Edinburgh Research Explorer

Dead ringers

Dead Ringers: Cardinals and their Effigies 1400-1520

Carol M. Richardson

Cardinals' tomb monuments in Rome form the most ubiquitous group of their portraits. From the fourteenth to the mid-sixteenth century these architectural memorials customarily include an effigy—a full-scale sculpted representation of the cardinal whose tomb it is—lying in state in full choir dress on his bier, just as his body might have been displayed during the long series of funeral liturgies and orations that marked his transition to the next life. Or, at least, that is what we assume these portraits to be. This essay will explore what cardinals' tomb effigies represent and ask to what extent they can be considered portraits at all. The unique group of portraits included in memorial art raises important questions about the definition of portraiture in the Early Modern period, in particular in relation to realism or 'lifelikeness', and points more to the significance of cardinals as a political and social group than to their individual appearance.

EFFIGIES

Cardinals—and indeed popes—were subject to conventions and strict controls that dictated every detail of their deaths, from the preparation of the last will and testament to the completion of any permanent monument. An important premise of this group of sculpted 'portraits' is the interchangeability of the conventions for the preparation for death and burial of popes and

cardinals. Agostino Paravicini-Bagliani, for example, points specifically to the fact that the unique ceremonials and funerary customs concerning the death and burial of cardinals were a relatively late development, dating to the end of the Avignon papacy.[1] By the early sixteenth century, specific aspects such as the *novena*, or nine days of masses, were reserved only for popes and cardinals, setting them apart from all other levels of society, secular or ecclesiastic.[2]

Just as cardinals' funerals increasingly simulated those of the popes, their permanent commemoration in the form of tomb monuments was similarly connected, not least because it usually fell to the cardinals to immortalise a pope in artistic form, and it was very much in a cardinal's interest to assert his papal credentials. The monument of Eugenius IV, for example, was commissioned by one of his cardinal-nephews, Francesco Condulmer (d.1453), and erected in St Peter's by 1455 during the pontificate of Nicholas V at the top of the north aisle in the papal basilica. Throughout this period, from 1445 until 1464, Pietro Barbo, Eugenius IV's other cardinal-nephew, was archpriest of the Vatican basilica, so presumably had some sway over what went on within its confines.[3]

Eugenius IV's monument was long thought by scholars to be the first tomb of a pope to reflect emerging trends in monumental design, with details taking classical rather than Gothic form, the prototype of the Renaissance curial tomb later perfected by Andrea Bregno. Instead, Eugenius IV's monument turned out to be a perfect example of the interchangeability of elite fifteenth-century tomb monuments, and of the impermanence of so many of these Early Modern memorials. For the purpose of this essay, it is the survival of the effigy—possibly the only original part of the whole ensemble—that is most significant.

---

[1] Paravicini-Bagliani, *The Pope's Body*, 2000, pp. 158-159. Also Herklotz, *"Sepulcra" e "Monumenta"*, 1985; Gardner, *Tomb and The Tiara*, 1992; Schraven, *Festive Funerals*, 2014.
[2] Dykmans, *L'Oeuvre de Patrizi Piccolomini,* 1980.
[3] Richardson, 'St Peter's in the Fifteenth Century', 2013 pp. 343-347.

In Old St Peter's the north aisle nearest the transept was developed as something of a Venetian zone by the middle of the fifteenth century. Two papal tombs, of Eugenius IV and Paul II, and two altars, to the Virgin and Child and Sts Peter and Paul, and to St Mark, were the result of commissions by Venetian cardinals. Eugenius IV's tomb was in place for just 60 years before it was sacrificed, like the other tombs and altars in the area, to the building work initiated by Julius II and Donato Bramante in the early 1500s. Parts of the tomb of Eugenius IV were shifted across what remained of the basilica's Constantinian nave in 1545. Then, in 1605, with the decision to demolish the rest of the original basilica, a new home was required once more. As a result of a fire in 1591, the church of San Salvatore in Lauro near the Via Recta and the Tiber was undergoing reconstruction.[4] San Salvatore was the obvious home for Eugenius IV's monument, as it was the Roman base of the Canons Regular of San Giorgio in Alga, a Venetian order which Gabriele Condulmer (Eugenius IV) had helped found *in minoribus*. The pope's monument stood in the cloister of San Salvatore, until the mid-nineteenth century when it was removed to the oratory of the Pio Sodalizio dei Piceni, where it remains today. At some point during its travels, Eugenius IV's effigy came to be incorporated within the framing elements of another, more modest, monument executed much later in the fifteenth century (fig. 1).[5] In its present form, the pope's effigy, wearing a papal tiara, seems incongruous in such a conventional superstructure.

There are countless similar examples in Rome of seemingly permanent memorials having remarkably transitory existences, but, as opposed to those of popes, the details for cardinals' tombs are more difficult to reconstruct as they are often disguised in new settings. Borromini's remarkable seventeenth-century reworking of the tomb monument of Cardinal Antonio Martinez de Chavez, who died in 1447, preserves only the effigy and a few smaller

---

[4] Kühlenthal, 'Zwei Grabmäler', 1976, pp. 25-29.
[5] Ciaccio, 'Scoltura romana', 1906, pp. 433-441.

figures from the original Gothic ensemble. Vivid green and red painted stone, and red breccia marble columns completely replace any fifteenth-century architectural elements to fit better into Borromini's modernised Lateran basilica.[6] Of the many cardinals' tomb monuments that were displaced by the rebuilding of the papal basilica, it is telling that their effigies were preserved, many of them still lined up inside rooms of the Grotte Vaticane (fig. 2). Set out in rows, it is as though the deceased still wait for their families to commemorate them sufficiently to enable them to move on from the waiting room of Purgatory.

Of all the parts of the tomb monument, then, the effigy was the most persistent. It stood most forcefully for the contract between the host institution and the cardinal's executors and heirs. Essentially a legal relationship as much as a spiritual one, money and property were bequeathed to pay for a chaplain who would ensure the preservation of the individual's memory through prayers and masses in perpetuity. While the soul of the individual was specifically commemorated and their remembrance regularly reactivated in this way, individual cardinals derived their significance more as members of the larger group that defined them, hence the significance of the choice of site. The commemoration or salvation of a certain individual was of lesser concern in the context of the history or continuity of the institution.[7] With space at a premium in Rome's venerable churches, however, life-size effigies and their considerable frames were vulnerable to 'reorganisation'.

An effigy might bear signs that mark it out as a particular person—in the case of Eugenius IV his papal tiara—and, presumably on the original monument, his Condulmer coat of arms, but without the wider associations that derive from its location, it is cast adrift from the anchors of ritual and history. This was why Eugenius IV's effigy had to be found a new

---

[6] Richardson, *Reclaiming Rome*, 2009, pp. 351-353.
[7] Binski, *Medieval Death*, 1996, pp. 102-103.

home with at least some specific resonance. But to what extent does the effigy constitute a portrait at all?

PORTRAITS

Harrison proposes in his book *The Dominion of the Dead* that funerals 'serve to separate the image of the deceased from the corpse to which it remains bound at the moment of demise'.[8] Disposal of the rotting cadaver therefore ensures that an eternal image 'is detached from their remains so that their images may find their place in the afterlife of the imagination'.[9] The tomb effigy, then, can be understood as the 'image assigned to its afterlife', which, for those still living, equates to memory which, in turn, supports commemoration.

But cardinals' tomb monuments in the Early Modern period also question these assumptions, which risk imposing particularly modern and Protestant values on the past. As Eamon Duffy pointed out, it was only in the mid-sixteenth-century Protestant prayer book that the dynamic of the funeral decisively shifted from the 'continuing presence of the dead among the living' to fulfil the purpose of mere waste disposal.[10] Subsequently, Protestant funerary rites ritualised a turning away from the dead and towards the living as the very 'boundaries of human community have been redrawn'. In England, life-size wooden and wax effigies of kings and queens were used to prompt seemly outpourings of public grief, by substituting the decaying cadaver and thus avoiding inappropriate repugnance.[11] This kind of effigy was the fruit of a very temporal concern with the present, much more than it was designed to reintroduce the dead monarch into the wider community of memory that transcends time.

---

[8] Harrison, *Dominion of the Dead*, 2003, p. 147; discussed in Pointon, 'Deathliness of Things', 2014, p. 170.
[9] Harrison, *Dominion of the Dead*, 2003, p. 148.
[10] Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, 1992, p. 475.
[11] Woodward, *Theatre of Death*, 1997, p. 204; for France see Giesey, *Royal Funeral Ceremony*, 1960.

In Catholic culture, the sense of sight is particularly close to memory.[12] In the papal court, its members, past and present, witnessed to a great deal more than their individual existence. If the deceased were to be forgotten, they suffered a fate of being lost forever in limbo or purgatory. Conversely, the dead can affect the fortunes of the living, an association that can be traced back to the most ancient history.[13] To avoid this, regular prayers and masses were commissioned in perpetuity where resources allowed. The image of the individual, or at least some sign of their specific existence, had to be perpetuated. Relatives were often left the honour of commemoration so that they might better fulfil the obligation of the living to remember the dead: memory and memorial are related for a reason.[14] As Catherine Bell suggested for rituals such as funerals,

> A lecture about the power of the ancestors will not inculcate the type of assumptions about ancestral presence that the simple routine of offering incense at an altar can inculcate. Activities that are so physical, aesthetic, and established appear to play a particularly powerful role in shaping human sensibility and imagination.

Cardinals' funerary monuments marked the end of a long process of preparation for death and the eternal afterlife which began in the individual's lifetime with making a will. Officials were appointed to make sure every part of the process from death to commemoration was carried out properly.[15] The cardinal was carefully laid out and dressed according to his rank as a deacon, priest, or bishop and displayed until the burial, sometimes for the three days it was believed that it took the soul to leave the body, or, in some cases, as quickly as possible.

---

[12] Oexle, 'Memoria und Memorialbild', 1984, pp. 386-388; Morganstern, 'The Tomb as Prompter for the Chantry', 2000, pp. 81-97.
[13] Toynbee, *Death and Burial in the Roman World*, 1971, p. 33; Koortbojian, *Myth, Meaning, and Memory*, 1995, p. 114.
[14] Bell, *Ritual*, 1997, p. 137.
[15] Herklotz, *"Sepulcra" e "Monumenta"*, 1985, p. 193.

All this assumes that tomb monuments, and in particular their constituent effigies, reflect funerals. While the body, or an effigy, was part of the funeral display for popes and monarchs, I have found no evidence to suggest that any representation of the human likeness of a dead cardinal was incorporated into the *novena*. These nine days of ritual observance had in fact evolved from the practical necessities of the thirteenth century when cardinals, to be eligible to vote in a papal election, were limited to nine days to reach Rome.[16] On occasion, the body itself might have remained on display for part of the obsequies, but the more common practice seems to have been the erection of a catafalque, the *castrum doloris*, or 'castle of grief', that temporarily supported the cadaver and subsequently stood in for it.[17] This was a draped ephemeral structure that was surrounded by candles and armorial bearings. Whereas in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, an elaborate process of embalmment ensured that the body could be safely on show for a week or so, by the fifteenth century speedy burial was not unusual, even for popes.[18] Ardicino della Porta (junior), who died on 4 February 1493, for example, was buried in St Peter's the next evening.[19]

Nevertheless, when Giacomo Grimaldi inventoried what was left of Constantine's St Peter's at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the burials that had not already been disturbed provided evidence that tomb effigies often represent what the corpse in the tomb was wearing.[20] Were artists on hand during the ceremonies to record the details of what they saw? This is very unlikely, not least because of the considerable delay between burial and memorial, and also of the conceptual gap between likeness and portrait, as will be discussed in the next

---

[16] Schraven, 'Majesty and Mortality', 2005, p. 144.

[17] As ephemeral structures, catafalques do not normally survive. An exception is that of Cardinal Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros who died in 1517 and whose catafalque, described in 2017 as a wooden 'frame covered with cloth to represent a tomb', survives in the Mozarabic chapel he commissioned in Toledo Cathedral: Sánchez Gamero, *Cisneros Cardenal Eterno*, 2001, pp. 43-46. Guillaume d'Estouteville's *castrum doloris* was still extant three years after his death, in 1486: Gill, 'Death and the Cardinal', 2009, p. 356.

[18] Richardson, *Reclaiming Rome*, 2009, pp. 442-444. On papal funerals see Schraven, 'Majesty and Mortality', 2005, pp. 143-157.

[19] Richardson, 'Andrea Sansovino', 2018, p. 184.

[20] Grimaldi, *S. Pietro in Vaticano*, 1972, pp. 212, 255 etc.

section. It was the long-established liturgical conventions that set the consistent appearance of cadaver and effigy, not any interest in capturing a specific moment.

Although an individual's wealth and power opened up endless possibilities for commemoration, the same conventions reduced the possibility of extravagance. Ludovico Trevisan, who died in March 1465, was reputed to be among the wealthiest men in Italy.[21] A cardinal since Eugenius IV's pontificate, Trevisan was widely travelled as commander of the papal forces, a position that enabled him to build a considerable collection of exotic objects from across the Mediterranean.[22] Subsequently serving as papal chamberlain, Trevisan was permitted by Paul II to make a will leaving most of his sizeable estate to his two brothers. On his death, however, the pope set aside the will on the pretence of taking the money to help pay for the crusade against the Turks. Paul II purchased some of the cardinal's collection from Trevisan's heirs while Sixtus IV used it as guarantee to secure loans from Florentine banks.[23] Nevertheless, Trevisan's household and family were not deprived of any inheritance by the popes: Luigi Scarampo, one of the cardinal's brothers, renounced his claim to the cardinal's estate in June 1465 because the heirs had already received more than 2,000 gold florins, and in return was given, among other things, the cardinal's house in Florence in the district of Santa Maria Novella. There were limits to the total amounts that cardinals could bequeath to their heirs, because most of their estate would have originally derived from ecclesiastical assignments and benefices.

Papal intervention in the distribution of Trevisan's estate meant that the provision of a monument was left to the Camera Apostolica. On his death Trevisan was buried in San Lorenzo in Damaso—we know this because his grave was despoiled by one of the basilica's canons.[24]

[21] Müntz, *Arts à la Cour des Papes*, 1879, pp. 177-178; Paschini, *Lodovico Cardinal Camerlengo*, 1939, p. 208.
[22] Bagemihl, 'Trevisan Collection', 1993, pp. 560-561.
[23] Bagemihl, 'Trevisan Collection', 1993, pp. 559-563; Fusco, *Lorenzo de' Medici*, 2006, pp. 83, 94, 186.
[24] Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, 1888, p. 281.

In November 1467 Paolo Romano was paid 50 gold florins for the monument and another 50 for an altar in Sant'Agnese dei Goti.[25] This was not a huge sum, similar to the 60 scudi paid in 1485 for the modest monument in San Clemente to Bishop Brusati, nephew of Cardinal Bartolomeo Roverella, that nevertheless includes an effigy.[26] It is not clear what was made for this first Trevisan monument, if anything, as the original basilica of San Lorenzo in Damaso was replaced as part of Raffaele Riario's new palace and church by the beginning of the sixteenth century. The monument in the north aisle of the church today was installed on 21 March 1505, the fortieth anniversary of Trevisan's death. Where then is the space for portrait likeness in all this?

LIKENESS

The effigy, where it is included, is the part of the monument that should incorporate the portrait but, as Irving Lavin explained in his important 1970 essay on portrait busts, *effigium* and *imago* are Latin words denoting portraits of any kind, whether painted or sculpted.[27] Conversely, scholars have long been careful to respect the distance between effigies and portraits. John White, for example, describes the likeness of Clement IV (died 1268)—incorporated in the tomb monument in San Francesco, Viterbo, and generally recognised as among the earliest in Italy to include a 'full salient effigy'—as 'modification of a studio pattern in the direction of portraiture'.[28] I would argue that this astute remark holds true well into the sixteenth century.

While, to the modern mind, a portrait denotes likeness, in a pre-photographic era, verisimilitude is an unreliable concept, 'the shadow of a shadow' as Jeanette Kohl, memorably puts it.[29] When Poliziano elegised Albiera, a fifteen-year-old daughter of the Florentine Albizzi

[25] Müntz, *Arts à la Cour des Papes*, 1879, p. 82: 5 November 1467. On the monument see Paschini, *Lodovico Cardinal Camerlengo*, 1939, pp. 211-212; Caglioti, 'Sui primi tempi romani d'Andrea Bregno', 1997.
[26] Bertolotti, *Artisti lombardi a Roma*, 1881, vol. 2, p. 285.
[27] Lavin, 'Renaissance Portrait Bust', 1970, pp. 211-212; Luchs, 'Portraits, Poetry and Commemoration', 2012, p. 83.
[28] Moskowitz, *Arca di San Domenico*, 1993, pp. 38, 61 n. 10; White, *Art and Architecture*, 1987, pp. 97-99.
[29] Kohl, 'Mimesis', 2013, pp. 205-207.

clan who died in 1473, he described a bust that 'returned life to me anew… restored my form and famous beauty … my character and conduct by song'.[30] Any correspondence between what Albiera may have looked like and her posthumous bust was therefore as much to do with her innate qualities and social charms as her outward appearance. Similarly, orations and eulogies that punctuated a cardinal's funerary rites, and that may have subsequently circulated as texts, were obviously more easily disseminated records of his character and achievements than a lump of stone. The permanence promised by the stone memorial signified the longer trajectory of the Church itself.

Effigies on cardinals' tombs incorporate signals of the status that justified the commemoration itself. They can also seem to display the body just after it has breathed its last, in a state of suspended perfection, something that derives from more recent ideas about memorialisation.[31] Paradoxically, in the Early Modern period, the specific likeness only drew attention to the surface or *vanitas*, and therefore the transience of the life of an individual, but any individualisation in the larger ritual confines of a church could also tip the balance back in favour of the bigger message.[32]

Even a painted portrait, which is usually smaller and therefore more intimate than a life-size funeral effigy, represents a great deal more than the accuracy of representational likeness. The display of painted portraits could be more controlled or limited, most often in domestic settings and to more select audiences, but tomb sculpture—in as much as it incorporates portraiture per se—broadens the genre, as it was designed for public display in churches. In both cases, the sitter rarely speaks for him/herself but rather communicates broader ideas about group identity and status, and therefore the individual's relative position

[30] Epitaph LXV, Poliziano, 1867, pp. 145-147, translated by Luchs, 'Portraits, Poetry and Commemoration', 2012, p. 78.
[31] Linkman, *Photography and Death,* 2011.
[32] Binski, *Medieval Death*, 1996, p. 103.

within a hierarchy. The portrait, as such, extended beyond specific physiognomy to heraldry and costume denoting rank and status. These unique markers of a person's physical presence combined with the liturgical context of tomb effigies serve to subordinate the individual to the institution. Together, these external signs manifested an inner dignity that, in the case of cardinals, derived from the pope. They were the members of the papal body which has the pope as its head.

Among the monuments Grimaldi found undisturbed at St Peter's were those of the two Ardicino della Porta cardinals, known as senior and junior (figs. 2 and 3). Their monuments still stood in the Oratory of St Thomas attached to the lower (north-west) aisle of Constantine's St Peter's. The elder Ardicino della Porta, a canon lawyer who had served at the Council of Constance, died in 1434. His monument was an ornate Gothic canopy tomb that was, for the period, deliberately archaising. The effigy represents the cardinal dressed in mitre and the narrow-sleeved dalmatic of a cardinal deacon, his hands appropriately gloveless.[33] As well as the clear indication of his status as a cardinal-deacon, the sculpted effigy shows signs of lifelikeness: prominent veins stand out on the back of the hands and creases mark the forehead and jowls (fig. 3). But the physiognomy, like the columnar treatment of the body, harks back to much earlier effigies of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In contrast, the effigy from the tomb monument of Ardicino della Porta Junior, which originally stood nearby that of his elder relation, suggests a different approach to credible likeness. The sunken cheeks, lopsided face and deep eye-sockets evince death's slackness, while the furrowed brows and loosely closed eyelids and lips capture a sense of life and character only just departed.[34] The corpse, dressed in the flowing chasuble and gloves of the cardinal-priest, is pressed by death and gravity into the bier. In both of the Ardicino della Porta effigies, the hands are clasped. As Vico

---

[33] Richardson, *Reclaiming Rome*, 2009, p. 326.
[34] Richardson, *Reclaiming Rome*, 2009, pp. 327-331; Richardson, 'Andrea Sansovino', 2018.

later put it, 'among all nations, the hand signified power'.[35] Even in death, this gesture communicated to the living the virtues of chastity, prayer and contemplation, of a life lived by means of the intellect rather than manual labour. More than this, a cardinal's rings represented 'incardination' to his titular church in Rome, and/or to his marriage to his diocese if he were a bishop as well.[36] His physical presence was therefore far more than representative of a hierarchy: he embodied the continuity of the Apostolic Succession.

The condition in which tomb monuments survive is variable to say the least. Very few tomb monuments for any category in Rome remain unchanged and in their original locations: only two of those I have come across in the second half of the fifteenth century do not seem to have been moved—the monuments of Cardinals Bartolomeo Roverella in San Clemente and Alain Coetivy in Santa Prassede. These two monuments hint at what was likely an important signal they transmitted within their settings. While both are relatively tucked away in their own chapel spaces, that of Coetivy in a small coffered chapel adjacent to the Chapel of the Column of the Flagellation in Santa Prassede, and Roverella at the threshold of his Chapel of S. John the Baptist in San Clemente, both effigies are positioned in such a way that upper parts of their sculpted cadavers are visible across the space of the main nave. This is too far distant to discern sculptural details, but the visibility of the heads nevertheless communicate individuality: somebody significant enough to be singled out in the church's sacred confines. Although we know very little about the original location of many tomb monuments, the majority seem to have positioned the effigy above eye level, making direct scrutiny of the cardinal's visage impossible. In many cases, such as Cardinal Roverella in San Clemente and Ardicino della Porta Jnr in St Peter's, the effigy was tilted slightly towards the viewer as an aid to visibility

[35] G.B. Vico, *Scienza Nuova* (1744), para 1027 in Burke, 'Presentation of Self', 1987, p. 155; Filipczak, 'Poses and Passions', 2004, pp. 83-86.
[36] Richardson, *Reclaiming Rome*, 2009, p. 106.

(fig. 2). Even then, with the exception of imperial noses and gravely furrowed brows, specifics are less obvious than the costume that denoted dignity and rank.[37]

DEATH MASKS

Of the period around 1300, Julian Gardner argues that portraits, as such, were only made of living persons: therefore 'we must abandon the notion of the death mask and regard the assumption of a 'portrait' quality in tomb effigies rather as a compliment to the creative talent of their sculptor rather than as an objective judgement'.[38] Death masks, as Marcia Pointon has observed, are a very niche object for art historians. They are most often discussed in the context of art history either as mechanical or as intellectual pursuits and in relation to the history of photography, which fixes them to a definition of realism or naturalism as an 'accurate' imprint.[39]

The wiry effigy of Pope Sixtus IV (1471–1484) surmounting the bronze monument designed by the Pollaiuolo brothers, for example, has little to do with other painted representations of the pope made when he was alive, but was nevertheless admired for its lifelike qualities.[40] The effectiveness of this 'portrait' derives from the forceful profile with its deep expressive wrinkles that stand for both life experience and death's decay, as well as just enough of a lack of symmetry to seem more 'real'. This was the same approach the Pollaiuolo brothers took for the double tomb portrait of Innocent VIII. Here the pope's sagging features, yet strong jawline and nose, could very well derive from a death mask. These tomb effigies contrast with portraits of the living popes in frescoes and on medals, retrospectively underlining the vanity of earthly existence. Such bronze effigies are relatively rare in Early Modern Rome, especially for cardinals. An important exception is that for Pietro Foscari, the Cardinal of

---

[37] Nodelman, 'How to Read a Roman Portrait', 1975, pp. 27-33; Brilliant, *Portraiture*, 1991, pp. 40-43; Little, *Set in Stone*, 2006; Dale, 'Romanesque Sculpted Portraits', 2007, p. 102.
[38] Gardner, *Tomb and The Tiara*, 1992, p. 175.
[39] Pointon, 'Deathliness of Things', 2014, p. 170.
[40] Wright, *Pollaiuolo Brothers*, 2005, p. 362.

Venice, who died in 1485 and was buried in Santa Maria del Popolo. Like the papal tomb effigies by the Pollaiuolo brothers, which the cardinal's heirs were deliberately imitating, Foscari's effigy arguably derives its spare—one might call it Gothic—linearity as much from the bronze-casting technique as from a concern with mirror-like accuracy.[41] This model probably then inspired the bronze monument for Cardinal Giovanni Battista Zen, who died in 1501, installed by 1521 in his chapel in San Marco in Venice which is similarly severe.

Mid-fifteenth-century cardinals' effigies in stone, such as that of Berardo Eroli or Ardicino della Porta Senior (fig. 3) from the old St Peter's, hark back to solid Gothic monuments of the preceding century such as Adam Easton's in Santa Prassede. Such correspondences between the portrait of a living (or at least recently alive) person and generally more idealised images of saints and venerated individuals worked in reverse in the earlier periods: Thomas Dale points to the deliberate 'typecasting' that blurred the boundaries between reliquary busts and portraits of rulers to put greater emphasis on the immortality of their legacy, and of their continuing presence in the memory of living institutions.[42] Monuments produced in the second half of the fifteenth century are suggestive of a wider variety of approaches to tomb portraiture, possibly the result of the participation of Lombard and Tuscan artists who brought their varied approaches to Rome's art market. By the early sixteenth century idealised classical types promoted by Florentine artists like Andrea Sansovino were more prevalent as an eternal future-proof image trumped any suggestion of mortality: the effigies of the two monuments included in Bramante's choir chapel in Santa Maria del Popolo, of Ascanio Sforza and Girolamo Basso della Rovere, are almost mirror images, a reassertion of the precedence of type over individuality.[43]

[41] Foscari, 'Il cardinale veneziano', 2000; the effect of different media on portraiture is signalled for further research in Rudolf et al., 'FACES', 2017, p. 286.

[42] Dale, 'Romanesque Sculpted Portraits', 2007, p. 101.

[43] Dale, 'Romanesque Sculpted Portraits', 2007, p. 101; Richardson, 'Andrea Sansovino', 2018; Langer, 'Maniera Moderna', 2019.

The notion that what we assume are portraits are in actual fact lifelike and not likenesses or portraits at all is further supported by Shelley Zuraw's observation that two later fifteenth-century tomb monuments share the same visage, suggesting a lack of contemporary concern with individual likeness as we might understand it today. When Mino da Fiesole was summoned from Florence to Rome to work for the brothers of Cardinal Niccolò Forteguerri, the sculptor interrupted the project he already had underway for a monument to Count Hugo of Tuscany, founder of the Badia of Florence, who had died almost five centuries earlier in 1001. The cardinal's effigy, in his titular church of Santa Cecilia in Trastevere, bears a remarkable resemblance to that of the Florentine count as 'Mino's ideal, middle-aged man' (figs. 5 and 6).[44] Commissioned before 1471, Zuraw proposes that the effigy was completed before Mino's departure for Rome in 1473 or 1474. However, since the count's tomb was only completed in 1481, it is possible that the portrait of Forteguerri was reused for that of the Count of Tuscany. Certainly, the cardinal's tomb portraits show signs suggestive of a death mask—sunken eye-sockets, relaxed musculature and lopsided features—albeit treated with Mino da Fiesole's refinement that gives stone the kind of vitality more often seen in bronze. A generous patron in Pistoia and in Rome, the sharing of Niccolò Forteguerri's features (though we have no way of knowing if they are his features) with the long-dead Count Hugo could arguably result in a subtle compliment to both. At the same time, in the absence of modern photography, such a comparison would have been impossible unless there was a death mask or drawings that each monument had in common and that the sculptor carried with him from Rome to Florence.[45] Accurate portrayal is therefore unimportant, but convincing verisimilitude is key to the success of the tomb effigy. In short, 'lifelikeness' is much more than skin deep.

---

[44] Zuraw, 'Public Commemorative Monument', 1998; Zuraw, 'Mino da Fiesole's Forteguerri Tomb', 2004, p. 85.

[45] Cormack, *Painting the Soul*, 1997.

Other than what can be seen, the evidence of the use of death masks is very rare and, in any case, art history has not been very kind to such objects.[46] Florence had been the centre of wax modelling (*ceroplastica*) from around 1200: in 1496, for example, the Medici family still owed Verrocchio payment for some twenty masks 'taken from nature' which were presumably death masks.[47] But I would urge caution in relating death masks to—arguably anachronistic—notions of Renaissance 'realism'.[48] Unlike antiquity, when wax *imagines* were publicly displayed as part of the cult of ancestor worship so that one's dead family continued to play a part in the present, Early Modern masks seem to have been more private objects, stored in boxes and cupboards in elite households.[49] Unless made less transient in bronze, more public displays of wax casts were given as votive offerings in churches, such as Santissima Annunziata in Florence, which 'transformed individual images into civic history'; however, these all but disappeared in the eighteenth century, especially after the Leopoldine reforms of 1786 that banned any *ex voto* from churches, commanding those that remained to be melted down to make candles.[50] Aby Warburg read the Florentine votives as evidence of the 'persistent survival of barbarism' from ancient Rome, further downgrading these early three-dimensional prints from artwork to superstitious totem.[51]

HUMOURS

Outer appearance reflects inner order as external signs witness to personal virtue.

> Then the body, the very image (simulacrum) of the mind, catches up this light
> glowing and bursting forth like rays of the sun. All of its senses and all its

[46] Pointon, 'Deathliness of Things', 2014, p. 171.
[47] Von Schlosser, 'Geschichte der Porträtbildnerei in Wachs', 1911; Seymour, *Sculpture of Verrocchio*, 1971, pp. 174-175; Paoletti, 'Familiar Objects', 1998, pp. 87-89; van der Velden, 'Medici Votive Images', 1998, pp. 126-136.
[48] The emphasis on realism in, for example, Schuyler, 'Death Masks', 1986, pp. 1-6 is problematic.
[49] On antique parallels see Kohl, '"Vollkommen ähnlich"', 2012.
[50] Paoletti, 'Familiar Objects', 1998, p. 88; Warburg, *Arte del ritratto*, in Ghelardi, *La Rinascita del paganesimo*, 2004, pp. 137-141; Dal Forno, *La ceroplastica anatomica*, 2017, p. 5.
[51] Foster and Britt, 'Aby Warburg', 1996, p. 18.

members are suffused with it, until its glow is seen in every act, in speech, in appearance, in the way of walking and laughing.[52]

Thus, Bernard of Clairvaux glossed the Song of Songs to give it institutional as well as personal significance.

The Early Modern understanding of human biology depended on theories of the humours, four bodily substances that, depending on their presence or absence, dictated the individual's temperament as well as his or her appearance. The humour of the leader or prince is sanguine, or blood-based. The sanguine was 'the ornament of the body, the pride of humours, the paragon of complexions, the prince of all temperatures, for blood is oil of the lamp of our life'.[53] As Opher Mansour explained for later variations on Raphael's portrait of Julius II adapted for Pius V, the sanguine temperament dictated the tightly drawn, sinuous churchman of action, as political ability and personal disposition are expressed physically and are therefore epitomised by the portrait of an individual who is a leader.[54] While contemporaries described his predecessor, Pope Pius IV, as 'forgetful of the interests of others, and given over entirely to his own comfort and satisfaction', Pius V was an ascetic, 'of a hot, dry complexion, emaciated, of reddish-white colour, with a long, thin, dry face … and a very aquiline nose'.[55] This description applies as well to cardinals' portraits such as Titian's *Cardinal Pietro Bembo* of c. 1540 in the National Gallery of Art in Washington. That said, as Irene Brooke discusses in her essay in this volume, in Bembo's case, rhetorical gesture represents a distraction from accurate physical likeness.[56] Hotter and drier humours, sanguine and choleric, characterised masters whereas the cooler and wetter humours, melancholic and phlegmatic, belonged to

[52] Bernard of Clairvaux, *Super Canticum Canticorum Sermo*, 85.10-11, translated in Jaeger, *Envy of Angels*, 1994, pp. 110-111; Dale, 'Romanesque Sculpted Portraits', 2007, p. 105.
[53] Thomas Walkington, *The Optick Glasse of Humors*, 1631, pp. 110-111, quoted in Paster, *Humoring the Body*, 2004, p. 230.
[54] Mansour, 'Prince and Pontiff', 2008.
[55] Albèri, *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti al Senato*, 1839–1863, p. 180; in Mansour, 'Prince and Pontiff', 2008, pp. 220-221.
[56] Burke, 'Presentation of Self', 1987, pp. 157-158; Brooke XXX.

servants (and, of course, women).[57] The reds and purples associated with the sanguine temperament, the character of leaders, chimed with the papal colour red, which in practice varied in tone from scarlet to purple.[58]

The effigy incorporated in the monument to the French cardinal, Alain Coetivy, in Santa Prassede is altogether something else. At some distance from the ideal sanguine leader, his power comes from his sheer bulk, which speaks loudly of a life enjoyed (fig. 8). Coetivy's solid effigy is a wonderfully characterful rendering complemented by the confident masses typical of Andrea Bregno and his workshop. A corpulent prelate who enjoyed life to the full, Coetivy's appearance was remarkable enough to be worthy of description in the *Commentaries* of Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini (Pius II): 'a tall man with a huge paunch'. Walking along as part of the procession of cardinals that accompanied the relic of the head of St Andrew from the Milvian Bridge to the Vatican proved particularly challenging, as he 'had difficulty propelling his great bulk'.[59] From the point of view of a Sienese pope, the cardinal's main flaw was his nationality and this dictated how one man viewed the other. Relative to the point of origin of the protagonist, those from more northern, colder parts of the Continent, were believed to tend to blockages caused by thickened and cooled humours—phlegm and clotted blood—that made them slow and undisciplined as a result.[60]

The personality that Andrea Bregno afforded his effigy for Santa Prassede brilliantly epitomises the timeless specificity that such an artist could impart to his subject. The flowing drapes of Coetivy's elegant chasuble (he was a cardinal-priest) and jewelled mitre sit awkwardly with the effigy's thick-set brow, bulbous nose, double chin, and flabby jowls. These nevertheless combine to give the impression of a remarkably determined and powerful

[57] Paster, *Humoring the Body*, 2004, pp. 210-211.
[58] Richardson, 'The Cardinal's Wardrobe', 2020.
[59] Pius II, 'Commentaries',1936-1957, p. 532.
[60] Paster, *Humoring the Body*, 2004, p. 13; Floyd-Wilson, 'English Mettle', 2004, pp. 137-138.

individual. Even then, Coetivy's representations in text and image fit in their contexts by means of contrast: Pius II's haughty, greedy cardinal is humbled in a religious procession, while his imposing physical presence in one of Rome's most venerable titular churches witnesses to the Church's power and continuity. Alain Coetivy's fleshy jowls are only to be expected in the effigy of the kind of corpulent and pugnacious individual described by Pius II. Outward appearance is only relevant in as much as it enables a view into the soul, and it is only possible, in the case of artworks, if an artist like Andrea Bregno had sufficient mastery over his materials.[61]

CONCLUSION

The addition of depth in sculpture (compared with painting) underscores the conflation of likeness with convincing-ness in three-dimensional effigies. Whether or not the portrait is an accurate likeness of an individual is neither here nor there, not least because this is impossible to prove, especially so long after the fact. 'Convincing' instead means affective and effective, as the author of the ancient rhetorical treatise *Rhetorica ad Herennium* wrote:

> We ought, then, to set up images of a kind that can adhere longest in memory. And we shall so if we establish similitude as striking as possible; if we set up images that are not many or vague but active (*imagines agentes*) … [it] will ensure our remembering them more readily.[62]

Commemoration has long served the purpose of focussing the minds of the living on life's realities: classical mythological sarcophagi that include specific references to the incumbent, for example, offer 'analogies, not identifications' so that 'the presence of the portrait features

---

[61] Woods, 'Illusion of Life', 2005, especially pp. 132-137.
[62] *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, III.22; trans. Yates, *Art of Memory*, 1966, pp. 9-10.

of the deceased merely intensifies and particularises the monument's message'.[63] The 'reality' is that of the continued presence of the dead in the community of the living.

The life-size, lifelike features of tomb effigies lend them qualities that other kinds of portraits lack. Individuals portrayed may be dead, or at least no longer alive or present, but their incorporation into memorial and ritual spaces ensures their immortality. By means of specific characterisation in facial features, carefully observed dress appropriate to strictly codified status, and the public and permanent nature of their display, they literally embody messages about the universal Church. Relatively small parts of much larger sculptural and architectural assemblages, the face is a tiny component of structures that were often substantial enough to strengthen the walls of churches, thereby building the individual incumbent quite literally into the foundations of the church, as successors of Christ the corner stone.

Taken together, cardinals' tombs witness to the apostolic succession and the persistence of papal Rome. As permanent indications of the personal combined with political ritual that took the form of ephemeral structures and funerary rites, of the religious and secular authority of the Church, of the relationship between an individual incumbent and the institution, cardinals' tomb monuments in churches work at a visceral level.[64] They inculcate assumptions about continuity, permanence and changelessness that are the bedrock of Roman Catholicism. Or, in Harrison's memorable words, 'The dead are our guardians. We give them a future so that they may give us a past'.[65]

---

[63] Koortbojian, *Myth, Meaning, and Memory*, 1995, pp. 9, 18, 123-125.
[64] Bell, *Ritual*, 1997, pp. 136-137.
[65] Harrison, *Dominion of the Dead*, 2003, p. 158.

Bibliography

Rolf Bagemihl, 'The Trevisan Collection', *The Burlington Magazine*, 135 (1993), pp. 559-563.

Catherine Bell, *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

Antonio Bertolotti, *Artisti lombardi a Roma nei secoli XV, XVI e XVII: studi e ricerche negli archivi romani* (Milan, 1881—anastatic reprint Sala Bolognese: Forni, 1985).

Paul Binski, *Medieval Death: Ritual and Representation* (London: British Museum Press, 1996).

Sarah Blake McHam, ed., *Looking at Renaissance Sculpture* (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Richard Brilliant, *Portraiture* (London: Reaktion, 1991).

Peter Burke, 'The Presentation of Self in the Renaissance Self Portrait', in *The Historical Anthropology of Early Modern Italy. Essays on Perception and Communication* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 150-167.

Francesco Caglioti, 'Sui primi tempi romani d'Andrea Bregno: un progetto per il cardinale camerlengo Alvise Trevisan e un San Michele Arcangelo per il cardinale Juan de Carvajal', *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*, 41/3 (1997), pp. 213-253.

Lisetta Motta Ciaccio, 'Scoltura romana del Rinascimento: primo periodo (sino al pontificato di Pio II)', *L'Arte*, 9 (1906), pp. 433-441.

Conrad Rudolph, Amit Roy-Chowdhury, Ramya Srinivasan and Jeanette Kohl, 'FACES: Faces, Art, and Computerized Evaluation Systems—A Feasibility Study of the Application of Face Recognition Technology to Works of Portrait Art', *Artibus et Historiae*, 75 (2017), pp. 265-291.

Robin Cormack, *Painting the Soul: Icons, Death Masks and Shrouds* (London: Reaktion Books, 1997).

Thomas Dale, 'Romanesque Sculpted Portraits: Convention, Vision, and Real Presence', *Gesta* 46/2 *Contemporary Approaches to the Medieval Face* (2007), pp. 101-119.

Federica Dal Forno, *La ceroplastica anatomica e il suo restauro: Un nuovo uso della TAC, una possibile attribuzione a G.G. Zumbo* (Florence: Nardini Editore, 2017).

Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992).

Marc Dykmans, 'L'Oeuvre de Patrizi Piccolomini ou le Cérémonial Papal de la Première Renaissance', *Studi e testi,* 1 (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1980), pp. 293-294.

Zirka Z. Filipczak, 'Poses and Passions: Mona Lisa's "Closely Folded" Hands', in *Reading the Early Modern Passions: Essays in the Cultural History of Emotions*, ed. by Gail Kern Paster, Katherine Rowe, and Mary Floyd-Wilson (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), pp. 68-88.

Mary Floyd-Wilson, 'English Mettle', in *Reading the Early Modern Passions: Essays in the Cultural History of Emotions*, ed. by Gail Kern Paster, Katherine Rowe and Mary Floyd-Wilson (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), pp. 130-146.

Antonio Foscari, 'Il cardinale veneziano Pietro Foscari e lo scultore senese Giovanni di Stefano in Santa Maria del Popolo a Roma', *Arte Documento*, 14 (Monfalcone: Edizioni della Laguna, 2000), pp. 59-63.

Kurt W. Foster and David Britt, 'Aby Warburg: His Study of Ritual and Art on Two Continents', *October,* 77 (1996), pp. 5-24.

Laurie Fusco, *Lorenzo de' Medici: Collector and Antiquarian* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

Julian Gardner, *The Tomb and The Tiara: Curial Tomb Sculpture in Rome and Avignon in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).

Meredith J. Gill, 'Death and the Cardinal: The Two Bodies of Guillaume d'Estouteville', *Renaissance Quarterly,* 54 (2001), pp. 347-388.

Giacomo Grimaldi, 'Descrizione della basilica antica di S. Pietro in Vaticano. Codice Barberini Latino 2733', in *Codices e Vaticanis selecti*, 32, ed. by Reto Niggl (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1972).

Ralph E. Giesey, *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France* (Geneva: E. Droz, 1960).

Robert Pogue Harrison, *The Dominion of the Dead* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).

Ingo Herklotz, *"Sepulcra" e "Monumenta" del Medioevo. Studi sull' arte sepolcrale in Italia* (Rome: Edizioni Rari Nantes, 1985).

C. Stephen Jaeger, *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950–1200* (Philadelphia PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994).

Jeanette Kohl, '"Vollkommen ähnlich". Der Index als Grundlage des Renaissanceporträts', in *Similitudo: Konzepte der Ähnlichkeit in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzei*, ed. by Martin Gaier, Jeanette Kohl, and Alberto Saviello (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 181–206.

Jeanette Kohl, "Notes from the Field: Mimesis", *The Art Bulletin*, 95 (2013), pp. 205-207.

Michael Koortbojian, *Myth, Meaning, and Memory on Roman Sarcophagi* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).

Michael Kühlenthal, 'Zwei Grabmäler des früheren Quattrocento in Rom. Kardinal Martinez de Chiavez und Papst Eugen IV', *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte,* 16 (1976), pp. 17-56.

Lara Langer, 'The Maniera Moderna of Andrea Sansovino's Cardinal Tombs at Santa Maria del Popolo', *The Sculpture Journal*, 28 (2019), pp. 75-102.

Irving Lavin, 'On the Sources and Meaning of the Renaissance Portrait Bust', *Art Quarterly* 33, (1970), pp. 207-226; also in *Looking at Renaissance Sculpture*, ed. by Sarah Blake McHam, (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 60-78.

Audrey Linkman, *Photography and Death* (London: Routledge, 2011).

Charles T. Little, ed., *Set in Stone: The Face in Medieval Sculpture* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2006).

Alison Luchs, 'Verrocchio and the Bust of Albiera degli Albizzi: Portraits, Poetry and Commemoration', *Artibus et Historiae,* 33/66 (2012), pp. 75-98.

Opher Mansour, 'Prince and Pontiff: Secular and Sacred Authority in Papal State Portraiture between Raphael's *Julius II* and the Portraits of Pius V and Clement VIII', in *Art and Identity in Early Modern Rome*, ed. by Michael Bury and Jill Burke (Farnham: Ashgate, 2008), pp. 209-229.

Anne McGee Morganstern, 'The Tomb as Prompter for the Chantry: Four Examples from Late Medieval England', *Memory and the Medieval Tomb*, ed. by Elizabeth Valdez del Alamo with Carol Stamais Pendergast (Farnham: Ashgate, 2000), pp. 81-97.

Anita Fiderer Moskowitz**,** *Nicola Pisano's Arca di San Domenico and Its Legacy* (University Park PA: Penn State University Press/College Art Association, 1993).

Eugène Müntz, 'Les Arts à la Cour des Papes pendant le XVe et le XVIe siècle: Recueil de documents inédits tirés des archives et des bibliothèques Romaines', *Bibliothèque des Ècoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome,* 9, Part 2, Paul II, 1464–1471, (Paris: E. Thorin, 1879).

Sheldoon Nodelman, 'How to Read a Roman Portrait', *Art in America,* 63 (1975), pp. 27-33.

Otto Gerhard Oexle, 'Memoria und Memorialbild', in *Memoria: Der geschichtliche Zeugniswert des liturgischen Gedenkens im Mittelalter*, ed. by Karl Schmid and Joachim Wollasch, *Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften*, 48 (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1984), pp. 384-440.

John T. Paoletti, 'Familiar Objects: Sculptural Types in the Collections of the Early Medici', in *Looking at Renaissance Sculpture*, ed. by Sarah Blake McHam (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 79-110.

Agostino Paravicini-Bagliani, *The Pope's Body*, trans. by David S. Peterson (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2000); first published as *Il corpo del Papa* (Turin: Giulio Einaudi, 1994).

Pio Paschini, *Lodovico Cardinal Camerlengo († 1465)* (Rome: Tiberino/Facultas Theologica Pontificii Athenaei Lateranensis, 1939).

Gail Kern Paster, *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

Pius II (Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini), 'The Commentaries of Pius II', in *Smith College Studies in History*, trans. by Florence Alden Gragg and Leona Christina Gabel: books 1–2, vol. 22 (1936–1937); books 2–3, vol. 25 (1939–1940); books 4–5, vol. 30 (1947); books 6–9, vol. 35 (1951); books 10–13, vol. 43 (1957).

Platina (Bartolomeo Sacchi), *The Lives of the Popes, from the time of our Saviour Jesus Christ to the Reign of Sixtus IV: Written originally in Latin and translated into English*, trans. by William Benham (London: Griffith, 1888).

Marcia Pointon, 'Casts, Imprints, and the Deathliness of Things: Artifacts at the Edge', *The Art Bulletin,* 96/2 (2014), pp. 170-195.

Carol M. Richardson, *Reclaiming Rome: Cardinals in the Fifteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

Carol M. Richardson, 'St Peter's in the Fifteenth Century: Paul II, the Archpriests and the Case for Continuity', in *Old Saint Peter's, Rome*, ed. by Rosamund McKitterick, John Osborne, Carol M. Richardson and Joanna Storey (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press/The British School at Rome, 2013), pp. 324-347.

Carol M. Richardson, 'Reputation, Patronage and Opportunism: Andrea Sansovino Arrives in Rome', *Sculpture Journal,* 27/2 (2018), pp. 177-192.

Carol M. Richardson, 'The Cardinal's Wardrobe', in *A Companion to the Early Modern Cardinal*, ed. by Mary Hollingsworth, Miles Pattenden and Arno Witte (Leiden: Brill, 2020).

Juan Pedro Sánchez Gamero and others, 'Cisneros Cardenal Eterno en el V centenario de su muerte/Cisneros the Eternal Cardinal on the 5th centenary of his Death', *Revista Catedral de Toledo,* 1 (Toledo: Via Sacra, 2017).

Julius von Schlosser, 'Geschichte der Porträtbildnerei in Wachs', *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen der allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses,* 29/3 (1911), pp. 171-258.

Minou Schraven, 'Majesty and Mortality: Attitudes Towards the Corpse in Papal Funeral Ceremonies', in *Roman Bodies*, ed. by Andrew Hopkins and Maria Wyke (London: The British School at Rome, 2005), pp. 143-157.

Minou Schraven, *Festive Funerals in Early Modern Italy: The Art and Culture of Conspicuous Commemoration* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014).

Jane Schuyler, 'Death Masks In Quattrocento Florence', *Source: Notes in the History of Art*, 5 (1986), pp. 1-6.

Charles Seymour Jr., *The Sculpture of Verrocchio* (London: Studio Vista, 1971).

Jocelyn M.C. Toynbee, *Death and Burial in the Roman World* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1971).

Hugo van der Velden, 'Medici Votive Images and the Scope and Limits of Likeness', in *The Image of the Individual: Portraits in the Renaissance,* ed. by Nicholas Mann and Luke Syson (London: British Museum Press, 1998), pp. 126-136.

Aby Warburg, 'Arte del ritratto e borghesia fiorentina' (1902), in *La Rinascita del paganesimo antico e altri scritti (1889–1914)*, ed. by Maurizio Ghelardi (Turin: Aragno Editore, 2004), pp. 137-141.

John White, *Art and Architecture in Italy, 1250–1400* (Harmondsworth: Pelikan, 2nd ed. 1987).

Kim W. Woods, 'The Illusion of Life in Fifteenth-Century Sculpture', in *Making Renaissance Art*, ed. by Kim W. Woods (London: Yale University Press/The Open University, 2005), pp. 102-137.

Jennifer Woodward, *The Theatre of Death: The Ritual Management of Royal Funerals in Renaissance England 1570–1625* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997).

Alison Wright, *The Pollaiuolo Brothers: The Arts of Florence and Rome* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005).

Frances Amelia Yates, *The Art of Memory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966).

Shelley E. Zuraw, 'The Public Commemorative Monument: Mino da Fiesole's Tombs in the Florentine Badia', *The Art Bulletin,* 80/3 (1998), pp. 452-477.

Shelley E. Zuraw, 'Mino da Fiesole's Forteguerri Tomb: A "Florentine" Monument, in Rome', in *Artistic Exchange and Cultural Translation in the Italian Renaissance City*, ed. by Stephen J. Campbell and Stephen J. Milner (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 75-95.