

## Medieval influence in Early Modern Neapolitan Historiography: The Fortunes of the *Cronaca di Partenope*, 1350-1680

Samantha Kelly

Early modern Neapolitan historiography of the long range—that is, works narrating several centuries or even millennia of the region’s past, rather than accounts of recent events or the deeds of a contemporary ruler—is generally understood to begin at the turn of the sixteenth century. The Aragonese rulers of the fifteenth century, especially Alfonso the Magnanimous (1442-58), are rightly credited with introducing Renaissance culture to Naples, having attracted to court many distinguished humanists who served in the royal administration and composed works for the crown. Preferring letters, orations, and moral and philosophical treatises, however, these court humanists composed few historical works, usually centered on the deeds of the Aragonese rulers themselves.<sup>1</sup> This short-range historical vision was dictated in part by the humanists’ desire to please and praise their royal patrons but also by their enthusiasm for classical models and ideals. Disinclined to suggest the present’s continuity with the preceding age of ignorance and political chaos, they preferred to hail contemporary princes as incarnations of classical heroism and virtue or to adumbrate the classical theme of fortune through the example of recent events. It was, thus, in the succeeding era of Spanish dominion that the long-range historical works flourished, eschewing the Latin idiom that had dominated Aragonese literary activity in favor of the vernacular tongue. Ironically, perhaps, the progenitor of this tradition was a foreigner: Pandolfo Collenuccio, a native of Pesaro, whose sweeping *Compendio delle Istorie del Regno di Napoli* influenced many later sixteenth-century treatments of Neapolitan history. “Collenuccio’s accomplishment was to have written a first complete history of southern Italy” from the late Roman era to the author’s own day, Tommaso Pedio has observed, echoing an opinion already current in the sixteenth century.<sup>2</sup> It quickly became “the most famous compendium of the history of the Regno,” frequently republished, extended, commented upon, and argued against in Naples for the next hundred years.<sup>3</sup>

Carlo Vecce has enriched this picture by drawing attention to the many “unofficial” historical works composed in and around Naples both before and after the appearance of

---

<sup>1</sup> Jerry Bentley, *Politics and Culture in Renaissance Naples* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 62, notes that “the several histories that Alfonso commissioned humanists to write on his family and deeds sought to portray his policy in the most favorable light.” That these were few, and lay outside the humanists’ main interests, is also noted by Eric Cochrane, *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 147-8.

<sup>2</sup> Tommaso Pedio, *Storia della storiografia del regno di Napoli nei secoli XVI e XVII* (Chiaravalle Centrale: Edizioni Framma, 1973), 28. In explaining his motives for writing a continuation of the *Compendio*, Tommaso Costo in 1588 called Collenuccio “il primo che a ciò fare si mise... e l’ufizio di scrittore di Compendio ottimamente facesse”: quoted in Giorgio Masi, *Dal Collenuccio a Tommaso Costo. Vicende della storiografia napoletana fra Cinque e Seicento* (Naples: Editoriale scientifica, 1999), 239. Cochrane, noting the Neapolitan humanists’ emphasis on contemporary history, also avers that “the task of putting the present into the context of the past thus fell to foreigners.” Although Collenuccio is not the first foreign historian in Cochrane’s survey, only his work achieved wide influence, “heralded as the Neapolitan equivalent of Sabellico’s history of Venice.” *Historians and Historiography*, 153-5.

<sup>3</sup> Masi, *Dal Collenuccio, passim*; the quotation appears on 51.

Collenuccio's work.<sup>4</sup> Like the "official" works composed in and for the Aragonese court, such as Pontano's *De bello napolitano*, some of these semi-private histories concentrated on the present and offered their authors' eyewitness accounts. But several of them accomplished a more comprehensive narration of the region's past through the accretion of successive writers' contributions. The *Diurnali detti del Duca di Monteleone*, for instance, briefly recounts the history of the realm from 1265 to 1371; a more detailed account, by two or more authors, continues the narration to 1443 before a final contributor added a few observations regarding the reign of Alfonso.<sup>5</sup> The notary Giacomo della Morte (known as Notar Giacomo), whose *Cronica* spanned the period from Naples' first foundation to 1511, acknowledged that he built upon a narrative begun by his father, while Giuliano Passaro, last contributor to the "Diaries" that go under his name, tells us that the work, which commences in the twelfth century, was begun by his ancestors.<sup>6</sup> The personal impetus behind and essentially private nature of these compilations is attested by the fact that each survives in only a single manuscript copy, and none were printed before the late eighteenth century.<sup>7</sup> Their popular origins made them "the most efficacious vehicle of an ideology that was not in conformity with the dominant power," but also "confined them to the *samizdat* of manuscript transmission," whence they were soon replaced by the grand historiography of sixteenth-century *eruditi* like Giovanni Battista Carafa and Angelo di Costanzo.<sup>8</sup>

The aim of this article is to trace the prehistory of early modern Neapolitan historiography and the role that one work, in particular, played in the development of both "unofficial" historical writing and mainstream printed histories of the late fifteenth-, sixteenth-, and seventeenth- centuries.<sup>9</sup> This process will allow us to observe how a medieval text was adapted to suit the interests and cultural standards of later eras. It will also highlight the commonalities that, via this common ancestor, linked different streams of early modern Neapolitan historiography—official and unofficial, manuscript and print, even foreign and native—to each other.

### *"Unofficial" Neapolitan historiography, 1350-1571*

Medieval southern Italy produced a rather large number of histories and chronicles, as is well known. The Normans, in particular, inspired a wave of historical writing in the twelfth century by their conquest and unification of the realm, but monastic and regional or local chronicles

---

<sup>4</sup> Carlo Vecce, "Les chroniques napolitaines de la Renaissance," in *L'actualité et sa mise en écriture aux XVe-XVIe et XVIIe siècles. Espagne, Italie, France et Portugal*, eds. Pierre Civil and Danielle Boillet, 77-91, (Paris: Presses Sorbonne nouvelle, 2006).

<sup>5</sup> *Diurnali detti del Duca di Monteleone*, ed. Nunzio Federico Faraglia (Naples: Giannini, 1895), discussed in Vecce, "Chroniques," 83.

<sup>6</sup> Vecce, "Chroniques," 89-90.

<sup>7</sup> The *Diurnali* were first printed in 1770 (Pedio, 34n), Passaro's diaries in 1785 (see n. 23 below) and the *Cronica* of Notar Giacomo in 1845 (see n. 21 below).

<sup>8</sup> Vecce, "Chroniques," 91.

<sup>9</sup> In the distinction utilized here between mainstream or "official" and "unofficial" historiography, I use a somewhat broader definition of "official" than that of Vecce: not only works of court writers in praise of their ruling patrons, but works of humanist authors printed in or soon after their authors' lifetimes.

abound both before and after their age.<sup>10</sup> Even so, the *Cronaca di Partenope* of circa 1350 inaugurated a new stage of historiography in southern Italy. It was the first mainland southern Italian history composed in the vernacular.<sup>11</sup> It was also the first chronologically comprehensive history of the city of Naples, and one that expanded its scope in the latter part of the work to treat the history of the realm.<sup>12</sup> Though this work has long been known to specialists, only recently have we acquired an accurate understanding of its author, date, original extent, and later evolution that allow us to assess its place in Neapolitan historiography. Written by the Neapolitan patrician Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa and completed between 1348 and 1350, the *Cronaca di Partenope* begins with the Greek migration to the Bay of Naples in the eighth century BCE and ends with the accession of Joanna I of Anjou in 1343. It retains an exclusively civic focus for its first 55 chapters, drawing heavily on legends and saints' miracles for its account of the notable events of antiquity and the early Middle Ages. With the arrival of the Normans, who first unified the region into a kingdom, the *Cronaca* expands its horizons to chronicle the deeds of successive southern Italian rulers, and thus becomes a history of the realm as well as of the city for its final twenty chapters.<sup>13</sup>

The *Cronaca's* influence was considerable and immediate. Soon after 1350 a second history was composed that, like the *Cronaca*, identified its principal subject as "the facts of the city of Naples" but also treated the history of southern Italy generally. I refer to this work as the "Southernized Villani," for it drew its material primarily from the fourteenth-century *Nuova Cronica* of the Florentine historian Giovanni Villani, selecting only those chapters or parts of chapters that concerned southern Italian affairs.<sup>14</sup> It is thus an early example of the role of "foreign" historians in the writing of the realm's history and of the adaptation of such work by native Neapolitans. To fill out Villani's considerable narrative on the realm's history, the author of the "Southernized Villani" inserted passages culled from the *Cronaca di Partenope*, as well as adding anecdotes of his own. The "Southernized Villani" was linked to the *Cronaca* not only in borrowing from it but also in circulating with it: it is found immediately after the *Cronaca* in virtually every surviving manuscript of the latter, and is found nowhere else.<sup>15</sup> Before 1400, this

---

<sup>10</sup> Cochrane, *Historians and Historiography*, 134-143, remains a convenient summary of medieval southern Italian historiography, though now in need of some updating (for instance, with regard to the *Cronaca di Partenope*).

<sup>11</sup> One vernacular Sicilian work may precede it and a second postdates it by about a decade; the tradition in Sicily seems to have ended there. See Cochrane, *Historians and Historiography*, 142-3. Sicily was not at that time part of the mainland kingdom, and these works did not contribute to either the *Cronaca* or the historiographical tradition that it spawned.

<sup>12</sup> The only earlier treatment of Naples' civic history was the *Gesta episcoporum neapolitanorum* of the late ninth and early tenth centuries, which treated Naples' bishops; it thus had a more limited chronological and topical scope. See the edition of Georg Waitz in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores langobardicarum et italicarum saec. VI-IX* (Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1878), 396-439. The *Cronaca di Partenope* drew very little from this predecessor, making it more emphatically a new start in civic historiography.

<sup>13</sup> The *Cronaca* has previously been treated as comprised of four parts, of which only the second, covering the period from the Normans to Joanna I, was attributed to Bartolomeo. Parts "I" and "II" are both to be attributed to him, while the later "parts" are distinct works that will be discussed further below. For a review of earlier scholarship and for the findings summarized here, see: *The 'Cronaca di Partenope': An Introduction to and Critical Edition of the First Vernacular History of Naples (c. 1350)*, ed. Samantha Kelly (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2011), 11-21.

<sup>14</sup> This unedited work was previously called "Part IIIa" of the *Cronaca di Partenope* though it is certainly a separate composition. The copy used for reference here is that found in New York, Morgan Library, MS M 973, fols. 51r-154v.

<sup>15</sup> The "Southernized Villani" follows the *Cronaca di Partenope* in ten of the surviving eleven manuscript copies of the original version of the *Cronaca*. The exception is Vat. Lat. 4601, whose copy of the *Cronaca* is mutilated and

paired circulation inspired the creation of a redacted or “B” version of the *Cronaca*. Among other changes, this version replaced the original *Cronaca*’s rather brief account of southern Italy’s Norman, Staufan, and Angevin monarchs with the more lengthy and detailed royal narrative found in the “Southernized Villani.” The 1390s then saw the production of two more local historical works: a continuation of the *Cronaca di Partenope* that carried its narrative of municipal and royal affairs to 1382 (the “Later Angevin Chronicle”), and the *Cronicon Siculum*, a Latin work that translated and expanded somewhat upon the last twenty chapters of the *Cronaca* as the start of its own history, and again carried its story forward to the author’s present. Finally, some later manuscript evidence suggests the existence of a history lying between the *Cronaca di Partenope* and the *Cronicon Siculum* (which I will call the “*Siculum* ancestor”): one that borrowed only the *Cronaca*’s final chapters at the start of its account but did not yet add the expansions to those chapters found in the *Cronicon Siculum*.<sup>16</sup>

If the *Cronaca*’s influence were confined only to these works it would still be notable. Before Bartolomeo, Naples had produced no local historiography in over four hundred years.<sup>17</sup> Afterward, in the space of half a century, it produced four and perhaps five, all indebted to the *Cronaca* and in virtually every possible permutation: original composition, redaction, continuation, and transposition into Latin. This half-century also witnessed the first general shift in the treatment of Neapolitan history. As mentioned above, Bartolomeo devoted the lion’s share of his narrative to Naples’ civic history: only the last twenty chapters, comprising about a fifth of the work’s overall length, treat the “royal era” of the late eleventh to mid-fourteenth centuries. All the histories composed in the following half-century evince a much greater interest in this more recent past and in the deeds of monarchs. The “Southernized Villani,” though a self-styled history of the city, devoted much more space than Bartolomeo to the realm’s royal dynasties. This royal interest is especially evident in its treatment of the early medieval period: where Bartolomeo had confined his gaze to Naples’ civic history in this era, the “Southernized Villani” instead offered a sort of prehistory of the realm’s Angevin rulers, narrating the deeds of the French kings from whom the Angevins descended. The redacted *Cronaca* displays a similar, if less dramatic preference for royal history, for its major alteration—incorporating much of the royal narrative of the “Southernized Villani”—served precisely to emphasize this aspect of Neapolitan history. The *Cronicon Siculum* went further, excising virtually all of the *Cronaca*’s early medieval civic material to begin its tale, and its borrowings from Bartolomeo, with the Normans, while the “Later Angevin Chronicle,” though full of detail regarding Neapolitan civic life, was similarly structured around monarchical deeds. The *Cronaca di Partenope* could also provide material for very civic-centered works, as we shall see, but the shift toward a realm-wide historiographical orientation, which would characterize most early modern Neapolitan historical works, was in place already in the later Angevin age.

These fourteenth-century histories conform closely to Carlo Vecce’s characterization of the “unofficial” historiography of the Renaissance. Like their fifteenth- and sixteenth-century counterparts, these works, with the exception of the *Cronicon Siculum*, were composed in the local vernacular. Most—the original *Cronaca*, the “Southernized Villani,” the *Cronicon Siculum* and its possible precursor—circulated only in manuscript throughout the early modern era, and both the *Cronicon Siculum* and the “Later Angevin Chronicle” are known in at most one

---

incomplete. See Kelly, ed., *Cronaca di Partenope*, 136, 148.

<sup>16</sup> On these fourteenth-century histories see Kelly, ed., *Cronaca di Partenope*, 80-95.

<sup>17</sup> The only known earlier work was the *Gesta episcoporum neapolitanorum*: see n. 12 above.

manuscript copy, a further testament to their character as semi-private narratives.<sup>18</sup> The “Later Angevin Chronicle” is an excellent example of the chronological layering Vecce describes (and is indeed one of his examples), since it was conceived as an extension of a preexisting work that carried the narrative up to the author’s present, but the *Cronicon Siculum* performed a similar continuation in building on early material it borrowed from its predecessor.<sup>19</sup>

That the genre of semi-private, unofficial vernacular histories should stretch back before the Aragonese age is not altogether surprising, though we are only now in a position to document it more fully. More notable is that the content as well as form of this strand of Renaissance Neapolitan historiography reflects medieval influence. Of the three examples of long-ranging, layered histories discussed by Vecce, the first, the *Diurnali*, offered only a very brief account of the later thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries.<sup>20</sup> The other two, however—the works by Giacomo della Morte and Giuliano Passaro—devoted more attention to the years before 1350, where the *Cronaca di Partenope* could serve as a source. Both did indeed draw on it as the foundation upon which more recent narrative contributions were built.

The *Cronica di Napoli di Notar Giacomo* endeavored to cover the entire span of Neapolitan history from the ancient foundation of the city to the year 1511.<sup>21</sup> Giacomo states that he built upon a compilation begun by his father Antonio; it may well have been Antonio, then, who gathered and put in order available information regarding Naples’ early history.<sup>22</sup> And one of his prime sources was certainly the *Cronaca di Partenope*, from which much of the first fifty-odd pages of Giacomo’s *Cronica* (in the modern edition) is drawn. Citing from the *Cronaca di Partenope* chapters (with the different chapter numeration of the redacted version of the *Cronaca* given in parentheses as “B”), the borrowings include: mention of Naples’ legendary first founder Tiberius Julius Tarsus and his construction of a temple to Apollo, including the *Cronaca*’s garbled Latin translation of the temple’s Greek inscription (chapter 7); the “three settlers” legend and naming of Naples’ six original *seggi* (14); a brief account of ancient Naples’ wars with neighboring cities (8-10); Hannibal’s siege of Naples and the related Neapolitan embassy to Rome (11-12); Virgil’s career in Naples in Marcellus’ time (16 [17B]) and his tomb in Naples (27 [28B]); Saint Peter’s conversion of the Neapolitans Candida and Aspren (34 [35B]); Pope Silvester’s conversion of Constantine, and the “poison legend” surrounding the Donation of Constantine (40 [41B]); the foundation of a Neapolitan monastery by Saint Patricia, identified as the emperor Constantine’s niece (48 [50B]); a Saracen siege of 788 (50 [52B]); the list of southern Italian lords before the arrival of the Normans (56 [58B]); and a condensed but recognizable version of the *Cronaca di Partenope*’s royal chapters, 57 (59B) to 75 (95B). Though Notar Giacomo’s *Cronica* borrowed a good deal from the civic-centered chapters of the *Cronaca*, it added information borrowed from other sources about the broader history of the early medieval period: the deeds of Byzantine emperors, thumbnail accounts of various

---

<sup>18</sup> It might be more accurate to say that the “Later Angevin Chronicle” survives in no manuscript copies: it made its way rather by accident into print, as we shall see, and the only known manuscript copy is in fact a copy of this printed edition.

<sup>19</sup> It is actually the *Cronaca di Partenope* that Vecce (“Chroniques,” 82-3) treats as an early example of this multi-author, semi-anonymous layering, reflecting then-current characterizations of the *Cronaca* as composed of four separately authored and chronologically successive parts, including the “Southernized Villani” and the “Later Angevin Chronicle.” The characterization still holds for the relationship between the *Cronaca* and the “Later Angevin Chronicle.”

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 83.

<sup>21</sup> Giacomo della Morte, *Cronica di Napoli di Notar Giacomo*, ed. Paolo Garzilli (Naples: Stamperia reale, 1845).

<sup>22</sup> Vecce, “Chroniques,” 90.

Germanic tribes, and the succession of French kings. This represents a somewhat different adaptation of the *Cronaca di Partenope* than that seen in the historians of the later fourteenth century but one that achieved a similar result of situating Naples' civic heritage more firmly within a realm-wide historical canvas.

The “Diaries” of Giuliano Passaro adopt what we might call a more traditional approach to Bartolomeo's work, borrowing only those chapters devoted to the realm's rulers from the late eleventh century forward. Giuliano identifies himself in his short introduction as a silkwormer of Naples whose chronicle “was begun by my ancestors.”<sup>23</sup> Its subject, he tells us, is “the history of the kingdom of Sicily before it was entitled a kingdom.” In fact, only the first paragraph of Passaro's history, which lists the lords of the various regions of southern Italy in the late eleventh century, treats the “pre-royal” era: both the title and the content of this first paragraph were borrowed from the *Cronaca di Partenope*, chapter 56 (58B). The following account of the Norman, Staufen, and Angevin rulers of southern Italy to 1343 is also drawn partly from the *Cronaca di Partenope*, but with even longer borrowings from a closely related text, the “Southernized Villani.”<sup>24</sup> Giuliano's forebears must therefore have consulted a manuscript copy of the original *Cronaca*, in which it was followed (as it was in virtually all manuscripts) by the “Southernized Villani,” and selected the chapters from each that they found most useful.

The manuscript containing Passaro's narrative also contains a copy of another fourteenth-century history: the “*Siculum* ancestor” that, I have proposed, stands between the *Cronaca di Partenope* and the *Cronicon Siculum*. It too begins with the lords of southern Italy in the late eleventh century (i.e., the *Cronaca di Partenope* chapter 56), but with some of the adjustments found in the *Cronicon Siculum*, and ends very much like Bartolomeo's narrative but with a few added sentences on the early reign of Joanna I. This text is copied in a different hand than Passaro's history and occupies a part of the manuscript that was bound with that containing Passaro's narrative at a later moment.<sup>25</sup> Evidence suggests, however, that the two works were related. A marginal comment at the end of the “*Siculum* ancestor” notes, “another ancient writing continues and finishes thus: *lo quale è moglie dello nostro signore Re Loise. Lo sopradetto breve informatione è tratta da diverse croniche la qual fa ad voi nostro signore re Luise lo vostro fedel vassallo Bartolomeo Carazzuolo ditto Carafa cavaliere napolitano.*”<sup>26</sup> This is the final line and colophon of the original *Cronaca di Partenope*, and indicates that the copyist had before him a copy of Bartolomeo's work—as, of course, did Giuliano Passaro or his predecessors. The manuscript as it now stands is a miscellany of various histories of southern Italy, but we can now

---

<sup>23</sup> There is an eighteenth-century edition, cited by Vecce (“Chroniques,” 90): Giuliano Passaro, *Storie in forma di Giornali*, ed. Vincenzo Maria Altobelli (Naples: V. Orsini, 1785). I cite from the sole manuscript copy: Naples, Biblioteca nazionale, MS X C 31, where the “Diaries” begin on fol. 99v (in the modern, consecutive foliation added in the bottom margin) and continue to the end of the manuscript at fol. 182r.

<sup>24</sup> Passaro's history clearly drew from the original *Cronaca di Partenope* and the “Southernized Villani,” and not from the redacted, “B” version of the *Cronaca* which melded the two. Its descriptions of Charles II and Robert of Anjou (fol. 107r-v in the modern foliation) follow the original *Cronaca* and not the redacted version; the work also includes passages from the “Southernized Villani” that did not make their way back into the redacted *Cronaca di Partenope*, for instance the epitaph of Frederick II on fol. 103v.

<sup>25</sup> The last text in the first part of the manuscript ends on fol. 87v; fol. 88 is blank. A new gathering then begins with another blank folio, followed by an unnumbered title page and a foliation that begins afresh at 1. The history of Passaro is the second text in this latter part of the manuscript, preceded by very brief notes, in annal form, for some years between 605 and 1102 (fols. 1r-9r in the original foliation, = 91r-99r in the modern foliation).

<sup>26</sup> This work occupies folios 80v-87v, where the marginal comment appears on 87v. The “title” given on fol. 80v — “*Chronicon de Bartolomeo Carazzuolo*”—clearly reflects this marginal comment: the work is not of course Bartolomeo's *Cronaca di Partenope* but a later adaptation of it.

identify three histories of the late fourteenth century that contributed to its contents: the *Cronaca di Partenope* itself and two works that borrowed from it.

Though not included in Vecce's survey of unofficial Renaissance historiography, a third work conforms to the same pattern and also owes a debt to a fourteenth-century ancestor. Around 1571 a canon of Sessa named Gaspare Fuscolillo completed his compendium of southern Italian history. After a brief Latin account of southern Italy's rulers from the late eleventh century to the reign of Charles I of Anjou, it contains "Chroniche de li antiqui ri del regno di Napoli" in three books.<sup>27</sup> The Latin account and the beginning of the third book of the "Croniche" are very similar to each other. Both begin with the list of pre-Norman lords of the various southern Italian provinces (= *Cronaca di Partenope* chapter 56) and narrate events of the Norman, Staufien, and early Angevin dynasties in language clearly derived from the *Cronaca*. Indeed, the vernacular text, which is considerably longer, follows the *Cronaca* very closely for its first eleven folios.<sup>28</sup> Small changes made to the *Cronaca* chapter 56, as well as the use of Latin in the first, short work, suggest a relationship to the *Cronicon Siculum* or its ancestor. Whether through the mediation of one of these works or through direct consultation of Bartolomeo's text, the influence of the *Cronaca di Partenope* in Fuscolillo's work is very clear and indicates that amateur historians continued to use Bartolomeo's medieval history as source material into the late sixteenth century.

The last "unofficial" Renaissance history of interest here is a bit different. It did not lift narrative from the *Cronaca di Partenope* and continue the history up to the author's present. Instead, its author, Melchiorre Ferraiolo, composed his own account of the events of his lifetime, including much eyewitness narrative on the late years of Aragonese rule and the invasion of Charles VIII of France in 1495. This work relates to the *Cronaca di Partenope* only through its author. In putting together his autograph manuscript, Melchiorre first copied the entire text of the *Cronaca di Partenope*, and with enough care that he updated some of its information. Only then did he write in his own chronicle, replete with marvelous half-page line drawings of great Aragonese events. Thus like the "Later Angevin Chronicler," Ferraiolo seems to have understood his own narrative as a sort of continuation of Bartolomeo's work.<sup>29</sup>

### *The Cronaca di Partenope in Print*

If the fortunes of Naples' medieval historiography illustrate a good deal of continuity in "unofficial" vernacular historical writing through the sixteenth century, they also suggest that there was considerable overlap between this "unofficial" stream and the more "official" world of humanist authors and printed works. The most obvious example of this overlap is the printing of the *Cronaca di Partenope* itself. Between 1486 and 1490, an edition was brought out by the Neapolitan printer and bookseller Francesco del Tупpo.<sup>30</sup> Del Tупpo stands at the origins of printing in Naples. There remains some debate whether Naples' first printer was Arnald of

<sup>27</sup> The sole manuscript copy is Naples, Società napoletana di storia patria, XIII AA 39. See also Bartolomeo Capasso, "Le 'Cronache de li antique ri del regno di Napoli' di D. Gaspare Fuscolillo," *Archivio storico per le province napoletane* 1 (1876): 35-43.

<sup>28</sup> The Latin text occupies fols. 1r-4v; the third book of the "Croniche" begins on fol. 66v, and follows the *Cronaca di Partenope* until it reaches the accession of Joanna I (i.e., the end of the *Cronaca*) at the bottom of fol. 77r.

<sup>29</sup> The manuscript containing these texts is New York, Morgan Library, MS M 801, made before 1500. See Melchiorre Ferraiolo, *Ferraiolo Cronaca*, ed. Rosario Coluccia (Florence: Accademia della Crusca, 1987).

Brussels, who may have begun printing as early as 1469 but whose first dated publication is 1472, or Sisto Riessinger of Strassburg, whose first edition appeared in 1472. Del Tuppo, in any case, was closely connected to both men. He and Arnald both served as copyists in the royal library before taking up printing; both enjoyed favors from King Ferrante, and the two men married their children to each other. In 1473 del Tuppo partnered with Sisto Riessinger—perhaps, as Castellano Lanzara has argued, because Riessinger needed the kind of royal support del Tuppo enjoyed—serving principally as editor for Riessinger before going into business for himself in 1478.<sup>31</sup>

Though educated at the court of Alfonso of Aragon and serving among the library personnel of his successor Ferrante, del Tuppo was not one of the distinguished humanists of the Aragonese age. He abandoned a planned Latin work on Aesop because, as one biographer has observed, “as a Latin writer he could not compete with or even distantly compare himself to Neapolitan humanists great and small,” and he concentrated his printing projects on juridical works for students and on fourteenth-century vernacular “classics” by Boccaccio and Dante.<sup>32</sup> Certainly his edition of the *Cronaca* involved neither source criticism nor philological study. He chose to publish an unusual copy of the *Cronaca*—one that contained the rarer, redacted version followed by the “Later Angevin Chronicle.”

Since the “Later Angevin Chronicle” now survives in only one manuscript copy that is itself a copy of this edition, it must have been an extremely rare work: del Tuppo may, indeed, have used the autograph in which the Later Angevin Chronicler appended his continuation to the redacted *Cronaca*. In short, del Tuppo undertook no comparison of multiple manuscript copies to establish his text. Neither did he bother to correct obvious discrepancies in the work, such as a chapter heading announcing the start of “Book Eight”—a holdover from the chapter’s original context in Giovanni Villani’s *Nuova Cronica* (which had made its way, via the “Southernized Villani,” into the redacted version of the *Cronaca di Partenope*)—that made no sense in its new location. Finally, doubtless again due to the interpolation of Villanian material in the redacted *Cronaca*, he added a comment to the *Cronaca*’s introduction that identified its author as “Giovanni Villano,” thus inaugurating a misconception about the *Cronaca*’s authorship that lasted until the nineteenth century.

Whatever its faults, this edition brought the *Cronaca* to a wider readership. It was the first printed edition that Melchiorre Ferraiolo copied into his manuscript before his own chronicle, and probably this edition that Notar Giacomo (or his father) used to recount much of Naples’ ancient and medieval past.<sup>33</sup> Their use of the printed edition is thus a second index of the

---

<sup>30</sup> Gennaro Maria Monti, “La ‘Cronaca di Partenope’ (Premessa all’edizione critica),” in idem, *Dai normanni agli aragonesi* (Trani: Vecchi, 1936), 59.

<sup>31</sup> M. Giuseppina Castellano Lanzara, “Origine della stampa a Napoli e biblioteche di stato delle due Sicilie,” in *Studi in onore di Riccardo Filangieri* (Naples: L’arte tipografica, 1959) vol. 2, 73-105, with comment on Riessinger’s need for partnership with del Tuppo at 99; Renzo Frattarolo, *I tipografi meridionali dalle origini al sec. XVIII* (Rome: Gismondi, 1955), 11-13; Marco Santoro, *La stampa a Napoli nel Quattrocento* (Naples: Istituto nazionale di studi sul rinascimento meridionale, 1984), 8, 42-43; Bentley, *Politics and Culture*, 58-9, 78-9. Apart from Castellano Lanzara, all the scholars above favor Riessinger’s status as Naples’ first printer.

<sup>32</sup> Alfredo Mauro, *Francesco del Tuppo e il suo ‘Esopo’* (Città del Castello: Il Solco, 1926), 79-80, 89-90, 100; Santoro, *Stampa a Napoli*, 23, notes that del Tuppo printed more vernacular works (twenty) than any other Neapolitan printer.

<sup>33</sup> That Ferraiolo copied the first printed edition was established by Curt Bühler, “The Thirteenth Recorded Manuscript of the *Cronaca di Partenope*,” *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 67 (1952): 580-584. Giacomo della Morte certainly relied on the redacted version of the *Cronaca*, but it is possible he consulted a manuscript copy of this version rather than the first edition.

interplay between printed and manuscript historiography, and between the world of “unofficial,” semi-private historical accounts and the “official” world of the palace school and royal sponsorship at whose margins del Tuppo lived.

A second edition of the *Cronaca*, published in Naples in 1526, brought Bartolomeo’s work one step closer to the circles of humanist scholarship. The editor, Leonardo Astrino of San Giovanni Rotondo, took the first edition as his starting point: he too offered the redacted version of the *Cronaca* and the “Later Angevin Chronicle” as a single work, and retained the attribution to “Giovanni Villano.” But, he also made fairly substantial changes to the text, as he declared in his new title for the work, “*Chroniche de la inclita cita de Napoli emendatissime*.”<sup>34</sup> In addition to dividing the text into three “books,” he left his editorial mark throughout the text, correcting errors, updating descriptions, and inserting commentary in ways that reflect the more erudite currents of early sixteenth-century culture.

One example of Astrino’s learned interventions is his correction of the *Cronaca*’s mangled Latin citations. Where Bartolomeo had offered ten lines of Virgil’s *Aeneid* in chapter 2, out of sequence and (to judge by the surviving copies) in quite faulty Latin, Astrino silently amended the passage by offering only the four lines that were in proper sequence and correcting their Latin.<sup>35</sup> A greater effort was required to correct the *Cronaca*’s citation of a Greek temple inscription in chapter 7. Bartolomeo had provided a Latin translation of the inscription and offered it as proof that one Tiberius Julius Tarsus had founded both the temple, dedicated to Apollo, and the city as a whole, out of his own funds. Thus in the *Cronaca* Tiberius became the original Greek founder of Naples, replete with a legendary biography that made Tiberius a rich and noble inhabitant of the area’s original settlement, Parthenope, who tired of its internal discord and thus founded his “new city” (Neapolis) nearby. The *Cronaca*’s garbled Latin translation and its surrounding narrative make clear that Bartolomeo (or more likely the contemporary person or tradition he was citing) was able to decipher only some of the Greek inscription: Tiberius’ name, the words for “temple” and “city,” and the phrase “out of his own funds.” Astrino instead offered his own, correct translation of the inscription, as he proudly noted in the text. This indicated that Tiberius Julius Tarsus was a freedman of Augustus who had built the temple only, dedicated to the Dioscuri (not Apollo) and to the city. This linguistic correction of the inscription did not, however, prompt Astrino to correct the surrounding historical narration. Apparently as eager as Bartolomeo to offer a single, heroic founder for the city, Astrino accepted Tiberius in this role, presumably still in pre-Roman times. He added, however, that the name *Neapolis* was “confirmed by the emperor Augustus”—a rather half-hearted effort to reconcile a pre-Roman civic foundation with the inscription’s reference to the Roman imperial era.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> I cite from the third edition of Carlo Porsile (Naples: C. Porsile, 1680), which offers a faithful reprint of the 1526 edition of the *Cronaca* and is much more readily available. The publication (which included two other historical works) bears the title *Raccolta di varii libri ovvero opuscoli d’historie del regno di Napoli....* The *Cronaca* appears first on pp. 1-105; the following works each receive a fresh pagination.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6: “Questa città [Tiberius] fè ad soi proprie spese... la quale ipso, & tutti li altri la chiamaro Neapolis, che in latino vene à dire Città Nova, benche tal nome da poi fosse confermato da Augusto Imperatore, in ne la quale fè edificare uno mirabile Tempio de marmore, ad honore de Castoro & Polluce, in nel fronte dil quale Tempio fè intagliare & scolpire littere grece, le quale narrano il nome de li Edificatori de la Città, e del Tempio, la quale Scriptura per fina à lo dì de hogue, se pò leggere manifestamente, la quale translatata per Messere Leonardo Astrino contiene le infrascripte parole: Tiberio Iulio Tarso ad Castore & Polluce, & à la Cita de Roma el Tempio, & quelle cose le quale sono del Tempio, procuratore de le cose maritime, liberto de Augusto, edificando de le cose proprie have dedicato.”

The *Cronaca*'s many legends of Virgil's magic powers prompted Astrino to make a more lengthy editorial comment. Virgil's reputation as a learned magician was well established in the later Middle Ages. Chronicled in the Latin works of Conrad of Querfurt, Alexander Neckam, and Gervase of Tilbury in the twelfth and early thirteenth century, Virgil's magic spells were well known in Naples by the time Bartolomeo included sixteen of them in his *Cronaca*.<sup>37</sup> Though Petrarch had famously dismissed the notion of Virgil's magic during a visit to Naples in 1341, later copyists of the *Cronaca*, as well as the work's first editor, del Tuppo, seem to have been less skeptical: none, at least, commented on the legends' veracity.<sup>38</sup> Astrino, however, could not let them pass without comment. At the end of the *Cronaca*'s final Virgilian legend he wrote:

Io potria del dicto Virgilio dicere multe altre cose, le quale hò sentito dicerese, de tale homo, mà perche in maior parte mi pareno favolose, & false, non hò voluto al tutto implire la mente de li homini de Sogni, & perche multe cose sono state dicte de sopra, de Virgilio, à le quale Io Scriptore de quelle, meno che li altri credo, prego ciascuno Lectore me habbia per excusato, perche non hò voluto fraudare la fama de lo ingeniosissimo Poeta, ò vera, ò falsa, & la benivolenza la quale ipso portava à questa inclita Città di Napoli. Mà la verità de tutte le cose la cognobbe, & conosce solo Dio, questo ben dirò che Io non scrivo cosa falsa, ne fabolosa, che de quella lo Lectore non sia facto accorto.

(I could say many other things that I have heard said about Virgil, but because they appear to me to be largely fabulous and false, I have not wanted to fill the minds of men with dreams; and since many things have been said above about Virgil which I, the writer of them, believe less than others do, I beg every reader to excuse me, because I have not wanted to impugn the reputation (true or false) of that most brilliant poet and the benevolence that he showed toward this great city of Naples. But the truth of all things God alone knew and knows: I will say this, that I write nothing false or fabulous without alerting the reader.)<sup>39</sup>

As with his half-hearted revision of Naples' foundation legend, Astrino seems to want to have his cake and eat it too. He distances himself from legends he considers credulous and ahistorical, but he does not remove them. His resolution, indeed, is merely not to add to them. Nor does he categorically dismiss those he prints. Acknowledging that such legends still circulated among his potential readers (and that some such potential readers believed the legends more than he), Astrino leaves the final judgment of their veracity to God.

But the most charming aspect of Astrino's attitude to the Virgilian legends is that he did, in fact, add to them. Despite his posture of humanistic discernment—most evident in his prefatory dedication, where he referred to the *Cronaca* as “apocrifa et aliena dalla Regola

<sup>37</sup> Domenico Comparetti, *Virgilio nel Medio Evo* (Florence: B. Seeber, 1896) and John Webster Spargo, *Virgil the Necromancer* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1934) remain foundational on this tradition.

<sup>38</sup> Petrarch recorded his exchange with King Robert of Anjou about Virgil's magical creation of the tunnel in his *Itinerarium ad Terram Sanctam*: see the facing-page Latin-Italian edition *Itinerario in Terra Santa*, ed. and trans Francesco lo Monaco (Bergamo: P. Lubrina, 1990), 58-9. None of the extant manuscripts of the original or redacted *Cronaca* has marginal comments questioning these legends.

<sup>39</sup> Cited from the 1680 edition (see note 34), 19.

Historiografica”—he seems to have been unable to resist the urge to “improve” and update them. Indeed, he largely rewrote the *Cronaca*’s final Virgilian legend, which concerns an Englishman who sought to appropriate Virgil’s bones for their magical powers. In addition to several interjections about the “vain opinions of men” and the superstitious “opinions of the common people (*vulgo*),” Astrino updated this legend’s location of Virgil’s tomb, claimed that the Englishman wished to wash Virgil’s bones and drink the water (instead of simply take the bones, as in the original *Cronaca*), and changed the ultimate destination of those bones from the Castel dell’Ovo to the Castel Nuovo.<sup>40</sup> Astrino made a more minor but telling intervention to the legend in which Virgil’s magic leech, thrown into a well, rids Naples of all leeches. Instead of the generic well found in the *Cronaca* and earlier texts, Astrino identified it as “the white well.” As Bartolomeo Capasso has observed, this was a well-known local landmark, probably ancient, heavily sculpted, and located on the upper decumanus of the ancient city center.<sup>41</sup> As with his transfer of Virgil’s bones from one medieval castle to another, Astrino seems here to have updated the content of the legend to reflect its contemporary iteration.

Astrino also altered topographic descriptions and semi-historical narrative to reflect contemporary realities. Instead of the six ancient *seggi* named by Bartolomeo, Astrino gave five, doubtless reflecting the five noble *seggi* that existed from the fifteenth century; he also commented that the *mercato vecchio* was now occupied by private houses, and that the *seggio* of Nido was located on a spot “now called La Iuiunia.”<sup>42</sup> Finally, the story of Naples’ decimation and repopulation by foreigners, which resulted (according to the original *Cronaca*) in the contamination of Neapolitan blood, prompted Astrino to add, “which [blood] was the most noble in all the world, such that one still says ‘Napoli Gentile.’”<sup>43</sup>

In sum, the *Cronaca* certainly underwent alteration as it passed into print. Some of those alterations were in the direction of greater linguistic accuracy and a more scientific historical approach: insertion of an original Greek citation, a gesture toward reconciling its evidence with the surrounding narrative, an editorial distinction between legend and history. But Astrino’s greater erudition did not prevent him from engaging with his text in ways rather similar to those with which Bartolomeo approached his own sources. He freely updated the narrative to reflect present circumstances and topography, accepted historically questionable legends (like that of Tiberius Julius Tarsus) that he found appealing, and was reluctant categorically to dismiss even those legends that he himself judged false but that remained, as Astrino acknowledged, current in his day. Indeed, some editorial interventions added rather than removed historical errors: the *Cronaca*’s attribution to Giovanni Villano/Villani and conflation with the “Later Angevin Chronicle” were mistakes introduced by its first editor and left uncorrected by its second, who clearly undertook no more manuscript collation than his predecessor.

The decision of two fifteenth- and sixteenth-century editors to publish editions of the *Cronaca* is not the only sign of the work’s acceptance at the higher levels of Renaissance Neapolitan culture. Another is the translation of the *Cronaca* into “humanistic” Latin. The translation was done by Alvaro de Paternò of Catania in the sixteenth century and does not seem to have circulated widely: it has been identified in one full and one partial manuscript copy. But,

---

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 18-19.

<sup>41</sup> Bartolomeo Capasso, *Napoli greco-romana* (Naples: Arturo Berisio Editore, 1978), 57 and note. The passage is found in the 1526/1680 edition of the *Cronaca* at page 12.

<sup>42</sup> Ed. cit., 10. On the variable number of *seggi* in the later Middle Ages and their reduction to five in the fifteenth century, see Kelly, ed., *Cronaca di Partenope*, 37-41.

<sup>43</sup> This is the chapter narrating Belisarius’ sixth-century siege of Naples: ed cit., 35.

Alvaro's labor does suggest that the work was not considered unworthy of humanists' attention or of the more elevated idiom of Latin.<sup>44</sup> A third index is the presence of manuscript copies of the *Cronaca* in the Aragonese royal library. A manuscript copied around 1400, in which a printed tract of the 1470s was later bound, made its way into the Aragonese royal library before 1495. So did a second manuscript containing the *Cronaca*, copied in 1479 by a provincial chancery scribe "in the name of" and perhaps at the request of his lord, a royal military captain.<sup>45</sup> Since neither manuscript was copied for the Aragonese rulers themselves, their presence in the royal library does not necessarily denote royal interest in them. A third manuscript was made for the Aragonese crown in the 1480s, however, and passed to the Este of Ferrara before 1495. Since Ercole d'Este had spent his youth at the Aragonese court and was married to King Ferrante's daughter in 1473, the manuscript was very likely a gift from Ferrante or his son Alfonso—an appropriate one, since it contained a history of the city and kingdom of Ercole's Neapolitan wife.<sup>46</sup> The history—one of the relatively rare manuscript copies of the redacted *Cronaca*—must have met with approval: the Este library also acquired a copy of the second printed edition of the work sometime after 1526.<sup>47</sup>

### *The Cronaca in Printed Histories, 1498-1680*

With the *Cronaca*'s passage to Ferrara we come to the city identified with the origins of sixteenth-century Neapolitan historiography, for it was here that Pandolfo Collenuccio composed his famous *Compendio delle Istorie del Regno di Napoli*. A scholar esteemed by his humanist contemporaries, Collenuccio served the Sforza and Medici before joining the court of Ercole d'Este, for whom he served as a secretary and diplomat.<sup>48</sup> His *Compendio* was written around 1498 at the request of Ercole who, as Collenuccio noted in his introduction, loved the land of his youth as much as his own homeland (and whose ignorance of Latin also dictated Collenuccio's choice of the vernacular idiom). Collenuccio aimed to offer a comprehensive history of southern Italy, but one organized around a central theme: "In the Kingdom of Naples are seen in our time more changes of government and more variety of rulers than in any other part of Italy. Whence it appears to be the fate of that region to have—not just often but always—tyranny, sedition, perfidy, rebellions, wars, ruin of cities, rapine and fires, and all the other calamities that normally proceed from avarice and ambition." The corollary to this history of misfortune, for Collenuccio, was the perennial faithlessness of the southern Italians themselves. "Titus Livy says that the

<sup>44</sup> Monti identified the complete copy as belonging in his time (the 1930s) to the Società storica siciliana, fondo Principe di Fitalia, where it had no shelfmark. The manuscript bore the title "Croniche e Documenti per Sicilia e Napoli", and offered the Latin translation of the *Cronaca* on fols. 232a-248a. In addition, Monti identified a copy of the first eight chapters only in Naples, Bib. Naz., fondo Brancacciano, I B 4, at fols. 93a-96b. It is he who judged the quality of its "humanistic" Latin. See Monti, "La 'Cronaca,'" 58-9.

<sup>45</sup> Descriptions of these manuscripts, with the *sigla* P1 and P2 respectively, are found in Kelly, ed., *Cronaca di Partenope*, 104-6, 113. They were among the thousand-odd manuscripts of the Aragonese royal library appropriated by King Charles VIII during his occupation of Naples in 1495, whence they were removed to France. On their presence in the Aragonese library see also Giuseppe Mazzatinti, *La biblioteca dei re d'Aragona* (Rocca S. Casciano: L. Capelli, 1897), 108, 175-6, and Tammaro de Marinis, *La biblioteca napoletana de re d'Aragona*, 4 vols. (Milan: Hoepli, 1947), vol. 2, 56.

<sup>46</sup> See the discussion of this manuscript (bearing the *siglum* E) in Kelly, ed., *Cronaca di Partenope*, 114-5.

<sup>47</sup> Domenico Fava, *La Biblioteca Estense nel suo sviluppo storico* (Modena: G. T. Vincenzi, 1925), 314 (no. 244).

<sup>48</sup> Pedio, *Storia della storiografia*, 27-9.

*regnicoli* fail to rebel only when there is no one to rebel against. And in another place he says that perfidy is intrinsic and natural to those of Campania.<sup>49</sup>

To illustrate this thesis, Collenuccio devoted Book One of his *Compendio* to brief descriptions of the various peoples—Goths, Vandals, Longobards, Saracens, Normans, etc.—who had invaded and conquered southern Italy over the centuries. Books Two through Five then turned to the internal history of the region. Going no further back than the time of Augustus, he dispenses with the Roman imperial age in a few lines. Though the Regno had been “tranquil and blessed” under the early Roman emperors, once the capital was transferred to Constantinople the empire “gradually became Greek in customs as well as in location and language, and in consequence declined from its former virtue and glory,” leaving all Italy, but especially the south, like a ship without tiller or captain. Collenuccio organized the rest of his narrative around the sequence of invaders introduced in Book One, detailing their deeds and the “faithless” reactions of the southern Italians dynasty by dynasty.

However Ercole reacted to this disparaging portrait of southern Italy, natives of the region were understandably upset. Indeed, adding to the insult was Collenuccio’s claim that southern Italians had been hardly able to write their own history, leaving the foreigner Collenuccio himself to fill the void.<sup>50</sup> Manuscript copies of the *Compendio* circulated in Naples by the 1520s, well before the first edition was published in Venice in 1539.<sup>51</sup> By 1552, four more Venetian editions had appeared, making the *Compendio* “the most famous vernacular history of the kingdom of Naples, endowed by this time with the status of a widely diffused manual.”<sup>52</sup> Certainly, it was one in which Neapolitans took particular interest. The first explicit riposte by a Neapolitan was Benedetto di Falco’s *Descrittione dei luoghi antichi*, published in Naples in 1548, which angrily dismissed Collenuccio as “an evil and lying writer.”<sup>53</sup> The *Compendio* was printed repeatedly in Naples in the later sixteenth century and inspired chronological continuations (often arguing with Collenuccio’s historical interpretation) by the Neapolitan historians Cola Aniello Pacca and Tommaso Costa.<sup>54</sup> An emphasis on *Napoli fedelissima* in contradistinction to Collenuccio’s portrait of faithlessness would also animate the *Dell’historia del regno di Napoli* of Giovan Battista Carafa (published posthumously in 1572) and the *Istorie della sua patria* of Angelo di Costanzo (written and published in phases from the 1550s to 1581), which was inspired, as di Costanzo acknowledged, by a desire to refute Collenuccio’s thesis.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> “Dico adunque che le mutationi de gli stati & la varietà de’ governi in niuna parte d’Italia piu si veggono a’ di nostri che in quella bellissima Regno di Napoli. Onde pare, che fatal sia à quella provincia havere non che spesso ma sempre tirannie, seditioni, perfidie, rebellioni, guerre, rovine di città, rapine & incendii, & tutte le altre calamità che dall’avaritia & ambitione, vere produttrici di tal peste, proceder sogliono.... et appresso Tito Livio... dice che tanto stanno questi regnicoli senza rebellione, quanto non hanno à chi rebellarsi. Et in un altro luogo egli dice, la perfidia esser propria & naturale à que’ di Campania.” Pandolfo Collenuccio, *Compendio delle Istorie del regno di Napoli*, ed. Girolamo Ruscelli (Venice: Giovan Maria Bonelli, 1552), fol. 1v-2r. The first edition of this work was printed in Venice by Michele Tramezzino in 1539.

<sup>50</sup> “La qual cosa fa ancora che manco mi maravigli, se rara memoria si truova fatta per croniche o per annali proprii de gli huomini di quell Regno, pensando che tutto quello proceduto sia dall continue mutationi & esilii & inquietudine de gli homini, che non hanno potuto havere otio à componere libri.” Ibid., fol. 2r.

<sup>51</sup> Masi, *Dal Collenuccio*, 22-4; Pedio, *Storia della storiografia*, 30-31.

<sup>52</sup> Masi, *Dal Collenuccio*, 15.

<sup>53</sup> Benedetto di Falco, *Descrittione dei luoghi antichi di Napoli e del suo amenissimo distretto*, ed. Ottavio Morisani (Naples: Libreria scientifica, 1972), 88: “...bugiardo scrittore e maligno, il quale nelle sue chroniche scrive che li regnicoli sono di tanta incostanza, che tanto non ribellano quanto non hanno a chi ribellarsi.”

<sup>54</sup> For a list of all editions (including continuations) of the *Compendio* see *ibid.*, 215-18.

Despite Collenuccio's assertion of an absence of earlier indigenous Neapolitan historiography—one seemingly affirmed by subsequent historians' tendency to single out the *Compendio* as a precursor—he himself drew upon one “native” Neapolitan history. As the brief synopsis above indicates, Collenuccio focused on the realm as a whole, paying relatively little attention to the city of Naples. Where he did mention Naples' civic history, however, he frequently relied on the *Cronaca di Partenope* in its redacted or “B” version. The first such instance is his brief account of the city's origins, which appears in his prefatory list of the major cities of the realm rather than in the historical narrative proper. Though Collenuccio certainly consulted Livy, a source also utilized by and cited in the *Cronaca*, his account of the settlers' trajectory from Euboea to Ischia, Cumae, Palaepolis/Parthenope and Naples, the “double settlement” of the last two cities, and the etymology and eventual disappearance of the name “Parthenope,” all echo the *Cronaca* more closely than any other source.<sup>56</sup>

Some of Collenuccio's narrative on the kingdom's medieval rulers also derives from the redacted *Cronaca*, most notably when reference is made again to the city of Naples. Thus, Collenuccio recounts Roger II's visit to Naples with the details found in the *Cronaca* at chapter 62B but also drew from the *Cronaca*'s immediately preceding and succeeding passages to recount Roger's battle with Pope Innocent II and to provide a portrait of the king's physical appearance, character, and deeds.<sup>57</sup> Similarly, he cites the *Cronaca* (chapter 64B) on the Neapolitan castles built by the Normans but also borrowed its surrounding narrative on the rebellion against William I in Palermo and the description of his successor, William II, as specially loved by the Neapolitans.<sup>58</sup> He includes the *Cronaca*'s account at chapter 72B of

<sup>55</sup> On Carafa's work, essentially a reprise of Collenuccio incorporating the protests of di Falco, see Masi, *Dal Collenuccio*, 133-6, 140. Di Costanzo explained the inspiration for his work in its introduction (cited by Pedio, *Storia della storiografia*, 30n); postils in the full 1581 edition of his history called attention to the “error of Collenuccio,” the “stupid error of Collenuccio,” the “malignity of Collenuccio” throughout the work (on which see Masi, *Dal Collenuccio*, 156-7).

<sup>56</sup> The passage of the *Compendio* (ed. cit., fol. 3r) reads: “edificata da' Cumei & Calcidensi, nazione Greca, li quali partiti dall'isola d'Euboea, oggi Negroponte, vennero prima ad Ischia, poi edificaron Cuma, et di li partiti edificarono in due volte Napoli in diversi tempi; habitando in due città una vicina all'altra, un popolo medesimo, chiamando la prima Paleopoli, che in Greco suona antica città, et la seconda Napoli, cioè città nuova. Benche alla prima ponessero in principio nome Partenope, per la sepoltura d'una delle tre sorelle meretrice famose chiamate Sirene, ch'era nominate Partenope, che in quell luogo truovarono sepelita. Onde poi cancellato in tutto il nome Paleopoli, solo è rimaso Napoli, da' poeti qualche volta usato Partenope.” The comparable narrative in the *Cronaca* is spread over several short chapters but includes the settlers' trajectory from Chalcis and Euboea to Ischia, Cumae, and Palaepolis/Neapolis; the proximity of the last two settlements and their being “one people”; and the etymologies of those cities' names and of Parthenope (in the *Cronaca* a princess, not a meretrice!). See Kelly, ed., *Cronaca di Partenope*, 165-73. Neither Livy nor Strabo offers a similarly detailed account.

<sup>57</sup> Collenuccio, *Compendio*, fol. 63v (battle with Innocent II), 63v-64r (visit to Naples), and 65r-v (description of Roger II); cf. the *Cronaca*, chapter 62B and the start of 63B, in the edition of Kelly at 247-50. For the battle and physical description, the *Cronaca* had borrowed from Romuald of Salerno's twelfth-century *Chronicon*, but Collenuccio's details, such as the notion that Roger II's son was inspired to bring him aid out of “filial piety,” are found only in the redacted *Cronaca*. Cf. *Romualdi salernitani chronicon* in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, vol. 7, part 1 (Bologna, 1928-35), 225, 236-7. Roger II's visit to Naples is absent from Romuald's narration. Though the event is recounted by Falcone Beneventano in his *Chronicon*, ed. Raffaele Matarazzo (Naples: Arte tipografica, 2000), 200-203, Collenuccio's details—the presence of the pope, the length of Roger's sojourn, the creation of 150 Neapolitan knights, and the fact that only now did Naples join the realm, having been previously under Byzantine rule—all match the *Cronaca* only.

<sup>58</sup> Collenuccio, *Compendio*, fols. 67v-68r; cf. *Cronaca di Partenope*, ed. cit., 250-52. The narrative of the rebellion in Palermo derives ultimately from Romuald's *Chronicon* (ed. cit., 246-47), but Collenuccio follows the *Cronaca*'s slightly different account of the fate of William I's son Roger. Description of Norman castles in Naples and of

Conrad Staufen's siege of Naples, including the story of a spy who sent a missive (reproduced in Latin) explaining how to take the city.<sup>59</sup> Collenuccio's interpretation is certainly different: he praises Conrad as "magnificent, generous, and magnanimous," whereas neither Bartolomeo nor the redactor of his work had had anything kind to say about Conrad or his dynasty in general. It was perhaps Collenuccio's pro-Staufen (or anti-Angevin) sympathies that inspired a related adaptation of the *Cronaca*. The *Cronaca*'s account in chapter 19 (20B) of Virgil's magic horse—an enchanted equine statue that healed all sick horses brought near to it—had concluded with a more recent anecdote, claiming that King Charles I of Anjou, upon entering the city of Naples, had composed Latin verses about his own bridling of this unbridled horse, that is, his dominion over the city. Collenuccio cited these same Latin verses but attributed them instead to Conrad Staufen.<sup>60</sup> Given the Aragonese rulers' hostility to the Angevins and Ercole's ties to the Aragonese, the change seems to reflect Collenuccio's desire to attribute this boast of dominion to a different, anti-Angevin conqueror.

By the time Collenuccio's narrative reached the Angevin age, his reliance on the *Cronaca di Partenope* may have become habitual, for he borrows from it even where the references to the city of Naples are scant or absent. His account of the Battle of Tagliacozzo, in which Charles I bested the last Staufen claimant to the throne and secured his hold on the kingdom, seems to draw on the redacted *Cronaca*'s version, for in recounting the role of "Alardo il Vecchio" (the Frenchman Érarde de Valéry), Collenuccio mentions Alardo's reluctance to get involved and his stated allegiance to the king of France, details not found in the other likely source for this episode, Giovanni Villani's *Nuova Cronica*.<sup>61</sup> Collenuccio's list of the fourteen children of Charles II almost certainly derives from the *Cronaca*, as Villani had mentioned only some of his sons and none of his daughters.<sup>62</sup>

We must now recall that the redacted or "B" version of the *Cronaca* had expanded the original *Cronaca*'s account of southern Italy's kings by drawing on the longer narrative of the "Southernized Villani." Thus many of the passages Collenuccio borrowed could have come from either source. That he drew on the redacted *Cronaca* is proven by his inclusion of passages not in the "Southernized Villani," such as the account of Naples' origins and the Latin verses regarding Virgil's magic horse. But Collenuccio also includes passages found in the "Southernized Villani" that did not make their way into the redacted *Cronaca*. These include the Latin tomb epitaph of Frederick II; the description of Charles I's appearance and character; and the description of Charles II as "another Alexander" and as lascivious in old age.<sup>63</sup> Two other passages of the *Compendio* very probably derive from the "Southernized Villani": the account of Charles of Valois' expedition against rebel Sicily on behalf of Charles II in 1302, and (quite out of keeping

---

William II's special love for Neapolitans are found in the *Cronaca* and not in Romuald.

<sup>59</sup> Collenuccio, *Compendio*, fols. 102v-103r; cf. Kelly, ed., *Cronaca di Partenope*, 260.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 103r; cf. *Cronaca di Partenope*, ed. cit., 187. The *Compendio*, like the redacted version of the *Cronaca*, reverses the distych's two lines: see Kelly, ed., *Cronaca di Partenope* at 296.

<sup>61</sup> Collenuccio, *Compendio*, fol. 115v; cf. *Cronaca di Partenope*, chapter 90B (ed. cit. at 266), and Giovanni Villani, *Nuova Cronica*, VIII: 26 (ed. Giuseppe Porta [Parma: Ugo Guanda, 1990-1], vol. 1, at 452).

<sup>62</sup> Collenuccio, *Compendio*, fol. 131v-132r; cf. *Cronaca di Partenope* chapter 92B, ed. cit. at 271-72, and Villani, *Nuova Cronica*, VIII: 95, ed. cit. at vol. 1, 558.

<sup>63</sup> Frederick's epitaph is in the *Compendio* at fol. 98v, in the "Southernized Villani" at chapter 33, and in Villani, *Nuova Cronica*, VII: 41 (ed. cit., vol. 1, at 332). Charles I's description is *Compendio*, fol. 125v, "Southernized Villani" chapter 43, and Villani, *Nuova Cronica*, VIII: 1 (ed. cit., vol. 1, at 406). Charles II's description is *Compendio*, fol. 131v-132r (before and after the list of his children), "Southernized Villani" chapter 121, and Villani, *Nuova Cronica*, IX: 108 (ed. cit. at vol. 2, 200).

with Collenuccio's other borrowings), the account of the origins of the "Saracens," i.e., the narrative on Mohammad.<sup>64</sup>

Certain details indicate that Collenuccio drew on the "Southernized Villani" and not its own source, the much more famous and widely diffused *Nuova Cronica* of Giovanni Villani. Like the "Southernized Villani" and unlike Villani's own work, Collenuccio has Charles of Valois passing along the coast of Calabria on his way to Sicily; both the "Southernized Villani" and Collenuccio also discuss a volcanic eruption on Ischia immediately after the narrative of the Sicilian expedition of Charles of Valois, whereas in Villani's work these episodes are separated by four chapters.<sup>65</sup> Equally telling is Collenuccio's description of Charles II, for here he includes facts absent from Villani but found in the "Southernized Villani," such as Charles's special benefactions to the city of Naples.

The conclusion to be drawn from these comparisons are two. Collenuccio certainly borrowed from the redacted *Cronaca*, a copy of which, as we know, was available to him in the collection of his patron, Ercole d'Este. But he also drew on one of the redacted *Cronaca*'s own sources, the "Southernized Villani"—a work that circulated, as far as extant manuscripts reveal, only with the original version of the *Cronaca*. It is possible that Collenuccio also consulted directly some of the works on which these two Neapolitan histories relied, for instance, the *Chronicon* of Romuald of Salerno or Giovanni Villani's *Nuova Cronica*. One is tempted to expect as much, given the wider diffusion and greater fame of those works. But none of the passages I have analyzed point in that direction. All indicate, instead, his use of the two closely related histories composed in Naples between about 1350 and 1380. This usage points to a fact not known through other indices: that not only the redacted *Cronaca*, but a manuscript containing the original version, too (with its constant companion, the "Southernized Villani") was available in Ferrara in the late fifteenth century and mined as a source by our humanist historian.

One final parallel between Collenuccio's *Compendio* and the *Cronaca di Partenope* deserves mention, for though it does not demonstrate Collenuccio's dependence on the earlier work, it further confounds easy distinctions between "humanist" and "medieval" historical writing. Collenuccio's history included an account of the sixth-century Gothic takeover of Naples and its reconquest by the imperial general Belisarius. The episode derives from Procopius' *History of the Wars*, a Greek work whose first known translation into Latin was accomplished by the renowned humanist Leonardo Bruni in 1441. This translation was certainly available to Collenuccio, for Ercole d'Este had commissioned a copy of it, and indeed Collenuccio proudly cited it as his source.<sup>66</sup> But, the same Belisarius story is also found in the *Cronaca di Partenope* and is close enough to Procopius' version to indicate that a translation of the work (or of this part of the work) must have been available in Naples circa 1350.<sup>67</sup> It is possible, though not necessary, that Collenuccio encountered the story first in the *Cronaca* and was thus prompted to search Procopius for this brief reference to Naples; it is clear, in any case,

<sup>64</sup> Charles of Valois' expedition: *Compendio*, fol. 131r-v, "Southernized Villani" chapter 111, Villani, *Nuova Cronica*, IX: 49-50 (ed. cit., vol. 2, 75-82). On the account of Mohammad, especially the role of the Christian monk "Sergio" and the description of Islam as borrowing from Judaism, Christianity, and paganism, see the *Compendio*, fol. 15r, the "Southernized Villani" chapter 1, and Villani, *Nuova Cronica*, III: 8 (ed. cit., vol. 1, at 117).

<sup>65</sup> See n. 64 above. The discussion of Ischia is in Villani IX: 54 (ed. cit., vol. 2, 87).

<sup>66</sup> Collenuccio, *Compendio*, fol. 30v; see Masi, *Dal Collenuccio*, 20, on Ercole's possession of a copy. A modern editor of Procopius identifies Bruni's 1441 translation as the earliest: see *Procopii caesariensis opera omnia*, ed., Jakob Haury (Leipzig: Teubner, 1962), vol. 1, liv-lv.

<sup>67</sup> Kelly, ed., *Cronaca di Partenope*, chapter 49 (51B), 231-32, with discussion at 73-4.

that he did consult Procopius directly. In terms of the continuity of medieval and early modern historical writing, it is worth noting that what appears to be a very “humanist” and indeed cutting-edge feature of Collenuccio’s history was also a feature of his medieval source text.

The foregoing analysis does not detract from Collenuccio’s scholarly accomplishment. He drew on a wide variety of works for his account of the realm’s ancient and medieval history and wove them together with considerable skill—such skill that tracing his specific textual debts is a laborious and painstaking enterprise. Once traced, however, those debts reveal the rather extensive use he made of the redacted *Cronaca* and the “Southernized Villani” and, thus, the Neapolitan and medieval roots of a foreign, humanist history pivotal in the later fortunes of southern historiography.

If we turn to the native Neapolitans who challenged Collenuccio’s interpretation of southern Italian faithlessness, we will find similar evidence of the *Cronaca*’s influence. Benedetto di Falco, like Pandolfo Collenuccio, was a humanist who composed his work in the vernacular in order to reach an audience unfamiliar with Latin. His modern editor has noted his tendency to accept oral tradition “without the least examination or confirmation,” though we might observe that Collenuccio, in his repetition (and creative reinterpretation) of the spy story, was capable of a similar acceptance.<sup>68</sup> And like the *Compendio*, though less spectacularly, di Falco’s *Descrittione dei luoghi antichi di Napoli e del suo amenissimo distretto* went through several editions in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.<sup>69</sup>

As its title indicates, di Falco’s work was more descriptive than historical: its subsections treated Naples’ antiquities, its churches, and its central and outlying streets, as well as the ancient ruins and baths of the nearby Phlegrean Fields, all framed by opening and concluding chapters simply “in praise” of Naples and its surroundings. His description of various sites in Naples, however, generally involved consideration of their origins and evolution, introducing a certain amount of historical narrative into the account. In this di Falco’s method was the inverse of Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa’s. Bartolomeo had organized his work chronologically, as befit a history, but the events he recounted were usually linked to a physical site or structure that memorialized the event and recalled it to mind, lending a certain descriptive quality to the work. The *Cronaca*’s similar admixture of history and description, as well as its primary focus on the city of Naples, doubtless made it a convenient source for di Falco, whose *Descrittione* echoes it in many places.

The clearest proofs of di Falco’s borrowing concern episodes or descriptions that are found for the first time in the *Cronaca di Partenope*, are legendary and based on local “oral” tradition, and are not found in other written sources except those dependent on the *Cronaca*. These include the description of Saint Patricia as a niece of the emperor Constantine, the story of the “three settlers,” and the several etymologies given for the *seggio* of Nido.<sup>70</sup> Di Falco’s mention of two Virgilian legends (those concerning the magic well and the tunnel to Pozzuoli)

---

<sup>68</sup> Benedetto di Falco, *Descrittione dei luoghi antichi di Napoli e del suo amenissimo distretto*, ed. Ottavio Morisani (Naples: Libreria scientifica, 1972), xii.

<sup>69</sup> Morisani numbers the editions at seven published between 1535 and 1680 (*ibid.*, xiii). Tobia R. Toscano, however, has demonstrated that the first edition was published in late 1548 or early 1549, the second edition appearing in 1568; in 1680 the *Descrittione* was published again alongside two other works, as will be discussed below. See Toscano, *Letterati corti accademie. La letteratura a Napoli nella prima metà del Cinquecento* (Naples: Loffredo editore, 2000), 213-244.

<sup>70</sup> Citing page references from Morisani’s edition of the *Descrittione*, its correspondences with the *Cronaca* are, in order: di Falco, 39, = *Cronaca* chapter 48 (50B), ed. Kelly at 227-8; di Falco, 62, = *Cronaca* chapter 14, ed. cit. at 179-80; di Falco, 56, = *Cronaca* chapter 14, ed. cit. at 181.

could derive from other sources, given how widespread those legends were. But since he describes the magic well as “the white well,” a detail added to the 1526 edition of the *Cronaca*, his source here was very likely that edition. Di Falco indeed acknowledged this indirectly by attributing the legend to “the ignorant plebs and vain chronicles”.<sup>71</sup> The story of a legendary Saracen siege of Naples, told in the *Cronaca di Partenope* in chapters 50-51 (52B-53B), is also echoed in the *Descrittione*. Though di Falco’s account is much briefer, the two share such details as the siege’s duration from June to January and the foundation of a church in Naples to commemorate the Saracens’ defeat. The *Cronaca* relied for this episode on a written source, now known in only one manuscript copy now in the Vatican. It is thus possible, though quite unlikely, that di Falco had independent access to this fictitious siege via the rare Latin source-text.<sup>72</sup> More possible is that di Falco drew directly on another of the *Cronaca*’s source-texts for two of the pious legends he recounts. Di Falco stated that the emperor Constantine founded six Greek-rite churches in Naples and created the cathedral position of *cimiliarca*; he also referred on two occasions to legendary Petrine foundation of the Neapolitan Church, recounting that Saint Peter stopped in Naples on his way from Antioch to Rome, gave his name to the Neapolitan church of San Pietro ad Aram, and converted Naples’ first Christians, an old woman named Candida and her friend Aspren, who became the city’s first bishop.<sup>73</sup> These data appear virtually identically in Bartolomeo’s *Cronaca*, but they derive ultimately from a fourteenth-century Latin liturgical work of the Neapolitan cathedral; thus di Falco may have accessed this liturgical text directly via the music master of the cathedral chapter, as he claims.<sup>74</sup>

Di Falco’s dismissive reference to “vain chronicles” suggests that he was reluctant to acknowledge his debt to the *Cronaca di Partenope*, and even where he almost certainly drew from it, he preferred to suggest an alternate source of information. His description of the *seggio* of Nido, for instance, is very close to that of the *Cronaca*: its location on the “third street” (i.e., the lower *decumanus*); its derivation from *Nilo* (the Nile), so called after a marble statue of a woman with many breasts who nurses as many children; its alternate name of “*scogliuso*” because it was located near the Naples *studium*. But di Falco claims that the marble statue had been only recently recovered in the Nido neighborhood due to excavations attendant upon the street’s repaving—as if this, and not the *Cronaca* (which offers an identical description of the statue), were the source of his information.<sup>75</sup> In a similar vein, di Falco claims (like the *Cronaca*) that certain men gave their names to outlying areas of the city. In the *Cronaca* these men were Albino, Avorio, and Don Pietro, the “three settlers” who emigrated to ancient Naples soon after its founding. In di Falco, Albino and Don Pietro appear again, but Don Pietro is identified as a “Spanish knight” (!), while Avorio is transformed into “Don Urso” so that di Falco can link him to, and explain him through, the city gate of that name.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> The well legend: di Falco, 28 = *Cronaca* chapter 18 (19B), ed. cit. at 185-6; the tunnel legend: di Falco, 10 = *Cronaca* chapter 29 (30B), ed. cit. at 195-7. The 1526 edition follows the “B” chapter numeration, since it offers the redacted version of the *Cronaca*.

<sup>72</sup> Di Falco, *Descrittione*, 43. Cf. the *Cronaca*, chapters 50- 51 (52B- 53B), ed. cit. at 232-39, and on its source text, 72-3.

<sup>73</sup> Di Falco, *Descrittione*, 48-9 on the Constantinian foundations = *Cronaca* chapter 41 (42B), ed. cit. at 216-8; di Falco, 32 and 96-7 on the Saint Peter legends = *Cronaca* chapters 33-35 (34B-36B), ed. cit. at 201-10.

<sup>74</sup> With regard to the position of *cimiliarca* he writes, “come ho letto in certi antichi annali li quali se servono per lo venerabile Don Salvatore Parascandolo napoletano, maestro della musical cappella de domo [*sic*]”: di Falco, *Descrittione*, 49.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 56.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, 62.

Di Falco's evident reluctance to cite the *Cronaca* and efforts to suggest alternate sources raise questions about the many other episodes in the *Descrittione* that echo the *Cronaca*. His citations of Livy are suspiciously identical to Bartolomeo's: the quotation linking Neapolis with Palaepolis and both settlements' foundation by emigrants from Chalcis, creating "due cittadi et uno popolo" (= *Cronaca* chapter 8); ancient Naples' war with Nola, also found in the *Cronaca* chapter 8; Hannibal's siege of the city (= *Cronaca* 11), and the Neapolitan embassy to Rome associated with Hannibal's campaign (= *Cronaca* 12).<sup>77</sup> He describes the jousts held in the field called Carbonara, as did the *Cronaca* chapter 26 (27B), and mentioned the tunnel, supposedly created by Virgil, that linked Naples to Pozzuoli, like the *Cronaca* 29 (30B), but in both cases cited Petrarch, whose writings did indeed include these stories. For Virgil, he offered the same famous quotation cited by Bartolomeo (*Illo Virgilium me tempore dulcis alebat Parthenope*), the same tomb epitaph, and the same few biographical details, but citing the ancient commentator Servius as his source.<sup>78</sup> The description of the *seggio* of Porto as located in a swampy area and hence called "Acquaro" could have been common local knowledge in sixteenth-century Naples, but it was certainly recorded in the *Cronaca* (chapter 13); the ancient inscription on the façade of the church of San Paolo was visible for di Falco to read and translate himself, but it was also cited (and in the second edition, correctly translated) in the *Cronaca* chapter 7.<sup>79</sup>

Benedetto di Falco had a wider knowledge of Naples' ancient inscriptions than Bartolomeo, cited more ancient and modern authorities, and of course was able to describe buildings and events posterior to Bartolomeo's time. He also had a different and more specific purpose for his work: to counter Collenuccio's description of southern Italians as faithless. The issue was particularly sensitive in 1548, for Naples had indeed just resisted the efforts of its Spanish viceroy to introduce the Inquisition. This defiance of the ruling power, and the very suspicion of Neapolitan heresy (a different kind of faithlessness), might have seemed to justify Collenuccio's calumny. This explains di Falco's angry remarks about Collenuccio's work and his emphasis on Naples' political and religious fidelity, which included a direct appeal to the Spanish emperor Charles V.

One theater in this literary war over Naples' reputation was its Greek heritage, and the treatments of it by Collenuccio and di Falco are one index of the distance Neapolitan historiography had traveled since the mid-fourteenth century. For Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa, this heritage had been a point of pride. He stressed the Greek origins of Naples' first settlers, characterized the emperor Constantine and his many supposed religious foundations in Naples as more Greek than Roman, and called attention to the continued use of the Greek language and religious rites in Naples in his own time. For Collenuccio, as we have seen, the Greek character of the later Roman Empire was the cause of its decline; he also cited Livy (who frequently referred to the Neapolitans as Greek) to prove the faithlessness of ancient Campania. Thus, Benedetto di Falco found it expedient to minimize and even deny Naples' Greek character. In a direct reply to Collenuccio's citation of Livy, di Falco claimed that in this passage Livy "is not speaking of all *regnicoli* but only of the Calabrians and the men of Lucania, which today is called Basilicata.... But behold how this ignorant pedant [Collenuccio] malignantly interprets Livy.... I say that in that time of which Livy speaks, the Lucanians and Calabrians were Greek and not Italian, as is clear in the passage of Livy himself. What writer praises the Neapolitans

---

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 27-30, 89.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 13-4. Virgil's brief biography, tomb epitaph, and quotation (in translation) are in the *Cronaca* at chapter 27 (28B), ed. Kelly at 193-4, while the same quotation is given in Latin in the *Cronaca* at chapter 5, ed. cit. at 170.

<sup>79</sup> Di Falco, *Descrittione*, 46, 44.

more for their fidelity and generosity than this same Livy?”<sup>80</sup> As an example of this fidelity, di Falco cites the ancient Neapolitans’ gift to and alliance with Rome during Hannibal’s invasion of Italy—conveniently omitting the fact that shortly thereafter, when Rome suffered its terrible defeat at the Battle of Cannae, Naples had abandoned its now-weakened Roman ally.

Di Falco’s narrative makes clear that the polemical nature of Collenuccio’s work, and its resonance with the tumultuous political events of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century, was a principal reason it became such an important touchstone for sixteenth-century Neapolitan historiography. As a foreigner who dared to impugn the historical reputation of *regnicoli*, Collenuccio had to be rewritten by native sons. One of the ironies of the ensuing debate was that both sides drew on a common source. Free of the inflammatory context surrounding the *fedelissima* debate, Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa had been willing to narrate episodes that did prove Naples’ faithlessness, such as its “lazy” acceptance of Gothic takeover in the Belisarius episode, later reprised by Collenuccio. He had also stressed examples of Naples’ fidelity, rewriting Livy’s account of the Second Punic War to portray Naples as Rome’s faithful ally in much the same way di Falco did two centuries later.<sup>81</sup> Neither Renaissance historian was willing to cite the *Cronaca* as one of his sources, but their use of it sheds light on the prehistory of their historiographical debate and the tendentious uses to which earlier material was put.

Two decades later, Luigi Contarini, a Venetian friar who spent many years in Naples, published another account of Naples’ past that drew on both the *Cronaca di Partenope* and the more recent works of Collenuccio and di Falco. Called *Dell’Antichità, Sito, Chiese, Corpi Santi, Reliquie, e Statue di Roma, con l’Origine e Nobiltà di Napoli* (Naples, 1569), it comprised a section on the antiquities of Rome and another on Naples, both cast in the form of a dialogue between Alessandro Leone and Ludovico Bembo.<sup>82</sup> Contarini’s interest in the origins of Naples made the *Cronaca* a convenient source, and indeed the two accounts have much in common. Like the *Cronaca* (chapters 2-4), he identifies the Cumaeans as Naples’ progenitors, and explains that a pestilence forced the Cumaeans to consult an oracle (specified in the *Cronaca* as Apollo) which ordered them to move to the previously founded settlement of Parthenope. Contarini followed this account, which was not included in di Falco’s *Descrittione*, with a description of Parthenope’s original location taken from di Falco.<sup>83</sup> His survey of ancient Naples’ original streets and of the *seggi* along them could have come from either source, since di Falco here is fairly close to the *Cronaca*, but the description of the marble statue of the Nile as “recently discovered” indicates that he was citing from di Falco.<sup>84</sup> Similarly, his discussion of Saint Peter’s sojourn in Naples and of Saint Patricia as Constantine’s niece derive ultimately from the

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., 88-89.

<sup>81</sup> In Livy (*Ab urbe condita*, XXII: 32 and XXIII: 1), Naples allies with Rome first, then abandons her after Rome’s defeat at the Battle of Cannae and faces Hannibal’s attack alone. The *Cronaca* reverses these events --Naples first faces Hannibal’s siege, then offers its aid to Rome — thus removing any hint of its desertion of a weakened ally. See Kelly, ed., *Cronaca di Partenope*, 63-4. Di Falco mentions both Hannibal’s siege of Naples and Naples’ embassy to Rome, but so far apart that their chronological relationship is obscured. But by portraying the embassy as an example of Neapolitan fidelity—quite in contrast to Livy—he seems to echo Bartolomeo’s version of events.

<sup>82</sup> Luigi Contarini, *Dell’Antichità... di Roma, con l’Origine e Nobiltà di Napoli* (Naples: G. Cacchii, 1569). I cite from the more widely available edition in the compendium of Carlo Porsile, *Raccolta di varii libri* (Naples: C. Porsili, 1680), which reprinted this work alongside others. In this edition the section on Naples (given a fresh pagination after that on Rome) occupies pages 2-170.

<sup>83</sup> “...in un colle dove hoggi si vede la chiesa di S. Anello et il monasterio di S. Patritia, dove si veggono ancora le mura antiche di quella città, il quale luoco è chiamato il Seggio di Montagna”: Contarini, ed. cit., 3; cf. di Falco, *Descrittione*, 27.

<sup>84</sup> Contarini, *Dell’Antichità*, 7-8; for di Falco’s version see above at n. 75.

*Cronaca di Partenope* but contain details indicating his immediate source was di Falco.<sup>85</sup> Contarini's account of the ancient temple in the city center, however, hews more closely to the *Cronaca*. He described it as "a temple to Apollo, or to Castor and Pollux, sons not of Jove, as the poets claim...." The original *Cronaca* had identified this temple as dedicated to Apollo; the second edition, and di Falco, had corrected this, translating *Dioscuros* (i.e., Castor and Pollux) as "sons of Jove." Contarini thus hedged his bets by citing both versions, but correcting what he saw as the error of the latter. He continued by noting that this temple "was consecrated to Saint Paul by Antonio the consul and duke of Naples, after the second war with the Saracens." This is certainly derived from the *Cronaca* chapter 51 (53B): di Falco had claimed that the Saracen siege had resulted in the foundation of a different church, Sant'Angelo a Signo.<sup>86</sup>

Contarini's account of southern Italy's "royal era" displays a similar admixture of overlapping sources. He follows the *Cronaca* chapter 56 (58B) in listing all the lords of the regions of southern Italy before the Normans' arrival. Regarding the later dynasties, his attribution of the "unbridled horse" verses to Conrad Staufen and not Charles I clearly shows his debt to Collenuccio. He adds, however, the story of Virgil's enchantment of the horse statue and its melting in 1322 to make church bells—details only found in the *Cronaca*.<sup>87</sup> His account of Charles II again wove together these two sources. The list of counts and officials he created certainly comes from the *Cronaca* in its redacted (probably printed) form, as did the following list of counts created by Charles' successor Robert. But, the description of Charles as "another Alexander in liberality" most likely comes from Collenuccio—who had borrowed it, as we have seen, from the "Southernized Villani."<sup>88</sup>

A fuller analysis of Contarini's debt to earlier histories would doubtless reveal further borrowings, but these few examples suffice to indicate the general nature of that debt. Despite the existence of more recent and more "humanistic" accounts of Naples' history, Contarini still consulted the *Cronaca di Partenope* and preferred some of its readings to those of di Falco and Collenuccio. His frequent combination of details found in the *Cronaca* with those found in one of the later histories suggests he preferred to include episodes found in both, as if this repetition were a guarantee of their value. Yet like his Renaissance predecessors, Contarini never explicitly named the *Cronaca* as one of his sources.

One might expect the *Cronaca* to recede in influence in the seventeenth century, replaced by the growing number of more recent histories and their more frequent recourse to original documents. In some respects, however, the seventeenth century witnessed an apogee of the *Cronaca*'s acceptance into "official" historiography. To my knowledge, the first historian to cite the *Cronaca* explicitly as a source was Giovanni Antonio Summonte (d. 1602), whose *Historia della città e del Regno di Napoli* was published twice in the seventeenth century.<sup>89</sup> In narrating events of the fourteenth century, he repeatedly cited the "Cronica di Napoli" by chapter and book, following the 1526 edition's division of the text.<sup>90</sup> He also cited it on Naples' ancient

---

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, 18, 22; cf. di Falco, 32, 39. Contarini's statements that the church of San Pietro ad Aram was hard by the Annunciata, and his location of the monastery of Santa Patrizia near the "old walls of Palaepolis," are details added by di Falco and not found in the *Cronaca*.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, 24. For the versions of di Falco and the *Cronaca* see above, n. 72.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 118. For the comparable passages of Collenuccio and the *Cronaca* see above, n. 60.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, 122-3. Cf. *Cronaca di Partenope* chapters 73 (93B) and 75 (94B), ed. cit. at 273-79; on Collenuccio's description of Charles II see above at n. 63.

<sup>89</sup> The first two volumes were published in Naples in 1601; the complete edition, cited here, is that of Antonio Bulifon (Naples: A. Bulifon, 1675). See Pedio, *Storia della storiografia*, 40 and note.

history, despite his awareness of its historical errors.<sup>91</sup> Indeed, while he was careful to correct its account of Naples' original settlement—and more thoroughly than had the editor Astrino in 1526—he also took pains to underline the work's value. “Though he makes a most manifest error,” Summonte observed, “yet one should bear in mind that at the time, there being no printing press, one lacked the information that we have since enjoyed through the multitude of publications provided by that press.” The author of the *Cronaca* (whom Summonte, following the authority of the printed editions, identified as Giovanni Villani) deserved to be remembered by posterity, “since he was the first to express his affection for his homeland in preserving its history.” To that end, “in order to recall him to the minds of men,” as well as to “remove the doubts of many whether he was the Florentine, which he was not, but rather our Neapolitan, and a noble of the piazza or seggio of Montagna,” Summonte recorded what he believed to be the author's epitaph in the church of San Domenico, corroded almost to illegibility.<sup>92</sup>

The second noteworthy event in the *Cronaca*'s seventeenth-century fortunes was its republication in a third printed edition in 1680. The editor and publisher, Carlo Porsile, offered a sort of compendium of Neapolitan historiography under the title *Raccolta di varii libri overo opuscoli d'histoire del Regno di Napoli di vari et approbati autori*. The first of these works by “approved authors” was the *Cronaca di Partenope*, faithfully reproduced from the second edition of 1526.<sup>93</sup> The other two works were ones we have already met: Luigi Contarini's *Dell'Antichità... di Rome con l'Origine e Nobiltà di Napoli*, and Benedetto di Falco's *Descrittione*. In his preface to the reader, Porsile observed that while it was useful to print contemporary learned works, he considered it yet better to “reprint those books that have been applauded by learned men on account of their excellence, [but] that, on account of the age of their [earlier] editions and the esteem in which they are held, have passed through everyone's hands and thus have declined in numbers, with the result that it is difficult to find any of them.”<sup>94</sup> His estimation of the *Cronaca* as highly valued rested on the fact that “Giovanni Villani Napoletano was the first to write, albeit in an outmoded and awkward Neapolitan vernacular, a history or chronicles of our homeland, whence later historians have drawn from it the most

<sup>90</sup> Summonte, *Historia*, Book III, chapter 4 (ed. cit. at 413-4), where he cites the “Cronica di Napoli al capitolo xiii del terzo libro” on the coronation of Joanna I's first husband, Andrew of Hungary, and chapter fifteen on the rapine of Joanna I's sister Maria. “Book Three” of the *Cronaca di Partenope* refers to the “Later Angevin Chronicle,” which had already been published as an integral part of the *Cronaca* in the first edition of 1486-90; it was the second edition, however, that divided the narrative into three books and was referenced here by Summonte.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, Book I, chapter 4 (ed. cit. at 34): “scrive egli al cap. 6 & 7 della Cronica di Napoli ch'essendo tra cittadini di Partenope nata discordia, che Tiberio Giulio Tarso trapassando di nobiltà e ricchezza gl'altri cittadini con suoi seguaci si partì, et edificò un'altra città poco lunghi da Partenope, e la chiamò Napoli quasi nuova città, il che è falsissimo per quel che di sopra habbiamo detto, per autorità di molti, che Partenope fu Napoli, e Napoli Partenope, a non diversa. E non da Tiberio Giulio Tarso, che fu liberto d'Augusto come nota l'iscrizione sopra le colonne del tempio hor detto di San Paolo, ma da Partenope istessa...”

<sup>92</sup> The epitaph identified one Giovanni Villano detto Rumbo, deceased in 1311: a seeming confirmation of the editions' misattribution of the work to Giovanni Villano/Villani, and one that contributed to that error's long life. *Ibid.*, Book I, chapter 4 (ed. cit. at 33-4).

<sup>93</sup> As a faithful reprinting of the second edition (which included an account of the Baths of Pozzuoli), Porsile's edition identifies the work on his title page as “Le Croniche dell'Inclita Città di Napoli, con li Bagni di Pozzuolo, & Ischia di GIO: VILLANO Napoletano.”

<sup>94</sup> “Di maggior giovamento, anzi opera di grandissima carità hò giudicato essere il ristampare quei libri, che per la loro Eccellenza sono stati applauditi da Letterati, e per l'antichità delle loro impressioni, e perche essendo di grandissima stima, e perciò andati nella mani di tutti, sono venuti meno, in modo, che grandemente suole penarsi in ritrovarne alcuno.” Carlo Porsile, ed., *Raccolta di varii libri...* (Naples: C. Porsile, 1680), in his prefatory address “al cortese lettore,” found on the unnumbered third and fourth pages of the edition's prefatory material, here at [iii].

memorable and ancient things.” Indeed, though he took the liberty of improving the Italian vernacular employed by di Falco and Contarini, he preserved the language of the *Cronaca*, “not wishing to alter it in any way, as I have been urged and advised by many honored learned men of our city, and particularly by Master Carlo de Lellis who, as everyone knows, can be called the splendor of our century as well as of our kingdom.”<sup>95</sup>

Even accounting for a certain degree of exaggeration on Porsile’s part, his comments testify to the contemporary interest in the *Cronaca* at the end of the seventeenth century. It does seem to have been a popular text. In addition to the two earlier editions, whose scarcity may indicate that they “passed through everyone’s hands,” the *Cronaca* survives in sixteen manuscript copies and must have circulated in many more in earlier centuries.<sup>96</sup> As for the esteem in which it was held by learned men, Porsile’s reference to Carlo de Lellis is telling. His research in the Neapolitan archives was foundational to modern historical inquiry and remains a valued source to this day.<sup>97</sup> De Lellis’ concern to preserve the *Cronaca* in the idiom of its time indicates a shift in the work’s reception, in which it was perceived more as a “primary source,” an artifact of its own age, than as the work of a fellow historian. The shift can be detected already in Summonte’s appreciation of the work as the first of its kind and in the historical distance with which he explained its inaccuracies. But it was not yet complete at the end of the seventeenth century. Porsile still placed the *Cronaca* on a continuum with more recent historical works, whose status as “secondary sources” is not cast in doubt. In noting later historians’ dependence on the *Cronaca*, Porsile may have had in mind only Summonte, who had explicitly acknowledged the debt. But his publication of the works of Contarini and di Falco together with the *Cronaca* may have been no accident: whether intentional or fortuitous, it is a last eloquent witness to a stream of influence that connects mainstream, printed Renaissance historiography with this medieval forebear.

## Conclusion

The later fortunes of the *Cronaca di Partenope* are but one thread in the history of early modern Neapolitan historiography, but they offer valuable testimony regarding the genre’s chronology, evolution, and character. For one, it is clear that the tradition began in the middle of the fourteenth century and not, as in other areas of cultural activity, with the Aragonese renaissance. The *Cronaca* inaugurated a new outpouring of local historical writing in the half-century after its

---

<sup>95</sup> “Giovanni Villano Napoletano... fù il primo à scrivere, benche in lingua materna, antica, e goffa Napoletana, l’Historia, ò siano Croniche della nostra Patria, onde da esso hanno cavato poi le cose più memorabili, & antiche gli altri Historici del Regno.... E benche in quanto al Contarino & al Falco si sia, cercavo in qualche maniera di migliorargli in quanto alle regole, e politia della lingua Italiana... si è lasciato il Villani nella sua materna lingua Napoletana, benche goffa, rispetto a’ tempi presenti, per non volerlo alterare in cosa alcuna, secondo che ne sono stato ammonito, e consultato da molti honorati, letterati della nostra Città, e particolarmente dal Signor Carlo de Lellis, il quale, come à tutti è noto, può dirsi lo Splendore del nostro Secolo, non che del nostro Regno.” Ibid, [iii-iv].

<sup>96</sup> These sixteen copies include one identified in the nineteenth century but now untraceable and two copies of early editions. The complicated relationships between surviving manuscripts suggest that many more, now lost, must have been involved in the text’s transmission. See the discussion in Kelly, ed., *Cronaca di Partenope*, 103-147.

<sup>97</sup> For instance, his *Discorsi delle famiglie nobili del Regno di Napoli*, 3 vols. (Naples: H. Saulo, F. Paci, 1654-71) and *Gli atti perduti della Cancelleria angioina transuntati da Carlo de Lellis*, ed. Riccardo Filangieri and Bianca Mazzoleni (Rome: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 1939).

composition and continued to inspire and serve as a source for writers of civic and realm-wide history through the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries. Its status as a foundational text was doubtless due, in large part, to its being the first Neapolitan history composed in the vernacular, the dominant language of historical writing in later centuries. Its influence can also be credited to Naples' continuing role as the realm's capital. The city had only recently achieved this position when Bartolomeo Caracciolo-Carafa wrote, and a certain anxiety about the future of Naples' civic traditions and identity informed Bartolomeo's narrative. But, as the identification between city and realm became ever closer over the succeeding centuries, the purely civic narrative of the *Cronaca* gained rather than lost in importance. Whereas historians of the later fourteenth century tended to focus heavily on its narrative of the "royal era," later writers such as Notar Giacomo and Contarini found it natural to begin their histories of the realm with material drawn from the *Cronaca*'s account of the city's early past or, as in the case of Benedetto di Falco, to compose a new civic work—one in which the fidelity of Naples itself could serve to disprove the alleged infidelity of southern Italy as a whole.

A second observation to be drawn from the legacy of the *Cronaca di Partenope* is the frequent cross-pollination of "native" and "foreign" histories. The *Cronaca*'s first successor, the "Southernized Villani," was also the first work to incorporate the narrative of a non-*regnicolo*, and indeed to base its account very heavily on the Florentine historian Giovanni Villani's extensive record of southern Italian affairs. The redacted *Cronaca*, by including so much of this Villanian narrative, further blurred the distinction between native and foreign authorship, and the works of later centuries did not necessarily define it more clearly. Pandolfo Collenuccio was a foreigner who drew on two native histories—the redacted *Cronaca* and its own source-text, the "Southernized Villani"—but those were themselves leavened with the "foreign" narration of Giovanni Villani. By the time of Luigi Contarini, the admixture of sources already indebted to each other (and each already "mixed" in its authorial provenance), not to mention the ambiguous status of Contarini himself, a Venetian native but Neapolitan denizen, illustrate how complex the pedigrees of Neapolitan historiography had become. The notion that Collenuccio's *Compendio* was a foreign product catalyzing an indigenous historiography in the Regno's defense is therefore somewhat misleading. It was a notion cultivated by Collenuccio himself, who claimed to be filling the historiographical void left by southern Italians, and it was perpetuated by Neapolitan historians who dismissed his derogatory portrait of the region as the work of a malicious outsider.<sup>98</sup> Still, the tendentious nature of their debate should not obscure the frequent interplay between texts produced within and beyond the realm, or the mobility and interregional connections of men like Contarini, Ercole d'Este, and Sisto Riessinger, the authors, patrons, and printers of Neapolitan historical works.

Finally, for all the adaptation and evolving reception that the *Cronaca* underwent from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries, equally striking is the degree of continuity perceptible in its consistent reappearance in editions, in manuscript copies, and as a source for amateur and published historians. Indeed, if we survey the range of writers who drew on Bartolomeo's work—from the Neapolitan silkworker Giuliano Passaro and the notary Giacomo della Morte to the esteemed humanist Collenuccio and the published authors of "grand historiography" such as Contarini and Summonte—the differences between unofficial and official historiography become more blurred. Generally speaking, it is true that unofficial

---

<sup>98</sup> Thus Tommaso Costo, in the preface to his continuation of (and riposte to) the *Compendio*, wrote of Collenuccio in 1588 that "nel ragionar nondimeno del Regno e de' Regnicoli si lasciò, come forestiero ch'egli era, da soverchia licenza troppo innanzi trasportare, toccandoli bene spesso con aspre ponture di parole non pur non rispettevoli, ma piene di veleno." Cited in Masi, *Dal Collenuccio*, 239.

historiography tended to be produced by multiple contributors, some or all of whom remained anonymous, and rarely made its way into print, while official historiography, being published, always bore an author's name and circulated more widely. Even this difference did not always hold. The "Later Angevin Chronicle" was an anonymous addition to an earlier history, creating that "layered" quality typical of unofficial histories; it also circulated very little (if at all) in manuscript. It made its way, rather by accident into print; the several "official" historians who drew on the *Cronaca* editions that included it illustrate the influence such a work could have.

It is the content more than the modes of transmission, however, that suggest the commonalities between the unofficial or amateur historiography of the later fourteenth to early sixteenth centuries and the printed, erudite histories of the Cinquecento. Their visions of the recent past could and did diverge, colored by the authors' different positions in Neapolitan society and by their attitude to its ruling powers, but their forays into the more distant past led them to common sources and thus common material. Their historical method, too, was relatively consistent. Tommaso Pedio has remarked upon the conservative and somewhat insular character of (printed) Neapolitan historiography in the sixteenth century. Eschewing the historical theory or Italy-wide scope of the most modern northern Italian historians of the age, the historians of Naples continued to hew to an episodic structure and exclusively southern Italian focus that Pedio traces back to the Renaissance.<sup>99</sup> Its roots, as we have seen, were in fact deeper than that, stretching back a full century before the advent of the Aragonese. The conservatism Pedio notes is amply confirmed by this long tradition, and by the ways in which Naples' first vernacular history—however amended, criticized, or silently obscured by later users—left its mark on narratives of the Neapolitan past for some three and a half centuries.

### *Bibliography*

- Bentley, Jerry. *Politics and Culture in Renaissance Naples*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Bühler, Curt. "The Thirteenth Recorded Manuscript of the *Cronaca di Partenope*." *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 67 (1952): 580-84.
- Capasso, Bartolomeo. "Le 'Cronache de li antique ri del regno di Napoli' di D. Gaspare Fuscolillo." *Archivio storico per le province napoletane* 1 (1876): 35-43.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Napoli greco-romana*. Naples: Arturo Berisio Editore, 1978.
- Castellano Lanzara, M. Giuseppina. "Origine della stampa a Napoli e biblioteche di stato nelle due Sicilie." In *Studi in onore di Riccardo Filangieri*. 3 vols. Naples: L'arte tipografica, 1959.
- Cochrane, Eric. *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Collenuccio, Pandolfo. *Compendio delle Istorie del regno di Napoli*. Edited by Girolamo Ruscelli. Venice: Giovan Maria Bonelli, 1552.
- Comparetti, Domenico. *Virgilio nel Medio Evo*. Florence: B. Seeber, 1896.

---

<sup>99</sup> "Il loro interesse è generalmente rivolto alla vita della capitale e, soltanto eccezionalmente, il loro sguardo va oltre i confini del Regno. Ad essi sfugge il problema generale e, all'analisi critica, preferiscono la narrazione episodica propria della cronaca e quel tipo di storiografia rinascimentale superata ormai negli altri paesi europei": Pedio, *Storia della storiografia*, 11; see also similar comments at 7, 10.

- Contarini, Luigi. *Dell'Antichità, Sito, Chiese, Corpi Santi, Reliquie, e Statue di Roma, con l'Origine e Nobiltà di Napoli*. In *Raccolta di varii libri overo opuscoli d'histoire del regno di Napoli*. Naples: C. Porsile, 1680. De Lellis, Carlo. *Discorsi delle famiglie nobili del Regno di Napoli*. 3 volumes. Naples: H. Saulo, F. Paci, 1654-71.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Gli atti perduti della Cancelleria angioina transuntati da Carlo de Lellis*. Edited by Riccardo Filangieri and Bianca Mazzoleni. Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo, 1939.
- De Marinis, Tammaro. *La biblioteca napoletana de re d'Aragona*. 4 volumes. Milan: Hoepli, 1947.
- Della Morte, Giacomo. *Cronica di Napoli di Notar Giacomo*. Edited by Paolo Garzilli. Naples: Stamperia reale, 1845.
- Di Falco, Benedetto. *Descrizione dei luoghi antique di Napoli e del suo amenissimo distretto*. Edited by Ottavio Morisani. Naples: Libreria scientifica, 1972.
- Diurnali detti del Duca di Monteleone*. Edited by Nunzio Federico Faraglia. Naples: Giannini, 1895.
- Falcone Beneventano. *Chronicon*. Edited by Raffaele Matarazzo. Naples: Arte tipografica, 2000.
- Fava, Domenico. *La Biblioteca Estense nel suo sviluppo storico*. Modena: G. T. Vincenzi, 1925.
- Ferraiolo, Melchiorre. *Ferraiolo Cronaca*. Edited by Rosario Coluccia. Florence: Accademia della Crusca, 1987.
- Frattarolo, Renzo. *I tipografi meridionali dalle origini al sec. XVIII*. Rome: Gismondi, 1955.
- Haury, Jakob, ed. *Procopii caesariensis opera omnia*. 4 volumes. Leipzig: Teubner, 1962.
- Kelly, Samantha, ed. *The 'Cronaca di Partenope': An Introduction to and Critical Edition of the First Vernacular History of Naples (c. 1350)*. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2011.
- Masi, Giorgio. *Dal Collenuccio a Tommaso Costo. Vicende della storiografia napoletana fra Cinque e Seicento*. Naples: Editoriale scientifica, 1999.
- Mauro, Alfredo. *Francesco del Toppo e il suo 'Esopo'*. Città del Castello: Il Solco, 1926.
- Mazzatinti, Giuseppe. *La biblioteca dei re d'Aragona*. Rocca San Casciano: L. Capelli, 1897.
- Monti, Gennaro Maria. "La 'Cronaca di Partenope' (Premessa all'edizione critica)." In idem, *Dai normanni agli aragonesi*. Trani: Vecchi, 1936.
- Passaro, Giuliano. *Storie in forma di Giornali*. Edited by Vincenzo Maria Altobelli. Naples: V. Orsino, 1785.
- Pedìo, Tommaso. *Storia della storiografia del regno di Napoli nei secoli XVI e XVII*. Chiaravalle Centrale: Edizioni Framma, 1973.
- Petrarch (Francesco Petrarca). *Itinerarium ad Terram Sanctam*. Edited with facing-page Italian translation by Francesco lo Monaco under the title *Itinerario in Terra Santa*. Bergamo: P. Lubrina, 1990.
- Porsile, Carlo, ed. *Raccolta di varii libri overo opuscoli d'histoire del regno di Napoli di vari et approbati autori*. Naples: C. Porsile, 1680.
- Santoro, Marco. *La stampa a Napoli nel Quattrocento*. Naples: Istituto nazionale di studi sul rinascimento meridionale, 1984.
- Spargo, John Webster. *Virgil the Necromancer*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934.
- Summonte, Giovanni Antonio. *Historia della città e del Regno di Napoli*. 4 vols. Naples: Antonio Bulifon, 1675.
- Toscano, Tobia R. *Letterati corti accademie. La letteratura a Napoli nella prima metà del Cinquecento*. Naples: Loffredo editore, 2000.

- Vecce, Carlo. "Les chroniques napolitaines de la Renaissance." In *L'actualité et sa mise en écriture aux Xve-XVIe e XVII siècles. Espagne, Italie, France et Portugal*, edited by Pierre Civil and Danielle Boielllet. Paris: Presses Sorbonne nouvelle, 2006.
- Villani, Giovanni. *Nuova Cronica*. Edited by Giuseppe Porta. 3 volumes. Parma: Ugo Guanda, 1990-1.
- Waitz, Georg, ed. *Gesta episcoporum neapolitanorum*. In *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores langobardicarum et italicarum saec. VI-IX*. Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1878.