

Imaging the Angevin Patron Saint: Mary Magdalen in the Pipino Chapel in Naples

Sarah S. Wilkins

In 1279, Charles of Salerno, the future Charles II, Count of Provence and King of Naples, discovered the body of Mary Magdalen at Saint-Maximin near Aix-en-Provence, an event that inextricably linked the Angevins to the Magdalen, whom they then adopted as patron saint of their dynasty.¹ Less than two decades later, in 1295, the earliest fresco cycle depicting the life of Mary Magdalen appeared in the church of San Lorenzo Maggiore in Naples.² In fact, three of the six extant central and southern Italian Magdalen fresco cycles dating from the late duecento through the middle of the trecento are located in Naples. In addition to the previously mentioned cycle in the Magdalen Chapel in San Lorenzo Maggiore, there are Magdalen cycles in the so-called Brancaccio Chapel in San Domenico Maggiore (1308-1309), and in the Pipino Chapel in San Pietro a Maiella.³ No other location boasts such a concentration of Magdalen narrative imagery.⁴

¹ King Charles I made the Magdalen his advocate and Protectress of the Angevin State prior to the Sicilian Vespers in March 1282. Étienne-Michel Faillon, *Monuments inédits sur l'apostolat de Sainte Marie-Madeleine en Provence et sur les autres apôtres de cette contrée, Saint Lazare, Saint Maximin, Sainte Marthe*, vol. 1 (Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1859), 908. Mary Magdalen maintained her role as the venerated protectress of the Angevin family and state under Charles II and Robert, as well as under Johanna I, who Faillon states “wanted to imitate the piety of the kings Charles II and Robert towards saint Magdalen.” Many of the subsequent documents speak of Johanna's veneration for the Magdalen. *Ibid.*, vol. 2: *Pièces justificatives*, 875-876, and 957-8ff.

² The cycle in S. Lorenzo currently consists of a *Supper in the House of the Pharisee*, *The Raising of Lazarus* and *The Magdalen in Her Cave*. Originally this program also included a “triptych” of saints and most likely, an additional one to two scenes. For images see Ferdinando Bologna, *I pittori alla corte angioina di Napoli* (Rome: U. Bozzi, 1969), chapt. 2, figs. 44-46, 48, 49, 52, 53. For the saint triptych and the *Raising of Lazarus* post-restoration, see Graziadei Tripodi, *Il Restauro come e perché* (Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1981), tavv. XV, XVI, 15-17. The only painted Magdalen cycle dated earlier is located on a panel painting depicting *Saint Mary Magdalen with Eight Scenes from Her Life* (hereafter referred to as the *Magdalen Master Dossal*) by the Magdalen Master, dated to ca. 1280. This panel is currently located in the Accademia in Florence. Its original provenance is unknown, but is presumed to be Florentine. For images, see Miklós Boskovits and Angelo Tartuferi, eds., *Dal Duecento a Giovanni da Milano. Dipinti*, vol. 1, Cataloghi della Galleria dell'Accademia di Firenze (Florence: Giunti, 2003), tav. VIII, figs. 68-76.

³ For images of the Magdalen cycle in S. Domenico Maggiore see Bologna, *Pittori*, tavv. XII, XIII and chapt. 2, figs. 21-30, 32. All of these churches were erected during the Angevin period, and all the cycles were commissioned, so far as can be determined, by noble patrons with ties to the ruling dynasty. Unfortunately each suffers from condition issues, with scenes partially or entirely missing.

⁴ The other three cycles are located in the Magdalen Chapel in the Lower Basilica of St. Francis, Assisi, and in the Chapel of the Podestà in the Bargello, and the Guidalotti-Rinuocini Chapel in Sta. Croce, both in Florence. For images of the cycle in the Magdalen Chapel in Assisi see Francesca Flores D'Arcais, *Giotto* (Milan and New York: Motta; Abbeville Press, 1995), 278-79, 282-83, 284-85, 286-87, 288, 298-99, 300-01; for images of the cycle in the Chapel of the Podestà, Florence (not fully reproduced) see Giovanni Previtali, *Giotto e la sua bottega*, ed. Alessandro Conti, with updated notes, bibliography and catalogue by Giovanna Ragionieri, 3rd ed. (Milan: Fabbri, 1993), diagram p. 349 and figs. 381-388; for images of the Guidalotti-Rinuocini Chapel see Joachim Poeschke, *Italian Frescoes: The Age of Giotto, 1280-1400* (New York: Abbeville Press, 2005), diagram p. 354, fig. 91, and pl. 209, 211, 215.

It was not a coincidence that the first monumental representation of the Magdalen's life occurred in the new Angevin territory of Naples, nor was it by chance that she remained a popular subject while Angevin power in Naples was at its height.⁵ Rather, the prevalence of Magdalen imagery in Naples was a direct response to Angevin rule. The Angevins' emphasis on the links between Mary Magdalen and their dynasty and their promotion of her cult in their newest and most important territory, Naples, acted as a catalyst, providing inspiration for the many representations of her life. Both Susan Haskins and Katherine L. Jansen credit the Angevin dynasty with spreading the cult of Mary Magdalen from France, where it first took root, to Naples, where it served as a symbol of the new ruling dynasty.⁶ While scholarship has acknowledged the special relationship between the Angevins and the Magdalen, the Magdalen cycles in Naples have not received adequate attention.⁷ The selection of Mary Magdalen as the subject for the Neapolitan fresco cycles reflects the desire of Neapolitan patrons to align themselves with the ruling dynasty by commissioning works of art that publicly declared their allegiance. This action testifies not only to the close association that had been established between Mary Magdalen and the Angevin dynasty, but also to the Angevins' systematic use of personal ties to sainted figures to increase their own legitimacy as a dynasty.

This article will focus specifically on the iconography of the final of the three Neapolitan Magdalen cycles, that in the Pipino Chapel in San Pietro a Maiella. Although this cycle of eight frescos is the largest and most complex Magdalen program in Naples, it has hitherto been little studied. The contributions of Katherine L. Jansen and Ferdinando Bologna are critical to my undertaking. Neither scholar, however, delved deeply into the chapel's iconography or meaning.⁸ While Bologna was interested primarily in attribution, Jansen offered a broad historical analysis of the Magdalen cult, preaching, and popular devotion in the late medieval period. Although she

⁵ The Angevins came to power in Naples in 1266 under Charles of Anjou, replacing the Hohenstaufen dynasty at the request of the Papacy. For the selection of Charles I by the Pope and the Angevin conquest of Naples, see Giovanni Villani, *Cronica*, with philological notes by Ignazio Moutier and historical-geographical appendices compiled by Francesco Gherardi Dragomanni (Florence: Sansone Coen Tip. editore, 1844), VI, 89-90; VII, 1-10. An English translation of VI, 89-90, and VII, 1, 3, 5-9, from Rose E. Selfe, trans., *Selections from The First Nine Books of the Croniche Fiorentine of Giovanni Villani*, ed. Philip H. Wicksteed (London: Archibald Constable, 1906) with modernized spelling and usage is available in Ronald G. Musto, ed., *Medieval Naples: A Documentary History, 400-1400. Historical Texts* (New York: Italica Press, 2011), Kindle edition. The numeration is different, however, with the first two books identified as VI, 88-89. See also Émile G. Léonard, "La Conquête Angevine (1250-1269)," in *Les Angevins de Naples* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1954), 37-73; Steven Runciman, *The Sicilian Vespers: A History of the Mediterranean World in the Later Thirteenth Century*, Canto Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 65-95.

⁶ Susan Haskins, *Mary Magdalen: Myth and Metaphor* (New York: Riverhead Books, 1993), 130; Katherine Ludwig Jansen, *The Making of the Magdalen: Preaching and Popular Devotion in the Later Middle Ages* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), 332.

⁷ Although the Brancaccio Chapel is discussed fairly often in terms of a disputed attribution to Cavallini, these chapels have not been generally considered in terms of their iconography or as visual expressions of the Angevin dedication to the Magdalen. On the general neglect of Naples in art historical scholarship except for on the local level, especially in English language scholarship, see the collection of essays in *Art and Architecture in Naples, 1266-1713*, eds. Cordelia Warr and Janis Elliott (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010). This factor has surely contributed to the neglect of the Magdalen cycles. In particular, see Cordelia Warr and Janis Elliott, "Introduction: Reassessing Naples 1266-1713," 1-15, esp. 1-2; Aislinn Loconte's discussion of Vasari's dismissal of Naples as provincial and peripheral, and the influence of this assessment on later scholarship: Aislinn Loconte, "The North Looks South: Giorgio Vasari and Early Modern Visual Culture in the Kingdom of Naples," 38-61; and Nicolas Bock's thought-provoking analysis of the concepts of center and periphery: Nicolas Bock, "Patronage, Standards and *Transfert Culturel*: Naples Between Art History and Social Science Theory," 152-175.

⁸ Jansen, *Making of the Magdalen*; Bologna, *Pittori*.

argued that the Pipino Chapel should be interpreted as evidence of Angevin propaganda, she discussed only one of the paintings in this cycle and did not investigate how the imagery functioned in the context of Angevin interests.

In comparison with the earlier Neapolitan cycles, that of the Pipino Chapel reveals a more specifically Angevin iconography, one that focuses extensively on the post-biblical life of the Magdalen in Provence, ruled in this period by the Angevins. Although the Pipino Chapel Magdalen cycle draws upon traditions established in earlier Magdalen narrative imagery, the program has many exceptional aspects: its unusual depictions of popular scenes, the inclusion of events that are infrequently seen in painted *vitae* of the Magdalen, and an organizational schema that has been manipulated to emphasize certain features of the Magdalen's life and character. For these reasons, it is crucial to examine its iconography within the context of Angevin promotion of the Magdalen cult in Naples.

Mary Magdalen, Provence and the Angevins

On December 9, 1279, Charles of Salerno found the body of Mary Magdalen within the church of Saint-Maximin in Provence.⁹ It was in almost immediate response to this important discovery by the heir to the throne of Naples that the house of Anjou adopted the Magdalen as patron saint of both its dynasty and territory. By the second half of the fifteenth century, the *Dominican Legend of Mary Magdalen at Saint-Maximin* claimed that a holy vision of the Magdalen, which appeared to Charles in prison, and his ensuing miraculous deliverance from captivity, had led him to discover her relics.¹⁰ It is probable, however, that the Angevins' rapid adoption of and devotion to the Magdalen was less inspired by a religious vision than by political calculation, part of a well-established Angevin strategy of *beata stirps*: evoking their personal connections to the divine to validate and promote their own legitimacy.

According to Gábor Klaniczay, the Neapolitan Angevins were the first ruling family "to make the notion of dynastic saintliness (*beata stirps*) the cornerstone of the sacral legitimation of their new dynasty."¹¹ Many Angevin actions testify to their tactic of promoting their own

⁹ For details on the discovery at St.-Maximin and the translation of the body, see Victor Saxer, *Le culte de Marie-Madeleine en occident des origines à la fin du moyen-âge* (Auxerre and Paris: Publications de la société des Fouilles Archéologiques et des Monuments Historiques de l'Yonne; Librairie Clavreuil, 1959), 230-239; Neal Raymond Clemens, "The Establishment of the Cult of Mary Magdalen in Provence, 1279-1543" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 1997), 66-75; Jansen, *Making of the Magdalen*, 18-19; and Haskins, *Mary Magdalen*, 127-128. Clemens, "Establishment of the Cult," 70-71, provides a transcription and English translation of the official invention and translation account (*procès-verbal*) taken from Paris B.N., n.a.l. 2672. See Faillon, *Monuments inédits*, vol. 2: *Pièces justificatives*, 775-816, doc. 66-88, for discovery and translation accounts and offices of the invention of Mary Magdalen.

¹⁰ Clemens, "Establishment of the Cult," 66-9. This earliest Latin version is Paris B.N., n.a.l. 2672, fol. 1-2v. See also Bernard Montagnes, "La légende dominicaine de Marie-Madeleine à Saint-Maximin," in *Le peuple des saints. Croyances et dévotions en Provence et Comtat Venaissin à la fin du Moyen Âge. Actes de la Table ronde organisée par l'Institut de recherches et d'études sur le Bas Moyen Âge avignonnais (Palais des Papes, Avignon) du 5 au 7 octobre 1984*, Mémoires de l'Académie de Vaucluse, 7^e série, 6 (Avignon: Académie de Vaucluse, 1987), 73-86. An edition of the legend taken from Paris, B.N., fr. 15530, fol. 565 is available in idem., *Marie Madeleine et l'Ordre Prêcheurs* (Marseille, 1984), 28-34. Both Haskins, *Mary Magdalen*, 127-8, and Jansen, *Making of the Magdalen*, 6, refer to the vision but do not make it clear that this embellishment considerably postdates the discovery.

¹¹ Gábor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses: Dynastic Cults in Medieval Central Europe*, trans. Éva Pálmai (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 295. For the concept of *Beata stirps* and the

sanctity as the basis for dynastic power. They vigorously petitioned for the canonization of members of the dynasty. The first family saint was Louis IX, King of France (r. 1226-1270) and elder brother to Charles I of Naples, who founded the Angevin dynasty.¹² Although Louis IX was not declared a saint until 1297, the Angevins actively campaigned for his canonization almost immediately following his death.¹³ While Louis' son Philip III may have started efforts to promote Louis' piety, it was Charles I of Anjou who seems to have taken charge.¹⁴ According to Klaniczay, the success of Louis' canonization was due to "Angevin influence over the papacy, influence strong enough to place the papal prerogative of canonisation at the service of the Angevins' ambition to capitalise on the cult of saints for purposes of dynastic propaganda."¹⁵ In her new assessment of St. Louis and sacral kingship, M. Cecilia Gaposchkin argues that "More than anyone, Charles was interested in promoting Louis' sanctity—not in and of itself, but as part of an argument of dynastic virtue in general."¹⁶ The testimony from the papal inquiry held in 1282 illustrates that in addition to advocating for the canonization of King Louis IX,¹⁷ Charles I also argued for the saintliness of his mother Blanche of Castile and two of his other brothers, Alphonse of Poitiers and Robert of Artois.¹⁸ In the same vein, in the early 1280s Charles I

Angevins, see: *ibid.*, 295-394, esp. 298-331; André Vauchez, "Beata Stirps: sainteté et lignage en Occident aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles," in *Famille et parenté dans l'Occident médiéval. Actes du colloque de Paris (6-8 juin 1974)*, Publications de l'École française de Rome, 30, (Rome: École Française de Rome, 1977), 397-406; *idem.*, *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages*, trans. Jean Birrell (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 177-183; Samantha Kelly, *The New Solomon: Robert of Naples (1309-1343) and Fourteenth-Century Kingship* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003), 119-132.

¹² For the cult of Saint Louis IX in the Angevin Kingdom, see M. Cecilia Gaposchkin, *The Making of Saint Louis: Kingship, Sanctity, and Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2008), 85-6.

¹³ According to Boyer, Louis IX's death provided the main impetus for Angevin exploitation of the theme of holiness. Jean-Paul Boyer, "La 'foi monarchique': royaume de Sicile et Provence (mi-XIII^e — mi-XIV^e siècle) in *Le forme della propaganda politica nel Due e nel Trecento: relazioni tenuto al convegno internazionale organizzato dal Comitato di studi storici di Trieste, dall'École française de Rome e dal Dipartimento di storia dell'Università degli Studi di Trieste*, (Trieste, 2-5 marzo 1993), edited by Paolo Cammarosano (Rome: École Française de Rome, 1994), 95.

¹⁴ Gaposchkin, *Making of Saint Louis*, 25-9. Boyer called Charles I's role in the canonization process "decisive." Boyer, "'foi monarchique,'" 95. Among Charles' earliest efforts to promote his brother's sainthood was his attempt in 1271 to keep Louis' heart and entrails for burial at the Cathedral in Monreale. According to Dunbabin, Charles had to settle for Louis' intestines only; it is unclear where his heart ended up. Jean Dunbabin, *Charles I of Anjou: Power, Kingship and State-Making in Thirteenth-Century Europe* (London: Longman, 1998), 231; Gaposchkin, *Making of Saint Louis*, 28 and n. 52. In the same year, Charles I was pivotal in the transfer of Louis' other relics to Paris. Gaposchkin, *Making of Saint Louis*, 28-9.

¹⁵ Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers*, 297.

¹⁶ Gaposchkin, *Making of Saint Louis*, 29.

¹⁷ Toynbee notes that although the surviving evidence from the processes of canonization is meager, it includes seven depositions given by Charles I in February 1282, in support of the canonization. Margaret R. Toynbee, *S. Louis of Toulouse and the Process of Canonisation in the Fourteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1929), 161. For a transcription of Charles of Anjou's testimony, see Paul-Édouard-Didier Riant, "Déposition de Charles d'Anjou pour la canonisation de saint Louis," in *Notices et documents publiés pour la Société de l'histoire de France à l'occasion du cinquantième anniversaire de sa foundation* (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1884), 170-176; discussion: 155-169. For a discussion of Charles' testimony in English, see Gaposchkin, *Making of Saint Louis*, 41-42.

¹⁸ The fact that Charles of Anjou's efforts in his testimony extended past Louis IX to other members of his immediate family has been widely noted. For this portion of Charles' testimony in the original Latin, a French translation, and discussion, see Riant, "Déposition de Charles d'Anjou," 169, 175. Gaposchkin, *Making of Saint Louis*, 30, provides an English translation of the relevant passage. See also Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 182; Kelly, *New Solomon*, 120; Dunbabin, *Charles I of Anjou*, 231; Boyer, "'foi monarchique,'" 96.

commissioned a life of his sister Isabelle, in the hopes of her canonization.¹⁹ Thus he “presented his family as a *beata stirps*, in which sainthood flourished in every generation.”²⁰

Angevin influence was similarly critical in the canonization of St. Louis of Toulouse (d. 1297, canonized 1317).²¹ St. Louis of Toulouse, also known as Louis of Anjou, was the second son of Charles II and heir to the kingdom. In 1296 Louis gave up his claim to the throne of Naples, in favor of his younger brother Robert, due to his longing to become a member of the Order of Friars Minor.²² Despite great reluctance, he acquiesced to the wishes of Pope Boniface VIII and accepted the bishopric of Toulouse in exchange for permission to join his beloved Franciscan Order.²³ Although not initially supportive of Louis’ religious vocation, King Charles II was greatly in favor of Louis becoming the bishop of Toulouse because it strengthened the Angevin-Papal alliance and increased the religious prestige of the dynasty.²⁴ Louis died, however, the following year, and Angevin strategy adjusted accordingly. According to Gardner, “Angevin determination to achieve the canonization of Louis of Toulouse...was crucial for Robert of Anjou’s legitimacy as ruler, and the whole Angevin succession to the Kingdom of Sicily.”²⁵ Louis’ body was brought to Marseilles, the seat of his emerging cult, and, with Angevin encouragement, a canonization inquiry was held there in 1307-8.²⁶

In addition to creating saints within their own family, Angevin strategy involved acquiring them as in-laws by intermarrying with dynasties renowned for their holy ancestors. Thus Charles of Anjou first sought a spouse for himself, and later for his children, from the Arpad dynasty of Hungary. The Arpads had recently produced an important royal saint, St. Elizabeth of Hungary (d. 1231, canonized 1235), and had a long history of sainted rulers such as St. Stephen (d. 1038), his son St. Emeric (who died in 1031 before ascending to the throne), and

¹⁹ Gaposchkin, *Making of Saint Louis*, 30.

²⁰ Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 182.

²¹ Toynbee, *S. Louis of Toulouse*, 95; Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 78. For documents from Charles II (27 January 1300) and Robert (12 September 1311) supporting the canonization of Louis of Toulouse, see *Processus Canonizationis et Legendae variae Sancti Ludovici O.F.M. Episcopi Tolosani*, *Analecta franciscana* 7, edited by Patribus Collegii S. Bonaventurae (Quaracchi: Ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1951), 455. Louis of Toulouse’s Canonization Process (*Processus Canonizationis*) and Canonization Bull (*Bulla canonizationis*) of April 7, 1317, are also both published in *Processus Canonizationis et Legendae variae*, 1-254, 395-399. For an in-depth discussion of the Canonization process for St. Louis of Toulouse, see Toynbee, *S. Louis of Toulouse*, part 2, chapter 2: “The Fourteenth Century. Account of the Process of Canonisation of S. Louis of Toulouse,” 146-194.

²² St. Louis was ordained a subdeacon on Christmas 1295 by Pope Boniface VIII, was made a priest May 20, 1296, and renounced the throne in January 1296. Toynbee, *S. Louis of Toulouse*, 94, 101-2, 105.

²³ He was made bishop of Toulouse December 1296 and entered the Franciscan Order on February 5, 1297. Toynbee, *S. Louis of Toulouse*, 110-117; Julian Gardner, “Saint Louis of Toulouse, Robert of Anjou, and Simone Martini,” *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 39 (1976): 18; *Processus Canonizationis et Legendae variae*, 15-16, chap. xxx, xxxi.

²⁴ See Toynbee, *S. Louis of Toulouse*, 111.

²⁵ Julian Gardner, “Conclusion: Santa Maria Donna Regina in its European Context,” in *The Church of Santa Maria Donna Regina: Art, Iconography and Patronage in Fourteenth-Century Naples*, eds. Janis Elliott and Cordelia Warr (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 196.

²⁶ Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 227. For more on this enquiry and Marseilles as the center of the developing cult of St. Louis of Toulouse, see Jacques Paul, “Témoignage historique et hagiographie dans le procès de canonisation de Louis d’Anjou,” *Provence historique* 23 (1973): 305-317. For documents dealing with the development of Louis’ cult in Marseilles, see M. H. Laurent, *Le culte de S. Louis d’Anjou a Marseilles au XIV^e siècle. Les documents de Louis Antoine de Ruffi suivis d’un choix de lettres de cet érudit*, *Temi e testi* 2 (Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1954). The Magdalen cult was also very active in Marseilles as this was the place converted by Mary Magdalen upon her arrival in France. For a succinct account of the life and canonization of Louis of Toulouse, see also Gardner “Saint Louis of Toulouse,” 17-20.

St. Ladislaus (d. 1095).²⁷ While Charles I's reputed attempt to wed St. Margaret (d. 1271), the daughter of King Béla IV (r. 1235-70), did not succeed, he successfully negotiated for his son Charles II to wed Mary of Hungary and his youngest daughter Isabella of Anjou to marry Ladislaus IV (the Cuman), both children of King Stephen V (r. 1270-1272). Charles' letter proposing the match to Stephen makes his motivations explicit. He refers to the Arpad king as a "powerful and warlike ruler, descended from a line of saints and distinguished kings."²⁸

As Tanja Michalsky and Adrian Hoch have convincingly argued, the concept of *beata stirps* was also reflected in Angevin artistic patronage in which the depiction of dynastic saints was used to promote the legitimacy and standing of the House of Anjou.²⁹ André Vauchez described such actions as part of a "systematic effort to exploit the belief in the sanctity of their dynasty in order to enhance their prestige and give a religious basis to their political domination."³⁰ It is in the light of this deliberate employment of saints for dynastic legitimation and political prestige that the Angevin relationship with Mary Magdalen, a saint related to them not by blood but by territory, should be viewed.³¹

Mary Magdalen, as an important biblical saint with an intimate and long-established association with the territory of Provence, was uniquely appealing to the Angevin dynasty. She was responsible for converting this area to Christianity through her preaching, an exceptional achievement for a female saint. According to legend, after Christ's death and resurrection Mary Magdalen, Martha, Lazarus, Maximin and other companions went to sea in a rudderless boat, miraculously reaching Provence in safety. There, Mary Magdalen converted the people of Marseilles before retreating to the wilderness at La Sainte-Baume, where she survived for many years on heavenly sustenance received at the canonical hours.³² By the time Charles II

²⁷ On the Arpad dynastic saints, see Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers*, 123-150, 158-160, 173-243, 246-279, 282-294, and 412-428: "Appendix 1: *Hagiography of Hungarian dynastic saints*." See also Vauchez, "Beata Stirps," 399-402; idem., *Sainthood*, 180 n.74, for a listing of the Hungarian saints and *beati*. Vauchez consistently gives 1030 as the date of St. Stephen's death, rather than the standard 1038.

²⁸ Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers*, 299-300.

²⁹ See for example Tanja Michalsky, "MATER SERENISSIMI PRINCIPIS: The tomb of Maria of Hungary," in *The Church of Santa Maria Donna Regina: Art, Iconography and Patronage in Fourteenth-Century Naples*, eds. Janis Elliott and Cordelia Warr (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 61-77; idem., *Memoria und Repräsentation: die Grabmäler des Königshauses Anjou in Italien* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), esp. 61-84: "Das Selbstverständnis der Anjous als *beata stirps*"; idem., "Die Repräsentation einer *Beata Stirps*: Darstellung und Ausdruck an den Grabmonumenten der Anjous," in *Die Repräsentation der Gruppen, Texte — Bilder — Objekte*, eds. Andrea von Hülsen-Esch and Otto Gerhard Oexle (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 187-224; Adrian Hoch, "Beata Stirps, Royal Patronage and the Identification of the Sainted Rulers in the St. Elizabeth Chapel at Assisi," *Art History* 15, no. 3 (September 1992): 279-295. In addition to the aforementioned essay by Michalsky, many of the other essays in the volume *The Church of Santa Maria Donna Regina: Art, Iconography and Patronage in Fourteenth-Century Naples*, eds. Janis Elliott and Cordelia Warr (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), address the concept of *Beata stirps*. See in particular Samantha Kelly, "Religious patronage and royal propaganda in Angevin Naples: Santa Maria Donna Regina in context," esp. 37-41; Cordelia Warr, "The *Golden Legend* and the cycle of the 'Life of Saint Elizabeth of Thuringia-Hungary,'" esp. 165-169; Janis Elliott, "The 'Last Judgement': The cult of sacral kingship and dynastic hopes for the afterlife," 175-193.

³⁰ Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 181.

³¹ Tanja Michalsky notes that the Magdalen was "considered one of the 'Angevin' saints" in the same sense as were the dynastic saints of the Angevins and Arpads. Michalsky, "MATER SERENISSIMI PRINCIPIS," 76 n. 21.

³² The most important and detailed account of the Magdalen's life in Provence is in *The Golden Legend* by Jacobus de Voragine, dated about 1260. This collection of the lives of saints was so popular that it is believed only the Bible was more widely read in the late Middle Ages. William Granger Ryan, introduction to *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*, by Jacobus de Voragine, vol. 1 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), xiii. The Life of Mary Magdalen contains two variants. The main account is based on the *vita* known as the *vita apostolica*-

discovered the Magdalen's body in Saint-Maximin, the ties between the saint and Provence were firmly fixed, the legend of the Magdalen's residency in Provence dating back to the mid-eleventh century.³³ It was invented to explain the presence of the Magdalen's relics at Vézelay, purportedly taken from Saint-Maximin in the eighth century in a *furtum sacrum*, or holy theft, to protect them from Saracen invaders. Ironically, this story gave the Angevins both the means to supplant the Vézelay body with the Saint-Maximin body (they simply claimed that the wrong body had been stolen), and the motivation to do so (by providing a saint both of highest importance and uniquely Provençal).³⁴

The Angevins thus promoted the Magdalen's cult both as a matter of personal devotion and as a way of increasing their own importance.³⁵ Although initial efforts were concentrated in Provence, the seat of the cult, and on the body, which had to be established as legitimate, promotion of the Magdalen as a means of enhancing Angevin prestige was especially imperative in Naples where the Angevins had been in power only since 1266.³⁶ Furthermore, the loss of Sicily—the seat of power for the Angevins' Norman and Hohenstaufen predecessors—in the 1282 uprising known as the Sicilian Vespers made their position in their new territory less secure.³⁷ This provided added motivation to demonstrate their legitimacy as the strong and still inviolate ruling power of Naples and Provence.

The Angevin adoption of Mary Magdalen as an ancestral saint and their promotion of her cult in the Kingdom of Naples were part of their strategy of *Beata stirps*, demonstrating the sanctification of their lineage and their reign. Although no narrative Magdalen imagery can be

eremitica (BHL 5443-5448), in combination with the *vita evangelica* (BHL 5439), a homily from Cluny. This composite *vita* is sometimes called the *vita evangelico-apostolica* (BHL 5450). The second account is known as the "Narrat Josephus" variant, due to the introduction it is given in the text, however, it is the same as the *vita eremitica* (BHL 5453-5456). Jacobus de Voragine, *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*, vol. 1, trans. William Granger Ryan (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), 374-383.

³³ Jean Misrahi, "A *Vita Sanctae Mariae Magdalene* (B.H.L. 5456) in an Eleventh-Century Manuscript," *Speculum* 18, 3 (July 1943): 336, 337. Misrahi dates the legend of the Magdalen's residency at La-Sainte-Baume to the twelfth century. See also Jansen, *Making of the Magdalen*, 52-3.

³⁴ The Angevin claim on Mary Magdalen was greatly strengthened in 1295 when Pope Boniface VIII acceded to the wishes of Charles II and officially acknowledged the relics at St.-Maximin as authentic. Clemens, "Establishment of the Cult," 76-80. For the papal bull see Faillon, *Monuments inédits*, vol. 2: *Pièces justificatives*, 815-820, doc. 89.

³⁵ Jansen, *Making of the Magdalen*, 19.

³⁶ Angevin efforts to promote the Magdalen cult in Provence are beyond the scope of this paper. However, as shall be discussed later, in 1283 Charles II placed Mary Magdalen's head in a reliquary marked with the secret seal of King Charles I, and surmounted by a royal crown sent by the king from Italy. Faillon, *Monuments inédits*, vol. 1, 907 n. 2; *ibid.*, vol. 2: *Pièces justificatives*, 805, doc. 86, for documentary notice of the translation and seal; Saxer, *Culte*, 234. On this and other Magdalen reliquaries commissioned by Charles II in Provence, see Faillon, *Monuments inédits*, vol. 1, 907-914. See also Haskins, *Mary Magdalen*, 128; Jansen, *Making of the Magdalen*, 313-4. Also important was the 1295 establishment of the Dominicans at St.-Maximin as a royal convent independent of local Episcopal authority. Notably, this was the same year as the earliest Magdalen cycle painted in Naples in S. Lorenzo Maggiore. See Clemens, "Establishment of the Cult," 76-77, 80, 83. For papal documents regarding the establishment of the Order of Preachers at St.-Maximin and indulgences granted, see Faillon, *Monuments inédits* vol. 2: *Pièces justificatives*, 815-832, doc. 89-95.

³⁷ For an early account of the Sicilian Vespers on March 30, 1382, and its immediate aftermath, see G. Villani, *Cronica*, VII, 57, 59-75. Selfe's English translation of VII, 61, erroneously indicated as VI, 61 (the account of the uprising itself) is available in Musto, ed. *Medieval Naples*. For discussions of the Vespers and its consequences, both within the kingdom and for European politics, see Runciman, *Sicilian Vespers*, 214-287; Léonard, *Angevins*, 137-160; Dunbabin, *Charles I of Anjou*, 99-113, 141-2.

securely linked to Angevin patronage,³⁸ Charles II promoted the saint's cult by commissioning and endowing chapels and churches dedicated to the Magdalen throughout the Kingdom of Naples.³⁹ He commissioned a church dedicated to Mary Magdalen (now San Domenico) in Manfredonia in 1294 (dedicated 1299);⁴⁰ founded a church, now destroyed, dedicated to the Magdalen in Brindisi;⁴¹ established a Franciscan church or chapel dedicated to the Magdalen in Sulmona, Abruzzo;⁴² endowed and dedicated the Dominican foundation at L'Aquila to the Magdalen;⁴³ and donated money to a church of Mary Magdalen at the Augustinian convent of San Agostino alle Zecca in Naples.⁴⁴ The most significant of such acts, however, was the

³⁸ While Jansen claims that Charles II commissioned the fresco cycle in S. Lorenzo Maggiore (citing Bologna, *Pittori*, 94-97), there is no evidence to support this assertion. The inclusion of unidentified non-Angevin *stemmi* in the program and the fact that the chapel was in the hands of the Arcamone family by 1387, which would be improbable if it was a royal commission, makes Charles II an extremely unlikely patron. Bologna did not in fact name Charles II as patron of this chapel, although he may have intended to imply a connection. He stated that Charles II was the patron of the final phase of the choir construction, and subsequently noted that the Magdalen Chapel frescoes illustrated a theme close to Charles' personal preferences. Jansen, *Making of the Magdalen*, 312 and n.13; Bologna, *Pittori*, 95-96. For Arcamone possession of the chapel, see Rosalba Di Meglio, *Il Convento francescano di S. Lorenzo di Napoli: registri dei documenti dei secoli XIII-XV* (Salerno: Carlone, 2003), 52. Reg.: ASN (Archivio di Stato di Napoli), Corp. soppr. 1184 (coporazioni religiose soppresse), ff 45v-46, 1247f27.

³⁹ Sarnelli claims that after being freed from prison by the Magdalen's intercession, Charles II promised to erect 12 Dominican foundations in her honor in his kingdom. Pompeo Sarnelli, *Cronologia de' Vescovi et Arcivescovi sipontini* (Manfredonia: Stamperia Arcivescovale, 1680), 229. On Charles' campaign to honor Mary Magdalen generally, see Jansen, *Making of the Magdalen*, 311-2.

⁴⁰ On the Magdalen Church in Manfredonia see, Sarnelli, *Cronologia*, 230-231; Nicola de Feudis, "S. Domenico e la cappella de 'la Maddalena' in Manfredonia," *La Capitana V* (1967): 55-60; Pina Belli D'Elia, "L'architettura sacra, tra continuità e innovazione" in *Le eredità normanno-sveve nell'età angioina: persistenze e mutamenti nel Mezzogiorno. Atti delle quindicesime giornate normanno-sveve* (Bari, 22-25 ottobre 2002), ed. Giosuè Musca (Bari: Edizioni Dedalo, 2004), 321-322; Pina Belli D'Elia, "Dalla *Luceria sarracenorum* alla *Civitas Sanctae Mariae*," in *Medioevo: Immagini e ideologie. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi* (Parma, 23-27 settembre 2002) 5, edited by Arturo Carlo Quintavalle (Milan: Electa, 2005), 410. For documents, see Jürgen Krüger, *S. Lorenzo Maggiore in Neapel: Eine Franziskanerkirche zwischen Ordensideal und Herrschaftsarchitektur. Studien und Materialien zur Baukunst der ersten Anjou-Zeit* (Wern: Coelde, 1986), 199 (81.1-6).

⁴¹ On the church in Brindisi see Belli D'Elia, "L'architettura sacra," 322; Maurizio D'Antonio, "Un insediamento mendicante all'Aquila: San Domenico. Brevi cenni sull'origine e la storia costruttiva," in *La chiesa aquilana: 750 anni di vita (1256-2006). Appunti per una storia; atti del convegno, L'Aquila, Cattedra Bernardiniana, 6-7-8 dicembre 2005* (Rome: Nuova Argos, 2007), 482. For documents, see Krüger, *S. Lorenzo Maggiore*, 186-7 (39.1-4).

⁴² The scope of the dedication is unclear, as it was not maintained, but documentary evidence from 1305 (Reg. Ang. 1305 b f. 73) indicates that Charles II commissioned a chapel, and that for a time, the entire church may have adopted the Magdalen dedication. This is generally supported by Orsini's argument, though Orsini is skeptical of a general dedication to the Magdalen and is unaware of the documentary evidence of 1305. See Virgilio Orsini, *Un convento, una città: S. Francesco della Scarpa a Sulmona (secoli XIII-XIX)* (Sulmona: Stabilimento Tipografico "Angeletti," 1982), 35-36 and notes; Pietro Piccirilli, "Notizie di Abruzzo-Molise: Sulmona," *L'arte* 12 (1909): 69. For documents see Krüger, *S. Lorenzo Maggiore*, 211 (112.4, 112.7).

⁴³ The church was dedicated to the Magdalen by 1309. Like several of the other Magdalenian churches, it later became S. Domenico. While Jansen states this happened quickly, the official dedication to the Magdalen was maintained until at least the eighteenth century, as can be seen from an inscription created after the earthquake of 1703. For the inscription, see D'Antonio, "Un insediamento mendicante," 483-4. For information about the church and its dedication generally, see *ibid.*, 466-485, esp. 474ff; Raffaele Colapietra, *Il complesso conventuale di S. Domenico all'Aquila: profilo storico*, with appendices edited by Pierluigi Properzi (L'Aquila: Colacchi, 1999), 11-24. For documents see Krüger, *S. Lorenzo Maggiore*, 194-5 (70.6).

⁴⁴ Belli D'Elia states that the church at the Augustinian convent was dedicated to the Magdalen and that it was renamed S. Agostino alle Zecca when it was radically transformed in the Baroque era. The documents published in Matteo Camera and Krüger indicate that the church did have a dedication to the Magdalen, at least during the Angevin era. See Belli D'Elia, "L'architettura sacra," 322; Belli D'Elia, "*Luceria sarracenorum*," 410. For

rededication of San Domenico Maggiore, the main Dominican church of Naples, in honor of Mary Magdalen in 1289.⁴⁵

As with Charles' funding and dedication of Magdalen monuments, the creation of Magdalen cycles, not only that in the Pipino Chapel, but also the earlier cycles in San Lorenzo Maggiore (ca. 1295) and San Domenico Maggiore (1308-1309), should be viewed as endeavors to promote the ruling house and their relationship to this famous saint. These cycles were likely commissioned by members of the Neapolitan nobility who had a vested interest in the success of the Angevins. These nobles would have wanted to visually express their connection with the ruling house of Naples in order to reinforce their fealty to them as well as glorify their rulers.⁴⁶ What better way to do so than commissioning cycles of paintings dedicated to the patron saint of the Angevin family, whose body had been discovered by the king himself?⁴⁷

The Pipino Chapel in San Pietro a Maiella

The Pipino Chapel is the second chapel to the left of the presbytery in the Celestine church and monastery of San Pietro a Maiella. The founding of the church between the end of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth century is credited to Giovanni Pipino da Barletta, who is buried within.⁴⁸ In his influential guide to his city, the Neapolitan author, lawyer, and cleric, Carlo

documents see Krüger, *S. Lorenzo Maggiore*, 164 (4.7, 4.8); Matteo Camera, *Annali delle due Sicilie, dall'origine e fondazione della monarchia fino a tutto il regno dell'augusto sovrano Carlo III Borbone*, vol. 2 (Naples: Stamperia e cartiere del Fibreno, 1860), 65 and n. 4. Recent scholarship on the Augustinian convent does not note the earlier Magdalenian dedication.

⁴⁵ Pompeo Sarnelli, *Guida de' forestieri, curiosi di vedere, e d'intendere le cose più notabili della Regal città di Napoli, e del suo amenissimo distretto...etc* (Naples: Bulifon, 1688), 219; Carlo Celano, *Notitie del bello, dell'antico e del curioso della città di Napoli per i signori forastieri date dal canonico Carlo Celano napoletano, divise in dieci giornate*, edited by Paola Coniglio and Riccardo Prencipe, final revision by Paola Coniglio (Naples, 1692; Fondazione Memofonte, 2010) <http://www.memofonte.it/ricerche/napoli.html> pubblicato, *Giornata Terza* (III), 112-113. Celano's influential guide to Naples was based on first-hand observation as well as extensive research using printed, manuscript, and archival sources. According to Sarnelli and Celano, Charles II began this church, laying the first stone himself on Epiphany 1283, when it was blessed by the Apostolic Legate, Cardinal Gerardo, Bishop of Sabina. It is not clear whether the original dedication was to the Magdalen. In the interim between the church's initiation and completion, however, Charles was captured in the war with the Aragonese and Sarnelli states that it was the Magdalen, Charles' protectress and advocate, who secured his release. Sarnelli, *Guida*, 218-219. Other sources, such as *La basilica di S. Domenico Maggiore in Napoli. Guida*, ed. PP. Domenicani, 3rd ed. (Naples: Tip. Laurenziana, 1977), 19, state that this is a "rededication" from S. Domenico to Saint Mary Magdalen. In any case, the dedication to Mary Magdalen did not catch on popularly, as noted in Celano, *Notitie*, III, 114. This church contains the Brancaccio chapel.

⁴⁶ Nicolas Bock has argued that in trecento Naples, royal patronage served as the main template on which the aristocracy based their own commissions and that the commissioning of works of art functioned to strengthen these patrons' social status. Bock, "*Transfert Culturel*," 156.

⁴⁷ Although the Pipino Chapel was commissioned during the reign of Charles II's son, King Robert (reigned 1309-1343) or great-granddaughter, Queen Joanna I (reigned 1343-1381), Charles II's discovery of Mary Magdalen's body continued to be of great interest during this period, with ongoing developments to the narrative. For texts pertaining to the discovery of the Magdalen produced before, during and after this period, and discussion of them, see Faillon, *Monuments inédits*, vol. 2: *Pièces justificatives*, , 775-816, doc. 66-88; Clemens, "Establishment of the Cult," 66-123.

⁴⁸ It is impossible to precisely date the foundation of the church as the church archive was destroyed by looting in the revolt of 1799, and no early sources provide the foundation date. Gaetano Filangieri, *Chiesa e convento di S. Pietro a Maiella in Napoli: descrizione storica ed artistica* (Naples: Tipografia dell'Accademia Reale delle Scienze,

Celano, described Pipino as a self-made man who, through virtue, worldly wisdom, and valor, rose from a poor notary to the first rank of the lords of the realm, close to Charles II.⁴⁹ He was also a noted builder of churches; his other patronage occurred in Barletta and Lucera, which he rid of the Saracens for Charles II in 1300.⁵⁰ According to Bruzelius, “his patronage followed closely the taste and aesthetic established in royal projects.”⁵¹

Although the chapel itself is not large, its Magdalen cycle is one of unusually great scope and exceptional iconography. Unlike earlier Neapolitan cycles—indeed, more than any other late medieval cycle in central or southern Italy—its focus is almost exclusively on the post-biblical life of the Magdalen.

The chapel, deeper than it is wide, contains eight Magdalen scenes grouped in pairs on two registers on the lateral walls (figs. 1, 2 and 3).⁵² In the upper register of the left wall, *The*

1884), 3 n. 3; Arnaldo Venditti, “Urbanistica e architettura angioina,” in *Napoli angioina*, vol. 3, *Storia di Napoli* (Naples: Soc. Ed. “Storia di Napoli,” 1969), 781. See also Caroline Bruzelius, *Stones of Naples* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 163, 168. Galante says the church was founded ca. 1299. Gennaro Aspreno Galante, *Guida sacra della città di Napoli*, ed. Nicola Spinosa, (Naples: Società Editrice Napoletana, 1872; repr. 1985), 105. Filangieri states it was built “tra la fine del XIII ed i principii del XIV secolo.” Filangieri, *S. Pietro a Maiella*, 1. The earliest reference to Pipino as the founder of the church is from 1560 by Pietro de Stefano, *Qual chiesa fu fundata da un gentil’huomo napolitano nominato Pipino, il sepolcro del quale è in detta chiesa*. Pietro de Stefano, *Descrizione dei luoghi sacri della città di Napoli*, edited by Stefano D’Ovidio and Alessandra Rullo (Naples, 1560; Fondazione Memofonte, 2007) <http://www.memofonte.it/ricerche/napoli.html>, 92v. Carlo Celano identified the commissioner of the church more specifically as “Pipino da Barletta.” Carlo Celano, *Notitie del bello, dell’antico e del curioso della città di Napoli per i signori forastieri date dal canonico Carlo Celano napoletano, divise in dieci giornate*, edited by Stefano De Mieri and Federica De Rosa (Naples, 1692; Fondazione Memofonte, 2010) <http://www.memofonte.it/ricerche/napoli.html>, *Giornata Seconda* (II), 205. Even earlier, Della Marra stated that Giovanni Pipino founded the church and was buried there. Ferrante Della Marra, *Discorsi delle famiglie estinte, forastiere e non comprese ne’ seggi di Napoli, imparentate colla casa della Marra* (Naples: O. Beltrano, 1641), 286. For an extensive list of sources that credit Pipino as the founder of the church, see Filangieri, *S. Pietro a Maiella*, 1 n.1. Filangieri himself was not sure that Pipino founded the church but said he was certainly its principal patron and benefactor. Filangieri, 2-3.

⁴⁹ Celano, *Notitie*, II, 205. One of the earliest references to Pipino as a notary who achieved great standing is found in Matteo Villani, *Cronica*, ed. Giuseppe Porta (Parma: Fondazione Pietro Bembo; Ugo Guanda Editore, 1995), VII, 103: “...Gianni Pipino, il quale di piccolo notaio per la sua industria fu fatto de’ maggiori signori de’ reame al tempo de’ re Carlo vecchio.” For more on Pipino and his relationship to the Anjou Dynasty, particularly Charles II, see Pietro Egidi, “La Colonia Saracena di Lucera e la sua distruzione,” *Archivio storico per le province napoletane* 38 (1913): 134-138; Della Marra, *Famiglie estinte*, 283-6; Caroline Bruzelius, “Giovanni Pipino of Barletta: The Butcher of Lucera as Patron and Builder,” in *Pierre, lumière, couleur: Études d’histoire de l’art du Moyen Âge en l’honneur d’Anne Prache*, ed. Fabienne Joubert et Dany Sandron (Paris: Presses de l’Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1999), 259-260. Bruzelius noted that in 1309, Pipino served as witness and executor to the king’s will. See also Bruzelius, *Stones of Naples*, 165.

⁵⁰ In addition to S. Pietro a Maiella in Naples, Pipino established the Celestine monastery of S. Bartolomeo in Lucera, oversaw the initial phases of work on the Cathedral of Lucera, which was commissioned by Charles II and has similarities to S. Pietro a Maiella, and reconstructed the choir of Sta. Maria Maggiore, Barletta. For Giovanni Pipino da Barletta as an architectural patron, see Bruzelius, “Giovanni Pipino,” 256-9; idem., *Stones of Naples*, 163-172; Belli D’Elia, “L’architettura sacra,” 324-335. For the construction of the Cathedral of Lucera see, Egidi, “Colonia Saracena di Lucera” 39 (1914), 753-761; and for S. Bartolomeo see ibid., 762-763 and Krüger, *S. Lorenzo Maggiore*, 198 (76.1-2).

⁵¹ Bruzelius, *Stones of Naples*, 163.

⁵² The attribution and dating of these frescoes varies. Bologna assigns them to two artists, the Primo maestro della “Bible Moralisee,” who he sees as responsible for the conception of the program as a whole and for the execution of the paintings in the upper register, and an unidentified lesser master. He dates them prior to 1354. Bologna, *Pittori*, 311, 313. The chapel signage identifies it as the work of the Maestro di Giovanni Barrile, Antonio Cavarretto, ca.

Supper in the House of the Pharisee, on the left (fig. 4), is paired with *Mary Magdalen Preaching (in Marseilles)*, on the right (fig. 5). One of only two scenes in the chapel based on a scriptural source, *The Supper in the House of the Pharisee* was almost universally included in Magdalen cycles of the period.⁵³ According to the Gospel of Luke, the Magdalen bathed Christ's feet with her tears, dried them with her hair, kissed and anointed them, "[a]nd he said to her: Thy sins are forgiven thee."⁵⁴ It is this event, her dramatic initial conversion from a life of sin, which established her as the perfect penitent. In contrast, the adjacent scene, *Mary Magdalen Preaching*, was rarely depicted in central and southern Italian cycles.⁵⁵ Like most of the legendary material, it was derived from the *Golden Legend*, the Dominican friar Jacobus de Voragine's immensely popular book of saints' lives. Jacobus described how the Magdalen traveled to Marseilles where she found the people worshipping false gods in a shrine portico. She, "with well-chosen words called them away from the cult of idols and preached Christ fervidly to them. All who heard her were in admiration..."⁵⁶

On the right wall, the upper register contains the *Voyage to Rome* on the left (fig. 6) and *The Prince Greeted in Rome by Peter* on the right (fig. 7). Unlike the other pairs, these two scenes are not only contiguous but also continuous, comprising part of the same narrative, the *Miracle of the Prince of Provence*. This miracle, in which the Magdalen converts the ruler of Provence and his wife by helping them to conceive, and then brings the wife of the prince back to life after her death in childbirth, is the only miracle that appears with frequency in Magdalen cycles.⁵⁷ The significance of the miracle as regards the Angevins and the reasons for the exceptional form it takes in this cycle will be discussed in greater detail below.

The lower register on the left wall pairs the *Penitent Magdalen in Her Cave* on the left (fig. 8) and a badly damaged scene in a church on the right, which almost certainly represented *The Death and/or Last Communion of the Magdalen* (fig. 9).⁵⁸ The scene of the Magdalen in her cave accompanied by an angel was an iconographic invention first found on the *Magdalen Master Dossal* and seen in all three Neapolitan chapels. It is not directly drawn from textual sources.⁵⁹ Instead of depicting a specific episode, it represents the totality of the Magdalen's

1340. Jansen does not propose an attribution and dates the cycle to the early fourteenth century. Jansen, *Making of the Magdalen*, 69 n. 62.

⁵³ It is also found on the *Magdalen Master Dossal* in the Accademia Museum, Florence; in the Magdalen Chapel in S. Lorenzo Maggiore, Naples; the Magdalen Chapel in the Basilica of St. Francis, Assisi; the Brancaccio Chapel in S. Domenico Maggiore, Naples; the Chapel of the Podestà in the Bargello, Florence; and the Guidalotti-Rinuccini Chapel in Sta. Croce, Florence.

⁵⁴ Luke 7.37-50.

⁵⁵ Of the aforementioned cycles, Mary Magdalen is seen preaching only on the *Magdalen Master Dossal* in the Accademia Museum, Florence.

⁵⁶ Jacobus, *Golden Legend*, vol. 1, 376.

⁵⁷ Although this is the only appearance of the *Miracle of the Prince of Provence* in Naples, it can be found in the Magdalen Chapel in the Basilica of St. Francis, Assisi, the Chapel of the Podestà in the Bargello and the Guidalotti-Rinuccini Chapel in Sta. Croce, both in Florence, as well as in the early fifteenth-century cycles in the Cappella della Maddalena in S. Domenico, Spoleto and the Magdalen Oratory in the Franciscan hermitage of the Belverde, Cetona.

⁵⁸ I base this identification on the remaining fragments of the fresco, containing some figures and painted architecture, and on the iconography of other Magdalen cycles. As I will discuss later, the organization of this cycle also supports the interpretation of this scene as the *Death/Last Communion of the Magdalen*.

⁵⁹ The fact that this scene does not come directly from the hagiography has not been previously noted. While angels play a role in the Magdalen's legendary life in the wilderness in the *Golden Legend*, they do not visit her at her cave as depicted in these paintings. Instead, they lift her up heavenward, where she hears their celestial chants and is relieved of her need for physical nourishment. This event is portrayed in the Magdalen Chapel in Assisi in the

retreat to the wilderness while firmly localizing the saint in her cave in Provence, home of the Angevin dynasty.⁶⁰ The mutilated scene on the right depicts the final episode in the Magdalen's life. As told by Jacobus, after her sojourn in the wilderness the Magdalen was brought by angels to the church in Aix where St. Maximin, one of the companions who had accompanied her to Provence, served as bishop. "All the clergy...were now called together, and blessed Mary Magdalen, shedding tears of joy, received the Lord's Body and Blood from the bishop. Then she lay down full length before the steps of the altar, and her most holy soul migrated to the Lord."⁶¹ The Last Communion and death of the Magdalen became a common theme in art, although this is its only known appearance in Naples.⁶² The Eucharist had important ramifications in the Magdalen's story, as penance was a prerequisite for receiving communion, and the Magdalen was the exemplar of penance.⁶³

Finally, the lower level on the right wall pairs the *Noli me tangere*, on the left (fig. 10), with *A Posthumous Miracle*, on the right (fig. 11). The *Noli me tangere* is the second biblical scene in the chapel. Like *The Supper in the House of the Pharisee*, it commonly appears in Magdalen cycles of the late medieval period.⁶⁴ It depicts the resurrected Christ's first appearance as described in John: "Jesus saith to her: Do not touch me, for I am not yet ascended to my Father. But go to my brethren, and say to them: I ascend to my Father and to your Father, to my God and your God" (John 20.17). It thus presents the Magdalen in her critical role as the Apostle to the Apostles, a role that became the justification for her unorthodox preaching activities (as a woman) once she reached Provence.⁶⁵ The scene with which it is paired, a posthumous miracle described in the *Golden Legend* involving the resurrection of a knight through prayers offered to the Magdalen, is, on the contrary, rarely depicted. The reasons for its inclusion in the Pipino Chapel are addressed below.

This cycle encourages the viewer to contemplate the nature of the Magdalen and her role after the events chronicled in the bible. Although the program is generally chronologically organized (fig. 3), thematic concerns were also given consideration, and the iconographer

Colloquy with the Angels, while the fresco of the *Magdalen in her Cave* located there, instead of pairing her with an angel, shows her receiving a cloak from a priest in preparation for her death. Jacobus, *Golden Legend*, vol. 1, 380.

⁶⁰ While scenes of the angelic elevation of the Magdalen included the cave beneath, the emphasis was on her otherworldly location.

⁶¹ Jacobus, *Golden Legend*, vol. 1, 381.

⁶² Although the details vary, these events appear on the *Magdalen Master Dossal* in the Accademia Museum, Florence; in the Magdalen Chapel in the Basilica of St. Francis, Assisi; the Chapel of the Podestà in the Bargello, Florence; and in the north of Italy, in the Palazzo della Ragione (ex-Sta. Maria Maddalena), Bergamo, and Sta. Maria Maddalena, Bolzano. The scene later appears in the Cappella della Maddalena in S. Domenico, Spoleto (fifteenth century). It is possible that it was also included in the cycle in S. Lorenzo Maggiore, Naples, of which several scenes are now missing. According to Jansen, *Making of the Magdalen*, 222, the Magdalen's Last Communion was also a common theme in medieval sermons.

⁶³ Furthermore, although it is not clear if it was the case in this fresco, images that included the Magdalen's soul ascending to heaven, such as those in the Magdalen Chapel in the Basilica of St. Francis, Assisi, and the Chapel of the Podestà in the Bargello, Florence, were a means by which iconographers made visible the success of her penitence and the efficacy of this route to heavenly reward.

⁶⁴ The *Noli me tangere* is also found on the *Magdalen Master Dossal* in the Accademia Museum, Florence; in the Magdalen Chapel in the Basilica of St. Francis, Assisi; the Chapel of the Podestà in the Bargello, Florence; the Brancaccio Chapel in S. Domenico Maggiore, Naples; and the Guidalotti-Rinuccini Chapel in Sta. Croce, Florence. It is also quite likely that the *Noli me tangere* was originally part of the program of the cycle in S. Lorenzo Maggiore, Naples, from which several scenes are now missing, as previously noted in notes 2 and 62.

⁶⁵ For a discussion of Mary Magdalen as Apostle to the Apostles, see Haskins, *Mary Magdalen*, 62-4, and Jansen, *Making of the Magdalen*, 18-19, 28, 58, 62-82.

deviated from narrative order with the placement of the *Noli me tangere*.⁶⁶ The cycle begins on the left wall where the scenes proceed from left to right across the upper registers of both walls, then down to the lower register on the left wall to do the same, concluding on the lower register of the right wall.

The unexpected placement of the *Noli me tangere* pairs the scenes meaningfully, creating iconographic significances that would not have been suggested in a strictly chronological narrative sequence.⁶⁷ The pairing of *The Supper at the House of the Pharisee* and *Mary Magdalen Preaching* (fig. 1) has its source in the *Golden Legend* where Jacobus explains why Mary Magdalen was so effective as a preacher: “and no wonder, that the mouth which had pressed such pious and beautiful kisses on the Savior’s feet should breathe forth the perfume of the word of God more profusely than others could.”⁶⁸ Moreover, the two scenes are linked thematically in that both deal explicitly with conversion. In *The Supper at the House of the Pharisee*, we see the Magdalen’s conversion; in *Mary Magdalen Preaching*, we see her successfully converting others because of that experience. The second pair of frescoes, the *Voyage to Rome* and *The Prince Greeted in Rome by Peter* (fig. 2), as previously mentioned, illustrates two parts of the same narrative event: the *Miracle of the Prince of Provence*. Although separated from each other by a border, together they form a discrete unit within the cycle. If the *Noli me tangere* had been placed in its sequential place in the program, these frescoes would have been located on different registers opposite each other. The unity would thus have been disrupted, lessening the import of the *Miracle of the Prince of Provence*.

The lower register on the left wall pairs the *Magdalen in Her Cave* with the *Magdalen’s Last Communion and Death* (fig. 1). Although the loss of part of the fresco, caused by the later addition of a tomb, have obscured the connection, both had a clear Eucharistic theme. While it is now effaced in the Pipino Chapel, other images of the Magdalen in her cave accompanied by an angel indicate that in this iconography, the angel is presenting the Host to Mary Magdalen. Thus in both frescoes the Magdalen receives the body of Christ. On the left, the Eucharist comes from a heavenly source and is received in the wilderness, the location of the Magdalen’s penitential and contemplative retreat from the world. On the right, she receives the Eucharist within the institutional framework of the church: within a building that recalls the church in which the frescoes are located and from a authority figure within the church hierarchy, a bishop. The placement of this latter scene in which the Magdalen received communion kneeling before the altar, adjacent to the actual altar of the Pipino Chapel, reinforced its liturgical associations. Worshippers receiving the sacrament in this chapel did so alongside an image of the Magdalen engaged in the same activity. As this event immediately preceded the ascent of the Magdalen’s soul to heaven, through emulating her, the faithful hoped to eventually receive the same reward.

The final pair of frescoes, the *Noli me tangere* and the *Posthumous Miracle* (fig. 2), are linked both thematically and visually. Thematically, they are united by the subject matter: resurrection. In the *Noli me tangere*, the Magdalen is witness to the resurrection of Christ; in the *Posthumous Miracle*, prayers to the Magdalen are the source of resurrection, illustrating her power and efficacy as an intercessor between man and God. Furthermore, this miracle recounts that the knight is resurrected by the Magdalen in order to make confession, do penance and

⁶⁶ Located on the lower register of the right wall, the position of the *Noli me tangere* at almost the end of the cycle causes the viewer to think the layout diverges from the proper narrative order more than it actually does.

⁶⁷ Thanks are due to Michelle Erhardt for suggesting a closer look at the pairings of the scenes and providing valuable insights, especially as regards the first and last pair.

⁶⁸ Jacobus, *Golden Legend*, vol. 1, 377.

receive *viaticum*—Last Communion. The miracle is thus connected to the Eucharistic images facing it on the lower register of the left wall. This, in tandem with the image of the resurrected Christ, creates a distinct emphasis on the body of Christ in all the frescoes on this register of the chapel. Visually, the artist connects the pair of frescoes through the unusual portrayal of the Magdalen. She is clad in a dark garment rather than the typical red robe seen in both *The Supper in the House of the Pharisee* and *Mary Magdalen Preaching*.⁶⁹ Her hair, one of her major attributes—which alludes simultaneously to her anointing of Christ and her sojourn in the desert—is completely covered in both images. Context alone identifies this somber figure as Mary Magdalen.

The patron of the Pipino chapel and its fresco cycle is unknown. Despite the lack of evidence regarding the patronage of this chapel, as the name suggests, scholars have linked it to the Pipino family.⁷⁰ This is due to the chapel's proximity to the tomb of Giovanni Pipino da Barletta, founder of the church.⁷¹ Jansen's suggestion that Giovanni Pipino da Barletta himself was the patron is implausible, despite the fact he was a close ally of Charles II.⁷² As noted, he was not buried within the chapel; in fact, he could not have been.⁷³ Giovanni Pipino da Barletta died in 1316, but this chapel was not built until a second phase of church construction dating to the mid 1320s or 1330s and was only decorated a decade later.⁷⁴

Bologna alternately attributed the cycle to a subsequent Giovanni Pipino, Count of Altamura, the chamberlain of King Robert the Wise (ruled 1309 to 1343).⁷⁵ While this second Giovanni Pipino would have been active during the correct period to serve as patron, his checkered political history, in which he was in and out of both favor and prison and at times engaged in acts of treason against the crown, seem to limit the periods in which he might have acted as commissioner.⁷⁶

Although it is not possible to identify a specific member of the Pipino family as the patron of this chapel, several factors argue in favor of it having been a Pipino commission. First and foremost, the selection of the Magdalen as the subject for the chapel's decoration and the vigorous emphasis on her legendary life demonstrates the patrons' desire to affiliate themselves with the Angevin dynasty. That the church of San Pietro a Maiella was a personal foundation of the Pipino family lends credence to the notion that they commissioned the later chapel. The church was dedicated to St. Peter of Morrone (canonized 1313), a Neapolitan saint who, like the Magdalen, had ties to the Angevins and whose canonization was promoted by that dynasty.⁷⁷

⁶⁹ The cycle is damaged and the color could be due to darkening of the pigments; however, vibrant reds are present in all of the upper register frescoes.

⁷⁰ For the Pipino family in this period generally, see Della Marra, *Famiglie estinte*, 283-291.

⁷¹ Bologna links the chapel to Pipino based on Galante's statement that Giovanni Pipino da Barletta's tomb lays near the chapel. Bologna, *Pittori*, 313-14; Galante, *Guida sacra*, 106.

⁷² Jansen, *Making of the Magdalen*, 316, n. 32.

⁷³ Jansen's wording implies that he is buried within the chapel, thus making her case for Giovanni Pipino da Barletta as patron appear more conclusive: "the Pipino chapel, which safeguarded Giovanni's tomb..." Jansen, *Making of the Magdalen*, 316.

⁷⁴ Bruzelius, *Stones of Naples*, 168, 170.

⁷⁵ Bologna, *Pittori*, 313-14.

⁷⁶ The main source for this Giovanni Pipino is Romolo Caggese, "Giovanni Pipino conte d'Altamura," in *Studi di storia napoletana in onore di Michelangelo Schipa* (Naples: I.T.E.A Editrice, 1926), 141-165. Léonard, *Angevins*, 354 and n.1 argues that his support for the Angevin court was much steadier and that he has been misinterpreted even by Caggese. See also Della Marra, *Famiglie estinte*, 286-291.

⁷⁷ Bruzelius, *Stones of Naples*, 172. Peter of Morrone, the titular saint of the church, was Pope Celestine V, who founded the Celestine Order in 1254.

This suggests a pattern of patronage in which the Pipinos promoted Angevin-affiliated saints. Further evidence supporting the identification of the patron as a member of the Pipino family is the imagery itself, in particular, the scene of the *Posthumous Miracle*.

One of the most unusual iconographical elements of this cycle is the inclusion of the miracle scene (fig. 11), which was based on a story from the *Golden Legend*: Mary Magdalen's resurrection of a knight killed in battle. This event was very rarely depicted; a miniature in the *Leggendario Ungherese* is its sole appearance beyond the Pipino Chapel.⁷⁸ In fact, although a number of posthumous miracles are recounted in the *Golden Legend*, the Pipino Chapel *Posthumous Miracle* is the only representation of any such miracle in a late medieval Magdalen cycle in central or southern Italy.⁷⁹ The rarity of posthumous miracles in painted images of the Magdalen can be attributed to the richness of the source material combined with the nature of the medium. Considering that these cycles range from three to eight scenes, iconographers, unlike hagiographers such as Jacobus de Voragine, had to distill their painted *vitae* down to only a few episodes that most clearly represented the nature of the saint in relation to the specific commission.⁸⁰ In contrast with many later saints, whose miracles served as proof of their status, Mary Magdalen's claim to sainthood did not rest on the performance of miracles, nor was her role as a thaumaturge the basis of her cult's popularity. The biblical account of her life unambiguously established that she was a saint, a fact that was expanded upon in the legendary accounts of her post-biblical life.⁸¹ Magdalen iconography therefore focused on events that illustrated her importance as a saint, particularly those invoking her role as the perfect example of penitence and her close relationship with Christ.

The most critical reason for omitting Mary Magdalen's posthumous miracles in an Angevin context, however, centers on the discovery of her body at Saint-Maximin by Charles II. Written before this seminal event occurred, the posthumous miracles described in the *Golden Legend* refer instead to the relics at Ste.-Madeleine in Vézelay. Thus to depict a miracle performed by the body of Mary Magdalen in the *Golden Legend* was to illustrate a miracle performed by the wrong body. Considering it was the discovery of the Saint-Maximin body that instigated the creation of cycles depicting the life of the Magdalen, representing miracles endorsing the Vézelay relics was unthinkable, especially for the Angevins, with their vested interest in the authenticity of the Saint-Maximin body.

Because of the rarity of posthumous scenes in Magdalen cycles and the importance of avoiding them in an Angevin context, the presence of the posthumous miracle in the Pipino Chapel demands explanation. As described in the *Golden Legend*, a knight "whose practice it was to visit the relics of Saint Mary Magdalen every year" died in battle. His parents, despairing that he had died "without making confession and doing penance," prayed to Mary Magdalen, whereupon he arose from his bier, called for a priest, confessed, received *viaticum*, and then died

⁷⁸ Jansen, *Making of the Magdalen*, 316 n. 35. Jansen notes that it may also have been present in a late fourteenth-century cycle at Pontresina, but the scene is too damaged to permit identification and is beyond the chronological and geographical scope of this article.

⁷⁹ This text is the most likely source for the legendary material found in Magdalen cycles, at least in central and southern Italy.

⁸⁰ The Chapel of the Podestà in Florence originally contained 9 Magdalen scenes of which only 8 survive. In central Italy, the cycle in S. Domenico, Spoleto, is exceptional in having 11 scenes, but this fifteenth-century cycle was painted over a century later than the "first wave" of Magdalenian narrative imagery.

⁸¹ I am leaving aside the issue of the conflation of multiple biblical figures into one saint, as this was well-established by this period.

again, his soul at peace.⁸² This miracle was acceptable as opposed to the others recounted in the *Golden Legend* because it was not caused through the proximity of the Magdalen's relics. In fact, the Magdalen's remains play no role in the miracle, which was produced thanks to prayer and the knight's genuine devotion to the saint. Moreover, this miracle emphasizes key themes of the Magdalen cult. She does not resurrect the knight as Christ did Lazarus, but, as the perfect penitent, she enables him to come back to life to confess and receive Last Communion, after which he dies once more.

Not only was this posthumous miracle acceptable because it did not directly refer to Mary Magdalen's remains at Vézelay, but its selection reflects a specific event in the life of Giovanni Pipino da Barletta, the church's founder, thus supporting Pipino family patronage of the chapel. A military leader under the Angevin kings,⁸³ Giovanni Pipino da Barletta had been thrown from his horse during the final battle in Lucera, and almost killed. This incident so affected him that in 1300 he founded the church of San Bartolomeo in that place, in honor of the saint on whose feast day the battle occurred.⁸⁴

Katherine Jansen's interpretation of the *Posthumous Miracle* was that not only the knight, but also his steed, were being raised from the dead, and she connected this to Giovanni Pipino da Barletta's near-death experience in Lucera. A close analysis of the image contradicts Jansen regarding the resurrection of the horse. While there is indeed a wounded or dead horse at the lower right and a standing horse behind, they are not the same horse: the one in the foreground is a bay, while the other is white; moreover their tack is utterly dissimilar.⁸⁵ In addition, there is also a third horse standing behind the white horse, which is now barely visible due to damage to the right-hand portion of the fresco. There is no need, however, for the horse to be resurrected for the proposed conflation between the miracle and Pipino's personal experience to occur. Horses are prominently featured in the scene, a feature for which the miracle's text offers no rationale. The three horses frame the figure of the dead knight and dominate the picture field from the center to the right. By means of the conspicuous inclusion of the horses in a miracle narrative in which they play no part, the artist alluded to Giovanni Pipino da Barletta's near-death experience in Lucera, adding another level of meaning to this image. A Pipino, taking possession of this chapel upon its construction around 1330, would want to honor this famous relative who was buried adjacent to it. By incorporating an event so important in Giovanni Pipino's life into a Magdalen miracle represented in the chapel, the Pipino patron would celebrate both Giovanni Pipino and the Angevins through the dedication of the chapel to Mary Magdalen, the Angevin patron saint.

The fresco of the *Posthumous Miracle* further deviates from the text of the *Golden Legend* by including the figure of the Magdalen. Moreover, there are strong connections between the Magdalen and the woman in prayer who stands by the tonsured priest blessing the knight. According to the *Golden Legend*, the woman who prays for the Magdalen's intervention is the

⁸² Jacobus, *Golden Legend*, vol. 1, 382.

⁸³ For Giovanni Pipino as military leader in Lucera, see Egidi, "Colonia Saracena di Lucera," 38 (1913), 115-144 and 681-707; 39 (1914) 132-171; Belli D'Elia, "L'architettura sacra," 323.

⁸⁴ Federico Spedalieri, *I dipinti e le chiese di Lucera* (Portici: Tipografia Bodoniana, 1914), 19-20; Jansen, *Making of the Magdalen*, 316. *Touring Club Italiano (TCI) 17: Puglia* (Milan: La Biblioteca di Repubblica, 2005) 241; Belli D'Elia, "*Luceria sarracenorum*," 411; Vito Salierno, *I musulmani in Puglia e in Basilicata* (Manduria: P. Lacaíta, 2000), 258. Egidi does not mention this legend. Egidi, "Colonia Saracena di Lucera," 38 (1913), 144; 39 (1914), 762-763.

⁸⁵ Damage to the right side of the fresco makes it impossible to determine whether the horse in the foreground is dead or merely injured.

knight's mother; his father, however, who also prays with her in the text, is conspicuously absent from the fresco, making the woman a key protagonist in the miracle. Indeed, the Magdalen takes no notice of the knight, instead directing all her attention upon the woman, whose eyes are raised to return the saints gaze. Intriguingly, the praying woman's appearance is strikingly similar to that of the Magdalen, who is shown above, flying in from the heavens, making a gesture of blessing.⁸⁶

The prominence of the female in prayer is emphasized by the Magdalen's focus on her and, in combination with the omission of the analogous male figure from the scene, raises the question of whether or not she could represent the patron of the cycle. In its emphasis on this pious woman, the focus of the painting becomes the efficacy of prayers to the Magdalen and, more immediately, the interaction of the two women. The similarity in the appearance of these two women further visualizes their connection. The parallels between the female figure and the Magdalen, combined with the Magdalen's indisputable concentration on her, makes it tantalizing to hypothesize that perhaps the patron of the Pipino Chapel was a patroness, possibly a female member of the Pipino family.

The strong representation of female agency in the scene of *Mary Magdalen Preaching* (fig. 5) further supports the idea that a woman from the Pipino family may have been the patron of this cycle.⁸⁷ Unusually, the Magdalen is depicted here as a preacher invested with scriptural authority. She stands frontally within a portico, holding a book in her left hand with her right arm raised, surrounded by seated onlookers who hang on to her words. While her active ministry in Marseilles was a significant part of her legend, prohibitions against female preaching made it somewhat problematic. Although the scene appears in earlier manuscripts and on the *Magdalen Master Dossal*, this is the only trecento fresco cycle in central or southern Italy to include it.⁸⁸ In this fresco, this scene testifies to the importance of her activities in Provence, calling attention to her foundational role in bringing Christianity to Marseilles and thus explicitly localizing her in Angevin territory, even more emphatically than the scenes of her retreat to the wilderness. Marseilles also had a recent sacred connection to the Angevins, as the resting place and focal point of the cult of the newest family saint, St. Louis of Toulouse.

It is evident that in addition to the suggestion of a female patron, the scenes chosen for this cycle and their iconography demonstrate deliberate references to the Angevins. This comes

⁸⁶ As in the adjacent *Noli me tangere*, Mary Magdalen's appearance is unusual. Her hair is entirely covered and her somber garments, in particular the burgundy head-covering with an opaque white underveil, give the distinct appearance of a nun's habit. I have been unable to identify this as the habit of a specific order and it is possible that it is instead meant to represent contemporary modest fashion. However, the combination of the dark fabric, completely-covered hair, and wimple are exceptional in Italian narrative Magdalen iconography of the period. Jansen noted that Mary Magdalen appeared as a nun in this image. Jansen, *Making of the Magdalen*, 218. The reason for the nun-like appearance of the Magdalen must be specific to the patronage of the Pipino Chapel: S. Pietro a Maiella was not a church associated with a nuns' convent, nor was Mary Magdalen, despite an association with the contemplative life, typically a prototype or exemplar for nuns. A widowed female patron, however, perhaps a tertiary or nun herself, might have been especially drawn to this modest image of the Magdalen.

⁸⁷ To my knowledge this image has never before been published.

⁸⁸ It is possible that *Mary Magdalen Preaching* is the missing scene in the Chapel of the Podestà in the Bargello, dated between ca. 1320 and 1337, but this cannot be determined. It does appear in the early fifteenth-century cycle in S. Domenico, Spoleto. The scene is more popular in the north, where it appears in frescoes in St. Maria Magdalena in Dusch (1325-50); Sta. Maddalena, Rencio (c. 1370-90); the Palazzo della Ragione, Bergamo (originally located in the Disciplinati Church of Sta. Maria Maddalena; late-fourteenth century); Sta. Maria Maddalena, Cusiano (c. 1470-97). For northern Magdalen imagery of the trecento and quattrocento, see Joanne W. Anderson, "The Magdalen Fresco Cycles of the Trentino, Tyrol and Swiss Grisons, c.1300-c.1500" (PhD diss., University of Warwick, 2009).

to the fore in the following two frescoes. Although the *Miracle of the Prince of Provence* or *Marseilles* was the one Magdalen miracle frequently depicted in fresco cycles, it is the Angevin connection that accounts for the tale's extraordinary prominence and unique iconography in this cycle.⁸⁹ The Provençal Cardinal Philippe Cabassole, Bishop of Cavaillon and an Angevin royal chancellor, included this miracle in his *Book of the History of Blessed Mary Magdalen*, a mid-trecento account of the life of the Magdalen and of the discovery and translation of her relics by Charles of Salerno. According to Victor Saxer, this work served as "a kind of *Speculum principum* for the usage of Angevin Princes and, undoubtedly, a small circle of secular aristocrats and ecclesiastical hierarchs."⁹⁰ He argued that Cabassole included this miracle specifically to act as an example of faith in God and devotion to Mary Magdalen for the counts of Provence of his own era.⁹¹ It is this understanding of the miracle as a model for the current Angevin rulers, evinced in contemporary literature, which accounts for the way it is depicted in the Pipino Chapel.

According to the *Golden Legend*, the Magdalen prevented the ruler of Provence and his wife from sacrificing to the gods in order to have a child. Through the Magdalen's prayers the woman conceived, thus ensuring the continuation of their line, and her husband decided to go on a pilgrimage to Rome. The pregnant wife refused to be left behind, but became sick on the journey, gave birth and died. Her husband left the body and the infant on a rocky shore, praying to Mary Magdalen to protect the child and the soul of his wife. When he reached Rome, St. Peter greeted him and took him on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. When at last he returned, the prince found his child still alive through Mary Magdalen's intervention, was along with his wife, who had been on a spiritual pilgrimage to Jerusalem with the Magdalen as her guide.⁹²

The division of this miracle into two scenes, the *Voyage to Rome* and *The Prince Greeted in Rome by Peter* (figs. 6 and 7), is a feature unique to this cycle. The miracle itself is not depicted in either fresco; only the viewer's knowledge of the story indicates that it will end happily thanks to the intervention of Mary Magdalen. Notably, in contrast with the *Posthumous Miracle*, Mary Magdalen herself does not appear in either scene; instead the key individual in

⁸⁹ Its general popularity was due to the fact that the event was free of the aforementioned issues that made posthumous miracles problematic. Additionally, it represented her active ministry in Provence without the potential difficulties that arose when showing a woman preaching.

⁹⁰ "...une espèce de *Speculum principum* à l'usage des princes angevins et sans doute d'un cercle restreint d'aristocrates laïques ou de hiérarques ecclésiastiques." Victor Saxer, "Philippe Cabassole et son *Libellus hystorialis Marie beatissime Magdalene*: préliminaires à une édition du *Libellus*," in *L'État Angevin: pouvoir, culture et société entre XIIIe et XIVe siècle; actes du colloque international organisé par l'American Academy in Rome, l'École Française de Rome, l'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, l'U.M.R. Telemme et l'Université de Provence, l'Università degli Studi di Napoli "Federico II" (Rome - Naples, 7- 1 novembre 1995)* (Rome: École Française de Rome, 1998), 203. For the text of the *Libellus hystorialis Marie beatissime Magdalene* see: BHL 5509-5511. Manuscript copies exist in Paris and Cologne: Paris, B.N., lat. 15031, fol. 4r-87v. and Cologne, Historisches Archiv der Stadt K6ln, W. 166, fol. 1-32v. The Cologne manuscript contains only the *vita*. In addition to the *vita* and translation account, Cabassole also describes four miracles he personally witnessed. Clemens, "Establishment of the Cult," 101. For more on Philippe Cabassole's career and for the dedication and general content of his *Book of the History of Blessed Mary Magdalen* see *ibid.*, 100-104; and Saxer, "Philippe Cabassole," 193-204. Saxer discusses Cabassole's new emphasis on the critical role of Charles II in the discovery, translation, and authentication, as well as his strong highlighting of the dynastic dimensions of the event. *Ibid.*, 196-8.

⁹¹ Saxer, "Philippe Cabassole," 202.

⁹² Jacobus, *Golden Legend*, vol. 1, 376-9.

both is the prince.⁹³ As the ruler of Provence, converted to Christianity by Mary Magdalen, the prince becomes a prototype or prefiguration of the Angevin ruler of Provence, Charles II, who discovered the Magdalen's body. Moreover, the narrative implies an ancestral relationship between the Magdalen and the rulers of Provence, suggesting that their connection did not commence with the discovery of her body but dates back to the very beginnings of Christianity in Provence. This is precisely the sort of sacral kinship that the Angevins strove to promote. According to the text, the Magdalen intervened, first to enable the prince and his wife to conceive, then to keep the wife and child miraculously alive. The clear dynastic implications of these events made the Magdalen a *de facto* progenitor of the ruling dynasty of Provence, and thus, by association, of the Angevins as well.

In the *Voyage to Rome*, the prince and his entourage sail from left to right towards Rome, depicted in the pendant painting located to the right. The death of his wife has already occurred because she lies motionless on an island at the left. *The Prince Greeted in Rome by Peter* illustrates a part of the tale not included in any other depiction in narrative cycles, all of which concentrate instead on the miracle of the wife and child. The visual and symbolic focus of this fresco is the connection between the prince and St. Peter. On the right stands Peter before the gates of Rome. The kneeling prince and St. Peter clasp hands in the center of the image, as Peter inclines towards the prince, raising him to his feet. As the first pope, St. Peter represents the papacy; promised the keys to the kingdom of heaven, he is the rock upon which Christ built his church. Rome represents the home of the Church on earth. Although the popes were located in Avignon during this period (1309-1378), the symbolic value of Rome as the center of the Catholic faith was unchanged. This scene is not critical to the Magdalen's legend; she plays no part in it. The inclusion of *The Prince Greeted in Rome by Peter* in the cycle, however, increases the emphasis on the prince of Provence and conveys the Angevin relationship to the papacy.

The Angevins and the papacy had been intertwined since Charles of Anjou was adopted as papal champion with the aim of conquering southern Italy.⁹⁴ Although the strength and balance of the relationship varied depending on the specific pope and king, the Angevins were officially vassals to the popes and their valued defenders. Once the papacy was transferred to Avignon, located within Angevin Provence, the Angevins were the foremost defenders of the papal cause in Italy and had special access to the popes.⁹⁵ This special relationship between the pope and the Angevin king was another sign of heavenly preferment of the Angevin dynasty, critical to the Angevins' legitimacy and power, and was thus celebrated in this image of St. Peter and the prince of Provence.

The emphasis on the prince of Provence seen in the unique elaboration of the *Miracle of the Prince of Provence* is augmented by a previously unrecognized feature of this cycle: The prince and princess of Provence appear in the fresco of *Mary Magdalen Preaching* (fig. 5) in the left background. Larger than the other onlookers, they are clearly set apart from the crowd. Leaning forward attentively, they are the only figures who clasp their hands in prayer, indicating their acceptance of the Magdalen's message. Their identity as the rulers of Provence is indisputable. Damage to the left portion of the *Voyage to Rome* (fig. 6) has made a conclusive

⁹³ Because there is considerable damage to the left third of the *Voyage*, the possibility that she originally appeared on the island cannot be completely discounted. She is, however, depicted in the tondo, which is located directly above and between the two frescoes.

⁹⁴ David Abulafia, *The Western Mediterranean Kingdoms 1200-1500: The Struggle for Dominion* (London and New York: Longman, 1997), 58. For an excellent account of the complex relationship between the Angevins and the Papacy, see Runciman, *Sicilian Vespers*. See also note 5 on the Angevin conquest of Naples.

⁹⁵ Abulafia, *Western Mediterranean Kingdoms*, 134.

comparison of the princess in the two frescoes difficult, although the princess in the *Voyage* is, like the woman in *Mary Magdalen Preaching*, dressed in red with a white head covering. The identity of the prince, however, is unmistakable; his forked beard, curling hair, blue hood and facial features in the preaching scene are almost identical to their appearance in *The Prince Greeted in Rome by Peter* (fig. 7). By including the rulers of Provence in the fresco of *Mary Magdalen Preaching*, the connection between these rulers, who were understood as precursors for the Angevins, and Mary Magdalen, who does not appear in the Miracle frescoes, is strengthened and made more immediate.

A connection between the Angevins and the Magdalen is also unusually depicted in the *Noli me tangere* (fig. 10). An atypically demure Magdalen, her hair completely concealed by her cloak, kneels before Christ, reaching towards him as he holds his right hand out towards her. Unlike Christ in the *Noli me tangere* on the *Magdalen Dossal*, who blesses the Magdalen, or Christ in the *Noli me tangere* in the Magdalen Chapel, Assisi, whose hand fends Mary Magdalen off as his body gracefully twists away in a dancing motion, Christ's gesture here is difficult to interpret. Neither clearly blessing her, nor emphatically pushing her away, the gesture can be read as either or neither. Interestingly, his hand is very close, almost touching her.⁹⁶ Moreover, Christ does not recoil from the Magdalen as in many representations of this scene; instead he stands still and frontal, firmly grounded. A Provençal legend related to the verification of the Magdalen's body sheds light on this unusual interaction between the figures and provides a uniquely Angevin significance for this scene.⁹⁷

The earliest appearance of the legend of the *Noli me tangere* is in the *Book of the History of Blessed Mary Magdalen*, completed ca. 1355 by Philippe Cabassole.⁹⁸ According to his account, there remained a piece of incorrupt flesh on the forehead of the Magdalen's skull where the resurrected Christ had touched her as he said, "*Noli me tangere*."⁹⁹ The relic of the Magdalen's skull with its nodule of flesh was popularly known as the *Noli me tangere* and provided verification that the body discovered by Charles II was the true body.¹⁰⁰ On December 10, 1283, Charles II had it placed in a crowned bust reliquary of gold and gilt silver, ornamented with diamonds, sapphires, rubies, topazes, emeralds, pearls, and other precious jewels.¹⁰¹ Most

⁹⁶ His hand is in fact closer to her than in any other image of the period except the *Magdalen Master Dossal*, where the constraints of the narrow picture field, rather than other considerations, are the cause.

⁹⁷ Faillon, *Monuments inédits*, vol. 1, 890.

⁹⁸ Clemens, "Establishment of the Cult," 95 n. 66; 101 and n. 83, 104.

⁹⁹ Faillon, *Monuments inédits*, vol. 1, 890. Faillon includes a quotation from Cabassole. See also Clemens, "Establishment of the Cult," 103-4, for Cabassole's description with an English translation. Versions of this legend can be found in later sources as well. In the popular late-fifteenth-century legend from St.-Maximin, *The Dominican Legend of Mary Magdalen at Saint-Maximin*, Mary Magdalen told Charles II in a vision that one sign by which he would identify her body was the piece of incorrupt flesh on her skull from Christ's touch as he said "*Noli me tangere*." Clemens, "Establishment of the Cult," 67.

¹⁰⁰ Faillon, *Monuments inédits*, vol. 1, 882; Clemens, "Establishment of the Cult," 104.

¹⁰¹ I have located four diverse images of this now destroyed reliquary. See Francesco Lucchini, "Face, Counterface, Counterfeit. The Lost Visage of the Reliquary of the Jaw of Saint Anthony of Padua," in *Meaning in Motion. Semantics of Movement in Medieval Art and Architecture*, eds. Nino Zchomelidse and Giovanni Freni (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011), fig. 8, for what is possibly the earliest image of the reliquary; a drawing from between 1538 and 1541 by Francisco de Hollanda; *As antigualhas*, Madrid, El Escorial, Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo, inv. 28-I-20, fol. 48v.; Faillon, *Monuments inédits*, vol. 1, 909-10 reproduced a print of unknown date from the collection of the Bibliothèque du roi à Paris (BnF), Cabinet des estampes, vol. d'Aix. It has not been possible to locate the original in their holdings. A second print is also reproduced in Faillon, vol. 1, 1031-1032. No identifying information is given, but it is identical to the first, with the addition of the supporting angels, donor figure, and base that were added to the reliquary in 1502 by Anne of Brittany. A seventeenth-century print,

unusually, the golden face of the bust was removable.¹⁰² Underneath a transparent crystal face was fixed in place, thus allowing worshippers to view the skull and its authenticating spot of flesh.¹⁰³ Now destroyed, the reliquary had an inscription on a golden plaque commemorating the relationship between Charles II and the Magdalen, which read:

CARNE PRIUS LUBRICA, POST HOC AMANDO PUDICA
HOSPITA MIRIFICA, CHRISTI SPECIALIS AMICA
TRANSITA POST MARIA, MICUIT BONITATE MARIA :
BIS SEXCENTENO JUNCTIS TRIBUS OCTUAGENO,
PRINCEPS SALERNÆ, BONITATIS AMORE SUPERNÆ,
HANC AURO LEVAT, QUAM SACRA CORONA DECORAT ;
ERGO PATRONA PIA, NOBIS ADESTO, MARIA,
HIC HUIC VIVENTI, PARADISUM DA MORIENTI.¹⁰⁴

This specifically Provençal/Angevin addition to the Magdalen's life—that Christ touched Mary Magdalen during the *Noli me tangere* event—became a key element in authenticating the

Les Reliques qui se voient en la Sainte-Baume et en l'église de Saint-Maximin en Provence (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France (BnF), département des Estampes et photographie, Collection Lallemand de Betz 2505), shows the reliquary *in situ* and other Magdalen reliquaries at St.-Maximin. See the BnF website, accessed February 15, 2011, <http://visualiseur.bnf.fr/>. While there are differences between the BnF image and the Faillon images, (most notably, the absence of the supporting angels and the donor figure of Anne of Brittany from the first image reproduced by Faillon, and the dearth of decoration on the dress of the figure in the BnF image), these three images are on the whole quite similar. In contrast, the drawing by Hollanda shows a figure with a dramatically different hairstyle, crown type, more modern style of dress, and an immense necklace, which is not found in the other images. While the supporting angels are present, their placement is not the same as in the BnF image or the second Faillon image, and the donor figure is absent. I suspect that Hollanda was working from a written description rather than from the visual evidence. For Anne of Brittany and her addition to the reliquary, see Faillon, *Monuments inédits*, vol. 1, 1031-1032.

¹⁰² For information and images of a similar bust reliquary with a rock crystal face and a now lost removable metal mask, see Lucchini, "Face, Counterface, Counterfeit," 35-62. This reliquary, containing the jawbone of Saint Anthony of Padua, postdates the *Noli me tangere* reliquary. An inscription indicates it was completed August 1, 1349. Lucchini argues that this was an uncommon reliquary design. Underscoring the rarity of this type of relic container, the *Noli me tangere* reliquary, which he calls an "important typologically similar object," is the only reliquary with which he compares that of St. Anthony. *Ibid.*, 43.

¹⁰³ Faillon, *Monuments inédits*, vol. 1, 882, 908-910. Faillon says that Charles II made the face of the bust removable so as not to deprive the piety of the faithful of the sight of such a precious relic and the miraculous signs therein. See also Jansen, *Making of the Magdalen*, 313-14; Clemens, "Establishment of the Cult," 103-5.

¹⁰⁴ Faillon, *Monuments inédits*, vol. 1, 909-10. Translation by Dr. Ashley Jones:

FORMERLY LUBRICIOUS FLESH, MARY BECAME, AFTER, VIRTUE-LOVING—
MIRACULOUS HOSTESS, SINGULAR FRIEND OF CHRIST,
THE GOODNESS OF MARY GLITTERS:
IN 1283 [LIT.: TWICE SIX HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-THREE]
THE PRINCE OF SALERNO, FOR THE LOVE OF HEAVENLY GOODNESS,
ELEVATES THIS [RELIQUARY] IN GOLD, WHICH THE HOLY CROWN ADORNS;
THEREFORE, PIOUS PATRONESS, BE NEAR TO US, MARY,
PRESENT TO THOSE LIVING, GRANT PARADISE TO THE DYING.

A translation of part of the inscription, with a slightly different interpretation, is provided by Jansen. Jansen, *Making of the Magdalen*, 314.

Angevin Magdalen body.¹⁰⁵ In the Pipino Chapel *Noli me tangere*, this is expressed visually. Christ is neither blessing the Magdalen nor fleeing from her. Rather, he is about to confer the touch on her forehead that provided the proof that the body discovered by Charles II is the true body of Mary Magdalen.¹⁰⁶ It is thus a singularly Angevin depiction of the *Noli me tangere*.¹⁰⁷

Conclusion

The Pipino Chapel contains the final and largest Magdalen cycle painted in late medieval Naples. The reigning Angevin dynasty had a strong interest in promoting the ties between themselves and the Magdalen, whose body Charles II had recently discovered in their territory of Provence. More than the earlier fresco cycles in San Lorenzo Maggiore and San Domenico Maggiore, this cycle unmistakably emphasizes the legendary life of Mary Magdalen and her links to Provence and sacral kingship, anticipated in a program carried out during Angevin rule.

While no documents confirm that the patron was a member of the Pipino family, the historical circumstances and the cycle's iconography make a Pipino a strong candidate. Whoever the patron may have been, it is clear that he or she was fully committed both to the promotion of the Magdalen cult and promotion of the Angevins, especially in the extraordinary two-part depiction of the *Miracle of the Prince of Provence*. This cycle combines scenes found in almost every Magdalen cycle (like *The Supper in the House of the Pharisee* and a scene of the Magdalen in the wilderness), together with rare scenes (such as the *Magdalen Preaching* and the *Posthumous Miracle*), as well as newly invented iconography (depicting *The Prince Greeted in Rome by Peter*) to create a program of almost unprecedented scope and unique meaning. Even traditional scenes such as the *Noli me tangere* were imbued with new layers of significance through iconography specific to an Angevin context. Thus the Magdalen cycle in the Pipino Chapel visually supports the Angevin adoption of Mary Magdalen not only as their patron saint, but also, by virtue of their shared roots in Provence, as a virtual member of their dynasty. By emphasizing the Magdalen as the *de facto* founder of the House of Anjou, this program reflected the Angevin conception of *beata stirps* and graphically confirmed Angevin authority in Naples.

¹⁰⁵ Clemens states that in texts written after that of Cabassole, the *Noli me tangere* became one of the most important signs of authentication. Clemens, "Establishment of the Cult," 104.

¹⁰⁶ While the text probably slightly postdates the Pipino Chapel cycle (the frescoes being dated to the 1340s, or before 1354), they are nearly contemporary. Furthermore, the dates for both the cycle and the text are speculative. Victor Saxer suggested that the text could be dated earlier than 1355 based on the dedication to Henry of Villars who died in 1354, but saw it as an open question. See Saxer, "Philippe Cabassole," 193-204; idem., "Les ossements dits de sainte Marie-Madeleine conservé à Saint-Maximin-la-Sainte-Baume," *Provence historique* 27 (1977), 268. See note 52 above for the dating of these frescoes. Furthermore, as is often the case with written accounts of legendary material, it is likely that Cabassole was transmitting already current belief that was circulating in oral tradition. Saxer discusses the sources for the *Libellus* in brief, but states that, "they should be specified in detail in a critical edition." Such a work has not been produced. Saxer, "Philippe Cabassole," 199-203.

¹⁰⁷ The iconography of Christ touching the Magdalen's forehead in the *Noli me tangere* was well established in the fifteenth century, including a Provençal example in the Basilica of St.-Maximin. By that time it had also spread to Spain and the Netherlands. See Philippe Malgouyres, "Maraîchage et dévotion. Le *Noli me tangere* de Nicolas Mignard à la cathédrale de Cavaillon," *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art français* (2000): 51-62; see especially 56 and fig. 9.

Bibliography

- Abulafia, David. *The Western Mediterranean Kingdoms 1200-1500: The Struggle for Dominion*. London; New York: Longman, 1997.
- Anderson, Joanne W. "The Magdalen Fresco Cycles of the Trentino, Tyrol and Swiss Grisons, c.1300-c.1500." PhD diss., University of Warwick, 2009.
- Belli D'Elia, Pina. "L'architettura sacra, tra continuità e innovazione." In *Le eredità normanno-sveve nell'età angioina: persistenze e mutamenti nel Mezzogiorno. Atti delle quindicesime giornate normanno-sveve (Bari, 22-25 ottobre 2002)*, edited by Giosuè Musca, 303-339. Bari: Edizioni Dedalo, 2004.
- . "Dalla *Luceria sarracenorum* alla *Civitas Sanctae Mariae*." In *Medioevo: Immagini e ideologie. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi (Parma, 23-27 settembre 2002) 5*, edited by Arturo Carlo Quintavalle, 401-420. Milan: Electa, 2005.
- Bock, Nicolas. "Patronage, Standards and *Transfert Culturel*: Naples Between Art History and Social Science Theory." In *Art and Architecture in Naples, 1266-1713*, edited by Cordelia Warr and Janis Elliot, 152-175. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Bologna, Ferdinando. *I pittori alla corte angioina di Napoli*. Rome: U. Bozzi, 1969.
- Boskovits, Miklós, and Angelo Tartuferi, eds. *Dal Duecento a Giovanni da Milano. Dipinti*. Vol. 1, *Cataloghi della Galleria dell'Accademia di Firenze*. Florence: Giunti, 2003.
- Boyer, Jean-Paul. "La 'foi monarchique': royaume de Sicile et Provence (mi-XIII^e – mi-XIV^e siècle)." In *Le forme della propaganda politica nel Due e nel Trecento: Relazioni tenute al convegno internazionale organizzato dal Comitato di studi storici di Trieste, dall'École française de Rome e dal Dipartimento di storia dell'Università degli Studi di Trieste, (Trieste, 2-5 marzo 1993)*, edited by Paolo Cammarosano, 85-110. Rome: École Française de Rome, 1994.
- Bruzelius, Caroline. "Giovanni Pipino of Barletta: The Butcher of Lucera as Patron and Builder." In *Pierre, lumière, couleur: Études d'histoire de l'art du Moyen Âge en l'honneur d'Anne Prache*, edited by Fabienne Joubert et Dany Sandron, 255-267. Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1999.
- . *Stones of Naples*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Caggese, Romolo. "Giovanni Pipino conte d'Altamura." In *Studi di storia napoletana in onore di Michelangelo Schipa*, 141-165. Naples: I.T.E.A. editrice, 1926.
- Camera, Matteo. *Annali delle due Sicilie, dall'origine e fondazione della monarchia fino a tutto il regno dell'augusto sovrano Carlo III Borbone*. Vol. 2. Naples: Stamperia e cartiere del Fibreno, 1860.
- Celano, Carlo. *Notitie del bello, dell'antico e del curioso della città di Napoli per i signori forastieri date dal canonico Carlo Celano napoletano, divise in dieci giornate, Giornata Seconda*. Naples, 1692. Edited by Stefano De Mieri and Federica De Rosa. Fondazione Memofonte, 2010. <http://www.memofonte.it/ricerche/napoli.html>.
- . *Notitie del bello, dell'antico e del curioso della città di Napoli per i signori forastieri date dal canonico Carlo Celano napoletano, divise in dieci giornate, Giornata Terza*. Naples, 1692. Edited edition by Paola Coniglio and Riccardo Prencipe, final revision by Paola Coniglio. Fondazione Memofonte, 2010. <http://www.memofonte.it/ricerche/napoli.html>.

- Clemens, Neal Raymond. "The Establishment of the Cult of Mary Magdalen in Provence, 1279-1543." PhD diss., Columbia University, 1997.
- Colapietra, Raffaele. *Il complesso conventuale di S. Domenico all'Aquila: profilo storico*, with appendices edited by Pierluigi Properzi. L'Aquila: Colacchi, 1999.
- D'Antonio, Maurizio. "Un insediamento mendicante all'Aquila: San Domenico. Brevi cenni sull'origine e la storia costruttiva." In *La chiesa aquilana: 750 anni di vita (1256-2006). Appunti per una storia; atti del convegno, L'Aquila, Cattedra Bernardiniana, 6-7-8 dicembre 2005*, 449-522. Rome: Nuova Argos, 2007.
- de Feudis, Nicola. "S. Domenico e la cappella de 'la Maddalena' in Manfredonia." *La Capitana* V (1967): 55-60.
- Della Marra, Ferrante. *Discorsi delle famiglie estinte, forastiere e non comprese ne' seggi di Napoli, imparentate colla casa della Marra*. Naples: O. Beltrano, 1641.
- de Stefano, Pietro. *Descrizione dei luoghi sacri della città di Napoli*. Naples, 1560. Edited edition by Stefano D'Ovidio and Alessandra Rullo. Fondazione Memofonte, 2007. <http://www.memofonte.it/ricerche/napoli.html>.
- Di Meglio, Rosalba. *Il Convento francescano di S. Lorenzo di Napoli: registi dei documenti dei secoli XIII-XV*. Salerno: Carlone, 2003.
- Domenicani, PP., ed. *La basilica di S. Domenico Maggiore in Napoli. Guida*, 3rd ed. Naples: Tip. Laurenziana, 1977.
- Dunbabin, Jean. *Charles I of Anjou: Power, Kingship and State-Making in Thirteenth-Century Europe*. London: Longman, 1998.
- Egidi, Pietro. "La Colonia Saracena di Lucera e la sua distruzione." *Archivio storico per le province napoletane*, 38 (1913): 115-144 and 681-707; 39 (1914): 132-171 and 697-766.
- Elliott, Janis. "The 'Last Judgement': The cult of sacral kingship and dynastic hopes for the afterlife." In *The Church of Santa Maria Donna Regina: Art, Iconography and Patronage in Fourteenth-Century Naples*, edited by Janis Elliott and Cordelia Warr, 175-193. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
- Faillon, Étienne-Michel. *Monuments inédits sur l'apostolat de Sainte Marie-Madeleine en Provence et sur les autres apôtres de cette contrée, Saint Lazare, Saint Maximin, Sainte Marthe*. 2 vols. Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1859.
- Filangieri, Gaetano. *Chiesa e convento di S. Pietro a Maiella in Napoli: descrizione storica ed artistica*. Naples: Tipografia dell'Accademia Reale delle Scienze, 1884.
- Flores D'Arcais, Francesca. *Giotto*. English edition translated by Raymond Rosenthal. Milan and New York: Motta; Abbeville Press, 1995.
- Galante, Gennaro Aspreno. *Guida sacra della città di Napoli*. Naples: Società Editrice Napoletana, 1872. Edited edition by Nicola Spinosa, 1985.
- Gaposchkin, M. Cecilia. *The Making of Saint Louis: Kingship, Sanctity, and Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2008.
- Gardner, Julian. "Saint Louis of Toulouse, Robert of Anjou, and Simone Martini." *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 39 (1976): 12-33.
- . "Conclusion: Santa Maria Donna Regina in its European Context." In *The Church of Santa Maria Donna Regina: Art, Iconography and Patronage in Fourteenth-Century Naples*, edited by Janis Elliott and Cordelia Warr, 195-201. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
- Haskins, Susan. *Mary Magdalen: Myth and Metaphor*. New York: Riverhead Books, 1993.

- Hoch, Adrian. "Beata Stirps, Royal Patronage and the Identification of the Sainted Rulers in the St. Elizabeth Chapel at Assisi." *Art History* 15, no. 3 (September 1992): 279-295.
- Jacobus de Voragine, *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*. Introduction and translation by William Granger Ryan. 2 vols. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Jansen, Katherine Ludwig. *The Making of the Magdalen: Preaching and Popular Devotion in the Later Middle Ages*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Kelly, Samantha. *The New Solomon: Robert of Naples (1309-1343) and Fourteenth-Century Kingship*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003.
- . "Religious patronage and royal propaganda in Angevin Naples: Santa Maria Donna Regina in context." In *The Church of Santa Maria Donna Regina: Art, Iconography and Patronage in Fourteenth-Century Naples*, edited by Janis Elliott and Cordelia Warr, 25-43. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
- Klaniczay, Gábor. *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses: Dynastic Cults in Medieval Central Europe*. Translated by Éva Pálmai. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Krüger, Jürgen. *S. Lorenzo Maggiore in Neapel: Eine Franziskanerkirche zwischen Ordensideal und Herrschaftsarchitektur. Studien und Materialien zur Baukunst der ersten Anjou-Zeit*. Werl: Coelde, 1986.
- Laurent, M. H. *Le culte de S. Louis d'Anjou a Marseilles au XIV^e siècle. Les documents de Louis Antoine de Ruffi suivis d'un choix de lettres de cet érudit*, *Temi e testi* 2. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1954.
- Léonard, Émile G. *Les Angevins de Naples*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1954.
- Loconte, Aislinn. "The North Looks South: Giorgio Vasari and Early Modern Visual Culture in the Kingdom of Naples." In *Art and Architecture in Naples, 1266-1713*, edited by Cordelia Warr and Janis Elliot, 38-61. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Lucchini, Francesco. "Face, Counterface, Counterfeit. The Lost Visage of the Reliquary of the Jaw of Saint Anthony of Padua." In *Meaning in Motion. Semantics of Movement in Medieval Art and Architecture*, edited by Nino Zchomelidse and Giovanni Freni, 35-62. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.
- Malgouyres, Philippe. "Maraîchage et dévotion. Le *Noli me tangere* de Nicolas Mignard à la cathédrale de Cavaillon." *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art français* (2000): 51-62.
- Michalsky, Tanja. "Die Repräsentation einer *Beata Stirps*: Darstellung und Ausdruck an den Grabmonumenten der Anjous." In *Die Repräsentation der Gruppen, Texte—Bilder—Objekte*, herausgegeben von Andrea von Hülsen-Esch und Otto Gerhard Oexle, 187-224. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- . *Memoria und Repräsentation: die Grabmäler des Königshauses Anjou in Italien*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.
- . "MATER SERENISSIMI PRINCIPIIS: The tomb of Maria of Hungary." In *The Church of Santa Maria Donna Regina: Art, Iconography and Patronage in Fourteenth-Century Naples*, edited by Janis Elliott and Cordelia Warr, 61-77. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
- Misrahi, Jean. "A *Vita Sanctae Mariae Magdaleneae* (B.H.L. 5456) in an Eleventh-Century Manuscript." *Speculum* 18, 3 (July 1943): 335-339.
- Montagnes, Bernard, O.P. *Marie Madeleine et l'Ordre Prêcheurs*. Marseilles, 1984.
- . "La légende dominicaine de Marie-Madeleine à Saint-Maximin." In *Le peuple des saints. Croyances et dévotions en Provence et Comtat Venaissin à la fin du Moyen Âge*.

- Actes de la Table ronde organisée par l'Institut de recherches et d'études sur le Bas Moyen Âge avignonnais (Palais des Papes, Avignon) du 5 au 7 octobre 1984*, Mémoires de l'Académie de Vaucluse, 7^e série, 6, 73-86. Avignon: Académie de Vaucluse, 1987.
- Musto, Ronald G., ed. *Medieval Naples: A Documentary History, 400–1400. Historical Texts*. New York: Italica Press, 2011. Kindle edition.
- Orsini, Virgilio. *Un convento, una città: S. Francesco della Scarpa a Sulmona (secoli XIII-XIX)*. Sulmona: Stabilimento Tipografico "Angeletti," 1982.
- Paul, Jacques. "Témoignage historique et hagiographie dans le procès de canonisation de Louis d'Anjou." *Provence historique* 23 (1973): 305-317.
- Piccirilli, Pietro. "Notizie di Abruzzo-Molise: Sulmona." *L'arte* 12 (1909): 69-72.
- Poeschke, Joachim. *Italian Frescoes: The Age of Giotto, 1280-1400*. New York: Abbeville Press, 2005.
- Previtali, Giovanni. *Giotto e la sua bottega*. Edited by Alessandro Conti, with updated notes, bibliography and catalogue by Giovanna Ragionieri. 3rd ed. Milan: Fabbri, 1993.
- Processus Canonizationis et Legendae variae Sancti Ludovici O.F.M. Episcopi Tolosani*. *Analecta franciscana: sive Chronica aliaque varia documenta ad historiam Fratrum Minorum spectantia*, 7. Edited by Patribus Collegii S. Bonaventurae. Quaracchi: Ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1951.
- Puglia. Touring Club Italiano (TCI) 17*. Milan: La Biblioteca di Repubblica, 2005.
- Riant, Paul-Édouard-Didier. "Déposition de Charles d'Anjou pour la canonisation de saint Louis." In *Notices et documents publiés pour la Société de l'histoire de France à l'occasion du cinquantième anniversaire de sa foundation*, 155-176. Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1884.
- Runciman, Steven. *The Sicilian Vespers: A History of the Mediterranean World in the Later Thirteenth Century*. Canto Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Ryan, William Granger. Introduction to *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*, by Jacobus de Voragine. Vol. I, xiii-xviii. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Salierno, Vito. *I musulmani in Puglia e in Basilicata*. Manduria: P. Lacaïta, 2000.
- Sarnelli, Pompeo. *Cronologia de' Vescovi et Arcivescovi sipontini*. Manfredonia: Stamperia Arcivescovale, 1680.
- . *Guida de' forestieri, curiosi di vedere, e d'intendere le cose più notabili della Regal città di Napoli, e del suo amenissimo distretto...etc.* Naples: Bulifon, 1688.
- Saxer, Victor. *Le culte de Marie-Madeleine en occident des origines à la fin du moyen-âge*. Auxerre and Paris: Publications de la société des Fouilles Archéologiques et des Monuments Historiques de l'Yonne; Librairie Clavreuil, 1959.
- . "Les ossements dits de sainte Marie-Madeleine conservé à Saint-Maximin-la-Sainte-Baume." *Provence historique* 27 (1977): 257-311.
- . "Philippe Cabassole et son *Libellus hystorialis Marie beatissime Magdalene*: préliminaires à une édition du Libellus." In *L'État Angevin: pouvoir, culture et société entre XIIIe et XIVe siècle; actes du colloque international organisé par l'American Academy in Rome, l'École Française de Rome, l'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, l'U.M.R. Telemme et l'Université de Provence, l'Università degli Studi di Napoli "Federico II" (Rome - Naples, 7-1 novembre 1995)*, 193-204. Rome: École Française de Rome, 1998.
- Spedaliera, Federico. *I dipinti e le chiese di Lucera*. Portici: Tipografia Bodoniana, 1914.

- Toynbee, Margaret R. S. *Louis of Toulouse and the Process of Canonisation in the Fourteenth Century*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1929.
- Tripodi, Graziadei. *Il Restauro come e perché*. Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1981.
- Vaucher, André. "Beata Stirps: sainteté et lignage en Occident aux XIIIe et XIVe siècles." In *Famille et parenté dans l'Occident médiéval. Actes du colloque de Paris (6-8 juin 1974)*, Publications de l'École française de Rome, 30, 397-406. Rome: École Française de Rome, 1977.
- . *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages*. Translated by Jean Birrell. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Venditti, Arnaldo. "Urbanistica e architettura angioina." In *Storia di Napoli*. Vol. 3, *Napoli angioina*, 665–888. Naples: Soc. Ed. "Storia di Napoli," 1969.
- Villani, Giovanni. *Cronica*. Philological notes by Ignazio Moutier and with historical-geographical appendices compiled by Francesco Gherardi Dragomanni. Florence: Sansone Coen Tip. Editore, 1844.
- Villani, Matteo. *Cronica*. Edited by Giuseppe Porta. 2 vols. Parma: Fondazione Pietro Bembo; Ugo Guanda Editore, 1995.
- Warr, Cordelia. "The *Golden Legend* and the cycle of the 'Life of Saint Elizabeth of Thuringia-Hungary.'" In *The Church of Santa Maria Donna Regina: Art, Iconography and Patronage in Fourteenth-Century Naples*, edited by Janis Elliott and Cordelia Warr, 155-174. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
- Warr, Cordelia, and Janis Elliot, eds. *Art and Architecture in Naples, 1266-1713*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- . "Introduction: Reassessing Naples 1266-1713." In *Art and Architecture in Naples, 1266-1713*, edited by Cordelia Warr and Janis Elliot, 1-15. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.