

Frustrated Seeing:

Scale, Visibility, and a Fifteenth-Century Portuguese Royal Monument

Jessica Barker

The Founder's Chapel at the Dominican monastery of Santa Maria de Vitória, Batalha was a microcosm of the artistic splendours of fifteenth-century Europe (*plate 1*). Writing in 1623, the Dominican friar Luís de Sousa relates how its founder, King João I (d. 1433), brought the most celebrated architects and skilled stonemasons from foreign lands to build the monastic complex.¹ Fifteenth-century documents record the presence of French, Flemish, English and German artists alongside their Portuguese counterparts.² Although stripped of its rich furnishings and decoration in the nineteenth century, the chapel once boasted magnificent wall paintings and altarpieces, including a lost panel attributed to Rogier van der Weyden, which depicted the Virgin and Child with kneeling figures of Isabella of Portugal, duchess of Burgundy (João's daughter) alongside her husband, Philip the Good and son, Charles the Bold.³ The centrepiece of the chapel, however, remains the magnificent polychromed limestone tomb of João I and his English wife Philippa of Lancaster (d. 1415), commissioned by the king in 1426 and complete by 1434 (*plate 2*). The finely-

carved effigies of the king and queen were recently examined in an article by Joana Ramôa Melo and José da Silva, who interpreted the novelties of their costume and attributes as part of the self-fashioning of the new Avis dynasty, and identified the unusual depiction of João's sagging flesh and lined skin as an early example of portrait likeness (*plate 3*).⁴ Yet this new awareness of the artistic virtuosity and innovative design of the effigies heightens an apparent paradox: the sculpted figures are extremely difficult to see in situ, resting upon a tomb chest that measures 170 cm from the base of the supporting lions to the chamfer of the chest.⁵ This essay focuses on the extraordinary height of the tomb chest and its implications for the relationship between the effigies and their viewers. Through an examination of the relationship between scale and sight in the Founder's Chapel at Batalha, this discussion complicates the notion that late-medieval art was characterised by a 'need to see', suggesting that the limited, conditional or partial visibility of an artwork could be a strategy to produce a distinctive type of aesthetic experience.⁶ The act of looking but not-quite-seeing, the impression of visual opulence both present and out of reach, creates a dynamic which oscillates between estrangement and fascination, simultaneously drawing the viewer towards the object while establishing an irreconcilable distance between them.

Elevated Effigies

The scale of the tomb of João and Philippa encapsulates a problem almost entirely ignored in the scholarly literature on funerary monuments: certain medieval effigies are positioned at so great a height that they are extremely difficult – and in a few cases, impossible – to see in situ.⁷ This group of ‘elevated’ effigies includes some of the most celebrated monuments from fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Europe. At the Chartreuse de Champmol (Dijon), the effigies of Philip the Bold, duke of Burgundy (d. 1404, tomb made 1381–1410) and his son John the Fearless (d. 1414, tomb made 1443–70) are placed on tomb chests that measure 243 cm and 246 cm in height respectively, meaning that the alabaster figures of the dukes can barely be glimpsed from the ground.⁸ At the Franciscan basilica of Santa Chiara in Naples the recumbent effigy of King Robert of Anjou (d. 1343, tomb made 1343–46) is placed almost beyond the visual range of the viewer, raised atop a tomb chest which is itself elevated on columns with life-sized standing figures.⁹ The same effect is achieved through a different arrangement at the monastery of Santa Maria de Poblet (Tarragona, Spain), where the effigies of the kings and queens of Aragon lie in rows on two stone screens far above the head of the viewer, spanning the space between the crossing and the transept of the monastic church.¹⁰ At Westminster Abbey, another royal mausoleum, the tombs of the Plantagenet kings and queens are located between

the piers surrounding the shrine of Edward the Confessor in a chapel behind the high altar.¹¹ Monks, pilgrims and other visitors to the abbey would have first encountered the royal tombs from the ambulatory, a position from which the glittering gilt-bronze effigies are scarcely visible, raised approximately 252 cm from the ground. Access to the Confessor's Chapel, affording much closer views of the royal effigies, seems to have become increasingly restricted in the later Middle Ages, with the additions of further tombs in the fourteenth century blocking the two staircases which had originally led to the shrine from the north and south sides of the ambulatory.¹² Another remarkable example is the memorial to Friedrich III, Holy Roman Emperor (d. 1493), in the south apsidal chapel at St Stephansdom in Vienna, begun in 1468–73 and completed in 1513 (*plate 4*).¹³ This massive and intricately carved monument measures 291 cm from the pavement to the chamfer of the tomb chest. The effigy of the emperor is recessed into the lid of the Salzburg marble chest, meaning that from ground level the sculpted figure is entirely obscured. The only way to see the effigy is to climb the staircase at the east end of the monument, carved with reliefs of the resurrected Christ and angels holding instruments of the Passion, and stand on a raised platform that encircles the tomb chest, a perspective that would only have been granted to a handful of viewers.

Late-medieval patrons had a keen interest in the size and dimensions of their monuments, with surviving contracts almost always stipulating precise measurements for the tomb chest and accompanying effigies.¹⁴ There are clear practical reasons for length and breadth to be specified in order to ensure that the monument would fit into its chosen position in the church.¹⁵ The height of the tomb, however, had symbolic as well as practical significance. Owing to the cost of materials, transport, craftsmen, and space occupied in the church, three-dimensional effigies on raised tomb chests were typically reserved for bishops, royals, nobles and the higher gentry, whereas the lower gentry, mercantile classes, priests, and members of religious orders opted for flat slabs, either incised stones or engraved brass plates.¹⁶ The connection between height and status meant that the relative heights of memorials in close proximity could be used to express hierarchical relationships. In Exeter Cathedral, a flat brass memorial to Canon William Langton (d. 1419) is situated immediately to the left of the raised stone monument to his kinsman Bishop Edmund Stafford (d. 1413), while in the Fürstenkapelle at Meissen Cathedral (Germany) a three-dimensional copper-alloy tomb of Friedrich I, ‘the Belligerent’, Margrave of Meissen and Elector of Saxony (d. 1428) is surrounded by nine flat engraved brasses commemorating members of his family (*plate 5*).¹⁷ Relative height could also be employed as a mark of deference and

respect. The will of Richard Fitzalan, third earl of Arundel (d. 1376) left only two instructions regarding his monument: that it be located in Lewes Priory, near to the tomb of his wife; and that his memorial be ‘no higher than hers’.¹⁸ Finally, there are documented cases of a patron ordering their tomb chest to be of exceptional height, apparently in full knowledge of the implications for the visibility of the effigy. In the contract for his tomb (dated 24 June 1448), Charles I, Duke of Bourbon orders the sculptor Jacques Morel to produce a monument ‘ten feet long and six feet wide, and as high as the tomb of the Duke of Burgundy in Dijon’.¹⁹ While the other dimensions are articulated through units of measurement, the height of the tomb is expressed in relation to another memorial.²⁰ This leaves scholars with the same paradox as the tomb of João and Philippa: Charles commissioned an effigy from Jacques Morel, one of the leading sculptors of his day, and yet he also stipulated that his tomb chest should be of such great height that this sculpted figure would be extremely difficult to see from the ground.²¹ As the son-in-law of John the Fearless, Duke of Burgundy, Charles de Bourbon must have been familiar with the monuments at Champmol and the visual effects produced by their unusual height. Whereas art historians tend to focus on the effigy, these examples indicate that medieval patrons placed as much (if not more) emphasis on the size of their monument. In the case of the tombs at Batalha, Champmol, Poblet, Santa

Chiara, St Stephansdom, and Westminster, effigies of great artistic innovation and virtuosity were placed at so great a height that they were extremely difficult, or impossible, to see from the ground. This suggests a radically different function for the effigy on these monuments: rather than a series of iconographic signs – costume, attributes, gestures, and facial likeness – forming a sculpted biography of the deceased to be ‘read’ by the viewer, the effigy was experienced as a half-seen thing, the blurred outlines of a bodily presence just out of reach.

Partial Visibility

All the examples of ‘elevated effigies’ discussed above, including the memorial in the Founder’s Chapel, were made during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, a period often associated with the European ‘visual turn’. Although the precise timing and nature of this transformation has been much debated, it is typically defined as a move towards an increasingly ocular-centric culture that emphasised vision as the dominant sense and equated sight with knowledge.²² Scholars tend to chart the ‘visual turn’ through two broad categories of evidence: scientific developments, including the study of optics and inventions which alter, transform or extend human sight; and artistic developments, principally the ‘rediscovery’ of single-point perspective and ‘rebirth’ of pictorial naturalism.²³ Most pertinent to this essay are studies that seek to bridge these two

categories, such as Suzannah Biernoff's *Sight and Embodiment in the Middle Ages*, or Samuel Y. Edgerton's *The Mirror, the Window, and the Telescope*, positing a relationship between a change in the status and science of sight and developments in the visual arts.²⁴ In *The Image and its Public*, Hans Belting pointed to the elevation of the Host and its display in a monstrance, the increasing popularity of mystery plays, the exhibition of relics and other cult objects, and the development of iconographies of 'presentation' (such as the *Pietà*) as evidence for a new 'need to see' in the later Middle Ages.²⁵ This heightened emphasis on the importance of vision has also been used to explain the growth in the popularity of the tomb chest during the thirteenth century: drawing a connection between the elevation of saints' shrines and the elevation of the effigy, Nigel Saul argued that 'the principal attraction of the chest was that it raised the effigy up, making it the object of attention'.²⁶

However, while tomb chests of moderate height do increase the visibility of the effigy, extreme elevation has the opposite effect, making the effigy much more difficult to see. The sculpted body of the deceased is distanced from both its corporeal referent (the corpse in the grave immediately below) and from the viewer. Medieval contracts reveal that the height of these monuments was a deliberate and informed choice, suggesting that the difficulty in seeing the effigy should be understood as an essential part of the monument's design. If – as

Belting argued – the viewing public in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries felt an increasing ‘need to see’, then the frustration of this desire could also be used to elicit a particular type of response to an artwork. Although dealing with an earlier period, Beat Brenk touches upon the implications of partial visibility for the relationship between monuments and their viewers in his article, ‘Visibility and (Partial) Invisibility in Early Christian Images’.²⁷ Addressing the often-noted problem that only the lowest four spirals of Trajan’s column can be seen clearly from the ground, Brenk suggested that the lower scenes act as an invitation, beckoning the viewer to gaze upwards at the rest of the column in an (albeit impossible) effort to follow the narrative of the Dacian war to the end. Brenk argued that the essential function of Trajan’s column as an expression of imperial *Magnificencia* would have been recognised by viewers regardless of their ability to see all the imagery of the reliefs: visibility took second place to awe. It is notable that the most elevated effigies commemorate those in positions of authority: kings, emperors and dukes. The *Secretum Secretorum* by pseudo-Aristotle, a handbook for rulers that circulated widely throughout the courts of medieval Europe, advised rulers to maintain distance in order to exert power over their subjects:

A king should appear before the eyes of the people only once a year ... and the crowd made to stand somewhat

distant [*remotis*], with the nobles and barons surrounding him.²⁸

The same performance of aloofness can be enacted through sculpture. In *On Longing*, an exploration of scale in art and literature, Susan Stewart argued that the grand scale of ‘public sculpture, sculpture of commemoration and celebration’ is designed to make the viewer feel small, enforcing their prostration before the monument. She claimed that an essential characteristic of the representation of the gigantic in public space is that it ‘be situated above and over, that the transcendent position be denied the viewer’.²⁹ It is precisely this ‘transcendent position’ that elevated effigies deny, transforming the relationship between monument and viewer by forcing them to strain to see only partial and distant views of the sculpted figures.

The problem with Stewart’s characterisation of scale, however, is that she takes small and large to be absolute categories that produce specific effects, with monumentality inextricably tied to the idea of the artwork possessing the viewer.³⁰ In the late Middle Ages and early Renaissance, the relationship between scale, visibility and power could work in both directions: elevation may have been a strategy to empower the artwork, but it could equally have been used to empower the viewer. In ‘Sensory Experience in Medieval Devotion’, Beth

Williamson suggested that partially-visible images (such as the ninth-century apse mosaic of the Virgin and Child in the Hagia Sophia, and the fourteenth-century sculpted busts adorning the triforium of the Cathedral of St Vitus in Prague) might have ‘served to stimulate the inner eye, in part as a reaction to the limitations of the corporeal eye’s ability to see the image clearly’.³¹ During this period the ‘inner eye’ was understood to be a form of seeing which operated on an imaginative level, related to, but distinct from, physical sight; the act of looking at material images was merely the first step on the path to inner sight and immaterial visions.³² If this model of seeing were applied to tomb sculpture, the elevation of the effigy could be interpreted as a strategy to encourage the viewer to look with their ‘inner eye’, a prompt for them to supplement the limited representational capacity of the sculpted image with the greater potential of their imaginative faculties. The difficulty, however, lies in assessing how far the effigy – a representation of the dead – would have engaged the viewer in a mode of seeing comparable to ‘sacred’ images, representing Christ, the Virgin or saints.

Sight takes on a particular resonance in relation to funerary sculpture. Tensions between the visible and the invisible are essential to the function and significance of tombs. The effigy of the deceased transforms the natural body into an artificial body, inverting its condition in the grave: the natural body is buried,

while the sculpted body is elevated; the natural body is hidden from sight, while the sculpted body is exposed to the viewer's gaze. These contrasts were heightened in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries through developments in funerary rituals and the design of tomb sculpture. Funeral effigies – life-like figures of the deceased sculpted in wood and dressed in elaborate robes – were first recorded in the Great Wardrobe accounts for the funeral of King Edward II of England in 1327.³³ These sculptures were made for performance, acting as a proxy for the corpse of the deceased concealed in the coffin during the funeral procession, Office of the Dead and Requiem Mass, and disappearing from view after the burial.³⁴ While funeral effigies replace and erase the natural body, 'transi' tombs (so-called because they depict the deceased in a state of transition) purport to open the tomb chest and reveal what had previously been hidden from sight: the corpse, in fact a second sculpted effigy representing the deceased as a rotting cadaver.³⁵ Beginning with the memorials to Cardinal Jean de Lagrange in Saint-Martial, Avignon (designed before 1394) and Archbishop Henry Chichele in Canterbury Cathedral (complete by 1426), this new form of funerary sculpture became fashionable among certain sections of the courtly and ecclesiastical elites in England and France during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.³⁶ Another development of this period, hitherto largely overlooked in scholarship, is the practice of entirely concealing the effigy

beneath a cloth, curtain or wooden cupboard, which would be drawn back to reveal the sculpted figure only on certain anniversaries and high feast days.³⁷ These funerary fashions each demonstrate an interest in manipulating and heightening the boundary between invisibility and visibility, employing both sculpture and performance to simultaneously reveal and conceal the body of the deceased. Elevated effigies can, therefore, be understood as part of this broader trend, positioning the effigy just beyond the viewer's gaze in order to draw attention to the nature of the tomb as a meeting-point for the seen and unseen.

The Founder's Chapel

The connections between scale, visibility, devotion, memory and power are particularly marked in the Founder's Chapel at Batalha. The monument to João and Philippa was part of a wider artistic programme aimed at reinforcing the legitimacy and sanctity of the new Avis royal dynasty. João, the illegitimate son of King Pedro I, won the throne of Portugal following an unexpected victory over the Castilians at the battle of Aljubarrota in 1385.³⁸ His marriage to Philippa of Lancaster in 1387 was arranged to cement an alliance with her father, John of Gaunt, who was engaged in an ultimately futile campaign against the King of Castile to claim the throne on behalf of his wife.³⁹ Batalha was the major artistic project of João's reign: construction of the monastery had begun by 1387 and continued

throughout the king's lifetime.⁴⁰ His will, written on 4 October 1426, describes how the king had ordered the monastery to be built on the site of Aljubarrota in gratitude to the Virgin for his victory granted by God.⁴¹ In the same testament, the king commissioned the Founder's Chapel.⁴² João forbade burial in the centre of the chapel to anyone except the King of Portugal, while reserving the chapel walls for the sons and grandsons of kings.⁴³ He also ordered a joint monument with his late wife Philippa, who had died in 1415 and whose body was interred in the south apsidal chapel of the monastic church.⁴⁴ The royal tomb was not completed until a year after the king's death: on 14 August 1434 the bodies of João and Philippa were transferred from their temporary graves at the east end of the church to the Founder's Chapel, carried by João's six sons and accompanied by a solemn procession of his grandchildren, royal women, lords, nobles and prelates.⁴⁵

Unusually for a royal mausoleum, the Founder's Chapel is situated at the west end of the monastic church, accessed through a narrow arch in the south aisle of the nave.⁴⁶ The procession of the royal corpses from south east to south west marked a transformation in the sacred topography of the monastic church, reconfiguring its visual space along a new axis. There were now two complementary and competing foci of attention: the high altar at the east end, which marked the centre of the daily monastic offices, and the tomb of João and Philippa

at the west end, which acted as a focal point for royal memory and power. The most frequent visitors to the Founder's Chapel would have been the Dominican monks resident at Batalha, who were required to spend many hours performing commemorative rites in close proximity to the monument.⁴⁷ Although the king does not specify the location of these services, they would almost certainly have taken place at the altar that once stood at the eastern end of the tomb, described by travellers in the eighteenth century, complete with a wooden altarpiece featuring a gilded low-relief carving of the Crucifixion.⁴⁸ As the first space in Portugal to be explicitly designated as a royal mausoleum, the Founder's Chapel was also a stage for grand ceremonies involving a diverse – albeit elite – audience.⁴⁹ João's epitaph records that the entire royal family, as well as 'the most eminent and powerful part of the prelates, lords and nobles of this land', were present in the chapel for the translation of João and Philippa's bodies.⁵⁰ This large gathering would have been repeated at least once a year: it was common practice in the later Middle Ages for the anniversaries of royal and aristocratic funerals to be marked by the public distribution of alms, large-scale processions and elaborate liturgical rites, attended by friends and relatives of the deceased.⁵¹ Indeed, the king's will instructs that the celebrations at Batalha for the anniversaries of his death and that of his queen were to be performed by

Cistercian monks from Alcobaça, ‘and other visiting monks and clerics’, in addition to the resident friars.⁵²

The architecture of the Founder’s Chapel enhances its function as a space for the performance of royal identity and power. It is a square-plan building, each interior wall measuring approximately 20 metres in length (see *plate 2*).⁵³ The east, south and west walls are punctuated by nine large windows with curvilinear Flamboyant tracery. The south wall has an arcade of four ogee-arched niches, each containing a monument to one of João and Philippa’s sons (with the exception of their eldest son and heir Duarte I (d. 1438), who later commissioned his own funerary chapel at the east end of the church).⁵⁴ The east wall is punctuated by further niches for (now-lost) altars associated with the princes’ tombs. The monument to João and Philippa stands within a separate octagonal space in the centre of the chapel, marked by eight narrow piers opening out into broken, stilted arches with cusped ornamentation (*plate 6*).⁵⁵ This area acted as a chapel within the Founder’s Chapel; the west end of the tomb is placed next to the two westernmost piers, and the altar was once situated between the two easternmost piers. The monument is surmounted by a lantern comprising a magnificent stellar vault raised on a clerestory of eight windows, creating a shaft of light that envelops the effigies of João and Philippa while leaving the memorials to their sons in comparative darkness (*plate 7*).⁵⁶ This architectural setting creates a potent

sense of elevation. Each pier is articulated by twelve delicately-carved pilasters, the central moulding rising above the arches to provide the springing for one of the eight points of the stellar vault (see *plate 2* and *plate 7*). Continuous vertical lines guide the eye from the arches to the ribs of the vault, and finally to the central boss carved with the arms of Portugal carried by angels, itself surrounded by a painted aureole incorporating the words 'por bem' [for good]. Soaring above the effigies, this lantern has been described as the architectural equivalent of a canopy of state: a cloth, often decorated with heraldic insignia, which hung above the seat of great lords and kings.⁵⁷ As well as reflecting the impression of loftiness created through the height of the tomb, the vault also reinforces the sense of frustrated seeing. Standing on the pavement of the chapel, the presence of decoration on the vault is apparent – the blurred edges of the trefoil cusps, finials and painted red rays all signal visual opulence – but it is impossible to decipher the royal mottos and the details of the royal escutcheon on the central boss with the naked eye. The presence of half-seen things indicates to the viewer that they are not the intended audience for this imagery; the royal emblems, suspended above the clerestory and held aloft by angels, are a heavenly vision presented exclusively to the effigies of the king and queen elevated on their high tomb chest.⁵⁸

Tensions between architecture, scale and sight continue on the tomb itself. In their introduction to 'To Scale', a special issue of *Art History*, Joan Kee and Emmanuel Luigi drew attention to the experiential qualities of scale, emphasising the distinction between the 'explicit size' of an object, its absolute dimensions, and its 'implicit size', what the arrangement of its parts suggests to a viewer about its proportions.⁵⁹ This concept of experiential scale opens up new ways of understanding the design of the royal tomb at Batalha. Elaborate micro-architectural canopies crown the heads of the royal effigies, their decoration echoing the motifs on the lantern: the exterior features pierced tracery, ogee arches and crocketed pinnacles, while the interior is adorned with ribs and miniature foliate bosses (see *plate 2*).⁶⁰ At the same time as miniaturising the architecture of the chapel, the canopies monumentalise the tomb and its effigies. Measuring over one metre in length, they are far larger than those typically found on funerary monuments in the fifteenth century and more than half the length of the royal effigies that they frame.⁶¹ The canopies thus disorientate the scale of the tomb, their perceived size shifting in accordance with whether they are viewed in relation to the sculpted figures or to the lantern vault. This has important implications for the perception of the royal figures. When the tomb is viewed in isolation, the relative sizes of canopy and effigies make the royal figures appear smaller than life-size. If the canopies are

seen as miniature versions of the lantern vault, the effigies conversely appear larger than life-size as the viewer is prompted to compare the scale of their own body within the lantern vault to the scale of the sculpted figures beneath the canopies which crown their heads.

Another, now-lost, feature of the monument would have amplified this effect. An unpublished drawing in James Murphy's sketchbook, dating from 1789, reveals that the west end of the tomb featured two saints, thirty-five centimetres tall, standing on slender columns over three metres high (*plate 8*).⁶² Like the effigies, these miniature figures had two-storey canopies suspended above their heads. The chapel and tomb can thus be understood as a series of figures and canopies nested within one another like Russian dolls, each setting up different relationships of relative scale: the standing saints with the canopies over their heads, the effigies with their canopies on the tomb chest, and the viewer standing within the lantern vault. In the Founder's Chapel the experience of scale oscillates between miniature and monumental, tying together viewer, effigies and architecture in fluctuating relationships of comparative size.

The scale of the canopies also contributes to the concealment of the royal effigies. When viewed from the west end of the tomb, the sculpted figures disappear behind the canopies, their presence signalled instead by the two escutcheons carved and painted with the arms of João and

Philippa (*plate 9*). The same effect is repeated when viewed from the east, with the effigies largely obscured by the corbels upon which they stand (*plate 10*). From the north and south, the effigies of the king and queen can be seen from a distance, but, as the viewer steps forward to scrutinise more closely, they are increasingly concealed from view, effaced by the massive tomb chest (see *plate 2*). Yet, despite their limited visibility, the effigies were carved with great care and detail.⁶³ Departing from the typical depiction of royal effigies in ceremonial robes, João is dressed in a full suit of armour and wears a tabard carved with the royal arms of Portugal (see *plate 2*).⁶⁴ He grasps the baton of command in his left hand and holds the hand of his wife with his right: a matrimonial gesture popular on English funerary monuments during the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, including the (now-destroyed) tomb of Philippa's parents at St Paul's Cathedral, and that of her cousin, Richard II, and his wife at Westminster Abbey.⁶⁵ The sculptor achieved a high degree of naturalism in the rendering of João's face, the sagging flesh and lined skin of the ageing king carved with remarkable subtlety (see *plate 3*). Philippa, in contrast, is shown with smooth skin, idealised features and uncovered hair (an attribute associated with virginity).⁶⁶ The queen holds a clasped book in her left hand (see *plate 13*).⁶⁷ She wears a long dress and mantle with an ornate band of vine scroll decoration at her neckline, held together at her breast by a diamond-shaped

brooch. Incised floral patterns imitating luxurious woven silk adorn the pillows beneath the heads of the royal effigies, as well as Philippa's sleeves and mantle (see *plate 3*). From the ground the outlines of their costumes are visible, but it is extremely difficult to see the intricate detailing on the effigies. Like the interior of the lantern vault, the tomb both offers and denies visual opulence: glimpsing the figures from a distance suggests the skill and detail of their carving, yet this artistic virtuosity remains just beyond the viewer's gaze.

Rather than the sculpted figures of the king and queen, it is the tomb chest that is placed at eye level and can thus be scrutinised by the viewer. Its design as well as its dimensions create a potent sense of monumentality. Six lions support the monument (now standing on a nineteenth-century stone base).⁶⁸ The lid of the chest is framed by a chamfer carved with vegetal decoration and the mottos of the king and queen in ornate Gothic lettering: Philippa's motto, *y me plet* [I love him] is placed below her effigy, and João's motto, *por bem* [for good] below his, the two mottos meeting on the east and west sides. The west end features a large escutcheon with the arms of St George surrounded by a garter (a reference to João's election to the Order of the Garter in 1400), the east end has an incised hawthorn tree (João's heraldic badge), while the north and south sides are entirely covered in Latin inscriptions (see *plate 9* and *plate 10*, and *plate 11*).⁶⁹ The central section of the tomb chest is

remarkable for its lack of decoration. There are no niches, no arcades, no registers, no statuettes, and remarkably little heraldic decoration, all features standard to monuments of this period (see, for example, *plate 4*). This is in stark contrast to the memorials commemorating João's father, Pedro I (d. 1367) and his consort Inês de Castro (d. 1348/49) at the Cistercian monastery of Alcobaça, whose limestone tomb chests are carved with scenes of the Life of St Bartholomew and the Life of Christ respectively, the miniature figures housed in extraordinarily intricate architectural frames (*plate 12*).⁷⁰ At Batalha there is no architectural articulation to break up the stark rectangular block of the tomb chest, meaning that its monumental proportions immediately impress themselves upon the viewer.

Text, not image, is the predominate experience of this monument in situ. The north and south sides of the tomb chest are entirely covered in Latin lettering, constituting one of the longest inscribed epitaphs on a medieval tomb (see *plate 2* and *plate 11*).⁷¹ While most inscriptions on tombs of this period are primarily concerned with persuading the viewer to pray for the soul of the deceased in Purgatory, the epitaphs at Batalha are biographical rather than devotional, describing the personality, achievements and exemplary deaths of the royal couple.⁷² The position of the inscriptions emphasises their relationship to the sculpted figures: Philippa's epitaph is positioned below her effigy on the south side of the tomb chest, while the epitaph to

João is below his effigy on the north side (see *plate 2*). The chronology of the events recounted in the two epitaphs makes it clear that they are intended to be read together, starting with Philippa's and ending with João's. Close connections between the textual and iconographic depictions of the royal couple indicate that the designer of the tomb and composer of the epitaph must have worked in unison, or else were one and the same. Philippa is described as girlish, devoted to reading and a model of marital fidelity; João's epitaph focuses on his military victories at Aljubarrota and Ceuta, complementing the depiction of his effigy in full armour and holding the baton of command. Yet it is impossible to read and look simultaneously: to be close enough to study the small, dense Latin lettering also means standing at the point at which the effigies are raised too high above the viewer's head to be easily seen (see *plate 11*). The various facets of the memorial are only revealed through concentration, movement and time: the viewer is required to walk around the different sides of the monument in turn (starting with the south and ending with the north), stepping forwards and backwards to read the epitaph, and straining their eyes upwards to glimpse the sculpted figures of the king and queen.

The inscription also makes a reference to the size of the monument upon which it is carved. Recounting Philippa's virtues, her epitaph comments that 'the plurality of them is impossible for the smallness of this stone to present'.⁷³ This

trope relates the monumentality of the tomb to Philippa's character, suggesting that even a memorial of such grand size is rendered 'small' by the vastly greater scale of the queen's virtue.⁷⁴ It is here that the symbolic and experiential qualities of height intersect: the inscription states that the size of the monument is evidence of the queen's virtue, an assertion enhanced by the fact that to read this claim means standing at the point at which the stone tomb chest towers over the viewer. In *On Longing*, Stewart emphasised the importance of inscriptions in enhancing the authority of sculpted monuments, claiming that 'the reduction of the individual viewer in the face of the public monument is all the more evident in the function of the inscription; one is expected to read the instructions for the perception of the work'.⁷⁵ The monument at Batalha arguably takes this relationship between inscription and authority even further. The lengthy Latin text requires the viewer to stop and read, a requirement that many laymen and women in the fifteenth century would have been unable to fulfil. Even for the courtly elites and Dominican monks able to decipher the Latin, the sheer length of the text (the two epitaphs combined comprise just fewer than 1,700 words), its copious abbreviations, and linguistic complexity must have presented a significant challenge.⁷⁶ To borrow Stewart's phrase, the 'reduction of the individual viewer' in front of the tomb is prompted by the difficulty in meeting its demands: the ornately-carved effigies

demand to be seen, and yet they are elevated beyond the viewer's gaze, while the Latin text is placed at eye-level, an implicit demand to be read, but its length and language prevent easy comprehension.⁷⁷ The sense of alienation produced by this wall of text emphasises the other-ness of the royal couple, an effect enhanced by the ornately-carved effigies, which are elevated above the epitaphs and beyond the viewer's gaze. Scale, visibility, complexity – and the aesthetic experience that they prompted – were essential to the design of the monument at Batalha, arguably even more important in communicating the power of the deceased than the regalia worn by their effigies or the inscriptions recounting their extraordinary deeds.

Medieval and Modern Experience

A codicil to this exploration of visibility and scale must be an acknowledgement of the problems faced in attempting to recover the medieval experience of the tomb. Although spared some of the ravages inflicted on the rest of the monastic church, centuries of alterations, losses, and restorations separate modern experiences of the Founder's Chapel from those of viewers in the fifteenth century. Much destruction and looting was inflicted by Napoleonic troops during their occupation of the monastery in 1810, with further losses of portable items after the dissolution of religious orders in Portugal in 1834.⁷⁸ Documents recording bequests to the chapel, as well as the accounts of

visitors in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, describe an abundance of rich furnishings, including liturgical vessels, wall-paintings, textiles, altarpieces, and even armour, of which only fragmentary traces remain.⁷⁹ Early writers comment in particular on the abundance of stained glass. Thomas Pitt, MP and connoisseur of the arts, noted on a visit in 1760: ‘the windows of this chapel are full of painted glass, with the arms of Portugal, Lancaster, and the Order of the Garter.’⁸⁰ Heraldic escutcheons, badges, and a Last Judgement scene (attributed to the German glazier Luís Alemão, who is documented at Batalha in 1446–50) survive in the tracery lights of the Founder’s Chapel; the glass in the main lights and clerestory windows dates from the restoration of 1873–4.⁸¹ Nineteenth-century glass allows more white light to enter the Chapel than its heavily-coloured medieval precursors, transforming the conditions under which the tombs are seen. Another significant alteration is the removal of a low platform that once raised the central octagon with the monument to João and Philippa above the surrounding ambulatory. This platform is depicted on an engraving of the Chapel published by W. H. Harrison in 1839; its subsequent removal has left traces on the surrounding piers.⁸² Its absence is also the most likely explanation for the rough stone plinths now found under the lions supporting the tomb of João and Philippa, meaning that from the position of the central octagon the royal tomb is raised between an additional eight and eighteen

centimetres over its original height (see *plate 2*).⁸³ Although the extra elevation is slight compared to the overall dimensions of the monument, the removal of the platform means that the modern viewer is denied the medieval experience of rising upwards towards the tomb, climbing the steps from the south aisle to the entrance of the chapel, and from the entrance to the platform of the central octagon.

The material transformation of the chapel is matched by other, intangible losses. The Founder's Chapel was conceived as a space for performance. João's will of 1426 stipulates that the masses of the Holy Spirit and Virgin Mary were to be said or sung daily for the souls of him and Philippa; every Monday the monks were to perform the Office of the Dead and a Requiem Mass; and an additional versicle was to be sung for the queen after the monks had completed the daily offices and before they went to eat.⁸⁴ On the anniversaries of João and Philippa's funerals, on All Soul's Day, and on the octave of the anniversary of their deaths these commemorative responsibilities were even more burdensome: the Dominicans were to say Vespers, Matins, all the other Offices of the Dead, two Requiem Masses, two responses, and the masses of the Holy Spirit and Virgin Mary.⁸⁵ These rituals can be understood in part as sonic re-animations of the royal couple, whose voices the priests ventriloquize in the act of crying out to God for mercy.⁸⁶ Sight was not the only – and perhaps not even the

primary – mode of remembering João and Philippa: the difficulty in seeing the royal figures needs to be weighed against the simultaneous experience of hearing ‘their’ voices. Other performances are evoked in the design of the monument itself. The epitaph contains no less than four references to the vigil of the Assumption of the Virgin on 14 August, the date of João’s death and the burial of the royal couple in the Founder’s Chapel, suggesting that the text was intended to be read aloud as part of the anniversary ceremonies prescribed in the king’s will.⁸⁷ Since seeing the tomb was often a communal activity, the viewer’s perception of its scale would have been governed by the monument’s size relative to the people who surrounded it, in addition to the sculpture’s constituent parts and positioning within the architectural space. Chief among these viewers-who-were-viewed would have been the priest standing on the altar platform at the east end of the tomb. As well as making him a spectacle for others, this raised position granted the priest a privileged view of the royal effigies, now partially visible behind the large corbels at their feet.

Modern viewers are afforded an even better view of the effigies, a visual access granted through reproduction rather than physical elevation. For the monument at Batalha, as well as for other ‘elevated’ tombs discussed in this essay, there is a notable discrepancy between the aspects of the monument that are typically emphasised in photographs and drawings and those

most visible in situ.⁸⁸ Part of the explanation for the neglect of visibility and elevation in relation to tombs lies in the use of drawings and photography, which allow later scholars to circumvent their own visual frustration by capturing details of the effigies inaccessible to viewers in the Middle Ages. The earliest publication on the Founder's Chapel in English, James Murphy's *Plans, Elevations, Sections and Views of the Church of Batalha*, released in instalments between 1792 and 1795, included a single, full-page engraving of the tomb to João and Philippa, showing the two royal effigies from above (*plate 13*).⁸⁹ Although published over a century and a half later, the same preference for aerial views of memorials is evident in the 417 black-and-white photographs appended to the end of the text in Erwin Panofsky's *Tomb Sculpture*, their angle and lighting seemingly transforming the recumbent effigies into standing statues (*plate 14*).⁹⁰ These reproductions shift modern encounters with tomb sculpture. A particularly striking example is the tomb of Frederick III at St Stephensdom in Vienna, where a large aerial photograph of the effigy has been erected next to the monument itself, allowing modern-day visitors to the cathedral a sight entirely inaccessible when looking at the memorial from the ground (see *plate 15* and *plate 16*).⁹¹ The viewer is now able to survey the totality of the sculpture in a single glance, occupying the 'transcendent position' that Stewart argued public monuments seek to deny to their audience.⁹²

When encountered through drawings and prints, photographs in books, or via the digital screen, the tomb is miniaturised; a monument that towers over the head of the viewer in situ is now smaller than the scale of their own body. While acknowledging the essential place of photography in art-historical study, it is also important to recognise the paradox that reproductions can enable art historians to see more but learn less. An essential – and overlooked – facet of tombs like that of João and Philippa was their frustration of scopic desire, the impression of visual magnificence both present and out of reach.

Notes

Thanks to the anonymous reviewers of *Art History* for their insightful comments, which were invaluable in shaping this article into its current form. I am also indebted to Pedro Redol for so generously sharing his expertise on Batalha and allowing me to access, measure and photograph the Founder's Chapel; Begoña Farré Torras and Joana Ramôa-Melo for innumerable conversations on Portuguese medieval sculpture; Veronika Decker for guidance and measurements in Vienna; and Maeve O'Donnell-Morales for advice on translations and the Castilian context. Thanks also to those who read and commented on drafts of this paper: Jocelyn Anderson, Simon Dell, Tom Nickson, John Lowden and David Park. I am grateful to the Henry Moore Foundation for funding this research.

¹ Friar Luís de Sousa, *Primeira Parte da História de S. Domingos*, 3rd edn., vol. 2, Lisbon, 1866, 262. See also Begoña F. Torras, ‘Four Princes, One Monument, One Perfect King: The Fifteenth-Century Pantheon of an Idealised Royal Family in the Monastery of Santa Maria da Vitória, Batalha,’ *Portuguese Studies Review*, 23: 1, 2014, 83, note 15.

² Huguet, the name of the master mason responsible for the Founder’s Chapel, recorded at Batalha from 1402 to 1438, suggests that he was a foreigner, possibly French. A ‘Master Conrad’ and ‘Master Whitaker’ are among the craftsmen commemorated in an inscription near the west entrance to the monastic church. Flemish and German artists are documented in the stained glass workshop during the second and third quarters of the fifteenth century, including a certain Luís Alemão, who may also have worked in Franconia and Nuremberg. See Carlos Barros, *O vitral em Portugal, séculos XV- XVI*, Lisbon, Banco Espírito Santo e Comercial de Lisboa, 1983, 83–84; Jean-Marie Guillouët, *Le portail de Santa Maria da Vitória Batalha et l’art européen de son temps*, Portugalia Sacra 1, Lleira, Textiverso, 2011, 198–216; Daniel Hess, ‘In Search of Luís Alemão: Stained Glass in Germany from 1400-1460 and the Fragments in Batalha,’ in Mario Abreu, ed., *O vitral: história, conservação e restauro: encontro internacional, Mosteiro da Batalha, 27-29 de abril 1995*, Lisbon, Instituto Português do Património Arquitectónico, 2002, 44–53; James Murphy, *Plans, Elevations, Sections and Views of the Church of Batalha*, London, 1795, 60; José da Silva and Pedro Redol, *The Monastery of Batalha*, London, Scala, 2007, 19, 28–9.

³ A Portuguese document dated 3 April 1445 records a ship loaded with goods from the Low Countries, including objects destined for Batalha. Lorne Campbell, ed., *Rogier van der Weyden and the Kingdoms of the Iberian Peninsula*, exh. cat., Madrid, Museo Nacional del Prado, 2015, no. 20, 173–5; Lorne Campbell and Yvonne Szafran, ‘The Portrait of Isabella of Portugal, Duchess of Burgundy, in the J. Paul Getty Museum’, *The Burlington Magazine*, 146: 1212, March 2004, 152. For discussion of other losses and

looting from the Chapel, see Patrícia Soares and Pedro Redol, eds, *Places of Prayer at the Monastery of Batalha*, exh. cat., Lisbon, Direção-Geral de Património Cultural, 2015, 79–83; Begoña F. Torras, ‘Brotherly Love and Filial Obedience: The Commemorative Programme of the Avis Princes at Santa Maria de Vitória, Batalha’, unpub. Master’s thesis, University of Lisbon, 2014, 89–91.

⁴ Joana Ramôa and José da Silva, ‘O retrato de D. João I no Mosteiro de Santa Maria da Vitória,’ *Revista de Historia da Arte*, 5, 2008, 77–95.

⁵All measurements of the monument at Batalha are my own. The height of the tomb chest given above (170 cm) does not include the stone plinths below the lions as these are almost certainly nineteenth-century additions (discussed below).

⁶ This phrase was used by Hans Belting to explain developments in late-medieval art and ritual, claiming that the new expectations and demands of the viewing public ‘included the much discussed “need to see”, which has yet to be sufficiently elucidated sociologically’. Belting’s argument, and its place in the historiography of late-medieval visuality, is discussed below. Hans Belting, *The Image and its Public in the Middle Ages: Form and Function in Early Paintings of the Passion*, New Rochelle, N.Y., Aristide D. Caratzas, 1990, 80.

⁷ The problem of elevation and visibility in relation to the ducal tombs at Champmol is noted in Sophie Jugie, ed., *The Mourners: Tomb Sculptures from the Court of Burgundy*, exh. cat., Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 2010, 40.

⁸ Although the monuments were dismantled in 1793 and reconstructed in 1819, the survival of large elements (including arcatures) means that the reconstructions must follow the dimensions of the original tombs. Jugie, *The Mourners*, 37, 44; Stephen N. Fliegel, S. Jugie et al, eds, *Art from the Court of Burgundy, 1364-1419*, Musée des beaux-arts, Dijon, 2004, 223–34.

⁹ Robert is represented three times on his monument: as an enthroned king, as a recumbent figure on the tomb chest, and in relief on the tomb chest, again as an enthroned king. The recumbent effigy is the most difficult to see from the ground. The tomb chest raised on caryatids was a popular model for aristocratic tombs in fourteenth and fifteenth-century Naples. Tanya Michalsky, *Memoria und Repräsentation, Die Grabmäler des Königshauses Anjou in Italien*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000, 325–41, figs 55–63.

¹⁰ This programme was initiated in 1349 by Pere el Ceremoniós, King of Aragon and continued to accumulate royal effigies until the late fifteenth century. Bruno Klein, 'Der König und die Kunst: Die Genese des aragonesisch-katalanischen *panteón* in Poblet unter Pere el Ceremoniós,' in Barbara Borngässer, Henrik Karge and Bruno Klein, eds, *Grabkunst und Sepulkralkultur in Spanien und Portugal*, Frankfurt, Vervuert, 2006, 317–38.

¹¹ Paul Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power 1200–1400*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1995; David M. Palliser, 'Royal Mausolea in the Long Fourteenth Century (1272–1422)', in Mark Ormrod, ed., *Fourteenth Century England. III*, Woodbridge, Boydell, 2004, 1–16.

¹² The addition of the tomb of Edward I (d. 1307) left only a narrow gap (45 cm) at the northern entrance, while the monument to Richard and Anne, completed in 1399, blocked entry via the southern staircase. In 1441 Henry V commissioned a stone screen behind the high altar, further enclosing the Chapel. Warwick Rodwell, *The Coronation Chair and the Stone of Scone: History, Archaeology and Conservation*, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 2013, 39, 41.

¹³ The monument was designed and initiated by Nicolaus Gerhaert van Leyden in 1468–73, and completed and installed in 1513 in an act of filial piety by Frederick's son Maximilian I. L. Silver, *Marketing Maximilian: The Visual Ideology of a Holy Roman Emperor*, Princeton, Princeton University

Press, 2008, pp. 197, 225–26. For an account of the tomb, see Stefan Roller, ed., *Nicolaus Gerhaert: Der Bildhauer des Späten Mittelalters*, exh. cat., Frankfurt, Liebieghaus Skulpturen Sammlung, 2012, 220–24.

¹⁴ See, for example, the contracts transcribed and translated in Sally Badham and Sophie Oosterwijk, ‘“Cest Endenture Fait Parentre’: English Tomb Contracts of the Long Fourteenth Century,’ in Sally Badham and Sophie Oosterwijk, eds, *Monumental Industry: The Production of Tomb Monuments in England and Wales in the Long Fourteenth Century*, Donington, Shaun Tyas, 2010, 187–236.

¹⁵ Nigel Saul, ‘Patronage and Design in the Construction of English Medieval Tomb Monuments’, in Paul Binski and Elizabeth A. New, eds, *Patrons and Professionals in the Middle Ages, Proceedings of the 2010 Harlaxton Symposium*, Donington, Shaun Tyas, 2012, 324.

¹⁶ Nigel Saul, *English Church Monuments in the Middle Ages: History and Representation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009, 58.

¹⁷ For Exeter, see Saul, *English Church Monuments*, 152. For Meissen, see Matthias Donath, ed., *Die Grabmonumente im Dom zu Meißen*, Leipzig, Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2004, 298–304, 335–7, 341–4, 357–60, 368–70, 371–3, 376–81, 402–04, 407–09; Sally Badham and Sophie Oosterwijk, ‘“Monumentum aere perennius”?: Precious-Metal Effigial Tomb Monuments in Europe, 1080–1430’, *Church Monuments*, 30, 2015, 14–17. The high tomb at Meissen has been dated to c. 1430; the floor brasses date from the second half of the fifteenth and first half of the sixteenth centuries.

¹⁸ ‘My body to be buried in the Chapter House of the Priory at Lewes, near to the tomb of Eleanor de Lancaster, my wife; and I desire that my tomb be no higher than hers’. Nicholas Harris Nicolas, *Testamenta Vetusta: Illustrations from Wills of Manners, Customs, etc. from the Reign of Henry the Second to the Accession of Elizabeth*, 2 vols, London, 1826, 1: 94–6.

¹⁹ ‘C’est assavoir que la dicte sepulture sera toute carrée, de dix piéz de long et de six piéz de large, et de la haulteur de la sepulture de feu monseigneur le

duc de Bourgogne estant à Dijon.’ See M. C. Guigue, ‘Jacques Morel sculpteur de Montpellier’, *Archives de l’art français. Recueil des documents inédits relatifs à l’histoire des arts en France*, vol. 4, Paris, J. -B. Dumoulin, 1855–56, 314.

²⁰ Another example of height specified in relation to an existing memorial is the contract between Richard II, King of England, and the masons Henry Yevele and Stephen Lote (dated 1 April 1395) for a monument commemorating himself and his recently-deceased wife Anne of Bohemia at Westminster Abbey. The King stipulates that: ‘the said masons should raise the said tomb above the level of the earth in height as much as the height of the tomb of the very excellent and very noble Lord the King Edward III’. Badham and Oosterwijk, *Monumental Industry*, 204–05.

²¹ Although the effigies of Charles de Bourbon and Anne of Burgundy are the only documented works by Jacques Morel to have survived, the monumentality and vigour of these figures, as well as the prestigious nature of Morel’s other commissions (including the tomb of King René of Anjou in Angers Cathedral), indicates his position as one of the preeminent sculptors of fifteenth-century France. See M. Natalis Rondot, *Jacques Morel, Sculpteur Lyonnais, 1417-59*, Paris, E. Plon Nourrit et C^{ie}, 1889.

²² The vast literature on this topic is beyond the scope of this article. For an overview of the issues and their relevance for the study of medieval culture, see Dallas G. Denery, *Seeing and Being Seen in the Later Medieval World: Optics, Theology and Religious Life*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005, 1–18; Suzannah Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment in the Middle Ages*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2002, 1–13.

²³ For scientific developments and optical illusions see, for example, David C. Lindberg, *Theories of Vision from Al-Kindi to Kepler*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1976, 104–77; David C. Lindberg, ed. and trans., *Roger Bacon and the Origins of Perspectiva in the Middle Ages: A Critical Edition and English Translation, with Introduction and Notes*, Oxford, Clarendon

Press, 1996; Marina Warner, 'Camera Ludica', in Laurent Mannoni, Werner Nekes, and Marina Warner, eds, *Eyes, Lies and Illusions: The Art of Deception*, London, Hayward Gallery, 2004, 13–39; Katherine Tachau, *Vision and Certitude in the Age of Ockham*, Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1988. For artistic developments see, for example, Samuel Y. Edgerton, *The Renaissance Rediscovery of Linear Perspective*, New York, Harper and Row, 1976; William M. Ivins, *On the Rationalisation of Sight: With an Examination of Three Renaissance Texts on Perspective*, 2nd edn, New York, Da Capo Press, 1973, especially 9–10; Erwin Panofsky, *Perspective as Symbolic Form*, trans. by Christopher S. Wood, New York, Zone Books, 1991, especially 65–66; John White, *The Birth and Rebirth of Pictorial Space*, London, Faber and Faber, 1957.

²⁴ Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment*; Samuel Y. Edgerton, *The Mirror, the Window and the Telescope: How Renaissance Linear Perspective Changed our Vision of the Universe*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 2009. For other examples of this approach, see Alfred W. Crosby, *The Measure of Reality: Quantification and Western Society, 1250–1600*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997, especially 165–97; David Summers, *Vision, Reflection and Desire in Western Painting*, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2007, especially 43–77.

²⁵ Hans Belting, *The Image and its Public in the Middle Ages: Form and Function in Early Paintings of the Passion*, New Rochelle, N.Y., Aristide D. Caratzas, 1990, 80–90. See also Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment*, 3, 133.

²⁶ Saul, *English Church Monuments*, 155.

²⁷ Beat Brenk, 'Visibility and (Partial) Invisibility of Early Christian Images', in Giselle de Nie, Karl F. Morrison and Marco Mostert, eds, *Seeing the Invisible in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2005, 140–44.

²⁸ 'Capitulum 12. de consuetudine optima regum Indie, scilicet de rara eorum apparicione coram multitudine, et quod tunc debeant facere magnifica. Et

propter hoc pulchra est consuetudo Indorum in dispensacione regni et ordinacione regis: qui statuerunt quod rex semel in anno appareat corum hominibus in regali apparatu et armato exercitu, sedens nobilissime in suo dextrario, ornatu armorum pulcherrimo decoratus, et stare faciunt vulgus aliquantulum a remotis, nobiles vero et barones circa ipsum.’ The text above follows the version in the manuscript annotated by Roger Bacon before 1257. Pseudo-Aristotle, *Secretum Secretorum, cum glossis et notulis fratris Rogeri*, ed. Robert Steele, Opera hactenus inedita Rogeri Baconi 5, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1920, 49.

²⁹ Susan Stewart, *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection*, Durham and London, Duke University Press, 1993, 89–90.

³⁰ According to Stewart, the only exception to the connection between monumentality and possession are inhabited sculptures such as the Statue of Liberty, which allow the viewer to climb inside and appropriate the monument’s transcendent view. Stewart, *On Longing*, 71, 75, 89–90, 102–3. See also the critique of Stewart in Joan Kee and Emmanuel Luigi, ‘Scale to Size: An Introduction’, *Art History Special Issue ‘On Scale’* 38: 2, April 2015, 254.

³¹ Beth Williamson, ‘Sensory Experience in Medieval Devotion: Sound and Vision, Invisibility and Silence’, *Speculum* 88: 1, January 2013, 32–8.

³² Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment*, 13, 122–8; Williamson, ‘Sensory Experience’, 3, 21–3.

³³ Julian Litten, ‘The Funeral Effigy: Its Function and Purpose’, in Anthony Harvey and Richard Mortimer, eds, *The Funeral Effigies of Westminster Abbey*, Woodbridge, Boydell, 1994, 4.

³⁴ An account of the funeral of Elizabeth of York (d. 1503) provides the only clue as to what was done with funeral effigies after the ceremonies had concluded, describing how the effigy was taken to ‘a secret place by St

Edwardes Shryne'. Philip Lindley, 'Queen Elizabeth of York', in Harvey and Mortimer, *Funeral Effigies of Westminster Abbey*, 46.

³⁵ For transi tombs see Jessica Barker, 'Stone and Bone: The Corpse, the Effigy and the Viewer in Late-Medieval Tomb Sculpture', in Jessica Barker and Ann Adams, eds, *Revisiting the Monument: Fifty Years Since Panofsky's Tomb Sculpture*, London, Courtauld Books On-Line, 2016, 113–36; Paul Binski, *Medieval Death: Ritual and Representation*, London, British Museum Press, 1996, 139–52; Kathleen Cohen, *Metamorphosis of a Death Symbol: The Transi Tomb in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1973; Pamela King, 'Contexts of the Cadaver Tomb in Fifteenth Century England', 2 vols, unpub. PhD dissertation, University of York, 1987.

³⁶ For the transi tomb of Archbishop Henry Chichele, see Christopher Wilson, 'The Medieval Monuments', in Patrick Collinson, Nigel Ramsay and Margaret Sparks, eds, *A History of Canterbury Cathedral*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1995, 476–81; for the transi tomb of Cardinal Jean de Lagrange, see Anne McGee Morganstern, 'The Lagrange Tomb and Choir: A Monument to the Great Schism of the West', *Speculum* 48: 1, January 1973, 52–69.

³⁷ The most comprehensive study of this practice is an unpublished lecture by Johannes Tripps, 'Enlivening the Tomb: Sepulcher and Performance in Late-Medieval Burgundy and Beyond', given at the Minneapolis Institute of the Arts, 23 January 2011, and available to download at <http://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/artdok/1527/>. There is a shorter discussion in Sanne Frequin, 'Veiling and Unveiling: The Materiality of the Tomb of John I of Avesnes and Philippa of Luxembourg in the Franciscan Church in Valenciennes', in Barker and Adams, *Revisiting the Monument*, 195–7.

³⁸ da Silva and Redol, *Monastery of Batalha*, 12–13.

³⁹ Anthony Goodman, 'Philippa [Philippa of Lancaster] (1360–1415)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online*, accessed September 24,

2013, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/22111. See also Peter E. Russell, *The English Intervention in Spain and Portugal in the time of Edward III and Richard II*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1955, chaps 16–20.

⁴⁰ João's will states that the construction of the monastery had already begun at the time of the siege of Melgaço in 1387. Saul A. Gomes, ed., *Fontes históricas e artísticas do mosteiro e da vila da Batalha: séculos XIV a XVII*, vol. 1, 1388–1450, Lisbon, Instituto português do património arquitectónico, 2002, doc. 52, 135. See also da Silva and Redol, *Monastery of Batalha*, 11–13.

⁴¹ Gomes, *Fontes históricas*, doc. 52, 135. See also da Silva and Redol, *Monastery of Batalha*, 11–13.

⁴² Gomes, *Fontes históricas*, doc. 52, 135, 138–9.

⁴³ Gomes, *Fontes históricas*, doc. 52, 138–9. A similar hierarchical spatial arrangement is found in the fourteenth-century funerary chapel of Gil de Albornoz (d. 1367) in Toledo Cathedral, as well as those of the Avigonese popes John XXII, Clement V and Clement VI. See Tom Nickson, *Toledo Cathedral: Building Histories in Medieval Castile*, University Park, Pennsylvania State University Press, 2015, 149–50.

⁴⁴ Gomes, *Fontes históricas*, doc. 52, 134–5. The epitaph on the tomb describes the Queen's first interment as taking place in '*Capella majori et principaliori*' [the major and principal Chapel]. The precise location is indicated by the presence of another inscribed epitaph to Philippa on the west wall of the south transept, as well as the recent discovery of a cavity under the pavement of the southernmost apsidal chapel. Thanks to Pedro Redol for providing this information.

⁴⁵ The reburial of João and Philippa is recorded in the epitaph on the tomb. For a transcription of the Latin, see de Sousa, *História de S. Domingos*, vol. 2, 299–301, 305–06.

⁴⁶ Royal tombs almost always occupy the most prestigious locations at the east end of the church, close to the high altar. To my knowledge, the only

fifteenth-century royal funerary chapel in a comparable location to the Founder's Chapel is the Chapel of St Cross on the south side of the western entrance of Cracow Cathedral, which houses the tombs of Casimir IV Jagiellon, King of Poland (d. 1492) and his wife Elisabeth Hapsberg (d. 1505). See Marek Walczak, 'Topography of the Royal Necropolis at Cracow Cathedral', in Jiří Roháček, *Epigraphica et Sepulcralia IV*, Prague, Artefactum, 2015, 78–80.

⁴⁷ Gomes, *Fontes históricas*, doc. 52, 137. The commemorative rites for João and Philippa are outlined in detail below.

⁴⁸ Murphy, *Plans, Elevations, Sections and Views*, 33, 35; Thomas Pitt, *Observations in a Tour to Portugal and Spain (1760) [Observações de uma viagem a Portugal e Espanha, 1760]*, edited by Maria João Neto, Lisbon, Instituto Português do Património Arquitectónico, 2006, 135. The altar is depicted in an engraving of the Founder's Chapel (after a painting by James Holland), published in William H. Harrison, *The Tourist in Portugal*, London, Robert Jennings, 1839, opposite 232.

⁴⁹ Gomes, *Fontes históricas*, doc. 52, 138–9. João's predecessors were buried in a number of different religious establishments, including Alcobaça and Coimbra, and all have their monuments within the main body of the church rather than a separate chapel. See da Silva and Redol, *Monastery of Batalha*, 75–77; Ramôa and da Silva, 'O retrato de D. João I', 77–9.

⁵⁰ de Sousa, *História de S. Domingos*, vol. 2, 301.

⁵¹ One of the best-documented examples of this practice are the elaborate ceremonies accompanying the anniversaries of Philippa's mother, Blanche of Lancaster, at the cathedral of Old St Pauls in London, recorded in the account books of her father, John of Gaunt. See N. B. Lewis, 'The Anniversary Service for Blanche, Duchess of Lancaster, 12th September, 1374', *Bulletin of John Rylands Library* 21, 1937, 176–92.

⁵² 'E nos dias dos finamentos da dita rainha e meu, os frades d Alcobaça e os do dicto Moesteiro e outros quaaesquer frades e cleriguos que hy venham

digam hum trintayro rrezado em cada hum sahimento aalem das missas e Oras que ham de dizer.’ Although the monks at Alcobaça are not explicitly instructed to go to Batalha for the celebrations, the fact that they are listed alongside visiting friars and clerics suggests that the King was envisioning one grand service at Batalha attended by the monks at Alçobaca, rather than two celebrations taking place simultaneously at separate monasteries. Gomes, *Fontes históricas*, doc. 52, 137. See also Soares and Redol, *Places of Prayer*, 77.

⁵³ The interior dimensions from north to south are 20.04 metres and the interior dimensions from east to west are 20.02 metres. Thanks to Pedro Redol for supplying these measurements.

⁵⁴ João and Philippa also had a predeceased son, Afonso, who died in 1400 aged 10 and was commemorated with a gilt copper-alloy effigy with silvered details at the Cathedral of Braga. Sally Badham and Sophie Oosterwijk, ‘“Monumentum aere perennius”?’ Precious-Metal Effigial Tomb Monuments in Europe 1080–1430’, *Church Monuments* 30, 2015, 79–88.

⁵⁵ da Silva and Redol, *Monastery of Batalha*, 77.

⁵⁶ There are Iberian parallels for the placement of a free-standing tomb under an octagonal vault, including the Saint Ildefonso chapel in Toledo Cathedral, Barbazana Chapel in Pamplona Cathedral cloister, the chapel of Saint Barbara in the old cathedral cloister at Salamanca, and the Saint Catherine Chapel in Burgos Cathedral cloister. See Nickson, *Toledo Cathedral*, 147–8.

⁵⁷ da Silva and Redol, *Monastery of Batalha*, 77.

⁵⁸ For the significance of a vision presented to the image of the King and concealed from the viewer, see Alexa Sand, ‘Vision and the Portrait of Jean le Bon’, *Yale French Studies Special Issue ‘Meaning and its Objects: Material Culture in Medieval and Renaissance France’*, 110, 2006, 68.

⁵⁹ Kee and Luigi, ‘Scale to Size’, 252. See also Joan Kee ‘What Scale Affords Us: Sizing the World Up Through Scale’, *ARTMargins*, 3: 2, June 2014, 3–30.

⁶⁰ The canopies on the tomb are nineteenth-century copies. However, comparison with a fragment of one of the fifteenth-century canopies (now in the lapidarium at Batalha), as well as Murphy's drawings, indicates that they are largely faithful to the original design.

⁶¹ These approximate measurements are based on the nineteenth-century copies; the one surviving fifteenth-century canopy is too fragmentary provide an overall length. However, since the dimensions of the effigies and tomb chest determine the dimensions of the canopies, the copies are an accurate guide to the size of the originals.

⁶² Murphy records the height of the column as 8 feet 9 inches and the capital as 1 foot 4 inches. Murphy arrived in Batalha on 29 January 1789; his letters report that all the sketches were completed in the following forty-three days. 'James Murphy's Sketchbook of the Monastery of Batalha (1789)', London, Society of Antiquaries MS 260, fol. 17. See also Pedro Redol, *Batalha: Viagem a um Mosteiro desaparecido com James Murphy e William Beckford*, Albuquerque: Centro do Património Estremadura, 2011, 14.

⁶³ There are many examples of sculptures from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries where less care and attention were paid to carving the areas of a figure that were less visible. There are many examples of sculptures from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries where less care and attention were paid to carving the areas of a figure that were less visible. See, for example, an alabaster St Catherine by André Beauneveu (worked on the reverse but not smoothly finished); a late-fourteenth century limestone Virgin from the south portal at Halle (reverse roughly-finished and hollowed out); the Aynard Virgin, attributed to André Beauneveu (reverse with drapery articulated but not smoothly finished). Susie Nash, *"No Equal in Any Land". André Beauneveu: Artist to the Courts of France and Flanders*, London, Paul Holberton Publishing, 2007, 42, 49–50, 80–1.

⁶⁴ Ramôa and da Silva, 'O retrato de D. João I', 81; da Silva and Redol, *Monastery of Batalha*, 78–80.

⁶⁵ For the hand-joining motif, see Jessica Barker, ‘Monuments and Marriage in Late-Medieval England: Origins, Function and Reception of Double Tombs,’ unpub. PhD thesis, University of London, 2015, 60–97.

⁶⁶ This is the earliest surviving example in Portugal of a female effigy with uncovered hair. Uncovered hair is, however, found on a number of memorials in England: usually reserved for unmarried girls, its virginal overtones meant it was also occasionally employed for the effigies of queens (who wore their hair loose at their coronation), including Philippa’s cousin-in-law, Anne of Bohemia. See Ramôa and da Silva, ‘O retrato de D. João I, 83; Kim M. Phillips, ‘Maidenhood as the Perfect Stage of a Woman’s Life,’ in Katherine J. Lewis, Noël J. Menuge and Kim M. Phillips, eds, *Young Medieval Women*, New York, St. Martin’s Press, 1999, 8.

⁶⁷ The attribute of the book, either closed or (more unusually) open, is associated with female effigies made in Portugal during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Examples include the effigies of Margarida de Albernaz (dated 1320–30) and Maria de Vilalobos (dated 1339–49) at Lisbon Cathedral, and the effigy of Beatriz Coutinho (dated 1455–62) at the church of Santa Maria da Graça, Santarém. See Joana Ramôa Melo, ‘Ler ou não ler: o livro como atributo feminino na tumulária medieval portuguesa’, in Delmira Espada Custódio and Maria Adelaide Miranda, eds, *O Livro de Horas. O imaginário da Devoção Privada: manuscritos*, Lisbon, Instituto de Estudos Medievais & Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal, 2015, 227–44.

⁶⁸ These stone bases were probably added in the nineteenth century after the removal of the platform in the centre of the Chapel (see discussion below).

⁶⁹ Hawthorn trees also appear between the mottos on the chamfer of the tomb chest. Torras, ‘Brotherly Love and Filial Obedience’, 33.

⁷⁰ Francisco P. Macedo and Maria J. Goulão, ‘Les tombeaux de Pedro et Inês: La mémoire sacralise d’un amour clandestin,’ in Wessel Reinink and Jeroen Stumpel, eds, *Memory and Oblivion: Proceedings of the XXIXth International Congress of the History of Art held in Amsterdam, 1-7*

September 1996, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999, 491–7. See also the Imago database of Portuguese art, accessed 16 October 2015

<http://imago.fcsh.unl.pt/>.

⁷¹ For a discussion of the epitaphs, a revised transcription of the Latin, and English translation, see Jessica Barker, ‘Sources and Documents: the Sculpted Epitaph’, *The Sculpture Journal*, forthcoming summer 2017.

⁷² For an overview of inscribed epitaphs in the Middle Ages, see the chapter on ‘Inscriptions’ in Saul, *English Church Monuments*, 335–65; Amando Petrucci, *Writing the Dead: Death and Writing Strategies in the Western Tradition*, trans. M. Sullivan, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1998, pp. 54–68. There is also a useful catalogue of medieval epitaphs in the self-published volume by Jerome Bertram, *Icon and Epigraphy*, 2 vols, Lulu press, 2015.

⁷³ ‘In his autem et aliis quamplurimis perseverando virtutibus, quarum plurimitatem hujus lapidis brevitatem nequiret ullatenus praesentare, dietim et continue meliorando, pervenit ad istius vivendae mortalis limitem ordinatum’. de Sousa, *História de S. Domingos*, vol. 2, 305. A similar statement on the impossibility of praising all of Philippa’s virtues occurs in chapter XCVIII the *Crónica de D. João I* by Fernão Lopes, a royal chronicle commissioned by Duarte in 1434. See Fernão Lopes, *Cronica del Rei Dom Joham I de boa memoria e dos Reis de Portugal o decimo*, vol. 2, ed. W. J. Entwistle, Lisbon, Imprensa Nacional, 1968, part 2, 211.

⁷⁴ The ‘small stone’ is a rhetorical commonplace often found on medieval epitaphs. A famous example is Petrarch’s epitaph for the tomb of Jacopo da Carrara, which refers to the great man lying ‘*sub marmore parvo*’ [under a small stone]. For Carrara’s epitaph, see Luca Palozzi, ‘Petrarch and Memorial Art: Blurring the Boundaries between Art Theory and Art Practice in Trecento Italy’, in Adams and Barker, *Revisiting the Monument*, 89–112.

⁷⁵ Stewart, *On Longing*, 90.

⁷⁶ Fifteenth-century sources suggest high levels of literacy in the Portuguese royal court during this period. Duarte, the patron of the epitaph, was well known for his erudition, authoring a number of works – including *Leal Conselheiro*, a book of advice for noblemen – during his short reign. Luís Miguel Duarte, *D. Duarte: Réquiem por um rei triste*, Reis de Portugal Series, Lisbon, Temas e Debates, 2007, 34–5, 197–212.

⁷⁷ Stewart, *On Longing*, 90.

⁷⁸ Torras, ‘Brotherly Love and Filial Obedience’, 89–91.

⁷⁹ Soares and Redol, *Places of Prayer*, 79–83. See especially Domingos António de Sequeira, *Álbum des Desenhos de Domingos António de Sequeira (1808)*, Lisbon, Museu Nacional de Arte Antiga, 1997, fols 45v and 46r; ‘James Murphy’s Sketchbook of the Monastery of Batalha (1789)’, London, Society of Antiquaries MS 260; Pitt, *Observations in a tour to Portugal and Spain*, 135.

⁸⁰ Pitt, *Observations in a tour to Portugal and Spain*, 135. See also Harrison, *The Tourist in Portugal*, 208; Murphy, *Plans, Elevations, Sections and Views*, 33; de Sousa, *História de S. Domingos*, vol. 2, 267.

⁸¹ Redol dates the medieval glass in the Founder’s Chapel to c. 1440–c. 1480, Barros to 1430–40, Hess to no earlier than 1440–50. Barros, *O vitral em Portugal*, 67, 80, figs 9–33; Hess, ‘In Search of Luís Alemão’, 50; Pedro Redol, *O Mosteiro da Batalha e o Vitral em Portugal nos Séculos XV e XVI*, Batalha, Câmara Municipal da Batalha, 2003, figs 37–41.

⁸² Harrison, *The Tourist in Portugal*, opposite 232. The engraving is reproduced in Soares and Redol, *Places of Prayer*, 79, fig. 16. For a discussion of the lost platform, see Torras, ‘Brotherly Love and Filial Obedience’, 18, 28.

⁸³ There is significant variation in the height of the rough stone bases underneath the lions, with those at the western end of the tomb 10 cm higher than those at the eastern end.

⁸⁴ The masses of the Holy Spirit and Virgin were spoken on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Sundays, while on Thursdays the mass of the Holy Spirit was sung and the mass of the Virgin was spoken, and on Sundays the mass of the Virgin was sung and the mass of the Holy Spirit was spoken. Gomes, *Fontes históricas*, doc. 52, 137. See also Soares and Redol, *Places of Prayer*, 77–8.

⁸⁵ Gomes, *Fontes históricas*, doc. 52, 137; Soares and Redol, *Places of Prayer*, 77–8.

⁸⁶ Much work remains to be done on integrating the sonic and visual elements of the liturgy of the Office of the Dead and Requiem Mass. For an examination of these issues in the context of the voice and ventriloquism, see Jessica Barker, ‘Voices of the Dead: Sight, Sound and the Macabre in Late-Medieval England’, in Stephen Perkinson and Noa Turel, eds., *Picturing Death: 1200-1600*, Leiden, Brill, forthcoming 2017. For a comparison of partial visibility and the silences within music, see Williamson, ‘Sensory Devotion’, 31–2.

⁸⁷ 14 August would have been the height of the commemorative rituals in the Founder’s Chapel as it was the only date when the monks would have been required to perform all the prayers and masses prescribed for the anniversaries of the King and Queen’s funerals, as well as the additional ‘*trintayro*’ [month’s mind] – involving monks from Alcobaça and other visitors to the monastery – prescribed for the anniversaries of the King and Queen deaths. Gomes, *Fontes históricas*, doc. 52, 137. See also Soares and Redol, *Places of Prayer*, 77–8.

⁸⁸ The following discussion is indebted to Geraldine A. Johnson's work on sculpture and photography, especially "'(Un)richtige Aufnahme'":

Renaissance Sculpture and the Visual Historiography of Art History', *Art History*, 36: 1, February 2013, 12–51. See also the recent article by Christopher R. Lakey, 'Contingencies of Display: Benjamin, Photography, and Imagining the Medieval Past', *Postmedieval*, 7: 1, Spring 2016, 81–95.

⁸⁹ Murphy's book translated earlier, extensive descriptions of the monastery written in 1623 by Friar Luís de Sousa, a monk at Batalha. See de Sousa, *História de S. Domingos*, vol. 2, 262, 267–74. For the influential nature of Murphy's book, see John Frew and Carey Wallace, 'Thomas Pitt, Portugal and the Gothic Cult of Batalha', *The Burlington Magazine*, 128: 1001, August 1986, 583; Maria João Neto, *Gothic Architecture: Designs of the Monastery of Batalha [ArquitECTURA GÓtica: Desenhos do Mosteiro da Batalha]*, Lisbon, Alêtheia Editores, 2008, 53–88; Redol, *Batalha: Viagem a um Mosteiro desaparecido*.

⁹⁰ Erwin Panofsky, *Tomb Sculpture: Its Changing Aspects from Ancient Egypt to Bernini*, London, Thames and Hudson, 1964, 52, figs 201, 202, 203. Theodore Müller's near-contemporary survey of western European sculpture shares Panofsky's preference for illustrating tombs from above. The main distinction is that Müller preferred to focus on the head and shoulders of the effigy rather than full-length views, lending the medieval effigies the appearance of a Renaissance portrait bust. Theodore Müller, *Sculpture in the Netherlands, Germany, France and Spain*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1966, figs 28–29, 31, 54–55, 82(a), 86(a), 136, 156(a), 161(a), 166(a).

⁹¹ In 1997, for the eight hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the building of St Stephansdom, the cathedral authorities erected a temporary metal platform next to the tomb of Frederick III, which allowed visitors to see his effigy from above. Thanks to Veronika Decker for providing this information.

⁹² Stewart, *On Longing*, 89.