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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 “tripych” 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.

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. 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. While scholarship has acknowledged the special relationship between the Angevins and the Magdalen, the Magdalen cycles in Naples have not received adequate attention. 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. 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
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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 Elliot (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010). This factor has surely contributed to the neglect of the Magdalen cycles. In particular, see Cordelia Warr and Janis Elliot, “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 reassessment 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.

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 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
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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. Although Louis IX was not declared a saint until 1297, the Angevins actively campaigned for his canonization almost immediately following his death. 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. 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.” 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.” The testimony from the papal inquiry held in 1282 illustrates that in addition to advocating for the canonization of King Louis IX, 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. In the same vein, in the early 1280s Charles I


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.


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. Thus he “presented his family as a beata stirps, in which sainthood flourished in every generation.”

Angevin influence was similarly critical in the canonization of St. Louis of Toulouse (d. 1297, canonized 1317). 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. 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. 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. 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.” 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.

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
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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. Bonaventuriae (Quaracchi: Ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventuriae, 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.
24 See Toynbee, S. Louis of Toulouse, 111.
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 XIVe 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). 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.”

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. 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.” 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.

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. By the time Charles II


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. 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 sacrem*, 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).

The Angevins thus promoted the Magdalen’s cult both as a matter of personal devotion and as a way of increasing their own importance. 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 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. 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
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*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.


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.


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.

securely linked to Angevin patronage. Charles II promoted the saint’s cult by commissioning and endowing chapels and churches dedicated to the Magdalen throughout the Kingdom of Naples. He commissioned a church dedicated to Mary Magdalen (now San Domenico) in Manfredonia in 1294 (dedicated 1299); founded a church, now destroyed, dedicated to the Magdalen in Brindisi; established a Franciscan church or chapel dedicated to the Magdalen in Sulmona, Abruzzo; endowed and dedicated the Dominican foundation at L’Aquila to the Magdalen; and donated money to a church of Mary Magdalen at the Augustinian convent of San Agostino alle Zecca in Naples. 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: regesti dei documenti dei secoli XIII-XV (Salerno: Carlone, 2003), 52. Reg.: ASN (Archivio di Stato di Napoli), Corp. soppr. 1184 (coporazioni religiose sopresse), 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.


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 Lavori di Studi (Sulmona: Stabilimento Tipografico Sulmona, Abruzzo; Magdalen in Brindisi; Manfredonia in 1294 (dedicated 1299); and donated money to a church of Mary Magdalen at the Augustinian convent of San Agostino alle Zecca in Naples. The most significant of such acts, however, was the

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.\(^ {45}\) Pomпоe 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: Bulilon, 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.

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.

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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{50} According to Bruzelius, “his patronage followed closely the taste and aesthetic established in royal projects.”\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{52} In the upper register of the left wall, The

\begin{footnotes}

\item[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., \textit{Stones of Naples}, 163-172; Belli D’Elia, “L’architettura sacra,” 324-335. For the construction of the Cathedral of Lucera see, Egid, “Colonia Saracena di Lucera” 39 (1914), 753-761; and for S. Bartolomeo see ibid., 762-763 and Krüger, \textit{S. Lorenzo Maggiore}, 198 (76.1-2).

\item[51] Bruzelius, \textit{Stones of Naples}, 163.

\item[52] The attribution and dating of these frescoes varies. Bologna assigns them to two artists, the Primo maestro della “Bible Moralisée,” 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, \textit{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. 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.” 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. 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...”

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. 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). 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. Instead of depicting a specific episode, it represents the totality of the Magdalen’s...
retreat to the wilderness while firmly localizing the saint in her cave in Provence, home of the Angevin dynasty. 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.”

The Last Communion and death of the Magdalen became a common theme in art, although this is its only known appearance in Naples. 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.

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. 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. 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.

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

Jacobus, Golden Legend, vol. 1, 381.

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.

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.

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.

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*. 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. 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.” 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, has 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.

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. 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. This is due to the chapel’s proximity to the tomb of Giovanni Pipino da Barletta, founder of the church. 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. As noted, he was not buried within the chapel; in fact, he could not have been. 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.

Bologna alternately attributed the cycle to a subsequent Giovanni Pipino, Count of Altamura, the chamberlain of King Robert the Wise (ruled 1309 to 1343). 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.

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.

---

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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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, 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.

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. 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.
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.
knights 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.

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. 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. 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.\(^\text{89}\) 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.”\(^\text{90}\) 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.\(^\text{91}\) 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.\(^\text{92}\)

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.


both is the prince.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{de facto} progenitor of the ruling dynasty of Provence, and thus, by association, of the Angevins as well.

In the \textit{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. \textit{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 \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{Voyage to Rome} (fig. 6) has made a conclusive

\textsuperscript{93} Because there is considerable damage to the left third of the \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{94} David Abulafia, \textit{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, \textit{Sicilian Vespers}. See also note 5 on the Angevin conquest of Naples.

\textsuperscript{95} Abulafia, \textit{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. 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.

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

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

This specifically Provençal/Angevin addition to the Magdalen’s life—that Christ touched Mary Magdalen during the \textit{Noli me tangere} event—became a key element in authenticating the

\textit{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 \textit{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, \textit{Monuments inédits}, vol. 1, 1031-1032.

\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{103} Faillon, \textit{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, \textit{Making of the Magdalen}, 313-14; Clemens, “Establishment of the Cult,” 103-5.

\textsuperscript{104} Faillon, \textit{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, \textit{Making of the Magdalen}, 314.
Angevin Magdalen body. 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. It is thus a singularly Angevin depiction of the Noli me tangere.

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.
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