fiesole in Rome, originally located in the same chapel as Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni’s, a similar pattern of inscription emerges. On the tomb of Francesco Tornabuoni (fig. 40, 1477-78, Santa Maria sopra Minerva), nephew of Francesca, the inscription reads:

To Francesco Tornabuoni, a noble Florentine, dear to Pope Sixtus IV and to others, snatched away by a bitter death from great expectations. I, his uncle, raised this monument.

Though not directly stated in the inscription, the “uncle” who raised the tomb is Florentine papal banker Giovanni Tornabuoni. Much like the Della Rovere tomb discussed above, this male relative patron takes full credit for the tomb’s construction,

---


201 FRANCISCO TORNABONO NOBILI FLORENTINO / SIXTO IIII PONT MAX CETERIS QUE CHARISS / ACERBA MORTE MAGNAE DE SE / EXPECTATIONI SVBTRACTO IOANES PATRVS POS (Translation: Zuraw, “The Sculpture of Mino da Fiesole,” 933). Little biographical information is known about Francesco Tornabuoni. In fact, the precise identity of which Francesco Tornabuoni is commemorated by the tomb is not exactly clear, though Zuraw concludes he might be a GiovanFrancesco di Filippo.

202 In both the life of Ghirlandaio and the life of Verrocchio, Vasari misidentifies the patron of the chapel, tomb, and frescoes of both Francesco Tornabuoni and Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni as Francesco Tornabuoni, rather than Giovanni Tornabuoni, a discrepancy first recognized by A. Reumont in “Il monumento Tornabuoni del Verrocchio,” Giornale di erudizione artistica 11 (1873): 167-68.
and here—as with a few women’s tombs, discussed more below—the inscription speaks with the voice of the patron by using the personal pronoun “I.”

Outside of Rome and the sculptural ambient of Mino da Fiesole, the tomb of Saint Savinus, located in the cathedral in Faenza, provides an example of a male saint’s tomb that does not mention the patron (who in this case was likely a woman) and is strictly informative much like the inscriptions honoring Beata Villana and Saint Catherine of Siena, as discussed above.\(^{203}\) The tomb dates from circa 1468-1471 and has been attributed to Benedetto and Giuliano da Maiano, or Antonio Rossellino, artists who were also involved in creating women’s tombs.\(^{204}\) Saint Savinus’ tomb is an arcosolium monument, a type of tomb that was also a typical Florentine tomb type, like the tomb of Nera Corsi Sasseti, in the last third of the \textit{quattrocento}.\(^{205}\) Saint Savinus’ inscription states:

\begin{quote}
In this marble tomb rest bones of the most blessed martyr and bishop Savinus\(^{206}\)
\end{quote}

While it would be irresponsible to make generalizations about all male saints’ tomb inscriptions based upon this one example, as some of them are significantly longer, the basic informative nature of the tomb inscription with limited laudatory adjectives and no mention of any sort of patron is notably similar to how many female saints are commemorated.\(^{207}\)

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{For this tomb see Nygren, “The Monumental Saint’s Tomb in Italy,” 325-327.}
\footnote{Nygren, “The Monumental Saint’s Tomb in Italy,” 326.}
\footnote{\textsc{IN HOC MARMO / REO TVMVLO OS / SA BEATISSIMI SAVINI / EPOSCOPI ET MARTIR / IS REQVIESCVNT} (Transcribed, Nygren, 326, translation mine).}
\footnote{Barnaby Nygren’s dissertation on saints’ tombs “The Monumental Saint’s Tomb in Italy,” is an excellent source for transcriptions of the inscriptions of these monuments,}
\end{footnotes}
Although the content of inscriptions is a nuanced point of difference between men’s and women’s monuments—women’s tomb inscriptions tend to focus more on intangible virtues rather than tangible accomplishments, which will be examined in greater depth in chapter four of the present study—the way patronage is approached in them is a point of similarity between the two. In both men and women’s monuments, the patron is frequently listed directly, his or her relationship to the deceased is stated, and references to even greater individuals, relatives or otherwise, like the mentions to Pope Sixtus IV, are included. These factors suggest that from the patronal point of view, taking credit for the construction of a tomb was the same regardless of the gender of the tomb honoree.

**Extant Contracts for Women’s Monumental Tombs**

While there are numerous extant documents connected to the lives and deaths of the women commemorated by monumental tombs in the fifteenth century, there are, to my knowledge, only two surviving contracts for this type of monument: for the tomb of Margherita Malatesta, of which only the inscription and a questionable effigy now though he only provides the original Latin and does not include translations. While I owe a debt of gratitude to Nygren’s work for partially inspiring the organization of my own project, one drawback of his study is that Nygren does not provide analysis of the inscriptions in his morphological analysis of saints tombs. A broader comparison of women’s tombs inscriptions and those men’s tombs will be conducted in chapter four of this dissertation.

208 These documents are either transcribed or cited in each monument’s respective catalogue entry.

209 The contract was first published in Pietro Torelli, “Jacobello e Pietro Paolo dalle Masegne a Mantova,” *Rassegna d’arte* 13 (1913): 70 and the original can be found at Archivio di Stato, Mantua, Archivio Gonzaga, D. V, I, busta 313. It is transcribed in full in cat. #13.

210 See cat. #13 for the difficulty of dating Margherita’s effigy.
survive, and the tomb of Beata Villana.\textsuperscript{211} Despite the paltry survival rate for contracts connected to women’s monumental tombs, as large, costly public sculptures these monuments would likely have all had some form of official agreement between the artist and the patron.\textsuperscript{212} Margherita’s tomb contract speaks to an arrangement made between Francesco I Gonzaga, Margherita’s husband and the ruler of Mantua, and the Venetian sculptor Pierpaolo delle Masegne, for the construction of the tomb. It is unequivocally delineated that the construction of the tomb should be completed within five months and that the fee paid would be 625 gold ducats, including the cost of the materials.\textsuperscript{213} The contract specifies precisely which type of stone should be used for the construction of the tomb: Carrara marble, Istrian stone, red stone from Verona, and black stone. It even specifies how each stone should be used—Margherita’s body should be Istrian stone, while her head and hands were to be sculpted in Carrara marble.\textsuperscript{214} The contract continues to articulate the other necessary sculptural components and the architectural framework of the tomb. Based on these instructions, scholars have assumed that

\textsuperscript{211} The original contract for the tomb of Beata Villana can be found at Archivio di Stato, Florence, Conv. Soppr. 102 (S. Maria Novella di Firenze), 101, foll. 196r-v and is published by Anne Markahm Schulz, \textit{The Sculpture of Bernardo Rossellino and his Workshop}, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), 163-164. It is transcribed in full in cat. #4.

\textsuperscript{212} For dozens of other examples of contracts and letters relating to commissions, see David S. Chambers, \textit{Patrons and Artists in the Italian Renaissance} (London: MacMillan, 1970), though very few (only one from the fifteenth century) of the documents printed in translation by Chambers are related to tomb monuments.

\textsuperscript{213} Wolfgang Wolters, \textit{La Scultura veneziana gotica (1300-1400)} (Venice: Alfieri Edizioni d’arte, 1976), 225.

Margherita’s monument was similar to the later tomb of her cousin Paola Bianca Malatesta in Fano, which bears a striking resemblance to what is described in the contract for the earlier tomb.\(^{215}\)

The contract for Margherita’s tomb follows general trends and patterns for contracts composed in the *quattrocento* by defining what should be depicted on the monument and how that should be accomplished.\(^{216}\) The tomb was originally located in what is considered the Gonzaga mausoleum, the chapel of Saint Louis of Toulouse (later San Bernardino) in San Francesco, Mantua, which included the imposing fourteenth-century monumental tomb for Margherita’s mother-in-law Alda d’Este.\(^{217}\) Consequently, the commissioner, “the magnificent lord sir” Francesco I Gonzaga might have been so specific in the contract because Margherita’s tomb was being situated within a locus of Gonzaga memory and commemorative tradition, though almost no traces of these tombs

\(^{215}\) See cat. #2.

\(^{216}\) Michelle O’Malley, *The Business of Art: Contracts and the Commissioning Process in Renaissance Italy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 5-9. O’Malley’s book is dedicated to analyzing contracts for altarpieces and frescoes, particularly in Florence, but in this instance, the contract for a public sculpture follows the general patterns she recognizes for these other types of public art. She outlines that these contracts always start with the date, and often where the contract was created, followed by the individuals involved in the following order: first the individual(s) responsible for the commission, then the artist designated to create it. The type of art to be created, and the responsibilities of each party involved are then delineated, and details of materials and payments are specified.

\(^{217}\) Jacopo Daino, Gonzaga chancellor, who in the mid 1500s, in a work dedicated to the *Origine e genealogia della famiglia Gonzaga* described Alda’s tomb: “una bellissima arca di marmor per la maggior parte indorata, con molte figure scolpiste nel marmor, sopra Quattro colonne di marmot fabricate con grandissimo magistero. E quest’arca è la più bella e di maggior valore che altra si trovi di presente in Mantova, sotto la quale si va quando s’entra nella cappella degl’Illuistrissimi Signori da Gonzaga.” See Laura Cavazzini, “Da Jacobello Dalle Masegne a Bonino da Campione, Da Margherita Malatesta ad Alda d’Este: qualche altro fragmento di Mantova tardogotica,” in 2 *L’artista girovago. Forestieri, avventurieri, emigranti e missionari nell’arte del Trecento in Italia del Nord* ed. Serena Romano and Damien Cerutti, (Rome: Viella s.r.l, 2012), 44, 246
exist today.\textsuperscript{218} Regardless of how his specifications might have been pre-determined, the language of the contract indicates that the act of commissioning her monument was not undertaken lightly. Substantial time and money were allocated for its construction and its costly materials and elaborate imagery, including five sculpted figures (four saints and Crucified Christ), suggest that no effort or expense was spared even though this was a tomb honoring a female member of the family.

Indeed, the contract makes no special mention of the tomb honoree’s gender, which does not seem to have factored into the business and economics of the commission at all. The extant inscription from Margherita’s tomb does make explicit reference to her “feminine” virtues, including her chastity, virginity, and her success in giving her husband distinguished offspring, but none of these concerns are addressed in the contract.\textsuperscript{219} While Margherita’s gender is marked in the contract by the inclusion of her onomastic saint, Saint Margherita, among the four saints designated, the act of including an onomastic saint in a commission, whether commemorative or otherwise, was a common practice by patrons of both genders.

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{219}{Whether or not inscriptions were carved by the sculptors who were charged with the rest of the monuments, or whether an inscription, in terms of text, lettering, lay-out, formatting, and content, was specified by the patron or not, or when an inscription was created and installed are all complicated, open questions. For some consideration of these and related concerns see Starleen K. Meyer and Paul Shaw, “Towards a New Understanding of the Revival of Roman Capitals and the Achievement of Andrea Bregno,” in \textit{Andrea Bregno: Il senso della forma nella cultura artistica del Rinascimento}, ed. Claudio Crescentini and Claudio Strinati (Florence: Maschietto, 2008), 276-331.}

Margherita’s graceful epitaph was composed by Bartolomeo degli Alboini da Volta. See Stefano L’Occaso, \textit{Fonti archivistiche per le arti a Mantova tra Medioevo e Rinascimento (1382-1459)}, (Mantua: Arcari, 2005): 112, fn. 1.}
\end{footnotes}
The contract for the tomb of Beata Villana, which is found in Santa Maria Novella, Florence, is similarly specific in terms of the sculpture intended for the beata’s tomb. Precise measurements for the constituent parts are specified, as are what colors of marble are to be used for various parts. The contract specifies when the tomb should be completed, and it indicates that the figure of the Beata Villana should be cut in half-relief, but at no point does it indicate the beata’s gender or make any particular reference whatsoever to any type sculptural elements that could be gendered in any way. The contract is notably similar in its requests and language to that of Margherita Malatesta, indicating that the practical processes of commissioning a tomb were not altogether different for a saint or a lay-individual, and that gender played almost no role in the financial and legal considerations when patronizing a tomb.

While the information from two contracts cannot be reasonably extrapolated to assume that all contracts for women’s tombs were the same, the evidence they do provide reaffirms a major factor of women’s tomb patronage that has been asserted in this dissertation. The gender of the tomb occupant does not seem to have played much of a role in the practical matters of commissioning a tomb, whether in contractual agreements or in inscriptions.

Motivations for Women’s Tomb Patronage

Like the tombs themselves, the patronage of these monuments has been little examined in extant tomb literature. When comment is made on commissioners’ motivations, vague allusion to the great love on the part of the patron is usually

---

220 “una basa di marmo bianco…una tavola di marmo rosso….un cornice di marmo bianco…” See cat. #4 for a transcription of the entire contract.
suggested. For example, while Isotta degli Atti can be credited with commissioning her own monument, her paramour and later husband Sigismondo Malatesta is understood to have been desperately in love with her, as evidenced by the medals and poems he commissioned to immortalize her. In light of these other testimonies, her tomb chapel in the Tempio Malatestiano, which was constructed while she was still alive, is usually thought to be the result of Sigismondo’s fervor for her. Notably, however, Sigismondo also commemorated his first two wives in the Tempio with a now-fragmentary slab and inscription. Since Isotta supplanted her predecessor, Polissena Sforza, in Sigismondo’s affections while Polissena was still alive, it suggests that motivations that had little to do with love impelled the construction of his other wives’ monument.

Other evidence has been used to suggest that love was the primary stimulus for constructing women’s tombs. The dramatic letter that Giovanni Tornabuoni wrote to his nephew Lorenzo de’ Medici after the death of his wife, Francesca Pitti, has also been

---

221 Zuraw attributes Giovanni Tornabuoni’s decision to commission a tomb for his wife, Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni, to his “remarkable devotion” to his wife, a notion which is furthered by Musacchio. Zuraw does follow that notion by stating that Francesca’s tomb would have been “a public statement of his [Giovanni Tornabuoni’s] power and presence in Rome.” The idea that women’s tombs function as statements of power, just as men’s tombs do, and that that was the primary goal of their patronage in general, will be furthered throughout this chapter. See Zuraw, “The Sculpture of Mino da Fiesole (1429–1484),” 968 and Musacchio, *The Art and Ritual of Childbirth in Renaissance Italy*, 29-31. The construction of the effigy of Beatrice d’Este is also attributed to the great sadness her husband Ludovico Sforza experienced at her loss. It is perhaps not coincidental that in these two instances there are also surviving letters written by the widowed husbands recounting the losses of their wives. See Luisa Giordano, “La “Ill.ma Consorte” di Ludovico Sforza,” in *Beatrice d’Este* ed. Luisa Giordano, (Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2008), 87-89.


225 See cat. #19.

226 ASF, MAP (Archivio di Stato, Florence, Mediceo avanti il Principato), xxxv, 746. See cat. #33.
credited with demonstrating the feeling necessary to motivate the construction of a monumental tomb. In it he refers to his “most sweet” wife and how “oppressed” he is by the bitterest feelings and sadness and asks for pardon from his famous nephew for his pain keeping him from writing longer. This letter is unique among their surviving letters.

\[227\] The letter written by Giovanni Tornabuoni to his nephew Lorenzo de’Medici is not unique. There are many extant examples of other letters recording the grief felt at the loss of men of distinction, as well as letters noting the loss of wives and other women. See Sharon T. Strocchia, *Death and Ritual in Renaissance Florence* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), 146. During the fifteenth century, Humanists embraced the tradition of funeral oration. Additionally, developing at this time was an interest in letter writing as a publishable and collectable form for Humanists, of which Leonardo Bruni and Carlo Marsuppini were certainly a part. For this see Cecil H. Clough, “The Cult of Antiquity: Letters and Letter Collections,” in *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance Essays in Honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller*, ed. Cecil H. Clough (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1976), 33-67. In Florence, though women were excluded from these orations, they would not uncommonly be elegant and eulogized in consolatory letters, where there could be an already established pattern for some of the adjectives used to describe the women. For example Florentine merchant Luca da Panzo used what Strocchia [*Death and Ritual*, 1] deems the “typical Florentine terms of endearment” to describe his recently deceased wife as “good” and “sweet.” (See Carte Strozz. ASF ser. 2 vol. 9 fol 122r). Bruni and Marsuppini also participated in this tradition, both addressing letters to members of the Medici family. Bruni wrote to Nicola di Vieri de’Medici in 1433 upon the death of his mother Bicie, for which see Gordon Griffiths, James Hankins, and David Thompson eds. and trans., *Humanism of Bruni*, (Binghamton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1987), 337-39. Marsuppini wrote to Cosimo and Lorenzo de’Medici also in 1433 following the death of their mother Piccarda Bueri, for which see Pier Giorgio Ricci, “Una consolatoria inedita del Marsuppini,” *Rinascità* 3 (1940): 363-433, or Alison M. Brown, “The Humanist Portrait of Cosimo de’Medici, Pater Patriae,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 24 (1961): 189-90. While Humanists like Leonardo Bruni and Carlo Marsuppini acknowledged the deaths of women in the 1430s, there are also examples of women acknowledging the death of another woman: when Eleonora of Aragon died on 11 October 1493, her two daughters Isabella d’Este Gonzaga and Beatrice d’Este Sforza wrote extensive letters back and forth, particularly regarding their mourning clothes. For these letters see A. Luzio and R. Renier, “Delle relazioni di Isabella d’Este Gonzaga con Ludovico e Beatrice Sforza,” *Archivio storico lombardo* ser. 2, 17 (1890): 74-119, 346-99, 619-74. Eleonora was eulogized by a young Ludovico Ariosto (see Molini, *Poesie varie di Lud. Ariosto*, capit. XIX, Florence, 1824). Isabella d’Este also ordered that Battista Mantovano make the funeral oration for Eleonora, indicating that by the end of the century, at least in this exceptional case, a woman was the recipient of a funeral oration.
correspondence for its depth of feeling. From an analysis of the letters written from Giovanni to Lorenzo during the years 1476-79, the dispatch recounting Francesca’s death is the only surviving example where Giovanni refers to his powerful nephew in his address as “My most dear Lorenzo.” The vast majority of the extant missives directed to Lorenzo during those years address the young Medici leader by his honorific, ‘il Magnifico.’ As such, Musacchio and Zuraw both assert that Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni’s tomb must exist due to her husband’s devotion to her and, as Musacchio puts it, “his desire to commemorate her as best as he could afford.”

While feelings were certainly a motivating factor, they cannot be the primary motivator, because in at least one instance, that of Barbara Manfredi, the commissioner of her tomb, Pino III Ordelaffi, was also the likely cause of her death by poison. As love and murder by poisoning are generally contradictory, other motivations must be ascribed to Pino’s choice to commemorate his “sweet wife”.

---

228 “Carissimo mio Lorenzo.”
229 The letter from Giovanni is in a general collection of letters to Lorenzo at the time.
231 Anna Colombi Ferretti, Luciana Prati, Mariacristina Gori, and Giordano Viroli, Il Monumento a Barbara Manfredi e la scultura del rinascimento in Romagna (Bologna: Nuova Alfa Editoriale. 1989), 13. Barbara was Pino’s first wife and he might have poisoned his second wife as well before he was survived by his third wife, Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola. See Beth L Holman, “Exemplum and Imitatio: Countess Matilda and Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola at Polirone,” The Art Bulletin 81.4 (1999): 643.
232 In the inscription on her tomb Pino refers to her as such: BARBARAE ASTORGI MANF[REDI] F[ORLIVENSI] / PINUS ORDELAF[FUS] UX[ORI] DULCISS[IMAE] / OB DIVINA VIRTUTUM MERITA / PONENDUM IUSSIT / VIX[IT] AN[NOS] XXII M[ENSES] VI D[IES] IIII / AN[NOS] SAL[UTIS] MCCCCLXVI (For Barbara Astorgi Manfredi from Forli, His very sweet wife, Pino Ordelaffo On behalf of her virtuous merits Ordered that this be placed. She lived for 22 years, 6 months and 4 days, and died in the year 1466).
been posited as a potential reason, it is also possible that a large-scale public sculpture could demonstrate that this disputed and controversial ruler of a town had power, wealth, taste, and the ability to literally shape his environment; motivations that are identical to those driving the construction of men’s tombs.

Therefore, the question arises: are there any impetuses for women’s tomb patronage that are distinct or different from the patronage of male monuments? Or is it possible, in fact likely, that women’s tombs were not thought of as marked by the gender of their honoree by fifteenth-century Italians patrons, but rather as the necessary response to a universal life process made possible by available funds, artistic interest, and perhaps, in some cases, the possibility of gaining political or social capital? Further analysis of the different patronal groups for women’s tombs will shed light on these possibilities.

Internal Patronage: Husbands (Conjugal Patronage)

The largest homogenous group of patrons for women’s monumental tombs is composed of husbands. Thirteen of the thirty-five tombs (or 37.1 percent) were commissioned by the occupant’s husband. Table 12 lists these monuments:

---


234 One that, through its single-arch form, refers to humanistic erudition and classical traditions.

235 “…the fundamental human obligation to bury the dead was inextricably bound up with the social imperative to bury them well.” (emphasis mine). Strocchia, Death and Ritual in Renaissance Florence, 5-6:
Table 12.
Husbands as Tomb Patrons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tomb Honoree</th>
<th>Patron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margherita Malatesta</td>
<td>Francesco Gonzaga#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilaria del Carretto</td>
<td>Paolo Guinigi#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paola Bianca Malatesta</td>
<td>Pandolfo III Malatesta#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisabetta Trenta</td>
<td>Lorenzo Trenta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isotta degli Atti*</td>
<td>Sigismondo Malatesta#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malatesta Women</td>
<td>Sigismondo Malatesta#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Manfredi</td>
<td>Pino III Ordelaffi#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria of Aragon Piccolomini**</td>
<td>Antonio Piccolomini Todeschini#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni</td>
<td>Giovanni Tornabuoni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nera Corsi Sassetti</td>
<td>Francesco Sassetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddalena Riccia</td>
<td>Antonio d’Alessandro Riccia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice d’Este</td>
<td>Ludovico Sforza#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generosa Orsini</td>
<td>Luca Zen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Isotta degli Atti can also be credited with the commission of her own tomb, which will be discussed more below.
** Maria of Aragon Piccolomini’s half-brother King Alfonso II of Naples was also likely involved in the construction of her tomb chapel, which will be discussed more below.
# Indicates that the patron was the ruler of their respective town or a member of the ruling family.

The patronage of women’s tombs by their husbands will be considered based on the social status and power of the husband, his political concerns, and the tomb’s geographical location. I will present an in-depth exploration of the one instance, that of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni, whose monument was considered in some depth in chapter one of this dissertation, where a tomb was located outside the primary concentration of patronage for its commissioner. Finally the inscriptions will be analyzed to judge whether or not the patrons are mentioned, or if their relationship to the deceased are noted. In
general, husbands were patrons of monuments when their wives died unexpectedly young, often in childbirth, and there are no extant examples of a husband involved in the patronage—through his will or other bequests—of a tomb for a woman who outlived him.\(^{236}\)

**Conjugal Patronage and Social Standing**

In a slight majority of instances of monumental tomb patronage, husbands acted as commissioners when they were rulers or members of ruling families. Eight of the fourteen tombs (or 57.1 percent) were commissioned by husbands who were politically powerful in their respective towns. As such, some women’s tombs can be interpreted as public monuments displaying the dynastic pretentions of their husbands, as is certainly the case for the tombs of Margherita Malatesta, Ilaria del Carretto, or Beatrice d’Este. For each of these women, whose husbands were the rulers of Mantua, Lucca, and Milan respectively, the tombs celebrated either in their inscriptions or iconography the essential roles these women played in dynastic continuation. In these instances, specifically because these women produced heirs and continued the family line, a public display of their memory supported the concrete and demonstrable power of their respective families.

For the remaining six tombs where the husband/patron was not a ruler or member of a ruling family, their political and social roles are diverse. In some cases, these men were closely connected to power through familial ties or allegiances. Antonio d’Alessandro Riccia, the patron of the double tomb for himself and his wife Maddalena,

\(^{236}\) Isotta degli Atti’s tomb is an exception to this generalization, which is discussed in greater detail below.
was a royal counselor and diplomat for the Aragonese in Naples.\textsuperscript{237} Luca Zen, who is presumed to be the commissioner of a tomb honoring his wife Generosa Orsini, was a procurator of San Marco, the second most powerful and prestigious civic position in Venice. Both Giovanni Tornabuoni and Francesco Sassetti were employed by the Medici Bank and were close Medici partisans in Florence. Lorenzo Trenta was perhaps the least politically and socially powerful of the lot; while a supporter of Paolo Guinigi, the despotic ruler of Lucca, he was only a merchant, though a hugely wealthy one.\textsuperscript{238} The varying social positions of these six men, though all wealthy and elite, do not necessarily speak to the same need to demonstrate dynastic power that many rulers perceived, but a permanent public marker like a tomb could demonstrate attempts to jockey for optimal social position.

**Conjugal Patronage and Geography**

Geographically, every tomb commissioned by the occupant’s husband is located in the town where he had the most power and was the site of the bulk of his patronage except for one: that of Francesca Pitti.\textsuperscript{239} She and her husband, Giovanni Tornabuoni, were both Florentines, but because Giovanni worked as papal banker as the head of the Medici Bank in Rome, Francesca’s tomb is located in that city despite the fact that the


\textsuperscript{239} I presented a talk on this tomb entitled “Ameliorating the Remembrance of the Most Bitter Deaths: Allusions to Sanctity in 15\textsuperscript{th} c. Italian Women’s Tombs” at the Renaissance Society of America Conference in 2011.
majority of the Tornabuoni family and patronage was in Florence.\textsuperscript{240} Francesca’s tomb was an early example of Giovanni’s patronage, and her passing was likely the driving factor for his commission of the Tornabuoni chapel in Rome in the first place.\textsuperscript{241} Francesca’s tomb was also one of the first instances where Giovanni publicly exhorted the virtues of his family through a work of art, which became a trope of his later patronage.

In his many commissions, Giovanni Tornabuoni showed himself to be a shrewd, calculating patron.\textsuperscript{242} For example, his most famous commission, paintings by Domenico Ghirlandaio in the \textit{cappella maggiore} of Santa Maria Novella in Florence (fig. 41), was commissioned in 1485 and completed between May 1486 and May 1490. The extant

\textsuperscript{240} Francesca’s death was actually recorded in the registers of the church of Santa Maria Novella, Florence: ASF. “Sepoltuario di Santa Maria Novella del Rosselli,” cod. II-I, 126, (under the date September 23, 1477): \textit{D. Francisca de Pittis uxor Joanni Francisci D. Simonis de Tornabuonis}. This notation lead some scholars to suggest that her tomb was actually located there; however, as noted first by Enrico Ridolfi and later by Shelley Zuraw, this notation in the death records indicates the date of death, not of burial. See Enrico Ridolfi, “Giovanni Tornabuoni e Ginevra de’Benci nel coro di S. Maria Novella in Firenze,” \textit{Archivio storico italiano}, ser. V, vol. VI, 1890, 426ff., n. 2 and Zuraw, “The Sculpture of Mino da Fiesole (1429-1484),” 952

\textsuperscript{241} Giovanni Tornabuoni also later also commissioned a wall monument honoring his nephew, Francesco, who died in 1480.

\textsuperscript{242} Maria Deprano had previously asserted that it was Giovanni’s commission of portrait medals in 1485-86 that was “the first realization of Tornabuoni’s interest in exalting his family.” Seemingly, however, this interest manifested eight years previously with the commission of first the tomb for Francesca and then the tomb for his nephew Francesco. See Maria Deprano, “‘To the Exaltation of His Family’ Niccolò Fiorentino’s Medals for Giovanni Tornabuoni and His Family” \textit{The Medal} 56 (2010): 23. Giovanni’s most prominent commission is the frescoes and decoration of the \textit{cappella maggiore} of Santa Maria Novella Florence, for which see: Patricia Simons, “Patronage in the Tornaquinci Chapel, Santa Maria Novella, Florence,” in \textit{Patronage, Art, and Society in Renaissance Italy}, ed. F.W. Kent and Patricia Simons with J.C. Eade (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 222. Simons, who wrote her doctoral thesis on patronage and included a particular focus on the chapel, suggests referring to the chapel by this name. The Tornaquinci were the forbears of the Tornabuoni, and it is partially through his descent from the Tornaquinci that Giovanni gained patronage rights over the chapel.
contract for the frescoes is unusual in the specificity demanded by the patron because Giovanni dictated stylistic elements in addition to technique and materials. The expansive frescoes of Santa Maria Novella’s cappella maggiore feature repeated portraits of Tornabuoni family members and friends. Scholars have identified portraits in most of the paintings, including twenty-one identifiable likenesses in one scene alone. The inclusion of so many Tornabuoni portraits was certainly not accidental. It presented a carefully managed depiction of the family as a cohesive unit piously respectful of religious practices, and by including portraits of other significant Florentines, carefully integrated into the upper reaches of local society. The shrewd crafting of an ideal public image for the family in the cappella maggiore was also at work in the Tornabuoni tombs in Rome.

What the cappella maggiore frescoes and all their Tornabuoni portraits do definitively assert is that Giovanni Tornabuoni’s patronage at the time, not unlike other similarly situated Florentines, such as Francesco Sassetti, was particularly focused on promoting his family, a fact which is even explicitly stated in the contract between

---

244 The imagery includes on the left wall the life of the Virgin and on the right wall the life of St. John the Baptist. On the window wall we find depicted: *St. Dominic Burning Heretical Books; and the Killing of St. Peter Martyr* in the top register, with portraits of the patron Giovanni Tornabuoni and Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni flanking the windows in the bottom register. In the vaults are found the four Evangelists.
Giovanni and his painter Ghirlandaio.\textsuperscript{247} Seemingly by representing his family repeatedly in paintings of childbirth, like \textit{The Birth of the Virgin}, including his wife who had died in childbirth, Giovanni emphasized the essential role that women played in the continuation of the family and women’s roles in the solidification of social status.\textsuperscript{248} And though Francesca had been dead for over a decade when the \textit{cappella maggiore} was painted, her donor portrait was prominently included, attesting to her continued and significant role in Tornabuoni family dynamics. Giovanni used representations of his wife in the public sphere to establish concretely the significance of the Tornabuoni family. Women were, after all, through marriage, the glue between two distinct patriline\textsuperscript{\textit{\textunderscore}}s,\textsuperscript{249} creating necessary bonds between what otherwise might have been conflicting families.\textsuperscript{250}

Honoring women who furthered the family line would have been a tangible way to assert the patron’s presence in a church, parish, or city, and would have been a means for a non-ruling individual to ape the patronage practices of those in power. Returning to Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni’s tomb, though the documentary evidence remains unclear, Francesca likely died in Rome, and bodies were often returned to hometowns following death.\textsuperscript{251} As Giovanni later planned to make the \textit{cappella maggiore} the burial chapel for

\textsuperscript{247} Deprano, “‘To the Exaltation of His Family’ Niccolò Fiorentino’s Medals for Giovanni Tornabuoni and His Family,” 23.

\textsuperscript{248} Cadogan, \textit{Domenico Ghirlandaio Artist and Artisan}, 14. The portrayal of childbirth would have been especially poignant for the Tornabuoni family, for not only did Francesca die in childbirth, but her daughter-in-law, Giovanna degli Albizzi, did as well, on October 7, 1488.

\textsuperscript{249} Edward Muir, “In Some Neighbours We Trust: On the Exclusion of Women from the Public in Renaissance Italy,” 276, passim.

\textsuperscript{250} It is worth remembering at this point that, as noted by a contemporary, it was the marriage between Francesca Pitti and Giovanni Tornabuoni that saved Francesca’s father, Luca Pitti, from exile.

\textsuperscript{251} Francesca is listed in the death registers of Santa Maria Novella Florence, see fn. 240 above.
his extended family, his choice to bury his wife in Rome instead of Florence seems intentional. His ambitious, family-focused patronage, one goal of which was to establish his family’s status in Rome, perhaps explains why he would memorialize his beloved wife there, as Francesca’s tomb could exist as a concrete marker for a family’s current and continued presence in a place. Visibly emphasizing dynastic continuation in public paintings and sculptures was certainly not a practice unique to the Tornabuoni, but Giovanni’s commissions demonstrate a remarkably sophisticated strategy towards displaying familial social standing.

With regard to the geographic locations of women’s tombs, Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni’s monument is the exception that proves the rule; family tombs were too important in terms of augmenting or reaffirming social status—in terms of patronal taste, wealth, and honor—to be built anywhere else aside from where the family had its power. This geographic pattern is true for tombs that were the product of conjugal patronage, but

---

253 As evidence for this, I would turn to the inscription that he placed on the tomb of his nephew that was adjacent to Francesca’s monument: FRANCISCO TORNABONO NOBILI FLORENTINO SIXTO IIII PONT MAX CETERIS QUE CHARISS ACERBA MORTE MAGNAE DE SE EXPECTATIONI SVBTRACTO IOANES PATRVVS POS (To Francesco Tornabuoni, a noble Florentine, dear to Pope Sixtus IV and to others, snatched away by a bitter death from great expectations. I, his uncle, raised this monument. Translation, Zuraw, “The Sculpture of Mino da Fiesole,” 933). The inscription, by referring to a relationship to the Pope, emphasizing Giovanni’s role as patron, and identifying his nephew as a “noble Florentine,” clearly implies a desire to establish a prominent presence in Rome. Nearly contemporaneously with the patronage of Francesco Tornabuoni’s tomb, Giovanni and his nephew were also depicted among the crowd in Ghirlandaio’s Vocation of the Apostles, in the Sistine Chapel, further indicating a close relationship both to the artist and to the Sistine Chapel’s patron, Pope Sixtus IV.
254 Maria DePrano, “‘To the Exaltation of His Family’ Niccolò Fiorentino’s Medals for Giovanni Tornabuoni and His Family,” 23.
it is also true, as we shall see, for tombs commissioned by the other types of patrons as well.

**Conjugal Patronage and Inscriptions**

Familial relationships and the marital relationship are prominent features in the inscriptions of tombs patronized by the occupant’s husband. Of the thirteen tombs that were commissioned by husbands, ten have extant inscriptions. Of these ten, four use the words “wife” or “married.” Four others make reference to a conjugal relationship through more oblique terms, including the inscription on the tomb of Lisabetta Trenta that refers to “the women” of Lorenzo Trenta, and thus indicates possession. The epitaph honoring Nera Corsi Sassetti, which refers to her as the “most sweet and gentle companion” of Francesco Sassetti, implies her status as his wife without calling her such. A final compelling case is the double tomb of Maddalena Riccia and Antonio d’Alessandro, whose inscription could be considered a play on words in combination with its effigial imagery. A relief effigy of Maddalena adorns the front of the tomb chest that supports the three-dimensional effigy of Antonio, and around the framing elements of Maddalena’s effigial relief is inscribed:

Antonio d’Alessandro and Maddalena Riccia, those whom God has joined together no man…

---

255 The tombs of Ilaria del Carretto, Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni, and Beatrice d’Este might have originally had inscriptions as part of their monuments, but no trace of these possible epitaphs survive.

256 The inscriptions honoring Margherita Malatesta; Barbara Manfredi; Maria of Aragon Piccolomini; and Generosa Orsini.

257 ANTONII DE ALEXANDRO ET MAGDALENE RICIE CONIVGVVM / QVOS DEVVS CONIVNXIT HOMO NON [illegible]. For this tomb see cat. #35. See also Tanja Michalsky, “Conivges in vita concordissimo ne mors qvidem ipsa disivnxit”: Zur Rolle der Frau im genealogischen System neapolitanischer Sepulkralplastik,” *Marburger*
Though the end of this inscription is currently illegible, it can be assumed that it alludes to the biblical notion of no man pulling asunder those married under the sight of God.\footnote{Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft 32 (2005): 80, and Heidemann and Scirocco, “Die Kirchen Santa Chiara und Santa Maria di Monteoliveto als Bestattungsorte der Adligen in Neapel.”} As the two figures are physically joined in effigy on one monument, the inscription is particularly clever in its description of their marriage.

While inscriptions on tombs commissioned by husbands unsurprisingly use virtuous adjectives to honor “sweet” wives, epitaphs do not bear out the notion that “love” was the primary motivating factor for husbands to commission tombs. Of the ten surviving inscriptions, only one, that celebrating Maria of Aragon Piccolomini, makes any reference whatsoever to conjugal love. Maria’s epitaph goes so far as to suggest that their three daughters were a testament to the love felt between Maria and her husband Antonio Piccolomini Todeschini, but this is the only reference to conjugal love made in any extant epitaph. Otherwise, although nearly all of the inscriptions are sufficiently laudatory,\footnote{See the Gospel of Mark 10:9.} none of them suggests a particularly loving relationship between the patron and the tomb honoree. Even in instances where there is compelling documentary evidence of love between a husband and the wife he honored with a monumental tomb, as is the case for Isotta degli Atti and Sigismondo Malatesta,\footnote{Except for that of Lisabetta Trenta, which is completely informative with hardly any adjectives at all, laudatory or otherwise: “This is the tomb of the women and descendants of Lorenzo [son] of the late nobleman Maestro Federigo Trenta of Lucca 1416.” See cat. #12.} there is no indication of this love, either in the inscription or the imagery of her tomb. In the exceptional case of

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
Barbara Manfredi, who was likely murdered by her husband Pino Ordelaffi, Pino takes credit for the tomb in the inscription and uses the laudatory language that could be expected on tombs originating from much happier relationships.\(^{261}\)

**Internal Patronage: Other Family Members as Patrons (Familial Patronage)**

The second group of patrons of women’s tombs is composed of family members, a less homogenous group than the husbands, but similarly prolific. Fourteen of the thirty-five tombs were commissioned by a family member who was not the tomb honoree’s husband. Table 13 lists these monuments with the relationship between the tomb subject and the patron listed in parenthesis after the name(s) of the patron:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tomb Honoree</th>
<th>Patron(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnese and Clemenza Durazzo</td>
<td>Margherita di Durazzo (sister)#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnese da Mosto Venier*</td>
<td>Niccolò Venier (son)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margherita di Durier*</td>
<td>Ladislaus of Naples (son)#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccarda Bueri</td>
<td>Cosimo and Lorenzo de’Medici (sons)#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Villana</td>
<td>Villana delle Botte and Fra Sebastiano di Iacopo di Rosso Benintendi (niece and grandson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vittoria Piccolomini</td>
<td>Eneas Silvio Piccolomini (son)#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medea Colleoni</td>
<td>Bartolommeo Colleoni (father)#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria of Aragon Piccolomini*</td>
<td>Alfonso II of Naples (half-brother)#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabetta Geraldini</td>
<td>Giovanni, Angelo, Bernardo, Battisto, and Girolamo Geraldini (sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franceschina Tron Pesaro</td>
<td>Niccolò, Benedetto, and Marco Pesaro (sons)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{261}\) See cat. #7. In the inscription she is called Pino’s “very sweet wife” and that he “ordered” the tomb to be erected “on behalf of her virtuous merits.”
Costanza Ammannati *  |  Jacopo Ammannati (son)  
Maddalena Orsini      |  Rinaldo Orsini di Monterotondo (son)  
Marsibilia Trinci     |  Carlo Oliva (son)#  
Beata Beatrice Rusca  |  Antonia Rusca (daughter)  

* The patronage of these tombs was shared by more than one individual. The tomb of Agnese da Mosto Venier was commissioned by Agnese herself and her son Nicolo. The tomb of Maria of Aragon Piccolomini was commissioned by her husband Antonio Piccolomini and her half-brother King Alfonso II of Naples. The tomb of Costanza Ammannati was commissioned by her son Jacopo Ammannati and Pope Sixtus IV. The four tombs (Isotta degli Atti’s tomb is another example) that span two different patronage groups will be discussed in more detail below.

# Indicates that the patron was a ruler of his respective town or a member of the ruling family.

Familial patronage will be considered according to the same criteria by which conjugal patronage was analyzed above. Generally, familial patronage was carried out by the children of the deceased, with ten of the fourteen tombs commissioned by the sons and daughters of the tomb honoree. Of these, the vast majority, nine of ten, was commissioned by sons.262 The one tomb patronized by a daughter honored Beata Beatrice Rusca. The four other tombs were commissioned by a sister (Margherita di Durazzo commissioned the tomb of her sisters Agnese and Clemenza); a niece and grandson (Villana delle Botte and Fra Sebastiano commissioned the tomb of their relative Beata Villana); a half-brother (Alfonso II of Naples was involved in the patronage of the chapel for Maria of Aragon Piccolomini); and a father (Bartolommeo Colleoni was the patron of the tomb of his daughter Medea Colleoni).

262 This percentage does confirm that for this type of patronage (meaning internal and familial), sons were the most frequent commissioners of tombs, as suggested by Zuraw, “The Sculpture of Mino da Fiesole,” 967-968. However, compared to the broader percentages, sons do not comprise as large a percentage of commissioners as Zuraw contends.
Familial Patronage and Social Standing

The individuals involved in familial patronage of women’s tombs are only slightly less connected to overt political and social power than the conjugal patrons of tombs. While some of the individuals were socially prominent, like Margherita of Durazzo, who was the regent queen of Naples and Hungary; her son Ladislaus, who was king of Naples and Hungary; Cosimo and Lorenzo de’ Medici, who were the de-facto leaders of Florence;263 or Eneas Silvio Piccolomini, better known as Pope Pius II; the proportion of individuals of such standing is slightly lower. Among tombs that were the result of familial patronage, seven of fourteen were patronized by rulers or members of ruling families.264 The patrons of the remaining seven tombs were, not surprisingly, still wealthy members of the Renaissance social elite, including a cardinal (Jacopo Ammannati) and a bishop (Rainaldo Orsini).

Familial Patronage and Geography

Like the examples of conjugal patrons, the tombs patronized by familial relations appear where they would generally be expected: in the geographical seat of the family’s life. For example, Piccarda Bueri, the wife of Giovanni di’Bicci de’ Medici and the mother of Cosimo ‘il vecchio’ de’ Medici, the pater patriae of Florence, is buried in Florence. Or Vittoria Piccolomini, the mother of Pope Pius II, who originated from Siena, was buried in Siena. Maria of Aragon Piccolomini, who was the illegitimate daughter of

263 Following Cosimo’s return from exile in 1434.
264 This stands in contrast to eight of thirteen or (61.5 percent) for conjugal patronage.
King Ferrante of Naples and the half-sister of the future King Alfonso II of Naples, was buried in Naples.

An exception to this practice is the tomb of Medea Colleoni, now located in the Colleoni Chapel at Santa Maria Maggiore, Bergamo. The tomb was originally located in the church of Santa Maria della Basella in Urgnano, from which it was moved in 1842.²⁶⁵ Urgnano is a small commune located eleven kilometers outside of Bergamo, but within the province of the larger city. Santa Maria della Basella, was founded as a Franciscan convent by Medea’s father, Bartolommeo, in 1462,²⁶⁶ as an example of his beneficence and largesse. It provides an early example of his practice of expanding his patronal and artistic interests beyond the borders of Bergamo. Another, and perhaps the most famous example, of Bartolommeo’s interest is that, in October 1475, he willed that Venice create an equestrian monument in his honor to be placed in Piazza San Marco.²⁶⁷ Though the

²⁶⁷ Giles Knox, “The Colleoni Chapel in Bergamo and the Politics of Urban Space.” Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 60.3 (2001): 290. At the time Bartolommeo was Captain of the Venetian army and had been since 1455, but based Venice’s governing structure, it would not have been possible to honor the Bergamesque condottiero so prominently. The monument that was constructed by Verrocchio was instead situated in the piazza of Santi Giovanni e Paolo. The mention of the equestrian monument is the fourth item in the codicil of the will and is transcribed here: Item prelibatus illustriissimus d. codicillalns denotissime rogavit et rogat prelibatus illustriissimam d. d. suam venetiarum et dignetur facere fiere ymaginem prelibati illustri domini codicillantis super equo brondeo et ipsam ymaginem ponere super platea sancti marci civitatis venetiarum ad memoriam perpetuam prelibati Ill. d. codicillantis (Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, Testamentum Ill. et Excell. D. D. Bortolomei De Colionibus, Cl. XIV, no. 4 (4553), c. 27 v. published in Andrew Butterfield, The Sculptures of Andrea del Verrochio, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 232. For Bartolommeo’s will and other documents related to this equestrian monument see Butterfield, The Sculptures of Andrea del Verrochio, 159-183, 232-236. Interestingly, the principal heirs of his will were his two surviving daughters, Caterina and Isotta, and his grandchildren Alessandro
dramatic equestrian monument honoring Bartolommeo did not end up being as prominent as he had initially planned, it is still an example of his audacious and politically motivated patronage.\textsuperscript{268}

Much as Giovanni Tornabuoni constructed a tomb for his wife Francesca in Rome while the bulk of his patronage was in Florence, Bartolommeo utilized the death of his daughter and the desire to commemorate her properly to cast a broader net for his patronage. Medea’s death from a fever at the age of fourteen in March 1470\textsuperscript{269} was unexpected, but by commissioning a large-scale tomb for her in the monastery that he had been endowing for the last eight years, Bartolommeo was expanding the reach of his patronal grasp through concrete and monumental means. As these two examples show, women’s tombs, like those for men, were vehicles to display wealth, power, taste, and devotion to one’s families.

**Familial Patronage and Inscriptions**

Of the fourteen tombs that are the product of familial patronage, seven specifically mention the relationship between the patron and the deceased in their inscriptions, and they frequently put greater emphasis on the patron than the tomb occupant. For example, the inscription on the tomb of Costanza Ammannati speaks not for the tomb’s occupant, but rather in the voice of the patron, her son Jacopo Ammannati.

\textsuperscript{268} The construction of his own tomb chapel at Santa Maria Maggiore, Bergamo, can also be viewed as politically motivated. See Knox, “The Colleoni Chapel in Bergamo and the Politics of Urban Space,” passim.

\textsuperscript{269} Kohl, *Fama und Virtus*, 38.
It begins: “When Sixtus IV was pope my mother Costantia was alive in God but dead for me…”\textsuperscript{270} While the voice of the inscription on Costanza’s tomb differs from that of Vittoria Piccolomini, it similarly focuses on the actions of the patron by continuing, “Those I have laid down I erect” and concluding with the boast, “Both when you were dead and alive I gave you as much as I could.”

Not all inscriptions on tombs that were the result of familial patronage lay the glory of the monument on the patron. As discussed above, the inscription honoring Beata Villana does not mention the patrons, her niece and grandson, at all, though this might be a matter of decorum, as taking credit for the tomb of a holy woman might have crossed the bounds of propriety. The inscription celebrating the sisters Agnese and Clemenza di Durazzo does reveal familial relationships—delineating their descent from their father, Charles of France, the duke of Durazzo—but, as also noted above, the actual patron of the monument, Margherita of Durazzo, and her relationship to Agnese and Clemenza (she was their younger sister), is not mentioned. Perhaps though, within the centuries-long tradition of Angevin burials, and all of the tombs’ emphasis on dynasty, a more explicit reference to the patron of the tomb was not considered necessary.

**External Patronage: Religious and Civic Institutions and Individuals**

Six tombs were patronized by religious or civic institutions and individuals, and in one especially unusual case, the most righteous of patrons, the Pope. All of the women commemorated through external patronage were engaged in religious life, either as saints

\textsuperscript{270} This inscription is especially strange when considered in light of the fact that Jacopo died in 1479, only two years after Costanza, and almost certainly before her tomb was constructed.
(Catherine of Siena, Fina, Justine, and Monica), a prioress (Chiara Gambacorta), or a nun or *pinzochere* (Costanza Ammannati).\(^{271}\) Table 14 outlines the patronage of these six tombs:

**Table 14.**
**External Patrons: Religious/Civic Institutions and Individuals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tomb Honoree</th>
<th>Patron(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chiara Gambacorta</td>
<td>Religious community at San Domenico, Pisa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Justine</td>
<td>Officials of Santa Giustina, Padua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Monica</td>
<td>Maffeo Vegio, Giovanna (last name unknown), Maria de Cinciis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Catherine of Siena</td>
<td>Saint Antoninus of Florence (1430s), Cardinal Angelo Capranica (1460s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Fina</td>
<td>General Council of San Gimignano, San Gimignano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costanza Ammannati*</td>
<td>Pope Sixtus IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Costanza Ammannati’s tomb is one of the four monuments that span two different patronage groups, which will be discussed in more detail below.

Two of the women with tombs in this patronage group—Saint Justine and Saint Monica—had been dead for over a thousand years when elaborate sculpted tombs were commissioned and created for them in the fifteenth century.\(^{272}\) Two others—Saint Catherine of Siena and Saint Fina—lived much closer to the *quattrocento*, but the construction of their final monumental tombs occurred decades and even centuries

---


\(^{272}\) Saint Monica died in 387 and Saint Justine died in 304.
following their deaths. Saint Catherine of Siena and Saint Fina, both had previous sepulchers prior to their current fifteenth-century monuments, as it was recognized immediately following their deaths that the burial sites of these holy women would be sites for pilgrimage and devotion necessitating monumental commemoration. Only Chiara Gambacorta and Costanza Ammannati actually lived during the fifteenth century; Chiara died in 1419 and Costanza in 1477.

Saint Monica, the mother of Saint Augustine of Hippo, the theologian and Father of the Church, was construed by her famous son in his writings as an ideal model of female spirituality, and as Meredith J. Gill put it, she was “the guiding omnipresence that made Augustine what he was.” Her cult began to flower in the fifteenth century in Rome, after Pope Martin V authorized a search for her relics, which were found in Ostia in 1424. Saint Monica’s body was transferred to Rome under a papal bull on 27 April 1430, and she was buried shortly thereafter at Sant’Agostino. Almost instantly Monica’s relics became a site of women’s devotion and patronage. The later

---

273 Saint Fina died in 1253 and Saint Catherine of Siena in 1380.
274 For a concise summary of the complicated history of Saint Catherine’s tombs, see Nygren, “The Monumental Saint’s Tomb in Italy: 1260-1520,” 393-395, and for the various iterations of Saint Fina’s monument, see Krohn, “Civic Patronage of Art in Renaissance San Gimignano,” 114-23.
275 Official canonization came decades later; 1460 for Catherine and Fina has actually never been officially canonized.
278 Pope Eugene VI authorized a confraternity in her honor in 1440.
renovations undertaken at Sant’Agostino by Cardinal d’Estoutville in the 1470s and 1480s are linked to the explosion of the cult of the female saint.\footnote{279}

Like Saint Monica, the tomb of Saint Justine was an invention of the fifteenth century. Though the current monument located in the Victoria & Albert Museum, London, is not absolutely proved to be a sarcophagus for Saint Justine,\footnote{280} documentary evidence proves at least the desire on the part of the officials of Santa Giustina of Padua to create a new tomb for that saint to be located at the high altar of the church in 1476.\footnote{281} The construction of these two early Christian saints’ tombs might have been just a product of the general proliferation of saints’ monuments that occurred in the late medieval period and continued undiminished into the fifteenth century.\footnote{282} It is notable, however, that, in the broader propagation of tomb monuments that occurred during these years, the construction of women’s monuments expanded apace with those for saints or men,\footnote{283} indicating that they were simply understood to be “tombs” without any gendered adjectival modifiers before the word.

**External Patronage and Social Standing**

\footnote{279}{Gill, “Remember Me at the Altar of the Lord: Saint Monica’s Gift to Rome,” 552-554.}
\footnote{280}{See cat. #5 for this debate and Nygren, “The Monumental Saint’s Tomb in Italy: 1260-1520,” 271-272.}
\footnote{281}{Saint Justine’s body had been located in the crypt of the church. For the document, see Maria Tonzig, *La Basilica Romanico-Gotica di Santa Giustina in Padova*. Vol. 29 of *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova*, (1929): 262.}
\footnote{282}{Nygren, “The Monumental Saint’s Tomb in Italy: 1260-1520,” 107 and passim.}
\footnote{283}{As Erwin Panofsky put it, the Renaissance, “formally sanctioned the principle of individual commemoration; a maximum of posthumous recognition came to be considered a reward not only for sanctity or at least piety, but also for political, military, literary, and artistic achievement, or mere beauty.” See Erwin Panofsky, *Tomb Sculpture* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1992), 73.}
Without a doubt, among those of the appropriate social status and means, commissioning a saint’s tomb—regardless of the saint’s gender—became a business that involved many of the peninsula’s most prominent religious and civic organizations and individuals.\(^\text{284}\) The patrons involved with commissioning the four monumental saints’ tombs in this study range from the church leadership of one edifice (the officials of Santa Giustina, Padua); to a humanist poet who was a member of the papal court (Maffeo Vegio\(^\text{285}\) with assistance from difficult to trace pious Roman women); to another saint and a cardinal (Saint Antoninus and Cardinal Angelo Capranica); and the general council of a city (the General Council of San Gimignano). For these individuals, the connection to these saintly monuments would have reflected some of their devotional luster back upon the commissioners.\(^\text{286}\)

In examining the patronal motivations for the remaining two monuments, those for Chiara Gambacorta are straightforward, while those for Costanza Ammannati are significantly less so. Chiara’s tomb was commissioned by the community at the convent that she had founded, San Domenico in Pisa. The community honored her with a (relatively) humble slab that they located (less humbly) at the foot of the high altar of the church.\(^\text{287}\) By honoring their foundress in this manner, the community at San Domenico was burnishing their own legend and reinforcing its position within the religious strata of Pisa.


\(^{285}\) Vegio even wrote a treatise on Monica’s life, *Laudensis de Vita et Obito Beate Monicae* (BAV, Ottobuon., Lat. 1253).

\(^{286}\) Nygren, *The Monumental Saint’s Tomb in Italy: 1260-1520,* 162.

In contrast, the patronage history of the tomb of Costanza Ammannati is much more complicated. While her son Cardinal Jacopo Ammannati was ostensibly the patron, his death two years after hers, and the subsequent subsumption of his moneys, accounts, and properties into the control of the Pope Sixtus IV, suggests that the pope must have been involved with the erection of her monument. By assuming control of the cardinal’s accounts, the pope also gained control of their (meaning Costanza and Jacopo’s) commemoration, and the pope himself must have authorized payments for their tombs. While the inducement for Sixtus IV’s patronal activities relative to the Ammannati tombs is primarily economic based upon his assumption of Jacopo Ammannati’s finances, Sixtus was certainly keen for any glory that his largesse as a patron throughout the city of Rome might reflect his way, even with the commission of a tomb for a pious old woman, whom he might have never met.

---

288 Three cardinals who all died around the same time experienced this same situation. Cardinal Forteguerri and Cardinal Anton Giacomo Venerio’s properties and accounts were, like those of Cardinal Ammannati, used to fund the Hospital of Santo Spirito at the behest of Sixtus IV (see P. De Angelis, L’ospedale di Santo Spirito in Saxia 2 vols., (Rome, 1962), Vol II: 351-657. Sixtus IV took these actions despite Cardinal Venerio and Cardinal Ammannati having wills, which specified other desires for their earthly goods.  
289 Zuraw, “The Sculpture of Mino da Fiesole,” 1029. Sixtus IV rejected Jacopo’s requested burial site of St. Peter’s and was responsible instead for choosing to locate both his and his mother’s tombs at Sant’Agostino.  
290 Zuraw, “The Sculpture of Mino da Fiesole,” 1019. Sixtus’ role in commissioning the cardinal’s tomb is recorded in the inscription on the base of monument, which reads: OBIIT APUD LAURENT VVLSINIEN AN SAL MCCCLXXIX X SEPTEMB IN URBEM RELATVS PIA FAMILIA DOMESTICA PROSEQUENTE ET HIC CONDITUS XYSTI IIII PONT MAX BENEFICIO VIX AN LVII MENS VI DI II (“He died in San Lorenzo in Bolsena, in 1470, 10th of September, was taken to the city, accompanied by pious servants and buried here, through the pope, Sixuts IV’s generosity; he lived 57 years, 6 months, 2 days.” Translation: Zuraw, 1005. There is another inscription on the tomb identifying the cardinal more thoroughly). Sixtus IV is also mentioned in the inscription on Costanza’s tomb, which will be discussed in greater detail below.
External Patronage and Geography

In all of the six cases of external patronage of women’s tombs, the sepulchers are located where expected, meaning the individual’s native city, except for one. Chiara Gambacorta was buried in the convent she founded in Pisa. The relics of Saint Justine had been interred at Santa Giustina in Padua for centuries. Saint Monica’s relics were found in Ostia and then transferred to an Augustinian church in nearby Rome. Saint Fina was the local protectress of San Gimignano and her body remained in that city. Costanza Ammannati was the mother of a cardinal in Rome and possibly involved with the religious community at Sant’Agostino, making that church unsurprising as the choice for her final resting place.

However, the tomb of Saint Catherine of Siena is not where one would expect to find it, because it is not in Siena. Rather, it is located in Rome at Santa Maria sopra Minerva, one of the most prominent Dominican churches in that city.291 In the fifteenth-century, Santa Maria sopra Minerva became a significant liturgical site for the newly emerging città eterna; two papal conclaves were held there, those for Eugene IV in 1431 and Nicholas V in 1447.292 Rome, as the heart of the Church and the home of the pope, also seems fitting as a burial site for any saint, though Saint Catherine of Siena is the only major saint interred there.

Despite the expectation that a saint who in her very name is designated by her city of origin, Siena, would spend eternity in that city, various reasons emerge for why Saint

---

292 Geiger, *Filippino Lippi’s Carafa Chapel*, 10-11. It served administrative functions for the Dominicans in the city, and by the last third of the century, was a major site of patronage for significant families and cardinals in Rome.
Catherine was buried in Rome. First, she did die in the papal city. Second, Catherine worked diligently during her life to reform the church and to return the papacy from Avignon to Rome, though she is, like many late medieval female saints, now best remembered and promoted for her mystical ecstasies and visions, including the reception of the stigmata. Despite these typical associations, she was also uncommonly involved in contemporary politics, including serving as a papal ambassador, and was a publicly influential woman; her letters address popes and statesmen and blatantly discuss their various duties and responsibilities.

The complicated construction history of Saint Catherine’s tomb indicates why individuals would want to connect themselves to the saint by patronizing her tomb, though its fragmentary state, and the lack of any currently known documentary evidence about its commission, means that conclusions about the tomb are necessarily tentative. However, two phases of the tomb’s construction have been isolated in the fifteenth-century (replacing an earlier trecento tomb), in the 1430s and the 1460s. The renovation of Catherine’s tomb in the 1430s likely stemmed from the greater efforts of Pope Martin V to reestablish and reinvigorate Roman churches following the papacy’s

---

294 Gerald Parsons, The Cult of Saint Catherine of Siena (Burlington VT: Ashgate, 2008), 10.
295 Parsons, The Cult of Saint Catherine of Siena, 11.
extended absences from the city.\textsuperscript{298} The tomb itself was commissioned by Antonio Pierozzi, the Prior of Santa Maria sopra Minerva in the 1430s, who later became Saint Antoninus of Florence.\textsuperscript{299} However, the extent of his patronage and the precise appearance of the tomb at that time are unknown.\textsuperscript{300} In the 1460s, Cardinal Angelo Capranica renovated Saint Catherine’s monument, though again it is unclear how much was accomplished and what of the extant, fragmentary effigy originated from this later patronage campaign.\textsuperscript{301} Angelo Capranica was also later buried in Santa Maria sopra Minerva near the tomb of Saint Catherine,\textsuperscript{302} almost certainly to bask in the holiness of being buried \textit{ad sanctos}, but also to capitalize on his patronal association with the saint. Individuals and institutions, from the quotidian up to the throne of Saint Peter, rarely missed the opportunity to bury a saint and bury them well.

\textbf{External Patronage and Inscriptions}

Of the six tombs that are the product of external patronage, two, those of Saint Justine and Saint Monica, do not feature fifteenth-century inscriptions. One epitaph, that of Saint Catherine of Siena, as discussed above, is strictly limited to identification without reference to patrons or laudatory description and adjectives. Two others, those of

\textsuperscript{300} Nygren, “The Monumental Saint’s Tomb in Italy: 1260-1520,” 395.
\textsuperscript{301} Bianchi suggests that the current sarcophagus is from this later period—it occurred after her canonization—due to the reference to Catherine as “Sancta” in the inscription. See Bianchi, “Il sepolcro di S. Caterina da Siena,” 34.
\textsuperscript{302} Nygren, “The Monumental Saint’s Tomb in Italy: 1260-1520,” 395.
Saint Fina and Chiara Gambacorta, make no reference to their patrons. The inscription on Saint Fina’s tomb, also discussed above, while a fascinating inscription addressing the reader as “Pilgrim,” puts emphasis on Fina’s importance as a local protectress, but does not give any credit to the San Gimignano General Council that commissioned her tomb. Chiara Gambacorta’s tomb inscription recognizes her role as a potential miracle-worker, but also as founder and prioress of the convent of San Domenico and also the magnificence of her father, but the community at San Domenico does not use the inscription to honor itself.

The only remaining inscription is that on the fascinating tomb of Costanza Ammannati. As noted above, the inscription speaks with the voice of her son, Cardinal Jacopo Ammannati, though in no place in the inscription does it identify Jacopo. It reads:

When Sixtus IV was pope my mother Costantia was alive in God but dead for me. Those I have laid down I erect. I am witness that the monuments that were the last ones for you were your son Pavia’s position. Both when you were dead and alive I gave you as much as I could. 1477. 303

The inscription does not directly identify Jacopo as the speaker, however, Costanza’s tomb and that of her son were pendants, formally similar, and located adjacent to each other in Sant’Agostino, and so it is likely that the correspondence between them would have likely been apparent to a fifteenth-century visitor to the church. 304 And while Jacopo


304 For more on the original locations of these two tombs and their relationship to memorial strategies of the Roman curia see Anett Ladegast, “Liturgie und Memoria bei den Ammanati-Grabmälern in S. Agostino,” in Vom Nachleben der Kardinäle. römische
is obliquely credited with the commission of the tomb in the inscription, through the line
“Those I have laid down I erect,” Pope Sixtus IV is acknowledged, not as the patron, but
with an understanding of his papal reign as the supreme marker of time. “When Sixtus IV
was pope” was a period that lasted from 1471-1484, but on the tomb of Costanza
Ammannati, it is given primacy over the rest of the inscription and can be viewed as
Sixtus’s claim of credit, suggesting the monument exists because Sixtus IV was pope.

While there are considerable parallels between tombs that were the product of
internal and external patronage there are also important differences. The motives for
internal patrons, whether husbands or other family members, tended to focus on creating
monuments that glorified the family as a whole, not infrequently as part of a series of
monuments or within the context of tombs honoring other family members. The gender
of the tomb occupant seems to have played a small part in the decision for internal
patrons to commission tombs, as they were usually part of broader, family-centric
patronage. We see these patterns especially playing out in the inscriptions of the
monuments, where internal patrons nearly always claimed some form of authorship for
the monument. In contrast, for the tombs that were the product of external patronage, the
patronal glory was similarly desirable, but reflected less directly. This is evidenced in the
differences in the inscriptions. In only one of the six cases (the tomb of Costanza
Ammannati) of external tomb patronage did the patron take credit for the tomb in its
epitaph. Despite these differences, regardless of whether the patron was internal or
external, monumental tombs were vehicles for conveying the appropriate respect for the
virtuous dead, whether they were wives, mothers, widows, or saints.

*Kardinalsgrabmäler der frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Arne Karsten and Philipp Zitzlsperger,
Multiple Patrons: Spanning the Patronage Divide

Four tombs were commissioned by more than one patron and spanned more than one patronage group as I have delineated them. They are the tombs of Agnese da Mosto Venier, Isotta degli Atti, Costanza Ammannati, and Maria of Aragon Piccolomini. These tombs with their two patron-groups raise the question of whether they follow the patterns we might expect, given the nature of those patron groups as explained in previous sections. Table 15 lists these tombs with their patrons:

Table 15.
Multiple Patrons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tomb Honoree</th>
<th>Patron One (relationship-patronage group)</th>
<th>Patron Two (relationship-patronage group)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnese da Mosto Venier</td>
<td>Agnese da Mosto Venier (Self)</td>
<td>Nicolo Venier (Son-Familial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isotta degli Atti</td>
<td>Isotta degli Atti (Self)</td>
<td>Sigismondo Malatesta (Husband-Conjugal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costanza Ammannati</td>
<td>Jacopo Ammannati (Son-Familial)</td>
<td>Sixtus IV (Pope-External)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria of Aragon Piccolomini</td>
<td>Antonio Piccolomini Todeschini (Husband-Conjugal)</td>
<td>Alfonso II of Aragon (Half-Brother-Familial)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though the patronal situation for these tombs is less straightforward than those previously discussed, the motivations for erecting tombs for these women remain largely the same. Agnese da Mosto Venier and Isotta degli Atti were involved in the commission of their own tombs, with the former receiving assistance from her son, and the latter from her paramour, who later became her husband. Because both of these women were
involved in the patronage of their own monuments, they will be discussed shortly in the next section of this chapter. Though the patronage of Maria of Aragon Piccolomini’s tomb was spread between her husband and her half-brother, her monument is typical of what one would expect for patronage in Naples, particularly for an individual related to the royal line: its overriding emphasis is on family and dynastic continuation. The patronage of Costanza Ammannati’s tomb has already been discussed in depth previously, but it should be concluded that, with regard to that monument, Jacopo Ammannati’s motivations to honor his mother seem to fall in line with typical familial obligations to honor family members. These would have been particularly acute in this instance since he, as a cardinal, had no children (at least none officially recognized) to continue the family line. Pope Sixtus IV’s involvement with Costanza’s tomb was economic, surely, but also indicates the general ethos and necessity, regardless of which

---

305 Emphasizing dynasty and women’s essential roles in it was a long-established practice of Neapolitan royal tombs initiated by the Angevins. See chapter one of this dissertation for more.
306 It was also typical of what Neapolitan nobles were capable of commissioning, as presented by Grit Heidemann at the Renaissance Society of America conference in 2012 with a paper entitled “Visualizing a Social Group’s Identity: Family Chapels in S. Maria di Monteoliveto, Naples” in the session Sacred Places, Public Spaces: Chapels, Tombs, and Memorial Culture in Renaissance Italy. For more on the patronage of Alfonso II see Hersey, Alfonso II and the Artistic Renewal of Naples 1485-1495, passim. Maria of Aragon Piccolomini’s chapel is located in the same church that Alfonso II patronized with his famous Lamentation by Guido Mazzoni. On the Lamentation see Heather Graham, “Affecting Bodies: Guido Mazzoni’s Lamentations in Context” (PhD diss., The University of California Los Angeles, 2010) and Timothy Verdon, The Art of Guido Mazzoni (New York and London: Garland Publishing Inc., 1978). And for a more general study of these terracotta tableaux see the forthcoming dissertation by Betsy Bennett Purvis from the University of Toronto, entitled “Palpable Politics and Embodied Passions: Terracotta Tableau Sculpture in Italy, 1450-1550.”
307 Zuraw does mention the tantalizing prospect of a document from 1478 in which the cardinal leaves property, including a house in Rome and a vineyard, to a Florentine woman named Fiammetta, though it is certainly beyond the scope of the current project to speculate on why the cardinal might have done such a thing. See Zuraw, “The Sculptures of Mino da Fiesole,” 1018.
group a patron belongs too—whether conjugal, familial, or external—of burying worthy individuals well, irrespective of their gender.\textsuperscript{308}

**Women and Self-Patronage of Monumental Tombs**

In six instances among the monumental tombs from *quattrocento* Italy, the women who were honored by tombs were also involved in the patronage of their monuments. They are listed as follows:

36. Caterina dei Francesi (c. 1405, San Felice Chapel, Sant’Antonio, Padua)
37. Agnese da Mosto Venier (c. 1410, Santi Giovanni e Paolo, Venice)
38. Sibilia Cetto (1421, San Francesco Grande, Padua)
39. Isotta degli Atti (1447, Chapel of Isotta of Saint Michael the Archangel, San Francesco, Rimini)
40. Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camponeschi (1488, San Bernardino, Aquila)
41. Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola (1503, San Benedetto Polirone, San Benedetto Po)

Two of these tombs (those for Agnese da Mosto Venier and Isotta degli Atti) had patrons in other categories as well, leaving four (of thirty-five, or 11.4 percent) tombs exclusively patronized by their subjects. Though this is a limited number in relation to the total number of extant women’s tombs, it is dramatically greater than previously posited, given that scholars have assumed there were *no* tombs patronized by women whether for themselves or for others. Of the six tombs, three of them include an effigy: the tombs of Caterina dei Francesi; Sibilia Cetto (her effigy is in relief as part of a slab tomb); and Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camponeschi. The tombs of Agnese da Mosto Venier and Isotta degli Atti are elaborately sculpted wall monuments, while Lucrezia Pico della

\textsuperscript{308} Strocchia, *Death and Ritual in Renaissance Florence*, 5-6. Again I would draw your attention (as in fn. 235) to Strocchia’s assertion that “…the fundamental human obligation to bury the dead was inextricably bound up with the social imperative to bury them well.” (emphasis mine).
Mirandola’s tomb is carved in the round. In the following sections, I shall examine these tombs in relation to the criteria applied to the already discussed patronage groups, social status, geography, and inscriptions, to show that they do differ from their male-commissioned counterparts. The tombs of Maria Pereria and Beatrice Camponeschi and Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola will also be studied in a separate section to demonstrate how they are representative of the changes women’s commemoration began to undergo at the beginning of the sixteenth-century.

**Self-Patronage and Social Standing**

All of the six individuals who patronized their own tombs were widows, except for Isotta degli Atti. Though Isotta was eventually left widowed, her tomb was commissioned and construction begun when Sigismondo Malatesta was still alive, and in fact, Isotta and Sigismondo were not even yet married, which will be discussed in greater depth below. This fact is significant, because it brings the self-patronage of women’s tombs in line with standard interpretations for other commissions by women during this period. For the scholars who have studied women’s patronage, particularly Catherine King, a woman’s marital status is viewed as the primary factor in whether or not a woman could patronize art, in that widows had significantly more freedom to commission art than women whose husbands were living. King also suggests that

---

310 Laws and regulations about whether women were returned their dowries upon widowhood varied from commune to commune. However, widows were usually, by a significant margin, the most financially independent group of Renaissance women.
funerary monuments were typical commissions for widows, though she clarifies her statement by stating that they would have usually been for a husband or a son.\footnote{311} Two typical examples of such widow-patrons are revealed by my study: Caterina dei Francesi and Sibilia Cetto, women who died in the first quarter of the fifteenth century, though in slightly different circumstances. Caterina was the wife of the prodigious patron Bonifacio Lupi, who commissioned the San Giacomo (later San Felice) Chapel at the Santo, Padua,\footnote{312} and her patronage of her tomb located in that space can therefore be considered an addendum to that of her husband. However, Sibilia, whose tomb is a slab and a double monument with her husband, is understood to be the sole benefactress of the hospital, church, and monastery of San Francesco Grande, Padua, a site that also included her double tomb.\footnote{313}

\footnote{311} King goes so far as to say, “when widows commissioned sculpted effigies of the grander sort – busts or full length figures in the round – they did so for men.” This assertion is incorrect. King, Renaissance Women Patrons, 80.


\footnote{313} The complex was entirely funded by her property. Her husband, Ser Baldo Bonafari, was a lawyer who managed her accounts until his death in 1418, at which point Sibilia seems to have taken over the administration of her funds and the construction of the complex. See King, Renaissance Women Patrons, 63. Sibilia specifically mentions the tomb that was constructed in her honor in her will, which can be found in the Archivio della Curia Vescovile di Padova: ACV, Hospitale Sancti Francisci ff. 5-10 and is, to my knowledge, unpublished. However, the will is discussed in Claudio Bellinati, ‘Ospitale Sancti Franciscii. Contributo alla storia della carità e dell’assistenza religiosa nell’ospedale di San Francesco a Padova (xv-xvii secolo),’ in Il complesso di San Francesco Grande in Padova: storia e arte, ed. Associazione Culturale Francescana di Padova (Padua, 1983), 21.
Women who were without sons had access to the dowries and inheritances that would otherwise be passed to male progeny. They, therefore, had greater flexibility to enact commissions through their wills, the primary avenue by which women could make provisions for art.\textsuperscript{314} But there are two instances of women’s tomb self-patronage that contradict these assumptions. Agnese da Mosto Venier is an example of a woman who provided for her funerary monument through her will, but significantly, she did have a son.\textsuperscript{315} Isotta degli Atti also had born a son to Sigismondo Malatesta in 1447 (and would go on to have more children by him),\textsuperscript{316} which did not preclude her from commissioning her tomb chapel in the next year, and in fact, scholars believe that it is the conception of the birth of this first son that is recorded in the (original) inscription of her sarcophagus.\textsuperscript{317}

Isotta degli Atti is, as mentioned above, a special case when it comes to her social position as well as the commissioning of her monument. Isotta, as has been elegantly analyzed by Helen S. Ettlinger, was a uniquely well-recorded mistress in early

\textsuperscript{314} Sibilia Cetto, for example, had no children at all. King, \textit{Renaissance Women Patrons}, 83ff.

\textsuperscript{315} For Agnese’s will(s) see cat. #24. For a discussion of Agnese’s tomb, see Hurlburt, “Individual Fame and Family Honor: The Tomb of the Dogaressa Agnese da Mosto Venier” and Hurlburt, \textit{The Dogaresse of Venice}. Niccolo Venier, who was almost certainly an executor of her will, takes credit for her tomb in the inscription, which is discussed in greater detail above.

\textsuperscript{316} This first son, Giovanni, died shortly after birth in May of 1447, though he was buried with “grandissimo onore di tutti gli ordini e da tutto il popolo” in San Francesco. See \textit{Cronaca Malatestiana}, 119 and Ettlinger, “Visibilis et Invisibilis: The Mistress in Italian Renaissance Court Society,” 774. Isotta had six children with Sigismondo (Giovanni #1, Malatesta, Giovanni #2, Sallustio, Valerio Galleotto, and Antonia), including another son, Malatesta, who was legitimized by papal fiat in 1450, though she and Sigismondo were not actually married until 1456. Malatesta also died in childhood. Sallustio survived to adulthood and eventually became Sigismondo’s designated heir. See P.J. Jones, \textit{The Malatesta of Rimini and the Papal State} (Cambridge, 1974): 205, 245.

\textsuperscript{317} Hope, “The Early History of the Tempio Malatestiano,” 62.
Renaissance history, despite the fact that she was not even Sigismondo Malatesta’s first recognized mistress. When Sigismondo met Isotta, who was only ten years old at the time, he had already been married twice (first to Ginevra d’Este and then to Polissena Sforza, his wife when he met Isotta), and was also involved with another woman Vanetta Toschi (with whom Sigismondo had at least two children prior to beginning his relationship with Isotta). Though mistresses were regular features of fifteenth-century Italian life, as Ettlinger’s study makes clear, Isotta’s liminal and pseudo-official position as “concubina,” might have opened the door for her more prominent patronage of her funerary monument while she was still alive.

Isotta can be considered patron of her own chapel because of a papal bull issued by Pope Nicholas V on 12 September 1447 decreeing that, in her will, she had endowed the chapel with 500 florins so that it could be renovated, that the friars in residence at San Francesco were to accept the donation, and appointed trustees and executors to enact Isotta’s stated desires. Other documentary evidence supporting the idea of Isotta’s active role in patronizing her own chapel is a receipt dated 15 May 1448 from Perleone de’Perleoni acknowledging the endowment of 500 florins from Isotta for the chapel.

---

320 As she was later described by Pope Pius II, who denied the validity of Isotta and Sigismondo’s 1456 marriage. Pius II, Commentaries, translated by F. A. Gragg (Northampton, MA, 1937-57): 167.
322 For a transcription of this document see cat. #13. It is difficult to compare pricing of art, but 500 florins could be considered both a hefty sum and a meager one for a work of art. The annual salary for a lawyer in the fifteenth century might have been around 350
Isotta’s patronage of her funerary chapel at San Francesco seems to have only been a small part of Sigismondo’s role as patron of the entire structure, but the fact remains that while neither a wife nor a widow she exercised exceptional patronal control over her own monument.

Women who patronized their own monuments were therefore not, as King has asserted, always widows, nor were they always without sons. While these instances are still rare among the broader body of women’s tombs, the combination of a broader understanding of women’s self-patronage of their tombs and the seemingly gender-neutral approach to tombs illustrated by those commissioned by men indicates that the gender of the patron and the tomb occupant is less important than the commemoration itself.

**Self-Patronage and Geography**

Women commissioned their own monumental tombs in many regions across the Italian peninsula and all of their monuments are located in their hometowns. Geography seems to have played a limited role in whether or not women were capable of commissioning their own tombs, though it seems clear that women were *only* capable of commissioning tombs in the primary locus of their familial power, unlike men.\(^{323}\) The even distribution of dates indicates that, contrary to the exponential proliferation of

---

\(^{323}\) Maria Pereira is an interesting exception to this idea, which will be discussed in greater detail below.
women’s tombs that occurred throughout the century, women’s ability to patronize their monuments did not fluctuate over the course of the *quattrocento*. Political considerations also do not seem to have a large effect on women’s patronage—Padua was under Venetian control from 1405 onward; Venice was a republic; Rimini was locally ruled by a *condottiero* as part of the Papal States; L’Aquila was part of the Kingdom of Naples; and San Benedetto Po was part of the Marquisate of Mantua—covering nearly every type of government possible in fifteenth-century Italy.

Significantly there are two tombs commissioned by women located in the city of Padua, a full one-third of the total of six monuments. This concentration, if it may be called that, might have been influenced by the precedence of female commemoration set in the *trecento* there by Fina Buzzacarini at the Paduan Baptistery.324 While a full exploration of women’s tombs in the fourteenth century is outside the scope of the present study, it is likely that locations with higher concentrations of monumental women’s tombs, like Padua or Naples, and locales with greater numbers of female patrons are probably continuing extant fourteenth-century traditions of how female patronage could be valued.

**Self-Patronage and Inscriptions**

The inscriptions on the tombs that are products of self-patronage are revealing; while the inscriptions are generally formatted the same with the same references to patronage, they approach the tomb subjects in entirely different ways. Five of them are

---

324 This is discussed in greater detail in chapter one of this dissertation.
available for comparison; and of these five, three of them, those for the tombs of Caterina Francesi, Maria Pereira, and Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola, put significantly more emphasis on the women honored by the tomb than the other inscriptions examined in this study. The women identify themselves first, and limit any references to husbands or other male relatives to the last few lines of the inscriptions. None of them speaks with the voice of a man, but rather as a neutral third-person narrator.

The inscription on the tomb of Caterina dei Francesi overtly states that it is Caterina’s tomb, and lists her myriad virtues: “Caterina dei Francesi is covered by this urn below….She was prudent and just and charming by the gravity of her morals / a standard of virtue…” before mentioning her husband at the end of the inscription. Though Caterina does not claim credit for constructing her own tomb, her inscription emphasizes her much more thoroughly than inscriptions on tombs commissioned by men. In the other two instances, the inscriptions of Maria Pereira and Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola, the women take explicit credit for the creation of their tombs. In the case of Maria Pereira, the inscription tells us, “for her worthy only daughter, and for herself, [she] erected [this monument] while still living.”

---

325 The other two inscriptions, those of Isotta degli Atti and Agnese da Mosto Venier, are on tombs that were products of multiple patrons (self patronage and conjugal for the former and self patronage and familial for the latter). Isotta degli Atti’s inscription, as has been discussed above, is unique in its laudatory praise of the subject without reference to the patron, while Agnese da Mosto Venier’s inscription is typical of tombs resulting from familial patronage. The inscription on the tomb of Sibilia Cetto is too worn to be read in photographs and because of the current location of the tomb, I was not able to see it in person, nor have I been able to find a transcription of the inscription in the literature. Caterina’s tomb inscription is cut down at the end, though a nineteenth-century record of the inscription indicates the missing part is the completion of a date and would not necessarily have any bearing on the interpretation presented here. See cat. #14 and Wolters, La scultura gotica veneziana, 231.

326 See cat. #26. Translation Benjamin Eldredge.
Mirandola inverts the typical language of such commissions by asserting she 
“commissioned the fashioning of the sarcophagus in this place for herself and for her 
most dear husband…”328 Maria Periería’s and Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola’s tombs are 
also indicative of a more self-aware style of women’s tomb patronage, and as such, they 
merit further discussion in the section below.

The End of the Fifteenth Century: the Tombs of Maria Pereira and Lucrezia Pico 
della Mirandola

The tombs of Maria Pereira and Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola deserve separate 
analysis because they represent the changing landscape of women’s commemoration at 
the end of the fifteenth century. In fact, Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola’s tomb was chosen 
as the end point of this study because it is not part of a tradition of female 
commemoration like the royal tombs in Naples, but rather begins an era of self-conscious 
female commemoration that continued and expanded in the sixteenth century.329 We can 
see the beginnings of this self-aware style of patronage in the tomb of Maria Pereira, 
which will be analyzed first.

In terms of social status, Maria Pereira was an aristocrat; she was a member of the 
Spanish royal family and married to Pietro Lalle Camponeschi, the count of Montorio 
and the hero of L’Aquila’s resistance to Neapolitan Aragonese control of the city.330

329 For more on this see Amy Cymbala’s forthcoming dissertation from the University of 
Pittsburgh. I would like to acknowledge the many conversations that I have had with 
Amy for helping to shape my thinking on this topic.
330 For this history, see Pierluigi Terenzi, “Una città superiorem recognoscens: la 
negoziacione fra L’Aquila e i sovrani aragonesi (1442-1496),” Archivio Storico Italiano 
Maria commissioned her tomb when she was still alive, which also, per its inscription, ostensibly was motivated in honor of her fifteen-month-old daughter who had suddenly died. The tomb, which takes the form of a “humanist tomb,”\textsuperscript{331} commemorates her family’s role in the political life of L’Aquila after her husband had already been exiled from the city and in the same year that she was ordered away by the King of Naples. Its location in L’Aquila was likely a conscious political statement on Maria’s part.\textsuperscript{332} It is also situated in the spiritually advantageous position adjacent to the high altar of San Bernardino, L’Aquila, allowing burial \textit{ad sanctos}, in that it is also directly adjacent to the elaborate tomb of Saint Bernardo of Siena.\textsuperscript{333}

In the inscription on the tomb, Maria gives herself credit for commissioning the monument and states its intention to honor her daughter who died as a toddler:

\begin{quote}
For the infant Beatrice Camponeschi, a sweet child, who lived 15 months, Maria Pereira de Noroña, Mother and noble descendent of the kings of Spain Through both her mother and her father wife of Pietro Lalle Camponeschi, Count of Montorio, for her worthy only daughter, and for herself, erected [this monument] while still living.\textsuperscript{334}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{331} The tomb’s formal connections to the “humanist” type of tomb will be discussed in greater detail in the next chapter of this dissertation.


\textsuperscript{333} For this tomb see the forthcoming dissertation by Pavla Langer, “Die Grabstätte des hl. Bernhardin in L’Aquila im Kontext der Heiligenverehrung des 15. und frühen 16. Jahrhunderts” from the Universität of Bonn.

\textsuperscript{334} BEATRICI CAMPONISCÆA E INFANTI DULCIS QUAE VIXIT MENSES XV MARIA PÆREYRA NORO- / NIAQUE MATER E CLARISSIMA HISPANORUM REGUM STIRPE TAM MATERNO QUAM PATERNO GENERE ORTA PETRI LAL- / LI CAMPONISCI MONORII COMITIS CONIUNX FILIAE Suae Unicae Benemerenti Et Sibi Vivens Posuit. (Translation Benjamin Eldredge).
Maria’s epitaph is the only surviving example from the fifteenth century of those self-patronized that makes a point to refer to herself as “still living.” By commissioning her monument, doing so while she was alive, and in the process creating one of the few extant monumental tombs that also commemorates a child (and a daughter no less!), the monument marks a new point in the construction of women’s monumental tombs in the fifteenth century.

An even more self-aware and active role in the creation of women’s tombs is a hallmark of sixteenth-century monuments, which is also in evidence by the tomb of Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola. Her tomb, dating from 1503, indicates a shift in thinking for women’s commemoration. The monument, located in the monastery of San Benedetto Polirone in San Benedetto Po (province of Mantua) is a simple rectangular sarcophagus with inscriptions and coats of arms on the front and a sharply pitched, gabled lid. The form of her sarcophagus, which is unique among the tombs in this study, refers back to classical monuments, the massive porphyry tombs of the later Norman kings of Sicily, and some of Matilda’s late medieval Pico family predecessors in Mirandola.\(^{335}\) More significantly, however, the appearance of Lucrezia’s tomb expressly emulates the earlier monument of Countess Matilda of Canossa, the eleventh- and early twelfth-century ruler of huge swaths of central and northeastern Italy, who had been buried at Polirone on her

wishes after her death in July of 1115.\textsuperscript{336} The two tombs were even located for a time in the same chapel, situating the visually similar tombs as pendants.\textsuperscript{337}

Though emulation on tomb monuments is not limited to Lucrezia—Maria Pereira’s emulation of a “humanist tomb” is another example of the practice—by consciously mimicking the earlier woman’s tomb, locating their monuments in the same edifice, and utilizing what would have been recognizable by the beginning of the cinquecento as a \textit{retardataire} style,\textsuperscript{338} Lucrezia’s patronage and tomb mark the beginning of new, more fully realized period of women’s commemoration. With her tomb the development of women’s monumental commemoration that characterized the \textit{quattrocento} comes to an end.\textsuperscript{339}

\textbf{Conclusion}

Aside from different emphases in their inscriptions, there are no significant differences between the monuments commissioned by women for themselves (or the few tombs commissioned by women for other women, like the tombs of Beata Beatrice Rusca and Beata Villana) and the tombs commissioned by men. The imagery and the iconography are consistent; effigies are not more prevalent on one type or the other; there is no dramatic difference between the size or elaborateness of the monuments based on whether or not they were commissioned by men or women; and the tombs were created

\textsuperscript{336} Holman, “Exemplum and Imitatio,” passim., especially 644.
\textsuperscript{337} Holman, “Exemplum and Imitatio,” 644.
\textsuperscript{338} The style of her tomb is dramatically unlike the elegant, classical refinement typical of tombs constructed everywhere else in Italy at the end of the fifteenth century and beginning of the sixteenth.
\textsuperscript{339} In the sixteenth century women’s tombs are commissioned with even greater frequency, and the developments that occurred in the fifteenth century—particularly the shift to a broader patrician, though still elite, patronal group—become codified.
by equally famous artists. Patronal differences do emerge when life-stage or status of the tomb honoree is considered. Tombs commissioned by husbands were primarily for women who died young, and a proportion of these were for women who died in childbirth. Widows were frequently honored with tombs by their children, though it was also this group of women who were most likely to commission tombs for themselves. Institutional patronage was exclusively saved for saints, beate, and women connected to institutional religious life, though lay-women could be honored by tombs originating from internal and external patrons. The motivations for patronage of tombs, whether the patron was a husband, child, more distant relative, or the pope, remain the same as they are for the patronage of men’s tombs. Finally, Maria Pereira’s tomb blatantly contradicts the assumptions expressed in the quotations at the beginning of this chapter, namely that women did not commission tombs for themselves. Additionally, Maria Pereira and her young daughter Beatrice were certainly not saints, and their tomb contradicts Catherine King’s assumption that a women could only commission an effigial tomb for a saintly woman. And as this chapter has demonstrated over and over again, while sons and husbands frequently were the patrons of their wives’ and mothers’ sepulchers, they certainly were not the “only” patrons of women’s monumental tombs.
Chapter Three. Women Out of Frames: Effigies on Women’s Monumental Tombs and Fifteenth-Century Portraiture

“She is lying on a simple pillow, with a hound at her feet. Her dress is of the simplest middle age character, folding closely over the bosom, and tight to the arms, clasped about the neck. Round her head is a circular fillet, with three star shaped flowers. From under this the hair falls like that of the Magdalene, its undulation just felt as it touches the cheek, & no more. The arms are not folded, nor the hands clasped nor raised. Her arms are laid softly at length upon her body, and the hands cross as they fall. The drapery flows over the feet and half hides the hound. It is impossible to tell you the perfect sweetness of the lips & the closed eyes, nor the solemnity of the seal of death which is set upon the whole figure. The sculpture, as art, is in every way perfect – truth itself, but truth selected with inconceivable refinement of feeling.”

John Ruskin’s ecstatic description of the effigy of Ilaria del Carretto, penned in a letter written to his father on 6 May 1845, illustrates the profound, even life-changing

---

341 Ruskin’s description of the Ilaria tomb is found in a letter to his father and is his first mention in writing of the monument, which he describes elsewhere as “life-changing.” Ruskin’s rapturous reaction is just one example of many where Ilaria has made an impact on writers. Her presence in literary works is well documented. For Ruskin’s description, see John Ruskin, The Works of John Ruskin, vol. ii, ed. E.T. Cook and A. Wedderburn (New York: Longmans, Green, and co., 1903-1912), 239, and for Ilaria in literature, see in particular Helen Geddes, “Iacopo della Quercia scultore sanese: Late Medieval or Early Renaissance artist?” Renaissance Studies 21.2 (2007): 199, fn. 36; 201, fn. 43. In her poem, “The Tomb of Ilaria Guinigi,” Edith called Ilaria “the first-born of the Renascence,” and the writer Charles Morgan in The Writer and His World. Lectures and Essays saw an interior radiance to Ilaria that could be found in no other Renaissance sculpture. Morgan also wrote about Ilaria in 1936, this time in his novel Sparkenbroke, A Tale of Piers Tenniel. Lord Sparkenbroke, where he described the tomb as a catalyst for emotions for the lovers of the story, and the author suggested the stone effigy has the quality of seeming alive. For Wharton, see Edith Wharton, “The Tomb of Ilaria Guinigi,” Scribner’s Magazine 9 (1891): 156 and Appendix 3. For Morgan’s writings, see Charles Morgan, The Writer and His World. Lectures and Essays (London: Macmillan and Co, 1960), 43-54, 47-50 and Charles Morgan, Sparkenbroke, A Tale of Piers Tenniel, Lord Sparkenbroke (New York: Macmillan, 1958), 380-84, 391-92, 452-52. An anthology dedicated to Ilaria published in 1962 includes extracts of poems by Gabriele d’Annunzio, Mario Bèrgomi, Ceccardo Roccatagliata Ceccardi, Alfonso Gatto, Manfred Lentzen, and Salvatore Quasimodo. Finally, Pier Paolo Pasolini in the poem “L’Appenino” from 1951
effects the sculpture had upon the author. Ilaria’s effigy moved not only Ruskin; according to Giorgio Vasari, when Ilaria’s despot husband was overthrown nearly twenty-five years after her death, the people spared her tomb, because of the “bellezza della figura.”\textsuperscript{342} Whether seen in the eyes of its initial fifteenth-century audience, or of a nineteenth-century English gentleman participating in the Grand Tour, the effigy of Ilaria del Carretto has been the absolute focal point of her monument. Such an emphasis on the effigy certainly is not specific to the Ilaria tomb, nor to women’s tombs in general, as after all, effigies are the most significant sculptural component of any tomb monument. However, the fact that a noticeable majority of women’s tombs feature a depiction of their honoree as an effigy or, in a few instances, through other types of bodily representations, merits attention, as these sculptures represent a neglected category of

\textsuperscript{342} Giorgio Vasari, \textit{Le vite de’ più eccellenti pittori, scultori ed architettori}, vol. 2, ed. Gaetano Milanesi (Florence: G.C. Sansoni, 1906), 112: “A Lucca e quivi a Paulo Guinigi che n’era signore fece per la moglie che poco inanzi era morta, nella chiesa di S. Martino una sepoltura; nel basamento della quale condusse alcuni putti di marmo che reggono un festone tanto pulitamente, che parevano di carne; e nella cassa posta sopra il detto basamento fece con infinita diligenze l’immagine della moglie d’esso Paulo Guinigi che dentro vi fu sepolta; e a’ piedi d’essa fece nel medesimo sasso un cane di tondo relievo, per la fede da lei protato al marito. La qual cassa, partito o piuttosto cacciato che fu Paolo l’anno 1429 di Lucca, e che la città rimase libera, fu levata di quell luogo, e per l’odio che alla memoria del Guinigio portavano i Lucchesi, quasi del tutto rovinata. Pure, la reverenza che portarono alla bellezza della figura e di tanti ornamenti, li rattenne, e fu cagione che poco appresso la cassa e la figura furono con diligenza all’entrata della porta della sagrestia collocate, dove al presente sono; e la cappella del Guinigio fatta della comunità” (Italics mine).
female portraiture. The independent portrait format in both painting and sculpture developed in the fifteenth century as a nuanced combination of likeness, ideals of beauty and virtue, identity and memory creation, all criteria that apply equally well to the function of effigies on monumental tombs. In fact, as major components of public, monumental sculpture, effigies are the single most prominent depictions of Renaissance women, enjoying much wider viewership than the painted and sculpted portraits usually restricted to a domestic context. Thus, female tomb effigies can and should be examined as examples of portraiture.

Like women’s tombs, portrait paintings and busts served a commemorative function (whether the woman they depicted was deceased or not), and the painted and sculpted forms developed simultaneously in the fifteenth century. As portraits of individuals, effigies even have the advantage over independent panel paintings and portrait busts in that the subject is always clearly identified. Effigies are demonstrably

More generally, effigies of either gender are excluded from broader discussions of portraiture, which will be examined in more detail in the literature review later in this chapter.


Though they lie outside the scope of my current project, the same argument could be made for male effigies.


A challenging aspect of studying Renaissance portraits is that the identities of the sitters, if they actually depict specific individuals, have often been lost to time. See Evelyn Welch, “Naming Names: The Transience of Individual Identity in Fifteenth-Century Italian Portraiture,” in The Image of the Individual ed. Nicholas Mann and Luke Syson (London: British Museum Press, 1998), 91-104.
public sculptures; they are large, located in churches, and by their prominence, they are meant to be seen in order to function as markers of memory. Painted panel portraits might be exchanged among families, particularly in northern court cities as part of marriage negotiations, but because of their small size and more private display, they were much more limited in their viewership. Portrait busts, like panel paintings, are smaller, more private works of art, typically displayed in the home. While these objects would have a smaller audience than public sculptures like tombs, all three types of portraits—panel paintings, busts, and effigies—were intended to construct memory. Despite their advantages of being identified, public monuments, effigies have played a peripheral role in the field of Renaissance portraiture studies. It is, then, the goal of this chapter to situate effigies as essential components within the broader discourse on Renaissance portraiture and demonstrate that, as publicly visible representations of Renaissance women, effigies on monumental tombs should be considered as likenesses that the subjects and patrons of these tombs devised to embody their memory. While these tombs engage with notions of

348 Rubin, “Understanding Renaissance Portraiture” 8-9. Rubin suggested that among court cities portraits of marriageable women would factor into marriage negotiations, while in the mercantile republics portraits were more typically created after marriage had taken place and new members of the family could be proudly portrayed.
350 Alison Wright suggested that painted portraits could be examples of public memory construction in that they were frequently hung in bedrooms, and bedrooms were ostensibly public places. See Alison Wright, “The Memory of Faces: Representational Choices in Fifteenth-Century Florentine Portraiture,” 88.
the ideal, the individualized and nuanced public presentations of these women in their effigies broaden our understanding of the ways Renaissance women were represented.

**Review of Portraiture Literature**

Portraits continue to be some of the most thoroughly examined and discussed artifacts from the Italian Renaissance, although effigies, despite the advantages outlined above, have played a strikingly limited role in this discourse. And while much of the portraiture literature focuses on panel painting, “portrait” should be, as suggested by the historian Peter Burke, defined as “a representation of an individual such that it could be recognized by friends and acquaintances as a ‘likeness,’” which absolutely should include effigies. The artificial separation of painted portraits from other types of likenesses, especially identified effigies, is a flaw of the literature and should be rectified to create a more thorough understanding of how Renaissance individuals represented themselves and had themselves represented by others. A selection of the vast corpus of literature on portraiture is here organized based on each source’s approach to the material, with particular emphasis on how it considers ideas of mimesis, and whether or not it includes sculpted imagery or addresses gender in its analysis. Overwhelmingly, these sources, though some include discussions of sculptural genres such as portrait busts and medals or address notions of commemoration, do not engage with effigy portraits.

*Early Florentine Studies:*

---

351 Notions of the ideal and its poetic connotations are addressed more thoroughly in the next chapter of this dissertation.

Renaissance portraiture became a distinctly studied category of art early in the twentieth century, with the initial attention directed nearly exclusively to Florence and profile portraits. Jean Lipman provided one of the earliest broad studies of Florentine portraiture with her article of 1936, the “The Florentine Profile Portrait in the Quattrocento,” in which she argued that the profile portrait was indicative of specifically Florentine taste in the second half of the *quattrocento*. She studied a group of fifty extant examples, of both men and women, and she did not include sculpture, either busts or effigies. Interestingly, Lipman did not make any gender distinctions in her analysis, and aside from suggesting that women’s images were “intrinsically flattering and more decorative,” she did not ascribe any virtuous or idealized attributes to the

---


355 Lipman, “The Florentine Profile Portrait in the Quattrocento,” 54. She argued that the limited illusionism of the painted profile portrait was a return to a more medieval abstraction of the image in order to create a clear and successful memory image.
portraits.\textsuperscript{356} The Florentine emphasis continued with Rab Hatfield’s article from 1965, “Five Early Renaissance Portraits,”\textsuperscript{357} which examined five of the earliest surviving Florentine portraits of men and began the taxonomic analysis of portraiture. His article is an early instance of the separation of genders, despite the fact that the five images all feature idealized profile-portraits, which became a distinctly gendered type later in the scholarship.\textsuperscript{358}

\textit{General Portraiture Surveys:}

Despite a continued Florentine emphasis, portraiture quickly became the subject of more general studies. John Pope-Hennessy provided an early wide-ranging analysis of portraiture in his A.W. Mellon Lectures at the National Gallery of Art, Washington DC, published as \textit{The Portrait in the Renaissance} in 1966.\textsuperscript{359} Pope-Hennessy included both Italian and northern Renaissance images in his lectures and acknowledged that portraits were included in frescoes and religious paintings. However, and perhaps most significantly, Pope-Hennessy held a narrow view of what could be considered a portrait, restricting the type to realistic and naturalistic images and arguing that “portraiture is the depiction of the individual in his own character” and that “portrait painting is

\textsuperscript{356} Lipman, “The Florentine Profile Portrait in the Quattrocento,” 95.
\textsuperscript{357} Rab Hatfield, “Five Early Renaissance Portraits,” \textit{Art Bulletin} 47.3 (1965): 315-334.
\textsuperscript{358} Other specifically Florentine sources also include the early book by Emil Schaeffer. See Emil Schaeffer, \textit{Das florentiner Bildnis} (Münich: Bruckmann, 1904). Contemporaneous with Rab Hatfield was Jean Alazard’s publication, see Jean Alazard, \textit{The Florentine Portrait} (New York: Schocken Books, 1968).
empirical.” Though Pope-Hennessy included a wider range of works of art because his definition of portraiture was more inclusive than that of previous scholars, he still fell short of considering effigies or gender. Pope-Hennessy’s insistence on the indexical mimetic quality of portraiture was vastly influential on later portraiture studies, both for scholars how upheld this notion and for those who tried to refute it.

A continued fascination with a wider understanding of portraiture continued with Gottfried Boehm, *Bildnis und Individuum: über den Ursprung der Porträtmalerei in der italienischen Renaissance* from 1985. Boehm sought to reconsider partially Jacob Burckhardt’s ideas of the relationship between Renaissance ideas of the individual and

---

360 Pope-Hennessy, *The Portrait in the Renaissance*, xi, 3. Pope-Hennessy also divided the portraits “in terms of the ideas by which [they were] inspired.”

361 Of the 330 images that Pope-Hennessy discussed throughout his lectures, only four are explicitly connected to monumental memorial imagery, and none are effigies. These are the death mask of Filippo Brunelleschi, which served as a model for a commemorative bust sculpted by Buggiano; the mask of Girolamo della Torre, from the *Della Torre Monument* by Riccio; and two small roundel portrait reliefs from tombs in Florence: one of Neri Capponi by Antonio Rossellino and one of Bernardo Giunigi by Mino da Fiesole. Pope-Hennessy, *The Portrait in the Renaissance*, 24, 82. For instance, when he discussed the unusual instance of the surviving panel painting and fresco of Giovanna degli Albizi (both Domenico Ghirlandaio, the former: 1488, tempera on panel, Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid; the latter: *Cappella Maggiore*, 1485-90, Santa Maria Novella, Florence) he did not examine the paintings in relation to the sitter’s gender at all. He asserted that female portrait busts adhere less strictly to classical precedents and conventions, but otherwise he did not interpret them differently than male portrait busts. As much as he ignored memorial imagery, Pope-Hennessy also did not make any considerations of gender. He did not address gender as a point of difference between portraits, either for panel paintings or portrait busts, and explained the later continuation of the profile view for women’s portraits in Florence by stating it was the most “advantageous” and “flattering” view-point. See Pope-Hennessy, *The Portrait in the Renaissance*, 41. Notably, Pope-Hennessy went on to assert that the standardized form of profile view for women’s portraits made it a subject of experimentation for all of the great late-fifteenth-century Florentine painters, a view which is congruent with my interpretation of women’s tombs as sites of sculptural experimentation. I discuss the formal experimentation typical of some women’s tombs elsewhere in this dissertation.

the portrait. While Boehm approached the material from a philosophical standpoint and addressed thematic approaches to portraits, including physiognomy, genre, self-portraits, and quasi-portraits, his emphasis was painted imagery, especially that from the Veneto, and he included almost no discussion of sculpted portraits. Boehm does, however, repeatedly acknowledge the important point that prior to the Early Modern period, portraits were not called by that name, but rather referred to as icons, *imago*, effigies, simulacrum, and exemplum, indicating the slippage that existed in contemporary thinking between the represented body and the corporeal body.

Lorne Campbell’s *Renaissance Portraits. European Portrait-Painting in the 14th, 15th, and 16th Centuries* from 1990 continued the survey approach to portraiture studies. Campbell also examined painted images only, through which he created distinct portrait types not limited by geography, and irrespective of the sitter’s gender. He further rejected Pope-Hennessy’s contention that portraits could be read to indicate the character of the sitter, though seeming to continue his notion that portraits were objective observations. In contrast to these earlier approaches, Richard Brilliant’s book, *Portraiture*, of 1991, applied a different method. The book is a study of portraiture through the ages, but he included specific discussions of likeness, identity creation,
reception and the self-portrait, which became particularly important points of theoretical discussions beginning in the 1990s, examined more below.\textsuperscript{369}

John Shearman included a lecture on portraiture in his 1988 A.W. Mellon Lecture series, published as “Portraits and Poets,” in \textit{Only Connect... Art and the Spectator in the Italian Renaissance} \textsuperscript{370} While Shearman’s focus was painted portraits, particularly from 1490-1530, he emphasized the commemorative nature of portraits, considered whether portraitists could be successful in describing the spirit and mind of painted figures, and described their relation to the classical \textit{Iconic Epigrams}.\textsuperscript{371} In effect, his concern was the \textit{paragone} of poetry and painting and the lifelikeness of portraiture, anticipating increasingly theoretical understandings of portraiture, which will be discussed shortly.

\textit{Gendered Approaches:}

As so many portraits exist of women, portraiture was a major entry point for feminist approaches to Renaissance art history, when, in 1988,\textsuperscript{372} Patricia Simons used

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Many of Brilliant’s ideas were subsequently examined in an approach specific to the Renaissance in Nicholas Mann and Luke Syson’s edited volume. See Nicholas Mann and Luke Syson, eds., \textit{The Image of the Individual: Portraits in the Renaissance} (London: British Museum Press, 1998). The essays take a broad approach to painted portraits including fifteenth- and sixteenth- century images, including to a limited extent, northern paintings. The essays in the volume begin with classical precedents for portraiture and examine ideas of likeness and identity. Also see the Introduction by Joanna Woodall of \textit{Portraiture Facing the Subject}, ed. Joanna Woodall (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 1-25.
\item Shearman, \textit{Only Connect...}, 112. The \textit{Iconic Epigrams} were a group of short epigrams addressing works of art, for which, see P. Vitry, “Études sure les épigrammes de l’anthologie palatine, qui contiennent la description d’une œuvre d’art,” \textit{Revue archéologique} 3\textsuperscript{rd} ser. 24 (1894) 315ff.
\item One of the earliest works that focused specifically on women’s portraiture was by Brita von Götz-Mohr, but her book analyzed sixteenth-century imagery and therefore
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
psychoanalytic conceptions of “the gaze” and “the eye” to contend that Florentine profile portraits were constructions of gender conventions. Specifically, she argued that because Renaissance women were more constrained socially—in their ability to move in public and even in their ability to look directly around them—they were represented in the profile pose much more regularly and for a much longer stretch of the fifteenth century than men were. Simons also asserted that “The woman was a spectacle when she was an object of public display at the time of her marriage but otherwise she was rarely visible, whether on the streets or in monumental works of art.” This interpretation functions when considering only painted portraits, but as my study of


374 While Simons’ article was ground-breaking by bringing new gender-related concerns to the study of canonical Renaissance objects, her disregard for classical numismatic precedents and other evidence of portraiture, like portrait busts, in relation to how men and women were portrayed in these paintings, limits the validity of her observations. For example, on page 8, Simons asserted that most of the portraits were created around the time of a woman’s marriage, either before or after. However, as most of the sitters of portraits are not identified and the dates of the paintings cover a range of possibilities, the question of when in a woman’s life she would be recorded in a portrait is something scholars can only speculate on, and most authors since Simons, including Paola Tinagli, have suggested that most of the images were posthumous, which is contrary to the assertions made by others (including Simons and Rubin) that these images were typically made around the time of the sitters’ marriages. See Paola Tinagli, *Women in Italian Renaissance Art. Gender, Representation, Identity* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 47-83


376 The question of whether or not Renaissance women were allowed in public spaces depended very much on location and is one that historians and art historians alike have tackled over and over. In the same year that Simons published her article, Elaine G. Rosenthal, addressed the complex and shifting nuances of women’s social positions in Florence, stating “The depiction of these women [ladies of a certain level] as protected and isolated from all contact except family and church is, at best, superficial.” See Elaine
women’s tombs shows, fifteenth-century women were readily visible in monumental works of art.

Despite the limitations of Simons’ article, her contribution to gender studies in Renaissance art undeniably paved the way for books like Paola Tinagli’s comprehensive approach to women in Renaissance art in *Women in Italian Renaissance Art, Gender, Representation, Identity*, from 1997, which includes a chapter on portraiture. Tinagli situated the genre within the framework for male portraits, in the tradition of Pope-Hennessy or Lipman, and while also emphasizing the individual as established by Burckhardt. She located women’s portraiture in the humanist discourse on ideal beauty and concluded that most women’s portraits were likely commissioned posthumously.

---

G. Rosenthal, “The Position of Women in Renaissance Florence: neither Autonomy nor Subjection.” in *Florence and Italy. Renaissance Studies in Honor of Nicolai Rubinstein*, ed. Peter Denley and Caroline Elam (Westfield College, University of London: Committee for Medieval Studies, 1988), 375. Later significant contributions to this discussion include Roger C. Davis, who suggested that public spaces are gendered masculine, while more private, domestic, or sacred spaces are gendered feminine, but that the boundaries between the two were permeable, and not fixed. See Roger C. Davis, “The Gendered City in the Renaissance,” in Judith C. Brown, and Robert C. Davis eds. *Gender and Society in Renaissance Italy* (London and New York: Longman, 1998), 19-38. More recently, and somewhat in opposition to Davis, Edward Muir concluded that, based on his analysis on a case study of Corneto, women were in public equally as much as men were and that the government statutes limiting women’s movements that other scholars have relied on to argue for women being stuck in the home were an artifact of law, essentially a display, based upon the need to establish trust between families. As women moved from family to family and back again when they married, became widowed, or married again, bonds of trust were created and recreated. See Edward Muir, “In Some Neighbours We Trust: On the Exclusion of Women from the Public in Renaissance Italy,” in *Florence and Beyond Culture, Society and Politics in Renaissance Italy*, ed. David S. Peterson (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2008), 271-289.

Paola Tinagli, *Women in Italian Renaissance Art. Gender, Representation, Identity* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 47-83. As I noted in the introduction of this dissertation, Tinagli’s book is an excellent attempt at reinserting women into the discourse of Italian Renaissance Art, but lacks any discussion whatsoever of tombs. This oversight continues the general trend of ignoring women’s tombs in the literature.
emphasizing the commemorative nature of the images.\textsuperscript{378} To her credit, Tinagli included an analysis of female donor portraits in religious paintings, continuing in Pope-Hennessy’s footsteps to expand scholarly understandings of the genre. Tinagli’s focus, however, is exclusively painting, so she did not consider busts and did not mention women’s tombs at all. A gendered approach to portraiture continued more recently in Andrea Pearson’s \textit{Women and Portraits in Early Modern Europe: Gender, Agency, Identity},\textsuperscript{379} a compilation of conference essays published in 2008. The book features an expansive approach, with an emphasis on women and identity creation and the bounds of women’s agency in the creation and use of portrait images.\textsuperscript{380} It includes no discussion of effigies, but includes analysis of paintings, and a few sculptures. Images analyzed are from both the north and the south from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries. Pearson’s volume also indicates how much more mainstream the study of women’s art has become in the last two decades.

\textit{Exhibition Catalogues:}

Also in the last two decades, portraiture has been a popular subject for large-scale international exhibitions with their attendant extensive exhibition catalogues. Joanna Woods-Marsden provided a survey of women’s portraiture, “Portrait of the Lady: 1430-1520,” in the catalogue for the exhibition \textit{Virtue and Beauty, Leonardo’s Ginevra}

\textsuperscript{378} Tinagli, \textit{Women in Italian Renaissance Art}, 49.
\textsuperscript{380} Pearson, \textit{Women and Portraits}, 12.
de’Benci and Renaissance Portraits of Women of 2001-2002. This was the first major exhibition focusing specifically on women’s portraiture from the Renaissance, though it emphasized, due to geographical, Vasarian bias, but also greater survival rates of paintings, the genre’s rise in Florence. Despite the Florentine emphasis, the exhibition included paintings and sculpture, paintings from Northern Europe, and also included male portraits where instructive comparisons could be made. Woods-Marsden’s essay reviewed portraits from their inception in the fifteenth century and characterized them based on type: first, whether dowry images, fantastical images of ideal beauty, portraits of ruling figures, or patricians, and by image convention; and second, either profile or three-quarters view. Woods-Marsden's interpretations are situated within Florence’s “culture of display” which focused on exhibiting patrician honor and achieved this in

---

women’s portraiture more generally by demonstrating feminine ideals of beauty and virtue.\(^{384}\) Though influenced by Simons’ earlier feminist contribution,\(^{385}\) by creating more nuanced and thorough comparisons between male and female portraits, Woods-Marsden, and the exhibition catalogue as a whole, provide the nearest-to-comprehensive approach to fifteenth-century women’s portraiture. However, by limiting the study to Florentine examples, she continued the tradition of citing one city as the normative center at the expense of the rest of the peninsula, creating a myopic picture of Renaissance women’s representations as a whole. Regrettably, the catalogue does not mention effigies at all.

Lorne Campbell, Miguel Falomir, Jennifer Fletcher and Luke Syson, edited the catalogue for the exhibition, *Renaissance Faces. Van Eyck to Titian*, at the National Gallery London, 15 October 2008- 18 January 2009.\(^{386}\) The exhibition included painted portraits, sculpture busts, full-length statues, medals, and drawings from across fifteenth and sixteenth-century Europe. The catalogue dedicated a section to “Remembering,” where the focus was on commemorative imagery, but despite the inclusion of sculpted imagery in the exhibition, the analysis did not include mention of tombs or effigies.

Finally, the most recent and largest reexamination of portraiture in the early Renaissance was the joint exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City and the Bode-Museum Berlin of 2011, *The Renaissance Portrait from Donatello to*
Bellini. The exhibition confirmed that fifteenth-century portraits continue to be a major focus and fascination for Renaissance scholars (and the general public). Unlike most previous scholarship, the exhibition and its complementary catalogue were organized based upon location, examining and demonstrating the distinct differences in portraiture among Florence, the court cities of Ferrara, Milan and Naples, and Venice and the Veneto. They included sculpted works in addition to painted panels, and images of women were not considered separately from those of men, but mostly in conjunction. Though the general catalogue essay, by Patricia Rubin, mentioned that funerary monuments and celebratory sculptures, particularly tombs for popes and rulers, are “common categories” of portraiture with particularly “long pedigrees,” effigy imagery was not considered in her essay or elsewhere in the catalogue. While I acknowledge that it is not possible to include the effigies from monumental tombs—nearly all of which are still in situ in their original churches—in international exhibitions, by not incorporating these identified images in their understanding of Renaissance portraiture, scholars have thus far failed to consider a large corpus of public portraits of non-ruling individuals.


Theoretical Approaches to Understanding the Presence (or Lack-Thereof) of the Sitter in Portraiture

In the late 1980s and 1990s, scholars began to consider how to understand the presence, or non-presence, of the sitter in portrait paintings. An early, seminal article addressing these theoretical notions was Harry Berger Jr.’s “Fictions of the Pose: Facing the Gaze of Early Modern Portraiture.” 389 Berger focused on fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Italian portraits to challenge the notion that it is possible to read the character of individuals in portraits. 390 He also emphasized the fictiveness of the represented situation and, according to Berger, how portraits actually represent a complex matrix of poses that enable the “three-way diachronic transaction between painter, sitter, and fictional field.” 391 Berger was followed in his theoretical explorations by Hans Belting, who in Anthropology of Images: Picture Medium and Body, 392 used anthropological methods to examine a vast swath of visual culture imaging the human body including, but not limited to, effigies, masks, ancestor portraits, cult statues, anatomical models, photography, video art, and digital art. For Belting, these objects are simulacra of the human body, which, in terms of effigies, function as substitutive presences for the actual deceased. 393

---

390 As had been championed especially by John Pope-Hennessy in The Portrait in the Renaissance. The A.W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts.
393 Belting’s ideas were expanded upon more recently in Georges Didi-Huberman, L’Empreinte, (Paris: Centre Georges Pompidou, 1997), 60-72; Fredrika H. Jacobs, The
In her article, “Renaissance Faciality,” Maria Loh further interrogated the appropriateness of using notions of “likeness” or “naturalism” to analyze fifteenth-century portraiture. Loh, who was approaching her material through the lens of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s ideas about ‘faciality,’ argued that portraits were iconic types and constructed identities, with imposed likenesses, meant to “obfuscate the autonomous ‘true’ self beneath it.” While Loh was not concerned with effigies in her article, she dismantled the traditional notion that five-hundred year old images could reveal much about the character of individuals they portray.


Maria Loh, “Renaissance Faciality,” Oxford Art Journal 32 (2009): 341-364. Loh’s additional project for the article aside from examining portraits in the Renaissance was to question how Renaissance art history is practiced.


Her focus is primarily painting, and the art she discusses are portraits of Michelangelo. Other sources question these ideas. See in particular, Georges Didi-Huberman, “The Portrait, the Individual and the Singular: Remarks on the Legacy of Aby Warburg,” in The Image of the Individual eds. Mann and Syson, (London: British Museum Press,
The preceding extensive literature review is intended to show the reader the deep tradition and focus on portraiture in Renaissance scholarship. It also indicates that, while tomb effigies are occasionally mentioned as examples of portraits, they are rarely included in any general investigations of portrait images.398

This chapter will now move to an analysis of the effigies of women’s tombs from quattrocento Italy in order to show that effigies, when considered within the wider portraiture discourse, provide nuanced and compelling new information about the public representation of women. After a general overview regarding the number of effigies found on extant women’s tombs, including discussion of geographical trends, empirical analysis of the effigies and their major points of difference will be presented. Particular emphasis will be placed on whether effigies are depicted as young or old; how they are dressed; what, if anything, they hold in their hands; and if their hair is visible and how it is styled. This chapter will also identify the limited instances where there were non-effigial representations of the deceased individual on women’s tombs. The question of likeness, a major concern for Renaissance portraiture, will then be examined in relation to the effigies.399 Finally, a study investigating the unique case of Beatrice d’Este—she is the most represented fifteenth-century woman who was also memorialized in effigy on a


398 Despite Hans Belting’s locating the origin of the fifteenth-century portrait in commemorative depictions, including death masks, in very few of these sources were actual effigy portraits included. See Hans Belting, “Aus dem Schatten des Todes. Bild und Körper in den Anfängen,” in Der Tod in den Weltkulturen und Weltreligionen, ed. Constantin von Barloewen (Munich: Deiderichs, 1996), 92-137.

399 The corresponding concern of the ideal will be considered in chapter four of the present dissertation.
monumental tomb—will be presented in order to understand better the differences between recording the features of women in portraits from their lifetime versus their concrete memorialization in funerary art.

**A Note on the Visibility of Effigies**

Only some of the monumental women’s tombs examined in this dissertation are still positioned in their original locations, while many of them have been moved. Monuments have been transferred to different churches, like the tomb of Barbara Manfredi,\(^{400}\) different towns, like the tomb of Medea Colleoni,\(^{401}\) or even different countries, like the tomb of Saint Justine.\(^{402}\) Tombs were in some cases located in areas of churches that would have afforded limited visibility for the lay-public, like the double-tomb of Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camponeschi, which is directly adjacent to the high altar of San Bernardino, L’Aquila.\(^{403}\) Because of these considerations, the question of the original visibility of these effigies, particularly regarding their smaller details, is complicated and problematic. However, because the effigy is in every case the focal point of its respective monument,\(^{404}\) and the effigies are typically located close to eye-level or above, the sculpted figures and their details would likely have discernible features, justifying a precise examination of these sculptural elements.

**Overview of Effigial Representation on Women’s Monumental Tombs**

\(^{400}\) See cat. #7.  
\(^{401}\) See cat. #9.  
\(^{402}\) See cat. #5.  
\(^{403}\) See cat. #26.  
\(^{404}\) The other focus of these monuments was their inscriptions, which are discussed in detail in the following chapter.
Of the thirty-five extant monumental women’s tombs from the *quattrocento*, twenty-five have effigies (or 71.4 percent), and twenty-eight (or 80 percent) include a representation of the deceased in some form, whether effigy, painted portrait, or bust portrait. Seven of the tombs have no (extant) image of the deceased. Table 16 lists the tombs based on if and how the deceased is represented:

Table 16.  
**Distribution of Effigies on Women’s Monumental Tombs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tomb Honoree</th>
<th>Effigy</th>
<th>Other Representation of Deceased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margherita Malatesta, 1399, San Francesco, Mantua</td>
<td>Yes? *</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterina dei Francesi, 1405, Sant’Antonio, Padua</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Votive Painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilaria del Carretto, 1405, San Francesco, Lucca</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnese and Clemenza Durazzo, 1408, Santa Chiara, Naples</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnese da Mosto Venier, 1410, Santi Giovanni e Paolo, Venice</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margherita di Durazzo, 1412, San Francesco, Salerno</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paola Bianca Malatesta, 1416, San Francesco, Fano</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisabetta Trenta, 1416, San Frediano, Lucca</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiara Gambacorti, 1419, San Domenico, Pisa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibilia Cetto, 1421, San Francesco Grande, Padua</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccarda Bueri, 1433, San Lorenzo, Florence</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isotta degli Atti, 1447, San Francesco, Rimini</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Justine, 1450, Santa Giustina, Padua</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Villana</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>Santa Maria Novella, Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malatesta Women</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>San Francesco, Rimini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vittoria Piccolomini</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>San Francesco, Siena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Monica</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>Sant’Agostino, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Manfredi</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>San Biagio, Forli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medea Colleoni</td>
<td>1467</td>
<td>Santa Maria della Basella, Urgnano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Fina</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>Collegiata, San Gimignano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria of Aragon Piccolomini</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>Sant’Anna dei Lombardi, Naples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabetta Geraldini</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>San Francesco, Amelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>Santa Maria sopra Minerva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franceschina Tron Pesaro</td>
<td>1478</td>
<td>Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nera Corsi Sassetti</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>Santa Trinità, Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costanza Ammannati</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>Sant’Agostino, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddalena Orsini</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>San Salvatore in Lauro, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsibilia Trinci</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td>San Francesco, Montefiorentino, Frontino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camtoneschi</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>San Bernardino, L’Aquila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddalena Riccia</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>Sant’Anna dei Lombardi, Naples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice d’Este</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>Santa Maria delle Grazie, Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generosa Orsini</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>Santa Maria Gloriosa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 16 shows, effigies were typical for women’s tombs throughout the peninsula, without regard to geographic considerations, except in the republics of Florence and Venice, where effigies were not often used to commemorate women.\(^{405}\)

It has been posited that in republics like Florence and Venice, political considerations and ideals precluded effigial representation for anyone, including women, except under particular circumstances.\(^{406}\) The above table shows that for women’s tombs in Florence and Venice, this is generally true, though more thorough analysis necessarily follows. In Florence, of the three fifteenth-century women’s tombs in the city, those of Piccarda Bueri, Beata Villana, and Nera Corsi Sassetti, only that for the holy woman, the

---

\(^{405}\) This is also discussed in brief in chapter one of this dissertation.  
Beata Villana, included effigial representation. As for the lay-women, one of the two tombs, that for Nera Corsi Sassetti, includes a small relief portrait bust in a roundel at the center base of the architectural framework for her arcosolium tomb. The Sassetti chapel also features a donor portrait of Nera, which will be discussed in greater detail below.

Though effigies for women are considered to have been inappropriate in a Republic like Florence, this reasoning cannot explain the prevalence of large-scale painted, public portraits of women in that city. Though effigies might not have been considered an option, individuals were monumentally commemorated in public in fresco paintings like in the cappella maggiore of Santa Maria Novella. That chapel includes dozens of images of Tornabuoni family members, including a number of portraits of Tornabuoni women. The lack of women’s effigial tombs created in Florence is also in contrast to the large numbers of women’s portraits created in that city; Florence is

---

407 See cat. #s: 31, 4, 16.  
408 The free-standing double tomb of Piccarda Bueri and Giovanni di Bicci de’Medici in the Old Sacristy of San Lorenzo, Florence, does not include any visual representation of Piccarda.  
409 King, Renaissance Women Patrons, 116.  
410 Other examples of these chapels and public works of art with portraits include the Sassetti Chapel, Santa Trinità, or the Medici chapel in the Palazzo Medici. Patricia Rubin explored this phenomenon in detail in Images and Identity in Fifteenth-century Florence (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007).  
perpetually the focal point of portraiture studies, as the preceding literature review demonstrated, because a plurality of extant women’s portraits originated there.412

To understand this discrepancy between different types of public portraiture in Florence, it is useful to consider Andrew Butterfield’s taxonomic analysis of tomb monuments in that city. Butterfield posited that Florentine tomb types, meaning floor slabs, wall monuments, or free-standing tombs, and the decision to include or omit effigies, are hierarchical indices of social position. Butterfield suggested that the majority of “property-holders” (presumably male, though he did not specify) were buried in floor tombs.413 Wall tombs were less common, with only a “handful” surviving today, all of which were family tombs, meaning monuments containing and honoring multiple members of the same family.414 More rare still were effigial wall tombs, of which Butterfield “knows of” twenty-two examples extant in the city from 1300-1500. Frustratingly, Butterfield did not catalogue these twenty-two monuments, so it is left to the reader to try to compile his own list. Significantly, though Butterfield made a point to use sex as a division for his typologies (which was discussed in greater detail above), he

412 Simons, “Women in Frames,” 4. She suggested that there are forty extant women’s portraits from fifteenth-century Tuscany. These images also repeat formal patterns, like the profile view, which has encouraged scholars to consider them as a group to the exclusion of other imagery, like portraiture from Venice and other locations that would conflict or contradict conclusions about profile portraits. It is also possible that the lack of effigial portraits of women in Florence, which again has often been understood as the normative locale for the study of Renaissance art as a whole, has contributed to their not being studied or considered elsewhere. I credit Catherine Kupiec for helping me clarify my thinking on this point.
413 Andrew Butterfield, “Social Structure and the Typology of Funerary Monuments in Renaissance Florence,” 50-51. He delineated several types of floor slabs including those with simple inscriptions, those with an inscription and a coat of arms, and those with portrait effigies.
414 Butterfield, “Social Structure and the Typology of Funerary Monuments in Renaissance Florence,” 51-52. Again, Butterfield did not specify that these family tombs would have likely encompassed the memorialization of women.
did not make any comment whatsoever on the fact that the rarest example of a tomb in Florence, the free-standing tomb, of which there is only one example, that for Giovanni di Bicci de’Medici and Piccardia Bueri, is a double-tomb honoring a woman.  

He concluded that memorialization through effigy was limited by social position in Florence.  

Of the twenty-two examples of effigial wall tombs, twenty of them commemorate individuals of the most elite civic or religious distinction, like the chancellors of the city Leonardo Bruni and Carlo Marsuppini, who were commemorated with a tomb type that came to be recognized in art historical literature as “humanist tombs.” For these tombs there was a “pattern in patronal status,” the pattern being the fact that a “private person, no matter how rich or powerful, could not be commemorated by an effigial wall monument.” For example, no member of the Medici family—the de-facto rulers of the city for over sixty years—was commemorated by an effigial tomb. The intersection between a lack of effigial tombs for private individuals and the prevalence of public painted depictions of these same individuals in chapels, like the

---

416 Butterfield, “Social Structure and the Typology of Funerary Monuments in Renaissance Florence,” 55. Tomb slabs were limited to elite men who were either knights and or aristocrats; doctors of law or medicine; higher ecclesiastics or other types of religious figures like abbots; and individuals buried at public expense due to civil service.
417 Butterfield, “Social Structure and the Typology of Funerary Monuments in Renaissance Florence,” 55. The monuments, which again, are not listed by their subject or artist, are broken down as follows: ten for popes, cardinals, or bishops; four for founders of religious houses; two for saints or beati, (of which one is presumably for the Beata Villana); two for humanist chancellors of the city; two for private citizens; one for a friar; and one of “uncertain identity and status.”
aforementioned *cappella maggiore* of Santa Maria Novella, suggests that those who could not commission effigial tombs in Florence still sought public portraits of themselves through painting.

Unlike in Florence, where there is representation of women on their tombs in two cases, in Venice there is no pictorial depiction—painted or sculpture—of a woman on her tomb from the fifteenth century. The situation between the cities is furthermore different because, while in Florence the use of effigies is limited for men as well as women, dogal tombs in Venice typically have effigies and, late in the *quattrocento*, even include full-length standing effigies. Thus, while in Florence, the distinction in tomb types can be argued to rest largely on social position regardless of gender, in Venice,

---

419 Interestingly, the Florentine Giovanni Tornabuoni did commission effigial tombs for his relatives, his wife Francesca Pitti and his nephew Francesco, but they were not in Florence, but rather Rome, where effigial representation was seemingly available to anyone. There are no Tornabuoni effigial tombs in Florence, though Giovanni Tornabuoni did intend to make the *cappella maggiore* of Santa Maria Novella a Tornabuoni mausoleum, see Sheila Ross McClure, “The Redecoration of Santa Maria Novella’s *Cappella Maggiore*,” (PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1983): 6-7. I would like to acknowledge Catherine Kupiec for helping me to clarify my thinking on this topic.

420 I refer here to people who were not socially the right type of individual (meaning a chancellor of the city, for example), despite their potential sufficient wealth to commission an effigial monument.

421 The Sassetti tomb chapel, which does include painted imagery of Nera Corsi and Francesco Sassetti, does not include effigies of either individual.


where the elected doge was the embodiment of the government, it was only these individuals who were accorded effigial representation, though the effigy was meant to be interpreted as the state, rather than a particular man.  

Aside from the situations described above in Florence and Venice, effigial representation for women on their monumental tombs transcended location and date; effigies were commonplace on tombs throughout the Italian peninsula and the fifteenth century. The social role of the woman honored by the monument also did not have an effect on whether or not she was bodily commemorated; effigies were used on tombs for saints, beate, royalty, aristocrats, religious women, and patrician women alike. However, economics certainly played a significant role in whether or not an individual was commemorated by an effigy. Effigial tombs would have been among the most costly and labor-intensive type of monument to commission, and it is for these commissions that the most famous fifteenth-century sculptors were involved, including Jacopo della Quercia (tomb of Ilaria del Carretto), Giovanni Antonio Amadeo (tomb of Medea

---

424 The increasing specificity of these effigies in the later fifteenth century, particularly on the tomb of Doge Niccolò Tron, comes, as Peter Humfrey put it, “dangerously close… to glorifying the particular man.” See Peter Humfrey, “The Portrait in Fifteenth-Century Venice,” in The Renaissance Portrait: From Donatello to Bellini, ed. Christiansen and Weppelmann, 52-53. Effigial representation was not completely restricted to doges, as a few exceptions do exist, including the tombs for the generali da mar and the lost tomb of Orsato Giustiniani, for which, see Leo Planiscig, “Das Grabdenkmal des Orsato Giustiniani: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der venezianischen Skuptur im Quattrocento,” Jarbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien 37 (1926): 93-102

425 Butterfield, “Social Structure and the Typology of Funerary Monuments in Renaissance Florence,” 55, suggested that despite his social divisions for type of monuments, ultimately wealth dictated what type of tomb an individual received more than any other factor. Also see chapter one for a comparison of the price of the tomb of Margherita Malatesta in relation to the costs of rent for a year, purchasing shops, or a home.
Colleoni), Verrocchio or Mino da Fiesole (Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni), and Antonio Rossellino and Benedetto da Maiano (Maria of Aragon Piccolomini), among others.

**Analysis of the Effigies’ Appearances**

Women’s tomb effigies have four points of difference that make them readily distinguishable from each other: how they are dressed; whether they are young or old; what they hold, if anything, in their hands; and the arrangement of their hair. These various distinctions are the keys to identity and memory creation for the effigies.

Clothing is a particularly weighty topic when discussing depictions of Renaissance women. In the scholarship on panel portraits, the elaborate embroideries and jewel encrustations of a woman’s costume are interpreted as signifying her family’s, or her new husband’s wealth, and as some scholars extend it, her value. Fillippo Lippi’s double portrait, *Woman with a Man at a Window* (fig. 42, c. 1440-1444, tempera on panel, Marquand Collection, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York) is frequently cited as an example of how clothes are important signifiers of a woman’s role and value, as the word *lealt[a] (loyalty)* is embroidered in gold and pearls on the cuff of the woman’s overdress.

Another example of this phenomenon is Pisanello’s depiction of *Ginevra d’Este* (fig. 43, 1435-49, tempera on panel, Louvre, Paris), one of the few identified panel portraits of a woman from the *quattrocento*. The sitter is identified by elements of her clothing

---

which include the small juniper sprig embroidered at her shoulder, a pun on her name, and by the elaborate pearl-encrusted urn holding branches, roots, and flowers on the back of her gown, the symbol of the Este family.

Clothes have also been one of the primary impetuses for discussions of the regulations of Renaissance women. The elaborateness of every part of fifteenth-century women’s apparel, whether their high-heeled platform shoes (zoccoli) or their mourning clothes, were perpetually the subject of laws that were meant to limit the grandiosity of sartorial display.428 Men were also subject to these regulations, but the emphases of sumptuary laws were placed firmly on women. For example, Florentine legislative documents with clothing regulations were set under the rubric for Ornementa mulierum “ornaments of women” and the individuals responsible for enforcing these laws were referred to as Ufficiali delle donne, or “officials of women.”429


Sumptuary laws are typically interpreted as examples of how the Renaissance patriarchal societal structure was oppressive to women, yet these documents can also indicate that fifteenth-century women were exercising a certain level of autonomy and independence. New mandates were passed every generation, and they were frequently revised to address changing fashions. Women would also go to great lengths to circumvent the laws and contest charges against them in court. A document recording the meeting of the Florentine priors in September 1433 that was set to approve new sumptuary legislation deserves to be transcribed in full here because, though it was meant to regulate women and uses severely critical language to do so, it indicates that women were exerting a measure of control over their clothing, and through those clothing choices even exerting control over men:

That these officials on women’s ornaments have an honest desire, in great measure, to restrain the barbarous and irrepressible bestiality of women who, not mindful of the weakness of their nature, forgetting that they are subject to their husbands and transforming their perverse sense into a reprobate and diabolical nature, force their husbands with their honeyed poison to submit to them.

This document indicates that clothing was ammunition for women’s diabolical powers and that in the eyes of the state there were correct garments that women should

---

wear that could repress their barbarity and push them towards a more virtuous ideal.\textsuperscript{433} Clothing was clearly linked (as it is today) with the creation of public identity, so closely analyzing how fifteenth-century women were clothed on their tomb monuments can provide insight into how these women were meant to be remembered. The major question regarding how women were dressed in their effigies is whether they are shown in secular clothing or religious clothing, as delineated in Table 17:

\textbf{Table 17. Appearance of Effigy: Types of Clothing}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tomb</th>
<th>Religious Garb</th>
<th>Secular Garb</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margherita Malatesta, 1399, San Francesco, Mantua</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterina dei Francesi, 1405, Sant’Antonio, Padua</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilaria del Carretto, 1405, San Francesco, Lucca</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnese and Clemenza Durazzo, 1408, Santa Chiara, Naples</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margherita di Durazzo, 1412, San Francesco, Salerno</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisabetta Trenta, 1416, San Frediano, Lucca</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paola Bianca Malatesta, 1416, San Francesco, Fano</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiara Gambacorti, 1419, San Domenico, Pisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibilia Cetto, 1421, San Francesco Grande, Padua</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Justine, 1450, Santa Giustina, Padua</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{433} The prevalence of regulations for women’s clothing also contradicts the notion that Renaissance women were not allowed in public that has been asserted in feminist approaches to the period. If women were not out in the world, their clothing would not have been seen and would not have needed to be regulated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Effigy Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beata Villana, 1451</td>
<td>Santa Maria Novella, Florence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Monica, 1455</td>
<td>Sant’Agostino, Rome</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Manfredi, 1466</td>
<td>San Biagio, Forli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Catherine of Siena, 1466</td>
<td>Santa Maria sopra Minerva</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medea Colleoni, 1467</td>
<td>Santa Maria della Basella, Urgnano</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria of Aragon Piccolomini, 1470</td>
<td>Sant’Anna dei Lombardi, Naples</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabetta Gerladini, 1477</td>
<td>San Francesco, Amelia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni, 1477</td>
<td>Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costanza Ammannati, 1480</td>
<td>Sant’Agostino, Rome</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddalena Orsini, 1480</td>
<td>San Salvatore in Lauro, Rome</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsibilia Trinci, 1484</td>
<td>San Francesco, Montefiorentino, Frontino</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camponeschi, 1490</td>
<td>San Bernardino, L’Aquila</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddalena Riccia, 1491</td>
<td>Sant’Anna dei Lombardi, Naples</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice d’Este, 1497</td>
<td>Santa Maria delle Grazie, Milan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Beatrice Rusca, 1499</td>
<td>Sant’Angelo dei Frari, Milan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 13 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In the Heemskerck sketch of the effigy of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni, it is unclear what type of clothing she wears.

Of the twenty-five tombs with effigies, eleven of them are shown wearing what can be characterized as “religious clothing,” while thirteen are depicted in “secular
clothing,” and the clothing of one effigy is unknown. “Religious clothing” denotes a long habit or mantle with an elaborate veil and wimple. This clothing could indicate that the deceased had fully entered into religious life, as was not uncommon for widows, or it might also signal that the individual was what Joyce Pennings has characterized as “semi-religious,” meaning a laywoman active within a religious community.\textsuperscript{434} The variety we see in clothing on female tombs is similar to what is also typically seen on male monuments. It is not uncommon for male secular individuals to choose to be buried in religious habit, but men could also be buried wearing secular clothing. For example, the effigy of Gianfrancesco Oliva (husband of Marsibia Trinci and buried in the same chapel, see cat #17) wears full armor, representing his position as a soldier, or the classical toga worn by the effigy of Leonardo Bruni, indicates his role as chancellor of Florence and humanist scholar.\textsuperscript{435}

It has been assumed that most monumental effigies of women were depicted in religious clothing. In fact, Shelley Zuraw asserted in her examination of the tomb of Costanza Ammannati\textsuperscript{436} that, “most female effigies depict the deceased in the long robes and habit of nuns.”\textsuperscript{437} But, as the evidence suggests, a slight majority of women’s effigies wear what I have characterized as “secular clothing,” meaning garments typical of the fifteenth century. Typical articles of clothing include a gown (a

\textsuperscript{436} See cat #10
\textsuperscript{437} Zuraw, “The Sculpture of Mino da Fiesole, (1429-1484)” (PhD diss., New York University, 1993), 1030. Zuraw might be intending to refer only to Roman tombs with this assertion, as all the extant monumental tombs for women in that city do depict women in religious clothing.
gamurra/cammura/camora) worn over a chemise (camicia), typically with an overdress (cioppa/giornea/mantello/pellanda/vestimento) of varying weight dependent on the season. The effigies depicted in secular clothing also typically wear some sort of hair ornament, whether a garland, as can be seen on the effigy of Ilaria del Carretto (fig. 44), or jewels, as on the effigy of Medea Colleoni (fig. 45).

Among the effigies depicted in secular fashions, particularly those of women who died unexpectedly young, their clothing displays them in especially elegant finery, representing them as if they are either about to be married or were only recently married, similarly to most panel portraits of young women. The effigies of Ilaria del Carretto, who died in her early twenties; Medea Colleoni, who died in her teens; Maria of Aragon Piccolomini (fig. 46), who died in her late teens; and Beatrice d’Este (fig. 47), who died in her early twenties, are all examples of this pattern. While Ilaria’s effigy wears

---

439 See cat #15.
440 See cat #9.
441 Sumptuary laws made particular allowances for brides to wear the most opulent clothing of a woman’s lifetime. See Landini and Bulgarella, “Costume in Fifteenth-Century Florentine Portraits of Women,” 94-95.
442 While the finery worn by their effigies might indicate newlywed status, the deaths of none of these women were particularly close to the dates of their marriage. Medea Colleoni was unmarried, though at the time of her death (she was only fourteen) negotiations were being undertaken to align her with Duke Galeazzo Maria Sforza of Milan. Ilaria del Carretto’s death occurred the closest to her marriage—she was married on 3 February 1403 and died on 8 December 1405—but it is unclear if she would have still been considered a newlywed after two pregnancies. Maria of Aragon Piccolomini died in 1469 at the age of eighteen, eight years after her marriage in 1461 (she married at the age of nine years old, though one would hope and assume that the union was not consummated in its first few years). Beatrice d’Este married at age sixteen in 1491 and
elegant, but perhaps the simplest clothes, those of Medea and Beatrice, feature elaborate floriated embroidery or brocade with detailed and carefully sculpted necklaces and hair adornments that are clearly meant to represent pearls and jewels. Beatrice d’Este’s effigy is particularly notable because she is depicted wearing an elaborate dress of latticed metallic threads with tassels that was modeled after a dress actually worn during her life for the public celebrations around the birth of her son Ercole Massimiliano in 1493. As the subject of a number of portraits, both painted and sculpted, in addition to her effigy, Beatrice d’Este is a particularly fruitful subject for further analysis, which will be conducted later in this chapter.

The fact that women who died young were depicted as youthful and lovely is not surprising, but what is surprising is that women who died at a more advanced age were always veristically depicted as older. This contrasts to the conventional wisdom of portraiture scholarship that women who were portrayed in painted portraits, at least in the fifteenth-century, were nearly uniformly young. As shown in Table 18, much like the died at age twenty-two in January 1497. For more on all of these women see their entries in the accompanying catalogue: cat. #s 5, 9, 20, and 27.

---

443 Herald, *Renaissance Dress in Italy 1400-1500*, 142.
444 See also chapter four of this dissertation, which addresses the relationship between images of women and the poetic ideal.
445 Woods-Marsden, “Profile of the Lady,” 64. There are, of course, exceptions to this that leap immediately to mind, including the painting frequently identified as *Lucrezia Tornabuoni* attributed to Domenico Ghirlandaio from circa 1475 (National Gallery, Washington). However, if that painting does depict Lucrezia, she would have been forty years old in 1475 and the image, aside from the veil and more modest clothing typical of older women of the period, does not seem to depict a woman of that age. Aside from recessed eye-sockets, the image does not depict wrinkles around the eyes or caliper lines that you would expect from a woman at an age, which at the time would have been well-advanced middle age. Beginning in the sixteenth century older women began to be depicted in portraits more frequently.
division between secular and religious clothing, there is a nearly even proportion of tombs with an older effigy and tombs with a younger one.\textsuperscript{446}

Table 18.
Appearance of Effigy: Depicted Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Depicted as Older</th>
<th>Depicted as Younger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margherita Malatesta*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterina dei Francesi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilaria del Carretto</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnese and Clemenza Durazzo</td>
<td></td>
<td>X x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margherita di Durazzo</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisabetta Trenta</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paola Bianca Malatesta</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiara Gambacorti</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibilia Cetto</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Justine</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Villana</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{446} Though a comprehensive comparison between the depicted ages of men and women on their tombs is beyond the scope of the present study, a few examples can provide useful context. Male effigies were also depicted as varying in age. The effigy of the Cardinal of Portugal (Antonio and Bernardo Rossellino, Luca della Robbia, Alessio Baldovinetti, Antonio and Piero del Pollaiuolo, 1460-73, Chapel of the Cardinal of Portugal, San Miniato al Monte, Florence) shows the cardinal, who died in his mid-twenties as a young man with smooth, unlined skin. The chapel of the Cardinal of Portugal is especially relevant to this study because the chapel of Maria of Aragon Piccolomini in Naples is directly modeled on it. For the chapel, see Frederick Hartt, Gino Corti and Clarence Kennedy, The Chapel of the Cardinal of Portugal, 1434-1459. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1964); Linda A. Koch, “The Early Christian Revival at S. Miniato al Monte: The Cardinal of Portugal Chapel,” \textit{Art Bulletin} 78.3 (1996): 527-555. In contrast, the tomb of Leonardo Bruni, (Bernardo Rossellino, 1444-47, Santa Croce, Florence), who was in his seventies when he died, is shown in effigy with deep wrinkles appropriate to a man his age. By accurately depicting the age of the deceased, effigies are engaging with a level of verism not necessarily seen in other types of portraiture, which is discussed later in this chapter.
**Saint Monica** | X |
| **Barbara Manfredi** | X |
| **Saint Catherine of Siena** | X |
| **Medea Colleoni** | X |
| **Maria of Aragon Piccolomini** | X |
| **Elisabetta Geraldini** | X |
| **Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni** | - |
| **Costanza Ammannati** | X |
| **Maddalena Orsini** | X |
| **Marsibila Trinci** | X |
| **Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camponeschi** | X |
| **Maddalena Riccia** | X |
| **Beatrice d’Este** | X |
| **Beata Beatrice Rusca** | X |

* The tomb of Margherita Malatesta is a particular case where the extant monument is possibly a composite of two tombs: the effigy of an older monument to Margherita’s mother-in-law, Alda d’Este, and the inscription from Margherita’s tomb. See cat. #13 for more.

Generally, women who died at a young age are depicted as young, while women who were more advanced in age are represented as such. Despite tombs’ engagement with the ideals of both beauty and virtue, which will be discussed more later in this dissertation, in no extant instance is a woman who died at an advanced age depicted as young and lovely. While in her sixties, Isabella d’Este famously had Titian paint her as a young woman (fig. 48, *Portrait of Isabella d’Este*, 1534-36, oil on canvas, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) indicating that, at least beginning in the sixteenth century, the appearance of “portraits” were easily manipulated based upon the patrons’ desires. This flexibility in depicting the age of effigies does not exist in fifteenth-century
monumental tombs. However, it is a challenge to discern precisely if the way these effigies are depicted, either younger or older, is accurately depicting the age at death for each individual tomb honoree. Because the documentary and scholarly records of many of these individuals are extremely limited, ascertaining when tomb honorees were born (and in some cases precisely when they died) has proved extremely difficult, if not impossible. Even for the most well-published and examined of women’s tombs, that of Ilaria del Carretto, scholars do not actually know when she was born, and we can only guess that, because she was described as “era bambina” (she was a baby/child/young) in 1390, she was probably in her early to mid-twenties when she died in December 1405.447

Regardless, the effigies on women’s tombs defy the conventional wisdom that portraits of women in the fifteenth century depicted nearly exclusively the young. Twelve of the twenty-five effigial monuments identified here depict the deceased as older, while twelve are shown as younger.448 This observation raises a number of questions, including whether effigies that were depicted as older reflect a particular emphasis on creating a more accurate likeness of the deceased? Or if, because the women who were depicted as older were also overwhelmingly shown in religious clothing (eight of the eleven effigies in religious clothing were also depicted as older women), these representations were intended to refer to a different set of virtuous ideals, specifically the deceased’s devotion.

448 It is not possible to judge the depicted age of the deceased for the tomb of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni based upon the Heemskerck sketch, but it would be reasonable to assume, based upon the donor and other posthumous images of Francesca in the Tornabuoni chapel at Santa Maria Novella, Florence, that she would have been represented as an older woman.
The older effigies demonstrate a great dedication to naturalism, and clearly are not meant to evoke ideal beauty in the sense that it is typically understood, though they may seek to emphasize characteristics associated with holiness and ideas of piety. In that sense, the non-ideal appearance of the older effigies, as well as the preponderance of effigies on monumental female tombs, are potentially linked to the renowned connection between late Medieval and early Renaissance beate and saints and their bodies. Holy women would often let their bodies waste away, damage themselves physically, or mar their flesh, through flagellation and other forms of self-harm\textsuperscript{449} as a demonstration of their commitment to their faith and devotion.\textsuperscript{450} By showing older women as older, with all of the non-ideal markers of age, these tomb effigies are contradicting the notion that beautifully ideal bodies are the best and most socially accepted means of reflecting virtues. More generally, the bodily emphasis in the construction of late Medieval and early Renaissance female saintly identity correlates to a similar emphasis for lay-women on their abilities to successfully bear children and their bodies’ role in that process.\textsuperscript{451}

Whether holy or lay, Renaissance women’s bodies were a very large component of their

\textsuperscript{449} For this phenomenon, see Donald Weinstein and Rudolph M. Bell, Saints and Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982); Caroline Walker Bynum, Holy Feast and Holy Fast (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987); André Vauchez, Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). Interestingly, though self-harm was a huge part of female saints’ hagiography, there is absolutely no reference to this made in their effigies, which are uniformly young and idealized, a point of difference between saintly effigies and those for lay-women. The idealized perfection of saintly effigies likely connects to notions of incorruptability—that their holy bodies would not degrade following their deaths—as a signal of their sanctity.

\textsuperscript{450} Though male saints also enacted some of these self-punishments, it was overwhelmingly a part of the construction of late Medieval and early Renaissance female saintly identity.

\textsuperscript{451} The document cited above, page 172 fn. 432, is typical in that it asserts it is God’s law as codified by the Florentine government that women were meant to bear children.
identities and thus it is unsurprising that realistic bodily representation is a major element of their commemoration.

Clothing and age are ways in which the female effigies are distinct from each other, but they can also be distinguished by what they hold in their hands. Gestures and hand movements can be weighty with meaning, and for *quattrocento* theorists, the appropriate body positioning in painted and sculpted scenes could indicate morality or virtue.452 In the fifteenth century, the poses of *gisant* effigies, whether male or female, were relatively limited, and it was not until late in the century and into the next, that effigies began to acquire more lively and energetic poses.453 For women’s monumental tombs, differences in pose are limited to the arrangement of the figure’s hands, and therefore hand arrangement is one of the few means by which the effigies could indicate virtue through action. The effigies position their hands in a few different ways. Either their hands are crossed at their lower abdomen, at their waist, or rest at their chest, where they are either palms together or crossed. The other major consideration regarding

---

452 In Leon Battista Alberti’s *On Painting* the author asserts, “Thus I desire, as I have said, that modesty and truth should be used in every istoria. For this reason be careful not to repeat the same gesture or pose. The istoria will move the soul of the beholder when each man painted there clearly shows the movement of his own soul. It happens in nature that nothing more than herself is found capable of things like herself…These movements of the soul are made known by the movements of the body.” See Leon Battista Alberti, *On Painting*, trans. John R. Spencer (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), 77.

Similar attitudes were expressed in Filarete’s *Treatise on Architecture* where the author asserts that, “Thus the actions, manners, and poses of everything match [the figures’] natures, ages, and types. Much difference and watchfulness is called for when you have a figure of a saint to do, or one of another habit, either as to costume or as to essence.” See Creighton Gilbert trans., *Italian Art 1400-1500: Sources and Documents* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1989), 89, based upon the text *Treatise on Architecture, Being the Treatise by Antonio di Piero Averlino, Known as Filarete*, 2. Vols., (New Haven and London, 1965), vol. 1, 306.

453 More energetic poses can be found on dogal tombs in Venice from late in the fifteenth century, or with the “sleeping” poses of the effigies found on the sculptor Andrea Sansovino’s tombs in Rome from the very beginning of the sixteenth century.
effigies’ hands is whether or not they are holding anything. Of the twenty-five examples, only four are holding objects, which will be discussed in greater detail below. Table 19 delineates how the hands of each effigy are depicted:

**Table 19. Appearance of Effigy: Arrangement of their Hands**

| Location of Hands: 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tomb Subject</th>
<th>At Lower Abdomen</th>
<th>At Waist</th>
<th>At Chest</th>
<th>Holding Something</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margherita Malatesta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterina dei Francesi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilaria del Carretto</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnese and Clemenza Durazzo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margherita of Durazzo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisabetta Trenta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paola Bianca Malatesta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiara Gambacorti</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, lily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibilia Cetto</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Justine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Villana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Monica</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Manfredi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Catherine of Siena</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medea Colleoni</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria of Aragon Piccolomini</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabetta Geraldini</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni *</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, baby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costanza Ammannati</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddalena Orsini</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsibilia Trinci</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Hand Gesture</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camponeschi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes, book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddalena Riccia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice d’Este</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes, fur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Beatrice Rusca</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based upon the Heemskerck sketch that is assumed to depict Francesca’s effigy.

Of the twenty-five effigies, nineteen have their hands crossed at their lower abdomens, three have their hands crossed at their waists, and three have their hands crossed or together at their chests. These locations and gestures are not restricted to women’s tombs and are similar to what one can find on men’s monuments.\(^{454}\) The hands together gesture is a devotional pose of prayer. Hands crossed at the waist or chest have a long tradition in funerary art, and the pose is interpreted to indicate the deceased’s humility, an expression of emotion, or possibly a liturgical reference to the cross.\(^{455}\) The majority of hands crossed at lower abdomens might be a means to draw attention to the reproductive areas of women’s bodies, but this pose is also used for men’s tombs. Only four of the effigies hold anything in their hands. This limited number indicates that these

---

\(^{454}\) This gesture is pervasive among fifteenth-century tombs. The following list includes a few especially famous examples of men’s monuments that include this hand arrangement: Donatello and Michelozzo’s *Tomb of Pope John XXIII*, Florence Baptistery, Florence, 1424; Antonio del Pollaiuolo’s *Tomb of Pope Sixtus IV*, Saint Peter’s Basilica, Rome, 1484-93; and Tullio Lombardo’s *Tomb of Doge Andrea Vendramin*, Santi Giovanni e Paolo, Venice, 1492-95. While these are all examples of monumental tombs for important leaders, this gesture was genuinely widespread and typical of all types of tombs and any individual.

objects have particularly important symbolic meaning for the creation of memory for the individual deceased persons, which can be further borne out by analysis of the objects.

For example, Chiara Gambacorti was the prioress of San Domenico in Pisa, the monastery she had founded in 1382. Her effigy, which is notable for being in relief (her monument is one of the few tomb slabs included in this study), depicts the prioress in full monastic regalia with her hands crossed, right over left, at her lower abdomen. In her left hand, she grasps the long stem of a lily, which terminates at her left shoulder in two fully bloomed flowers and three buds. The lily can be interpreted as a symbol of purity and also as a reference to the Virgin, who is frequently depicted with the flower. Purity and virginal connotations would be apt for the construction of memory of a powerful prioress because, as a holy woman, the Virgin was certainly Chiara’s primary devotional model. There is also a specifically Dominican association with the lily: Saint Dominic and Saint Catherine of Siena are frequently depicted with one, connecting Chiara to the leading lights of the Dominican movement.

Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni, who was discussed in some detail in the first chapter of this dissertation, was the Florentine wife of Giovanni Tornabuoni, and died in Rome in 1477. Her tomb is no longer extant, but a drawing of an effigy from the Roman Sketchbooks of Martin van Heemskerck from the 1530s has long been associated with her tomb monument. In the sketch, the three-dimensional effigy rests on a bier with hands crossed at her lower abdomen. She holds a baby to her chest, which, if the drawing is an

---

456 For more on the tomb of Chiara Gambacorti, see cat #3 and Ann Roberts, Dominican Women and Renaissance Art, the Convent of San Domenico of Pisa. (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008).
457 Roberts, Dominican Women, 96.
458 For more on the tomb of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni, see cat. #30.
accurate depiction, would have made Francesca’s tomb unprecedented in its iconography in the fifteenth century. The baby’s presence is not at all surprising if considered within the context of Francesca’s death; she was one of countless women in the Renaissance who died in childbirth, and we know from a letter written by her husband, Giovanni Tornabuoni, to his nephew, Lorenzo ‘il Magnifico’ de’Medici, that their child also did not survive. The poignant double effigy puts supreme emphasis on Francesca’s role as mother and dynastic genetrix for the Tornabuoni family and also, unusually for a lay-person’s tomb, refers to the way in which she died.

Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camponeschi’s tomb provides another example of rare iconography on a tomb monument, and in this instance, it is exceptional because Maria Pereira commissioned it herself. Maria was a member of the Spanish royal family and

460 See cat. #33 for a transcription of this letter.
461 Francesca’s tomb would have been the earliest instance of a lay-person’s tomb depicting the manner of their death, or a death-scene at all, in the fifteenth century. By including this type of imagery, which up until Francesca’s tomb had only been featured on saints’ tombs, the iconographic program would potentially have been making saintly allusions for Francesca’s memory. Children’s effigies did exist at least in a limited capacity in the Middle Ages. Philippe Ariès concluded that children’s tombs did not exist before the sixteenth century as he puts it, “the little thing that disappeared so soon in life was not worthy of remembrance.” See Philippe Ariès, Centuries of Childhood, trans. Robert Baldick, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), 36. However, as Sophie Oosterwijk pointed out, Ariès is wrong by noting that children sometimes appeared on late Medieval tombs in English examples in the role of pleurants, or the weeping figures typically depicted on sarcophagi. Children could also be depicted in effigy on their parents’ tombs. An example of a tomb with a full-size effigy of a child is the alabaster monument to Sir Walter Griffith and his first wife, Joan Neville (later 1460s or early 1470s, Burton Agnes, Yorkshire, England), which originally included diminutive, but full-size effigies of both a son and a daughter. See Sophie Oosterwijk, “Babes on Brackets on Medieval Tomb Monuments: a Meaningful Distinction or an Iconographic Oddity?” in Rolf de Weijert, Kim Ragetli, Arnou-Jan Bijsterveld and Jeannette van Arenthals eds., Living Memoria Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Memorial Culture in Honour of Truus van Bueren. (Hilversum: Verloren, 2011): 251
was married to Pietro Lalle Camponeschi, the leader of L’Aquila’s resistance to Neapolitan control. The double-tomb includes the small, wretched effigy of Maria and her fifteen-month-old daughter Beatrice, inviting prayers for the souls of both figures. Maria is shown with her arms crossed at her lower abdomen, her hands resting on a book. Maria’s tomb is the only extant woman’s tomb within the scope of this study that includes a book. While I have been unable to ascertain if there is an inscription on it, indicating whether it is religious, perhaps a bible or book of hours, or otherwise, the mere presence of a book on her tomb indicates two significant points. One, Maria wanted to commemorate her ability to read, and possibly even situate herself as a scholar, which at that time was an unusual skill for women. Though exact literacy rates are difficult to determine, fifteenth-century Italy is considered to be a generally literate society, though women were at a considerable disadvantage. Two, Maria’s tomb follows very explicitly the pattern of the “humanist tomb,” not only in its single-arch format, but also through the inclusion of a book resting on the effigy.

462 See cat. #26.
463 Based on the 1427 catasto returns in Florence Robert Black argued that there was approximately a 69.3% literacy rate for adult males in the city at that time. See Robert Black, “Literacy in Florence, 1427,” in Florence and Beyond: Culture, Society and Politics in Renaissance Italy ed. David S. Peterson (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2008), 205. Whereas Paul F. Grendler, presenting late fifteenth-century Florence as a case-study and through an analysis of school attendance records, argues that literacy rates were closer to 30-33% of the male population, with female literacy less, though greatly variable based upon social class. See Paul F. Grendler, Schooling in Renaissance Italy: Literacy and Learning, 1300-1600 (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), 71-78. Maria Ornel Marotti suggests that in the sixteenth-century literacy rates for women in urban centers approached 12%, though it would have been significantly less in smaller towns and in rural areas. See Maria Ornel Marotti, Italian Women Writers from the Renaissance to the Present (College Park, PA: Pennsylvania State Press, 2004), 70. On women’s literacy, see also Virginia Cox, Women’s Writing in Italy, 1400-1650. (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008) and Peter Mack, A History of Renaissance Rhetoric, 1380-1620 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
On the original “humanist tomb,” Bernardo Rossellino’s monument to Florentine chancellor Leonardo Bruni, Bruni’s effigy holds to his chest one of his major literary works, the *Historiarum Florentini Popoli* (*History of the Florentine People*), intending to highlight his contributions to Florence, but also his scholarly ambitions and literary erudition. Continuing in that tradition, on his tomb the effigy of Carlo Marsuppini, Bruni’s successor as chancellor, also holds a book, though in this case it is not identified. Commemorating these men, both scholars and authors, with books on their effigies, which also adorned both men’s chests at their funerals, might have been inspired by the *trecento* Tuscan tradition of placing manuscripts on the bodies of medical doctors and lawyers during their funerals.  

464 Commemoration with a book also draws upon the Roman tradition where the tombs of poets, philosophers, and rhetoricians would depict the deceased with a book, symbolizing, as Anne Markham Schulz puts it, “a life devoted to poetry, history, literature, and philosophy.”  

465 In the proliferations of the “humanist tomb” that followed the initial two monuments, which rarely commemorated humanists, the motif of a book was included in the tombs of Pietro da Noceto, a papal secretary (Matteo Civitali, 1472, Duomo, Lucca), and the tomb of Antonio Roselli, a jurist (Pietro Lombardo, 1467, Sant’Antonio, Padua). Both of these men had positions that would indicate not only basic literacy but also a great deal of reading and writing. However, this pattern was not continued when the

---

464 Helen Ann Ronan, “The Tuscan Wall Tomb 1250-1400” (PhD. Diss., Indiana University, 1982), 12. I credit Katy Gail Richardson for noticing this correspondence. See Katy Gail Richardson, “The Context and Function of Four Exceptions to Effigial Wall Tomb Patronage in Quattrocento Florence,” (MA Thesis, Louisiana State University, 2006), 65

form spread to Rome with the tomb of Cardinal Cristoforo della Rovere (Andrea Bregno and Mino da Fiesole, 1478, Santa Maria del Popolo, Rome).\footnote{These are the “humanist” tombs that Shelley Zuraw considers the closest imitations to the original two monuments though they do not commemorate humanists. See Shelly E. Zuraw, “The Public Commemorative Monument: Mino da Fiesole’s Tombs in the Florentine Badia,” \textit{The Art Bulletin} 80 (1998): 459. Andrew Butterfield also criticizes the notion of “humanist tombs” in “Monument and Memory in Early Renaissance Florence,” in \textit{Art, Memory, and Family in Renaissance Florence}, ed. Giovanni Ciapelli and Patricia Lee Rubin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 135-162. For the tomb of Pietro da Noceto, see Steven Bule, “Nuovi documenti per Matteo Civitali,” \textit{Rivista d’Arte} 40 (1988): 357-67. For the tomb of Antonio Roselli, see Giovanni Lorenzoni, “Dopo Donatello: Da Bartolomeo Bellano ad Andrea Riccio,” in \textit{Le sculture del Santo di Padova Fonte e Studi per la Storia del Santo a Padova}, vol. 4 (Vicenza: Neri Pozza, 1984), 97-98.} The motif of the book also did not recur in the other three women’s tombs that followed the humanist tomb type pattern: Barbara Manfredi’s tomb in Forlì, Marsibilia Trinci’s tomb in Montefiorentino, and Maria of Aragon Piccolomini’s tomb in Naples. All of these tombs follow the formal template of the “humanist tomb,” but none of them signals the deceased’s erudition or learning through the presence of a book. By including the small book on her tomb, regardless of its subject, Maria Pereira was highlighting her literacy and locating herself, quite extraordinarily, within the scholarly tradition, which shaped the original two humanist tombs.

The final tomb in which the effigy holds an object is Beatrice d’Este’s monument located now in the Certosa di Pavia. At her waist Beatrice grasps a small fur pelt, which Jacqueline Musacchio has identified as a weasel.\footnote{Jacqueline Marie Musacchio, “Weasels and Pregnancy in Renaissance Italy.” \textit{Renaissance Studies} 15.2 (2001): 172-187.} While weasels or other members of the mustelid family appeared with some regularity in Renaissance art, notably in Leonardo’s \textit{Lady with an Ermine (Cecilia Gallerani)} (1489-90, oil on wood panel,
Czartoryski Museum, Kraków, Poland), they do not usually appear on tomb sculpture. Only two women’s effigial tombs feature animals of any sort, Beatrice’s weasel pelt and the dog at the foot of Ilaria del Carretto’s effigy. As evidenced by contemporary bestiaries, these animals were often considered to be symbolic; dogs generally represented loyalty, while weasels, in Musacchio’s estimation, could indicate pregnancy, or their pelts could function apotropaically. Beatrice d’Este died shortly following the birth of a stillborn son, so while it is unlikely that the pelt is meant to represent a protective talisman, it could perhaps function as a reminder of how she died by symbolizing her fertility. Much as the unusual iconography on the tomb of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni likely framed Francesca’s death in childbirth for the Tornabuoni dynastic cause, the inclusion of the weasel pelt on Beatrice’s tomb operated in the same fashion.

For each of the four tombs in which the effigy clutches an object, then, it becomes clear that these inclusions were explicit additions to the memory creation of these individuals. Whether references were made to purity and likeness to the Virgin, like Chiara Gambacorti; the scholarly abilities of the deceased, like Maria Pereira; or sacrifice in the virtuous service of dynasty-building like Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni or Beatrice

---

468 Musacchio, “Weasels and Pregnancy in Renaissance Italy,” 172.
469 Musacchio, “Weasels and Pregnancy in Renaissance Italy,” passim.
470 Beatrice’s effigy, which is situated as a double-tomb with the effigy of her husband, Ludovico Sforza, has been interpreted as emphasizing Beatrice’s necessary role in creating a reinvigorated Sforza dynasty on the basis of its demonstrable emulation of French royal tombs, so the inclusion of an animal pelt that could allude to pregnancy or fertility would be in the same vein. See cat. #27 for more information. However, it should also be noted in this case, small animal pelts were also popular accessories at the time for aristocratic ladies, so the inclusion on her tomb might have been more simply a reference to an object that Beatrice regularly wore. She was renowned for her fashionable choices, which were copied profusely in the Sforza court, so the inclusion of this pelt might be more of an indicator of her status as a stylistic innovator, which will be discussed in greater detail below.
d’Este, these inclusions concretize desirable attributes of their deceased. With the exception of the book, the attributes also speak to what could be considered among the ideals for Renaissance women—purity for holy women, or fertility for the women who acted as generational fulcrums for their families—showing how these tombs engaged with ideas of the feminine ideal, which will be addressed in more detail in the next chapter of this dissertation.

The final means by which the individual effigies can be distinguished is through the arrangement of their hair. As Evelyn Welch has argued, hair, by means of its styling and adornment, had political and diplomatic implications and could represent friendship, familial relationships, or clientage. \(^{471}\) More simply, loose, unbound hair indicated a woman was newly married, or betrothed, \(^{472}\) while women who had been married longer, older women, and widows typically hid their hair behind veils. \(^{473}\) Table 15 shows the hair arrangements for the effigies on fifteenth century monumental tombs.

| Table 20. Appearance of Effigy: Visibility and Adornment of their Hair |
|--------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| **Tomb Subject**   | **Hair Covered** | **Hair Uncovered** | **Loose Strands** | **Other Adornment** |
| Margherita Malatesta  | X               |                 |                 |                 |
| Caterina dei Francesi | X               |                 |                 |                 |
| Ilaria del Carretto  |                 | X               | X               | X               |


\(^{472}\) Simon, “Women in Frames,” 9. Loose hair could also have erotic connotations as is particularly demonstrated by a set of portraits by Sandro Botticelli from the 1480s featuring women with elaborate cascading hairstyles that are generally interpreted as being fantasy images of pin-ups. See Monika A. Schmitter, “Botticelli’s Images of Simonetta Vespucci: Between Portrait and Ideal,” *Rutgers Art Review* 15 (1995): 33-57.

\(^{473}\) Tinagli, “Profile Portraits in the Quattrocento,” 63.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnese and Clemenza Durazzo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margherita di Durazzo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisabetta Trenta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paola Bianca Malatesta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiara Gambacorti</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibilia Cetto</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Justine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Villana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Monica</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Manfredi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Catherine of Siena</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medea Colleoni</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria of Aragon Piccolomini</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabetta Geraldini</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costanza Ammannati</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddalena Orsini</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsibilia Trinci</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camoneschi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddalena Riccia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice d’Este</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Beatrice Rusca</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 20, sixteen of the twenty-five effigies are depicted with their hair covered, indicating they were either pious, older married women, or widows when they died. The remaining eight who are depicted with their hair uncovered, otherwise adorned, or with loose strands are all young lay-women, except for the relief effigy of
Saint Justine. The depiction of Saint Justine is alone among the effigies depicting saints or _beate_ in that her hair is loose and uncovered with a halo surrounding her head. Her tomb is also unique among those for female saints in the _quattrocento_ in that she is depicted in secular clothes. However, the damaged state of Saint Justine’s tomb, as well as its strange provenance, suggests that this monument might not be from the fifteenth century.474 In general, the women who are depicted with uncovered hair are younger, and generally within a few years of their marriage, which would coincide with how women’s painted portraits are typically understood.

The various distinctions between effigial representation—age, clothing, placement of hands, and hair—though at times subtle, suggest that at least basic considerations towards the details of these women’s lives, whether young or old, secular or religious, mothers or widows, are reflected in their tomb monuments. In that sense, the effigies confirm the underlying Burkhardtian theme of the portraiture literature reviewed at the beginning of this chapter; effigies on women’s tombs in the fifteenth century were portraits of individuals, they were the lifelike delegates of the dead—in a sense their permanent stand-ins475—and therefore these sculptures should be considered in the portraiture discourse.

**Non-Effigial Depictions of the Deceased on Women’s Monumental Tombs**

Among the eleven tombs for women that do not include effigies, three of them do feature representations of the deceased. These are the tombs of Vittoria Piccolomini,
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(1454, San Francesco, Siena); Saint Fina, (1468, Collegiata, San Gimignano); and Nera Corsi Sassetti, (1479, Santa Trinità, Florence). Vittoria Piccolomini’s monument includes a half-length portrait relief in a large shell frame. In the relief she is depicted as elderly, veiled, and in religious clothing, and her left hand is visible, holding a handkerchief or piece of cloth. Vittoria’s image mirrors that of her husband, Silvio. The form of this monument is unique among tombs created in the fifteenth century, and it is possible that this image is not from that period, but rather the late seventeenth-century.\textsuperscript{476} There was a fire at San Francesco that damaged the tomb in August 1655, and scholars are divided as to whether the current monument is composed of surviving fragments of the original fifteenth-century tomb, or if it is a seventeenth-century replacement.\textsuperscript{477} Thus, it is such an outlier that it does not bear much scrutiny in this study, except to note that, if from the \textit{quattrocento} it would be nearly singular as a portrait bust depicting an older woman.\textsuperscript{478}

The tomb chapel of Saint Fina includes many different representations of the saint, including a life-like head reliquary and three narrative reliefs depicting scenes from her life, including the appearance of Saint Gregory to Saint Fina announcing her death, a nurse supporting the head of the dead Saint Fina, and a posthumous miracle in which Saint Fina saves a child.\textsuperscript{479} On the walls of the chapel flanking the tomb, Domenico Ghirlandaio and his workshop painted narrative scenes of Saint Fina’s legend, including \textit{The Annunciation of Santa Fina’s Death by Saint Gregory the Great} and \textit{The Funeral of}

\textsuperscript{476} Gianlorenzo Bernini initiated the turn away from effigies on tomb monuments towards relief portraits with the tomb of Maria Raggi in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome in 1647, suggesting that a tendency towards experimentation on women’s monument continued from the fifteenth century all the way into the seventeenth. I credit Melissa Yuen for providing me with this information.

\textsuperscript{477} See cat. #32 for more.

\textsuperscript{478} For sources on portrait busts see: fn. 349 above.

\textsuperscript{479} Nygren, “The Monumental Saint’s Tomb in Italy,” 405.
Santa Fina. In the sculpted reliefs and in the painted scenes, Saint Fina is represented as youthful, with loosely bound, uncovered hair. She is haloed in all of the images and wears secular clothing. These features emphasize her youth and beauty, and possibly aim to align her with the Virgin Mary. As Linda Koch has argued, these images contributed to the construction of her sanctity, in that she was still a local beata when these images were created, and they helped to codify and concretize her legend.

Nera Corsi Sassetti is depicted twice in the Sassetti chapel, though she is not depicted in effigy. At the bottom center of the architectural frame of her arcosolium tomb, there is a small roundel with her profile portrait (fig. 49). Nera is shown in profile again in a kneeling donor image on the altar wall adjacent to her tomb and the chapel’s painted altarpiece (fix. 50). Significantly, both her tomb and her donor image are located on the heraldic dexter of the chapel, which is in opposition to what is typical of paired images (whether in profile portrait panels or donor images) of men and women, where the women are nearly always located on the heraldic sinister. By breaking this convention of gendered portraiture, Nera’s tomb and donor image significantly honor her memory while complicating existing understandings of patriarchal hierarchy in paired imagery. The roundel portrait of Nera is in dialogue with both painted profile portraits

---


482 Woods-Marsden, “Portrait of the Lady,” 69. It should also be noted that Nera’s tomb and donor image are on the heraldic dexter of the chapel, and they are also the closer of the two tombs to the high altar.

When these other representations are included in the totals with the effigial tombs, twenty-eight of thirty-five monuments (80 percent) feature a representation of the deceased, and fifteen of twenty-eight monuments (53.5 percent) depict the deceased as an older individual, upending the conventional wisdom regarding women’s painted portraiture from the \textit{quattrocento} that they were nearly exclusively represented as youthful and idealized. The remaining thirteen monuments that depict younger women do maintain some of the conventions of ideal beauty that are typically argued for in regard to painted panel portraits, which will be discussed in more detail in chapter four of this dissertation. The conventional understanding of depicting young women in relation to ideals does seem to be in effect with tomb effigies, but the large number of non-ideally beautiful depictions of older women in effigy indicates totally different standards and conventions in play, which have thus far gone unrecognized in the literature on Renaissance women’s portraiture.

\textbf{The Question of Likeness}

I have argued throughout this chapter that the effigies found on women’s monumental tombs should be considered within the discussion of portraiture for
quattrocento art and have analyzed their representations accordingly. However, I have not yet addressed a significant concern for early Renaissance portraiture: that of likeness. I use the term likeness to mean a depiction of the deceased that would have been readily recognizable to those who knew her, which is particularly relevant to effigies as they were meant to recall the features of the absent deceased.\textsuperscript{484} As Tanja Michalsky puts it, “the act of commemoration itself determines the identity of the commemorated.”\textsuperscript{485} In effect, the identities of the women memorialized by monumental tombs were created by the sculpture, inscriptions, and ceremony or liturgy—whether funeral orations, masses said at her tomb, or candles donated for her—undertaken in her honor. This chapter will now examine the usefulness of likeness as a criterion in understanding effigies in order to

\textsuperscript{484} The notions of verism and likeness play a large role in the idea of memoria, as outlined by Otto Gerhard Oexle. He established the concept as not simply memory, but the connection between the living and the dead accomplished through liturgical and social acts, including image-making, and the related concerns of the ability to visualize the absent and make the absent present through remembering. See Otto Gerhard Oexle, “Memoria und Memorialbild,” in Memoria der geschichtliche Zeugniswert des liturgischen Gedenkens im Mittelalter, edited by Karl Schmid and Joachim Wollasch (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1984), 384. For a recent comprehensive study of memoria, see Rolf de Weijert, Kim Ragetli, Arnou-Jan Bijsterveld and Jeannette van Arenthals eds., Living Memoria. Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Memorial Culture in Honour of Truus van Bueren. (Hilversum: Verloren, 2011). Likeness or verism is particularly a challenging concern in ruler tombs. In his classic study, Ernst Kantorowitz argued that effigies were meant to be understood as representing the continuation of institutions rather than individuals. See Ernst Kantorowitz, The King’s Two Bodies. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957). In contrast, Kristin Marek studied the effigy of King Edward II from after 1327, an example of extreme verism, which in its individuality would be difficult to understand as the institution of kingship. See Kristin Marek, Die Körper des Königs. Effigies, Bildpolitik und Keiligkeit (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2009). I thank Dr. Benjamin Paul for drawing my attention to this source.

\textsuperscript{485} “…dass der Akt der Kommemoration selbst die Identität der Kommemorierenden bestimmt.” Tanja Michalsky, Memoria und Repräsentation Die Grabmäler des Königshauses Anjou in Italien (Göttingen: Vandenoek & Ruprecht, 2000), 18. Translation mine.
suggest that effigies are the most indelible portraits of these individuals, as they were explicitly intended to concretely and publicly embody their memories.

Though Leon Battista Alberti wrote in his *On Painting* (and has been quoted ever after by art historians as saying) that it was through the art of portraiture that “the absent [were made] present” and the dead could be seen by “the living many centuries later,” the question of whether or not *quattrocento* portraits depicted accurate likenesses is a thoroughly complicated one. There was in the fifteenth century an expectation that a portrait should bear a resemblance (*similitudo*) to the sitter and be a true *ritratto dal naturale*, as evidenced by Isabella d’Este’s famous lament of the challenge to find painters who could accurately “counterfeit perfectly the natural face.” But there was also a concurrent expectation, initiated by Petrarch and furthered by Neo-Platonists like Pietro d’Abano, and later by individuals like Lorenzo ‘il Magnifico’ de’ Medici, that

---


488 In a letter from Isabella d’Este to the Countess of Acerra, April 3, 1494, ASMAG, busta 2991, libro 3. C.30v., no 99, published in Alessandro Luzio, *La Galleria dei Gonzaga,* (Milan, 1913), 188: “Mò che l’habiamo in carta e in cera, etiam che per relacione de Jacomo, et per quello che nui stesse iudicamo, seGil assimiliano poco, sapendo cum quanta difficoltà se ritrovano pictori che perfectamente contrafaciano el vulto naturale, tenemolo charissimo e spesso lo consideriamo, supplendo cum la informacione de Margartia, Jacomo et altri che hanno vedult la S. V. al defecto del picture per modo che niente restamo ingannate del concepto nostro.”
portraits should be able to capture a sitter’s appearance as well as his or her character.\textsuperscript{489}

To represent an individual’s character meant to highlight virtuous and ideal qualities, straying from the notion of likeness. In the case of quattrocento Florentine women’s painted portraits displaying character meant stressing poetic ideals, which included golden hair, youth, fair skin, and regular features, whether or not such things were accurate for the sitter, which created typological codes and representational modes for that type of art.\textsuperscript{490} In sum, Renaissance portraits are understood today to be fictions—in Stefan Weppelmann’s phrasing, “fiction[s] of verisimilitude,” and in Patricia Simons’, they function as “fictive, rhetorical device[s].”\textsuperscript{491}

Despite this emphasis on the “fictiveness,” of painted portraits, regarding effigies, art historical theorists like Hans Belting and Georges Didi-Huberman have, particularly in relation to the use of death masks,\textsuperscript{492} suggested that veristic effigies on tombs would create a \textit{simulacrum}, or suggest to the viewer that the deceased’s body was actually present.\textsuperscript{493} A similar concern—that the effigy could make the body seem physically present—was a component of duecento and trecento commemoration of saints. Saints’

\textsuperscript{489} Stefan Weppelmann, “Some Thoughts on Likeness in Italian Early Renaissance Portraits,” in \textit{The Renaissance Portrait from Donatello to Bellini}, ed. Christiansen and Weppelmann, 64.
\textsuperscript{490} These typologies and representational modes are not restricted to women’s portraits, but the evidence of this patterning is particularly strong among women’s portraits from Florence. Weppelmann, “Some Thoughts on Likeness,” 64, 66.
\textsuperscript{492} Only one woman’s tomb, that of Chiara Gambacorta, is thought to have utilized a death mask for the effigy. See Roberts, \textit{Dominican Women and Renaissance Art}, 94.
\textsuperscript{493} Belting, \textit{An Anthropology of Images}, 80, 87 and Belting, \textit{Faces. Eine Geschichte des Gesichts}, 150. See also Georges Didi-Huberman, \textit{L’Empreinte}, 60-64, which particularly addresses the use of death masks.
tombs from those centuries usually did not include an effigy specifically because it was thought that a sculpted body would draw attention away from the saint’s physical relics.494 By the fifteenth century, however, this ability to recall the body of the deceased seems to have been the goal of effigies, including effigies of women.

It would be reasonable to expect, then, that effigies are consistent with painted portraits in that they would recognizably represent the individual they are meant to depict, but with a sufficient emphasis on virtuous appearance and ideals to adhere to certain normative stereotypes. Because these were monumental and costly sculptures located in public spaces, there is a significantly greater prominence and permanency to the image, making the stakes of representation decidedly higher than in painted portraits or even sculpted busts.495 Because of the prominence and expense of effigies, it stands to reason that they would be even more idealized than their more private, economically produced counterparts.496 But, because exactly half of the effigies depict the deceased as older, reflecting their age at the time of death, it seems that, in tomb sculpture, there was an even greater tendency towards likeness than in painted portraiture.

The lifelikeness of effigies might have even been enhanced by polychromy, which might have been present on the hair, face, and clothing of these effigies. Though there are

494 Paul Binski, *Medieval Death, Ritual and Representation* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996), 94. In the fifteenth century, effigies also became central components of saints’ tombs, which was not at all the case in the preceding centuries.
496 Anita Moskowitz, *Italian Gothic Sculpture*, 310. She asserts that women’s monuments were typically idealized and that “the female must be presented in her role as attractive child-bearer,” though she does draw attention to the tomb of Margherita Malatesta (cat. #13), which is an example of an un-ideal female effigy.
traces of polychromy on only one women’s tomb—that of Margherita of Durazzo\(^{497}\) (fig. 51)—increasingly scholars are finding that polychromy was an element that was used with hitherto unrecognized frequency on fifteenth-century tomb monuments.\(^{498}\)

Margherita of Durazzo’s tomb features extensive polychromy: on the face of her monument where the queen is enthroned her dress shoes traces of blue and green, and her hair a reddish, golden color also used on her scepter and crown. There is also, though it does not include an effigy, blue, red, and gilding on the monument to Isotta degli Atti, indicating that color, rather than the stark white marble to which modern viewers are accustomed, might have been more prevalent on these sculptures than currently recognized.\(^{499}\) Conservation of individual tombs might reveal more such evidence of the use of color on these tombs, further augmenting the verism of effigial sculpture.

However, discerning whether an image that is five-hundred years old provides an accurate representation of an individual is a challenging task.\(^{500}\) In order to judge whether there is actually a likeness, it is helpful to utilize Georgia Sommers Wright’s criteria for identifying a likeness: there must be two or more securely identified images of the individual; they must be documented or at least presumed on good evidence to have been
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497 See cat. #1.
498 For example after careful conservation and cleaning the remains of extensive polychromy and gilding were found on Desiderio da Settignano’s tomb for Carlo Marsuppini. See Christopher Weeks, “The Restoration of Desidero da Settignano’s Tomb of Carlo Marsuppini in S. Croce, Florence” The Burlington Magazine 141 (1999): 732-38.
499 Cat. #18. Additionally, in a sixteenth-century description of the trecento tomb of Alda d’Este, Jacopo Daino wrote that the tomb was “per la maggiore parte indorata,” (for the most part gilded). See fn. 217 for the full transcription and citation of this description.
500 Maria Loh suggests that portraits cannot be considered “truthful documents” in terms of their revealing the actual appearance of fifteenth-century individuals. See Maria Loh, “Renaissance Faciality,” 347.
made within the lifetime of the subject; and images must resemble each other.\footnote{Georgia Sommers Wright, “The Reinvention of the Portrait Likeness in the Fourteenth Century,” *Gesta* 39.2 (2000): 118. Wright is working within the medieval tradition, but her criteria are justifiable for use during the Renaissance as well.} While very few of the women commemorated by effigies on monumental tombs meet these criteria, one individual unquestionably does: Beatrice d’Este. By analyzing the painted and sculpted images of Beatrice, it is possible to make reasonable hypotheses about the emphasis on likeness in women’s effigies from the fifteenth century.

**Beatrice d’Este: a Portrait Bust, a Painting, and an Effigy**

Beatrice d’Este was the daughter of Ercole I d’Este, the Marquess of Este and the second duke of Ferrara. In 1491, she married Ludovico Sforza, who was, at the time, Duke of Bari and the regent of Milan, ruling for his young nephew, Gian Galeazzo Sforza. In 1495, Gian Galeazzo died suddenly and suspiciously, granting the title of Duke to Ludovico and Duchess to Beatrice. Ludovico’s marriage to Beatrice, which had been in the works since 1480, granted him significant legitimacy because of Beatrice’s family ties to the long-reigning Este of Ferrara and the royal Aragonese in Naples.\footnote{Luisa Giordano, *Beatrice d’Este 1475-1497* (Pisa: ETS, 2008), 68.} By 1495, Beatrice had had two sons, Ercole Massimiliano in 1493 and Francesco II in 1495, and had established herself in the Milanese court. Upon her arrival in Milan, Beatrice took the unconventional step of maintaining the unusual and distinctive hairstyle that she had worn in her natal home: a long false braid that hung from center-parted hair called a *coazzone*.\footnote{A *coazzone* is analogous to the modern rat-tail hairstyle. Evelyn Welch, “Art on the Edge: Hair and Hands in Renaissance Italy,” 247. Brides would have typically been expected to abandon the styles of their natal courts in order to adopt the customs and
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\footnote{501}{Georgia Sommers Wright, “The Reinvention of the Portrait Likeness in the Fourteenth Century,” *Gesta* 39.2 (2000): 118. Wright is working within the medieval tradition, but her criteria are justifiable for use during the Renaissance as well.}

\footnote{502}{Luisa Giordano, *Beatrice d’Este 1475-1497* (Pisa: ETS, 2008), 68.}

\footnote{503}{A *coazzone* is analogous to the modern rat-tail hairstyle. Evelyn Welch, “Art on the Edge: Hair and Hands in Renaissance Italy,” 247. Brides would have typically been expected to abandon the styles of their natal courts in order to adopt the customs and
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new fashion.\textsuperscript{504} Evelyn Welch has suggested that Beatrice effectively imposed this hairstyle upon the Milanese court, and other women there quickly adopted it, establishing Beatrice's dominant position in her marital home.\textsuperscript{505} Whatever the politics in the Milanese court in the 1490s, Beatrice achieved what would have been considered success for a wife in Renaissance Italy by bearing two sons, and as evidenced by a letter written by Ludovico to his brother-in-law Francesco Gonzaga, the Marquis of Mantua,\textsuperscript{506} he was inconsolable at her death.

Beatrice is an excellent candidate for analyzing the question of likeness in an effigy because of the number of verifiable images of her that were created during her


505 Welch, “Art on the Edge,” 248, argues that Beatrice’s efforts in this regard might have been because of the sexual politics at play in Milan. Ludovico had had a mistress for a number of years, Cecilia Gallerani, the subject of Leonardo’s Lady with an Ermine (Cecilia Gallerani), perhaps making Beatrice’s desire to establish her dominant position among the women at court more acute. See also Evelyn Welch, Art and Authority in Renaissance Milan (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 225. On Cecilia Gallerani see Janice Shell and Grazioso Sironi, “Cecilia Gallerani: Leonardo’s Lady with an Ermine,” Artibus et Historiae 25 (1992): 47-66.

506 The letter is published in Archivio storico lombardo Ser. II vol. XVII, 1890 p. 639. The letter reads: “La Illustriussima nostra consorte, essendole questa notte alle due hore venuto le doglie, alle cinque hore partirsi un figliuolo morto, et alle sei et mezza rese el spirit a Dio; del quale acerbo et immature caso ci troviamo in tant amaritudine et cordoglio quanto sia possibile di sentire, et tanta che più grato ci saria stato morire noi prima et non vederne mancare quell ache era la più cara cosa havessimo a questo mondo; et benchè siamo in questa grandezza et extremità di cordoglio fuori di ogni misura et sappiamo che all S.V. non sarà di manco dolore, nondimeno non havemo volute omettere di significargli noi el caso come c’è parso convenire aloffitio et amore nostro fraterno verso la S.V., la quale preghiamo non vogli mandare alcuno a condolersene con noi per non renovare el dolore. Di questo caso non c’è parso scriveri alla Ill. Madonna Marchesana, rimettendo che la S.V. con quello megliore modo parerà a Lei le lo faccia sapere, quale siamo certi che insieme con la S.V. è per sentirne inextimabile dolore.”
lifetime, most notably a portrait bust (fig. 52) by Gian Cristoforo Romano from 1490 (Musée du Louvre, Paris) and the so-called Pala Sforzesca (fig. 53) painted by the Master of the Pala Sforzesca from 1494-95 (tempera and oil on panel, Pinacoteca di Brera, Milan) which depicts her as a donor figure. While the three images of Beatrice are not precisely contemporaneous, they do all originate from the last seven years of Beatrice’s life, from age fifteen to twenty-two, when her identity as the wife of Ludovico Sforza and the duchess of Milan began and was solidified.

In the portrait bust, Beatrice is depicted as a young girl, yet she already sports the elaborate coazzone braid (fig. 54) that she would later institutionalize within court fashion in Milan. She has a long oval face, large wide eyes, and fleshy cheeks. The inscription on the base of the bust reads DIVAE BEATRICE D HERC F, translating to “to the divine Beatrice, daughter of Duke Ercole.” Her clothing marks her as Este progeny: the Este diamond ring is depicted on the bodice of her gown, encircling the Sforza symbol of a cloth sieve (buratto). The bust might have been commissioned by Ludovico Sforza because the emblems on her chest do refer to the hoped-for fecundity of their marriage, or the bust might have been meant to be a reminder of Beatrice and the Este-Sforza union in the Ferrarese court after her departure for Milan. The bust itself is in an all’antica style, with classical lettering and situated on a socle, locating the portrait
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507 Translation from Christiansen and Weppelmann eds., The Renaissance Portrait from Donatello to Bellini, 255. By referring to her as “Diva” the sculpture is making allusions to antiquity and the practice of deifying empresses.
508 Christiansen and Weppelmann eds. The Renaissance Portrait, 255.
509 Giordano, Beatrice d’Este, 68, 75-77.
in a classical-humanist context,\textsuperscript{511} and also likely indicating that Beatrice’s appearance was enhanced to emphasize her virtues, in this case her youth, beauty, and hoped-for fertility.

The so-called \textit{Pala Sforzesca, or Altarpiece of Sant’Ambrogio ad Nemus}, was painted by the otherwise little-known Master of the Pala Sforzesca\textsuperscript{512} and was commissioned by Ludovico himself in January 1494 to decorate the altar of a small church outside the walls of the city, Sant’Ambrogio ad Nemus, that was very close to many of Ludovico’s other grand architectural projects.\textsuperscript{513} The painting depicts a \textit{sacra conversazione} with Ludovico and his son Ercole Massimiliano kneeling to the left of the Virgin’s throne, with Beatrice and another child, likely Ludovico’s natural son with Cecilia Gallerani, Cesare, kneeling to the right.\textsuperscript{514} The inclusion of Ludovico’s illegitimate son in an image that amounts to a family portrait has been interpreted as an indication of granting the boy legitimacy in an effort to increase the number of Ludovico’s heirs and to bolster his claim to the Milanese dukedom.\textsuperscript{515} Flanking the Virgin and child are four Doctors of the church, including Saint Ambrose, Saint Gregory the Great, Saint Augustine, and Saint Jerome, all of whom are located under an elaborate

\textsuperscript{511} Christiansen and Weppelmann eds., \textit{The Renaissance Portrait}, 257.
\textsuperscript{512} The painting has at times been attributed to Giovanni Ambrogio de Predis.
\textsuperscript{513} Guido Lopez, et al., \textit{Gli Sforza a Milano} (Milan: Cassa di Risparmio delle Provincie Lombarde, 1978), 161. The first mention of the \textit{pala} is in a letter sent to Ludovico by Marchesino Stanga, the ducal secretary, on 22 January 1494: “Per satisfare ala commissione quale me ha facta la ex.tia v.ra circa l’ancona de s.to Ambroso ad Nemus ho mandato per lo picture quale me ha dato la nota inclusa per chiezea de quello etractato circa ciò, quale mando a la ex.ia v. et in bona gratia sua di continuo me recoman.o. Mediolano xxij Ianuarij 1494” (ASM, Sforzesco, 1114, first published by Malaguzzi Valeri, (1905): 45). For Ludovico’s architectural commissions see Welch, \textit{Art and Authority in Renaissance Milan}, passim.
\textsuperscript{514} Laura Baini, “Le Commissioni dinastiche. La Pala per Sant’Ambrogio ad Nemus,” in \textit{Ludovicus Dux}, ed. Louisa Giordano (Vigevano, Diakronia, 1995), 158.
\textsuperscript{515} Baini, “Le Commissioni dinastiche, La Pala per Sant’Ambrogio ad Nemus,” 160.
golden and bejeweled baldacchino. Flying angels suspend the Virgin’s elaborate crown above her head at the top of the painting.

Beatrice is situated on the heraldic sinister of the painting, which is often the position of the female counterpart of a donor couple. She is shown kneeling in a fancy gold, black, and blue striped gown. Elaborate golden tassels decorate her sleeves and she is bedecked in jewels, including a long pearl necklace, chokers, huge gems, and a pearl headdress that leads the viewer’s eye to her distinctive coazzone stretching down her back. Her face again takes the long oval shape, with an elongated nose and fleshy cheeks and chin, though with a greater sharpness to the features that could either be the product of the profile view or perhaps the few years of marriage and motherhood showing on her young face. She is positioned so that the left hand of the Virgin points directly to her, reaching out to make a visual connection between the only two women and mothers in the scene. Additionally, she is framed by the left hand of Saint Jerome, who presents her to the Virgin. Beatrice is shown to be significantly smaller than Ludovico and, as is not uncommon for donor images like these, the scale of the earthly figures is slightly smaller than the heavenly ones surrounding them. The blue, black, and gold stripes of Beatrice’s gown give her a decorative appearance, particularly because, through its linearity, her adornments harmonize with the golden architecture that surrounds them all.

As an altarpiece, the Pala Sforzesca was a very public representation of Beatrice, and created a relatively consistent image of her with the earlier, more private portrait bust. Because both of these works of art were executed while she was alive and they resemble each other, we can, per Georgia Sommers Wright’s criteria, use them as

---

516 An exception is Nera Corsi Sassetti in her donor image next to her tomb in the Sassetti Chapel.
“control” portraits by which to judge the appearance of her tomb effigy. The effigy features the same oval face, wide set eyes, and fleshy chin and cheeks, though the nose is a bit shorter and more rounded. Consistent with the size differences between Ludovico and Beatrice in the Pala Sforzesca, Beatrice is significantly smaller, by nearly a head, in their effigial representations. Significantly, Beatrice is not depicted on her effigy wearing her coazzone hairstyle. Instead her hair is arranged in a halo of tight curls around her face with longer tendrils of loosely curled hair resting on her chest. This deviation from what could be considered her trademark hairstyle likely is due to the gisant nature of fifteenth-century effigies; because the figure is lying down, the long coazzone would not have been visible behind the effigy. The sculpted hairstyle allows for the virtuosic display of drill-work that Cristoforo Solari achieved to create the small curls around her face (fig. 47). The sophisticated drill-work exhibited on Beatrice’s effigy demonstrates that women’s tombs, much like any other significant public art, could be sites for an artist to demonstrate his considerable skill.\footnote{Lisbeta Trenta’s tomb has been considered in the critical tradition as being less successful than that of her husbands’ and that because it is a woman’s tomb it was considered less important to display virtuosic carving in the effigy, with which I disagree. For this argument see James Beck, Jacopo della Quercia, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), 160-161.}

Significantly, the effigy is the least idealized of the three images of Beatrice. Though the three all share the same features, in the effigy her face and neck are noticeably fleshier, particularly her neck, which shows naturalistic creasing, features which were not present in the earlier portrait bust or painted image. While Beatrice would have certainly changed in appearance between ages fifteen and twenty-two and after having two children, the appearance of the effigy is less smoothly refined than either of
the previous two images, suggesting that in the permanent monument to Beatrice’s memory there was an increased emphasis on naturalism. Though these tombs interact with ideas of the ideal, the effigy should therefore be understood as a likeness and a portrait. It was, at the very least, the identity constructed for her that was meant to function as the lasting and most permanent representation of her memory.

Otherwise the consistency in representation between the early portrait bust, the *Pala Sforzesca*, and the effigy indicates that a commitment to likeness was a goal at least for the public memorial monument of a duchess. Though this emphasis on consistent imagery might have been more important for a duchess whose husband’s reign was of questionable legitimacy, it suggests, particularly considering the cost and effort in creating a monumental effigial tomb, that appearances of women’s effigies more generally were not generic and that they demonstrated a general commitment to likeness. The specificity in depictions of clothing, age, gesture, and hairstyle indicate a marked tendency towards individualized representation. As such, effigies, as the most public, prominent and costly depictions of women, especially non-ruling lay-women, become even more central to the discussion of portraiture. And, as demonstrated by Ruskin’s rapturous description of the effigy of Ilaria, they are the most striking and poignant elements of women’s monumental tombs.
Chapter Four. Idealizing the Dead: Inscriptions, the Poetic Ideal, and Women’s Monumental Tombs

Pien di quella ineffabile dolcezza
che del bel viso trassen gli occhi miei
nel di che volentier chiusi gli avrei
per non mirar già mai minor bellezza,

Lassai quel ch'i 'più bramo; et ò sí avezza
la mente a contemplar sola costei,
ch'altro non vede, et ciò che non è lei
già per antica usanza odia et disprezza.

In una valle chiusa d'ogni 'ntorno,
ch'è refrigerio de' sospir' miei lassi,
giunsi sol com Amor, pensoso et tardo.

Ivi non donne, ma fontane et sassi,
et l'immagine trovo di quel giorno
che 'l pensier mio figura, ovunque io sguardo.\textsuperscript{518}

The trecento poet Francesco Petrarca is renowned for his sonnets and other writings expressing his devotion to the ideal beauty and virtue of his poetic muse, Laura. Petrarch’s emphasis on her beauty intersects quite literally with art historical concerns in his famous sonnets numbered 77 and 78 of the Canzoniere in which he recounts having asked painter Simone Martini to use his heaven-inspired talent to portray his paradisiacal beloved.\textsuperscript{519} Many of the poems in the Canzoniere and Petrarch’s other works, as well as in those of his stilnovisti predecessors, like Dante Alighieri, established notions of ideal

\textsuperscript{518} Francesco Petrarca, Sonnet 116. “Full of that ineffable sweetness / that my eyes drew from her lovely face, / so I’d have closed them willingly / that day, never to see any lesser beauty, / I left what I loved more: and have so set / my mind on contemplating her alone, / that I see no one else, and what is not her / I hate and despise, through constant habit. / Thoughtful and late, I came with Love alone / into a valley that's closed all round, / that leaves me refreshed with sighs. / No ladies there, but fountains and stones, / and I find the image of that day / my thoughts depict, wherever I gaze.” (Translation A.S. Kline, emphasis mine.)

\textsuperscript{519} Sonnets 77 and 78 are printed in Italian and English in Appendix 1 of this dissertation.
beauty within fifteenth-century Italian culture, which have been recognized and analyzed by art historians. However, these same poems have also forged links between these idealizations of women, who were, at least in the case of Petrarch’s Laura and Dante’s Beatrice, dead, and concrete representations of deceased early Renaissance women in monumental tombs. In sonnet 116 from the *Canzoniere*, printed above, Petrarch himself evoked a connection between the absence of a woman and the stone that takes her place, indicating that poetic ideals subtly underscored the construction of monumental tombs. This chapter argues that, through their inscriptions, as examples of public literary works honoring women, women’s tombs engaged with conceptions of ideal dead women that permeated Petrarch and Dante’s poetry and Renaissance culture at large. Honoring a family member through a public monument that linked her to the legendary Beatrice or Laura by way of an inscription was a means to heighten the glory reflected back on families.

The content of the inscriptions on women’s tombs tells much about the function and intended reception of monuments because, not only do they attest to the grief felt over the loss of an individual, they solidify what survivors (specifically, the commissioner) considered to be the salient defining points for the deceased. Building on the analysis of epitaphs as patronage documents in chapter two, this chapter will begin with a survey of the relevant inscribed material. Six components of tomb inscriptions will be identified and the epitaphs will be analyzed based upon their locations, meaning whether they are situated on an inscription-bearing tablet or inscribed directly onto the sculptural fabric of the tomb. The two tombs which feature artist’s signatures as part of
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their inscriptions will then be considered prior to an examination of how inscriptions on male/female double-tombs represent gender differently than on female-only tombs, followed by a discussion of the general function of women’s tomb epitaphs.

Following the categorization of the material at hand, this chapter will then shift to a broader examination of notions of the feminine ideal as established by Petrarch, Dante, and other poets, and how these ideas underscored art connected to women in the quattrocento in order to argue that these notions would also underpin any public representation of women, especially their tombs. These poetic associations will be considered as a means of highlighting virtue, most prominently chastity, or a variation thereof, as the greatest possible achievement for Renaissance women, and the one most often emphasized on their tombs. While these virtues have been identified in other art connected to women, specifically portrait painting, the functional difference between women’s painted portraits and large-scale, sculptured public monuments, indicates that there were grander, public stakes for the ideal behavior women were meant to aspire to.

Overview of Epitaphs on Women’s Monumental Tombs

As fundamental aspects of memory creation, epitaphs were certainly among the most carefully studied and planned features of Renaissance commemorative monuments. Renaissance inscriptions were influenced by the thousands of remnants of classical inscriptions that littered Italian cities, which began to be the focus of humanist scholars in the fifteenth century.\(^{522}\) Epitaphs in ancient Rome had conscious relationships to poetry as they were often meant to be read out loud, and in a performative sense evoked the living through the spoken word.\(^{523}\) Fifteenth-century humanists began composing tomb inscriptions based on classical Greek and Roman epitaphs that particularly emphasized an individual’s earthly accomplishments, especially those that were in the service of the state (for men’s tombs).\(^{524}\) But, as chapter two indicated, inscriptions for both men and women varied greatly in terms of content, length, and laudatory language, indicating there were diverse approaches to the literary commemoration of tomb honorees. Of the thirty-five tombs in this study, thirty have extant, legible inscriptions, all of which were


composed in Latin. Latin literacy was limited to the higher classes and the better educated, and thus, though it also fits the church contexts in which these tombs were located, these Latin inscriptions clearly connoted social status.\footnote{Iiro Kajanto, \textit{Classical and Christian: Studies in the Latin Epitaphs of Medieval and Renaissance Rome}. (Helsinki: Suomalaine Tiedekatemia, 1980), 10. Latin literacy is also considered in greater detail later in this chapter when the audience for tomb inscriptions is discussed.}

Though inscriptions are essential components of most tombs, how they came to be included on fifteenth-century monuments—both in terms of their facture and the reasoning behind their composition—is an on-going mystery. Inscriptions are nearly completely absent from the documentary record, meaning we do not know in most cases who composed them, or who inscribed them into the stone;\footnote{Paul Stiff, “Brunelleschi’s Epitaph and the Design of Public Letters in Fifteenth-Century Florence.” \textit{Typography Papers} 6 (2005): 70.} and there is no mention of the inscriptions whatsoever in the two extant contracts for monumental women’s tombs, those for the tombs of Margherita Malatesta and Beata Villana.\footnote{See chapter two for an analysis of these contracts. Inscriptions are missing from the documentary record for male tombs as well.} Despite this puzzling lacuna, inscriptions were as prominent an element of fifteenth-century tomb monuments as any type of figural or other sculpture. Of the five tombs that do not feature inscriptions, in four cases—those of the tombs of Ilaria del Carretto, Saint Justine, Saint Monica, and Francesco Pitti Tornabuoni—there is no documentary evidence for the original inscriptions, but it is likely that they had them, or at least were intended to.\footnote{Most reconstructions of the tomb of Ilaria del Carretto suggest that it included an inscription on the lost cassa that was likely the intervening element between the sarcophagus and the effigy. See James Beck, \textit{Jacopo della Quercia}, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), 58. Gabriele Fattorini, \textit{Jacopo della Querica e l’inizio del Rinascimento a Siena} (Florence: E-ducation.it S.p.A., 2008), 90; Robert Munman, \textit{Sienese Renaissance Tomb Monuments} (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1993), 121, among others.}
These monuments have all suffered from movement and dispersal of their constituent parts, resulting in the likely loss of any potential original inscription. In the fifth case—the tomb of Beatrice d’Este—it is possible that no inscription was ever completed for the monument as the tomb was left unfinished. For the other thirty tombs, much like effigies, inscriptions are hugely significant components of the iconography of the monuments and will here be analyzed in depth. Table 21 lists the tombs, whether or not they have extant inscriptions, and the type of lettering used in the epitaphs:

**Table 21. Inscriptions on Women’s Monumental Tombs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tomb Subject</th>
<th>Inscription?</th>
<th>Lettering Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margherita Malatesta, 1399, San Francesco, Mantua</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterina dei Francesi, 1405 Sant’Antonio, Padua</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilaria del Carretto, 1405, San Francesco, Lucca</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnese and Clemenza Durazzo, 1408, Santa Chiara, Naples</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnese da Mosto Venier, 1410, Santi Giovanni e Paolo, Venice</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margherita di Durazzo, 1412, San Francesco, Salerno</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paola Bianca Malatesta, 1416, San Francesco, Fano</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisabetta Trenta, 1416, San Frediano, Lucca</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiara Gambacorta, 1419, San Domenico, Pisa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibilia Cetto, 1421, San Francesco Grande, Padua</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccarda Bueri, 1433, San Lorenzo,</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name and Date</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Isotta degli Atti, 1447, San Francesco, Rimini</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beata Villana, 1451, Santa Maria Novella, Florence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saint Justine, 1451, Santa Giustina, Padua</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimini</td>
<td>Malatesta Women, 1454, San Francesco, Rimini</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siena</td>
<td>Vittoria Piccolomini, 1454, San Francesco, Siena</td>
<td>Yes**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Saint Monica, 1455, Sant’Agostino, Rome</td>
<td>No***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forlì</td>
<td>Barbara Manfredi, 1466, San Biagio, Forlì</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siena</td>
<td>Saint Catherine of Siena, 1466, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Medea Colleoni, 1467, Santa Maria della Basella, Urgnano</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siena</td>
<td>Saint Fina, 1468, Collegiata, San Gimignano</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>Maria of Aragon Piccolomini, 1470, Sant’Anna dei Lombardi, Naples</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>Elisabetta Geraldini, 1477, San Francesco, Amelia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni, 1477, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Franceschina Tron Pesaro, Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, Venice</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Nera Corsi Sassetti, 1479, Santa Trinità, Florence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Costanza Ammannati, 1479, Sant’Agostino, Rome</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Maddalena Orsini, 1480, San Salvatore in Lauro, Rome</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsibilia Trinci, 1484, San Francesco,</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Montefiorentino, Frontino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinci, 1484, San Francesco, Montefiorentino, Frontino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camponeschi,</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>San Bernardino, L’Aquila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1490, San Bernardino, L’Aquila</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddalena Riccia, 1490, Sant’Anna dei</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lombardi, Naples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombardi, Naples</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice d’Este, 1497, Santa Maria delle</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Grazie, Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazie, Milan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generosa Orsini, 1498, Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, Venice</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Beatrice Rusca, 1499, Sant’Angelo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>dei Frari, Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dei Frari, Milan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola, 1503, San</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Benedetto Polirone, San</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedetto Polirone, San Benedetto Po</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Classical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The inscription on the tomb of the Malatesta Women is no longer extant though it was recorded in 1765.
** The tomb of Vittoria Piccolomini’s current inscription is not original; fragments of the fifteenth-century inscription remain, but the current inscription dates from the seventeenth century.
*** The current inscription on the tomb of Saint Monica is also not original.

As delineated in Table 21, a fundamental element of inscriptions is the type of lettering of which they are composed. There are two different approaches to lettering in the extant inscriptions on the tombs: the nine tombs that pre-date the tomb of Piccarda Bueri in 1433 all feature gothic lettering. All tombs that follow Piccarda’s have classical lettering in their inscriptions. These distinctions maintain the stylistic patterns as outlined in chapter one, but will be examined in greater depth below.

Gothic, as it is used here, refers to the late-Medieval script developed primarily in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and is characterized by variable letterforms,
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abbreviations, and spindly decorative flourishes, whereas Classical (also referred to as Humanist) lettering copied Republican and Imperial Roman epigraphy, or that based on such precedents, involving standardized letterforms in capitals. The shift from Gothic to Classical lettering first occurred in manuscripts in Florence in 1402-1403, and Classical lettering’s earliest reappearance in Renaissance sculpture was on public sculptures by Lorenzo Ghiberti and Donatello from around 1420. Tomb monuments played a significant role in the dissemination of the Classical lettering. Ghiberti’s tomb for Leonardo Dati (1425, Santa Maria Novella, Florence) provided one of the earliest uses of Roman letterforms, while Donatello’s tomb for the anti-Pope John XXIII (1422-1428, Baptistery, Florence) was the proper beginning for true Roman lettering in public tomb inscriptions. Classical letterforms became increasingly popular throughout the fifteenth century, but the persistence of Gothic letters on women’s tombs into the fourth decade of the century is consistent with patterns observed in other inscriptions, such as those on men’s tombs, and dedicatory or signatory inscriptions on other types of

530 The early fifteenth century was not the first revival of classical lettering, with prior revivals occurring in during the Carolingian period and in Pisa and Palermo in the eleventh-thirteenth centuries. See Christine Margit Sperling, “Artistic Lettering and the Progress of the Antique Revival in the Quattrocento,” (PhD diss, Brown University, 1985), 22-29.
532 Kajanto, Classical and Christian, 12.
sculptures including pulpits, sculpted altarpieces, and figural sculpture. That women’s tomb inscriptions shifted from Gothic lettering to Classical lettering contemporaneously with the shift seen on men’s tombs, other types of sculpture, and painting, indicates that no difference in the intellectual approach to lettering may be declared based on the gender of the tomb occupant. Thus, the shift from Gothic to Classical lettering provides a further instance in which fifteenth-century “women’s tombs” were not considered as a separate group but were instead just understood to be “tombs” without any gendered modifiers.

Six Elements of Women’s Tomb Inscriptions

While the inscriptions on women’s tombs fall easily into groups based upon the form of their lettering, trying to classify them based on what those letters spell out is less straightforward. I have identified six elements that occur in women’s tomb inscriptions. The inscriptions may do some or all of these things, and they vary widely in their combinations of these elements. They may identify the tomb occupant; identify the patron (a function which was discussed in detail in chapter two of this dissertation); include laudatory adjectives or descriptions for the tomb occupant and/or the patron; include references to other important individuals; include facts about the deceased, typically her death date; and include rhetorical flourishes. The inscriptions can feature any number of these six separate components, but only one element is consistently found.

---

in all thirty extant inscriptions: they all identify the tomb occupant. In twenty-eight of the tombs the women are explicitly identified by, at minimum, their first names and frequently, where applicable, their natal and married names as well. In only two instances are the tomb occupants not expressly named, but still referred to by identifiable means: the tomb of Lisabetta Trenta and the tomb of the Malatesta Women. These two exceptions bear closer scrutiny here, because despite the lack of specificity, it is still possible to identify the occupants, proving that the main function of tomb inscriptions was identification and the public recognition of these women.

While the inscriptions on neither the tomb of Lisabetta Trenta nor that of the Malatesta Women lists their occupants by name, oblique but understandable references are made to identify them. On the tomb of Lisabetta Trenta, the inscription begins:

This is the tomb of the women and descendants of Lorenzo…

The ambiguity of the phrasing of “of the women” indicates the tomb could commemorate not just Lisabetta Onesti Trenta, who was Lorenzo Trenta’s first wife, but also his second wife Giovanna Lazari. However, the tomb is typically referred to as that of Lisabetta Trenta (as it is called also in this study), because it was commissioned while Lisabetta Trenta (as it is called also in this study), because it was commissioned while Lisabetta was still alive. Additionally, because Lisabetta Trenta’s tomb is a pendant slab with that of her husband’s—which identifies him completely—and both include effigies of the deceased it would have been obvious to any contemporary viewer that the female

---

535 James Beck, Jacopo della Quercia, 159. She died in 1426, while the tomb was commissioned a decade earlier in 1416.
536 HOC EST SEPULCRVM / LAVRENTII Q[VON]DAM NOBILIS VIRI MAGISTRI / FEDERIGI TRENTA / DELVCHA ET SVONRVM DESENDE[N]TIVM AN[N]O MCCC16 (This is the tomb of Lorenzo [son] of the late nobleman Maestro Federigo Trenta of Lucca and of his descendants 1416 (Translation, Beck, Jacopo della Quercia, 159).
tomb was for Lorenzo’s wife. Finally, while the tomb might have eventually contained
the remains of both Lisabetta Trenta and Giovanna Lazari, it did at one time bear the
Onesti arms on the escutcheon at the bottom of the tomb to the right of her feet, clearly
identifying the occupant as Lisabetta.  

The identifying inscription on the tomb of the Malatesta Women is a slightly less
straightforward case than that of Lisabetta Trenta, because only a tiny remnant of the
tomb remains, and there is only a record of the inscription from the eighteenth century.
Giovanbattista Costa recorded the following inscription in 1765:

Tomb of the Heroines of the House of Malatesta  

The “heroines” are almost certainly Sigismondo Malatesta’s first two wives that preceded
Isotta degli Atti: Ginevra d’Este, who died in 1440, and Polissena Sforza, who died in
1449. Based on Sigismondo Malatesta’s inclusive approach to commemoration in San
Francesco, which included tombs for himself, his third wife Isotta, his first two wives,
and a tomb for his ancestors, the likely identities of those commemorated by the tomb
would have been readily apparent. Though the tombs of Lisabetta Trenta and the
Malatesta Women make oblique references to their honoree instead of direct ones, the
information provided is enough to assume the identity of the occupant. Therefore

---

Imola” Bulletino senese di storia patria 32 (1925): 73.
539 Charles Hope, “The Early History of the Tempio Malatestiano,” in Journal of the
540 For the broader context of San Francesco and Sigismondo’s building program there
see Hope (as in the previous footnote) and Helen S. Ettlinger, “The Sepulchre on the
Façade: A Re-Evaluation of Sigismondo Malatesta’s Rebuilding of San Francesco in
Sigismondo’s children who predeceased him were also buried at San Francesco. These
include his first legitimate son who was buried in the tomb of his adopted father Carlo
Malatesta, and his first son with Isotta, who was also buried in Carlo’s tomb.
identifying the tomb honoree can be considered the most important and pervasive
element of tomb inscriptions on fifteenth-century women’s tombs. It also bears repeating
that since tombs are the only consistently identified works of art depicting fifteenth-
century women, the virtues ascribed to them in their inscriptions and their representations
in effigy provide a more specific understanding of the expectations for women in
particular social positions, They offer specific biographical information that is often
lacking for other types of works of art.

The second component of the tomb inscriptions is identifying the patron of the
monument. This element has been examined in-depth in chapter two of this project, but
will be briefly reviewed here. The patron is explicitly mentioned as commissioner—
meaning the inscription reads, “this individual erected this monument” or a variation of
that phrase—in eleven tomb inscriptions.541 In a further twelve tombs the name of the
patron is included in the inscription though it does not identify the patrons in their
capacity as commissioners.542 In the remaining seven inscriptions, four honored saints or
holy women—the tombs of Saint Fina, Beata Villana, Saint Catherine of Siena, and
Chiara Gambacorta—where it would have been inappropriate to take explicit patronal
credit for the monument in its inscription. The last three inscriptions that do not refer to
the patron were on tombs honoring Agnese and Clemenza Durazzo, Isotta degli Atti, and
the Malatesta Women. It is likely in all three of these cases that the patron would have

541 These include the tombs of Vittoria Piccolomini; Franceschina Tron Pesaro; Agnese
da Mosto Venier; Barbara Manfredi; Maddalena Orsini; Maria Pereira and Beatrice
Camponeschi; Generosa Orsini; Beata Beatrice Rusca; Elisabetta Geraldini; Lucrezia
Pico della Mirandola; and Piccarda Bueri.
542 These include the tombs of Margherita Malatesta; Caterina Francesi; Lisabetta Trenta;
Maria of Aragon Piccolomini; Nera Corsi Sassetti; Marsabilia Trinci; Medea Colleoni;
Costanza Ammannati; Maddalena Riccia; Sibilia Cetto; and Margherita of Durazzo.
been readily identifiable by the tombs’ contexts. The tomb of Agnese and Clemenza Durazzo is one of at least three monuments commissioned by their younger sister Margherita of Durazzo and is situated within the primary locus of Angevin memorialization, the church of Santa Chiara, Naples. Within that framework, it is possible that Margherita’s patronage of her sisters’ tomb would have been obvious.

The patronage of the tombs of Isotta degli Atti and the Malatesta Women was similarly apparent, situated as they were within their respective chapels at San Francesco, Rimini, the interior of which boasts copious incidents of the Malatesta elephant and Sigismondo Malatesta’s (and Isotta’s) “SI” monogram. Much like the Angevin monument where the tomb’s context made patronage fairly clear, Sigismondo’s involvement with the commissioning of these tombs was self-evident.

Identifying the patron of a monument is nearly as important as identifying the occupant because these monuments were rarely exclusively about the individual honor of

---

543 She also commissioned the tombs for her father, Charles and her other sister Johanna with her husband Robert of Artois. These monuments are located in San Lorenzo Maggiore, Naples. See Nicolas Bock, *Kunst am Hofe der Anjou-Durazzo der Bildhauer Antonio Baboccio* (1351-ca. 1423) (Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2001), 119.


545 As discussed in chapter two, Isotta can also be considered patron of her own chapel. Like Sigismondo, she does not take any credit for her patronal activities in the inscription on her tomb, and in fact, Charles Hope contends that it is unlikely that Isotta was involved in any way with composing the inscription. As he puts it, “In particular, it is difficult to envisage that Isotta, rather than her lover, was responsible for the extraordinary decision to decorate her tombs, while she was still alive, with a prominent inscription praising her beauty and virtue.” See Hope, “Early History of the Tempio Malatestiano,” 59.
the tomb subject, except in the case of Isotta degli Atti. They aimed instead at creating
general familial honor. The inclusion of the patron in the inscription, whether explicitly
called such or not, aligns with the general function of these tombs, calling attention to
the deceased’s familial relationship to still-living member(s), and thus extending and
publicly extolling women’s vital roles as the link between families.

The third element of inscriptions is the laudatory adjectives and phrases for the
tomb occupant and/or the patron. Unsurprisingly, the virtues of the women were
frequently mentioned in the inscriptions, though patterns emerge in the laudatory
language used depending on whether the tomb was commissioned by a man or a woman.
The most frequently mentioned virtues on tombs commissioned by men include: “chastity” or “virginity,” “modesty,” and “piety,” though there are few distinct patterns to
the adjectives used to describe the women. While references to “virginity,” “chastity,” or
“modesty” might be more expected to appear on tombs for women who died unmarried
or at a younger age, like Medea Colleoni, these phrases appear with the same regularity
for more mature women who had married and had had children at the times of their
deaths, like Margherita Malatesta and Piccarda Bueri. Chastity is also included in the
inscription of a beata, Beata Beatrice Rusca, who is lauded for her “wonderful chastity”

---

546 The unique credit afforded Isotta in her inscription is discussed in chapter two.
547 It bears repeating that male tombs function in the same way.
548 See chapter three for a discussion of women’s roles in linking two families.
549 These are not the only virtues mentioned, but they are the most frequent.
550 Her inscription refers to her as Bartolommeo Colleoni’s “virgin daughter.”
551 Margherita’s inscription describes how she “maintained her chastity while still a
virgin.” In the threnody on Piccarda’s tomb she is referred to as Giovanni di Bicci’s
“chaste wife.”
in her inscription. The pervasiveness of this trope in inscriptions for all types of women indicates how central a woman’s fidelity to her marriage was to her critical role in protecting the legitimate succession of wealth and property to her progeny and in aligning two separate families (her natal and conjugal families). Chastity was the supreme virtue for women, in both religious doctrine and in broader society regardless of their status in life, so its regular emphasis on tomb epitaphs, which, as public monuments, could be understood as examples for their contemporary female viewers, is not at all surprising.

The virtue of piety, or a variation on an individual’s pious character, was used less comprehensively on women’s tombs, as in the surviving examples it is reserved for women who were widows engaged in religious life or saints and beate. “Pious” was not an adjective used to describe women who died at a young age; for such women, “chaste” or “virginal” were the more frequently used descriptors. Marsibilia Trinci, Franceschina Tron Pesaro, and Maddalena Orsini were all lauded for their piety, and all three had adult children who were the commissioners of their tombs. Otherwise, piety and devoutness was restricted to holy women, including Chiara Gambacorta, who is called “most devout and religious sister” in her epitaph.

552 It is important to point out that chastity indicated virginity, but also fidelity to marriage.
553 For this see Sharon T. Strocchia, “Gender and the Rites of Honour in Italian Renaissance Cities,” in Gender and Society in Renaissance Italy ed. Judith C. Brown and Robert C. Davis (London: Longman, 1998), 54-55. As Strocchia argues, the value of women’s chastity was so high that sexual insults were female-centered, men would be called “cuckold,” and women would be insulted through sexualized slurs. See also Daniel Lesnick, “Insults and Threats in Medieval Todi,” Journal of Medieval History 17 (1991): 71-89, especially 76.
Inscriptions could also allude to a woman’s more general virtuousness. For example, though it does not mention specific virtues, Paola Bianca Malatesta is noted in her inscription for being both “famous for her virtue,” and “equal to men in her great virtues.” That she is celebrated as the equal of men in her inscription blatantly indicates that it was not simply success in feminine virtues like chastity or piety that could glorify a woman and honor their family.

In fact, inscriptions could also laud women for less traditionally feminine virtues, and it is significant to note that instances where women are commemorated for their “prudent,” “just,” “wise,” or simply “worthy” qualities more often appear on tombs patronized by women. Caterina Francesi, who commissioned her own tomb, described herself as “prudent and just and charming by the gravity of her morals / a standard of virtue.” Similarly, Sibilia Cetto lauded her “noted wisdom” in her epitaph, a virtue not usually associated with women. As these women were already engaged in the generally masculine practice of commissioning public monuments, their cooptation of virtues and language more commonly attributed to fifteenth-century men for their inscriptions is not at all surprising.

Notably, the other tombs that women were involved in commissioning for themselves also avoid the specific virtues of the laudatory adjectival language typical of tombs commissioned by men. Agnese da Mosto Venier’s inscription refers to her as “illustrious” and “distinguished” but does not praise her for typically feminine virtues, and Isotta degli Atti’s brief inscription refers to her “deserved honor” but not to her

---

555 See cat. #2.
chastity, modesty, piety, or any other specific virtue more typically associated with women. Maria Pereira’s inscription refers to the worthiness of her daughter Beatrice, but describes herself simply as “mother” and a “noble” descendant of the Kings of Spain without any other adjectives. Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola’s inscription includes only facts. Creating self-laudatory inscriptions might have betrayed the feminine virtues—like modesty—that these women would have been encouraged to possess.

It is significant, however, that women, in the creation of their own monuments, seemed to engage less overtly with the broader dialogue of feminine virtue. Though the origins of inscriptions are usually cloudy—the authors of epitaphs are frequently as unknown as the actual carvers or process of carving the inscriptions—this shift away from laudatory language indicates an active choice on the parts of the female commissioners. As fifteenth-century elite women, they were certainly aware of the virtues they were supposed to have, but chose not to emphasize them on their monuments. The laudatory language in epitaphs on tombs commissioned by men honor a female member of the family and therefore honor the greater family unit, whereas women’s self-commissioned tombs functioned outside the strictures of dynastic or familial commissions and did not rely as heavily on exhibiting socially acceptable examples of female virtue. Rather, these tomb inscriptions either ascribe masculine

557 Maria of Aragon Piccolomini’s epitaph is an important exception as it was possibly composed by the humanist scholar and poet Giovanni Pontano, which will be examined in greater detail below.

558 Various treatises and sermons from the period describing the necessary feminine virtues were addressed directly to women, like Giovanni Dominici’s *Regola del governo di cura familiare* (1416), or Ludovico Dolce’s *Dialogo di M. Lodovico Dolce della institution delle donne* (Venice 1547). On the treatises of Saint Bernardino of Siena and women’s roles and conduct, see R. Rusconi, “St Bernardino of Siena, the Wife, and Possession” in *Women and Religion in Medieval and Renaissance Italy*, ed. D. Bornstein and R. Rusconi, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 182-96.
virtues to their occupants or no virtues at all, suggesting that the emphasis on stereotypically feminine virtues existed in male discourse more prominently than it did in the practical lives of Renaissance women.

Though they were common elements of epitaphs, not all inscriptions included laudatory phrases or adjectiveal descriptive language for their tomb honoree. Some, like those for Lisabetta Trenta or the Malatesta Women, both of which are described above, employed strictly identifying language. Thus, while laudatory phrasing was a common component of tomb epitaphs, it was not required, as these two inscriptions indicate. In addition, the exclusion of laudatory language or adjectives crossed the patronal gender divide, as Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola, who commissioned her own tomb, did not include any description, virtuous or otherwise, of herself in her inscription. While we see that adjectives were sometimes considered optional, these inscriptions still clearly identify the female occupants of the tombs, undeniably the most important element of inscriptions.

Laudatory phrasing in women’s tomb inscriptions could also involve lengthy odes to the patron. The most blatant example of this practice is on the tomb of Agnese da Mosto Venier, where her son Nicolo, who was executor of her will and, in that sense, could claim patronage rights for her tomb, began the inscription with a celebration of himself:

1410 and 1411. Nicolo Venier, a great man born from the illustrious Venier lineage, who you, Antonio, famous doge of Venice, begat, constructed this lofty tomb…

Though calling the Malatesta women “heroines” does have laudatory connotations without references to virtues.
This inscription lists and celebrates two individuals (Nicolo and Antonio) before mentioning the woman who actually occupied the tomb. Similarly, the inscription on the tomb of Medea Colleoni also spends more words praising the “illustriousness” of her father Bartolommeo Colleoni’s military position than it does describing any of Medea’s qualities. These examples indicate that, as prominent, public markers, tombs were excellent vehicles for extolling the superior qualities of not just the deceased, but other individuals, or entire families.

The fourth component of tomb inscriptions is references to other significant or noteworthy individuals. In many cases, these additional people are illustrious relatives, providing greater prominence and glory to the family as well as to the subject’s lineage. As on the tomb of Agnese and Clemenza Durazzo, the patron, their sister Margherita, is not mentioned, but their father, Charles of France, duke of Durazzo, is listed in the inscription. Or on the tomb of Lisabetta Trenta, the patron Lorenzo Trenta is characterized without any other references as the “[son] of the late nobleman Maestro Federigo Trenta of Lucca.”

One salient example illustrates the benefits of such a maneuver: on the tomb of Chiara Gambacorta the inscription makes reference to her father, the “magnificent” Don Pietro Gambacorta. Though Don Pietro was not responsible at all for the commission of the monument—as it was commissioned by the community at San Domenico—by naming their foundress’s politically important father the convent linked itself to broader societal status. The Gambacorta family was one of the most powerful in Pisa during the

560 Here lies Medea, the virgin daughter of the illustrious Duke Bartholomeo Colleoni, Duke of Gavi, Captain General of the Venetians, 6 March 1470.
561 See cat. #23.
562 See cat. #29.
trecento and Pietro Gambacorta ruled Pisa from 1369-1393. Though Pietro’s
government was brutally ended with his assassination in 1392 by a political ally, Jacopo
d’Appiano, the Appiano regime ended shortly thereafter in 1398. The references made
to Pietro’s magnificence in Chiara’s tomb inscription from two decades later thus indicate
a desire to link the convent with the power of Pisa’s politically independent trecento
fortune, rather than the strife and subservience to larger powers that characterized the
city’s politics in the fifteenth century.

Most significantly, in two inscriptions, on the tombs of Costanza Ammannati and
Marsibilia Trinci, the reigning pope was mentioned despite that fact that he was not a
relative in either case. On Costanza’s tomb, Pope Sixtus IV can be attributed some of
the patronal credit for the construction of her monument, as discussed in chapter two,
thus accounting for the reference to himself. Pope Innocent VIII was not involved in the
patronage of Marsilibia’s tomb, but the convent of Montefiorentino, near Frontino (in the
province of Pesaro), was located in the papal states. The inclusion of the pope in the

564 The government coup also involved Chiara refusing to provide asylum in the convent
of San Domenico to her brother Lorenzo who was attempting to flee assassins. He died at
their hands a few days later. See Roberts, *Dominican Women*, 12-13.
565 For a history of Pisa during the rule of Pietro Gambacorta see: P. Silva, *Il governo di
Pietro Gambacorta e le sue relazioni col resto della Toscana e coi Visconti* (Pisa: Nistri
1910). For Pisa’s fifteen-century political history, see Michael Mallet, “Pisa and
Florence in the Fifteenth Century. Aspects of the period of the first Florentine
Domination,” in *Florentine Studies: Politics and Society in Renaissance Florence*, ed,
Nicolai Rubinstein (London, Faber & Faber, 1968), 403-41.
566 Pope Pius II is also mentioned in the inscription on the tomb of Vittoria Piccolomini,
but he was the patron of Vittoria’s tomb in his role as Vittoria’s son. The extant
inscription on that tomb is also problematic and almost certainly from the seventeenth
century. See cat. #32.
inscription likely was meant to indicate the Trinci-Oliva family’s allegiance to the pope, particularly given their complicated and shifting allegiances to more local rulers.\textsuperscript{567}

While these references to other individuals are not common, they do highlight how women’s tombs were used as vehicles of connecting individuals, meaning the tomb honorees and their families, to the broader political and social contexts of their locations and periods.\textsuperscript{568} Though women’s tombs honored individuals who generally had much less political and social power than men, these memorials were still used—just like tombs for men—as public markers for status and alliances and to curry favor with more powerful individuals.

The fifth component of women’s tomb inscriptions is the inclusion of factual information, typically dates. Dates included in epitaphs were frequently, but not always, references to the time the tomb occupant died. Dates appear on tomb monuments with some regularity, though with a range of specificity. They are included on eighteen of the monuments with inscriptions, of which fifteen refer to the death date of the tomb’s honoree. These death dates can be as general as a year of death, like on the tomb of Agnese da Mosto Venier, whose inscription begins with her death year of “1410,” though

\textsuperscript{567} The Oliva were traditionally allied with the Malatesta of Rimini and were enemies of Federico da Montefeltro in nearby Urbino. Gianfrancesco Oliva (Marsibilia’s husband) was actually wounded in the leg at Città di Castello in 1474 when the papal armies advanced upon that city following its rebellion. On this war, see D.S. Chambers, Popes, Cardinals and War: the Military Church in Renaissance and Early Modern Europe (London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd, 2006), 80. Gianfrancesco’s effigy depicts him in his armor, referring to his prominence as a soldier, and the lengthy inscriptions also refer to the wound he sustained, which plagued him until his death four years later in 1478. See Linda Pisani, Francesco di Simone Ferrucci. Itinerari di uno scultore fiorentino fra Toscana, Romagna e Montefeltro (Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2007), 120.

\textsuperscript{568} This is also a feature of men’s tombs.
it does not get any more specific than that.\textsuperscript{569} Costanza Ammannati’s tomb inscription includes the date “1477,” which is assumed to be her death date, though like Agnese’s tomb, it does not specify that.

In contrast, the factual information on other tombs can be strikingly more specific. The inscription on Chiara Gambacorta’s tomb states the precise date of her death, her age, and the length of time she spent as a nun. It reads, “She died in 1320 on April 17 in the 57\textsuperscript{th} year of her life, and in the 37\textsuperscript{th} year of her life in the monastery.\textsuperscript{570} By detailing what a large portion of her life was spent at the convent, the inscription justifies the construction of her tomb and emphasizes Chiara’s great spirituality and devotion, appropriate for a monument that was honoring the foundress and helping to establish the legend of San Domenico. The inscription on Barbara Manfredi’s tomb is similarly specific. In its last lines it reads, “She lived for 22 years, 6 months and 4 days, and died in the year 1466.\textsuperscript{571} The precision in this inscription is a bit nefarious, however, as Barbara Manfredi’s husband Pino Ordelaffi is suspected of poisoning and ending his wife’s life; by including the precise number of days she lived, it highlights the control he allegedly exerted over her lifespan.

However, other tombs with less gruesome histories also included such lifespan specificity in their inscriptions. For example, the epitaph on the tomb of Marsibilia Trinci begins: “For [Marsibilia] who lived 70 years and died on February 25\textsuperscript{th}, in the pontificate of Innocent VIII 1485.” By including Marsibilia’s advanced age at the very beginning of her inscription, her son Carlo Oliva, the tomb’s patron, might have been trying to draw

\textsuperscript{569} The inscription actually begins “1410 and 1411,” with the first date is understood to be when Agnese died and the second likely indicating when the tomb was completed.  
\textsuperscript{570} See cat. #3.  
\textsuperscript{571} See cat. #7.
attention to the fact that she did live well beyond what was the typical life expectancy during the fifteenth century.\footnote{In Europe from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century the average lifespan was about 61 years for adults who were not involved in manual labor or warfare. See Philippe Abastado, Gilles Guiramand, and Bernard Bousquet, “Signs of Aging, the Lifespan and Self-Representation in European Self-Portraits since the 15th century,” \textit{Aging \& Society} 25 (2005): 147-58.} Because Marsibilia’s longevity is noted first in the inscription it seems to play a role in her ability to achieve the tremendous virtue that Carlo also ascribes to her, in which he declares “…this feminine kind overcomes with virtues I, Carlo, enjoy this honor of so great a mother, religion, piety, holy customs, and modesty are the shining wreaths of her illustrious life.”\footnote{See cat. #17.} In this case the length of Marsibilia’s list of virtues seems to mirror the length of her life.\footnote{The exceptionally long lives of artists, like Michelangelo, are often factored into their outstanding success as artists. On Michelangelo’s longevity, see S.J. Olshansky, “From Michelangelo to Darwin: the Evolution of Human Longevity,” \textit{The Israel Medical Association Journal} 5 (2003): 316-18.}

There are three instances where tomb inscriptions include dates that do not have anything to do with the death date of the tomb honoree. These include the inscriptions on the tombs of Lisabetta Trenta, Vittoria Piccolomini, and Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola. The epitaph on Lisabetta Trenta’s tomb ends with the date “1416.” Lisabetta actually died in 1426, so scholars are divided on the reasoning for why the date 1416 appears on her (and her husband’s) tomb. James Beck has argued that 1416 refers to the date of commission for the two slab tombs,\footnote{Beck, \textit{Jacopo della Quercia}, 71, 94.} while Marco Paoli contends that it instead refers to the translation of Saint Riccardo’s relics into the chapel of San Riccardo at San Frediano, Lucca.\footnote{Marco Paoli, “Jacopo della Quercia e Lorenzo Trenta nuove osservazioni e ipotesi per la cappella di San Frediano di Lucca,” \textit{Antichità viva} 19 (1980): 27ff.} In either case, this year does not refer in any way to Lisabetta’s death.
The date on Vittoria Piccolomini’s tomb inscription has even less to do with the death dates of Vittoria or her husband Silvio. The inscription ends with a reference to the year 1695 when a fire destroyed their original fifteenth-century tomb and the current monument was “restored” by their Piccolomini descendants. As nearly two hundred and fifty years had passed since the tomb was originally erected, maintaining the specific life-details of the tomb occupants seems to have become less of an important consideration for the Piccolomini family members who restored the monument. The Piccolomini tomb provides a fascinating case where posterity has indicated what factors are most important in the long-term maintenance of tomb monuments—in this case, that means identifying significant historical family members such as Vittoria’s son, Pope Pius II.

The third instance where the date on the epitaph does not match the death date of the tomb occupant, like the Trenta tomb, likely indicates the commission date for the monument. The epitaph on the tomb of Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola includes, separated from the bulk of the inscription, the date “1503.” 1503 has been understood as the commission and erection date for the monument, but it is also significant because it is the year of the death of her husband, Gherardo Felice Appiano d’Aragona. Lucrezia did not actually die until 1511, a date which does not appear on her tomb. Lucrezia had

---

577 Giancarlo Gentilini and Carlo Sasi, Monte dei Paschi di Siena, Collezione Chigi Saracini. 4. La scultura: bozzetti in terracotta, piccolo marmi e altre sculture dal XIV al XX secolo (Siena: SPES, 1989), 74.
578 1503 has historically been misunderstood to be the date of Lucrezia’s death, but a letter first published by Albany Rezzaghi, written by Fra Davide Soderini informing Francesco Gonzaga of her death on 4 September 1511 (ASMAN, AG, b. 2983 verifies the later date. See Albany Rezzaghi, La terra di Segnate e limitrofi: Richerche e documenti (Modena: Società Tipografica Modenese, 1928), 105, 255. For more, see Beth
already established the plans for her own memorialization in her will from 1500, but as Beth Holman notes, it was her husband’s sudden death in 1503 that led to the construction of their joint monument. The situation for Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola was the same as that of Bartolommeo Colleoni and his daughter Medea three decades earlier and in Bergamo: a sudden death led to the construction of a tomb. However, in Lucrezia’s case, the genders have been reversed, suggesting that, during the fifteenth century and definitely by the beginning of the sixteenth century, gender played only a minor role in considerations of appropriate commemoration.

The sixth and final component of tomb inscriptions is rhetorical flourishes. While some of the inscriptions on women’s tombs provide little more than factual information, others are examples of longer prose epitaphs that became increasingly common after the middle of the fifteenth century. Though the inscriptions on women’s tombs are overwhelmingly written in prose, there are a few instances where poetic forms are included, including the threnody on the tomb of Piccarda Bueri, and the epitaph of Maria of Aragon Piccolomini, which includes plaintive rhetoric that goes significantly beyond the laudatory phrasing discussed above. In these instances, the authorship of the inscriptions is usually attributed to a humanist author. For example, though it does not

---


579 See cat. #28.


581 See cat. #9.

582 Sparrow, *Visible Words*, 13. Sparrow notes that an analysis of papal and other epitaphs indicates that verse was abandoned by the middle of the quattrocento, and that Pope Nicholas V’s epitaph was the last papal tomb inscription to be written in verse.

include elaborate poetic or rhetorical phrasing, the inscription on the tomb of Nera Corsi Sassetti was likely composed by Bartholomaeus Fontius, who was friends with Nera’s husband, Francesco Sassetti, and was considered an authority on classical inscriptions by his contemporaries.\textsuperscript{584}

The more elaborate inscriptions demonstrate a poetic erudition on the part of the author and establish mournful literary imagery that would enhance the sculpted imagery on the tomb monuments. On the tomb of Piccarda Bueri, the second of her two epitaphs is a threnody, or a poem or song of mourning with origins in classical poetry. It reads:

\begin{quote}
If services to the homeland, if fame and family and generosity toward all were measured on the dark mountain, alas he would happily live with his chaste wife in the homeland, an aid to the poor and a haven and support to his friend. But since all things are conquered by death, you, Giovanni, lie in this tomb, and you, Piccarda, as well. Accordingly an old man grieves, a youth and a boy, each age. The saddened fatherland, deprived of its parent, grieves.\textsuperscript{585}
\end{quote}


The threnody extensively lauds the leadership virtues of her husband Giovanni di Bicci, the founder of the Medici bank and the originator of Medici dominance in Florence, with evocative imagery of the passage of time. The author alludes to aging and grief both on the part of individual man, in the line “an old man grieves,” but also on the part of the “saddened fatherland.” The evocative imagery suggests that not just the Medici family, but all of Florence mourns for the loss of Giovanni and Piccarda. It provides her an equal share of the mourning, giving a woman public credit on one of the grandest possible scales. There is evidence to indicate that this inscription was added to the tomb years after it was erected in San Lorenzo and significantly later than the first inscription. In the seventeenth century, the authorship of this inscription was credited to humanist and poet Angelo Poliziano.

Humanist poets were not just involved in composing epitaphs in Florence; Giovanni Pontano likely composed the inscription on the tomb of Maria of Aragon

---

586 The imagery of a grieving old man and aging of a youth and a boy is analogous to classical grave stele, like the Grave Stele from the Ilissos River (attributed to Skopas, ca. 340 BCE, marble, National Archaeological Museum, Athens), which depicts an old man, and young man, presumed to be the deceased, and a crying boy. Though this particular grave stele could not have been known in fifteenth-century Italy as it was uncovered in Athens in 1874, it is potentially a motif that was known in Italy.

Piccolomini in Sant’Anna dei Lombardi, Naples.\textsuperscript{588} The haunting inscription directly addresses the reader and indicates that the epitaph, like its classical forebears, was meant to be read out loud. It also likens Maria’s death to sleep by stating:

You who read these words, do so in a low voice lest you wake the sleeper. Mary of Aragon, a child of King Ferdinand, is enclosed within. She married the stalwart Duke of Amalfi, Antonio Piccolomini, to whom she left three daughters as a witness of their mutual love. One can believe she is sleeping, for she little deserved to die. She lived 20 years. In the year of our lord 1470.\textsuperscript{589}

Allusions to death as sleep were a popular theme in Renaissance funeral poetry.\textsuperscript{590} Giovanni Pontano himself was deeply involved in writing poems commemorating women and even on the subject of women’s sepulchral monuments, which will be discussed in greater detail at the end of this chapter.

While only a few of the inscriptions on women’s tombs reach the level of sophistication seen in the inscriptions of Nera Corsi Sassetti, Piccarda Bueri and Maria of Aragon Piccolomini, these instances indicate that women’s tomb inscriptions were worthy occupations for humanist scholars of the highest order and were not disregarded because of the gender of the tomb occupant. By including a humanist-composed inscription on a tomb, it implies the highest levels of erudition, cultivation, and education on the part of the commissioner and family. Additionally, both Piccarda and Maria of


\textsuperscript{589} QUI LEGIS SUMMISIUS LEGAS NE DORMIENTEM EXCITES / REGE FERDINANDO ORTA MARIA ARAGONA HIC CLUSA EST / NUPSIT ANTONIO PICCOLOMINEO AMALFAE DULCI STRENUO / CUI RELIQUIT TREIS FILIAS PIGNUS AMORIS MUTUI / PUELLAM QUIESCERE CREDIBILE EST QUAE MORI DIGNA NON FUIT / VIX AN XX / AD MCCCLXX. (Translation George Hersey, \textit{Alfonso II and the Artistic Renewal of Naples 1485-1495} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969), 111)

\textsuperscript{590} Hersey, \textit{Alfonso II and the Artistic Renewal of Naples 1485-1495}, 111.
Aragon’s inscriptions meditate on what death is, or can be likened to—meaning loss for the fatherland, a cause for mourning, or characterizing death as sleep—these emphases are the same regardless of gender.

**Locations of Inscriptions**

With the constituent parts of women’s tomb inscriptions thus established, it is necessary now to consider where these inscriptions were located. Like the effigies, inscriptions were nearly always among the most prominent components of tomb architecture. Unlike effigies, which can be visually understood from a distance, inscriptions must be easily visible and legible, making their placement on the monument one of the most significant components of the structure of the tomb. This study identifies two primary concerns regarding the placement of inscriptions: their physical locations on the monument and whether or not they are located on an inscription-bearing tablet or inscribed directly onto the sculptural fabric of the tomb. These two considerations are outlined in the following three tables. Table 22 demonstrates the physical locations of inscriptions on the wall and free-standing monuments in this study, while table 23 does the same for the slab tombs.

Table 22.
**Locations of Inscriptions on Wall- and Free-Standing Tombs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tomb Subject</th>
<th>Above Effigy</th>
<th>On Sarcophagus or Effigy Supporting Element</th>
<th>Below Sarcophagus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margherita Malatesta **</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

591 “Inscription-bearing tablet” is a term used to describe devices carrying inscriptions, frequently cartouches, but also scrolls, coined by John Sparrow, *Visible Words*, 13.
592 Table 24 below outlines the use of inscription-bearing tablets.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caterina Francesi**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilaria del Carretto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnese and Clemenza Durazzo</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnese da Mosto Venier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margherita di Durazzo</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paola Bianca Malatesta</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccarda Bueri</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isotta degli Atti</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Villana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Justine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vittoria Piccolomini**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Monica**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Manfredi</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Catherine of Siena***</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medea Colleoni</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Fina#</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria of Aragon Piccolomini</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabetta Geraldini</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costanza Ammannati</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nera Corsi Sassetti</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddalena Orsini</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsabilia Trinci</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camoneschi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice d’Este</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Generosa Orsini  -  -  X
Beata Beatrice Rusca**  -  -  -
Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola  -  X  -

** The damage, dismemberment, and rearrangement of these tombs makes it impossible to conclude where the inscriptions were originally located.
# Because of the constituent parts of Saint Fina’s tomb, which include an altar, tabernacle for relics, and a sarcophagus, the arrangement of her inscription is atypical, which will be discussed below.

| Table 23. Locations of Inscriptions on Slab Tombs |
|---|---|---|---|
| Tomb Subject | Around perimeter | At bottom | At top |
| Lisabetta Trenta | X | - | - |
| Chiara Gambacorta | X | - | - |
| Sibilia Cetto | X | X | - |
| Franceschina Tron Pesaro | - | - | X |
| Maddalena Riccia | X | - | - |

There are, as shown by the two above tables, general patterns to inscription placement. On wall and free-standing monuments, inscriptions are mostly located on the tomb chest or effigy-supporting sculptural element. These spaces tend to be among the largest areas on which inscriptions could be inscribed and also tend to be close to eye-level, making them the ideal placement for legibility. In the four cases where the inscriptions are above the effigy—the tombs of Beata Villana, Medea Colleoni, Maddalena Orsini, and Saint Fina—three (those on the non-saintly tombs) bear epitaphs that are much shorter than most of the inscriptions located on sarcophagi. Beata Villana’s inscription, which is
inscribed on a scroll held by two angels, is only two lines,\(^{593}\) while Medea’s, also on a scroll, but not held by any figures, is only slightly longer at three.\(^{594}\) The inscription above the effigy on Maddalena Orsini’s tomb, which runs across the top frieze of her temple-front tomb, identifies her son as the patron and is only a single line long.\(^{595}\) Saint Fina’s inscription, which is significantly longer than the other three in the same group, is located on a sarcophagus, but owing to the complex combination of a tomb, a relic-containing tabernacle, and altar that comprises her monument, the small, curved sarcophagus is at the top of the sculptural ensemble.\(^{596}\)

Three tombs locate their inscriptions below their respective tomb chests: the tomb of Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camponeschi and two monuments in Venice, those of Agnese da Mosto Venier and Generosa Orsini. The inscription honoring Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camponeschi is not located on the elaborately carved sarcophagus that supports Maria’s effigy. Her lion-footed sarcophagus features two registers, the bottom with elaborate foliate designs and the top with winged *putti* heads connected by floral swags and surrounded by other ribbon-like flourishes; thus no undecorated space is available here for an inscription. Instead, the inscription adorns the base supporting the sarcophagus, which also acts as the supporting element for the tiny effigy of Maria’s daughter Beatrice. Despite this variation in the inscription’s placement, its location would

\(^{593}\) *OSSA VILLANE MULIERIS SANCTISSIME / IN HOC CELEBRI TUMULO REQUIESCINT.*

\(^{594}\) *HIC IACET MEDEA VIRGO FILIA QUODA ILLUSTRIS ET / EX D BARTHOLOMEI COLIONI DE GAVIA SER DVD / VENETIAR CAPIT GNALIS 1470 6 MARCI.*

\(^{595}\) *RANALIVS VRSIN ARCHIEPVVS FLORENT PARDII B M PIENTISS P.*

\(^{596}\) Linda A. Koch, “The Santa Fina Chapel in San Gimignano: The promotion of a female saint and the Early Christian revival in the Renaissance,” (PhD diss., Rutgers University, 1991), 74. This small sarcophagus does contain most of Saint Fina’s relics, though her head is contained in a reliquary contained within the tabernacle below.
still be at nearly eye-level because of the high base that comprises the lower portion of the monument. Additionally, by locating the textual element of the tomb right below the effigy of Maria, it forces the viewer to contemplate the death of a very young child, which, per the inscription, the monument was explicitly erected to commemorate.

In contrast, the two Venetian tombs approach the inscription in a distinct manner. The tomb of Agnese da Mosto Venier, a high wall tomb consisting of a sarcophagus on consoles situated within an elaborately sculpted pointed-arch framework, features an inscription that is completely separate from the other sculptural elements and located below the sarcophagus, aligned with the bottom of the consoles. The placement of the inscription below the rest of the tomb components is almost certainly for legibility; in its present location, it is already difficult to read, and were it situated higher up on the sarcophagus, it would be illegible. Agnese’s tomb is located high up on the wall adjacent to the tomb of her husband, Doge Antonio Venier. The doge’s tomb hangs above the entrance to the Chapel of the Rosary, with his inscription significantly higher than that of Agnese’s making it impossible to read without assistance. The tendency to locate wall tombs high on the wall seems to be a trait more typical of the Veneto, necessitating these separate inscription plaques.

The inscription on the tomb of Generosa Orsini is similarly located to its Venetian predecessor, though the form of the tombs is dramatically different. Generosa’s is an urn

---

597 The inscription reads: For the infant Beatrice Camponeschi, a sweet child, who lived 15 months, Maria Pereira y Norona Mother and noble descendent of the kings of Spain, through both her mother and her father, wife of Pietro Lalle Camponeschi, Count of Montorio, for her worthy only daughter, and for herself, erected [this monument] while still living. See cat. #26.

598 Tombs located high on the wall can frequently be found in Venice and nearby Padua, but are less common to the extent that they nearly do not appear at all in other regions, like Florence, Rome, and Naples.
tomb situated in a circular frame,\textsuperscript{599} up on the wall of the left transept of Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari. The urn is elaborately sculpted with foliate designs. The inscription is situated within a small circle frame, below the larger circular frame containing the tomb.\textsuperscript{600} As in the case of Agnese’s monument, the placement of the inscription for Generosa Orsini’s tomb is likely for ease of legibility; if the inscription adorned the tomb urn itself, it would be nearly impossible to read. By separating the inscriptions, these Venetian tombs put particular emphasis on them and confirmed the importance of being able to read and identify the person interred within, so that the family is honored.

Table 23 demonstrates that on the five slab tombs included in this study, three of them follow what could be considered the typical practice of featuring the inscription along the outside framing element of the rectangular slab. These long, straight pieces of stone allow for inscriptions of considerable length. The other two slabs arrange their inscriptions differently; the tomb of Sibilia Cetto includes most of its inscription at the bottom of the effigies’ feet, with a portion of it on the frame at the top and bottom. In contrast, the tomb of Franceschina Tron Pesaro is inscribed at the top of the tomb. Franceschina’s tomb does not feature an effigy, but rather a coat of arms in the center, so the epitaph is the primary adornment of the tomb. Notably, Franceschina’s tomb inscription is also oriented towards the altar—which features Giovanni Bellini’s \textit{Frari}

\textsuperscript{599} The tomb seems to be in the same formal tradition as the Jacopo Marcello tomb attributed to Pietro Lombardo, also in Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari. On this tomb see Ursula Mehler, \textit{Auferstanden in Stein. Venezianische Grabmäler des späten Quattrocento} (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 2001), 99-108. Jacopo Marcello’s tomb is an urn monument within an oval frame, and there are at least three other Venetian tombs that feature an oval frame: the tombs of Ludovico Foscarini, Giovanni Zanetti, the Bishop of Treviso, and Agostino Onigo, also from Treviso. See again, Mehler, \textit{Auferstanden in Stein}, 103.

\textsuperscript{600} Between the two sculptural members is an inverted trapezoidal entablature supporting two angels holding coats of arms and a two-headed eagle.
Triptych (1488, oil on panel, Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, Venice)—indicating that the intended audience for the inscription was not a worshipper in the chapel, but the friar saying mass at the altar. A broader discussion of the intended audience of tomb inscriptions is continued below.

Table 24 shows whether or not the inscriptions were situated on a separate tablet or if they were inscribed directly onto the sculptural elements.

**Table 24.**
Specifcics of Inscription Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tomb Subject</th>
<th>Separate Tablet</th>
<th>Integrated into sculptural elements</th>
<th>Sculpted details with inscription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margherita Malatesta*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterina dei Francesi*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Diamond Pattern at top of plaque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilaria del Carretto</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnese and Clemenza Durazzo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnese da Mosto Venier</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margherita di Durazzo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paola Bianca Malatesta</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Coats of Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisabetta Trenta</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiara Gambacorta</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibilia Cetto</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccarda Bueri</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Putti holding inscription scroll***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isotta degli Atti</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Putti holding inscription scroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata Villana</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Angels holding inscription scroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Justine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vittoria Piccolomini*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel of the Malatesta Women</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Monica</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Manfredi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Putti holding inscription scroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Catherine of Siena</td>
<td>Yes and No*</td>
<td>No and Yes*</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medea Colleoni</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Fina</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria of Aragon Piccolomini</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabetta Geraldini</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesca Pitti Tomabuoni</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franceschina Tron Pesaro</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costanza Ammannati</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nera Corsi Sassetti</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddalena Orsini</td>
<td>Yes and No**</td>
<td>Yes and No**</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsibilia Trinci</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Putti holding inscription scroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddalena Riccia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Pereira and Beatrice Campaneschi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice d’Este</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generosa Orsini</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice Rusca</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gilding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The inscriptions for these tombs are currently situated as separate tablets; however because of the damage, dismemberment, and/or rearrangement of these monuments over the centuries, it is unclear if that was their original arrangement.
** Saint Catherine of Siena’s tomb includes two inscriptions: one on the front in the tablet and another on her pillow that is incorporated into the sculpture to the extent that it appears like embroidery on the fabric of her pillow.

*** This motif of putti presenting the inscription was originally used in Florentine tomb sculpture on the tomb of the anti-pope John XXIII in the Florentine Baptistry. See Ronald Lightbown, *Donatello and Michelozzo: An Artistic Partnership and its Patrons in the Early Renaissance* (London: H. Miller, 1980), 4-51.

The specific placement within the sculptural components of the tomb monuments is nearly evenly divided between inscriptions located on separate tablets and inscriptions integrated onto the sculptural elements. As Table 24 shows, fifteen tombs feature inscriptions on tablets, with their epitaphs located within a sculptured relief frame of varying complexity. Fourteen tombs feature epitaphs inscribed directly onto the sculpture of the monument, either the sarcophagus itself, friezes, borders or edges. Inscription-bearing tablets could be shaped as unfurling scrolls usually held by angels or putti, as on the tombs of Piccarda Bueri, Isotta degli Atti, Beata Villana, Barbara Manfredi, and Marsibilia Trinci, or as a cartouche, as is seen on the monuments for Saint Catherine of Siena, Costanza Ammannati, Nera Corsi Sassetti, Maddalena Orsini, and Beata Beatrice Rusca. The tablet with the inscription honoring Agnese da Mosto Venier is a simple rectangle with a corbeled border, while that on the tomb of Medea Colleoni is a rectangle, though it appears as if it is a banner being released to hang as the lower left corner “curls up” as if in the process of unfurling. Regardless of their shape, the primary purpose of these tablets was to carry words, rather than any other type of sculptural decoration and embellishment, and they therefore put an increased emphasis on the inscription.

---

602 Inscriptions located on tablets also bear a resemblance to *cartellini*, the illusionistically painted scraps of paper that appeared frequently in Venetian painting and would usually be used to bear the painter’s signature. For the use of *cartellini*, see Kandice Rawlings, “Liminal Messages.” (PhD diss., Rutgers University, 2009). For other
Inscriptions that are integrated into the sculptural elements of the tombs, meaning inscribed directly on the sarcophagus, frieze, base, or other sculptural component place slightly less emphasis on the inscription, because of a lack of framing materials. Without a distinct frame to highlight the inscription, epitaphs inscribed directly onto the sculpture of the tomb are hard to see from a distance and the inscription becomes much less of the focus of the sculptural ensemble.\textsuperscript{603} Despite their lesser legibility, it is unlikely that the inscriptions were considered to be less important. Rather, their placement, which was frequently in the center of the monument, close to eye-level, probably was determined by the other sculptural elements of the ensemble chosen and included by the artist and/or the commissioner.\textsuperscript{604}

\textbf{Issues of Legibility and the Intended Audience for Tomb Inscriptions}

The prominence of inscriptions on women’s tomb monuments indicates that they were meant to be read by a fifteenth-century (and later) audience; these words are not hidden or presented away from the viewer in a way that would indicate a divine intended audience. Thus, considering the audience for tomb inscriptions raises questions about their legibility, particularly in terms of their composition in Latin. As Latin literacy was far from universal in the quattrocento, were tomb inscriptions intended to be read and

\textsuperscript{603} They are also much more difficult to see in photographs of the tombs.  
\textsuperscript{604} Again, in the two extant contracts for women’s tomb monuments a discussion of the inscription is not included. As the creation of inscriptions of these monuments is such a hazy subject, my contributions here are necessarily speculative.
understood solely by those with elevated skills and education? And since Latin literacy was not widespread, particularly among women, does that alter the interpretation of these monuments as presenting exempla of worthy women to the fifteenth-century public? The following section will examine these questions in order to elucidate the intended audience for women’s tomb inscriptions.

As was briefly discussed in the previous chapter, while Renaissance Italy is understood to be a generally literate society, literacy rates in the fifteenth century are difficult to determine, particularly for women. The more specific concern of Latin literacy is even more difficult to establish, though it is essential to remember that any fifteenth-century individual, despite his or her education or literacy level, would have had regular interaction with the Latin oral tradition in the church. While education in Latin was generally limited to clergy members, members of the monastic community, or those undertaking a humanist education, practices that typically excluded women, there is evidence for both secular and religious women with Latin competence. It is also the case that women from upper-class and elite families—the types of families that would

---

605 Paul F. Grendler, *Schooling in Renaissance Italy: Literacy and Learning, 1300-1600* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), 71-78 argued that a third of late fifteenth-century Florentine males would have been literate at least in vernacular Italian. It is also useful to consider that fifteenth-century Italians might have had a visual literacy that helped them understand Latin inscriptions even if they were not actually literate in Latin. See Michael Baxandall’s *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth-Century Italy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).


have the funds and inclinations to commission monumental tombs—were much more likely to be educated, which could include instruction in Latin. In fact, Leonardo Bruni (whose tomb has been discussed elsewhere in this dissertation) composed for Battista da Montefeltro a prescription for the education of girls that included the entire course of humanist studies with the exception of rhetoric. Aside from their educations and regularly experiencing Latin in their attendance at church services, the elite women who could have been commemorated by monumental tombs also might have been the subject of a Latin oration at their wedding, as records for over 300 orations by humanists at courtly weddings survive, and in some of these orations the learned qualities of the bride were extolled. They also could have learned the rudiments of Latin inscriptions from their repeated exposure to tomb monuments.

While their Latin composition likely precluded certain women from understanding the inscriptions on women’s tombs, a guaranteed audience for the inscriptions was the Latin-speaking and reading clergy members and monks in residence in their respective church locations. Reaching the individuals who were regularly saying mass in a church was an essential element of tomb inscriptions and the tombs as a whole.

608 Isabella d’Este is a famous example of a woman who strove to achieve a classic humanist education. Stevenson suggests it was because women occasionally ruled cities they would be taught Latin, or so they could teach their children. See Stevenson, Women Latin Poets, 152-153.
611 The literacy rate for the lower classes was significantly lower, and outside the humanist court contexts, women of lower classes would have had less of a general familiarity with Latin despite still experiencing it regularly in church services.
Tomb monuments, particularly those located within family chapels, were not commissioned in a vacuum; in addition to a sculpted monuments, endowments would have been made to fund masses to be said for the deceased’s soul, usually, but not always adjacent to the tomb, and candles would have been purchased to illuminate the church in the deceased’s honor. Masses and candles were imperatives to assist the eternal souls of the deceased to be released from Purgatory. The concern for continual masses to be said for the deceased following his or her demise is elucidated by the emphasis placed on and money dedicated to this concern by Franceschina Tron Pesaro in her will from 1432.612 The bulk of the document is a list of money designated for various individuals to say the mass at various different locations, including further in the future; the will includes plans for a person of “bona chonsienzia” (good conscience) to go within a year to a particular church of San Lorenzo to pray for Franceschina’s soul (“l’anema mia”).613

Franceschina Tron Pesaro was certainly not alone in her concern for the continued salvation of her soul after her death. Giovanni Tornabuoni made continued efforts to memorialize his wife Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni through religious means beyond the construction of her monumental tomb at Santa Maria sopra Minerva. At least until 1481, he made repeated donations of wax to be burned in her honor at Santa Maria Novella, Florence, on the anniversary of her death.614 As evidenced by the tomb in Rome, the

613 See cat. #21.
chapel in Florence, and the donations of wax, also in Florence, Giovanni Tornabuoni’s concern for his wife’s soul crossed geographical boundaries and cost considerable sums. Similar donations of candle wax and endowments for masses were likely made for all of the women included in this study in order for the clergy members and religious individuals, whether priests, monks, or nuns, to agree to continue to pray for the soul of the deceased.

By setting in stone, in the public arena, the identities and virtues of women, their inscriptions crafted particular memories of what should be best remembered about these individuals and families. That these inscriptions would have been written in Latin, the language of the church, in the edifice where fifteenth-century Italians would have regularly listened to Latin sermons could have led to the result that the virtues of these women would have seemed to be codified, and possibly even sanctified, by the church, even in the minds of those who were not Latin literate. Women’s tombs, with their attendant written words would have, in their monumentality, situated their subjects as exempla somewhat on a par with the other women visualized in churches, whether the Virgin or female saints, and the Latin inscriptions would have further certified this connection.

---

suo donna – libber 18” (from Giovanni Tornabuoni, on the 25th day, 18 pounds of large candles for the office he had made for Madonna Francesca his wife – pounds 18).

615 For a discussion of the significance of the written and spoken word, particularly poetry, in Renaissance culture, see Lauro Martines, “Poetry as Politics and Memory in Renaissance Florence and Italy,” in Art, Memory, and family in Renaissance Florence, ed Giovanni Ciapelli and Patricia Lee Rubin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 48-66, especially 49-51.

616 This would have been especially the case in churches that contained both a woman’s tomb and female saints’ tombs or painted imagery depicting the Dormition of the Virgin.
Artists’ Signatures

Sculptors’ signatures are also a consideration for the inscriptions on women’s tombs.617 Only two women’s tombs include artists’ signatures on the monuments: the tombs of Margherita di Durazzo and Medea Colleoni.618 The inclusion of a signature on a tomb added a new voice to the inscription, that of the sculptor, rather than the patron or the deceased, and the inclusion of the sculptor’s voice might have crossed the bounds of propriety.619 As Philipp Fehl has noted, by including a signature on a tomb, “what they [the artists] do for the dead, in appropriate distance, they also do for themselves,”620 meaning that the memorialization they achieve for others is also something that they themselves participate in. Signatures are not common on tomb monuments for men or women despite their public and prominent locations and their capacity to function as a means of publicity for sculptors. Both of the signatory inscriptions on the women’s tombs are relatively short and limited strictly to factual information without laudatory


618 Although there are no signatures on the tombs themselves, the architecture of San Francesco, Rimini, which houses the tomb of Isotta degli Atti and housed the tomb of the Malatesta women, is signed. Agostino di Duccio and Matteo de’Pasti are credited with the architecture of the temple and Isotta’s chapel due to their signatures on the interior of the building. On a cornice between the first and second chapels on the left side Matteo signed: “MATTHEI V[ERONENSI]S D[E] P[ASTIS]. ILLVSTRIS. ARMINI. DOMINI. NOBILISS[IMI] ARCHITECTI. OPVS.” Mirroring Matteo’s signature is that of Agostino di Duccio: “OPVS AVGVSTINI FLORENTINI LAPICIDAE.” See Charles Hope, “The Early History of the Tempio Malatestiano,” in Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 55 (1992): 88.

619 Philipp Fehl, “Death and the Sculptor’s Fame: Artist’s Signatures on Renaissance Tombs in Rome,” Buletyn Historii Szuki 59 (1997): 197. Fehl’s particular focus is papal tombs, but the decision to include or not to include a signature on a monument, tomb or otherwise, and how that affected an artist’s status is a complicated question. See Boffa, “Artist Identity Set in Stone,” particularly chapter four for a discussion of this question.

620 Fehl, “Death and the Sculptor’s Fame,” 197.
elaborations or descriptions. On the tomb of Margherita di Durazzo, the sculptor Abbot Antonio Baboccio di Piperno and his assistant Alessio di Vico signed the tomb on the middle support: “The Abbot Antonio Baboccio di Piperno Made [this tomb] with his assistant Alessio di Vico.” On the tomb of Medea Colleoni, Giovanni Antonio Amadeo signed along the base of the sarcophagus: “Giovanni Antonio de Amadeo made this work.” Both of these signatures are highly visible on their respective monuments and suggest that for the artist there was no difference in creating a tomb monument for a woman than for a man.

**Women’s Tomb Inscriptions in Relation to those on Men’s Tombs**

Renaissance tomb inscriptions are, unfortunately, an understudied element of their compositions. Though a comprehensive investigation of male tomb inscriptions in comparison to female inscriptions is beyond the scope of this project, the treatment of the

---


623 IOVANES ANONIUS DE AMADEIS FECIT HOC OPUS (Translation mine).
different genders in the inscriptions on male/female double tombs will here be considered. This will at least point the way toward questions of interest that would underpin such a broader examination. Of the eleven double or couple’s tombs included in this study, eight include individuals of both genders, and seven of those have extant inscriptions. These tombs include those of: Lisabetta Trenta; Sibilia Cetto; Piccarda Bueri; Elisabetta Geraldini; Vittoria Piccolomini; Maddalena Riccia; and Generosa Orsini. For all of these tombs, except that of Generosa Orsini, who is buried with her son Maffeo, the women are entombed with their husbands.

Various patterns emerge when these inscriptions are analyzed as a group. While usually subordinated to their husbands, in that the placement of women’s names are after those of men’s, there is otherwise not a dramatic difference in the mode in which the husband is honored in contrast to the wife. The treatment of the honorees is in fact completely gender-neutral in five of the inscriptions, meaning the men are not afforded more laudatory adjectives or descriptions than the women. In the remaining two inscriptions, those of Lisabetta Trenta and Piccarda Bueri, the differences are only remarkable in the case of Lisabetta Trenta. As noted previously, the inscription does not specifically name the woman (or women) it honors, but instead refers to the female occupant (or occupants) of the tomb as “the women… of Lorenzo.” As this inscription is strictly informative, it still does not privilege one gender over the other with any laudatory language; however, it does describe the women as objects of male possession.624

624 This inscription on this tomb is consistent with the general understanding of Renaissance women as an oppressed class that was the property of men. See Patricia Simons, “Women in Frames: The Gaze, the Eye, the Profile in Renaissance Portraiture.”
The inscription on the tomb of Piccarda Bueri provides a different approach to reading the gender in epitaphs as it includes a longer prose inscription and a threnody. These two inscriptions do spend the bulk of their lines praising the “very distinguished man Giovanni,” who was the “parent” that the “saddened fatherland” was now “deprived” of. However, by including Piccarda in the inscription, by naming her the same number of times that Giovanni is named, by equally crediting her as the parent of the patrons Cosimo “il Vecchio” and Lorenzo de’Medici, the inscriptions give a large amount of public credit to a woman, which is a contrary nuance—on the broadest stage—to what has been characterized as Florence’s particular hostility to women’s roles in public.625

**Function of Women’s Tomb Inscriptions**

As demonstrated above, women’s tomb inscriptions varied in length and in how much, and what type, of information was included. While the various elements of women’s tomb inscriptions have been examined in detail, the broader function will be discussed here. Most of the women commemorated by monumental tombs can be characterized as wives and mothers, and as the ultimate goal of Renaissance marriage

---

625 Florence has been characterized, in Dale Kent’s words, as “among the more unlucky places in Western Europe to be born a woman,” because of the exclusion of women from public life in that city. See Dale Kent, “Women in Renaissance Florence” in *Virtue and Beauty*, ed. David Alan Brown (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 26. However, the inclusion of Piccarda in a monumental work of art, to say nothing of the two other monumental women’s tombs in Florence, nuances our understanding of women’s public roles in that city.

*History Workshop* 25 (1988): passim. However, Lisabetta Trenta’s inscription is the only example that points towards this sort of historical interpretation of women’s objectified positions. In contrast, the other tomb inscriptions and the monuments in their entirety can potentially nuance our understanding of women’s roles and their autonomy or lack thereof.
was procreation, it is not at all surprising that a common theme of tomb inscriptions is women’s achievements in establishing and maintaining a family. Thirteen of the inscriptions make direct or indirect reference to descendants. By referring to children on the tombs the inscriptions emphasize the virtuous success of the wives in their primary societal role, that of motherhood. In their inscriptions, women were remembered for their virtuous accomplishments of being mothers, just as Leonardo Bruni argued that they should be in a condolence letter he wrote to Nicola di Vieri de’Medici upon the death of his mother Bicie, “the excellences of a woman’s life are reckoned to be (unless I am mistaken) good family, a good appearance, modesty, fertility, children, riches, and above all virtue and a good name.”

Continuing the family lines was the major triumph of women, and this was expressed in their epitaphs. And while that notion can be interpreted as indicating how women were limited to the domestic sphere, by publicly lauding the achievement of motherhood—just as men’s achievements were frequently celebrated on their tomb monuments—women’s successes were removed from the private arena and thrust into the public one. By celebrating women’s accomplishments as mothers their epitaphs were serving precisely the same function as those on the tombs of men, which also honored accomplishments. The precise nature of those accomplishments might have been different, but the function was the same, furthering the argument that women’s and men’s tombs served the same commemorative purposes.

**Women’s Tombs and the Poetic Ideal**

---

The preceding analysis has established how inscriptions functioned within their commemorative function. It is valid now to consider how these epitaphs— as literary works—functioned within the broader context of late medieval and Renaissance poetry, particularly in relation to notions of the poetic ideal. As considerations of the poetic ideal are frequently applied to other arts connected to women—it is its own subset of the literature on women’s painted portraiture—it is necessary to interrogate if and how poetry underscores monumental commemoration.

The duecento Dolce stil nuovo, forged by the poets Guido Guinizelli and Guido Cavalcanti, initiated a new form of Tuscan love poetry rooted in feudal traditions of courtly love poetry that created standards of beauty for women in the emerging vernacular Italian tradition. These concepts were elevated and refined in Dante Aligheri’s Vita nuova from the 1290s, the precursor of the Divine Comedy, where, through a combination of prose and poetry, the author elaborated upon the conditions of meeting his beloved Beatrice for the first time, their infrequent relationship over the years

627 Analogous arguments have been made for the poetic inspirations and influences on portrait painting in the Renaissance. See for example, Elizabeth Cropper, “The Beauty of Women: Problems in the Rhetoric of Renaissance Portraiture” in Rewriting the Renaissance The Discourse of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe ed. Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, and Nancy J. Vickers (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1986).
628 For sources on the dolce stil nouvo, see Italo Bertelli, La poesia di Guido Guinizelli e la poetica del “dolce stil nuovo” (Florence: F. Le Monnier, 1983); Vittore Branca, Rimitori del dolce Stil Nuovo (Milan: Società editrice Dante Alighieri, 1971); Gianfranco Contini, Poeti del Duecento (Milan: Riccardo Ricciardi, 1960); Guido Favati, Inchiesta sul Dolce stil nuovo (Florence: F. Le Monnier, 1975); Mario Marti, Poeti di Dolce stil nuovo (Florence: Le Monnier, 1969);
629 Kirkham, “Poetic Ideals of Love and Beauty,” 51.
until her death, and the mourning that followed. Beatrice can be interpreted as a signifier for divine love and salvation, and Dante and Beatrice meet again in the *Divine Comedy* in the *Purgatorio* on the ascent up to paradise. Beatrice has been interpreted as many allegorical notions, including Wisdom, Salvation, and Faith, but her ability to embody these qualities hinges on her being dead. Her apocalyptic death is the harbinger of Dante’s own salvation.

Dante’s characterization of Beatrice as a Christ-like salvific representation is a precursor to Francesco Petrarca’s similar characterization of Laura, the object of his decades-long unrequited love, which is expounded upon in the 366 poems of the *Rime sparse*, or *Il Canzoniere*, composed between 1327 and 1374. Though this division does not originate with Petrarch, the poems are divided by Laura’s death and labeled either “in vita” or “in morte.” Laura, who, like Beatrice, might have only been a muse created by the author, was Petrarch’s nonetheless real and ideal inspiration, and her death on 6 April 1348 was the crux of Petrarch’s poetic life. Unlike Beatrice, whose physical

---

633 “…where she goes Love drives a killing frost into base hearts / that freezes and destroys what they are thinking / should such a one insist on looking at her, / he is changed to something noble or he dies. / And if she finds one worth to behold her, / that man will feel her power for salvation / when she accords to him her salutation.” Dante Alighieri, *Vita nuova*, trans. Mark Musa (Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 1973), 33.
634 Martinez, “Mourning Beatrice,” 23. These are, of course, also connected to the legendary portraits of Laura by Simone Martini as the poet describes in sonnets 77 and 78 from the *Canzoniere*, which are included in appendix 1 of this dissertation.
characteristics Dante did not describe in detail, Laura’s lovely features are given in bits and pieces throughout Petrarch’s poetry; though he never enumerates them fully, he does mention individual features including her golden hair, pale and beautiful face, dark eyebrows, and shining eyes, which became touchstones for quattrocento painters of women’s portraits. For both of these women, whether they were real or imagined figures, their deaths and the commemoration of their deaths was the most significant force for the poets who immortalized them.

The deaths of Beatrice and Laura and the manifestation of their ideal qualities through their deaths would have been a notion familiar to elite men and women who were capable of commissioning monumental tombs in the fifteenth century. Educated patrons, or those who wanted to give the appearance of education and erudition, would have owned manuscript and later printed copies of the works of Dante and Petrarch. Notions of the virtuous female deceased would have had currency in the learned humanist circles and the courts where they were situated. This is particularly compelling since some of the fifteenth-century manuscript copies of the Canzoniere included miniatures of a tomb with an effigy in conjunction with poem 264, a wretched meditation on the gulf between

636 Kirkham, Poetic Ideals of Love and Beauty,” 51.
637 Trapp, “Petrarch’s Laura,” 66.
638 Salvatore Bongi indicates that Paolo Guinigi, the ruler of Lucca and the patron of Ilaria del Carretto’s tomb, had a book collection that was carefully curated and guided, and that he was not missing any principal example of Latin or Italian literature in order to create the correct courtly, erudite appearance. See Salvatore Bongi, Paolo Guinigi e delle sue ricchezze, (Lucca: Tipographia Benedini-Guidotti, 1871). Petrarchismo as a phenomenon reached its height in the sixteenth-century rather than the fifteenth, but interest in both Petrarch and Dante was immediate and only increased throughout the quattrocento. On Petrarchismo and art, see Elizabeth Cropper, “On Beautiful Women, Parmigianino, Petrarchismo, and the Vernacular Style.” Art Bulletin 58 (1976): 374-394 and Mary Rogers, “Sonnets on Female Portraits from Renaissance North Italy,” Word & Image 2.4 (1986): 291-305. For Petrarchismo in Renaissance culture more generally see: L. Baldacci, Il Petrarchismo italiano nel cinquecento (Padua, Liviana, 1974).
Laura’s life and death, which initiates the “in morte” selection of poems. Poem 264 is the only poem from “in morte” that is typically illustrated, and though Petrarch actually describes Laura’s tomb as “al duro sasso / che ‘l mio caro thesoro in terra nasconde,” in a later poem, the moment of her death is when her illustrated tomb is erected. Virtuous women received tombs, as Petrarch himself suggested in sonnet 116, as quoted at the beginning of this chapter: “Ivi non donne, ma fontane et sassi.”

The tomb of Ilaria del Carretto, by a significant margin the most thoroughly studied monument examined in this dissertation, has already been considered by Bruno Pinchard as indelibly linked to, as he puts it, the “l’impulsion fondamentale” (fundamental impulse) that Dante had underwritten in Italian courtly culture in fifteenth-century Italy. But I would suggest that it is not simply Ilaria’s tomb that should be interpreted in light of Dante or Petrarch, but rather all women’s tombs from the fifteenth century. Though, as we see them now as uncolored white marble, women’s effigies

---

639 Trapp, “Petrarch’s Laura,” 152, 160. The earliest appearance of Laura’s tomb is from a manuscript on vellum from the 1440s by the Master of the Vitae imperatorum (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana MSS Barb. Lat. 3943, fol. 115v and in its copy on paper, also BAV MSS Barb. Lat. 3954, fol 100. In the 1460s), Laura’s tomb appeared twice in two manuscripts by Bartolomeo Sanvito of Padua (London, Victoria and Albert Museum MS L101-1947, fols 9v, and Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional MS 611, fols 1v, 97).
641 “No ladies there but fountains and stones,” (Translation A.S. Kline).
643 There is limited evidence that tombs were polychromed; there are traces of polychromy on the tomb of Margherita of Durazzo (see cat. #1), further conservation of individual monuments might reveal greater instances of polychromy on women’s tombs. As noted in chapter three, scholars have recently been discovering that other fifteenth-century tombs, like that of Carlo Marsuppini, featured much more extensive polychromy than was previously realized. Therefore it is important to acknowledge the possibility that
could not represent the ideal features that painted portraits achieved, meaning the golden hair and shining eyes, these women made of stone—recall “ivi non donne, ma fontane et sassi”—could certainly recall Petrarch’s poems and the connotations of the ideal and of feminine virtue that they contain.

Later in the fifteenth century, the connection between women’s tombs and poetry became even more explicit. At the Aragonese court in Naples, in the humanist circle of Giovanni Pontano in the last decades of the fifteenth century, women’s commemoration was a frequent theme of poetry.\textsuperscript{644} Pontano’s \textit{De tumulis}, a collection of 113 funereal epigrams, includes many that meditate on the deaths and commemoration of women. In particular, Poem XLIV, which includes a dialogue between a dead lady and the poet, begins: “Marble cannot have me and the urn of my grave cannot conceal me / I depart from life wrapped in white snow-like roses.”\textsuperscript{645} Pontano’s poems are as much about the monuments as they are about the individuals commemorated by them.\textsuperscript{646} Pontano had constructed a chapel dedicated to his wife Adriana Sassone, after her death, at Santa Maria Maggiore alla Pietrasanta, Naples.\textsuperscript{647} Though it does not hold a tomb, the chapel

---


\textsuperscript{645} Giovanni Pontano, \textit{De Tumulis}, “Nec me marmor habet, nec me tegit urna sepultam; in niveas abii candida versa rosas” Poem 44. (Translation in Ascher, 165.)

\textsuperscript{646} Ascher, “Renaissance Commemoration in Naples: the Rota Chapel in San Pietro a Maiella,” 196 fn. 19: Pontano dedicated the tenth elegy of \textit{De tumulis} not to an individual but to a monument.

\textsuperscript{647} As this chapel does not contain a sculpted tomb—monumental, slab, or otherwise—it was not considered as part of this study, though it is briefly addressed, with the chapel of Giovanna degli Albizzi, in supplementary catalogue B at the end of this project. The chapel of Giovanna degli Albizzi, like that of Adriana Sassone, was a memorial chapel that honored a woman, but did not include any sort of tomb. On this chapel see chapter five of Maria Kathleen Deprano’s dissertation, “The Art Works Honoring Giovanna degli
does contain a number of dedicatory inscriptions in Adriana’s honor.\(^{648}\) The chapel also creates a direct relationship between Adriana and Petrarch’s Laura on the paving tiles. The painted majolica tiles include the phrases: “Ave Maria,” “Pontanus Fecit,” “Adriana Saxona,” and significantly, “Laura bella,” forging an unambiguous link between the deceased Adriana, the Virgin Mary, and Petrarch’s Laura in creating a literary display of personal and familial virtue.\(^{649}\)

The poetic connotations of women’s tomb monuments also functioned in the other direction, with the impetus to poetry originating in the effigy and then finding expression in the written word. A lovely (and no longer extant) effigy, attributed to Tommaso Malvito and thought to commemorate Beatrice Notari, a young poetess who died near Nola, inspired poet Antonio Tebaldeo to write sonnets honoring the beauty of the deceased. Tebaldeo, a Ferrarese poet, did not know Beatrice Notari and was only

---


familiar with her through the effigy. In 1499, Tebaldeo’s nephew published the sonnets in Ferrara, dedicating them to Isabella d’Este. Tebaldeo refers to the effigy only by her first name, Beatrice, which could not help but be a reference to Dante’s Beatrice.

Art inspiring poetry is certainly not limited to women’s monumental tombs. Contemporaneously to Tebaldeo’s inspiration by Beatrice Notari’s effigy, humanist poets like Pietro Bembo, Giovanni della Casa, and later in the sixteenth-century, Torquanto Tasso, wrote poems motivated by portraits of women painted by the likes of Leonardo da Vinci and Giovanni Bellini. And even in these poems the idea of a sculpted woman has currency; in Bembo’s poem on Giovanni Bellini’s portrait, likely of Maria Savorgnan, the poem begins:

“O imagine mia celeste e pura,
che splendi più che ‘l sole agli occhi miei
e mi rassembri ‘l volto di colei,
che scolpita ho nel cor con maggiore cura…”

The notion of sculpting a woman as if made of stone originated in Petrarchan poetry and is reminiscent of the imagery the trecento poet created in sonnet 116.

---

653 Rogers, “Sonnets on Female Portraits,” 291.
655 “O my image, celestial and pure, / shining, to my eyes, more brightly than the sun, / and resembling the face of the one / that, with even greater care, I have sculpted in my heart.” Translation Rogers, 301, emphasis mine. See the rest of the poem in Appendix 2.
656 Rogers, “Sonnets on Female Portraits,” 293.
Women’s tombs were not only the subjects of literary and poetic discourse in the Renaissance, but at least in a few instances they have had substantial literary afterlives. The tomb of Ilaria del Carretto, as was explained in chapter three of this dissertation, has been the subject of poems, meditations, epistles, and novels. And while Ilaria’s tomb has the lion’s share of attention for fifteenth-century women’s tombs more generally, it is not the only one that reappears later in literary works. Isotta degli Atti, in the capacity of “mistress/goddess” of the Tempio Malatestiano appears (along with her predecessors as Sigismondo Malatesta’s wife, Polissena Sforza and Ginevra d’Este, who are only mentioned when they die) in the “Malatesta Cantos,” a section (cantos 8-11) of Ezra Pound’s *Cantos*.\(^{657}\) Pound is certainly less rapturous about Isotta than, for example, Pier Paolo Pasolini is about Ilaria;\(^{658}\) she is not ascribed any particular virtues and is primarily characterized as a jealous wife resentful of her husband’s absence,\(^{659}\) Pound does, through the voice of Sigismondo Malatesta, assert that women glorify their city through their beauty and ornament: “Vogliamo, / che le donne, we will that they, le donne, go ornate, / As be their pleasure, for the city’s glory thereby.”\(^{660}\) While this line could be

---


658 See fn. 341.

659 Goldblatt, “Gender Matters in Pound’s “Cantos,”” 42.

interpreted as the women ornamenting themselves, it can also be interpreted as

*representations*, like effigies, of women ornamenting a city.

While the poetic allusions concerning women were frequently about beauty, they were also primarily about virtue. It was particularly for the virginal and chaste quality of their love that Petrarch celebrated Laura, and certainly Beatrice’s virtues—notably chastity and humility—were her most significant qualities. So while not all of the women celebrated by monumental tombs were young, with golden hair and dark eyebrows, the emphasis on virtues, as demonstrated in their epitaphs, links them to the poetic ideal. Women’s tombs by their very nature, as commemorative monuments to women, would recall the poetic commemoration of Beatrice and Laura and their particularly untouchable brands of unequivocal virtue. The effigies of women, bodily representations in hard stone, remote and removed from this world, just as Beatrice and Laura were, would have been especially evocative of their heroic beauty and chastity. As I have argued throughout this dissertation, women’s tombs functioned similarly to the commemorative framework established by men’s tombs. But I would like to suggest finally that erecting public sepulchers linked the female deceased to the virtues of Beatrice and Laura, the most illustrious examples of poetic perfection, and this intellectual connection brought even greater glory to the women, the monuments’

---

661 Trapp, “Petrarch’s Laura,” 58. 64, 179. Laura, though her identity as an actual person is still debatable, supposedly had an actual, physical tomb that was discovered by Maurice Scève in the Chapel of the Holy Cross in the Franciscan church in Avignon as recounted in Abraham Gölnitz’ *Ulysses Belgico-Gallicus* from 1631. Her tomb was supposed to have the extremely simple epitaph: “MLMI” which has been interpreted to mean: MADONNA LAURA MORTA IACET (Lady Laura lies here dead).

662 Kirkham, “Poetic Ideals of Love and Beauty,” 51.
patrons, and their families.
Conclusion

This dissertation has demonstrated that, despite pervasive assumptions to the contrary, women were commemorated by monumental, sculpted tombs in fifteenth-century Italy. Though they are demonstrably the most public and the most prominent works of art connected to women in fifteenth-century Italy, monumental tomb sculptures—save for the single exception of Ilaria del Carretto’s, sculpted by Jacopo della Quercia—have been all but ignored in the art historical scholarship. Whether commissioned by men or women, these elaborate sculpture ensembles, often comprised of at least an effigy, sarcophagus, inscription, and architectural framework, thrust women’s virtues and achievements into the public realm and served as integral components of the broader commemorative culture of *quattrocento* Italy.

As chapter one demonstrated, the fifteenth century was a period of development and experimentation, as evidenced by the thirty-five women’s tombs extant from that century. These tombs are located throughout the Italian peninsula, and though commonly situated in the typical Renaissance centers of Florence, Rome, Venice, and Milan, they can also be found in smaller, more provincial locations. Prior to 1400, monumental tombs primarily memorialized women of the ruling class, but as the fifteenth century progressed, commemoration spread to a broader range of elite, but non-ruling women. Women’s tombs formally and stylistically followed the better-studied patterns and trends of men’s tombs, indicating that, though they commemorated individuals that were less socially prominent and powerful, they were not considered to be lesser monuments. Women’s tombs were usually situated within the bounds of marital memory, emphasizing
dynastic and genealogical concerns, foregrounding in the public sphere women’s achievements as mothers, a role that has typically been considered to be private.

Chapter two illustrated that patronage of women’s tombs was varied and took nearly as many forms as there are monuments. Though conjugal patronage was typical, it was not the only type of relationship that led to the construction of women’s tombs. Children—both sons and daughters—as well as more distant relations were involved with patronage, as were external individuals and groups. Women commissioned their own monuments in a surprising number of cases, and though these works represent still a small proportion of the number of public works of art commissioned as a whole, their existence means that female patrons’ involvement with the construction of any public art is greater than previously understood. Aside from emphasizing different virtues in their inscriptions, the gender of the patron had little effect on the appearance of the monument. According to those inscriptions, as well as the two extant contracts, gender, either for the patron or the tomb honoree, played little to no role in practical patronal decisions, but patronal differences did occur based on the stage in life or status of the tomb honoree. Tombs commissioned by husbands were primarily for women who died young, many of whom died in childbirth. Children were often the patrons for tombs for their widowed mothers, though it was also this group of women, widows, who were most likely to commission tombs for themselves. Institutional patronage was exclusively saved for saints, beate, and women connected to institutional religious life, though lay-women could be honored by tombs commissioned by internal or external patrons. While love has often been ascribed as the reason for erecting a tomb for a woman, this chapter indicates that, just like tombs for men, monumental commemoration occurred when it was
financially possible and strategically advantageous for the honor and glory of the individual, his or her family, and the patron.

Chapter three highlighted the significance of effigies to women’s monuments and made a case for considering effigies as portraits by inserting them into the vast discourse on Renaissance portraiture. Though portraits are one of the most widely studied categories of fifteenth-century art, effigies play only a tiny role in that literature, despite their advantages over other types of likenesses, such as panel paintings and sculpture busts. Effigies are identified, highly visible images of women that functioned to create indelible memories of individuals and, with their specificity in terms of clothing, age, gesture, and hairstyle, indicate a heightened tendency towards individualized representation, more so than any other depiction of fifteenth-century women. As such, effigies, as the most public, prominent, and costly depictions of women, especially non-ruling lay-women, should become central to the discussion of portraiture.

As essential a component to tomb sculpture as effigies, inscriptions, analyzed in chapter four, vary widely in the amount of information conveyed in them. Composed of varying combinations of six elements including identifying the tomb occupants; identifying the patron; laudatory language or descriptions of the tomb occupant and/or the patron; references to other important individuals, usually other relatives or the pope; facts about the deceased, typically the death date; and rhetorical flourishes. Although all of them concretely identify their honoree, tomb inscriptions are public literary works that laud women in a mode similar to poetry. As such, they, along with women’s monuments as a whole, are underscored by notions of ideal women found in the poetry of Dante, Petrarch, and their stilnovisti predecessors. Ideas about ideal women, especially deceased
ideal women, were current among the elite and educated individuals who were also capable of commissioning monumental tombs. Worthy women, like Dante’s Beatrice and Petrarch’s Laura, both of whom were dead when eulogized, were celebrated through poetry, but actual worthy fifteenth-century women were commemorated with tombs.

By compiling and analyzing the thirty-five extant examples of women’s monumental tombs and thus proving the extent of their existence, this project demonstrates that they were best described as “tombs” without any gendered modifiers. The substantial cost of these large-scale sculptured tombs, whether in terms of money, time or labor, means that they were neither commissioned nor constructed without careful consideration. As such, they should not be excluded from our understanding of fifteenth-century Italian cultures of death and commemoration. Finally, with tombs, women were both displayed and involved in public art in ways that have hitherto not been acknowledged or discussed. The nuanced public portrayal of women as presented on these tombs—even though it was posthumous—changes our understanding of fifteenth-century women’s relationships to the civic sphere and their connection to communal art. By displaying actual women, and highlighting their best qualities, women’s tombs made them exempla for their viewers, male and female alike.
Catalogue of Fifteenth-Century Women’s Tombs

The tombs are arranged in sections by formal type as delineated in chapter one of this dissertation. The sections are as follows:

Section One: Independent Tombs
Section Two: Independent Tombs originally located within Couple or Family Chapels
Section Three: Independent Chapels
Section Four: Independent Double Tombs
Section Five: Double Tombs within Couple of Family Chapels

Within each section the tombs are arranged chronologically.
Section One: Independent Monuments

List of Tombs:
1. Tomb of Margherita di Durazzo, 1412, San Francesco, Salerno
2. Tomb of Paola Bianca Malatesta, 1416, San Francesco, Fano
3. Tomb of Chiara Gambacorti, 1419, San Domenico, Pisa
4. Tomb of Beata Villana, 1451, Santa Maria Novella, Florence
5. Tomb of Saint Justine, 1451, Santa Giustina, Padua
6. Tomb of Saint Monica, 1455, Sant’Agostino, Rome
7. Tomb of Barbara Manfredi, 1466, San Biagio, Forlì
8. Tomb of Saint Catherine of Siena, 1466, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome
9. Tomb of Medea Colleoni, 1467, Santa Maria della Basella, Urgnano
10. Tomb of Costanza Ammannati, 1479, Sant’Agostino, Rome *
11. Tomb of Maddalena Orsini, 1480, San Salvatore in Lauro, Rome
12. Tomb of Beata Beatrice Rusca, 1499, Sant’Angelo dei Frari, Milan
1. **Tomb of Margherita di Durazzo**, died in 1412 (fig. 6)

**Attribution:**
Signed by Antonio Baboccio di Piperno and Alessio di Vico as *laborante* in 1412 (Braca, 141 and Bock, 412).

**Date:**
1412

**Location:**
The tomb was originally behind the high altar of San Francesco, Salerno. Now it is located in the left aisle of the Cathedral, Salerno (Bock, 428).

**Material:**
White Marble with traces of polychromy.

**Patron:**
King Ladislaus her son (Bock, 413). Though not involved in the commissioning of her own tomb (at least there is no documentary evidence to support this idea), Margherita commissioned other tombs for her family members in the same chapel, as well as three tombs in San Lorenzo, Naples, including the tomb for her sisters Agnese and Clemenza Durazzo and the tomb for Ludovico Durazzo both in Santa Chiara, Naples (Gaglione, 113).

**Inscription:**
Under the effigy:
I MARTGARITA CAELOS UBI FULGIDA VITA SCANDITO SECURA CONDU / CUNT TE TUA THURA NAM TIBI SACRATUM TERRIS REGINA / BEATUM INCLITA DIMICTIS NOMEN QUOD SECULA VICTIS / POSTERA SERVABUNT LIV[O]RIBUS ET PERAMABUN

Go, Margarita, quiet up to heaven to live in the light, climb safely on, your incense fumes accompany you, for you, illustrious queen, leaving behind on earth a sacred and blessed name for the centuries when the envious have been defeated and only the highly appreciated are preserved. (Translation in German, Bock, 428; translation from German to English, mine).

On the back:

Meanwhile, the year of the Lord 1412 takes its course, it does not run cheerful because of her death on the sixth day of August in the dim light of the ninth hour. During the Feast
of the Redeemer is celebrated the fifth indiction they are prey to the beautiful kingdom of heaven. (Translation in German, Bock, 428; translation from German to English, mine).

On one short side:
MATER SERENIS / SIMI REGIS LADISLAI

Mother of the Most Serene King Ladislaus

On the other side:
REGINA MARGA / RITA DE DURATIO

Queen Margherita of Durazzo

On the middle support:

The Abbot Antonio Baboccio di Piperno Made [this tomb] with his assistant Alessio di Vico (translation mine)

**Condition:**
The tomb underwent restoration that concluded in 1989 (Braca, 161).

**Relevant Documents:**
No documents connected to the tomb are known to survive (Bock, 429).

**Description and Discussion:**
Margherita of Durazzo was queen of Naples and Hungary during the reign of her husband Charles III of Naples and ruled as Queen Regent during her son Ladislaus’ minority. Her tomb combines different traditions of iconography of Neapolitan royalty and continues the formal trend typical of Neapolitan royal tombs from the preceding century of a tomb chest supported off the ground and with a canopy above. In the case of Margherita’s tomb her cassa is supported by columns behind four figures of Virtues: Faith, Hope, Fortitude, and Prudence. The figures are nearly carved in the round and do not function as the support. A foliate column supports the cassa in the center. The short sides of the sarcophagus are decorated with the Neapolitan royal arms. The long sides of the tomb chest both show the queen enthroned with her court: in one instance she holds a scepter and an orb, in the other she holds an orb and is writing in a book proffered by one of her attendants. Above these sculpted reliefs are panels bearing the long inscriptions and it is upon this surface that the effigy of the queen rests. In both the enthroned scenes and on the effigy Margherita is depicted crowned, while the clothing she wears on the effigy departs significantly from the other scenes, though Bock notes (430-432) that the clothing depicted is extremely fashionable and provides a wealth of information about contemporary clothing. Above, two angels on either side pull back curtains revealing the effigy and supporting a lid in the shape of a three-dimensional
trapezoid with a foliate spray at the top. Details throughout the monument are highlighted with polychromy.
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2. **Tomb of Paola Bianca Malatesta** died 13 June 1398 (fig. 7).

**Attribution:**
Filippo di Domenico and his workshop, based upon payments he received in 1413, 1414, and 1415 for work intended for the Malatesta (Rambaldi, 88, publishes the document found at: Archivio di Stato, Fano, Cod. Malatestiano 21, fol. 321 r. e fol. 329 v.), or the Dalle Masegne, though no definitive attribution is known (Wolters, 233).

**Date:**
1416-21?

**Location:**
The tomb was originally located and continues to stand in San Francesco, Fano. It was originally in the presbytery and was moved in 1559, then again in 1795, and then possibly again before landing in the portico in the middle of the nineteenth century (Wolters, 232).

**Material:**
White and red marble. White is used for the figures, the inscription and some of the architectural details, while red is exclusively used for the architectural framework.

**Patron:**
The precise patron is unknown, though it is presumed to be her husband, who survived her by over twenty years.

**Inscription:**
CLARA PUDICICIE DUX PAULA BIANCA POTENTIS / AGENITRICE TRAHENS URSINI SANGUINIS ORTUM / CUI PATRIM MALATESTA GENUS CELSUM QUE MARITUM / PANDULAUM AULA DEDIT FORME SPLENDORIBUS OMNES / VINCENS ATQUE VIROS UMMIS VIRTUTIBUS EQUANS / HIC CINERES LIQUIT CELEREMQUE PETITVIT OLIMPUM / OBIIT AUTEM MCCCLXXXXVIII IN FESTO SANCTI ANTONII.

Duchessa Paola Bianca, famous for her virtue, drawing her origin from a mother of the Orsini blood, to whom the house of Malatesta gave her her father’s family and her exalted husband Pandolfo, who vanquishes all others with the splendors of her beauty and is equal to men in her great virtues; She left her ashes here and she quickly sought Olympus; Moreover she died on the fest of St. Anthony, 1397. (Translation Benjamin Eldredge, Rome, 2014).

**Condition:**
The tomb is missing some of the architectural frame, which is also heavily corroded, some of the standing sculptures are especially damaged on their appendages, and the face of the effigy is damaged.
Relevant Documents:
Aside from the payment document listed above, which might not relate at all to the tomb, no relevant documents are known (Wolters, 232).

Description and Discussion:
Paola Bianca was the daughter of Paola Orsini and Pandolfo II, the lord of Pesaro. She was the widow of Sinibaldo Ordelaffi, the lord of Forlì and married Pandolfo III Malatesta, the brother of Margherita Malatesta, in 1388. Her tomb is a complex monument that has possibly been modified substantially over the years as it has been moved around the church of San Francesco (Venturi, 41). As it stands today the tomb is a grand-scale wall monument. The sarcophagus is divided in two with the lower half featuring the inscription given above, flanked by Malatesta stemmi. The top half of the sarcophagus features *imaginæ clipeatae* of Saint Catherine, Saint Anthony Abbot, Saint John the Baptist, a Franciscan saint, a saint with a cross and a Book, and a martyr saint with a vessel. Five of the saints are on the front, with the last on the short side towards the effigy’s feet (Wolters, 232).

The lid of the sarcophagus is pyramidal, with the effigy of Paola Bianca facing towards the viewer. Above the effigy and sarcophagus, an architectural framework of red marble is attached to the wall, twisting columns provide the illusion of a complete frame though they do not actually support the canopy. The canopy is composed of five lobed arches, with the central arch significantly larger. Below the arches there are seven figures supported on consuls, one under each with three under the central arch. The figures are: Archangel Gabriel, an anonymous saint, possibly Saint Bonaventure (Selvelli, 1943: 63), the Virgin, Christ on the cross, Saint John the Baptist, Saint Francis, and the Annunciate Virgin. As noted by Wolters, the varying poses and torsion of these standing figures, particularly the Archangel Gabriel and Virgin Annunciate, which are also noticeably smaller than the others, indicate that they were originally likely arranged differently (Wolters, 232).

Because of the familial relationship between Paola Bianca and Margherita Malatesta (they were cousins) and the evidence from the commission contract for Margherita’s tomb (see catalogue entry #13), scholars tend to believe that Paola Bianca’s tomb was a copy of the appearance of Margherita’s no longer extant tomb.
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3. **Tomb of Chiara Gambacorta**, died 17 April 1419 (fig. 8).

**Attribution:**
The sculptor of the slab is not known (Roberts, 94), though Zucchelli (238) suggests it might have been a local stoneworker named Giovanni Picchia Pietre. The slab is similar to a tomb slab in the Church of Santa Caterina of an unknown woman who died in 1401, Roberts argues the two monuments could have been executed from the same pattern or at least from the same workshop (Roberts, 96).

**Date:**
Likely sculpted shortly after Chiara’s death in 1419, possibly with the help of a death mask (Roberts, 94).

**Location:**
Chiara’s body was initially located inside of the nun’s choir at the foot of the high altar of San Domenico, Pisa. In the 1430s when her remains were exhumed the slab was moved to a protected niche in the north wall of the nun’s choir, left of the east altar of the inner church, where it remained until the twentieth century. (Roberts, 101). The monument can now be found in the reconstructed (after damage in World War II) convent of San Domenico.

**Material:**
Marble

**Patron:**
The monument was erected by the community of San Domenico, the monastery that Chiara had founded in 1382 (it was officially sanctioned by papal bull from Urban VI on 17 September, 1385) and for which she served as prioress from 1395 to her death in 1419.

**Inscription:**
HIC JACET DEVOTISSIMA RELIGIOSA SOROR CLARA VITA ET MIRACULIS GLORIOSA PRIORISSA, ATQUE FUNDATRIX HUIUS MONASTERII FILIA OLIM MAGNIFICI DOMINI PETRI DE GAMBACURTIS OBIIT ANNO MCCCCXX DIE XVII APRILI AETATIS AUTEM LVII ET IN MONASTERIO VIXXI ANNO XXXVII

Here lies the most devout and religious sister Clara, who because of her glorious life and miracles was prioress and founder of this monastery. Once she was the daughter of the magnificent Don Pietro di Gambacorta. She died in 1420 on April 17 in the 57th year of her life, and in the 37th year of her life in the monastery. (Translation Benjamin Eldredge, Rome, 2012)

**Condition:**
The slab tomb is in good condition with limited wear or breakage.
Relevant Documents:
A fifteenth-century *vita* of Chiara describes the location of the tomb:

“La sere medesima facendo le monache entrar drento duo homini della familglia di fuori per il facessine la fasso per sotterare detto corpo. Sogne quelli entrado usati a sotterrare del altri non ferno la detta fossa nel luogo solito, ma in chiesa a piede del grado del altare poche sopra dove alhora era posta la bara col corpo…”

Description and Discussion:
Chiara Gambacorta was born in 1362, the daughter of Pietro di Andrea Gambacorta who was the ruler of Pisa from 1369-1393. She was married at age 12 to Simon da Massa, though her devotional inclinations, including a commitment to chastity, bodily mortifications, and emphasis on charity started early. Chiara’s husband died after three years of marriage, and resisting a remarriage, she entered the convent of Santa Croce in Fossabanda in 1378 (For Chiara’s life see: Murphey, *Blessed Chiara*, passim). Chiara, with financial assistance from her father helped found a new convent at San Domenico, which opened in 1382 and received official sanction in 1385 (Roberts, 12). Chiara became prioress in 1395 and she remained in that office until her death in 1419.

Chiara’s tomb is a rectangular slab carved in relief. Her effigy, where she is depicted in her Dominican robes, holds a lily and rests within a slightly pointed, lobed arch as part of a larger architectural framework. Outside of the gabled “roof” of the arched tabernacle two angels stand in devotional poses. The inscription runs along the outside rectangular frame of the tomb in a gothic script. That form of Chiara’s tomb is typical for those of Pisan laypersons of the late *trecento* and early *quattrocento* (see: M. Paoli, “Un Aspetto Poco Noto della Scultura Trecentesca Pisana: La Lapide Sepolcrale con Ritratto,” in *Antichità Viva* 21 (1982): 38-47). Though according to Roberts, Chiara’s tomb also engages with traditions of Dominican burial as seen in Lorenzo Ghiberti’s tomb for Leonardo Dati (1427, Santa Maria Novella, Florence) and the tomb of Fra Angelico (after 1455, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome), because the tombs share similar formal characteristics in terms of their architectural frameworks and the depictions of the deceased in their Dominican habits (Roberts, 96). Initially, Chiara’s tomb was situated at the high altar of San Domenico, but it was subsequently moved.

Chiara’s body was exhumed in 1432 and at that time her slab tomb was moved into a more monumental arrangement. It was situated within a recessed and arched niche on the north wall of the nun’s choir. Under the arch a Crucifixion scene was frescoed creating a much more distinguished and monumental setting for the tomb (for this type of arrangement see: Andrew Butterfield, “Monument and Memory in Early Renaissance Florence,” in *Art, Memory and Family in Renaissance Florence* edited by Giovanni Ciapelli and Patricia Lee Rubin. Cambridge (2000): 144-145).
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4. **Tomb of Beata Villana**, died 1360 or 1361 (fig. 22).

**Attribution:**
Bernardo Rossellino was commissioned to sculpt the tomb in based on the contract (see below).

**Date:**
1451, also based on the contract.

**Location:**
The tomb is found Santa Maria Novella, Florence. It was originally located in the fourth bay on the right of the nave, though it was moved in 1569 into the sacristy while Giorgio Vasari renovated the church. In 1570 it was moved again to the fifth bay on the right of the nave and again to the Rucellai chapel in 1861. It can currently found in the second bay on the right of the nave, where it was moved in 1909 (Nygren, 331).

**Material:**
The effigy and curtain are in white marble, with an undecorated slab of red marble below. Traces of gilding can be seen on the curtain and angels.

**Patron:**
Fra Sebastiano di Iacopo di Rosso Benintendi, the Beata’s grandson and Villana delle Botte, her niece patronized the tomb. Fra Sebastiano is credited with commissioning the project, while Villana was responsible for funding it (King, 18). Circa 1440 Villana commissioned a reliquary or an altarpiece from Ghiberti and Fra Angelico to honor her blessed aunt and then posthumously funded the construction of the *beata’s* effigial tomb monument by making Fra Sebastiano her heir (King, 221).

**Inscription:**
OSSA VILLANE MULIERIS SANCTISSIME / IN HOC CELEBRI TUMULO REQUIESCINT

The bones of the most saintly woman Villana rest in this celebrated tomb (translation mine).

**Condition:**
The wall monument with effigy is in good condition, though the feet of the effigy are slightly damaged, as is the white marble slab, and the left foot of the left angel.

**Relevant Documents:**
Contract for the tomb:
Archivio di Stato, Florence, Conv. Soppr. 102 (S. Maria Novella di Firenze), 101, foll. 196r-v (Published in Schulz, 163-164):
“Sia manifesto anch'io vedra la presente scritta chome egle certa chosa che bernardo dimatteo lastra uolo del pplo di santo ambrogio. dasettignano, a tolto affare dame frate bastiano di Jacopo sindacho e procurato del convent di Santa maria novella, una sepoltura di marmo la quale ae astare nel muro sotto il crocifisso che e disopra al corpo della beata Villana in questo modo cioè chella detta sepoltura comince in terra uno fregio dimarmo Nero alto uno terzo Lungho braccia tre e sette ottavj. disopra aquesto una basa dimarmo bianco Lungha braccia tre e mezzo. crosa uno sesto scorniciata pulita. disopra una tavola dimarmo rosso. Lungha braccia tre e uno quarto. alto uno braccio a uno terzo recinta Ladetta tavola duna corniciuzz morta dolce e bem pulita. E di sopra Ladetta tavola una cornice di marmo bianco, scorniciata bene conintagli bj bell crociforme uno sesto. 

larcha uno terzo tutte le dette chose faccio una testa dichassa di sepoltura concornice di sotto e di sopra alta in tutto col fregio nero braccia due. E poj disopra alla detta chassa. Uno padiglione di marmo bianco di larchezza il difuorj di braccia quatro iscarso. alto dalla chassa in su braccia due e mezzo colla testa delliene sotto il detto padiglione la figura della beata Villana achiacere intagliata di mezzo rilievo. di lunghezza di braccia tre come sta quella che ve dipocho rilievo. E questo ae aessere dimezzo rilievo. Dipoj sotto el detto padiglione ae aessere due angnoli dimezzo rilievo. iqualj anno atenere colluna mano il panno del padiglione e collaftra una carta cioè uno epitafio conquelle lettere che lo gli dirò intagliate e messed j nero aolio. El detto drappo cioè il panno del padiglione vadj giu insino apresso alla basa della chassa. Eldetto drappo sia frangiato intorno isbrizzato doro. E poi dentro nel campe del padiglione di drieo brocchato doro edaltrr coloore Nero e brocchato di fuorj variato da quello di dentro. E tutto il detto lavorio ritornj alto con ignj suo lavoro braccia quattro emezzo. elargho come edetteo disopra

Ancora il detto bernardo abbia ataglare e smurare. e murare. e amandare via i calcinaccj. e affare tutto il detto Lavorio netto aognj sua spesa doro e dogna altra cosa. ex cetto che Io abbia solo affare alzare il crocifisso quello equanto sama dj bisogno amia spesa. tanto chel detto Lavorio cisipossa porre sotto. E per le dette chose Io frate bastiano di Jacopo sopradetto dilicentia del mio pio priore debo dare al detto bernardo lire seicento cinquanta di detto lavorio. El detto bernardo promette sotto la pena di fiorini venti e mezzo 

E Io frate bastiano globricho come sindacho e procuratore I fructj del podere di marignolache in chaso che Io nol pachasse abbia dipotere riccor quivj. Alla quale scritta si soscriverra il detto bernardo essere contento alle dette cose disua propria mano aquesta scritta laquale Io frate bastaino o fatta di sua volotna questo dj 12 luglio 1451. E ancora frate Guido dimichele al presente priore del convent di santa maria novella dammj licentia e dessere contento alle dette cose. E o uno disgeno di sua mano come astare ildetto Lavorio il quale disegno o Io frate bastiano detto’ attenere apresso ame

Io bernardo dimateio sopra detto sono contento quanto di sopra si conteine e per chiaezza di cio mi sono soscritto di mia propria mano questo 12 di luglio 1451

Io frate guido dimichele priore al presente di scia ma novella do licentia aldetto frate bastiano che faccifare eldetto lavorio e obligarsi alla detta spesa e per chiaezza dicio misono soscrallo alla detta scripta dimia propria mano questo dj xij di luglio 1451

Ancora siamo rimasj dacordo difare una giunta adetto lavorio in questo modo cioe due stipitj di marmo bianchon uno archo su amezzo tondo e scorniciato amodo darchitrape lavorato dolce glistipitj altj braccia due e mezzo larcho dirichogljo braccia due. larcho il vano dellarcho braccia quattro. larghj gil stipitj in faccia mezzo braccio.
crossj uno quarto ditutto detta agiunta dognj spesa che vi va fornito fine apieno aperfectione come detto e nellaltro e messo di colore azurro il campo. gli debo dare lire cento. e chosj siamo rimaso dacord e che alzare il tabernacholo del crocifisso sia a spesa del detto bernardo eper chiarezza dicio il detto bernardo sisocriverra di sua mano essere contenu alla detta agiunta questo dj 27 di genaio 1451 E debbe avere fatto detto lavorio per di qui a pasqua di resurrssio proxima che viene
eaperfectione come detto e nellaltro e me messo di colore azurro il campo. gli debbo dare lire cento. e chosj siamo rimaso dacord e che alzare il tabernacholo del crocifisso sia a spesa del detto bernardo eper chiarezza dicio il detto bernardo sisocriverra di sua mano essere contenu alla detta agiunta questo dj 27 di genaio 1451 E debbe avere fatto detto lavorio per di qui a pasqua di resurrssio proxima che viene

E se Io frate bastiano volessj riducere in minore quantita il tabernacolo dj detto crocifisso Io labbia affare amie spese e ridotto che fusse in minore qualita. Eglij labbia affare appichare nel muro in quel modo chegli parra che stia bene a sue spese echiachato a sua spesa. Solo toccha ame frate bastiano apachare laspesa di ridurlo aminore qualita se mi parra. ognaltra spesa dognj minima chosa toccha al detto bernardo e compagnj.

Io bernardo dimatteieo sono chontento quanto di sopra si chonteiene acetto chel crocifisso nonsono tenuto apaghare neferro nepiombo nedipintura nemaiestro dilegname ma ongnj altra chosa alle mie spese E piu debo fare una chormignia di marmo inagliata nel modo del padiglone mavadano amie spese ogj questo dj 27 di genaio 1451 annullando ongnj pena sopra scritta e salvo giusto impedimento.”

Description and Discussion:
Beata Villana was the daughter of a Florentine merchant; prior to becoming a Dominican Tertiary she married and had a son. She died in 1361. The current monument was not her first tomb; her original monument was a slab with an effigy (Schulz, 59). But as devotion to the Beata increased, her family commissioned subsequent and increasingly grandiose memorial markers to honor her. On 27 November 1441 Francesco di Piero di Stefano Benintendi charged Villana’s grandson Fra Sebastiano di Jacopo Benintendi, an official in the convent of Santa Maria Novella, with the construction of an altar at her tomb (Orlandi, 41). A few years later on 2 May 1444, the Beata’s niece Villana delle Botte donated her home in her will to the Società di S. Croce del Tempio in order to finance the celebration of Villana’s feast (Orlandi, 42). The next year Fra Sebastiano commissioned Lorenzo Ghiberti to create a silver reliquary for Villana’s relics (Orlandi, 42). This tendency towards aggrandizing Villana’s memory led to her tomb commissioned on July 12, 1451 by Fra Sebastiano (Orlandi, 43-44), through the funds of the Beata’s niece Villana delle Botte (King, 221). Bernardo Rossellino was charged with creating this tomb (Orlandi, 43-44).

The new tomb was located in roughly the same location as the original and was potentially intended to be the focal point of the altar commissioned a decade previously (Nygren, 332). Nygren suggests the tomb was influenced by Donatello and Michelozzo’s Coscia tomb in the Florentine Baptistry. The tomb as it stands today is nearly identical to that described in the scritta related to the commission, which is reproduced above, though the dimensions do not exactly correspond (Schultz, 109n.). The tomb is a wall monument with an effigy in relief below sculpted curtains. Two standing angels flanking the effigy support the curtain; they also hold the banderole featuring the inscription. The effigy wears a Dominican habit emphasizing the Beata’s spirituality, though Villana never took vows and was not a tertiary at the time of her death (Nygren, 332). The effigy crosses her hands upon her chest and holds nothing in them. Above the banderole with
the inscription there is a low-relief depiction of the hands of God holding a crown. Below the sculpted effigy and bier is an undecorated red marble slab.
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5. **Tomb of Saint Justine**, died in 304 (fig. 13).

**Attribution:**
The literature is divided over the attribution of the tomb. Agostino di Duccio (Fiocco, 467; Maclagan and Longhurst, 38; and Ruggeri Augusti, 56), Bertoldo di Giovanni (Venturi, vol. 6, 501; Tonzig, 276), and Gregorio di Allegrretto (Pope-Hennessy, 332; Ivanoff, 190) have been suggested as authors of the monument. In the literature from the Victoria & Albert Museum, the tomb’s current home, the tomb is tentatively attributed to Gregorio di Allegrretto.

**Date:**
The tomb dates from circa 1450-76. The earlier date originates from Ruggeri Augusti’s suggestion that the Saint Justine monument compares to the 1456 tomb of Giovanni di Antonio Gattamelata at Sant’Antonio, Padua (Ruggeri Augusti, 60); the later date of 1476 comes from a document from 14 January of that year published in Tonzig (262, see below), that might indicate the officials of Santa Giustina commissioned a new tomb for the saint.

**Location:**
The tomb was originally found in the church of Santa Giustina, Padua; it is currently located in the Victoria & Albert Museum, London.

**Material:**
Marble

**Patron:**
The officials of Santa Giustina were the likely commissioners of the tomb based on a document from 14 January 1476 (see below).

**Inscription:**
There is no extant inscription on the sarcophagus.

**Condition:**
The tomb is in nearly ruinous condition, though the relief on the front survives nearly entirely intact. When it was initially bought in Venice (prior to being removed to the V&A, London) the sculpture was being used as a water trough with two holes on the sides for water drainage. No other sculpture is linked to the saint’s tomb and there is no documentary evidence suggesting that other sculpture connected to the saint’s monument existed.

**Relevant Documents:**
A document from 14 January 1476, published by Tonzig (262), might refer to the commissioning of this tomb. In the document the officials of Santa Giustina ask to remove the saint’s body from the crypt and place it in a new arca to be constructed and
placed under the high altar (Nygren, 271). However, there is no evidence the body was ever moved (Tonzig, 262).

**Description and Discussion:**
Saint Justine was a fourth-century martyr who died on the Ponte Corvo in Padua in 304 when she refused to marry the pagan Roman Emperor Maximus. Though there is no definitive evidence or documentation, the identification of this monument as the fifteenth-century tomb of Saint Justine is widely accepted in the literature (Nygren, 271). The extant monument consists of a sarcophagus with an effigy of the deceased in relief carved on the front. The figure is lying on a bier and draped in cloth, with a halo surrounding her head. The effigial relief recedes shallowly into space, creating the not entirely convincing appearance of a three-dimensional effigy. On the sides of the sarcophagus are reliefs depicting angels with censers indicating that the sides were visible and that the monument was free-standing on at least three of its sides. The back is not carved, suggesting the sarcophagus was mounted into a more complex structure or placed against the wall.

If this was the sculpture commissioned in 1476, it was never used as a resting place for the body of the saint and as noted by Nygren, it is unclear what the function of this object might have been, though it might have served as the front of an altar table (Tonzig, 262-265 and Nygren, 271). Zampieri suggests that the monument was originally a Roman tomb that had been recarved (Zampieri, 153).

**Bibliography:**
6. **Tomb of Saint Monica**, died in 387 (fig. 23).

**Attribution:**
Isaia di Pisa is credited with the construction of the altar dedicated to Monica; he had also been involved with the tomb of Saint Catherine of Siena and the reliquary chapel of Sant’Andrea in St. Peter’s (Gill 1999, 556). Humanist Porellio Pandone lists the tomb as among Isaia di Pisa’s sculptures in the *carme* “Ad immortalietatem Isaiae pisani marorum celatoris” (Nygren, 396).

**Date:**
The monument dates from circa 1455. The tomb is dated based upon the beginning of Pope Callixtus III’s papacy; he reigned from April 1455-August 1458 (Montevecchi, 116-117). The tomb had previously been dated to c. 1450-63 (Berger, 12).

**Location:**
Following their discovery in Ostia and transfer to Rome, Saint Monica’s relics were initially located at San Trifone, then later moved to their current location in Sant’Agostino, Rome. The tomb was originally situated in a chapel to the right of the crossing, but through the renovations of the church commissioned by Cardinal d’Estoutteville in 1479-83 the church was built up around the existing chapel and the tomb came to be located to the left of the apse (Gill 1999: 554).

**Patron:**
The patron of the tomb is unclear, though there are a few recorded persons active in the translation of Monica’s relics and the construction of markers in Monica’s honor. A woman named Giovanna (her last name is not recorded, though she might have been an Augustinian tertiary (Gill 1999, 550) and the humanist Maffeo Vegio initiated the effort in 1429 to bring Monica’s relics to Rome. Maria de Cinciis also patronized Monica’s relics, and in 1455 Vegio had a marble altar constructed in Monica’s honor in Sant’Agostino (Gill 1999: 550, 555). At that point an inscription noted Vegio’s involvement with Saint Monica’s monument reading: “Matteo Veggio … Fondatore della Cappela di S. Monaca” (Archivio di Stato, Rome Agostiniani in Sant’Agostino, 22 [1658], fol. 89R, published in Gill 1999, 561-61).

**Inscription:**
No original inscription survives. The current inscription on the sarcophagus likely dates from modifications made in 1566 (Nygren, 396).

**Condition:**
The tomb was modified in 1566 and again in 1760 when the church was renovated and many tombs were moved and changed. Only the effigy survives from the fifteenth century; the rest of the monument is composed of pieces from other tombs (Nygren, 396).

**Relevant Documents:**
Papal Bull form Marin V dated April 27: the reburial of Monica’s relics on April 9 at the convent of Sant’Agostino:
Archivio di Stato Roma, Agostiniani in Sant’Agostino 34, fol 81R. (Published in Gill, 1999, 560):

Bulla concessionis licentie translationis corpus Sancte Monice de Civitate Ostiensi domum fratrum ordinis heremitarum sancti Augustini de Urbe et reconditionis et sepellitionis eiusdem corporis in eandem Ecclesiam et confirmationis et notificationis eiusdem translationis et repositionis … Martini V pontificates eiusdem anno XIII.

**Description and Discussion:**
Saint Monica was the mother of Augustine and lived from 331 until 387. Her body was found in Ostia in 1430 and was transferred to Rome and buried in Sant’Agostino following a papal bull issued by Pope Martin V on April 27, 1430 (Gill 1999: 550). Veneration of Monica became increasingly popular throughout the fifteenth century and Pope Eugene VI recognized a confraternity dedicated to her in 1440 (Gill 1999: 549).

Only the effigy remains of the fifteenth-century monument. In it Monica is depicted lying on a thin bier and pillow, heavily draped in the garments typical of an older, holy woman. The recumbent effigy is currently atop a sarcophagus as part of an arched wall tomb, but the original arrangement of the monument is unknown.

Though its original appearance is impossible to reconstruct, Monica’s tomb was a locus of devotion particularly for Roman women starting with the transfer of her relics in the mid-fifteenth century and continuing into the sixteenth; there was a particular interest for women to locate their tombs and cenotaphs near the saint’s (the common practice of burial *ad sanctos*) including monuments built in 1501, 1505, 1527, 1546, 1585, and 1590 (Gill 1999, 555). Notably Sant’Agostino was the location of another monumental woman’s tomb even in the fifteenth century, that of Costanza Ammannati (cat. #10), which was possibly originally located adjacent to Saint Monica’s monument (Gill 1999, 557).

**Bibliography:**
7. **Tomb of Barbara Manfredi**, died 7 October 1466 (fig. 15).

**Attribution:**
Francesco di Simone Ferrucci was first given credit for the sculpture in 1892 by Venturi (337), though there are no documents that specifically link the sculpture to that artist (Ferretti and Prati, 13).

**Date:**
The tomb dates from 1466-68, immediately after Barbara’s death. Schrader is alone in his assertion that because of the “high quality” of the monument and its relation to the Oliva tombs in Montefiorentino (see cat. #17), it must date from a later period in Ferrucci’s career (Schrader, 191).

**Location:**
The tomb was originally located in the Gaddi Chapel, dedicated to Saint Bernardino in the church of San Biagio in Forlì. San Biagio was destroyed by bombing in 1944 during World War II, at which point the monument was presumed lost (Schrader, 191. See: John Lafarge, *Lost Treasures of Europe*. New York (1946): 24.) However the fragments of the tomb were collected and reassembled in 1947 in San Mecuriale, Forlì, where it stands today. For more on the reconstruction see below.

**Material:**
Marble and Istrian stone. Some of the marble used in the reconstruction comes from other monuments (Zurli and Emiliani, 213-16)

**Patron:**
Barbara’s husband Pino III Odelaffi, based upon the inscription. Pino might have caused her death through poisoning.

**Inscription:**

And at the very bottom edge of the inscription:
B.M.

For Barbara Astorgi Manfredi from Forli,
His very sweet wife, Pino Ordelao
On behalf of her virtuous merits
Ordered that this be placed
She lived for 22 years, 6 months and 4 days,
and died in the year 1466. (Translation Benjamin Eldredge, Rome, 2013)
Well Merited

**Condition:**
Barbara Manfredi’s tomb has sustained significant damage. The monument was sawn in half by French troops in the early nineteenth century (Gori, 23). It was also nearly destroyed by bombing in World War II. Pietro Reggiani was responsible for the reconstruction of the tomb; reconstruction efforts began in 1947. Fragments of the tomb of Pino Ordelaffi were used in the reconstruction (Schrader, 192, Bazzoli and Selli, 80, and Gori, 13ff). In 1984-86 the monument was disassembled and restored again, following water damage to the church (Zurli and Emiliani, 213-126). The move and reconstructions of the monument have lead to visible seams and stains from water damage.

**Relevant Documents:**
There are no extant document known that are connected to the monument. See Schrader, 90-127 for all published documents connected to the artist, Francesco di Simone Ferrucci.

**Description and Discussion:**
Barbara Manfredi was the daughter of Astorre II Manfredi, the seigneur of Faenza. She was engaged at the age of seven to Pino III Ordelaffi, a *condottiero* and the disputed lord of Forlì, and they married in 1462. Barbara was the first of three wives for Pino, the second was Zaffira Manfredi and the third Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola, who is discussed elsewhere in this dissertation (see cat. #28). Pino might have been the cause of Barbara’s death; he was accused of poisoning her, though there is no documentary evidence as to why she died at a young age (Gori, 13). The commissioning of Barbara’s elaborate tomb has been interpreted as evidence of Pino’s guilty conscience.

The tomb is in the traditional “humanist” form, with a sarcophagus and effigy placed within a round-headed arch. The sarcophagus sits on a foliate base and the supporting pilasters feature foliate decoration. The effigy rests on a bier atop a simple rectangular tomb chest that features putti displaying a cartouche with the inscription. Above the sarcophagus three panels imitate draperies. The background draperies and Barbara’s clothing and the shroud on her bier are elaborately carved with foliate designs. Above the draperies an ornately carved entablature separates the lower section of the tomb from the lunette. In the lunette a half-length Virgin and Child are depicted in a roundel, with flanking putti heads.

**Bibliography:**
8. **Tomb of Saint Catherine of Siena**, died 29 April 1380 (fig. 24).

**Attribution:**
The attribution of the effigy is unknown. While often credited to Isaia da Pisa, Bianchi (Bianchi, 25) and the authors of the study published by the Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (102) reject this attribution. Bianchi instead suggests that it was created by one of the many stone carvers (“scapellatori” or “marmorari” active in Rome during the middle of the century (Bianchi, 29), further attributing it to the workshop of Paolo di Mariano (Bianchi, 34). Nygren (395) does not posit an attribution.

**Date:**
1430 for the effigy; 1466 for the sarcophagus.

**Location:**
The tomb has occupied a few different locations in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome, where it is currently found at the high altar of the church. It was originally located first on the wall and later under the altar in the Chapel of the Madonna of the SS. Rosario to the right of the high altar (Norman, 414). The tomb was moved to the high altar in 1855 (Norman, 411).

**Material:**
Marble with gilding.

**Patron:**
The tomb itself might have been commissioned by Antonio Pierozzi, the Prior of Santa Maria sopra Minerva in the 1430s, who later became Saint Antonino of Florence (Norman, 412 and Bianchi, 23). After her canonization, Cardinal Angelo Capranica renovated Saint Catherine’s chapel, including a renovation or the construction of a new tomb for the saint (Bianchi, 34 and Nygren, 395).

**Inscription:**
On the plaque on the side of the sarcophagus:
SANCTA CATERINA VIRGO DE SENIS ORDINIS SANCTI DOMINICE PENITENTIA

Saint Catherine Virgin of Siena of the Saintly Order of Dominican Penitents (Translation mine)

On the pillow under the head of the effigy:
BEATA KATERINA

Blessed Catherine

**Condition:**
Only a few pieces remain from the various fifteenth-century tomb-building campaigns. While the remaining effigy is in good condition, the current tomb is composed of pieces from multiple different commissions and renovations beginning in the trecento and reoccurring in the quattrocento. More recently, the tomb was renovated and restored in 1999-2000 (Norman, 411).

Relevant Documents:
Saint Antoninus’ Summa Historialis (XXII, XIV, 19) discusses the translation of St. Catherine’s body in 1430:

“ad locum eminatiorem in capella iuxta maiorem capellam”

Description and Discussion:
Saint Catherine of Siena was born in March 1347. She was one of the most widely known and influential female saints from the late medieval period and early Renaissance in Italy, and was canonized by Pope Pius II on 29 June 1461. She is the only major saint interred in Santa Maria sopra Minerva. The tomb of Saint Catherine had undergone at least three renovations and transformations since the end of the trecento, but her chapel and tomb received attention in the 1460s when it was remodeled by Cardinal Angelo Capranica. (Nygren, 395) The current state of the tomb is fragmentary, but what does remain is an effigy, likely from a renovation of her tomb that took place in 1430 and a sarcophagus with vegetal imagery including an inscription plaque held by two angels. The effigy depicts the saint as young, wearing the habit of a Dominican tertiary, with her hands crossed at her lower abdomen.

The renovation of her tomb in the 1430s likely stemmed from the greater efforts of Pope Martin V to reestablish and reinvigorate Roman churches following the papacy’s extended absences from the city (Bianchi, 24). Though the original appearance of the tomb is unknown, the carving of the effigy suggests that it was meant only to be seen from one side, suggesting it was potentially a wall tomb, or a free-standing monument next to a wall (Bianchi, 30 and Nygren, 394). The bottom of the feet and the pillow at the head of the effigy have been left rough and unfinished, also suggesting that the effigy was fitted into a niche or a superstructure of some sort. Bianchi (34) has hypothesized that while the effigy dates from the 1430 renovations, the sarcophagus dates from the later 1460s campaign, both because of its stylistic appearance and also because Catherine is referred to as “Sancta” in the inscription, which would make sense as she was canonized in 1461. The “Sancta” on the inscription plaque differs from the “Beata” before her name inscribed on the effigy’s pillow, again suggesting the different dates of creation for the two parts of the tomb.

Bibliography:
9. **Tomb of Medea Colleoni**, died 6 March 1470 (fig. 16).

**Attribution:**
Giovanni Antonio Amadeo was already working for Bartolommeo Colleoni at the time of Medea’s death. Her tomb is an entirely autograph monument by the sculptor (Shell, 55). Along the base of the sarcophagus is Amadeo’s signature: IOVANES ANONIUS DE AMADEIS FECIT HOC OPUS (Giovanni Antonio de Amadeo made this work).

**Date:**
1467-73

**Location:**
The tomb was originally located in Santa Maria della Basella, Urgnano, though it is currently found in the Colleoni Chapel, Bergamo. The tomb was moved in 1842 (Shell, 58 fn. 1). The process of relocating the tomb began in 1784, due to shifting ownership of the monastery of Santa Maria della Basella, though it was not until 1841 when serious negotiations arose and it was settled to sell the tomb. On 5 February 1842 it was moved and Medea’s remains reburied in Bergamo on the 17 February 1842 (Bernstein, 25, 27). At this point the floor of the chapel was marked: “Corpus Medeae hic jacet” (Here lies the body of Medea) (Bernstein, 27).

**Material:**
Carrara Marble

**Patron:**
The tomb was commissioned by Medea’s father, Bartolommeo Colleoni.

**Inscription:**
Above the effigy:

HIC IACET MEDEA VIRGO FILIA QUODA ILLUSTRIS ET / EX D BARTHOLOMEI COLIONI DE GAVIA SER DVD / VENETIAR CAPIT GNALIS 1470 6 MARCI

Here lies Medea, the virgin daughter of the illustrious Duke Bartholomeo Colleoni, Duke of Gavi, Captain General of the Venetians, 6 March 1470 (Translation Benjamin Eldredge, Rome, 2012)

Between the brackets, this inscription dates from 1842 and indicates that the tomb was moved in that year.

INSIGNE HOC MONUMENTUM E TEMPLO S. MARIAE DE BASELLA HUC TRANSLATUM NON. FEBR. AN. MDCCXLII

This eminent monument was translated here from the church of Santa Maria di Basella on the fifth of February 1742. (Translation Benjamin Eldredge, Rome, 2012)
**Condition:**
The tomb is in good condition. It suffered little damage when it was moved in 1842 and the entire chapel underwent restorations in the 1980s (for the restorations see Breschiani).

**Relevant Documents:**
A letter from Marco of Marliano to Galeazzo Maria Sforza, Duke of Milan, on March 7, 1470 informs the Duke of Medea’s death (Published in Kohl, 38):

ASM, Archivio Sforzesco, Carteggio interno 897:
“Ceterum sono advisato che Bartolomeo da Pergamo se levato da Malpaga et e andato ad Romano molto gramo et dolente, perche una sua filiola chiamata la Medea, ala quale vole tuto il suo bene, sta in caso di morte.”

A reference to the tomb is made by Antonio Cornazzono in a biography of Colleoni published in 1472 (Shell, 58 fn. 2):

“Basellam enim prope Serium flumen condidit maximo ejus dolore, & lachrymis decoratam. Nam Medeam filiam virginem a eo unice diectam, quam sexagenarius ex Amica sustulerat immature morte praereptam ibi in pario marmore reposuit.”

**Description and Discussion:**
Medea Colleoni was the daughter of the renowned *condottiero* Bartolommeo Colleoni. She died at age 14 from a fever (Kohl 2004, 38). She was buried in the church of Santa Maria della Basella in Urgnano, a church founded by Bartolommeo in 1462 (Kohl 2004, 38). At the time of her death her father had been working towards marrying her to Duke Galeazzo Maria Sforza of Milan (Knox, 297).

The tomb is an independent wall monument framed by richly decorated pilasters. At the top of the frame are curtains and a Colleoni coat of arms. The sarcophagus rests on cherub heads and the front of the tomb chest is divided into three sections: in the center is a Man of Sorrows, the two flanking sides display Colleoni coats of arms. Medea is depicted in effigy directly atop the flat lid of the sarcophagus. She is shown as a young girl, befitting her young age at the time her death. Above the figure of the deceased is the inscription panel with the inscription listed above. Also above the inscription plaque are reliefs of the seated Madonna and Child, with kneeling Saints Catherine and Clara to the left and right. Behind the reliefs in the background of the niche are alternating black and white lozenges creating a checkerboard pattern. Medea’s sudden death and her tomb have been posited as the motivations for Bartolommeo to begin considering his own memorialization and might have been the impetuses for the commissioning of the Colleoni Chapel, the second location of Medea’s tomb (Piel, 22, 31). However, Shell argues that Bartolommeo had already decided to commission his monument by 1469 and already had Amadeo in his employ, shifting the artist to the now “necessary” second monument for Medea (Shell, 55).

**Bibliography:**
The literature on Medea Colleoni’s tomb comprises only a tiny part of the broad and vast literature on the Colleoni Chapel. These selected sources are limited to those with more of an emphasis on Medea’s tomb:
10. Tomb of Costanza Ammannati, died in 1477 (fig. 30).

**Attribution:**
The tomb has been attributed to most of the sculptors working in Rome in the late *quattrocento* including Andrea Bregno (Davies, 194) or a follower of Luigi Capponi (Riccoboni, 34). In general, the attribution of Costanza’s tomb is linked to the artist for the tomb of her son, Cardinal Jacopo Ammannati, which Zuraw concludes was sculpted by Mino da Fiesole (Zuraw, 1026). Zuraw also concludes that Costanza’s tomb was designed by Mino da Fiesole, with the carving completed by Mino’s workshop. The tabernacle in the center of Costanza’s tomb is by a sculptor in the workshop of Isaia da Pisa (Zuraw, 1027).

**Date:**
The effigy and the architecture of the tomb date from after 1477, and more likely after 1479, and the death of Cardinal Jacopo Ammannati. The sacrament tabernacle at the center of the tomb is datable to the 1450s and 1460s based on its stylistic correspondence to other works (Zuraw, 1032).

**Location:**
Costanza’s tomb was originally located in Sant’Agostino near that of her son, Cardinal Jacopo Ammannati, though it has been moved multiple times and the two tombs have not always been together. The tombs were likely originally located on the transept walls flanking the apse at the crossing: Costanza’s probably to the left of the chapel of Saint Monica with the Cardinal’s to the right next to the Chapel of Saint Nicola da Tolentino (Gill 1999, 557). It is unclear when they were moved, but they are currently in the courtyard of the Palazzo dell’Avvocatura Generale dello Stato, the ex-cloister of Sant’Agostino, Rome (Zuraw, 1029).

**Material:**
Marble, with traces of gilding.

**Patron:**
Costanza’s son, Cardinal Jacopo Ammannati, is ostensibly the patron, as recorded by the inscription on her tomb, though as Zuraw notes it cannot be concluded that Jacopo actually intended at any point to commission a tomb for his mother (Zuraw, 1029). Following Jacopo’s death, two years after that of his mother, Pope Sixtus IV gained control of the cardinal’s accounts and managed the erection of both Jacopo’s and his mother’s tombs (Zuraw, 1029). In the process, Sixtus rejected Jacopo’s desire to be buried in Saint Peter’s in favor of the newly constructed church of Sant’Agostino, which Cardinal d’Estouteville was actively renovating between 1479 and 1483 (Zuraw, 1029). If Pope Sixtus IV was the primary mover behind the construction of both the cardinal’s and his mother’s tombs, it indicates that women’s tombs were not exceptional.

**Inscription:**
When Sixtus IV was pope my mother Costantia was alive in God but dead for me. Those I have laid down I erect. I am witness that the monuments that were the last ones for you were your son Pavia’s position. Both when you were dead and alive I gave you as much as I could. 1477 (Translation Zuraw, 1028) See Massimo Miglio, *Un Pontificato ed una citta*; 415ff for an analysis of these inscriptions. 

**Condition:**

Because of the number of times the tomb has been dismantled, moved, and re-erected, the marble is broken in many locations. The upper cornice is broken into six pieces, and the tabernacle another six (Zuraw, 1033). 

**Relevant Documents:**

Letter written by Cardinal Ammannati upon the death of his mother to G. Lolli

*Epistolae et Commentarii Iacobi Picolomini Cardinalis Papiensis*, Rome, 1506 2nd ed.

Iacopus Philippus Mayna 327-28, Lettera 674, page 897 (Published in Zuraw: 1028)::


Viva Deo defuncta mihi Constantia mater.”

Cardinal Ammannati’s will (*Testamento Iacobi Picolomini Cardinalis Papiensis ad memoriam humanea imbecillitatis et funebrium impesarit contemptum, pie et prudenter lectores instituens, n.d.*, fols 184-187: fol. 185. See Zuraw, 1028) briefly mentions his mother but does not refer to tombs for either of them.

Costanza Ammannati’s death is described in S. Pauli, *Disquisizione istorica della patria, e compendio della Vita di Giacomo Ammannati Picolomini, Cardinale di S. Chiesa, detto il Papiense, vescovo di Lucca e di Pavia*, Lucca, 1712: 88-91. Paul transcribes an epitaph from 1477, which was written in a letter by Cardinal Ammannati to Gregorio Lolli, though this epitaph is not precisely what is found on the extant tomb:

Viva Deo, defuncta mihi Constantia Mater

Quos potui hic elegos, qua monumenta tibi.

Ultima sunt Fili Papiensis, munera testor

Deunctae, et viva quod potui id tribui.
Description and Discussion:
Little is known about the life of Costanza Ammannati, aside from the date of her death based upon a letter written by her son (see above). Based upon how she is depicted in her effigy, in the clothing of a nun or pinzochere, a “semi-religious” order in Rome (see: J. Penning, “Semi-Religious Women in Fifteenth-Century Rome” Mededelignen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome, XLVII, N.S. 12, 1987: 115-46 and K. Gill, “Open Monasteries for Women in Late Medieval and Early Modern Italy: Two Roman Examples,” The Crannied Wall: Women and Religion in Early Modern Europe, edited by C. Monson, Ann Arbor (1992): passim), it can be assumed she was active within a religious community, though more specifics are not known. Costanza died two years before her son, and it seems that he initially intended a much more modest memorial for his mother and himself (Zuraw, 1029).

Costanza’s tomb is highly unusual among extant tombs for either men or women in the fifteenth century because it includes in the center a sacrament tabernacle, which Costanza might have commissioned herself (Zuraw, 1031). The general appearance of the tomb is similar to that of her son’s and very reminiscent of that of the nearly contemporaneous tomb of Maddalena Orsini (cat. #11). A profile relief effigy on a bier is located above a decorated base and an inscription plaque. All of this is framed within a foliate rectangle. Above is a superstructure that takes on the appearance of a temple-front or a pedimented three-arch triumphal arch. In the center archway resides the sacrament tabernacle. Above the tabernacle there is a relief of the transfigured Christ. By combining a sacrament tabernacle and a tomb Costanza’s monument linked liturgy and memory indicating memorial strategies specific to the Roman curia (Ladegast, 67-88). In the two flanking archways are two saints, identified as Augustine and Monica, which can also be interpreted as evoking the maternal bond between Costanza and Jacopo (Gill 1999, 557).

The triple-arched temple front appearance of Costanza’s tomb is the first appearance of this form in Rome, though it became a prevalent form later in monuments by Andrea Bregno and Sansovino (Zuraw, 1037). As such it is a significant example of precocious experimentation on a woman’s tomb that was influential in later tomb design.

Bibliography:
11. **Tomb of Maddalena Orsini**, died before 1480 (fig. 31).

**Attribution:**
The monument is frequently attributed to Mino da Fiesole and his workshop. This is because the effigy is strikingly similar to that of Costanza Ammanati (cat. #10). Zuraw suggests that the carving of the two effigies is so similar that a single artist “must” be responsible for both and that the same artist can also be credited for the Saint Cecilia and Saint Nicholas sculptures on the tomb of Cardinal Forteguerri (Zuraw, 1038). For Zuraw, this man was an assistant in Mino da Fiesole’s Roman workshop working from 1474 until 1480, by which point Mino had already departed from Rome (Zuraw, 1038).

**Date:**
After 1480 (Zuraw, 1038)

**Location:**
In the refectory of San Salvatore in Lauro.

**Patron:**
Rinaldo Orsini di Monterotondo, the archbishop of Florence and Maddalena’s son, based upon the inscription on the tomb.

**Inscriptions:**
Below effigy:
MAGDALENA VRSINA / PVDICITIAE EXEMPLVM

Maddalena Orsini Example of Modesty (translation mine)

In the frieze at the top:
RANALIVS VRSIN ARCHIEPVVS FLORENT PARDII B M PIENTISS P

Rinaldo Orsini, Archbishop of Rome, erected [this monument] for the well deserving and most pious (Translation Benjamin Eldredge, Rome, 2013)

**Condition:**
The tomb is noticeably damaged and has suffered considerable losses (Zuraw, 1038).

**Relevant Documents:**
No known documents are linked to this tomb.

**Description and Discussion:**
Maddalena Orsini’s precise identity is difficult to ascertain; however, it seems likely that she was the mother of Clarice Orsini, the wife of Lorenzo de’Medici. Clarice’s mother was named Maddalena, and she had a brother named Rinaldo. Maddalena’s tomb was commissioned by Rinaldo Orsini, who was the archbishop of Florence and a cousin to Lorenzo de’Medici (For more on mentions of Clarice’s mother in Medici correspondence
see: Janet Ross, *Lives of the Early Medici as told in their Correspondence*, 108, 124, 127; Natalie R. Tomas, *The Medici Women Gender and Power in Renaissance Florence*, 60; Yvonne Maguire, *The Women of the Medici*, London (1927): 153). However, none of the tomb sources assert this familial relationship, and a more precise identification is still elusive. Maddalena Orsini was definitively related to Maria Cenci Orsini, who was one of the founding members of the confraternity at Sant’Agostino in honor of Saint Monica. Gill suggests that these religious connections “permitted” commemoration for these women (Gill 2005, 73).

Maddalena’s wall-tomb takes the form of a temple-front with her relief effigy resting in a rectangular frame surmounted by the architectural frame. The design is noticeably similar to the tomb of Costanza Ammannati (cat. #10). The effigy of Maddalena Orsini is dressed in the garb of a pious lay-sister with the inscription: MAGDALENA URSINA . PVDICITIAE EXEMPLVM on her bier. Above the effigy a temple front composed of fluted pilasters delineates three spaces: a central area with a Madonna (and lost Child figure), which is flanked by two semi-circular niches with sculptures of two saints, Saint Benedetto to the Madonna’s right and the onomastic Magdalen to her left (the Saint Benedetto is a gesso copy, Zuraw, 1038). Along the frieze at the top of the temple front reads a dedication from her son Rinaldo.

**Bibliography:**
12. **Tomb of Beatrice Rusca**, died 6 March 1490 (fig. 34).

**Attribution:**
In the early twentieth century the tomb was attributed to Bambaia (Pinardi, 57, and Vigezzi, 60). More recently, however, it is credited to Benedetto Briosco (Roth, 14).

**Date:**
The tomb is dated between 1490 and 1499 based on the death of Beatrice and the date in the extant inscription.

**Location:**
The effigy and inscription are installed in the wall of the right transept of Sant’Angelo de’Frari, Milan. The original church of Sant’Angelo was torn down in 1535 with a new edifice constructed by 1600 (Pinardi, 20). The tomb was transferred into the new church.

**Patron:**
Antonia Rusca, Beatrice Rusca’s daughter and the wife of Giovanni Maria Visconti takes credit for the tomb in the inscription (see below).

**Inscription:**

Here lies Beatrice, the shining jewel of the Rusca family, who was married to Count Francino. When she was left a widow, the sacred Franciscan Order sustained her in wonderful chastity under the shelter of its wings, and the Third Order provided her with a regime for living such that she rejoices with God among those on high now that her deeds have been blessed. Antonia Rusca, wife of Giovanni Maria Visconti, dedicated this to her mother Beatrice in 1499. (Translation King, 225)

**Condition:**
The face of the effigy has suffered losses, as well as more general wear and damage. The tomb also does not maintain its original form, though its precise original appearance is unknown (Roth, 14, 17).

**Relevant Documents:**
No commission or contractual documents are currently known, but a family history written by the Cistercian Roberto Rusca and dating to 1610 records a passage about Beatrice and her original tomb:
Beatrice was the wife of Franchino Rusca, the Count of Locarno, who was also a lieutenant of Filippo Maria Sforza (Roth, 14). After Franchino’s death in 1465, Beatrice became a Franciscan tertiary, devoting herself to the religious life. Her tomb is currently found in the church of Sant’Angelo, Milan, though it was originally located in the previous edifice of the same name and location that was demolished in 1535 (Pinardi, 20). The monument was moved to the new church sometime before 1610 when it was described in a family chronicle written by Roberto Rusca. Based upon the brief description from Rusca, the current tomb does not seem to correspond fully to what was originally constructed. Currently the monument only comprises an effigy in half-relief and an inscription, though the seventeenth-century description mentions an “arca” which suggests a more elaborate sarcophagus (the word could simply be referring to the entire monument, but usually it refers more specifically to a sarcophagus or tomb chest).

The effigy is an example of the dramatic verism in tomb portraiture: Beatrice’s face is sculpted in what Roth (17) describes as “unflinching realism.” Beatrice’s cheeks sag and deep wrinkles line her face and her closed eyes are deeply recessed. The skin of her hands is carefully rendered to seem thin with protruding veins, reflecting the typical appearance of an older woman. Beatrice’s effigy, which is in half-relief, is shrouded in the robes of a Franciscan tertiary, with her head on a pillow supported by a scrolling funeral bier, the appearance of which recalls antique funerary furniture. Beatrice’s appearance can be interpreted as underscoring her devotion and religiosity, which is further promoted by the small reproduction of her reclining figure in a relief depicting The Death of the Virgin on one of the pilasters flanking the primary relief on the portal of the Certosa di Pavia, also by Briosco (Roth, 17). Roth argues that the correspondence between the effigy of Beatrice and the figure of the deceased Virgin is “unmistakable.” (Roth, 17).
Beatrice’s tomb is notable because it is one of only a few commissioned by a woman, her daughter Antonia. King (15-16) suggests that it was Beatrice’s “spiritual excellence,” which allowed for a female patron, but as the rest of this dissertation has shown female commemoration and its patronage by other women is not as unusual as King and other have supposed.

Bibliography:
Section Two: Independent Tombs originally located in Family Chapels

List of Tombs:
13. Tomb of Margherita Malatesta, 1399, San Francesco, Mantua
14. Tomb of Caterina dei Francesi, 1405, Sant’Antonio, Padua
15. Tomb of Ilaria del Carretto, 1405, San Francesco, Lucca
16. Tomb of Nera Corsi Sassetti, 1479, Santa Trinità, Florence
17. Tomb of Marsilibia Trinci, 1484, San Francesco, Montefiorentino, Frontino
13. **Tomb of Margherita Malatesta** (also known as Margherita Gonzaga), died 28 February 1399 (fig. 1).

**Attribution:**
Jacopo and Pierpaolo Dalle Masegne are credited with the tomb based on a contract for its commission between Francesco Gonzaga, Margherita Malatesta’s husband, and the Dalle Masegne. The contract was first published in 1913 (Torelli, 70), and is reprinted in full below.

**Date:**
1399

**Location:**
The tomb was originally located within the chapel of San Bernardino, the Gonzaga family mausoleum in San Francesco, with many other Gonzaga tombs. Currently it is found in the Ducal Palace, Mantua.

**Material:**
The original commissioned tomb was of made of Carrara marble and Istrian stone per material specifications in the contract.

**Patron:**
Francesco Gonzaga, Margherita’s husband, was the patron based on the contract.

**Inscription:**
INCLITA MARMORIO REQUIESCUNT OSSA SEPULCRO / MARGARITA TUI GENUIT QUAM MAXIMUS OLIM / MILITIE SUBLIME DECUS GALAOTUS IN ORBEM / QUEM MALATESTA TULIT PLENIS FULGORIBUS AULA / HEC GENEROSA SUUM STARET DUM VIRGO PUDOREM / NUPTA DEDIT FRANCISCE TIBI CLARISSIMA PROLES / GONZAGE PRECLARA VIRO MERITISQUE PARENTUM / TEMPORE LABENTI NATIVA LESE SOLUTA / CARCERE CORPOREO CELI MIGRAVIT AD AULAS / FEBRUUS EXTREMO RAPUIT TUNC MILLE TRECENTIS / NONAGINTA NOVEM DOMINI CURRENTIBUS ANNIS.

In this marble tomb lie [your?] illustrious bones, Margherita, who were once born to the great Galeotto Malatesta, the glory of a mighty army, into this world which Malatesta sustained from a court full of splendor. This well born lady maintained her chastity while she was still a virgin, then once married, she gave you distinguished offspring, Francesco Gonzaga, children outstanding for their strength and the merits of their ancestors. With the passing of time, according to natural law, she was released from her corporeal prison and she migrated to the halls of heaven. In the end Death took her in the year of the lord 1399. (Translation Benjamin Eldredge, Rome, 2013)

**Condition:**
Fragmentary; only inscription and possibly effigy (see below) remain.

**Relevant Documents:**
Two primary documents relate to the commission of the tomb. The first is a letter from Francesco Gonzaga to Jacobello Dalle Masegne from 27 May 1399 the relevant portion below:
Archivio di Stato, Mantua, Archivio Gonzaga, F. II, 6, busta 2093 (Published in Torelli, 70):

“…sibi dabimus ad faciendum, se erimus in Concordia cum eodem, archam unam quam fieri facere per magnifica quondam consorte nostra disposuimus, et de qua iam alias fuimus ei loquuint”

The second is a contract from 5 April 1400, written in Venice between Francesco Gonzaga and Pierpaolo Dalle Masegne:
Archivio di Stato, Mantua, Archivio Gonzaga, D. V, I, busta 313 (Published in Torelli, 70):

“Al nome de dio amen, a di XXX de decembrio 1400 lo magnifico signor meser Francesco de Gunçaga, Manthue … è d’accordo cum maestro Piero Polo, taiapiera, da Venexia, ch’el dito maestro Piero Polo i die far una archa fornida secundo lo designamento fato e secondo qui de soto se contiene a tute soe spexe posta in opra in Mantoa. Prima l’archa de eser alta da terra fino al frixo dove sta lo coperto, dove sta la figura, piedi quarto e mezo; item l’archa die eser longa pedi sie e larga dentro neta pedi doe. Et die eser fuora del muro tuta, apoçata al muro, la qual archa die eser de le pire infrascritte, çòè lo fondo de la dita archa di eser de piera bianca d’Istria e longa piedi sie e mezo e larga piededoe e quarto uno, lavorado a cornixe, e sopra dicto fondo die eser una sponda alta pié uno e quarto uno, e longa piedi sie, la qual sponda die eser de piera rosa e lavorada a cinque compasi cum cinque mezefigure dentro demarmaro da Charara. E li campi de l’archa dieno eser longi piededue et quarto 1, e alti piedi 1 e quarto uno, de piera rosa, cum compaso uno per campo, cum meça figure de marmoro da Charara; dentro a la faça de l’archa de drio die ese de piera bianca d’Istria a la longheça de la faça denanti; el coperchio de la dita archa de sopra die eser aguçu, e suso la mitade del dito coperchio die eser una figura de dona de piera d’Istria, salvo che la testa e le mano dieno eser de marmoro de Charara; l’altra mità de lo coperchio die eser de piera d’Istria. Et per adoraxun de l’archa de soto deno eser su la tera uno començamento de piera negra alto piedi due seguendo ala raxun de l’archa de terra de pie de piera d’Istria, salvo che la testa e le mano dieno eser de marmoro de Charara; dentro a la faça de l’archa de drio die ese de piera bianca d’Istria a la longheça de la faça denanti; el coperchio de la dita archa de sopra die eser aguçu, e suso la mitade del dito coperchio die eser una figura de dona de piera d’Istria, salvo che la testa e le mano dieno eser de marmoro de Charara; l’altra mità de lo coperchio die eser de piera d’Istria. Et per adoraxun de l’archa de soto deno eser su la tera uno començamento de piera negra alto piedi due seguendo ala raxun de l’archa de terra de pie de piera d’Istria, salvo che la testa e le mano dieno eser de marmoro de Charara; l’altra mità de lo coperchio die eser de piera d’Istria. Et per adoraxun de l’archa de soto deno eser su la tera uno començamento de piera negra alto piedi due seguendo ala raxun de l’archa de terra de pie de piera d’Istria, salvo che la testa e le mano dieno eser de marmoro de Charara; l’altra mità de lo coperchio die eser de piera d’Istria. Et per adoraxun de l’archa de soto deno eser su la tera uno començamento de piera negra alto piedi due seguendo ala raxun de l’archa de terra de pie de piera d’Istria, salvo che la testa e le mano dieno eser de marmoro de Charara; l’altra mità de lo coperchio die eser de piera d’Istria.
Description and Discussion:
Margherita Malatesta was the second wife of Francesco Gonzaga, a condottiero and ruler of Mantua. Their marriage in 1393 produced two surviving children: Gianfrancesco (1395-1444), Francesco’s heir who became marquis of Mantua, and a daughter Alda, who later married Francesco Novello da Carrara, lord of Padua. Margherita died on 28 February 1399, and based on an extant contract, her tomb was commissioned shortly thereafter. Though little now survives, the tomb was a wall-monument located in the church of San Francesco, to the right of the entrance of a chapel, of which very little currently remains, used by the Gonzaga as a mausoleum. Margherita Malatesta’s tomb was dismembered between 1782 and 1798 when the chapel was deconsecrated (Cavazzini, 248). All that definitively remains of the tomb is an inscription, though a sculpted effigy has been associated with Margherita’s monument since 1857 when Carlo D’Arco linked the two elements (D’Arco, 36). Modern scholarship unanimously agreed that the effigy depicts Margherita Malatesta. However, Laura Cavazzini’s article persuasively argued that the gisant actually depicts Margherita’s mother-in-law Alda d’Este (Cavazzini, passim.). Alda had died in 1381, nearly two decades prior to Margherita and Cavazzini’s analysis of the effigy’s dress, a fashion out of vogue by 1399, and the deep wrinkles of the face indicate that the effigy must depict Alda rather than Margherita, who was 31 at her death.

An idea of the original appearance of the tomb can be ascertained based on the contract for the commission drawn up between Francesco Gonzaga and the Dalle Masegne. According to the contract, the tomb was to be completed in five months and the artists were to be compensated 625 gold ducats, which was also supposed to include the cost of the material (Wolters, 225). Regarding the appearance of the tomb, the contract is explicit: the Dalle Masegne were meant to design a polychrome tomb with Carrara marble, Istrian stone, red stone from Verona and black stone. Margherita’s head and hands were sculpted in Carrara marble, with the rest of her form composed of other stone. The effigy rested on a cover sloping down on both short ends to a sarcophagus. On the sarcophagus front and sides there were seven quatrefoils containing half-figures of saints. An inscription with letters in low relief, likely the extant inscription, was found on the
base below the cassa, accompanied by a series of stemmi. An arched architectural cornice rose above the tomb and enclosed five sculpted figures: a crucifixion between two mourners, San Ludovico, and Santa Margherita, all standing on floriated supports. Based on the description, the appearance of the tomb was closely copied shortly thereafter in the funerary monument of Margherita’s cousin, Paola Bianca Malatesta, located in Fano (cat. #2). Of the various sculptures listed in the contract, only the inscription definitively remains. However, Wolters suggests a group of seven half-figures of prophets in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna might have originated from Margherita’s tomb without providing more explanation for this suggestion, one which is not returned to by later scholars (Wolters, 225).

**Bibliography:**

14. **Tomb of Caterina dei Francesi**, died 1405 (fig. 2).

**Attribution:**
There is no definitive attribution for the tomb, as no documents provide a link to any particular sculptor. Due to stylistic considerations, Aegidius da Wiener Neustadt (Checchi, Gaudenzio and Grossato, 339 and Timofiewitsch, 319) has been posited as the artist, as have both Rainaldino di Francia (Sartori, 277, fn. 26), and a sculptor of the Dalle Masegne ambient (Wolters, 231). For Wolters, the tomb bears a similarity to the tomb of Andrea Manfredi in Santa Maria dei Servi, Bologna, which he credits to the Dalle Masegne workshop. (Wolters, 231).

**Date:**
The tomb dates from circa 1405 based upon Caterina’s last will, which is dated to 19 July 1405 (see below) and the year 1405 is also found in the inscription.

**Location:**
Caterina’s tomb was originally located in the San Giacomo Chapel (later San Felice) in Sant’Antonio, Padua. Now it is located in the cloister of the Santo. It was moved there in 1773 (Sartori, 277).

**Material:**
White marble for the head, hands, and inscription, red marble for the body.

**Patron:**
Caterina requested in her will to be buried in the same chapel as her husband, who died before her. (Cenci, 91 and Wolters, 231).

**Inscription:**
HAC DE FRANCISIS TEGITUR CATHERINA SUB URNA / CUI NATALE SOLUM STAIA TUSCA DEDIT / PRUDENS IUSTA FUIT MORUM GRAVITATE VENUSTA / NORMA PUDICACIAE SPLENDIDA CELA BONI / STRENUUS INSIGNIS COIUNX BONIFACIUS ILLI / MARCHIO SORANCE STIRPE SATUSQUE LUPA MCCCV DI [...]

Caterina de Francesi is covered by this urn below to whom Tuscan Staia gave the sun birth
She was prudent and just and charming by the gravity of her morals
a standard of virtue and splendid heavens of good
her well known and vigorous husband Bonifacio
the Marquis of Sorance of the Lupo family 1405 on the day … (Translation Benjamin Eldredge, Rome, 2013)

**Condition:**
The tomb is fragmentary; the effigy is now situated as if standing on the inscribed plaque, though the original appearance of the monument is unknown. It is possible that the effigy
might have originally lain atop a simple sarcophagus as part of a wall tomb, with the inscription on the front (Wolters, 231).

**Relevant Documents:**
Caterina’s will dates from 19 July 1405 and in it she declares an intention to be buried in the chapel of San Giacomo under the tomb of her husband. In the case that that burial location is not possible, she requested to be buried in the church of S. Maria dei Frari in Venice. (Cenci, 91, and Wolters, 230). Neither Cenci nor Wolters publish the will, though Cenci (91) mentions it was written in Venice by the notary Angeletus de Venetiis, and lists it as “ASF Diplomatico, Spedale di S. Giovanni Battista detto di Bonifacio, pergamena del 1405, 19 luglio” (I was unable to find this document when I searched at the archive in Florence in July 2013).

**Description and Discussion:**
Caterina di Antonio dei Franceschi di Staggi, typically referred to in the literature as Caterina dei Francesi (or Francesci), was the second wife of Bonifacio Lupi (1316-1390), a condottiero and the marquis of Soragna. She outlived her husband by at least fifteen years as her last surviving will is dated 19 July 1405. At the time of the construction of Caterina’s tomb, the San Giacomo Chapel already contained the monumental paired wall tombs of Bonifacio Lupi and the Rossi family, which included Bonifacio’s maternal grandfather Guglielmo and three uncles Rolando, Pietro, and Marsilio, as well as a floor slab honoring Bartolomea Scrovegni (the sister of Enrico Scrovegni and wife of Marsilio II da Carrara), which had been in place prior to Bonifacio’s patronage of the chapel (Bourdua, 693).

The San Giacomo Chapel, located in the shallow south transept of the Santo, is a significant example of late trecento Paduan patronage, as its construction included architecture, painting and sculpture commissions. Architect and sculptor Andriolo de’Santi was commissioned by Bonifacio to design the chapel in 1372 and the painter Altichiero began work there in 1377. The original contract for the chapel, dating to 1372, does not mention tombs of any kind (Bourdua, 694). Andriolo reconfigured the already extant transept space to create an intimate chapel, utilizing pointed arches and other features consistent with late gothic architecture; the architectural members are delineated in white and red marble. Altichiero’s frescoes dominate the walls, with emphasis on the large-scale Crucifixion under three arches on the long side, with episodes from the life of St. James, and an Enthroned Madonna on the other walls.

It is unclear where Caterina’s tomb might have been located in the San Giacomo Chapel. Following the suggestion by Wolters that it was a simple wall monument (Wolters, 231), there is no physical evidence in the comprehensive Altichiero frescoes of markings or damage consistent with the placement of a wall tomb. The tomb, or the gisant and inscription at least, were moved from the chapel to the wall of the cloister in 1773. Giacomo Ferretto described the tomb in 1810: “Nel pavimento della cappella di S. Felice c’era l’effigie sulla lapide sepolcrale di Cattarina moglie di Bonifacio de’Lupi, la quale fu posta in piedi nel muro del vicino chiostro.” (“In the pavement of the chapel of San Felice there was the effigy on the tombstone of Caterina, wife of Bonifacio de’Lupi, which was placed standing in the wall of the nearby cloister.” Published in Sartori, 277, Translation mine).
As the monument exists now it consists of the effigy figure with the head and hands in white marble and the body in red. Caterina wears the habit of either a nun or a tertiary, with a veil and wimple. Her hands are crossed over her abdomen and below them is a distinct hole in the marble indicating a missing element, perhaps a belt (Wolters, 231). In its current arrangement the effigy “stands” on top of the inscription plaque. The inscription has also suffered damage; it was cut down on the right side, by roughly 25 cm, which must have happened after 1853 (Wolters, 231). As of 1853, Bernardo Gonzati recorded the complete date as either MCCV DIE XX IUII or MCCV D. XX JUN. However, there is no explanation for why the inscription on the tomb, which reads “20 June,” is before that of the date of Caterina’s final will, “19 July” (Wolters, 231). There is no evidence or record of other surviving sculpture from the original tomb configuration.

**Bibliography:**
The literature on the Santo and the San Felice chapel is vast; the bibliography listed here is limited to that which is most relevant to Caterina’s tomb:

15. Tomb of Ilaria del Carretto (or Maria Caterina degli Antelminelli or Jacopa de’Trinci), died 8 December 1405 (fig. 3).

Attribution:
Jacopo della Quercia with Francesco di Valdambrino and/or Giovanni da Imola (?) are usually ascribed the tomb. Regarding authorship, there is near consensus that the effigy and the dog at its feet are autograph sculptures by Jacopo della Quercia, which was first asserted in Vasari. In modern scholarship Marquand is one of the few who attributes the sculpture elsewhere, in this case to “some foreign sculptor,” (Marquand, 29) though this suggestion has not been embraced. Despite this near consensus for the effigy, Jacopo’s authorship of the rest of the sarcophagus has been thoroughly debated. James Beck, (Beck 1991, 63f) suggests that Jacopo was the designer, if not the executor, of two sides of the sarcophagus and rejects the traditional notion that the two sides of putti were executed by different artists based on perceived qualitative and stylistic differences, which Beck explains as the result of differing states of conservation (Beck 1991: 64). Due to these perceived differences the south side of the sarcophagus has traditionally been attributed to Jacopo and the north to Francesco di Valdambrino (Munman, 123). For Beck, the various putti were created by a combination of work by Francesco di Valdambrino, Jacopo and another assistant, Giovanni da Imola (Beck 1991: 144).

Date:
The date is debated, but most likely 1405-7. The date of the tomb is closely connected with the traditional assumption of variance of styles between the effigy and the sarcophagus reliefs, with the more “gothicizing” effigy ascribed an earlier date and the more “classicizing” sarcophagus dated as later. The disputed subject of the tomb also influences assertions of date, about which, see more below. If the tomb commemorates Ilaria del Carretto, the generally agreed upon terminus post quem for the tomb is 1405, the year of Ilaria’s death and the terminus ante quem is likely to be 1407, when Paolo Guinigi married his third wife Piagenta. However, if the tomb commemorates one of Paolo Guinigi’s other wives, as outlined below, the tomb could date to any period between 1405-1413, when Jacopo della Quercia was forced out of Lucca due to inappropriate conduct, or 1416-1425, when the artist began work in Bologna for San Petronio. The absolute latest the tomb could have been constructed would have been 1430, which was when Paolo Guinigi was overthrown and exiled from Lucca and the tomb was dismembered.

Location:
Originally located in the Chapel of Santa Lucia in San Francesco, currently in the Duomo, Lucca. In the Duomo it has been moved several times and its original location has been thoroughly discussed. Locations have been suggested such as the Chapel of Santa Lucia in the cloister of San Francesco (Paoli, 233f, based on the sixteenth century ‘Cronica di Lucca’ by Salvadore Dalli, published by Lazzareschi, 80), or in the south transept of the Cathedral, in front of the altar of SS. Giovanni and Biago (Munman, 122). However, most of the assertions of an original location in the Cathedral are based on its presence there after its initial construction. Whereas the chapel of Santa Lucia, which had
been a long-standing site of Guinigi patronage is the much more likely original location based upon the notation in Sercambi (Beck 1988, 25 and 1991, 141; Belli Basaril, 68), as well as physical evidence outlined in the articles of Marco Paolo (Paolo, passim.). By the time of Vasari the tomb had been moved to the cathedral, where Vasari saw it against the wall outside the sacristy where it remained until 1721 (Munman, 122). It has since been moved to various locations within the Cathedral, where it remains today.

**Material:**
White Marble

**Patron:**
Paolo Guinigi (husband)

**Inscription:**
None known.

**Condition:**
Fragmentary: effigy and tomb chest survive. The size relationship between the effigial slab and the sarcophagus panels is not congruent, leading scholars to believe there was an intervening or transitional element between them (Krautheimer 1971, 91-97). According to Beck there were likely three distinct elements to the tomb: the ‘all’antica’ sarcophagus with the ten putti; a marble casket or cassa, likely with an inscription; and the effigy of Ilaria with her dog (Beck 1988: 26, 30). Beck also suggests that there might have been a canopy over the tomb (Beck 1991: 146) in the tradition of trecento tombs (Hanson, 39). Due to the fragmentary nature of the remaining sculpture there is also no consensus over whether the monument was free-standing as it exists today, or a wall tomb. The argument that the monument was a wall tomb, supported by Longhi, Lanyi, Panofsky, and Del Bravo is based, as Beck asserts on two notions: that there is too great a stylistic difference between the effigy and the putti relief below and between the north and south putti sides; and “that it is awkward, art historically, to find that a dynamic new type of a centrally designed monument was the invention of a provincial sculptor located in an artistic backwater” (Beck 1991: 147). Beck continues to convincingly argue that the intervening casket would have mitigated any of the perceived stylistic difference between the effigy and the putti frieze and that because the putti frieze continues all the way around the monument, it must have been conceived as free-standing (Beck 1991: 147-148). Because the remaining sculpture is so fragmentary and there is such a lack of consensus about how the parts were connected, other suggestions have arisen including that the effigy and sarcophagus were not originally conceived as a single work, and that the monument might have been at one point a double tomb, like those commonly found commemorating Burgundian and French royalty (List-Freytag, 9-20).

**Relevant Documents:**
There are no known documents regarding the commission or construction of the tomb (Beck 1991: 143). However, Giovanni Sercambi was the chronicler of the Guinigi court and many of his records from the relevant years survive. Reprinted below are passages relevant to Ilaria del Carretto and her death:

56: The marriage of Paolo and Ilaria

XLVII Come il Signor Paulo Guinigi prese per Donna Madonna Ylaria Figluola di Messer Charlo Dal Charetto:
Ora lasseremo di contare al presente de’facti di Lombardia, e torneràsi a contare che essendo il magnifico signore Paulo Guinigii sense donna, fu per alcuni amici tractato di darli per donna Madonna Ylaria figluola di messer Charlo marcheze del Carretto, e quella ne menò del mese di ferraio in 1403. E fèsi smizurata festa in santo Romano, e durò la corte più giorni, essendoli al predicto signore donato per lì suoi ciptadini grande quantità d’argentieri di più maniere, vini, pollame, confessione, carni, salvagine, cera in grande abondansia; intanto che fu una magnitudine tale festa per tanto dono. E così si dimorò colla dicta spoza.

77: The birth of Ladislao, Ilaria’s son

LXXI. Come al signor Paulo Guinigi naque della sua donna Madonna Ylaria Lancilao Lassasi di parlare del dicto Iohanni Colonna e a suo tempo vi si tornerà, e conteràsi come al signore Paulo Guinigi della sua donna Madonna Ylaria, naque uno fanciullo a dì .xxxiii. settembre in 1404; del quale nascimento se ne fe’ festa & fuochi di falò per la ciptà et contado di Lucah, il quale si tenne senza batismo fine a dì .xxi. dicembre dicto anno. E il dicto di, in domenicha, a petitione de re Lancilao di Napoli, fu bactegiato in suo nome proprio per uno barone del dicto re, nomato messer Angiele napoletano. Al quale bactismo funno molti venerabili ciptadini di Lucha e molte venerabilissime donne; e puoseli nome Lancilao. Idio, per sua pieta, li di buona et lunga vita; e così per l’autore di questo libro se ne fa dolcie prego a nostro signore Dio & a nostra donna vergine Maria et a tucta la coret celeste. Amen.

120: The death of Ilaria

CXX. Come Morìo Madonna Ylaria Mogle del Signor Paulo Guinigi di Lucha

Come è stato contato che il signore Paulo Guinigi di Lucha prese per donna Madonna Ylaria figluola di messer Carlo del Carretto, e quella onorevolemente condusse e di quella avuot uno figluolo maschio, com’è stato contato, parturendo, l’anno di .MCCCCV. del mese di novembre quazi all’uscita, una fanciulla, alla quale fu al batismo nomata Ylaria. Dio la faccia buona. E rimanendo la dita Madonna Ylaria di tal parto alquanto inferma, e perchè tutti siamo mortali, come fu piacere di Dio, a dì .VIII, dicembre in .MCCCCV., la predicta Madonna Ylaria si morìo. Della quale morte il predicato signore suo marito fu sommamente doglioso, e simile tucta la ciptadinanza; e perchè era donna d’ogni honore, il predicato signore all’awequio di tal donna fe’ magnificamente quello che a ugni grandonna o signore si convenisse, così di messe, oratione, vigilie, vestimenti, drappi, cera, limozine in grande quantità, che sesre’lungo scrivere a dovere contare ogni particella. E però lasseremo di contare il modo, e torneremo a dire che non rimase cosa, che d’onore fusse e beene di quella anima, che non si facesse; per la qual cosa si de’presumere che Dio arà quella anima collocate in nella sua Gloria, alla quale conduca etiandio noi, quando passeremo di questa vita a Dio piaccia.
126-127: The marriage of Paolo to Piagentina

CXXIV. Come il Signore Paulo di Lucah prese per Mogle Madonna Piagentina figlola del signor Rodolfo da Camerino.

Tornasi ora a contar, che morta Madonna Ylaria mogle del signor Paulo, com’è stato contato, fu deliberato per li amici et parenti del dicto signore, che prendesse moglie; e doppo molto praticare si conchiuse che prendesse Madonna Piagentina figluola del signore Rodolfo da Camerino. E quella honorevolmente menò a Luchha del mese di marzo in MCCCCVII. ; facendo di tal donna honorevole festa di armeggiare e altri sollazzi, come a tali feste si richiedeno, con deznari et cene in grande abundantia. E fèsi tal festa in nel palagio, alla qual festa concourse per lo commune di Firenza bella imbasciaria, così per lo commune di di Siena; e simile per lo signore di Corona e alquanti marchezi di Lunigiana. Ai quali inbasciatori per lo dicto signore Paulo fu donato vegliuti et drappi honorevolmente, sendo che a tali homini si richiedeano. E fatta la festa, ongniuno si ritornò a suoi magioni, rimanendo con piacere la dicta spoza col suo marito.

170: The death of Piagentina’s son, who was buried in the same chapel as Ilaria

CXCI. Come naque al Signor Paulo uno Fanciullo della sua donna e poco visse.

A di XXVIII. Settembre dicto anno, naque al signor Paulo Guinigi della sua donna nomata Madonna Piagentina, figluola di Rodolfo signore di Camerino, uno fanciullo, il quale fu bactegiato per lo cardinal di Bordeus, e puoseli nome Francesco et Angiolo, E come fu piacere di Dio, a dì VI. octobre, il dicto fanciullo morìo e fu sopellito in nella cappella di santa Lucia a santo Francesco. Della quale morte il padre e la madre e altri parenti et amici funno dolorosa; ma pur quello che Dio vuole, conviene che ogni persona stia content, dandosi pacie.

233-34: The death of Piagentina and her burial in the same chapel as Ilaria

CCLXVI: Come Morìo Madonna Piagentina donna del Signor Paulo Morìo Si chome innanti avete sentito che il signor Paulo Guinigi di Lucha avea preso per donna Madonna Piagentina, figluola del signor Rodolfo da Chamerino, della quale ebbe molti figluoli, fra quali funno Sveva, Agustino FIlippo, Angiolo et Rodolfo; et essendo gravida, a dì XI. settembre, doppo il disertarsi, quella Idio chiamò a sè l’anno di MCCCXVI. Al chui corpo fu facto sommo honore, come già fu facto a Madonna Ylaria, com’è stato contato. E fu sepellita in nella chieza overo cappella di Santa Lucia de frati minori. La chui anima Idio l’abbia in nella sua Gloria collocate. Amen

Description and Discussion:

Ilaria del Carretto was the second of Paolo Guinigi’s, the lord of Lucca, four wives and the mother of his heir, Ladislao. Ilaria died from complications in childbirth on 8 December, 1405. While the scholarly record is divided, the general consensus is that the large-scale, likely free-standing tomb currently found in the Cathedral of San Martino in Lucca commemorates Ilaria. However, debate about the subject of the tomb has focused on which of Paolo Guinigi’s four wives it commemorates. In the early literature the effigy is consistently referred to as Ilaria, with only one exception (Geddes, 186 fn.1). In modern scholarship Lunardi, Mancini, Mansi, and Pelù asserted and maintained that the tomb actually commemorates Paolo’s first wife, Maria Antelminelli. However, with the reintegration of the short-side head-piece featuring the Guinigi/Carretto arms, this
suggestion has been primarily silenced (Munman, 123). List-Freytag argues that it honors Jacopa de’Trinci, Paolo’s fourth wife (List-Freytag, 9-20), though her arguments have not overcome the continued general understanding that the tomb commemorates Ilaria. There are no definitive documents naming the subject of the tomb and the contemporary Guinigi chronicler, Giovanni Sercambi, does not mention such a large-scale tomb for any of Paolo’s wives, though he does note that both Ilaria and Paolo’s third wife Piagentina (as well as her deceased infant son) were buried in the same chapel in San Francesco. Vasari saw the tomb in the Cathedral in Lucca and in his mention of it in his 1568 Vita of Jacopo della Quercia, does not designate which wife it commemorates, rather simply stating that Paolo Guinigi had it made for his wife (la moglie). Despite the ambiguity regarding identity, scholars have overwhelming and consistently declared the tomb to commemorate Ilaria del Carretto.

The tomb is fragmentary; currently it consists of the effigy of a young woman with a small dog at her feet on top of a marble slab and a sarcophagus that is composed of four separate pieces of marble held together today by modern support apparatus. The effigy slab is separate from a sarcophagus, and there is a size difference between them, leading some scholars to indicate there must have been an intervening element between the sarcophagus and the effigy (see above). The two long sides of the sarcophagus each feature five garland bearing putti, ten in total. The short sides of the sarcophagus include at the effigy’s feet, an elaborate foliate cross and at the effigy’s head the re-integrated coat of arms that combines the Guinigi and Carretto families.

The effigy has been traditionally characterized as “gothic” in the scholarly literature primarily because of its dress, which is a high-necked cioppa or pellanda, typical of France and Flanders. The figure is young and lovely, with smooth, unlined skin and no tension in the face. It cannot be characterized as a portrait likeness because no other known portraits of Ilaria del Carretto or any of Paolo Guinigi’s other wives are known to exist. The effigy wears a floriated headdress and also likely originally a metal diadem, due to extant holes in the back of the head. Two pillows support the head, and thus the level of relief of the head and upper torso is much higher than the feet. At the effigy’s feet is a small dog that Vasari explains as a symbol of fidelity, and as Allan Marquand notes, is extremely rare in Italian commemorative monuments, typical only in Milan or Naples, “where foreign influences were strong” (Marquand, 28). The dress of the effigy and the presence of the dog have lead scholars to compare the tomb primarily to and cite influences from French and Burgundian tombs (Hanson, 39).

The tomb of Ilaria del Carretto is one of the most thoroughly discussed commemorative monuments in Renaissance scholarship and is by a significant margin the most thoroughly examined tomb honoring a woman. It has been the subject of poetry, featured in works of fiction, and was declared by John Ruskin to be “life-changing” (Ruskin, in Cook and Wedderburn, vol. ii: 239).
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16. **Tomb of Nera Corsi Sassetti**, died in 1490? (fig. 29).

**Attribution:**
There is no consensus in the literature on the sculptor of Francesco and Nera Corsi Sassetti’s tombs, though they are most often attributed to Giuliano da Sangallo or a member of his workshop (von Fabriczy, 3, 6; Warburg, 245; Middeldorf, 107-115; Degenhart, 190, 250-251; De Tolnay, 239 fn. 5; Lisner, 99-119, 190-208; Draper, 55-58). Other suggested attributions include Bertoldo di Giovanni (Venturi, 385-389), though there is no documentation that would lead to a definitive attribution.

**Date:**
1479-85, though there is no documentary evidence for the dates of the tombs (Cassarino, 107), the dating is based upon inscriptions on the frescoes (Boorsook and Offerhaus, 18-19).

**Location:**
Sassetti Chapel, Santa Trinità, Florence

**Material:**
Black Marble

**Patron:**
Francesco Sassetti (husband)

**Inscription:**

Francesco Tommaso Sassetti caused it to be made (Translation mine)


In the name of God Almighty Nera Corsa, most sweet and gentle companion, with whom he pleasantly lived, Francesco Sassetti put up [this tomb] (Translation mine)


Francesco Tommaso Sassetti caused it to be made (Translation mine).

On the front: DEO OMNIP [OTENTI] FRANCISCUS SAXETTUS SIBI V [IVUS] POSUIT.

By God almighty, Francesco Sassetti erected [this tomb] for himself while still living.
Condition:
Though some of the frescoes in the chapel bear marks of scratches, perhaps due to Francesco’s desired dusting of the frescoes (see relevant documents below), the frescoes and tombs are in good condition, particularly following a restoration in 1967-68 (Borsook and Offerhaus, 71).

Relevant Documents:
Borsook and Offerhaus have published a number of relevant early documents connected to the negotiations and commission of the chapel (59-68). Neither Nera Corsi nor her tomb is specifically mentioned in any of these documents. Here I have reprinted the portion of Sassetti’s will that refers to the chapel:
ASF, Strozziiane II, No. 76 (Spogli), cc. 493-494 (Published in Borsook and Offerhaus, 67):
‘…e che l’altare, o verso sepoltura di marmo fatto per Tommaso suo padre e loro avolo la quale haveva disegnata pore in Santa Maria Novella dietro alla sepoltura loro antic ache di poi, per l’asprezza e stranezza de’frati di detto luogo che havevano fatto loro villania in levar via l’Arme loro dell’Altare Maggiore e la Tavola, era restate sospeso detto suo pensiero, onde li ricorda che se mai tornano in autorità e buono stato faccino correggere e riporre tutto al suo luogo, e non essendo d’accordo con i detti frati di Santa Maria Novella si contentava facessino pore detto edifice di Cappella et Altare e Sepoltura in Santa Trinità dirimpetto all’uscio della Sagrestia dove all’hora era un uscio rimurato con l’arme delli Scali nel cardinal et apiè della Cappella di detti Scali, che credeva glie ne darebbono licenza…”

Additionally there is a mention of the provisions Francesco left for the maintenance of the chapel, reprinted here:
ASF, Conventi Soppressi 90, No. 135 ‘Ricordanze di Don Averardo Niccolini su S. Trinità’ (mid-17th century, see c. 73), c. 26 verso (Published in Borsook and Offerhaus, 67):
‘Quando si spaza la Chiesa si netti l’Altare, li sepolchi, e pulirli spesso dalla polvere, et una volta l’anno nettarla da alto a basso in modo che sia pulita.’

Description and Discussion:
Nera Corsi was a member of an old Florentine family and married Francesco Sassetti in 1459. Sassetti was a Medici partisan and general manager of the Medici bank from 1469 until his death in 1490. Nera gave birth to ten children, five male and five female, before her death in 1490 (Cadogan, 232). Nera’s tomb is located in the Sassetti Chapel, Santa Trinità, Florence.

Francesco Sassetti initiated his patronage of the chapel at the far right of the transept of Santa Trinità in 1479, after losing his, potentially dubious, patronage rights to the high altar chapel of Santa Maria Novella (Borsook and Offerhaus, 13). The chapel
features an elaborate fresco cycle of the life of Saint Francis, Francesco’s onomastic saint and a popular subject of art patronage in Florence. Other decorations include sybils in the vaults, donor portraits flanking the altar, and grisaille images depicting antique coins around the arcosolium tomb niches. Domenico Ghirlandaio and his workshop are responsible for the frescoes, as well as an altarpiece depicting the Nativity. The frescoes are considered in the scholarship to be superlative examples of Republican Florentine ideals (Borsook and Offerhaus, 9), and include an impressive array of contemporary portraits of Sassetti family members, Medici family members, including Lorenzo ‘il Magnifico’ and his sons, and other Medici supporters (Rubin, 130). For detailed analysis of these frescoes see especially Borsook and Offerhaus, passim, and Cadogan, 230-236.

Aside from the paintings, the chapel contains the twin tombs of Nera Corsi and Francesco Sassetti. The two tombs, massive sarcophagi of black porphyry, or “pietra di paragone,” are nearly identical save for their inscriptions and the reliefs in pietra serena that frame the niches. They are arcosolium tombs.

Nera Corsi Sassetti’s tomb is, unusually, located on the left side of the chapel, Christ’s heraldic dexter, which is considered the more blessed location. Her monument, like that of her husband, is a large sarcophagus with a curving top, featuring bucraania and inscriptions on the front and the lid. The tomb is set back into a niche and the framing elements include numerous reliefs: foliate imagery and roundels featuring nereids and sea monsters, all meant to allude to Nera and Francesco’s felicitous relationship (Borsook and Offerhaus, 21). A roundel in the center of the framing reliefs below the tomb contains a portrait of Nera in profile, represented as a respectable Florentine matron, in the same mode that Ghirlandaio had depicted her in the adjacent frescoes.

Immediately around Nera’s tomb niche are grisaille paintings, which can be understood as a play on words of the name of her natal family. On the right two horsemen are shown with the inscription: DECURSIO S [ENATUS] C [ONSULTO]. The imagery is based on that of a Neronian coin, suggesting the play on Nera’s name: Nera de’Cursis (Saxl, 28). On the left the grisaille image shows the triumph of Germanicus with the inscription GERMANICUS CAESAR / SIGNIS RECEPTIS.

Among Florentine tombs the arcosolium tomb type was not altogether uncommon: at least five others were constructed between 1417 and the 1480s, with one, the tomb of Onofrio Strozzi form the 1420s, also located in Santa Trinità, in the sacristy (Butterfield, 61-63). Butterfield further argues that the arcosolium tomb type was specifically used to commemorate a group of “superelite” Florentine men (Butterfield, 62-63), who were all granted knighthood by the republic, without addressing how the inclusion of a woman’s tomb among this group complicates such generalizations.
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17. **Tomb of Marsibilia Trinci**, died 25 February 1485 (fig. 18).

**Attribution:**
Scholars resoundingly agree that Francesco di Simone Ferrucci created the tombs commemorating Marsibilia Trinci and her husband Gian Francesco Oliva, and at times also the architecture of the chapel. Venturi was the first to attribute the tombs to Francesco di Simone Ferrucci, due to its similarity with the monument of Barbara Manfredi, and this theory has been generally accepted since (Venturi, 377). However, Parmiggiani places the tombs within the activities of Ferrucci’s workshop, rather than by the master himself (Parmiggiani, 91). Pisani, in her 2007 monograph, claims Francesco di Simone Ferrucci is “irrefutably” the author of the tombs due to their stylistic similarities to documented Ferrucci monuments (Pisani, 54).

**Date:**
1484-89

**Location:**
The tomb is located in the Cappella Oliva, at the Convent of San Francesco at Montefiorentino, Frontino (province of Pesaro), Italy.

**Material:**
Carrara Marble

**Patron:**
Carlo Oliva (son)

**Inscriptions:**
Above Marsibilia’s effigy on an architrave within the tomb architecture:
VIX . AN . LXX MORTUAE V KIS. MARTII INNOCENTIO OTTAVO PON MAX MCCCLXXXV.

For [Marsibilia] who lived 70 years and died on February 25th, in the pontificate of Innocent VIII 1485

On Marsibilia’s sarcophagus:
HIC IACE[T] ILLA : QUIBUS NON FULGE DOTIBUS ULLA / MARSIBILIA
INSIGNIS – (effaced) TRINCIA PROGENIE / SFORTIA DUX LIGUR. FRANCISCUS.
(illegible) PATRI / FRATRIQUE NUPSIT POST SUA FATA PATRI / FEMINEUM
MATRIS HONORE FRUOR / RELIGIO PIETAS SANCTI MORES[QUE]
CERNUNT ANIM[A]E ET POST MORTEM CERNERE MATRI / MAUSOLEO HINC
LICEAT ME[QUE] PATREM SIMUL /

Here she lies: for which marriage there was no torch
extraordinary Marsibilia [] of the Trinci, Francesco Sforza Duke of Liguria [] of the father and of the brother she married after her fate of the father this feminine kind overcomes with virtues I, Carlo, enjoy this honor of so great a mother, Religion, piety, holy customs, and modesty are the shining wreaths of her illustrious life. If the souls see and after death to see for mother by this mausoleum hence shall be allowed both my and my father at once

Above Gian Francesco’s effigy on an architrave within the tomb architecture: VIX. AN LXXII MAN. I DIE. XVI MORTUUS S F III ID AUGUSTI MCCCLXXVII.

He died August 30, 1377, having lived 72 years 1 16 days,


You, Gian Francesco, lie here on account of the sixth by paired wounds Chance was not able to be more lovely than you and when once the enemy had come over the walls of Tifernum [Città di Castello?] they were defended by your blood, mind, and hand before my feet fall the pious limbs of my parents while I am born into Tuscany and bearing two wounds but take the pious gifts of your mournful son, take this chapel and mausoleum and have this poem for you.

On the cornice of the chapel: CAROLUS OLIVAS PLANANI COMES IOANNIFRANCISCO / MARSIBILIAEQUE TRINCIAE COMITIBUS PARENTIBUSQUE SUIS / CLARISSIMIS OB SINCERAM IN EOS PIETATEM SACELLUM / HOC ATQUE MAUSOLEA CONSTRUXIT MCCCLXXXIII

Carlo Oliva, Count of [Planani], for Gianfranceso and Marsibilia Trinci Counts and his outstanding parents on account of his sincere piety towards them constructed this chapel and these tombs 1484 (Translations Benjamin Eldredge, Rome, 2013)

Condition:
The wall tomb is in good condition with minimal damage or loss. A restoration of the chapel occurred in 1923, which included the restoration of plaster, the sealing of a window, and placement of new floor tiles. The only significant damage to the tombs is cracks in the carved drapery at the back, which supposedly occurred when French soldiers opened Marsibilia’s and her husband’s tombs early in the nineteenth century (Schrader, 266).

**Relevant Documents:**
There are no known documents related to the church or tomb (Pasini, 98).

**Description and Discussion:**
Marsibilia Trinci, the widow of Leone Sforza (brother of Francesco Sforza), was buried in a tomb across from her second husband, Gian Francesco Oliva, following her death on 25 February 1485. Her tomb is placed in a chapel commissioned by her son, Carlo Oliva. This chapel, commissioned to honor his parents, might have been intended as his burial chapel as well. The chapel is located to the right of the old entrance into the church of San Francesco at Montefiorentino (Schrader, 266).

The chapel contains the two mirror-image tombs of Marsibilia and Gian Francesco, an altarpiece depicting a *Sacra Conversazione* from 1489 by Giovanni Santi, and two intarsia prayer stalls (*inginocchiatoi*), which depict customized imagery for both Marsibilia and Gian Francesco. On Marsibilia’s prayer stall the intarsia depicts a bowl of fruit, a candleholder, two missals, a book with the name “Dante” on the spine, and a chalice covered by a paten. At the bottom are *stemmi* for the Oliva and Trinci families (Pasini, 111).

Marsibilia’s tomb is remarkably similar to that of Barbara Manfredi in Forlì (cat. #7), which was constructed roughly twenty years previously by the same artist, Francesco di Simone Ferrucci. Marsibilia’s tomb is a wall monument to the left of the altar, Christ’s heraldic dexter, the more honored position in the chapel. The tomb consists of an arched niche surrounded by elaborately carved foliate pilasters supporting an equally decorative architrave and frieze. At the top of the niche a roundel contains a bust-length relief of the Virgin and Child, much in the tradition of the “humanist” tombs of Florence, specifically that of Leonardo Bruni, and the tomb of Barbara Manfredi. Marsibilia’s effigy, naturalistically sculpted in showing her as an older woman with wrinkled skin, rests on a draped bier atop the sarcophagus (Pisani, 54). Two putti unfurl a drapery across the front of the sarcophagus, which features the lengthy inscription listed above. The tomb of her husband, opposite Marsibilia’s, is nearly identical save for the effigy and inscription.

The literature is insistent on the Florentine character of both the architecture of the chapel and the “Florentine niche-type tombs,” also characterized as “humanist tombs” honoring Marsibilia and Gian Francesco (Pasini, passim.; Pisani, 54; Schrader, 227). While the tombs bear similarities to monuments that were previously constructed in Florence, by the 1480s arched niche-tombs were widely deployed throughout the peninsula for diverse individuals (Zuraw, 459). By the time that form was used for the Trinci and Oliva tombs in the 1480s, it seems to have become less distinctly Florentine, and instead a widely used, functional tomb type.
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Section Three: Independent Tomb Chapels

List of Tombs:
18. Chapel of Isotta degli Atti, 1447, San Francesco, Rimini
19. Chapel of the Malatesta Women, 1454, San Francesco, Rimini
20. Chapel of Maria of Aragon Piccolomini, 1470, Sant’Anna dei Lombardi, Naples
21. Chapel of Franceschina Tron Pesaro, 1478, Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, Venice
22. Chapel of Saint Fina, 1468, Collegiata, San Gimignano
18. **Tomb of Isotta degli Atti**, died 9 July 1474 (fig. 10).

**Attribution:**
Agostino di Duccio and Matteo de’Pasti are credited with the architecture of the temple and Isotta’s chapel due to their signatures on the interior of the building. On a cornice between the first and second chapels on the left side Matteo signed: “MATTHEI V[ERONENSI]S D[E] P[ASTIS]. ILLVSTRIS. ARMINI. DOMINI. NOBILISS[IMI] ARCHITECTI. OPVS.” Mirroring Matteo’s signature is that of Agostino di Duccio: “OPVS AVGVSTINI FLORENTINI LAPICIDAE” (Hope, 88). Regarding the attribution of the sculpture there is debate in the literature over which artist created which reliefs. On the attribution debates, see: Seymour, 133, 239 n. 10; Janson, 105-28; Kühlenthal, 59-100; Pope-Hennessy, 68-73, 309-14; Middendorf, 310-22; Pasini, 106. Hope, following Ricci (Ricci, 103), is of the general opinion, which is the most prevalent in later literature, that Agostino di Duccio “supervised” the creation of all of the sculpture (Hope, 132 fn. 304). However the attribution to Agostino di Duccio was only made at the end of the nineteenth century, prior to that, the reliefs were attributed to artists like Francesco Laurana, Luca della Robbia, Bernardo Ciuffagni, Pasquino da Montepulciano, Sperandio, and a brother of Donatello (Pasini, 52).

**Date:**
1447, based on the papal bull by Nicholas V authorizing Isotta’s endowment of the chapel (see below).

**Location:**
Tempio Malatestiano, Rimini

**Material:**
Marble, blue paint, gilding

**Patron:**
Sigismondo Malatesta (paramour/husband) and Isotta herself. Patronage of Isotta’s own chapel was at least partly self-motivated (Hope, 59).

**Inscription:**
D[IVAE or OMINAE]. ISOTTAE. ARIMINENSI. B[ENE]. M[ERENTI]. SACRVM. MCCCCL

To the deserved Honor of the Divine (or Lady) Isotta of Rimini 1450 (translation mine)

There was also an earlier inscription that read:
ISOTE ARIMINENSI FORMA ET VIRTUTE ITALIE DECORI. MCCCXCLVI

To Isotta of Rimini, by her beauty and virtue the honor of Italy. 1446 (translation Hope, 62).
**Condition:**
The sculpture is in excellent condition, with some loss to the blue and gold painting, particularly the painted cloth. Much of the condition is due to the extensive renovations the chapel and church as a whole have undergone. The church was significantly damaged in World War II, after which it was subject to a long renovation program; the most recent renovations in the chapel took place in 1990-2000 (Paolucci, 241).

**Relevant Documents:**
For extensive documentation of the construction of the Tempio Malatestiano as a whole see Ricci, 563-595.

For the papal bull issued by Nicolas V on 12 September 1447 granting Isotta the right to endow the chapel see Soranzo, 17-19.

The next document mentioning Isotta is from 15 May 1448 when Perleone de’Perleoni issued a receipt for 500 florins from Isotta for the endowment of the chapel: Rimini, Archivio Notarile. Rogiti di Rancesco Paponi (Published in Ricci, 585 III):

“tamquam de propriis pecuniis ipsius conventus… et dictam quantitatem promixit ipse Perleonus reddere ac numerare dictis sindicis seu ipsi conventui et fratribus tunc demum cum ipsi sindici seu frater predicti repererint aliquas possessions vel aliqua predia seu res immobiles in quibus dicta quantitas dictorum quingentorum florenorum expendatur, que quidem possessions et res immobiles sten et stare debeant pro dote Capelle ab Angelis construente seu construendo vela liter reparande vel ampliande in dicta ecclesia S. Francisci per magnificam et generousam iuvenem dominam Isotam de Actis de Arimino, sub ii stamen pactis videlicet quod singulo die in dicta Capella debeant celebrare et dicere due misse ad altare dicte Capelle per fratres sacerdotes dicti conventus quod si dicte due misse dietim non dicerentur, quod tunc et eo casu fructus ipsarum possessionum ut supra emendarum pro dica Capella et eius dote debeant distribui et errogari inter paupers Christi amore Dei, et quod nihil ad ipsos fratres de dictis fructibus perveniat.”

**Description and Discussion:**
Isotta degli Atti was the young mistress, later wife, of Sigismondo Malatesta, during his reign as lord of Rimini. Isotta is the best-documented mistress from the fifteenth century and part of what Helen Ettlinger calls the “apogee of mistresses” (Ettlinger, 772, 773). Born the daughter of a wealthy wool merchant, she caught Sigismondo’s eye when he was twenty-six and she was ten years old, despite his simultaneous involvement with two other women: his wife, Polissena Sforza, and his previous mistress, Vanetta Toschi (Ettlinger, 774). Isotta became Sigismondo’s mistress in 1446, and by 1454, had become Sigismondo’s “visible pseudo-wife” (Ettlinger, 777). Work on her chapel in San Francesco commenced with Sigismondo’s initiation of remodeling the already extant church in 1447; at the same time, work began on the chapel of Saint Sigismondo, the chapel intended to contain the tomb of Sigismondo Malatesta.

Isotta’s chapel, the second from the façade on the south, or right side when facing the altar, took the place of a pre-existing chapel, which had been founded and constructed by Leontino da Rimini, the bishop of Fano in 1362-1389 (Pasini, 128). Isotta can
arguably take patronal credit for her chapel, due to a papal bull issued by Pope Nicholas V on 12 September 1447 decreeing that she had endowed the chapel in her will with 500 florins so that it could be renovated, that the friars in residence at San Francesco were to accept the donation, and that appointed trustees and executors to enact Isotta’s stated desires (Hope, 59). As Charles Hope states, it is “virtually certain” that Sigismondo and Isotta acted together in the renovation and construction of her chapel in San Francesco, though it is likely that the major decisions, particularly the decorative decisions related to her tomb (she was fifteen at the time of the papal bull), were likely made by Sigismondo (Hope, 59). Isotta is not Sigismondo’s only wife or mistress to be buried in San Francesco; the organization of Malatesta tombs was carefully arranged, with his other wives and mistresses buried in the opposite chapel on the north side (Hope, 84), which is discussed in greater detail in the following entry (cat. #19).

The chapel, usually now referred to as the chapel of Saint Michael the Archangel or the Chapel of Isotta, is architecturally and decoratively distinct from the other chapels in the church, though it did serve as a model for the opposite chapel on the north side (Hope, 62). The entrance arch of the chapel is pointed and across the entrance is a low balustrade featuring ten putti bearing stemmi. Two of these putti were remade in the nineteenth century probably by Liguorio Frioli (Turchini, 778, fn. 110), while another, the farthest to the left towards the altar, was destroyed in World War II and remade in gesso (Paolucci, 239). The balustrade might have been part of the original thirteenth-century church; however Agostino di Duccio and his workshop sculpted the ten putti (Kokole, 295-296).

As on all the other chapels in the Tempio, on the frieze framing the pointed entrance arch there is an inscription reading: SIGISMVNDVS PANDVLFVS MALATESTA PAN F FECIT ANNO GRATIAE M CCCCL (Sigismondo Pandolfo Malatesta Son of Pandolfo Made [the church] in the Year of Grace 1450, translation mine). The pilasters supporting the entrance arch each feature fifteen reliefs of putti making music, holding stemmi, or the Malatesta impresa. The three sides of the pilasters are divided into five levels featuring different images. The backgrounds of the reliefs are painted blue, while the wings and some details of the musical instruments being played by the putti are highlighted with gilding. Below the pilasters are reliefs of the Malatesta elephants.

Inside the chapel the left wall supports the large-scale tomb of Isotta degli Atti. Her tomb chest is elevated, resting on top of two Malatesta elephants and consoles. The lid, the bronze swag unfurled by two putti on the front, and the base of the tomb chest all feature the inscription listed above. However, the bronze swag covers an earlier inscription that read: ISOTE ARIMINENSI FORMA ET VIRTU TE ITALIE DECORI. MCCCCXLVI (To Isotta of Rimini, by her beauty and virtue the honor of Italy. 1446. Translation, Hope, 62). 1446 was the date of the birth of Isotta and Sigismondo’s first son, though the child died in infancy and was buried in another chapel in the Tempio. On the lid of the tomb chest rests the Malatesta stemma, including a repetition of the intertwined “SI” monogram representing the names “Sigismondo” and “Isotta.” Above the stemma is a helm and coronet supporting an elaborate elephant crest. Unfurling from the elephants’ trunks are banners reading on the left: TEMPVS LOQVENDI (time to speak) and on the right: TEMPVS TACENDI (time to be silent, translations mine). Emerging from atop the helm, but below the coronet is an elaborate cloth of honor, which
frames the entire tomb structure. Though in poor condition, the cloth was painted with an elaborate blue and gold brocade pattern. On the wall behind the tomb another elaborate gold brocade pattern is painted on the wall.

Also in the chapel, dating from the time of its construction, are construction sketches in black charcoal below Isotta’s tomb depicting the organization of the balustrade and putti at the entrance of the chapel. The sketch was revealed in the most recent renovation of the chapel in 1990-2000 (Paolucci, 241). Additionally, there is on the central chapel wall between two windows a small sculpture of Saint Michael Archangel, the titular saint of the chapel, also sculpted by Agostino di Duccio. He holds a sword in one hand and a balance in the other. The sculpture stands in a tabernacle niche. The rest of the chapel decoration, including a Crucifixion and a slab tomb dedicated to the Blessed Giovanni Gueruli, date from the sixteenth- and eighteenth-centuries respectively.

Bibliography:
The literature on the Tempio, particularly Leon Battista Alberti’s intervention in it, is vast. Because of this, I have limited the bibliography here to the sources most relevant to the Chapel and Tomb of Isotta:

19. **Tomb of the Malatesta Women** (fig. --)

**Attribution:**
Agostino di Duccio. For a broader discussion of the attribution of the architecture and sculpture of the Tempio Malatestiano see catalogue entry #18 on Isotta degli Atti.

**Date:**
1454

**Location:**
Second Chapel on the left, Tempio Malatestiano, Rimini

**Material:**
Marble

**Patron:**
Sigismondo Malatesta

**Inscription:**
MALATETARVM DOMVS HEROIDVM SEPVLCHRVM (As recorded by Giovambattista Costa in 1765, inscription no longer extant)

Tomb of the Heroines of the House of Malatesta (Translation mine)

**Condition:**
Fragmentary, only a small piece of the tomb-slab remains. The Temple was repaved in the seventeenth century, which covered the tomb, and it was then rediscovered in 1913 (Paolucci, 245). The slab tomb of Federico Tonti replaced the Tomb of the Malatesta women in approximately 1823 (Paolucci, 210). The tomb was also damaged during a World War I bombing in 1916 (Ricci, 240, fn. 42) and the fragment of the tomb was lost until 1978, when it was “rediscovered.” It is now located in the offices of the Curia. (Hope, 84).

**Relevant Documents:**
For general documentation of the Tempio Malatestiano see catalogue entry #18 on Isotta degli Atti. There are no known documents that specifically refer to this chapel or its precise occupants.

**Description and Discussion:**
For a broader discussion of the Tempio Malatestiano see catalogue entry number #18 discussing Isotta degli Atti. All that remains of the tomb of the Malatesta women is fragments. The existing fragments indicate the monument was originally a slab tomb; the fragment shows that the central section depicted a shield with alternating quarters containing the Malatesta stripes and the “SI” monogram; above the shield were paired elephant heads with scolls, likely inscribed with the ‘Tempus loquendi, Tempus tacendi’
motto that is found elsewhere in the Tempio (Hope, 84). The precise occupants of the tomb are not known, though since Costa’s reference to the tomb for “le donne del Casato Malatesta,” it has been assumed to have honored Sigismondo Malatesta’s two wives prior to Isotta, Ginevra d’Este who died in 1440, and Polissena Sforza who died in 1449 (Costa, 35; Hope, 84). According to Costa, the tomb was originally in the middle of the pavement of the chapel and was composed of white and red marble, though at the time of his viewing it was partially covered by an altar. (Costa, 35f).

Bibliography:
The literature on the Tempio, particularly Leon Battista Alberti’s intervention in it, is vast. Because of this, I have limited the bibliography here to the sources most relevant to the Chapel of the Malatesta Wives:

20. **Tomb of Maria of Aragon Piccolomini**, died 1469, buried 5 March 1469 (fig. 17).

**Attribution:**
Antonio Rossellino and Benedetto da Maiano are credited with the construction of Maria’s tomb chapel. Vasari attributes the decoration to Antonio Rossellino, due to its similar appearance to the Chapel of the Cardinal of Portugal, San Miniato al Monte, Florence, which has been resoundingly accepted in later literature (Carl, 325). Rossellino died while work on the chapel was still underway, and in 1481, the patron, Antonio Piccolomini Todeschini, Duke of Amalfi, requested that the Abbot of San Miniato al Monte find a new sculptor to complete the work (Fabriczy, 162-65). This new sculptor is widely understood to have been Benedetto da Maiano. Though there are conflicting opinions about specific attributions of the various parts of the chapel, due to “ambivalent” styles (Carl, 326), the altarpiece is typically attributed to Rossellino (Apfelstadt, 155), the *Resurrection* above the effigy attributed to Benedetto (Cunardi, 44), and Maria’s tomb is generally understood to have been begun by Rossellino, then left unfinished at his death and completed by Benedetto. The effigy in particular is ascribed to Benedetto (Apfelstadt, 152).

**Date:**
1470-early 1490s

**Location:**
Piccolomini Chapel, Sant’Anna dei Lombardi, Naples. The chapel is directly to the left upon entering into the church.

**Material:**
Marble

**Patron:**
Patronage is ascribed to both Maria’s husband, Antonio Piccolomini Todeschini, the Duke of Amalfi and nephew of Pope Pius II (Carl, 325), and to her half-brother, Alfonso II, later King of Naples (Hersey, 112).

**Inscription:**
QUI LEGIS SUMMISIUS LEGAS NE DORMIENDEM EXCITES / REGE FERDINANDO ORTA MARIA ARAGONA HIC CLAUSA EST / NUPSIT ANTONIO PICCOLOMINEO AMALFAE DULCI STRENUO / CUI RELIQUIT TREIS FILIAS PIGNUS AMORIS MUTUI / PUELLAM QUIESCERE CREDIBILE EST QUAE MORI DIGNA NON FUIT / VIX AN XX / AD MCCCLXX.

You who read these words, do so in a low voice lest you wake the sleeper. Mary of Aragon, a child of King Ferdinand, is enclosed within. She married the stalwart Duke of Amalfi, Antonio Piccolomini, to whom she left three daughters as a witness of their mutual love. One can believe she is sleeping, for she little deserved to die. She lived twenty years. In the year of our lord 1470. (Translation Hersey, 111 and Cunardi, 543).
Condition:
The sculpture of the chapel has been maintained in good condition. The chapel was
“modernized” in the eighteenth century and again in the nineteenth, and was also
considerably restored after the church was bombed heavily in World War II, particularly
during the years 1942-43 (Cunardi, 45).

Relevant Documents:
There is limited primary documentation for the chapel; however, there are two letters
(Borsook, 15 docs. 17 and 18) from 1477 written by Filippo Strozzi that associate
Antonio Rossellino with the chapel:

Doc. 17 Letter from Filippo Strozzi on 20 April 1477:
“Sarà di questa aportatore maestro [blank] detto il Rosetto, maestro di scholtura, viene
per aiutare porre la chapella del ducha di Malfi a Monte Uliveto, che lui l’a fatta qui e
mandata poi chosti. È de’ buoni maestri ci sieno in simile operazione.”

Doc. 18 Letter from Filippo Strozzi on 22 April 1477:
“E sendovi venuto maestro Antonio detto il Rosso, che à fatto la chapella del ducha di
Malfi…”

There is also a notarial act of 18 July 1481 that shows that the Duke of Amalfi sought
restitution of fifty gold florins from the heirs of Antonio Rossellino for an advance
payment on the tomb, the work for which was interrupted by Rossellino’s death. The
Duke also instructed the abbot of San Miniato, Fra Bartolomeo, to find another sculptor,
likely Benedetto da Maiano:
ASF, Archivio Diplomatico, San Bartolomeo di Monteoliveto di Firenze (published in
Fabriczy, 163 and Apfelstadt, 148):

“… prefatus Ill. Dominus Dux exposuit coram nobis, quod superioribus temporibus
locavit Antonio Rossellino de Florentia ad faciendum et laborandum quoddam
laborerium marmoreum pro construendo quoddam [sic] sepolcro, cui magistro Antonio
nonnullas pecuniarum quantitates causa et occasione predicta prefatus dominus Dux suo
nomine asseruit fuisse solutas, et pagatas. Et quia, sicut Domino placuit, prefatus
magister Antonius, antequam dictum laborerium expleret, fuit morte preventus, et
remansit debitor prefato Ill. domino duci in ducatis quinquaginta vel circa, prout accepit
et certioratus exitit a Venerabili religioso frater Bartolommeo de florentia abate SAnc
Miniatis de florentia predicta ordinis montis oliveti, pro quibus ducatis quinquaginta vel
circa recuperandis … Nec non ad relocandum et compleri faciendum dictum laborerium
per aliquem probum et in arte predicta expertum magistrum…”

Description and Discussion:
Maria of Aragon was the illegitimate daughter of King Ferrante of Naples, born in 1452.
She married Antonio Piccolomini Todeschini, son of Nanni Todeschini of Siena and
Laudonia Piccolomini, sister of Pius II. They had three daughters, who are acknowledged
in the epitaph on her tomb.
Maria’s tomb chapel is located in Sant’Anna dei Lombardi, which was founded in 1411, and at the time was known as Santa Maria di Monteoliveto (Apfelstadt, 145 fn. 3). The church benefitted from a great deal of patronage from the Aragonese court and has been characterized as “a royal pantheon” because of the number of monuments commissioned by and in honor of members of the royal Aragonese house and, as George Hersey contends, a dedicated interest from King Alfonso II (Hersey, 109ff). The Piccolomini chapel is one of three built in the church in the last three decades of the fifteenth century, all by Aragonese family members or supporters (Pepe, 97-116; Heidemann and Scirocco, 29, 32). While Alfonso’s overriding concern for patronage of the church indicates he might have been involved in the patronage of his half-sister’s burial chapel (Hersey, 112), Maria’s husband Antonio is more broadly considered the patron because of a notarial act from 18 July 1481, which acknowledges the death of Antonio Rossellino and indicates that Antonio Piccolomini sought restitution of 50 gold florins from the sculptor’s heirs paid in advance for Maria’s tomb, which had not at that point been completed (Fabriczy, 162-165). As Antonio’s involvement with both selecting artists and paying them is documented and there are no documents suggesting explicit involvement by Alfonso (Apfelstadt, 147), it is reasonable to assume Maria’s husband as the primary patron of her monument.

Maria’s chapel is the largest tomb monument commemorating a woman from the fifteenth century. The space is located in the northeastern corner of the nave of Sant’Anna dei Lombardi and is comprised of two chambers. The first serves as an antechamber to the burial room proper and was renovated with much of the rest of the church when significantly more chapels were added in the seventeenth century (Apfelstadt, 149). The rights to this small space were sold by the Piccolomini to Pietro Luigi Moschini in 1826, and it was further restored and renovated in 1874 (Apfelstadt, 149). Little of the fifteenth-century elements remain in this antechamber save for the quartered arms of the Piccolomini d’Aragona located in the middle of the floor.

The larger, second chamber is accessed through a ceremonial entrance arch and it features a domed, Greek-cross plan with Maria’s tomb, altarpiece, and a sedile situated in shallow arched niches on the three walls. Above the sculptures on the lower parts of the walls are frescoes; however, the dome is unadorned.

Maria’s tomb is located on the left side when facing the altar. A large sarcophagus rests on elaborately carved supports on top of a base featuring funerary reliefs of antique origin, including floriated swags and skulls. The sarcophagus bears the above inscription. Atop the sarcophagus, Maria lies on a bier flanked by two putti. She wears a brocaded gown, which has been interpreted as a bridal gown, as well as a flowered veil, suggesting that her tomb equates to her marriage bed (Hersey, 114). The entire sarcophagus and bier complex is framed by pilasters supporting an entablature, with a flat marble background in one panel. Standing above the pilasters on the entablature are two crouching angel figures. In the center above Maria’s effigy is a roundel depicting the Resurrection surrounded by an entablature. Above the Resurrection is a tondo representing the Madonna and Child held aloft by two flying angels. The background of this upper zone of the tomb is frescoed a dusty red color. Carved curtains emerging from the keystone of the arch are pulled to either side framing the entire tomb structure. It is this room that has drawn comparison, through its obvious similarities, to the chapel of the Cardinal of Portugal in San Miniato al Monte, Florence (nearly all sources, including Vasari, note
how the Neapolitan chapel is a near-copy of its Florentine precedent). Most of them also include qualitative judgments disparaging Maria’s chapel as a less-successful copy. For a thorough comparison of the two monuments see Hartt, Corti, and Kennedy, 62ff or Apfelstadt, 150-151.

Maria’s tomb is similar to that of the Cardinal of Portugal, though there are significant differences, which can be attributed to the gender and vocational difference between their two subjects. The Florentine program emphasized the “celebrated celibacy” of the Portuguese Cardinal, while the Neapolitan tomb emphasized Maria of Aragon’s role as a married woman (Carl, 328) and her status as a young mother. Differences include: the Resurrection on the Neapolitan tomb is a replacement for latticework grating on the Florentine tomb; the base of Maria’s tomb features an inscription and relief imagery while the Cardinal’s has an inlaid base; the Florentine tomb has three marble panels in the background, while the Neapolitan tomb only has one; there are also divergences of proportion and style (Apfelstadt, 151). Apfelstadt also notes that Maria’s effigy is reversed. However, that is not the case within the architectural framework of their chapels; both the effigies have their heads towards the altars of their chapels and their feet towards the entrances. Three significant divergences not mentioned by Apfelstadt are the location of the tombs within their respective chapels, the arrangement of the two sedilia, and the presence of significantly more painting in the Florentine example. Maria’s tomb is located to the left when looking at the altar of the chapel, while the Cardinal of Portugal’s is to the right, and the sedile in Maria’s chapel is a flat bench, while in the Cardinal’s chapel the sedile is an elaborate throne meant to invoke a cathedra. The Cardinal of Portugal’s chapel also features significantly more painting and decorative elements, including more elaborate frescoes above the sculptural elements, a glazed terracotta ceiling, and a painted altarpiece.

In contrast, the altar in Maria’s chapel is a sculpted Adoration scene within a framework of pilasters supporting an entablature. Flanking the Adoration are two standing saints and two bust-length figures who have been variously identified. The bust-length figures are usually agreed to be Old Testament prophets (Cunardi, 44; Apfelstadt, 172), but the identifications of the standing figures are more tenuous because they lack distinct attributes. Suggested identifications include: Saint Andrew on the left, with Saint Luke on the right (Apfelstadt, 172) or Saint James on the left and Saint John the Evangelist on the right (Cunardi, 44), among others.

Bibliography:
21. **Tomb of Franceschina Tron Pesaro**, died in 1478 (fig. 28).

**Attribution:**
The artist of Franceschina’s tomb is unknown and not provided by any sources.

**Date:**
1478-1488

**Location:**
Chapel of the Immaculate Conception or Chapel of the Pesaro of San Benedetto or Sacristy, Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, Venice

**Material:**
Red marble

**Patron:**
Niccolo, Benedetto, and Marco Pesaro, the sons of Franceschina Tron Pesaro, are credited with the tomb based upon the inscription.

**Inscription:**
FRANCESCHINAE TRO(N). PIENTI / SSIMAE MATRI NICHOLAEUS BE / NEDICTUS ET MARCHUS PIASU / RI PETRII PATRICII VEN(ETI). SIBII / QUE ET POSTERIS / POSUERE / MCCCCLXXVIII AN(N)O SALUTI(S) / QUARTO / NONAS IUNII

Niccolo, Benedetto, and Marco Pesaro, sons of Pietro and Venetian nobles, set up [this monument] for their most pious mother Franceschina Tron, and for themselves and their descendants, in the year of health 1478, on the 2nd of June (Translation Benjamin Eldredge, Rome, 2013).

Inscription in the Bellini painting:
IANUA CERTA POLI DUC MENTEM DIRIGE VITAM / QUAE PERGAM COMMISSA TUAE SINT OMNIA CURAE

Protector of Heaven’s door, guider of my thoughts, conductor of my life, to your care I entrust all of my actions.

**Condition:**
The tomb is a slab in front of the altar, but the entire chapel, including Giovanni Bellini’s *Frari Triptych*, was commissioned in Franceschina’s honor. The chapel later became the family mausoleum. The ceiling frescoes are in poor condition, and no other sculptures aside from Franceschina’s tomb survive. However, her monument is in good condition, though the inscriptions and coat of arms are relatively worn.

** Relevant Documents:**
Franceschina wrote at least two surviving wills, one from 1432, the other from 1442
ASV, Miani, B. 743, no. 72, dated 2 July 1432 (Published in Goffen, 1986: 187 fn. 17
and Goffen, 1986: 188 fn. 20):

“Mi Francesquina, muggier de miser Piero da Qua’da Pexaro, fo de miser Andrea de
Chonfinio de San Benedeto, sana del chor[po] e de la mente, vogio questo sia el mio
testament, e vogio che sia mie fedel chomesario mio mario [marito] ser Piero da Qua’da
Pexaro e mia madre e mio fradelo e mia sorela e vogio questi mie chomesarri die dar in
pirtuti mie legati, e laso ducati 2 che me sia ditto le mese de San Griguol per anema mia,
e laso ducat 3 al Chorpo de Xpo per l’anema mia e laso ducate 3 a Sancto Andrea per
l’anema mia e laso ducati 3 a Sancto Alovixe per l’anema mia e laso ducati 3 a San
Gerolulmo per l’anema mia e laso ducati 3 ale munege di Agnoli de Murano per l’anema
mia e laso ducati 3 ale munege de San Bernardo de Murano per l’anema mia e laso
ducate 6 que me sia manda asixa una persona de bona fame que priega dio per l’anema
mia e laso ducati 4 che me sia ditto le mese de la Madona per l’anema mia e laso ducati 3
che sia dadi a qualque bona persona que vada a Chastelo agno vene retour el perdun per
l’anema mia uno ano e laso ducati 2 che sia dadi a qualque persona de bona chonsienzia
que vada uno ano de longo angomer chore tuor el perdon a San Lorenzo e laso ducati 6
che me sia chavado uno prexonare per l’anema mia e laso ducati 2 dona Malgarita de
Lubana que la priega dio per l’anema mia che mia mare la tegnua per amor de dio e laso
ducati 3 a mio fante Nicholò do Soria qual che trovi in qua’da Pexaro per l’anema mia e
laso ducati 2 a mia neva Mariza que la priega dio per l’anema mia e laso ducati 2 a la mia
femena Albanexe per l’anema mia e laso ducati 10 che sia despendai a puoveri que sia
de grandisima nezesità per lanema mia e laso ducati 6 che sia desensadai ai puoveri de
SAnto Lazaro e laso ducati 2 a Santa Brizida que I priega di per anema mia e laso ducati
2 a la Charitá per anema mia e laso ducati 3 a Sancto Zorzi da lega che diga mese per
l’anema mia e laso ducati 4 a mia ameda madona Beruza Trevisan per l’anema mia e laso
ducati 40 a mia madre a loaso ducati 25 a mio frar e laso ducati 23 a mia sour e laso
ducati 100 a mio mario e laso tuto el mio rexidio a mie fioli si mascholi chome femene
inqualmente; anchora vogio e hordeno que tuti i mie beni mobeli stabili chaduchi e
hordenadi hover deshordenadi che m’aspetase per alguna via e muodo hover in zenio
vogia sia de mie fioli si mascholi chome feme inqualmente; manchando l’un, vada de
l’un in l’altro in fina que isia etade che se posa hordenar, non se trovando nasun de lor
in fina que la etade, laso ducati 400 a m marido laso ducati 90 a mia madre e laso ducati
90 a mio far e laso ducati 50 a mia sorela per lo rexiduo che sia mesi in la quamera de in
presente e sia tolto el pro e sia desespando trar di mese e puoveri e laso ducati 3 al
noder.”

ASV, Gritti, B. 560, no. 255:
“Ego Franceschina uxor viri noblis Ser Pietro de Cha’da Pexaro quondam domini
Andreas confinio S. Panthaleonis…”

Description and Discussion:
Franceschina Tron was the second wife and widow of Pietro Pesaro. Franceschina was
the daughter of Niccolò Tron of San Benedetto, who was from a different branch of the
Tron family than the doge of the same name. She was mother to three sons, Niccolo,
Benedetto and Marco, and had adopted the children of her husband’s previous wife Alessandrina Priuli (Goffen, 1986: 32). Though Franceschina left behind at least two documented wills, which dispersed her dowry generously to a number of religious institutions and family members, she made no provisions in her wills for her own burial, leaving decisions regarding her commemoration up to her surviving sons (Goffen, 1986: 36).

Franceschina’s tomb is located in the Sacristy chapel, directly to the right of the choir and transept of Santa Maria Glorioso dei Frari, the primary Franciscan church in Venice. The church was neither Franceschina’s local parish church, nor did she make specific bequests to the church in her two wills. (Goffen, 1986: 37). The chapel was patronized by Franceschina’s three sons, Niccolò, Benedetto, and Marco, in honor of their mother, which involved enlarging the existing space and decorating the chapel with a slab tomb in the center of the floor honoring Franceschina and listing their patronage in an inscription. Franceschina’s sons also commissioned Giovanni Bellini’s *Madonna and Child with Saints Peter, Nicholas, Benedict, and Mark*, usually called the *Frari Triptych*, at roughly the same time that they commissioned her tomb, though the painting was not installed until a decade following the beginning of construction (Goffen, 1988, 310 n.34). The painting still decorates the chapel’s altar and consists of a triptych depicting the enthroned Madonna with the onomastic saints of Franceschina Tron’s deceased husband and her three sons, Saints Nicholas of Bari, Peter, Mark and Benedict. The triptych is signed “IOANNES BELLINVS / F[ECIT] / 1488. The chapel was the first of many subsequent Pesaro commissions, and later became the Pesaro family mausoleum. It is likely that there were, at one time, wall tombs for other members of the family, but currently only Benedetto’s tomb survives, which stands above the entrance to the sacristy (Goffen, 1986: 37).

Franceschina’s tomb is a slab right in front of the Bellini altarpiece in the center of the chapel floor. The rectangular slab features a floriated border, and the inscription indicating Franceschina as the tomb’s subject and the patronage of her sons at the top of the slab, facing away from the chapel’s entrance. In the center of the slab are the Pesaro arms, also facing the altar of the chapel. The architecture of the chapel comprises one bay of groin vaulting and a ribbed apse with three arched trefoil windows. The architecture of the chapel maintains the gothic architecture of the rest of the Church. Originally the chapel was frescoed, including a surviving *Annunciation* on the triumphal arch, though within the chapel only fragments of painting survive, including four evangelists in the vaults and bits of the borders, those this imagery is in poor condition.

**Bibliography:**
The bibliography on Franceschina’s tomb is extremely limited. In some instances in the scholarship on Giovanni Bellini her monument is mentioned, those sources are included here:

22. **Tomb of Saint Fina**, died 12 March 1253 (fig. 25).

**Attribution:**
The tomb is nearly always attributed to Benedetto da Maiano; however, Giuliano da Maiano has received credit for some of the scenes (Ciardi Duprè dal Poggetto, 36).

**Date:**
1468-88

**Location:**
Saint Fina Chapel, Collegiata, San Gimignano

**Material:**
The tomb is composed of marble and gilding, though the chapel also contains frescoes.

**Patron:**
General Council of San Gimignano

**Inscription:**
VIRGINIS OSSA LATENT TVMVLO QVEM SVSPICIS HOSPES / HAEC DECVS EXEMPLVM PRAESIDIVMQVE SVIS / NOMEN FINA FVIT PATRIA HAEC MIRACVLA QVERIS / PERLEGV QVAE PARIES VIVAQVE SIGNA DOCENT / MCCLXXV

Pilgrim, in this tomb rest the bones of a Virgin, Protector and the Glory, always a great example to her people. Fina was her name, and this her homeland. Do you seek miracles? See what the walls and lifelike statues teach. (Koch, 101-102)

**Condition:**
The chapel has been maintained in good condition, though recent restoration removed alterations made in 1626, 1738, 1880-1 and after 1978 (Nygren, 405).

**Relevant Documents:**
The documentation of Saint Fina’s chapel is extensive. For these documents see Koch, 200ff and Krohn, 128ff. Included here is a record of the Deliberation for the construction of Saint Fina’s tomb and allotment of funds:
Archivio della Biblioteca Comunale di San Gimignao, *Libro di deliberazioni e provvisoni della Comune* NN 130, fol 34r / OO 3, fol. 50v. 1472, July 8 (Published in Carl 1978, 285):

Pro capella Sancte Fine et sepulcro costruendo quod habere debeat
quo libet anno modia XX grani usque in annos quinque
Quante dignitatis et glorie sit urbs et terra illa que decorate est aliquot corpore beato, et quante commendationis sint illi qui omnibus eorum viribus omnique cura et diligentia student corpus illud [ornare et illustrar] cum apparatibus exterioribus ornare atque illustrare, nemo est qui nesciat. Et non solum ad hoc intent fuit semper religio et septa Christianorum, verum etiam illa paganorum et eorum qui Christum [nostrum] numquam cognoverunt, quibus, ut legitur, semper cura fuit et summa diligentia deos suos observare et in eorum decus et honorem temple amplissima construere atque illa ornatissimis apparatibus illustrare. Et pro tanto, cum terra Sancti Geminiani sit decorate et illustrate beatissimo corpore gloriose viriginis Sancte Fine, et conveniens sit un homones dicte terre Christiani esse videantur, dictum corpus apparatibus exterioribus pro viribus suis ornare tam quam [cappellam] perfectionem capella dicte Sannte iam incepte [perficiendam] quam etiam circa [sepulcrum] constructionem sepulcri ubi recondi debeat corpus tante et tam beate Virginis: consilio prefati consultori intelligatum est et sit per presentem provisionem reformatum et ordinatum quod finite presenti fictu grani molendinorum comuni Opera et seu Capella Sancte Fine et pro ea Honofrius Operarious …, habeat et habere debeat quolibet anno usque in annos quinque inde proximos futuros, modia viginti grani de grano molendinorum dicti Comunis [prout olim habuit]. Que modia XX grani ex nunc intelligantur esse et sint assignata dicto Honogrio pro dicta capella perficienda et sepulcro corporis dicte beate Virginis construendo.

Description and Discussion:
Saint Fina was born Fina dei Ciardi in the late 1230s and died in 1253. Much of her history is unknown, though there is a brief early hagiography describing her early devotion and piety to Christ, which later resulted in a paralyzing illness and voluntary martyrdom (Koch, 9). Fina’s piety was recognized in her native San Gimignano and devotion to her emerged quickly following her death and the subsequent miracles her body performed (Koch, 11). She was interred in various monuments at the Collegiata, and there was a concerted effort from the beginning to promote her cult through the veneration of her relics (Koch, 5). The fifteenth-century monument, which was constructed during an effort by the town council to expand the entire church of the Collegiata and construct a chapel in Saint Fina’s honor, is a chapel combining architecture, sculpture, and painting in a singular program in Fina’s honor. All three of the artists were Florentines working towards the beginning of their careers: Giuliano da Maiano was responsible for the architecture of the chapel, Benedetto da Maiano for the tomb and tabernacle, and Domenico Ghirlandaio for the frescoes.

Fina’s tomb is unusual for a saint’s tomb and a woman’s tomb because it combines a tomb, an altarpiece, and a reliquary tabernacle. The sarcophagus lies under an altar table. Upon the altar table rests the rectangular-shaped altarpiece which functions as a tabernacle for the bust-shaped reliquary containing the saint’s head, which is similar to tabernacles meant to hold the Host (Nygren, 407). Flanking the central cavity for the reliquary are four sculpted standing saints, and the inscription transcribed above appears at the top, on a symbolic sarcophagus above narrative reliefs. Above the tomb structure two angels flank a Madonna and Child tondo. The entire tomb structure is set into an arched niche with sculpted curtains and frescoes on the spandrels. On the side walls of the chapel there are frescoes by the Ghirlandaio workshop depicting the death and burial of Saint Fina. Like the roughly contemporaneous frescoes in the Sassetti chapel in nearby
Florence, the burial scene of Saint Fina contains a number of portraits of local contemporaries (Nygren, 407). In the vault frescoes depict the four Evangelists, while the three lunettes at the top of the walls depict Saints Gregory and James, Ambrose and Augustine, and Nicholas of Bari and Gimignano. The frieze below the lunette shows a series of painted prophets. The tomb within a niche format of Saint Fina’s tomb is reminiscent of Florentine monuments like the tomb of the Cardinal of Portugal in San Miniato al Monte.

Bibliography:
Section Four: Independent Double Tombs

List of Tombs
  23. Tomb of Agnese and Clemenza di Durazzo (sisters), 1408, Santa Chiara, Naples
  24. Tomb of Agnese da Mosto Venier (mother and daughter), 1410, Santi Giovanni e Paolo, Venice
  25. Tomb of Generosa Orsini (mother and son), 1498, Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, Venice
  26. Tomb of Maria Pereira and Beatrice Camponeschi (mother and daughter), 1490, San Bernardino, L’Aquila
  27. Tomb of Beatrice d’Este (wife and husband), 1497, Santa Maria delle Grazie, Milan
  28. Tomb of Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola, (wife and husband) 1503, San Benedetto Polirone, San Benedetto Po
23. **Tomb of Agnese and Clemenza di Durazzo**, who died in 1383 (or possibly 1388, the sources differ) and 1371, respectively (fig. 4).

**Attribution:**
Antonio Baboccio da Piperno and his workshop is credited with the tomb, though this attribution is doubted (Venturi, 60) and considered controversial (Bock 2001: 119), though no other definitive attribution has been asserted.

**Date:**
1408-10

**Location:**
Next to the tomb of Maria of Anjou-Durazzo, to the right of the entrance portal on the east wall of the northern transept of the Basilica di Santa Chiara, Naples.

**Material:**
Marble

**Patron:**
Margherita of Durazzo, the younger sister of Agnese and Clemenza and the Queen of Naples and Hungary (Venturi, 60).

**Inscription:**

Here lies the bodies of these illustrious ladies, Lady Agnese of France, empress of Constantinople and the virgin Lady Clemenza of France, daughter of the late Prince and illustrious lord, the Lord Carlo of France, Duke of Durazzo, let their souls rest in Peace. (Translation in German, Bock, 2001: 441. Translation from German to English, mine).

**Condition:**
The tombs were modified in the seventeenth century: originally the cassa was supported by three caryatid virtues, though only two currently remain, and a caryatid sculpture currently located in the Clarissan cloister might be the missing third figure (Bock, 2001: 441 and Gaglione, 1997: 47). The tomb suffered severe damage during the bombardment of Santa Chiara that occurred in 1943 and has since been restored.

**Relevant Documents:**
No specific documents are known regarding the commissioning of the tomb (Bock, 2001: 441); however, Agnes Durazzo’s will survives, as published in Bock, 2001: 473-487, but is too long to re-print in this context. The will and its codicil can be found at ASF,
Description and Discussion:

Agnese and Clemenza di Durazzo were sisters and the daughters of Charles I, Duke of Durazzo, and Maria of Calabria, Countess of Alba. They were the older sisters of Margherita of Durazzo, Queen of Naples and Hungary, whose tomb is discussed in catalogue entry #1. Agnese was married twice and widowed twice, first to Cansignorio della Scala of Verona, and second to James of Baux, the last Latin Emperor of Constantinople. Clemenza never married. Agnese died in 1383, and Clemenza died in 1371 (Bock 2001: 120).

Agnese and Clemenza’s tomb follows the pattern of many of the Angevin tombs in Naples, which was initiated by Tino di Camaino in the trecento: caryatids supporting a sculpted cassa with an effigy under a canopy held open by angels (Braca, 161). However, Agnese and Clemenza’s tomb is unusual among those honoring the Angevins in that it, like the tomb of Johanna of Anjou-Durazzo and her husband, celebrates two individuals and features both of their effigies on top of the cassa. At the center of the cassa is an Imago Pietatis, which is supported by two virtue caryatids. According to photos, prior to its damage during World War II, above the sloping lid of the cassa was a Virgin and child flanked by saints. At the top of the pointed canopy is an image of the blessing clipeate Christ. The appearance of the tomb is very similar to those others commissioned by Margarita of Durazzo found in San Lorenzo Maggiore, the tomb of her father Carlo, and also the tomb of her sister Johanna and her husband Robert of Artois. (Bock 2001: 119).
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24. Tomb of Dogaressa Agnese da Mosto Venier, died May 1410 (fig. 5).

**Attribution:**
Early scholars tend to attribute the tomb to Filippo di Domenico (Paoletti, 75; Rambaldi, 29; Lorenzetti, 332; and Da Mosto, 100), or the school of the Dalle Masegne (Lambert, 290). Wolters (232) dismisses these attributions in favor of not naming a sculptor, though declaring that two separate hands created the monument. More recent scholars do not attempt a more definitive attribution, with Hurlburt declaring the question of its authorship “unresolved.” (Hurlburt 2006, 143)

**Date:**
The tomb is typically dated to circa 1410 based upon Agnese death in May of that year.

**Location:**
The tomb is located on the wall near the door to the Chapel of the Rosary of Santi Giovanni e Paolo, Venice. Agnese’s tomb is below and to the left of her husband’s monument.

**Material:**
The tomb is composed of pink Istrian stone and marble.

**Patron:**
Agnese made stipulations and provisions in her will(s, see below) for the tomb, though her son Niccolò claimed credit for the monument in the epitaph.

**Inscription:**
DE MCCCX E DE MCCXI / HUNC NICOLAUS VIR MAGNUS ORIGINE CLARA / VENERIO GENITUS TUMULUM CONSTRUXIT IN ALTUM / ANTONI VENETUM DUX INCLITE QUEM GENUISTI / QUO IACET ILLUSTRIS CONUINX TUA CLARA DUCISSA / AGNES INSIGNINS IAM PETRONELLA SEPULTA EST ILLIUS ET QUONDAM GENEROSA DUCISSA IUGALIS / EX ARCHIPELAGO QUA CUM SUA NATA BENIGNA / URSULA IUNCTA IACET QUÆ MORS INFUNUS ACERBN / ANTE DIEM RAPUIT CUMQUE ILLUM RECTOR OLIÆMPI ET GENUS OMNE SUUM COMPLETO CALLE VOCABIT / AS SUPERUM PATRII SIMUL HEC SUA MEMBRA QUESCENT

1410 and 1411. Nicolo Venier, a great man born from the illustrious Venier lineage, who you, Antonio, famous doge of Venice, begat, constructed this lofty tomb where your illustrious consort distinguished dear dogaressa Agnes lies, and now together with Petronilla, generous former duchess from the archipelago, and wife, with whom also lies her kind daughter Ursula, whom the ruler of Olympus seized before her time, and his whole family, completing the travel, will call [him] to the heavens, these members [of his family] who rest together (Translation Hurlburt 2003: 143).

**Condition:**
A small amount of corrosion and the head of the angel is modern, part of the sword is missing, and two of the prophets are missing hands (Wolters, 231).

**Relevant Documents:**
Agnese wrote at least three extant wills in 1401, 1403, and 1410. For a discussion of these wills, see Hurlburt, 2003: 135-136.

In her will from 1401 she requested burial in the Venier family tomb in Santi Giovanni e Paolo:
ASV, AN, Testamenti, busta 367, will number 71, notary Angioleto (Published in Hurlburt 2003: 135 fn. 21):

“…quod predicti mei commissarii faciant fieri michi unam archam in monasterio antedicto quam prope honeste fieri poterit penes archam que fieri debet pro predicto Illustrissimo domino Antonio Veniero duce olim marito meo pro qua mea archa fienda vel emenda possit expendere ducatos 20 auri…”

In her will of 1403 she requested her own tomb:
ASV, AN, Testamenti, busta 367, will number 73, notary Angioleto (Published in Hurlburt, 2003: 135 fn. 22):

“Volo et ordino meum corpus debere seppelliri in monasterio SS Giovanni e Paolo ordinis preidentororum et volo quod michi fiat una archa sub illa que fieri debet pro supradicto illustrissimo principe domino Antonio Venerio vel quanto magis prope et honeste fieri poterit in qua archa predicti commissarii mei expendant illud quod sibi videbitur et etiam pro obsequium pr mei sepulture fiendo.”

Her final will repeated these requests and can be found at: ASV, CI, Notai, busta 189, fols. 31v-32v, notary Spinelli (see: Hurlburt, 2003: 136, fn. 23).

**Description and Discussion:**
Agnese was the wife of Doge Antonio Venier. She became Dogaressa when she was already fifty years old in 1383 (Hurlburt, 2003: 131). Antonio Venier died on 23 November 1400, and in Agnese’s will from 1403, she mentioned that work had not started on his tomb, indicating she was at least nominally overseeing the construction of his tomb (Hurlburt 2003: 134). Though her son took credit for the monument in its inscription, Agnese’s many wills indicate she was preoccupied with her own memorialization and provided for it.

The constructed tomb is composed of a sarcophagus set within a pointed-arch frame. On the sarcophagus are figures of John the Baptist, Peter Martyr and an *Imago Pietatis* in the center. In the lunette above is depicted an Enthroned Madonna and Saints Anthony and Dominic to either side. In the arched architectural framework a tondo with the risen Christ decorates the apex of the arch with an *Annunciation* being enacted across the base of the arch, Gabriel on the left with the Madonna on the right. Above the lunette are two small flanking figures, likely prophets (Hurlburt 2003: 141). At the top of the monument, Saint Agnese, the dogaressa’s onomastic saint, brandishes a sword. There is
no effigy or indication of the subject of the tomb except the figure of Saint Agnese and the inscription.

Agnese’s tomb is immediately below that of her husbands, and as Hurlburt points out, this proximity “unfailingly” relates the Dogaressa’s monument to the tradition of ducal tomb iconography (Hurlburt, 2003: 142). Additionally, the imagery on Agnese’s tomb makes subtle allusions to Venice’s politics, particularly the presence of her husband’s ducal coat-or-arms, as well as the depiction of the Annunciation itself, which refers to the founding of Venice on the feast of the Annunciation in 421 (Hurlburt, 2003: 142).

Bibliography:
Few sources discuss Agnese’s tomb specifically, it is at times mentioned in broader discussions of Santi Giovanni e Paolo, which are included below:

25. **Tomb of Generosa Orsini** (with her son Maffeo Zen), death date unknown (fig. 33).

**Attribution:**
Unknown, although the shape is similar to oval tombs sculpted at the time by Pietro Lombardo (Brand, 170-197). However, Brand does not discuss the Orsini-Zen tomb and does not attribute it to Pietro Lombardo.

**Date:**
1498 (Goffen, 186, fn. 11).

**Location:**
In the left transept of Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, Venice.

**Material:**
Marble

**Patron:**
Unknown, though likely Luca Zen, Generosa’s husband, based on the inscription.

**Inscription:**
DEUS / IESUS MEUS / GENEROSAE URSI / NAE VX A CHARISS / MAPHEO FILV ERUDI / TISS LUCA ZENUS / DIVI MARCI / PROCURATOR / V F

My lord
Jesus
for Generosa Orsini,
wife
and for her beloved son Maffeo
the very learned Luca Zen
Procurator of San Marco
made this offering
(Translation Benjamin Eldredge, Rome, 2013)

**Condition:**
The tomb is in good condition without any obvious wear or damage.

**Relevant Documents:**
No relevant documents are currently known.

**Description and Discussion:**
Generosa Orsini was the wife of Luca Zen, a procurator of San Marco and the presumed patron of the tomb. The tomb memorializes Generosa Orsini and her son Maffeo Zen, who, like his father, was also procurator of San Marco. The tomb is an urn shape with foliate designs in relief in a circular frame. On the lid of the urn is a half figure of the Virgin and Child. Flanking the urn are two lions. Below the circular frame two angels
flank a double-headed eagle holding the stemma of Venice. Below on a roundel is the inscription above.

The literature on the Orsini-Zen tomb is extremely limited. Holly Hurlburt does not mention the tomb in in her discussion of women’s tombs in Venice (Hurlburt, 139-153, see especially, 142). However, the existence of the Orsini-Zen monument contradicts Hurlburt’s assertion that following the construction of the tomb for Dogaressa Agnese da Mosto Venier, “It would be at least a century before another woman received a wall memorial: again, she was figure of great political significance in the city—the former Queen of Cyprus Caterina Corner” (Hurlburt, 142. Caterina Corner died in 1510 and therefore her monument post-dates the scope of this study). When the tomb is mentioned it is often called that of “Generoso” Orsini, implying that it commemorates a man, when in fact it commemorates a woman.
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26. **Tomb of Maria Pereira (also spelled Pereyra) and Beatrice Camponeschi**, Maria Pereira died after 1490 and Beatrice Camponeschi died before 1488 (fig. 19).

**Attribution:**
Silvestro dell’Aquila

**Date:**
The tomb was commissioned by 1488, with construction underway by 1490 (Sulli, 209-210).

**Location:**
The tomb is in the choir to the left of the high altar of San Bernardino, L’Aquila.

**Material:**
White and red Marble

**Patron:**
Maria Pereira commissioned the tomb for herself, based upon the inscription on the monument.

**Inscription:**
BEATRICI CAMPONISCACAE INFANTI DULCIS QUAE VIXIT MENSES XV MARIA PEREYRA NORO-/ NIAQUE MATER E CLARISSIMA HISPANORUM REGUM STIRPE TAM MATerno QUAM PATerno GENERE ORTA PETRI LAL-/ LI CAMPONISCI MONTORII COMITIS CONIUNX FILIAE SUAE UNICAe BENEMERENTI ET SIBI VIVENS POSUIT.

For the infant Beatrice Caompneschi, a sweet child, who lived fifteen months, Maria Pereira y Norona
Mother and noble descendent of the kings of Spain through both her mother and her father
wife of Pietro Lalle Campnoeschi, Count of Montorio,
for her worthy only daughter, and for herself, erected [this monument] while still living.
(Translation Benjamin Eldredge, Rome, 2013)

**Condition:**
The tomb sustained minor damage from the earthquake in 2009, though the church was severely damaged. Restoration is on-going.

**Relevant Documents:**
Sulli and Chini refer to two passages in the unpublished *Annali* of A. L. Antinori (*Annali*, mss., Biblioteca Provinciale “S. Tommasi,” L’Aquila) of relevant documents that are no longer extant, or else their locations are unknown
In Antinori, *Annali*, vol. 17, under the year 1488, page 18 (Published in Sulli, 209 and Chini,):

A reference to the state of the work in 1490:
In Antinori, Annali, vol. 17, under the year 1488, page 82:
“Non era terminato ancora il bell’Edifico di marmi sculti che ella faceva lavorare da Silvestro della Torre a forma di Cappella nella Chiesa di S. Bernardino onde contituì un Procuratore per assistere alla composizione e alla struttura.” With the citation: “Epist. (?) Procur. A. 1490 in Fasciculis Scripturarum Camponiscorum ap. Rit. Mon. Aqu. P. 6137” (Sulli, 209-210)

Description and Discussion:
Maria Pereira was linked by blood to the Spanish royalty and was the wife of Pietro Lalle Camponeschi, the count of Montorio and the hero of L’Aquila’s resistance to Neapolitan control of the city (Pizzuti, 62). In 1484 her husband lost the favor of the Aragonese, was arrested and exiled to Naples. Maria and her young daughter Beatrice tried to get to Pietro in Naples, and it was during these exertions that Beatrice died at the age of twenty-five months (Pizzuti, 62). Upon Maria’s return to L’Aquila, she commissioned the tomb to commemorate herself and her young daughter.

The tomb takes the form of what has been designated a “humanist” tomb: originated in Florence with Antonio Rossellino’s tomb of Leonardo Bruni and Desiderio da Settignano’s tomb of Carlo Marsupini, both in Santa Croce, the type consists of a tomb chest with effigy set within an arched niche, recalling a triumphal arch. By the 1490s this form of tomb was widely dispersed across the peninsula and rarely, by that period, did it commemorate humanists (on this point see: Zuraw, Shelley, “The Public Commemorative Monument: Mino da Fiesole’s Tombs in the Florentine Badia.” The Art Bulletin 80.3 (1988): 459). The tomb of Maria Pereira is perhaps unique among extant tombs (the tomb of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni, based upon the evidence from the Heemskerck drawing, for which see catalogue entry #33, might have contained similar imagery, in that case with the effigy of the child resting on the chest of her mother).

The effigy of Maria lies atop a foliate sarcophagus. Between the claw-foot supports, rests the tiny effigy of Beatrice. Flanking the sarcophagus sit two angels bearing the arms of the Camponeschi. Below the sarcophagus and effigies is a smaller sarcophagus sculpted in relief for Beatrice. In the pilaster supports of the arch flanking Beatrice’s sarcophagus are two stemmi of the Camponeschi family. On either side of Maria’s sarcophagus are Saint John the Baptist, Saint Francis, Saint Lucy and Saint Catherine. Behind the sarcophagus and in the lunette are panels of dramatic red marble.
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27. **Tomb of Beatrice d’Este** (with her husband Ludovico Sforza), died 2 January 1497 (fig. 20).

**Attribution:**
Cristoforo Solari

**Date:**
1497

**Location:**
Originally located in Santa Maria delle Grazie, Milan, the tomb is now found in the Certosa di Pavia. The tomb was moved to the Certosa in 1564 (Giordano 1995, 186).

**Material:**
Marble

**Patron:**
Ludovico Sforza had already begun considering his final resting place as early as 1490 with the construction of a chapel at Santa Maria delle Grazie begun in 1492. With Beatrice’s premature death in 1497 construction of her tomb was expedited and the construction of Ludovico’s effigy followed shortly thereafter.

**Inscription:**
As far as I am currently aware, none remains, or was ever created for the original tomb. However, there is an inscription on the later red marble base that supports the effigies.

**Condition:**
Only Beatrice and Ludovico’s paired effigies remain, of what was originally a more elaborate, though unfinished tomb.

**Relevant Documents:**
Letter from Ludovico il Moro to Francesco Gonzaga, Marquis of Mantua, 1497, announcing the death of Beatrice.
(Luzio and Renier: 125):

“Et potens Domine cognate et tanquam frater carissime,
La Illustrissima nostra consorte, essendole questa notte alle due hore venuto le
doglie, alle cinque hore partirì un figliuolo morto, et alle sei et mezza rese el spirit a Dio;
del quale acerbo et immature caso ci troviamo in tant amaritudine et cordoglio quanto sia possibile di sentire, et tanta che più grato ci sarìa stato morire noi prima et non vederne
mancare quell ache era la più cara cosa havessimo a questo mondo; et benchè siamo in
questa grandezza et extremità di cordoglio fuori di ogni misura et sappiamo che all S.V.
non sarà di manco dolore, nondimeno non havemo volute omettere di significargli noi el
caso come c’è parso convenire allo offitio et amore nostro fraterno verso la S.V., la quale
preghiamo non vogli mandare alcuno a condolersene con noi per non renovare el dolore.
Di questo caso non c’è parso scrivere alla Ill. Madonna Marchesana, rimettendo che la S.V. con quello megliore modo parerà a Lei le lo faccia sapere, quale siamo certi che insieme con la S.V. è per sentirne inestimabile dolore.

Mediolani, 3 Januarii 1497 hora undecima

Ludovicus M. Sfortia

Anglus Dux Mediolani”

Letter from Floriano Dolfo, a Bolognese canon and friend of Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere to Isabella d’Este, dated 10 January 1497 (Archivio storico Lombardo: 639):

“Cossi come, ill. Ma M.ma Marchesana, sopra ogni altra donna che hoggi al mondo spiri, sola seti aliena da ogni costume et inclinamento femineo et, sbandite tute le levitate et sensualitate, di che ne sono per natura le donne copiose, vi sete accostata ad li virtuosi et constant acti virile, mediante li quali può V. Ex. più presto essere in lo savior et constant collegio de li homini che nel nobile armento de le donne annumerata, similmente in questo acerbo caso de la morte di la b. m. vogliati confermarvi, ecc.”

ASMi, Missive 206bis, 30 July 1497 (reproduced in Archivio di Stato, Milano, Ludovico il Moro. La sua città e la sua corte (1480-1499), 102: Memoriale delle cosse che ad fare messer Marchesino:

Pasquier Le Moyne described the tomb of the duchess in 1515 (Pasquier Le Moyne, Le couronnement du roy Francois premier de ce nom voyage et conqueste de la duche de millan, victoire et repulsion des exurpateurs dicelle avec plusierus singularitez des eglises, couvens, villes, chasteaux et forteresses diceslle duche Fais lan mil cinq cens et quinze, Paris 1520. Published in Giordano 183-185):

“la sepulture de Beatrix femme du More est eslevee en hault bien richement et dessoubz pres terre nostre seigneur ou tombeau”

Description and Discussion:

Beatrice d’Este was the daughter of Ercole I d’Este of Ferrara and Eleonora d’Aragona; she was born on 29 June, 1475. The contract for her marriage to Ludovico Sforza of Milan was arranged in April of 1480 when Beatrice was only five years old. The marriage alliance between Ferrara and Milan was politically beneficial for both sides. She married Ludovico Sforza, the Duke of Bari and leader of Milan, in 1491. She had two sons, Ercole, called Massimiliano in 1493, and Francesco II in 1495. Also in 1495, Ludovico Sforza was invested as Duke of Milan. Beatrice died from childbirth at the age of twenty-two (Archivio storico lombardo, XVII 639) in the night between the second and third of January 1497.

Beatrice’s tomb is part of a double monument memorializing her and her husband, Ludovico. Ludovico had begun plans for construction of a funerary chapel in Santa Maria delle Grazie, Milan, as early as 1490, and the first stone of the chapel was laid in 1492 (Giordano 1995, 178). Upon Beatrice’s untimely death in 1497, activity at the chapel increased significantly (Sanudo I, 812), and Cristoforo Solari was tasked with
sculpting an effigy for Beatrice; Solari had already been working for Ludovico on the façade of the Certosa di Pavia with Giovanni Antonio Amadeo (Schulz, 55). Originally and prior to the death of Ludovico it was thought that, Beatrice’s effigy was arranged with a no-longer-extant terracotta Lamentation group composed of eight figures (Giordano 1995, 185). More recently, however, it has been posited that both Beatrice’s and Ludovico’s effigies remained in Solari’s workshop and the workshop of the Duomo of Milan until they were transferred to the Certosa di Pavia in 1564 (Morcheck, 227-242). It should be noted that the tomb constructed originally for Beatrice, and later including an effigy to Ludovico, was intended to be free-standing, which was extremely unusual for lay individuals in fifteenth-century Italy. Had the monument been completed, it would have of nearly unparalleled magnificence. The project likely would have included a canopy over the effigies at the high altar of Santa Maria delle Grazie (Giordano 1995, 185). The tomb was never completed due to the French invasion and Ludovico’s loss of power in Milan.

As it exists now, the incomplete tomb depicts the young Beatrice as a gisant with her hands crossed at her waist and holding a small animal pelt, usually identified as a member of the weasel family, which possibly refers to her fertility in providing the duke with two male heirs. Though recognized as a trend-setter in her lifetime, particularly with her distinctive coazzone hairstyle (Welch, 241-268), her effigy here is presented with her hair curled around her face and falling loosely to her shoulders, possibly to emphasize her youth.

Beatrice’s effigy and that of Ludovico share a funerary bed, though the figures of their effigies were sculpted separately. The style of the tomb—a free-standing double tomb for the ruler and his wife—is similar to those typical for the kings of France. It is possible that Ludovico was aware of the French model and was intentionally imitating the form (Giordano 2008, 88). By imitating the French model, Giordano suggests that Ludovico intended with his tomb to legitimize his rule of Milan, and through Beatrice, to proclaim him the founder of a renewed Sforza dynasty (Giordano 2008, 89).
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28. **Tomb of Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola** died 1511 (fig 21).

**Attribution:**
The sculptor of Lucrezia Pico dell Mirandola’s tomb is unknown, though unconnected to the construction of the tomb, Giulio Romano is linked with later architectural interventions at Polirone.

**Date:**
The tomb is dated 1503, based upon the inscription on its front.

**Location:**
San Benedetto Polirone, in San Benedetto Po, in the province of Mantua.

**Material:**
Marble

**Patron:**
Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola is the patron of her own tomb, based upon the inscription (see below).

**Inscription:**
LVCRETIA PICA ARRAG. / DEAPPIANO / MONTISAGA COMITISSA /
SARCOPHAGVM / HOC LOCO SIBI / ET GERARDO FOELICI / ARRAG DE
APPIANO/ MONTISAGA COMIT / CONIVG CARISS / FACIVNDVM CVRAVIT

Lucrezia Pico d’Aragona de Appiano, countess of Montegano, commissioned the fashioning of the sarcophagus in this place for herself and for her most dear husband Gherardo Felice d’Aragona de Appiano, count of Montegano 1503 (Translation Holman, 643).

**Condition:**
The base under the sarcophagus was added in the eighteenth century during the renovation of the monastery. (Holman, 661), otherwise the tomb maintains good condition

**Relevant Documents:**
Lucrezia’s will dating from June 3, 1500:
ASMil, FPR, SBP, b. 214, no.45 fols. 5-11; no. 46 (Published in a partial transcription, Holman, 653):

“In Christi Nomine Amen. Anno Domini a nativitate eiusdem millesimo quingentesimo indictione tertia die iovis undecimo mensis Junij regnante ser(enissi)mo d(omi)no Maximiliano Romanoru(m) Rege, In loco S(anc)ti Benedicti de Padolirone v(ide)l(icet) in sacristia seu in quodam loco ultra sacristiam ubi monaci confitentur…”
IBIQ(ue) mag(nifi)ca comitissa d(omi)na Lucretia f(ilia) q(uondam) mag(nifi)ci comitis d(omi)ni Jo(hannis) Franc(esc)i de la Mirandula et uxo r mag(nifi)ci comitis d(omi)ni Gherardi de Aragonia de Opiano sana Dei gratia mente sensu intellectu et corpore considerans casu(m) et quod ni certius morte et incertius hora mortis volens more bona(e) chr(is)tian(a)e vivere et bona sua disponere dum sit in sanitate consituta, quia in puncto mortis alia sunt cogitanda et ideo nolens intestate decedere ne post eis mortem aliqua lis oriri possit de bonis suis inter successors et affines suos per presens nuncupatiuu(m) tetamentu(m) sine scriptis dispositione(m) bonoru(m) et formam v(idelicet) quia anima(m) suam omnipotentiae Deus (mediavit) curia(m) celesti devotissime commedavit cadaver vero suu(m) sepeliri voluit et iussit in cimiterio et iuxta monasteriu(m) Sancti Benedicti de Padolirone in qua(m) sepulcro ibi construendo per monacos infrascriptos eiu(s) heredes et prout ipsis heredibus videbitur et placuerit et quod induantur omnes de familia sua qui tempore mortis ipsius testatricis erunt in domo sua et ad servitia ipsius testatricis vestibus nigris v(idelicet) masculi cu(m) mantellis et capuccis et femin(a)e cu(m) mantellis et velis ut moris est, ita tamen quod brachium panni taliu(m) vetisum non excedat valorem soldoru(m) triginta bononinoru(m) et prout ipsis heredibus et comissariis infrascriptis plauuerit…

In omnibus autem aliis suis bonis mobilibus et im(m)obilibus iruibus et actionibus cuiuscumque(ue) generis sint et sint ubicumque velint sive magna sive parva quantitate ipsa mag(nific)ca d(omi)na Lucretia sibi heredes suos universals instituit et esse voluit monasterium Sancti Benedicti de Padolirone situ(m) in territorio Mantuano seu eius venerabiles monacos de observantia et qui in observantia vivant prout faciunt de p(raese)nti, et casu quo ipsu(m) monasteriu(m) aliquo tempore teneretur per alius personas qua(m) per monachos S(anc)ti Benedicti de observantia tunc et ex nunc prout ex tunc h(a)eredes suos instituit totam congregationem monachorum(m) Sanctae Justin(a)e de observantia et eius monacos agravans ipsos haeredes ad dandu(m) et exponendu(m) quarter in anno sextaria vigiti panis pauperibus Christi in loco della Signata territorij Mantua(e) ubi ipsa nun(c) habet habitationem suam v(idelicet) in festo Corporis Christi viginti Item ad festu(m) anu(n)tiationis beat(a)e Maria(e) virginis viginti Ite(m) in fest assumptionis beat(a)e Maria(e) virginis viginti Item in nativitate D(omi)nus tunc et ex nunc prout ex tunc h(a)eredes suos instituit totam congregationem monachorum(m) Sanctae Justin(a)e de observantia et eius monacos agravans ipsos haeredes ad dandu(m) et exponendu(m) in dicto loco tempore capituli generalis si fiet capitulu(m) in dicto loco S(anc)ti Benedicti. Item et in obitu dictae d(omi)na(e) ad celebrandu(m) missa(m) solemnem si fiet capitulu(m) in dicto loco S(anc)ti Benedicti et ad celebrandu(m) perpetuo anniversariu(m) solemne(m) pro anima ipsius testatricis et antecessoru(m) suoru(m) prout fit de Comitissa Mathedi. Item et ad celebrandu(m) perpetuo missa(m) solemnem tempore capituli generalis si fiet capitulu(m) in dicto loco S(anc)ti Benedicti. Item et in obitu dictae d(omi)na(e) ad celebrandu(m) missa(m) solemne(m) per totam Congregationem prout fit pro monacis. Item agravat ipsa d(omi)na testatrix dictos h(a)eredes quod per prius satisfactis o(n)ibus legatis et legatarijs ac obligationibus in p(raese)nti testament annotates de proventibus et fructibus bonoru(m) ipsius testatricis incipient fabricare unam ecclesiam(m) in dicto loco S(anc)ti Benedicti et ad honorem prefati Sancti Benedicti destuendo veterem qua(m) nunc est vel prout melius videbitur dictis heredibus, in qua nova ecclesia construenda fiat sacellu(m) sive capella(m) una(m) in honorem S(anc)ti Hieronymi ni qua singulis diebus celebrentur salte du(a)e missa(e) faciendo com(m)emorationem defunctoru(m) suoru(m). Item legavit et reliquit in specie h(a)eredibus predictis terras suas et possesionoem quae nuncupantur Il Zamfrognano in territorio Mirandulae hac condictione quod obligati sint perpetuo de fructibus ipsius possessionis tantu(m) celebrare sive celebrari facere quotidie duas missas in ecclesia
noviter constructa per ipsa(m) d(ominam) testatricem in villa Signat(a)e predicta, et hoc pro animabus ipsius d(ominae) testatricis et q(uondam) d(omi)n(a)e su(a)e matris et suor(a)m defunctor(u)m et si ipsi fructus no(n) essent sufficientes pro faciendo celebrari dictas missas non agravat ipsos h(a)eredes nisi pro ipsis fructivus tantu(m) reservato tamen sibi d(omi)nae posse assignare dictam possessionem dictae ecclesiae della Signata et facere beneficiu(m) cuius ipsa habeat ius patronatus si sibi placuerit et reservation in se d(omi)na quod possit disponere de ipsa possessione prout sibi placuerit…

Benedetto Luchino’s 1592 description of Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola’s bequest and renovation of Poliron’s church by Giulio Romano

Benedetto Luchino, *Cronica della vera origine, et attioni della illustrissima, et famosissima Contessa Matilda* (Mantua, 1592). (Published in Holman, 656).

“No gli anni 1500, l’Illustriissima Signor Lucretia Picca della Mirandola, figliuola del già signor Gio. Francesco, & moglie del Conte Gerardo d’Aragonia d’Oppiano, per incaminare le cose dell’anima sua al port della salute, si dispose di lasciare la Corte della Segnata al Monastero di San Benedetto. Discorrendo perciò sopra le miserie de questa nostra mortale, & caduca vita, & considerando non esser cosa più certa della morte, nè più incerta dell’ahora sua; volle prude(n)temente prevenire alle cose sue mentre ch’era sana di corpo, & d’intelletto, & effettuare il suo desiderio, acciò preoccupata da qualche accidente, non restasse impedita, & intestate. Et per ischifare ogni lite, & contrasto, che nascere potesse tr’l Monastero, & I suoi parenti doppo la morte sua, volle ordinare il suo Testamento in questa maniera. Lasciò tutte le sue facoltà mobili, & immobili, oltra la Corte della Segnata al Monastero di S. Benedetto inteieramente. Co(n) questo patto, che si fabricasse la Chiesa tutta di nuovo, overo in quell miglior modo, che si potesse agevolme(n)te accommodare. Et oltra questo, che le fosse cantata l’anniversario solenne ogni anno per l’anima sua, & de’ suoi Progenitori; & che dispensata fosse una buona limosina, quattro volte l’anno, per maggiore suffragio dell’anima sua, si come si costumava di fare per la illustriss(ima) Contessa Matilda. L’animo della Signora testatrices fù realmente adempito, circa il fare I fondamenti della chiesa, & il suo modello, ma per cagion di guerre, & impedimenti notabili de’ fiumi, che travagliavano il Monastero, a babrica dormì per anni, poco meno di quaranta. Onde avvedutisi I Parenti della Signora, volevano mover lite al Monastero. Et agitandosi la causa in Roma alla gagliarad, il Rev. Abbate Cortese, fù avisato dal Signor Giacomo suo fratelli da Roma di tutto il negocio, e subitamente si diele principio alla fabrica. Et per meglio, & più presto incaminare l’opera ad un fine desiderato, tolsero l’eccellentissimo architetto Giulio Romano, & per sua compagnia Battista Mantovano grandissimo pratticone, & così la Chiesa nostra hebbe un felicissimo principio negli anni 1539 & fù finite in poco più di cinque anni.

**Description and Discussion:**

Lucrezia Pico della Mirandola was the daughter of Count Giovanni Francesco I Pico of Mirandola and Giulia Boiardo, and was from the outset a wealthy woman (Cerretti, 84-100). She was initially married to Count Pino II Ordelaffi of Forlì, who had been previously married to Barbara Manfredi, whose tomb is discussed elsewhere in this dissertation (cat #7), until Pino’s death in 1480, at which point Lucrezia became regent
for Pino’s illegitimate fourteen-year-old son Sinibaldo (Holman, 643). Sinibaldo was killed when Pino’s nephews, Antonmaria and Francesco delgi Ordelaffi laid siege to Forli, though Lucrezia was saved when Federico da Montefeltro arrived, leading the papal armies to force a truce. Pope Sixtus IV granted the city to his nephew Girolamo Riario, count of Imola, granting Lucrezia a vast amount of land, goods, and cash as compensation (Cerretti, 88. See also Ernst Breisach, *Caterina Sforaza: A Renaissance Virago*. Chicago (1967) 43-47). In 1483, Lucrezia married the count of Montegano, Gherardo Felice Appiano d’Aragona, the brother of the ruler of Piombino.

Lucrezia’s will dates from June 11, 1500, distributing her considerable assets and naming the monastery of San Benedetto Polirone as her primary heir. As relayed by her will the monks of Polirone were meant build a tomb for her in the monastery’s cemetery, but her wishes were altered after the death of her husband in 1503, and she commissioned a sarcophagus for both of them (Holman, 643).

Lucrezia’s sarcophagus is formally simple and devoid of decoration save for the prominent inscription on the front that relays the commission information. On either side of the inscription are Lucrezia and Gherardo’s coats of arms and in the center is the IHS monogram of Saint Bernardino of Siena, a Franciscan. The inscription is gilt and the arms feature red, blue and gilding. The form of the tomb consists of a basic rectangular sarcophagus with a gabled lid that derives from classical sarcophagi and is a direct imitation of the tomb of Countess Matilda of Canossa, who had been buried at Polirone since 24 July 1115 (Holman, 638).

**Bibliography:**
Section Five: Double Tombs in Couple or Family Chapels

List of Tombs:
29. Tomb of Lisabetta Trenta (wife and husband), 1416, San Frediano, Lucca
30. Tomb of Sibilia Cetto (wife and husband), 1421, San Francesco Grande, Padua
31. Tomb of Piccarda Bueri (wife and husband), 1433, San Lorenzo, Florence
32. Tomb of Vittoria Piccolomini (wife and husband), 1454, San Francesco, Siena
33. Tomb of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni (mother and child), 1477, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome
34. Tomb of Elisabetta Geraldini (wife and husband), 1477, San Francesco, Amelia
35. Tomb of Maddalena Riccia (wife and husband), 1490, Sant’Anna dei Lombardi, Naples
29. **Tomb of Lisabetta (or Isabetta) Onesti Trenta** and her husband Lorenzo Trenta, died before 1426 (fig. 12).

**Attribution:**
Since Vasari, the Trenta tombs have been attributed to Jacopo della Quercia, but in more modern scholarship, there is a debate over whether there is a stylistic difference between the tombs of Lorenzo Trenta and Lisabetta Trenta; Lisabetta’s tomb is characterized as more curvilinear and referred to as stylistically gothic, leading some to attribute it to Jacopo della Quercia’s assistant Giovanni da Imola (Beck, 160). However, Giovanni da Imola was imprisoned in 1416, and had been since 1414, suggesting that if the date inscribed on the tombs is correct (see below), Giovanni da Imola could not be their creator. Their differing appearances might be due to the significantly poorer condition of the Lisabetta tomb, as it is more worn down. As suggested by James Beck, the tomb is by Jacopo della Quercia, but the “softer” stylistic characteristics are owed to “differences in custom and conventions in the rendering of a man and a woman” (Beck, 161). Gabriele Fattorini notes that the style of the tombs is similar to that exhibited by the nearly contemporaneous *Fonte Gaia*, indicating Jacopo della Quercia as the author of the monuments, though not without the help of some assistants (Fattorini, 141).

**Date:**
According to Beck, the altar dates to circa 1410-13 and the tomb slabs from 1416, per their inscriptions (Beck, 71, 94). However Marco Paoli argues that 1416 rather refers to the translation of San Riccardo’s relics into the chapel and does not refer to the creation of the slabs (Paoli, 27ff.)

**Location:**
Originally, Chapel of Santa Caterina, adjacent to the church, currently Trenta Chapel (Cappella di San Riccardo) San Frediano, Lucca.

**Material:**
Marble

** Patron:**
Lorenzo Trenta

**Inscription:**
(Lorenzo Trenta)
HOC EST SEPULCRVM / LAVRENTII Q[VON]DAM NOBILIS VIRI MAGISTRI / FEDERIGI TRENTA / DELVCHA ET SVONRVM DESENDE[N]TVM AN[N]O MCCC16

This is the tomb of Lorenzo [son] of the late nobleman Maestro Federigo Trenta of Lucca and of his descendants 1416

(Trenta’s wives)
This is the tomb of the women and descendants of Lorenzo [son] of the late nobleman Maestro Federigo Trenta of Lucca 1416 (Translation Beck, 158, 160).

**Condition:**
The tombs are slightly worn-down slabs, though the effigy of the woman has suffered more damage. Though only slab tombs, the Trenta monument is included here because the entire burial commission originally was part of a family chapel and is now part of a burial chapel also containing an elaborate sculpted altarpiece by Jacopo della Quercia and a late classical sarcophagus containing the relics of San Riccardo under the altar.

**Relevant Documents:**
There are no documents related to the creation of the Trenta tombs (Beck, 158, 160), which were commissioned while Lorenzo was still alive. However, the monument is mentioned in Lorenzo Trenta’s will:
(Published in Lazzareschi, 72):

> “in tumulo seu sepulcro iam diu constructo in cappella sancte Kate[onym]e constructa in ecclesia sivi apud ecclesiam sancti Frediani de Luca in quo positum et sepultum fuit corpus suit patris et corpus avi patrni sui ipsius testoris.”

**Description and Discussion:**
Lisabetta Onesta Trenta was the first of Lorenzo Trenta’s two wives; he married his second, Giovanna Lazari, after Lisabetta’s death in 1426. Lorenzo Trenta was a wealthy merchant and supporter of Paolo Guinigi (Fattorini, 138). This slab tomb, though frequently referred to as Lisabetta’s tomb, can more generally be referred to as the tomb for the Trenta wives, because there are currently no specific identifying markers indicating the occupant(s) of the tomb. The inscription is also vague due to its reference to “the women of” Lorenzo Trenta. However, it is typically believed to be the tomb of Lisabetta Onesta because it was commissioned while she was still alive and during their marriage (Beck, 159). The tombs were originally located in the Chapel of Santa Caterina, but by the time they were recorded by Vasari, the monuments had been moved into the Chapel of San Riccardo (Beck, 159). The Chapel of San Riccardo was patronized by Lorenzo Trenta in the creation of the Trenta altarpiece, which will not be discussed here, though see the bibliography listed below, particularly Beck, 151-156. Both Lisabetta and Lorenzo Trenta are depicted on their tombs as if lying on their funeral biers with their hands crossed in front of their abdomens. Originally, there were visible stemmi at the feet of the figures, recognizable as those of the Trenta and Onesta families (Fattorini, 138).

Stylistically the tomb of Lisabetta has been thought to be more “gothicizing” than that of her husband, which has led to protracted attribution debates as discussed above.

**Bibliography:**
30. **Tomb of Sibilia Cetto**, with her second husband Ser Baldo Bonafari, died 12 December 1421 (fig. 11).

**Attribution:**
Unknown

**Date:**
1421, based upon the date of Sibilia’s death and the date of the inscription on the tomb.

**Location:**
The tomb was originally in the convent church of San Francesco Grande, Padua. It is currently in the cloister of Santa Maria della Neve, where it was moved in 1852 (Bellinati, 28 fn. 45).

**Material:**
Red marble

**Patron:**
Sibilia commissioned it herself, along with its surrounding convent and hospital context per her will and the inscription.

**Inscription:**
SIBYLA DE CEPTO. Mille Quatercentum Domini Primoque Vicenis / Annis post Baldum Duodena Luce Decembris / Hic Iacet Egregii Prudentisque Sibilla Nota / Quondam Gualpertii de Cepto in pace quiescat.

Sibillia de Cetto, in the year of our lord 1420, two years after Baldo, on the twelfth day of December, here lies eminent Sibillia of the late Gualperti de Cetto of noted wisdom, rest in peace (Translation mine).

**Condition:**
The tomb is an extremely and uniformly worn slab.

**Relevant Documents:**
The wills of Sibilia Cetto are too lengthy to be reprinted here, but can be found in the Archivio della Curia Vescovile di Padova: ACV, *Hospitale Sancti Francisci* ff. 5-10. For an analysis of the wills see Bellinati, 20-23. In the will she specifically states that she wishes to be buried in a new tomb in the church of San Francesco with her second husband Baldo (Bellinati, 21).

**Description and Discussion:**
Sibilia Cetto was born the daughter of a wealthy merchant, Gualperto Cetto. She maintained and added to her wealth throughout her life and was married twice, first to Bonaccorso Naseri in 1370 (Collodo, 31), second to Ser Baldo da Piombino (called
de’Bonafari) on 21 May 1390. She was buried with her second husband Ser Baldo Bonafari in a slab tomb of her own commissioning, originally located in the Convent Church of San Francesco. Sibilia, through her own fortune, though administered by her lawyer husband (King, 63) founded the convent and the adjacent hospital with chapel. Sibilia specified in her will that she wanted to be buried in a new tomb, erected in San Francesco and that it should be for herself and her second husband, who had predeceased her (Bellinati, 21).

The red marble double tomb depicts Sibilia and Baldo in effigy in relief situated within a gothic-style, pointed trefoil arch framework. A lengthy inscription is inscribed at their feet. Though the effigies are worn down, but still mostly legible; Baldo wears the costume of a lawyer, while Sibilia is depicted in the habit of a Franciscan nun with a corded tie at her waist, in which she had requested to be buried (King, 64). The effigies are precisely the same size, indicating no hierarchy based on gender, though the inscription on the tomb clearly emphasizes it as Sibilia’s monument, rather than that of Baldo.

Bibliography:
31. **Tomb of Piccarda Bueri** with her husband Giovanni di Bicci, died 19 April 1433 (fig. 9).

**Attribution:**
Buggiano (Andrea Cavalcanti), the adopted son of Filippo Brunelleschi, is usually credited with the sculpture of the tomb based on Brunelleschi’s *catasto* report from 1433, which states that Brunelleschi owed Buggiano for work completed on a tomb and other objects (Ruschi, 86). Brunelleschi was of course the primary artist—with interventions by Donatello—active in the Old Sacristy and San Lorenzo as a whole (for Brunelleschi at San Lorenzo, see bibliography listed below).

**Date:**
The tomb is dated to 1433-1440. The *terminus post quem* for the tomb is generally considered to be the death date of Piccarda Bueri in 1433; though Giovanni di Bicci seems to have been memorialized in some sort of no-longer-extant tomb prior to her death. The current monument was clearly intended as a double tomb from the start, based on the inclusion of her death date and information in the inscriptions. The *terminus ante quem*, at least for its commission, is the death of one of the patrons, Lorenzo de’Medici, in September 1440. (Cornelison, 30).

**Location:**
The tomb is situated in the center of the Old Sacristy, below a vesting table, San Lorenzo, Florence.

**Material:**
Marble

**Patron:**
Cosimo and Lorenzo de’Medici, the sons of Giovanni di Bicci and Piccarda, are identified by the inscription as the donors of the tomb. Cosimo was also involved with many commissions at San Lorenzo, in addition to the sepulcher for his parents. For Cosimo’s interventions at San Lorenzo, please refer to the bibliography listed below.

**Inscription:**
```
COSIMUS ET LAURENTIUS DE MEDICIS V. CL. / IOHANNI AVERARDI F. ET
PICARDAE ADOVARDI / F. CARISSIMIS PARENTIBUS HOC SPEULCHRUM /
FACIUNDVM CURARUNT. OBIIT AUTEM IOHANNES / X. KAL MARTIAS
MCCCCXXVIII PICARDA VERO / XIII KAL MAIAS QUINQUENNIO POST E
VITA MIGRAVIT
```

Cosimo and Lorenzo de’Medici, sons of the very distinguished man Giovanni di Averardo and sons of Piccarda di Adovardo, have seen to the construction of this tomb for their very beloved parents. Giovanni died ten days before the first of March 1428, but Piccarda passed away 13 days before the first of May in the fifth year following.” (Translation Paoletti, 59)
If services to the homeland, if fame and family and generosity toward all were measured on the dark mountain, alas he would happily live with his chaste wife in the homeland, an aid to the poor and a haven and support to his friend. But since all things are conquered by death, you, Giovanni, lie in this tomb, and you, Piccarda, as well. Accordingly an old man grieves, a youth and a boy, each age. The saddened fatherland, deprived of its parent, grieves. (Translation Paoletti, 59. This inscription is considered to be a threnody, which is a mourning song or poem in honor of the deceased, a type of lament with roots in classical Greece and Rome).

**Condition:**
The tomb is in excellent condition with little observable wear or damage.

**Relevant Documents:**
There are documents related to earlier monuments in the sacristy and to other elements of the sacristy, but there are no currently known documents connected to the sarcophagus.

**Description and Discussion:**
Piccarda Bueri was the daughter of Edoardo Bueri and married to Giovanni di Bicci de’Medici in 1386. She was the mother of Cosimo, ‘il Vecchio,’ de’Medici and Lorenzo, both of whom are listed as patrons of her monument in the inscription on her tomb. Piccarda died in 1433, five years after her husband Giovanni.

The current tomb in the Old Sacristy of San Lorenzo was not the first monument erected there to honor Giovanni di Bicci, but it is the first to commemorate Piccarda, as her death date is considered the earliest date at which the tomb might have been commissioned. It is likely that the commission actually dates from 1434 after the six-month exile from Florence that Cosimo was subjected to following the death of his mother (Cornelison, 28). The tomb is an imposing freestanding monument (and the only surviving freestanding tomb erected in fifteenth-century Florence) see: Andrew Butterfield, “Social Structure and Typology of Funerary Monuments in Early Renaissance Florence,” *RES* 26 (1994): 54). It is a rectangular sarcophagus with gabled lid carved on all sides. The long sides of the sarcophagus feature swag and inscription-bearing putti, while the short sides include more putti with floriated designs. The sarcophagus stands on a large rectangular slab base decorated with four Medici emblems. Two of the emblems serve as stone lids leading to burial sites in the pier supporting the sacristy below (Cornelison, 32). There are slight differences, including the style of the putti, the lettering, content, and location of the inscriptions from one side of the
sarcophagus to the other (Cornelison, 29), though the fact that the sarcophagus is decorated on all sides has lead some scholars to suggest that it was always intended to be located at the center of the Sacristy (Paoletti, 195-219 and Ciardi Duprè, 39). Cornelison, however, argues that because of the stylistic differences the side with the threnody was likely carved significantly after the rest of the tomb had been completed, though she concludes that the tomb was probably originally intended to be located under an open arch between the sacristy and transept chapels (Cornelison, 30-31).

The sarcophagus sits under a table that was expressly designed to function with the memorial marker. The table was likely begun after 1444, with both the tomb and the table in the center of the sacristy by 1459 (Haines, 28). The vesting table features a large round porphyry disk in its center, which had originally decorated the center of the floor of the sacristy, but was superseded by the placement of the tomb there. The disk was placed on the table by 1463 (Cornelison, 33).

Piccarda’s tomb is unique among those in this study for a tomb for a laywoman in that it is freestanding, providing a commemorative honor usually reserved for saints. It should be noted, however, that it is a double tomb even though the monument is nearly always referred to as simply the tomb of Giovanni di Bicci, despite the equal treatment she receives in the dedicatory inscription and the threnody.

**Bibliography:**


For broader analyses of the Old Sacristy, or San Lorenzo, and Brunelleschi’s architecture, which tend to briefly mention the tomb see:

32. **Tomb of Victoria Piccolomini** with her husband, Silvio Piccolomini, died circa 1454.

**Attribution:**
Antonio Federighi is typically credited with the sculpture, though Urbano da Cortona and Francesco di Giorgio Martini have also been connected to the reliefs (Munman, 145).

**Date:**
1454-59

**Location:**
The tomb was originally on the left wall of the cappella maggiore of San Francesco, Siena. The current monument is found on the south cloister wall of the same church.

**Material:**
Marble

**Patron:**
Victoria and Silvio’s son, Enea Silvio, Pope Pius II, is credited with commissioning the monument based upon the inscription.

**Inscription:**
(current)
SILVIUS HIC IACEO, CONIUX VICTORIA MECUM EST / FILIUS HOC CLAUSIT MARMORE PAPA PIUS / SEPUVLCRVM TEMPLI INCEDIO COMBUSTUM / FAMILIA PICOLOMINEA INSTAURAVIT / ANNO D. M.DC.LXXXXV.

Here I, Silvio, lie, my wife Victoria by my side. Our son, Pope Pius, laid us in this marble tomb. [The tomb] burned in the fire in the church and was restored by the Piccolomini Family in the year 1695 (Translation mine)

**Condition:**
Only fragments of the original inscription and a few figural fragments remain. The bulk of the tomb was destroyed in a fire in 1695 (Gentili and Sasi, 74). The original monument was likely quite large and potentially as much as four and a half meters long (Gentili and Sasi, 74). The current monument, a wall plaque with inscription and reliefs of busts of Vittoria and Silvio, likely dates from after the fire (Paoletti, 105). The extant reliefs show no indication of having been damaged by fire, and it is unlikely that they would survive so fully, when the rest of the monument was ruined (Munman, 145).

**Relevant Documents:**
Pope Pius II discusses the transfer of his parents’ remains to San Francesco in his commentaries, the relevant portion of which is reprinted here (Memoirs of a Renaissance Pope. The Commentaries of Pius II [an abridgment], trans. By Florence A. Gragg, New York, (1959): 104:
“The Pope’s mother had died four years earlier, his father eight. The latter was buried at Corsignano, the former at Siena, both in Franciscan monasteries. Long ago a certain knight of the Piccolomini family named Pietro had erected at the Minorite convent before the city gates a sumptuous marble tomb for himself and his descendants, in which many of his family now lie. In this tomb the brethren of the order buried the mother of Pius (then Bishop of Siena and absent in Germany), who had fallen asleep at Creula, a fortified stronghold of the diocese, and had desired to be buried in a Franciscan monastery. This angered Piero, grandson of the first Piero, who thought it an outrage that the dust of one of alien blood should mingle with the bones of his ancestors for Vittoria, Pius’s mother, though married into the Piccolomini family, was by birth a Fortiguerra. Therefore Piero gave orders that the next night the body should be exhumed and interred elsewhere. The monks then laid the noble lady inside the church by the high altar, but in the earth without any marble, hoping that her son would some day do honor to his mother. Nor were their hopes in vain; for when Pius, who had some time before learned of the details of his mother’s death and burial, returned to his own city, had had the bones of his father Silvio moved from Corsignano to Siena and a noble tomb of white marble from the Ligurian mountains built for both his parents. He himself composed the following couplet for their epitaph:

Here I, Silvio, lie, my wife Vittoria by my side. Our son, Pope Pius, laid us in this marble tomb”

Description and Discussion:
Vittoria Forteguerri Piccolomini was the mother of Enea Silvio Piccolomini, later Pope Pius II. As recorded in her son’s Commentaries, upon her death in Siena she was interred in the traditional Piccolomini monument, though shortly thereafter exhumed and reinterred in a newly constructed, sumptuous marble tomb honoring her and her previously deceased husband, Silvio. The original fifteenth-century monument was nearly completely destroyed in the great fire at San Francesco on 24 August 1655. The extant tomb consists of half-length bust portraits of Vittoria and Silvio in scallop shells. Between them is a copy of the original epitaph. The form of this monument is unique among tombs created in fifteenth-century Siena (Munman, 146). Therefore it seems likely that the current monument was produced in the late baroque period in 1695, the date on the inscription (Carli, 1971: 28 and 1980: 40f.)

Bibliography:
33. **Tomb of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni**, died 23 September 1477 (fig. 27).

**Attribution:**
The tomb is attributed variously to Verrocchio, or workshop of Verrocchio, or Mino da Fiesole, or Francesco di Simone Ferruci. Beginning with Vasari, the tomb of Francesca was credited to Verrocchio, which provides the basis of later attributions to that sculptor. In modern literature, scholars have been split upon the creator of the tomb, with credit going to one or a combination of the aforementioned sculptors. For a review of the attribution debates see Butterfield, 237 and Zuraw, 952.

**Date:**
After 1477, based upon Francesca’s death on 23 September of that year.

**Location:**
Originally Francesca’s tomb was located in the Tornabuoni Chapel, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome. A surviving relief is currently found in the Bargello, Florence.

**Material:**
White marble based on the extant relief and that material being used on the extant tomb of Francesca’s nephew Francesco.

**Patron:**
Giovanni Tornabuoni (husband)

**Inscription:**
None known.

**Condition:**
The tomb was destroyed, though associated traces and fragments remain, including a sketch in the notebooks of Martin van Heemskerck, a relief in the Bargello (image above); and various sculpted Virtues, which might be connected to the tomb, see below.

**Relevant Documents:**
There are no commission documents connected to the tomb. However there is an extant letter written by Giovanni Tornabuoni to his nephew Lorenzo de’Medici informing him of Francesca’s death:

ASF, MAP (Mediceo avanti il Principato, Archivio di Stato, Florence), xxxv, 746.

Carissimo mio Lorenzo. Son’ tanto oppresso da passione e dolore per l’acerbissimo e inopinato chaso della mia dolcissima sposa che lo medesimo non so dove mi sia. La quale chome durai inteso ieri, chome piacqui a Dio, a hore xxii sopra parto passò di questa presente vita, e lla creatura, sparata , lei, gli chamavo di chorpo morta, che m’è stato anchora doppio dolore. Son’ certissimo che per la tua solita pieta avendomi chompassione marai per ischusato s’io non ti scrivo a longho.
ASF. “Sepoltuario di Santa Maria Novella del Rosselli,” cod. II-I, 126, (under the date September 23, 1477):
“D. Francisca de Pittis uxor Joanni Francisci D. Simonis de Tornabuonis (p. 679)"

ASF, Conventi Soppressi, 102 [Santa Maria Novella], 106 1, no. 11 6 September 1540. Testament of Messer Leonardo Tornabuoni; copy made on 6 November 1540 by Angelo Vallato of the original by Ser Stefano degli Amanni:

In Nomine Dominj Amen. Anno A nativitate eiusdem Dominj nostrj, Yhesu Christi, Millesimo quingentesimo quartigesimo, Indictione xij, die vero sexta mensis Septembris… In presentia mej, notarij, et Testium suprascriptorum ad hec specialiter vocatorum et rogatorum; personaliter constitutus Reverendus pater, Dominus Leonardus Toranbonus, espiscopus Ianzianensis… 5. Item voluit et mandavit quod fiat una sepultura In ecclesia sanctae Mariae Novello de Florentia, In qua sepultrua debeant exponi scuta mille, Infra quatuor annos, a die mortis testatoris computandos; que fiat ad instar sepulture Cosmi de Medicis. 6. Item lure legatj reliauit venerabili eccleise sanctae Mariae super Minerbam de Urbe scuta tricenta exponenda In dote Cappelle seu altaris sanctj Johannis site In dict ecclesi[as]ia, ubi est sepultura domine Francisece, avie ipsius Testatoris. In quo altarj voluit quod fiat una cappella ad instar aliarum cappellarum fiendarum In navi ubi est dictum Altare santj Johannis, et hoc quatenus jn dicta navj fieri contingat alie cappelle; et si dicta cappella fierj contingat, voluit quod in ea reponanturossa dici domine Francisece cum ornamentis et sepultura marmorea prout nunc est Iusta [sic] dictum altare santj Iohannis. 7. Item voluit et mandavit dictus Testator corpus suum deponi Iusta dictum altare sanctj Iohannis donec asportetur Florentie in dicta cappella fienda In eccleisa sancte Marie Novella, et voluit quod asportetur Infra quatuor annos a die mortis Testatoris computandos… Actum Rome In Regione sanctj Eustachij in camer Domus habitationis ipsius Testatoris

Description and Discussion:
Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni was the wife of Giovanni Tornabuoni who died in childbirth on 23 September 1477. Though no longer extant, a variety of sources can be used to reconstruct the appearance of Francesca’s tomb, including early descriptions found in Vasari, Roman guidebooks, and mentions in a descendant’s will. Additionally, the still extant tomb of her nephew Francesco, which was originally located in the same chapel and is now located next to the *counter-façade* of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, provides comparative information. Francesca’s tomb was likely a wall monument composed of an effigy lying on a bier or sarcophagus placed below three sculpted Virtues. The Tornabuoni Chapel was originally frescoed with episodes from the lives of the Virgin and John the Baptist by Domenico Ghirlandaio, as recorded in Vasari. However, when the chapel was sold to the Nari family in the seventeenth century and subsequently remodeled, both the frescoes and Francesca’s tomb were lost.

The only extant sculpture which scholars have widely acknowledged must come from the monument is a relief currently in the Bargello Museum, depicting a childbirth scene on the right and the presentation of the child to its father on the left. Despite the long association of the Bargello relief with the tomb of Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni, initially suggested by Alfred Reumont in 1873 (Reumont, 167) and maintained in much of the ensuing scholarly tradition, there is only circumstantial evidence that the relief was
present on the tomb. Due to its size, 45.5cm tall by 169.5cm wide (17.9 x 66.7 inches), it possibly functioned, as Günther Passavant (Passavant, 24) has suggested, as part of a “pedestal-like” decorated base for Francesca’s sarcophagus.

The Virtues that Vasari mentions as part of the tomb likely adorned the wall above the effigy, similar to the arrangement of the Tartagni monument in San Domenico, Bologna. Various sculptures have been suggested as these possible sculptures, including a set of sculptures in the Musée Jacquemart-André in Paris (Zuraw, 957-60). However, there are four Virtues in Paris, in contrast to the three described in Vasari. Shelly Zuraw has posited other reliefs as these three lost virtues, including a Faith and Charity in the National Gallery in Washington D.C, and a third, Hope, that had been in the Kaiser Friedrich Museum in Berlin, but was destroyed during World War II.

Additionally, other clues to the appearance of Francesca’s tomb can be found in Martin van Heemskerck’s Roman Sketchbooks, dating from the 1530s, where there is a small sketch of an effigy of a woman atop a sarcophagus supported by acanthus scrolls. Lying on the woman’s chest is an infant, an unprecedented mother-and-child double effigy on a Renaissance commemorative monument. The drawing has been associated with Francesca Pitti Tornabuoni since 1934, when Hermann Egger connected the sketch, a letter written by Giovanni Tornabuoni to his nephew Lorenzo de’ Medici informing him of Francesca’s death, and the Bargello relief. In Heemskerck’s notebooks, the effigy is adjacent to a sketch of the corner of a sarcophagus supported by sphinxes, clearly identifiable as part of the tomb of Francesco Tornabuoni. (Hülsen and Egger, 22).
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34. **Tomb of Matteo and Elisabetta Geraldini**, death date unknown (fig. 26).

**Attribution:**
Agostino di Duccio. De Nicola attributes the tomb to Agostino di Duccio; he credits Agostino with the two adoring angels and the figures of Saint Anthony and the effigies to Agositino’s workshop (De Nicola, 387).

**Date:**
1477 (De Nicola, 387) or 1484/85 (Brunetti, 49).

**Location:**
Cappella Geraldini, San Francesco, Amelia (Umbria, province of Terni). The chapel contains six tombs dedicated to the various members of the Geraldini family, though the double tomb of Matteo and Elisabetta is the only one that overtly honors a female member of the family.

**Patron:**
Giovanni, Angelo, Bernardo, Battista, and Girolamo Geraldini, the sons of Matteo and Elisabetta Geraldini, as recorded in the inscription.

**Condition:**
The effigies on the tomb are split into three distinct pieces with a break right below the hands and another across the shins of the figures. Another break, directly to the left of the inscription indicates the tomb has been fully dismembered at least once.

**Inscription:**
ANGELUS PRAESUL SVESSANUS GERALDINAE FAMILIAE / INSTAURATOR IO CATHACENSIS / EPISCOPUS SACELLI / HUIUS FUNDATOR BERNARDINUS BATTISTA HIERONYMUS / EQUITES COMITES QUE PALATINI FILII PIENTISSIMI / MATHEO ET HELISABETTAE BENEMER PARENTIBUS / GERALDINIS POSVERUNT MCCCCLXXVII

Angelo, the bishop of Sessa, of the Geraldini family,
Giovanni, Restorer of Catanzaro
Bishop of the Cathedral
founder of this [the tomb]
Bernardino, Battista, Gerolamo
Knights and Counts Palatine, and most pious sons,
erected [this monument] for Matteo and Elisabetta Geraldini,
their worthy parents, 1477 (Translation Benjamin Eldredge, Rome, 2012)

**Relevant Documents:**
No commission documents related to the tomb are currently known.

**Description and Discussion:**
Elisabetta Gherardi was matriarch of one of the most prominent families in the small Umbrian town of Amelia, the Geraldini. While information about Elisabetta is extremely limited, her sons had ties to the papal courts, including Angelo Geraldini, who worked for Popes Nicholas V, Callixtus II, Sixtus IV, and Innocent VIII successively.

The wall tomb features the double effigies of Matteo and Elisabetta on top of a large rectangular sarcophagus on consoles. The sarcophagus includes the lengthy inscription and two flanking Geraldini coats of arms on its front. Above the tomb chest, two angelic figures that are shown from the waist up are depicted with their hands crossed at their chests. The angel on the left side of the tomb (at the heads of the effigies) gazes up adoringly at a half-length figure that likely depicts Saint Francis, while the angel on the right (at their feet), looks down towards the effigies.

**Bibliography:**
35. **Tomb of Magdalena Riccia** with her husband Antonio d’Allesandro, died circa 1491 (fig. 32).

**Attribution:**
Tommaso Malvito (Pane, 154).

**Date:**
1491, based on the original inscription on the *sedile* that was part of the memorial chapel.

**Location:**
Originally located in a chapel dedicated to the Alessandro family in Sant’Anna dei Lombardi, Naples, (Heidemann and Scirocco, 31), the tomb has long been dismembered. The chapel is now referred to at the Fiodo chapel, because of the later addition of a monument to Antonino Fiodo. The chapel is forms a sort of anteroom to the chapel containing Guido Mazzoni’s *Lamentation*, adding prestige to the location.

**Patron:**
Antonio d’Alessandro, based on the original inscription on the *sedile*.

**Condition:**
Magdalena’s tomb has the appearance of a floor slab that has been used as the front relief for the sarcophagus of her husband, Antonio d’Alessandro’s, tomb. Though the tomb has been removed from its original chapel context, the remaining parts of the monument survive in relatively good condition.

**Inscription:**
ANTONII DE ALEXANDRO ET MAGDALENE RICIE CONIVGVM / QVOS DEV\_HOMO NON [illegible]

Antonio d’Alessandro and Maddalena Riccia spouses, those whom God has joined together no man… (Translation mine)

On the remaining *sedile* in the chapel:
ANTONIUS DE ALEXANDRO IURIS CONSULTUS AD SUAS ET SUOR RELIQUIAS QUOUSQUE OMNES RESUR / GAMUS REPONENTAS SACELLUM CONSTRUXIT ET REDEMPTORI NOSTRO DICAVIT MCCCCLXXXXI

Antonio d’Alessandro Lawyer and the remains of his family are stored in this chapel until the Resurrection built and dedicated to Our Redeemer 1491 (Translation mine).

**Description and Discussion:**
Maddalena Riccia was the wife of the judge, proto-notary and president of the Privy Council in the Aragonese court, Antonio d’Alessandro (Heidemann and Scirocco, 31). Originally their monument comprised part of a larger chapel complex that was typical of family chapels at Sant’Anna dei Lombardi, in that, like the chapel of Maria of Aragon...
Piccolomini (see cat. #20), it included a tomb, an altar and a sedile (Heidemann and Scirocco, 31). What remains today, however, is only the tomb and the sedile though they have been separated from their original contexts.

The double tomb is composed of seemingly two distinct parts. On the top, Antonio is depicted in effigy wearing an elaborate robe and stole, which would mark him as a member of the Ordine della Giara (Michalsky, 78). Also signaling his profession, his head rests not on a pillow, but on a stack of books (Michalsky, 78). Maddalena Riccia’s tomb takes the appearance of a floor slab affixed to the front of Antonio’s sarcophagus. Her effigy is in much lower relief than that of her husband and the details of her costume are much simpler. The inscription describing their matrimonial union runs along the rectangular frame of Maddalena’s tomb. Antonio and Maddalena’s tomb is one of the first of a series of monuments in Naples with the wife depicted in full effigy on the front of the sarcophagus of her husband. This organization is a continuation of a long tradition going back to the Angevin monuments of depicting family members on the front of tomb chests in order to promote ideas of family continuity and dynasty (see Michalsky, passim).

Bibliography:
Supplementary Catalogue A: Memorial Chapels for Women (without sculpted tombs)

List of Monuments:
1A. Chapel of Altabella Avogaro, 1484, San Fermo Maggiore, Verona
2A. Chapel of Giovanna degli Albizzi, 1490, Santa Maria Maddalena di Cestello, Florence
3A. Chapel of Adriana Sassone, 1492, Santa Maria Maggiore alla Pietrasanta, Naples
1A. Chapel of Altabella Avogaro

Attribution: The painted altarpiece is signed by Francesco Buonsignori.

Location: San Fermo Maggiore, Verona

Date: 1484

Patron: Altabella is depicted as donatrix in the altarpiece, suggesting that she was the patron of the painting, if not the entire chapel.

Description and Discussion:
Altabella Avogaro was the widow of Donato dal Bovo. The main feature of her chapel at San Fermo Maggiore, Verona, is the altarpiece, which depicts a Virgin and Child with Saints and Donatrix Altabella Avogaro, widow of Donato dal Bovo, painted by Francesco Buonsignori. Altabella is depicted in a bust-length profile portrait

Bibliography:
Catherine King, Renaissance Women Patrons, 154; Sally Hickson, Women, Art, and Architectural Patronage in Renaissance Mantua, 28.
2A. Chapel of Giovanna degli Albizzi, died in 1488.

Attribution: The painted decorations and the design of the stained glass window are attributed to Domenico Ghirlandaio.

Location: Santa Maria Maddalena di Cestello, now known as Santa Maria Maddalena de’Pazzi

Date: 1490

Patron: Lorenzo Tornabuoni, Giovanna’s husband.

Inscriptions: There are no recorded inscriptions from the chapel.

Relevant Documents: Angelo Poliziano [Angelo Ambrogini Poliziano, Prose volgari ineditae e poesie Latine e Greche edite e inedited, ed. Isidoro del Lungo (Florence: G. Barbèra Editore, 1867), 154] composed an epitaph in Giovanna’s honor, which reads:

LXXXIV
In Joannam Tornabonam
(MCCCCLXXXVIII)

Stirpe fui, forma, natoque, opibusque, viroque
Felix, ingenio, moribus atque animo.
Sed cum alter partus jam nuptae agetur et annus,
Heu! Non dum nata cum sobole interii
Tristius ut caderem, tantum mihi Parca bonorum
Ostendit potius perfidia quam tribuit.

JOANNAE ALBIERAE UXORI INCOMPARABILI
LAURENTIUS TORNABONUS
Pos. B.M.

To Giovanna Tornabuoni
(1488)

Happy I was in lineage, beauty and birth, wealth and husband
In nature, character and soul
But when now another pregnancy and year of marriage passed
Alas! I died with offspring not yet born within
That I fell more sadly, treacherous Fate showed to me
Many gifts rather than give them.

GIOVANNA ALBIZZI, IMCOMPARABLE WIFE OF
LORENZO TORNABUONI
WELL MERITED
Description and Discussion:
Giovanna degli Albizzi was the wife of Lorenzo Tornabuoni, the daughter-in-law of Francesca Pitti and Giovanni Tornabuoni. Like her mother-in-law, she died in childbirth in 1488. Lorenzo commissioned a chapel in her memory at Santa Maria Maddalena di Cestello, which included an altarpiece painted by Ghirlandaio, a predella, benches, candleholders, an altar frontal, and a stained glass window also designed by Ghirlandaio. Lorenzo also supplied priestly robes for the church and funds (four hundred ducats) for the cloister, chapter house and refectory of the Cistercian convent at Cestello (DePrano, 199-200). The chapel does not contain a sculpted tomb of any kind, though it does feature repeated representations of the Albizzi and Tornabuoni stemme throughout the decoration.
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3A. Chapel of Adriana Sassone, died in 1490.

Attribution: Fra Giocondo, Francesco di Giorgio, or Andrea Cicione

Location: Santa Maria Maggiore alla Pietrasanta, Naples

Date: 1490-1492

Patron: Giovanni Pontano, Adriana’s husband.

Inscriptions: The decoration of the *cappella Pontano* is almost entirely composed of its various inscriptions, including seven ancient inscriptions carved on marble slabs, with five in Latin and two in Greek, all of which are either funerary or celebrate conjugal love. (For the latin see: Theodor Mommsen, *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. Inscriptiones Bruttiorum, Lucaniae, Campanie …* X (Berlin: Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1883), 2872, 1543, 2041, 2688, 2873. For the Greek see: George Keibel, *Inscriptiones Graecae. Siciliae et Italie …*, XIV (Berlin: Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1890), 763, 888. All inscriptions transcribed in Riccardo Filangieri di Candida, “Il Tempietto di Giovanni Pontano in Napoli.” *Atti della Accademia Pontaniana* 56 (1926): 103-139. Additionally, Pontano composed inscriptions describing the construction of the chapel and its contents, including epitaphs for his wife, Adriana Sassone, and the other individuals who are memorialized in the chapel including their children, his friend Pietro Golino, and himself. The exterior dedicatory inscription above the portal on the main facade reads:

DIVAE MARIAE / DEI MATRI DEI AC DI/VO IOANNI EVANGELISTAE SACRUM
IOANNES IOVIANUS PONTANUS / DEDICAVIT / MCCCCXCI

Divine Mary, Mother of God, shrine to Saint John the Evangelist, Giovanni Gioviano Pontano dedicated [this chapel] 1492.

This inscription is repeated in a slightly shortened version on the lateral portal reads:

DIVAE MARIAE / DEI MATRI DEI AC DI/VO IOANNI EVANGEL. IOANNES IOV/IANUS PONTANUS / DEDICAVIT / AN DM MCCCCXCI

Description and Discussion:
Adriana Sassone was the wife of humanist scholar and politician Giovanni Pontano in the Aragonese court of Naples. Following Adriana’s death in 1490, Pontano constructed a chapel on the exterior of, but connected to Santa Maria Maggiore alla Pietrasanta. The small rectangular building is situated on the *decumano maggiore* (the Via de’Tribunali) of Naples, one of the central arteries through the city, and was meant to recall the appearance of classical mausoleums. The interior, which has been restored, includes an altar with tablets of the aforementioned inscriptions. Little of the original decoration of the chapel remains, and there is no trace of any sculpted tombs, either physically or in the historical record. One decorative element that does remain is the maiolica hexagonal...
paving tiles on the floor, which include allegorical imagery and the following repeated inscriptions: “Ave Maria,” “Pontanus fecit,” “Adriana Saxona,” and “Laura bella.” Above the altar in a niche is one surviving fresco depicting the *Madonna and Child with Saints John the Baptist and John the Evangelist.*

**Bibliography:**

Supplementary Catalogue B: Memorial Inscriptions, Slabs, Non-Monumental, and Lost Tombs

The following list is an on-going project of documenting women’s memorial markers, including slabs or other monuments for women that do not include monumental sculpture. These monuments are arranged chronologically and, in some cases, include limited information and notes about the monuments.

1B. Tomb of Johanna Anjou-Durazzo and her husband Robert of Artois, San Lorenzo Maggiore, Naples, date varies: either 1390s, shortly after 1400, or until 1409.

The monumental double tomb of Johanna Anjou-Durazzo and her husband Robert of Artois is a compelling example of an Angevin couple tomb. While in most particulars it meets the criteria to be included in the larger catalogue, it is instead listed here because of the variability of the date provided in the literature.


2B. Tomb of an Unknown Woman, Santa Caterina, Pisa, after 1401.


3B. Tomb of Dogaressa Marina Gallina Steno, Sant’Andrea della Zirada, 1422 (no longer extant)

The tomb slab was destroyed in the seventeenth century, but it is described in the Stefano Magno Chronicle, BNM, MS ITal. ser VII 515 (7881) fol. 58r. It was a tomb slab for Dogaressa Marina Gallina Steno in Sant’Andrea della Zirada, with an epitaph that read: “Here lies the body of the Most Serene Dogaressa Marina wife of the Most Serene and Excellent Prince Lord Michele Steno former famed doge of Venice who died May 4, 1422. May her soul rest in peace.” Marina Gallina Steno’s will of 1420 includes a desire to be buried at Sant’Andrea della Zirada—it was her convent—and she left 25 ducats for burial there in a nun’s habit.


4B. Tomb of Saints Teuteria and Tosca, SS. Teuteria e Tosca, Verona, 1427.

Teuteria and Tosca were early Christian saints and martyrs. Their red marble sarcophagus dates from 1160, but per the inscription included below, the tomb was raised and reliefs of the saints were added in the fifteenth century.
SANCTA TEUTERIA STIRPE REGIA EDITA MAGNAS
SUB OSGUALDO ANGLIAE REGE IBI ENIM NATA EST
PERSECUTIONES TULIT QUI POST MODUM OPERA ET
ORIZATIONIBUS SANCTAE TEUTERIAE AD IESU
CHRISTI FIDEM CONVERSUS SANCTISSIMUS
CHRISTIANUS EVASIT EA VERONAM PROFECTA AD
SANCTAE TUSCAE DISCIPLINAM HAEC S. PROCULI
VERONESIS EPISCOPI SOROR ERAT SE TRANSTULIT
UBI AMBAE SPIRITUM REDDIDERE DIEVUS
SANCTORUM FIRMI ET RUSTICI ANNO INCARNATI
VERBI CCXXXVI CUM AUTEM IN HOC TEMPUS
EARUM CORPORA HUMI CONDITA MANSISSENT
REVERENDUS IN CHRISTO PATER DOMINUS ELIAS
EPISCOPUS SVELLENSES PIETATE DU DUCTUS ALTUS
ELEVARI CURAVIT ANNO CHRISTI MCCCCXXVII

For more see: Da Lisca, Allesandro. “La Chiesa di S. Teuteria e Tosca in Verona.”

5B. Tomb of Francesca Giorgio (Zorzi), Seminario Patriarcale, Venice (originally in
S. Maria delle Vergini), after 1428

For more see: Wolters, Wolfgang. _La Scultura Veneziana Gotica (1300-1460)._ Venice
(1976), 253-254 and Lowe, Kate. “Elections of Abbesses and Notions of Identity in
Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Italy, with Special Reference to Venice.” _Renaissance

6B. Tomb of Santa Chiara da Montefalco, Santa Chiara, Montefalco, 1430.
Painted wooden sarcophagus, paintings damaged.

For more see: Nessi, Silvestro. “Un raro cimelio nel monastero di S. Chiara a
Montefalco.” _Commentari: Rivista di critica e storia dell’arte_ 14.1 (1963): 3-7; Nygren,
Harvard University, (1999).

7B. Tomb of Beata Giovanna da Signa, San Lorenzo, Signa, 1438.
Painted wood sarcophagus.

For more see: Soldani, F. _Ragguaglio istorico della beata Giovanna da Signa._ Florence:
Pietro Caetani Viviani, (1741); Lastri, Marco. _Memorie della Beata Giovanna da Signa._
Florence: Battista Stecchi, (1761); Menegatti, Federigo. _La beata Giovanna da Signa._
Signa: Innocenti e Pieri, (1929); Dalarun, Jacques. “Jean de Signa, Ermito Toscane du

8B. Tomb of Giovanna De’Beccaria, San Nicolò, Padua, 1439.
Tomb was located in the oratory, which served as Giovanna’s funerary chapel.


9B. Tomb of Saint Eufemia, Saint Eufemia, Rab, Croatia, 1440?
Wall-mounted rectangular tomb with relief of the Madonna and Child; weathered. Imagery relates to that found contemporaneously in the Veneto.


10B. Tomb of Maddalena dei Teruncelli, Santa Maria dei Servi, Padua, 1443.

11B. Tomb of Saint Rita da Cascia, Santa Rita, Cascia, 1457.
Wooden painted tomb.


13B. Tomb of Caterina di Bosnia, Santa Maria in Araceli, Rome, 1478 (see Davies, 248)


14B. Tomb inscription of Dea Morosini Tron, Cloister of San Giobbe, Venice, 1478
Dea Morosini Tron’s tomb inscription reads:


15B. Tomb of Maddalena and Stefano Satri, S. Omobuoni, Rome, 1482.
Tomb includes a relief of Maddalena, Stefano, and their son Giovanni Battista.


16B. Tomb of Lucretia Andreotti, San Silvestro in Capite, Rome, 1484.
The slab tomb of Lucretia Andreotti is particularly notable because, per the inscription, which is included below, she commissioned the monument herself.

LVCRETIA RELICTA JACOBI ANDREOTTI SIBI VIVENS POSVUIT ANNO SALVTATIS MCCCLXXXIII

(Lucretia, relict of Giacomo Andreotti, placed this for herself, while she was living, in the year of salvation 1484 (translation mine)


Tomb slab.

18B. Tomb of Carlotta of Cyprus, Vatican Necropolis, Rome, 1487.


19B. Tomb of Giovanna Aldobrandeschi, Santa Maria in Araceli, Rome, 1488.
Tomb slab.


20B. Tomb of Donna Daverzeli, Santa Cecilia, Rome, 1490.
Incised Tomb Slab. The tomb also includes a depiction of the deceased in her role as Hospitaler of Santa Cecilia.

The inscription reads: “Qui giase Dona adoraata a Daverzeli Hospitalera del Ospetale de Santa Cecilia. De S. L .Tebre.”


21B. Tomb of Giovanna Tebaldi, Santa Croce, Florence, unknown date.
Tomb slab.


22B. Tomb of Maria Cenci Orsini, Chapel of Saint Monica, Sant’Agostino, Rome, unknown date.


23B. Tomb of the Abbess Lucia, Sta. Bibiana, Rome, unknown date.
Tomb slab.
Appendix 1. The Poetry of Petrarch:

Sonnets 77, 78, 116, 264, and 333 by Francesco Petrarca from *Il Canzoniere* translated by A.S Klein.

77:

Per mirar Policleto a prova fiso  
con gli altri ch'ebber fama di quell'arte  
mill'anni, non vedrian la minor parte  
de la beltà che m'ave il cor conquiso.  

Ma certo il mio Simon fu in paradiso  
(onde questa gentil donna si parte),  
ivi la vide, et la ritrasse in carte  
per far fede qua giù del suo bel viso.  

L'opra fu ben di quelle che nel cielo  
si ponno imaginar, non qui tra noi,  
obè le membra fanno a l'alma velo.  

Cortesia fe'; né la potea far poi  
che fu disceso a provar caldo et gielo,  
et del mortal sentiron gli occhi suoi.  

Polyclitus gazing fixedly a thousand years  
with the others who were famous in his art,  
would not have seen the least part  
of the beauty that has vanquished my heart.  

But Simone must have been in Paradise  
(from where this gentle lady came)  
saw her there, and portrayed her in paint,  
to give us proof here of such loveliness.  

This work is truly one of those that might  
be conceived in heaven, not among us here,  
where we have bodies that conceal the soul.  

Grace made it: he could work on it no further  
when he'd descended to our heat and cold,  
where his eyes had only mortal seeing.
Quando giunse a Simon l'alto concetto
ch'a mio nome gli pose in man lo stile,
s'avesse dato a l'opera gentile
colla figura voce ed intellecto,
di sospir' molti mi sgombrava il petto,
che ciò ch'altro à piú caro, a me fan vile:
però che 'n vista ella si mostra humile
promettendomi pace ne l'aspetto.

Ma poi ch'i' vengo a ragionar co llei,
benignamente assai par che m'ascolte,
se risponder savesse a' detti miei.

Pigmalïon, quanto lodar ti dêi
de l'immagine tua, se mille volte
n'avesti quel ch'i' sol una vorrei.

When Simone had matched the high concept
I had in mind with the design beneath his hand,
if he had given to this noble work
intelligence and voice with the form,
he would have eased my heart of many sighs,
that make what's dearer to others vile to me:
since she's revealed to the sight, so humble,
promising peace to me in her aspect.

But when I come to speak with her,
benignly though she seems to listen,
her response to me is still lacking.

Pygmalion, what delight you had
from your creation, since the joy I wish
but once, you possessed a thousand times.
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Pien di quella ineffabile dolcezza
the day, never to see any lesser beauty,
che del bel viso trassen gli occhi miei
that my eyes drew from her lovely face,
nel dí che volentier chiusi gli avrei
so I'd have closed them willingly
per non mirar già mai minor bellezza,
that day, never to see any lesser beauty,

lassai quel ch'ì piú bramo; et ò sí avezza
I left what I loved more: and have so set
la mente a contemplar sola costei,
my mind on contemplating her alone,
ch'altro non vede, et ciò che non è lei
that I see no one else, and what is not her
già per antica usanza odia et disprezza.
I hate and despise, through constant habit.

In una valle chiusa d'ogni 'ntorno,
Thoughtful and late, I came with Love alone
ch'è refrigerio de' sospir' miei lassi,
into a valley that's closed all round,
giunsi sol com Amor, pensoso et tardo.
that leaves me refreshed with sighs.

Ivi non donne, ma fontane et sassi,
No ladies there, but fountains and stones,
et l'immagine trovo dì quel giorno
and I find the image of that day
che 'l pensier mio figura, ovunque io sguardo. my thoughts depict, wherever I gaze.
I' vo pensando, et nel penser m'assale
una pietà sí forte di me stesso,
che mi conduce spesso
ad altro lagrimar ch'i' non solleva:
ché, vedendo ogni giorno il fin piú
presso,
mille fiate è chieste a Dio quell'ale
co le quai del mortale
carcer nostro intelletto al ciel si leva.
Ma infìn a qui niente mi releva
prego o sospiro o lagrimar ch'io faccia:
e cosí per ragion conven che sia,
ché chi, possendo star, cadde tra via,
degno è che mal suo grado a terra giaccia.
Quelle pietose braccia
in ch'io mi fido, veggio aperte anchora,
ma temenza m'accora
per gli altrui exempli, et del mio stato
tremo,
ch'altri mi sprona, et son forse a
l'estremo.

L'un penser parla co la mente, et dice:
- Che pur agogni? onde soccorso attendi?
Misera, non intendi
con quanto tuo disnore il tempo passa?
Prendi partito accortamente, prendi;
e del cor tuo divelli ogni radice
del piacer che felice
nol pò mai fare, et respirar nol lassa.
Se già è gran tempo fastidita et lassa
se' di quel falso dolce fugitivo
che 'l mondo traditor può dare altrui,
a che ripon' piú la speranza in lui,
che d'ogni pace et di fermezze è privo?
Mentre che 'l corpo è vivo,
ài tu 'l freno in bailia de' penser' tuo:
deh stringilo or che pòi,
ché dubbioso è 'l tardar come tu sai,
e 'l cominciari non fia per tempo omai.

Già sai tu ben quanta dolcezza porse
agli occhi tuoi la vista di colei
la qual ancho vorrei
ch'a nascer fosse per piú nostra pace.

I go thinking, and so strong a pity
for myself assails me in thought,
that I'm forced sometimes
to weep with other tears than once I did:
for seeing my end nearer every day,
I've asked God a thousand times for those
wings
with which our intellect
can rise from this mortal prison to heaven.
But till now nothing has eased me,
no prayers, or sighs, or tears I produce:
and that is what has to be,
since he who had strength to stand, but fell on
the way,
deserves to lie on the ground and find his
level.
I see those merciful arms,
I which I believe, still open wide,
but fear grips me
at other's example, and I tremble at my state,
that spurs me higher, and perhaps I near the
end.

One thought speaks within me, and says:
'What do you hope for? Where do you seek
help?
Wretch, are you not aware
how much to your dishonour the time passes?
Take the wise decision: take it:
and tear from your heart
each root of pleasure,
that brings no joy, and allows no breath.
If you've long been weary and disgusted
with that false fugitive sweetness
that the traitorous world grants more to others,
why place your hopes any longer
in what is free of peace and certainty?
While your body is alive,
you have your thoughts in your control:
grasp them while you may,
since it's dangerous to delay as you know,
and beginning now is not soon enough.

You know well what sweetness came
to your eyes at the sight of her
Ben ti ricordi, et ricordar te 'n déi,
de l'immagine sua quand'ella corse
al cor, là dove forse
non potea fiammma intrar per altrui face:
ella l'accese; et se l'ardor fallace
durò molt'anni in aspectando un giorno,
che per nostra salute unqua non vène,
or ti solleva a piú beata spene,
mirando 'l ciel che ti sì volve intorno,
imortal et addorno:
ché dove, del mal suo qua giú si lieta,
vostra vaghezza acqueta
un mover d'occhi, un ragionar, un canto,
quanto fia quel piacer, se questo è tanto?

Da l'altra parte un pensier dolce et agro,
con faticosa et dilectevol salma
sedendosi entro l'alma,
preme 'l cor di desio, di speme il pasce;
che sol per fama gloriosa et alma
non sente quand'io agghiaccio, o quand'io
flagro,
s'i' son pallido o magro;
et s'io l'occido piú forte ri
nasce.
Questo d'allor ch'i' m'addormiva in fasce
venuto è di dí in dí crescendo meco,
et temo ch'un sepolcro ambeduo chiuda.
Poi che fia l'alma de le membra ignuda,
non pò questo desio piú venir seco;
ma se 'l latino e 'l greco
parlan di me dopo la morte, è un vento:
ond'io, perché pavento
adunar sempre quel ch'un'ora sgombre,
vorre 'l ver abbracciar, lassando l'ombre.

Ma quell'altro voler di ch'i' son pieno,
quanti press'a lui nascon par ch'adugge;
e parte il tempo fugge
che, scrivendo d'altrui, di me non calme;
e 'l lume de' begli occhi che mi strugge
soavemente al suo caldo sereno,
mi riten con un freno
contra chui nullo ingegno o forza valme.
Che giova dunque perché tutta spalme
la mia barchetta, poi che 'nfa li scogli
who I might still wish,
for our peace, had never been born.
Remember clearly, as you must,
how her image ran to your heart,
there where perhaps
the flame of no other torch could enter:
she kindled you: and if the deceiving fire
has lasted many years awaiting that day
that will never come, of our salvation,
raise your thoughts to a more blessed hope,
gaze at the heavens as they turn about,
imortal and adorned:
for if your longing, so happy at its ills,
can be eased down here
by the glance of an eye, by speech, or song,
what is that joy above, if this is such?

From another side a sweet and bitter thought,
with its wearying and delightful burden,
seated in my soul,
oppresses the heart with desire, feeds it with
hope:
that solely for glorious kindly fame,
feels nothing when I freeze or when I burn,
or if I'm pale and thin:
and if I kill it, it's reborn more fiercely.
From when I first slept in my cradle
it came to me, increasing day by day,
and I fear the tomb will enclose us both.
Yet when my soul is stripped of these limbs,
that desire cannot travel with it:
and if Latin or Greek
speak of me after death, it is mere air:
and so, because I fear
to always gather what an hour will scatter,
I wish to leave the shadows, grasp the true.

But that other desire with which I'm filled
seems to destroy the other as it is born:
and time is flying,
so that writing of her does not calm me:
and the light of lovely eyes that melts me
gently in their serene warmth,
controls me with a rein
against which no wit or force avails.
What joy then if my boat has all sails spread
è ritenuta anchor da ta' duo nodi?
Tu che dagli altri, che 'n diversi modi
legano 'l mondo, in tutto mi disciogli,
Signor mio, ché non togli
omai dal volto mio questa vergogna?
Ché 'n guisa d'uom che sogna,
aver la morte inanzi gli occhi parme;
et vorrei far difesa, et non ò l'arme.

Che i' fo veggio, et non m'inganna il vero
mal conosciuto, anzi mi sforza Amore,
che la strada d'onore
mai nol lassa seguir, chi troppo il crede;
et sento ad ora ad or venirmi al core
un leggiadro disegno aspro et severo
ch'ogni occulto pensiero
tira in mezzo la fronte, ov'altri 'l vede:
ché mortal cosa amar con tanta fede
quanta a Dio sol per debito convensi,
pìu si disdice a chi piú pregio brama.

Quel ch'ella ancora richiama
la ragione svïata dietro ai sensi;
ma perch'ella odi, et pensi
tornare, il mal costume oltre la spigne,
et agli occhi depigne
quella che sol per farmi morir nacque,
perch'a me troppo, et a se stessa, piacque.

Né so che spazio mi si desse il cielo
quando novellamente io venni in terra
a soffrir l'aspra guerra
che 'ncontra me medesmo seppi ordire;
né posso il giorno che la vita serra
antiveder per lo corporeo velo;
ma varîarsi il pelo
veggio, et dentro cangiarsi ogni desire.
Or ch'i' mi credo al tempo del partire
esser vicino, o non molto da lunge,
come chi 'l perder face accorto et saggio,
vo ripensando ov'io lassai 'l viaggio
de la man destra, ch'a buon porto
aggiunge:
et da l'un lato punge
vergogna et duol che 'ndietro mi rivolve;
dall'altro non m'assolve

if it's still dragged on the rocks
by those two cables?
You who free me from all other ties,
that bind me to the world in diverse ways,
my Lord, why will you not free
my face ever of this blush of shame?
Like a man who dreams,
death seems to be before my eyes:
and I would make defence, yet have no weapons.

I see what I have done, truth badly understood
does not deceive me, rather Love compels me,
he who never lets those who believe
in him too much follow the path of honour:
and I feel a gracious disdain, bitter and severe,
from time to time, in my heart,
that reveals every hidden thought
on my forehead, where others see:
to love a mortal being with such faith
as is owed to God alone, is the more
denied to those who seek more merit.
And it cries out still in a loud voice
to reason, lead astray by the senses:
but though mind hears, and thought
attends, habit spurs it on,
and pictures to the eyes
her who was born only to make me perish,
by pleasing me too much, and herself.

I do not know what span heaven allotted me
when I was newly come to this earth
to suffer the bitter war
that I contrive to wage against myself:
nor through the corporeal veil can I
anticipate the day that ends my life:
but I see my hair alter
and my desires change within me.
Now that I think the time for death
is near, or at least not far,
I'm like one that loss makes shrewd and wise,
thinking of how it was he left the path
of right, that brings us to our true harbour:
and I feel the goad
of shame and grief turning me about:
yet the other does not free me,
un piacer per usanza in me sí forte
ch'a patteggiar n'ardisce co la morte.

Canzon, qui sono, ed ò 'l cor via piú
freddo
de la paura che gelata neve,
sentendomi perir senz'alcun dubbio:
ché pur deliberando ó vòlto al subbio
gran parte omai de la mia tela breve;
né mai peso fu greve
quanto quel ch'i' sostengo in tale stato:
ché co la morte a lato
cerco del viver mio novo consiglio,
et veggio 'l meglio, et al peggior
m'appiglio.

that pleasure so strong in me by custom
that it dares to bargain with death.

Song, you know I grow colder
with fear than frozen snow,
knowing I must truly die:
and that by indecision I've always turned
to ashes the best part of my life's brief thread:
nor was there ever a heavier burden
that that which I sustain in this state:
for with death at my side
I search for new help in living,
and see the better, and cling to the worst.
333:
Ite, rime dolenti, al duro sasso
che 'l mio caro thesoro in terra asconde,
ivi chiamate chi dal ciel risponde,
benché 'l mortal sia in loco oscuro et
basso.

Ditele ch'i' son già di viver lasso,
del navigar per queste horribili onde;
ma ricogliendo le sue parte fronde,
dietro le vo pur così passo passo,

sol di lei ragionando viva et morta,
anzi pur viva, et or fatta immortale,
a ciò che 'l mondo la conosca et ame.

Piacciale al mio passar esser accorta,
ch'è presso omai; siami a l'incontro, et
quale
ella è nel cielo a sé mi tiri et chiame.

My sad verse, go to the harsh stone
that hides my precious treasure in the earth,
call to her there, she will reply from heaven,
though her mortal part is in a low, dark place.

Say to her I'm already tired of living,
of navigating through these foul waves:
but gathering up the scattered leaves,
step by step, like this, I follow her,

only I go speaking of her, living and dead,
yet alive, and made immortal now,
so that the world can know of her, and love
her.

Let it please her to watch for my passing,
that is near now: let us meet together, and her
draw me, and call me, to what she is in
heaven.
Appendix 2: Poem by Pietro Bembo on Giovanni Bellini’s portrait, likely of Maria Savorgnan
No. XIX.

O imagine mia celeste e pura,
Che splendi più che ‘sole agli occhi
Miei e mi rassembri ‘l volto di colei
Che sculptia ho ne cor con maggiore cura,

Credo che ‘l mio Bellin con la figura
T’abbia dato il costume anco di lei,
Che m’ardi s’io ti miro, e per te sei
Freddo smalto, a cui giunse alta ventura

E come donna in vista dolce, umile,
Be mostri tu pietà del mio tormento:
Poi, se mercé ten prego, non rispondi.

In questo hai tu di lei men fero stile,
Né spargi si le mie speranze al vento,
Ch’amien, quand’io ti cerco, no t’ascondi.

O my image, celestial and pure,
Shining, to my eyes, more brightly than the sun,
And resembling the face of the one that,
with even greater care, I have sculpted in my heart.

I believe that my Bellini, as well as her face
has given you the character of her,
For you burn me, if I gaze on you, you who are
cold stone, to which has been given great fortune

And like a lady with a sweet and gentle expression
well may you show me pity for my torment,
then, if I beg for mercy, you do not reply.

In this you behave less proudly than her,
nor do you toss my hopes to the wind; for at least, w
hen I search for you, you do not hide.
Appendix 3: Edith Wharton, “The Tomb of Ilaria Guinigi”


Ilaria, thou that wert so fair and dear
That death would fain disown thee, grief made wise
With prophecy thy husband’s widowed eyes
And bade him call the master’s art to rear
They perfect image on the sculptured bier,
With dreaming lids, hands laid in peaceful guise
Beneath the breast that seems to fall and rise,
And lips that at love’s call should answer, “Here!”

First-born of the Renascence, when thy soul
Cast the sweet robing of the flesh aside,
Into these lovelier marble limbs it stole,
Regenerate in art’s sunrise clear and wide
As saints who, having kept faith’s raiment whole,
Change it above for garments glorified.
Appendix 4: Pier Paolo Pasolini, “L’Appennino”


Dentro nel claustrale transetto
come dentro un acquario, son di marmo
rassegnato le palpebre, il petto
lontananza. Lì c’è l’aurora
dove giunge le mani in una calma
e la sera italiana, la sua grama
nascita, la sua morte incolore.
Sonno, i secoli vuoti: nessuno scalpello potrà scalzare la mole
tenue di queste palpebre.
Jacopo con Ilaria scolpì l’Italia
perduta nella morte, quando
la sua età fu più pura e necessaria.

Within the cloister transept
as in an aquarium, her eyelids are
of resigned marble, her breast
where her hands join in calm
remoteness. Here is Italy’s dawn
and evening, its poor
birth, its dying without color.
Sleep, the hollow centuries; no scalpel
can lay bare the tender massiveness
of these eyelids.
Jacopo with Ilaria sculptured Italy,
lost in death, when her age
was more pure and necessary
Appendix 5: John Ruskin and Ilaria del Carretto


John Ruskin letter (#26) to his Father, 6 May 1845, from Lucca:

Ruskin’s first mention of Ilaria del Carretto:

“... Finally when the rose tints leave the clouds, I go and spend a quarter of an hour beside the tomb of Ilaria di Caretto. It is in the cathedral. She was the second wife of Paolo Guinigi, Signore of Lucca in 1430. He left the Lucchese several good laws which they have still, but in a war with the Florentines he was betrayed by his allies, and died in prison in Pavia. The tower of his palace-fortress is overgrown with copsewood, but the iron rings to which his horses used to be fastened still are seen along the length of street before it, and hooks by which the silken draperies were suspended on festa days. This, his second wife, died young, and her monument is by Jacopo della Querce, erected soon after her death. She is lying on a simple pillow, with a hound at her feet. Her dress is of the simplest middle age character, folding closely over the bosom, and tight to the arms, clasped about the neck. Round her head is a circular fillet, with three star shaped flowers. From under this the hair falls like that of the Magdalene, its undulation just felt as it touches the cheek, & no more. The arms are not folded, nor the hands clasped nor raised. Her arms are laid softly at length upon her body, and the hands cross as they fall. The drapery flows over the feet and half hides the hound. It is impossible to tell you the perfect sweetness of the lips & the closed eyes, nor the solemnity of the seal of death which is set upon the whole figure. The sculpture, as art, is in every way perfect – truth itself, but truth selected with inconceivable refinement of feeling. The cast of the drapery, for severe natural simplicity & perfect grace, I never saw equaled, nor the fall of the hands – you expect every instant, or rather you seem to see every instant, the last sinking into death. There is no decoration nor work about it, not even enough for protection – you may stand beside it leaning on the pillow, and watching the twilight fade over the sweet, dead lips and arched eyes in their sealed close. With this I end my day, & return home as the lamps begin to burn in the Madonna shrines; to read Dante, and write to you. I am falling behind with my notes however, & therefore tomorrow as you know what I am about, I will not write unless I meet with anything particularly interesting – but the day after. Love to my mother.

Ever my dearest Father Your most affe Son J Ruskin.”
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