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Abstract

This dissertation examines the early fourteenth-century architecture, art, and urbanism of Lucera in Apulia, a city that for most of the thirteenth century served as the only Muslim settlement on the Italian peninsula until its violent purge and destruction by the king of Naples on August 15, 1300. As a city that was suppressed, repopulated, and rebuilt within the span of two decades, Lucera is unique and facilitates a case study that bridges scholarship on the art and architecture in southern Italy, urbanism, multiculturalism, and the emergence of states. This interdisciplinary work argues that Lucera’s destruction and reconstruction were due to the rise of an Angevin state and investigates how the repopulated city’s art and architecture were affected by the priorities of consolidation and centralization.

This dissertation emphasizes the growth of Angevin cities as social and historical phenomena within an analysis of their built environments and the art forms that inhabited them. The most fundamental question raised is how did the emergence of the centralized Angevin crown, the same force that willed the end of Muslim Lucera and its subsequent reconstruction, affect architectural production as well as the dissemination of artistic styles throughout the kingdom? In addition, what was the relationship between arts on a smaller
scale, many examples of which were “imported” from regional artistic centers, and buildings, which largely were vernacular constructions? This dissertation argues that the links between political centralization, building production, and artistic circulation within the Angevin South were inextricable. It reaches three fundamental conclusions: the development of an Angevin state meant that a large population of visible religious and ethnic minorities at Lucera was seen as detrimental to political, social, and cultural consolidation, necessitating a purge; the group of outsiders was located within an economically important region of the kingdom, prompting an immediate reconstruction to complete a network of urban centers that had begun three decades earlier; and the same commercial and diplomatic networks of which rebuilt Lucera formed one of the final pieces facilitated the circulation of materials, individual expertise, and art work employed to build, govern, and furnish the reconstructed city. In essence, this dissertation provides a history of the Angevin state through a detailed examination of Lucera’s art and architecture rather than providing purely monographic histories of each object.
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Units of Measurement

Length:

1 *canna* (rod) = 8 *palmi* (palms) = 2.109 meters

Weight and Volume:

1 *tomolo* = 55.32 liters = 40 kg
1 *salma* = 8 *tomoli*
1 *carro* = 36 *tomoli* (wheat) = 1900 liters = 1,440 kg
1 *carro* = 48 *tomoli* (barley)
1 *carro* = 50 *tomoli* (oats)
1 *salma* of oil = 169.3 liters

Currency:

1 *uncia* (ounce) = 30 *tari* = 600 *grani* = 3,600 *denari*
1 *ducato* = 10 *carlini* = 100 *grani* = 600 *denari*
1 *uncia* = 60 *carlini*; 1 *tari* = 2 *carlini*
1 *ducato* = 40 *celle*
1 silver *carlino* = 5 ½ *celle*

Sources:

A Note on the City’s Name

The name Lucera, or Luceria, was used consistently for the city until August 24, 1300 when the Angevin crown named the rebuilt city Civitas Sanctae Mariae, or the City of Saint Mary. Its new name did not endure, however, and the city reverted officially to Lucera in the sixteenth century while under Aragonese rule. For the sake of consistency, the name Lucera is used throughout the dissertation. Civitas Sanctae Mariae is used for emphasis only and only when discussing the Angevin urban project as rhetoric. Moreover, the English demonym Luceran is preferred to the Italian lucerino.
The Kingdom of Naples (Map: Hubert Jaillot, 1696)

The Kingdom’s Twelve Provinces

1. Terra di Lavoro (included Naples)
2. Abruzzo Ultra
3. Abruzzo Citra
4. Contado di Molise
5. Capitanata
6. Principato Ultra
7. Principato Citra
8. Basilicata
9. Terra di Bari
10. Terra D’Otranto
11. Calabria Citra (Val di Crati)
12. Calabria Ultra (Terra Giordana)
Introduction

On August 15, 1300, the Feast of the Assumption, troops loyal to the Angevin King of Naples Charles II departed from their nearby fortress and entered Luceria sarracenorum, or Lucera of the Saracens, a city in the Northern Apulia region of Italy that for the past seventy years had been home to thousands of Muslims from Sicily and Malta. By August 24, the Feast of Saint Bartholomew, most of the city’s residents had been killed or sent to southern Italy’s port cities to be sold into slavery.

Lucera holds a unique place within late medieval histories of Italy, the Mediterranean region as a whole, colonialism, and the treatment of minorities. The only known permanent Muslim settlement on the Italian peninsula, it prospered under its founder, Frederick II, and continued to do so for three decades under the successive Angevin kings. Its place within Italian, Mediterranean, and European landscapes ended abruptly, however, when the crown swiftly, and by all surviving accounts unexpectedly, purged the city in an event that continues to spark scholarly debate.

Most historians have been concerned with the motivations behind Luceria sarracenorum’s destruction. As an historian of art and architecture I am focusing on its reconstruction, and more specifically examining how both events were intimately related to each other. Plans immediately were put into place to erase all evidence of a Muslim settlement, and within a year after its destruction the crown had taken dramatic steps to repopulate and rebuild the city. The Angevin king ordered Lucera’s central mosque destroyed and built in its place a new cathedral dedicated to the Virgin. The city’s name officially changed from Lucera of the Saracens to Civitas Sanctae Mariae, the City of Saint
Mary. Christian refugees from Calabria, Catalan merchants, Angevin courtiers and administrators, and the Dominican, Franciscan, Augustinian, and Celestinian orders all were invited to settle the rebuilding city. In addition, an annual market fair was instituted for every fall. Finally, the city was declared royal property and its church was given privileges that made it one of the most wealthy and powerful within the Kingdom.

This dissertation examines the development of Christian Lucera during its first half-century, framing the event within the contexts of Angevin art works and architectural production. As a prominent royal city built during the maturity of Angevin rule, its reconstruction serves as an ideal case study for examining how the crown approached the construction of buildings, the production of space, and the use and circulation of art in cities outside of its capital. I argue that architectural building and art making, not to mention *Luceria sarracenorum’s* destruction, were linked inextricably to the rise of an Angevin state.

In sum, this particular political and social reality affected most outcomes within the crown’s urban projects. My thesis differs from other examinations of Angevin architecture and the destruction of Lucera, in particular those that frame its production within a weak, poor, and demoralized crown. The history that I will recount is one of a state coming together rather than one falling apart at the seams.

Like the reconstruction of Lucera as a whole, the city’s visual landscapes are signs of much wider movements. As a result, the history of the Regno, or at least particular aspects of its political, social, and cultural economies, can be read through these buildings and the objects that inhabited them. Both the presence of these monuments as well as the history of their productions speak to the larger phenomena under which they were created.
Lucera’s medieval buildings and Angevin architecture as a whole have been deeply understudied by scholars. Following nineteenth- and early twentieth-century examinations by a number of scholars, three German—Heinrich Wilhelm Schulz, Eduard Sthamer, and Arthur Haseloff—and two French, Camille Enlart and Émile Bertaux, a nearly century-long lull settled over book-length studies of the region with the exception of Arnold Venditti’s long essay of 1969 published in volume three of Storia di Napoli. Only in 2004 with the publication of Caroline Bruzelius’s magisterial The Stones of Naples were the buildings of the kingdom examined in relation to each other. While providing to date the most comprehensive study of buildings within the Angevin capital and beyond, Bruzelius outlined a curious phenomenon among the crown’s architectural products. She argued that whereas the first Angevin king, Charles I of Anjou, the youngest brother of Louis IX of France, had attempted to build elaborate “French Gothic” monuments within his new kingdom, the buildings of successor kings Charles II and Robert of Anjou—including those at rebuilt Lucera and works such as the cathedral of Naples—noticeably were more sedate, more austere, and more vernacular, that is culturally and geographically specific, than those of the first king. As Jill Caskey noted, the architectural style of the kingdom’s later kings contrasted greatly with the small-scale objects they commissioned, such as sumptuous

---


metalwork, but also paintings, manuscripts, and sculptured works. Some of these objects, including the metalwork, evoked the crown’s “Frenchness,” or at least its French and Capetian origins, while others displayed cosmopolitan flair that revealed the role of the Kingdom’s capital Naples as a site of interregional exchange, court patronage, and as the art historian Nicolas Bock has argued, an arbiter of taste.

A number of the peninsula’s greatest artists, including the painters Giotto, Pietro Cavallini, Simone Martini, and the Sienese sculptor Tino di Camaino, all spent time in the capital as court artists. Moreover, derivations of their work spread quickly to the Kingdom’s other cities and regions including Amalfi, Bari, L’Aquila, and Lucera. What was the source of this aesthetic disconnection between the buildings constructed and the objects housed inside of them?

Bruzelius argued that a number of factors sparked a shift toward architectural austerity. These included the influence of a new mendicant spirituality (her study focuses exclusively on church architecture within the Kingdom), a lack of workers and poor materials, an all-around dismal economic situation caused by a war against the Aragonese crown over the island of Sicily, and an attempt on the part of Angevin rulers to appear less

---


... colonial in their impact on the built environment. She maintained that these factors led to forms that neither were intended, nor capable of being read as exclusively “French” or its supposed stylistic marker, the “Gothic.” As Bruzelius revealed in the title of one of her many important essays on the subject, Angevin architecture on a whole has been regarded as “not Gothic enough,” especially when considering the relationship between the buildings, the objects housed within them, and the French Capetian patrons who built them.

This work approaches the issue from a different set of perspectives. Employing a number of theoretical and methodological models, including the idea of the medieval building as a stage setting proposed by the archaeologist Matthew Johnson, the creation of social space pioneered by Henri Lefebvre, recent revisionist studies on southern Italian economic history, and an increased emphasis on the study of the building process by medieval architectural historians, I argue that Lucera’s destruction, its reconstruction, the use of vernacular architectural forms, and the presence of more “courtly” artworks within the walls of its “austere” buildings all were the product of the emerging state. Because of the

---


integrative tenor of the argument, this dissertation analyzes the social and political history of the Angevin kingdom and rebuilt Lucera within its examination of buildings and art. As will be revealed in the pages that follow, all of these phenomena represent increased regional integration, consolidation, and centralization through an effective bureaucracy that created cities quickly and maintained the road and sea networks that connected them effectively. The implications are two-fold for Lucera and the kingdom as a whole. Buildings were constructed rapidly and efficiently because architecture served as a sign of presence rather than any specific symbolic form, and art objects, or “court styles” cultivated by invited or homegrown artists within Naples disseminated quickly throughout a remarkably mobile region. The same cause, increased centralization and integration, created two different, yet complimentary aesthetic effects when framed within the contexts of production. Both can be attributed to the birth of an Angevin state. This realization, however, has been buried underneath the weight of two historiographical traditions, in particular, that continue to impact scholarship on the subject.

1. The Kingdom of Naples and the Angevin Crown

The Kingdom of Naples, the *Regno*, or the “Kingdom of Sicily” as it was called officially during the Middle Ages, comprised at its peak all of what now is considered mainland southern Italy plus the island of Sicily and parts of southern Lazio. The kingdom was created in 1130 by the Norman Roger II, and from its earliest inception was marked by comparatively high levels of centralization, consolidation, and bureaucratization. In the field of architecture, this is seen most evidently by the extensive program of castellation throughout the kingdom that created outposts for military support against rebellious barons as well as visible symbols of Norman Administration.

The solidification of organized power and institutions only increased under the successor to Norman rule, the German emperor Frederick II. On September 1, 1231 the monarch established the Constitutions of Melfi (*Liber Augustalis*), a set of legal codes that addressed public and private law as well as judicial procedure. The codes organized all sectors of society, and through its bureaucratization of the kingdom created an increasingly powerful administrative class. Many of these individuals studied at the University of Naples, Europe’s oldest “secular” university that was established in 1224 specifically to groom bureaucrats. The level of political and social organization established through the codes has led to much scholarly agreement that the Kingdom was one of Europe’s earliest states, if not

---

9 Mainland southern Italy, termed “Il Mezzogiorno” in Italy, encompasses the contemporary administrative regions of Abruzzo, Basilicata, Campania, Calabria, Apulia, and Molise.

in the complete modern manifestation that developed centuries later. Because of this, this dissertation often will refer to the Kingdom as a state in a sign of its territorial consolidation and the remarkably high degree of organized administrative and power structures within its borders. It by no means attempts to equate the political situation of the Regno with modern states, however.

The Angevin kings adopted many of the administrative changes made during Hohenstaufen rule, and even added to them. In fact, the continuity between certain aspects of Hohenstaufen and Angevin rule serves as a major theme not only in this work, but also in most studies dedicated to this particular period in Italian history. However, an apparent discord toward the visual signs of old Hohenstaufen rule, the roots of which most likely are tied to the new Angevin crown’s battle for legitimacy, affected on a large scale the survival of outward examples of Swabian presence. Angevin purges targeted specifically Hohenstaufen visual cultures, populations or persons loyal to the old regime, and even the names of cities. The eradication of these aspects of old rule by the Angevins and the retention of the more structural elements reveals that new crown was concerned, in particular, with altering the aesthetics of kingship within the Regno. This is no more apparent than in the destruction and reconstruction of Lucera, but also is evident in the urban histories of other cities examined here such as Manfredonia.

The Angevin crown’s first king, Charles of Anjou (1226-1285), the Count of Provence, Anjou, and Maine and the youngest sibling of King Louis IX of France performed the conquest of the Regno. Upon permission from his older brother, in 1263 Charles accepted the French pope Urban IV’s (born Jacques Pantaléon of Troyes) offer to conquer
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the Kingdom that by then was ruled by Frederick II’s illegitimate son Manfred. Under the terms of the agreement, Charles would rule the Regno as a papal fief, a status that legally remained unchanged even if the relationship between future popes and the Angevin kings appeared less and less feudal with time. The arrangement did, however, create a strong bond between the two institutions, as the Angevin crown became the champion of the Guelf cause in Italy. Angevin interests and papal interests at times, therefore, appear indistinguishable.

In one of many examples of this complex relationship, agents of the church, both bishops and mendicants, played a role well beyond the pastoral in the rebuilding and re-Christianization of Lucera. Within the Kingdom, church and state became fused at levels rarely seen in previous centuries, particularly in southern Italy.¹²

Charles, already a Roman senator since 1263, was crowned King of Naples on January 6, 1266 in the papal capital. The following month, on February 26, 1266, the Angevin king defeated and killed the Hohenstaufen ruler Manfred in the Battle of Benevento, thereby conquering the kingdom. Two years later on August 23, 1268, the Angevin king defeated residual insurgents led by Manfred’s nephew Conradin in the battle of Tagliacozzo.

¹² R.I. Moore argued that this fusion is a characteristic of many European polities during the period. It forms a primary element of what he called the “persecuting society,” or the rise in the persecution of religious and social minorities during the later Middle Ages. Moore argued that the phenomenon occurred when church and organized territories came together in Europe to create a universal community based within common Christian orthodoxy as well as the organizational structure of new centralized territories. The creation of a common identity inevitably required the creation of “others,” a group the historian argues was marginalized within institutionalized frameworks rather than from popular movements as previously suggested. See R.I. Moore, The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Power and Deviance in Western Europe, 2nd ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007). For arguments concerning late medieval majority-minority relations grounded on similar premises, see David Abulafia, “Monarchs and Minorities in the Christian Western Mediterranean around 1300: Lucera and its Analogues,” in Mediterranean Encounters: Economics, Religious, Political, 1100-1550 (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 2000); and Suzanne Conklin Akbari, Idols in the East: European Representations of Islam and the Orient, 1100-1450 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009). Moore’s basic thesis of the fusion of “church” and “state” during the later Middle Ages also guides a 2006 volume dedicated to the “secular” use of churches during the late Middle Ages. See Paul Trio and Marjan De Smet, eds., The Use and Abuse of Sacred Places in Late Medieval Towns (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2006).
some fifty kilometers from the town of L’Aquila.\textsuperscript{13} In an effort to deter further rebellion, the new king found Conradin guilty of treason and on October 29, 1268 ordered the Hohenstaufen heir beheaded in Naples.\textsuperscript{14}

The Angevin monarchs of interests for this study are Charles I, who reigned from 1266 until his death in 1285, his heir Charles II, king from 1285 to 1309, and Robert of Anjou, the third son of Charles II and King of Naples from 1309 to 1343. It was under these three kings that Lucera entered the Angevin domain first as a Muslim settlement, was destroyed, and then subsequently rebuilt and re-Christianized. Framing this dissertation within the reigns of these three rulers is necessary also because they often have been described as disjointed (at least Charles I from the latter two) in their artistic and architectural endeavors. The castles, two Cistercian monasteries, and private chapels built by Charles I often are viewed in contrast to the cathedrals and mendicant foundations sponsored by the latter two kings. As will be revealed, however, the building aims between the first Angevin king and his heirs hardly can be described as discontinuous, particularly after applying the methods of reading architecture described in the following sections.

2. The ‘Southern Question’ and the Kingdom of Naples

This dissertation on Lucera and its place within Angevin art and architectural economies contributes to a recent increase in the study of southern Italy. The region long has


been shut out from the histories of Europe—whether of art, politics, or societies—because of its perceived backwardness. However, a surge of scholars on the wave of post-colonial studies have begun to re-examine and challenge accepted conclusions about the region that have impacted scholarship since at least the second half of the nineteenth century. The roots of the so-called “southern question” (*questione meridionale*), a catchall employed to describe the South’s modern economic and social retardation, can be traced to the periods around Italian Unification, and in particular to the 1860s and 1870s. Anxious about their place within “Europe,” a club that included nation-states such as England, France, and eventually Germany, northern Italian bourgeoisie portrayed their southern countrymen in text and art as backward, uncivilized, and altogether separate from the more industrialized North.¹⁵

A problem for revisionist historians is that the South’s lack of growth, indeed a real issue by the time of Unification, was projected backward. Most nineteenth- and early twenty-century writers sought the historical origins of the South’s troubles, and located them within the Middle Ages.¹⁶ For these writers, the advent of territorial consolidation and the centralization of power begun under the Normans effectively drained the region of ancient resources, of any sense of communal liberties, and of any semblance of a proper (read *bourgeoisie*) social order.¹⁷ These perceived origins only were compounded within the

---

¹⁵ The political party “Lega Nord” (“Northern League”) spearheads this attitude today. At times the party has called for the succession of Northern Italy, which it defines as all of northern peninsular Italy to the southern borders of Tuscany, Umbria, and Marche. On the roots of the “southern question,” see Nelson Moe, *The View from Vesuvius: Italian Culture and the Southern Question* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Lucy Riall, “Which Road to the South? Revisionists Revisit the Mezzogiorno,” *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 5, no. 1 (2000), 89-100; and Sakellariou, 2-40.

¹⁶ Sakellariou, 12.

¹⁷ This perceived lack of liberty within the South contributed to Pierangelo Schiera’s argument that the North’s communes served as the true cradle of the modern state versus the *Regno* or the papal territories. See Schiera, S22-S23. On the perceived destruction of the southern bourgeoisie, see Benedetto Croce, *History of the Kingdom of Naples*, trans. Frances Frenaye (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), 15-16. For a discussion of Croce interpretation of the “southern question,” see Sakellariou, 11-12; and S.R. Epstein, *An Island for Itself: Economic Development and Social Change in Late Medieval Sicily* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 4.
historiography with the rise after the Second World War of developmental economics, a field that gave birth to the concept of dual economies or “center-periphery” models. This is the theory that states small industrial regions rely on receiving raw materials from large, but perpetually backward agricultural sectors. This later theoretical development, a Marxist analysis of contemporary relationships between first world nations, developing countries, and the ruling elite of the developing nations, again was projected anachronistically onto late medieval Italy when a number of studies revealed that some southern raw materials in fact were sent to Florence in the “North” during Angevin rule. A one-to-one ratio, therefore, was established between the Global South’s relationships with modern industrialized nations and late medieval southern Italy’s relationship with its northern, “modern,” allies. From this, the Regno and its population firmly have been placed on the periphery of most historical models that emphasize a “center.”

As Jill Caskey has noted, the development of the “southern question” coincided with the professionalization of art history, itself a symptom of nationalism. This has meant that the art and architecture of the South either has been shut out totally from narratives, or that it has been viewed as provincial in relation to the artistic “centers” it purportedly mimicked. Rarely has Angevin art production been studied on its own terms or examined with consideration of local concerns or conditions. This especially is the case for the crown’s buildings, whose formal austerity has been attributed in part on a poor economic situation spurred by the crown’s loss of Sicily after the Vespers Rebellion and ensuing war (1282-

---

18 Sakellariou, 14.
20 Caskey, Art and Patronage, 16-18 and 60-67.
Unsurprisingly, the historiography of the “southern question” has traced the roots of the region’s ills to the very same events.\textsuperscript{21}

The inextricability of southernist historiographies and the evaluation of Angevin artistic canon means that when one is re-evaluated, the other should follow. This is one of the primary goals of the present study, as it relies in part on revisionist histories of the South as an interpretative model for the creation, circulation, and reception of Angevin art and architecture. By far the most work on re-envisioning late medieval southern Italy has been done in the field of economic history. There, scholars such as S.R. Epstein and Eleni Sakellariou have presented the South as far more dynamic, commercially robust, and economically prosperous than previously accepted. The bases of their studies rely on two premises. The first is that long distance (today, international) trade, the kind addressed in modern dual economic theories and that which has led to the South’s labeling as economically peripheral, long has been overemphasized in studies. Both have maintained that local and regional trade, i.e. commercial exchange within the Regno, was the much larger, although less well documented, percentage of economic activities.\textsuperscript{22} Second, in total opposition to traditional southern historiographies that have equated political control with social and economic degradation, both Epstein and Sakellariou have argued that territorial consolidation and political centralization facilitated regional market integration by lowering transport costs, enforcing contract agreements, weakening the monopolies of once “autonomous” urban centers over the countryside, and stimulating the circulation of labor and new technologies.\textsuperscript{23} For them, it indeed was the strong arm of the monarchs and their administrative classes who fostered, rather than hindered the economic vitality of the

\textsuperscript{21} Epstein, \textit{An Island for Itself}, 5; and Sakellariou, 11.
\textsuperscript{22} Epstein, \textit{Freedom and Growth}, 4; and Sakellariou, 37-38.
\textsuperscript{23} S.R. Epstein, \textit{Freedom and Growth}, 69; and Sakellariou, 4
kingdom by making exchange between cities easier. They hold that the common economic community forced upon the populations from the top down in the end was more beneficial to the growth of the kingdom than independent, isolated markets.

Epstein’s and Sakellariou’s arguments are of interest in particular to art and architectural historians because of their emphasis on cities. Their revised economic histories rely on cities as the centers of commerce, regional exchange, and integration. Unsurprisingly, the Regno was one of the most urbanized regions in Europe, and the crown, through its fostering of political and economic integration, maintained the land transportation networks that connected these cities. Also unsurprising in light of these revisionist analyses is that the Kingdom experienced a relatively flat urban hierarchy, a reality that separated it from most other urbanized regions dominated by a single large metropolis. No single mega urban center dominated as Naples later would in the seventeenth century. The Regno’s capital was one of four large cities that counted populations between 20,000 and 34,000 souls, and a host of other secondary cities counted populations between 10,000 and 20,000. These figures speak in direct contrast to the southernist writers who argued that the capital sucked the country dry.

Because of this wider context, to speak of Angevin art and architecture is to speak of art and architecture within cities. Few known or surviving Angevin works exist outside of its urban settlements. I argue even that Angevin fortress construction was a type of city

---

24 At this point, Naples was the second largest city in Europe after Paris. It is during this period that historians like Epstein and Sakellariou have argued the South began its degradation. See Birgitte Marin, “Town and Country in the Kingdom of Naples, 1500-1800,” in Town and Country in Europe, 1300-1800, ed. S.R. Epstein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 321.

25 Naples’s population at the turn of the fourteenth century, including the surrounding towns counted in its census, has been estimated at 31,000 to 34,000. The other largest cities, all along the Adriatic coast in Apulia, were Barletta with an estimated population of 25,000, Trani with 21,000, and Bitonto with 20,000. See Sakellariou, 95; and Epstein, Freedom and Growth, 90-91.

26 The exceptions are the two Cistercian abbeys that were built to commemorate military victories.
architecture, as the purposes of these complexes were not solely defensive, an assertion that will be explained more fully in the following section and chapter. Moreover, Angevin art and architecture must be viewed within the context of cities that were constructed rapidly and directed under a centralized administration, and the physical integration of those cities and their populations through the mechanisms supported by the crown.\textsuperscript{27} This affected the form Angevin-commissioned buildings took and the smaller-scale objects that inhabited them. The picture of cities within the \textit{Regno} drawn by Epstein and Sakellariou is dynamic, fluid, but also authoritarian. These all are conditions that affected the production and circulation of Angevin forms as well.

3. Toward a New Iconography of Architecture at Lucera

Running parallel to the historiographical issues specific to Southern Italy are those of a more general concern to art and architectural historians, namely the methodologies employed to examine how medieval buildings were “read” over time. The overwhelming influence on this topic has been Richard Krautheimer, who in 1942 published two essays that advanced his theories on how architecture bore meaning.\textsuperscript{28} The first established the concept of an “Iconography of Architecture,” which since then has become a hermeneutic tool of indispensable value for many histories of medieval architecture. According to Krautheimer, most medieval buildings in Europe essentially were copies; their individual forms referenced an understood prototype whose emulation was the goal. His theory relied overwhelmingly

\textsuperscript{27} At least nine cities, including Naples, either were rebuilt extensively or constructed \textit{ex novo}, adding to a dense network of regional centers.

on a reading of the architectural plan; and his two most classic examples were centrally planned churches and basilical forms with projecting transepts. For Krautheimer, all churches within the former group, whether circular or octagonal, were intended to evoke to the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem. Basilicas with transepts, on the other hand, conjured the late antique, early Christian basilicas of Saint Peter’s and Saint Paul’s in Rome. This second group formed the subject of his companion article on a “Carolingian Revival.” In that work, he argued that the use of the form went through periods of decline and resurgence corresponding to political, social, and cultural events of “Roman Revival.” For him, the forms, which to the viewer always evoked Rome, were brushed off and employed whenever an individual or group sought to evoke the memory of the emperor Constantine’s support for Christianity.

As just noted, Krautheimer’s influence has been extensive. Of particular importance to the study of Lucera, an architectural historian of near equal authority, Robert Branner, advanced Krautheimer’s core ideas into new contexts and employed them within the examination of a single historical period and a single great individual. In his study of Capetian “court” art and architecture, Branner argued not only that a distinctive architectural aesthetic was cultivated during the rule of Louis IX of France, but also that the aesthetic was so recognizable as a sign of the king and his reign that patrons outside of the court adopted the style.²⁹ Branner’s thesis holds as much weight in the most recent studies of Angevin architecture because it integrated even more so than Krautheimer’s theory specific historical, social, and political contexts within his analyses of disseminated architectural forms. For

---

Branner, one specific individual, Louis IX, and his much admired rule over his territories led to the spread of the style through both disseminations from Paris as well as appropriations from afar of the capital. Indeed, Bruzelius’s work on the Angevin crown’s churches and its “influence” on architectural projects by the aristocracy reads as positioned theoretically directly between Krautheimer and Branner. For her, the court architecture of the Regno mimicked that of its Capetian relatives in terms of its impact and recognizability on the southern Italian landscape. Aesthetically and more importantly symbolically, however, it eschewed the Rayonnant forms of Paris for the “reform minded” buildings of Krautheimer’s Roman basilicas and mendicant churches of the North.

The works of all three authors—Krautheimer, Branner, and Bruzelius—are admirable, and their emphases on the circulation and reception of architectural forms is shared by this study. As argued previously, the very organizational structure of the Regno allowed for the circulation of people, materials, and art described in numerous studies as “courtly,” or derivative of the court.30 Certain images, most especially the crown’s heraldry, certainly could have been read as “Angevin,” “Capetian,” or “courtly” within the kingdom’s cultural, political, and social economies. As evidence reveals, these objects were disseminated throughout the kingdom. This study differs from those earlier works, however, in the restrictions it places on what viewers could “read” through the crown’s buildings.

The methodological steps away from these earlier analyses are numerous, but at its core this study rejects the notion inherent in all of these arguments: that is that most, if not all, medieval buildings could be understood as conceptually “whole.”31 The basis of this is a

30 See, for example, Bologna, I pittori; Leone de Castris, Arte di Corte; Caskey, Art and Patronage, 195-242; and Caskey, “The Look of Liturgy,” 108-129.
31 Marvin Trachtenberg has argued that Alberti’s theoretical idea of architectural “authorship” introduced the topos of a conceptually whole building. See Marvin Trachtenberg, “Building Outside Time in Alberti’s “De re
reinsertion into the building histories the myriad of individuals who built these buildings, used these buildings, and thought about these buildings. In this sense the analysis of Angevin forms is much more democratic than works that promote a definite “meaning” of architectural form, which recent studies have rejected in consideration of the number of human factors involved throughout the life of a building. A spate of recent scholarly work, including one essay by Bruzelius, have emphasized the process, often lengthy, of building during the Middle Ages and its effect on the limits of constructing iconographies.32 One particular aspect uncovered in some of these essays is the imprecise language used by patrons when commissioning works. This reveals that formal decisions often were made at “lower levels” of the production line.33 Formal wholeness and stylistic cohesion as interpreted within the historiography, then, appears not to have been the priority. Moreover, other studies, including an entire volume dedicated to the subject, have shown how medieval church spaces were used for multiple purposes, including religious, legal, and political.34 With this new scholarship in mind the formal whole of buildings no longer can be conceived as bearing a single coherent message. Rather, most medieval buildings should be read as a collection of parts, each comprising their own “messages.” This leads to a much more rich reading of architecture, particularly in regard to examining competitive or cooperative agencies, even if it denies the historian the theory of a grand scheme. At best it allows a reading of the building as a sign of what I call presence—of the crown in particular for the Angevin south—and in the words of the archaeologist Matthew Johnson as a “stage setting”

33 See, in particular, Davis, “Guidelines: The Bishop’s Garden”; and Johnson, 11.
34 Trio and De Smet, eds., The Use and Abuse of Sacred Places.
where the lives and identities of individuals “played out.” As he noted, when the identities of the protagonists who inhabited these buildings changed, so did the meaning of medieval spaces even if the form went unaltered.

This study of Angevin Lucera, then, reinserts individuals back into an analysis of forms. It examines the relationship between royal patrons and building administrators, between administrators and workers, and between workers and the land from which they drew materials. The main thrust of these issues will be considered through an analysis of building forms as well as the rich contents of the Angevin chancellery registers that survive in reference to Lucera and other sites outside of the capital. Understanding the relationships between the individuals who ordered, who constructed, and who used these buildings are the most valuable insights gathered from an examination of the architectural sites. In the end, they reveal that the true purpose of architecture within the Angevin realm was as a sign of presence and as a sign of permanence on the part of the crown. Secondarily, they serve as signs of a crown who could build “by remote control” in an indication of its control over the entire region. For those who forgot, the sumptuous cosmopolitan and up-to-date art that filled its churches as well as an all-important semiotic marker, the Angevin arms,

35 Johnson, 3.
36 Ibid.
37 The chancellery registers, the most extensive collection of late medieval royal documents in Europe, are the copies of all the letters, diplomas, and mandates issued by and in the name of the Angevin Kings. They are one of the single greatest feats of Angevin centralization, bureaucratization, and administration. While much of the Angevin archives were destroyed during the Second World War, work continues on their restoration. Moreover, much of chancellery documents that pertained to Lucera and construction projects had been published in collections prior to the Second World War. They include those volumes edited by Stahmer, Schulz, and Pietro Egidi, ed. Codice diplomatico dei saraceni di Lucera (Naples: Stab. Tip. L. Pierro, 1917). On the structure of the Cancelleria, see Andreas Kiesewetter, “La cancelleria angioina,” in L’État Angevin: pouvoir, culture et société entre XIIIe et XIVe siècle (Rome: L’École française de Rome, 1998), 361-415. On the chancellery registers as a sign in and of themselves of Angevin centralization, see Dunbabin, Charles of Anjou, 23.
38 Franklin Toker originally used this phrase to describe a late medieval patron or site director’ ability to dictate construction without physical involvement during building. Means of communication he cited included early examples of architectural plans and building contracts, such as the illustrated contract for the Sansedoni Palace in Siena dated to 1340. See Franklin Toker, “Gothic Architecture by Remote Control: An Illustrated Building Contract of 1340,” The Art Bulletin 67, no. 1 (March 1985), 67-95.
reminded the viewer quickly that the building was a product of a crown that had figured out how to project its dominion over all of its lands.

4. Outline of Chapters

Chapter one examines the history of the Muslim settlement of Lucera, *Luceria sarracenorum*, from its establishment during the second quarter of the thirteenth century to its destruction and purge in 1300. The chapter serves as the foundation for the entire dissertation, as its second half re-evaluates the steadily debated question of motivation behind the city’s destruction. Turning away from interpretations rooted in the historiographical traditions of the “southern question,” specifically that the settlement was destroyed and liquidated for short term financial gain, I argue in accordance with historians such as David Abulafia and R.I. Moore that the settlement’s destruction must be viewed instead within the prisms of state control and the effect of emerging centralized states on the fate of Europe’s minorities. For as long as the Angevin crown had been in possession of the settlement, Lucera’s Muslims were defined as property of the king. Legally, the crown merely liquidated its assets when destroying the city. This by far is the most historically jarring act of state control involving Lucera. However, it must be viewed only as the beginning of a policy of control and consolidation involving the city. Once declared a “royal city,” many of the same actors involved in Lucera’s destruction, including the knight Giovanni Pipino, as well as many of the same mechanisms and networks employed during the Muslim settlement’s purge were involved in its reconstruction and rebranding. Both *Luceria sarracenorum*’s destruction and *Civitas Sanctae Mariae*’s construction truly were
two sides of the same force (one negative, the other positive) that pushed for improved regional integration within the Kingdom.

The next three chapters each use the texts of royal orders given during the early months of Lucera’s re-construction as contexts for examining the art, architectural, and institutional priorities for Lucera and comparative urban centers. Chapter two focuses specifically on the construction and furnishing of Lucera’s cathedral, a building declared a palatine chapel from its conception. Through an examination of the form and Angevin texts, the chapter examines all known building stages, including the procurement of materials and funds, and also analyses the completed built form and the surviving fourteenth-century objects found inside of it. The first half of the chapter is concerned mostly with how the two elements of architectural form and small-scale art object relate, especially in light of the formal disjuncture expressed previously. The second part re-examines the life and career of Pierre d’Angicourt, a Frenchman and the so-called “prothomagister operum curie” for the realm. Referred continuously throughout the historiography as an “architect” of the realm, including the architect of Lucera’s cathedral, I argue through a close re-examination of the building documents and the Angevin administrative class as a whole that the Frenchman certainly was present at many Angevin building sites, but that his duties were more of a bureaucratic nature than design or construction. In fact, in this re-examination he emerges merely as the most well known, and perhaps the most powerful, of countless Angevin clerks, notaries, and courtiers who organized and directed the crown’s building sites. In most cases these sites were composed of royal bureaucrats with seemingly little to no practical building knowledge, and local builders pulled from areas rarely beyond the confines of provincial borders. This realization has profound implications for how the crown’s buildings should be
read, and explains beyond the poverty argument why vernacular architecture was the mode for most Angevin buildings.

The third chapter examines the religious orders and the buildings they constructed in the rebuilt city. Lucera is unique for a city of its size because the three largest mendicant orders—the Dominicans, the Franciscans, and the Augustinians—were invited to build foundations within the city immediately after the purge. In addition, the Celestinian order, which recently had gained Angevin patronage through the crown’s ties to its founder Pope Celestine V, operated within the city. This was a level of saturation reserved generally only for much larger cities, although it was not unusual for Angevin urban projects. Here, as in other Angevin towns the orders were active, rather than reactive, agents for the crown during reconstruction. Using this context as a framework, I examine their built environments—in all cases the surviving churches, which display the same traits of vernacular building styles combined with circulated “moveable” arts as that found within the cathedral. In sum, these buildings, rather built directly by the crown or not, look so much like Lucera’s cathedral not because Lucera’s cathedral evoked some sort of “mendicant spirituality,” but because they were constructed under similar conditions, aims, and expectations within a centralized structure. For both the mendicants and the crown, the biggest priority for architecture was presence. “Symbolic meaning through specific forms” in these buildings has been more of a burden for their historiographies.

Chapter four places the rebuilding of Lucera, the construction of its institutions and buildings, and the circulation of art objects, into larger Angevin contexts by examining
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comparative Angevin urban projects at L’Aquila in Abruzzo, Manfredonia in Apulia, and Cittaducale in Lazio (once part of Abruzzo). All four cities were connected to each other by the so-called “via degli Abruzzi,” the Regno’s superhighway that linked Naples to its allies in Florence, its ports on the Adriatic, and all points in between through a branch that ran north-south along the Apennines and east-west across the peninsula. The crown engaged in intense urban restructuring along this transport corridor. However, the cities rarely have been discussed in relation to one another and even less frequently have their buildings been discussed within the same forum. The reasons are the two historiographical traditions addressed previously. Angevin urban projects rarely have been viewed as interrelated, a symptom of southernist historiographies, and the buildings across all four landscapes share little formally. What will be revealed during the chapter, however, is that the process for building and art circulation at these other new towns shared much in common with Lucera. This comparison shows that rebuilt Lucera, Civitas Sanctae Mariae, not only formed part of an urban network hitherto understudied by historians, but that its construction followed an Angevin model perfected by the beginning of the fourteenth century.

The fifth and final chapter forms its own part to the dissertation, as it is the one section to focus primarily on an aspect of Lucera’s art and architecture diachronically. Its subject is the statue of Santa Maria Patrona, a portable wooden statue of the Virgin and Child known in other parts of the European world as a Sedes sapientiae, or a Throne of Wisdom. Currently the statue forms the center of celebrations occurring every August 15 that commemorate the purge of Muslim Lucera. This festival proclaims that on the night of August 15, 1300, the knight Giovanni Pipino processed around the recently purged city the wooden statue that had been present within the city since its freedom from iconoclastic
Byzantium in the eighth century. The statue, however, is much later in date than the eighth century, bears Gothic formal qualities, and in fact is a product of artistic “modernization” and regional circulation under a consolidated Angevin kingdom (similar examples can be found in other cities along the “via degli Abruzzi”). This has created a verifiable tension between the statue as an actual Angevin art object and the statue as the center of an Angevin commemorative cult. As in the overall issues pertaining to the study of the Angevin south, contemporary accounts of the cult and *ex post facto* historical inventions have fused. This chapter unravels those two separate strands of discourse to identify when the Angevin art object stopped being Angevin in the effort to support a pro-Angevin cult. In this sense, the life of the *Patrona* statue is representative of the historiographical fusions, elisions, and confusions that have affected on such a monumental scale our understanding of Angevin visual economies.
Part I

Chapter 1

*Luceria sarracenorum*

This chapter examines the history of the Muslim settlement at Lucera, referred throughout Angevin diplomas as *Luceria sarracenorum* (Lucera of the Saracens). Forced to relocate to the city by the emperor Frederick II following rebellions in Sicily and Malta, Lucera’s Muslims lived in the geographically strategic and economically important Apulian city from roughly the third decade of the thirteenth century until the destruction of the settlement on the Feast of the Assumption, August 15, 1300. During that period they served as farmers, soldiers, merchants, and artisans, all at the pleasure of Hohenstaufen crown and succeeding Angevin kings of southern Italy. Legally these settlers were referred to as *servi camerae*, or servants of the royal chamber (treasury), a status that made them possessions of the crown. This allowed the Hohenstaufen emperor and later the Angevin kings to exact huge tax sums from the settlers. It also granted the Angevin crown legal license to purge *Luceria sarracenorum* and sell its inhabitants and their goods during the liquidation of the settlement.40

This dissertation is concerned specifically with how and why Lucera was rebuilt, and more generally with understanding the process of constructing medieval urban landscapes. However, analyzing the beginnings, workings, and ultimate destruction of the proceeding Muslim settlement is essential to understanding why Angevin rulers placed so much effort into immediately reconstructing and resettling the city. In turn, understanding Muslim
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Lucera’s destruction relies on examining Civitas Sanctae Mariae’s reconstruction. This method of examining both phases of the city’s history in relation to each other has yet to be employed, as studies on the Muslim settlement rarely examine activities after the liquidation of the colony, and works on the rebuilding of the city often rely uncritically on those same studies for their “histories” of the settlement’s beginning, middle, and end. It is clear, however, that the debate about the motivations for the purge of Luceria sarracenorum argued in many of those histories is far from settled. Scholars have continued to grapple with the reasons for the settlement’s destruction, especially when considering its economic importance derived from valuable agricultural output (wheat, wine, and oil were all major products of the settlement and surrounding farmlands) and the huge amount of tax the Angevin crown was able to collect from its inhabitants. The early twentieth-century historian Pietro Egidi argued that the destruction of the settlement—and more importantly the liquidation of its settlers and their goods—was predicated on short-term financial gain in the face of an increasingly expensive war against the Aragonese crown in Sicily. Egidi’s argument went unchallenged largely for much of the century, as did scholarly consensus on the Kingdom’s reported financial woes. More recent studies have challenged these conclusions, however, first on the basis that the crown’s finances were not as dire as often reported, and second on the assumption that the costs of Lucera’s immediate reconstruction—complete with the insertion of a number of royal institutions that shaped the city as a sort of an alter Neapolis—far outweighed any sum gained for the settlement’s destruction. The latter argument, put forth by the historian David Abulafia, reveals most
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42 Abulafia, “Monarchs and Minorities,” 234-263.
explicitly the need to study *Luceria sarracenorum*’s destruction and *Civitas Sanctae Mariae*’s reconstruction in conjunction with one another.

The concluding sections of this chapter do just that. Setting up the following three chapters devoted specifically to the mechanics of rebuilding and relying in part on the conclusions raised first by Abulafia, I argue that the motivations for *Luceria sarracenorum*’s destruction were far more complex than historians have concluded. These motivations involved not only economic concerns, but the economy’s inextricable links with religious, political, and social concerns as well. Rebuilt *Civitas Sanctae Mariae* reveals as such. When viewed within the larger context of Angevin city building and regional consolidation examined in chapter 4, rebuilt Christian Lucera appears to have held much of the same strategic and commercial importance as *Luceria sarracenorum*. In fact, the one major difference between the two cities was that Muslims inhabited the thirteenth-century settlement, whereas the fourteenth-century city was held up as a bastion of Christianity. Through their actions the Angevin crown also re-founded a city that earlier had been viewed as the epitome of heretical Hohenstaufen leadership. The emphasis on demographic shift rather than a total change in the “function” of the city reveals that Lucera’s destruction, which led to its nearly immediate reconstruction, was more about perception than financial exigencies or even religious, cultural, and ethnic hatred in and of itself. This comes across most clearly in one of the Angevin crown’s first acts, the changing of the city’s name from *Luceria sarracenorum*, a city “inhabited” by Saracens, to *Civitas Sanctae Mariae*, a city now “owned” by the Virgin Mary. The effect was intentional, and reveals that the crown was invested keenly in rebranding cities for political gain even if their statuses within the commercial, political, and geographic economies of the kingdom remained the same after
regime change. These conclusions for the destruction of Lucera lead us to reconsider a
number of issues within larger studies of the period, most especially the relationship between
religious polemic and political actions. What, indeed, was religion in the Middle Ages and
what was its role within late medieval societies?

1. The Resettlement of Sicily’s Muslims

Rising 219 meters on a hill approximately 250 kilometers from Rome and twenty
from the contemporary provincial capital Foggia, Lucera sits in a dominant position
overlooking the vast Tavoliere di Puglia plain bound by the Subappennines, Gargano
promontory, and Adriatic Sea (fig. 1–1). It is this geographic position—which allows it not
only to keep watch over all its neighbors, but also places it within one of the most fertile
areas on the Italian peninsula—that has made the city continuously inhabited and contested
since the Neolithic period. Record of Lucera’s strategic importance dates to as early as the
fourth century BCE when it became a Roman garrison against the Samnites, according to the
first-century BCE/CE historian Livy. The city remained important strategically from that
period until Italian unification, passing through the hands of a number of ruling groups that
included Lombards, Normans, Hohenstaufen, Angevin, Spanish, and French (fig. 1–2).

The city’s strategic position, and its location within the breadbasket of Italy, led
Frederick II to transport thousands of Muslims from Sicily and Malta to Lucera, employing

43 On Lucera’s early history, see Carlo Carletti, “Lucera paleocristiana: la documentazione epigrafica,” in Storia
e arte nella Daunia medioevale, ed. Giovanni Fallani (Foggia: Leone Editrice, 1985), 31-38; Giuliano Volpe,
ed. San Giusto: la villa, le ecclesiae. Prima risultati dagli scavi nel sito rurale di San Giusto (Lucera): 1995-
1997 (Bari: Edipuglia, 1998); Giorgio Otranto, “Due epistole di papa Gelasio I (492-496) sulla comunità
cristiana di Lucera,” Vettero Christianorum 14 (1977), 123-137; Michele Fuiano, Economia rurale e società in
Puglia nel medioevo (Naples: Ligouri Editori, 1978), 46; and Vitina Tafuri, “Note di epigrafia paleocristiana
pugliese,” in Studi di memoria di P. Adiuto Pugignani (Cassano Murge: Ecumenica Editrice, 1975), 47-56.
them primarily as auxiliary soldiers and farmers. Sent to Lucera beginning in the first half of the 1220s as a result of a Muslim uprising in Sicily fought since the end of the twelfth century, relocation to the city held two outcomes according to most historians. First, it alienated the kingdom’s Muslims from religious brethren in other parts of the Mediterranean. Second, it repopulated an area that was important to the crown strategically, but to this point hostile to Hohenstaufen rulers. In addition, the architectural historian Nunzio Tomaiuoli has
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45 James M. Powell, David Abulafia, and Alex Metcalfe have shown that the Muslim rebellion formed part of a larger Sicilian movement against the island’s new German rulers that only compounded for the Muslim population dissatisfaction stemming from the Norman King William II’s decision to grant extensive estates to the Cathedral of Monreale. This act had placed most Muslims in Sicily under ecclesiastical lordship, bringing an end to a relative autonomy enjoyed since the late eleventh century. Powell argued that it was not religious tensions per se, but regional factionalism and the position of Sicily’s Muslims within the middle of the larger Sicilian conflict that led to the deportations. Alex Metcalfe has noted that the Muslim rebellion in Sicily is just one example of Sicily’s (and later Lucera’s) Muslims caught in the middle of political battles during the Norman, Hohenstaufen, and Angevin periods. While divided by religion, Muslim and Christian populations in Sicily were linked by their hatred of the Swabian crown. For example, a letter written around 1194 by an anonymous author to the treasurer of the church of Palermo lamented that Christians and Muslims were unable to work together against their common hatred of the Hohenstaufen. In addition, the island’s Muslims do appear on occasion to have found Christian allies in their fight against the Hohenstaufen. An account taken from the Chronicle of Alberic (1232-1252) reveals that Sicily’s Muslims forged an alliance with the merchants of Genoa and Marseilles, who also had been hurt by Frederick’s confirmation of grants and privileges to Monreale. Surviving Genoese notarial and diplomatic materials that reveal tense relations between the maritime republic and Sicily during the period partly support this account. Military campaigns against Sicily’s Muslims were fought from 1222-1224 and 1243-1246, who during Frederick II’s infancy had created a statelet of their own at Entella and Iato. The deportations from the island began in 1224, although they continued until the final elements of the Muslim rebellions were suppressed in November of 1246. Muslim captives were sent first from Iato to Palermo, then on to Lucera. Metcalfe has noted that the relative absence of archaeological finds around Iato relating to objects of daily life suggests that the deportations to Lucera were organized, orderly, and that most of the population took their belongings with them. On the history of the rebellion, see, “A Letter Concerning the Sicilian Tragedy to Peter, Treasurer of the Church of Palermo,” in History of the Tyrants of Sicily by ‘Hugo Falconus,’ 1154-69, trans. Graham A. Loud and Thomas Wiedemann (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), 252-264; Alex Metcalfe, The Muslims of Medieval Italy (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), 285; David Abulafia, “The Last Muslims in Italy,” Dante Studies 125 (2007), 273; James M. Powell, “Frederick II and the Rebellion of the Muslims of Sicily, 1200-1224,” in Crusades, the Kingdom of Sicily, and the Mediterranean (Ashgate: Ashgate, Variorum, 2007); and Julie Anne Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy: the Settlement at Lucera (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2005), 70. 46 Smaller numbers of Muslims were sent to other locations, including Girofalcò in Calabria and Acerenza in Basilicata. Egidi argued that the area immediately around Lucera by 1220 was exhausted and empty of people while untrustworthy and inconsistent barons dominated neighboring cities. He argued that the settlement of the Muslim population at Lucera, in effect, placed a large number of loyal subjects in the area, although when and how Sicily’s Muslims switched from rebellious to loyal subjects has never been adequately explained. Taylor argued that the Muslim settlement was part of a greater program of resettling northern Apulia. This included the resettlement of nearby Foggia, where Frederick II built a palace in 1223. See Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 39. For the deportations, see Fridericii II historia diplomatica (HDFS), ed. Jean-Louis-Alphonse Huillard-Bréholles (Paris: Henricus Plon, 1852-1861), 1:626; Pietro Egidi, “La colonia sarracena di Lucera e la sua distruzione,” Archivio storico per le province napoletane 36 (1911), 604; Alex Metcalfe, The Muslims of
offered further explanations for the choice to settle Sicily’s Muslims specifically at Lucera. He posited that Lucera’s Roman and early medieval urban imprint, partly intact but somewhat depopulated as a result of centuries of fighting over the city, was the one position within the region able to accommodate a large influx of people and also offer an abundance of building material. In this instance Tomaiuoli partly relies on the work of the early twentieth-century historian, Pietro Egidi, whose history of the Muslim settlement remains the most thorough and cited. Egidi suggested that Lucera’s Roman historical imprint was appealing both pragmatically and ideologically to the German emperor. In addition to its readily available building material, the historian argued that the city’s Roman heritage enticed Frederick II, who in other cases had founded or recast settlements and cities with Roman-inspired names such as Augusta, Cesarea, and L’Aquila. Here, Egidi appears to use partly as evidence for this ideological charge an inscription (fig. 1–3) that now survives only as a replica on the city’s southern gate, the Porta Troia. Connecting thirteenth-century Lucera’s resurgence to its ancient past, the text reads:

SAMNITVM VRBS FVERAM CONDAM LVCERIA CLARA ET BENEVENTANI CONSORS DITISSIMA REGNI DIRVIT IRATVS CONSTANTIVS AT FRIDERICVS SVRGERE ME JVSSIT PVLCRAM FECITQVE POTENTEM
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48 See Egidi, Archivio storico per le province napoletane 36 (1911), 604-605; and Taylor, Muslims of Medieval Sicily, 40. For Frederick II’s interest in the antique not only in art, but also in the sciences, laws, and literature, see Arnold Esch, “Friedrich II. und die Antike,” in Friedrich II: Tagung des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom im Gedenkjahr 1994, eds. Arnold Esch and Norbert Kamp (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1996), 201-234.
49 Ernesto Pontieri, “Lucera sveva-angioina: riflessioni intorno a un momento della sua storia,” Atti della Accademia Pontaniana XVII (1968), 5. See also Haseloff, Architettura, 99. The inscription translates approximately as “(I) the bright city (of) Lucera had been built (by) the Samnites and shared in the most rich Kingdom of Benevento (and) was destroyed by the angered Constantius but Frederick ordered me risen and made me beautiful and powerful.”
While similar inscriptions tied to the emperor survive in places such as his palace in nearby Foggia and the castle of Cesarea, a number of others bearing similar language were invented during the sixteenth century in efforts to revitalize Hohenstaufen history. Combined with the fact that the original no longer survives, Lucera’s inscription on the Porta Troia may fall into this latter category. If this is the case, evidence of a conscious Roman revival cease, and Frederick II’s choice to resettle Sicily’s Muslims at Lucera may have been overwhelmingly more pragmatic than romantic.

Important questions still remain concerning the number of settlers deported to Lucera, the number of individuals who lived within and around the city before the Muslim presence, and how the city’s physical plant both before and during Hohenstaufen rule. Figures from medieval chroniclers concerning the number of Muslims deported to Lucera range from a few thousand to hundreds of thousands, often reflecting deep and varied ideological motivations. For example, the *Chronicon ignoti monachi cisterciensis S. Mariae de Ferraria*, written between 1228 and 1250, placed the number of Muslim residents at 15,000, while Ricordano Malaspini’s history of Florence (ca. 1281) placed the number at 130,000. The Muslim chronicler Ar Ruman reported to the Ayyubid Caliph al-Malik al-Kamil I Nasir ad-Din (1218-1238) that 170,000 Muslims inhabited the city. The Florentine Chronicler Giovanni Villani (ca. 1348) reported that around 100,000 Muslim souls lived in the city and that 20,000 were soldiers. Matthew Paris (1240-1253) reported around 60,000 Muslims in the city (“Erant autem infideles in ipsa Luceria plus quam LX milia”) but Riccardo da San Germano (died ca. 1243), author of a chronicle of Southern Italy
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50 Taylor noted that the Frederick’s palace at Foggia bore an inscription that read: “Sic Caesar fieri iussit opus istum Protomagister Bartholomeus sic construxit illud Hoc fieri iussit fredericus Caesar ut urbs sit Fogia regalis sedes inclita imperialis.” See Taylor, *Muslims in Medieval Italy*, 40.
from 1189 to 1243, reported a much more modest figure of 10,000 Muslim inhabitants not just in Lucera, but all along the Adriatic coast ("De Luceria apud Ravennam vadunt X milia sarracenit"). While Lucera certainly was a large city—one of the largest, if not the largest in the region of Capitanata—modern scholars argue against the most inflated figures. Egidi noted that in the early twentieth century Lucera’s population stood at around 16,600. He added that seven hundred years earlier half of the city’s land would have been dedicated to agriculture and that no building would have been taller than two stories. Based on these premises, the historian placed the figure of medieval inhabitants at no more than 40,000. Ernesto Pontieri, writing in the late 1960s, noted that a figure of around 60,000 was an exaggeration given the continuous dwindling of the Muslim population in Sicily since the Norman invasion due to conversions, emigration, and death from rebellions. Today, most scholars place the number of deported Muslims between 15,000 and 30,000. This relies partly on Egidi’s accounting of approximately 10,000 individuals arrested during the 1300 suppression of the settlement.

While Frederick II’s serendipitous discovery of a city that was strategically important, agriculturally abundant, ideologically useful, and deserted most likely is an exaggeration, thirteenth-century Lucera does appear to have been a city much smaller and less illustrious than its Roman imprint. The capital of a Lombard gastaldia, or a royal demesne, armies of Byzantine emperor Constans II destroyed Lucera in 663. Its history for
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51 Egidi reported all of these figures. See Egidi, Archivio storico per le province napoletane 36 (1911), 623-624.
52 Ibid., 624.
53 Pontieri, 8.
54 See Egidi, Archivio storico per le province napoletane 38 (1913), 703. Taylor put the number of inhabitants at between 15,000 to 20,000 while Abulafia noted that 15,000 to 30,000 Muslims inhabited Lucera. See Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 41; David Abulafia, “La caduta di Lucera Saracenorum,” in Per la storia del mezzogiorno medievale e moderna: studi in memoria di Jole Mazzoleni (Rome: Ministero per i beni culturali e ambientali, Ufficio centrale per i beni archivistici, 1998), 1:172; and Abulafia, “Monarchs and Minorities,” 235.
the next four centuries is unclear, although the city changed hands between Lombard and Byzantine rulers on several occasions before eventually falling more securely to the Byzantines at the end of the tenth century. Rebuilt Byzantine Lucera, however, does appear to have been constructed on a much smaller scale than Roman and Lombard settlements. The city then fell under Norman rule following the Hauteville consolidation of southern Italy, and passing references to the city’s contribution to the first crusade survive from the end of the eleventh century. This suggests that a sizeable population did, in fact, live within the city before Muslim resettlement. By this point, however, much of the land in and around the city was owned by a number of powerful Benedictine monasteries, including those of Santa Sofia in Benevento, Santissima Trinità in Venosa, Santa Maria of Montevergine, and Santissima Trinità at Cava dei Tirereni. Frederick II seized some of these lands during the resettlement of Muslims, and an Angevin diploma from July 25, 1300 noted that the emperor had compensated some of these monasteries for land lost during Muslim resettlement. Other landowners, however, were allowed to retain their properties and employed Muslim farmers to tend to crops.

Documents housed at one of the monasteries previously mentioned also provide the best indications of Lucera’s urban landscape right before Muslim resettlement. Eleventh-century sources now housed in the archive of the monastery at Cava dei Tirreni reveal some,  
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57 Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 41.

58 CDSL, no. 306 (July 25, 1300). The Angevin diploma notes that knowledge of land compensation under Frederick II stemmed from documenta puplica stored at Lucera’s Hohenstaufen palace.

59 Taylor, 41; and Martin, 801-803.
although fragmentary, details about the city’s form. For example, the city’s main piazza was called the *platea pubblica*. It contained tanks and pits to stow crops, as well as a market.\(^{60}\)

The city also contained a cathedral and parish churches, a tax office, and houses.\(^{61}\)

Architectural details, however, unfortunately are lost.

---

### 2. Hohenstaufen and Saracen Lucera.

The Muslims settled Lucera beginning in the 1220s were granted a degree of autonomy within the city that included the freedom to practice Islam openly.

Moreover, no surviving evidence suggests that the city’s Muslims were required to wear particular dress as Jewish populations within the *Regno* were required under Hohenstaufen and later Angevin rulers.\(^{62}\) Based on surviving textual sources, most settlers continued to bear Arabic names and speak their mother tongue (fig. 1–4).\(^{63}\)

However, a letter from Pope Gregory IX to Frederick dated August 1233 suggests
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\(^{60}\) Taylor, 35; and Tomaiuoli, 103.


\(^{62}\) Taylor noted that despite continuing to practice Islam, evidence of a tavern within the city and vineyards owned by wealthy Muslim farmers suggests that alcohol was consumed (or that Christians lived in the city). She showed that some pigs were raised, too. However, it is unknown how much of the livestock and grapes were sold and how much, if any, was used for personal consumption. For this matter, see Taylor, “Muslim-Christian Relations in Medieval Southern Italy,” *The Muslim World* 97 (April 2007), 194; and Taylor, *Muslims in Medieval Italy*, 68.

\(^{63}\) According to Giuseppe Staccioli and Mario Cassar, most Lucerans bore Arabic names similar to those found in Sicilian documents from the Norman period. Derivations of some of these names continue to survive with some frequency within the region and other areas of southern Italy. See Giuseppe Staccioli and Mario Cassar, “The Muslim Settlement of *Lucera sarracenorum* (Lucera) – Life and Dispersion as Outlined by Onomastic Evidence,” (working paper, University of Malta, 2012), 5, http://malta.academia.edu/MarioCassar/Papers/99106/The_Muslim_Settlement_of_Luceria_Sarracenorum_Lucera_. See also Staccioli and Cassar, 5-11, for a list of over 250 Arabic names in Lucera from notarial records compiled by Egidi. On North African genetic legacies in Lucera, which compare to levels found in Sicily and the Iberian peninsula, see Christian Capelli, et al., “Moors and Saracens in Europe: Estimating the Medieval North African Male Legacy in Southern Europe,” *European Journal of Human Genetics* 17, no. 6 (June 2009), 848-852.
that some spoke Italian as well. Muslim leaders called _alchadi (qadi)_ handled internal affairs involving the Muslim population and performed tasks that included ruling on disputes within the settlement and during Angevin rule procuring Muslim workers for construction projects. In its ability to self-rule the Muslim settlement was defined as a _universitas_, a term used within southern Italy from the Middle Ages through the eighteenth century to denote a community that was self-administered by local statutes. However, despite their relative autonomy within the city, freedom of movement beyond Lucera appears to have been reserved only for a select few. These individuals included merchants, powerful residents, farmers whose tracts were located beyond the walls, and settlers needed for royal projects elsewhere.

Royal diplomas, later chroniclers, and surviving architectural fragments give some, although quite incomplete indications of the urban fabric at Hohenstaufen Lucera. In 1233 Frederick II began to fortify the city with walls. Combining the
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_HDFS_ 4:452. Pope Gregory’s letter to Frederick dated August 27th, 1233 that pleads with the emperor to accept Dominicans sent to Lucera to convert the population speaks of the “Sarracenis qui Capitanate Nuceriam incolunt et italicum idioma non mediocriter ut fertur intilligunt.”

For example, on September of 1275, the crown requested that the Muslim _milites_ Ricardo and Leone as well as two other Muslims of Lucera called Gayecto Madio and Lamuto procure “…magistros fabricators, operarios manipulo et personas alias necessaries…” for the construction of the city’s fortress. See Riccardo Filangieri, ed., _I registri della Cancelleria angioina_ (Naples: L’Accademia, 1950-), vol. 13, reg. 70, no. 40; and Shamer, vol 1, doc. 136. See also Taylor, _Muslims in Medieval Italy_, 86.

_Universitates_ (in Italian _università_) differed from hamlets, for instance, which depended on a neighboring city or village for administration. The term continued to be used in southern Italy until it was replaced by the term “commune” under Napoleonic rule. See Abulafia, “La caduta di Lucera Saracenorum,” 175; and Tommaso Astarita, _The Continuity of Feudal Power: The Caracciolo di Brienzo in Spanish Naples_ (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 110.

For example, Taylor argued that with the exception of a few prominent members, Lucera’s Muslims probably were not allowed to make the Hajj. See Taylor, _Muslims in Medieval Italy_, 45 and 71.


It was through a drainage pipe under the city’s walls that the Hohenstaufen apologist and chronicler Nicholas of Jamsilla argued that the Angevin king Conradin entered the settlement in 1254. The veracity of Nicholas’s claim is debatable, however, as the event follows an ancient literary topos. See Nicolò Jamsilla, _Le Gesta di Federico II imperatore e dei suoi figli Corrado e Manfredi, Re di Puglia e di Sicilia_, trans. Francesco de Rosa.
textual and archaeological fragments, Tomaiuoli argued that by the middle of the century the urban fabric stretched from the historic center of Lucera west toward the location of a new palace (fig. 1–5).\textsuperscript{70} Notarial sources from the early months of 1300 reveal that the city contained many of the amenities found in other self-sufficient medieval communities. At least three main gates controlled access to the city: the Porta Troia to the south, Porta San Giacomo to the east, and Porta Casalnuovo to the north. The \textit{via pubblica} served as Lucera’s principal road and commercial artery. It led to the city’s main piazza, which was surrounded by numerous palaces and produce shops.\textsuperscript{71} Other parts of the city contained stores where roasted fruit (\textit{fructus combuste}) and pastries were sold; smith shops; and sites for the production of tiles, bricks, vases, jars, and pots.\textsuperscript{72} Some buildings overlooked gardens and urban orchards, and one house even contained a garden where beekeeping was practiced.\textsuperscript{73} It is unknown what buildings from the Hohenstaufen period, if any, currently survive within the city. However, Caroline Bruzelius has suggested that the city’s current urban plan reflects that of the thirteenth-century Muslim settlement.\textsuperscript{74} Her assertion is reasonable, especially in consideration of Angevin diplomas from the rebuilding and re-Christianization of the city that reveal many homes that once belonged to

\textsuperscript{70} Tomaiuoli, “Lucera sveva-angioina,” 106.
\textsuperscript{71} Ibid., 107. Other streets included the \textit{via balnej}, which may have housed baths, and the \textit{ruga episcopii}, the location of the Cathedral. The exact locations of these two streets within the current city are unknown, however.
\textsuperscript{72} Ibid., 108.
\textsuperscript{73} Ibid.; and Egidi, \textit{Archivio storico per le province napoletane} 36 (1911), 624. Immediately after the purge the Angevin familiar Giovanni Minutolo of Naples received a house in Lucera confiscated from a Muslim named Boabdille with an attached garden. See \textit{CDSL,} no. 519 (August, 27, 1300), Appendix B; and chapter 2 of this dissertation.
\textsuperscript{74} Bruzelius, \textit{Stones of Naples}, 110.
Muslim settlers were given to prominent Angevin agents who resettled in the city.\textsuperscript{75} The widespread reclamation of these houses revealed in the texts suggests that many buildings within the city that were not overtly religious or symbolic of Muslim presence were reused after the purge.

Visibly Islamic monuments serving Lucera’s Muslim population included a cemetry and at least one mosque. Moreover, the settlement reportedly contained an Islamic “\textit{gymnasium},” perhaps a Qur’anic school, according to protests made by Pope Gregory IX.\textsuperscript{76} All that is known of Lucera’s mosque, however, is that it was destroyed quickly after the suppression. Writing from Anagni in August of 1301, the Angevin king Charles II ordered Lucera’s new cathedral to be built over the site “where once the profane rite of the Synagogue of the condemned prince Muhammad was,”\textsuperscript{77} which if accurate, reveals that the mosque was located within the center of the city.\textsuperscript{78} His statement will be analyzed more deeply in the second chapter. For now, however, it must be said that nothing is known of the mosque’s form, scale, or builders. Moreover, no mosques survive in southern Italy that possibly could offer

\textsuperscript{75} CDSL, no. 519 (June 1, 1301), Appendix B.
\textsuperscript{76} In a letter to Frederick II dated 1236, the pope accused the city’s new settlers of spoliating stones from churches in the area around Lucera for the construction of the building. Pertinent parts of the letter follow: “Et ad illud in primis quod de ecclesiis regni nostri Sicilie per ministros nostros spoliatis privilegiis, possessionibus et bonis sacris usibus deputatis ac ipsarum lapidibus ad Agarenorum gymnasia construenda translates proponitur.” See \textit{H.D.F.S.}, 4:906; and \textit{Epistolae saeculi XIII e regestis pontificum Romanorum selectae}, vol. 1, ed. Carl Rodenburg (Berlin: Weidmannos, 1883), no. 494. On the Lucera “\textit{gymnasium},” see also Taylor, \textit{Muslims in Medieval Italy}, 54 and 71; and Metcalfe, 289. Alex Metcalfe noted that no signs point to Lucera as a site of high culture or Islamic intellectualism and that the “\textit{gymnasium}” kept up some form of institutional education for minimal standards of legal competence and religious learning.
\textsuperscript{77} CDSL, no. 611 (August 20, 1301), Appendix C.
\textsuperscript{78} Pina Iaccobbe and Addolorata Ricco have tht noted the central location of the Cathedral and presumed mosque has always been important, being the site of an ancient Roman forum. In terms of its plan, the area abandons the regular grid pattern around it in favor of a radial scheme. See Pina Iaccobbe and Addolorata Ricco, “La Cattedrale di Lucera dalle origini alla metà del XIX secolo,” \textit{Puglia Daunia} 2, no. 2 (1994), 70.
any comparison. This mosque mentioned in the Angevin diplomas is the one confirmed mosque for the city. Others have been mentioned in later histories by local chroniclers, but the accuracy of their reporting brings serious doubts. For example, in his history of Lucera, the early twentieth-century historian Giambattista Gifuni argued that the chapel located within the walls of the Angevin fortress (discussed later in this chapter) was built over the ruins of a smaller mosque. His arguments were based on an inscription at the base of the chapel, discovered in 1725 and mentioned in Giambattista D’Amelj’s 1861 history of the city, which noted that Charles II built the structure over a mosque. This inscription surely is a later invention, however. Its most glaring mistake is that it attributes the construction of the chapel to Charles II. All Angevin sources that pertain to the building, however, reveal that it was built under Charles II’s predecessor and father, Charles I of Anjou.

Lucera’s palace and fortress complex west of the city center, begun by Frederick II and greatly expanded under the Angevins from 1269 to 1286, has received more scholarly attention than any other structure within Luceria sarracenorum (fig. 1–6). Eduard Sthamer’s collection of documents related to the building of the Angevin fortress (1912) and Arthur Haseloff’s analysis of those sources in conjunction with his archaeological work (1920) remain the most comprehensive studies on the site. For now though, only the Hohenstaufen palace

---

79 The only known remains of a mosque in Sicily is that at Segesta, a double-naved hypostyle preceded by a large courtyard that was built and used during the course of the twelfth century. See Alessandra Molinari, *Segesta II: Il castello e la moschea, scavi 1898-1995* (Palermo: Flaccovio Editore, 1997), esp. 95-99, 105-109.
will be analyzed. Comments on the massive expansion project under the Angevin crown will be reserved for later in this chapter.

As Taylor noted, the exact date in which the Hohenstaufen palace was constructed is uncertain. Scholars have suggested dates that range between the early 1220s and the middle of the 1230s. It is most safe, though, to follow Haseloff, who noted that the palace definitely was under construction, if not completed, by 1240. His assertions were substantiated by the one Hohenstaufen source in reference to Lucera published by Sthamer, an imperial mandate dated April 22, 1240 where an individual named Dragono, the castellan of Naples, was ordered to send stone reliefs \textit{(ymagines lapideas in galeis delatas)} to the palace of Lucera. These, presumably, were for the building’s decoration, although as later Angevin diplomas reveal (discussed in chapter 2), the request for decorative objects does not necessarily imply that the building neared completion.

The Hohenstauen palace remained relatively intact until the end of the eighteenth century when it finally succumbed to over 400 years of earthquakes,

---


82 For example, the French archaeologist Ghislaine Noyé argued that the palace was built between 1223 and 1225 while the Italian historians Pasquale Natella and Paolo Peduto suggested that the castle was built between 1233 and 1235. Tomaiuoli also posited that the structure was begun around 1233. See Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 48; and Tomaiuoli, “Lucera svevo-angioina,” 106.

83 Haseloff, Architettura sveva, 185.

84 Sthamer, vol. 1, doc. 38.
spoliation, and war. While only the walls surrounding the first level of the castle survive today, archeological and restoration work, the eighteenth-century drawings from the French architect and traveler Jean Louis Desprez (fig. 1–7, fig. 1–8, and fig. 1–9),

and the written accounts of the seventeenth-century chronicler Carlo Corrado piece together an incomplete, yet useful outline of its structure. Together, they reveal that the building was a three-story tower (called a Turmkastell by German scholars and a donjon by the French) approximately twenty meters in diameter that was built around a courtyard. A massive vaulted pyramidal gallery—presumably a defensive structure—that measured approximately fifty meters long on each side and

85 Jean Louis Desprez was sent to southern Italy by the abbot of Saint-Nom to illustrate the publication, Voyage pitoresque de Royaume de Naples et de Sicilie (Paris, 1781-86). Much of the Hohenstaufen palace and Angevin fortress complex survived during this period, only to be dismantled in the following century. On Desprez’s journey to Apulia, see Fulvia Fioreino, Viaggiatori francesi in Puglia dal Quattrocento al Settecento (Fasano: Schena Editore, 1993), 2:114-246.

86 An Italian version of Corrado’s report, found originally in a translation published in Rassegna Pugliese (1886), 216 reads: “... una forte Rocca che era una ritirata del Castello circondata entro la piazza d’un altro fosso, fatta in forma quadrata con un gran volto per ogni quadro da collocarsi 500 cavalieri, o poco meno, con sito da conservarvi le vettovaglie e le soldatesche insieme, sotto lo stesso volto. Sopra questo volto si gira una loggia ben larga, con sui parapetti, al di fuori, e con quattro torri minori per la guardia e per le sentinelle, che vi stavano di presidio, ed in mezzo a questi voltoni si erige un gran torrione quadrato intorno al quale stave 3 stanze ben grandi per fatta, ed una per ogni angolo, che facevano il numero di 16, componenti uno appartamento nobilissimo ed un altro simile di alter tante stanze sava collocate di sopra, che facevano in tutto un numero di 32 stanze regali, senza le alter comodit che vi erano e sotto e sopra questi due appartamenti, ai quali si saliva per una scala a lumaca da salirvi un Huomo solo, che dava l’ingresso dal fondo, a fianco del quartiere della cavalleria, che fino ad hogi dimostra l’antica magnificenza. Questo rocca dicono essere, al tempo antico, stata dai Romani edificata, come dinota una iscrizione he anc...

87 A form originally exclusive to England and France, Carl Arnold Willemsen noted that the Normans brought the donjon to southern Italy. Haseloff referred to the form as a pyramidenturm, and cited as examples the castles of Tertiveri and Castelfiorentino in Capitanata Termoli in Molise, Monteserico castle in Basilicata, the Tor Sapienza in Campagna Romana, and the Adernò Castle in Sicily. See Carl Arnold Willemsen, “Federico II costrutore in Puglia,” in Studi di storia pugliese in onore di Giuseppe Chiarelli, ed. Michele Paone (Galatina: Mario Congedo Editore, 1972), 531; and Haseloff, Architettura sveva, 220-221.
approximately seven and one-third meters tall surrounded the first level.\textsuperscript{88} Today, remains of the gallery’s vault and brick ribs survive (fig. 1–10) as well as restored versions of the nine arched embrasures and arrow loops that pierced each side of the base.

The two floors above the vaulted base, each approximately ten and a half meters tall, may have comprised of royal apartments.\textsuperscript{89} Each level contained sixteen rooms, totalling thirty-two in total (fig. 1–11 and fig. 1–12). In its configuration around a courtyard, Lucera’s Hohenstaufen palace shared similar spatial qualities with its better-known contemporary Castel del Monte near Andria, but its overall tower design resembled the Hohenstaufen castle at Termoli, located some seventy-five kilometers to its north and west (fig. 1–13). Built on the acropolis of the old Roman town,\textsuperscript{90} the palace at Lucera contained rubble walls faced with local brick and capped by tufa corner stones, a mode of construction also employed during the building of the Angevin fortress complex and fourteenth-century churches. In addition, local materials and antique spolia, some of which delivered from as far as

\begin{flushleft}
\small
\textsuperscript{88}According to the seventeenth-century chronicler Corrado, the gallery was able to accommodate 500 horses, archers, and provisions under its vaulted firing galleries. This number seems to be an exaggeration, however. See Haseloff, \textit{Architettura sveva}, 220-221.
\textsuperscript{89} Haseloff, \textit{Costruzione degli Hohenstaufen}, 153.
\textsuperscript{90} Archaeological excavations have revealed that Byzantine and Norman settlements also were once located at the site. This evidence is far more sound than the polemics that suggested Lucera’s cathedral once stood on the site. Gifuni and Egidi noted that a passage from the biography of pope Gregory IX (papacy 1227-1241) stated that Frederick II built the palace on the site of Lucera’s old cathedral. The emperor supposedly built a latrine over the site where the altar once stood “ubi titulus altaris extiterat, idem christianissimus Fridericus, palatii purgamenta substituit et ubi filius Dei mactabatur in ara labes hominis purgaturus, filius hominis in contumeliam Creatoris ventris immunditiam positurus accedit.” Egidi was quick to note that this was likely an invention and part of anti-imperial polemics by Guelf writers, most notably due to its similarity to the literary flourish made by Nicola da Calvi, a Franciscan bishop of Assisi (1250 to 1273) and confessor to pope Innocent IV. That Franciscan reportedly argued in his biography of pope that the Hohenstaufen emperor had built a latrine over a consecrated altar at an estate called Salzburg not far from Lucera (“In Apulia in villa que Calseburgum vocatatur, altare Domino consecratum fecit dirui et in eodem latrinas edificari.”). For the text of both polemics, see Egidi, \textit{Archivio storico per le province napoletane} 36 (1911), 627 and 627, note 1. On the polemics, see also Gifuni, 12-13.
\end{flushleft}
Castel dell’Ovo in Naples (as noted in Sthamer’s source), provided materials for construction as well as for ornament.91

Desprez’s drawings of the courtyard’s walls (fig. 1–9) reveal that the space was accessible from the ground floor through portals marked by broken arches supported by columns. Lozenge-shaped windows also are visible flanking the portal. His drawing of the second level reveals double lancet windows on each wall flanked by pairs of round windows. In addition, a cornice runs along the middle of the wall, bisecting it into two horizontal bands. The third floor, which may have been octagonal in shape, was marked by alternating sets of double lancet windows topped by single round windows and vaulted, or at least deeply-set windows marked pierced by block tracery. Details first shown in Desprez’s drawings were noted also by D’Amelj (fig. 1–14), who published in the middle of the nineteenth century a number of plates displaying details of arcades, capitals, and base profiles from the palace. D’Amelj’s prints reveal that in addition to the window details outlined in Desprez’s drawings, interlaced arcades and arches with multicolored stone bands might also have been architectural details present within the Hohenstaufen palace.92 A century after D’Amelj’s designs, Carl Willemsen’s reconstruction of the castle from 1968 included vaulted hallways around each level (fig. 1–15).

91 Even today, Lucera contains one of the largest surviving collections of Roman sculpture in southern Italy. Most of it now is contained in the civic Museum, as well as other public sites throughout the city. See Michael Greenhalgh, “Ipsa ruina docet: l’uso dell’antico nel Medioevo,” in Memoria dell’antico nell’arte italiano, ed. Salvatore Settis (Turin: Giulio Einaudi editore, 1984), 154; and Luigi Todisco, Puglia Basilicata, vol. 2 of Scultura antica e reimpiego in Italia meridionale (Bari: Edipuglia, 1994), 207 and 230-231.

92 Desprez’s drawings in general are considered accurate due to their faithfulness to structures that still survive, such as the particulars of the portal at Castelfiorentino. Haseloff described Desprez’s drawings of the portal as of “a faithfulness like a photograph.” The suggestion that Muslim sculptors may have provided some of the masonry work was made first by nineteenth-century visitors to the site, including Vincenzo del Pozzo (1859) and Benevento Colasanto (1894). See Arthur Haseloff, Costruzioni degli Hohenstaufen, 142; and Bertaux, “Les arts de l’Orient,” 428.
The use of the Hohenstaufen palace is unclear. Nineteenth century writers, notably Lucera historian Giambattista D’Amelj, cited a number of functions for the site, including a mint and a harem for the emperor.\textsuperscript{93} Others suggested that the palace also included a park populated by camels, leopards, moneys, and Arab horses.\textsuperscript{94} While evidence in fact reveals that leopards were kept at Lucera, other assertions, most especially that the castle was a harem, recently have been dismissed.\textsuperscript{95} That the site served as some sort of pleasure palace now appears to be an argument steeped in nineteenth-century orientalism.\textsuperscript{96} Moreover, no surviving evidence suggests that coins were ever minted at the palace. The palace does appear to have been frequented, on occasion, by Frederick II, however. Haseloff noted that the emperor was present at Lucera at least seven times, including twice before the completion of the palace and five times between 1240 and 1246. In addition, the archaeologist and art historian suggested that additional visits, perhaps side trips from Frederick’s more frequently recorded sojourns in nearby Foggia, may have gone unrecorded.\textsuperscript{97} Moreover, while probably not a mint, the site does appear to have played an important economic role for the settlement and perhaps the kingdom as a whole. Thirteenth-century Islamic ceramics and glassware from as far as China were discovered within the palace complex during archeological work in the 1960s.\textsuperscript{98}

\textsuperscript{93} D’Amelj, 191.
\textsuperscript{94} Haseloff, Costruzioni degli Hohenstaufen, 12.
\textsuperscript{95} Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 49. On the leopard keepers of Lucera, see Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 100-101.
\textsuperscript{96} Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 52.
\textsuperscript{97} Haseloff, Costruzioni degli Hohenstaufen, 12.
\textsuperscript{98} Objects of particular Islamic use include water vases with decorated filters, which Whitehouse argued were used exclusively by the Islamic population and disappeared from use in the area after the purge of 1300. The Chinese objects found include pieces from three objects: one edge of a basin dated to the eleventh century, fragments of a plate dating probably from the Sung Dynasty (twelfth century), and a fragment of a white porcelain basin, roughly contemporaneous to the time of the castle’s use under the Hohenstaufen. See David
Similar objects have been found at the Hohenstaufen castles in Castel Fiorentino, Bari, Gravina, and Lagopesole, which suggests that these castles were used as a marketplace, or that the Hohenstaufen crown possessed a taste for the types of wares for domestic use, or both.\textsuperscript{99} The former may be substantiated by a second class of wares discovered during archaeological work around Lucera’s palace. David Whitehouse argued that this group, a collection of clear glass chalices similar to those made in eleventh-century Corinth, was produced on site in Lucera.\textsuperscript{100} If so, the palace could have served as both a site of production and exchange for foreign and locally produced products.

The final issue on the Hohenstaufen palace worth mentioning is its location. If Tomaiuoli’s hypothesis of Muslim Lucera’s settlement under Frederick II is correct (fig. 1–5), Muslim settlers inhabited the land abutting the palace. As with the presence of exchangeable wares, the physical relationship between the Muslim settlement and the palace reveals that the royal structure was built not solely for defensive purposes or as a retreat for the emperor, but that it served as a symbol of economic integration between the settlers of Lucera, their rulers, and the surrounding area. As will be revealed below, the relationship between the later Angevin fortress

---


\textsuperscript{100} Corinth’s glass workers had been transferred to Sicily and other parts of southern Italy after Roger II destroyed the city in 1147. This suggests that at some point Muslim glass workers in Sicily may have learned the technique. See Whitehouse, “Apulia,” in \textit{La ceramica medievale nel Mediterraneo occidentale} (Florence: All’Insegna del Griglio, 1986), 573-586; and Whitehouse, “Ceramiche e vetri medioevali provenienti dal castello di Lucera,” 177-178. On the distribution of wares in southern Italy from the twelfth through the thirteenth centuries, see Whitehouse, “Note sulla ceramica dell’Italia meridionale nei secoli XII-XIV,” in \textit{La ceramica medievale di San Lorenzo Maggiore in Napoli}, eds. Maria Vittoria Fontana and Giovanna Ventroni Vassallo (Naples: Istituto universitario orientale, 1984), 417-427.
and the Muslim settlement was quite different. The Angevin crown physically separated the palace and later fortress complex from the Muslim settlement through the creation of a large moat and wide no man’s land. Lucera’s residents most likely did not misunderstand the change in tone under the Angevin rulers signaled by the shift in spatial dynamics, and neither have modern scholars. Pina Belli D’Elia argued that the Hohenstaufen palace and new Angevin fortress complex were intended to project two different messages, the former serving as a royal retreat with fortifications, while the latter was meant to serve as an imposing and unwelcoming symbol of strength and domination.\footnote{Belli D’Elia, “Dalla Luceria sarracenorum alla civitas Sanctae Mariae,” 404; and Antonio Cadei, “Federico II e Carlo I costruttori a Brindisi e Lucera,” in Le eredità normanno-sveve nell’età angioina: persistenze e mutamenti nel Mezzogiorno, ed. Giosuè Musca (Bari: Dedalo, 2004), 235-301. See also Tomaiuoli, 131.} In addition, I would add that the physical separation of castle/palace/fortress from city reveals that the economic relationship between the two areas had changed. Whereas the Hohenstaufen city plan implies in some ways collaboration between the Muslim population and the Swabian crown, the Angevin urban plan projects an economic relationship between crown and settler that appears more predatory and segregated. The lines between producer and consumer, lord and vassal, became even more pronounced, a shift that also will be revealed in the settlers’ legal status (discussed below) and ultimate purge under Angevin rule.

Most of Lucera’s settlers produced goods or served directly their Hohenstaufen and Angevin rulers. Many were farmers or shepherds and some were artisans, including tanners and textile makers, silversmiths, and arms manufacturers. These groups not only produced goods that could be exchanged, they also provided a
steady and reliable taxable group for Hohenstaufen and later Angevin rulers. Most farmers grew wheat and barley—the highest quality within the Regno—or raised livestock, including pigs, goats, sheep, and horses. Between 1239 and 1240 Frederick provided the city’s farmers a thousand head of cattle to tie them to the land. The settler’s production of commodities, as well as the strategic position of city, made Lucera a thriving commercial center. Between June 22 and July 8 of each year the city played host to one of only seven annual commercial fairs in southern Italy. This suggests also that the city was by no means cut off from outsiders. Rather, it served an important role in regional economic integration. Muslim merchants, one of the few groups allowed to leave to settlement in order to conduct business, and the small group of educated elite who served as administrators of the city, undoubtedly facilitated commercial activities both during the fair and throughout the year.

The settlers also were employed as soldiers and archers. At their greatest strength, perhaps up to a few thousand of Lucera’s Muslims served as auxiliary

---

102 Following the destruction of the settlement, saracenos artistas of arms, leather goods, and wall building were sent to Naples on Charles II’s order. See Julie Ann Taylor, “Luceria sarracenorum: Una colonia musulmana nell’Europa medievale,” Archivio Storico Pugliese 52 (1999), 235; and Bertaux, Les arts de L’Orient musulman, 420-425.

103 Scholars have questioned the social consequences of such large-scale agricultural migration. Ferdinando Maurici argued that the transfer of an entire agrarian class from Sicily to Lucera led to an unrecoverable loss of agricultural and technical knowhow on the island, while Jean-Marie Martin noted that the transfer of Sicily’s Muslims to Lucera taxed the land and resources around the settlement, increasing tension between Christians living in the area. See Jean-Marie Martin, “La colonie sarrasine de Lucera et son environnement, Quelques réflexions,” in Mediterraneo medievale: Scritti in onore di Francesco Giunta (Soveria Mannelli: Rubbettino Editore, 1989), 2:809-810; Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 19; and Taylor, Luceria sarracenorum, 12.

104 The Norman king William II had done the same in Sicily when he placed the island’s Muslims under the lordship of the church of Monreale. See Metcalfe, 287.

105 Lucera’s fair was one of seven spaced out between the first of April and the first of November. The other six were held at Sulmona, Capua, Bari, Taranto, Cosenza, and Reggio. The Angevin crown created even more, beginning in March at Gaeta, San Mauro (Basilicata), Brindisi, Sulmona, Manfredonia, Castel Petroso (Molise), and San Severo in Capitanata. See Georges Yver, Le commerce et les marchands dans l’Italie méridionale au XIIIe & au XIVe siècle (New York: Burt Franklin, 1968), 71-76.
soldiers under both Hohenstaufen and Angevin regimes. Many of these, however, may have been conscripted, and the number of professional fighters may have numbered only in the hundreds. Muslim soldiers participated in numerous theaters during the roughly eight decades of the settlement. They reportedly fought under Frederick II against the second Lombard League at Cortenuovo and Parma, and under Manfred against Charles I’s Angevin forces at San Germano and Benevento in 1266. Angevin registers attest to the importance of Lucera’s fighters as well. Archers, in particular, were recorded fighting in Achaea (Greece), Durazzo, Romania, and the Levant under Angevin condottieri.

A number of scholars, notably Jean-Marie Martin and Julie Anne Taylor, have argued that under the Angevin crown exceptional Muslim soldiers were “knighted,” forming a military class that supplanted Lucera’s aristocratic alchadi formed under the Hohenstaufen crown. Whereas military prowess may have been a means of social advancement for a few isolated occasions, such as when Robert of Artois, regent of the Kingdom from 1284 to 1289, conferred decorations in 1291 onto three Muslims of Lucera named Balduyno de Carbanò, Salem Garruyno, and Salem, son of

---

106 As Taylor has noted, the 10,000 Muslim soldiers recorded by Riccardo da San Germano appears a gross exaggeration, especially considering the settlement probably had a total population of 15,000 to 20,000. See Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 103.
107 Ibid., 103.
108 Giovanni Villani and Salimbene de Adam were among near contemporary writers who noted the contribution of Muslim archers at Benevento. See Giovanni Villani, Chronica (Florence: Magheri, 1823), book 8, chapters 6-7; and Salimbene de Adam, Chronica, ed. Giuseppe Scalia (Bari: Laterza, 1966), 2:681. Piero Pieri noted that around 4,000 Lucerans, perhaps a slightly high sum, fought at the battle of Parma. See Piero Pieri, “I saraceni di Lucera nella storia militare medievale,” Archivio storico pugliese 6 (1953), 95 and 97.
109 CDSL, no. 20 (July 26, 1289), no.191 (June 3, 1296), no. 289 (March 12, 1300), and no. 290 (March 13, 1300). See also Taylor, “Luceria sarracenorum,” 235; Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 104; and Romolo Caggese, Foggia e la Capitanata (Foggia: Claudio Grenzi Editore, 2008), 130.
110 Martin, 801; Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 92 and 104; and Taylor, “Freedom and Bondage among Muslims in Southern Italy during the Thirteenth Century,” Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs 27, no. 1 (2007), 72.
Ninabet, the assertions of these scholars as a whole appear less solid when examining Angevin sources more deeply. They appear to rest on the use of the word *miles* to describe some of these figures, most notably a Luceran named Abdelasisius (‘Abd al-‘Aziz) and another named Agedius who later converted and changed his name to Nicholas after the purge. As will be explained in more detail in the second chapter, however, the word *miles* under the Angevin crown did not imply military service *per se*. Rather, it implied knighthood earned through a variety of means—in many cases through administrative competence. Moreover, in the Angevin sources that mention Muslim soldiers proper, the word *solidatos*, or the even more specific *arcerios* (*equites* or *pedites*) is used. It appears, then, that the Hohenstaufen *alchadi*, Lucera’s administrative class, remained under the Angevins. At most, they only received a change of title.

Whether knights earned their title by the sword or the stylus, members of this high Muslim social class received many exemptions from taxes. The Angevin historian Jean Dunbabin noted that the crown used tax exemptions as a form of social and political control. Moreover, the language used by the crown’s officials in granting exemptions highlighted the social inferiority of those forced to pay tax.

Indeed, to be a Muslim in Lucera who received exemptions from taxation was even

111 CDSL, no. 58 (March 6, 1291).
112 CDSL, no. 34 (September 28, 1298), CDSL, no. 137 (March 8, 1295), CDSL, no. 162 (April 19, 1295), CDSL, no. 88 (January 16, 1293), CDSL, no. 29 (September 17, 1289), CDSL, no. 206 (July 31, 1296), CDSL, no. 347 (September 27, 1300), CDSL, 394, no. 394 (October 22, 1300), CDSL, no. 393 (October 23, 1300), CDSL, no. 397 (October 26, 1300), CDSL, no. 395 (October 22, 1300), CDSL, no. 443 (January 20, 1301). See also Taylor, *Muslims in Medieval Italy*, 102-108.
113 CDSL, no. 20 (July 26, 1289), no. 191 (June 3, 1296), no. 289 (March 12, 1300), and no. 290 (March 13, 1300).
114 Martin, 801. Some members of the class became incredibly wealthy landowners, renting from and renting to monasteries within the area. See Taylor, “Freedom and Bondage among Muslims in Southern Italy during the Thirteenth Century,” *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* 27, no. 1 (2007), 72.
115 CDSL, no. 189 (May 25, 1296).
more significant than to be an upper class Christian who received the same privilege. The tax burden for all other Muslims within the settlement was the heaviest within the Regno, and Taylor has argued that one of the reasons movement was controlled in and out of Lucera by Hohenstaufen and later Angevin rulers was so that taxes could be collected more easily. Taxes imposed were numerous and of a high rate, and included under both the Hohenstaufen and Angevins the jizya, a tax imposed on Jewish communities within the Regno as well; the terragium, a tax that collected about one-tenth of a harvest (imposed on both Christians and Muslims), the canon terrarium, a land tax imposed solely on Muslims, the gabella, an excise tax collected on Christians and Muslims, and the subventio generalis, a sort of city income tax based on the wealth and population of the community as a whole.

During the last decade of the thirteenth century the city, Lucera paid more than one sixth of the subventio generalis imposed on the region of Capitanata, despite comprising only an estimated five percent of the region. In 1294, the subventio generalis imposed on Lucera amounted to slightly less than five hundred ounces. Within the region, only five communities paid over one hundred ounces. And in the kingdom as a whole only Naples, Barletta, Trani, and Bitonto, the four largest

---

117 The Angevins offered tax exemptions for converts, although how often this was offered or how many of Lucera’s residents partook, is unknown. Taylor has noted that the Angevins discouraged the conversion of Jews by subjecting converts to property seizures. See Egidi, Archivio storico per le province napoletane 37 (1912), 670; Abulafia, “La caduta di Lucera Saracenorum,” 177; Taylor, “Freedom and Bondage,” 73-74; and Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, xviii.

118 Lucera’s Muslims were allowed to elect their own officials (eximatores) that evaluated the local harvest for tax purposes. In a letter from July 25, 1300, Charles II accused the Muslims of electing officials who underestimated local grain and barley production, cheating the crown of one tari per salma of grain. See Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 92.

119 Ibid., 74-75.

120 Ibid., A tax of 206 ounces, 5 tari, 15 grani was imposed onto Vieste; 131 ounces, 14 tari, 11 grani onto San Giovanni Rotondo; 125 ounces, 5 tari, 13 grani onto Foggia; 115 ounces onto Corneto; and 101 ounces onto Ascoli.
cities of the kingdom, paid more than Lucera. Bari, an important port city and pilgrimage center in Apulia, paid twenty fewer ounces than the Muslim settlement.

The legal justification for such steep taxation of Muslims at Lucera, their eventual enslavement after the purge, and as alluded to earlier, the relationship between Muslim producers and Christian consumers under the Angevin crown, stemmed from the Muslim’s official status as *servi camerae*, or servants of the royal chamber (treasury). A status shared with Jewish subjects and different from slavery (the term *sclavus* was used in Hohenstaufen and Angevin documents to denote slaves), servants of the royal treasury and their possessions nevertheless were considered property of the King. While earlier in Frederick’s II reign the term *servus* held different connotations, its meaning in Lucera’s context stems from Frederick’s relations with his Jewish populations in Germany. There, in 1236 the emperor brought the region’s Jews under the direct protection of the crown, a move that ensured revenues from the group would be collected by the crown and not the church. In addition, the new status physically protected Jews from blood libels and other acts of anti-Semitism.

---

121 Ibid., 75. Only Naples and Barletta, the largest cities in the Kingdom, paid significantly more at 668 ounces and 622 ounces, respectively. Trani, the third largest city in the Regno and which until the 1290s had a significant taxable Jewish population, and Bitonto, the fourth largest city in the kingdom, both paid around 500 ounces.
122 Egidi, *Archivio storico per le province napoletane* 37 (1912), 75.
123 Egidi noted that Lucera’s Muslims were also, at times, referred to as *servi fisci*, or simply *servi*. Egidi, *Archivio storico per le province napoletane* 36 (1911), 606.
124 The earliest known use of the term for a Muslim stems from a register of Frederick II in 1239-40 that mentions a man called ‘Abd Allah’ sent to learn to read and write Arabic under a master Joachim. According to Abulafia, the term in this sense was used first by Frederick in a Sicilian context to indicate Jews and Muslims part of his inner circle, and did not denote necessarily whether a person was free or slave. See Abulafia, “The Last Muslims in Sicily,” 279-280.
125 Ibid., 278. The status appears to have been applied to non-Christians in Sicily as well. A privilege issued by Frederick II in 1237 exempted a *magister* Busach, described as *iudes medicus*, *servus camera nostrae*, from taxes imposed on Jews in Palermo. Jews were given a similar status in Aragonese Tereul (1176) and Castilian Cuenca (1190).
Lucera’s Muslims certainly required the physical protection offered through Hohenstaufen rule and until 1300 by the Angevins within their new environment. Contrary to claims made by Egidi and others that Lucera was empty at the time of colonization, some Christians remained in the city and the surrounding areas, which led at times to tensions over land and revenue lost to the Muslim settlers. As noted earlier, Frederick compensated some ecclesiastical and monastic landholders, as well as local barons for land lost due to the deportations. Monasteries were given lands elsewhere and barons were given permission to collect the *terragium* tax from Muslims who farmed on their land. Nevertheless, Christians from surrounding communities on occasion robbed Lucera’s Muslims who were allowed to venture outside of the settlement, as recorded in 1295 and March of 1300 when the Angevin king Charles II was forced to intervene after Muslim merchants returning to the settlement had their goods and proceeds taken.

Lucera’s bishopric, however, appears to have been one institution that did not fare well after Muslim settlement. While some contemporary reports may have been exaggerated, Lucera’s cathedral and its clergy nevertheless were diminished greatly during the time of Muslim settlement. This is unsurprising given the fact that fewer Christians who would have supported the church financially lived in the area. For

---

126 One such incident dates to 1299 and 1300 when Christian residents from the surrounding area accused Lucera’s Muslims of burning forests around Lucera. See Abulafia, “La caduta di Lucera Saracenorum,” 177.
127 Agreements with landowners on the payment of the *terragium* from the 1290s can be found in the CDSL, no. 54 (February 3, 1291) and no. 79 (March 24, 1292). See also Taylor, *Muslims in Medieval Italy*, 41, 113-114.
128 Taylor, *Muslims in Medieval Italy*, 175-177.
129 For example, the biography of Gregory IX, the same polemical text that stated Frederick II built his palace latrine over the altar of the old cathedral, stated that the bishop was allowed to retain only twelve clergy (“Ille quidem antistes de tot milibus hominum quos christianae religio congregavit ibidem, duodecim christicolas habere permittus”). See Egidi, *Archivio storico per le province Napoletane* 36 (1911), 627, note 3.
129 CDSL no. 174 (February 25, 1296).
comparison, degraded bishoprics were also reported in medieval Spain as Christian and Muslim populations shifted.\textsuperscript{130}

A number of surviving papal diplomas suggest that anti-imperial writers were partly correct in accusing Frederick II of doing little or nothing at times to aid Lucera’s diminished church. For example, Muslims reportedly tore down the church of San Pietro in Bagno on the outskirts of Lucera in the early 1230s for building material. In a surviving letter to the emperor dated December 3, 1232, Pope Gregory IX bemoaned the destruction of the church and pleaded with Frederick to compensate for the loss.\textsuperscript{131} The pope again lamented the loss of another Christian building when four years later in September of 1236 he accused the emperor of using stones from the dilapidated cathedral to construct the city’s Muslim gymnasium.\textsuperscript{132} In a reply from November of that year Frederick pleaded ignorance and claimed that he knew of no destruction.\textsuperscript{133} He added, however, that if the cathedral had been destroyed it was because it was beyond repair. The emperor offered to help the bishop reconstruct the church, but the cathedral, both as a building and as an institution, appears to have diminished for the next six decades. Only in 1296 during Angevin rule did the church receive documented relief. Because of its poor status, the crown offered on February 25, 1296 a portion of its proceeds from financial transactions in the area to aid in the

\textsuperscript{130} Taylor, 	extit{Muslims in Medieval Italy}, 176; and Robert Ignatius Burns, 	extit{Medieval Colonialism: Postcrusade Exploitation of Islamic Valencia} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), 191.

\textsuperscript{131} Domenico Vendola, ed., 	extit{Documenti tratti dai registri vaticani, da Innocenzo III a Nicola IV} (Trani: Vecchi & C. Editori, 1940), no. 179; and \textit{Epistolae saeculi XIII}, vol. 1 no. 494.

\textsuperscript{132} \textit{Epistolae saeculi XIII}, vol. 1, no. 700. Gregory listed the spoliation of churches among a series of Church grievances against the emperor (\textit{Item de ecclesiarum lapidibus agarenorum gymnasium construuntur}). See also \textit{H.D.F.S.} 4:906 (text presented here in note 37).

\textsuperscript{133} \textit{H.D.F.S.} 4:914-923. See also Haseloff, \textit{Costruzioni degli Hohenstaufen}, 106.
upkeep of Lucera’s by then-bishop Aymardus and its clergy. This aid seemingly continued until the destruction of the Muslim settlement. On October 12, 1299 the crown threatened to penalize royal officials who were slow to distribute payments to the church.

3. Angevin Lucera

After roughly four decades of Hohenstaufen rule, Lucera passed to the control of the Angevin Charles I of Anjou, the youngest brother of the French King Louis IX, following his papal-sponsored overthrow of Fredrick’s heir Manfred in 1266. The settlement did not fall easily into French hands, however. Exploiting its strategic position and fortified walls, Hohenstaufen loyalists fighting in support of Frederick II’s grandson Conradin (executed after his defeat to Charles I at Tagliacozzo in August of 1268) secured themselves within the city. In 1268 Angevin forces laid siege to the fortified settlement protected by Hohenstaufen loyalists and the city’s Muslims for over a year until starvation forced the besieged to capitulate.

---

134 The texts promise Lucera’s bishop Aymardus funds. They also order the region’s captains, justices, bailiffs, and castellans to collect and distribute the funds to the bishop. See CDSL, no. 174 (February 25, 1296), and CDSL, no. 175, (February 25, 1296). Aymardus was made bishop of Lucera by Celestine V December 12, 1295. On his appointment, see Domenico Vendola, ed. Documenti tratti dai registri vaticani da Bonifacio VIII a Clemente V (Trani, Vecchi, 1963), 9-10.

135 CDSL, no. 271 (October 12, 1299).

136 Jean Dunbabin has argued that Christian nobles who fought against Charles after his defeat of Manfred included those who felt offended when Charles would not accept their oaths of loyalty, as well as those who anticipated a Conradin victory, especially after the ease in which he entered Rome in July of 1268. See Dunbabin, 56-57. For a detailed history of the rebellion and siege at Lucera, see Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 142-147; Haseloff, 121-124; and Joachim Göbbels, “Der Krieg Karls I. von Anjou gegen die Sarazenen von Lucera in den Jahren 1268 und 1269,” in Forschungen zur Reichs-, Pabst- und Landgeschichte: Peter Herde zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen dargebracht, eds. Karl Borchardt and Enno Brünz (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1998), 361-401.
Following the Angevin victory, Lucera’s Muslims received the heavy financial penalty of paying for the cost of the siege. Christian rebels at Lucera, on the other hand, were executed. In addition, terms of the agreement made between the crown and the city’s Muslims included the surrender of Manfred’s royal treasure stored within the city as well as massive reparatory payments counting 40,000 ounces per annum. The city’s defenses were destroyed as well. In return, Lucera’s Muslims were allowed to continue living as they did under the Hohenstaufen, including practicing Islam openly.137

Angevin policies in Lucera for the next thirty years resembled those of the Hohenstaufen due to the settlement’s continued military and economic value.138 Heavy taxation continued and under Charles I, and the use of the term servus came to mean explicitly individuals whose person and possessions belonged to the king. The settlement continued self-rule under its the status as a universitas within the kingdom, and like all other communities of its kind was governed by a municipal government that ran daily affairs and answered to the king.139 However, while Lucera’s Muslims were allowed to practice Islam freely and continue self-rule within its borders, the Angevin crown began almost immediately to alter the demographic landscape of the settlement. This was done most visibly through the construction of a new fortress

---

137 Christian communities that rebelled were fined as well, as were cities that did not provide assistance to Angevin forces during the rebellions. Dunbabin argued that Lucera’s Muslims might have been allowed to practice Islam openly, at least initially after the siege, because Charles’s 1270 alliance with the Emir of Tunis dictated that he could not mistreat the Muslims in his kingdom. See Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 150; and Dunbabin, 154.
139 Abulafia, La caduta di Lucera saracenorum, 175.
complex and the importation of Christian settlers from Provence. In effect, the phase was the crown’s first attempt to re-Christianize Lucera, and served perhaps as an experiment for the larger program to come. Taylor has noted that like the Muslims of Lucera, Provençal settlers were mostly of an agrarian class. Land incentives were granted to the new Christian settlers, and those immigrated to Lucera did so at the king’s expense. New settlers’ houses, however, were located within the fortress, perhaps to protect the population, or maybe perhaps to control their movement. In addition, over 100 sergeants and gatekeepers were stationed at the fortress in its early stages, making it the most heavily guarded fortification in Capitanata.

Construction of the fortress, which occurred approximately from 1269 to 1283, coincided with major changes to Lucera’s urban landscape. As mentioned earlier, these changes reflected the Angevin crown’s different attitude toward the Muslim settlers. The urban perimeter of the rest of the city was contracted, guaranteeing greater control and also forming the city limits that remained until the end of the nineteenth century (fig. 1–16). The parts of the settlement that fell outside of this new contracted perimeter, the western portion of the Hohenstaufen city

---

140 The importation of Provençal settlers formed part of a larger program termed by Giuseppe Galasso as “Francesizzazione, feudalizzazione, e nobilitazione,” which included the giving of land grants to approximately 700 French and Provençal aristocrats as well as chief posts within the court. Dunbabin argued that Provençals might have been recruited because they were used to the Mediterranean climate, spoke a language already familiar in the kingdom, and had lived under a similar political system in Provence. See Giuseppe Galasso, Il Regno di Napoli: Il Mezzogiorno angioina e aragonese, 1266-1494 (Turin: UTET, 1992); and Dunbabin, Charles I of Anjou, 59-63.

141 Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 155; and Letizia Penza, Le liste dei castellani del Regno di Sicilia nel lascito di Eduard Sthamer (Martina Franca: Mario Congedo Editore, 2002), 57-58.

142 Rivoire, 180.

143 However, the number of soldiers stationed at the fortress continued to dwindle throughout the century to less than thirty-five by 1299. This suggests, once again, that the fortress’s role was not exclusively as a military stronghold. On the castellans of Lucera’s fortress, see Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 153.

144 The first document that lists details on work on the castle is an order from November 6, 1273 that mentions payments of ninety-five ounces of gold to Pierre d’Angicourt and Riccardo da Foggia for the construction of the walls. See Sthamer, vol. 1 doc. 67; and Haseloff, Architettura sveva, 186.

145 Tomaiuoli, 107.
that abutted the old palace and new fortress site, appear to have been cleared, creating a roughly 600 meter-wide no man’s land between the city’s new limits and the Christian settlement housed within the fortress (fig. 1–16 and fig. 1–17). The fortress complex was declared independent of the city in Lucera’s constitutions, and more than 900 meters of towered walls, which incorporated the old Hohenstaufen palace in their design, enclosed the roughly 20,000 square meter fortress.146 Protected on its western and southern edges by a steep cliff, a deep moat was dug along the eastern edge of the complex after 1278, creating an even greater physical divide from the city. A permanent drawbridge was added in 1281 (fig. 1–18).147

Building projects, which also involved a renovation of old Hohenstaufen palace, included the construction of the surrounding walls, housing for settlers, a new palace for the Angevin court and administrators, a chapel, and a plumbing system that included the construction of a massive cistern near the Hohenstaufen palace and smaller cisterns throughout the fortress (fig. 1–19).

Construction of the walls formed the first phase of building projects (fig. 1–20, fig. 1–21, and fig. 1–22). Supported by twenty-four towers, the largest in the southeast (referred to in contemporary Angevin diplomas as the turris de leuncia but now called the torre della Regina) and northeast (referred to in contemporary diplomas as the turris de leone but now called the torre del Re) corners at twenty-five and fifteen meters tall, respectively, the massive 1.6 meter-thick brick-faced walls incorporated the northern wall of the Hohenstaufen palace (fig. 1–23 and fig. 1–24),

147 Sthamer, vol. 1, doc. 248 (July 20, 1278). See also Haseloff, Architettura sveva, 251-252; and Bruzelius, Stones of Naples, 107.
integrating the old palace within the fortress’s walls as would be done less than a
decade later during the construction of the walls and fortress of the new city of
Manfredonia (fig. 1–25). The main portal was placed along the northeast section of
the walls adjacent to the Hohenstaufen palace, facing north instead of directly east
toward to moat (fig. 1–26).

A city completely self-sufficient and independent of the Muslim settlement
was built within the safety of the walls. A second palace was among the numerous
buildings constructed at the complex. Completed by the end of 1275, the building’s
original form is unknown, as only scant remains of its foundations survive (fig. 1–27
and fig. 1–28). Nevertheless, the palace appears to have been rectangular in form,
surrounded a central courtyard, and included apartments, a hall, and a loggia within
an upper story on one side of the courtyard.148 Rooms for royal clerks and servants
most likely surrounded the other three sides of the courtyard. The Angevin castle at
Manfredonia (fig. 1–29) and Angevin additions to the Hohenstaufen castle at Bari
(fig. 1–30) share a similar configuration, and were marked at least on one side of their
courtyards by arcades of thick, squat broken arches. Unlike Manfredonia and Bari,
however, the new palace within Lucera’s fortress probably was not marked at its
corners by towers, as no traces of their foundations have been excavated, and the
building most likely was constructed of brick with tufa accents like all other
important structures within the fortress. In terms of size, surviving fragments of the
courtyard suggest that it was of similar dimensions to that at the Hohenstaufen palace
(roughly twenty meters in diameter). All other indications of its scale are now lost,
however. In addition to the new palace, a number of smaller royal buildings for

148 Sthamer, vol. 1, doc. 296 (April 5, 1279).
curial clerks also were built between 1276 and 1279, as well as a two-story house for royal guests (*hospitalis*) built after 1277.\(^{149}\)

Sixty-five houses were built inside the fortress complex and by 1280 at least 150 Christian families had settled within the fortress complex.\(^{150}\) As a result of the new Christian population, a chapel was constructed between 1276 and 1280 in the center of the fortress (fig. 1–31 and fig. 1–32).\(^{151}\) Only its foundation survives today, but the chapel remained partly intact until the eighteenth century. The chronicler Corrado’s description, Desprez’s drawings, and Angevin records indicate that it contained a single nave terminated by a vaulted trapezoidal choir topped along its nave by a trussed roof. According to Pina Belli D’Elia, it marked, along with the earlier but now destroyed chapel of the Angevin villa San Lorenzo in Pantano near Foggia, the first apparition of a “Gothic” single nave church in Apulia.\(^{152}\) According to the Corrado chronicle, the earliest mention of the chapel outside of Angevin diplomas, the walls were built of brick, evidenced by remaining fragments, and

\(^{149}\) Haseloff, *Costruzioni degli Hohenstaufen*, 264. According to Haseloff, the guesthouse contained five rooms on each of its two floors, each with its own fireplace, window, and external stairs.

\(^{150}\) Sthamer, vol. 1, doc. 343 (January 9, 1280), and Égidi, *Archivio storico per le province napoletane* 36 (1911), 651-653. Houses were built to accommodate two families. In addition to houses for settlers, a barracks, stables, a treasury, arsenal, well, mill, forge, and refectory were built within the fortress’s walls over a fourteen-year period. See Haseloff, *Architettura sveva*, 141.

\(^{151}\) Dunbabin noted that Charles I attempted to increase ecclesiastical patronage in the kingdom by building a chapel in every royal castle ministered by one of his clerical servants. See Dunbabin, *Charles I of Anjou*, 150. The chapel survived until the end of the eighteenth century. As mentioned earlier, a number of local Lucera historians argued that Charles II built the chapel over a mosque. Their attributions are inaccurate, however, considering the documentary evidence that survives showing the chapel was built during the construction of the fortress. Haseloff argued that false attribution was invented at a time when the exploits of Frederick II, Charles I, and Charles II were often confused or conflated. In addition to its incorrect attribution, local legend went even further, stating that the mosque on which the chapel was built rose over a temple of Apollo. See Gifuni, 17; and Haseloff, *Architettura sveva*, 328.

\(^{152}\) Belli D’Elia, “Dalla Luceria sarracenorum alla Civitas Sanctae Mariae,” 405. San Lorenzo was restored by Charles I. Haseloff argued that the style was brought from southern France by Pierre d’Anginour, an issue that will be dealt with more fully in chapters 2 and 3. See Bertaux, “Les Artistes française,” 96; Sthamer, vol. 1 docs. 8,11-17, and 28; Haseloff, *Architettura sveva*, 161; and Nunzio Tomaiuoli, “La Capitanata nel periodo angioina: appunti di architettura religiosa,” in *Siponto e Manfredonia nella Daunia: III Convegno in preparazione delle celebrazione per i 1500 anni dell’Apparizione di San Michele, Siponto, 11-12 marzo 1989* (Foggia: Edizioni del Golfo, 1990), 201.
reinforced at their corners by blocks of tufa (fig. 1–33). Writing in 1937, the historian Giambattista Gifuni argued that the chapel was Franciscan. However, no evidence survives that suggests the Franciscans had any spiritual, institutional, or architectural presence within Lucera’s fortress. Rather, the chapel was designated a royal chapel, as evidenced in a mandate sent in 1279 to the justiciar of Bari for wood to complete the roof, doors, and windows. The chapel is referred to continuously in this text as the *cappelle nostre* within the *fortellica nostre castre* paid for by *curie nostre*. As will be discussed in the following two chapters, similar grammar—in particular the use of the word *nostre* (our) to describe projects under Angevin patronage—was later employed in reference to the royal chapels of the church of San Nicola and Lucera cathedral.

At slightly larger than 200 square meters and located at the center of the fortress, Haseloff concluded that the chapel served both the imported Christian population and the court. This is a reasonable assertion, as works on Capetian chapels by Robert Branner and most recently by Meredith Cohen have shown that “royal” chapels often were open to the public as well. In this sense the chapel within the fortress appears to have served a dual function both a parish church and as a royal chapel, a practical arrangement considering the relatively small number of

---

153 Haseloff, *Architettura sveva*, 326. Corrado’s Latin description also connected the building stylistically to the cathedral, noting, “ecclesia non parue magnitudinis, licet hodie sine tecta, adhunc tamen integra existens, lateribus coctis, ad arcis muri similitudinem cathedralisique nostre parem erecta nobiliter conspicitur.”


155 Sthamer, vol. 1, doc. 315 (August 20, 1279).

156 Haseloff, *Construzioni degli Hohenstaufen*, 278. Royal and public use of the same chapel would not have been unusual. Meredith Cohen has recently shown that both the public and French royal court celebrated at Sainte Chapelle.

Christian settlers within the complex and the fact that the Angevin royal court was rarely in Lucera.\(^{158}\)

Like Lucera’s fourteenth-century churches discussed in the following chapters, certain aspects of the fortress’s chapel reveal that some architectural styles and motifs—especially those that were relatively portable like capitals, bases, jambs, lintels, etc.—circulated throughout the Angevin Kingdom. The Lucera historian Giambattista D’Amelj, who published an image of the chapel’s portal in 1861, argued that the composition, a simple post and lintel construction with slender, unarticulated jambs topped by an ogival tympanum, shared many similarities with the portals of Lucera’s fourteenth-century cathedral and Franciscan church (fig. 1–34, fig. 1–35, and fig. 1–36). In actuality comparisons can be drawn even more widely, incorporating as well the main portal of the late thirteenth-, early fourteenth-century church of San Domenico in Manfredonia (fig. 1–38) as well as the fourteenth-century Neapolitan portals at the churches of San Piero a Maiella, San Domenico, and Santa Maria dell’Incoronata (fig. 1–39, fig. 1–40, and fig. 1–41). Whereas the fourteenth-century portals in re-Christianized Lucera and Manfredonia incorporated a gable, a motif native to Apulia used to embellish portals as early as the late eleventh century (fig. 1–37), the basic post, lintel, and archivolt structure seen at all seven Angevin churches appears to have been introduced to the Kingdom at some early point during the dynasty’s rule. The reasons for its use and circulation, as well for the architectural similarities in general between the fortress chapel and Lucera’s later

\(^{158}\) An earlier chapel may have existed before the completion of the central fortress chapel. In 1270, Charles I sent three ounces of gold for decorations of a royal chapel administered by a chaplain called Giovanni. This is the first and last mention of the chapel, however, and if it continued to be used after the completion of the central chapel is uncertain. See Taylor, *Muslims in Medieval Italy*, 156.
Angevin structures, appear to be explicable through modes of production rather than ideology, however. This is an issue that receives deeper analysis in the following chapter.\textsuperscript{159}

Despite the efforts of the Angevin crown, the first attempt to re-Christianize Lucera appears unsuccessful. Owing perhaps to a volatile climate that included frequent seismic activity and the effects of malaria, scholars have reported that by 1280 only a small fraction remained of the 150 families that had arrived between 1274 and 1278.\textsuperscript{160} By the same year more than half of the 128 houses built for settlers had been destroyed, and the other sixty-five were in need of repairs.\textsuperscript{161} Pietro Egidi posited that most of Lucera’s early Christian settlers relocated to the nearby Apennine Mountains. He argued that as late as the early twentieth century traces of Provençal remained in local dialects.\textsuperscript{162}

4. The Destruction of *Luceria sarracenorum*

The question with which most scholars grapple remains: What occurred between the first attempts at re-Christianization in the 1270s and August 15, 1300 to propel the events of the latter date? The problem has been so vexing because the few surviving sources from this period provide little evidence that appears to stray beyond business as usual. The final moments of documented contact between the crown and

\textsuperscript{159} In fact, the architectural similarities between the chapel and later fourteenth-century buildings led Haseloff to consider pushing the date of the fortress chapel up to the early fourteenth century. Their similarities also undoubtedly strengthened the claims of the 1725 inscription, which attributed the construction of the chapel to Charles II’s defeat of the Muslim settlers in 1300. See Haseloff, *Costruzioni degli Hohenstaufen*, 280-281.

\textsuperscript{160} Bruzelius, *Stones of Naples*, 107.

\textsuperscript{161} Egidi, *Archivio storico per le province napoletane* 36 (1911), 653.

\textsuperscript{162} Ibid., 656.
the Muslim settlement occurred in the months before the destruction. One was a privilege dated June 17.\footnote{CDSL, no. 294 (June 17, 1300). The text reads: “Karolus secundus universis presentes licteras inspecturis tam presentibus quam futuris. –Fidei christianae cupientes augumentum et affectantes actencius Christi fidelium numerum adaugeri, qualibet erronee secte vel ritus pravitate destructa, de certa scientia nostra presencium tenore concedimus, pollicentes ut hii omnes et singuli de sarracenis terre nostre Lucerie, qui, profanato sue dapnate secte ac scismatis immo perfidie seu credulitatis errore, conversi fuerint et venerint ad ortodoxe Christi Jesu fidei vere cultum, sacri baptismatis et expiancium fontis lavacrum assumendi sint, serventur perpetuo, donec vivent, immunes exempti et liberi ab omni genere et specie sive modo prestacionis fiscalium munerum, subvencionum, collectarum, donorum, iurium, gabellarum, exactionum et cuiuslibet alterius hucusque consuete vel solite contribuccionis aut redditus, angarie vel tributi. Amplius concedentes ut, hiis qui nunc taliter convertentur ad fidem abeuntibus vel defunctis, filii superstites eorumdem perpetuo, donec vivent, immunitate pociantur et gaudeant a prestacione extraordinariaorum iurium, carnagii scilicet, taberne, canonicis et ciusvis alterius soliti vel antiqui, et ad ea tantummodo Curie teneantur, que teneri fideles nostris nativi seu antiqui christiani regnicole Curie nostre prestant. Ut in honorem et reverentiam Chriti Jesu, cuius inconsutile tunicam induunt et in cuius aqua fidei ac fonte baptismatis renascitur, se ad congregacionem fidelium matris Ecclesie gaudeant in amoris gratiae caritate receptos. Presentibus autem obstare nolumus quocumque mandatum, ordinacionem aliquam vel statutum per nos aut per quemcumque alium factum vel in antea faciendum, quantumvis expressum, eciam si oporteret de illo fieri de verbo ad verbum in presentibus mencionem. –Datum Neapoli, per Bartholomeum de Capua, militem, etc., die XVII iunii, XIII ind.” See also Abulafia, “La caduta di Lucera sarracenorum,” 177; and Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 177.} In it, Charles II’s granted all Muslims of the settlement who converted to Christianity exemptions from numerous taxes—both those special taxes imposed on them as Muslims and \textit{servi camerae} and those levied on the population of the kingdom as a whole. In addition, converts were given exemptions from rents. As will be revealed in the following chapter, this set of privileges shares remarkable similarities to those conferred on Christian immigrants who settled re-Christianized Lucera, but one wonders how such an offer would have been understood to Lucera’s Muslim residents. Would it have been seen as rhetoric, one of several calls to convert that occurred during the course of Christian-Muslim interaction within the \textit{Regno}?\footnote{In fact, the Angevin crown ordered the Franciscan tertiary Ramon Llull to preach to Lucera’s Muslims on February 1, 1294 (CDSL, no. 98). Three months later he the crown ordered the Franciscan to Naples to preach to Muslim prisoners held at Castel dell’Ovo (CDSL, no. 100. May 12, 1294). Taylor noted that these “compulsory” sermons to Muslims and Jews were fairly common in Spain and Italy, and on occasion conversion from the result of one led to privileges such as release from prison. See Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 174-175.} Evidence from after the destruction of the settlement suggests that conversion to Christianity did not always guarantee safety, a fact
possibly already known to the city’s residents. Another question that can be asked is whether the privilege even reached the residents of the city? It is dated only two months before the settlement’s destruction, a period of time that may not have been long enough to see the message delivered, communicated, and a response received.

The final documented contact, an order from the crown directed to the Christian captain of the city, Arnaldo of Villanova, is even more confusing considering subsequent events. On August 4, 1300, less than two weeks before the purge, the crown requested the names of all new officials ruling the settlement. Whereas this information in the end could have been used during the course of the purge, the request in itself was fairly common. In fact, this type of information was collected for every universitates within the kingdom, and served a mode of keeping track of who was administering the crown’s towns and cities. In itself, it reveals again that until the settlement’s destruction Lucera’s residents enjoyed some degree of self-rule. The question remains, however, whether the request was sent because this information typically was requested in the month of August (no information, for instance, survives that reveals when new Muslim administrators were chosen or elected) or because the crown insisted upon an updated list of the ruling class within Luceria sarracenorum in preparation for events two weeks later.

The crown acted eleven days later. Angevin forces led by trusted Angevin courtesan Giovanni Pipino began the purge of Luceria sarracenorum on the Feast of the Assumption, August 15, 1300. Muslim leaders and their families were the first to be rounded up, arrested, and sent to Naples. The remainder of the population then

---

165 Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 181-183.
was attacked and sacked. The siege lasted until August 24, the feast day of Saint Bartholomew.

Egidi noted that crown’s original plan was to redistribute the city’s Muslim population into small groups among the areas of the Regno. In September of 1300, over 5,000 Muslims and livestock were sent to Venosa in Basilicata and cities in Abruzzo and Molise. In both cases, escorting soldiers and Christian residents of surrounding communities attacked columns of Muslims, despite orders from Charles II against such acts. According to reports, thirty-three women, twenty-two children, and eight men were killed in the column heading toward Abruzzo and Molise while over 150 were killed on their way to Venosa.\footnote{CDSL no. 334 (September 13, 1300), and no. 335 (September 16, 1300). See also Egidi, \textit{Archivio storico per le province napoletane} 38 (1913), 687. The theft of Muslim goods left behind, which the crown considered royal property, as well as armed robbery along roads appears to have been a problem for at least a year after the Muslim suppression. See Taylor, \textit{Muslims in Medieval Italy}, 179-180.}

Plans to redistribute Lucera’s Muslims were abandoned early. Settlers subsequently were sold into slavery, an act justified due to their legal status as property of the king.\footnote{CDSL, no. 325 (September 8, 1300)} Large groups were sent for sale to Naples, Barletta, Bari, and Otranto.\footnote{Egidi noted that slaves were also sold in numerous other cities in Apulia and the kingdom, including Bitonto, Trani, Canosa, Andria, Ruvo, Melfi, Salerno, Pescara, and Corneto. See Egidi, \textit{Archivio storico per le province napoletane} 38 (1913), 697-698; and CDSL, nos. 322, 429, 428, 761, 458, 481, 524, 447, 791, 659, 551, 791, and 744.} In Lucera, a commission was installed by Giovanni Pipino to confiscate and sell Muslim property.\footnote{CDSL, no. 327 (September 10, 1300), and no. 328 (September 10, 1300). The commission included the royal treasurer Rainaldo Cognetti and Guglielmo de Ponciaco, Niccola da Somma, and Tommaso Scillato da Salerno, rational masters of the Gran Curia. See also Egidi. \textit{Archivio storico per le province napoletane} 38 (1913), 133.} In Bari, the treasurer of the church of San Nicola, Pierre of Angers, was appointed to sell captured Muslims and their goods.\footnote{CDSL, no. 436 (January 18, 1301), and \textit{CDSL}, no. 659 (January 13, 1302). For Pierre of Angers, see also chapter 3 of this dissertation.} In early 1301 the justice of the Terra d’Otranto was directed to sell male slaves at two ounces of
gold, artisans at three, and women and children for one ounce.\textsuperscript{171} While most of the city’s Muslims were captured, including those who had converted to Christianity, some were spared, namely a small number of elites including the \textit{milites} Abdelasisius and Agedius, now called Nicholas.\textsuperscript{172}

The exact number of captured and subsequently sold or lost from illness or the death marches is unknown. Pipino placed the number of deported Muslims around 10,000.\textsuperscript{173} Egidi accounted for 6,000 killed and captured, but estimated the number to be more than 9,500.\textsuperscript{174} Others, including those who may have escaped, have gone unrecorded.

5. Motivations for Destruction?

The ever-important question of why Lucera was destroyed, re-Christianized, and repopulated remains debated. Numerous textual sources from the Angevin court cite religious motivations. In a royal order dated September 20, 1300, Charles II admitted that the destruction was years in the making, and justified the act on account of the damages incurred on the Christian population by the Muslim presence in the

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Taylor, \textit{Muslims in Medieval Italy}, 180.}
\footnote{These two individuals were allowed to keep some of their homes and vineyards after conversion to Christianity. Agedius was allowed even to keep a home in nearby Troia for him and his heirs. Other property, including some gold and silver, was confiscated, however. They retained most of their rights and privileges undoubtedly because of their devotion to the crown and statuses as Angevin \textit{milites}. For instance, as a loyal Angevin courtier Abdelasisius reported to the crown on Muslim property due for confiscation. On the retention of rights and privileges by these Muslim elites, see \textit{CDSL}, no. 325 (September 8, 1300), no. 359 (October 10, 1300), no. 394 (October 22, 1300), no. 396 (October 23, 1300), no. 397 (October 26, 1300), no. 399 (October 28, 1300), and no. 447 (January 26, 1300). See also Taylor, \textit{Muslims in Medieval Italy}, 181-182; Taylor, \textit{“Luceria sarracenorum,”} 121; and Brian Catlos, \textit{Muslims of Medieval Latin Christendom} (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 125. On Abdelasisius’s reports on Muslim foodstuffs due for royal confiscation, see \textit{CDSL}, no. 447 (September 27, 1300), Appendix D.}
\footnote{Abulafia, “La caduta di Lucera saracenorum,” 177.}
\footnote{Egidi, \textit{Archivio storico per le province napoletane} 38 (1913), 698-703.}
\end{footnotes}
region for over seventy-five years. Egidi, however, found these texts to be of rhetorical value more than anything else, and argued that they served as a smoke screen for more economic motivations. He cited a number of royal mandates that revealed some Christian converts in Lucera were sold alongside their Muslim neighbors, and others that revealed Muslim slaves were able to buy their “redemption” in exchange for an annual payment of twelve *tari*. Concluding, the historian argued that the need to pay for the costly Vespers war resulted in the financially shortsighted decision to destroy Lucera, sell its residents into slavery, and liquidate their goods.

---

175 CDSL, no. 342. “... propter multa orrenda et detestanda christiano nomini inimica que idem sarraceni in reverenciam Dei et divine oproprium maiestatis iugiter commitebant ibidem.”

176 CDSL, nos. 460 (February 11, 1301), no 498 (April 17, 1301), no. 659 (January 13, 1302), and no. 773 (April 14, 1307).

177 Profoundly important to an understanding of southern Italian politics, or at least the historiography of southern Italy during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century, a detailed analysis of the War of Sicilian Vespers nevertheless is beyond the scope of this study. However, it began as a rebellion on March 30, 1282 against Angevin fiscal policies on the Island of Sicily, exploding into a successionary war between the Angevin and Aragonese crowns that also involved the Palaeologan dynasty and spread to parts of the Italian mainland, most especially parts of Campania, Basilicata, and Calabria, whose refugees eventually resettled Lucera. Peace finally came in 1302 with the signing of a treaty at Caltabellotta in Sicily that awarded the Italian mainland to the Angevin crown and the island of Sicily to the Aragonese. A vast number of studies exist on the period, including Michele Amari, *Un periodo delle istorie siciliane del secolo XIII* (1841; reprint, Palermo: Accademia nazionale di scienze lettere e arti di Palermo, 1988); Steven Runciman, *The Sicilian Vespers. A History of the Mediterranean World in the Later Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958); and David Abulafia, *The Western Mediterranean Kingdoms, 1200-1500* (London: Longman, 1997).

178 Egidi wrote, “insomma si va manifestando sempre più chiaramente che il primo movente dell’inumana persecuzione non è né il fanatico fervor religioso, nè la protezione dei tormentati cristiani di Puglia, nè il timor di violente ribellioni, ma il desiderio, l’angosciosa necessità del danaro, la quale spinge e cercare in ogni modo, ad ogni costo.” Egidi, *Archivio storico per le province napoletane* 38 (1913), 707. On the destruction of the colony for financial reasons, see also Bruzelius, *Stones of Naples*, 3-6, 107; and Taylor, *Muslims in Medieval Italy*, 186. In fact, some proceeds of Lucera’s destruction were used immediately to aid in the Vespers rebellion. Egidi noted that Naples and all of Terra di Lavoro (the Royal province in which Naples was located) were struck by famine and that the army of the Duke of Calabria entered Catania hungry and with no pay. On September 10, 1300 the King ordered his rationali masters in Apulia to send 3000 *salme* of grain from Lucera to Manfredonia, where it would be shipped to Catania. A further 8,000 *salme* of grain and orzo was sent to Naples and Salerno, and 20,000 *salme* of grain and orzo was sold in Troia, Foggia, Barletta, and Manfredonia. In total, the transaction numbered 30,000 *salme,* around ten million liters. Egidi noted that the Vespers rebellion cost between 32,000 and 33,000 ounces a year and estimated that in total, around 12,000 ounces (approximately 3.6 million lira in 1914) was made from the suppression of the settlement. On the sale and transport of confiscated foodstuffs, see CDSL, nos. 327-340 and no. 347 (Appendix D); and Egidi, *Archivio storico per le province napoletane* 39 (1914), 146.
Egidi’s de-emphasis of strictly religious motivations influenced later historians of Lucera. In 1935, Riccardo Bevere noted that a royal privilege dated June 27, 1302 allowed a Muslim settlement of 200 hearths to be established thirty kilometers north of Lucera at San Paolo di Civitate provided no mosque was built. He argued that the diploma served as proof that Charles II’s actions resulted from financial motivations rather than religious intolerance. Ernesto Pontieri cited the same source thirty-three years later, and concluded that religion was used to justify a much more practical need for money.

While points made by Egidi, Bevere, and Pontieri remain valid, two questions need to be considered when considering their conclusions. First, what was the tone of relations between the crown and its minorities at the turn of the fourteenth century? Second, what financial gain would have occurred through the liquidation of Luceria sarracenorum?

5.1 The Regno and its Minorities at the Turn of the Century

A host of studies from the last three decades have begun to place increased emphasis on the connection between increased political, territorial, and cultural
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180 In another diploma Bever cited, Charles’ successor Robert of Anjou charged the justices of Apulia and Capitanata to tax all Muslim men fifteen tareni in support of the fight against Ludwig the Bavarian. The notice was sent to cities including Bari, Otranto, Barletta, Manfredonia, Foggia, and Sancta Maria (Lucera), suggesting that all of these cities, or at least their surrounding communities, had some Muslim presence. He noted also that Muslim soldiers continued to be used in the campaign against Sicily, and argued that the “negotium Lucerie was merely an interruption in the continued religious tolerance of the Angevins.” See Bevere, 222-228.
181 Pontieri, 22.
consolidation, and the degradation of minority rights during the late Middle Ages. The overarching theme for most of these works is that in the creation and galvinaztion of a unified “in” group, others, or boogeymen were created to solidify the base. This was the main argument of the historian R.I. Moore, who argued that a so-called “persecuting society,” the period in European history when religious and ethnic minorities, heretics, and other undesirables were persecuted systematically, formed when the phenomenon of state building combined with the desire to form a universal community grounded in Christian orthodoxy. For Moore, the birth of the state truly served as the driving force for this new phase in Christian-minority relations.

For one, newly consolidated territories were in need of a common identity to unify once disparate populations. Moreover, the organizational structure of the state itself allowed for the actual persecutions to take place at a level of efficiency previously unseen.

Re-examining Luceria sarracenorum’s destruction with these theories in mind as well as within the contexts of the Angevin crown’s relations with the papacy and its more general rise as a state, helps illuminate the much more complex motivations for the settlement’s destruction. As in other parts of Europe, the period surrounding the destruction and re-Christianization of Lucera was marked by attempts from the popes and the Angevin kings to consolidate power and territory both within the

---


Italian peninsula and throughout the Mediterranean. Attempts at consolidation were realized through a number of methods, including a general movement to convert, persecute, or expel non-Christians and heretics. In addition, the Angevin crown and the church fought a series of campaigns against Christian leaders on the peninsula opposed to their aims of consolidation known collectively by scholars as the Italian Crusades. In short, the church used “holy wars” against Christian leaders who were political enemies. Perhaps the most well-known of all of these Italian Crusades was the Angevin conquering of the Regno itself, where Charles I, by the request of Pope Urban IV, regained for the Church the southern kingdom whose Christians reportedly had been persecuted by the heretical and excommunicate Manfred. The demise of Lucera’s Muslims can be connected to both the general trend of minority persecutions and the Italian crusades performed in part by the Angevins through their status as non-Christians and through their historic ties to the so-called heretical Hohenstaufen kings. In this sense their defeat represented multiple types of victories;

184 Modern scholars as well as contemporaries to the events have criticized the Papacy’s Italian crusades as a misuse of spiritual power for political aims and ultimately as detrimental to the crusades in the Holy Land. However, as Norman Housley has argued, the events within Italy and the Holy Land were linked inextricably in papal thinking. Papal control of the Italian peninsula reinforced its claims of temporal control throughout Christendom, a control that allowed it to defend the faith against non-Christians and heresy and administer to the spiritual needs of Christians. Moreover, popes from Innocent III to Boniface VIII argued that control of Sicily, the ultimate goal of the Italian Crusades, was imperative for victory in the Holy Land. On papal justification of the Italian crusades, see Norman Housley, The Italian Crusades: The Papal-Angevin Alliance and the Crusades against Christian Lay Powers, 1254-1343 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), esp. 35-70, 66, 93, 239; Housley, “Politics and Heresy in Italy: Anti-heretical Crusades, Orders and Confraternities, 1200-1500,” Journal of Ecclesiastical History 33, no. 2. (April 1982), 193-208; and Maureen Purcell, Papal Crusading Policy: The Chief Instruments of Papal Crusading Policy and Crusade to the Holy Land from the final Loss of Jerusalem to the Fall of Acre, 1244-1291 (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 4-20. Two contemporary sources engage in this debate: Boniface VIII’s bull Unam sanctam (1302), which relies largely on Innocent IV’s letter Cum simus from 1245 (the latter of which again was reissued by John XXII), and Dante’s response to papal grasps for temporal power, De monarchia, composed sometime between 1308 and 1318.

185 Giovanni Villani’s narration of the conquest provides the richest account of the Charles I’s journey as a holy war, although much papal correspondence beginning with Gregory IX frames the popes’ struggles with the Hohenstaufen as an affront against Christianity. In his narration of Conrad’s beheading, he refers to his being put before an Angevin kangaroo court as an inquisition, or a trial performed to determine heresy. See Villani, Chronica, book 6:88-89; and 7:1-29.
it was as politically advantageous as it was religiously exigent. Both advantages, however, appear hardly indistinguishable.

A letter from Gregory IX dated August 1233 asking Frederick II to receive Dominican missionaries at Lucera marks the earliest surviving evidence of the Church’s discomfort with the existence of the Muslim settlement at Lucera.\footnote{HDFS 4:452. “Imperialem mansuetudinem rogandam duximus et hortandam quatenus sarracenis qui Capitaneat Nucerian incolunt et italicum idioma non mediocriter ut fertur intelligunt, per tuas litteras firmiter dare debeas in mandatis ut fratres ordinis predicatorum, pacis angelos, quos ad eos cum exhortationis verbo dirigimus, in pace suscipiant, patienter audiant et prudenter iis que pro salute sua proponuntur intendant.”} The historian James Powell noted that Gregory’s emphasis on the Muslims’ ability to speak Italian well, and therefore communicate with their Christian neighbors, made the need for their conversion or seclusion all the more imperative.\footnote{Powell, “The Papacy and the Muslim Frontier,” 195.} After Gregory accused Frederick three years later of being disinterested in the conversion process, the emperor replied dismissively that one third of the Muslims had already converted.\footnote{HDFS 4:828-832. Karla Mallette noted that during the course of these conversations, Frederick argued that his support of the settlement was a service to the Church, as it isolated the Muslims during the course of their conversions. The reality, however, was that financial and political incentives led to Fredrick’s lack of motivation to convert Lucera’s Muslims. Taylor noted that Frederick may have discouraged conversion due to his ability to tax the residents at such a high rate. See Mallette, “Poetries of the Norman Courts,” in The Literature of Al-Andalus, eds. Maria Rosa Menocal, Raymond P. Scheindlin, and Michael Sells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 383; and Taylor, “Freedom and Bondage,” 73.} According to Powell, the Dominicans, charged by the pope to convert Lucera’s Muslims and also the papacy’s chief inquisitors against heresy, soon were expelled from Sicily in all likelihood because of their connection with the papacy.\footnote{James M Powell, “Frederick II and the Muslims: The Making of an Historiographical Tradition,” in The Crusades, The Kingdom of Sicily, and the Mediterranean (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 2007), 5.} By 1235 the fate of Lucera’s Muslims became tied in part to the Church’s or the Angevin crown’s political struggles within Italy between the Hohenstaufen dynasty,
Ghibelline factions, Italian noble families, and the Aragonese royals in Sicily. Most papal rhetoric against Lucera from the fourth decade of the thirteenth century to around 1268 painted the city’s Muslims as the personal foot soldiers for the Hohenstaufen dynasty’s heretical aims on the peninsula. In a sense, the relationship between the Hohenstaufen crown and Lucera’s Muslims reinforced the treachery of each group. Frederick II and later Hohenstaufen royals Manfred and Conradin were charged as heretics not only because of their attempts to cause schism through encroaching on lands reserved for the church, but also because of their support of a Muslim settlement 250 kilometers from Rome, “the geographical expression of Christianitas,” according to Housley. Contenporary accounts point to Hohenstufen disdain for the rulers’ promotion of Luceria sarracenorum. For example, Matthew Paris’s Chronica majora noted that as early as 1238 Frederick’s rivals accused the emperor of “execrably enormous heresies and blasphemies,” including being “more in consensus with the laws of Mohammad than Jesus Christ,” having Muslim concubines, and valuing alliances and friendship with Muslims more than with Christians. Moreover, a political poem in Provençal by a Genoese merchant named Calega Panzano, disparaged Frederick’s support of Lucera’s population, referring to them as “can descrezen de Nucheria” (miscreant dogs of Lucera).

After Manfred murdered Borello of Anglona, a papal agent in the Gargano Mountains near the Muslim settlement, and fled to Lucera to prepare for battle against the papacy, Alexander IV issued the bull Pia matris in May 1255 that accused Lucera’s Muslims of

190 Housley, “Italian Crusades,” 46.
192 Mallette, 33.
sheltering rebels against the church. For his part, Manfred was charged with *impium foedus*, or in alliance with an enemy of the faith, which in part justified the crusade against him. Similar crusades issued by Urban IV (1261-1264) and Clement IV (1265-1268) against Manfred mentioned his alliance with the Muslims of Lucera.

The first war framed within crusader imagery against the Muslims of Lucera specifically occurred after the city’s inhabitants rebelled against Charles I in 1268. Crusader preaching by the cardinals Eudes of Châteroux and Rodolfo Grosparmi used prophetic writings, notably examples from the Israelites and instances where God punished the kings of Israel who disobeyed his command to kill their enemies. During this period, Charles of Anjou positioned himself as a defender of the faith whose fight against the Muslims of Lucera would satisfy God, avoiding the punishment the Israelites received for not defeating the Lord’s enemies.

While the presence of Lucera’s Muslims remained a source of frustration for the papacy, most open calls for its destruction quieted after the Angevins gained complete control over the region. This suggests once again that their survival under the Angevin
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193 Christoph T. Maier, “Crusade and Rhetoric against the Muslim Settlement of Lucera: Etudes of Châteauroux’s *Sermones de rebellione sarracenorum Lucerie in Apulia*,” *Journal of Medieval History* 21 (1995), 348. Five years later Alexander would lament that the presence of Muslims in Lucera had affected the entire region and destroyed the church in Capitanata. See Vendola, *Documenti tratti dai registri vaticani, da Innocenzo III a Nicola IV*, no. 351.

194 Maier wrote that Markward of Anweiler had received the same charge by Innocent III for his alliance with Sicilian Muslims during Frederick II’s infancy, although *impium foedus* was not officially formulated in canon law until the mid thirteenth century. See Maier, 347.

195 Giovanni Villani and Matthew Paris noted that in 1258, English nobles at Parliament argued that all crusading vows to the Holy Land should be changed in order to help Henry III conquer Sicily, “which can be done with honesty because of the town of Lucera in Apulia, which is inhabited by infidels.” See Housley, *Italian Crusades*, 65.

196 Vendola, *Documenti tratti dai registri vaticani, da Innocenzo III a Nicola IV*, nos. 373-375.


198 Charles I did promise to eventually destroy the settlement, although his promise went unfulfilled. A contributing factor to his inaction may have been his alliance made in 1270 with the Emir of Tunis, which
crown rested on their relation to the crown’s political authority. Following their repayment to the Angevin crown of the costs incurred during the rebellion, life for the Muslim population appears to have continued for the most part as it had under the Hohenstaufen. Lucera’s Muslim soldiers continued to be used as auxiliary troops and the city’s agricultural production and tax base continued to be profitable for the crown. In fact, only four surviving texts dated between 1268 and 1300 make mention of the religious identity of Lucera’s residents as their core subjects. Two of these texts, one granting privileges to converted Muslims and the other inviting Ramon Llull to preach to the settlement’s residents have been alluded to earlier. Two others, both orders from the crown to Dominican inquisitors requesting that the officials hunt, retrieve, and penalize Christian heretics who were hiding within the settlement, do not speak directly to the Muslim settlers, per se. However, they do reveal that in the settlement’s status as a place were minorities were allowed relative self-rule, Lucera was viewed as a place where other outsiders and enemies of the crown could seek refuge. In this sense the settlement still appears to have been an impediment to the consolidation of papal and royal authority, and must have accounted for the ultimate decision to destroy the settlement at the beginning of the following decade. This lack of authority was particularly hazardous given the crown’s precarious political status during the late thirteenth century and the strategically important land (both politically and economically) on which the settlement rest.

Dunbabin states stipulated that Charles not make the lives of Muslim subjects any more miserable. See Abulafia, “La caduta di Lucera saracentorum,” 182; and Dunbabin, Charles I of Anjou, 154. 199 CDSL, no. 85 (December 16, 1292), and CDSL, no. 99 (May 12, 1294). In both instances the Dominican inquisitor Giovanni of San Martino was sent to the city to track fugitive heretics. Guglielmo de Tocco accompanied him during the first trip. Taylor suggested that some of the Christian heretics may have been Muslim converts who had “slipped” away from orthodoxy. The Dominicans’ investigation, particularly in 1292, appears to have occurred within delicate, although unknown contexts, as the royal order stated that inquisitors were to going about their work in a way that did not draw scandal (“ita tamen quod perinde non oriatur scandalum”). See also Taylor, Muslims in Medieval Italy, 174-175; and Abulafia, “Monarchs and Minorities,” 241.
5.2 The Financial State of the Regno

The crown’s willingness to relinquish its lucrative tax base at Lucera through potential privileges earned from conversion and through the sale and murder of the settlement’s residents raises questions concerning both the crown’s financial state at the time and Egidi’s argument that Lucera’s destruction was motivated by a need to pay for the War of the Vespers. While the historian conceded that the decision would have been short sighted considering the settlement’s economic potential, a further look at the state of the Angevin economy from the period reveals that much of the evidence employed by Egidi and subsequent authors for a late thirteenth-century “financial crisis” either has been deployed anachronistically or used without consideration of other economic factors, such as credit or the domestic market. A more expansive look at the Angevin economy, particularly during the period immediately after the destruction of Lucera, reveals that the crown fully understood the economic potential of Lucera—so much so that re-Christianized Lucera, Civitas Sanctae Mariae, in many ways was a direct replication, now with Christian subjects, of the former Muslim settlement.

First, a brief look at the Angevin economy during its wars in Sicily is necessary. In a paper included in an infrequently cited Australian volume published at the end of the 1970s, the economic historian John Pryor argued that no direct correlation could be found between the crown’s financial state and its foreign and security policies during the reigns of Charles I, Charles II, and Robert of Anjou.\textsuperscript{200} He found that fighting (and losing) wars did not necessarily bankrupt the crown. He argued, instead, that the kingdom was far more prosperous during the multiple military failures of Charles II and Robert of Anjou than

\textsuperscript{200} John Pryor, “Foreign Policy and Economic Policy,” 51.
during the military victories of Charles I when Angevin domains were at their largest and most expansive.\textsuperscript{201} In other words, controlling Charles I’s vast empire that included at times Southern Italy, Sicily, and parts of France, Greece, Albania, the Balkans, Piedmont, and Jerusalem was far more expensive than control of the relatively smaller territory controlled by Charles II and his heir. In fact, from the beginning of the fourteenth century through the reign of Robert of Anjou, the Angevin crown held more gold on account than most of Europe’s monarchs.

Moreover, scholars have shown that the crown relied largely on credit to pay for their Sicilian campaigns.\textsuperscript{202} While the Sicilian campaigns were extremely expensive, the Angevin crown financed their fight through borrowing. For most of these campaigns, the crown borrowed from their suzerain, the pope, who received loans from Guelph bankers or raised money through clerical tenths or other fundraisers.\textsuperscript{203} By the turn of the fourteenth century, however, the kings of the Regno borrowed from Florentine Guelph bankers directly.\textsuperscript{204}

Abulafia revealed that Florentine banks loaned funds directly to the Angevin crown in exchange for privileges that included the right to export valuable southern commodities including wheat, wood, oil, and wine.\textsuperscript{205} Rather than paying back most of these sums, the

\textsuperscript{201} Ibid., 46.
\textsuperscript{202} Ibid., 51.
\textsuperscript{203} The clerical tenth was a form of taxation regularly associated with crusades that levied one-tenth the income of clergy in a particular location within Christendom. Other fundraisers included caritative subsidies, reservation annates, block subsidies, and penitential gifts. Caritative subsidies were donations made to the pope by clergy. Reservation annates collected a portion of the first year’s income of a new official of a benefice. Inhabitants of lands subject to the Holy See paid block subsidies. See Housley, \textit{Italian Crusades}, 174-187.
\textsuperscript{204} Housley noted that demands from the popes, French, and English for crusading support led to the collapse of several banking houses, including the Buonsignori of Siena, the Ammanti of Pistoia, the Riccardi of Lucca, and the Mozzi of Florence. See Housley, \textit{Italian Crusades}, 239. Pryor argued that much of the crown’s debt was either forgiven by creditors or later paid by Robert of Anjou. For example, the king paid 88,852 ounces in back feudal rent owed to the papacy during the 1330s, the same decade in which he launched at least six campaigns in Sicily. See Pryor, 46.
\textsuperscript{205} David Abulafia, “Southern Italy and the Florentine Economy, 1265-1370,” \textit{The Economic History Review} 34, no. 3 (August 1981), 377-388.
crown forgave tariffs and expensive export licenses imposed on Florentine merchants.\footnote{Ibid., 380. Abulafia noted that these Florentine traders still had to pay the going rate for the commodities.}

During the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, Florentine merchants gained almost exclusive control over numerous southern Italian ports in regard to foreign trade. Abulafia argued that this eventually made them the \textit{de facto} agents for Angevin commercial activities within the Mediterranean.\footnote{Ibid. Abulafia noted that analogous activities by Florentine merchants occurred in Ireland and England.} The close economic connection between Florence and the \textit{Regno} was driven by politics, both being supporters of the pope.\footnote{This, apparently, did not stop Florentine merchants from operating in Sicily after its control by the Aragonese. See Abulafia, “Southern Italy and the Florentine Economy,” 386-387.} In fact, the two Guelph states remained closely tied politically, economically, and consequently culturally for most of the fourteenth century.\footnote{For more on this historiographical issue, see chapter 2.} The level of cooperation even resulted in sporadic Angevin rule of Florence. For example, Charles, the Duke of Calabria and King Robert of Anjou’s son, governed Florence as \textit{signore} from 1326 until his death in 1328. The same year of the duke’s death also saw the beginning of one of the most culturally important events in Neapolitan-Florentine cooperation. In that year Florence’s most famous painter, Giotto, arrived in the Angevin capital city where he served as court painter from 1328 to 1333.\footnote{Giotto’s presence in Naples is well recorded and examined more deeply in chapter 2.}

In addition to their gold on account and the seemingly unlimited lines of credit, the Angevin economy was bolstered by a robust domestic market that until recently has gone unstudied and underemphasized.\footnote{For revisionist studies, see Epstein, \textit{An Island for Itsself}; Epstein, \textit{Freedom and Growth}; and Sakellariou. According to Epstein, the domestic market has gone largely unnoticed because of its lack of documentation, particularly in notarial records.} While discussed more fully in the fourth chapter, a sign of its very real presence is that Muslim Lucera, located at an important crossroads between Florence and Naples and the Adriatic sea towns and the capital, participated directly in
intraregional commercial exchange through the annual market fair instituted first under the Frederick II. This fair was renewed almost immediately during reconstruction.

While it is true that grain from the seized city almost immediately was sent to feed Angevin troops in Catania, and that wine, wheat, and wood sent to the prince Philip of Taranto’s court was paid with proceeds from the sale of Muslim possessions, these incidents appear more as transactions of convenience rather than motivators for the settlement’s destruction. In fact, as Abulafia has argued, even within the short term, the cost of destroying and rebuilding Lucera almost immediately after the destruction was far greater than any profit made from selling Lucera’s Muslims and their goods. The loss of tax revenue, the cost of transporting Christian re-settlers in addition to land grants and tax exemptions, and the destruction of the mosque(s) and building of churches *ex novo* made Lucera’s destruction and immediate reconstruction a much more expensive venture than profits gained from its liquidation. Moreover, until the reconstructed city and its commercial activities matured, agricultural production valued both abroad and within the kingdom was seriously affected. Rather than being financially expedient, the destruction of Lucera’s Muslim settlement was quite an economic gamble, and indeed a temporary setback, especially until the city’s reconstruction and re-Christianization was complete.

---

212 On the Hohenstaufen Market at Lucera, see Yver, 71.
214 On the effects of the destruction on the region, see Martin, 809; and Egidi, *Archivio storico per le province napoletane* 39 (1914), 171.
5.3 Motivations reassessed

By re-examining the crown’s relationship with minorities and heretics as well as its finances, the motivations for Lucera’s destruction now appear related more to a desired perception rather than to economic factors. However, the economic historian Egidi was right in the sense that failure during the Vespers war led to Lucera’s destruction. Considering the religious and political environment, the timing of the event, and the written and visual rhetoric employed afterward, Lucera’s destruction and its near-immediate rebuilding and refashioning as Civitas Sanctae Mariae acted not as a way for the Angevin crown to fatten its coffers during a costly war, but rather aided in the construction of a royal identity and the consolidation of Angevin territory during an uncertain time when war in Sicily drained both resources and morale. In fact, as Abulafia has argued, the settlement’s destruction should be viewed within the contexts of state building rather than disintegration. He suggested that the crown’s action was advantageous in the formation of an Angevin state in three ways: first, it demonstrated authority, second, it served as a means for Charles II to win the approval of subjects and his suzerain, Pope Boniface VIII by persecuting an unpopular minority, and lastly, in tune with arguments put forth by scholars such as Moore, Powell, and Susan Akbari, it helped create religious uniformity that could harmonize with attempts at greater governmental contraction.215

Lucera’s destruction, therefore, served as an important symbol of the crown’s commitment to the Papacy and its self-fashioning as miles Christi, both necessary for the

---

215 Abulafia, “Monarchs and Minorities,” 258-259. Abulafia argued that the mechanisms through which the crown’s actions were justified was Roman law, which argued that the state possessed the authority to rule over its property and persons.
consolidation of its political power. Powell noted that on the eve of the destruction, Charles II had returned from Rome where Boniface VIII had criticized him for allowing Lucera’s Muslims to exist so closely to the Papal States. In fact, despite arguing Lucera’s destruction had more to do with financial accounts than the inseparable religious and political environment, Bevere suggested that the destruction may have been seen as a gift to the pope for the Jubilee year, a connection not missed by Egidi either, who argued that the city’s destruction at that time might have revived Charles’s popularity among the public.

Boniface appears to have been more than satisfied with the outcome, as a diploma from February of 1301 that invited Franciscan friars to Civitas Sanctae Mariae noted that Charles II, zelo fidei et divotionis, had espulsia perfidia from the city.

The self-fashioning as a victorious crusader and zealous soldier of Christ appears to be the image in which Charles II sought legitimacy as king. Throughout his reign, Charles II placed his piety on full display, which was marked not only by his active patronage of the Church and its buildings but also by the religious culture of his court. How genuine his religion was is not a necessary line of inquiry here. What his actions do reveal, however, is

---

216 Dunbabin noted that this self-fashioning began under Charles I, who as a foreigner and papal vassal rested on his divinely-willed military victories to legitimize his rule, being called by Clement IV after his victory against Manfred at Benevento in 1266 the “illustrious shield and protector of Holy Mother Roman Church and the Christian faith.” See Dunbabin, “Creating an Image for a New Kingship,” 25.


218 Bevere, 224; and Egidi, Archivio storico per le province napoletane 38 (1913), 687. Angevin diplomas do connect the event with the Jubilee year, writing that in the Jubilee year, the “gens ipsa viperea” were dispersed. CDSL no. 655 (January 10, 1300), and no. 662 (January 14, 1302). See also Egidi, Archivio storico per le province napoletane 38 (1913), 678.

219 Georges Digard, Maurice Faucon, and Antoine Thomas, eds. Les registres de Boniface VIII, no. 4012. The letter offers the province a house in the newly Christianized Lucera.

220 Charles’s many acts of piety included support of the cults of St. Nicholas and the Magdalene, the latter becoming a cult tied directly to the court, and his support of the hermit pope Celestine V, whom Charles protected and housed in Naples. On the Angevin cult of the Magdalen, see Katherine Jansen, The Making of the Magdalen: Preaching and Popular Devotion in the Later Middle Ages (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000). For Charles II’s religious policies and politics, see Dunbabin, The French in the Kingdom of Sicily, 1266-1305, 199-213. For Charles II’s support for religious building in contrast to his father, see Bruzelius, Stones of Naples, chapters 1-3.
how intertwined our modern conceptions of religion, politics, and society were during the period. In fact, in many cases under the Angevin crown they appear one in the same.

Discussing Angevin court culture under Charles II, Dunbabin noted:

Strict, not to say militant, orthodoxy was the first requirement for active membership of the household . . . The regular visits of inquisitors, the strong position of the mendicant orders, the presence among the landholders of the Regno of various families with close connections to cardinals, and the obligation of the kings to demonstrate their wholehearted support of the papacy at all times, created an atmosphere un congenial to any form of free thought.221

Religion, therefore, or at least modern conceptions of religion, was the cloak in which the state was presented. Charles’s letters following the destruction of Lucera express the piety the he projected. His letter to Giovanni Pipino dated August 24 of 1300 admitted that the Lucera problem long had been a concern of his and for the Angevin dynasty in general, his father Charles I promising to destroy the settlement thirty years earlier (Appendix A).222 In other diplomas, the king justified the act “propter multa horrenda et detestanda Christiano nomini inimica,” a similar charge made against the Hohenstaufen by the Angevin crown’s papal lords.223

Egidi argued that these letters clouded economic opportunity, but after an examination of the religious and political environment as well as the crown’s financial state, Lucera’s destruction provided a different kind of opportunity, one first pointed out by Abulafia. It allowed the crown to present itself as a pious defender of Christianitas and a unifier of the faithful at a point in history marked by the papal Jubilee, the increased hostility toward non-Christians, the rise of the Angevin Regno as a state, and high profile and

---

223 *CDSL* no. 342 (September 20, 1300).
embarrassing military losses against the Pope’s heretics in Sicily and the infidel in the Holy Land.224

A review of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century commentaries of Dante’s *Commedia* reveals the lasting historical and cultural impact of Lucera’s destruction. Karla Mallette, a literary historian, has shown that while Dante never specifically mentioned Lucera, commentators including Boccaccio (1373-1375) connected the Muslim city directly to a number of cantos within *Inferno*, namely *Inferno X*225 where Frederick II spends eternity in the sixth circle of Hell among other heretics, and *Inferno XXVIII*226 where Mohammed sits in the eighth circle as a schismatic. These commentaries are statements in regard to the status of Lucera within the contemporary imagination. They reveal implicitly that the events at Lucera, specifically in regard to what Lucera represented both in its existence as a Muslim colony and its destruction in 1300, remained within the minds of Italian writers during the decades and centuries following the settlement’s destruction.

Lucera’s destruction provided a signature victory for a royal dynasty in need of unifying its *Regno* and projecting a self-identity. Perception, therefore, appears to have been the most powerful motivator. Muslims and other non-Christians continued to live in small

---

224 Abulafia, “Monarchs and Minorities,” 257-260; Abulafia, “The Last Muslims in Italy,” 284; and Taylor, “Luceria sarracenorum: A Muslim Settlement in Medieval Christian Europe,” 119-120. Taylor noted that Charles II might have felt increased pressure to succeed as a crusader given the legacy of his uncle Louis IX of France.

225 Malette, 34. Boccaccio commented on *Inferno X*, 119: “And out of contempt for the Church [Frederick] sent to Tunisia for a great quantity of Saracens, and he gave them by decree a city long since dismantled, called Lucera (or in the common language Nocera), practically in the center of the Pugliese plain; and he built for himself a wondrous and beautiful and strong castle, in one section of the city that lay a bit higher than the other, which still stands. The Saracens made their houses within the dismantled city, each as well as he could; and since the countryside was fruitful they lived there willingly, and they multiplied to such a quantity that they had the run of all of Puglia, whenever they had the desire.” For Boccaccio’s commentary, see the Dartmouth Dante Project (http://Dartmouth.dante.edu); and Malette, 34.

226 Malette has noted that another place where Lucera is mentioned is in *Paradiso XI*: 48 where a number of commentators, including Jacopo della Lana (1324-28) confused a village connected to Saint Francis called Nocera in Umbria with Lucera “in Puglia sotto la signoria di quelli della casa di Francia” because of the city’s recent place in history. For all of these commentators, Malette added that the establishment and continued existence of *Luceria sarracenorum* was a scandal. See Malette, 37 and 43.
groups within the region, without minorettes, as seen from the text published by Bevere, but *Luceria sarracenorum*, the symbol of their presence on the peninsula, was destroyed.\(^{227}\) As will be revealed in subsequent chapters, the construction and administration of re-Christianized Lucera, *Civitas Sanctae Mariae*, served as the antithesis of Muslim Lucera. It very much was the mirror to the Muslim settlement. Whereas *Luceria sarracenorum* to the Angevin crown represented scandal, illegitimacy, and lawlessness, *Civitas Sanctae Mariae* represented victory, legitimacy, and the presence and consolidation of the region under the crown.

The aim of this chapter was to situate *Lucera sarracenorum*’s origins and eventual destruction within the larger context of activities within the region. David Abulafia’s assertion that its destruction ultimately should be viewed within the growing power of the state is profoundly convincing, especially in consideration of the events that followed. The reconstruction of *Luceria sarracenorum* into *Civitas Sanctae Mariae* was a result of increasing political and territorial consolidation during the creation of an Angevin state. As argued at the beginning of the chapter, Lucera’s destruction and its reconstruction should be examined together rather than separately. As the goal of regional and political consolidation sparked the purge, the mechanisms of that same consolidation are present during the process.

\(^{227}\) As stated within the text and noted by Abulafia, the construction of a minaret and the use of the call to prayer was forbidden, as they served as instantly recognizable signs of Muslim presence in the region. In effect, the crown allowed Muslims to remain, as long as they were “invisible.” As Powell noted, these events cannot be understood in modern terms of religious tolerance. In the medieval context, practical and/or political considerations often determined whether an outsider group was allowed to exist or operate freely within society. In regard to the unstable relationship between Muslims and Christians during the thirteenth century, he wrote that the “primary sources under consideration less provide evidence of degrees of tolerance and intolerance and rather provide a deeper insight into the manipulation of political and religious ideology for propaganda purposes in the thirteenth century.” See Powell, “Frederick II and the Muslims,” 7; Abulafia, “The End of Muslim Sicily,” in *Muslims under Latin Rule*, ed. James M. Powell (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 103; and Abulafia, “Monarchs and Minorities,” 246.
of rebuilding and the outcome of the new urban landscape. Both Lucera’s destruction and its reconstruction should been viewed within this lens.
Chapter 2
The Cathedral of Santa Maria Assunta and the Construction of Civitas Sanctae Mariae

“…ad reverenciam pie Matris eius, humane utique condicionis tutele, cuius auxilium in his que iam per te acta sunt et cepta in die nuper preteriti festi Assumpcionis eius miraculose tibi non ambigimus astitisse, mutato nomine dicte terre dataque illi denominacione ab eadem gloriosissima Virgine ut Civitas Sancte Marie de cetero nominetur…”\(^{228}\)

“…Set specialiter inter cetera tibi hoc unum imponimus quod locum illum notatum arabice musquitum, in quo saraceni predicti orant et ad orandum soliti convenire, statuas et facias servari et haberi pro maiori eccl. inibi construenda, denominacionem a prefata Domina n. humani patrona generis habitura…”\(^{229}\)

On August 24, 1300, nine days following the raid on Lucera, Charles II sent a diploma to Giovanni Pipino containing the two above passages (Appendix A). After the king congratulated the nobleman, miles, and Angevin courtier for his victory over the Muslim settlers, the diploma quickly transitions into an outline for the first steps of rebuilding and re-Christianizing Lucera. Of those steps, the two cited above are the most telling of the crown’s aims to purge all memory of the former settlement. As outlined, first, in honor of the Virgin Mary, who reportedly aided Pipino and his troops during the raid that began on the feast of her Assumption, Charles ordered that the city’s name would be changed from Luceria sarracenorum to Civitas Sanctae Mariae, or the City of Saint Mary. Second, the king mandated that a new cathedral be built and dedicated to the city’s new patron. In one of the most highly charged—and historically debated—acts of Lucera’s rebuilding, the monarch stated that the location of the city’s new cathedral would be “at the place in Arabic called the musquitum (mosque), where the Saracens prayed and paid homage.

\(^{228}\) CDSL, no. 318 (August 24, 1300).
\(^{229}\) Ibid.
This chapter investigates the building of Lucera’s cathedral, Santa Maria Assunta. As a church that soon was declared a palatine chapel and was built under the direct financial and administrative patronage of the Angevin crown, the cathedral served as the largest and most impressive symbol of Lucera’s rebuilding and re-Christianization. In addition, it served as the most potent sign of the rebuilt city’s role within the Angevin crown’s aims to establish power throughout its realm. As I argue throughout this chapter and in the ones that follow it, Angevin church building during the period, and Lucera’s rebuilding as a whole, must be viewed within this wider context of state-making. This becomes clear through an integrative examination of these buildings’ forms and furnishings as well as the processes through which they were constructed. As I will show, the very manner in which Lucera’s cathedral was built, furnished, and managed reflects extensive bureaucratic control throughout the kingdom, an administrative innovation that helped the crown achieve its overall aims of territorial consolidation.

The opening section of this chapter outlines the settlement of individuals into the city. Given numerous property and tax benefits, these new inhabitants included refugees from the Vespers war in Calabria and settlers from areas outside of the kingdom, including Catalonia. Others entered the city as members of the nobility, as merchants, or as agents of the Angevin crown. The focus in this section will be on the third group. Their names feature most frequently in the royal diplomas, and as individuals personally invited the resettlement at the newly-minted royal town most were involved directly in the construction of the cathedral. These figures include a variety of administrative officials including the city’s captain, the fortress’s castellan, the provincial justice, Giovanni Pipino himself and high-ranking soldiers
who received houses in compensation for their participation in the purge, and the city’s bishop and twenty canons who received their salaries directly from the crown.

The following sections examine the construction of the cathedral and the completed monument. While sharing a number of formal resonances in plan with the near-contemporary cathedral of Naples and other churches of the capital city, including San Pietro a Maiella and San Domenico, I argue that the church firmly is a product of local builders and workers. For example, the projection of walls and piers, the use of brick to face the church, and sculptural details within the interior and exterior of the site are rooted deeply within centuries-old architectural and artistic traditions local to Lucera and parts of Apulia stretching south to Bari. On the other hand, surviving interior decoration and furnishing, including several crosses, the occasional capital, pieces of metalwork, and one tomb effigy, reflect more “modern” tastes emanating from the capital Naples or other regional artistic centers that circulated throughout the kingdom. I conclude that the combination of the more vernacular structural components with “cosmopolitan” and “modern” furnishing reflects a situation in which materials, individuals, and art works traveled fluidly throughout the kingdom but the physical act of construction was viewed as a local initiative.

The final sections of this chapter examine the implications that the processes of construction at Lucera hold for notions of architectural circulation, typology, agency, and meaning within the Angevin realm. I reconstruct the career of Pierre d’Angicourt, the French “proto-master of curial works” first mentioned in the previous chapter. Pierre often has been described in studies as an “architect,” and in many cases as the architect of Lucera’s cathedral. The examination of his duties within surviving Angevin building documents and of his steady rise within the ranks of the Angevin court, however, reveals that the Frenchman
was more adept at administrative duties than architectural design or construction. He was not the great “court architect” often described in scholarship. Rather, he serves as the paradigmatic figure for the effect of bureaucratization on Angevin architectural and urban projects. This chapter serves as the foundation for the subsequent chapters, and introduces much of the theoretical and methodological underpinnings that drive this dissertation’s investigation of Lucera’s rebuilding. The conclusions that surface will complicate entrenched ideas on the function of ecclesiastical architecture as well as the relationships between the cathedral, the mendicant orders, and temporal powers—especially within the setting of the papal-backed, proto-state of the Angevin Regno of Naples.

1. The Creation of an Administrative and Merchant Class in Civitas Sanctae Mariae

The mandate quoted above makes clear the important role of Giovanni Pipino in the initial steps to rebuild and populate Lucera. In addition to initiating construction on the cathedral, Giovanni was charged with dividing and granting at his discretion land tenements of the newly cleared city. This included houses “fit for the future canons and clerics of the church (Appendix A).”230 In a royal privilege dated the same day (August 24, 1300), Pipino himself was granted “one of the better houses in Lucera” in recognition of his efforts for the crown and for the “re-inhabitation of Lucera, henceforth called Civitas Sanctae Mariae.”231

230 “et quod similiter domus que sunt circiter locum ipsum, de quibus et prout expedire videris, pro futurus eiusd. eccl. canonicis et clericis conserventur.” Egidi noted that this final condition involving the canons was added at the margins of the document. See CDSL, no. 318 (August 24, 1300).
231 CDSL, no. 319 (August 24, 1300). “…rehabitationem Lricie, vocande de ceterno Civitas S. Marie…Hac ergo consideration premoniti, concedimus et mandamus tibi, tenore presentium, ut eligas et habeas tibi pro velle tuo unam de melioribus dominibus terre predce, quia nos eam, utpote que nunc nostra est eque a cetere ipsius terre domus ad. Cu. n. rationalibiter devolute noscuntur, tibi et tuis hered. in perpetuum damas donamus et tradimus ex nunc de cetra n. scientia et gratia speciali concedentes tibi has licteras nn, pendent Maiest. n. sigillo munitas, in ipsius rei testimonium et cautelam.”
The Neapolitan nobleman Giovanni Minutolo was among of the first individuals to receive a house in Lucera. In a privilege dated August 27, 1300 and subsequently recopied into a diploma dated June 1, 1301, Pipino, who had “authority and license in this land, now called Civitas Sanctae Mariae, to provide and grant the underwritten fixed goods,” provided Minutolo a house with a garden on the “ruga de barbara, next to the via pubblica” that previously had been owned by the Muslim Boabdille Indulti (Appendix B). The house was exempt from rents and provided with the “rights and privileges of treasury accounts and all other things pertinent.”

Minutolo’s presence is one of the earliest pieces of evidence that Lucera’s rebuilding was part of a much larger plan for regional integration and consolidation. The rights granted to the nobleman and the location of his house, near the via pubblica, the main commercial district of Muslim Lucera, suggests that he moved to Lucera to help create a center of trade (a subject to which I will return in Chapter 4). The precedent of the Angevin crown providing commercial “feuds” to families in emerging cities had been set in Naples. The historian Giuliana Vitale has shown that the Minutolo were one of a number of families who, through noble rights, had become involved in trade during the expansion of Naples as a mercantile center. In an effort to boost the city’s port, the crown provided property and stores listed in diplomas as apothecae to these families. In 1296, Giovanni and his brother Ligorio obtained authorization “de aedificatione apothecorum inter Logiam Januensium et Petram Piscium,” close to where the church San Pietro Martire still stands. They received additional land near

---

232 CDSL, no. 319a and no. 519. “Ex cuius quidem auctoritate ac licentia potestatis Iohannes ipse in terra predicta, vocata nunc Civitae Sanctae Mariae, infrascripta bona stabilia donavit atque concessit qd. Iohanni Minutulo de Neapoli militi, fid. n.”

233 The Latin reads “cum omnibus iuribus rationibus et pertinentiis suis.”
the city’s port in the following years, creating a profitable commercial enterprise by 1306. The Neapolitan situation, therefore, created a model for structuring and growing emerging markets. Moreover, Giovanni Minutolo appears to have been one of its exporters to Lucera.

Six Catalans who relocated to Lucera in 1301 also appear to have been involved in reinvigorating the city’s commercial activities. A travel pass dated April 21, 1301 warns all those along the travel route not to molest a group of Catalans or their goods during their journey from Naples to Lucera. All six are named in the decree: Guilielmus Peros, Iohannes de Marcus, Martinus Peres, Rimperos Perrus de Aquaviva, Sancius Petrus de Merida, and Iohannes Martini. Whereas no information is provided about these individuals beyond their names and origins, it is most likely that they were merchants. Catalan merchants recently had entered Naples following the marriage in 1297 of Yolande of Aragon, sister of the Angevin adversary in Sicily James II, and Robert, son of Charles II, duke of Calabria, and the future king of Naples. In addition to contributing to the uneasy peace between the Angevins and the Aragonese over the rule of Sicily (to the Aragonese) and Southern Italy (to the Angevins), the marriage opened trade routes between the two kingdoms. Grain and wine were two of the most important commodities exchanged between

---

234 Giuliana Vitale, Élite burocratica e famiglia: dinamiche nobiliari e processi di costruzione statale nella Napoli angioino-aragonese (Naples: Liguori, 2003), 38, 41-42. What, exactly, the Minutolo exchanged is not specified in the documents.
236 Another sign that these men were merchants rather than normal settlers was that they were traveling seemingly without families. Surviving decrees that address Calabrian settlers often reference women and children.
238 Romolo Caggese, Roberto d’Angiò e i suoi tempi (Florence: R. Bemporad & Figlio, 1922), 560. See also Yver, 195-206 and 217-219. That Catalans in the Regno were involved in merchant activities comes through in a royal Diploma dated February 15, 1302 (CDSL, no. 669). In the diploma, Charles II orders a group of Catalan merchants to pay five hundred ounces of gold due to Robert, the Duke of Calabria (and future King Robert of Anjou). The order had been sent once in September of 1300 and again the following month.
the ports of Barcelona, Naples, Ischia, Gaeta, Taranto, and Manfredonia (fig. 2–1). It appears, then, that these Catalan settlers formed part of an extended network of trade, which, as I argue in Chapter 4, connected not only the Kingdom’s seaports to foreign commerce, but also the crown’s most important regional centers including Manfredonia, Naples, and Lucera by land.

Judging from surviving sources, however, most new settlers were Calabrian refugees displaced from the Vespers War. At the time of resettlement, many of these individuals lived in communities throughout Basilicata and the Terra di Bari. The number of new settlers does not come through in the sources, however, as in all cases the surviving diplomas detail exemptions from resettlement to Lucera rather than orders to resettle to the rebuilt city. Nevertheless, these exemptions are very important sources because they reveal two fundamental aspects of the crown’s program of resettlement. First, in the very nature that the surviving sources are exemptions, that is special exceptions from relocating to Lucera, it appears that resettlement for many Calabrian refugees in Basilicata and the Terra di Bari was forced and widespread. This is in contrast with earlier attempts to settle the fortress with Calabrians (see chapter 1), but is not unlike the crown’s resettlement of entire populations along its northern frontier (see chapter 4). The re-inhabitation of Lucera was not for pioneering Calabrians. Rather, it appears to have been a comprehensive program to redistribute the Calabrian population throughout the Regno.

The reasons for exemption from resettlement were varied. In some cases individuals, presumably because of their familial, social, or economic statues, were not forced to resettle at Lucera. For example, on July 26, 1301, the families and servants of the bishops of Rappola (Basilicata) and Venosa (Basilicata), as well as a number of other named individuals

---

239 Caggese, 560.
were not forced to resettle.\textsuperscript{240} Moreover, on August 12, 1301, the Calabrians Giovanni de Barboro and his brother Costantino, residents of the Apulian city of Molfetta for the past fifteen years, were allowed to stay in their adoptive home.\textsuperscript{241} In other instances, all of the new Calabrians living within a single city were given exemptions. This is the case for the Calabrians resettled in Venosa, Rapolla, Acerenza (Basilicata), San Chirico (Basilicata), Lavello (Basilicata), Melfi, and the village di Turitto (Terra di Bari).\textsuperscript{242} Furthermore, some Calabrians who had settled on the estates of members of the Angevin and Capetian royal families allowed to remain, as were a number of individuals engaged in the middle of certain, presumably important duties.\textsuperscript{243} For example, a Calabrian wall builder named Silvestro who lived in Irsina in Molise and worked at the building site of that city’s Franciscan convent was allowed to continue his work. In addition, dozens of farmers and carpenters were allowed to remain in their temporary locations until All Saints’ Day so that they could harvest their crops.\textsuperscript{244}

While the nature of some individual exemptions and those tied to French princes can be explained as personal favors, the others reveal the second important aspect of the Angevin resettlement program: the crown was unwilling to allow the degradation of one area for the growth of another. This strategy is completely in tune with an overall flat distribution of population promoted that was discussed first in the introduction and will be covered more

\textsuperscript{240} CDSL, no. 590.
\textsuperscript{241} CDSL, no. 608. Other personal exemptions were recorded for July 1, 1301 (CDSL, no. 544), July 15, 1301 (CDSL, no. 565), July 23, 1301 (CDSL, no. 585), July 27, 1301 (CDSL, no. 593), July 30, 1301 (CDSL, no. 597), and August 31, 1301 (CDSL, no. 613). The reasons for these exemptions were not revealed in the sources.\textsuperscript{243} CDSL, no. 541; CDSL, no. 542; CDSL, no. 575; CDSL, no. 582; CDSL, no. 590; CDSL, no. 592; CDSL, no. 595; CDSL, no. 599; CDSL, no. 600; CDSL, no. 605; CDSL, no. 606; and CDSL, no. 607.
\textsuperscript{243} For example, those Calabrians living in the masserie of Robert, the Count of Artois, at Guadiano and Spinazzola in Apulia, and those in servicia massariarum of Philip, Prince of Taranto were allowed to remain. In addition, Calabrians who cultivated the land on the masserie Salsburgi near Foggia, which had been conceded to the monastery of Santa Maria Real Valle, stayed at their posts. See CDSL, no. 573 (July 18, 1301); CDSL, no. 590 (August 1, 1301); and CDSL, no. 605 (August 9, 1301).
\textsuperscript{244} CDSL, no. 589 (July 25, 1301), CDSL, no. 601 (August 7, 1301), and CDSL, no. 602 (August 8, 1301).
fully in chapter four. The exemption of entire groups of Calabrians living within a single city suggests that those groups had come to make important economic or social contributions to the areas where they were allowed to stay, such as tending to the land or other activities important to the region’s stability. The exemption of the De Barboro brothers, who by this point had become tied to the land of Molfetta by living there for fifteenth years, suggests the same as well. Moreover, the wall builder Silvestro was engaged in a building project elsewhere and the farmers in Basilicata were allowed to complete their agricultural work in that land until they resettled. To remove both would have been to halt progress on a building project or to jeopardize the collection of a harvest. This also explains why residents of areas surrounding Lucera were not recruited to resettle. For these residents to resettle into Lucera would, in effect, lead to the depopulation of those communities—communities, which, in fact, were required to bear part of the costs of Lucera’s purge and reconstruction. Rather, the nature of the resettlements and exemptions suggests that the crown sought to avoid both disproportionate growth and decline of its communities.

Lucera’s new settlers were given a host of legal and financial privileges in exchange for meeting certain conditions (Appendix C). Settlers received a *domus*, exempt from taxes, to which they gained absolute ownership upon inhabiting the house for ten years uninterrupted. In addition to exemption from property taxes, settlers were exempt for ten years from all other taxes and duties and given land grants in amounts determined by their

---

245 This period of fifteen years should be viewed in comparison to other Angevin resettlement diploma’s, including Lucera, which show that residence for ten years constituted ties to place.

246 For example, Charles II ordered Petro della Marra, justice of Capitanata, to recover 1200 from *certis terris pro restaurazione collecte ac aliorum iurium Lucerie*. An additional 2000 ounces was taxed from the communities of Capitanata *pro restaurazione iurium Lucerie* in 1310. The nine years between these two taxes suggests that additional taxes may have been imposed in the intervening years. See *CDSL*, no. 441a (January 19, 1301). On the taxation of surrounding communities following the purge, see also Taylor, *Muslims in Medieval Italy*, 184.
social standing. The grants included access to water sources and irrigation for tending the land.\textsuperscript{248}

However, despite its special patrimony by the crown, the city did not initially achieve the type of population growth desired. This was due in large part to the many nobles who had received land without upholding the residency requirements for the crown’s privileges. On February 29, 1304, Charles II ordered the captain of Lucera, the chief fiscal, judicial, and military official within the city, to ensure that the nobles who had been assigned houses and assets in the city inhabit those houses legitimately until the next Pentecost or risk the cancellation of all rights and privileges.\textsuperscript{249}

Residency requirements were enforced to ensure the growth and functional governance of the city, as well as municipal participation from multiple social classes. Among the first administrative bodies established by Charles II in Lucera was an elected group of ten men \textit{de maioribus, mediocribus, et minoribus civitatis ipsius} who served as counselors during the rebuilding process.\textsuperscript{250} By the 1330s similar elected administrative bodies served in other cities of the \textit{Regno}, including Sessa and Salerno in Campania, Ortona

---

\textsuperscript{248} Counts were granted fifteen hectares; barons between nine and twelve hectares; knights 720 ares; minor nobles, and non-knights six hectares; bourgeoisie, judges, notaries, doctors, and merchants 480 ares; and simple landowners 380 ares. Religious houses that did not already have claims in the territory could receive nine hectares; convents received 720 ares; and bishops received 9-15 hectares for themselves and 360 ares for every chaplain, canon, priest, or deacon. Those ecclesiastics and churches that previously had employed Muslims for the cultivation of their land were allowed to retain land needed for “sustenance” alone, with the rest being pooled into the amounts granted to new residents. Many of these concessions were repeated in a royal diploma dated February 29, 1304 (CDSL, no. 754). Land grants of this type appear to have been offered regularly during the first decades of rebuilding until the 1330s when Robert of Anjou ordered the land redistributed after apparent abuses of land grants by nobles. See Pietro Rivoire, “Lucera sotto la dominazione angioina,” \textit{Rassegna Pugliese} VII & VIII (1901),182; and Caggese, 479-480.


\textsuperscript{250} CDSL, no. 611, Statute 14, (August 22,1301) and CDSL, no. 654, Statute 21 (January 10, 1302). The text of the August 22 text (Appendix C) reads “Item, quod Omnia et singula, spectantia circa premissa et alia facientia ad comune bonum Civitatis predicte habitatorum ad illum qui prerit habitacioni Civitatis eiusdem, fiant per eum cum consilio decem hominum de maioribus, mediocribus, et minoribus Civitatis ipsius, quos Universitates civitatis eiusdem duxerit eligendos.” Who, exactly within Lucera elected these men is not specified.
in Abruzzo, the Apulian cities of Molfetta, Trani, and Barletta, and Crotone in Calabria.\footnote{The number of administrators varied per location. Twelve officials administered Ortona, three at Molfetta, and four at Trani and Crotone. Six officials administered Sessa, Barletta, and Salerno. See Caggese, 388-394.}

The group of ten at Lucera was chosen from multiple sectors of society in an apparent effort to constrain the influence of nobles, who by the late 1339 threatened the work of the ten.\footnote{Ibid., 483.}

By that period, election to the group of ten required residency in Lucera for ten years, land ownership in order to be attached to the city, and term limits so that positions could not be abused.\footnote{As the Italian historian Alessandro Clemente argued, the hierarchical structure under which these elected groups worked in cities such as Lucera (they usually answered to the captain of the università or the provincial justiciar) made these cities “autonomous” only in instances of day-to-day operations. See Alessandro Clementi, Autonomie e legislazione statutaria nell’Italia meridionale,” in Momenti del medioevo abruzzese (Rome: Bulzoni Editore, 1976), 131-200.}

Lucera’s group of ten worked within a larger Angevin system of regional administration.\footnote{Provincial justices often were picked from the French nobles who descended on southern Italy, or Southern Italian nobles who had proved their loyalty to the crown. The position often served as a stepping-stone for more important administrative duties within the kingdom. On justices in the Kingdom of Naples, see Serena Morelli, “I giustizieri nel Regno di Napoli,” in L’État Angevin: Pouvoir, culture, et société entre XIII et XIV siècle (Rome: L’École française de Rome, 1998), 491-517; and Samantha Kelly, The New Solomon: Robert of Naples (1309-1343) and Fourteenth-Century Kingship (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 137-139.}

The group counseled the city’s captain, who in turn answered to the provincial justice of Capitanata, an official with similar responsibilities at regional level.\footnote{CDSL, no. 649.}

The variety of names listed in Angevin diplomas suggests that captains held relatively short terms. In a royal diploma dated July 28, 1301 Charles II named Rinaldo de Saint-Didier (Vaucluse) captain of the city.\footnote{CDSL, no. 654.} By December 28, 1301, Pietro della Marra, the former Justice of Capitanata, had replaced the Frenchman on the order of Giovanni Pipino.\footnote{CDSL, no. 713 (November 1, 1302).} He held this position for less than a year, however, and was replaced by Pandolfo of Salerno November 1, 1302.\footnote{CDSL, no. 649.} Moreover, it appears that Giovanni Pipino served in a role above the
captain. As just stated, he nominated Pietro della Marra for the position. Furthermore, in one diploma dated eight years after his death, the courtier was named posthumously *rector et gubernator* of Lucera. These titles were never employed in surviving Angevin texts during his life, however. Instead, Angevin diplomas often address him by the titles tied directly to his position at court—namely the master *rationalis*, a high-ranking position within the office of the chamberlain, or *miles*, familiar, and counselor. These terms will be analyzed below. For now, though, it can be said that the social dynamics that seep through the language of Angevin diplomas between Pipino, the crown, and other administrators read as if Pipino was at least unofficially, if not officially, the overlord of Lucera as if the city had been entrusted to him as a feud.

The Angevin diplomas that survive and deal with Lucera’s rebuilding reveal that as the chief administrators of the local and regional levels, Lucera’s captains and the Capitanata region’s justices, played a large part in the city’s physical and social reconstruction. Their duties included collecting and distributing funds for construction projects, procuring building materials, recruiting workers from within their jurisdictions, and distributing privileges to Lucera’s canons and bishop. As will be discussed below, this organizational system shows remarkable continuity with that in place during the construction of the kingdom’s fortresses by Charles I.

The canons and bishops of Lucera worked parallel to the regional and local administrators in the construction of the cathedral. These institutions, which, according to Angevin diplomas were quite poor and possibly miniscule prior to the purge, were boosted in number and endowment during reconstruction. By 1302 a figure named Stephan, the former

---

259 *CDSL*, no. 801 (September 24, 1324).
260 This can be deduced through the examination of early Angevin building documents published by Sthamer.
bishop of Salpi, had replaced the bishop Aymardus whose episcopacy stretched back to 1295. Two diplomas from Charles II to Lucera’s new bishop dated January 10 and January 18, 1302 ensured that the crown would protect the prelate, the chapter’s twenty canons, and provide a total of 200 ounces of gold per year divided amongst them. On January 17, Charles II ordered Pietro della Marra, the captain of Lucera, to procure part of the prebends from the province’s bailiff, another administrative official charged with collecting revenue owed to the crown. Initially, payments to the chapter appear to have been made piecemeal and collected from multiple sources judging by another mandate, dated November 6 of the same year, that instructed the captain to pay the bishop twelve ounces of the sum the chapter was due to receive for the year. The Angevin diplomas pertaining to the building of the cathedral also reveal this piecemeal method of procuring and dispensing funds. By 1303, however, the distribution of the funds to the chapter appears to have been somewhat standardized, as Charles II ordered the captain of Lucera to make payments every trimester with a penalty of ten ounces for every missed payment.

The crown also provided the church with numerous properties and feuds. For example, the crown donated a number of stores to the cathedral and chapter. Like other royal donations of property within the city, retaining the privilege required that the church to

---

261 In fact, two surviving bulls from Pope Boniface VIII dated June 9, 1302 reveal that Aymardus and Stephan swapped positions, with Aymardus transferring to Salpi. The diocese of Salpi (Salpi is modern day Trinitapoli in the Italian province of Barletta-Andria-Trani, Apulia) was suppressed in 1547. On the transfer of the bishops, see Vendola, ed., Documenti tratti dai registri vaticani da Bonifacio VIII a Clemente V, nos. 44 and 45. On Aymardus’s transfer to Lucera in 1295, see Vendola, ed., Documenti tratti dai registri vaticani da Bonifacio VIII a Clemente V, 9-10.
262 CDSL, no. 655 (January 10, 1302), Appendix F; and CDSL, no. 666 (January 18, 1302). Like other privileges granted to the settlers of Lucera, payment to the canons was contingent on the residence within the city. According to the January 10 diploma, four canons were allowed away at any time for study. By February 2, 1304, the number had been reduced to two. See CDSL, no. 655 (January 10, 1302); CDSL, no. 750 (February 2, 1304, summary).
263 CDSL, no. 665 (January 17, 1302).
264 Ibid. This mandate survives only as a summary provided by Egidi. The source of the twelve ounces was not recorded.
265 CDSL, no. 736 (May 1, 1303, summary).
maintain possession. In a mandate dated April 12, 1303, Charles ordered Lucera’s present and future captains to reclaim the properties should the bishop and canons sell them.  

Other lands donated included the nearby lands of Apricena outside of Foggia and the Palazzo di Guardiola in northern Apulia. The only price for the bishop and his successors retaining these lands was “consecrated fidelity” and “liege homage” toward the king. On top of sizeable cash payments, then, the royal privileges granted to the cathedral made the institution quite wealthy. For example, Apricena was one of the most fertile areas of the region and would have generated great profit from the cultivation of northern Apulia’s famed agricultural products. These donations, therefore, transformed the city’s cathedral, even before its construction, into a verifiable feudal power within the region. In this sense and many others (as will continue to be revealed), Lucera’s cathedral held a status within the royal court of some similarity to Bari’s San Nicola, a church that received numerous rights, privileges, and grants after it was declared a palatine chapel by Charles II in 1296.

As at San Nicola, the Angevin king controlled Lucera’s chapter’s composition as well as its purse strings. In a bull addressed to Charles dated November 17, 1303, Pope Benedict XI, in gratitude of the monarch’s generosity to the church of Lucera, granted “not only [the king] but his successors of the Regno” the privilege to appoint half of the chapter’s canons, including archdeacon and cantor. In addition, the king was given the power to ratify

---

266 CDSL, no. 733 (April 12, 1303, summary).
267 CDSL, no. 710a (October 24, 1302); CDSL, no. 734 (April 25, 1303); CDSL, no. 750 (February 2, 1304); and D’Amelj, 241.
268 “Sacramentum fidelitas” and “ligium homagium.” See CDSL, no. 750 (February 2, 1304).
270 Charles II declared Bari’s San Nicola basilica the site a cappella regis on April 15, 1296. The church’s holdings included the cathedral of Altamura, a church that plays a prominent role in the analysis of Lucera’s cathedral. On the church as a potenza feudale after Charles II’s declaration, see Gerrardo Cioffari, “La riforma di Carlo II d’Angiò e i codici liturgici di San Nicola,” in I codici liturgici in Puglia (Bari: Levante, 1986), 29; and Jill Caskey, “The Look of Liturgy,” 112.
Lucera’s bishop. As with most papal bulls, however, the text only confirmed an ongoing practice. Charles already had selected six canons between January 18 and July 1, 1302. As will be revealed below, the canons, particularly the archdeacon chosen directly by Charles II and his heirs, were among the chief administrative figures for the construction of Santa Maria Assunta.

2. The Construction of the Cathedral

Lucera’s cathedral of Santa Maria Assunta, whose interior measures approximately 43.5 meters by 25.7 meters, rises within the center of the medieval city (fig. 2–2, fig. 2–3, and fig. 2–4). Three-aisled with a transept that extends beyond its aisles, the church is capped at its east end by three rib-vaulted apses. Each apse is nearly as wide as the aisle that precedes it. A trussed roof covers the nave, aisles, and transept in tune with most Angevin churches built in the early fourteenth century.

Benedict’s 1303 bull helps reconstruct a timeline for the church’s construction. However, most sources that illuminate the building process are royal mandates sent to administrators at the building site and throughout the realm to procure and distribute materials, workers, and funds. The earliest of these sources date to the autumn of 1300, the

---

271 The source reads, “non solum te sed et sucessores tuos in eodem regno.” See Domenico Vendola, ed. Documenti tratti dai registrari vaticani: dal Innocenzo III a Nicola IV, no. 54. Pietro Rivoire argued that the king’s privileges and power to appoint canons not only solidified Lucera’s cathedral as a palatine church in both name and deed, but also created a certain dualism between the bishop and the canons who spearheaded the rebuilding of the cathedral. See Rivoire, 184.

272 CDSL, no. 666 (January 18, 1302); CDSL, no. 671 (March 25, 1302); CDSL, no. 677 (May 5, 1302); CDSL, no. 679 (May 27, 1302); CDSL, no. 638 and 638a (July 1, 1302). During this period Charles selected as canons the Frenchman Hugo of Sisteron, Godfrey (Goffrido) of Nice, Bartolomeo di Angelo da Perugia, Pietro Arnaldi, Giovanni Borelli, and Gerardo de Lalo. In each instance he presented their names directly to Bishop Stephan.

273 The nave is approximately 12.35 meters long; the north aisle is 6.78 meters wide, and the south aisle 6.57 meters wide. This is quite large for an Apulian church, but measures comparatively to the great churches of the region, including San Nicola in Bari (approximately 55 m x 22.5 m (nave)), Bari Cathedral (55 m x 25.5 m), Bitonto Cathedral (approximately 45 m x 18 m), and Trani Cathedral (53 m x 20 m).
latest to 1317, and most cover the years between 1303 and 1311. It is reasonable to adduce, then, that the majority of construction occurred within a period of ten to fifteen years, culminating before the third decade of the century. The amount of time needed to complete the project, therefore, appears comparable to other major building projects within the Regno, including the construction of the fortress at Lucera, the renovations of the castle at Lagopesole, and the construction of the cathedral at Naples.

As mentioned earlier, the idea of a new cathedral first enters the Angevin registers on August 24, 1300, nine days after royal troops began the purge, when Charles II ordered Giovanni Pipino to build the cathedral, “named in honor of the aforementioned Mary,” in the place “called in Arabic musquitum, where the Saracens pray to statues.”274 The source, like many other early Angevin diplomas that mention Lucera’s past settlers, exhibits a high degree of rhetoric that may just have been flourish—these are the same documents that at times require over a dozen lines to introduce the king or recipient. Nevertheless, the passage has led to considerable debate, both textual and archaeological, on whether the cathedral was built on the site of the old mosque, and if so, whether it incorporated architectural elements from the Muslim house of prayer.

The issue dates at least to the seventeenth century when the Lucera chronicler Rocco Del Preite interpreted the text to mean that the mosque was spoliated and transformed into a Christian church.275 It convinced Del Preite that the current cathedral had not been built ex novo, but instead resulted from the transformation of the mosque. His discussion of the transformation was accompanied by a plan of Santa Maria Assunta that bore the inscription,
At that time the mosque of the Saracens, now the temple of Saint Mary”).²⁷⁶ Arthur Haseloff, writing some 200 years later, rejected Del Preite’s literal reading of the text, as did Pietro Rivoire and Giambattista D’Amelj, who argued that the church shares nothing architecturally in common with any known mosque.²⁷⁷ Most recently Nunzio Tomaiuoli has rejected Del Preite’s argument that spoliation occurred. He noted that another Angevin diploma, dated January 10, 1302 (Appendix F), contradicts any notion that parts of the old mosque survive. In that source, which outlines privileges guaranteed to the cathedral and the chapter, Charles II expresses his joy that “of the mosque there remained only the memory of the form of the building, as if swallowed by a chasm.”²⁷⁸ This phrase from this text, while also prone to rhetorical flourish, appears to close the debate on whether portions of the mosque were incorporated into Santa Maria Assunta.

While evidence suggests that the Cathedral is not the mosque transformed, the question of whether it stands on the site of the old mosque remains. In the early eighteenth century, the Lucera chronicler Domenico Lombardi argued that renovations to the church revealed a marble inscription in Arabic naming the builders of the mosque as Ismail-Ali and Ismail-Ali and

²⁷⁷ Iacobbe and Ricco, 69.
²⁷⁸ Tomaiuoli, “Albori della Cattedrale di Lucera,” 278. The pertinent portion of the text (CDSL, no. 655. January 10, 1302) reads: “Verum quia in ipsa deleta Luceria, post partim cesos partim eiectos abinde quoslibet Sarracenos, inventa est, que venerabatur ab illis sub cultu et nomine Machometti, muscheta, templum scilicet yldolatre veneracionis eorum, providimus merito ut, ipsa in quamdam solum memoriam preterite forme eius remanente inibi, viduata, utpote absorta voragine sui patriarche dyaboli quem colebat, nominis eius, eu omni figure, mutata in caput Anguli fieret, qui est Ecclesie celebris Christus deus; ita ut non iam muscheta prevariationis et scismatis, set domus orationis domini et ecclesia fidei caritatis et spei, sub eiusd.” The emphasis is mine. Iacobbe and Ricco have argued that the document reveals the mosque may have been used for some time as a church while construction plans were being made. See Iacobbe and Ricco, 71.
Abubeker.²⁷⁹ By the end of the nineteenth century the inscription had been “lost”—a common occurrence for antiquities that supposedly fill gaps within Lucera’s historical genealogy.²⁸⁰ On that account, Emile Bertaux rightly found the discovery suspect, and in 1895 rejected the idea that either the names of Muslim builders or any other material remains of a mosque survive at the site.²⁸¹

More recent archaeological work has reignited the debate. Excavations under the sacristy in 1987 revealed a much older wall structure in stone, proving that the site was constructed over earlier buildings. Pina Iacobbe and Addolorata Rico posited that the wall formed part of the thirteenth-century mosque.²⁸² Moreover, they bolstered their hypothesis by examining the topography of the area around the cathedral and archaeological site. They found that unlike the rest of the medieval city that aligns more or less along a grid, three roads from the west, northwest, and southwest converge toward the cathedral and its piazza, creating a radial plan (fig. 2–5). As such, the two architectural historians proposed that the piazza was the site of Roman Lucera’s forum.²⁸³ Finally, they suggested that the discovery of this supposed forum meant that the site had been Lucera’s most important public space since antiquity. This led them to conclude that the piazza was the location most likely to possess the city’s mosque.²⁸⁴

²⁸⁰ For this issue, see chapter 5 of this dissertation.
²⁸² Iacobbe and Ricco, 70.
²⁸³ For the excavations under the sacristy, including the discovery of imperial-age pavement, see Marina Mazzei, “La cattedrale: le indagini archeologiche,” in Castelli e cattedrali di Puglia: a cent’anni dall’Esposizione Nazionale di Torino, eds. Clara Gelao and Gian Marco Jacobitti (Bari: Mario Adda Editore, 1999), 340.
²⁸⁴ Ibid.
The authors’ analysis of Lucera’s geographical, social, and economic topographies is intriguing, and provides the most thoughtful argument for the presence of the mosque at the site. It seems reasonable to conclude that the site of the cathedral had always been central to the city’s life and therefore also hosted Muslim Lucera’s mosque. However, the argument also raises two issues. The first is in relation to the wall Iacobbe and Rico described as belonging to the mosque. To date the wall has not been dated with precision. As I argue throughout the dissertation, the use of certain building materials and techniques within the region show remarkable continuity over centuries. At times construction work spanning centuries is not easily distinguishable. Therefore, if the site really was continuously inhabited, the wall could have belonged to a building from any number of centuries, as the mosque, if it had existed at the site, was present for no more than seventy years.

Second, their argument raises the question of the motivations for building the cathedral at the site. Was the cathedral built at the site because it historically had been the center of the city, or was it built at the site as an act of damnatio memoriae in regard to the mosque? Was Charles’s order to build in the place “called in Arabic Musquitum” a means of establishing the exact location for where he wanted his church built—the historic center of the city where it most likely was positioned near the market and captains palace as was the norm in other new towns (see chapter 4)—instead of a direct affront against the building as mosque? Like all things concerning the crown’s motivations at Lucera, the answer probably lies in parts of both, as Angevin urban projects and especially church construction reveal a nexus of political, historical, economic, and social motivations nearly impossible to disentangle. Whether or not the piazza was the center of urban life prior to Angevin rebuilding, it certainly was made the center of urban life afterwards.
Whereas the debate over the existence and the location of the now-destroyed mosque will continue to rage, questions over Santa Maria Assunta’s construction timeline decidedly are more settled. Having said that, the two earliest building documents have caused some confusion over construction stages.

Both sources are royal mandates in which the king requested the castellan of Lucera’s fortress to provide very specific objects for the building site. On October 21, 1300, a little more than two months since the beginning of the raid, Charles ordered the unidentified fortress administrator to provide bells stored at the complex for the cathedral and the Franciscan, Dominican, and Augustinian foundations to be built (Appendix E). Two years later, on February 27, 1303, Charles ordered the castellan, now identified as Bernard of Avignon, to “glorify and endow” the cathedral with a wood crucifix *cum beata Virgine et b. Iohanne*, missals and books for other liturgical celebrations, linen and muslin textiles and vestments, hides large enough to cover an altar, two coffers for storing “ecclesiastical things,” two basins, not of silver, for washing hands, and “marble columns and stones of the ancient church for the construction of the church named for the Virgin.”

The early dates for these donations, all of which except for the columns were not integral for construction, led the Lucera historian Giambattista D’Amelj to argue that the

---

285 CDSL, no. 392.
286 CDSL, no. 729. “Karolus II mag. Bernardo de Aviniano, fisci n. proc., et Castellano castri Civitatis S. Marie…Ad ampliandum et dotandum maiorem eccl. civitatis eiusdem…m. ut nuncio…epi Civit. ipsius crucifixum ligneum cum beata Virgine et b. Iohanne, libros ecclesiasticos pro missis et aliiis officiis celebrandis, pannos eciam tam de lino et sindone quam samido et capas sacerdotalis, item columnas marmoreas et lapides antiquarum ecclesiarum pro constructione eccl. que vocabulo b. Virginis insignitur, necon tantum de corio ad cooperiendum altare et duas archas pro custodiendis rebus ecclesie ac duo bacinos, dum tamen non sint argenei, pro manibus abluendis, que quidem res in castro predeo per per cu. custodiri dicuntur, statim pro serviciis de eae eccl. assignare cureitis.” In another early liturgical donation dated February 2, 1304, the king promised provide the church with a *parasside argentea* and fifteenth pounds of wax each year. These donations are listed in a text that also confirms the church’s rights to the feuds of Apricena and Guardiole. See CDSL, no. 750 (February 2, 1304, summary).
church was completed by 1302.\textsuperscript{287} He posited that construction on the church had been begun in 1295, well before the Muslim purge, and that the bishop Stephan consecrated it on the first Sunday of October in 1302.\textsuperscript{288} More recently, Nunzio Tomaiuoli has provided a different explanation. He argued that the objects were intended for a temporary church used during the construction of the cathedral.\textsuperscript{289} He drew his conclusions directly from the presence of the bells, which he suggested might have been suspended by some temporary structure. Textual as well as visual evidence reveals that scaffolds were used as temporary belfries. An illumination by the so-called Master of the Dominican Effigies for Domenico Lenzi’s \textit{Specchio umano} (ca. 1335) depicts a wood scaffold supporting a bell along the skyline of the city of Siena (fig. 2–6).\textsuperscript{290} In fact, Lucera’s belfry may have remained a wood scaffold or some other temporary structure for centuries, as scholars have argued that an inscription dated 1567 along the upper cornice of the bell tower reveals that the bishop Pietro de Petris completed the structure.\textsuperscript{291}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item D’Amelj, 230.
\item Ibid., Iacobbe and Riccio rely on D’Amelj’s consecration date, although they argue that construction on the cathedral had not yet begun. They argued that the mosque was used as a temporary cathedral for some time before construction. See Iacobbe and Riccio, 71.
\item Tomaiuoli, “Albori della Cattedrale di Lucera,” 282.
\item I would like to thank Jill Caskey for bringing this illumination to my attention.
\item \texttt{PETRUS DEPETRIS UTRIUSQUE JURIS OCTOR EPISCUSSIPUS LUCERINUS REFERENDA[RIUS] SANCTISSIMI DOMINI[NOSTRI] PAPAE Q[SANCTAE] SEDIS AP[OSTOL]E IT INSTAURAVIT ILLUISTR[A]VIT.} The belfry was restored between 1991 and 1994. Tomaiuoli noted that the window tracery employed in the lantern appears to date from the fourteenth century. Three explanations exist if this is correct. The first, which Tomaiuoli argued, is that the windows were put aside for completion. This would be quite remarkable given the flurry of building activity during the first three decades of the century. The second is that Pietro de Petris obtained windows from elsewhere that stylistically are similar to those used during fourteenth-century construction. This would imply that bishop was interested in some sort of architectural historicism, a reference to the church’s origins, which seems questionable given the other architectural “updates” to the church during the period and in successive centuries. A third explanation is that most or all of the work on the tower was completed in the fourteenth century and that any changes that were made to the tower by Pietro were minor. On the tower, see Iaccobbe and Ricco, 73–74; and Nunzio Tomaiuoli, “La cattedrale: i restauri,” in \textit{Castelli e cattedrali di Puglia: a cent’anni dall’Esposizione Nazionale di Torino}, eds. Clara Gelao and Gian Marco Jacobitti (Bari: Mario Adda Editore, 1999), 377.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Whereas a temporary house of worship must have existed, the donations may have been more of a symbolic gesture at the time than practical. Charles II, like his predecessor, was very impatient when it came to building projects. For example, on January 15, 1304, the king wrote to Giovanni Pipino, ordering the courtier to receive all funds collected by the bailiffs of Lucera, Troia, and Foggia in order to “proceed with the rapid execution of the work (on the cathedral) without the hindrance of decelerating.” Moreover, the sources specify that the donations were intended for the major ecclesia, the term used for the cathedral throughout the construction documents. Therefore, it appears that the donations were intended to designate place and presence. In effect, they established a topography of the sacred and by extension a topography of Angevin power within the city. This rings true especially with the king’s emphasis on bells, which numerous scholars now have shown were used as symbols of Christian and institutional identity throughout the Middle Ages. Bells, both from their visibility high upon towers and aural qualities projected onto the landscape, demarcated the space from which they could be seen and heard as belonging to the possessor. This made them highly powerful and contentious objects. For example, religious orders


\[293\] CDSL, no 749 (January 15, 1304). “Karolus II Iohanni Pipino de Barolo, militi, etc. – Noscere te credimus quod Nos pro opere fabrice maioris ecclesie Civitatis S. marie de iusticiariatu Capitinate, quam pia decrevimus disposizione fundari, totam pecuniam provenientem ex iuribus redditibus et proventibus baiulacionum Curie Civitatam S. Marie prefate, troye ac terre Fogie ac corrigie Troyane de iusticiariatu iamdicto graciose provifimus deputandam. Cum igitur precipium votivumque nostris insit affectibus ut dicti operis prosecutio celeri executione procedat, nullis retardanda prepediis, volumus…” See also Tomaiuoli, “Albori della Cattedrale di Lucera,” 286.

competed with one another over the height of belltowers, Muslim conquerors in Spain carried off as trophies bells taken from Christian churches, and in the case of Lucera, the redistribution of bells at four important nodes of power and influence (three of which will be the subject of the following chapter) marked the presence of the crown, its agents, and Christianity within the city. In fact, the Angevin crown had already set a precedent for the rhetoric of bell transfers three decades earlier. In a mandate dated April 8, 1269, the first Angevin king Charles I ordered the transfer of a large bell at Manfredonia, viewed by some medieval chroniclers as the symbol of the port city, to the cathedral church of San Nicola in Bari. This was part of a program of cleansing Manfredonia of Manfred. Conversely, the donation of bells to Lucera’s churches marked the stamping of the Angevin mark on the city. Even before building could be completed Charles’s donations to the cathedral and mendicant foundations signaled effectively that Civitas Sanctae Mariae was property of the crown and “open for business.”

Actual construction on the church appears in full swing by 1304. This was an expansive enterprise that occurred over the reign of two Angevin kings and included the involvement of royal agents from throughout northern and eastern portions of the Regno (fig. 2–7). On March 10, 1304, Charles II ordered the bailiff and foresters of the town of Biccari, twenty kilometers southwest of Lucera, to provide every stone in the old Hohenstaufen palace and other royal buildings in the area for the construction of Lucera’s cathedral. They

---

295 Filangieri, ed., I registri, vol. 2, reg. 8, no. 215. April 8, 1269. “Pro Ecclesia Beati Nicholai de Baro, Karolus etc. Baulis magistro jurato et judicibus, nec non et universis hominibus Sypanti Novelli, ut, sus pena M unciarum auri, campanam in ipsa terra existentem, ecclesiae beati Nicholai de Baro per Maiestatem Regiam concessam, procuratoribus ipsius ecclesiae, latoribus presentium, sine tarditate et mora debeant assignare. Datum Fogie, VIII aprilis, XII ind.” Giovanni Villani noted that the bell served as a votive offering and memorial to the city’s governor, the chamberlain Manfredi Maletti. The chronicler described the bell as “la piu grande che si trovi di larghezza, e per la sua grandezza non può sonare.” See Giovanni Villani, Chronica (Florence: Magheri, 1823), book 6, chap. 46.
also were charged with collecting wood both for cooking lime as well as for construction.\textsuperscript{296}

On the same day, Charles ordered the prelates, counts, barons, and all other royal functionaries of the region to gather the necessary number of workers and materials for the cathedral. The king demanded also that none of these officials impede passage or impose customs and duty upon workers and goods involved in the Cathedral’s construction.\textsuperscript{297}

Robert of Anjou (reigned 1309-1343) sent a similar mandate in May of 1309 when he ordered that the customs officers of Manfredonia not charge duty on timber coming by sea to the port for the construction of Lucera’s cathedral.\textsuperscript{298}

The amount of wood needed by this time for the cooking of lime, the spanning of the roof, and the fabrication of construction supports such as scaffolding meant timber flooded in from all over the kingdom. One such location was the mountains near Bagnoli Irpino in Principato Ultra. On May 31, 1309, Robert, the bailiff of Nusco (Principato Ultra) sought restitution from two individuals, Giovanni D’IOnario and Roberto Scalzamulo di Bagnoli, who were accused of cutting down timber in the forests reserved for the construction of Santa Maria Assunta.\textsuperscript{299} In addition, a fine of twenty ounces of gold was threatened on the administrator of the forest for late delivery of materials. Two months earlier the cathedral’s construction administrators ordered from the monastery of Santa Maria di Ripalta, the monastery of Santa Maria della Vittoria near L’Aquila, itself recently under construction, and from Giacomo da Santa Maria, the administrator responsible for the goods confiscated from the Templars, over sixty-four oxen and water buffalo for the transport of wood.\textsuperscript{300} Whether these animals were used to transport wood from Manfredonia to Lucera, Campania to

\textsuperscript{296} CDSL, no. 757 (March 10, 1304).
\textsuperscript{297} CDSL, no. 756 (March 10, 1304, summary).
\textsuperscript{298} CDSL, no. 783 (May 31, 1309, summary).
\textsuperscript{299} CDSL, no. 782 (May 31, 1309).
\textsuperscript{300} CDSL, no. 779 (March 27, 1309, summary).
Lucera, or Biccari to Lucera is unknown, although those who provided the animals seem to have had difficulty with having them returned. On May 12, 1311, Adenolfo Misserello, the new administrator of Templar goods, sought restitution from the cathedral chapter for twenty-six animals not returned. Furthermore, on February 25, 1317, Bandino di Napoli, a judge in Lucera, and Giacomo da Vico, a notary in the city, requested that building administrators for the cathedral confirm that four oxen at the work site died a natural death that past September. This is the final surviving text that references construction on the cathedral. It is reasonable to assume that the cathedral was nearly complete by this date given the cessation of documents, the fourteen-year span between this source and the procurement of materials at Biccari, and the frantic pace in which the Angevin kings expected construction to be completed.

As mentioned earlier funds for construction was collected by Angevin bailiffs, justices, and captains, and redistributed to the building site. For example, on February 8, 1311 Robert of Anjou ordered the canon Hugo of Sisteron and the notary Giovanni of Bari, the building administrators of the site, to collect funds destined for the cathedral from those officials who owed them. As the texts that deal with the procurement of materials concern mainly wood, livestock, and stone, coinage appears to have been used mostly to purchase other materials, such as brick, nails, and lead, and to pay workers. Workers needed would

---

301 *CDSL*, no. 785c (May 12, 1311).
302 *CDSL*, no. 788c (February 25, 1317, summary).
303 *CDSL*, no. 785 (February 8, 1311, summary).
304 On the salaries of workers under the Angevin crown, see Small, 331-332. She has shown that under Charles I laborers made approximately six grani per day, a sum barely above subsistence level, but well above starvation level (approximately 1.2 liters of husked unmilled grain was needed per day to survive in the thirteenth century. Six grani purchased ten liters). Stonemasons earned twelve grani per day in the winter and fifteenth in the summer. Wall builders and carpenters earned the same sum. Brick makers earned six tari per 1,000 bricks.
have included unskilled laborers, drivers, stone masons, stone cutters, builders, carpenters and their assistants, concrete makers, workers who made floors, and plasterers.\textsuperscript{305}

Funding for the new cathedral was funneled from multiple sources, including taxes collected from the surrounding communities of the province.\textsuperscript{306} This was a longstanding practice used both by Charles I and by the Hohenstaufen emperor Frederick II.\textsuperscript{307} Another source of funding included the proceeds from the charge on stamps on scales and other tools of measurement. Profits gained from the imposition of this particular tax in Lucera, Foggia, and Troia contributed to construction coffers.\textsuperscript{308} Other sources of income appear more one-off and opportunistic, and include the sale of some Muslim property in Lucera, and even the funneling of personal debts owed to the crown to the construction site. On April 26, 1303, Charles II ordered ten of the forty ounces owed the court by an unnamed individual funneled to the cathedral site. The other thirty remained in Naples.\textsuperscript{309}

The bishop and canons also must have contributed to the construction of the cathedral through their sizeable privileges, as they, ultimately, were in charge of directing the construction project. During most of the project, the Provençal canon Hugo of Sisteron and notary Giovanni da Bari served as co-	extit{expensores} and 	extit{praepositi}, making them in charge at the site of financial issues, procurement of materials and workers, and overall construction activities.

\textsuperscript{305} Small, 331-332. She argued that unskilled laborers numbered approximately forty to sixty percent of the workforce.
\textsuperscript{306}\textit{CDSL}, no. 784a (1310-1311). Importing the cost on surrounding communities for royal projects dated back to the reign of Frederick II.
\textsuperscript{307} Small, 326.
\textsuperscript{308} \textit{CDSL}, no. 749 (January 15, 1304); and \textit{CDSL}, no. 751 (February 27, 1304). Since 1303, the sum of the tax also had been used to pay the bishop and canons of Lucera. \textit{CDSL}, no. 736 (May 1, 1303).
\textsuperscript{309} \textit{CDSL}, no. 735 (April 26, 1303, summary). This is similar, albeit on a smaller scale, to a method employed at other Angevin building projects, including San Lorenzo Maggiore, where a portion of a debt owed to the crown by Matteo Ruffolo (400 ounces of 2,400 owed) was funneled to the construction site of Neapolitan Franciscan foundation in 1284. See Caroline Bruzelius, “‘ad modum francie,’” 409; Bruzelius, \textit{The Stones of Naples}, 55; and Jill Caskey, \textit{Art and Patronage}, 38-45.
Hugo of Sisteron is mentioned first in Angevin documents on January 18, 1302 when he is named the first canon of the cathedral’s chapter.\textsuperscript{310} By March 10, 1304, the registers name him deacon of the chapter and along with the notary and noble Giovanni da Bari, \textit{expensores} of the cathedral project.\textsuperscript{311} Sometime after that date they gained the titles \textit{praepositi}, or provosts, a title that meant they directed the building site. Both are referred to as such until Hugo’s death in 1311. In a document dated February 8 of that year, Robert of Anjou nominated the unnamed archdeacon of the cathedral to replace Hugo and work alongside Giovanni da Bari.\textsuperscript{312} By February of 1317, the archdeacon Giacomo da Precina served in the role. Giovanni da Bari, who outlived his two previous colleagues, continued to serve as co-provost.\textsuperscript{313}

Tomaiuoli argued that Hugo of Sisteron and Giovanni da Bari were chosen for their roles because of Hugo’s architectural competence and Giovanni’s business acumen.\textsuperscript{314} While this is possible, there is no specific evidence to suggest they possessed such capacities; and it appears more likely both were chosen for their roles because of their close ties to the court. It should be noted that the Provençal Hugo was named the first canon of the chapter a year before he was named both \textit{praepositus} and deacon. Following his death, the \textit{praepositus} continued to be an archdeacon, making it more likely that the prerequisite for the job was administrative experience at the Angevin court rather than architectural knowledge. This would compare to other Angevin building projects, including the earlier construction of Castel Nuovo and the abbey of Santa Maria della Vittoria, whose longtime director was the

\textsuperscript{310} \textit{CDSL}, no. 666 (January 18, 1302).
\textsuperscript{311} \textit{CDSL}, no. 755 (March 10, 1304). See also Tomaiuoli, “Albori della Cattedrale,” 284.
\textsuperscript{312} \textit{CDSL}, no. 785 (February 8, 1311, summary). See also Tomaiuoli, “Albori della Cattedrale,” 284.
\textsuperscript{313} \textit{CDSL}, no. 788c (February 25, 1317, summary). See also Tomaiuoli, “Albori della Cattedrale,” 284.
\textsuperscript{314} Tomaiuoli, “Albori della cattedrale,” 284.
appropriately named Pierre de Chaule, a clerk from Picardy and member of Charles I’s court.\textsuperscript{315}

3. The Completed Cathedral\textsuperscript{316}

3.1. The Interior

An initial observation of piers, capitals, and other structural elements within interior reveals that some stylistic modes circulated throughout the kingdom. However, the manner of execution suggests that local workers, even if forms were transmitted throughout the Regno, executed these elements. Moreover, in some cases architectural similarities may have resulted from long standing regional (rather than local, or Apulian) practices rather than a conscious evocation of the capital. This is one of the challenges faced when examining Lucera’s cathedral within the context of Angevin architectural projects. The cathedral’s


\textsuperscript{316} Restorations by the Royal Soprintendenza from 1875 to 1892 returned the cathedral to its medieval appearance. This followed the designation of the church as a national monument in the years following Italian unification (the fortress and cathedral were declared national monuments in 1871 and 1878, respectively). Alterations included the removal of side chapels built along the exterior wall of the church, the removal marble capitals and bases added to the marble shafts around the choir and the nave piers during the church’s imbaroccamiento, the removal of stucco added to nearly every remaining pier, pillar, rib, cornice, and capital, and the repair of the single lancet windows, which had been squared during the seventeenth century. Circular windows cut into the walls of the sacristy were closed as well and the church’s floor was replaced. The most dramatic restoration, however, was removal of a coffered ceiling that had been added in 1641. Added originally to control heat from escaping through the roof, the ceiling constrained air circulation, leading to rot in the roof’s trusses. Most of the Baroque marble (bianco argento, verde antico, and marmo rosso di Francia) contained in the church was sold by the commune at auction on February 22, 1892. Items for bid included putti, crown mouldings, capitals, pedestals, cornices, basses, and balustrades. On post medieval additions and subsequent additions, see Iacobbe and Riccio, 74-79. The restoration reports, containing volumes of orders, designs, and handwritten letters are held at the Archivio Centrale dello Stato, Rome AA.BB.AA 1° vers., B. 462, F. 337, SF. 1; AA.BB.AA., 2° vers., 2° serie, B. 126; AA.BB.AA., 2° vers, 2° serie, B. 126; AA.BB.AA., 1 vers., B. 461, f. 336, SF. 5; and AA.BB.AA, 1° vers, B. 463.
ashlar piers are a particularly resonant example of this phenomenon. Six run along the left side of the nave while five full piers and a sixth half pier attached to the bell tower support the right nave arcade (fig. 2–8). Each comprises of a rectangular core measuring approximately 130 cm x 110 cm with attached semi-circular shafts at their east and west ends. The piers are spaced approximately 3.8 meters from the other.

The challenge with the pier composition lies in their origins and/or their motivations for use. Similar piers (fig. 2–9) are found at the major churches of Naples, including the Cathedral of Naples (ca. 1294-1309) and the churches of San Pietro a Maiella (first quarter fourteenth century), Santa Chiara (ca. 1313-1338), and San Domenico (ca. 1294-1325). This suggests some level of connection between Angevin architectural projects, and Caroline Bruzelius has argued that the similarities between piers at Lucera and Naples was one of a number of means (most especially, the ground plan) in which Angevin crown sought uniformity in its cathedrals.\textsuperscript{317} On the other hand, the composition at Lucera is similar to a number of much earlier piers found along the Adriatic coast as well (fig. 2–10 and fig. 2–11), including those of the much earlier church of San Gregorio in Bari (late eleventh century), San Nicola (late eleventh, early twelfth century), the cathedrals of Bisceglie (1073-1295) and Conversano (eleventh-twelfth centuries), the church of Santa Maria del Buonconsiglio in Bari (nineth-twelfth centuries), and parts of Bari’s castle built under Hohenstaufen rule during the middle of the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{318} What changes at Lucera from the other Apulian examples is its extensive use. It is the only method for supporting the arcade made of pointed arches whereas in earlier examples piers had been used nearly exclusively to break

\textsuperscript{317} Bruzelius, 108. The piers of Naples cathedral are the largest, followed by Lucera, San Domenico, San Pietro a Maiella, and Santa Chiara.
\textsuperscript{318} Bruzelius noted that similar piers with columns and masonry shafts are found in Campania at the cathedrals of Caserta Vecchia and Sessa Aurunca. See Bruzelius, Stones of Naples, 92.
up a row of reused columns and capitals supporting arches. This leads to the question of whether the use of the pier at Lucera was (or would have been seen) as an evocation of Naples or a longstanding regional practice for supporting nave arcades? An argument in favor of any sort of conscious political argument seems difficult to make, especially when considering both arch and pier. Surviving combinations reveal that arch and pier/column supports were not used with any consistency in Naples. For example, for all its similarities to Lucera’s piers, those at the later church of Santa Chiara support round arches. Moreover, whereas Naples cathedral employs the piers in support of pointed arches, the pointed arches of the adjoining chapel (and former church) of Santa Restituta renovated under the Angevin crown are supported by reused columns.\textsuperscript{319} Adding to this analysis, especially in regard to any notion of how Lucera’s piers would have been read, is the fact that the most figural elements of the composition, the pier capitals, show the legacy of Apulian stone carving, bearing motifs that include schematized foliage and vegetation carved in deep relief (fig. 2–12).\textsuperscript{320} For the viewer these surely must have been the least abstract and most visually appealing elements of the compositions, and they point directly to the very specific geographic position and accompanying artistic tradition in which the cathedral was constructed. Unfortunately the capitals that top the piers at Santa Chiara, San Domenico, and San Pietro a Maiella are too mutilated to offer viable comparisons. However, what does


\textsuperscript{320} François Lenormant argued that the capitals share strong similarities with surviving pieces of the archivolt of Frederick II’s palace at Foggia. While not much of a direct connection can be made between Lucera’s capitals and the archivolt at Foggia, Lucera’s pier capitals appear very much within the realm of an Apulian sculptural tradition. It should be cautioned, though, that some of these capitals were replaced during the course of restorations, although, according to the restoration reports, “of a kind and type like the original.” See François Lenormant, \textit{A travers l’Apulia et la Lucanie. Notes de voyage} (Paris: A. Lévy, 1883), 96; and Rome, Archivio Centrale di Stato, AA. BB. AA. 2 vers., 2 ser., B. 126.
survive suggests that the Neapolitan capitals followed a different sculptural tradition than those at Santa Maria Assunta.\footnote{321}

The use of columns within the church raises similar issues. Twelve reused columns (eleven *verde antico* and one *cipollino*) form the lower portion of two-tiered shafts that support the three transept arches and three apse arches (fig. 2–13). Another two *verde antico* columns support the gable above the main portal on the church’s façade. The columns are the only surviving marble columns in the church, and considering their prominent placement around the choir and along the façade are probably those *columnae marmora et lapides antiquae* transported from the city’s fortress to the construction site.

The upper register of the two-tiered shafts is made from cut limestone. As with the piers, a similar solution was used to extend the height of reused columns at the cathedral of Naples.\footnote{322} At the same time, stacked shafts support an arcade that surround the twelfth-century apse of the cathedral of Troia, located a much closer twenty kilometers south of Lucera (fig. 2–14). Whether the referent was the cathedral of Naples, a church in which ideologically Santa Maria Assunta may have shared more, or the cathedral of Troia, the main church of a city located nineteen kilometers away that contributed directly to the construction of the cathedral of Lucera monitarily through taxes and also possibly through manpower, technically remains debatable. However, the answer seemingly points more and more to a local referent. The question, like so many of these issues, lies within the realm of competing agencies between workers, patrons, and intermediaries such as building project administrators. To be to determine definite answers, however, unfortunately requires the type of explanatory documents that did not, or at least no longer, survive from the period.

\footnote{321}{The abacus of the capitals at San Pietro a Maiella and Santa Chiara share much more in common with each than examples at Lucera.}

\footnote{322}{Bruzelius, *The Stones of Naples*, 79. The piers of Naples Cathedral also contain stacked reused columns.}
Despite the many unanswerable questions, the choice at Naples, Lucera, and Troia to stack columns in order to increase their height is much more elegant than the numerous examples where the height of shorter reused columns is compensated by extending the height of the base or the capital. Examples of that strategy can be found within the nave arcade of the cathedral of Bari (late twelfth, early thirteenth century), the portico of Santa Maria Incoronata in Naples (fourteenth century), and the nave arcade at the Franciscan foundation of Santa Maria in Aracoeli in Rome (second half thirteenth century). However, the combining of marble shafts and ashlar columns at Lucera breaks the church into horizontal segments. At Lucera, the uses of cornices at the breaking points that continue as courses around the church emphasize this segmentation as well as the fact that Lucera’s cathedral is much more squat than its Neapolitan counterpart. Additional segments of coursing carved in the style of the arcades’ capitals anchor those that support the apse and transept arches (fig. 2–15). Examples at other Angevin churches, including the Franciscan church in Lucera and the Neapolitan churches of Sant’Eligio and San Pietro a Maiella display fragments of similar types of coursing anchored to apse arch capitals. However, although roughly contemporary, none of Neapolitan examples match Lucera’s cathedral in the amount of surviving coursing, or in in the case of the Neapolitan churches, in the style of carving employed.

Whereas most structural elements within the interior point to local manufacture, surviving fourteenth-century objects that furnished the space reflect a different set of economies. They decidedly are more modern than the vernacular forms employed during construction, and instead speak to current stylistic and iconographical trends reflective of

---

323 The coursing continues along the exterior of the church as well, and at times is the same height as the coursing running parallel on the interior of the church.
both the crown’s desires to project its presence, power, and legitimacy, as well as the more
general phenomenon of Naples as regional artistic taste-maker. Importantly, they reflect that
art objects and artists emanating from Naples and other cultural centers circulated throughout
the kingdom—indeed on the same networks that supplied Lucera’s building materials,
settlers from Basilicata and the Terra di Bari, and merchants for the new city under
construction—and furnished wealthy and important sites throughout the kingdom with art
evocative of the capital. The result was that the cathedral’s “current” and “courtly” interior
furnishings stabilized its vernacular building form, placing an effective Angevin stamp on a
building whose structural form belonged to the local landscape.\textsuperscript{324}

In all, objects within the cathedral that survive, or are known to have existed, that
reflect this circulation of artistic priorities from the capital include two pieces of metalwork,
at least one wood crucifix, a tomb slab, and a freestanding wood sculpture of the Virgin and
Child (this last work receives separate treatment in the fifth chapter). In addition, the
interior, just like many of the surviving objects under consideration, contains surviving
heraldry from the royal family. The most conspicuous surviving sign of an Angevin “stamp”
on the building, the crown’s arms remain in the bosses of all three vaulted apses, and on the
vaulting above the entrance under the bell tower (fig. 2–16, fig. 2–17, and fig. 2–18). The
importance of heraldry as a marker of presence will be discussed below and in extended
detail in the third chapter.

As noted earlier, the crown donated a large number of liturgical furnishings to the
cathedral at the time of its construction. In addition to the items mentioned previously, in
1309 the future King Robert of Anjou, then the Duke of Calabria, donated a silver cross with

\textsuperscript{324} Much more on the relationship between “current” furnishings and vernacular structures in Angevin building
will be revealed in chapter 3.
a reported cost of four ounces, twenty-five *tarì,* and four *grana* to the cathedral.\textsuperscript{325} The cross was the product of French metalworkers, in particular Guillaume de Verdelay, active at the Angevin court from the end of the thirteenth century until the 1330s.\textsuperscript{326} The group produced a number of pieces at the turn of the fourteenth century for important royal establishments. These included two crosses, one now lost, for San Nicola in Bari, the silver-gilded bust of Saint Januarius at the cathedral of Naples, and a cross donated by Celestine V to his birthplace of Isernia.\textsuperscript{327}

The Lucera cross no longer survives, but the cathedral’s similar royal status to San Nicola and the relatively close period during which both were produced suggests that the Bari cross can provide important insights into the look of the now-missing piece of metalwork. The double-sided silver and enamel Bari cross is approximately 1.1 meters tall. It contains fragments of the True Cross within the center, and is marked at its ends, base, and top by a series of fleurs-des-lis and Angevin heraldry. Jill Caskey has noted that this was an iconographical shift from earlier True Cross reliquaries found in Byzantine environs, southern Italy, and Gothic France.\textsuperscript{328} Rather than displaying Christological imagery like

\textsuperscript{325} Schulz, vol. 9, doc. 139. See also Giovanni Boraccesi, *Gli argenti della cattedrale e del Museo Diocesano di Lucera* (Foggia: Claudio Grenzi Editore, 2003), 13.


\textsuperscript{327} Bertaux, “Les artistes française,” 270 and 277. Other French royal donations of fine metalwork to royal foundations included the reliquary of the True Cross donated by Philip Augustus to Saint-Denis in 1205; a bust of Saint Denis donated to the abbey by Mathieu de Vendôme, counselor of Louis IX; a bust of the Magdalene donated to the cathedral of Aix by the future Charles II; and a bust of Louis IX donated to Sainte-Chapelle by Philip the Fair. See Bertaux, “Les artistes française,” 277-278; and Jill Caskey, “The Look of Liturgy,” 117.

\textsuperscript{328} These include the Stauroteca of Romanus donated to the abbey of Monte Cassino around 990, the mid-twelfth-century cross of Sicilian manufacture donated to the Cathedral of Cosenza by Frederick II in 1222, and
those examples, the Bari cross emphasizes Angevin presence and power. The Evangelists displayed at the ends of the crosses in the earlier examples are replaced by representations of Angevin heraldry. The alterations shift not only iconographical paradigms, but ideological as well. The Angevin arms on the cross effectively claimed royal ownership over the object and the sacred space that it occupied, as it did when physically placed onto the cathedral along the bosses and arches of the three apses and the gable of the main portal. These arms, according to Caskey, “define[d] the Angevins as custodians of the holy objects that they support[ed] and surround[ed].”

The silver cross at Lucera most likely bore a similar message. While not described as a reliquary cross like that at San Nicola, Angevin ownership most likely was demonstrably displayed. This seems even more likely considering that the two surviving pieces of metalwork at the cathedral, the front and back cover of an evangeliary, bear references to the Angevin crown through similar strategies as at Bari. These pieces, each made of silver with gilt silver and enamel medallions, generally are dated to the middle of the fourteenth century and have been identified on account of stamps on the front cover as a product of metalworkers from the Abruzzan town of Sulmona, an important center for the craft (fig. 2–19 and fig 2–20). The front cover depicts Christ in Majesty with the symbols of the Evangelists and the back portrays Christ crucified between the Virgin, John, and two angels. The front cover also contains three enamel medallions. Two, which surround Christ, contain an example from the Limousin region of France, now held at the Musée de Cluny, date to the second half of the thirteenth century. See Caskey, “The Look of Liturgy,” 117-118.

329 Ibid.
330 Ibid.
331 On the evangeliary, See Pace, “Arte di età angionia,” 255-256; and Boraccesi, 26; and Michele D’Elia, ed. Mostra dell’Arte in Puglia dal tardo antico al rococo (Rome: De Luca, 1964), 48. Boracessi argued that the stamps containing the three letters “SUL” are the oldest-surviving brand markings for Sulmonesi metalworkers. On Sulmona as an important commercial center during the late Middle Ages, see Paola Gasparinetti, “La ‘Via degli Abruzzi’ e l’attività commerciale di Aquila e Sulmona nei secoli XIII-XV,” Bullettino della Deputazione Abruzzese di Storia Patria (1964-1966), 31-35, and 81-92.
portraits of prophets bearing scrolls. The third medallion at the feet of Christ depicts a kneeling angel in profile holding a shield that bears a bishop’s crozier as the stem of a fleurs-des-lis (fig. 2–21). Like the Bari cross, the evangelium’s emphasis on the Angevin arms and the office of bishop immediately connected the performance of the liturgy and the bishop’s charge with the crown. That the emphasis on royal presence still was a priority for the Lucera evangelium—created approximately half a century after the Bari cross and argued by most scholars to be an episcopal, rather than royal donation—suggests that the visual language employed in works such as the Bari cross was the rule, and one that persisted, rather than the exception for important liturgical objects donated to the Regno’s great churches.\(^3\) This implies that the Lucera cross donated by the king just nine years following the purge contained royal referents that were as powerful, if not more, than those seen at San Nicola and within the Lucera evangelium.

A fourteenth-century wood and polychrome crucifix now positioned on the cathedral’s high altar speaks to the taste for and circulation of new artistic modes as well (fig. 2–22). This time, however, the cultural referent most likely is central Italy or perhaps even Germany rather than France. The sculpture is a so-called *crucifix dolorosus*, a type of devotional image that developed first in the late twelfth century to emphasize Christ’s death and suffering upon the cross.\(^3\) Visceral and graphic in its representation Christ’s body as gaunt and bloody, elongated and slouched, and with his mouth and eyes open post mortem, the image type was in direct contrast with the *Christus triumphans*, or the representation of Christ’s triumphant death on the cross signified by his erect posture, open eyes, and calm countenance. Developed initially out of Dominican mysticism, the presence of the *crucifix*

\(^{332}\) Unfortunately, the evangelium text itself no longer survives. See Braccesi, 26.

dolorosus image type at Lucera’s cathedral speaks both the introduction of a new style and iconography into the landscape as well as the rise of a new form of devotion.334

Géza de Francovich, the Italian art historian who coined the phrase crucifix dolorosus, dated the work to approximately 1335 to 1340 on account of the rendering of the deep folds and large, richly detailed knot of Christ’s loincloth, the wide, swollen open gashes in Christ’s right side, his feet, and his palms, the individual modeling of the ribs, and the finely rendered curls on Christ’s beard.335 The work certainly is one of the most impressive examples of a Christus dolorosus on the peninsula, and de Francovich suggested that the work was modeled after Rhenish prototypes due to a large collection of similar sculpted images in and around Cologne. The art historian was unsure, though, whether the work resulted from a German sculptor or a Neapolitan sculptor trained within a German tradition.336

More recently, however, work on a group of crucifixi dolorosi from central Italy suggests that Lucera’s sculpture may have originated directly from the peninsula.337 A high concentration of wood crucifixes dating to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries from Tuscany, Umbria, and the Marche reveals that that region served as a center for their production in addition to and independent of sculptors from the Rhineland. In fact, art


335 Ibid. Christ’s crown, depicted more as a weave of ropes more than of thorns, appears to be the result of later alterations.

336 de Francovich, “L’origine e la sua diffusione,” 196-197. See also Leone de Castris, Arte di Corte, 162; and Pace, “Arte di età angiona,” 253. Leone de Castris suggested that the “Rhenish” qualities of the sculpture may be the stylistic afterlife of two German sculptors named Theodoricus de Alemanna and Galeactus Frater who reported carved an image of Charles II enthroned in 1309. On these sculptors, see also Lorenz Enderlein, Die Grabbegräben des Hauses Anjou in Unteritalien: Totenkult und Monumente 1266-1343 (Worms: Wernesch Verlagsgesellschaft, 1997), 67, note 19.

337 de Francovich was the first to study this group. See Géza de Francovich “A Romanesque School of Wood Carvers in Central Italy.” The Art Bulletin 19, no. 1 (March 1937), 4-57.
historian Pavel Kalina has suggested that Lucera’s crucifix shares direct parallels stylistically with at least three other works, including one that he has dated to the first decade of the fourteenth century held at the church of San Domenico in Orvieto, the so-called Crucifix of Oristano in Sardegna that he dates from the same period, and a third reportedly donated to the cathedral of Palermo in 1311 by the Sicilian noble Manfredi Chiaramonte. Kalina’s attributions have immense implications for contextualizing Lucera’s crucifix. He has suggested that the same central Italian artist or workshop could have created all four, making the Lucera crucifix an Italian work instead of Rhenish (either by production location of origins of sculptors). Moreover, his connection would push the date of Lucera’s crucifix back to the first decade of the fourteenth century. From there, the question, perhaps fleetingly, can be asked whether this crucifix is in fact the crucifixum ligneum cum beata Virgine et b. Iohanne donated to the church by Charles II in 1303. Numerous examples of freestanding, largescale crucifixes and Deposition groups from central Italy and beyond contained accompanying statues of the Virgin and Saint John. No such figures survive at

338 Kalina, 86-88. Kalina’s dates for all four images are approximately three decades earlier than those given by de Francovich and later Monika von Alemann-Schwartz. This is on account of Kalina’s assertion that the Italian crucifixes developed independently from those in Germany. In classic studies of the objects, de Francovich and von Alemann-Schwartz argued that the Italian crucifixes developed from German models, namely the early fourteenth-century crucifix dolorosus at St. Maria im Kapitol in Cologona. See de Francovich, “L’origine e la sua diffusione”; and Monika von Alemann-Schwartz, “Crucifixus Dolorosus: Beiträge zur Polychromie und Ikonographie der rheinischen Gabelkruzifixe” (PhD Diss., Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Bonn, 1976), 185-196, 385, 390-392. On the Palermo Crucifix, which was restored in the early 1990s, see Diana E. Kaley, Il Crocifisso Chiaramonte della Cattedrale di Palermo (Palermo: Cattedrale di Palermo, 1993). Like de Francovich’s and von Alemann-Schwartz’s assements of the Lucera crucifix, Kaley argued that the work was done by a German sculptor in Italy.

339 The similarity between the Orvieto sculpture and the Lucera crucifix, particularly in the rendering and moulding of the long, pronounced, and horizontal ribcage, the deep drapery of the loincloth, the rigidity and grip of the fingers, and the swell of the foot wounds are particularly striking between the Orvieto sculpture and the Lucera crucifix.

340 Leone de Castris and Calò Mariani made similar hypotheses even before pushing back the crucifix’s date. See Leone de Castris, Arte di corte, 162; and Maria Stella Calò Mariani, La Puglia fra Bisanzio e l’Occidente (Milan: Electa, 1980), 210.

341 A Notable example of the Crucifixion with freestanding figures of the Virgin and John is found at the Pinacoteca of Montone in Umbria. The group was formerly held at the church of San Gregorio in the same city.
Lucera today; however, it was not unusual for these groups to be dispersed after the Middle Ages. Thirteenth-century statues of Saint John and the Virgin now held in the collections of the Musée de Cluny and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, among other institutions, attest to the fact. Admittedly, nothing else links concretely Charles II’s donation to the crucifix held today within the cathedral. The crucifix dolorosus studied by Francovich, Kalina, and others, and the (possibly lost) crucifix described in the 1303 donation diploma could be different works. Nevertheless, whatever the patronal source of the surviving fourteenth-century object—whether it was royal, noble, religious, or merchant—the crucifix dolorosus not only is of high artistic value and imported from outside of the region (most probably central Italy), but the work also helped introduce into the Regno a new mode of image veneration relatively foreign to the kingdom, particularly in and around Apulia.

The final surviving fourteenth-century object within the cathedral, a marble gisant of a youthful soldier now within the cappella Galluci, also engages with late medieval anxieties over death and the body (fig. 2–23). First, however, a very brief statement needs to be made on the historiography of the object. Lacking any identifiers, all the more intriguing by a blank shield on the chest that presumably displayed heraldry, the object had been identified since at least the end of the sixteenth century as a cenotaph of Charles II.  

The inscription still placed above it that dates to the eighteenth century identifies the statue as such. While this misidentification has not fully died—it continues to be aided by the inscription that

---

Notable examples of deposition groups include those at the cathedrals of Tivoli and Volterra, and the Abbey of Montevergine in Campania, and the cathedral of Scala.  

Fifteenth-century documents reportedly read by Emmanuele Cavalli may also identify the statue as Charles, as well as a document dating to 1579 that mentions the construction of an altar in a chapel where “the marble monument of Charles II of Anjou is found.” See Lenormant, 98; and Giuseppe Gerola, “La statua di Lucera e l’iconografia di Carlo II d’Angiò,” in Miscellanea di storia dell’arte in onore di Igino Beneventuto Supino (Florence: L.S. Olschki, 1933), 81-84.

The eighteenth-century inscription at the statue’s feet reads, “Carolus II Andegavenis AS. MCCC Te mplum Deo et Deiparae dicavit.” This was the same century in which Carlo Corradi’s (d. 1725) identified the statue as Charles II. See Lenormant, 98; and Gerola, 81-84.
remains above the slab—the early twentieth-century art historian Giuseppe Gerola provided the first systematic analysis against its identification as Charles II. Gerola analyzed the few surviving images of Charles II and argued that the statue lacked any iconographic signifiers that linked it to the king. Moreover, citing the presence of armor in addition to dogs right below his feet, a symbol of courtliness and loyalty in late medieval funerary monuments, he rightly connected the statue to a number of Neapolitan tombs of nobles found in the side chapels of Santa Chiara, San Domenico, and San Lorenzo that date from the middle of the fourteenth century (fig. 2–24).

Within this context first outlined by Gerola, the tomb slab at Lucera’s cathedral is representative of growing anxieties within the Regno over death as a result of the doctrine of Purgatory, codified after 1245, and the visual responses of both the laity and religious institutions to these new concerns for purifying the soul during this intermediary state. The late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries saw a rise in new technologies aimed at aiding in the transition to heaven. Burial as close as possible to the religious and the laity who could pray for a soul became increasingly important, resulting in the rise of burial underneath the pavement, in niches, and in added chapels in churches. Moreover, tombs,

---

344 The images cited by Gerola, which include coins from the Kingdom of Naples, the Signoria of Cuneo in Piedmont, and the County of Provence; seals and bulls from Provence and Naples; and a fresco of the Last Judgment dating to around 1320 at Santa Maria Donnaregina always include a crowned Charles, whether enthroned or knighted, who usually wears a rich dalmatic with a belt and long stole. See Gerola, 92-97. See also, Julian Gardner, “Seated Kings, Sea-Faring Saints and Heraldry: Some Themes in Angevin Iconography,” in L’État angevin: pouvoir, culture et société entre XIIIe et XIVe siècle (Rome: L’École française de Rome, 1998), 115-126. The archeologist François Lenormant, finding the statue position upright in 1883, was the first to offer doubts on an Identification as Charles II, citing that the figure lacked a crown. See Lenormant, 98.

345 Gerola, 92-97. On this topos in fourteenth-century tombs in the Regno, see also Caskey, Art and Patronage, 199-200.


347 Caroline Bruzelius, “The Dead Come to Town: Preaching, Burying, and Building in the Mendicant Orders,” in The Year 1300 and the Creation of a New European Architecture, eds. Alexandra Gajewska and Zoë Opacic (Turnout: Brepolis, 2007), 203-224. Bruzelius argued that San Domenico in Naples and the Cathedral of Naples may have been the first churches to incorporate burial chapels in the original plans.
and in particular effigy tombs that identified the dead, became important vehicles for memorialization.\textsuperscript{348} The phenomenon began in mendicant churches, with the orders using the sale of burial space as a means to pay for construction. Cathedrals soon followed suit, however, leading in extreme cases to competitions over dead bodies that turned violent.\textsuperscript{349}

The Lucera slab, now understood to have belonged to an unknown member of the nobility, would have formed the top of a rectangular box. This type of tomb became widespread in the \textit{Regno} among the nobility beginning in the second quarter of the fourteenth century and the Lucera box most likely included an inscription along the border that identified the individual—essential if he was to be remembered and prayed for—as well as heraldry, iconic images of the Madonna and Child, the \textit{imago pietatis}, or the Apostles and saints, or portraits of the dead on its front.\textsuperscript{350} As Lucera’s cathedral contained no side chapels during the fourteenth century, the monument would have been placed along the wall of an aisle or perhaps one of the side apses, and mounted at the back on a plinth and supported on its front by legs. It dates to the middle of the fourteenth century on account of its resemblance to the tombs of the Angevin courtiers Enrico Sanservino in Teggiano (after 1336), Filippo Sangineto in Altomonte (after 1347), and the tomb of Francesco della Ratta,


\textsuperscript{349} The most well known example is the case of the battle in 1288 over the body of a Florentine merchant between the Bishop and Canons of Salerno and the Franciscans of the city’s friary. The representatives of the cathedral reportedly kidnapped the body of the merchant for burial and then returned to the friary to beat and strip the friars naked and destroy their books and vestments. On this episode, see Caskey, \textit{Art and Patronage}, 222; and Bruzelius, “The Dead Come to Town,” 205.

\textsuperscript{350} For the most extensive survey of these objects, see Michalsky, \textit{Memoria und Räpräsentation}. 
the Count of Caserta who died in 1359 (fig. 2–25).\textsuperscript{351} The similarities in particular are striking between the Lucera slab and that of Francesco della Ratta, as both wear similarly brocaded armor with high fringed collars, knee-length skirts with relatively shallow folds, and a curly bob that appears to have been fashionable in the Regno for all male members the royal family and nobility.

The Lucera slab’s resemblance to these comparative tombs reveals that this type of sepulchral monument for the wealthy and powerful gained momentum throughout the Regno, spreading from Naples to other locales such as the Amalfi coast, Calabria, and Lucera. As such, it reveals also that in places like the newly rebuilt city the nobility were as important importers of “courtly” art as was the crown. If art, rather than architecture, was used as the true stamp of stylistic modernity within Angevin visual economies, the nobility, in effect, were just as responsible for bringing Naples to Lucera.

3.2. The Exterior and West End

The use of brick to face the rubble masonry core separates the cathedral and the rest of Lucera’s churches from other buildings constructed throughout the Regno by the Angevin crown. The choice of brick was distinctly local, and the material served as the building block of choice for nearly every surviving Lucera construction until the Second World War. Like the Angevin fortress and the buildings within it, the one-and-half-meter thick exterior walls of Lucera’s cathedral and other fourteenth-century churches are faced in brick over rubble

\textsuperscript{351} See also Michele D’Elia, 47. On the tomb of Enrico Sansevero, see Michalsky, Memoria und Räpresentation, 235-236. On the object’s link stylistic link to the tomb of Filippo Sanginetto, see Pace, “Arte di età angioina,” 248. On the tomb of Francesco della Ratta, see Michalsky, Memoria und Räpresentation, 233, note 8.
masonry and accented with ashlar corner stones. Brick structures also survive at the Castle of Melfi and San Lorenzo in Pantano outside Foggia, yet the extent to which brick was used at Lucera grants a unique appearance to buildings that otherwise share many stylistic similarities with their Apulian cousins. The ubiquity of the product and continued use from antiquity through the present makes dating periods of refurbishment, reconstruction, or restoration particularly difficult in the city.

Brick has a long history as a building material within Lucera. The material was used for the construction of the Roman amphitheater at the eastern edge of town (fig. 2–26). Angevin diplomas from the 1270s on the building of the Angevin fortress show that some of the brick used for its construction was produced in Fiorentino, a town that has since been destroyed and absorbed by the modern city of Torremaggiore some twenty-five kilometers from Lucera (fig. 2–7). During the construction of Lucera’s fortress Charles I ordered that eighty masters from the town make brick for the massive complex. At the time forty ounces of gold bought 200,000 bricks.

The scale in which brick was produced at that time for the fortress and the presence of millions of bricks in fourteenth-century Lucera suggests that large-scale brick production at Fiorentino, and most likely Lucera as well, continued well into the fourteenth century. Whereas no surviving fourteenth-century documents connect Fiorentino to Lucera’s reconstruction, many bricks, particularly at the cathedral and to a lesser extent at San Francesco, measure the same as the dimensions dictated by Charles I for each Fiorentino

---

353 Haseloff, Architettura sveva, 158.
brick: 29/30 cm. x 15 cm. x 4.5/5 cm.\textsuperscript{354} This suggests that the standard, undoubtedly an ideal rather than reality in consideration of the scale of production, remained in place throughout the period of Lucera’s reconstruction. Other bricks (not counting those used in subsequent restorations), however, are smaller, some are much larger, others, particularly at San Francesco, are fragments, suggesting that the blocks were produced at multiple sites and possibly reused from abandoned or crumbling buildings (fig. 2–27).

All exterior decorative elements are confined to the façade. Articulation includes the portals, a single lancet window, the windows of the belltower, some consoles along the roof line, and a rose window that has been heavily restored, its minimal ornament is analogous to other Apulian church façades that date between the fourteenth century and the construction of the Basilica San Nicola in Bari at the turn of the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{355} At Lucera the west end rises twenty-eight meters at its peak, but its flat profile above the two side portals contrasts with Apulian conventions where pitched facades continue their slope above those areas. In addition, the positioning of its bell tower above the side portal breaks from regional conventions.\textsuperscript{356} By contrast, San Nicola’s massive rectangular towers that date from the twelfth century flank the side portals, and at Santa Maria Maggiore in Barletta the late twelfth-century bell tower was placed behind and to the north of the portals (fig. 2–28 and fig. 2–29). The effect is that Lucera’s cathedral lacks the arrow or triangular shape seen in most of the great churches dating from the late Middle Ages in southeast Italy.

\textsuperscript{354} Haseloff noted that these measurements match those at the castle of Melfi and Lucera’s fortress. This is true especially along the north wall of the fortress.

\textsuperscript{355} The list of facades and churches influenced by San Nicola is long, and includes those of the Cathedral of Bari as well as the cathedrals of Bovino, Barletta, Trani, Bitonto, Bitetto, and Ruvo. For San Nicola’s architectural impact in Apulia and the Adriatic, see Kai Kappel, \textit{San Nicola in Bari und seine architektonische Nachfolge: Ein Bautypus des 11.-17. Jahrhunderts in Unteralien und Dalmatien} (Worms: Wernersche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1996).

\textsuperscript{356} This break from convention is seen also at the Cathedral of Altamura. Both cathedrals’ bell towers were completed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. However, the positioning of the bell towers appears to date the fourteenth century.
As with the interior, some exterior elements pose challenges in regard to evaluating ideology, agency, and the process of building within the Regno. The addition of a twenty-five-meter-tall octagonal tower at the north corner is most representative of these elements. Its presence marks another interesting difference between the façade of Lucera’s cathedral and others within the Apulian milieu, especially since its purpose is solely decorative (fig. 2–2). Moreover, the use of octagonal towers on church facades appears completely new to region around this period, and is seen at a number of churches attached to the Angevin crown. Churches with octagonal towers include the palatine chapel at Castel Nuovo, the Dominican church of Santa Maria della Consolazione in Altomonte, Calabria from the mid fourteenth century built by the Angevin courtier Filippo Sangineto, the Cathedral of Altamura reconstructed under Charles II and Robert of Anjou (fig. 2–30 and 2–31), and the churches of L’Aquila built during the last quarter of the thirteenth century (discussed in chapter 4). Examples at L’Aquila include Santa Maria di Collemaggio (begun 1287, construction through the fourteenth century), the church the Angevin crown supported after the pontificate of the order’s founder, Pope Celestine V.357

It is telling that most, if not all of these examples postdate the octagonal bell tower constructed at the shrine of the Archangel Michael at Monte Sant’Angelo (fig. 2–32). The tower was built sometime between 1274 and 1278 under the orders of Charles I by the local

masons and brothers Giordano and Marando of Monte Sant’Angelo. Standing at twenty-seven meters tall and nearly eight meters in diameter, the tower rises above all of the other structures of the medieval town that sits atop Monte Gargano. The tower is notable for what it reveals about the continuity of building techniques between Hohenstaufen and Angevin rule. Giuseppe Agnello and Maria Stella Calò Mariani, among other scholars, have argued that with its dimensions, elevation, vaulting, and sculptural decoration, the tower is a direct reference to Frederick II’s Castel del Monte near Andria.\(^{358}\) Was the Monte Sant’Angelo bell tower the prototype for the later octagonal facade towers? Moreover, the replication of a Hohenstaufen monument for an Angevin-sponsored project raises a number of questions regarding intent and agency. Does the style of the tower mark the intentions of a new sovereign to emulate a former ruler of Apulia? Is its design the result of employing masons trained in local building practices? Was the work begun under the Hohenstaufen regime and completed by Giordano and Marando? The answer may include parts of all explanations, but the construction of Monte Sant’Angelo’s tower and octagonal tower at Lucera provides another example of vernacular building forms and practices finding a place among Angevin architectural commissions.

Questions of agency, intent, and process culminate in the study of the cathedral’s façade portals. The forms appear as if they are the combination of portals used throughout Naples during the fourteenth century and those of Apulia that had been employed since the end of the eleventh century. Overall, the shape of the jambs, lintels, archivolts, and tympana show strong affinities with fourteenth-century Neapolitan portals and the Lucera fortress

---

chapel portal discussed in the first chapter. Moreover, a sculpture of the Virgin and child set within the tympanum has been linked to the workshop, or more likely the afterlife, of Tino di Camaino, the sculptor from Siena who took residence at the Angevin court in Naples from 1324 until his death in 1337 (fig. 2–33). Caskey and others have shown that the sculptor’s legacy was particularly strong outside of the city of Naples, and that the spread of Tinesque work belonged to the new era of cultural dissemination from Naples. She suggested that this cultural dissemination was facilitated by the spread of artists trained in the Neapolitan workshops of Tino and other court artists like Giotto and Pietro Cavallini. The Virgin and Child group at Lucera appear to be a product of this dissemination. The figure of a standing contrapposto Madonna, round-faced with deep, v-shaped folds, holds the Christ Child. It is the most “Gothic” piece of carving attached to the cathedral. However, it displays local characteristics as well. The two stand on a plinth and underneath a trefoil canopy supported by two lions, as per in many Tino works, yet the lions themselves look, and are executed in the same manner, as lions employed as consoles and pedestals along the Apulian coast in earlier centuries. Their Apulian characteristics are especially revealing in

359 Calò Mariani argued that the sculpted piece has clear assonances to Madonnas produced by the workshop of Tino di Camaino, including a sculpted enthroned Madonna in the canopy of the monument of Charles of Calabria (destroyed during the Second World War) or the group of Virgin and Child sculptures conserved at the Bargello (dated 1321-1323). See Maria Stella Calò Mariani, “La scultura lapidea,” in Capitanata medievale, ed. Maria Stella Calò Mariani (Foggia; Claudio Grenzi, 1998), 169.

360 A number of important Neapolitan tombs have been attributed to Tino, including those of Mary of Hungary (d. 1323), wife of King Charles II, at Santa Maria Donna Regina; Charles (d. 1328), the Duke of Calabria (son of King Robert of Anjou), at Santa Chiara; Catherine of Austria (d. 1323), first wife of Charles of Calabria at San Lorenzo Maggiore; and Mary of Valois (d. 1332), second wife of Charles of Calabria, at Santa Chiara. On Tino as court artist, see Warnke, The Court Artists 7-8; Lorenz Enderlein, Die Grablegen des Hauses Anjou in Unteritalien: Totenkult und monumente 1266-1343 (Worms: Wernersche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1997); Samantha Kelly, The New Solomon, 59; Nicolas Bock, “Künstler, Grab und Auftraggeber,” 27; Bruzelius, The Stones of Naples, 99 & 157; Cathleen A. Fleck, “The Rise of the Court Artist,” 460-483; and Bock, “Patronage, Standards, and Transfert Culturel,” 578.


362 Ibid., 239.
the execution of the schematized, yet layered hair, the design of their wide, bulging eyes, and
the rendering of their wide open, almost smiling mouths with sharp pointy teeth.

Other elements within the portal composition, however, point strictly to local
sculptors, or at least the incorporation of local reused sculptural work into the overall design
of the portals. The portals’ gables are distinctly Apulian and bear deep pointed canopies like
those seen at other sites along the Adriatic coast, including San Nicola in Bari (fig. 2–34).
The one significance difference between the gable at Lucera’s main portal and most in
Apulia created between the end of the eleventh and the fourteenth centuries is that column
bases support the shafts rather than consoles usually fashioned as lions, oxen, or elephants.

In addition sculptural details within the portals as a whole are distinctly local.\textsuperscript{363} Foliage and interlace patterns as well as friezes bearing conjoined lions, masks, and pecking
birds separate the area between the jambs and archivolt (fig. 2–35 and fig. 2–36). All of
these motifs are deeply rooted vernacular repertoires, dating at least from the end of the
eleventh century. Sculpture along the gable also belongs to this stylistic tradition, and an
image on the side of the baldachin that depicts a hooded figure driving livestock or cutting
vegetation bears close resemblance to twelfth-century details on the so-called “Lions” portal
at San Nicola (fig. 2–37, fig. 2–38, and fig. 2–39).

The combination of Neapolitan and Apulian elements within the portals raises
numerous questions regarding agency, intent, and process. Do the portals represent instances
of intentional blending of the old (Apulian) with the new (Neapolitan)? Was the combination
of vernacular forms with more “courtly” a means of appropriating local forms for royal use?

\textsuperscript{363} As early as 1883 François Lenormant argued that local masons carved the cathedral’s portal, capitals, and
other sculptural decorations. In the 1930s Giambattista Gifuni linked the sculptural work to Nicola di
Bartolomeo da Foggia. See Lenormant, 96; and Giambattista Gifuni, Lucera, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. (Urbino: S.T.E.U., 1937),
18.
Did the two elements play off of each other, one serving as an index to which the other could be read?\textsuperscript{364} Or was the result a question of production? Were these pieces manufactured in one location and shipped from Naples and Lucera? Did carvers move between each location? Were these elements the product of local workers modeling Neapolitan forms?

For now, questions of ideology will be set aside. In regard to the Neapolitan aspects of the portal (jamb, lintel, archivolt, and tympanum), however, the materials employed appear to eliminate the possibility that the portal was made outside of Lucera. Many of the Neapolitan portals similar in form to the cathedral’s jambs and lintels were manufactured in marble. Those at Lucera are carved in tufa, a stone readily available in the area.\textsuperscript{365} Moreover, the material along the base of the main portal shifts between marble and tufa, although it appears that the pieces were carved together as a unit (fig. 2–40). The use of marble here, then, seems to have been done so intentionally. When the marble was spent (in this case on the end segments of the base), the carver(s) completed the piece with available tufa. This brief switch to marble also occurs at the top of the portal’s jambs, and suggests that a worker in the local tufa opted to embellish the portal upon finding suitable marble.

This seems to suggest strongly that the ‘Neapolitan’ portions of the portal were completed on site. By whom, however, is not clear. Was the work done by a traveling worker from the capital or local workers with newly imported forms? Would the portals of the fortress, among them those of the chapel discussed in chapter one, have been a model for

\textsuperscript{364} For this type of argument, see David M. Gillerman, “Cosmopolitanism and Campanilismo: Gothic and Romanesque in the Siena Façade,” The Art Bulletin 81 (1999), 437-455. The author of this dissertation admittedly has trouble accepting it.

\textsuperscript{365} The tufa used for Lucera fortress was cut from the foot of Monte Gargano and areas around Canosa di Puglia. See Sthamer, vol. 1, docs. 65, 373, and 514. Today the area around the Gargano accounts for ninety percent of the building stones in Apulia and twenty percent in Italy. The area around Canosa, including Trani, Andria, Ruvo, and Bisceglie continues to be the site of the second most important quarries in Apulia.
the cathedral’s? Unfortunately no written sources point to imported stone workers during Lucera’s re-Christianization, meaning that the matter may never definitively be closed.

Taking into account the wider study of Angevin labor practices, however, suggests that local workers made the portals. Drawing from documents dating to the reign of Charles I in Basilicata, Small has suggested that most skilled workers in the Angevin Regno, particularly stone workers, were local. Bruzelius argued that only highly skilled metal workers, painters, and sculptors appear to have been brought from outside of the South. As the previously mentioned documents reveal, many unskilled laborers and those responsible for gathering and/or fabricating building materials (e.g., brick) were from nearby areas. Moreover, the figural sculpture along the portals, combined with the design of the gables, suggests that local workers fabricated the portal. The case of the Neapolitan portal combined with the Apulian gable and sculpture may very well be the result of a local builder experimenting with new forms that circulated through the Regno.

The anonymity of labor is a challenge to studying the reconstruction of Lucera. However, in earlier building projects within the city the identities (broadly) of some workers have been preserved. Ashlar blocks within the Torre del Re at Lucera’s fortress, constructed during the 1270s, display prominently the markings of stonemasons paid by the piece (fig. 2–41 and fig. 2–42). These markings are particularly fascinating since the marked sides face

---

366 Carola M. Small, “The Crown as an Employer of Wage Labour,” 323-341. Attempts were made to recruit French and Provençal skilled workers, particularly stonemasons and carpenters, to resettle at Lucera's fortress in the 1270s. How many stayed, however, is unknown. Bruzelius noted that overall many of the settlers to the fortress had “melted away” after a year or two. See Caroline Bruzelius, “The Labor Force North and South: Workers and Builders in the Angevin Kingdom,” in Arnolfo’s Moment: I Tatti Studies, eds. David Friedman, Julian Gardner, and Margaret Haines (Florence: L.S. Olschki, 2009), 117.

367 Bruzelius, “The Labor Force North and South,” 116. While she does not believe French stone workers flooded the Regno, Bruzelius did posit that a first wave of Neapolitan stone workers might have completed parts of the portals and some of the capitals within the arch, which she connected to San Lorenzo Maggiore in Naples. There is no evidence of Neapolitan workers at Lucera, however, and the apse capitals, if belonging to a stylistic world tied to San Lorenzo, may have been transported to Lucera. See Bruzelius, The Stones of Naples, 108.
outward, projecting toward the viewer. Unfortunately, no such markings survive in pieces of ashlar used for the cathedral, nor do stamps exist on the bricks. The identities of Lucera’s cathedral workers and builders are noticeably more anonymous than those at the fortress. However, the placement of the mason’s marks facing outward suggests either that workers were not strictly supervised (somewhat unlikely given Small’s discussion of shackled workers in Basilicata) or that the presence of a mason’s mark was not seen by supervisors to be detrimental to overall building outcomes. This would suggest that the goal of construction was to complete a work that was structurally sound, timely in its execution, and as inexpensive as possible. Other details, such as some aspects of the outward appearance, may have been less of a priority. This, perhaps inadvertently, suggests that workers were awarded a certain deal of agency, explaining outcomes such as the portals of Lucera’s cathedral.

4. Pierre d’Angicourt, the *fabrica* of Santa Maria Assunta, and Questions of Production

The sections above, which examine each individual aspect of the church’s construction, suggest that some building outcomes at Lucera’s cathedral resulted from the labor force employed throughout the site. Others who have studied Lucera’s cathedral have sought to explain these outcomes through the identity of an architect. This is a question that has been vexing to scholars, most of all because no surviving sources name a figure with such a position. Nevertheless, many have identified Pierre d’Angicourt, the *prothomagister operum curiae* in charge, at times, of building projects at Lucera’s fortress as the designer of

---

368 These often were the only stipulations outlined by patrons in medieval building contracts, along with the project being cost-efficient, of course.
the building. This is not totally without reason. One document does connect him to the cathedral site. On January 15, 1304, Pierre was charged was assessing the value for restitution of *domus* around the building site that would need to be demolished.\textsuperscript{369} Moreover, some have argued that the formal similarities between Lucera’s cathedral, the cathedral at Naples, and the Magdalen shrine at Sainte-Maximin-la-Sainte-Baume (Provence) built by the Angevin crown reveals that a single individual designed all three. Pierre d’Angicourt has been identified as that individual in most instances (fig. 2–43).

These arguments on the whole, however, suffer from two separate, but related, flaws. First, they are based on the idea of the great medieval architect, an individual who single-handedly conceived, designed, and articulated each individual construction step.\textsuperscript{370} Recently scholars, most notably Marvin Trachtenberg, have begun to argue that this individual is an anachronism.\textsuperscript{371} Second, they fail to unpack Pierre’s duties at building sites as well as the place of individuals like the Frenchman within a larger courtly and bureaucratic structure.

This methodological problem begins first and foremost with a misunderstanding of terms.


\textsuperscript{370} On Pierre as architect, see Warnke, 5.

\textsuperscript{371} See, for example, Trachtenberg, “Building Outside Time”; and Trachtenberg, *Building in Time*. 
For example, most have read words such as *magister* (master) and *prothomagister* (first, or foremost master) to mean a vocation, for example a builder or sculptor of some sort. However, the use of the term was much more nuanced and contextual, and was employed within Angevin diplomas for hosts of individuals within the Angevin nobility. Instead of signifying a duty, they signified a rank.

Considering these issues, this section re-examines the biography, and the historiography, of Pierre d’Angicourt. While reflecting on what others have said about the Frenchmen, I will return to the building documents in which Pierre is mentioned to gather what his duties actually were. At the same time I will chart his social rise within the Angevin nobility. These two phenomena, his work and his social standing, were inextricably linked. Moreover, they were one and in the same. They, combined with the comparative material that will be discussed in regard to builders, administrators, and the structure of the Angevin court and bureaucracy, reveal that Pierre was not an architect or any type of designer, as many have believed. Rather, he was an impressive administrator who rose through the bureaucratic arm of the Angevin court. This reveals that Angevin architectural projects, in fact, were highly bureaucratized—the result of the bureaucratization of the court and of the kingdom as a whole.

Writing in 1883, François Lenormant was the first to identify Pierre as the architect of the cathedral. Noticing the “Gothic” aspects of the church, such as the vaulted apses, he argued that the designer of the cathedral was a native of the Île-de-France (despite the fact the Angicourt is in Picardy).\footnote{Lenormant, 95. Lenormant’s analysis is based off of the French archaeological approach to the study of architecture. This method, formed during the period in which Lenormant wrote but dominant well into the twentieth century (and at times today), compared all manifestations of Gothic architecture to Paris and the Île-de-France, in particular Chartres cathedral. According to E. Lefèvre-Pontalis, the chair of Archaeology at the}
important identification of an auctor, thereby fueling conflations, conjectures, and confusion over the Frenchman’s identity and his role for the Angevin crown.

Outlining Pierre’s curriculum vitae was attempted first by Émile Bertaux in 1905 and then by Arthur Haseloff in 1920. Haseloff noted that Pierre entered the Angevin documents in 1269 as a lathomus (stone cutter) or maczonerius (procurer of materials), but quickly rose to the title of reparator castorum by 1271, a position that received a stipend of three ounces of gold per month. This salary was on par with high functionaries of the realm like the provisor Castrorum, the official responsible for the maintenance of castles, and at thirty-six ounces a year was more than that earned by Lucera’s canons. The year also marked the first time he was sent to work at Lucera’s fortress, a site where he worked uninterruptedly until 1275 when he was called to court for other projects. In 1277 the Frenchman gained the title prothomagister operis, the same year in which his name was mentioned in construction projects at Barletta, Bari, Mola, Villanova, Brindisi, Melfi, and Manfredonia. The following year he gained the title prothomagister et provisor operum curie, and was linked to the construction of Castel Nuovo, castle at Gaeta, and along with Pierre de Chaule, the building of the new city of Leonessa at the northern confines of the
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L’École des Chartres during the early twentieth century and a proponent of the method, the study of a building should include the determination of the campaigns of construction, an analytical analysis of the edifice, and a connection of the edifice with a particular school. Lenormant’s analysis of Lucera’s cathedral reflects wholeheartedly this method. He must have judged parts of the building sufficiently Gothic, in fact French Gothic, which inevitably meant it was designed by a Parisian architect. Others did not identify Pierre as Parisian. Heinrich Schulz argued that he was from Beauvais, while Émile Bertaux and Camille Enlart identified his home as Angicourt in Pas-de-Calais. See Haseloff, Architettura sveva, 162. On Lefèvre-Pontalis, see Stephen Murray, “The Study of Gothic Architecture,” in A Companion to Medieval Art: Romanesque and Gothic in Northern Europe, ed. Conrad Rudolph (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006), 387. Bertaux, “Les artistes française,” 89-114; and Haseloff, Architettura sveva, 161-168. Haseloff, Architettura sveva, 161-162. To review, the twenty canons divided a stipend of 124 ounces. The bishop earned fifty ounces annually. Sthamer, vol. 1, doc. 147. For his activities at these sites, see Sthamer vols. 1 and 2.
The new position necessitated extensive travel (fig. 2–44), and he received a travel expense of three tari per day as well as a security detail of four mounted scuterii who each were paid a salary of two ounces of gold and armed with a helmet, iron shoulder ruff, sword, and dagger. For a comparison, the captain of Lucera received a similarly sized security detail during the city’s reconstruction. Furthermore, two years earlier Angevin diplomas begin to refer to the Pierre as familiaris or fides nostre to the king. Giuliana Vitale has argued that these titles, tied closely to the Angevin court and conferred upon the swearing of an oath, were used to consolidate and consecrate official personal relationships that already existed with the king. For example, Giovanni Pipino and Giovanni Minutolo, the court figures who received houses in Lucera on August 27, 1300, frequently are referred to in diplomas as familiaris and faithuls of the king. It appears, then, that Pierre d’Angicourt’s new role as prothomagister stemmed from, and most likely continued to foster, a personal relationship with the king.

Pierre d’Angicourt’s role as prothomagister of military projects provides an intriguing connection with the Cathedral of Lucera, as features of the church, including the octagonal tower attached to its façade, the external buttressing along the church’s flanks, and the method of buttress construction around the apses show strong similarities with


379 Sthamer, vol. 1, doc. 232. See also Haseloff, Architettura sveva 162-163.

380 Haseloff, Architettura sveva 164. Haseloff noted that a 1276 text published by Heinrich Schulz originally contained the titles. These were omitted, however, when the text was printed. However, a document published by Eduard Sthamer, dated March 4, 1278 in reference to construction at Lucera's fortress lists Pierre as familiaris and fides nostre. See Sthamer, vol. 1, doc. 232.

381 Vitale, 49. See also Kelly, The New Solomon, 57; and Warnke, 9 and 115.
construction solutions at Lucera’s fortress (fig. 2–45 and fig. 2–46). Additionally, the method in which the exterior walls and buttressing were constructed—a combination of brick cores and ashlar corner stones—resembles the walls and towers of Lucera’s fortress. This detailing could further connect the church to Pierre, as architectural elements from military buildings including towers, buttressing, arrow loops, and machicolations long had served as decorative motifs for the fortress churches of Provence, the Angevin crown’s most important French possession.

Since Lenormant, Pierre d’Angicourt has been connected to a number of churches based on their stylistic affinities to Lucera. These include the church of San Pietro a Maiella in Naples, built under the support of Giovanni Pipino, and the cathedral of Altamura, where d’Angicourt’s presence has been traced from Angevin documents dating 1301 to 1308. The French prothomagister also has been connected to Charles II’s major architectural contribution in Provence, the church of Saint-Maximin. Camille Enlart, writing in the last decade of the nineteenth century, suggested that Pierre had authored both the church dedicated to the Magdalen in Provence and the cathedral in Lucera. He noted that in 1295 an individual named Petrus Gallicus was sent from Naples to Saint-Maximin to preside over its

---

382 Pina Belli D’Elia noted the similarities between the buttressing, particularly around the apse, at Lucera and at Saint Maximin, and argued that Lucera’s buttressing provided an aesthetic versus structural solution unlike the supports of the Provençal church. She went on to argue that if Pierre d’Angicourt was involved in the construction of the cathedral, it was at this stage. See Belli D’Elia, “L’architettura sacra, tra continuità e innovazione,” Le eredità normanno-sveve nell’età angioina: persistenze e mutamenti nel Mezzogiorno, ed. Giosuè Musca (Bari: Dedalo, 2004), 328-329.

383 On the fortress churches of Provence, see Sheila Bonde, Fortress-Churches of Languedoc: Architecture, Religion, and Conflict in the High Middle Ages (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). Upon seeing the church, the eighteenth-century Chronicler Carlo Corrado wrote that it was “more solid than stone, as if it had been formed from metal.” Alfredo Petrucci, Cattedrali di Puglia (Rome: Carlo Bestetti, 1960), 124-125.

384 Adriana Pepe, “La cattedrale di Altamura,” 341. For the connections between Lucera and San Pietro a Maiella, see Iacobbe and Ricco, 73.

385 The construction of Saint Maximin occurred over several centuries. See Christian Freigang, “Kathedralen als Mendikantenkirchen,” 45.
Enlart’s identification, however, has led to concerns that Pierre d’Angicourt has been conflated with a number of individuals active at the Angevin court during the reigns of Charles I and Charles II.387

The closest formal connections, however, are between the cathedrals of Lucera and Naples. Lenormant argued that the Frenchman was the architect of both.388 In the late nineteenth century, Emanuele Cavalli argued that both churches were designed by a Neapolitan architect/engineer called Masuccio because “Masuccio was the architect that served the two Carli angioini in the construction of the cathedral of Naples, [and] because the cathedral of Lucera is quite similar in style, architecture, design and size to that of Naples, less for that that regards the front or façade…”389 Masuccio now is known to be a seventeenth-century invention by the biographers Carlo Celano and Bernardo De Dominici in an effort to connect the building of the Naples Cathedral to a native son.390 In the absence of any name linked to original documents that pertain to the construction of the church, Vinni

386 Enlart was unsure whether Pierre le Français and Pierre d’Angicourt were the same person, and his architectural connections between Saint-Maximin and the cathedral of Lucera largely have been dismissed. See Enlart, 22-25; and Bruzelius, Stones of Naples, 78.
387 In his work, Georg Steffens (Die Lieder des Troevers Perrin von Angicourt (1905)) conflated the Angevin prothomagister Pierre d’Angicourt and the court poet Perrin d’Angicourt. The identity of Pierre d’Angicourt as Petrus Gallicus at Saint-Maximin remains the most complicated, however. Haseloff argued that the chances Charles II had another Pierre with a similar job and of a similar social class working at the same time as Pierre d’Angicourt was unlikely (He seems to have forgotten that under Charles I Pierre de Chaule held a similar role). The Petrus sent to Provence was placed above all others who worked at the site, including the master Matheus who already had been hired by the Bishop of Sisteron. Charles’s letters to the building site ordered that Petrus be treated as a member of the court. He was assigned a house while he worked in Provence, and was conferred judicial power over all of those who worked on the site. However, from where Petrus Gallicus was sent to work at Saint-Maximin is unknown, making a firm conclusion that the prothomagister in question was Pierre d’Angicourt impossible. See Haseloff, Architettura sveva, 166.
388 Lenormant, 96.
390 Carlo Celano, Notizie del bello dell’antico e del curioso della città di Napoli (1692; reprint, Naples: Floriana, 1856), 150. Bernardo De Dominici, Vite de pittori, scultri, ed architetti napoletani (1742; reprint, Bologna: Forni, 1971), 17-63. De Dominici posited that Masucio took over the building of Castel Nuovo from Giovanni Pisano, and upon completion was given by Charles II the job of designing Naples Cathedral. De Dominici accounted for the church’s Gothic elements by arguing that Massucio, who was instructed in “all the good rules of architecture” and bello ingegno, was compelled by his patron to add French elements to what could have been a perfectly Roman church.
Lucherini recently suggested that the architect of the Neapolitan cathedral was one of the architects known to have worked for the crown in Naples, chief among them Pierre d’Angicourt.\textsuperscript{391} All of these arguments, however, are circular. In most of these narratives, Pierre d’Angicourt (or Massucio) is assigned authorship of one cathedral because he was assumed to have designed the other.

A look at Pierre d’Angicourt’s career and upward social mobility alludes to his place within the Angevin court. At the time of his documented presence at Lucera’s rebuilding (1304), he was listed as miles, a title he had been given since at least 1289 that denoted not so much military service but rather his position as a feudal lord.\textsuperscript{392} He appears to have received his first feud in 1279 when he took possession of Pietramontecorvino, located twenty kilometers northwest of Lucera. He possessed the estate until 1283.\textsuperscript{393} A year earlier he was described as vallectus (valet), familiaris et fides nostri in a mandate from Charles I to the Justice of Bari in regards to materials needed for the castle of Manfredonia.\textsuperscript{394} Furthermore, Haseloff reported that in 1288 he was granted the casale (hamlet) of Chirillani in Basilicata.

\textsuperscript{391} Lucherini also listed as a possible architect Francesco di Vico, who has been connected to the Certosa di San Martino, and Gagliardo Primario, who was present at the convent of Santa Chiara in Naples. Bruzelius suggested that work on the cathedral could have been attached to the workshop of the De Vico family who was present at the Realvalle, Santa Chiara, and San Martino building sites, or the Primario family who was involved in construction projects at Santa Maria Donnaregina, Santa Chiara, and the Palazzo di Quisisana in Castellammare. See Vanni Lucherini, \textit{La Cattedrale di Napoli: Storia, architettura, storiografia di un monumento medievale} (Rome: L’École française de Rome, 2009), 293-298; and Caroline Bruzelius, “Ipotesi e proposte sulla costruzione del Duomo di Napoli,” in \textit{Il Duomo di Napoli dal paleocristiano all’età angioina}, ed. Serena Romano and Nicolas Bock (Naples: Electa, 2002), 128. For the late thirteenth-century cathedral of Naples, see Franco Strazzullo, “Le vicende dell’abside del Duomo di Napoli,” in \textit{Studi in onore di Domenico Mallardo} (Naples: Fiorentino, 1957), 147-182.

\textsuperscript{392} On Pierre as miles, see Warnke, 5.

\textsuperscript{393} Tomaiuoli, “Albori della Cattedrale,” 274. His possession of the feud is recorded in a collection of building documents edited by Salvatore Savastio. See Salvatore Savastio, \textit{Notizie storiche sull’antica città di Montecorvino di Puglia e sul borgo di Serritella} (Pozzuoli: Puteolana D. Conte, 1940), 69 and 72.

and the *casalia* Montoroni et Mallani outside of Bari.\textsuperscript{395} The German art historian went on to note that Pierre earned the titles *vicar* of the *Terre dell’Honor di Monte Sant’Angelo*, of Lesina in the Gargano, and of Andria.\textsuperscript{396} He may have settled toward the end of his life in the Apulian port of Barletta, the kingdom’s second-largest city and the home of numerous wealthy familiars.\textsuperscript{397} Two suspect, but illuminating if true, anecdotes would suggest that Pierre was wealthy and powerful while a resident of the city. In 1304 a street in Barletta supposedly was altered to allow for the expansion of his house.\textsuperscript{398} Furthermore in 1313, three years after his death, his heirs sought to recover 400 ounces of gold that he had loaned to the Barletta representatives of the Lambertesche, a powerful Ghibelline family from Florence.\textsuperscript{399}

Pierre d’Angicourt’s promotion to the nobility reflected his importance to the court and the importance of the role of court *prothomagister*, but the extent of his influence on the design of buildings remains unclear. The same question has applied to figures such as a cleric (*clericus*) from Picardy, Pierre de Chaule, who was the long-time director of works at Castel Nuovo and also documented at early Angevin building sites, including the abbeys of Santa Maria Realvalle and Santa Maria della Vittoria.\textsuperscript{400} Nicolas Bock has argued that Pierre de Chaule’s role as supervisor of these royal projects was created especially for the French clerk. By the reign of Charles II, however, the responsibility of building projects had fallen

\textsuperscript{395} Haseloff, *Architettura sveva*, 164.
\textsuperscript{396} Calò Mariani, *L’arte del Duecento in Puglia* (Turin: Istituto bancario San Paolo di Torino, 1984), 170, no. 9; and Haseloff, *Architettura sveva* 165.
\textsuperscript{397} Barletta was the hometown of Giovanni Pipino. The city appears to have served as base of the family’s operations even after the reconstruction of Lucera.
\textsuperscript{398} Bruzelius reported this event. See Bruzelius, *Stones of Naples*, 94-95.
\textsuperscript{399} Haseloff, *Architettura sveva*, 165. In comparison, 400 ounces of gold purchased 2,000,000 bricks in the 1270s.
under the royal chamberlain (cambellanus). This office not only guarded the royal jewels and managed the king’s public appearances, but also became the prefect of all royal castles, strongholds, and constructions.\textsuperscript{401} It was under this office that artists such as Montano d’Arezzo, Pietro Cavallini, Tino di Camaino, and Giotto were employed as Angevin court artists. Their benefits included a fixed salary, property, and for Giotto, the title of familiaris of the court.\textsuperscript{402} It appears, then, that by this time—the period in which Lucera was reconstructed—the very process for creating art and buildings had become even more bureaucratized, or at least their bureaucratization had become even more institutionalized.

The framework of the court artist employed so often in reference to Giotto, Montano d’Arezzo, Pietro Cavallini, and Tino di Camaino, has been used in reference to Pierre d’Angicourt and Pierre de Chaule as well.\textsuperscript{403} Two assumptions appear to be made about the Frenchmen, however. The first is that those employed as directors of building sites were architects by modern definition. The second is that these directors earned their status at court in the same way as did painters and sculptors: just as Giotto was invited to Naples because he was a great painter and became familiar to the King Robert of Anjou because of the close relationship formed during his time at court, Pierre d’Angicourt and Pierre de Chaule earned their positions at court because of their “architectural knowledge,” a vague term often used in reference to the two figures. However, is this a useful framework for understanding their roles? Despite being employed within the same supervisory office,\textsuperscript{404} were Pierre

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[401]{Nicolas Bock, “Patronage, Standards and Transfert Culturel,” 577.}
\footnotetext[402]{Ibid. On the use of the term familiar for court painters outside of Naples, notably the painter Theodoric at the court of Prague, see Andrew Martindale, The Rise of the Artist in the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance (London: Thames and Hudson, 1972), 37-41.}
\footnotetext[403]{See, for instance, Warnke, 5, for Pierre d’Angicourt; and Bock, 577, for Pierre de Chaule. Aceto implies that Pierre de Chaule was an architect. See Aceto, 256.}
\footnotetext[404]{A royal order from 1330 that confirmed Giotto's status as a familiar read as follows: “Freely do we associated in the community of our familia those approved by the uprightness of their ways and commended by their distinctive excellence. Sensible therefore that Master Giotto of Florence, painter, familiaris and our fruitful}
d’Angicourt or Pierre de Chaule “artists?” Did they design buildings? If not, why were they employed and how were Angevin buildings conceived and built?

A re-evaluation of Angevin documents that pertain to building projects goes far in illuminating the process. The surviving documents that refer to construction at San Lorenzo in Pantano near Foggia, Lucera’s fortress, and the walls of Manfredonia are the most helpful. They include many individuals’ names, titles, and the duties attached to those titles. Such expansive detail does not exist in the handful of surviving sources referring to the building of Lucera’s cathedral. However, the few instances that show a combination of names, titles, and duties match those from a generation earlier. For example, the presence at the building site of the praepositus (provost) and expensor (duties explained below) remains consistent throughout the decades. Furthermore, building projects during both eras occurred within a larger bureaucratic structure that involved other functionaries of the realm including the city captains, provincial justiciars, and bailiffs who collected men, materials, and money for the building site. Used in combination with the physical evidence surveyed earlier (i.e., the use of material(s), sculptural design, and architectural elements), the fourteenth-century documents suggest that the process of building had not changed much between the completion of Lucera’s fortress and the building of its cathedral.

Multiple studies have read terms used throughout the sources—praepositus, expensor, prothomagister, and magister—interchangeably to describe perceived architects within the Angevin realm. Upon a reexamination of the building documents, however, only

---

servant, is sustained by prudent deeds and exercised in fruitful services, we willingly receive him as our familiaris and retain him in our household, that he may possess and enjoy those honors and privileges which other familiaris possess, after taking the accustomed oath.” Martindale noted that the language of the appointment appears to have followed a civil service formula, as an almost identically worded diploma was issued upon the confirmation of a (unnamed by Martindale) clerk to the familia of Robert of Anjou in 1316. See Martindale, 37-38.
the first two titles denoted job descriptions. The *expensor*, which has no exact English translation but is more or less a cognate, was charged with managing funds for building projects. He received funds from the multiple sources that were funneled through regional justices, civic captains, or castellans; and he dispensed those funds throughout the building project. In other words, he administered the *introitus et exitus* of the building site.\(^{405}\) The *praepositus* (provost) was the chief executive of the building site. He directed builders and workers on site and off (for instance, brick makers), procured materials, and served as the ultimate quality control. As the project’s manager he at times was the most direct line of communication to the crown. The exception was when the crown addressed justices or captains in order to procure funds from neighboring communities or other outside sources. In most cases, especially those that do not mention specific amounts of money, letters from the crown were sent to the *praepositus*. The Angevin building documents address Pierre d’Angicourt as *praepositus*.\(^{406}\)

The other titles, *magister* and *prothomagister*, represented ranks, or levels of expertise, rather than vocations within the Angevin world. Re-reading the Angevin building documents reveals individuals called masters of the law and of chapels, masters in carpentry, building, stone cutting, of glass windows, and masters of works, among others.\(^{407}\) The construction of the chapel at San Lorenzo in Pantano marks one of the earliest instances when the title “master” is used as a level of expertise rather than a vocation. In 1269 an

---

\(^{405}\) For example, Pierre de Chaule was described as an *expensor* at times for Santa Maria della Vittoria. See Egidi, *Carlo d’Angiò*, 43-45.

\(^{406}\) This is not to say that every usage of the term is crystal clear. Egidi showed that Pierre de Chaule was listed at times as *credencerius*, a term that appears to have the same significance as *praepositus*, at Santa Maria Reaval Valle, Santa Maria della Vittoria, and Castel Nuovo. Moreover, he suggested that at times a *praepositus* could serve simultaneously as *expensor*. What is important, though, is the understanding that individuals in the building documents who bore one (or more) of these three titles were the ones who directed the building site either logistically, financially, or both. See Egidi, *Carlo d’Angiò*, 16 and 45.

\(^{407}\) Sthamer, vol. 1, docs. 9, 68, and 431.
individual described as a clerk named Petrus de Bonolio received one cart, four oxen and ten workers from the bailiffs, judges, *magistris iuratis*, and other officials of Foggia and San Lorenzo for the construction of the chapel. By following year he had gained the title *magister operis capelle* along with the title *praepositus*.\(^{408}\)

The title *prothomagister* appears to imply more than anything a master of masters. As a result, the *praepositus* (provost) is listed, at times, as *prothomagister* due to his position as director of construction works, and therefore the director of multiple *magistri* that included masters of carpentry, building, stone cutting, glass, and so forth. As a designation of rank, its usage appears to be fluid. Those who governed other experts were *prothomagistri*, and therefore he who was deemed *prothomagister* depended on the composition of experts present. In other words, the *prothomagister* might change depending on who was in the room. This is seen especially during the construction of Lucera’s fortress. The massive site had multiple *praepositi*, each of whom as responsible for construction of a certain portion of the fortress and leaders of other masters gained the title *prothomagistri*. For most of the construction, Pierre d’Angicourt and Riccardo da Foggia were called *prothomagistri* due to their roles first as *praepositi super opera muri Lucerie* and later as *praepositi operis fortellitie*.\(^{409}\) Between 1274 and 1276, Pierre and Riccardo are listed as *praepositi* of two separate wall segments—Pierre directing the construction of the east wall facing the city and Riccardo directing the north wall of the fortress facing Fiorentino.\(^{410}\) However, at the same time an individual named Goffrido de Bonguilielmi is listed as *praepositus* (provost) of all works within the fortress. In the company of the building crews they directed, Pierre and

\(^{408}\) Sthamer, vol. 1, docs. 11, 12, 15, 19-22.
\(^{409}\) This was until 1278 when according to Bertaux, Riccardo da Foggia was dismissed in disgrace due to negligence. See Bertaux, “Les artistes française,” 96.
\(^{410}\) Sthamer, vol. 1, doc. 97.
Riccardo were *prothomagistri*. When Pierre and Riccardo were in the company of the provost for all fortress works, Goffrido served as the *prothomagister*.

The exception to the fluidity was the rank of *prothomagister operum curie*. The rank, obtained first and only in the surviving sources by Pierre d’Angicourt, designated the court’s roving *praepositus*: the man who traveled around royal building sites to audit and direct building projects if needed. As such he always was the master of masters, the provost of provosts, and a few examples from Pierre’s career reflect this power dynamic. The most notable dates to 1281 when the Frenchman complained directly to Charles I that the castellan of Melfi administrating its building was concentrating on the wrong parts of the rebuilding program by neglecting the wall near the new gate and focusing on less urgent projects. This had caused the project to go over budget.

As a sign of rank rather than a job description, the term *prothomagister* was applied to masons and other builders as well. Descriptions of builders as such occur less often than *praepositi*, but are seen in one particular example with Giordano de Monte Sant’Angelo. An inscription dated 1274 on the tower commissioned by Charles I at the Sanctuary of Saint Michael lists the tower as the work of the *prothomagistro* Giordano and his brother Marando (fig. 2–45). By 1277 Giordano was working on the walls of Manfredonia some fifteen kilometers from his hometown. An early Angevin diploma dated November 3, 1277 lists

\[\text{TEMPORE QUO CHRISTI CARNEM DE VIRGINE SUMPSIT ANNO DOMINI MCCLXXII Sub Pontificatu Gregorii X Prosperante Domino Carlo Sicilie Archidiacono Sua Dente Felice Coeptum Hoc Opus Protomagistro Iordano e Marando Frate Eius Ente XXVII Marci Hora Prima Solis Secunde Indictionis.}\]
him as the primary wall builder.\footnote{Sthamer, vol. 1, doc. 423.} By 1278 other masons, stonecutters, and carpenters were named in the documents, but Giordano is always listed first. While he was never called prothomagister the position of his name within the documents reveals that he was the most senior master of the building trades present.\footnote{Another interesting question is whether family dynamic led to his naming as prothomagister of the masons responsible for the tower. While Giordano received the honor of not only a master but also a master of master, Marando is identified as his brother (presumably younger). By comparison, in the document dated March 23 of 1278 that listed Giordano first amongst other masons, Marando is listed directly after, but instead of being named his brother is described as de eodem Monte. See Sthamer, vol. 1, doc. 431.} This example serves as a reminder that the terms used by the crown for the designation of rank were always reliant on context. One’s standing was always relative.

Given their contractual nature, the documents clearly establish each individual’s role at construction sites. They also clearly establish that in most cases praepositi were notaries, jurists, clerks, or other types of educated administrators. This shows that the prerequisite for the job was not building experience, but rather managerial skills. A number of scholars have shown that these same individuals formed the extensive bureaucratic framework—a framework argued to be far more advanced than other unified kingdoms such as France—employed to administer the Regno.\footnote{Salient studies include Léon Cadier, Essai sur l’administration du royaume de Sicile sous Charles 1er et Charles II d’Anjou (Paris: E. Thorin, 1891); Sylvie Pollastri, Le lignage et le fief: L’affirmation du milieu comtal et la construction des états féodaux sous les Angevins de Naples, 1265-1435 (Paris: Éditions Publibook, 2011); Luciano Catalioto, Terre, baroni, e città in Sicilia nell'età di Carlo d’Angiò (Messina: Intilla, Editore, 1995); Samantha Kelly, "Noblesse de robe et noblesse d’esprit à la cour de Robert de Naples: La question d’italianisation,” in La noblesse dans les territoires angevins à la fin du moyen âge (Rome: L’École française de Rome, 2000), 347-361; Vitale, Eltie burocratica e famiglia; Caskey, Art and Patronage, 31-35 and Kelly, The New Solomon, 54-72. Jean Dunbabin has argued that certain aspects of the Angevin bureaucracy, notably its means of taxation and the creation of a chancery, were adopted in Capetian territories at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Groups of Angevin bureaucrats recruited north implemented these changes. These individuals included Rainaldo Cognetti, a recorded miles from Barletta who as “Guardian and Master of all the Lands of the Noble Count of Artois” under Robert II of Artois, the first cousin of Charles II and regent of the Regno during the Angevin king’s imprisonment in Barcelona. Rainaldo returned to the Regno in 1299 and from September 9, 1300 until November 11, 1300 served as “treasurer” responsible for accounting foodstuffs confiscated from the city’s Muslim population (Appendix D). On Rainaldo at Artois, see Anne Hagopian Van Buren, “Reality and Literary Romance in the Park of Hesdin,” in Medieval Gardens, ed. Elisabeth B. MacDougall (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1986), 126-134; Jean Dunbabin, The French in the Kingdom
feuds, or stipends, forming a true *noblesse de robe*. The examples of individuals who took this route are countless, and include none other than Giovanni Pipino of Barletta, originally a notary, and Bartolomeo da Capua, the former jurist who became the crown’s protonotary-logothete, the highest position within the Angevin court that was described by Samantha Kelly as the king’s alter ego.\(^{418}\) Both men rose through the ranks of the court, receiving promotion after promotion, and appear to have reached their highest positions through a combination of administrative competence, fervent loyalty, and a certain amount of luck. As such, the Angevin administration and nobility was in some ways a meritocracy, at least for those who had shown loyalty to the crown.

Returning to Pierre d’Angicourt we see that his career and social trajectories resulted from the same merits. He was a member of this administrative elite. The concern with making Pierre an “artist,” however, has shaded this realization. Haseloff argued that Pierre d’Angicourt began his career as a *lathomus*. His conclusions most likely resulted from a reading of a document dated December 30, 1269 that lists a *magister lathomi sibi tabulas* called Petrus who provided tablets and other pieces of marble for the castle of Lucera.\(^{419}\) It appears that Haseloff read *magister* as a job description rather than a designation of rank, and as a result, invented a rags to riches story for the Frenchman that saw him rise from humble stonecutter to *miles* and wealthy feudal lord. On the other hand Emile Bertaux, recognizing that stone cutters did not become lords, argued that Pierre d’Angicourt was first a foremost a

---


\(^{419}\) Sthamer, vol. 1, doc. 43.
chevalier et feudataire who through his social position became “architect.” He apparently imagined a restless noble, dissatisfied with his life on the feud, who moved to court to design buildings. Both trajectories, however, flow against all other evidence that shows building project managers were recruited from the ranks of clerks, notaries, and other administrators.

The bureaucratic structure of Angevin building projects is articulated most clearly in a construction document dated March 23, 1278 for the walls of Manfredonia. Two groups are listed in the royal mandate. The first names builders and their respective expertise. The second group names building administrators, all of whom are identified as justices, protonotaries, and advocates of the Angevin court.

The document reveals an additional piece of significant information. Almost all of the individuals listed are identified by their geographic origins. While the project’s administrators are shown to have come from places throughout the Angevin realm including Foggia, Amalfi, Salerno, Andria, and France, every builder listed was local. The project’s carpenters, masons, and builders came from Manfredonia as well as nearby cities including Monte Sant’Angelo, Foggia, San Giovanni Rotonda, Vieste, Andria, and Barletta. The only worker whose surname did not reveal a place of origin was a builder called Rogerio, whose use of the patronymic di Carioiohanne, suggests that he could have come from the region around Bari.

---

421 Sthamer, vol. 1, doc. 431.
422 The given name Calioiohanne (or Kaloiohanne), Greek in origin, occurs frequently in sources dating from the late tenth to early eleventh centuries collected in the Codice Diplomatico Barese. A number of clerics addressed in documents number 4 (dated June 990), number 8 (dated the year 1003), number 14 (March 1019), number 16 (August 1025), number 25 (March 1036), number 37 (April 1057), and fragment 2 (November 971) bear the given name. It was recorded as a patronymic by the thirteenth century, as evidenced by the example above and the presence an individual named Theodore of Calioiohanne, identified by the historian Raffaele Colapietra as a member of the “old Byzantine Aristocracy from Bari,” at the construction site of Lucera’s fortress in 1270. Furthermore, an individual named Tommaso of Calioiohanne served in 1280 as expensor of Bari’s castle during renovations. On Calioiohanne and its derivatives as a given name under Byzantine dominance, see Francesco
In all, the Manfredonia document, along with the other sources analyzed above, reveal that Angevin building sites were comprised of royal clerks pulled from throughout the Kingdom and local builders. The surviving sources on the building of Lucera’s cathedral point to this structure as well. From the project’s onset, the Provençal canon and archdeacon of Lucera, Hugo of Sisteron, and the notary Giovanni da Bari served as praepositus and expensores. Following the death of Hugo of Sisteron, the praepositus appointed remained a deacon, which was a position appointed directly by the crown.

In summation, Pierre d’Angicourt’s brief cameo at Lucera in 1304 and appearances at Altamura in the first decade of the fourteenth century now seem in tune with his role for much of the 1270s and 1280s as prothomagister operum curiae. The single source that links him to Lucera’s cathedral states that he assessed the value of property needed for construction of the cathedral. Haseloff suggested that this was a humble task for a once great figure. By this time his career must have slowed, he may have been elderly, and perhaps was no longer the prothomagister operum curiae, but the job he was charged to do at Lucera was one of a trusted administrator like those performed since his introduction in the documents.

That Angevin sources reveal the names of administrators, not architects, and local builders reveals the extent to which construction was bureaucratized. In fact, that a group within the administrative class directed building projects in the Angevin kingdom was a sign of its emergence as a modern, centralized government. Like other business conducted by the crown—the collection of taxes, the administration of justice, and so forth—the bureaucratization of building within the Regno reflected the realities of needing to manage a
wide expanse of territory and people within the technological constraints of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Few regimes or patrons in late medieval Europe were faced with these conditions. When they were, however, they appear to have taken similar measures. For example, Pierre-Yves le Pogam has shown that masters of works with similar duties of administrative oversight began to emerge around the same time under various institutional milieu, from the Kings of England and France, to the towns of Bruges and Ypres and the increasingly centralized papacy.423

The historian Raffaele Colapietra, writing in the mid 1970s, was perhaps the first scholar to notice the prevalence of courtly familiars and administrators whom he described as “members of the old Byzantine mercantile aristocracy from Bari and Frenchmen” during the construction of Lucera’s fortress.424 He argued that their oversight showed the importance of the fortress’s mercantile and economic profile above military and technical aspects of construction.425 His argument complements the recent research of the archaeologist Matthew Johnson, who has argued that many late medieval English castles’ economic importance to the land around them superseded their assumed defensive purposes.426

---


424 While failing to see Pierre as a bureaucrat, Haseloff did notice that castle projects built under Charles I benefitted from an enmeshed Angevin administrative corps. See Haseloff, Architettura sveva, 407.


426 Matthew Johnson, Behind the Castle Gate. Johnson’s main case study was the fourteenth-century English castle at Bodiam.
concerned chiefly with monetary issues. However, if economy is understand more broadly, we see that as Johnson has argued in regard to castles, Angevin buildings served more so as stage settings that played host to a number of different types of interactions between individuals and objects. More will be discussed in regard to this topic when issues of architectural typology are addressed in chapter three.

So how did architectural forms circulate? The documents show that at times the Angevin kings outlined their expectations. They wrote to builders and praepositi stating how many builders should work at the site, how much equipment and materials should be procured, the dimensions of walls, where things should be placed, and the like. The travel involved in Pierre’s career, along with anecdotes of his tearing down walls deemed unsatisfactory, suggests that his position afforded him ultimate control over what buildings became, but both the architectural and documentary evidence suggests buildings resulted from the collaboration of individual builders rather than an initial, grand scheme. The types of requests made in the Angevin documents provide only a sketch of the buildings, and the use of terms such as *in our manner* or *according to our provisions* reveal the limits of non-verbal communication at the time for construction projects. Moreover, many of these requests reveal desires beyond the aesthetic. Returning to the 1278 Manfredonia document one last time reveals the crown’s intentions. In the source Pierre d’Angicourt was reported to have measured “personally” a tower that was to contain a cistern. Measuring the tower before the listed group of judges, notaries, and clerks, Pierre provided the dimensions requested for the wall, the amount of stones required, and the number of masons and manual labor needed. At the end of the text and after calculating the dimensions of the tower and the

---

427 For example, Pierre subjected fellow prothomagister at Lucera, Riccardo da Foggia, to *impeticiones vel insultus* for which the court had to intervene. The dispute arose apparently because segments of the walls built under Riccardo’s supervision had proceeded too slowly and over budget. See Haseloff, *Architettura sveva*, 167.
materials and workers needed, the project was expected to cost in total 216 ounces, 5 *tari*, and 19 *grani*. It is clear in this case that Pierre’s preoccupation with dimensions, workers needed, and the type of materials used pertains to the cost of the project for the crown. Pierre de Chaule would have possessed a similar skillset, as he was an auditor and tax collector in Naples from 1268 until his work at Santa Maria della Vittoria.\(^{428}\)

This approach undoubtedly shaped building outcomes, but the system also left much room for individual workers to leave an imprint on the fabric of a building.\(^{429}\) Much depended on the competence and experience of stonemasons and builders constructing the buildings to fill in details.\(^{430}\) The competence of the builders was even more important when architectural aspects such as Lucera’s façade tower circulated from one landscape to another, as expertise in local building materials was crucial for the safe and lasting projection of a building into space. Lucera’s fortress and churches were made of brick, a material with a long building history in the immediate area but was rarely used in other Angevin construction projects. This points to the contribution of local workers for the structure of the church.

\(^{428}\) Among other duties, Pierre de Chaule assessed the value of goods confiscated from traitors of the crown. See Aceto, “Le castrum novum de Naples,” 262.

\(^{429}\) The bureaucratization of architecture has been addressed recently by Robert Maxwell in “Romanesque Construction and the Urban Context: Parthenay-le-Vieux in Aquitaine,” *JSAH* 66, no. 1 (March 2007), 24-59. In a particularly articulate explanation of the heterogeneous nature Romanesque churches in Aquitaine, Maxwell concluded, that “the sharp rise in urban growth put a strain on established patterns of monumental activity formerly rooted chiefly at major *civitates* and reshuffled traditional modes in order to meet the demands arising at literally hundreds of sites, particularly *castra*. This is not to deny the important role played by *magistri operis*, the “masters of works,” who must have overseen the efforts of sundry carpenters, masons, sculptors, and glaziers, nor to dismiss entirely the notion of bands of carvers or masons coordinating their work; after all, the preceding analysis underscored the relative continuity of St-Pierre’s construction. It does, however, challenge the prevailing notion, at least as applied to northern Aquitaine, of site *magistri* of fixedly hierarchical workshops that coordinated construction right down to the final architectural details or endeavored to produce a model of sculptural style. If Fulk and William had to intervene to keep men at their work sites, it likely meant that workers had neither the habit of nor the inclination for plying themselves to one master style.” This labor situation, including the problem of dealing with rebellious workers, has numerous parallels to the situation in the *Regno*. See Maxwell, 55. On workers in the *Regno*, see Bruzelius, “Charles of Anjou and the Architecture of the French in Italy;” Bruzelius, “Workers and Builders in the Angevin Kingdom;” and Small, “The Crown as an Employer of Wage Labour.”

Textual and archaeological evidence suggests to the following hypothetical processes for Angevin construction. The crown requested that a building be of one particular form and/or of a certain size, and possess certain elements such as a tower in a particular place or the use of buttress along the aisles. Ultimately, though, the task fell onto builders to make those demands a reality. This is revealed in the construction of the idiosyncratic elements at the cathedral, such as the use of the octagonal tower or buttressing along the flanks. While both were new elements for Apulian churches, chosen for reasons unknown and by unknown forces, both were constructed in ways true to vernacular building traditions. For example, the aisle buttressing probably was made by those builders of the fortress towers, or at least by builders groomed in that tradition. The cathedral’s piers provide another example. While they share a similar profile to a number of Neapolitan examples, and ultimately may have been chosen because of the use at the cathedral of Naples, the mode of construction, and even the pier profiles, were not new to Apulia. Although not employed on the same scale as at Lucera and Naples, Apulian piers with similar profiles date to the twelfth century, and include those of the churches of San Gregorio in Bari, San Nicola, the cathedrals of Bisceglie and Conversano, and Santa Maria di Buonconsiglio in Bari (fig. 2–10 and fig. 2–11).

The importance of local workers and materials has been stressed previously, but what this understanding of how architectural ideas circulated reveals is that architectural decisions were made not necessarily out of a lack of funds or resources, or even a heightened cultural sensitivity, as has been argued in the past, but as the product of the process of architectural bureaucratization under the Angevin crown. It also explains how Pierre d’Angicourt could be attached to vastly different looking structures between the Kingdom and Provence. As a praepositus, his job was to ensure that the rough outlined given by the crown was done

431 For a similar model, see Davis, “Guidelines: The Bishop’s Garden.”
satisfactorily. The important question left, however, is what constituted satisfactory structural work? Was it solid construction, function, an architecture that bore meaning, aesthetics, or some combination of all of these factors?

What do these conclusions hold for questions of agency? The crown was certainly the prime mover in these projects, but workers were given much room to complete their tasks using local building practices. While the documents reveal that the crown was at times tyrannical in its treatment of builders and administrators, credit was given at times when deemed due. Before the advent of the important painters and sculptors who were granted titles of nobility and accompanying riches, masons like Giordano and Marando were credited *in perpetuum* for their work with the Monte Sant’Angelo inscription. Their names, the *prothomagistro Iordano e Marando frate eius*, are listed in the text that also mentions King Charles I, Pope Gregory X, and the archdeacon of the sanctuary, whose name is not recorded. In many of the building documents builders’ names, titles, and places of birth are listed, which purposely or not—like the outward facing mason’s marks—assign a degree of ownership to the builders and the localities from which groomed. In all, the evidence suggests that construction projects were not the result of a crown in desperate need of more funds, better materials, and more skilled workers, but the product of an emerging centralized power and the use of the extensive bureaucracy needed to operate its expansive territory. In this regard the building of the crown’s churches at this time—the result of the institutional system put in place—was far more “French” than often argued.432

---

432 This understanding of the building process is in the same spirit of Günther Binding’s technical understanding of the term *opus francigenum*, and is in response to the wide body of literature that views the formal aspects of Angevin architecture in relation to France. On *opus francigenum*, see Günther Binding, “Opus Francigenum: Ein Beitrag zur Begriffsbestimmung,” *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 71, no. 1 (1989), 45-54.
5. The Role of the Arts in Angevin Policy

Studies of other artistic media reveal that the Angevins were conscious of style. Nicolas Bock and Cathleen Fleck, in particular, have argued that the Angevin court employed place-specific painting styles by artists (e.g., the commissioning of frescoes by the Roman Cavallini and Tuscan Giotto) as a visual sign of the crown’s political and/or historical ties and aspirations. To what extent did the Angevin crown have the same expectations for architecture knowing what we know about the building process?

Some scholars have argued that Angevin buildings constructed at the turn of the fourteenth century evoked patriarchal basilicas of early Christian Rome. Many other churches during the period are argued to have had similar aspirations. Michael T. Davis has argued that Philip the Fair’s renovations of the royal palace in Paris adopted Roman, Carolingian, and Byzantine styles in an effort to claim equal status with the Roman emperor. The evocation of early Christendom in late medieval architectural projects was no greater than in Rome itself, according to Sible de Blaauw. He argued that the addition of transepts at the Lateran and Santa Maria Maggiore toward the end of the thirteenth century evoked Saint Peter’s and San Paolo fuori le Mura in an effort to “solidify the perceived heritage of the patriarchal basilicas through the creation of a typologically more homogeneous group of

---

buildings.” According to de Blaauw, these architectural updates, combined with new iconographic programs in mosaic, conflated Rome’s illustrious past with its current rulers, and created “the illusion of age-old authenticity.”

Bruzelius and Christian Freigang have posited that the cathedrals of Naples and Lucera enter into this dialogue of recalling the early Christian basilicas of Rome. Bruzelius in particular has argued that the insertion of transepts at both churches and their uses of spolia were meant to recall an early Christian and Roman heritage. She noted that these aesthetic sensibilities had two aims, both of which signaled a new political vision. The first, in its rejection of the more ostentatious “French” churches built by Charles I, signaled a shift in policy from cultural and political imperialism to adaptation and coexistence. The second aim, in its evocation of the early Christian patriarchal basilicas of Rome, placed Charles II along with Charlemagne as the renovators and supporters of the church par excellence.

Her first conclusion, that the rejection of Charles I’s architecture signaled a shift from

---


435 An example of this time conflation in Roman art is the façade mosaic of Santa Maria Maggiore commissioned by Nicholas IV that depicts the legend of the church’s founding by Pope Liberius. In the Nicholas mosaic, though, Liberius traces the outline in the snow of a church bearing a transept rather than its original basilical plan. See Julian Gardner, “Patterns of Papal Patronage circa 1260-circa 1300,” in The Religious Roles of the Papacy: Ideals and Realities, 1150-1300, ed. Christopher Ryan (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1989), 451.

436 Transepts also were introduced to San Domenico and Sant’Eligio after 1294.

437 Bruzelius noted that Charles II was famously despised by his father Charles I partly because of the reforms he attempted to institute as Prince of Salerno. See Caroline Bruzelius, “Columnas marmoreas et lapides antiquarum ecclesiarum: The Use of Spolia in the Churches of Charles II of Anjou,” in Arte d’Occidente: temi e metodi. Studi in onore di Angiola Maria Romanini, eds Antonio Cadei, et al. (Rome: Sintesi informazione, 1999), 192; and Bruzelius, “Ad modum franciae,” 420.

438 Bruzelius, “Columnas marmoreas,” 193. Recent studies have argued that the cathedral of Naples was a church that belonged more to the archbishops than the Angevin crown. Built by the bishops and canons of Naples, the church’s evocation of early Christian Rome was meant to position Naples as an altera Roma, an alternative to Rome as the seat of the church. However, this positioning of the church was actively promoted by Charles II as part of an overall aggrandizement of Naples as a city as seat of the Angevin crown. See Nicolas Bock, “Il re, i vescovi e la cattedrale: sepulture e costruzione architettonica,” in Il Duomo di Napoli dal paleocristiano all’età angioina, eds. Serena Romano and Nicolas Bock (Naples: Electa, 2002), 132-147.
cultural and political imperialism, will be re-evaluated in chapter three when form versus decoration in architecture is reconsidered.

Countless examples, including the Angevin metalwork surveyed in this chapter, reveal that the crown did use art to insert the current rulers of Naples into an existing history with the aim of legitimizing rule. These visual strategies were employed even more vigorously during the reign of Robert of Anjou, especially in regard to the emphasis on dynastic continuity and beata stirps, or holy lineage. The idea of a saintly lineage, traced through Robert’s brother, the Franciscan bishop Louis of Toulouse, his great uncle, King Louis IX, and a number of other saintly royals from the crown’s Hungarian line, became the major theme of a number of monumental paintings, manuscripts, and royal tombs. Indeed, the Angevin crown was keenly aware of history and willing to exploit it through the visual arts. But did architecture, considering the technology of building during the period and the all-important visual literacy of the viewer, lend itself to such ideological history lessons? Did the Angevins employ an iconography of architecture?

One example in particular at Lucera’s cathedral has been read as an ideological statement, a sign of the crown’s aims to claim connections to Rome. Bruzelius argued that Charles’s orders to the castellan of the city’s fortress in 1303 for columnnas marmoreas et lapides antiquarum ecclesiarum revealed his attempt to use ancient spolia to connect himself with Rome, with Charlemagne the renovator of the church, and ultimately with Constantine. However, does the document reveal this aim if analyzed more deeply? The first issue with the text is the manner in which the stones are described. They are described

---

439 Important commissions exhibiting this theme include the tombs of Mary of Hungary (d. 1323) at Santa Maria Donna Regina and Robert of Anjou at Santa Chiara, the Anjou Bible, and the San Louis of Toulouse Altarpiece by Simone Martini. See, for example, Cathleen Fleck, “Patronage, Art, and the Anjou Bible in Angevin Naples (1266-1352),” 40.

as ancient not in and of themselves, but rather “of the ancient church” (*antiquarum ecclesiarum*). This is a clear reference to the old cathedral, destroyed during the Muslim settlement, but also scrapped and its contents inventoried and stored in the fortress. As numerous scholars have shown, the storing of building materials for reuse at a later date from late antiquity through the nineteenth century was more common, and indeed the rule rather the exception, than some spolia studies admit.\footnote{See, for example, Dale Kinney, “‘Spolia. Damnatio’ and ‘Renovatio Memoriae,’” *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 42 (1997): 117-148; Arnold Esch, “On the Reuse of Antiquity: The Perspectives of the Archaeologist and of the Historian,” in *Reuse Value: Spolia and Appropriation in Art and Architecture from Constantine to Sherrie Levine*, eds. Richard Brilliant and Dale Kinney (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2011), 13-31; Michael Greenhalgh, “Spolia: A Definition in Ruins,” in *Reuse Value: Spolia and Appropriation in Art and Architecture from Constantine to Sherrie Levine*, eds. Richard Brilliant and Dale Kinney (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2011), 75-95.} Reuse was not always bound in revival ideologies. In fact, it occurred often because of the value of building materials as materials. Moreover, no evidence suggests that the old cathedral was early Christian or that it in any way was “Roman.” Therefore, at most, by using stones “of the ancient church,” Charles was the *renovator* of that church—the old cathedral—although even that seems unlikely. For instance, Santa Maria Assunta was built in the center of the city, not somewhere along the city’s boundaries where most scholars have argued the old cathedral stood.\footnote{On the possible locations of the old cathedral, see chapter 1 of this dissertation.}

The second aspect that needs to be reconsidered is the use of the word “amplify.” Charles’s order states that the columns are meant to amplify (*ad ampliandum*) the new church. Was this because they evoked Rome or because they were seen as valuable objects purely from a material standpoint (they being marble)? The latter seems more likely, especially when we see that the document carries the word “amplify” over to a host of other objects donated in the same sentence, including liturgical objects, the crucifix with John and Mary, and the linens for the altar. The donations of the stones, in fact, come in the middle of the list—they are mentioned neither first nor last—which suggests that they had the same...
purpose as the other objects of making the church a more hospitable, luxurious, a pleasant place to inhabit.\textsuperscript{443}

This reading of the document seems in tune with other stylistic evidence as well. Even if the addition of a transept and the use of spolia at Lucera evoked Rome, the church contains gothicized and vernacular Apulian stylistic affinities as well. As previously mentioned, Caskey has noted that pointed arches were added to the early Christian basilica of Santa Restituta at Naples Cathedral two decades after the main sanctuary was adorned with a transept and spolia.\textsuperscript{444} What can be concluded about these combinations of styles?

The issue of eclecticism has formed the center of current debates on the Gothic in its Italian adaptation and in its survival beyond the fourteenth century. In some cases, as has been argued by Marvin Trachtenberg, Bruzelius, David Gillerman, and Caskey, the cosmopolitan nature of Italian cities, in particular those involved in commerce, created an environment where multiple tastes actively came together in buildings often supported by a diverse patronal class.\textsuperscript{445} In less cosmopolitan areas, as Karl Fugelso has argued, eclecticism was the byproduct of slow, unintentional assimilation.\textsuperscript{446}

Was eclecticism meant to form part of a rational system under the Angevins, however? Were these parts now deemed “eclectic” intended at all when constructed? The previous analysis of the building site at Lucera suggests not; rather, we should look at how

\textsuperscript{443} Greenhalgh, in particular, has turned attention onto the material as the luxury in reuse studies. See Greenhalgh, “Spolia: A Definition in Ruins,” 75-95.
\textsuperscript{444} Caskey, Review of The Stones of Naples, 525-527. Inversely, Santa Chiara’s chapel arches are round. Recently, Bruzelius has re-evaluated some of her earlier conclusions. See Bruzelius, “Project and Process in Medieval Construction.”
\textsuperscript{445} Trachtenberg contrasts this environment to Northern Europe, where a relatively uniform class of patrons “demanded relatively uniform monuments for relatively uniform purposes.” See Marvin Trachtenberg, “Gothic/Italian ‘Gothic’ Toward a Redefinition,” JSAH 50, no. 1 (March 1991), 22-37; Caroline Bruzelius, “A Rose by Any Other Name”; Gillerman, “Cosmopolitanism and Campanilismo,” 437-455; and Caskey, Art and Patronage.
\textsuperscript{446} Fugelso cites the cathedrals of Todi and Orvieto for his argument. See Karl Fugelso, “Multiculturalism in Italian Gothic Architecture,” in Multicultural Europe and Cultural Exchange in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, ed. James P. Heffers (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), 91-112.
these buildings came together rather than striving to locate the perfect synthesis. Two scholars in particular have offered intriguing insights in this regard. In his discussion of the use of spolia at the Arch of Constantine, Bryan Ward-Perkins questioned recent readings on the ideological charge of re-used reliefs by highlighting that much of the building material for the site was reused as well. He argued that if scholars began their analysis with the re-use of the building material and worked their way up to the reliefs, pragmatism may be seen as the main motivation for re-use.\textsuperscript{447} More recently, Elizabeth Bradford Smith has used the building of Santa Maria Novella to argue against terms like eclecticism and historicism. Her analysis highlights that the church was planned initially with a trussed roof, but vaulted only after a builder capable of the task joined the building site. This suggests that its form was the result of changes in basic design decisions rather than an attempt to portray an “eclectic” church.\textsuperscript{448} With the organization of Angevin construction projects in mind, many elements once thought as a sign of historicism or eclecticism may now be seen as a sign of the long process of construction and the collaboration between dozens of workers, administrators, and materials from local sources and abroad. As Michael T. Davis has argued, Gothic architecture should not be seen as a rationalist system but as a sum of parts used interchangeably.\textsuperscript{449} Lucera’s cathedral offers a perfect example for this new way of thinking about the architecture of the period.

\textsuperscript{447} Ward-Perkins does not discount ideology altogether as a motivator for the use of the reliefs, but argues that pragmatism may have been the main motivation. See Ward-Perkins, “Re-using the Architectural Legacy of the Past.”

\textsuperscript{448} Elizabeth Bradford Smith, “Santa Maria Novella.”

\textsuperscript{449} Davis, “Angevin Architecture in the Kingdom of Naples,” 18-21.
6. Conclusions

This chapter had numerous aims. The first was to outline the steps taken to repopulate *Civitas Sanctae Mariæ* and to establish the administrative structure of the city. Giving new settlers a *domus* that was tax- and rent-free, plots to cultivate, and vineyards to grow grapes fostered repopulation. Repeated often in the literature as a place solely to resettle Calabrian refugees, new settlers in Lucera also included prominent nobles involved in merchant activities including Giovanni Minutolo, revealing that the Angevin crown had larger, commercial ambitions, when it decided to rebuild and re-Christianize Lucera.

Next, I outlined the building of the cathedral, both as a building and as an instrument of royal power through its endowments and chapter. Built during the first two decades of the fourteenth century, Angevin documents reveal that construction was an event that involved the entire kingdom. Materials, people, and money were brought in from all over the *Regno*. This involved the cooperation of countless officials, including civic captains, provincial justiciars, bailiffs, abbots of monasteries tied to the crown, and royal custodians of goods from suppressed religious orders. The undertaking truly was a regional collaboration, revealing the importance of Lucera’s rebuilding for the Angevin crown.

I then examined the actual building fabric. While the building now appears to share many similarities with contemporary buildings in Naples, a deeper examination reveals that it also is very much tied to the Apulian landscapes. This is especially true in regard to the presence of local sculptural styles, building techniques, and materials used. All of these factors, combined with the surviving building documents, reveal that local builders constructed the cathedral. On the other hand, interior decoration, especially surviving
liturgical instruments and funerary sculpture, shows that smaller arts from Naples circulated throughout within the Regno.

Finally I examined the career of Pierre d’Angicourt. Examining the historiography, the documentary evidence, and the archeological remains examined in the previous section, I argued that Pierre was not an architect as he often has been described. Rather, he was a manager, a member of the powerful and upwardly mobile noblesse de robe who became familiari of the king through personal loyalty, administrative competence, and one assumes controlled ambition. This reveals that the practice of Angevin architecture was bureaucratized, and its formal outcomes were a product of these mechanisms.

All of these factors show that we should reevaluate how we approach Angevin buildings specifically, and those of the late Middle Ages in general, in regard to issues such as an iconography of architecture and function. The following chapter will build further on this methodological statement, as well as the larger socio-cultural study of Lucera’s rebuilding, through the examination of the religious orders and their buildings in Civitas Sanctae Mariae.
Chapter 3
San Francesco and the Religious Houses of Civitas Sanctae Mariae

Lucera was the center of much building activity by the close of 1300. In addition to the construction work that had begun on the cathedral, plans were in the works for the establishment of a number of religious houses within the city. On October 21, 1300 Charles II wrote to the castellan of Lucera’s fortress and requested that the official send bells to the cathedral and the three sites where the crown had provided houses for Franciscan, Dominican, and Augustian foundations (Appendix E). As discussed in the previous chapter, bells long had been used in western Christianity as a means to mark institutional presence, especially in contested spaces such as the re-Christianized cities on the Iberian Peninsula, Latin occupied Constantinople, and even within cities of the Latin West where competing religious institutions sought greater presence and influence. Their use as demarcations of space and power seems no different in the newly founded Civitas Sanctae Mariae.

The mandate is significant for two additional, but related reasons. First, it reveals that all three orders were invited to settle into the city immediately after destruction. In addition, Celestinian monastery was founded. Cities with Dominican, Franciscan, and Augustinian (as well as Celestinian) foundations were extremely few in number at the time. In fact, Naples and L’Aquila were the only other cities in the Regno that supported the three mendicant

orders and the Celestian monks. This connection was not coincidental. Samantha Kelly has argued that Charles II and Robert of Anjou practiced a royal policy of catholicity that spread favors across the religious orders in order to solidify political ties. This included not only the presence of Franciscans, Dominican, Augustinians, and Celestinians (most especially in the case of the order’s founder, Pope Celestine V) at court, but also the distribution of Angevin royal tombs across mendicant foundations within Naples. Their presence within Lucera so soon after its destruction must be seen in this context.

Second, it reveals that the orders were some of the very first individuals to settle Lucera. This process was totally different from how mendicants often established foundations in cities during the late Middle Ages. As urban orders supported by the laity and tasked with their cura animarum, the “care of their souls” through preaching and administering the sacraments, the number of mendicant foundations in a city often reflected the size of its population as well as its relative wealth that was needed to support these groups of beggars. In fact, papal controls such as Clement IV’s 1268 bull Quia plerumque addressed the growing problem of oversaturation within cities by ordering that mendicant foundations be located 140 Roman canne (312.76 meters) apart. This was not the case in rebuilt Lucera where the Dominican, Franciscan, and Augustinian foundations were built 200

451 During the same period, only three other cities in Capitanata, Troia, Foggia, and Manfredonia, possessed more than one mendicant foundation (both cities contained Franciscan and Dominican establishments). See Luigi Pellegrini, “Gli ordini mendicanti in Capitanata. Secoli XIII-XIV,” in Capitanata medievale, ed. Maria Stella Calò Mariani (Foggia: Claudio Grenzi, Editore, 1998), 114.


to 300 meters from each other. Here, the three orders were invited by the crown to settle into a city that at this point had few permanent inhabitants. Therefore, they participated in, rather than reacted to, the reconstruction of the city. If establishing a rich and powerful cathedral was one step in Lucera’s rebuilding, employing the loyal orders as administrators and extensions of the crown was another. Indeed this strategy had precedent in none other than Naples, where the crown aggressively suppressed the private chapels and houses of rebellious aristocrats, building religious houses of the loyal mendicants and Celestinians in their place.454 The physical implantation of the four orders, the presence of nobles such as Giovanni Pipino during the rebuilding of the city, and designation of the cathedral as a royal chapel, in effect transformed Civitas Sanctae Mariae into an alter Neapolis, a microcosm of sorts of the capital and its court.

This chapter investigates the establishment of the religious houses in Lucera built during the first two decades of the fourteenth century. As groups closely allied to the Angevin crown through mutual papal ties, the orders served as reformers, administrators, and as royal instruments of social, economic, and political control within Civitas Sanctae

454 Examples include San Pietro a Maiella supported directly by the King’s familiar Giovanni Pipino, which was built over the destroyed chiesette of Sant’Agata “ad Ficariola” and S. Eufemia “iurus” of the monastery of Saints Sergius and Baccus, and the Convent of Santa Chiara built on land once owned by the Caputo family, a member of the Neapolitan aristocracy that had been exiled by Charles II to Eboli following the crown’s “great struggle amongst Neapolitans” in 1305. The decision by the archbishop of Naples Peter of Sorrento to donate land in the heart of the city to the Franciscans for San Lorenzo in 1234 and the Dominicans in 1230 for what later would be San Domenico also appears to be an earlier strategy of establishing topographies of power in opposition to then-Hohenstaufen rule of the city. In fact, Bruzelius has argued that the studia of both the Franciscans and Dominicans at the time were intended to counter Frederick II’s secular University of Naples. On the foundations of San Pietro a Maiella and Santa Chiara, see Alfonso Leone, “Il convento di S. Chiara e le trasformazioni urbanistiche nel secolox XIV,” in Richerche sul Medioevo napoletano: Aspetti e momenti della vita economica e sociale a Napoli tra decimo e quindicesimo secolo, ed. Alfonso Leone (Naples: Edizioni Athena, 1996), 164-170. On the construction of Santa Chiara, see Bruzelius, Stones of Naples, 133-153. On the Dominican and Franciscan studia, see Caroline Bruzelius and William Tronzo, Medieval Naples: An Architectural and Urban History, 400-1400 (New York: Italica Press, 2011), 58-59.
Mariae. Using this socio-historical context as a framework, I will examine the built environments of these groups that, as early as September 27, 1300, were employed by the crown to assist in the accounting of confiscated Muslim foodstuffs (Appendix D). The physical locations where their foundations were implanted within the city, which all tightly surround the cathedral, serve as spatial manifestations of the Angevin crown’s aim that the three mendicant orders, and most likely the Celestinian order as well, perform active roles in the city’s rebuilding and future (fig. 3–1).

The first section of the chapter examines the Celestinian foundation dedicated to Saint Bartholomew. While not a mendicant foundation strictly speaking, the monastery and its church were built within the same era as the cathedral and mendicant churches. Moreover, by the final decade of the thirteenth century, the order had joined the mendicants as religious communities that enjoyed direct patronage by the crown and court. Regarding San Bartolomeo, it received substantial direct financial support from Giovanni Pipino and his heirs. Built according to legend on the site where the Angevin courtier fell from his horse (and survived) in battle, and therefore constituting an *ex voto* of sorts, the monastery was one of no fewer than three church building projects within kingdom that received direct financial

---

455 Luigi Pellegrini also has made this argument. See Pellegrini, “Gli insediativi e strutture territoriali dei Francescani in Capitanata e Molise nel secolo XIII, in *I Francescani in Capitanata*, eds. Tommaso Nardella, Mario Villani, Nicola de Michele (Bari: Mario Adda Editore, 1982), 54. The precedent for mendicant involvement in Angevin temporal affairs had been set in Provence, where Angevin support of the order, the dynasty’s connections to Louis IX, and the dynasty’s papal alliance led to unprecedented Dominican involvement in secular affairs. See Jacques Paul, “Angevins, frères prêcheurs et papauté,” in *L’État Angevin: Pouvoir, culture et société entre XIIe et XIVe siècle* (Rome: L’École française de Rome, 1998), 221-251. For parallel examples, see Hubert Houben, “Religious in Secular Offices in Late Medieval Southern Italy,” in *Churchmen and Urban government in Late Medieval Italy, c. 1200-c. 1450: Cases and Contexts*, eds. Frances Andrews and Maria Agata Pincelli (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 318-319.

456 CDSL, no. 347 (September 27, 1300), no. 348 (September 27, 1300), and 401 (November 3, 1300). Two members each of the Dominican, Franciscan, and Augustinian orders were chosen to participate in the audit of grain destined for Manfredonia and Brindisi. See also Taylor, “Luceria sarracenorum,” 121.

457 In fact the physical distance between these foundations, which in all cases measures between 200 and 400 meters, at times falls far short of the minimum 140 *canne* ordered by Clement IV.
support from Pipino and his heirs.\textsuperscript{458} The foundation continued to be supported by the Pipino family after his death and is the best-documented religious foundation in terms of lay donations.

The next three sections of the chapter investigate the mendicant foundations established during re-Christianization. They include the Augustinian foundation dedicated to Saint Leonard and the Dominican and Franciscan houses dedicated to the their respective founders. San Leonardo’s architectural and documentary record is in the poorest state, but what little medieval remains survive add to our understanding of architectural production and patronage in fourteenth-century Lucera. Similar challenges arise through the study of San Domenico’s architectural imprint. Its church shares a similar plan to San Leonardo and is the smallest of Lucera’s three mendicant foundations. The somewhat small and simple architectural form of the Dominican church does not match the impact of the order’s administrative role within the construction of \textit{Civitas Sanctae Mariae}, however. During the fourteenth century the foundation emerged as one of the most important priories in the region, and by 1323 two Dominicans of international renown had already served as bishops of the city. One was the Dalmatian Augustine Kažotić, who after stints as Bishop of Zagreb and a member of Pope John XXII’s inner circle in Avignon arrived in Lucera as leader of the bishopric. The Angevin crown promoted his canonization immediately following his death in 1323 and soon after the Dalmation bishop entered the ranks of venerated Dominican saints.

The third mendicant foundation surveyed here is the Franciscan convent. It has received the most scholarly attention because its medieval imprint remains the most intact.

\textsuperscript{458} The other two were Santa Maria Maggiore in Barletta and San Pietro a Maiella in Naples, also a Celestinian foundation.
The church of San Francesco, marked conspicuously above its apse and on its main portal by the Angevin arms, contains a single aisle capped by a vaulted choir. Its form resembles a number of Angevin building projects including the Clarissan foundation of Santa Maria Donna Regina, the fortress chapel of Lucera, and the city’s cathedral. In fact, it often is described as a reduced version of the city’s cathedral. However, like the cathedral, its surviving architectural and sculptural elements reveal that local workers constructed the church. The surviving elements of its fourteenth-century decorative program, on the other hand, provide further evidence that artistic styles from Naples circulated throughout the Regno.

The final section of the chapter places the mendicant foundations of Lucera within the larger contexts of southern Italian architecture, mendicant building types, and Angevin urbanism. Previous scholars have described all four foundations, relatively small single-nave churches, as prototypical mendicant monuments in Apulia. Moreover, some have argued that it was buildings such as these, as well as a new Angevin political policy of social and cultural inclusion, that stimulated a shift in the iconography of Angevin architecture—a shift often described as a turn to austere, locally driven forms.459 How are these ideas complicated after examining Lucera’s built environment and the contexts in which it was created? In the final section I challenge these arguments, and expand those made in the previous chapter. I will do this first through an examination of the literature of mendicant architecture. Then, in consideration of the ideas put forth in the previous sections as well as the second chapter, I problematize ideas regarding architectural iconography, production, austerity, and function within the Angevin realm. My conclusions for this section and the chapter as a whole rely

heavily on notions of a “topography of power,” a theory that has been used most effectively in examinations of papal building projects in early medieval Rome.\(^{460}\) As Marvin Trachtenberg has written in relation to Roman basilicas constructed during the Middle Ages, “meaning through formal or structural expression was not [the] burden” of Lucera’s mendicant churches.\(^{461}\) Rather, they, along with the artwork, heraldry, and Angevin personalities attached to them, served as sign markers, a semiotic field that marked the presence of the orders, their connections to the Angevin crown, and their administrative, political, and religious roles within the construction of *Civitas Sanctae Mariae*.

1. The Celestinian Monastery of San Bartolomeo

The Celestinians were an ascetic branch of the Benedictine order founded in the mountains of Abruzzo in 1244. Named after their founder Pietro da Morrone, the eventual Pope Celestine V, the Celestinians have received little study in comparison to the larger Benedictine orders or the mendicant communities established contemporaneously, and by the end of the eighteenth century they had dissolved. Nevertheless, because of the close ties

\(^{460}\) For notions of a topography of power in Rome, see Thomas F. X. Noble, “Topography, Celebration, and Power: The Making of Papal Rome in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries,” in *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages*, eds. Marke Jonge, Francis Theuws, and Carine van Rhijn (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 45-91; Caroline Goodson, “Revival and Reality: The Carolingian Renaissance in Rome and the Case of S. Prassede,” *Acta ad archaeologiam et atrium historiam pertinentia* ns 5 (2005), 163-192; Caroline Goodson, *The Rome of Pope Paschal I: Papal Power, Urban Renovation, Church Rebuilding, and Relic Translation*, 817-824 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 81-159. For medieval topographies of power outside of Rome, see Marvin Trachtenberg, *Dominion of the Eye: Urbanism, Art, and Power in Early Modern Florence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). Like this dissertation, Trachtenberg argues that late medieval urbanism at times could be coherent and often times that coherence served to reinforce power relationships. Unlike this dissertation, however, Trachtenberg contends that strict theoretical rigor and geometric planning guided not only the layout of the city, but also how viewers were intended to receive the building fronts. While authoritarian, this dissertation contends that the Angevin crown left many architectural details to those at the building site projecting their topographies of power. There is no evidence of a grand and strictly followed scheme.

between the founder and the Angevin king Charles II, the order formed an important institutional presence within some Angevin cities. While the details of the relationship between the Celestinians, particularly after the death of their founder, and the Angevin crown have not yet been uncovered, it is clear that the two groups remained allied for much of the fourteenth century.

The Celestinians came to Lucera within the first year of the city’s re-Christianization. Giovanni Pipino provided the initial financial support for the construction of a foundation. The church and monastery were located along the southwestern edge of the Angevin city limits at the exact location, according to legend, where Giovanni Pipino fell from his horse during the raid on *Luceria sarracenorum*. He supposedly escaped injury from the fall, and the church and monastery were dedicated to Saint Bartholomew in commemoration of the saint’s feast (August 24), the very day in which Pipino declared victory in the city.

Because of later architectural interventions, very few traces remain of San Bartolomeo’s fourteenth-century imprint (fig. 3–2). The medieval shell that survives reveals that the church was designed originally as a single longitudinal nave with no apse (fig. 3–3). Moreover, a trussed roof most likely covered the nave before Baroque alterations. The eighteenth-century *imbaroccamento* of the church was dramatic, however. The roof was barrel-vaulted, side chapels were added along the walls, and the main altar was replaced by a large marble structure with polychrome stone inlay.  

Moreover, the surrounding convent was transformed into a royal boarding school following the monastery’s suppression in 1807.

---

462 The marble altar was the work of the Neapolitan sculptor Aniello Gentile. The work was completed in 1739. See Eduardo Nappi, *Arte napoletana in Puglia dal XVI al XVIII secolo* (Fasano: Schena Editore, 1983), 55-56.
From this point on the church of San Bartolomeo served as the chapel for the new school, the “Real Collegio di Capitanata” (fig. 3–4).463

Despite the unfortunate loss of its medieval imprint, the church and convent of San Bartolomeo are the best documented of Lucera’s religious foundations. Surviving texts, especially in regard to lay donations, reveal important information in regard to the monastery’s patrons and its wealth. The majority of the texts that survive are preserved in the archives of the monastery at Montecassino.464 These sources reveal that the monastery was tied to the Pipino family from its very beginnings. In a bull dated March 14, 1301, Pope Boniface VIII praised Giovanni Pipino for his victory over the Muslims of Lucera and for his intentions to build the church and convent in honor of Saint Bartholomew.465 The wording of the bull suggests that at the time construction of San Bartolomeo remained in the planning stages, but in recognition of Pipino’s intentions, Boniface granted an indulgence of one year and forty days to those individuals who visited the church during the annual feast of Saint Bartholomew and during the annual commemorations of the church’s consecration.466

464 The sources originally had been stored at Santo Spirito del Morrone, the mother church of the order near Sulmona. That monastery was suppressed in 1807 and its archives were moved to Montecassino in 1845. For summaries of documents pertaining to San Bartolomeo, which number fourteen in total, see P. Tommaso Lecisotti, “Documenti di Capitanata: fra le carte di S. Spirito del Morrone a Montecassino,” Japigia (1940), 27-44.
465 Domenico Vendola, ed., Documenti tratti dai registri vaticani da Bonifacio VIII a Clemente V, no. 34. A shorter version of the bull is found in CDSL, no. 478a (March 14, 1301).
466 A significant omission from the bull is the mentioning of the foundation as Celestinian. The convent is mentioned only as the church built by Pipino “ad honorem Dei et Beati Bartholomei apostoli, in cuius festo, ut assertitur auxilio invocato, de sarracenorum perfidia, qui tunc in eadem civitate morantes suis obscenis operibus et nefandis actibus regionem circumpositam corrumpebant . . .” The omission could be because the intention of the bull was to grant indulgences to the church rather than the monastery itself. A copy of the bull, sent on July 24, 1301 by Giovanni Pipino’s envoy, the Celestinian Giovanni di Fiumefreddo at the abbey of Santo Spirito near Sulmona, may reveal that the church of San Bartolomeo was conceived before the Celestinian monastery. This text, which was published only in summary by P. Tommaso Lecisotti, may in fact be an invitation for the order to inhabit the church under construction. However, an explanation that sparks political intrigue may point to Boniface VIII’s relationship with the order’s founder, the hermit Pietro da Morrone, who became Pope Celestine V for five months until he resigned and subsequently was imprisoned at
Boniface’s bull was copied and redistributed at least twice. Giovanni di Fiumefreddo, envoy and familiar of Giovanni Pipino, sent a copy of the bull on July 24 of the same year to a Celestinian brother named Simone, the so-called procuratore for Santo Spirito. This is the earliest San Bartolomeo document in the Santo Spirito archives, and it may have served as the invitation for the Celestinians, an order that at this period operated mostly in Abruzzo, to inhabit San Bartolomeo. An additional transcript of the bull was sent to Lucera and addressed to a number of figures there, including: the Bishop of Lucera, Aymardus; two of his canons and his deacon, Giacomo di Guasco; the captain of the city, Ansaldo di Monteleone; five Dominican friars in the city; and a number of judges; notaries; and familiars of the king. The second copy of the bull, like the first, was published only in summary, and therefore caution must be used in its analysis. However, the names and offices addressed suggests that these individuals served as some sort of unit charged with accepting and/or administrating the new religious institutions of Civitas Sanctae Mariae. The presence

---

467 Lecisotti, doc. 1.
468 Lecisotti, doc. 1. Those listed include Aymardus, the bishop; his canons and chaplains Giovanni di Casale S. Giovanni, Giovanni di Castelvechio, and the deacon Giacomo di Guasco; the nobles Ansaldo di Monteleone, captain of the city, and Elissaios di Alamagnone, cleric (ostarius), valet, and familiar of the king; the Dominican brothers in Lucera Giovanni di Castellaneto, Pietro di Vaczano, Nicola di Bari, and the conversi Pietro di Durazzo and Francesco di Genova; Matteo di Termoli, judge and accessory of the captain of the city; Oderisio di Montodirisio, notary and familiar of the king; and the judge Leone di Matera.
in the address of five Dominican preachers alongside the bishop, canons, captain of Lucera, notaries, and judges suggests once again that the mendicant orders played a fundamental role in the institutional administration of a re-Christianized Lucera.

Funding for the foundation appears to have come primarily from the Pipino family, but the monastery received donations from other laymen as well. On December 5, 1304 Giovanni Pipino ratified a donation of unspecified goods made to San Bartolomeo by Pandolfo of Salerno, the captain of Lucera from 1303. By 1310, San Bartolomeo was the second-wealthiest religious foundation within the bishopric of Lucera according to the tenth paid to the papacy. In 1325 it remained the second wealthiest, after the parish of Santa Maria (the cathedral).

The foundation continued to grow and its wealth increased throughout the course of the fourteenth century. By virtue of Giovanni Pipino’s will, his son Nicola Pipino of Minervino (Barletta) provided on June 16, 1317 an additional nine ounces annually on top of the large sums given by the family. The sum was intended to sustain two additional monks, raising the number established during the monastery’s foundation. The endowment also included two ounces per annum to support two orphans. The funds for the donation were drawn from a house in Lucera near Nicola’s own dwelling on the via pubblica. It reportedly was located near the loggia of the shoemakers and merchants.

---

469 Lecisotti, doc. 2. Pandolfo was named captain of Lucera in a document dated March 10, 1303 (CDSL, no. 731).
470 The cathedral parish by far was the richest of the diocese. The bishop and chapter each paid 105 ounces in 1310. San Bartolomeo paid considerably less in twenty-four tari, and the church of San Nicandri paid seventeen and one-half tari. All other churches paid less than a sixth of San Bartolomeo’s sum. For these sums, see Domenico Vendola, ed. Rationes decimarum italae nei secolo XIII e XIV: Apulia-Lucania-Calabria (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1939), years 1310 and 1312.
471 Lecisotti, doc. 3.
472 Ibid. This document is one of the few fourteenth-century documents that mention structures other than churches and monasteries in Lucera. In the San Bartolomeo documents, the “loggias” in question appear to serve commercial rather than juridical or administrative purposes. For a discussion of loggias as tribunals, see
first chapter, the *via pubblica* served as Lucera’s major commercial street during the Hohenstaufen era, and it appears that it continued to serve this role into the fourteenth century. This suggests that the house from which the donations were drawn most likely was involved in commercial activities.

On January 19, 1349 Pietro Pipino, a grandson of Giovanni Pipino, granted to the monastery the nearby feud of Ripatetta, an area historically known for ceramic production but by the fourteenth century most likely rich with wheat fields and vineyards. This was land that previously had belonged to the prestigious Lombard monastery of Santa Sofia in Benevento.\(^{473}\) Finally, in his 1361 will, the same member of the Pipino family, listed in Lecisotti’s documents as “the Count of Lucera,” endowed the monastery with a large butcher shop and a loggia as well as houses, hospitals, workshops, fields, vineyards, land, and goods “pro fabrica, constructione, and edificazione” of a hospital and chapel dedicated to “S. Peter of the Celestines.”\(^{474}\) The monastery did not receive these endowments, however until January 1, 1400.\(^{475}\)

In contrast to the cathedral, which received a vast sum of its donations and privileges from the crown, the surviving records of San Bartolomeo reveal that the foundation received the vast majority of its support from Lucera’s wealthy families, most of all the Pipino clan.

---

\(^{473}\) Lecisotti, doc. 7. This land may have been attained through Pietro’s numerous lordships. Among other titles, he is named in Lecisotti’s summaries as the Count of Vico, Lord of San Severo, Patrician of Roman Princes, and as an “Illustrious Liberator of Rome and of Sicily.” The Spanish King Charles V confirmed the monastery’s possession of Ripatetta in 1536. See Lecisotti, doc. 13.

\(^{474}\) Lecisotti, docs. 9 and 10.

\(^{475}\) Additional donations to the church at the end of the fourteenth century included those from the Judge Agostino Rapolla, who donated to the monastery goods located in the town of Pietramontecorvino as well as part of the dowry received through his marriage. See Lecisotti, doc. 11 (April 10, 1395).
These families themselves, however, were aligned closely with the Angevin crown. The Pipinos were one of the clans and individuals designated “familiars” to the king. As noted in the examination of Pierre d’Angicourt, the use of the term familiar was given to members of the Angevin court (the magna curia regis) but consecrated an already official relationship between the individual and the king. In most cases it was a reward for personal fidelity to the king and competency in service to the crown through the performance of administrative, judicial, and financial duties. As individuals who received the personal trust of the king, many also supported the foundations of numerous religious houses and chapels. The motivations for many of these projects were a combination of personal piety and political alliance with the Angevin crown. The religious groups supported often were allied with the crown, and many artistic commissions within these spaces, including fresco programs and tomb sculpture, reinforced royal tastes. The results were twofold. The financial support from these groups for artistic and architectural projects favored by the crown demonstrated their loyalty. At the same time the artistic products reinforced a new Angevin visual culture on the southern Italian landscape.

Romolo Caggese’s history of the Pipino family remains the most detailed. The family’s origins have been disputed, but most likely are in Barletta, the northern Apulian port and second-largest city in the Regno where Giovanni Pipino supported a major architectural project for the first time.

---

477 For the adoption of Angevin visual culture by southern Italy’s elite classes, see Bruzelius, Stones of Naples, 155-202; Caskey, Art and Patronage in the Medieval Mediterranean, 190-242; Bock, “Patronage, Standards and Transfert Culture!”; and Bock, “Center or Periphery?”
479 Giovanni Pipino is addressed in numerous Angevin texts as Johannes Pipinus de Barulo. The genealogist Berardo Candida Gonzaga posited that the Pipino family had French origins and followed Charles I to southern
Caggese reported that Giovanni Pipino rose first within the ranks of Charles I, who conferred knighthood onto him in 1289. In 1291 the newly knighted noble from Barletta accompanied Robert of Artois, Vicar of the Kingdom, to Artois.\textsuperscript{480} In the same year he was appointed a master *rationalis*, a chief financial minister for the realm. He retained that title upon his return from Artois in 1292, and according to Caggese, remained an important member of court form then until his death in 1316.\textsuperscript{481}

A number of strategic marriages united the Pipino clan politically and economically to other important southern Italian families with ties to the Angevin court. In 1295, Giovanni Pipino’s daughter Angiola was married to Nicola della Marra, a member of the prominent Ravellese clan, some of whom had immigrated to Barletta in the 1230s.\textsuperscript{482} A year later, his Italy to seek fortune. Other historians, following the argument of the fourteenth-century chronicler Matteo Villani, argued that Giovanni Pipino was a notary from Barletta. Caggese’s argument falls into the camp of Villani and his followers. See Caggese, 142. On Pipino’s origins, see also Sylvie Pollastri, *Le lignage et le fief: L’affirmation du milieu comtal et la construction des états féodaux sous les Angevins de Naples*, 1265-1435 (Paris: Éditions Publibook, 2011), 272.

\textsuperscript{480} Caggese, 142. Dunbabin noted that Giovanni had returned to the *Regno* by July 1292. Robert’s entourage to Artois also included another Barlettan, Rinaldo Cognetti, the count’s “Master of Artois” who later was listed as a treasurer responsible for accounting Muslim foodstuffs in Lucera due for shipment to Catania. On Rinaldo and Giovanni in Artois, see Dunbabin, *The French in the Kingdom of Sicily*, 110-119. On Rinaldo at Lucera, see also chapter 2 of this dissertation.

\textsuperscript{481} Caggese, 142. Bruzelius noted that Giovanni Pipino was one of the three executioners of Charles II’s will in 1309, present at the signing of the Angevin treaties with James II of Aragon, and from 1306-1307 represented the king in negotiations with the papacy over debt owed Holy See. Giuliana Vitale noted that he served as an Ambassador for the crown to Genoa in 1308. See 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*, eds. Fabienne Joubert and Dany Sandron (Paris: Presses de l’Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1999), 260; and Vitale, 242.

\textsuperscript{482} Along with the Rufolo, the Della Marra clan was one of the Southern Italian families most closely tied to the Angevin crown. Like the Pipino they held numerous administrative positions. In 1283, Charles of Salerno, the future King Charles II, arrested prominent members of both families on account of corruption. The imprisoned were subject to heavy fines and stripped of assets. Some members of each family, including Lorenzo Rufolo and Angelo and Galgano Della Marra, were convicted of crimes and executed. Matteo Rufolo and Ruggero Della Marra were freed, the latter receiving a pardon and being welcomed back into to royal court. Jill Caskey has argued that the arrests served as a means for the Angevin monarch to assert his authority (and serve as a warning) over the politically and economically powerful members of the royal household. On the role of the Della Marra and Rufolo families within the Angevin court, see Caskey, *Art and Patronage*, 29-38; Pollastri, 32; and François Widemann, “Les Rufolo: les voires de l’anoblissement d’une famille de marchand en Italie méridionale,” in *La Noblesse dans les territoires angevins à la fin du moyen âge*, eds. Noël Coulet and Jean-Michel Matz (Rome: L’École française de Rome, 2000), 115-130. For the Rufolo imprisonment, see Caskey, *Art and Patronage*, 38-45; and Bruzelius, *Stones of Naples*, 54-57. On the role of marriage in solidifying ties among Angevin noble clans, see Vitale, 92-107.
son Nicola married Giovannella di Altamura, the daughter of Giovanni Sparano da Bari, the deceased lord of Altamura. This arrangement allowed the Pipino clan to inherit the city in the Terra di Bari as a feud in addition to the feud of Vico, of which Giovannella was countess. The Pipino family remained closely tied to the Angevin court throughout the lives of the Pipino patriarch and his son Nicola. The ascent of Nicola’s eldest son Giovanni, however, led to the family’s dramatic fall from grace. Over the course of a decade, the Pipino clan regressed from one of the most favored in the kingdom to an enemy of the crown. The family’s later precarious relationship with the crown does not seem to have affected its support for San Bartolomeo, however, as the generous donations from 1349 and 1361 attest.

San Bartolomeo was one of two Celestinian foundations founded by Pipino. The other, San Pietro a Maiella in Naples, is the best-known building project supported by Giovanni, owing to its good state of conservation (fig. 3–5). The church was built during the same two or three decades that saw the construction of the cathedrals of Naples, Lucera, and the church of San Domenico in Naples. As discussed in the previous chapter, the church has been linked stylistically with the aforementioned churches for much of the past one hundred years of scholarship. However, while all four share a similar plan with three aisles, a
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483 Caggese, 143. The marriage produced four sons: Giovanni; Pietro, the generous patron of San Bartolomeo; Ludovico; and Matteo, who died young.
484 The younger Giovanni Pipino instigated a number of rebellions throughout the 1330s that 1350s and fought at various times against the della Marra family in Barletta, Robert of Anjou, and the Hungarian branch of the Angevin crown. See Caggese, 145-165. See also Vito Tirelli, “Un feudatorio nella crisi della monarchia angioina alla metà del sec. XIV: Giovanni Pipino, Palatino di Altamura, Conte di Minervino,” Archivio storico pugliese 2 (1958), 108-155; and Pollastri, 276-280.
485 Lecisotti, docs. 7 and 9-10.
486 In addition, Giovanni supported the construction of the late thirteenth-, early fourteenth-century chevet of Santa Maria Maggiore in Barletta. The only surviving example of adopted Rayonnant-like forms in Apulia, Giovanni Pipino was one of thirty-six wealthy Barlettani who contributed to the construction of the east end, implying that his participation was civic-driven rather than courtly. See Bruzelius, “Giovanni Pipino of Barletta,” 261-262; and Caroline Bruzelius, “‘A Torchlight Procession of One.’ La choeur de Santa Maria Maggiore de Barletta,” Revue de l’art 125 (1999), 9-19.
trant, and multiple apses at their east ends, San Pietro a Maiella’s decorative details, including its simplified lanceted bases and the protruding abaci of its battered capitals, fall much more in tune with the Neapolitan churches.

The church serves as the burial place of Giovanni Pipino. His tomb, a rectangular box that bears the Pipino arms along the front and sides, now is embedded within the wall of the left transept. This location is not the tomb’s original resting place, as the heraldic symbols placed on the sides of the tomb now are partly hidden within the wall. Originally, the tomb most likely rested on a ledge against a wall like numerous contemporary monuments in Naples.487

At one point the tomb may have been located in the adjacent apse, now called the Pipino chapel. The oratory houses a Magdalen fresco cycle that served as a sign of Giovanni’s close ties with the Angevin crown.488 The scenes in the cycle include the conversion of the Magdalen, the Noli me tangere, Mary Magdalen’s preaching in Provence, the location of her shrine church at Sainte-Maximin-la-Sainte-Baume, and the Marseilles miracle.489 Additionally, the cycle includes a scene from the Golden Legend that depicts the saint’s miraculous resurrection of an unhorsed knight killed in battle. Katherine Jansen has argued that this scene, an addition for the Magdalen fresco cycles seen only in one or two

487 This group of tombs includes the royal sepulchers of Mary of Hungary at Santa Maria Donna Regina and Robert of Anjou, Charles of Calabria, and Mary of Valois at Santa Chiara. Numerous other tombs, especially within the side chapels of Santa Chiara, were mounted this way as well. See, for example, Lorenz Enderlein, Die Grablegen des Hauses Anjou in Unteritalien: Totenkult und Monumente 1266-1343 (Worms am Rhein: Wernersche Verlagsgessellschaft, 1997).


489 Legends dating from the twelfth century held that Mary Magdalen went on an apostolic mission to Provence. Of her numerous apostolic activities, the Magdalen was said to have converted the city of Marseilles through her preaching. According to Wilkins, scenes depicting the Magdalen preaching were quite rare in central and southern Italy. On Mary Magdalen as Apostolorum Apostola (the Apostle of Apostles) in Provence, see Jansen, 270-277.
surviving examples, commemorates Pipino’s fall from his horse at Lucera. As mentioned earlier, in Lucera the same event supposedly was commemorated through his patronage of San Bartolomeo.

The inscription in leonine verse on Pipino’s tomb invokes his victory at Lucera, and notes that due to his efforts Lucera “was made Christian” from the “damned barbaric people.” That Pipino’s role at Lucera is the one deed mentioned specifically on his tomb speaks not only to the importance of Lucera’s destruction for Angevin plans to consolidate power in the Regno, but also to the continuing prestige, power, and fame gained by Pipino from his role in the destruction of the settlement. Most likely it was this everlasting fame of the familiar from Barletta that led Charles II’s heir Robert of Anjou to tolerate his grandson’s acts of rebellion for over four years before finally declaring the younger Giovanni Pipino a rebel in 1341.

In returning to San Bartolomeo, the connections between the Lucera foundation and San Pietro a Maiella extend beyond the inscription that invokes the purge of the Apulian city. As mentioned earlier, both sites were Celestinian foundations. This speaks powerfully to both Giovanni’s and by extension the crown’s use of religious patronage as a political tool. Bruzelius rightly argued that Giovanni Pipino was attracted to supporting the Celestinian order for a number of reasons, including their local origins in the important Angevin province of Abruzzo (a point I raise when I examine the formation of Angevin L’Aquila in chapter four), and the close relationship between the order’s founder, the hermit pope

490 Ibid., 317. Jansen has argued that the episode from the Golden Legend was depicted in the Leggendario ungherese (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. Lat. 8541, fol. 104r), a book that represented the “hagiographic pantheon” of the Angevin Hungarian branch made possibly for Giovanna of Anjou’s first husband, Andrew of Hungary, and a fresco cycle in Pontresina in Switzerland. The Pontresina fresco is too badly damaged to confirm the identity of the scene, however. See Jansen, 316, note 35, and 325, note 62.
491 The inscription reads: “Innumeris annis bonitas memoranda Ioannis huius Pipini, cuius laus consona fini, per quem barbarica damnatia gente subacta gaudet Luceria, iam nune Christicola facta.”
Celestine V, and Pipino’s patron, Charles II. Moreover, their close ties to the Angevin king most likely meant that the hermit pope and Pipino met, either in L’Aquila or in Naples.\footnote{As will be addressed in chapter 4, Giovanni Pipino was recorded in L’Aquila on September 28, 1294, only a month after Celestine’s coronation at the monastery of Santa Maria di Collemaggio.} Charles’s short relationship with the new pope is an extraordinary period in the history of the South and the Papacy. The king intervened personally in the election of Celestine V in 1294 and convinced the pope to make a number of decisions politically advantageous to the Angevin crown in the five months between the pope’s election and his resignation. In fact, numerous scholars have argued that Celestine V was the Angevin king’s puppet. During his short papacy Celestine transferred the papal Curia to Naples, made twelve new cardinals tied to Angevin crown, named the Angevin protonotary Bartolomeo da Capua to the office of pontifical notary, annulled the 1278 bull by Nicholas III, *Fundamenta militantis ecclesie*, which prohibited the election of foreign kings and princes to the Roman senate, and accepted peace negotiations between the Angevin and Aragonese crowns.\footnote{Charles I of Anjou, father of Charles II, was elected sole senator of Rome in 1265. The well-known statue of the king by Arnolfo di Cambio (1277) now held at the Capitoline Museums in Rome commemorated this position. On Angevin control of Celestine’s papacy, see Nicolas Bock, “Il re, i vescovi, e la cattedrale: sepulture e costruzione architettonica,” in *Il Duomo di Napoli dal paleocristiano all’età angioina*, ed. Serena Romano and Nicolas Bock (Naples: Electa, 2002), 136. On the twelve cardinals created by Celestine V, seven of which were French and five Italian, see Trinci, 19-34. On the Angevin influence on Celestine V, see also Alessandra Bartolomei Romagnoli, “Le bolle di Celestino V cassata da Bonifacio VIII,” in *Celestino V nell settimo centenario della morte. Convegno nazionale Ferentino, 10-12 Maggio 1996*, ed. Bancamaria Valeri (Casamari: Associazione Culturale “Gli Argonauti” Ferentino, 2001), 207-232.} During this period Celestine’s order joined ranks with the mendicants as spiritual soldiers for the Church, and by extension the crown of Naples. The political nature of the Celestinian order’s connections to the crown continued after its founder’s death, and even led to the its spread to France where it was supported by the cousin of Charles II, King Philip IV.\footnote{Philip invited the order to France in 1300, left 4,000 livres to the house in Paris through his 1311 will, and plead for Celestine’s canonization in 1313. On Philip’s support of the order by way of Naples, see Dunbabin, *The French in the Kingdom of Sicily*, 209-210.}
In her analysis of San Pietro a Maiella, Bruzelius has suggested that extant building projects supported by Giovanni Pipino display an interest in local tastes, materials, and a commitment to austerity and simplicity. In this sense she has argued that the buildings mimic in style and in iconography the monuments of Charles II, especially the Cathedrals of Naples and Lucera, and San Domenico. For her, the projects exhibit stylistically the qualities that may have attracted Pipino to the Celestinian order in the first place, namely the order’s ideals of austerity, their origins in nearby Abruzzo, and their support by Charles II. She has argued, therefore, that the forms refer to particular religious, historical, and political messages. Her analysis in these instances speaks to the larger historiographical issue of an iconography of mendicant architecture and building types that will be discussed in the final section of the chapter. For now, however, one initial reaction to her conclusions can be made. In regard to formal connections between San Bartolomeo and San Pietro a Maiella, neither appears to resemble the other in either style or iconography. San Bartolomeo contained a single rectangular aisle whereas San Pietro a Maiella was constructed with a nave, two aisles, a transept, and three, later five, apses, undoubtedly a sign of a larger contingent of monks in a larger city. Moreover, neither Celestinian monument resembled either of the two important Abruzzan foundations at the time: the church at the motherhouse of Santo Spirito and the basilica of Santa Maria di Collemaggio in L’Aquila, the site of Celestine V’s coronation and the place where his relics were translated following his Canonization. The existence of a “Celestinian building type,” therefore, does not appear to have existed. Each building project, rather, appears to have been created independently of the other. In this sense they indeed have a “taste for the local” because each monument was
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495 Bruzelius, “Giovanni Pipino of Barletta: The Butcher of Lucera as Patron and Builder,” 265-267; and Bruzelius, Stones of Naples, 172.
constructed under local conditions using local workers. As mentioned in the second chapter, these conditions speak more to the larger bureaucratization of construction at the time—a result of both increased administrative centralization as well as building activity throughout the region—than to a conscious effort to present vernacular styles for the sake of them being local. A larger discussion on this issue will follow in the final section of the chapter.

2. The Augustinian Foundation of San Leonardo

Charles II’s early orders for mendicant assistance in the accounting of confiscated foodstuffs and for bells to be sent at the sites of their future foundations (Appendix D and Appendix E) reveal that the three largest mendicant orders were present at Lucera within weeks of the Muslim purge and Christian rebuilding. During the course of the city’s reconstruction each order founded houses well within the confines of the city’s three-kilometer perimeter of walls completed by the middle of the fourteenth century.

The Augustinian order, the third largest mendicant group, was founded in 1256 through the unification by Pope Alexander IV of five hermit communities: the Hermit Brothers of Tuscany, Williamites, Bontes, Brettini, and hermits of Montefavale. During the late thirteenth century the order transitioned from mostly rural and ascetic to predominately urban, pastoral, and learned.496

San Leonardo, the Augustinian foundation of Lucera, is the least known of the three churches. Moreover, not much is known about the activities of the Augustinian friars in Lucera beyond their initial aid in redistributing property. The church and monastery are

located to the east of the cathedral, and as such is the only foundation of the three mendicant orders and San Bartolomeo located to the east of Santa Maria Assunta (fig. 3–6).

The church of San Leonardo contains a single nave with a vaulted square choir (fig. 3–7). The nave’s dimensions are not symmetrical, revealing that the foundation was built on an irregular plot and that the preexisting street was not redirected.\footnote{The church’s nave is approximately twenty-nine meters long on its northern end and thirty-one meters along the southern wall. The choir measures between forty-nine and sixty-four meters square.} Like Lucera’s other fourteenth-century churches, San Leonardo received heavy alterations during the eighteenth century, and was reconstructed completely during the twentieth century. Interventions have included a reworking of the choir vaulting and the addition of arches along the walls of the church. Altars were added underneath these arches, forming seven small chapels. Of all of Lucera’s churches, San Leonardo is most similar to San Domenico. Both are single aisled churches, were lit by small single-lancet windows, and both contain square vaulted apses. They also were constructed using similar construction techniques. Tomaiuoli has shown that the abutment for the apse vault at San Leonardo, a rare surviving element of its medieval origins, contain mouldings similar to those found at San Domenico.\footnote{Nunzio Tomaiuoli, “La Capitanata nel periodo angioina: appunti di architettura religiosa,” in Siponto e Manfredonia nella Daunia (Foggia: Edizioni del Golfo, 1990), 206.} Slender rounded shafts attached to a larger rectangular core supported both vaults (fig. 3–8 and fig. 3–9).

As Tomaiuoli noted, none of the church’s medieval origins remain beyond its plan and choir abutment. The church has been altered in every other facet. These include the early twentieth-century alterations to its façade (fig. 3–10). The changes appear to have been meant to evoke the original façade, which was altered at some point during the baroque renovations. Verticality, a quality seen in many Apulian facades, is expressed through brick pilasters attached to the wall face, and stone consoles and columns embellish the gable. The
new portal is a simplified version of the medieval structure it replaced (fig. 3–11). The original portal likely resembled those at the cathedral, San Francesco, and fortress chapel. Like those examples it combined the form of portals used throughout the churches of Angevin Naples (a relatively simple jamb, archivolt, and broken arch) with local Apulian sculptural details.

The heavy restorations mark just one problem with reconstructing the building’s history. While not insignificant in their details, only two written sources survive that aid in reconstructing a building timeline and establishing patterns of patronage. On January 13, 1303, an Augustinian friar named Paul was given permission by the crown to build a hospital. The project was to be paid, at least in part, through begging for alms. The project appears at least to have been in the planning and collection stages by that point, as a second letter dated to the same day relates to stones stolen from the hospital construction site. In the letter the crown assured the friar that civic authorities would aid in finding the culprits and collecting restitution. Beyond these two documents, however, all that is known for sure about the Augustinians of Lucera is that they were present in the city from at least September of 1300 and that they built the church and hospital of San Leonardo at some point after October 21, 1300, when bells were ordered sent to their construction site. The details of their medieval activities beyond these dates have remained, and continue to remain, however, unknown.


500 CDSL, no. 722 (January 13, 1303): “Karolus II Capitaneo Civit. S. Marie…Exposuit…fr. Paulus…quod…certam…quantitatem lapidum…iniquus homo vel homines…ei substulerunt, in impedimentum pii…operis [hospitalis],…m. qt. ut…inquiras una cum iudice et notarios…quos inveneris deos lapides substulisse, debita correctione castiges, et amplius ante cogas…lapides integer restituere…”
3. San Domenico and the Dominicans of Lucera

The 1301 transcript of Boniface’s bull sent to city officials in Lucera named five Dominicans: Giovanni di Castellaneto, Pietro di Vaczano, Nicola di Bari, and the conversi Pietro di Durazzo and Francesco di Genova.¹ The church and priory of San Domenico appear to have been completed between the naming of these five Dominicans and the death of Lucera’s second Dominican bishop, Agostino Kažotić in 1323.

San Domenico is located at the modern intersection of the via San Domenico and via Agostino Casotti, approximately 200 meters west of the cathedral and 300 meters to the south of San Francesco. The local historian Giambattista Gifuni wrote that the church was founded on the ruins of a large Muslim storehouse. He posited that the monastery incorporated some of the previous structure’s walls, although no evidence points to the veracity of his claims.²

The church shares many similarities with San Leonardo (fig. 3–12). It also is a single aisle with a wide and deep vaulted square chancel altered during the eighteenth century by the addition of shorter lunette vaults (fig. 3–13). Like San Leonardo, arches were added along the lateral walls of the church, creating eight small chapels. In addition, the roof of the nave was raised and barrel vaulted, wide widows were added along the new roofline and along the sides of the choir, and the entire exterior was covered in stucco (fig. 3–14). Furthermore, the priory was transformed into barracks for the Carabinieri after its suppression in the nineteenth century (fig. 3–15).

¹ Lecisotti, doc. 1.
² Gifuni, 39.
Restorations in the 1930s and in 1980 revealed fourteenth-century elements of the building. Stucco was removed from the exterior wall, revealing three single lancet windows closed during Baroque alterations (fig. 3–16). The windows are much more narrow than their replacements, and are located midway up the wall, revealing that the Baroque renovations included a significant increase to the height of the nave walls. The exposed windows also show that like other churches of Lucera, San Domenico’s walls were faced with brick and tufa cornerstones, some of which appear to have been reused (fig. 3–17). The little brickwork exposed, however, is less neat than that at the cathedral or even at San Francesco, although this may be from later repairs due to damage. San Domenico also is the smallest and squattest of Lucera’s mendicant foundations. Its nave measures approximately twenty-nine meters in length and fourteen meters in width, and its chancel is approximately eighty-one meters square.

Details of the church’s fourteenth-century structure have been exposed within the church choir. Like at San Leonardo, the slender columnar supports for the choir’s original vaulting survive in all four corners (fig. 3–9). These correspond to thick buttresses on the exterior of the choir. Like the brickwork revealed along the original nave windows, the ashlar work on the exposed piers at the entrance of the choir contains smaller pieces of tufa and is more irregular than other examples in the city. The shape of the piers also varies from examples at the cathedral and San Francesco. They are more square and blocky, qualities that extend to the piers’ polygonal bases.

503 Nunzio Tomaiuoli reported the details of the final interventions. See Tomaiuoli, “Lucera-chiesa di S. Domenico,” in Restauri in Puglia 1971-1983, ed. Riccardo Mola (Fassano: Schena, 1983), 2:305-311. 504 One reused corner stones is positioned midway up the northeast corner of the church reads ISTUM:LAPIDEM:DEDIT:ECCL'E: NICOLAUS. It is unlikely, however, that this stone was meant to recognize a patron of this church because of its illegibility.
A single lancet window discovered behind the organ in the 1930s, however, reveals that other parts of the church were executed more elegantly (fig. 3–18 and fig. 3–19). The window is capped by a tondo outlined in knobs in the shape of eight-pointed starbursts, and the outside row of molding is formed by a row of stacked balusters. While the stacked balusters are unique among surviving masonry in Lucera, the starbursts found around the tondo are analogous to a motif that runs along the top of a single lancet window on San Francesco’s apse (fig. 3–20). This suggests that the same sculptors worked at both sites or that San Domenico and San Francesco received sculpted works from a similar source, either as new or reused products.

Despite San Domenico’s aesthetic and dimensional shortcomings in relation to fourteenth-century Lucera’s other extant churches, the surviving textual sources show that the Dominicans of Lucera were a powerful force during the rebuilding and re-Christianization of Civitas Sanctae Mariae. In fact, what survives suggests that the crown may have relied upon the group more than any other religious order in the administration of Lucera’s rebuilding.

San Domenico was one of the most powerful Dominican foundations in Capitanata during the fourteenth century.\footnote{Pellegrini, “Gli ordini mendicanti in Capitanata,” 116.} By 1323 two Dominicans had served in succession as Bishop of Lucera. Both were of international renown and both had close ties to the Angevin crown and the papacy. The first, Giacomo di Fusignano (1308-1322), originally was from Latium. He served a number of important roles within the order before his episcopacy, including minister general of the province of Rome (1288), prior of Santa Maria Sopra Minerva in Rome (1289-1290), executor of the will of Latino Malabranca Orsini (the Dominican Cardinal and nephew of Pope Nicholas III), and provincial prior for the Kingdom
of Naples (1298-1301). The final position led to a place within the Angevin court where Giacomo was appointed chaplain and familiar of king Charles II (1299).

Not merely concerned with spiritual matters, Charles II also appointed Giacomo as legate to Genoa. This was an enormously important position, as among other nuances, Genoa was an ally of Naples’s Aragonese rivals in Sicily as well as physically located between the Angevin crown’s possessions in Italy and Provence. The Dominican held this position at least in 1299 and again in 1308, when he was sent to the maritime republic to recover Angevin possessions in Piedmont. Two high-ranking court officials who accompanied him marked the importance of the trip also: the Grand Chamberlain and a master rationalis.

Clement V appointed Giacomo Bishop of Lucera the same year as his final recorded trip to Genoa. As the Dominican scholar Tommaso Käppeli argued, Charles II undoubtedly drove this appointment. Seen in this light the position of bishop of Civitas Sanctae Mariae must have been viewed by the king to be as important as the diplomatic mission to Genoa in which he previously had installed the Dominican. The king seems in this instance to have wanted a close confidant with connections beyond the see and its territory administering the

---


507 Charles II’s recommendation of Giacomo to Genoa, dated November 12, 1299, reads: “Pro Fratre Iacobo de Fusiniano priore Predicatorem. – Scriptum est universis amici nostris de Ianua. Salutem et sinceram dilectionem. Ecce venerabilem et religiosum virum fratrem Iacobum de Fusiniano, priorem provinciaem ordinis Predicatorum dilectum, cappellum, consiliarium et familiarem ostrum pro certis negotiis que nos et commune Ianue tangent ad civitatem ipsam personaliter destinamus, commisso sibi per nos ut vobiscum conferat vestrumque requirat consilium et auxilium super illis. Ideoque, ne in scribendo cuilibet vestrum pro se, aliquem fortasse omitti continget, scribendum vobis in generali providimus amicitiamque vestram attente rogamus ut eidem priori in his que vobis ex parte nostra verbotenus dixerit, fidem velitis indubiam adhibere.” Published in Käppeli, 142.

508 Käppeli, 138. Its possessions in Piedmont were incredibly important to the Angevin crown, as they formed part of the land route between Naples, Provence, and France. On the route as the most cost effective means of travel as well as its importance for the movement of troops and ceremonial processions, see Jean Dunbabin, The French in the Kingdom of Sicily, 1266-1305 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 33-35.
bishopric. All indications suggest that the new post was not a demotion for Giacomo. In fact, the prestige of the Dominican’s posts only increased. In 1322, following a fourteen-year episcopate at Lucera, Giacomo was named bishop of Methoni in Peloponnese, the important Venetian outpost that served as the main transportation and economic hub between Venice and the Holy Land.\textsuperscript{509}

Little is known about the details of Giacomo’s episcopate in Lucera. He undoubtedly participated in the construction of the cathedral, but beyond this no evidence of preaching, pastoral, or administrative work survives. The one text that does survive from the time of his episcopate is his response to the question of apostolic poverty requested by Pope John XXII. Revealing his importance overall within church, Angevin, and Dominican hierarchies, he was one of over fifty bishops, cardinals, and theologians asked to submit an opinion on the matter. John XXII used these in turn when preparing his bull \textit{Cum inter nonnullos}, which declared heretical the opinion of the Spiritual Franciscans that Christ and the Apostles owned no possessions.\textsuperscript{510} Unable to attend the consistory personally due to illness, Giacomo’s opinion, which fell into line with the pope’s, was sent to Avignon.\textsuperscript{511}

\textsuperscript{509} Giacomo succeeded another Dominican, Gilles de Ferrare, the Patriarch of Alexandria who had died. In 1333 Giacomo was succeeded after his death by a Franciscan named Matteo. See Ciampi, 163; and Käppeli, 139.
\textsuperscript{510} The collection of opinions is held at the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (MS BAV vat. Lat. 3740). The manuscript is divided into five sections. Sections one and two the opinions of those Franciscans who believed that Christ and the Apostles possessed nothing. Sections three to five were the opinions of those solicited who believed the contrary. Section three records the opinions of cardinals, section four bishops, and section five masters of theology. On the document and the proceedings, see Louis Duval-Arnold, “Les conseils remis à Jean XXII sur le problème de la pauvreté du Christ et des Apôtres (MS. Vat. Lat. 3740),” in \textit{Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae} (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1989), 3:121-201; Ciampi, 148-158; Patrick Nold, \textit{John XXII and his Franciscan Cardinal: Bertrand de la Tour and the Apostolic Poverty Controversy} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003), esp. 37-42; and Melanie Brunner, “Pope John XXII and the Franciscan Ideal of Absolute Poverty,” (PhD Diss, University of Leeds, 2006), esp. 29-32.
\textsuperscript{511} Giacomo’s response reads: “Ego, frater Iacobus, episcubus civitis sancte Marie, olim dicte lucerie, quia congregationibus dominorum prelatorum et magistrorum in theologia infirmitate gravatus interesse non potui, ipsorum respondiones non audivi et ideo protestor quod ea que nunc scribe suppono correctio ni et emendation domini nostri summi pontificis, precipue si contingat me ex ignorantia mea a veritate et a dictis sapientiorum deviare.—Ad questionem ergo qua queritur utrum assere Christum et apostolos non habuisse aliquid in communi, sit hereticum, videtur mihi absque preiudicio loquendo quod, cum Christum et apostolos habuisse vel non habuisse aliquid in communi non sit articulus fidei, ex terminis questionis non videtur circa hoc heresis
Giacomo’s successor at Lucera also was asked by the John XXII to write an opinion on the matter. This man, the Dominican Augustine Kažotić from Dalmatia, was installed as Bishop of the city in 1322. His episcopate lasted for one short, but historically momentous year, as today he is counted among the “santi protettori” of Lucera.\(^{512}\)

Kažotić was born around 1260 to a noble family in Trogir, a city in southern Dalmatia. He appears to have been ordained by 1280 and by the end of the decade had studied at the University of Paris.\(^{513}\) Kažotić spent much of the rest of the thirteenth century as an inquisitor investigating Christian heretics. The Dominican chronicler Galvino Fiamma (1283-1344) recorded one event in particular involving his activities. In 1286 a rogue member of a third order of Dominicans reportedly attacked him and another colleague.\(^{514}\)
Kažotić was severely wounded with a blow to the head, but survived. His companion, Iacopo Orsini, the nephew of Cardinal Matteo Rubeo Orisini, did not. This event does not appear to deter his activities as an inquisitor, however. During some point toward the end of the century he reportedly was sent to Bosnia by Boniface VIII to investigate Bogomilism, a gnostic sect founded in Bulgaria that rejected political and church hierarchies.

Kažotić, therefore, had made a career by the end of the century of identifying, analyzing, and rectifying out-of-line Christians. His skills as an inquisitor dealing with heresy and rebellion undoubtedly led the Dominican pope Benedict XI to return Augustine to his homeland in 1303 as Bishop of Zagreb, then part of the kingdom of Hungary. His mission to Zagreb would mark the first recorded instance of his encounter with the Angevin dynasty, albeit the Hungarian branch that at times was in open conflict with the Neapolitan crown. Nevertheless, Kažotić became bishop of a region whose social and political strife in many ways mirrored the area around Lucera. The Angevin crown was even newer to Hungary than to Southern Italy, and throughout the Dalmatian’s episcopacy struggled to obtain, let alone consolidate (as in southern Italy) power. The new bishop returned to a region marred by power struggles between the Angevin branch in Hungary, remnants of the ruling Arpad dynasty of Hungary, and powerful nobles strengthened through salutary neglect since the end of the thirteenth century. These conditions had a crippling effect on the

---

515 This event is strangely similar to the attack at Lucera that eventually killed the bishop. More historical work is needed to determine whether Fiamma, writing after the death of Augustin, confused this story set during Kažotić’’s youth with the blow to the head that would kill him.

516 Ciampi, 22-23.

517 Charles I of Hungary (also known as Charles Robert or Carobert) was the first Angevin King of Hungary (reigned 1312-1342). Charles’s claim to the thrown was made through his father, Charles Martel (1271-1295), the eldest son of Neapolitan king Charles II and Mary of Hungary, sister of Hungarian Ladislas IV (reigned 1272 to 1290). His two royal rivals for the crown were Wenceslas III, son of Wenceslas II, King of Bohemia and son of Hungary King Béla IV (ruled 1235-70), and Otto of Wittelsbach from Bavaria. These three fought for succession against each other and the kingdom’s powerful barons. The most powerful noble, Csák Máty, ruled over an area that today comprises most of modern day Slovakia. Another family, the Kőszegi, ruled over
church in the region, whose lands and goods had been seized by nobles, and on the people, who inevitably suffered most from the effects of these struggles for land, goods, and power. Kažotić instituted sweeping social and religious reforms while bishop.\textsuperscript{518} Among these, he recovered church property and rights seized by nobles, established a code of conduct for the cathedral chapter, and reformed the Zagreb rite. He also reportedly built a hospital in Zagreb (and maybe even a new cathedral), dug wells in villages, and founded a free cathedral school within the city. The last reform was especially important for the education of the bishopric’s clergy, as the kingdom at the time lacked universities.\textsuperscript{519} Many of these reforms were paid with funds provided reluctantly by the noble and merchant classes of the region.

Kažotić was exiled to Avignon in 1318 or 1319. The circumstances of this event are not certain, but it appears that his reforms threatened King Charles Robert’s (also known as Carobert) own attempts to control the noble classes in the region. In an effort to fund his successionary battles, the Hungarian king had seized large amounts of ecclesiastical property almost all of the Transdanube (Most of Hungary west of Budapest). Receiving the support of Boniface VIII, then Benedict XI, and also the head of the Hungarian church, Charles was crowned King of Hungary in 1310. He continued to fight counterclaims, however, and did not fully grasp hold of all of Hungary until his defeat of the last baron, János Babonić, in 1323. After securing his place in Hungary he challenged his uncle Robert of Anjou’s claim to the Kingdom of Naples. The Hungarian and Neapolitan lines of the Angevin Dynasty continued to fight over the crown of Naples until war was waged between the Hungarian King Louis I and his cousin Joanna I of Naples beginning in 1347. On Charles Robert’s succession and his struggle with Hungary’s barons, see Enikő Csukovits, “La vie noble en Hongrie,” in \textit{La noblesse dans les territoires angevins a la fin du moyen âge}, eds. Noël Coulet and Jean-Michel Matz (Rome: L’École française de Rome, 2000), 159; and István Petrovics, “The Kings, the Towns, and the Nobility in Hungary in the Anjou era,” in \textit{La noblesse dans les territoires angevins a la fin du moyen âge}, eds. Noël Coulet and Jean-Michel Matz (Rome: L’École française de Rome, 2000), 436.

\textsuperscript{518} Hrvatski Biografski Leksikon, s.v. “Kažotić, Augustin,” by Franjo Šanjek (2009), http://hbl.izmk.hr/clanak.aspx?id=197; and Pasquale Socco, “Due santi nella Lucera del loro tempo,” in \textit{Miscellanea di storia lucerina. Atti del I e II Convegno di studi storici} (Lucera: Centro Regionale Servizi Culturali Educativi, 1987), 112. Luigi Pellegrini argued that many of the mendicants elected to episcopal seats during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were, from time to time, the \textit{longa manus} of papal politics or instruments of control on local lords. See Luigi Pellegrini, “Vescovi e ordini mendicanti,” in \textit{Vescovi e diocese in Italia dal XIV alla metà del XVI secolo: Atti del VII Convegno di storia della Chiesa in Italia} (Brescia, 21-25 settembre 1987), vol. 1., eds., Giuseppina de Sandre Gasparini, Antonio Rigon, Francesco Trolese, and Gian Maria Varanini (Rome: Herder Editrice e Libreria, 1990), 199.

\textsuperscript{519} On the cathedral school as the main site of intellectual formation in the Angevin kingdom of Hungary, see Marie-Madeleine de Cevins, “La formation du clerge paroissial en Hongrie sous les rois Angevins,” in \textit{Formation intellectuelle et culture de clerge dans les territoires angevins (milieu du XIIIe-fin du XV siècle)}, eds. Marie Madeleine de Cevins and Jean-Michel Matz (Rome: L’École française de Rome, 2005), 47-78.
and extorted substantial funds from the benefices of church officials. Ironically, in an effort to solidify Charles’s right to the throne, the bishop may have preached some eleven years earlier of the king’s holy lineage before a group of nobility. This event, if authentic, suggests that Kažotić’s relationship with Charles Robert was not always fraught.

Kažotić continued to govern the bishopric of Zagreb from Provence and also became a member of Pope John XXII’s inner circle. This may in fact have been where the Dalmatian bishop met by-then king of Naples Robert, who resided in Avignon from approximately 1320 to 1324. In addition to his participation in the consistory on poverty (he sided with the pope), the bishop also was one of the ten individuals in 1320 (five bishops, the two masters general of the Franciscans and Dominicans, and three masters of theology) who presented

---

520 The assembly of nobles to proclaim a king was held in Rákos in southeastern Hungary. On October 10, 1307, Kažotić reportedly spoke before a group of Hungarian nobility assembled to decide who held the rightful claim to the throne. The bishop reportedly first established the legitimate rules of previous kings, including Wenceslas of Bohemia and Otto of Bavaria, and then in favor of Charles preached: “Charles’s rights, as God and men will witness, stem from the fact that he derives his lineage from our most saintly kings. Elizabeth, the sister of his great-grandfather, King Béla IV, irradiated Germany with the glory of her saintliness; the other Elizabeth, the granddaughter of the same king’s sister, shed the light of her holiness on Hispania; Béla IV’s daughter, Margaret (who, incidentally, was born in Trogir, and is a fellow citizen of mine), lit up Dalmatia with the glow of her sanctity; and his other daughter, Cunegond, has illuminated Poland. In like manner, his granddaughter, Mary, our Charles’s grandmother, has shed the light of holiness through that most saintly bishop, Louis of Toulouse, first on Italy, whose life-giving air he breathed, and then on Gaul, whence he took flight to his eternal reward. Our Charles is his brother’s issue. And we must also mention Louis IX, that most outstanding of the kings of France and the king most highly approved in heaven and on earth: from his adolescence to his last breath, he fought not for himself but for Christ’s kingdom; he was an ancestor of our Charles through his brother, Charles, our Charles’s grandfather.” This speech survives only in the seventeenth-century life of the bishop written by Joannes Tomcus Marnavitus (“Oratio S. Augustini Gazotti. Dicta in Campo Rakos pro Carolo,” in Historia cathedralis ecclesiae Zagrabiensis), then Bishop of Zagreb, and some scholars have argued that a number of details, if not the entire speech, are forged. However, some successive authenticated historical events keep open the possibility that the event occurred. The assembly of nobles did actually occur and the papal legate to Hungary, the cardinal Gentile di Particino da Montefiore, provided a similar type of address before Hungarian nobles assembled on November 27, 1308 at the Dominican priory in Pest. In 1319 Charles Robert’s second wife, Beatrice of Luxemburg, renewed the privileges of the Dominican priory in which Margaret of Hungary lived. The king also introduced the cult of Saint Louis of Toulouse to Hungary and named his children Charles (1321-2?), Ladislas (1324-1329), Louis (1326-1382), Stephen (1332-1354), and Elizabeth (d. 1367) after dynastic saints. See Gábor Klaniczay, Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses: Dynastic Cults in Medieval Central Europe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 324-326. On holy lineage and Angevin legitimation, see the following sections in this chapter.

521 Samantha Kelly has suggested that much of Robert’s patronage of churchmen and even artists, including Simone Martini and Petrarch, bore connections to Avignon. On Robert’s sojourn in Avignon, see Kelly, The New Solomon, 22-72.
opinions to the pope on heresy, sorcery, the invocation of demons, and sacrilege. In his reasoned response Kažotić argued against the use of inquisition for ignorant people accused of superstition, noting that the roots of the malfeasance stemmed from ignorance rather than malice.522

The bishop’s treatment of heresy and obvious skill in enacting institutional reforms were put to use once again soon after the consistory on apostolic poverty. In 1322, after four years in Avignon, John XXII made Kažotić Bishop of Civitas Sanctae Mariae, undoubtedly under the sanction of, and perhaps even active promotion from, the pope’s former lord, King Robert of Anjou.523

It appears that Kažotić was sent to Lucera to institute many of the same reforms that led to his exile from Croatia. Whereas in Hungary these were seen as an encroachment on royal prerogatives, in Naples they played an important role in the royal consolidation of power. Local chroniclers have posited that was he sent to convert remaining Muslims in the city.524 These explanations are unlikely, however, as the bishop never had filled this role during his career. As an inquisitor he investigated heretics, not infidels, and all of his writings, including his responses on sorcery and poverty, dealt with abuses within Christendom. His reforms in Zagreb were very much in the same vein as his inquisitional activities, as they sought to rectify abuses to and within the Church.

Kažotić may have faced similar challenges in Lucera as in Zagreb. Rebellious Christians reportedly had caused the social strife throughout the construction of Civitas

---

522 Ciampi published this text. See Ciampi, 142-148.
523 Pope John XXII (then Jacques Durese) served as chancellor, the second highest-ranking member of the Angevin court, under Charles II and during the first year of Robert of Anjou’s rule. See Kelly, The New Solomon 62.
524 Ciampi, for example, referred to Lucera at the time as in partibus infidelium. Pasquale Siccio claimed that Muslim bandits roaming the countryside. See Ciampi, 116; and Soccio, 123.
Sanctae Mariae. As in the earlier cases of heretics hiding within Muslim Lucera (Chapter One), the city’s “hub” status combined with its probable growing pains during the early stages of its redevelopment appears to have made it susceptible to fugitives seeking sanctuary. In one instance in 1303, Charles II ordered the city’s captain to aid Lucera’s bishop Stefano in hunting down excommunicated clerics wandering through the area and seeking refuge with relatives.\footnote{CDSL, no. 731 (March 10, 1303).} Other issues of “heresy” appear to be of a more everyday variety. In another case during the same year the king asked the captain to help the bishop in prosecuting adulterous clerics and laity.\footnote{CDSL, no. 738 (July 3, 1303).} That the Angevin crown began to appoint Dominican bishops who were both political allies of the crown and equipped to fight heresy is consistent with the crown’s relationships overall with the papacy, the mendicant orders, and outsiders. As has been stated previously, Kažotić’s skills as an inquisitor and his previous experience in Zagreb made him especially appropriate for the job. Moreover, the practice of inquisitions was tied directly to Angevin aims of consolidation, as heresy was considered a crime against the state.\footnote{Maurizio D’Antonio, Il convento domenicano dell’Aquila: vicende di storia e architettura, 1255-2009 (L’Aquila: Edizioni Libreria Colacchi, 2010), 108.}

In addition to his attempts to make the same religious, civil, and social reforms as in Zagreb, the bishop also reportedly initiated the construction of the episcopal palace, established an orphanage, and founded a hospital attached to the priory of San Domenico.\footnote{The orphanage was run by the refugees of the monastery of Santa Maria Annunziata at Castel Fiorentino. Most of these foundations appear to have been built directly north of the cathedral in the area of the earliest fourteenth-century episcopal house. The orphanage was rebuilt in the seventeenth century. The current Bishop’s palace was built between the second half of the eighteenth century and the first decades of the nineteenth, and is located on the west end of the Piazzo del Duomo. On the location of the old curia and orphanage, see Ciampi, 83-84.}\footnote{CDSL, no. 738 (July 3, 1303).} Kažotić, however, only could have initiated most of these projects. He was struck on the head with an iron rod and died on August 3, 1323, less than a year after he was sent to
Lucera. Local tradition has blamed his murder on one of the Muslims who remained in Lucera. It seems more likely, however, that the bishop was attacked and killed by one of the rebellious nobles or clerics he was sent to Lucera to reform. According to the seventeenth-century chronicler Rocco Del Preite, the bishop then was interred at the church of San Domenico where the veneration of his relics cured numerous maladies including blindness and kidney disease.\textsuperscript{529}

If not known outside of papal and Angevin circles before his death, Kažotić undoubtedly gained fame after his death. On October 20, 1325, Charles, the duke of Calabria and heir to the Neopolitan throne, sent a letter to John XXII petitioning for Kažotić’s beatification and canonization. Among his numerous deeds and piety, the duke stated that the bishop had performed countless miracles.\textsuperscript{530} Numerous other medieval writers after Charles, including Galvino Fiamma, also cited the bishop’s ability to work wonders.

\textsuperscript{529} Rocco Del Preite, \textit{Breve descrizione della Città di Lucera di S. Maria prima detta Luceria per historia dalla sua origine} (1690; reprint, Lucera: Catapano Grafiche, 2005), 109-112. The Dominican’s remains were translated to the cathedral in 1812.

\textsuperscript{530} The text reads, “Santissimo in Christo Patri, et Clementissimo Domino, Ioanni divina Providentia Sacrosantae Romanæ ac Universalis Ecclesiæ Summo Pontifici, Carolus Dux Calabriæ, recommendationem humilem, et devote Pedum oscula beatorum. Ne multiloquio, Alme Pater, et Domine, occupatissimas aures Sanctitatis Vestrae fatigem, desistendum vidi præsentia pagina pandere plurimam in partis istic laudem, quam sibi beatus Pater Augustinus quondam Episcopus Civitatis Sanctæ Marieæ, dudum vocatae Luceriae, ex miraculorum affluencia, quae post eius obitum Divina clementia, veluti copiosa in misericordia, et in retribution munifica, jam meritis eius ostendit, et quotidie dignatur ostendere, vindicarit. Credo equidem illorum aliqua jam esse ad notitiam vestram ex relatu divulgantis famæ perducta; et expecto, ac etiam cupio, quod singulariter singular, quae profecto magna esse noscuntur, ad ipsam notitiam vestram etiam et in publicum per opportunæ indigationis seriem deducantur; sicut enim fide digna relation me instruxit, non ignotum Beatitudini Vestrae fuit, cum adhuc ipse in hoc saeculo constitutes, quam mirabili sinceritate vitae micabat, pollebat claritate scientiae, ac mirificis operibus coruscabat. Ego quoque, mi Domine Reverende, testi Deo, et in conscientia bona loquor, quod, eo mecum, cum primum petit partes istas, per vices aliamque colloquente, concepi, et vidi tam in ejus verbo, et facie, quam in gestu, quod valde ejus conversation esset, quamque Omnia, quae in eo errant, non nisi notabilia, et erudition ad virtutes, ac ad salute aedificatione viderentur; quodque cum post ejus migrationem ad Dominum, ex devotione magna, qua ad illum afficior, ejus limina visitasset, magna mihi fides facta est de nonnullis miraculis per ejus excellentia merita divintus perpetrates. Cum itaque ad inquirendum de his certius Beatitudinis Vestrae scientiam, ac devote petendum, de ipsius Beati patris vita, et miraculis partier inquiri, secundum morem Ecclesiæ in talibus consuetum, Latores praesentium Sanctitatis Vestrae pedes cum reverential debita, et fiducia magna petunt, devotus postulo, supplex quaeso, ut alma et perspicax providential vestra, benigna (si placet) petitionem ipsam consideration discutiens, et ad eam exaudientiam mentis aciem dignanter inflectens, inquisitionem ipsam jubere fierit, ut moris, et iuris est, gratioso dignetur, quae ubi patrata fuerint, vestroque conspectui praesentata, si effectus ejus suadeat, et vestra benignitas id decernat, praefatum
By the following decade the bishop was included visually within the pantheon of famous Dominicans. A panel painting from the sacristy of Santa Maria Novella (ca. 1336) created by the so-called “Master of the Dominican Effigies” includes Kažotić (fig. 3–21 and fig. 3–22).\textsuperscript{531} The image is a depiction of Christ and the Virgin surrounded by seventeen famous Dominicans including Saint Dominic, Peter Martyr, Thomas Aquinas, and Pope Benedict XI. Kažotić, shown wearing a mitre, carrying a staff, and labeled as “Saint Augustine of Dalmatia,” stands on the third row of saints directly below Christ, the Virgin, and the venerable group previously mentioned.\textsuperscript{532}

Fifteen years later the saint was included in another work of famous Dominicans. Tommaso da Modena included the bishop in his depiction of forty Dominican saints, popes, cardinals, and beati for the chapter house of San Nicolo in Treviso (fig. 3–23 and fig. 3–24).\textsuperscript{533} Kažotić is depicted ruling a sheet of parchment in his cell. The inscription that accompanies his portrait identifies him as the bishop of Lucera and praises the Dominican for

\begin{align*}
\text{Patrum in illius reverentiam, et honorem, qui eum veluti laudabilis retributor, sanctificare dignatus est, in Sanctorum (si placet) matricula, cum sonorae Canonizationis praeconio, ne ipsius merita grandia, operaque mirifica debito praemio careant, adscribant; per quod Sancta Mater Ecclesiae de tanto nove aggregationis consortio, vestry felici tempore Praesidatus jubilet, et exultet Civitas, in qua ipse feliciter obit, et felicius in Domino requiescat.}
\end{align*}

\text{Scriptum Neapoli, anno Domini 1325, die 20 octobris nonae Indict.” Ciampi published the text. See Ciampi, 163-165.}

\text{The panel was last exhibited outside of Florence at a 2012 exhibition at the J. Paul Getty Museum (Los Angeles) and a 2013 exhibition at the Art Gallery of Ontario (Toronto). I would like to thank Jill Caskey for bringing the presence of “Saint Augustine of Dalmatia” to my attention.}

\text{The panel is dated to around 1336 on account of the presence of the Dominican Maurice of Hungary, who died in that year. Emilio Panella argued that the central placement of Maurice might suggest that a Hungarian community at Santa Maria Novella commissioned the work. He noted also that the labeling of some figures as saints, including Kažotić who officially was beatified only in 1702, suggests that centralized canonizations still were not in place. See Emilio Panella, “‘Effigi domenicane, o meglio ‘Tavola del beato Maurizio d’Ungheria,’” Convento domenicano Santa Maria Novella in Firenze, accessed June 8, 2013, http://www.smn.it/arte/effigi/htm. On the panel see also Christine Sciacca, ed. Florence at the Dawn of the Renaissance: Painting and Illumination, 1300-1350 (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2012), 54-57.}

\text{In her Ph.D. dissertation on Dominican patronage in central Italy (‘‘Dominican Patronage of the Arts in Central Italy: The Provincia Romana, c. 1220-c.1320, University of London (1980)), Joanna Cannon argued that the program was “an illustrated version of a Dominican obituary list” in which “a legally trained brother would also have seen the echoes of the depiction of the Consistory Court behind this structure, another context involving authority exercised among advisers and followers.” Qtd. in Robert Gibbs, Tommaso da Modena: Painting in Emilia and the March of Treviso, 1340-80 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 76.}
being a model of elegance and virtue, a fervent and most zealous preacher, and the performer of many miracles.\textsuperscript{534}

Both images are worthy of further study that cannot be done in this work. For our purposes, however, they reveal that in less than three decades after his murder, Kažošić already had achieved fame within Dominican communities on the peninsula. This undoubtedly leads to questions concerning Kažošić’s and Lucera’s status within fourteenth-century Italy. Was Kažošić made famous because of his role at Lucera, or was Lucera made famous because of the presence of high-ranking figures such as Kažošić and Giacomo di Fusignano? Through an examination of the lives and activities of both figures, the answer to the question appears not either/or, but rather both. The rebuilding of Lucera, a high profile undertaking undoubtedly known beyond the region, was entrusted to individuals who already had achieved high status within papal and Angevin courts.

4. The Church and Convent of San Francesco

Of Lucera’s mendicant churches, the early fourteenth-century single-naved San Francesco has received the most scholarly attention (fig. 3–25). A large Angevin shield that announces its royal patrons marks its portal. The convent is the most peripheral of Lucera’s mendicant foundations: it is located along the northern edge of the Angevin city limits, approximately 200 meters from the cathedral and just within the wall that would encircle Lucera by the middle of the fourteenth century. This location corresponds to a bull dated February 28, 1301 in which Boniface VIII granted permission to Franciscans from the

\textsuperscript{534}“\textit{Beatus fr. Augustinus de Tragurio de Provincia Hungarie ordinis frm. predicaturum episcopus Lucerie fuit speculum mundicie scola virtutum predicator fervens et zelantissimus per multis claruit miraculis.” Published in Gibbs, 263.
province of Sant’Angelo\textsuperscript{535} to accept “houses” on the periphery of Lucera donated by Charles II.\textsuperscript{536} This document discounts a local tradition that held the foundation was built on the site of a mosque “with a white dome.”\textsuperscript{537}

Like every other early fourteenth-century foundation within the city, San Francesco underwent substantial alterations in subsequent centuries. Major changes to the church had been made by the final decades of the seventeenth century. Like the cathedral, a coffered ceiling was added around 1682 that lowered the height from floor to ceiling by four meters (fig. 3–26).\textsuperscript{538} The addition of the ceiling cut off the top of the apse arch as well as the top band of a fresco cycle devoted to the life of Saint Francis. Around the same time a wood choir with twenty-two stalls was added around the apse, blocking the lowest registers of apsidal frescoes as well as parts of the single-lancet windows (fig. 3–27).\textsuperscript{539}

The local Franciscan superior and future saint, Antonio Fasani (1681-1742), made further alterations to the church in the eighteenth century. Upon his return from Assisi in 1709, Fasani remarked that the he had found the church “sconcia e deforme.”\textsuperscript{540} Alterations under his oversight were dramatic. Between 1713 and 1739 the façade’s gable was truncated, its rose window was closed, and two smaller rectangular windows were inserted between the portal and rose window (fig. 3–28). In addition, a wooden choir was constructed

\textsuperscript{535} This Franciscan jurisdiction corresponds roughly geographically to the modern region of Molise and the northern Apulia province of Foggia.

\textsuperscript{536} CDSL, no. 470 (February 28, 1301). See also Vendola, ed. Documenti tratti da registri vaticani da Bonifacio VIII a Clemente V, no 34. The bull notes that the houses were located along the limits of the city (“civit. limites consistentes”). This text was written after Charles II’s order to the castellan to send bells to the area where houses had been donated to Franciscans (October 21, 1300). Papal bulls regularly confirmed actions \textit{ex post facto}.

\textsuperscript{537} Masimilliano Monaco, \textit{La chiesa-santuario di San Francesco di Lucera: Guida storico-artistica} (Lucera: Diocesi di Lucera-Troia: Ufficio Beni Culturali Ecclesiastici, 2007), 11-12.


\textsuperscript{539} Ibid., 13-14.

\textsuperscript{540} Ibid.
along the retrofaçade, paintings were added over fifteenth- and sixteenth-century frescoes in the choir, and eight marble altars were installed along the lateral walls of the church. The final major interventions to the church and convent occurred between 1792 and 1798 under the direction of Crescenzo Lepore, maestro muratore of Lucera.

The convent suffered intermittent periods of neglect for the next century and a half. It was suppressed in 1809 and parts of the complex abandoned. Areas still in use were reappropriated as the communal archives, a prison, and barracks for prison guards. From 1817 to 1869 the chapter halls housed the civic library. A small community of Franciscans was allowed to return in 1856. They left Lucera again in 1862, four years before the official suppression of monasteries in Italy in 1866. Ownership of the complex then passed to the Municipality of Lucera.

The friars who returned to the convent for good in 1932 discovered the complex uninhabitable. The state of the foundation was so poor that the returning Franciscans were forced to celebrate Mass in the small oratory of an attached royal confraternity. Restorations began on the roof in 1937 under local supervision. In 1938 the direction of the restoration was turned over to the Soprintendenza of Bari. Over the next five years restorations to the choir, roof, façade, and retrofaçade returned the church to its early fourteenth-century imprint (fig. 3–29 and fig. 3–30). On October 4, 1943 the church reopened to the public.

---

541 Ibid., 14.
542 Ibid.
543 Ibid., 16.
544 Ibid.
545 Giambattista Gifuni, “Per la conservazione della chiesa francescana di Lucera,” L’Osservatore Romano (Nov. 26, 1939), 3. The confraternity, the Congregation of Santa Croce, had been given part of the complex in 1899.
546 Restorations during the period included the removal of the coffered ceiling; the reopening of the rose window, closing of the two rectangular windows, and restoration of the façade gable; the removal of the
Like San Leonardo and San Domenico, the church of San Francesco, which is located along the south end of the convent, is a single-aisle church vaulted at its east end but covered by a trussed roof above the nave (fig. 3–31, fig. 3–32, and fig. 3–33). It is much larger than Lucera’s Augustinian and Dominican foundations, however, which may suggest that the foundation housed more friars and/or received greater financial support from its royal patrons. The church measures approximately forty-eight meters from the entrance to the back wall of the choir, nearly twelve and a half meters across the nave, and is approximately twenty-two meters from floor to roof. In addition to noting its greater dimensions, scholars on numerous occasions have described the monument as both a reduced version of the cathedral and as architecturally analogous to Santa Maria Donna Regina in Naples (fig. 3–34). This has led a number of them, notably Tomaiuoli, to argue that the church was built during the first two decades of the fourteenth century. The formal similarities

retrofaçade choir and choir stall around the apse; the restoration of the windows; and the restoration of some frescoes in the apse. Three of the eight side altars were also removed. Additional restoration work was completed in the cloister and chapter house in 1959; on the pavement, external roof, and plasterwork of the church from 1977 to 1981; and around the apse between 1998 and 2003. See Monaco, La chiesa-santuario di San Francesco di Lucera 18; Nunzio Tomaiuoli, ed. “La chiesa di San Francesco di Lucera,” 26-48; Gifuni, “Per la conservazione della chiesa francescana di Lucera,” 3; and Gifuni, “I restauri della monumentale chiesa francescana di Lucera,” L’Osservatore Romano (April 26, 1941), 3.

547 A local tradition held that Charles II built the church in homage of his son, Louis of Toulouse. The Saint was born at Lucera’s fortress, according to Luca Wadding. He most likely confused Lucera with the city of Nocera located twenty kilometers southeast of Naples. It was in this city that Louis of Toulouse reportedly spent part of his childhood. See Gifuni, “Per la conservazione della chiesa francescana di Lucera,” 3.

548 San Leonardo’s nave, built on a slightly irregular plot, measures approximately thirty meters in length and twelve meters in width. The chancel is approximately eight meters long and eight meters wide. The nave of San Domenico is approximately thirty-two meters in length and sixteen meters in width. Its choir, slightly wider than long, is approximately ten meters long and twelve meters wide.


between San Francesco and Santa Maria Donna Regina are undeniable and will be addressed in this chapter’s final sections on mendicant building types.

Faced in brick, fragments of brick, and some rubble, the church contains three tall single lancet windows along its south wall, three additional single lancet windows within the apse, and a further two along the north wall. Those on the north wall now are closed, but their presence suggests that the fourteenth-century parts of the convent directly to the north never rose above the windows’ baselines. Relatively simple stone splays and arches frame almost all of the windows in the church. Only the largest window, which is located in the center of the apse, displays any sort of sculptural elaboration. Two arches, the outermost of which is supported by slender columnar shafts resting on floriated consoles, frame the opening on the exterior (fig. 3–35). The outermost arch itself contains the same carved starbursts found around the apse window of the Dominican church.

Additional sculptural details at San Francesco, combined with its use of brick facing, reveal once again that local Apulian workers constructed Lucera’s churches. For example, as at the cathedral, San Francesco’s interior was lit by a large rose window that pierced its façade (fig. 3–36). The current window tracery was added during the twentieth-century restorations, but the interlace relief pattern of vines, leaves, and grapes along the inner ring of molding is original and evocative earlier Apulian reliefs seen throughout the region, such as at Bari. Moreover, like the three façade portals at Lucera’s cathedral, San Francesco’s main portal as well as that along its southern flank combines Neapolitan designs with vernacular sculptural motifs (fig. 3–37 and fig. 3–38). Apulian sculptural details such as foliate patterns, eagles, pecking birds, and lion consoles are employed in similar contexts at both sites along the outer masonry edges of the porches, on the capitals of the porches and jambs, and directly
underneath the lintels. Moreover, the portals at San Francesco introduce additional vernacular repertoires. These include the use of dentils along the outer band of the archivolt in the case of the main portal (fig. 3–39) and directly underneath the lintel of the south portal. This same detailing survives along the late twelfth-, early thirteenth-century rose window of Santa Maria Maggiore in Barletta, the early fourteenth-century octagonal tower on the façade of Altamura Cathedral, and along the early thirteenth-century rose window at the cathedral of Bovino (fig. 3–40 and fig. 3–41).

The projection of the semicircular apse, which like the cathedral contains the Angevin arms over its arch, suggests the presence of local workers as well (fig. 3–32 and fig. 3–42). It contains sculptural details and motifs along the bases, capitals, and cornices similar to those on the church’s portals (fig. 3–43 and fig. 3–44). Moreover, the voussoirs that create the apse arch share the same profile as those that make up the apse and transept arches at the cathedral (fig. 3–45 and fig. 3–46). These differ from profiles seen at the nearly contemporary Neapolitan churches, and the churches to which Lucera’s are compared most, of Sant’Eligio, San Pietro a Maiella, and Santa Maria Donna Regina (fig. 3–5, fig. 3–34, and fig. 3–47) revealing once again that much of the building materials for Lucera’s early fourteenth-century churches were sourced from the same, local locations.

San Francesco once was covered with fresco. Unfortunately, few traces of its early paintings survive. Successive architectural alterations, humidity, and the application of a layer of plaster in the late 1970s removed from the nave almost all evidence of early works. Only a faint trace remains near the apse arch (fig. 3–48), and restorations to the choir between 2001 and 2003 revealed some early paintings that employ Franciscan
These include a Madonna and Child with Saints Francis and Anthony and a depiction of the Crucifixion where a badly damaged figure in brown, presumably the founder of the order, prays at Christ’s feet (fig. 3–49). As will be revealed in the fifth chapter, the image of the Madonna and Child later became an important cult image.

A surviving program behind the choir’s piscina is of interest because of its ties to both new forms of visual devotion as well as new iconographies emanating from the capital (fig. 3–50). As with the fourteenth-century metalwork, wood sculpture, and funerary monuments in the cathedral, these frescoes are the most “modern” surviving remnants of the Trecento monument. Two scenes behind its openwork tracery fill the niche used for washing liturgical vessels. An unusual scene of the Annunciation fills the bottom register. Here, God the Father is depicted on a cloud releasing an incarnate Christ child toward the Virgin.

According to David M. Robb’s early twentieth-century study on the iconography of the Annunciation, the motif derives from Saint Bonaventure’s meditation, the *Lignum vitae* (1259-1260). Its earliest surviving representation, dated to approximately 1310, is a panel by the inventive (iconographically) Florentine painter Pacino da Buonaguida (fig. 3–51 and fig. 3–52).

After Pacino’s work the motif continued to be employed in a Tuscan context, particularly in Florence and Siena, and eventually spread to Northern Italy, the Pyrenees,

---


552 David M. Robb, “The Iconography of the Annunciation in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries,” *The Art Bulletin* 18, no. 4 (December 1936), 526. Bonaventure’s *Lignum vitae* (Tree of Life) is a meditation on the life and Passion of Christ. The depiction of the Annunciation in Pacino di Bonaguida’s representation of the work depicts the incarnate Christ twice. The first image of the Savior is a haloed bust held in the lap of God the father. Golden rays shoot from this image, carrying another, this time naked Christ Child toward the Virgin. The painting originally may have been commissioned for the Clarissan convent of Monticello outside of Florence. It now is held at the Accademia in Florence. See Sciacca, 148-149, 301. On its provenance, see also Julian Gardner, “Nuns and Altarpieces: Agendas for Research,” in *Römisches Jahrbuch der Biblioteca Hertziana* 30 (1995), 52.
Spain, Bohemia, and Germany during the second half of the century.\footnote{Robb, 526. Michela Tocci argued that the Annunciation group employed a configuration produced in Assisi and Siena between the end of the thirteenth century and the first three decades of the fourteenth century. She argued that the Lucera Annunciation is a later, Neapolitan version of the grouping. See Michela Tocci, “La chiesa di S. Francesco a Lucera: Un esempio di architettura minorita medievale Capitanata,” in I Francescani in Capitanata, eds. Tommaso Nardella, P. Mario Villani, and P. Nicola de Michele (Bari: Mario Adda Editore, 1982), 181. Benedict XIV (1740-1758) eventually condemned the motif as Gnostic on account of its representation of Christ’s incarnate body prior to the Holy Spirit entering the Virgin.} Having said that, the example at Lucera is the only surviving example of the motif with the *Regno*, begging the question as to whether the presence of this motif at San Francesco was the result of shifts in devotional imagery felt throughout the kingdom or a product of its Franciscan context specifically.

This issue is intensified and complicated when considering the companion Man of Sorrows that fills the upper register. Unlike the Annunciation arrangement, the image of the dead Christ standing within his tomb does not appear to be particularly “Franciscan.” Rather, the motif was employed widely throughout the Kingdom during the fourteenth century. Moreover, its monumentalized depiction within the context at San Francesco is the same as the Man of Sorrows painted behind the piscina at the church of San Domenico in Manfredonia (Fig 4–38) and a slightly later representation of the motif above the altar of the Capella Galluci at Lucera’s cathedral. In the present case, however, its pairing with the “Franciscan” Annunciation appears to have created a new type of image pairing, one that may have been nearly exclusive to a Franciscan and southern Italian context through the combination of the Incarnate Annunciation with the Angevin Man of Sorrows piscina. In addition, its location, pairing, and scale created an image that served the dual, often simultaneous, function of liturgical object and devotional tool. This also is true for the
wooden crucifix at Lucera’s cathedral. In its monumental setting, particularly behind the piscina used for cleaning liturgical vessels, the image served as a commemoration of Christ’s sacrifice for the Friars who had just reenacted it. In this sense it fits neatly with the overall increase in Passion imagery, particularly around the altar, employed within Franciscan churches in order to spur co-suffering of Christ’s torments during the performance of the mass. The Franciscan devotional exercise included at least three elements (or sometimes two, depending on one’s sex): the participation in the performance of the mass itself, the viewing and/or contemplation of the host, and the contemplation of the Passion images that framed or served as the backdrop for the Eucharistic celebration. In addition, Man of
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555 The placement of the Man of Sorrows within the piscina corresponds to the Byzantine use of the image within the prosthesis or diaconicon of Eastern Churches. On the use of the Man of Sorrows in a Byzantine liturgical context, see Henk van Os, “The Discovery of an Early Man of Sorrows on a Dominican Triptych,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 41 (1978), 74.

556 Within the *Regno*, the most innovative surviving uses of Passion images within a liturgical setting are found in the Clarissan foundations of Santa Maria Donna Regina (first quarter fourteenth century) and Santa Chiara (second quarter fourteenth century). In both cases, Passion cycles were employed within the nun’s choirs to aid the Poor Clares in contemplating the mass in which they could not actively participate. See Cathleen Fleck, “Blessed the Eyes That See Those Things You See”; The Trecento Choir Frescoes at Santa Maria Donna Regina in Naples,” *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 67, no. 2 (2004), 201-224; Hisashi Yakou, “Contemplating Angels and the Madonna of the Apocalypse,” in *The Church of Santa Maria Donna Regina: Art, Iconography, and Patronage in Fourteenth-Century Naples*, eds. Janis Elliot and Cordelia Warr (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 93-106; and Stephen Wolohojian, “Closed Encounters: Female Piety, Art, and Visual Experience in the Church of Santa Maria Donna Regina in Naples,” (PhD Diss., Harvard University), 1994. On other passion cycles within Franciscan and Neapolitan churches, see also Adrian Hoch, “Pictures of Penitence from a Trecento Neapolitan Nunnery,” *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 61 (1998), 206-222. On the Franciscan Passion cycles in general, see Anne Derbes, *Picturing the Passion: Narrative Painting, Franciscan Ideologies, and the Levant* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). The Church of Santa Maria Donna Regina is particularly significant as one of the earliest Clarissan churches built *ex novo*. For the architectural history of Santa Maria Donna Regina, see Émile Bertaux, *Santa Maria de Donna Regina e l’arte senese a Napoli nel secolo XIV* (Naples: F. Giannini, 1899); Gino Chierici, *Il Restauro della Chiesa di S. Maria di Domaregina a Napoli* (Naples: Francesco Giannini & Figli, 1934); Janis Elliot and Cordelia Warr, eds., *The Church of Santa Maria Donna Regina: Art, Iconography, and Patronage in Fourteenth-Century Naples* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004); and Bruzelius, *Stones of Naples*, 99-103. Santa Maria Donna Regina’s choir was later adopted at the Clarissan Monastery of Pedralbes in Barcelona (1326). See Pere Beseran i Ramon, “Incidències napolitanes a Catalunya. Revisions sobre l’escultura i arquitectura trecentista,” in *El Trecento en obres: Art de Catalunya i art d’Europa al segle XIV*, ed. Rosa Alcay (Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona, 2009), 137-146.
Sorrow’s pairing with the incarnational imagery below, especially in its derivation from Bonaventure’s text, reinforces the frescoes function as a devotional tool. The pairing of the Man of Sorrows with Marian iconography was reserved in many examples during the period for personal diptychs, which often contained a panel of the Man of Sorrows next to one of the Madonna and Child. One can see how this traditional devotional pairing, which emphasized both Christ’s beginning as a man through the Incarnation and his eventual demise as flesh through the Passion, also was appropriate as a backdrop for the time-collapsing performance of the Mass.

Dating for the composition is imprecise, but the iconography of the Man of Sorrows appears to provide a *terminus post quem*. Iconographically, it shows a number of similarities with mid to late fourteenth-century images of the Man of Sorrows, including a panel depicting by the Neapolitan painter Roberto D’Oderisio (active 1335-ca.1382). Both the Lucera Piscina and Robert panel depict Christ as a half figure standing within his tomb, head turned to the side, and eyes closed (fig. 3–53). Moreover, both display Christ in front of the cross from which the *arma Christi* hang. The Roberto D’Odorisio panel is dated to between 1352 and 1354. This was a period in which the Man of Sorrows image gained increased circulation within the *Regno*. In addition to paintings and small objects such as

---


559 Roberto D’Oderisio’s work contains many more iconographical elements, including the Virgin and John in the tomb with Christ as well as a host of other motifs such as Judas kissing Christ, a soldier sleeping at the tomb, Christ praying in the garden, and other vignettes from his Passion. The Lucera representation, located in a relatively tight space, appears to include only the elements deemed most necessary: the dead Christ, his tomb, and the instruments of his Passion.
enamels, the motif became a popular image for Neapolitan tombs.\textsuperscript{560} Stylistically, however, the two paintings share little in common. Christ in the Lucera image is more emaciated, his face is pointier, and his ribs are more visible. Moreover, the modeling of the figures at Lucera, especially within the Annunciation register, reveals that the work is later than Roberto D’Odorisio panel. Nevertheless, the similar iconography between the Piscina and the panel, even with the disparity to style, is telling. It shows once again that throughout the fourteenth century, painting, sculpture, and other small-scale objects gained a common currency throughout the Regno that allowed them to be copied, understood, and appreciated.

5. Mendicant Building Types and the Mendicantization of Angevin Architecture

In the previous sections I outlined the surviving architectural and artistic monuments of Lucera’s three mendicant and Celestine foundations. While what survive are only shells of their fourteenth-century foundations, the creation of the four houses in a single Angevin city was momentous and reveals the great extent to which the crown relied on the orders as a longa manus in the reconstruction and re-Christianization of Lucera. The question that remains, however, is how these buildings, especially within the context of these particular orders as Angevin agents, fit into the larger narratives of mendicant architecture, southern Italian architecture, and Angevin urbanism.

\textsuperscript{560} Valentino Pace, “Morte a Napoli. Sepolture nobiliari del Trecento,” in Regionale Aspekte der Grabmal Forschung, ed. Wolfgang Schmid (Trier: Porta Alba Verlag, 2000), 41-62. See also Pace, “Arte di età angioina,” 252-253. Michalsky argued that Catherine of Austria’s tomb at San Lorenzo (ca. 1324) contains the earliest image of the Man of Sorrows on a sepulchral monument. She has suggested that it inspired later appropriations. On Tino di Camaino’s tomb of Catherine of Austria and the spread of the Man of Sorrows, see Michalsky, 

Memoria und Repräsentation, 115-117, 233, and 281-289.
Architecturally, all four churches contain a single trussed nave, vaulted choirs, and flat, unarticulated walls. These qualities led the art historian Michela Tocci in 1980 to label the churches prototypical mendicant establishments in Apulia. Tocci’s observation raises a problematic issue, however, because many churches built under the Angevin crown during the period—both mendicant and not—possess these same qualities. The natural question following this realization, therefore, is were all or none of these churches “mendicant types?” Most scholars have argued in favor of the former. They have based their work on four assumptions. The first has been that a mendicant building type, and by extension “an iconography of mendicant architecture,” existed during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century. The second has been that this iconography was austere and conveyed ideas of spiritual “reform.” The third is that this iconography was attractive to the Angevin crown. Finally, the fourth assumption has been that the Angevins themselves shared in these ideas of reform. When these assumptions are combined, the argument that has been made is that the crown’s buildings not inhabited by the orders—say, the palatine chapel at Castel Nuovo in Naples or the cathedrals of Lucera and Naples—adopted similarly austere, locally driven forms in order to convey the crown’s political reforms. These secular churches have been seen as formal representations of a shift from the more imperialistic rule of the crown’s first king, Charles I—manifested architecturally through his castles and more

561 Tocci, 176.
“Gothic” churches—to the more pious, politically and culturally adaptive reign of Charles II.⁵⁶³

In addition to the fact that the destruction and rebuilding of Lucera, an undertaking by Charles II, was in the same imperialistic spirit as his father’s conquest of the Kingdom, many questions can be raised from these arguments. Most of all are questions that ask what constitutes mendicant architecture and what motivated the Angevin crown to adopt “mendicant styles.” The final section of this chapter is shaped by these questions, and uses the idea of a “mendicantization” of Angevin church architecture as a springboard for a discussion of building types at the turn of the fourteenth century, architectural austerity, and the circulation of architectural forms.

6. The Study of Mendicant Architecture

Two assumptions that traditionally drive studies of mendicant church architecture are that the buildings of the orders were “functional” and that these monuments adhered to unique building types.⁵⁶⁴ In terms of functionalism, the structural form of these churches

---

⁵⁶³ For example, see Freigang, 33-60; and Bruzelius, Stones of Naples, passim. Werner Gross argued that the turn of the fourteenth century was met with deep political, societal, and economic changes that shifted worldviews, making mendicant building types acceptable for secular churches. See Werner Gross, “Die Hochgotik im deutschen Kirchenbau: der Stilwandel um 1250,” Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft 7 (1933), 246-290; and Die abendländische Architektur um 1300 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1948). See also Paul Crossley’s Introduction in The Year 1300 and the Creation of a New European Architecture, eds. Alexandra Gajewski & Zoë Opacić (Turnhout: Brepolis, 2007), 9-16. On the rupture in architectural styles between Charles I and Charles II, see Caroline Bruzelius, “Charles I, Charles II, and the Development of an Angevin Style,” 99-114; and Bruzelius, Stones of Naples, esp. 1-45.

long has been described as built to accommodate preaching, and austere as a result of the mendicant emphasis on poverty. In terms of building type, scholars have posited that these so-called functional concerns, peppered with an assumed desire to display architecturally a foundation’s allegiances (or rivalries), led to buildings that evoked an ideal model. Overall, the theory in most of these narratives was that architectural form alone was capable of bearing meaning. Moreover, studies presumed that meaning could be recognized by contemporary viewers as representative of mendicant ideals, associations, use, or a host of other qualities.

Recent studies have begun to revisit these assumptions. Louise Bourdua’s examination of mendicant church decoration in the Veneto has revealed that lay collaboration in mendicant projects affected formal and iconographic outcomes in painting cycles. Bruzelius’s work on funerary chapels has shown that many mendicant construction projects were slow, additive, and amoeba-like, challenging norms that imagined mendicant churches as cohesive architectural programs. Functionalist arguments that emphasized the need for vast halls for preaching also have lost ground with new evidence of, and appreciation for screens that show mendicant spaces were more divided and not always the cavernous spaces they appear to be today (fig. 3–54). Furthermore, signs of exterior pulpits, both fixed to the
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566 Caroline Bruzelius, “The Dead Come to Town Preaching: Preaching, Burying, and Building in the Mendicant Orders,” in *The Year 1300 and the Creation of a New European Architecture*, eds. Alexandra Gajewski and Zoé Opačić (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 213; and Bruzelius, “Project and Process.” A cohesive architectural program is necessary for any analysis that purports a grand architectural scheme.
church like a balcony and of the transportable variety fixed on wheels, reveal that mendicant preaching at times was performed outside of the church (fig. 3–55).567

Assumptions that mendicant buildings represent architectures of spirituality, reform, and austerity remain in many studies of mendicant buildings, however. These assumptions have led to the anointment of the single-nave church as an ideal type for the mendicant orders. This building form has been argued to be so successful in representing the mission of the mendicant orders with its flat and unarticulated walls, ability to be trussed or vaulted, and longitudinal plans culminating in vaulted polygonal or rectangular choirs that it was used by other groups, including the Angevin crown under Charles II, intent on conveying similar messages of piety, reform, and austerity.568

One initial problem concerning an idea of a “mendicantization” of Angevin architecture during this period, however, is chronological. While the turn of the fourteenth century is described as the moment of the paradigm shift for Angevin architecture, the earliest versions of the single-nave church commissioned by the crown date to the second

567 On screens within mendicant churches, see Donal Cooper, “Access All Areas? Spatial Divides in the Mendicant Churches of Late Medieval Tuscany,” In Ritual and Space in the Middle Ages: Proceedings of the 2009 Harlaxton Symposium, ed. Frances Andrews (Donington, UK: Shaun Tyas, 2011), 90-107. The subject of external pulpits has been raised by Bruzelius, who noted that numerous fourteenth- and fifteenth-century paintings depict wood pulpits erected in front of mendicant churches or in squares. Some sites, including San Francesco in Pula, Croatia, contain permanent exterior stone pulpits overlooking the street. See Bruzelius, “The Dead Come to Town Preaching,” 207.

568 The significance of the ribbed vault in otherwise box-like churches has been a source of debate. Marvin Trachtenberg has argued that the mendicant use of the vaulted choir resulted from the style’s inherent spirituality; while Bruzelius has suggested that the use of Gothic elements may have been seen as a deliberate sign of newness for the reformer orders, or because of the style’s associations with Louis IX who protected the nascent orders during their infancy. See Trachtenberg, “Gothic/Italian ‘Gothic,’” 33; Caroline Bruzelius, “Il Gran Rifutio: French Gothic in Central and Southern Italy,” in Architecture and Language: Constructing Identity in European Architecture c. 1000-c. 1650, eds. Georgia Clarke and Paul Crossley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 39; and Bruzelius, “A Rose by Any Other Name,” 99. Through an analysis of Villard de Honnecourt drawings, Schenkluhn argued that thirteenth-century choirs were viewed as pars pro toto of the church. See Wolfgang Schenkluhn, “The Drawings in the Lodge Book of Villard de Honnecourt,” in Art, Architecture, Liturgy, and Identity, eds. Zoé Opacic and Achim Timmermann (Turnhout: Brepolis, 2011), 290. Combined with Schenkluhn’s observations, a less contentious argument for vaulted apses may be that the altar area was the most important part of the church and therefore received the most impressive design. It most certainly was completed first; probably exhausted a huge portion of resources; and vaulting the entire church may have been seen as either unnecessary or unattainable.
half of the thirteenth century. These included the palatine chapel at Lagopesole completed before 1275, a 16.05 x 7.22 meter rectangle with a semi-circular apse similar to earlier examples from the Terra di Bari (3–56 and 3–57), the chapel at Lucera’s fortress examined during the first chapter, and possibly even possibly the palatine chapels at Foggia and Bari, which no longer survive.\(^{569}\) Both the chapels at Lagopesole and Lucera contained one aisle, a trussed roof, a single apse, and single lancet windows—the most important elements of Apulian mendicant churches according to Tocci. As sign of the strength of this thesis already by the 1930s, the Lucera historian Giambattista Gifuni confused Lucera’s chapel with a Franciscan church.\(^{570}\) However, no surviving evidence suggests that a permanent Franciscan or mendicant foundation existed at Lucera before the beginning of the fourteenth century, and there is certainly no reference to one within the fortress.

These earlier chapels are significant. They reveal that the Angevin use of the single-nave form in the early fourteenth century was not the result of appropriating specifically mendicant forms. Rather, the crown’s use of the single-aisle occurred parallel to, if not earlier than, the mendicant use of single-nave churches in the South. What does this insight suggest:
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\(^{570}\) Gifuni, *Lucera*, 11.
hold for ideas of architectural austerity and political reform under Charles II and Robert of Anjou? Was Charles I, the first Angevin king who often is thought as more bellicose and imperialistic than his successors, also a reformer inspired by the architecture and ideology of the mendicants? Or was the single-nave form used in contexts other than mendicant, or aspiring mendicant, foundations?

The answer lies firmly in the latter. Single-naved plans were used for a variety of secular, that is not belonging to a religious order, church plans throughout twelfth- and thirteenth-century Europe. They were not the exclusive property of the mendicants. Examples particularly close to the French, Capetian, and colonizing Charles I included the “fortress churches” (built to look like a fortress rather than be part of a fortress) of Provence, a region ruled by the Angevin crown, and French palatine and private chapels. The second group included the chapels of French bishops, including at the cathedrals of Laon (1161), Paris (1170), Noyon (1183), and Reims (first half thirteenth century), and later those of King Louis IX of France at the chateau of Saint-Germain-en-Laye (1238) and none other than the Sainte-Chapelle in Paris (1248).

Paradoxically, it was the success and fame of the Sainte-Chapelle that proves the single-nave architectural form was not inherently special in and of itself, nor capable of carrying specific meaning, whether mendicant, episcopal, or royal. Sainte-Chapelle as an idea held considerable influence on future French private chapels, and a number of princely Sainte-Chapelle replicas, each possessing a fragment of the true cross or crown of thorns.


were built after the canonization of Louis IX in 1297. However, the architectural variety among these copies reveals more than anything that the rectangular vessel deployed in the original chapel served merely as the vehicle or frame through which other objects or performances of more specific significances could be understood. The Angevin dynasty also replicated the power of Sainte-Chapelle, and invoked the French chapel specifically at the church of San Nicola in Bari that was declared a palatine chapel by Charles II in 1296. Of interest, or perhaps confusion, to the architectural historian is that the Angevin king made few, if any structural modifications to the three-aisled twelfth-century church. Rather, the church was transformed into an Apulian Sainte-Chapelle through the institution of the Sainte-Chapelle liturgy as well as the creation of a royal treasury that possessed the relics of the Holy Thorn, the Wood of the Cross, and land holdings that included the Cathedral of Altamura fifty kilometers to the southwest.

---

573 These included the Sainte-Chapelle chapel dedicated to the Virgin at the residence of Bourbon-l’Archambault, built between 1315 and 1321 by Louis I of Bourbon, and the chapel of Notre-Dame-de-Chateau-du-Vivier founded by Charles V in 1352. Sainte-Chapelle, the Abbey of St-Denis, and the Dominican Monastery at Rue-St.-Jacques served as the main cult centers following the canonization of Louis IX. Philip the Fair spent considerable sums to renovate and refurbish the church with new liturgical furniture and books. See Cecilia M. Gaposchkin, *The Making of Saint Louis: Kingship, Sanctity, and Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008), 73-77.

574 Most recently, Jill Caskey has framed San Nicola as a southern Italian Sainte-Chapelle. Her work is informed by Alexei Lidov’s concept of hierotopy, the creation of sacred space through the multisensory ‘network’ (Lidov’s emphasis) of images, ritual, sounds, smells, etc., and Henri Lefebvre’s concept of space as a product perception (quantitative, i.e. measurable, space), conceived space (imagined space), and lived space (daily experience or cultural perceptions of a setting). See Caskey, “The Look of Liturgy: Identity and *ars sacra* in southern Italy,” in *Ritual and Space in the Middle Ages: Proceedings of the 2009 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Frances Andrews (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2011), 108-129. See also Alexei Lidov, “Hierotopy. The Creation of Sacred Spaces as a Form of Creativity and Subject of Cultural History,” in *Hierotopy: The Creation of Sacred Spaces in Byzantium and Medieval Russia*, ed. Alexei Lidov (Moscow: Indrik, 2006), 32-58; and Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, esp. 38-46. Charles II personally donated the cross during his 1301 visit. San Nicola received generous privileges from the Angevin court, and its first canon and treasurer, Peter of Angers, was given considerable power and influence that made him the *de facto* governor of San Nicola and the official archpriest of the Cathedral of Altamura. His duties also included directing the sale of Lucera’s Muslims and their goods after the colony’s destruction. On Pierre’s involvement in liquidating Muslim property, see *CDSL*, no. 436 (January 18, 1301) and *CDSL*, no. 659 (January 13, 1302). For the Treasury of San Nicola and Peter of Angers, see Gerrado Cioffari, “Il Tesoro di S. Nicola dai Normanni agli Angioini,” in *Lo scrigno del Tesoro di San Nicola di Bari*, ed. Eugenio Scandale (Bari: Mario Adda Editore, 2009), 3-30. The Angevin crown created a second “Sainte-Chapelle” in Naples toward the end of the fourteenth century at Santa Maria Incoronata. That church, an unusual two-aisle plan that resulted from part re-use of an older tribune and part new construction,
That San Nicola was seen as a personal chapel of the Angevin kings is suggested by the concessions granted to the royal family by Boniface VIII in the governance of the church. In 1304, an Angevin decree known as the *Fundamentalis constitutionem* designated San Nicola “the King’s chapel” and noted that Charles II directly nominated the prior, treasurer, cantor, vice-cantor, and half of the one hundred canons and clerics. All clergy were paid by crown, and the treasurer served as the most direct line of communication between the crown and church. The constitution also designated the liturgical usage at San Nicola as Parisian.

The Angevin crown replicated Sainte-Chapelle, then, not through architectural form, but through ritual and endowments. San Nicola was not unique in this case. Robert Branner’s work on Capetian service books revealed that the objects traveled with the French kings’ itinerant *cappella*. It was these objects, the transportable relics and reliquaries that traveled with the kings, the use of special masses, and the physical presence of the king that transformed one of the king’s *chapels royale* into the royal chapel. As in Alexei Lidov’s

---

...Cioffari, “Il tesoro di San Nicola,” 13-14. In addition to the monasteries given to the church by the pope and the plenary indulgences granted to visitors of the pilgrimage site, the church’s clergy was declared exempt from papal taxation in 1298.

576 Ibid. San Nicola had been an important church and center of international pilgrimage since its construction at the turn of the twelfth century. Charles II’s devotion to the patron of the falsely accused and imprisoned during his own imprisonment in Barcelona from 1284 to 1288 contributed to the privileges the church received following his release and ascent to the throne. Many private chapels were dedicated to Saint Nicholas, including the royal chapel Sainte-Chapelle replaced. Other chapels dedicated to Saint Nicholas included those at the Cathedrals Laon, Meaux, Noyon, Reims, Callixtus II’s papal chapel in Rome, and the Caetani chapel at Bove di Capo. Tosti-Croce speculated that the dedication to Saint Nicholas may reference Justinian’s royal chapel at the Great Palace of Constantinople. See Tosti-Croce, 502.


578 Branner argued that the chapels each followed a different liturgical usage when the king was not present. For example, the chapel at Corbeil had Augustinian canons in charge. In 1254 and 1255, the chapel at Senlis followed the usage of Sainte-Chapelle in Paris. See Robert Branner, “The Sainte-Chapelle and the Capella...
concept of hierotopy and Henri Lefebvre’s trialectic of “perceived,” “conceived,” and “lived” space, the interaction of these individual elements within a concrete setting transformed the space.\textsuperscript{579}

Wall painting, and in particular fresco, also is an important element to consider when reading medieval spaces. This is the case especially for buildings with substantial wall surface like the single naved churches in question. Within the Angevin kingdom, and in fact within most of Italy, fresco painting played an integral role in conveying meaning to a place. It, perhaps, had the ability to transform spaces most dramatically. Equally dramatic, however, is when the images that were present no longer survive due to climate, alterations, or neglect. Unfortunately, this absence all too often is overlooked in the reading of buildings, in particular those Angevin churches deemed to be “austere.” The surviving evidence, nevertheless, reveals that single-nave churches with flat, painted walls could, in fact, be seen as the opposite of somber. The richly decorated Scrovegni Chapel in Padua painted by Giotto and his workshop provides a salient example. The nearby Augustinian friars complained to Padua’s bishop of its height (from floor to roof it measures almost thirteen meters) and bell tower (again, an important symbol of institutional presence), and lamented that the church, despite its flat walls, exhibited pomp, vainglory, and profit.\textsuperscript{580} Later in life the Florentine artist painted an even more vast space space: the roughly thirty-meter-tall

\textsuperscript{579} A modern example that is particularly apt is Air Force One, the call sign for the aircraft that transports the President of the United States. Whereas the two VC-25A’s (the U.S. military version of a Boeing 747), which bear a distinctive livery of white, slate-blue, cyan, and gold with the presidential seal and words “United States of America,” are referred colloquially as “Air Force One,” the sign technically applies for any United States Air force plane on which the president is onboard. This concept of transformative space is expressed with particular drama in the closing scenes of the 1997 film \textit{Air Force One}. See \textit{Air Force One}, Blu-ray Disc, directed by Wolfgang Petersen (1997; Culver City, CA: Sony Pictures Home, 2009).

\textsuperscript{580} Chiara Frugoni, \textit{L’affare migliore di Enrico: Giotto e la Cappella Scrovegni} (Turin: G. Eiaudi, 2008), 461.
Angevin palatine chapel at Castel Nuovo (fig. 3–58). Very little remains of his Neapolitan frescoes, but an Angevin document dated 1331 noted that Giotto was reimbursed for materials including ass’s leather, gesso, gilded tin, silver, and fine gold used in the painting of the chapel, a “secret chapel,” and an individual panel painting. The fragments of fresco that do survive at the palace chapel include depictions of illustrious men (fig. 3–59), and these remnants, the materials used by Giotto in the painting of the chapel, and the scale of the chapel suggest that austerity, although often argued, was not a quality intended for the painted space.

The Augustinian complaints in Padua introduce the element of scale to articulations of austerity. The Dominican statutes listed height and vaulting restrictions throughout the thirteenth century, and the Franciscan order legislated against curiositas (excess) and superfluitas (superfluity) in buildings. Most of these restrictions already were ignored by the second half of the century. Vault and height restrictions were lifted altogether from the Dominican constitutions in 1300, and by the middle of the fourteenth century the order made no attempts to enforce the restrictions that remained on architectural ornamentation. If

581 This church effectively replaced the Cappella Palatina in Palermo as the main Angevin court chapel.
582 Camillo Minieri-Ricco, “Geneologia di Carlo II. Re di Napoli,” Archivio storico per le Province Napoletane 7, no. 4 (1882), 676.
583 The Illustrious men cycle in the chapel may have been similar to a cycle painted by Giotto in the great hall of the castle. On the cycle and its relation to Petrarch, see Giuseppe de Blasiis, “Immagini di Uomini Famosi in una sala di Castelnuovo attribuite a Giotto,” Napoli nobilissima 9 (1900), 65-67; Christiane L. Joost-Gaugier, “Giotto’s Hero Cycle in Naples: A Prototype of Donne Illustri and a Possible Literary Connection,” Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte 43, no. 3 (1980), 311-318; and Warnke, 8-9.
584 On Franciscan building restrictions, see Roberto Cobiochi, “Franciscan Legislation, Patronage Practice, and New Iconography in Sassetti’s Commission at Borgo San Sepolcro,” in Sassetti: The Borgo San Sepolcro Altarpiece, ed. Marchtet Israëls (Florence: Villa I Tatti; Leiden: Primavera Press, 2009), 107-109. The period of regulation also appears to be the one time architectural cohesion appeared a goal, at least for the Dominicans. For example, Humbert of Romans, Minister General of the Dominican order from 1254 to 1263, lamented that “orders…[should] show uniformity not only in their observations, but also in their habits and in their buildings …It makes me groan to think how far from achieving this we are…while our churches are of all types and arrangements.” Quoted in Caroline Bruzelius, “The Architecture of the Mendicant Orders in the Middle Ages: An Overview of Recent Literature,” Perspective 2 (2012), 372.
mendicant architecture as a type reflected ideals of poverty, austerity, even as defined by the orders, was ignored openly by the second half of the thirteenth century. This comes as no surprise given lay involvement in building projects as Bourdua and Bruzelius have pointed out; the amassed wealth of many foundations within the orders; and internal strife concerning the definition of poverty that struck the Franciscans, in particular, by the second decade of the thirteenth century. 586

The concluding words on the subject of austerity, the mendicants, and their connection with the Angevin crown should be reserved for Louis of Toulous, a proponent of apostolic poverty and the son of Angevin King Charles II who renounced his claim to the Kingdom of Naples for Franciscan robes. Louis was canonized in 1317, and this helped legitimize Angevin rule through the concept of Beata stirps, or holy lineage. 587 However, neither Louis’s father nor his brother, Robert of Anjou, emphasized the boy bishop’s sympathies for the extreme poverty of the Spiritual Franciscans when they promoted his sainthood. Moreover, no references to Louis’s controversial views on poverty were made in the bull of his canonization, Sol oriens mundo. Julian Gardner has argued that this document is totally conventional in its emphasis and phraseology. 588 In addition, sermons by James of Viterbo, the Archbishop of Naples, and then-king Robert of Anjou emphasized the Franciscan bishop’s obedience as well as his royal and episcopal magnificence. They downplayed, however, his attachment to poverty. 589 In consideration of all of these texts, Gardner argued that the political, rather than spiritual (including his attachment to poverty),
nature of Louis’
s’s canonical
d deeply colored his iconography. Because of this expressly
earthly function of the Angevin prince’s canonization, Louis of Toulouse’s cult all but
withered away by the end of Angevin power on the peninsula.\textsuperscript{590}

This excursion into the study of mendicant architecture and palatine chapels leads to a
number of observations. The first is that a single formal mendicant building type is very
difficult, if not impossible to define or recognize. This pertains especially to any idea that
austerity—a term that bore great ambiguity and even contention during the Middle Ages and
often is employed anachronistically today—served as a unifying quality for a type. The
architectural and documentary evidence reveals that “austerity,” both in its medieval
definitions and its present understandings, often was ignored during the construction of
mendicant foundations. Additionally, flat walls often have been thought to evoke austerity.
The use of paint and other types of ornament during the fourteenth century, much of which
no longer survives, complicates this assertion, however.

The second, related, observation is that a style often thought of as representative of,
and belonging to the mendicant orders—the single-nave church—was used for various other
structures, including palatine chapels, as early as the twelfth century. The Angevin kings
employed the form as well for many palatine and mendicant churches. The question of why
it was employed in these contexts can be answered in part by examining building processes
rather than ideology. For the mendicant orders, many foundations were built with a single
nave because they were modifications of older structures or confined by irregular or
constricted plots of land, as Bruzelius and David Gillerman have argued. Moreover, like the

\textsuperscript{590} Gardner, “The Cult of a Fourteenth-Century Saint,” 179-180. Gardner has argued, for instance, that
convention is the driving force for Simone Martini’s altarpiece of the saint. In the image Louis wears a
Franciscan habit of regulation cut and amplitude beneath his cope and mitre, not the close fitting and short dress
worn by the Spirituals by the time of the work’s commission.
Angevins, the orders were centralized organizations concerned with quick and efficient expansion, resulting in simple and easily producible forms. Last, but certainly not least, the mendicant orders lacked the building expertise required for more architecturally ambitious projects.\textsuperscript{591} These groups did not produce builders like the Cistercians; and experienced builders often were acquired through the ranks of the \textit{conversi}.\textsuperscript{592} For example, Elizabeth Bradford Smith has shown that the Dominican foundation of Santa Maria Novella in Florence was planned originally with a trussed roof, but vaulted only after an experienced builder arrived at the site.\textsuperscript{593} Her analysis reveals that mendicant builders were flexible and opportunistic at best, and in most cases a single nave made the most of an order’s financial and human capital.

The organization of building projects within the Angevin realm accounts for similar formal outcomes. The \textit{expensores} and \textit{prepositi} discussed in the second chapter managed Angevin construction projects. All surviving documentary evidence reveals that most in these offices were more adept at duties of an administrative nature rather than architectural design or construction. This organizational structure reveals not only that the site comprised mostly of court administrators and local workers, but also that the crown was concerned with creating a large volume of architecture spread across a wide geographic area in a relatively short period of time. Like the mendicant orders, a single-nave church may have made the most of these priorities. The nature of how these buildings were built allowed them to be

\textsuperscript{591} Bruzelius, “Project and Process,” 118; and David M. Gillerman, “S. Fortunato in Todi: Why the Hall Church?” \textit{JSAH} 48, no. 2 (June 1989), 160-164.
\textsuperscript{593} Smith, “Santa Maria Novella,” 621-630.
completed relatively quickly and relatively cheaply. On top of this their rather “blank” forms provided them certain chameleon-like properties.

The chameleon quality of these buildings introduces the third observation: the Angevin crown understood architecture as a marker of presence and an envelope in which objects within and around the building served as bearers of meaning. Architectural form, ornament, decoration, liturgy, textiles (when possible), and their relationship to the surrounding environment need to be integrated, therefore, into the studies of these buildings. However, architecture, particularly within the context of Angevin urbanism, cannot be held to the same type of iconographical analyses as the other elements. Its monumental scale made it subject to a completely different process of creation than the smaller works examined throughout the dissertation. This was a process where factors such as time, environment, and competing human agencies held a greater impact on the completed fabric.

594 For a similar plea, see Labunski, 390-392. The work on ninth-century Rome by Noble and Goodson do just this. For example Noble has argued that papal building projects need to be considered in relation to their locations within the city as well as other symbols of papal authority introduced at the time including coins, new titles and means of addressing other rulers in documents, new dating devices in papal documents, and the use of stationary processions. See Noble, “Topography, Celebration, and Power”; Goodson, “Revival and Reality”; and Goodson, The Rome of Pope Paschal I.

595 On the human factor, see chapter two of this dissertation. The realization by scholars, particularly of late medieval and early modern northern Europe, that these environmental and logistical factors affected the outcome of buildings has led to an increased interest in the study of “microarchitecture.” Scholars argue that masons used structures such as pulpits, baptismal fonts, fountains, and sacrament houses, all a more manageable scale than buildings, in part to experiment with new masonry forms. They, therefore, may serve as a better representation of a builder’s “intentions” than large-scale projects where the host of factors listed above affected the outcome. On this subject, see, for example, Francois Bucher, “Micro-Architecture as the ‘Idea’ of Gothic theory and style,” Gesta 15 (1976), 71-89; Christine Kratzke and Uwe Albrecht, eds. Mikroarchitektur im Mittelalter: ein gattungsübergreifendes Phänomen zwischen Realität und Imagination (Leipzig: Kratzke, 2008); Achim Timmermann, Real Presence: Sacrament Houses and the Body of Christ, c. 1270-1600 (Turnhout: Belgium: Brepolis, 2009); and Ethan Matt Kavaler, “Microarchitecture circa 1500 as Model of the Sacred,” in Jheronimus Bosch: His Sources. 2nd International Jheronimus Bosch Conference, May 22-25, 2007, ed. Jo Timmermans (’s-Hertogenbosch: Jheronimus Bosch Art Center, 2010), 190-209. On the impact of time in architectural “authorship” versus other artistic media, see Marvin Trachtenberg, “Building Outside Time,” 123-134.
When evaluated on its own terms, however, Angevin architecture, even without its decoration, very much represents the same forces and ideals that produced “French” reliquaries bearing fleurs-des-lis or tomb sculptures and frescoes deeply concerned with dynastic continuity. While these objects, due to the distinctive processes in which they were produced, employ a different visual language than the crown’s buildings, the intentions behind both art making and monument building were similar. Both represented the presence of the crown, its durability in the face of foreign and internal threats, and its spread across the southern Italian landscape. With this in mind the priorities of Charles I of Anjou and his successors do not appear so different. As a result, church building under Charles II and Robert of Anjou must be seen as a continuation of, rather than a break from, Charles I’s castle building. It merely was the next step.

7. Conclusions

This chapter had a number of aims. The first was to introduce the importance of the three mendicant orders and the lesser-known Celestinian order during the rebuilding of Lucera. As agents of the crown, a role that they had served previously and would continue to serve, the orders played a central role in the aftermath of the city’s destruction, and judging by how quickly they were assigned plots, in its reconstruction. The details of their roles in reconstruction are uncertain considering the lack of documentation in reference to these foundations, but the early documents inviting the orders to accept houses donated by the crown, the employment of high ranking mendicants as bishops of the city, and visual cues such as the use of Angevin heraldry that survives at San Francesco on the portal and above
the apse arch, reveals that the crown claimed ownership—whether financial, ideological, or some combination of both—for the establishment and operation of these houses. Heraldry, in particular, was a powerful means to establish royal presence and control and was used in other areas of Angevin control including Florence, the city in which Charles of Calabria, Robert of Anjou’s son, served as signore from 1325 until his death in 1328 (fig. 3–60).

These remnants, therefore, effectively reveal that the orders operated in alliance with the crown (and the papacy, although the links between the three institutions were at times inextricable), serving, like the Angevin noble administrators discussed in the second chapter, as a longa manus of Naples.

Using the above situation as context, the second aim was to examine the built environments of these orders. The buildings have received drastic alterations, are relatively small, and most, with the exception, perhaps, of San Francesco, are of somewhat insignificant aesthetic importance. Architecturally, however, they are immensely important. For one, they served as spatial signifiers of the orders’ presence, and by extension the crown’s tremendous presence, within the small city of Lucera. Whereas none of these are great churches like the mendicant foundations in the larger cities of Bologna, Florence, Paris, Naples, or Rome, they nonetheless reveal that Lucera was one of only two cities within the Regno outside of Naples to house three mendicant orders and the Celestinian order. This in and of itself is a sign of the city’s importance to the crown, the financial ability of the

596 In fact, on June 20, 1329, Florence’s Riformagioni issued a decree stating that public officials could place or paint on structures including palaces, houses, hotels, gates, and walls only sculpture, images, or heraldry that depicted Christ, the Virgin Mary, other (unnamed) saints, the Roman Church, the Angevin crown, the king of France, or the arms of the commune of Florence or the Guelf party. The use of other images would be subject to a penalty of 500 florins. The decree is held in the Archivio delle Riformagioni di Firenze, part of the Archivio di Stato di Firenze, and was published by Johann Wilhelm Gaye in his collection of letters, contracts, and other primary sources pertaining to art and artists in Italy from the fourteenth through sixteenth centuries. See Johann Wilhelm Gaye, Carteggio inedito d’artisti dei secoli XIV, XV, XVI (Florence: Giuseppe Molfini, 1839), 1:473-474.

597 The other city, L’Aquila, is examined in the following chapter.
crown and Lucera’s early residents to support the foundations, and the standing of the city’s intended role within the political, social, and cultural economies of the Angevin kingdom.

In addition to their importance as signs of presence, the architectural details that remain reveal that the buildings were the product of local builders. As argued in the second chapter, this phenomenon, tied to the point just made about presence, speaks to the bureaucratization of architecture under the Angevin realm more than ideological shifts within an “iconography of architecture.” Angevin churches were not constructed with trussed roofs, flat walls, and out of local materials with the intention of being austere. The few interior details in Lucera’s churches that remain—one potential tomb sculpture, textual evidence of metal work, a wooden crucifix and statue (discussed in chapter five) and traces of fresco—show, firstly, that these types of objects, combined with the performance of liturgies, transformed spaces, secondly, that more current and elaborate artistic styles circulated widely throughout the *Regno*, and lastly, that new modes of worship were introduced at Lucera. Rather, the formal outcomes of Angevin architecture were the result of the mode of construction—quick, fast, and efficient—the same means applied to the simple churches built by the mendicant orders during their infancies. Both groups at these critical junctures were concerned with quick expansion driven by centralized administrative units, and both employed architecture as a sign of institutional presence rather than as “formal or structural expression” or ideology. Seen in this light, Angevin church building during the period appears more aggressive than benevolent, and more continuous than discontinuous with the architectural policies of Charles I. As will be shown in the fourth chapter, which places Lucera’s destruction and rebuilding within the context of other Angevin urban projects, the

---

598 Trachtenberg employs this phrase in the negative in his assessment of Rome’s pontifical churches as well. See Trachtenberg, “On Brunelleschi’s Choice,” 169.
construction of *Civitas Sanctae Mariae* was part of a much larger plan that stretched back to the first Angevin king for the economic, political, and social consolidation of the *Regno*. 
Chapter 4
Civitas Sanctae Mariae and its Urban Analogues: L’Aquila, Manfredonia, and Cittaducale

The Angevin crown established two markets as part of the rights and privileges granted on August 22, 1301 to the newly christened Civitas Sanctae Mariae (Appendix C).599

The first, a weekly market used by residents of the city and surrounding countryside to purchase everyday goods, was held every Tuesday. The second, a regional market fair, occurred annually over an eight-day period surrounding the feast of Saint Bartholomew (August 24).600 Both markets were free from royal tariffs. The privilege granting the weekly market extended for ten years in keeping with other ten-year privileges that encouraged growth within the city. The rights for the regional market fair lasted indefinitely.601

Long understudied by scholars, Lucera’s annual market fair and those like it had a profound impact on regional integration within the Regno. Examined for the first time at the beginning of the twentieth century, the historian Georges Yver identified seven market fairs that had been established under Frederick II, including one at Luceria’s sarracenorum.602 Under the Angevin crown, the number jumped to over twenty.603 For Yver and later

---

599 The establishment of the markets is the twelfth privilege granted in the diploma. It reads, “Item, qualibet septimana fiat in terra ipsa forum rerum venalium, die videlicet Martis, et quolibet anno nundine generales fiant durature per octo dies, quatuor videlicet precedendos et quatuor subsequentes festum beati Bartholomei.”

600 The date of the regional market fair was changed in subsequent years as not to conflict with others established under the crown. By February 29, 1304, the date of the eight-day fair had settled around All Saints’ Day (November 1). On the changes in date, see CDSL, no. 654 (January 10, 1302), CDSL, no. 656 (July 15, 1302), and CDSL, no. 754 (February 29, 1304). For the history of Lucera’s market, see also Dionisio Morlacco, “Fiere e mercati a Lucera,” Archivio Storico Pugliese 41 (1986), 252-256.

601 Successive monarchs reconfirmed the privileges, including Robert of Anjou (reigned 1309-1343), Joanna I (1343-1382), Ladislaus (1386-1414), and Alfonso I (1442-1458). By the sixteenth century Lucera held two regional fairs, each lasting twenty days. See Morlacco, “Fiere e mercati,” 256-257; and Sakellariou, 199.

602 The other Hohenstaufen markets were held at Sulmona, Capua, Bari, Taranto, Cosenza, and Reggio. See Yver, 71.

603 Ibid., 72-73. Angevin regional fairs included those at Gaeta, San Mauro (Basilicata), Brindisi, Sulmona, Capua, Manfredonia, Castel Petroso in Molise, San Severo in Capitanata, Santa Maria de Vico near Bari, Barletta, Ortona, Taranto, Cosenza, Salerno, Naples, Bitonto, and L’Aquila.
economic historians guided by center-periphery debates, however, the markets were understood as events frequented only by foreign merchants, particularly Florentines, and dominated by cross-regional trade. More specifically, these scholars viewed the events solely as export centers, or places where foreign merchants acquired raw materials from southern sources to be sent north for production in the more industrialized centers of the peninsula.

Without denying the presence of foreign merchants on the southern Italian economy, revisionist economic historians including Steven R. Epstein and Eleni Sakellariou have argued that foreign trade comprised only a small proportion of commercial activity at these events. Rather, they have viewed these markets as a sign of robust internal economic and commercial integration. For them, the majority of activity at these fairs was regional in nature, creating a domestic commercial network fostered by the crown to promote economic growth within the kingdom. Furthermore, these historians have argued that regional commercial integration fostered through the fairs led to the creation of a state market. In sum, they contend that the fairs contributed to the birth of an Angevin state and at the same time served as a product of it.

604 For the presence of Florentine merchants at these fairs and at Lucera’s ports, see Abulafia, “Southern Italy and the Florentine Economy.”
605 The economic historian Steven R. Epstein described this historiographical tradition most cogently. See Epstein, An Island for Itself, 107; and Epstein, Freedom and Growth, 74.
606 See, for example, chapter 1 on the impact of Florentine credit on the crown’s ability to fight the Vespers War.
607 Epstein and Sakellariou both cite this particular motivation as the main impetus for regional market fairs. See Epstein, An Island for Itself, 107; Epstein, Freedom and Growth; and Sakellariou, 193.
608 Epstein’s central argument in Freedom and Growth is that the rise of the centralized state made growth coordinated and competitive markets possible. According to the author, “centralization underli[ned] all the major institutional changes to market structures during the period (1300-1750). It lowered domestic transport costs (through waiving tariffs and tolls), made it easier to enforce contracts and to match demand and supply, intensified economic competition between towns and strengthened urban hierarchies, weakened urban monopolies over the countryside, and stimulated labor mobility and technological diffusion.” His argument moves against the grain of earlier economic historians who proposed that one reason northern Italy was more prosperous than the South was because of the independence of its city-states, which were free from the
Thinking of regional fairs in this manner leads to a revision of the purpose—or at least the significances—of the cities that held them. It is no coincidence that many of these cities were rebuilt, expanded, or constructed *ex novo* by the crown. Like the fairs, they, too, should be examined within the context of regional integration and state-making rather than, as often is the case, compared economically, culturally, or architecturally to phenomena outside of the Kingdom. That these cities formed an internal network, rather than isolated export centers, is supported by an additional piece of evidence. Epstein, Sakellariou, and others have noted not only that the *Regno* was highly urbanized by the beginning of the fourteenth century, but also that it displayed a relatively flat urban hierarchy. That is, at the beginning of the fourteenth century, Naples’s population including surrounding countryside of approximately 31,000 to 34,000 was only slightly larger than the estimated 25,000 residents of Barletta, the 21,000 of Trani, and the 20,000 in Bitonto, all cities along the Adriatic coast in Apulia (fig. 4–1). According to Epstein and the urban historian Birgitte

---

609 Sakellariou, 95. Sakellariou calculated these figures based on tax allocations of the *subventio generalis*, or “hearth tax” imposed on cities within the *Regno* under the Angevin crown. Each hearth generally was taxed at 3 *tari*. In 1301 Naples’s tax rate was fixed at 693 ounces, 8 *tari*, and 4 *grana*, or 20,798.2 *tari* after exchanges. This equates approximately to 6,933 hearths. Scholars generally equate a single hearth to 4-5 individuals, meaning that Naples’s rate of taxation was equivalent to a population of approximately 27,731 to 34,664. Considering fluctuations, Sakellariou adjusted the range to 31,000-34,000. Birgitte Marin, who relied on the work of early twentieth-century historian Giuseppe Pardi, estimated that the population of Naples ranged from 50,000 to 60,000 by 1320. Sakellariou has argued that this figure is unfounded, however. On these higher levels, see See Birgitte Marin, “Town and Country in the Kingdom of Naples, 1500-1800,” in *Town and Country in Europe, 1300-1800*, ed. S.R. Epstein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 320; and Giuseppe Pardi, “Napoli attraverso I secoli. Disegno di storia economica e demografica,” *Nuova rivista storica* 7 (1923), 569-578.
Marin, the territory of the kingdom was then “filled in” with other major regional centers, including Salerno and Aversa on the west Coast, Melfi, L’Aquila, and eventually Lucera within the interior, and Taranto, Brindisi, Monopoli, and Bari on the Adriatic.\(^{610}\)

In sum, the crown used city building and market exchange as means to resettle and integrate the *Regno*. Cities were a vital, if not the most vital means of state building and control for the crown. They also fostered regional integration by establishing centers where commercial goods, individuals, and for the art historian’s purposes, artistic ideas interacted and were exchanged. These same networks that carried currency, saffron, wool, bishops, and bureaucrats from city to city also disseminated painters from Naples or ideas of their Neapolitan products, metalwork from the capital and Sulmona in Abruzzo, and the recognition of the most important Angevin semiotic marker, the dynasty’s heraldry, throughout the *Regno*. From the beginning of their reign in 1266 through the first quarter of the fourteenth century, the Angevin kings feverishly built cities, transferred populations, and established commercial markets. Building these cities claimed territory and created new urban centers. Establishing regional markets within the towns integrated them. The reconstruction of Lucera must be viewed within this context.

This chapter surveys three additional Angevin urban projects: the reconstruction of L’Aquila in Abruzzo begun under Charles I, the expansion of the Adriatic port of Manfredonia under the same king, and the creation *ex novo* of Cittaducale near Rieti during the first decade of the fourteenth century. The aim is straightforward: to reveal that Lucera’s

---

\(^{610}\) This flat urban hierarchy differs from other urbanized regions within the peninsula. For example, the Po plain was dominated by three large urban centers: Venice, Milan, and Genoa. Tuscany was dominated by Florence, Pisa, and Siena; and Palermo and Messina were significantly larger than any other city in Sicily. See Epstein, *Freedom and Growth*, 90-91. Birgitte Marin has argued that the urban hierarchy became unbalanced only in the early sixteenth century as Naples became the second largest city in Europe after Paris. It was only after this period that revisionist economic historians argue that the South began to experience economic degradation. See Marin, 321.
destruction and subsequent reconstruction under the title *Civitas Sanctae Mariae*, including the methods in which the city was rebuilt, were not isolated events. In fact, *Civitas Sanctae Mariae* was one of numerous urban projects, first begun during the previous century, which together consolidated the kingdom and created the cultural, political, and commercial networks from which rebuilt Lucera thrived.

Examining these urban projects together reveals two fundamental issues for Angevin art and architecture production. The first is that cities were a “conduit” for centralization. Their existence, function, and the process through which they were created equally were products of centralization. As will be revealed, these three cities shared similar patterns of institutional and architectural building as rebuilt *Civitas Sanctae Mariae*. The two earliest, L’Aquila and Manfredonia, in many ways served as a blueprint for the rebuilding of Lucera and its contemporary Cittaducale. Seemingly paradoxical, the consistent rebuilding pattern employed during architectural construction of these cities yielded across different landscapes stylistically dissimilar buildings combined with iconographically, and at times stylistically homogeneous art objects. Angevin buildings as a whole were constructed mostly in vernacular styles and techniques. Many of the art objects that filled them, however, shared much in common across landscapes because of their reproducibility and portability. Both results were the product of a centralized, interconnected kingdom where artists, small-scale art objects, and bureaucratic courtiers circulated from city to city. A lack of architectural cohesion between the cities has resulted in little to no comparative examinations of the buildings. However, as will be revealed, the process of building remained consistent.

---
611 The term “conduit” is taken from the cultural anthropologist Mia Fuller’s discussion of Fascist-era new towns in Italy. See Fuller, “Tradition as a Means to the End of Tradition: Farmers’ Houses in Italy’s Fascist Era New Towns,” in *The End of Tradition?*, ed. Nezar Alsayyad (Hoboken: Taylor and Francis, 2013), 176.

612 To cite Fuller again, a similar phenomenon occurred six centuries later with Fascist-era new towns. See Fuller, 177.
reiterate what I argued at the close of the second chapter, the systematization of the building process, rather than the stylistic product, was the true *opus andegavinus* in Angevin construction.

The second issue, which is related to the first, is that the long period in which these projects fall reveals a high degree of continuity between the architectural and urban projects of Charles I and Charles II. Architectural historians previously have pinned the aims of these two monarch’s building projects against each other: Charles I has been labeled often as the imperialistic castle builder while his heirs Charles II and Robert of Anjou have received the labels of great and pious church builders. Instead, all three rulers should be viewed as place builders with the same ends of consolidating the kingdom. In a major part, Charles II’s rebuilding of *Civitas Sanctae Mariae* held a similar purpose as the reconstructions of L’Aquila and Manfredonia begun by his predecessor and the near-contemporary construction *ex-novo* of Cittaducale.

1. The via degli Abruzzi

A major premise of the argument presented in this chapter is not only that were these new towns built, but that they were connected. Their connectivity strongly suggests that the urban projects of the Angevin kingdom were not planned as isolated events; and the construction of one new town affected all economies within the kingdom: political, social, and cultural. As such, their constructions should be examined in relation to one another.

---

613 As noted in the previous chapter, see Freigang, “Kathedralen als Mendikantenkirchen: Zur politischen Ikonographie der Sakralarchitektur unter Karl I., Karl II. und Robert dem Weisen,” 33-60; Bruzelius, “Charles I, Charles II, and the Development of an Angevin Style in the Kingdom of Sicily,” 99-114; and Bruzelius, *The Stones of Naples*. 
In this regard, this chapter begins with an examination of the physical network that connected these cities, the so-called “via degli Abruzzi” (fig. 4–2). Snaking through the Aterno-Pescara river valley and through the Apennines while within the Regno, the route was not so much a single road but a series of interconnected routes. It had existed at least since Roman domination when it was called the Valeria-Claudia Valeria-Claudia Nova and was known to be in use during Hohenstaufen rule in the region. The importance of the system rose dramatically, however, under the Angevin crown and Naples’s rise as royal seat. It connected the new capital to allies in Florence and Rome through its north-south artery, and it created a land route between Naples to the Adriatic ports through an east-west branch. Nearly all of the crown’s documented urban projects, including Lucera and the three examined in this chapter, occurred along these two corridors. Beginning in Tuscany and moving through Perugia and Rieti, cities within the Kingdom located along the main north-south branch included the Abruzzan cities of Cittaducale, L’Aquila, Sulmona, and Isernia as well as Benevento and Capua in modern day Campania. The east-west leg that connected Naples to the Adriatic port of Manfredonia passed through Capua and Benevento, continuing onto the Apulian cities of Bovino, Troia, Lucera, and Foggia. From there, secondary roads ran along the coast north to the important pilgrimage site of Monte Sant’Angelo and south along the ancient via Traiana toward Canosa, Bitonto, Bari, and Brindisi.

---

614 Sakellariou, 145; and Paola Gasparinetti, “La ‘via degli Abruzzi’ e l’attività commerciale di Aquila e Sulmona nei secoli XIII-XV,” *Bullettino della Deputazione abruzzese di Storia Patria* (1964-1966), 7-8. Conradin reportedly used the road when he departed from Rome to clash with Charles I who at the time was besieging Lucera. The two rulers fought at Tagliacozzo, not far from L’Aquila. Conradin was defeated, tried for heresy, and then beheaded in Naples. See Giovanni Villani, *Chronica*, book 7, chaps. 25 and 26.


616 Sakellariou, 146. Brindisi, the greatest port in southern Apulia, was an important point of departure for the Levant.
By the end of the thirteenth century the road system had become the preferred commercial, diplomatic, and pilgrimage route for individuals traveling between these centers. It was safer from banditry than roads like the via Latina and the northern branch of the Appian Way. It also was better maintained. During the fourteenth century parts of the route were even opened to wheeled transport. Other stretches, including those high in the Apennines of Abruzzo remained accessible only by mule, horse, or foot. Nevertheless, these mountainous portions of the road remained the more viable north-south transport route for individuals and groups, especially those traveling without heavily armed escorts. It most likely was the route taken to Naples by Pietro Cavallini, Giotto, Tino di Camaino, and other “court artists” from the North. Giovanni Boccaccio reportedly traveled the length of the route with his Florentine banker father Boccaccino in the autumn of 1327. Moreover, the road features prominently in the writer’s novel, *Il filocolo*, when his protagonists travel from Naples to Rome through the “salvatici e freddi monti d’Abruzzo,” stopping in Sulmona, the hometown of the poet Ovid. According to another prominent Florentine, the merchant and politician Francesco di Balduccio (1310-1347), the journey on horseback from Florence to Naples took eleven to twelve days. The midpoint often was L’Aquila or Sulmona, reached from either terminus in five to six days.

The volume of activity along the route resulted in its upkeep under direct orders from the Angevin crown. Surviving Angevin diplomas reveal that the crown was as aggressive in maintaining it and other road systems as it was building and expanding the cities located along it. A few documented examples will suffice to reveal that the crown prioritized upkeep

---

617 Boccaccino arrived in Naples as the representative of the Bardi bank within the city. See Gasparinetti, 21.
619 Gasparinetti, 13; and Sakellariou, 146.
of the road as well as safe passage. The crown repaired the roads between Manfredonia and Monte Sant’Angelo at least twice, once in 1272 and another time in 1308.\textsuperscript{620} From 1305 to 1306 parts of the via degli Abruzzi connecting the Terra di Lavoro (today roughly southern Lazio, Northern Campania, and western Molise) to Capitanata were repaired under an order given by Charles II.\textsuperscript{621} In the same year the king repaired parts of the road destroyed by flood between Nocera and Salerno.\textsuperscript{622} Two decades later Robert of Anjou drained parts of the system flooded near Capua, constructed inns along the route, and also conferred increased powers on provincial justices in the fight against brigandage, highway robbery, and piracy around the network.\textsuperscript{623} Sakellariou has argued that through its actions, the crown expressed that road maintenance “was among the duties of royal authority, echoing the principles of Roman law.”\textsuperscript{624} At a more fundamental level, however, Angevin concern for infrastructure and its maintenance of the system communicated that the via degli Abruzzi and its offshoots were the political, cultural, and economic lifelines for the kingdom. The system linked the crown and its new capital to its most important foreign allies as well as its domestic centers—including Lucera, L’Aquila, Manfredonia, and Cittaducale—that so effectively aided in the consolidation of the kingdom.

\textsuperscript{620} Filangieri, ed. \textit{I registri} vol. 7, reg. 17, no. 68 (summary); and Yver, 70.
\textsuperscript{621} Yver, 70; Sakellariou, 147-148. Yver based his analysis on Cancelleria documents that were destroyed during the Second World War and have yet to be reconstructed.
\textsuperscript{622} Yver, 70; Sakellariou, 148.
\textsuperscript{623} Sakellariou, 148. The edicts were known as the arbitrary letters. See Also Yver, 64-67, 70-71; and Gasparinetti, 14-18.
\textsuperscript{624} Sakellariou, 148.
2. L’Aquila

L’Aquila, a city of political and commercial importance to the Angevin crown and the modern-day capital of Abruzzo, entered international headlines on April 6, 2009 when an earthquake measuring 6.3 on the Moment Magnitude Scale devastated the city, killing three-hundred and eight people and damaging severely much of the cultural patrimony examined in this study. Located near a fault line that runs beneath the Central Apennines, the city has been subject to numerous devastating earthquakes since its foundation. According to the fourteenth-century chronicler Buccio di Ranallo, the earliest occurred on December 3, 1315 and resulted in the reconstruction of many monuments begun during the previous century.

A second struck in 1349, and subsequent destructive earthquakes have rocked the city in 1461 and 1703. The eighteenth-century earthquake reportedly was even more devastating than the most recent, and served as the catalyst for the Baroque rebuilding of the city.

L’Aquila’s history of damaging earthquakes immediately raises two issues for scholars. For architectural historians and archeologists, the series of destructions and rebuilds creates multiple challenges for those seeking the “original” physical plant. What survives from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is fragmentary; and the larger

---

625 On the effects of the earthquake on L’Aquila’s late medieval architectural sites, see “Il terremoto del 6 aprile 2009 in Abruzzo: Danni, interventi, iniziative e schede,” special issue, “Kunst Chronik: Monatsschrift für Kunstwissenschaft Museumwesen und Denkmalpflege” 63, no. 2 (February 2010); and Chiara Marcotulli, “L’analisi stratigráfica muraria e il terremoto: storia sismica degli edifici del “Quarto” S. Giovanni nella città dell’Aquila (XIV-XVIII secolo),” in VI Congresso nazionale di archeologia medievale, eds. Fabio Redi and Alfonzo Forgione (Florence: All’Insegna del Giglio, 2012), 768-773.

626 “Foro li terramuti, li quali io vi ò contati, del mese di dicenbro alli tre giorni intrati, e de mercordì vìnnero, sacciate cari frati: era e quarto tenpora li dì santificati. Li terramuti foro più de quarto stemane; iaceano per lle logie como persone strane, facenno penetenza la sera e la domane, frustannose ciascuno co’lì frustati in mane.” See Buccio di Ranallo, Cronica, ed. Carlo de Matteis (Florence: Galluzzo, 2008), 75-76. See also Marcotulli, 769; and Valentino Pace, “La terra trema: storia e attualità dei sismi in Abruzzo,” in “Il terremoto del 6 aprile in Abruzzo: Danni, interventi, iniziative e schede,” special issue, Kunst Chronik: Monatsschrift für Kunstwissenschaft Museumwesen und Denkmalpflege” 63, no. 2 (February 2010), 45-46.

627 The eighteenth-century historian Anton Ludovico Antinori noted that L’Aquila was little more than ruins after the 1703 earthquake (“intera fu poco meno che rovinata”). The disaster included the death of reportedly over 600 worshipers who perished when the church of San Domenico collapsed onto them. See Anton Ludovico Antinori, Annali degli Abruzzi, vol. 24 (Bologna: Forni, 1971), 37-39. See also Marcotulli, 769.
architectonic picture can be pieced together only through these few remains as well as surviving Angevin diplomas. For historians more generally, the history of the earthquakes reveals the complexity of the relationship between the people who have inhabited the city and the geographic place from which it sprang. It is a location that has both given to and taken away from its populations. For all the potential for destruction, the land has been equally of great value, both before Angevin rule, especially during, and continuing much later. This has led to its continuous habitation as well as the subsequent rebuilding programs when necessary since its founding. Cities historically have not been bound to their original locations when deemed hazardous to the population. One needs to look no further for an example than the port of Siponto along the Adriatic. Its death due to malaria outbreaks and the transfer of its population gave rise to the city of Manfredonia, originally called “New Siponto,” which is examined later in this chapter.

Located one hundred kilometers east-north-east of Rome and surrounded by Italy’s tallest mountain peaks south of the Alps, L’Aquila rises 720 meters above sea level within the valley formed by the Aterno-Pescara river system. One of two frequent midpoints on the via degli Abruzzi between Florence and Naples, the location proved to be politically and commercially advantageous at the time of its refoundation and expansion under the Angevin crown. Charles II granted the city a market fair in 1294, an important year in the development of the city, and by the early fourteenth century the L’Aquila already had become an important center for the production of saffron and metalwork. In addition,  

---

628 The other midpoint, as noted earlier, was Sulmona.
629 As noted below, Charles II reconfirmed the city’s rights as a royal city. In general, 1294 was an important year in Angevin urban revitalization as Charles II returned permanently to Naples as King after years of uneasy peace with the Aragonese. Beyond those at L’Aquila, construction projects included the expansion of Naples and the construction of the capital’s new cathedral. See Bruzelius, *Stones of Naples*, 77-95.
630 On the production of saffron and metalwork in L’Aquila, see Gasparinetti, 36-80, including a published diploma dated 1317 in which Robert of Anjou offered protection for saffron merchants against exorbitant tolls.
thriving wool, textile, and leather industries resulted from its location along one of the principle routes of transhumance from Abruzzo to Apulia. \(^{631}\) By the fifteenth century, the city was the kingdom’s second largest. \(^{632}\)

L’Aquila’s origins during the first half of the thirteenth century arose under vastly different circumstances. The city was settled first in 1229, destroyed in 1259, and then rebuilt by the Angevins after 1266. \(^{633}\) Most details of L’Aquila’s history between 1229 and 1259 are now lost, however. Nevertheless, the sources that survive point to a city made important due to its strategic position, a strategic position that eventually led to its destruction. Located approximately sixty kilometers southeast from the papal stronghold of Rieti, surviving documentary sources reveal that the Popes and Hohenstaufen kings of the Regno used the city as a battleground over influence within the region. The earliest settlement was founded when Pope Gregory IX granted residents of the feudal territories of Forcona and Amiternum the right to establish a new city at a nearby location called Acculi. \(^{634}\) By 1254 the Hohenstaufen king Conrad IV had “re-founded” the city in order to exert during the movement of their product. On the presence of Provençal merchants in the city as early as 1274, see Raffaele Colapietra, “Lucera e l’Aquila sotto i primi Angioini,” Rassegna di Studi Dauni 2, no. 1-2 (1975), 17.

\(^{631}\) This route, one of the principle transhumant tratturi within the Regno, ran parallel to the via degli Abruzzi between L’Aquila and Foggia. See Sakellariou, 145. On the wool trade, see Gaudenzio Budelli, Cinzia Caponeschi, Franco Fiorentino, and Maria Cristina Marolda, “L’Aquila: nota sul rapporto tra castelli e ‘locali’ nella fondazione di una capitale territoriale,” in Città, contado, e feudi nell’urbanistica medievale, ed. Enrico Guidoni (Rome: Multigrafica Editrice, 1974), 184.

\(^{632}\) Sakellariou, 125 and 446. Her analysis is based on population figures from 1447.

\(^{633}\) Little is known about the fate of the city during the intervening period. Modern L’Aquila is a continuation of Angevin L’Aquila.

\(^{634}\) Jean-Louise-Alphonse Huillard-Bréholles published the letter. See H.D.F.S., 3:159-162. Permission was granted to settle the area on condition of a payment of one thousand ounces of gold. Acculi had existed as a small village (borgo) from at least 1095 when the Bishop of Forcona Odorisio consecrated a church dedicated to the Blessed Mary of Acculi. Most modern scholars have interpreted Gregory IX’s act as a papal check on imperial territorial expansion through the reassertion of ancient imperial land grants offered to the Church. See Alessandro Clementi and Elio Pirodi, L’Aquila (Bari: Laterza, 1986), 9-23; Maurizio D’Antonio, Il convento domenicano dell’Aquila: Vicende di storia e architettura, 1255-2009 (L’Aquila: Edizioni libreria Colacchi, 2010), 41-42; M.I. Fobelli, “L’Aquila,” in Enciclopedia dell’arte medievale (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1991), 2:196-202; and Stefania Paone, “I rapporti con la capitale del Regno. Le rotte commerciali e i poteri comitali,” in L’Aquila, Magnifica citade: Pittura gotica e tardogotica a L’Aquila e nel suo territorio (Rome: Campisano Editore, 2009), 13-28.
influence within the region.\textsuperscript{635} In the process, the king altered the city’s name to the similarly sounding *Aquila* in honor of the eagle, the “triumphant symbol” of the Hohenstaufen empire.\textsuperscript{636} His act was countered between the years 1255 and 1256 when Pope Alexander IV transferred the episcopal seat of Forcona to L’Aquila, establishing a bishopric within the city housed at a new cathedral dedicated to Saints Massimo and Giorgio, and invited the Franciscan and Dominican orders to settle within the city.\textsuperscript{637} These acts appear to have swayed influence (or perhaps were a result from already swayed influence) permanently in favor of the papacy. In 1259 Manfred reportedly destroyed the city because of its Guelph tendencies. All that survives of the event is the recounting by Buccio. The chronicler was brief. He noted that Manfred, who recently had gained lordship of the kingdom and vehemently opposed the Church, destroyed the city through “force and tyranny” with the aid of malicious subjects.\textsuperscript{638}

\textsuperscript{635} Conrad issued the privilege re-establishing the city for “the faithful” of the crown and free from traitors and enemies, presumably those who supported the pope. The document released all individuals living between Amiternun and Forcona from vassalage and granted them the right to settle at L’Aquila, called for the construction of a wall around the city for defense, and established two regional markets per year and three local markets per week. For the text of the privilege, see Spagnesi and Properzi, 98-107. For commentary on the bull, see Spagnesi and Properzi, 26-17; Clementi and Pirodi, 15-17; Colapietra, “Lucera a L’Aquila,” 11; Fobelli, 196; and D’Antonio, 13.

\textsuperscript{636} “…a victiricium signorum nostrorum.” “Aquila” directly translates to eagle in both Latin and Italian. See Spagnesi and Properzi, 100-101.

\textsuperscript{637} The bull at the time was Berardo di Padulo, a diplomat who once served as ambassador to Prague for Ottokar II, the king of Bohemia. See Elpidio Valeri, “Gli ordini mendicanti e la città,” in *San Domenico all’Aquila: Il restauro del complesso monumentale*, ed. Maurizio D’Antonio (Pescara: Carsa Edizioni, 2011), 13. The bull was confirmed on February 20, 1257. For this text in full, see Spagnesi and Properzi, 108-113. The establishment of a Dominican foundation at L’Aquila was confirmed in the acts of the general chapter for the 1255. The pertinent text reads: “Item (scil. Concedimus) Provinciae Romanae (scil. Domum) ponendam apud Aquilam seconum eundem modum.” Franciscans were present at least by the same year when Alexander issued a bull dated April 13 granting indulgences to those who visited the foundation. On the early presence of the Mendicants at L’Aquila, see Raffaele Colapietra, *Il complesso conventuale di S. Domenico all’Aquila. Profilo storico* (L’Aquila: Edizioni Libreria Colacchi, 1999), 11 and 13; Colapietra, “Lucera e L’Aquila,” 12; Paone, 13; Valeri, 14; D’Antonio, *Il convento dominicano dell’Aquila*, 46 and 70; and Maurizio D’Antonio, “L’architettura del complesso conventuale,” in *San Domenico all’Aquila: Il restauro del complesso monumentale*, ed. Maurizio D’Antonio (Pescara: Carsa Edizioni, 2011), 36.

\textsuperscript{638} “Alli cinquanta nove fo sconcia e fore oscitti. Perché illu re Manfreda poi venne in signoria, e contra della chiesa, con forza e tirania, co lli mali rendicoli, che gra’ copia n’avia: qual era per offizio e quale per lecconia.” See Buccio di Ranallo, *Cronica*, 22-24.
L’Aquila’s fortunes changed dramatically once the Church’s Angevin allies conquered the Kingdom and rebuilt the city. No longer a geopolitical pawn between two rivals, the same strategic position that led to its downfall allowed the rebuilt city to thrive as an important center of communication between the two institutions as well as serve as a fundamental component within the network of the Kingdom’s urban centers.

Rebuilding and expansion began as early as 1266, but accelerated under Charles II. Angevin priorities were three-fold. Like the earliest incarnation of L’Aquila, the first priority was to populate the city and at the same time diminish the power of the feudal barons that surrounded it. This occurred through continuing the process of consolidating the populations of nearby castelli, hamlets, and other feuds. The second priority was to organize the new population in such a way that facilitated the crown’s administration of the city and its population, with perhaps a second goal of creating a semblance of social harmony. Third, but certainly not least, was the need to rebuild quickly, efficiently, and as fourteenth-century Angevin texts suggest, permanently. All three priorities were a product of increased centralization. Understood together, the result was a rather innovative mode of city building that the crown replicated throughout the kingdom at sites such as Lucera.

The consolidation of castelli occurred throughout the second half of the century. Rocca di Ocre, a settlement suppressed by the Angevins in 1267, was among the first. By 1294, individuals from seventy-one of these territories had amalgamated into the universitas of L’Aquila (fig. 4–3). To accommodate these populations, the crown overlaid an

---

639 Budelli, et al., 184.
640 What becomes apparent through the study of L’Aquila’s consolidation is that not all individuals from the castelli resettled within the city walls. Some of the population remained in the original foundations, and from that point the locations served as satellites for the new centralized urban core. Legally, however, the consolidated neighborhoods and the original castelli outside of the walls fell under the same jurisdiction of the universitas. A somewhat similar relationship between city center and surrounding hinterland comes through in Lucera’s resettlement appendices. For example, statute seven of the resettlement ordinances presented August
orthogonal grid onto the more organic settlement of the earliest incarnation of L’Aquila (fig. 4–4).\footnote{ORTH} The center of the plan was formed by a market square that also housed the cathedral of Saints Giorgio and Massimo, a remnant of the earliest city.\footnote{ORTH} The city then was divided into quarters, its quarters were divided into locali, and locali were divided into lots.

Scholars rightly have connected the crown’s use of the orthogonal plan with other contemporary urban foundations created ex novo, such as the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Florentine new towns established as economic colonies under Florence’s powerful mercantile regime, and the bastides of southwest France built largely by the kings of France, England, and the counts of Toulouse between 1200 and 1400 (fig. 4–5, fig. 4–6, and fig. 4–7).\footnote{ORTH} Orthogonal plans were much more advantageous than organic growth for monarchs and rulers increasingly concerned with hygiene and order during consolidations of power. Moreover, as the architectural historian David Friedman has argued, grids were employed

\footnote{22, 1301 (Appendix C) reveals that Civitas Sanctae Mariae extended at least three kilometers beyond the urban core.\footnote{ORTH} Most scholars note that the first settlement spread organically out from two intersecting streets. See D’Antonio, Il convento domenicano, 69.\footnote{ORTH} Saints Massimo and Giorgio was one of a number of churches that were spared destruction. These included also the churches of Santa Giusta, Santa Maria di Accului, San Biago di Amiterno, San Pietro di Coppito, San Paolo di Barete, and San Lorenzo di Pizzoli. The last five churches include the names of the castelli from which their parishioners originated. See Orlando Antonini, Chiese dell’Aquila: Architettura religiosa e struttura urbana (Pescara: Casa Edizioni, 2004), 20.\footnote{ORTH} As David Friedman has noted, more than one thousand new urban centers were created in Europe between the early twelfth and mid fourteenth centuries. See David Friedman, Florentine New Towns: Urban Design in the Late Middle Ages (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1988), 5. The work on bastides is vast. Particularly useful for my work, however, is Adrian Randolph, “The Bastides of Southwest France,” The Art Bulletin 77, no. 2 (June 1995), 290-307. He noted that over 700 bastides were created between 1200 and 1400. On the orthogonal plan of L’Aquila, see Spagnesi and Properzi, 53-61; Donato Giancarlo De Pascalis, “Dagli Svevi agli Angioini nella Puglia medievale: il disegno politico e urbanistico di Manfredonia,” in Città nuove medievali: S. Giovanni Valdarno, la Toscana, l’Europa, ed. Enrico Guidoni (Rome: Bonsignori Editore, 2008), 105-126; Francesco Paolo Fiore, “Fondazione e forma di Cittaducale,” in Atti del XIX Congresso di storia dell’architettura (L’Aquila: Marcello Ferri Editore, 1980), 2:475; and Umberto Michele, “La Storia dell’urbanistica di Cittaducale come questione di metodo nella redazione dei P.P. e di piani di Recupero dei Centri Storici,” in Cittaducale: Settimana dei beni culturali e ambientali. 27 settembre – 4 ottobre 1981 (Rieti: Editrice il Velino, 1990), 59.}
overwhelmingly for new towns because of their replicability.\textsuperscript{644} The system worked as well on relatively flat terrain, as at Manfredonia, as it did on the relatively hilly, as was the case with L’Aquila and later Cittaducale. Based solely on right angles and set dimensions, creating an orthogonal plan in space did not require a map—a chart or mere description providing dimensions for a new city’s streets would suffice. This ease through which the orthogonal plan could be projected has far-reaching implications for understanding the relationship between emerging centralized powers and their urban expansions during the late Middle Ages. As pointed out by Friedman and the art historian Adrian Randolph, the manner in which the plans were projected meant that administrators, rather than professional designers or artists, could create new towns.\textsuperscript{645} Coherent urban planning, therefore, was established and at the same time bureaucratized through the use of the grid. This was fundamentally important for the centralized powers—whether based in Naples, Florence, London, Paris, or Toulouse—which employed new urban centers to resettle their frontiers.

The orthogonal plan, then, was fully embraced by powers during the late medieval period of political and territorial consolidation. Its utility reached far beyond the ease of its replicability, however. As Randolph has argued, orthogonal plans as a whole were especially useful in facilitating control within an urban landscape.\textsuperscript{646} In the case of L’Aquila, this was made clear by the privileges and statutes that survive from its period of rebuilding.

Two sources in particular illuminate how the crown employed the orthogonal plan to exert control. The first, a diploma issued by Charles II in 1294 that reconfirmed the city’s rights as a royal city, established the Angevin regional fair, and was presented to the city


\textsuperscript{645} Friedman, “Urban Design without maps,” 177; Randolph, 301.

\textsuperscript{646} Randolph, 306-307.
before the presence of prominent courtiers including Giovanni Pipino (Lucera, therefore, was not his first experience with Angevin urbanization), marked the end of the most fervent rebuilding period for the city. The second, the so-called *Statuta civitatis aquile* issued by Robert of Anjou in 1315, was a collection of 687 decrees for the effective administration of the city. Examined together, they reveal just how the geometric regularity created by the orthogonal plan served a fundamental role in the ordering of populations.

The orthogonal plan allowed the city to be divided into the quarters, *locali*, and lots mentioned earlier. The 1294 diploma provides the earliest mention of this division. Lots, the smallest unit within the scheme, measured 7.5 x 4 rods (canne), or approximately 1,436 square feet. Each lot corresponded to a hearth (*fuochi*), a taxable unit. The correspondence between lots and taxable units appears the rule rather than the exception for many orthogonal towns from the period. For the *bastides* of southwest France founded by Edward I, the size of an individual lot measured 4 x 10 rods. Each unit was taxed at a rate of six derniers.

A collection of lots in the Angevin city created a block, and a collection of blocks made a *locale*, or a neighborhood (fig. 4–8). At L’Aquila, each neighborhood corresponded to a single former feudal territory. For example, all the residents of the former *castelli* of Paganica settled within a *locale* that bore the same name. Therefore, by 1294, L’Aquila

647 For the full text of the diploma, see Spagnesi and Properzi, 114-123.
648 This work has been edited and transcribed in full. See Alessandro Clementi, ed. *Statuta civitatis aquile* (Rome: Nella sede dell’istituto, 1977). Spagnese and Prperzi published portions of the statues that pertained to taxation and the construction of buildings. See Spagnesi and Properzi, 124-151.
650 Used to calculate population, medieval demographers generally equate one hearth for four to five individuals.
651 This was the tax rate in 1285. See Randolph, 177.
contained seventy-one of these neighborhoods. Once again the orthogonal plan made this type of organization possible. It made the city easily expandable and able to accommodate new territories as their populations were absorbed. Moreover, each neighborhood possessed a square that contained a fountain and a church dedicated to the patron of each former castelli. The parish served as the administrative center of each neighborhood, acting as part house of worship, part tax office, and part voting district for the election of civic representatives who worked in conjunction with the city’s captain on civic matters. The use of the parish in this guise appears to be fairly common, particularly in new or resettled towns founded under the Angevins and elsewhere. A similar use of parishes within an

652 This is a far lower number than the reported ninety-nine castelli of oral legends solidified in the Fontana della Rivera (more commonly known as the Fontana delle Novantanove Cannelle (spout holes)) located along the western wall of the city. The low-walled fountain, originally primary source of water for residents in the western portion of the city, contains three sides and ninety-three stone masks from which water flows. Six additional spout holes do not contain masks. Both the legend and the fountain are products of numerous alterations, however. Raffaele Colapietra has shown how the legend of the ninety-nine founding castelli, instead of the seventy-one or so, was solidified during the second half of the sixteenth century. Moreover, the fountain, which has been used as a primary source of evidence for the ninety-nine castelli, was constructed over the course of at least three phases. The earliest dates to the 1270s. The chronicler Buccio di Ranallo reported that the fountain (then called the “Rivera”) was built in 1275 under the rule of the captain of L’Aquila, a Florentine called Lucchesino. Art historians have argued that this phase included the construction of the west and south walls and the inclusion of up to sixty-three masks. It is not known, however, whether these masks at the time were meant to represent consolidated castelli. According to Ferdinando Bologna, approximately twenty of the masks on the west wall survive from this first phase on account of their stylistic indebtedness to the legacy of Nicola Pisano. The work generally is attributed to a sculptor called Tancredi da Pentoma on account of a surviving inscription on the fountain naming the individual its “maker” (A.D. MCCLXXII Magister Tancredus de Pentoma de Valva hoc opus fecit”). This date is three years earlier than Buccio’s attribution, suggesting either that the inscription or chronicler is incorrect by three years or that this first phase occurred over a span of time. The second building phase dates to the fifteenth century and included the extension of the original walls and the addition of a third in L’Aquila’s trademark pink and white checkerboard pattern using one square palm (approximately 108 square inches) stones. The third and the addition of a third in L’Aquila’s trademark pink and white checkerboard pattern using one square palm time.

organizational structure appears almost certain for rebuilt Lucera, although the lack of surviving documents makes the details of the arrangement uncertain. The one surviving diploma that mentions these churches, an order dated May 25, 1314 sent by Giovanni Pipino to the city’s captain, Pietro da Cortone, noted that by 1308 Lucera contained eleven parishes.\footnote{The document, which survives only as a summary, describes the churches as “poor,” and requests that five ounces of gold collected from individuals given houses by the crown in Lucera be divided evenly amongst the churches, except for the church of Santa Maria Maddalena, the largest of the churches, which was to receive two shares instead of one. That the funds were collected from royal coffers reveals that the crown directly supported these churches, most likely because of their use within the administrative structure. The paltry sums requested by Pipino to support the churches (each share was 12.5 tari, less than half an ounce) reveals that these churches indeed were poor, but also quite small. In addition to Santa Maria Maddalena, the other churches were San Martino, Sant’Angelo, San Giacomo, San Paolo, San Marco, San Matteo, San Lorenzo, San Pietro, Santa Lucia, and Santa Caterina. Only San Giacomo, Santa Lucia, and Santa Caterina survive in some guise. By the middle of the fourteenth century Santa Caterina had been absorbed into a female Benedictine monastery. A summary of the document is found in CDSL, no. 786a (May 25, 1314). See also Gaetano Schiraldi, “La comunità cristiana di Lucera nell’alto e basso medioevo: primi appunti per una storia,” La Capitanata 23 (2009), 58.}

Pride of origin was given an additional boost for the oldest and most powerful neighborhoods in L’Aquila. In general, they were clustered toward the center of the city and the Piazza del Mercato that housed the cathedral.\footnote{Budelli, et al., 192.} Additionally, boundaries for the city’s quarters were drawn in such a way as to allow four of the most powerful locali the right to serve as the primary administrative center for each section. Each quarter was named after that neighborhood’s parish, termed by scholars today the “capo di quarto” church. Under Charles II, the quarters were named Santa Maria di Paganica, San Giorgio (now Santa Giusta), San Pietro di Coppito, and San Giovanni (now San Marciano). Moreover, piazzas and fountains of these parishes were larger than those of the subordinate neighborhoods.
within the quarter (fig. 4–9). Overall, the system of territorial organization created a verifiable social ordering within the city that began at the familial unit represented by lots, progressed upward to the locale represented by the parish church and piazza, moved a further step upward to the city’s quarters named after the parishes of the most powerful locali, and finally ended with the greater civic, and by extension royal, institutions represented by the cathedral, the market, and the captain’s adjacent palazzo. Through both the process in which it was projected and its ability to establish physical order, the orthogonal plan served as the perfect emblem of the crown’s centralized control over the institutions and populations of L’Aquila.

As argued in the previous two chapters, the same forces of centralization and bureaucratization that led to the primacy of the orthogonal plan resulted also, seemingly paradoxically, in a democratization of architectural style. The organization of L’Aquila’s society from the king downward allowed decisions for architectural detailing and style to rise from the opposite direction. As at Lucera, the crown in L’Aquila employed architecture most fundamentally as a sign of presence and permanence. Its priorities were to build quickly, soundly, and abundantly. Judging from Angevin diplomas, by 1315 the number of churches built or under construction within the city numbered at least seventy-six: a parish for each locale, the cathedral, and the four churches of the mendicant and Celestinian orders. As a result of the flurry of building activity, the crown set strict guidelines for the dimensions of buildings, the materials that should be used, and the timeframe in which they should be completed. For example, statute seven of the 1315 laws stipulated that each neighborhood
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657 Santa Maria was the largest quarter at the start of the fifteenth century according to a tax audit under King Ladislaus of Anjou. It contained 1,220 hearths. Santa Giusta (by then San Giorgio) was the second largest, followed by San Pietro and San Marciano (then San Giovanni). As a whole the city counted 3,867 hearths, roughly equivalent to a population of 16,000-19,000. For the text of the audit, see Spagnesi and Properzi, 141-147.
with fewer than one hundred hearths should build a church eight rods long, four rods wide, and four rods tall. Those with more than one hundred hearths should construct a church twelve rods long, four rods wide, and four rods tall. Furthermore, statute three hundred of the same laws ordered that each neighborhood was required to build a *domus* (not defined, perhaps a public hall of some sort) made of “proper stone” with a “proper wood roof” for every fifty hearths. Both of these stipulations were a result of the crown’s priority to create the appearance of permanence at L’Aquila, both in terms of physical space and also in terms of the populations required to invest in such an undertaking. In accordance with the construction of other buildings willed by the crown, funding and construction of these parishes fell presumably in part onto the residents of the neighborhood. Who was required to support the construction of the stone *domus* was made more explicit, however. A wealthy member of the neighborhood was responsible for undertaking the task with a penalty exacted if not complete within a year.

As seen in the case of Lucera and elsewhere, the tight control over construction parameters gave way to a relative freedom of architectural detailing and style. The closest sign of an aesthetic agenda appears within statute five, which required that each neighborhood’s church should be constructed “in the manner and timeframe” always stipulated. This again follows a pattern for Angevin building documents throughout the Kingdom in which phrases such as “in our manner” or “according to our provisions” were employed to describe how the crown wanted monuments built. These provisions, however, the specifics of which almost certainly were communicated orally, are never delineated in
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659 Ibid., 197-198.  
660 Ibid., 9-11. “…specialiter facti tenentur nonnulli usque ad certum tempus et numerum construere domos in civitate prefata…”
any of the documents. Since no distinguishable Angevin formal architectural style exists, these “provisions and manners” most likely meant in a way that was timely for the project, sound and permanent in construction (the crown often stipulated that “good stone” be used), followed the most basic conventions for form and dimensions, and was as economical as possible.

At L’Aquila as elsewhere within the Kingdom, achieving these goals meant that local labor and experts were employed for construction. Within the crown’s set of parameters, L’Aquila experienced the explosion of a vernacular style known by scholars today as the scuola aquilana.661 Wall construction, façade design, and architectural detailing show remarkable continuity between L’Aquila’s late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century churches. Their forms also can be read like buildings constructed under short time constraints. Judged by modern standards—like much Angevin architecture—as austere, most of L’Aquila’s churches were constructed with trussed roofs in one of three plans: a single aisle with no articulated presbytery, a single aisle with three apses, and a single aisle with transept and three apses (fig. 4–10).662 L’Aquila’s great churches, including the cathedral renovated during the early fourteenth century, the mendicant foundations, and the Celestinian church of the Collemaggio, included three naves, as many apses, and a transept like the other

661 This architectural style eventually spread to other cities in Abruzzo, most likely because of the abundance of workers groomed in the style. Ignazio Carlo Gavini’s work remains the most comprehensive study of churches displaying the characteristics of this style. See Ignazio Gavini, Storia dell’architettura in Abruzzo.

662 Surviving churches bearing a single aisle with no apse include San Francesco di Paolo, built around 1290. Those bearing a single aisle with three apses include San Marco (begun around 1290 with renovations during the first half of the fourteenth century), San Flavino (ca. 1290-1294), Santa Maria di Paganica (second half thirteenth century, renovations after 1349), San Marciano (second half of the thirteenth century), Santa Maria di Roio (second half thirteenth century), and San Nicola d’Anza (second half thirteenth century). The early fourteenth-century church of San Silvestro, the parish church for the locale of Collebrincioni, is a rare exception. It contains three aisles, three apses, and a non-protruding transept. See Antonini, Chiese dell’Aquila, 42.
great churches of the Regno. More than anything, however, the choice of architectural plan appears to reflect the size of the clergy and congregation served.

Interior piers, when necessary, and external towers frequently were octagonal (fig. 4–11 and fig. 4–9), creating a connection with the buildings of the kingdom surveyed in the second chapter. Exterior walls were projected by a method termed apparecchio aquilano by the architectural historian Ignazio Carlo Gavini. This involved facing a rubble core with small, relatively uniform rectangular pieces of limestone (fig 4–12 and fig. 4–13). Like the churches of Lucera, sidewalls were pierced with single-lancet trilobed windows.

The façades, many of which were built during the fourteenth century, truly served as the “face” of the style, however. They easily are the most recognizable legacy of the scuola aquilana, as the design spread to other areas within Abruzzo and continued to be employed and updated during subsequent centuries (fig. 4–14). Constructed in ashlar masonry, their square flat fronts were embellished in most cases solely by three elements: a rose window, a single horizontal cornice that broke the surface into two segments (the lower segment sometimes was articulated by vertical pilasters), and a single portal composed of deep receding jambs, a round tympanum often reserved for fresco, and elaborately carved lintels and archivolts bearing fantastic creatures, foliate patterns, and geometric designs (fig. 4–15, fig. 4–16, and fig. 4–17). Like the scuola aquilana overall, the portals display a remarkable level of consistency in terms of iconographical composition over a long period of time. This suggests that they were the sole domains of local workers, who, as Bruzelius has noted, possessed similar iconographic and stylistic repertoires as the sculptural workshops of Apulia. She has pointed out however, that the level of execution varies, suggesting that multiple sculptors and sculptural workshops produced the portals. The name of just one of
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these sculptors survives. Raimondo di Poggio, presumably a native of Poggio Picenze, one of the larger neighborhoods of Santa Maria whose residents originally had inhabited a region rich with limestone quarries, signed his name on the portal of Santa Maria di Paganica, the “capo” church of his quarter.  

As Bruzelius noted, virtually nothing exists of the original interiors of these churches following multiple and substantial renovations throughout the centuries. Thirteenth- or fourteenth-century frescoes, interior sculpture, and nearly every other medieval object that once filled these buildings are gone. Most of these churches now lack that important semiotic marker of Angevin presence found at many other sites, royal heraldry. Because of this, few scholars have examined these buildings as medieval or as Angevin foundations and the implications they hold for our understanding of the crown’s architectural and urban priorities. Nevertheless, examining what little survives from the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, combined with the documented provisions outlined by the crown, paints a clearer picture of the architecture of Angevin L’Aquila. That increased clarity, in turn, helps establish and confirm the architectural and urban priorities as a whole for the crown. Overall, building priorities and the environment in which they were born at L’Aquila provided a kind of antecedent for the rebuilding of Lucera.

The urban strategies at both cities link even closer when examining the relationship between the mendicant orders and the rebuilding of L’Aquila. As at Lucera these groups were present from the early stages of rebuilding, administering to the nascent rural population that continued to flood the city. However, like the Apulian city, their presence
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664 Ibid.
665 Ibid. Raimondo may also have worked in other cities in the region, including Lanciano, Atri, and Sulmona.
666 One type of object that survives from some of these churches is the polychrome wooden sculpture. The issue raised from their survival is the subject of chapter 5.
must be framed also within the larger administrative and institutional structure created under the Angevin crown. During the late Middle Ages the installation of the orders within the city perpetually bore a political element. In the fight between the popes and Hohenstaufen kings, the Franciscans and Dominicans of L’Aquila represented papal claims to the land. When they returned after 1266 they did much the same, serving as agents of the popes and the Angevin kings. As at Lucera, all three major orders plus the Celestinians had built foundations in L’Aquila by the end of the thirteenth century. As at Lucera, this was a number far greater than was “needed” according to Le Goff’s saturation model, which suggested that the number of mendicant orders within a city was proportional to its population. Also like Lucera, the positioning of the mendicant foundations at L’Aquila formed a tight triangle around the city core and its cathedral, establishing a topography of power (fig. 4–18). If this level of institutional presence helped project Lucera as an alter Neapolis, it did the same for L’Aquila. As becomes quite clear when comparing Angevin rebuilding programs, the crown’s urban goal, in effect, was to create multiple representations of its capital.

The late thirteenth-century Augustinian and Franciscan foundations remain mostly as a memory. In 1282 a group of Augustinian friars transferred from a foundation dedicated to Saint Onofrio located somewhere outside of the city’s walls to a new home inside the city dedicated to their patron. The church, originally containing three aisles, a transept, and most likely three apses, was altered dramatically during the eighteenth century and suffered heavy damage from the 2009 earthquake. The earliest documentation of a Franciscan return to
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667 The Benedictines at Campo di Fossa and the Cistercians at Santa Maria Nuova also had settled into the city by the end of the thirteenth century. Little work has been done on their presence, however. See Clementi and Pirodi, 35.
668 Le Goff, “Ordres mendicants et urbanization,” 939-940. See also chapter 3.
L’Aquila dates to 1288 when Charles II urged the captain of the city to offer a house near their convent to the order if needed.\textsuperscript{669} The text implies that the Franciscans already had re-established their presence within the city and by that point were in the process of expanding their community. Subsequent documentation of Angevin support for construction dates to 1289, 1301, and 1306 when the king donated twelve ounces to the foundation for bells.\textsuperscript{670} The convent later was destroyed by the earthquake of 1349, rebuilt in 1360, and suppressed in the early nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{671} Few remains of the foundation survive.\textsuperscript{672}

While the lack of physical remains prohibits architectural analysis, the topographical positioning of these foundations within the city reveals much about their role within L’Aquila. Like Lucera, these mendicant foundations hardly were peripheral. The convent of Sant’Agostino, built within the quarter San Marciano, was positioned a mere three hundred meters south of the cathedral and market, the city’s religious, social, and economic center. The Franciscan convent was built three hundred meters directly north of the city’s central pole. It possessed an even more prestigious location than the Augustinian foundation, sharing a piazza with the captain’s palace.\textsuperscript{673}

The strategic positioning of the two mendicant orders contrasted with the city’s most well known monument, the Celestinian foundation of Santa Maria di Collemaggio (fig. 4–19 and fig. 4–20). Its peripheral location, in part, points to its construction prior to the order’s support by the Angevin crown. Located outside of the city southeast of the Piazza del

\textsuperscript{670} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{671} Fobelli, 200.
\textsuperscript{672} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{673} Krüger noted that the house offered to the order for the expansion of their foundation was described in the diploma as located between the Franciscans and the captain’s palace. See Krüger, 196. On the palace, of which little remains, see Fobelli, 199.
Mercato, the basilica and its monastery were begun in 1287 after, according to legend, Pietro di Morrone, the future Pope Celestine V, experienced a dream in which the Virgin Mary requested he build a church on the site. The church is of interest for the study of Angevin L’Aquila because it appears that at its origins, at least, it was not an Angevin or Angevin-willed project. Despite this, the large church, which bears three aisles, a transept, and single apse, was projected in the same scuola aquilana style as the dozens of churches built within the city. This suggests that it, too, was constructed by local builders and that the primary rhetorical statement made by architectural styles in Angevin buildings was the inherent claim on the land and local populations ordered to build them. Scholars have revealed that the church was built on a pre-existing fortification from which ashlar blocks of limestone were reused for the south side of the church as well as for its single octagonal tower. In other walls built during the early phases of construction, apparecchio aquilano was employed.

The bi-chrome façade, an example of an updated scuola aquilana façade, was completed at the turn of the fifteenth century.

It is tempting to conclude that the monastery’s proximity to L’Aquila, L’Aquila’s importance within Angevin economies, and the relationship between Celestine V and Charles II contributed to the crown’s practice of supporting Celestinian foundations within important urban centers. If the monastery’s early foundations, and its Celestinian founders, did not directly stem from Angevin intervention, by 1294 the monastery and the order undoubtedly had entered the Angevin sphere. On August 29 of that year the basilica served as the site
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675 Like most of the city’s churches, the basilica has been subject to numerous renovations as a result of earthquakes and changes in taste. The 2009 earthquake severely damaged the transept and choir, and caused cracks in some structural walls. On the building history of the basilica, see Cirana, 59-60; Gavini, 1:455-458; and Gavini, 2:52-64.
where Pietro di Morrone was consecrated as Pope Celestine V. The event took place before none other than Charles II and possibly even Giovanni Pipino, who was present when the city’s privileges were issued a month later (September 28). In a bull dated the following day, September 29, 1294, Celestine issued the so-called *Perdonanza di S. Celestino*, the full pardon of sins for all of the faithful who visited the basilica on August 28 or 29, the anniversary of his coronation. The sequence of these events within the crown’s prized new town seems less than coincidental given the Celestine-Angevin relationship examined during the previous chapter. The city was made a pilgrimage destination in addition to its positioning as an important center of commercial and political communication. This, in effect, connected the physical manifestation of Celestinian identity, the Collemaggio, to that of Angevin identity, the rebuilt city itself. The result appears to have affected all subsequent Angevin support of the Celestinians, including Giovanni Pipino’s personal votive gifts at Naples and Lucera.

The year 1294 also was important for the Dominicans, the order that received the most conspicuous Angevin support within the city. In addition to naming Nicola Castroeceli as L’Aquila’s first Dominican bishop, Celestine V created the *Provincia Regni Sicilia*, transferring the order’s priories and houses located within the Angevin kingdom away from the Province of Rome. As Cioffari has noted, the move held expressly political aims, as the order fell under the *de facto* rule of Charles II, who, in commemoration of the event, reportedly donated a gold florin every week to each foundation within the province.\(^{676}\)

Particularly important foundations received more. The Neapolitan priory San Domenico, then dedicated to the Magdalen, received three florins per week. Barletta’s foundation as well as L’Aquila’s received two.

The Dominican priory at L’Aquila steadily increased in prominence. Originally established as a *domus* some time between 1255 and 1257, the foundation was elevated to a *conventus* in 1276. Six years later it was one of only five Dominican foundations in Abruzzo along with those at Sulmona, Penne, Atri, and Chieti.  

Maurizio D’Antonio, author on the most comprehensive study of the Dominicans in L’Aquila, has argued that the priory included a *studium* by 1291. According to Buccio di Ranallo, in 1293 the foundation hosted Charles Martel, Charles II’s first-born son and heir apparent.

The physical traces of the thirteenth-century foundation now are lost. Moreover, its location is unknown. What survives now of the Dominican presence in L’Aquila is the priory begun at the beginning of the fourteenth century. According to Buccio, the new foundation was founded in 1309 when Charles II ordered it be built in dedication to the Magdalen. To support its operation, the king pledged an annual stipend of fifty ounces per year for at least ten years.

Located approximately 350 meters north-northwest of the cathedral, the foundation possesses a dominant position within the city on the top of a hill (fig. 4–18). Literature on
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677 Ibid., 72 and 77.
678 D’Antonio, “L’architettura del complesso conventuale,” 39. Other Dominican schools were located in Barletta, Foggia (1292), and Naples. See Pellegrini, “Gli Ordini mendicanti in Capitanata,” 116.
680 The dedication of the L’Aquila foundation to the Magdalen made it one of a number of the Dominican foundations dedicated to the saint by the crown. Those foundations included Saint Maximin in Provence (1295), the priory at Manfredonia (1294), San Dominico Maggiore in Naples (1283), and the foundations at Brindisi (1304) and at Capua (1294). See D’Antonio, “L’architettura del complesso conventuale,” 45.
the site often identifies its location as the site of a former royal palace donated by Charles II for his favored order. While a particularly attractive thesis, especially in regard to Angevin support of the foundation, a number of scholars recently have dismissed the claim, identifying the 1308 diploma that reports the donation a forgery.\textsuperscript{682} Strong Angevin support nevertheless seems certain given its prestigious location, record of financial support, and the church’s dedication to the Magdalen. Whether or not a palace was present earlier does not diminish this fact.

The priory has been subject to at least five building phases, hiding its medieval imprint.\textsuperscript{683} However, much of the original form of the church as well as some portions of wall survive. These fragments reveal that the fourteenth-century church was quite large, measuring 27.4 meters wide and 45.3 meters deep and arranged like the other great churches of the city with three naves, a transept that measured 36 meters wide and 12.4 meters tall, and a deep vaulted apse (fig. 4–21, fig. 4–22, and fig. 4–23).\textsuperscript{684} Its dimensions are nearly identical to Lucera’s cathedral, which may be coincidental or point to a standardization of measurements for churches of particular import.\textsuperscript{685} Like the other churches of the scuola aquilana, however, its façades on the west end and south transept were constructed in ashlar masonry with minimal articulation save horizontal coursing, a rose widow, and a single receding portal. In a sign, or perhaps homage, of lay support at the Magdalen and the

\textsuperscript{682} Raffaele Colapietra and Maurizio D’Antonio recently have challenged the diploma on account of its unusual format, which includes naming Bartolomeo da Capua “regent,” a position the Angevin protonotary was never known to have (at least officially) possessed. They assert that the antiquarian Ludovico Antonio Muratori forged the text during the eighteenth century. The oral tradition of the foundation in regard to a former Angevin palace dates to at least the sixteenth century. See Colapietra, \textit{Il complesso conventuale di S. Domenico}, 16-24; and D’Antonio, \textit{Il convento domenicano}, 90-91. D’Antonio published a copy of the text under scrutiny.

\textsuperscript{683} Phases include the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century origins, a fifteenth-century phase, an eighteenth-century rebuild, the transformation of the living quarters into a prison during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and the restoration of the foundation that was completed right before the 2009 earthquake. See Antonini, “San Domenico nell’architettura sacra aquilana,” 113; and D’Antonio, \textit{Il convento domenicano dell’Aquila}.

\textsuperscript{684} These measurements denote that the church was almost three times as wide and long as the largest parish churches ordered in the 1315 statues, but only about one half taller.

\textsuperscript{685} Lucera’s cathedral measures approximately 43.5 meters deep by 25.7 meters wide.
adoption of Angevin symbols in noble heraldry, a wooden beam bearing one of the few
remnants of pre-baroque interior decoration includes a shield bearing two fleurs-des-lis (fig.
4–24). Its date, however, is unknown.

Only in wall construction does Santa Maria Maddalena differ from earlier churches
surveyed. Fourteenth-century remnants, particularly around the apse, are constructed in
ashlar instead of the apparecchio aquilano ubiquitous at earlier churches. More than
anything, this appears to be the result of an expansion within the city of ashlar workers at
some point after 1309. Many of scuola aquilana façades, constructed entirely in ashlar, were
begun during the period, as were renovations in ashlar to the walls of the cathedral, the
Collemaggio, and a number of parish churches including S. Pietro di Coppito and Santa
Giusta after the earthquake of 1315. The architectural historian Fabio Redi attributed the
change to the presence of a new master and workshop operating within the city from 1315 to
1350. He speculated that these individuals could have been invited to the city by one of
two Tuscan and mendicant bishops during the period to “upgrade” building styles. This
analysis carries obvious undertones of a perceived architectural provincialism in regard to the
apparecchio aquilano, and Redi’s attribution to an outside force seems unnecessary
considering that the scuola had employed previously ashlar blocks for towers, piers, and
reinforcement. However, the change does speak to an increase in the use of ashlar
masonry, an evolution driven possibly by some technological advance that made the
extraction and transport of cut stone easier, or by an increased number of individuals capable

686 Fabio Redi, “La costruzione della cattedrale nel contesto del cantiere cittadino dell’Aquila,” in La chiesa
aquilana. 750 anni di vita (1256-2006): Appunti per una storia. Atti del Convegno L’Aquila, Cattedra
687 Those bishops were Filippo Delici da Lucca, an Augustinian whose episcopacy lasted from 1312 to 1328,
and Angelo Azzioli, a Florentine and Dominican, who was bishop from 1328 to 1342. See Redi, 427.
688 Maurizio D’Antonio, “San Domenico nell’architettura sacra aquilana,” in San Domenico all’Aquila: il
of working with the blocks. For both phenomena L’Aquila’s growth as a town as well as improved transport infrastructure under the crown are more likely explanations than foreign interaction. The natural rise in population from the growth of the city as a center of commerce, diplomacy, and pilgrimage to the Collemaggio appears to have given birth to a new and larger generation of stonecutters.

2. Manfredonia

The city of Manfredonia already has featured prominently in this dissertation. Labeled by the early fourteenth-century chronicler Giovanni Villani as “the greatest port between Venice and Brindisi,” the city on the Adriatic played a visible and documented role during the construction of Civitas Sanctae Mariae. It was one of two places, the other was Brindisi, where confiscated grain from Luceria sarracenorum audited by the representatives of the mendicant orders was sent to be sold or put onto ships for soldiers in Calabria (Appendix D). Moreover, timber bound for the construction of Lucera’s cathedral entered through the port, free of duty by order of Robert of Anjou. The city’s history also has proven to be particularly useful for understanding Angevin building, as its building documents provide the most extensive picture of Angevin construction processes.

Located approximately forty kilometers northeast of Foggia and an additional twenty from Lucera, Manfredonia formed the Adriatic terminus of the via degli Abruzzi’s east-west branch (fig. 4–25 and fig. 4–2). As noted earlier, from there the southern branch of the Appian Way connected the port to its southern counterpart Brindisi through the highly
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689a “…la quale ha oggi il migliore porto che sia da Vinigia a Brandizio.” See Giovanni Vilanni, Chronica (Florence: Magheri, 1823), 71-72.
690 See also CDSL, no. 329 (September 10, 1300, summary), no. 330 (September 10, 1300), and no. 348 (September 27, 1300).
691 CDSL, no. 783 (May 31, 1309, summary).
populated Apulian coastal cities of Barletta, Trani, and Bari. Another maintained by the crown led north and northeast fifteen kilometers to Monte Sant’Angelo, making the city the last way station before the important pilgrimage site favored by the Angevin kings (fig. 4–26 and fig. 4–27).  

Manfredonia, then, served as one of the kingdom’s great hubs. Connecting the Regno and points beyond through land and sea, the city’s development under the Angevin crown was driven by substantial domestic and foreign commercial exchange fostered by its port, an annual regional fair held during the spring, the production of salt, and another thriving industry: pilgrimage to the shrine of the Archangel Michael.  

Like L’Aquila and Lucera, Manfredonia was redeveloped under the Angevins. Its origins date to the decade prior to the Angevin conquest of the Regno when the Hohenstaufen king Manfred founded it to replace a port city three kilometers to the south called Siponto.  

An ancient and important center for the production of salt, a series of earthquakes in the 1230s reportedly led to the accretion of silt along Siponto’s coast. This transformed its salt marshes into stagnant ponds that bred mosquitoes, causing malaria outbreaks. Writing about the origins of Manfredonia, Giovanni Villani wrote that Manfred had to “unmake” (disfare)  

\[692\] For these branches of roads, see Sthamer, “Die Haupstrassen,” 111; and Sakellariou, 146. On Monte Sant’Angelo as a regional pilgrimage site, see Jill Caskey, “Medieval Patronage & Its Potentialities,” in Patronage: Power & Agency in Medieval Art, ed. Colum Hourihane (Princeton: Index of Christian Art, Princeton University, 2013), 4–6. On Angevin architectural projects at the site, see Bruzelius, The Stones of Naples, 36–40; and chapter 3.  

\[693\] The earliest attestation of a regional fair dates to 1301. The date appears to have wavered between May and April. See Yver, 71; and Sakellariou, 474.  

\[694\] The oldest city in the Regno’s province of Capitanata, Siponto was settled first by the Greeks and served as the most important port in the region through the first half first half of the thirteenth century. On its history and monuments, see De Pascalis, 105-106; Maria Rosaria Guarini, “Manfredonia: Strategia forma e significato di una città di fondazione sveva,” Quaderni del dipartimento patrimonio architettonico e urbanistico, storia cultura e progetto 10 (1095), 21-36; and Giuseppe de Troia, Dalla distruzione di Siponto alla fortificazione di Manfredonia (Foggia: Schena, 1987), 15-63.
Siponto because its surrounding marshes were unhealthy and because it no longer possessed a port.695

Founded as “New Siponto,” the early Hohenstaufen history of Manfredonia remains obscure. All that is known for sure is that Manfred issued a diploma officially granting the city status in 1263, that it contained a royal mint, and that the symbol of the city appears to have been a bell described by Villani to be so large that “it could not be played.”696 Both the mint and the bell are known only because Charles I transferred them from Manfredonia: the

695 *Chronica*, 71-72. The full text reads, “Questo Manfredi fece disfare la città di Siponto in Puglia, perché gli paduli che l’erano intorno non era sana, e non avea porto; e di quegli cittadini ivi presso a due miglia, in sulla roccia, e in luogo d’avere buono porto, fece fondare una terra la quale per suo nome la fece chiamare Manfredonia, la quale ha oggi il migliore porto che sia da Vinegia a Brandizio.” The site on which Manfredonia was settled previously was home to a *borgo*. The land itself was owned by an individual named Manfred Maletta, a count and the chamberlain of the Hohenstaufen court. A veritable Pipino-like figure praised by the chroniclers including the Franciscan Salimbene de Adam (*Chronica*, 1283-1288) and Giovanni Villani, Maletta ruled the city as governor until 1266. His virtual rule of the city, combined with his shared given name with the Hohenstaufen king, has led to considerable controversy concerning the origins for the city’s originally unofficial name. Salimbene and Giovanni Villani asserted that the city was named after the King. For apparently political reasons, Boniface VIII argued that Manfredonia was named after the count (from here on referred to as Maletta). The pope, who in a 1299 diploma noted that Maletta had received the land from Innocent IV, pleaded with Charles II in 1300 to restore some of the count’s lands, houses, and goods around the city confiscated after his exile to Venice. Boniface noted that the count had done many acts of charity while in exile, including donating a number of castles in Sicily to Robert, then the Duke of Calabria, to support the war on the island. It is unknown whether the request fell on deaf ears; however, the count did reportedly die in Naples and was buried at the Franciscan convent of San Lorenzo. For Salimbene on Maletta, see Salimbene de Adam, *Chronica*, vol. 2, ed. Giuseppe Scalia (Bari: Laterza, 1966), 686. For Giovanni Villani’s opinion of the figure, see Giovanni Villani, *Chronica*, book 6, chap 46. On Boniface’s diplomas, see Domenico Vendola, ed. *Documenti tratti dai regestri vaticani*, vol. 2 (Trani: Vecchi, 1963), XXIV-XXX and docs. 28 (December 30, 1299), 29 (December 30, 1299), and 30 (January 11, 1300). On Maletta’s death and burial, see Krüger, 148.

696 The diploma survives because it was copied and confirmed by Charles II on May 18, 1300. For the full text, see Christianzano Serricchio, “Manfredi e la fondazione di Manfredonia,” in *Siponto-Manfredonia* (Foggia: Edizioni del Rosone, 2004), 38-43. As the historian Pier Fausto Palumbo noted, the relatively brief document contains just three elements. The first, the motivation for the new settlement, noted that the “bad air” of Siponto “vetus” required the transfer of its residents to “Symptontum novellum.” The second element, the granting of privileges, freed new residents from taxes for a decade and granted them rights to use the new port for both the importation and exportation of goods. Lastly, the privilege named Maletta governor of the new town. As in most diplomas and bulls of the type, the privilege most certainly confirmed resettlement rather than initiated it. See Pier Fausto Palumbo, “La fondazione di Manfredonia,” *Archivio storico pugliese* 6 (1953), 386. On the bell, see Giovanni Villani, *Chronica*, book 6, chap. 46. The chronicler noted that Maletta donated the bell to the city. He was unclear whether its size made it unplayable because of an acoustic issue or because it could not be moved.
mint was moved to Brindisi in 1266 and the bell donated in 1269 to San Nicola in Bari. Each event appears to have been an act of *damnatio memoriae*, suggesting that as at Lucera an initial Angevin purge of the city occurred.

Like L’Aquila, Angevin Manfredonia developed on top of an orthogonal grid, the standard for new towns in Europe. It was much smaller than the kingdom’s new town in Abruzzo, however, and measured roughly only twenty-four hectares in area (fig. 4–28 and fig. 4–29). Retaining today even more of its grid structure than modern-day L’Aquila, the historic center of Manfredonia still is marked by the intersection at right angles of straight, wide streets approximately eight meters in width (fig. 4–30 and fig 4–31).

---

697 For the transfer of the mint, see Filangieri, ed., *I registri*, vol. 1, reg. 1, doc. 58. For the transfer of the bell, see Filangieri, ed., *I registri*, vol. 2, reg. 8., doc. 215. Charles threatened to impose on the bailiff of Manfredonia a fine of a staggering 1,000 ounces of gold for the late arrival of the bell.

698 This is the earliest example of the Angevin crown using bells, both their removal and implantation, as a marker of presence. On the rhetoric of bells, see chapter 3. The purges appear to be just some of the acts that motivated Salimbene de Adam to argue that Charles I “hated the city,” an assertion that the Angevin redevelopment of the city negates. Another act, according to the chronicler, was the prohibition of the term Manfredonia. According to the chronicler, the king ordered instead that the city be called by its official name of Sipontum Novenum ("Sed rex Karolus habet eam exosam, in tantum quod eam audire nominari non potest, immo vult quod appelletur Sipontus nova."). Salimbene’s final charge of forced name change has held a lasting impression on the historiography; however, it is an exaggeration. Angevin diploma’s use interchangeably “Sipontum novellum” and “Manfredonia” throughout the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. One diploma dated 1272 even combines names, referring to the city as “Sipontum quod nunc dicitur Manfredonia,” or “Siponto that now is called Manfredonia.” For Salimbene’s text, see Salimbene de Adam, *Chronica*, 685. For the 1272 diploma, a list of commodity profits in various communities within the Regno, see Filangieri, ed., *I registri*, vol. 2, reg. 10, doc.137.

699 For the mapping out of the original urban form, see Guarini, 21-36.

700 De Pascalis suggested that the urban form may have been set under Manfred, a possibility considering the ubiquity and universality of the orthogonal plan in late medieval Europe. He cited examples of previous Hohenstaufen use of the form at Augusta in 1232 and Terranova, now Gela, in 1233. See De Paschalasis 109. Salimbene argued that much of the city had been developed under Manfred. Much of his account is unreliable, however, as he apparently never saw the city personally, and also attributed Manfred with some projects built under the Angevins crown. For example, he noted that Manfred built six kilometers of wall around the city. In reality, the project to surround the entire city with walls was mostly, if not entirely Angevin, and consisted of approximately 2,400 meters of wall rather than the 5,916 meters (four Roman miles) he argued. See Salimbene de Adam, *Chronica*, 685. His full description of the city reads: “Hec fuit loco alterius civitatis que dicebatur Sipontus, et distat ab ea per miliaria duo; et si vixisset prisci per paucos annos amplius, fuisset Manfredonia una de pulcerribus civitatis de mundo. Est enim ex toto murata in circitu et per IIII miliaria durat, ut dicunt, et habent optimum portum, et est ad radicem montis Gargani; et principalis strata tota inhabitur, et omnia fundamenta aliarum domorum iam facta sunt, et vias amplissimas habet, que ad pulcritudinem faciunt civitatis. Sed rex Karolus habet eam exosam, in tantum quod eam audire nominari non potest, immo vult quod appelletur Sipontus nova.”

701 Guarini, 31.
the ten-meter wide *platea magna Manfridonia* (now called the Corso Manfredi), connected the via degli Abruzzi with the road to Monte Sant’Angelo, making the center of the city the literal fulcrum between the interregional highway and the pilgrimage center promoted by the Angevin crown.\(^{702}\) The road most likely was the main commercial drag in the city (as it is now), and while not mentioned specifically in surviving documents, the design of the main road in such a manner inevitably led to increased income for the crown and city through the potential for lodging, trade, and tolls charged for goods entering or exiting the city.

Of all Angevin building projects within the city, the physical and documentary record for the construction of the city’s castle and walls remain most intact (fig. 4–32 and fig 4–33).\(^{703}\) Begun in 1277 by royal order and completed approximately in 1284, the construction project truly was regional in scope, employing, as at the rebuilding of Lucera, the entire apparatus of the crown’s bureaucratic network to direct construction progress and workers, funnel funds to the site from throughout the region, and procure and transport construction materials, especially wood and work animals, from throughout the kingdom.\(^{704}\) This level of kingdom-wide coordination was not lost on Haseloff, one of the earliest scholars to analyze the construction documents. Writing on the difference between Hohenstaufen and Angevin building projects, the archaeologist and art historian noted that:

> If many works under the Hohenstaufen were not completed, the construction [projects] of Charles I instead were finished in the final years of his

---

\(^{702}\) *Platea* often was used to denote the most important street for cities in Capitanata and derives from the Greek *plateia*, the equivalent of a Roman decumanus. On the medieval street names of Manfredonia, see Guarini, 25-27. Their names survive mostly from Angevin building documents and a collection of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century documents once preserved at the monastery of San Leonardo di Siponto. See F. Camobreco, ed., *Regesto di S. Leonardo di Siponto* (Rome: Ermanno Loescher & C., 1913), docs. 208 (1279), 237 (1312), 247 (1325), 273 (1394) 290 (1432), and 307 (1448). See also Sthamer, vol. I., doc. 449 (March 14, 1279). On the use of the highway as the major axis in orthogonal new towns, see Friedman, *Florentine New Towns*.

\(^{703}\) Both were subject to subsequent alterations, particularly under Aragonese and Spanish rule in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Later alterations did not alter the original lines of the castle and walls, however.

\(^{704}\) Eduard Sthamer published the 120 Angevin diplomas from 1277 to 1284 outlining construction of the walls, towers, and castle at Manfredonia. See Sthamer, vol. 1, 133-168.
governance with a precision that [was] almost mechanical. If in the first case [the Hohenstaufen] we shall admire the grandiosity of intent, the artistic level and the effort of implementation, we cannot negate on the other hand our recognition that the mode of thought of Charles I turned with sage restraint only to the realizable, of a sovereign, that, who thanks to a tenacity without peer, with the aid of an enmeshed organizational administration, reached always with surefootness the goal that he proposed.\textsuperscript{705}

Like the other sites surveyed, and especially Lucera, the very construction process was a symptom of the emerging state Manfredonia in part integrated. Angevin construction projects in cities, both their processes and products, truly were inextricably linked to the state they were built to solidify.

As noted in the second chapter, the construction site at Manfredonia was comprised of administrators, both local and from other regions of the kingdom, and builders primarily from the surrounding areas. For most of the construction a judge named Benedetto of Manfredonia and another individual named Nicolo Trancredi of Foggia served as \textit{expensores} of the walls. By 1279, two individuals named Felicio de Vestris, presumably from the nearby town of Vieste, and Iohanni de Philippo de Esculo, a native of Ascoli Piceno in the Marche, served as \textit{expensores} of the castle and its five towers while two additional men identified as Giovanni Bruno and Giovanni Bullono worked as \textit{credenzerius}. As \textit{prothomagister operum curiae}, Pierre d’Angicourt occasionally enters the Manfredonia diplomas to measure and inspect completed works as well as to communicate provisions for the castle, towers, and walls “ordered” by the \textit{rex}.\textsuperscript{706} A host of other judges, notaries, \textit{vallecti}, and \textit{militi} also are present periodically in the documents to aid in procuring,

\textsuperscript{705} Haseloff, \textit{Architettura sveva}, 407.
\textsuperscript{706} Pierre was present at Manfredonia on at least five occasions: March 6, 1278, March 23, 1278, December 11, 1279, October 15, 1281, and September 9, 1283. See Sthamer, vol. 1, docs. 430, 431, 486, 528, and 537. The one instance where provisions are said to have come directly from the Charles I (“\textit{rex fieri precepit}”) dates to April 25, 1278 and regards the provisions for the construction of the cistern placed within a tower of the fortress. See Sthamer, vol. 1, doc. 436 (April 25, 1278).
inspecting, or disseminating information, as are the justices of Capitanata, most especially a figure called Guidoni who, too, was referred to as a knight (*militi*) in a diploma dated February 9, 1278.\textsuperscript{707} Of local builders, the most prominent throughout the work was Giordano of Monte Sant’Angelo. He appears to have remained head builder of all *magistri fabricatoribus* for the duration of work on the city’s walls.\textsuperscript{708}

The rich documentary and archaeological evidence for the walls, castle, and towers are deserving of their own dedicated study beyond the scope of this chapter.\textsuperscript{709} For now, though, a brief description of the project will provide a clearer image of the Angevin urban fabric of Manfredonia and its physical connections to other Angevin projects. The walls built by Giordano and his associate builders surrounded the city completely, including the coast, with the castle complex bearing five rectangular towers, two *palacii*, and terraces serving as the northeast corner of the walls as did the old Hohenstaufen palace served at Lucera’s fortress (fig. 1–25 and fig. 1–24).\textsuperscript{710} They fortified four large city gates “pro ingresset egressu” that faced respectively Monte Sant’Angelo to the northeast, Foggia to the southeast, the mountains to the north, and the Adriatic Sea directly south.\textsuperscript{711} Two smaller gates, both located along the coast, opened at the port and the area of the butchers.\textsuperscript{712} The wall measures approximately 2,400 meters in circumference, 8.434 meters (four rods) tall,

\textsuperscript{707} Sthamer, vol. 1, doc. 427.
\textsuperscript{708} In addition to the local builders for Manfredonia’s walls listed first in chapter 2 (Sthamer, vol. 1, doc. 431. March 23, 1278), two diplomas mention specifically wall builders from nearby Barletta working at the site. See Sthamer, vol. 1, docs. 427 (February 9, 1278) and 444 (October 25, 1278).
\textsuperscript{709} I currently am at work on this study.
\textsuperscript{710} For the construction of the walls, see De Pascalis, 111; Guarini, 32-33; Haseloff, *Architettura Sveva*, 387-407; and Nunzio Tomaiuoli, *Il castello e la cinta muraria di Manfredonia nei documenti del XVIII sec.* (Foggia: Atlantica Editrice, 1984), 20-25.
\textsuperscript{711} According to provisions set on November 3, 1277, each gate was to measure sixteen palms high (4.218 meters) and twelve palms wide (3.164 meters), and contain two arches *de bonis tufis*, one facing outward and another facing into the city. Moreover, each gate was to contain two doors made of “good and strong wood.” See Sthamer, vol. 1, doc. 423 (November 3, 1277).
\textsuperscript{712} These two smaller gates measured eight palms tall (2.109 meters) and six palms wide (1.581 meters). See Sthamer, vol. 1, doc. 423 (November 3, 1277).
1.318 meters (five palms) thick, and was made primarily of rubble and reused stone collected north of the wall and at vetus Siponto (fig. 4–34). Studies on the wall reasonably have asserted that Angevin Manfredonia may have been more compact, and possibly more orderly, than the original Hohenstaufen city. The primary evidence for such a claim is an Angevin diploma dated November 3, 1277 that stipulated reused stone for the new wall was to be procured in part from an area outside of the ruga de comite, the northernmost street parallel to the main axis, that included ruins of an older wall, domos cohóertas (buried? covered? houses), and a domos ex parte iudeorum. This order implies that some settlement, which included a Jewish population at some point, was located outside of the confines of the city but abandoned and subject to neglect. If so, the model of reduction bears resemblance to Muslim Lucera that occurred around the same time. As at Luceeria sarracénorum this reduction most likely was performed in order to facilitate control and ease the administration of the city, which included the construction of the wall itself.

A Turkish sack of the city in 1620 devastated much of the built and documentary record of life within the walls. Because of this, no known documents survive pertaining to the resettlement of populations, as at L’Aquila, or the parceling of Manfredonia’s city blocks that measure most regularly in the southwest section of the historic center (fig. 4–35). Inside the city Charles I reportedly ordered in 1270 the construction of a cathedral dedicated to Saint Lawrence. It was built in the center of the city on the ruga s. Laurenti, but destroyed completely by the seventeenth-century invaders. A completely rebuilt cathedral sits in the same location (4–28). Three decades later in 1300 Charles II supported the construction of...
an adjacent archbishop’s palace. Its completion tentatively has been dated to the second
decade of the century but the palace was destroyed, like the cathedral, in 1620.716

Records housed outside of the city indicate that the Angevin crown sponsored
mendicant foundations in Manfredonia as it did in the other important cities in the Regno. In
a sign of its regional importance, by the end of the thirteenth, beginning of the fourteenth
century the relatively compact city was one of only four cities in Capitanata with both
Franciscan and Dominican settlements.717 In fact, as at Lucera, representations of the two
orders oversaw the accounting of Muslim confiscated foodstuffs while stored temporarily at
Manfredonia (Appendix D). The Franciscans were present as early 1278 according to a bull
from Pope Nicholas II dated March 18, 1278.718 Six years later on February 5, 1284, Charles
I in a royal diploma allowed the order to sell two hundred salme of salt annually for their
needs. Moreover, between 1308 and 1309 the crown granted the sale of thirty salme of crops
for construction of a church dedicated to Mary.719 Unfortunately, though, no trace of this
foundation survives. Another Franciscan convent on the modern day via San Francesco
replaced it in 1348, but has been subject to numerous changes, including seventeenth-century
rebuild after the sack of the city, eighteenth-century alterations, and a heavy medieval-esque
restoration during the past century (fig. 4–36).

717 The others were Troia and Foggia, which possessed Franciscan and Dominican establishments, and Lucera
with its Dominican, Franciscan, and Augustinian foundations. See Pellegrini, “Gli ordini mendicanti in
Capitanata. Secoli XII-XIV,” 114.
718 Pellegrini, “Criteri insediativi,” 55.
719 For both concessions, see Kruger, 199. The 1284 concession was confirmed in 1292. See Maria Luisa
Located on a parallel street directly south to Manfredonia’s main axis, the so-called *ruma publica ecclesiae fratrum predicatorm* in a document dated 1311, the church of San Domenico is the sole religious structure in Manfredonia to retain any late medieval character (fig. 4–37). One of the numerous Dominican foundations dedicated to the Magdalen within the kingdom, construction on the church began around 1294, two years after a group of preachers moved to the city from Taranto and a year after three Dominicans named Padre Giovanni di San Martino, Pellegrino di Foggia, and Angelo di Termoli received a house provided by Charles II. In 1309, the year of his death, Charles II donated to the foundation bronze statues (“imaginem de metalli”) from Barletta to be melted and made into bells. Whereas the presence of bells provides no firm confirmation of completion, the fact that the church was used to reference the street two years later suggests that by this time the Magdalen was the most important extant monument along the artery.

San Domenico underwent major alterations during the seventeenth century like every other church in Manfredonia; however, it retains number of its late thirteenth- and early fourteenth- century features. Surviving details include the vaulted rectangular chapel of the Magdalen, the former east end of the medieval church, some remnants of the flanking walls, and the main portal of the west façade. Each surviving element fits into the Angevin patterns for construction and decoration outlined in this chapter and the previous two. For example, interior remnants of the Magdalen chapel, including the depiction of the Man of Sorrows within the “Gothic” traceryed piscina analogous to San Francesco in Lucera, reveal the circulation of small-scale sculpted pieces and styles as well as visual iconographies within

---


722 Krüger, 199.
the kingdom (fig. 4–38). This is unsurprising, especially within the setting, given the
importance of the Dominican foundation and the level of connectivity Manfredonia enjoyed
with the rest of the kingdom. Other surviving works within the chapel reveal like so many
other examples in Angevin churches that private commissions also adopted this “up-to-date”
visual culture as a sign of allegiance to the crown and status. These art works include a
fresco in which an unnamed patron praying before a manifestation of the Virgin and Child is
advocated by Saint Nicholas, an important saint because of his connection to merchants but
also because of his veneration by the crown, and a sepulchral slab from a notary named
Andrea from nearby Troia that features his personal heraldry that adopted the lily of the
Angevin crown paired with three six-petaled flowers (fig. 4–39 and fig. 4–40). The
objects or the individuals who created these works now could more easily be put onto a cart,
a mule, or travel between cities, creating certain homogenizing elements within buildings.
Moreover, the increase in communication between regions and cities meant that these
particular signs could be read and understood more easily by the individuals circulating
throughout them.

On the other hand, remnants of the actual church building—the rectangular shell in
which circulated objects, styles, and iconographies were presented—most likely were
indistinguishable from most buildings constructed for centuries in the area. Surviving
remnants of the medieval walls indicate that they were rubble faced with limestone ashlar
blocks, a method of wall building ubiquitous along the Apulian coast from Monte
Sant’Angelo to Lecce. Another fragmented fourteenth-century fresco inside the chapel

---

723 For parallels in other urban centers outside of Naples, see Caskey, *Art and Patronage*, 192-239.
724 The stone slab, approximately 1.55 long by .65 meters wide and 14 centimeters thick, includes the partly
degraded inscription, “Hanc sibi…davit…notarius urnam andreas cuius patris Troia…it.” Its date of manufacture
is unknown.
depicts Saint Dominic holding a model of the church. If the rendering is an accurate rendering of the building, the single aisle church also contained an octagonal belltower in tune with those at Lucera, L’Aquila, Altamura, Altomonte, and most especially Monte Sant’Angelo (fig. 4–41). Moreover, the surviving portal, capped like so many Angevin churches with the stemma of the dynasty, is nearly indistinguishable from those of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, save some updated gothicized elements through the diagonal splaying of jambs and archivolts and the pointed tympanum seen also in nearby Lucera’s portals (fig. 4–42). Like those of the former Muslim settlement, the product most likely was the result of a local builder who had come into contact with gothic forms either through travel or the circulation or smaller sculpted objects.

San Domenico, therefore, forms a similar pattern for Angevin building projects seen at other sites, including the walls and castle of the same city. The actual structure, the building shell, was decidedly vernacular for efficiency of projection. Signs of local manufacture with local materials included the projection of rubble walls faced with ashlar limestone and the gabled main portal, which shares so much in common with those in Lucera and elsewhere in Apulia. Its interior decoration, however, where single “authors” who circulated or copied circulated objects could produce rich semiotic fields, showed more continuity with the churches and artistic commissions of the greater kingdom. The piscina framed with tracery and containing a fresco of the Man of Sorrows, the tomb slab of Andrea da Troia that adopts the Angevin lily, and possibly even the fresco of the unnamed patron and Saint Nicholas praying before the Virgin and Child point to a “modernization” and

---
725 The style of portal, a hallmark of vernacular sculpture in the region, has been discussed extensively in chapters 1 and 2.
726 On the difference between single authorship and corporate authorship and its impact on art and architectural projects, see chapter 3.
circulation of art ideas throughout the Regno. Both of these elements operated under different technologies of production, leading to distinctive but complimentary results. Because of the system, not in spite of it, San Domenico shares much in common architecturally and artistically with the churches of Lucera. They not only were constructed under similar circumstances by the same production apparatus; they also were geographically close to one another. This meant that the two cities separated by approximately sixty kilometers of the via degli Abruzzi shared both a common royal-promoted visual culture and a similar vernacular architecture.

4. Cittaducale

Cittaducale, a small hill town nestled within Lazio’s northeast border with Abruzzo, is the final city surveyed (fig. 4–43). Positioned approximately ten kilometers southeast of the papal stronghold Rieti and fifty kilometers northwest of L’Aquila, the city was founded around 1309 as one of four new towns at the northern confines of the Regno (4-44). Built initially as a group to consolidate the frontier politically, socially, as well as economically, Cittaducale eventually became the most dominant of these cities founded at the Angevin

---

727 The earliest of these cities was Leonessa, founded in 1278, followed by Posta Reale, Cittaducale, and Cittareale. Another city, Porta Reale, was founded in 1329 but soon abandoned. Both Pierre d’Angicourt and Pierre de Chaule were present at times during the construction of Leonessa. See Andrea Di Nicola, “La fondazione di cittaducale e il controllo della montagna,” Bullettino della Deputazione abruzzese di Storia Patria (2007-2008): 475-481; and Alessandro Clementi, “La Formazione del confine settirionale del Regno di Sicilia al tempo dei primi Angioini,” in Celestino V e i suoi tempi: Realtà spirituale e realtà politica. Atti del 4° convegno storico internazionale L’Aquila, 26-27 agosto 1989 (L’Aquila: Centro Celestiniano, Sezione Storica, 1990), 65-66. On earlier Angevin attempts to consolidate and protect the north through the office of “Captain of the mountain,” a position institutionalized in the 1270s that was charged with surveillance of roads and passes on the frontier and protection of communities, see Di Nicola, 465-466.
terminus of the via degli Abruzzi.\textsuperscript{728} By the fifteenth century it had developed into an important center for wool and cloth production.\textsuperscript{729} Because of Cittaducale’s economic importance the city became the seat of a bishopric in 1503. It held this status until the office was suppressed in 1818.\textsuperscript{730}

Named after its reported founder Robert of Anjou, at that time the duke of Calabria,\textsuperscript{731} Cittaducale was one of the smallest and final new town projects under the Angevin crown. It also was one of the “purest,” as it was built \textit{ex novo} (to review, Lucera, L’Aquila, and Manfredonia all were redeveloped on previous sites) on a hill along the Velino river and the via degli Abruzzi (fig. 4–2). However, despite these noteworthy conditions, the formation of the city, and in particular its role within Angevin cultural and social economies, has been the subject of few scholarly studies. Archeological, historiographical, and modern political factors have contributed to the absence. In the realm of the archeological, significant earthquakes since the fourteenth century, a frequent hindrance for architectural study within the region as a whole, has done substantial damage to the medieval built environment.\textsuperscript{732} Of known fourteenth-century monuments, only portions of the city’s

\textsuperscript{728} The ancient via Salaria also ran through the area of Cittaducale and fellow new towns Cittarea and Posta. For the archaeological record of the road in this vicinity, see Niccolò Persichetti, \textit{Viaggio archeologico sulla via Salaria nel circondario di Cittaducale} (Rome: Tipografia della Reale Accademia dei Lincei, 1893), 34-46 and 151-153.

\textsuperscript{729} Sakellariou noted that in 1473 royal tax collectors determined the city wealthy, leading to an increase in the \textit{sommario}. Additionally, the assessment noted that an \textit{Arte della lana} had operated within the city for some time and that the city had been paying insufficient tax in relation to wealth for years. See Sakellariou, 348.

\textsuperscript{730} Once suppressed, Cittaducale’s church institutions fell under the jurisdiction of the Archdiocese of L’Aquila.

\textsuperscript{731} The continual subject of controversy, the oldest surviving textual indication that the city received its name in such matter dates to a 1343 bull in which Pope Clement VI authorized a Franciscan settlement in the area. Writing about the origins of the city, its increased growth, and the need for the order to preach to residents, Clement noted that the city received its name when “the King of Sicily, then Duke of Calabria, “ordered and made constructed and built” (“mandavit et fecit contrui et aedificari”) the city situated in the Diocese of Rieti at the confines of his kingdom that he declared be referred to for posterity under the name Città Ducale (“sub nomine seu vocabulo civitatem Ducalem censuit in posterum appelandom.”). For the bull, see Luca Wadding, ed. \textit{Annales minorum seu trium ordinum a S. Francisco institutorum} (Florence: Tipografia Barbèra, 1932), 7:606-607.

\textsuperscript{732} Cittaducale was plagued by many of the same earthquakes that have rocked L’Aquila. On earthquake damage to the city’s architectural patrimony, see Antonio Muñoz, “Monumenti d’Abruzzo. Cittaducale,”
cathedral, Augustinian church, captain’s palace and tower in the main square, surrounding walls, and defensive tower (next to the so-called “Porta Napoli”) survive. In addition, those monuments that do survive share architectural qualities more in tune with nearby cities L’Aquila and Rieti than Naples. This has meant that when Cittaducale’s surviving monuments have been analyzed and categorized, they have been so exclusively along geographical contexts rather than both the geographical and socio-historical. In order words, how these monuments share formal and structural qualities with local construction is addressed. The question of why that is the case, however, often has been neglected.

Moreover, Cittaducale’s early history suffers from a dearth of surviving documents. A wealth of royal documents pertaining to its construction where not published—unlike for Lucera, L’Aquila, and Manfredonia—prior to the destruction of the Angevin chancellery registers during the Second World War. Early documentary evidence of the city that survives includes a papal bull that address the city’s Franciscan as well as a number of unpublished notary documents drafted at the city’s Augustinian house. Because of this reality, studies of the city that do exist rely overwhelmingly on a sixteenth-century local chronicle composed by the historian Sebastiano Marchesi. This work, like so many local chronicles of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Italy, is overwhelmingly exceptionalist, however.

Finally, political issues of more recent making have added to Cittaducale’s separation from studies of the Angevin realm. A 1927 reorganization of Italian provinces led to the transfer of Cittaducale and the other Angevin frontier towns from the province of L’Aquila in

---


Abruzzo to the Province of Rieti in Lazio. Although this realignment occurred at a time when Italy already had been unified, and therefore it did not remove the city from the Regno, the rearrangement of provinces nonetheless shed part of Cittaducale’s southern status, as well as a level of its historical Angevin identity, to modern viewers and scholars.

These challenges, especially those of archeological and textual natures, also mean that whatever can be reconstructed of Angevin Cittaducale will be less complete than the other urban projects examined. For example, the details of who, specifically, populated the city are far murkier than those pertaining either to Lucera, which was repopulated by refugees and individuals from throughout the realm, or L’Aquila, whose populations came mostly from the surrounding castelli. In addition, surviving names of churchmen, builders, captains, or other noblesse de Robe responsible for the urban project do not exist. For the time being, Cittaducale’s early history very much is lost, and not much can be said in the way of historical details. However, the piecemeal evidence of medieval urbanism that does survive points strongly to Angevin patterns. These include its urban layout complete with a city wall system accessed by four gates, the use of vernacular architecture for the crown’s commissions, and the introduction of the mendicant orders. In fact, these patterns reveal that Cittaducale, one of the final royal new towns constructed, served as a culmination of Angevin regional consolidation. While smaller than the likes of Lucera, L’Aquila, and Manfredonia, its end product points to a perfection of sorts for the building and urban processes outlined throughout this dissertation.

Cittaducale’s status as an Angevin (or any) new town is revealed most strongly through the pronounced orthogonal plan still visible within the urban fabric (fig. 4–45 and fig. 4–46). Five long, straight longitudinal roads intersect with six cross streets on the slope
of a hill, creating a grid roughly 550 meters long and 160 meters wide.⁷³⁴ The central axis, now called the corso Mazzini, remains the most prominent road. It is eight meters wide instead of the four or five for other streets, and marked at its northeast terminus by the tower of the so-called “Porta Napoli,” the city’s gate which faced the road to the Regno’s capital (fig. 4–47 and fig. 4–48). The remnants of arcades on buildings along the road reveal that they once contained loggias. This reveals strongly, and perhaps unsurprisingly, that the road served as the major commercial street in tune with Manfredonia’s layout and other new towns Friedman outlined (4–49).⁷³⁵ A limestone archway on an edifice along the southwest end of the road still displays surviving Angevin heraldry (fig. 4–50). This proves an interesting discovery. Now a private home, the original purpose of the building is unknown. However, its position at the beginning of the city’s former commercial corridor, coupled with the presence of Angevin arms, suggests that it was some sort of storehouse or perhaps even customs house once possessed by the crown.

In keeping with many new towns of the era, the center of the Cittaducale is marked by a very large central square measuring approximately eighty-four meters long by approximately forty-four meters on the north side and fifty-five meters on the south side (fig. 4–51). Unlike L’Aquila, but in tune with smaller, more compact orthogonal plans, this was the only major square within the city; and it served as the location for all major civic, religious, and royal buildings during Angevin rule. By the middle of the fourteenth century the square contained what was then the communal church and later the cathedral (now called Santa Maria del Popolo), a porticoed palace for the captain of the city, an Augustinian convent, and at least the first level of a bell tower.

⁷³⁴ For a survey of the grid and its roads, see Friedman, Florentine New Towns, 112.
⁷³⁵ See also Festuccia, “Cittaducale, fondazione angioina,” 91.
The intersection of roads and the central piazza, therefore, created a city divided into quarters. In this sense the city plan operated like a reduced version of L’Aquila. Like L’Aquila, the populations for each quarter appear to have been drawn from the surrounding feudal territories consolidated into the city. Unlike L’Aquila, however, each and every castelli does not appear to have possessed its own parish church, or at least a parish clearly defined by a piazza and a fountain. In this sense Cittaducale’s grid is not as legible in regard to social ordering as that of the much larger Abruzzan city. In other words, Cittaducale’s urban layout does not reveal what populations settled the city as clearly as L’Aquila’s plan. This suggests that the individual castelli amalgamated at Cittaducale were less populous than those around L’Aquila and perhaps not large or significant enough individually to warrant division into geographically designated locali. The population overall of the northern frontier appears far lower than that of the province Capitanata or the area directly around L’Aquila, leading to new towns much smaller than those within the interior and along the coasts of the Regno. These lower populations “up North” also mean that the mendicant orders appear to have settled Cittaducale at a much slower pace, and consequently appear to have had much less of an institutional presence in the formation of the city than other more populated and perhaps more contested Angevin urban sites. By the middle of the fourteenth century the town possessed only two mendicant foundations in the vicinity: an Augustinian house located on its central square and a Franciscan convent positioned outside of the city walls.\footnote{The Franciscans were invited to settle on a plot outside of the city in 1343 according to Clement VI’s bull. The Augustinians were in the city at least by 1348 when a notary act was drafted in the Claustro Sancti Augustini. The city did include a Benedictine monastery dedicated to Saint Catherine of Alexandria, another important Angevin saint, by 1328, however. For the Franciscans, see Wadding, 7:606-607. For the notary document drafted at Sant’Agostino and the monastery of Saint Catherine, see Andrea Di Nicola, “Il più antico documento di Città Ducale contributo per datare la fondazione della citta,” Bullettino della Deptazione abruzzese di Storia Patria 81 (1981), 93-94.}
The consequence of this lack of visible social ordering combined with a lack of documentary evidence, however, is that the majority of the castelli, hamlets, and other territories consolidated into the city now are lost to history. The names of only a few fourteenth-century parish churches, and on occasion the communities responsible for constructing them, remain. For example, a number of unpublished fourteenth-century notary documents held in Rieti identify the parishes of San Antimo, which served the former residents of the castello Balviano in the Vomano river valley, and Santa Maria, which served the former residents of Cesoni thirty kilometers to the southwest of Cittaducale.\textsuperscript{737} Scholars have identified these two churches, in addition to two others dedicated to the Holy Cross and Saint John, tentatively as the city’s “capo di quarto” churches (fig. 4–52).\textsuperscript{738}

Despite the lack of information concerning Cittaducale’s religious communities, the architectural remains of the surviving churches and other remaining monuments reveal, nevertheless, the by now quite familiar characteristics of Angevin urban building that prioritized efficiency, speed, and soundness.\textsuperscript{739} While fragmentary and missing nearly all original ornament, surviving fourteenth-century churches by and large were single rectangular vessels with trussed roofs and flat, unadorned façades save a rose window and portals with round arched tympana. Buildings with these features include the church of Santa Maria del Popolo on the southern edge of the city’s piazza (fig. 4–53), the church of Sant’Agostino on the northern edge of the piazza (fig. 4–54), and the double-aisled church of

\textsuperscript{737} Di Nicola, “Il più antico documento,” 93-94.
\textsuperscript{738} The origins of the parishioners of San Giovanni and Santa Croce are unknown. A fifth church dedicated to Saint Nicholas was built by the former residents of Poggio Girardo according to an unpublished notary document dated July 14, 1314 now held at the monastery of Santa Caterina in Cittaducale. The physical fabric no longer survives, however. See Di Nicola, “Il più antico documento,” 93-94. On the division of quarters, see also Festuccia, “Cittaducale, fondazione angioina,” 92; and Fiore, 478.
\textsuperscript{739} Studies of Cittaducale’s monuments are scarce. See Muñoz, 35-48; and Gavini, 2:130-140.
San Giovanni that survived in ruins until the 1930s (fig. 4–55 and fig. 5–56). Revealing themselves to be the products of local builders, the façades specifically show resonances with the scuola aquilana west ends ubiquitous fifty kilometers to the south. Moreover, all three of these churches appear to have contained ribbed vaulting only in the apse area, a trait seen throughout the churches of the Angevin realm and other places where a lack of funds or time meant that only the most important section of the church received elaborate architectural articulation. At Santa Maria del Popolo a rectangular apse was vaulted while Sant’Agostino and San Giovanni contained polygonal apses (fig. 4–57 and fig. 4–58).

In terms of wall building, limestone, a common building material for the area, was the primary building block for construction of Cittaducale’s churches. Limestone rubble was employed as fill and ashlar blocks of somewhat irregular dimensions were used especially for facing and edges. This method of construction extended to the captain’s palace, parts of which still remain, the projection of the city’s walls, and the twenty-five meter tall tower beside the Porta Napoli (fig. 4–59 and fig. 4–60). According to the archeologist Marisanta Valenti, this type of construction has direct analogues to examples found at the thirteenth-century Augustinian house at Rieti, and at a later fifteenth-century Augustinian foundation in nearby Amatrice. If so, this points again to the trait of a certain “timelessness” to vernacular architectural methods seen most explicitly through the examination of Angevin Lucera. Moreover, the structural continuity between the surviving fourteenth-century churches and buildings of Cittaducale and those of the surrounding areas reveals once again

740 San Giovanni was abandoned after the earthquake of 1703 the led to so much damage in L'Aquila. See Muñoz, 44.
741 For the analogies between wall building at Cittaducale and Rieti, particularly between the churches of Sant’Agostino and Santa Maria del Popolo in Cittaducale and the churches of Sant’Agostino, Rieti, and Sant’Agostino in Amatrice, see Marisanta Valenti, “L’architettura sacra: S. Agostino e S. Cecilia: Analisi storica di alcuni particolari architettonici, restauro conservativo ed ipotesi di riuso,” in Cittaducale: Settimana dei beni culturali e ambientali. 27 settembre–4 ottobre 1981 (Rieti: Editrice il Velino, 1990), 111-121.
that Angevin urban projects sought long-standing local architectural solutions for regional ambitions.

5. Conclusions

The goal of this chapter was to examine three Angevin cities built both before and after rebuilt Lucera and compare their methods of construction and urbanization to the rebuilt and re-Christianized Apulian town. The examinations of all three cities—L’Aquila, Manfredonia, and Cittaducale—have aided in recognizing the pattern of Angevin urban renewal, and its regulated process, seen also at Lucera. Each city was built or revitalized for a different purpose: Cittaducale shored up the Regno’s frontier while also serving as the first point of contact with the crown’s northern allies; L’Aquila acted as an economic, cultural, and political hub between Florence, Naples, and all parts in between; Manfredonia provided the crown another Adriatic port, supposedly the “greatest between Brindisi and Naples,” and also connected the capital to its cities in the south of Apulia and the important pilgrimage site of Monte Sant’Angelo; and Lucera, or Civitas Sanctae Mariae after August 15, 1300, served as a major intersection between the north–south and east–west branches of the via degli Abruzzi as well as an advantageous source of propaganda in a world where religious and political were inextricable. What has been made clear is that none of these foundations was organic. Rather, they were planned and calculated urban projects. Moreover, while these cities were founded under different circumstances, the overall motivation for building each was the same. The end goal of these events was the consolidation of territory, economies, and power within the kingdom. The construction of these cities, therefore, served as local
solutions for greater regional ambitions. Unsurprisingly, the building process of each city mirrored overall Angevin strategies that employed local methods in the service of larger state goals. The constructions of these cities were both products of the state as well as microcosms of the state at every level. While they often adopted local architectural solutions for the sake of efficiency, they encompassed all of the crown’s administrative and bureaucratic apparatus, transportation infrastructure, and material resources. This particular aspect of their creations, however, often has been understated, ignored, or misunderstood because of a failure to see these cities within a network. This has been the result in general of a failure to see southern Italy in the Middle Ages as dynamic, self-sufficient, and integrated, a phenomenon in large part impressed onto the region from outside studies. It also is a consequence, however—as in the case of Cittaducale just examined—of local historiographical traditions created well after the Middle Ages that have emphasized local exceptionalism. For various reasons, these works, in almost every instance the product of local historians, remove their cities’ histories from wider, more multifaceted contexts and frameworks. The results of these local traditions are some of the strongest examples of Italian campanilismo manifested at the expense of regional shared histories and identities. The fifth and final chapter returns to Lucera and investigates in particular the issue of historiographical exceptionalism and its effect on the study of Angevin Italy. It examines specifically in the longue durée the cult of an Angevin art object, the wooden Madonna and Child known as the Patrona, housed within the Cathedral of Santa Maria Assunta.

742 Campanilismo, a term with no direct English translation but contains as its root campanile, or bell tower, expresses one’s particular attachment to local or civic identities over regional, superregional, or national allegiances. The concept dates at least to the Middle Ages, particularly in Northern Italy, where city-states often rivaled one another and rallied their citizens through symbolism of their bell towers.
Part II

Chapter 5
Angevin Cult, Cult of the Angevins, or Both? The Procession of the Santa Maria Patrona Statue

The purge of *Luceria sarracenorum* is commemorated every year in a four-day long celebration of the Feast of the Assumption on August 15. The festival centers on the veneration and multiple processions of the so-called *Santa Maria Patrona*, a freestanding wood and polychrome statue of the Virgin and Christ Child (fig. 5–1). The statue, today viewed as a palladium that commemorates the purge of the city’s Muslim population, possesses an ancient genealogy according to local legends. They state that the statue was rescued from Byzantine iconoclasts, brought to Lucera after 744, and then hidden (buried, to be specific) by the city’s bishop during Muslim settlement of the city. The *Patrona* supposedly remained under the protection of the depleted church until removed from its hiding place in celebration of Giovanni Pipino’s victory on August 15, 1300. The legends state also that a procession of the *Patrona* has taken place on the feast day every year since in thanksgiving of the Virgin’s rescue of Lucera from the Muslim yoke. Moreover, special processions and venerations of the statue have been performed in those times when the city’s very existence has been threatened: namely during earthquakes, plague, potential economic disaster, and war.

Given the above narrative, the activities surrounding *Santa Maria Patrona* appear ripe for engagement with increasing interest in medieval civic processions. Foundational studies on image processions in Rome particularly, but also in Byzantium and Northern Europe, provide frameworks through which the statue and its functions can be understood.
Much of this scholarly work describes how processed images—both painted and sculpted—were employed during the Middle Ages to demarcate sacred space or temporal presence, granting power to the individual, institution, or collective bodies who organized these rituals.\(^{743}\) For example, scholars including Hans Belting, Sible de Blauw, Thomas Noble, and Caroline Goodson have shown how medieval popes, especially during the early and high Middle Ages, employed stational liturgies and image processions to assert authority over the Roman landscape and its inhabitants.\(^{744}\) These rituals formed part of a comprehensive program to create and sustain what Noble called “the Republic of Saint Peter.” Moreover, work on Burgundian ceremonial processions during the late Middle Ages, a subject closer in time, if not space, to Lucera’s re-Christianization, has shown how the territories’ rulers
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appropriated local rituals and created new ones in order to project, if not truly assert, regional and state unity. In all of these studies the urban landscape served not only as the backdrop, but also the driving force for such processions. City and ritual were co-dependent during these events. The emerging urban landscapes were in need of performances that physically established borders and spatial networks. The processions, on the other hand, required articulated urban backdrops in order to make their functions as well as their powers both relevant and resonant. Within these theoretical frameworks, the local legends cited previously, and the imagery projected during the feast’s celebration to this day, it might appear that Lucera’s Assumption procession of the Patrona developed as an Angevin sponsored public ritual. Moreover, this procession, combined with the crown’s physical reconstruction of Lucera, the repopulation with subjects from elsewhere within the Regno, and the creation of religious and secular institutions that established power structures, might appear to have formed part of a comprehensive royal program that (re)invented local and regional identities for the newly re-Christianized city.

However, the Patrona statue and its Assumption ritual possess much more complicated histories than the legends make explicit. These stories are beset by a number of problems. The most glaring of all is that the statue is not as ancient as most of these stories


In reality, the *Patrona* belongs to a type of object employed exclusively during the Middle Ages in the Latin West: the so-called “Throne of Wisdom” statues. The earliest of these statues dates to the late tenth century, or roughly two hundred years after the reported translation of the statue from Byzantium to Lucera. In regard to the *Patrona*, iconographic and stylistic analyses show that an artist from southern Italy employing up-to-date northern, “Gothic” forms created the work some time between the end of the thirteenth and the first decades of the fourteenth centuries. This workmanship reveals that rather than being Byzantine, the *Patrona* statue very much is a product of the artistic environment nurtured by the Angevin crown’s consolidation of its kingdom.

The second problem with these legends is that they serve as the only pieces of “evidence” that the procession began as an Angevin ritual. In fact, the earliest written source that mentions the *Patrona* explicitly dates only to the early seventeenth century when the statue reportedly was housed on top of an altar within the cathedral. As will be revealed, surviving sources for the next century and a half describe the statue as “ancient,” “old,” or “venerated.” However, during this period how old was never elaborated; and ultimately the statue was described as stationary—that is, placed on top of an altar or within a niche—rather than used in procession. Recorded instances of processions involving the *Patrona* survive

---

747 The dating of this object according to these stylistic factors is widely accepted. As I will suggest in the following pages, the social history of the object supports this date as well. On its dating through stylistic and iconographic analyses, see Leone de Castris, *Arte di corte*, 162; Maria Stella Calò Mariani, “Le statue lignee,” in *Capitanata medievale* (Foggia: Claudio Grenzi Editore, 1998), 180-181; Maria Stella Calò Mariani, “Icone e statue lignee medievali nei santuari mariani della Puglia: la Capitanata,” in *Santuari Cristiani d’Italia: committenze e fruizione tra medioevo e età moderno*, ed. Mario Tosti (Rome: L’École française de Rome, 2003), 29-30; Maria Stella Calò Mariani, “Immagini mariane in Capitanata. Contributo sulla scultura pugliese fra XIII e XV secolo,” in 24 Convegno nazionale sulla preistoria–proistoria–storia della Daunia, San Severo 29-30 novembre 2003, ed. Armando Gravina (San Severo: Centro Grafico, 2004), 33-36; and Maria Stella Calò Mariani, “Santa Maria Patrona di Lucera: Devozione e arte,” in *Santa Maria, Patrona di Lucera: Storia, Arte, Devozione* (Foggia: Claudio Grenzi Editore, 2008), 85.

748 See chapters 2 and 3 on the issue of artistic circulation within the kingdom.

only from the eighteenth century. Moreover, reports between the beginning of the seventeenth century and the middle of the eighteenth century reveal that the residents of Lucera venerated the statue not as part of a fixed, consistent celebration—as is the case with the Assumption procession—but rather during particular moments of crisis. Earthquakes were the most frequent threat that required the statue’s apotropaic qualities, but the *Patrona* also became the focus of intense civic devotion in the seventeenth century when Lucera’s political situation became precariously close to changing. That political crisis ended in 1691, and by that point the statue was venerated as the *Patrona* of the city. The circumstances under which the statue received this title, however, appear to differ from what the later legends that attest its Byzantine origins report.

Presented within these contexts, any study of the *Patrona* statue and the Assumption procession is marked by a number of tensions that will be examined in this chapter. This chapter addresses two, although others undoubtedly exist. For one, a tension exists between the *Patrona* as a work of art—or more precisely a product of an Angevin cultural milieu as argued by Pierluigi Leone de Castris and others—⁷⁵⁰—and the statue as an important cult object for the residents of Lucera. The *Patrona*’s status as a sign of Angevin cultural reorientation and its value as a local cult object and palladium have been at odds at least since the

---

eighteenth century and most likely earlier. However, the recognition of this tension is a fairly recent development. It is the result of a “scientific” art history, which has included a series of twentieth-century restorations that removed layers of black paint from the Patrona, colliding with local practices and legends. Recognition of this tension, and more specifically recognition of the Patrona as a work of art in addition to a devotional image, holds considerable implications for how the statue should be understood within the context of Lucera’s re-Christianization, Lucera’s position as a cultural center during Angevin rule, and also for how this type of sculpture, especially within an Italian context, contributes to wider studies of Thrones of Wisdom that focus often exclusively on examples from northern Europe and the Pyrenees.

Second, a tension exists between the Assumption procession, its Angevin-centered imagery, and the veneration of the statue as patron in times of earthquake, plague, war, and near-economic disaster. Local legends that focus upon the Assumption ritual argue implicitly that the “original” procession of August 15, 1300 activated the statue’s ability to protect the city from other calamities. Records that predate the seventeenth-, eighteenth-, and nineteenth-century Assumption legends, on the other hand, suggest that the perceptions occurred in the reverse. They reveal that the object’s perceived ability to protect the city from natural disaster triggered retroactively its importance within the “Angevin” Assumption

---


752 Ilene Forysth’s 1972 study of Thrones of Wisdom remains the most comprehensive work on the objects. However, it pays no attention to Italy or those sculptures created in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. An appendix provides two citations for further study into Italian examples (those cited are G. Castelfranco, “Madonne romaniche in legno,” Dedalo III (1930), 768-778, and an exhibition catalogue from the Museo Poldo Pezzoli in Milan entitled Mostra di sculture ligneedi medioevali (Milan: Edizioni dell’Ente Manifestazione, 1957). These studies, however, had become somewhat outdated even by the time of Forsyth’s publication. See Ilene H. Forsyth, The Throne of Wisdom: Wood Sculptures of the Madonna in Romanesque France (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972).
procession. It is clear that the statue has been venerated as *Patrona* of Lucera at least since the seventeenth century. The question, not completely answerable, however, remains how and why the statue first attained this status.

This last point made exposes the overarching problem with the study of the *Patrona*. Disentangling contemporary sources written during the period they cover from invented “histories” written *ex post facto* is needed desperately.\(^753\) In fact, this is one of the greatest issues to affect the entire study of Lucera’s re-Christianization. While both discourses are due individual scrutiny, scholars and local historians often have not differentiated between events documented in time from those historical inventions written centuries after the events they reportedly cover. This has led to instances, for example, when eighteenth- or nineteenth-century inventions are treated as fourteenth-century sources.

Overall, this dissertation has spent many pages trying to disentangle, rectify, and analyze these two very different types of evidence. The analysis of how and why contemporary records and later histories reliant on inventions fused often has been illuminating. Any examination of the birth of the Assumption procession, which occurred only during the eighteenth century, is no different. Although not a medieval ritual, its evocation of the fourteenth century is telling. It reveals that modern Lucera identifies most strongly with the Angevin period of its existence. In a sense, the celebration of the Assumption procession shows that this period has been marked as Lucera’s “Golden Age,” an idea that may be justifiable, or at least understandable, when examining the city’s life in the *longue durée*.\(^754\) Moreover, that an “Angevin” ritual was created and promoted hundreds


\(^ {754} \) This term was used first by the French Annales School whose approach to historical research involved the examination of political, economic, and social structures over long periods of time.
of years later and without the aid or coercion of any Angevin king, prince, or courtier reveals that the city’s re-Christianization, a process that appears ongoing, has been taken over by its current citizens. As such, the reconstruction of Lucera, and the crown’s ultimate aims of establishing its royal legacy, were most successful.

These fundamental issues are examined throughout this chapter. First, I provide an overview of the Assumption procession and its modern interpretation by participants and scholars. Today the festival takes place over three days and includes not only two processions—a historical one with actors in medieval costume called the *corto storico* and a solemn religious one involving the *Patrona* statue—but also concerts by orchestras and popular music groups, fireworks, and a giant balloon set off into the sky representing the Virgin’s assumption to heaven (fig. 5–2). The festival in this current form has remained relatively unchanged since at least the mid nineteenth century. I argue that the annual celebration of the feast serves both as a link to *Civitas Sanctae Mariae*, Lucera’s urban development under the Angevins, as well as a means to address, and potentially alleviate, current civic challenges.

Next, I introduce the *Patrona* statue as work of art. I analyze the form and style of the freestanding statue and devotional object, and insert it as well as other Italian versions into the category of the so-called Thrones of Wisdom (*Sedes sapientiae*). Scholars who examine this type of statue often have focused on examples from France, the Pyrenees, and Germany. The *Patrona*, along with other “Thrones” found in important Angevin centers including Naples and L’Aquila, differs stylistically from those produced earlier on the Peninsula and contemporaneously in other urban centers. These examples are more “modern” than comparative examples in the South. This stylistic shift reveals that the
presence of new artists, works of art, and the means for their circulation within and throughout these powerful urban centers affected aesthetically a type of devotional object that had existed in Italy since at least the end of the twelfth century. In other words, the Patrona statue’s presence at Lucera and how it looks, especially after being stripped of later polychromy meant to create the illusion of its “Byzantine” identity, is a direct result of the freer exchange of goods, ideas, and individuals driven by Angevin consolidation. Thinking about the object in this way unveils one half of the key tension of art versus cult object highlighted throughout this chapter.

The final portion of the chapter reveals the second half of this tension by examining the veneration of the Patrona from the seventeenth through the early twentieth centuries. It is at this moment that the Assumption procession was codified as a regular feast commemorating the purge of Muslim Lucera by the Angevin crown. Employing ideas put forth by the historian Patrick Geary on the reconstruction of sacred value across time and space, I will show how the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century re-enlivening of the cult, spurred first in part by Lucera’s current political position within the Kingdom of Naples, involved the re-emphasis of the Angevin origins for the ritual and the city. I will do this by examining separately but in chronological order the recorded contemporary events of veneration and the ex post facto “histories” of the Patrona invented during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. Most scholars of the Patrona since the twentieth century have examined the cult chronologically as well. However, many treat equally both the events documented by contemporary accounts and moments invented by chroniclers ex post facto.755 For example, many current scholars begin their chronologies of the feast at the

755 Similar methodological pitfalls occur when treating historical biographies and hagiographies of saints equally. For this issue in regard to Saint Francis of Assisi, see André Vauchez, “Historiography and Biography:
date August 15, 1300, the day the Muslim purge began and Giovanni Pipino supposedly processed the statue of the Patrona. The oldest written source detailing this event dates only to the nineteenth century, however. Instead, I will present the events in the order in which they occurred—that is, from the moment a votive gift was offered or the year in which a chronicler or historian wrote about the statue. Analyzing the history of the cult in this way will reveal that as it gained steam during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, local writers began to invent solutions for the lack of historical information from earlier periods. In turn, the celebration of the Patrona itself and the visual imagery tied to the statue—now under the influence of these inventions—began to allay a new generation of writers’ concerns for the procession’s origins. In other words, by the nineteenth century an internal dialogue began to unfold between the chronicle writing tied to the cult and the actual performance of the rituals surrounding the Patrona. As Alexander Nagel and Christopher Wood have shown in other examples, the cult during these moments became reflexive, recursive, and “capable of interpreting itself.” Leading from this analysis the ultimate question can be asked of whether the codified Assumption procession is an Angevin cult, or a cult of the Angevins.

---


1. The Lucera Assumption Procession Today

The Assumption procession today is the culmination of a four-day-long festival dedicated to the Virgin’s feast day and founding of the Christian city. The evening of August 13 sets the historical context for the event. Lucera’s thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century history is conflated into a procession featuring horns, drums, and flag throwers that leads from the fortress to the cathedral. The first half of the procession represents the Hohenstaufen era of the city and includes actors portraying falconers, Muslim settlers, and Frederick II. The second half of the procession represents the city’s Angevin era and includes individuals playing Charles II and Giovanni Pipino.

The eve of the Assumption feast on August 14 sees the most solemn events during the festivities. During this ritual, the bishop of Lucera offers the Patrona—now dressed in a long brocaded veil and triple crown—a bejeweled lily and the keys to the city before Lucera’s mayor, the cathedral chapter, clerics, city officials, police, military, and the festival

---

757 The feast arose out of narratives known in the East by the mid fifth century and in the West by the sixth century detailing Mary’s death and assumption to Heaven. Three early versions of the Assumption were available in the West, including the narrative located in Gregory of Tours’s Liber in Gloria martyrium, and the most popular version, the so-called Gospel of Pseudo-Melito that recounted the events as follows: After Mary’s death, her body was processed through the streets of Jerusalem by the apostles. John led carrying a palm. Peter and the other apostles carrying Mary’s body followed him, singing, “Israel has come out of Egypt. Alleluia” [Psalm 113:1]. A great cloud with a choir of angels also accompanied the procession. Once Mary’s body was placed in her tomb outside of the city, Christ appeared with the angels to ask the apostles what to do with her. They replied, “Raise up the body of your mother and take her with you rejoicing in Heaven.” Christ agreed, uttering the words, “Arise (surge), my love (proxime mea), my dove (columba mea), my tabernacle of glory, vessel of life, celestial temple; because you did not suffer the stain of sin through intercourse, you shall not suffer the dissolution of the body in the grave.” The narrative was treated in the West as part of the Apocrypha, and therefore not part of the liturgy until the seventh century. It was adopted in Constantinople during the reign of the emperor Maurice (582-602) under the title Dormition. Prior to the year 1000, the August procession that replicates the narrative appears to have been celebrated in the West almost exclusively in Rome. Pope Sergius (687-701) introduced the feast to the city and the feast spread north of the Alps only after the emperor Otto III participated in the Rome procession during the year 1000. On the history of the feast and the early processions, see Rachel Fulton, “Quae est ista quae ascendit sicut aurora consurgens?: The Song of Songs as the Historia of the Office of the Assumption,” Medieval Studies 60 (1998), 55-57; and Fulton, From Judgment to Passion: Devotion to Christ and the Virgin Mary, 800-1200 (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 269-273.

758 The video for 2012 procession can be found at www.newsetvlucera.it/notizia5635.htm.
committee. Both the historical procession and the solemn one aim to recreate the city’s Angevin re-founding, and the act of presenting keys to Virgin replicates the legend that Charles II presented iron keys to the *Patrona* during a trip to the city in 1304. The statue then is brought to the cathedral’s piazza where a large balloon is set into the air to commemorate the Virgin’s assumption into heaven.

Currently, the procession of the *Patrona* statue occurs on the evening of August 16. Reflecting the city’s social order, the convoy departs from the cathedral and it is led by the city’s bishop, mayor, and clergy. The statue, carried on a platform, then follows, and is trailed by the rest of the procession comprising of civic leaders, the police, the *Carabinieri*, members of the city’s religious orders, and the civic confraternities (fig. 5–3). Statues of important local saints, including the Archangel Michael, Blessed Augustine Kažotić, Francesco Antonio Fasano, Anthony Abbot, and Roch, also join the procession occasionally.

At the conclusion of the procession, an orchestra performs “Ave Maria.”

The Assumption procession today is not only a link to the past; it also addresses Lucera’s very real contemporary concerns. For example, during the 2012 celebrations,

---


760 Numerous studies have examined the relationship between participants in civic processions and a region’s social order. In most cases, the observed order of participants in processions reflects the social order rather than countering it. See Richard Trexler, “The Construction of Regional Solidarities in Traditional Europe,” in *Religion in Social Context in Europe and America, 1200-1700* (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002), 424; Don Handelman, *Models and Mirrors: Towards an Anthropology of Public Events* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); and Gabriel Guarino, *Representing the King’s Splendour: Communication and Reception of Symbolic Forms of Power in Viceregal Naples* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), chapter 2.

761 Other saints that have been involved in the procession include Santa Anna di Cappuccino, San Pasquale dal Salvatore, Saint Anthony of Padua, Saint Michael, Saint Cecilia, and Saints Cosmas and Damien.

762 David Kertzer has argued that rituals both link the past to the present and link the present to the future. He argued that “this helps us cope with two human problems: building confidence in our sense of self by providing us with a sense of continuity…and giving us confidence that the world in which we live today is the same world
Lucera’s residents asked for the Virgin’s intercession to prevent the closure of the city’s tribunal and the serious reduction of services for its hospital. The 2012 processional route reflected these concerns, incorporating the court located near the monastery of San Francesco and the hospital north of the old medieval walls. The remainder of the course travelled past the Piazza San Giacomo along the east edges of the medieval city; the Porta Foggia, the city’s west gate; the Piazza San Leonardo near Lucera’s Augustinian foundation; and the Piazza del Carmine northeast of the cathedral. Addressing directly the fear of losing the city’s tribunal and hospital, Lucera’s bishop, Monseigneur Domenico Cornacchia, proclaimed to the faithful after the procession, “I wish to express not only in words, but also in deeds, that I am your Cyrene. I want to bear your cross, especially for those who cannot: the sick, the unemployed, and those who help those like the employees of the hospital and the tribunal.”

Previous processional routes were more stable. According to the local historian Enrico Venditti, living along the so-called “strada di processione” in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was of great prestige, and houses along the route commanded higher rents. At that point the processional passed through the city’s other medieval gates, including the Porta Troia to the south and Porta San Severo to the north, where it stopped and blessed the agricultural fields in the distance. The various neighborhoods surrounding each

---

763 www.newsetvlucera.it/notizia5640.htm. His speech, in the original Italian, read, “Desidero manifestare non solo a parole, ma con fatti, che sono il vostro cireneo. Sento di portare la vostra croce, specie quella di coloro che non ce la fanno, dei malati, dei disoccupati, di quelli che temono per il proprio posto di lavoro come per i dipendenti dell’ospedale, del prestigioso Tribunale di Lucera e di quelle realtà lavorative a rischio sopravvivenza. Fra qualche istante, in un minuto di silenzio, riascolteremo il tocco delle campane a morto della nostra chiesa madre. Volevamo sentirle a festa, come il giorno di Pasqua; speriamo che sia solo rimandato e non solo un sogno questo desiderio.”

gate waved banners and competed with one another over which area could welcome the
*Patrona* most enthusiastically.\(^{765}\)

For much of its history the *Patrona* has been venerated also outside of these
processions in times of civic distress. Contemporary records note that the statue was
venerated after earthquakes in 1627, 1688, 1702, 1731, 1805, 1832, 1851, and following a
cholera outbreak in 1837 and a drought in 1843.\(^{766}\) In the last two instances, the statue of the
Virgin reportedly moved its eyes from left to right and up toward the heavens, turned toward
the figure of the Christ Child, and then bent from the main altar of the cathedral toward the
faithful praying before the statue.\(^{767}\) The statue also has been venerated in times of political
upheaval and war. One particular episode dates to 1799 when the French general Guillaume
Philibert Duhesme threatened to burn and raze Lucera after Sanfredisti within the city,
members of the anti-Partenopean Republic movement led by Cardinal Fabrizio Ruffo,
murdered the officer’s quartermaster. The bishop, chapter, magistrates, court, and nobles
processed with the statue from the Porta Troia at the southern entrance of the city toward
advancing troops. At the sight of the statue and the solemn procession of Lucera’s citizens,

---

765 Idem.
766 Earthquake data gathered by the Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia can provide some sense of
the devastation to areas in and around Lucera. The 1627 earthquake (July 30), whose epicenter was in the
Gargagno, measured approximately 6.66 on the Moment Magnitude Scale; the 1688 earthquake (June 5,
epicenter near Benevento) 6.98; the 1702 earthquake (March 14 near Benevento) a 6.54; the 1731 earthquake
(March 20 in Foggia) a 6.52; The 1805 quake (July 26 in Molise) a 6.62; and the 1851 quake (August 14 in
Basilicata) a 6.38 on the scale. The data can be found at the Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia,
“Catologo parametro dei terremoti italiani (dal 1000 al 2006),” http://emidius.mi.ingv.it/CPTI11/.
767 The 1837 event was documented in a canonical process to prove the miracle held at the Archivio Storico
Diocesano in Lucera (*Lucerina super assertis miraculis intercessione Beatae Mariae sempere Virginis
praecipue elapse anno MDCCXXVII*). See Dionisio Morlacco, “Il culto di Santa Maria Patrona,” in
Trincucci (Foggia: Litostampa, 2007), 214; and Massimiliano Monaco, “Il culto della Vergine Patrona nella
Città di Lucera,” in *Santa Maria Patrona di Lucera: Storia, arte, devozione*, ed. Massimiliano Monaco (Foggia:
the advancing troops were said to have retreated.768 More recently, the Patrona’s protection was invoked during the Second World War when the nearby city of Foggia was destroyed during Allied air raids in 1943. Aediculae with replicas of the Patrona bearing the inscription Santa Maria ora pro nobis anno di Guerra 1943 (“Holy Mary, pray for us, year of the war 1943”) still survive throughout the confines of the city (fig. 5–4).

Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Lucera’s local historians argued that the civic veneration of the Patrona dates as far back as the eighth century when monks fleeing Byzantine iconoclasm introduced Marian image cults to Italy.769 Overall, the purpose of emphasizing this legend was to legitimize the authenticity of the Patrona as a miracle-working image through a distinguished historical genealogy. Moreover, the legend was used to underline the statue’s physical durability when faced with extinction. According to these writers, a Lucera bishop named Marco brought a Byzantine statue of Mary from Rome in 744, placing it within a niche of the derelict cathedral. The statue supposedly reinvigorated the city and the diocese; and numerous churches and plots of land around the city were dedicated to the Virgin. Some contemporary sources, indeed, attest to early Marian devotion in the city. According to one ninth-century notarial document, a forest in the


769 This aspect of the Parona legend coalesced after 1861 with the publishing of Giambattista D’Amelj’s Storia della città di Lucera. See Giambattista D’Amelj, Storia della città di Lucera (Lucera: Ed. Scepi, 1861), 227-228; Vincenzo Coletti, Indagini storiche sopra Lucera (Pompeii: Scala tipografica pontificia per I figli dei carcerati, 1934), 89; Morlacco, “Il culto di S. Mari Patrona,” 201; and Monaco, “Il culto della Vergini Patrona nella città di Lucera,” 18, note 24.
vicinity of the city was named in honor of the Virgin by 833. Moreover, by 1068 the cathedral was dedicated to the Virgin according to a donation made to the church.

None of these earliest sources mention a Marian image cult, however. All documentation of a “Byzantine” image at Lucera dates from after the seventeenth century. In addition, all “news” of the Patrona’s Byzantine identity within the context of the Assumption procession begins with the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century chroniclers themselves. In addition to their previous claims, these writers noted that Lucera’s successive thirteenth-century bishops hid the statue after Frederick II transported Muslim settlers to Lucera.

According to their narratives, the Patrona remained hidden until the night of April 15, 1300 when Aymardus, bishop of the city since 1295, uncovered the statue. These writers then claimed that Giovanni Pipino’s soldiers led the statue in procession on the battlefield in celebration of their initial victories at Luceria sarracenorum.

What can be seen from this quick survey of the Patrona’s ritual life is that the statue’s history as a cult object is depicted anachronistically. Chroniclers writing after the solidification of the cult invented historical origins for the statue that reached back more than a millennium. This was done in order to explain the Patrona’s brown appearance, its powers and desireability as a venerated object, and also its role within the fairly recently established

---

770 Francesco Nitti di Vito, Le pergamene di S. Nicola di Bari, vol. 4 of Codice diplomatico barese (Trani: Vecchi, 1900), 468. The forest was known as the Woods of Saint Mary of the Episcopal Seat. See also Morlacco, “Il culto di Santa Maria Patrona,” 199.

771 The document stated that in a public ceremony, a woman named Dumnana donated her goods the church of Santa Maria of Lucera, cathedral of the Bishop Lanzo. See Francesco Cara dellese, l’Apulia ed il suo commune nell’alto medioevo (Bari: Società di Storia Patria per la Puglia, 1960), doc. 13. See also Morlacco, “Il culto di Santa Maria Patrona,” 199-200.


773 Morlacco, “Il culto di Santa Maria Patrona,” 202. Aymardus was a real figure and served as bishop of Lucera from December 12, 1295 until June 9, 1302. On his episcopacy at Lucera, see chapters 1 and 2 of this dissertation.

774 See Gian Battista Gifuni, Origini del Ferragosto lucerino. Con un appendice sul Duomo angioina e sulla statua del suo fondatore (Lucera: T. Pesce, 1932), 20; Morlacco, “Il culto di Santa Maria Patrona,” 202-203;
Assumption procession. This issue is the major theme for the final section of this chapter, which returns to these writers and assess their impact on the Patrona cult today.

2. The Patrona as a Work of Art: Thrones of Wisdom North and South of the Alps

As argued above, Lucera’s historians have posited since the nineteenth century that the Patrona statue was Byzantine in manufacture (fig. 5–5). This provenance only recently has been challenged, as centuries of polychromy—including layers of dark paint added to the figures’ hands and faces sometime before the early eighteenth century—was removed during a series of twentieth-century restorations.\textsuperscript{775} These results effectively problematized the idea that the statue was Byzantine in origin, most especially since those claims relied fully on the idea that the statue’s dark polychrome signified its “eastern” origins. Unwilling or unable to dismiss earlier local legends when confronted with a new “scientific” art history, postwar writers on Lucera’s cult have posited that the current sculpture replaced the much older, but now lost monument rescued from Byzantine iconoclasts.\textsuperscript{776}

\textsuperscript{775} The statue first was restored in 1936 and then again in 1999. The 1936 restorations were conducted by Enrico Vivio and supported by the Commune and the Soprintendenza ai Monumenti Nazionali. During this restoration the left arm of the Christ Child was restored as well as the back of the figure’s head damaged by woodworm. The Virgin’s right hand and missing fingers on her left hand also were restored. Most dramatically, the 1936 restoration removed the layer of dark polychrome along the figures’ hands and faces, revealing a pinkish complexion that Vivio argued was the “colore primitivo.” The 1999 restoration removed this second layer, exposing another that is darker, most likely from the varnish (rosy cheeks underneath the varnish suggests that the tone once was lighter). The 1999 restorations also removed red, white, and blue brocaded polychrome on the statue’s clothing, uncovering the gold gilded dress seen today. At some point during the restorations curly locks added to the figure of the Christ Child were removed as well. On the restorations, see Enrico Vivio, “Il restauro della statua lignea di S. Maria Patrona e dal crocifisso della cattedrale,” Bollettino della Diocesi di Lucera 33, no. 5-6 (1938), 90-93; Franco Schettini, “La Madonna angioina di Lucera,” Corriere di Foggia (August 15, 1948), 3; Giuseppe Trincucci, “Il nuovo volto della statua di Santa Maria Patrona,” Il Centro (July 31, 1999), 3; and Maria Stella Calò Mariani, “Santa Maria Patrona di Lucera: Devozione e arte,” in Santa Maria Patrona di Lucera: storia, arte, devozione, ed. Massimiliano Monaco (Foggia: Grenzi Editore, 2008), 85.

\textsuperscript{776} For this argument, see Monaco, “Il culto della Vergine Patrona nella città di Lucera,” 16-18; and Morlacco, “Il culto di Santa Maria Patrona,” 20.
No “Byzantine” statue ever existed, however. This is proven by the combination of four interconnected explanations. The first is the statue’s restoration. It showed that the Patrona’s “flesh” originally was not brown, the sole supporting physical “evidence” for the statue being Byzantine. The second explanation is that scholars now understand many Marian images invented ancient, often Byzantine heritages during the Counter-Reformation.

Substantiating these new heritages included composing legends and in some cases darkening pigments.\textsuperscript{777} The third is that the Iconoclastic Controversies, a major plot point within the Patrona legend, did not occur in the manner as once widely accepted. Recent scholarly

\textsuperscript{777} Overall, the majority of medieval “Black Madonnas” appear to have been darkened during the early modern period for the sake of strengthening sacred genealogies. Against the grain of a vast number of other explanations for the significance of these objects (reasons given have included that their color is the result of environmental effects, the occult or alchemy, their production in Egypt, the influence of surviving ancient cults, or the product of a literal reading of Song of Songs 1:1-16 (\textit{Nigra sum sed formosa filiae Jerusalem sicut tabernacule Kedar, sicut pelles Salmonisi}—“Black am I, yet lovely, daughters of Jerusalem, like the tents of Kedar, like the tent curtains of Solomon”), Xavier Baral i Altet has argued convincingly that a number of “Black Madonnas,” including the Madonna at Montserrat in Catalonia and an example at Le Puy-en-Velay destroyed during the French Revolution were painted at some point during the sixteenth century in order to assign the them Byzantine origins (for example, following its painting, the legends surrounding the Virgin at Le Puy stated that the statue was carved in the tenth century and brought back from crusade in Egypt by Louis IX). Through an examination of fifteenth-century miniatures (\textit{The Golden Book of Margaret of Austria} at the Staatsbibliothek in Vienna in the case of the statue at Le Puy and a late fourteenth-, early fifteenth-century illustration in the library of Montserrat for the Virgin at the Catalan monastery), he showed that both statues possessed light hands and faces in preceding centuries. He noted that the need for images of “Byzantine origin” resulted from Counter-Reformation’s emphasis on the ancient heritage of devotional images. See Xavier Barral i Altet, “I volti scuri: una questione irrisolta dell’arte religiosa medievale,” in \textit{I santi venuti dal mare}, ed. Maria Stella Calò Mariani (Bari: Mario Adda, 2009), 265-276. On the invention of ancient genealogies for image cults during the Counter-Reformation, see Marie Durand-Lefebvre, \textit{Étude sur l’origine des Vierges noires} (Paris: G. Durassie & C., 1937); Nagel and Wood, 204-207; and Kirstin Noreen, “The Icon of Santa Maria Maggiore, Rome: an Image and its Afterlife,” \textit{Renaissance Studies} 19, no. 5 (2005), 660-672. For the now-destroyed Black Virgin from Chartres Cathedral darkened most likely between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to connect it to ancient druid worship and as a consequence claim Chartres the oldest church in France, see James Bugslag, “Pilgrimage to Chartres: The Visual Evidence,” in \textit{Art and Architecture of Late Medieval Pilgrimage in Northern Europe and the British Isles}, eds. Sarah Blick and Rita Tekippe (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 143-147. Other examples of Black Madonnas include the Holy Face of Lucca, the Madonna of Guadalupe in Basque Country, the Chostockowa icon, and the \textit{Madonna Nera} in Loreto. For alternative explanations of “Black Madonnas,” see Malgorzata Olezkiewicz-Peralba, \textit{The Black Madonna in Latin America and Europe: Tradition and Transformation} (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2009); and Lucia Chiavola Birnbaum, \textit{Black Madonnas: Feminism, Religion, and Politics in Italy} (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1993). The explanation that the Byzantine origin of the \textit{Patrona} statue was tied directly to its black coloring and vice versa is supported by a comparative Black Madonna, “La Sipontina,” now held at the Cathedral of Manfredonia. Local legends dated the statue to the sixth century. It recently was restored to its original lighter hue and carbon dated to the second half of the thirteenth century. For the announcement of the restoration of the statue, see Franco Rinaldi, “L’antica statua “Sipontina” è tornata, dopo il restauro, al suo antico splendore.” \textit{Manfredonia24} (March 28, 2012) http://wwwmanfredonia24.net/2012/03/28/lantica-statua-sipontina-e-tornata-dopo-il-restauro-al-suo-antico-splendore/.
works complicate centuries of misunderstandings about the period. Lastly, but most critically, there are no surviving, datable eighth-century statues from the Byzantine world. Together, these four explanations reveal that the current statue was darkened, sometime before the eighteenth century, and that this attempt to “Byzantinize” the statue was grafted onto a historiographical tradition of Eastern iconoclasm, much of which was either invented or exaggerated. In the process of creating this new genealogy a fundamental aspect of the *Patrona* statue was lost, however. Whereas the attention of local legends has rested on legitimizing the image as an ancient palladium, the *Patrona*’s artistic value, and its contribution to the larger issue of Angevin artistic circulation examined throughout this dissertation, has not received significant attention. The reality is that this aspect of the *Patrona* is far more illuminating than its cult to studies on thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Angevin political, cultural, and social influence within the Regno. The *Patrona* festival was initiated centuries after the dissolution of the dynasty.

Standing at 129 centimeters, the freestanding, wood, polychrome, and gilded *Patrona* belongs to a class of western devotional objects called Thrones of Wisdom (fig. 5–6). Depicting the Virgin and Child enthroned, these sculpted works, most of which measure between two and four feet in height, are totally different in terms of form, style, or iconography from any known objects venerated in Byzantine lands—another sobering

---

778 Thomas Noble has contributed some of the most recent work on the subject. He has argued that iconoclasm in the East was “uneven, episodic, and never as devastating in human or material terms as formerly believed.” He added that many of the same uneven, episodic debates occurred in the West as well. On the dichotomy commonly constructed that presents Byzantium as totally iconoclastic and the West as totally iconodule, he argued that, “we are not dealing with the bizarre and inexplicable asymmetry of a civilizational shock at one end of the Mediterranean that produced only a ripple at the other end.” See Thomas F. X. Noble, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 5. For a revisionist history of Iconoclasm in Byzantium, see also Leslie Brubaker, *Inventing Byzantine Iconoclasm* (London: Bristol Classical Press, 2012).

779 Until this point only Leone de Castris and Calò Mariani have discussed the statue as an artistic product. See Leone de Castris, *Arte di corte nella Napoli angioina*, 161-162; Calò Mariani, “Le statue lignee,” 180-183; and Calò Mariani, “Santa Maria Patrona di Lucera: Devozione e arte,” 85.
Revelation for Lucera’s legends.\textsuperscript{780} The earliest, of German and French manufacture, date to some time between the end of the tenth and first half of the eleventh centuries.\textsuperscript{781} The period

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{780} Hans Belting and Pierluigi Leone de Castris have established a dichotomy between the veneration of freestanding statues in the West and panel paintings in the East, particularly during the early and high Middle Ages (Belting, among others, does acknowledge that panel paintings had been venerated in Rome since the early Middle Ages). Belting has argued that Thrones of Wisdom are “a type of Western cult figure that stands in total contrast to the Eastern icon.” Leone de Castris went as far as to argue that some medievales were conscious of the differences between freestanding statues and panels, employing them as representations for each respective Christian denomination. He has suggested that freestanding wood sculptures were introduced to Basilicata during the late twelfth century following the establishment of important Benedictine monasteries in the region, including those at Venosa, Banzi, Irsina, and Montescaglioso. The establishment of the monasteries formed part of the region’s “Latinization” (like much of southern Italy and Sicily, Basilicata long had been part of the Byzantine Koiné), and Leone de Castris argued that the introduction of sculpture was intended to serve as a direct counter to local veneration of “Greek” panel paintings. Whether this distinction was self-conscious is debatable due to lack of documentary evidence. However, statistical data of important devotional images in southern Italy does reveal correlations between areas more culturally “Greek” or “Latin” and the type of devotional images venerated. Using data gathered by the Dominican preacher Serafino Montorio’s early eighteenth-century survey of Marian devotional images in the Kingdom of Naples (Zodiaco di Maria, 1715), Leone de Castris gathered that eighty-eight percent of devotional images venerated in Calabria were panels. In the area around Otranto (southern Apulia), one of the most culturally Greek lands in southern Italy, panel paintings comprised ninety-four percent of venerated images. Areas where western cultural currents had integrated more successfully counted closer ratios between panel and sculpture. For example, in Basilicata, sixty percent of images were painted. In Capitanata, fifty-four percent were panels. Of course these numbers only reveal part of the story, as they include images created after the thirteenth century, the period in which the dichotomy between sculpture and panels, at least in the West, certainly broke down. One of the most extraordinary examples of this breakdown is Coppo di Marcovaldo’s thirteenth-century Madonna panel at Santa Maria Maggiore in Florence. It combines a relief of the Madonna and Child enthroned with a panel depicting the twelve apostles, angels, the Virgin’s throne, the Annunciation, and the Mary’s at the tomb. Other examples include the Madonna and Child at Alatri (ca. 1250), which combines a freestanding Throne of Wisdom with a carved wooden panel. For the dichotomy between sculpture and panel, West and East, see Belting, Likeness and Presence, 387; and Pierluigi Leone de Castris, “Le origini, dal XII al XIV secolo,” in Scultura lignea in Basilicata: dalla fine del XII alla prima metà del XVI secolo (Turin: Umberto Allemandi & Co., 2004), 3. On the ratios between sculpture and panel in southern Italy, see Pierluigi Leone de Castris in Scultura in legno in Calabria: da medioevo al settecento (Pozzuoli: Paparo, 2009), 27. See also Serafino Montorio, Zodiaco di Maria, ovvero le dodice province del Regno di Napoli (Naples: Paolo Severini, 1715). Serafino Montorio’s work will form an important part of my analysis of the historiographical tradition surrounding the Patrona statue later in this chapter. On Coppo di Marcovaldo’s panel, see Belting, Likeness and Presence, 387. On the Alatri statue, see Henk van Os, Sieneaes Altarpieces, 1215-1460: Form, Content, Function, trans. Michael Hoyle (Groningen: Bouma’s Boekhuis, 1984), 1:14-15. On the rise of panel paintings in thirteenth-century Italy, particularly in altarpieces, see van Os. Beth Williamson recently has challenged some of van Os’s conclusions. See Beth Williamson, “Altarpieces, Liturgy, and Devotion,” Speculum 79, no. 2 (2004), 341-406.\textsuperscript{781} Some of the oldest Throne of Wisdom statues include the statue from Clermont-Ferrand dated to the middle of the tenth century, the golden Madonna of Hildesheim (first quarter of the eleventh century), and the Madonna of Paderborn (1051-1076). The Clermont-Ferrand statue, which also functioned as a reliquary, was melted down in 1793. An image of the statue survives in a text dating from the late tenth, early eleventh centuries (Clermont-Ferrand, Bibliothèque Municipale, ms. 145, fol. 130v-134v). See Ilene Forsyth, The Throne of Wisdom, 31; and Forsyth, “Magi and Majesty: A Study of Romanesque Sculpture and Liturgical Drama,” The Art Bulletin 50, no. 3 (September 1968): 215-218. The Essen Madonna, the oldest surviving freestanding statue of the Virgin created between 973 and 982, is not always classified as a Throne of Wisdom. It is gilded and the cloisonné enamel was used for the eyes of the Virgin and Child. It is now housed in the treasury of Essen Cathedral. See Montserrat Pages i Paretas, “Les origines de la statue de la Vierge a l’Enfant romane,” in Romanes et Gothiques: Vierges a l’Enfant restaurees des Pyrenees-Orientales, ed. Jean-Bernard Mathon.
of their greatest production as well as their spread to other regions, including Catalonia and Italy, occurred during the twelfth century.

Scholars have continued to debate the impulse for these statues’ development and dissemination. Ilene Forsyth, who in 1972 produced the most comprehensive work on the statues, has argued that the increased interest in the concept of Christ’s Incarnation, the rise of the Virgin Mary as the intercessor par excellence, and the Virgin’s maternal role as a vessel, or “throne,” for Christ as Word (Logos) required a visual manifestation. In fact, some of these priorities, especially the notion of the Virgin as vessel, were expressed

(Milan: Silvana Editore, 2011), 17; and Frank Fehrenbach, Die Goldene Madonna im Essener Münster: Der Körper der Königen, eds. Michael Bockemühl, Jörg van den Berg, and Karen van Berg (Ostfildern: Edition Tertium, 1996). The ninth-century reliquary of Saint Faith at Conques also serves as a sort of prototype for the statues, as do freestanding Carolingian ruler statues made of wood and sheathed in precious metals, stucco, and sometimes stone. In his Liber miraculorum Sancte Fides (early eleventh century), the theologian Bernard of Angers noted that neighboring regions including Auvergne, Rodez, and Toulouse also possessed statues of local saints made of gold, silver, and other metals. These included a statue of Saint Gerard made of gold and stones. Bernard noted that it contained “an expression so human that the simple people sense[d] that they [were] being watched by the gaze of an inquisitor and they pretend[ed] that it wink[ed] at pilgrims whose prayers it answer[ed].” Martin Büchsel has argued that Bernard’s initial reaction to the statues suggests that they were not common before the year 1000. See Bernard of Angers, “Miracles of Saint Foy,” in Readings in Medieval History, vol. II: The Later Middle Ages, ed. Patrick J. Geary (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 327; and Büchsel, 59. On Carolingian ruler prototypes, see also Forsyth, Throne of Wisdom, 80. She names a number of prototypes, including the statues of Duke Ragenarius (ca. 850), Duke Solomon (871), and the Narbonne Crucifix (ca. 890).

Forsyth wrote, “When installed in their churches, these handsome sculptures had a lofty function. Although occasionally serving as reliquaries, there were not fashioned chiefly for that purpose; nor were they meant solely to satisfy the needs of the piety. The majestic, hieratic visualization of the Sedes sapientiae, which they afforded to local altars as well as to processions, dramas and other ceremonies within the community, made them authentic representations of the Virgin and her son…the statues were visible demonstration that the Incarnation was not merely abstract and remote history. Through their agency its message could be comprehended as a perpetually meaningful reality. The authors of the official stand taken in the Libri carolini were not quite ready to indulge this function of art, fearing idolatrous results. Such reluctance was overruled as sculpture’s power to evoke this drama, central to Christian thought, was realized. In the veneration of the image devotion passed to the prototype so that the worshipper, in a vicarious sense, stood before God incarnate.” See Forsyth, Throne of Wisdom, 154-155. The Benedictines Saint Peter Damien (d. 1072-1073) and Guibert de Nogent (d. 1124) were among the earliest theologians to equate Mary with the throne of Solomon. Peter Damien, in particular, equated the description of Solomon’s throne in 1 Kings 10: 18-20, which was carved in ivory (representing the Mary’s virginity) and overlaid with gold (representing God). For the Throne of Wisdom and the Incarnation, see Forsyth, The Throne of Wisdom, 1-2; Katherine Allen Smith, “Bodies of Unsurpassed Beauty: ‘Living’ Images of the Virgin,” Viator 37, no. 1 (2006), 184; and Alessandra Frosini, Scultura lignea dipinta nella Toscana medievale: Problemi e metodi di Restauro (San Casciano Val di Pesa: Libro Co. Italia, 2005), 18. On the spread of the Virgin as intercessor, including her role as the protector of the First Crusade, see Pages i Paretas, 17.
explicitly in a number of these statues. For example, two Italian examples from the end of the twelfth century, one in Todi and the other from Arezzo but now at the Bode museum (fig. 5–7 and fig. 5–8), include the inscription, “the Father’s wisdom shines forth from the bosom of the mother.” 783 Other groups of statues exploited the concept of Virgin as vessel even more literally. The so-called Vierges ouvrantes, for example, functioned as tabernacles and include painted scenes from the life of the Virgin, the life of Christ, or a depiction of the Trinity on the insides of their doors (fig. 5–9 and fig. 5–10). 784 Before these some of the earliest Thrones of Wisdom, including the tenth-century statue at Clermont-Ferrand and another at the Church of the Magdalen in Vézelay, possessed compartments in which relics could be placed. In these instances the statues truly served as vessels for holy matter.

These more strictly liturgical uses for the Throne of Wisdom statues do not appear the norm, however. As Charles Hope has argued in general for images of the Virgin and Child, most Thrones of Wisdom served principally as images of, as well as objects of devotion toward, the Virgin. He maintained that the Christ Child was present to serve as an attribute, meaning that the images as a whole most likely did not emphasize in popular usage connotations of incarnational imagery that made them acceptable Eucharistic, that is

783 The original Latin inscriptions read, “In Gremio Matris Fulget Sapientia Patris.” See Hans Belting, Likeness and Presence, 300; and Gianna A. Minna, “Coppo di Marcovldo’s Madonna del Bordone: Political Statement or Profession of Faith,” in Art, Politics, and Civic Religion in Central Italy, 1261-1352: Essays by Postgraduate Students at the Courtauld Institute of Art, eds. Joanna Cannon and Beth Williamson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), 237-293. One of the statues, known as the “Madonna of Presbiter Martinus” was originally at a Benedictine abbey in Borgo San Sepolcro near Arezzo. It is now held at the Bode Museum in Berlin. The second statue is located at the church of Santa Maria in Camuccia near Todi. An Abruzzan panel painting from the second half of the thirteenth century, the so-called Sivignano Madonna now held at the Museo Nazionale d’Abruzzo in L’Aquila, also bears the inscription.

784 Most Vierges ouvrantes date from the thirteenth through fifteenth centuries and were produced in Germany, France, and Castille-Leon. According to Melissa Katz, the current number of surviving statues is catalogued at sixty-five. She has argued that initially these objects were commissioned by members of the clergy, nobility, and monastic orders, but later were found in rural shrines, confraternity chapels, parish churches, and domestic settings. See Melissa R. Katz, “Marian Motion: Opening the Body of the Vierge ouvrante,” in Meaning in Motion: The Semantics of Movement in Medieval Art, eds. Nino Zchomelidse and Giovanni Freni (Princeton: Department of Art and Archeology, Princeton University, 2011), 63-91; and Caroline Walker Bynum, Christian Materiality: An Essay on Religion in late Medieval Europe (New York: Zone Books, 2011), 86-87.
liturgical, images within theological circles. Their powers on the ground, so to speak, simultaneously were more simple and also much more complex, but boiled down to the fact that devotion to the Virgin continued to increase throughout the High and later Middle Ages and that tangible images of the saint were viewed as ideal intercessory tools. This essentially forms the undercurrent of Italian art historian Enzo Carli’s 1943 study of the objects, which revealed that Marian statues were produced widely throughout central and southern Italy from the Middle Ages through to the twentieth century. He noted that their great range in quality made them most difficult to study as art objects (he argued that the lowest quality statues were more appropriate for the study of folklore and therefore are not cited in his work). Without dwelling too much on his value judgments, the great number and range in quality of statues uncovered by Carli reveals that not all of these statues were intended for “high” use and viewed as complex theological statements manifested in three dimensions. Rather, they were images that were prized as images and powerful because they were venerated images. Surviving medieval texts, in fact, confirm this attitude toward some of these statues. For example, both Belting and David Freedberg have shown that the reliquary function of the Vézelay Throne of Wisdom had been forgotten by the middle of the twelfth century. They each cited a medieval chronicle that reported sometime between 1160 and 1165 a compartment behind a trap door was discovered on the back of the statue that contained a lock of the Virgin’s hair as well as relics belonging to John

---

785 Charles Hope, “Altarpieces and the Requirements of Patrons,” in _Christianity and the Renaissance: Image and Religious Imagination in the Quattrocento_, eds. Timothy Verdon and John Henderson (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1990), 544. See also Williamson, 352. To add, Williamson has argued that “the mechanics of the celebration of Mass” were governed by local conditions rather than centralized theological rulings (such as decisions made on the Eucharist at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215) for much of the Middle Ages. This shows that the theological arguments made from the top were not the unifying factors for the widespread devotion to Thrones of Wisdom. See Williamson, 347.


787 Belting, _Likeness and Presence_, 302-303; and Freedberg, 94.
the Baptist and the Apostles Peter, Paul, Andrew, and James. That the relics had been forgotten reveals that the faithful venerated the statue as a three-dimensional image rather than as a more theologically permissible reliquary.\textsuperscript{788}

It was this lack of strict theological adherence to the use of images, in fact, that made Thrones of Wisdom such versatile objects disseminated across the Latin West and reemployed in subsequent centuries. They were used in a variety of settings. Forsyth showed through a number of French texts and monumental sculptural works that the statues were used in Epiphany plays as early as the tenth century (fig. 5–11).\textsuperscript{789} Freedberg and Belting further substantiated her arguments when they both cited an eleventh-century text from Nevers that noted clerics dressed as the Magi and others in the congregation as Herod and the Midwives during the play. At one point during the performance the midwives would point to the statue and respond to the Magi, “Here is the Child whom you seek (\textit{ecce puer adest quem quartitis}).”\textsuperscript{790}

In addition the statues were used in civil ceremonies as institutional representatives. Forsyth revealed that knights swore feudal oaths in the presence of the Golden Madonna at Hildesheim prior to the sixteenth century. This particular statue also presided over

\textsuperscript{788} This non-liturgical usage of three-dimensional images caused some anxiety for theologians. Through his reading of the \textit{Liber miraculorum}, Martin Büchsel has shown that Bernard of Angers argued that the veneration of wooden crucifixes (such as the tenth-century Gero cross, which originally did not contain a repository for relics) was acceptable because of the crucifixion’s connection to the Eucharist. Bernard, however, was hesitant to offer similar sanction for other three dimensional statues, including the reliquary of Saint Faith. He referred to the reliquary as a “\textit{statua}.” See Büchsel, 50.

\textsuperscript{789} Forsyth, “Magi and Majesty,” 218-221. Forsyth’s argument is most convincing when citing a tympanum at Pimpierre (Vosges), a sculpted retable at Königswinter (Rheinland), and a lintel on the south portal of the church of Notre-Dame-du-Port in Clermont Ferrand. For instance, in the late twelfth-century lintel at Notre-Dame-du-Port, three figures approach a representation of a Throne of Wisdom statue. The figures of the Madonna and Child bear the similar full-length clothing defined by shallow, wavy folds seen on the Morgan Madonna (fig. 5–10). The stylistic similarities between the statue and the representation of the Virgin and Child on the tympanum suggest that lintel depicts an image of an image rather than the Virgin and Child themselves.

\textsuperscript{790} Freedberg, 288; and Belting, \textit{Likeness and Presence}, 300.
ceremonies involving newly elected bishops. In addition, the portability of the “Thrones,” which was aided by their scale and manufacture in wood (at this point it is unclear whether this was a consequence or intention of their manufacture), made them ideal objects to use in processions, a function that will become increasingly important later in the chapter.

Contemporary writers provided detailed accounts of processions involving the Throne of Wisdom at Chartres (known as the Notre-Dame-sous-Terre), and the procession was depicted on pilgrim badges by the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. Processes also involved the statue called Notre-Dame-du-Puy, and the Virgin at Hildesheim was the subject of an annual procession on the first of August. These rituals were used to denote a variety of feast days, to gain favor for an affected city or region, and to settle civil disputes. As such, just like the Paterna statue in its later history, the physical circulation of these objects was performed to claim, recover, and demarcate space, a function that relics and panel paintings had served previously in the Byzantine world and in Rome.

No medieval documents survive describing Italian processions of these objects. Therefore, it is presumptuous to suggest that this was a major way the statues were deployed
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791 Forsyth, The Throne of Wisdom, 45. Other types of images had served this function in earlier periods. Martin Büchsel recently has shown that the Saint Foy reliquary at Conques served as a representative of the abbey in legal disputes. In one notable example found in Bernard of Anger’s Liber miraculorum Sancte Fidis (early eleventh century), the reliquary was taken to Molompize some 125 kilometers away in order to assert the Abbey’s claim to the land. The description of the event reads: “It [was] a deeply rooted practice and firmly established custom that, if land given to Sainte-Foy [was] unjustly appropriated by a usurper for any reason, the reliquary of the Holy Virgin [was] carried out to that land as a witness in regaining the right to her property. The monks announce[d] that there [would] be a solemn procession of clergy and laity, who move[d] forward with great formality carrying candles and lamps.” See Büchsel, 59.

792 Forsyth, The Throne of Wisdom, 43.

793 Ibid.

in the region. Many works do, however, appear to have been destined for altars. Hans Belting has argued that some late twelfth- and early thirteenth-century Tuscan examples, many of which were carved with flat backs, were hung over the altar and slanted from the wall toward the viewer (fig. 5–12).\footnote{Belting, \textit{Likeness and Presence}, 387. He cited in particular the Throne of Wisdom now held at the Bode Museum in Berlin.} Henk van Os has argued that others, including an example from Alatri (fig. 5–13) were placed on top of the altar table along with caskets, pyxes, reliquaries, and Eucharistic doves.\footnote{van Os, 14-15.} He suggested that many Italian “Thrones” formed the main component of altar decoration until “more visible” painted panels became important to church decoration. It is likely that an altar also was the setting for a number of late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century statues produced within the \textit{Regno}, including examples at Bugnara in Abruzzo, Ercolano in Campania, Fossa in Abruzzo, and Scurcola Marsciana in Abruzzo (fig. 5–14, fig. 5–15, fig. 5–16, fig. 5–17, and fig. 5–18). Their flat or hollow backs suggest that they originally were placed within tabernacles.\footnote{Tomei noted that the oldest wood tabernacles for Virgin statues dated from the first half of the thirteenth century in France and Catalonia. He cited in particular a Madonna and Child from the Church of Saint-Blaise in Grandrif Puy-De-Dome that has been dated to the last quarter of the thirteenth century. Its doors now are missing. See Alessandro Tomei, “Le donne lignee della prima età angioina,” 28.} The \textit{Patrona} statue most likely was housed in a similar structure before it was placed within a marble niche atop the right transept altar during the first half of the seventeenth century.

The use of these statues, therefore, was hardly fixed. Their flexibility as images led to their employment in a variety of settings; it also meant that their iconographies and styles were susceptible to change. In other words, stylistically, groups of statues display significant difference due in part to the fact that these statues did not operate within a closed circle of usage or meaning and also because the artists manufacturing them often worked across
This cross-pollination of influences, which affected both the styles and iconographies of these statues, is essential for the study of Thrones of Wisdom as art objects. These shifts allow historians to date many of them—especially those of “high” manufacture—based on stylistic and iconographic analysis. They also help historians analyze the artistic milieu in which the producers of these objects worked. The styles of many high and late medieval statues often reveal the period and location in which they were produced. Only in the sixteenth century did strong signs of artistic conservatism, usually in the mode of stylistic or iconographic archaism, become a major part of their manufacturing processes. This archaism undoubtedly was the result of outside political and cultural factors that spurred the second, or perhaps third or fourth lives of these objects.

Numerous studies have shown that sculptors during the later Middle Ages worked across mediums, including wood, stone, and ivory. Notable figures known to have worked in such a manner include Nicola Pisano, Giovanni Pisano, Arnolfo di Cambio, and later Tino di Camaino. See Carli, *Scultura lignea italiana*, 41; and Paul Williamson, “Symbiosis across Scale: Gothic Ivories and Sculpture in Stone and Wood in the Thirteenth Century,” in *Images in Ivory: Precious Objects of the Gothic Age*, ed. Peter Barnet (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 39–45. Carli argued that non-specialists carved the more humble examples of Throne of Wisdom statues. See Carli, *Scultura lignea italiana*, 6.

For a recent theory of stylistic analysis, see Sarah M. Guérin, “‘Tears of Compunction’: French Gothic Ivories in Devotional Practice” (PhD Diss., University of Toronto, 2009), esp. 87-120. On style and dating, see chapter 3 of this dissertation.

In addition to the painting of the *Patrona* statue and “La Sipontina,” Italian examples of archaism include the Madonna of Santa Maria della Vittoria near Scurocola Mariscana (fig. 5–18). Like the *Patrona* of Lucera, the statue has been the subject of many local chronicles. The statue was mentioned first at the end of the seventeenth century by the historian Muzio Febonio who wrote that it was miraculously recovered in 1525 under the ruins of the abbey of Santa Maria della Vittoria. According to a legend of unknown origins, Charles I of Anjou dedicated the statue to the abbey in commemoration of his victory against Conradin at Tagliacozzo. The legend stated that the statue was brought from Palestine by Saint Louis and given to his brother Charles I who donated the statue to the monastery. Carli, however, discounted the legend based on the statue’s style. He placed the date of the statue’s manufacture to sometime during the 1320s or 1330s. Recent scholars of Abruzzan sculpture such as Alessandro Tomei have attempted to move the work closer to the beginning of the fourteenth century. The surviving tabernacle (fig. 5–19) dates to the sixteenth century during the time of the statue’s supposed rediscovery from the ruins of the monastery. Its iconography clearly was meant to historicize the structure. The panel behind the statue of the virgin contains a blue ground and gold lilies, supporting the legend of the statue’s Angevin origins, but the paintings are of obvious sixteenth-century manufacture. Emile Bertaux argued that the paintings were the work of Saturino Gatta da S. Vittorino, a disciple of the Umbrian painter Fiorenzo di Lorenzo (1440-1554). The doors contain scenes from Christ’s infancy along the left and his Passion along the right. For the sculpture, see Tomei, 24; and Enzo Carli, “Per la scultura lignea del Trecento in Abruzzo,” *Le arti* (1940-41), 437-438. For the legend and historiographical issues, see Pietro Egidi, *Carlo I d’Angiò*, 27 and 27, note 4.
Studying these statues as works of art, rather than focal points of cults, therefore, provides the best means for examining the *Patrona* statue within an Angevin cultural milieu. Like other Throne of Wisdom statues across the Latin West, the *Patrona’s* style reflects generally the contemporary artistic currents in which it was produced. Specifically, its style reveals the “opening up” of southern Italy to outside artistic currents, including those from France and central Italy. This included, but was not limited to, the apparent influence of French ivory works, a quality shared by a number of other examples in Abruzzo and Campania (fig. 5–15, fig. 5–16, fig. 5–17, fig. 5–18, and fig. 5–27) that suggests either ivory models or sculptors who also worked in ivory and other media entered southern Italy from France by the end of the thirteenth century. This does not mean, necessarily, that an ivory was a direct model for the *Patrona* statue, however. All of these examples appear more “Gothic” than predecessors or even contemporary sculptures such as the recently re-dated *Sipontina* now held at the cathedral of Manfredonia (fig. 5–20).\(^801\) This is unsurprising given their presumed original locations around Naples, L’Aquila, and within Lucera—all areas prized by the Angevin crown and interconnected during the consolidation of the *Regno.* These regions formed part of the exact network in which people—in this case artists—and goods—in this instance works of art—traveled. As such, the *Patrona* statue’s style as well as its presence at Lucera was a direct result of the new social, political, and artistic consolidations within the kingdom.\(^802\)

\(^801\) Rinaldi, “L’antica statua “Sipontina” è tornata.”

\(^802\) On the stylistic shifts seen in these objects, particularly in Abruzzo after the arrival of the Angevin crown, see Curzi, “Statue da palcoscenico”; Catalano, “Sculture in legno policromo dal territorio molisano”; Paone, “Il Trecento angioino”; Paone, “Pittura e scultura lignea”; and Fobelli, “L’Aquila,” 200. Examples of wood sculpture under this new cultural environment include other saints as well, including an early to mid fourteenth-century sculpture of Saint Catherine of Alexandria now held at the Museo Nazionale d’Abruzzo in L’Aquila.
Some comparisons with French, Catalan, and Central Italian Thrones of Wisdom are necessary in order to identify the stylistic and iconographic innovations present within the *Patrona* statue and those related to it. Examining these statues across time and space reveals iconographic and stylistic changes made from century to century and across regions. They also provide a baseline on which stylistic modifications introduced during Angevin rule can be judged. For example, a twelfth-century Throne of Wisdom now held at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York exhibits stylistic traits seen across a group of statues from the Auvergne region of France (fig. 5–6). In fact, it shows a great resemblance even to the sculpted image of a Throne of Wisdom on the lintel of Notre-Dame-du-Port (fig. 5–11) in the same region. The statue, measuring approximately seventy-nine centimeters tall, still retains traces of polychrome on Virgin’s and the Christ Child’s faces, on the throne, and within the creases of the shallow, wavy folds of the Virgin’s mantle. Christ sits frontally on his mother’s lap in a position resembling Byzantine Nikopeia icons, and the Virgin cradles his midsection with her right hand and his leg with her left. Originally the Christ Child, who wears a long wavy tunic and some type of holster, would have held a book in his left hand while offering a sign of benediction with his right.

Although the same frontal position is retained, near-contemporary examples produced to the south in the historically Catalan areas of Roussillon, Vallespir, Conflent, Cerdanya, and Capcir show noticeably divergent iconographies and styles (fig. 5–21 and fig. 5–22). They differ from those of Auvergne most noticeably in the fashioning of clothing, the
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rendering of faces, and the positioning of hands. As in examples at Ger and the (now) Black Madonna of Montserrat, a long tunic with a high collar and a shoulder-length headpiece replace the full veil and shallow, wavy folds on the mantle of twelfth-century French examples like that in New York. Their faces, eyes, and noses also tend to be longer and more exaggerated, which might suggest that originally Catalan statues were employed in contexts less intimate and more monumental than those farther to the north. Lastly, the Christ Child is given the appearance of almost floating on top of the lap of the Virgin, as many Catalan examples depict the Virgin’s arms bent to her sides and hovering perpendicular to the length of his body. The Christ Child in some of these examples even are detachable. Like the exaggerated faces, this positioning may once have held some sort of significance within a ritual context, as the Virgin’s hands at one point seem to have been used to support items such as rods or candlesticks.

Catalan-styled Thrones eventually spread to parts of southern Italy, particularly Basilicata, during the late twelfth and early thirteenth century (fig. 5–23). 804 Further north on the peninsula, a significant center of production for the objects developed around parts of Tuscany, Umbria, and Abruzzo. 805 As in the case of the Central Italian crucifi xi dolorosi

804 A number of late twelfth-, early thirteenth-century Thrones of Wisdom in Basilicata show clear stylistic and iconographic connections to iconographic prototypes. They include examples at Banzi, Rapolla, Calvello, Ors o le o, Viggiano, Sant’Arcanglo, and Armento (fig. 5–23). To this date, scholars have struggled to describe the exact social, cultural, or political connections between the regions at the time (unlike the late thirteenth century, when a Catalan presence in Basilicata is documented). The group of Catalan-styled woodwork also counts a number of crucifixes, including those now found in the Campanian town of Aversa and the Apulian cities of Nardò and Andria. These objects were gathered together for a 2004 exhibition in Matera entitled Scultura lignea in Basilicata: dalla fine del XII alla prima metà del XVI secolo. The exhibition catalogue, cited above, bears the same name. On the crucifixes, see also Michele D’Elia, ed., Mostra dell’arte in Puglia dal tardo antico al rococo. Bari: Pinacoteca Provinciale luglio 1964-settembre 1965 (Rome: De Luca, 1964), 12-14.

805 Some of the earliest examples include a statue from Lettopalena (Chieti), now held at the Museo Nazionale d’Abruzzo; a statue from Teramo now held at the church of San Giovanni Battista in Castelli; and a statue dated to the twelfth century at the church of Santa Maria dei Bisognosi in Pereto (L’Aquila). See Lucia Arbace, ed. La sapienza risplende: Madonne d’Abruzzo tra Medioevo e Rinascimento (Turin: Umberto Allemadi & C., 2011), 42-50; and Mancini, 99.
examined in the second chapter, all surviving works from these areas appear closer stylistically to examples from north of the Alps than Catalonia. In a sense they form the iconographical and stylistic building blocks for Lucera’s statue. In most cases, drapery patterns and the type of dress present clear connections to French examples. For example, the Bode Museum Madonna (Arezzo), the Madonna of Santa Maria in Camuccia (Todi), and another Tuscan/Umbrian Throne of Wisdom in Detroit that has been dated to the first half of the thirteenth century (fig. 5–12) all wear a similar garment, described by Belting as “liturgical length,” over a long-sleeved tunic. This, in fact, is the same type of dress worn by the Sipontina (fig. 5–20), which recently was re-dated to the same era as the Patrona statue and those related to it but apparently not affected by the same stylistic forces. Like the Morgan Madonna, which also bears this type of dress, the toe boxes of the Virgins’ shoes peek just from underneath their full tunics. The rendering of faces in the central Italian examples also are markedly different than the earliest Catalan examples, for example, eschewing the larger, wider eyes and more exaggerated facial features found in that region.

Every example listed so far presents the Christ Child seated frontally on the Virgin’s lap. This was a relatively stable relationship for Throne of Wisdom statues, especially in Italy, until the middle of the thirteenth century. From that period the standing Christ on the Virgin’s knee enters iconographic repertoires. The earliest surviving example is an Abruzzan statue from Bugnara dated to 1262 by an inscription across its base (fig. 5–14).806 Stylistically the Bugnara statue shares many of the same traits as the Central Italian examples

806 Gabriella Albertini, “Cenni sulla scultura lignea in Abruzzo,” in L’Abruzzo nel medioevo, eds. Umberto Russo and Edoardo Tiboni (Pescara: Ediars, 2003), 518; Antonio Caleca, “Le Statue della Madonna in Trono,” in Sacre Passioni. Scultura lignea a Pisa dal XII al XV secolo, ed. Mariagiulia Burresi (Milan: Federico Motta Editore, 2000), 47. The statue is 124 cm tall and 48 cm wide. It was restored in 1982 and 1983. The Inscription, which also names its creators “Pace and his son Domenico,” reads, ANNO DM MCCLI M(a)G PACE ET FILIUS DC S(ulpse) BUNT HOC OPUS. The Museo Nazionale d’Abruzzo was severely damaged in April 2009 L’Aquila earthquake. Recently, the statue has been part of exhibitions in Trento and Rimini.
surveyed previously. These included shallow, linear folds, v-shaped opening over the toe boxes, and a long-sleeved tunic underneath a full, “liturgical” type of gown. However, the presence of a standing Christ is novel, and the dated inscription important, for it anchors to text the arrival of the new iconographic motif within Italian examples of the statues.

The deployment of a standing Christ in the Bugnara statue ushered a new period of development for Italian Throne of Wisdom statues. From this point, especially in the case of “high” examples from the regions of the Regno previously mentioned, iconographic and stylistic shifts seen in media throughout the Regno were applied to Thrones of Wisdom. The standing Christ motif was adopted within the Kingdom for a number of wood sculptures a few decades after it had developed in French ivories around the second quarter of the thirteenth century (fig. 5–24). In addition to the Patrona, late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century examples include the statues at Ercolano south of Naples (fig. 5–15), Fossa in Abruzzo (fig. 5–16), San Silvestro in L’Aquila (fig. 5–27), and Scurcola Mariscana near Charles I’s Cistcercian monastery of Santa Maria della Vittoria (fig. 5–17). By the first half of the fourteenth century the motif was employed throughout the Regno across sculpted media and scales. Outside of wood sculpture, examples include a marble plaque depicting the Virgin and Child with Queen Sancia of Majorca, Saints Clare and Francis, and Angels attributed to the Angevin court sculptor Tino di Camaino, and a mid-fourteenth-century marble Virgin and Child that originally may have been placed on the tympanum of San Domenico in Naples (fig. 5–25 and fig. 5–26).

807 Early examples include a freestanding ivory statue now held at the Walters Art Museum in Baltimore and another now held in Nantes at the Musée Thomas Dobrée.
808 On the tympanum statue, see Michalsky, Memoria und Repräsentation, 323. The statue measures approximately 171 cm tall, contains a flat back, and includes a companion statue of a standing Saint Dominic with a much smaller and kneeling kingly patron. It now is held at the Museo Nazionale di San Martino, Naples.
Stylistic connections between these Thrones of Wisdom just mentioned, the marble sculptures from Naples, and the earlier ivories are substantial. The Thrones of Wisdom and marble sculptures display deeper and more pronounced drapery than earlier Italian examples. Folds and the position of the Virgin’s legs are rendered diagonally rather than vertically in an effort to accentuate the shape of the body underneath the clothing. Moreover, these statues’ faces, hands, and digits are more delicately rendered than the earliest surviving Abruzzan examples. In addition, a number of iconographic shifts occur that are reflective across artistic media. For example, the Virgin’s dress changes from earlier Madonna and Child compositions, reflecting clothing seen first in the thirteenth-century French ivories of the Madonna and Child but also reproduced in fourteenth-century manuscripts produced in Naples (fig. 5–28 and fig. 5–29). In these later examples the Virgin wears a full veil and mantle that opens above the waist in a dramatic curve around a bent right arm. The opened mantle reveals a tunic with a high neckline cinched at the waist by a belt, again emphasizing Mary’s corporeal form more than the closed mantle and tunic of statues from earlier eras. Moreover, the throne disappears almost completely in these examples. Instead, the Virgin appears to be seated on a stool rather than the wider, cushioned seats of the earlier statues.

The most striking iconographic difference, however, lies in the changing relationship between the Virgin and the Christ Child. The interaction between the two figures, and between the figures and the viewers, is more intimate than the hierarchical Thrones of Wisdom produced previously North of the Alps, in Catalonia, and elsewhere in Italy. At times in the Abruzzan examples the Christ Child even appears to walk on the knee of the Virgin. These shifts reveal a substantial change in the artistic models used for these
statues—again, ivories appear to have played some, but not the entire role in this development—and perhaps even a new attitude toward them as images.

The *Patrona* statue admittedly appears somewhat more hierarchical than some of its closest Abruzzan cousins. This may, in fact, have encouraged its later career as the palladium for Lucera. The interaction between the Virgin and Child is more rigid than examples like the Madonna of Scurcola Mariscana. This, perhaps, is a holdover from the formality that remained in some contemporary Apulian devotional images unaffected by Angevin-led artistic changes (fig. 5–30). Moreover, the Virgin’s face (fig. 5–31 and fig. 5–32) is somewhat more elongated than the faces of Fossa, San Silvestro, or any of the French ivories that appear to be stylistic and iconographic ancestors. Nevertheless, the statue fully belongs to the artistic environment introduced to the region by the Angevin crown.  

Both the dress of the Virgin and the Christ Child’s long, yet shapely tunic that reveals a slightly bent left knee allude to manufacture during the end of the thirteenth century of first decades of the fourteenth. In addition, the rendering of the Child’s short bob, a fashionable hairstyle in courtly images (fig. 5–33), resembles numerous fourteenth-century examples, including a host of tomb sculpture both in Lucera and in Naples (fig. 2–23), portraits of Angevin monarchs (fig. 3–34), and various miniatures within the *Anjou Bible* (fig. 5–35).  

This last observation is fundamental, for the fact that the *Patrona* statue is tied stylistically to examples across media and locations reveals once again that the statue most likely was not a copy of either an ivory or an earlier throne of wisdom. Rather, its form and style resulted

---

809 Leone de Castris analyzes the image under the chapter entitled “Le componenti transalpine” in his *Arte di corte nella Napoli angioina*. See Leone de Castris, *Arte di corte*, 162.
810 Schettini argued also that the Christ Child’s hair was wholly a product of an Angevin cultural milieu. See Schettini, 3.
from a general reception of new artistic ideas within the kingdom and their circulation by objects and workers within established networks.

To review, the *Patrona* statue, which once was believed to be Byzantine in origins, no longer is understood to be so by modern art historians. Rather, it belongs to a class of freestanding wood statues of the Virgin and Child known collectively as Thrones of Wisdom that developed at some point during the tenth or eleventh centuries in French and German lands. By the end of the twelfth century these items had spread to areas including Catalonia and Italy, most likely because of their power as effective and versatile devotional objects used for a variety of purposes including processions, altarpieces, and reliquaries.

When the Angevin crown arrived in southern Italy, therefore, these objects already formed an important role within sacred landscapes of the region. Subsequent cultural realignments did not introduce the statues to the region, nor is it known if the crown introduced any new means of venerating the statue. In fact, nothing is known about the settings or uses of these statues under the Angevin monarchs. Rather, the intersection of Thrones of Wisdom in Italy with new, “updated” styles appears (for now) to be significant mostly for evaluating the artistic impact from Angevin consolidation. The arrival of new artists and new works such as ivories impacted the artistic development of some Throne of Wisdom statues in the region. That is not to say, however, that every Marian statue produced in southern Italy at the time displays these new traits (the *Sipontina* of Manfredonia is a prime example). In fact, the introduction of new styles and modes appears to have affected a somewhat exclusive group—statues that now, although not necessarily always, are located at prestigious foundations that once formed part of an economically, socially, and politically important network of Angevin towns, castles, and cities. In this sense they represent some of
the “highest” examples of Thrones of Wisdom within the kingdom, benefitting from the circulation of goods, objects, and people within this established network.

Herein lies the paradox between the Patrona as a fourteenth-century art object and the Patrona as a cult object today. Its style and presence within Lucera is the direct result of Angevin consolidation of the Regno, yet the mode in which that consolidation (for Lucera’s concern the destruction of the Muslim settlement and rebuilding of the city) and the statue (as Byzantine object) are celebrated neutralizes this reality. This portion of the chapter has been concerned with exposing the first half of this paradox. The following examines the second through an analysis of the birth, or perhaps rebirth, of the Patrona statue as patron of Lucera.

3. Angevin Cult or Cult of the Angevins?

The Santa Maria Patrona statue is a complex object. The study of its life as a devotional object through surviving visual and written sources reveals the complicated route through which much after its creation, the statue eventually was transformed into a Byzantine devotional image at the center of an Angevin initiated ritual. Despite local histories from the eighteenth through the twenty-first centuries that attest otherwise, the earliest sources on the statue provide no indication that the Patrona has always been used in the manner claimed today. The disjuncture between its late medieval creation and early use and the much later early modern histories reveal that the latter reconciled a lack of information from the distant past about the statue through the invention of sacred genealogy. In this way the ritual history of the Patrona belongs to a group of venerated objects whose origins have been separated by time or by space from practices adopted later. Many of these objects are relics, which
throughout the Middle Ages and after moved farther from their original contexts through series of translations, inventions, and thefts. Patrick Geary theorized their commodification and circulation in early medieval contexts. He argued that with each change in location and rupture from their historical origins, a new sacred genealogy was created to prove to new followers that the objects not only were efficacious in the present, but always had been useful intercessory tools. The same strategy was employed in Lucera beginning in the eighteenth century to justify current attitudes toward the *Patrona*.

This final section of the chapter traces the birth of the modern *Patrona* cult, epitomized by the Assumption procession, through the events surrounding the cult and the writers who attempted to fill its historical gaps. Nothing is known about the *Patrona* statue between the time of its creation and the turn of the seventeenth century. I argue that the more the statue was venerated as a savior from civic disaster and as sign of the city’s Angevin origins through the Assumption procession, the more concerned writers and image makers alike became with tracing—and in many instances inventing—a genealogy that constructed historical value for the *Patrona*. Like relics, devotional images have gained their power and fame not only through an ability to perform miracles in the present, but also through a traceable genealogy of miraculous workings.

Knowledge of devotion to the *Patrona* prior to the seventeenth century at best is vague and at worst nonexistent. Besides one possible reference to the statue in the 1594

---


pastoral visitation of Lucera’s cathedral, the earliest surviving explicit reference to the Patrona dates to 1627. On October 12 of that year Lucera’s decury, the parliament of ten men first established in the city by Charles II in 1302, provided five hundred ducats to embellish a chapel that possessed the statue. The donation was made reportedly in thanksgiving for the Virgin’s intervention during an earthquake that six months earlier had destroyed the neighboring city of San Severo but spared Lucera. This is the earliest reference to the Patrona as an efficacious protector against earthquakes, a role that receives continuous mention for the next two centuries. Based on these surviving sources, it was this role that led to the statue’s eventual position as the patron of the city and even later place within the annual Assumption procession.

The next three events during the seventeenth century mark the period during which the Patrona’s role as protector of the city and an increased interest in Lucera’s Angevin origins coalesced. This revival in the interest of Angevin Lucera was manifested first in a fresco painted sometime during the second quarter of the seventeenth century (fig. 5–36). The work, destroyed during the nineteenth-century restorations and known through the

---

814 Lucera, Archivio della Curia Vescovile di Lucera Visita pastorale alla Cattedrale di Lucera fatta da mons. Marco Magnacervo nell’anno 1594, fol. 25 verso. The canonical visitation, an official examination by Lucera’s bishop Marco Magnacervo of the clergy, religious communities, laity, and ecclesiastical property within the diocese, includes within a list of the cathedral’s bonae “a very holy wood sculpture that is gilded, quite old, and receives much devotion” (“un altra imagine di legno dove è scolpito molto santo indorata e assai vecchi è molto devoto.”). Pastoral visitations, a product of the Counter-Reformation, were conducted annually or bi-annually to verify that a diocese had applied the norms outlined by the Council of Trent. On the history of the pastoral visitation and their uses as historical sources, see Gabriele de Rosa, “La Regestazione delle visite pastorali e la loro utilizzazione come fonte Storica,” Archiva ecclesiae: Bollettino dell’Associazione archivista ecclesiastica,” 22-23 (1979-1980), 27-52; Salvatore Palese, “Visite pastorali in Puglia: storia religiosa e azione pastorale nel Mezzogiorno,” Archiva ecclesiae: bollettino dell’Associazione archivista ecclesiastica 22-23 (1979-1980), 379-410; and David Gentilcore, “Methods and Approaches in the Social History of the Counter-Reformation in Italy,” Social History 17, no. 1 (January 1992), 79-98.

815 CDSL, no. 654, statue 21 (January 10, 1302). See also chapter 2.

816 Lucera, Biblioteca Comunale di Lucera “R. Bonghi,” Sezione Archivio Comunale di Lucera, Registri delle Deliberazioni decurionali (12.10.1627). This donation was reported also in Gifuni, 41; Morlacco, “Il culto di S. Maria Patrona,” 208; and Monaco, Il culto della Vergine Patrona,” 21.

817 As noted earlier the earthquake, which occurred July 30 and whose epicenter was located to the northeast of Lucera in the Gargano, measured approximately 6.66 on the Moment Magnitude Scale. “Catologo parametrico dei Terremoti Italiani (dal 1000 al 2006).”
reproductions discussed below, was painted on the right entrance wall to the cathedral. It depicted a kneeling Charles II holding a model of the cathedral before the Virgin and Child on a cloud. The cathedral was rendered clearly in its seventeenth-century form, complete with the belltower and north chapels finished during the previous century. Whether the unnamed painter intended to depict an image of the Virgin and Child or an image of thePatrona— and therefore an image of an image—is less clear. Whereas the two crowned figures wear a similar dress as thePatrona statue and the Christ Child’s bob is rendered similarly to the statue’s, Christ sits rather than stands on his mother’s lap in the painting and the two images diverge stylistically. This issue is fundamental to understanding the role of thePatrona statue and the accompanying imagery within the Lucera cult; and the liberties taken when creating images of thePatrona will be addressed more fully later in the chapter. Finally, the fresco bore the inscription: Protege, Diva Parens, Carolia pia dona secondi hoc templum, hanc Urbem, nomine clara tuo. Regia iura intent, annosque diplomata signat mille et tercentum temporis atque duos.818

The date for the painting is uncertain. Some writers have argued that the image was created under the bishopric of Fabrizio Suardo (1619-1637) while others have argued that the fresco was completed in 1647. Some even have managed to argue that the fresco was completed under the bishopric of Fabrizio Suardo in 1647!819 A date after 1642 is more

818 The translation reads “Protect, O Divine Mother, as Charles II gave this temple and this city, renamed in your name, (with) royal rights noting and diplomas signaling (during) the year 1302.” The fresco was quite large, measuring 5.4 meters tall and 4.4 meters wide. The work was whitewashed and uncovered on a number of occasions until it was destroyed completely during the final restorations. See Rocco Del Preite, Breve descrittione della Città di Lucera di S. Maria prima detta Luceria per historia della sua origine (1690; reprint: Lucera: Catapano, 2005), 105-106; Giambattista D’Amelj, Storia della città di Lucera (Bologna: Forni, 1861), 237; Giambattista D’Amelj, “L’Affresco rinvenuto nel Duomo di Lucera,” Gazzetta della Capitanata 1, no. 9 (February 28, 1880), 1; and Gifuni, 21.
819 Both Morlacco and D’Amelj managed to attribute the fresco to the patronage of a man who had not been Lucera’s bishop for ten years (he became bishop of Caserta after his stint in Lucera) and had been dead for nine.
likely, however, given the content of the inscription that makes explicit references to the rights and privileges granted to Civitas Sanctae Mariae by Charles II.\textsuperscript{820}

Some historical contextualization is necessary for dating and analysis of the fresco. The Kingdom of Naples from 1504 to 1707 was ruled by the Spanish crown and governed most immediately by a viceroy. By the third decade of the seventeenth century, the Spanish sought from their possessions new revenue to fund the Thirty Years War. Drained of the financial resources gained from precious metals in the New World and taxation in Castile, the crown turned to Naples where it enacted a rapacious policy of taxation on everything from rents to fruits, vegetables, and flour.\textsuperscript{821} These new tax policies eventually led to the revolt begun July 7, 1647 in Piazza Mercato, Naples by the revolutionary Masaniello.\textsuperscript{822}

Lucera, no longer officially called Civitas Sanctae Mariae at least by 1536, had fared relatively well throughout most of Spanish rule.\textsuperscript{823} The city had experienced some loss in population during the late sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth centuries, but it had retained its position as the capital of the provinces of Molise and Basilicata and continued to be a prosperous and important regional marketplace due to the market fairs instituted first by Charles II (see chapter 4).\textsuperscript{824} The amount of revenue that continued to flow through Lucera

\textsuperscript{820} On these rights, in particular the declaration of the city as royal property and the institution of the annual market fairs, see chapters 2 and 3.


\textsuperscript{822} The first acts of the rebellion involved the ransacking of the tax office, flour stores, and viceroy’s palace. Masaniello (Tommaso Aniello) was assassinated on July 16, 1647 but unrest in Naples continued until April of the following year. On the events surrounding the rebellion as well as the ritual responses by the viceregal and ecclesiastical authorities (for example, the exposition of the sacrament and procession of the head and blood of Saint Januarius), see Burke, 191-206.

\textsuperscript{823} Monaco, “Il culto della Vergine Patrona,” 12, note 19. A diploma presented by Charles IV in 1536 referred to the city as Lucera.

\textsuperscript{824} Urban Population decline was a general trend in the kingdom during these centuries. The exception was Naples, which had a population of over 300,000 by 1647. Morlacco estimated that the population of Lucera at
during the fairs was put on display when the event was sacked during a raid in 1592 that killed Lucera’s bishop Scipione Bozzuti. The five hundred bandits led by Marco Sciarra reportedly seized two million *scudi* in coin and merchandise, an amount equivalent to half of the tax revenue for the Kingdom of Naples.  

Lucera was dangerously close to losing its ancient rights and privileges in 1642. However, in addition to exacting heavy taxes within the Kingdom, the crown also earned revenue through the sale as feuds of towns and cities. These transactions occurred throughout the Spanish reign, but especially during the first four decades of the sixteenth century and the period coinciding with the Thirty Years’ War. Over 1,500 towns and villages were enfeoffed during these periods, amounting to over ninety-five percent of the communities within the Kingdom and over seventy-five percent of its population.

In that year the Spanish viceroy Ramiro Núñez de Guzman offered the city of Lucera to the count Matthias Galass, general of the Austrian Armada, for services rendered and sixty thousand ducats. The results for the city would have been disastrous. Owning a fief resulted in hundreds of civil and criminal rights and privileges—almost all of which were detrimental economically and legally to a community’s inhabitants. In fact, Lucera’s residents would

---

the beginning of the seventeenth century hovered around 5,000, but after the outbreak of the plague in 1656 numbered around 3,000. See Dionisio Morlacco, “Fiere e mercati a Lucera,” *Archivio storico pugliese* 41 (1988), 266. On the general decline of urban populations within the kingdom beginning in the sixteenth century, see Eleni Sakellariou, *Southern Italy in the Late Middle Ages: Demographic, Institutional, and Economic Change in the Kingdom of Naples, c. 1440-c. 1530* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 93-126; and Astarita, 14.

Gregory Hanlon, *Early Modern Italy, 1550-1800* (Houndmills, Hasingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan Press, 2000), 301-302. Banditry at the end of the sixteenth century was the forerunner to the social rebellion that culminated in the 1647 rebellion. Hanlan has argued that in highly organized raids like that at Lucera, townspeople often aided. This local involvement in the raid led the Viceroy in Naples, Juan de Zúñiga y Avellaneda, to send three companies of soldiers to Lucera in order to subdue any insurrection. On the occupation of Lucera after the raid, see Villari, 39.

Astarita, 217.

Villari, 38.

Astarita broke down a baron’s feudal rights into four categories: 1) the rights to exercise royal powers and enforce laws and collect legal fees; 2) the right to enact monopolies on particular economic activities; 3) the right to subject the general population to additional taxes, duties, and fees; and 4) the right to impress vassal’s
have seen the results of a community under the feudal yoke first hand. Nearby San Severo, a mere twenty kilometers to the north, had been sold as a feud at the beginning of the sixteenth century, re-entered the royal domain in 1521-1522 after paying a ransom of 42,000 ducats, and then was sold again in 1583-1584 to the baron Paolo di Sangro. Its re-feudalization led to a mass exodus by many prosperous families who had returned to the city when it reentered the royal domain at the middle of the century. Most of these refugees fled to Lucera or the other historically “free” town within the province, Manfredonia.  

The cathedral fresco must be seen within this context. Here the Virgin as the patron and protector of the city was invoked, and the viewer was reminded of her role in the history of Lucera’s rebuilding following the August 15 purge. In this sense the fresco served as both a votive offering and a history painting. In addition to invoking the Virgin, Lucera’s residents and whoever else might enter the cathedral were reminded not only that the city was named after the Mother of God, but also that its status from reconstruction to the present as an economically vibrant, prosperous community was made possible from the rights and privileges received under King Charles II. These were rights that successive rulers from the fourteenth century through the sixteenth had renewed, and rights that the city hoped would be renewed once again.  

As a votive and history painting, the fresco bridged both the past and the present.
It is difficult to determine whether the painting sparked or was a product of increased pro-Angevin, historicist imagery within the city at the time. The city’s royal origins, its rights received from that privilege, and the Virgin’s role as patron continued to be invoked during the intervening years of the drawn out legal battle over Lucera’s status. Official communal documents are one place where this type of imagery is found. The register that contains the decury’s deliberations from 1674 to 1715 includes a rhetorically rich set of images completely absent in previous or subsequent registers. Four prefatory pages precede the deliberations. Following the title page, the next three make explicit references to the city’s foundation and the role of the Virgin as Patron.

As a whole, the four pages collapse time by representing Lucera’s past, its current reality, and its hopes for the future. The first (fig. 5–37), the title page, recognizes the current ruler of the kingdom. It leads with the inscription *Carolus Secundus Dei Gratia Rex* in reference to Charles II of Spain, King of Naples from 1665 to 1700. The elaborate Hapsburg arms follow, as does the date in which the prefatory pages were created, 1674.\(^{831}\)

The second page (fig. 5–38), the most richly decorated of the four, marks the beginning of an emphasis on Lucera’s Angevin past and its hopes for the future. It leads by identifying the city as *Civitas Luceria S. Mariae*, a variation of Angevin city name *Civitas Sanctae Mariae*, which had fallen out of use in the previous centuries. A second inscription emphasizing Lucera’s ancient status follows. The inscription, “*Quondam urbs magna suis totum celebrate per orbem: Si modo non eadem; splendidia fama patet,*” or “once this great city was celebrated throughout the world: if this is not the same now, let it be known its

\(^{831}\) The subsequent register of deliberations for the years 1715 to 1798 also recognizes the current monarch Charles III (1714-1734) in its title page. It, however, eschews any heraldry, and also includes the inscription *Ego Domina & Patrona*, seemingly referring to the Virgin Mary. This inscription is a different hand from the Charles inscription, however, which reads in full “Carolis III Hispanias Dei Gratia Rex & VI Romanorum Imperator Semper Augustus.”
splendid fame.” The inscription addresses directly the city’s importance under the Angevin crown as well as the reality that its place within the world culturally, socially, and politically was not as it once was. The use of the phrase was not unique, however. In fact, it appears to have been in use for at least a century as a rallying cry for once great cities broken under Spanish rule. The exact words graced the main portal of Ruvo di Puglia by the first half of the sixteenth century. Ruvo, some one hundred kilometers southeast of Lucera, had been enfeoffed in 1458.\footnote{On the Ruvo inscription, see Gerolamo Boccardo, “Ruvo,” in Nuova encyclopedia italiana, ovvero Dizionario generale di scienze, lettere, industrie, ecc., vol. XIX (Turin: Unione Tipografico–Editrice Torinese, 1885), 940.}

The elaborate seal of Lucera follows the inscription. It is composed of a crown with two bunches of wheat and a lion carrying a standard that depicts the same Madonna and Child composition from the cathedral fresco. A banner is weaved into the seal bearing the text “si S. Maria est pro nobis, quis contra,” or “If Saint Mary is for us, who is against us?” Rocco del Preite, the author of a history of Lucera written sixteen years after the decury page was composed, identified the standard-carrying lion as Charles II,\footnote{Del Preite, 106.} a convincing argument given the final element of the page as well as what follows on the next. Just beneath the communal seal the fourth and final inscription of the page reads, “Vim duplicat Leo, Christi pro aram dum pronus adorat: Virginis auspicio Urbs ceu Leo fortis erit.” The text translates as “the lion who pays homage before the altar of Christ gains (doubles?) his strength. Under the patronage of the Virgin the city will be strong like the lion.”

The inscription serves as a bridge between the second page and what follows on the next, a nearly exact replication of the now lost cathedral fresco (fig. 5–39). The complete survival of the page includes elements that may already have been destroyed when the badly
damaged fresco was photographed in the nineteenth century. As in the fresco, Charles II presents the seventeenth-century cathedral to the Virgin and Child on a cloud who simultaneously are crowned by two angels. Elements not seen in the painting include an attendant who stands behind the king holding the king’s cloak and a depiction of the cityscape reduced to Lucera’s walls and four gates. Moreover, the decury page opts for a different inscription to explain the image as that from that of the fresco. Running beneath the kneeling king read the words “Domina mea Sanita Maria Lucerie me ac civitatem hanc in Suam submitto custodiam,” or “My Lady Holy Mary of Lucera I submit this city into your custody.”

Read together, the second and third prefatory pages support Lucera historian Rocco del Preite’s assertion that the lion represents Charles II. Charles is depicted in the third page submitting himself before the altar of Christ—in fact he donates to Christ and the Virgin the building that houses the altar to which he submits. And as has been argued in the previous chapters, Charles’s reconstruction of the city, epitomized in the fourteenth century and at the time of the Angevin revival by the construction of the cathedral, was both a sign and a symptom of his strengthened rule within the Regno. The lion certainly had become stronger by rebuilding Lucera and the other urban projects that consolidated the Kingdom. Lastly, the inscription that rests below the king’s feet and re-emphasizes that the city had been placed underneath the patronage of the Virgin serves a dual role. It is both an invocation to the Virgin and a reminder to whomever opened the register that the intercession of the Virgin would lead to Lucera’s resurgence.

The fourth and final prefatory page (fig. 5–40) provides a final reminder of the Virgin’s intended role in Lucera during this uncertain period. It leads with the title “Iesus S.

834 A 1719 annotation in a different hand labeled the roads and gates depicted in the cityscape.
Maria Patrona” before the accompanying inscription explains that the book is a collection of deliberations by Lucera’s elected body, some of whom are named, and ends with the date that the deliberations began, August 25, 1674. As noted earlier, this book is unique in its use of images and texts that evoke the city’s re-foundation under Charles II and its patronage under the Virgin. It is a product of the very particular legal predicament faced by the city at the time, but most likely only one example of many images, most now lost, that employed a similar rhetorical message.

The city fought its new legal status in court, and after nearly fifty years of uncertainty as well as a payment to the crown of fourteen thousand ducats, Lucera was restored to the royal domain on December 20, 1691. The Patrona statue was credited with saving the city. In thanking the altar in the cathedral’s right transept that now houses a statue of Saint Roch was built for the Patrona’s display, solemn masses were held in the Virgin’s honor on September 13 and December 20, and a crown and silver-plated keys were donated to the statue by Lucera’s decury (fig. 5–41). In addition, a companion fresco to the Charles II

835 Those named include Massimano Carapresa, Achille Pagano, Giuseppe Zampaglia, Ipolito Ferrari, and the scribe, Giuseppe di Vincerè.
836 Lucera, Biblioteca Comunale di Lucera, “R. Bonghi,” sezione Archivio comunale di Lucera, Regestro delle deliberazioni decurionali (August 24, 1692); Monaco, “Il culto della Vergine Patrona,” 19-20; Morlacco, “Il culto di Santa Maria Patrona,” 209. Plans for the altar were put in place at least by 1690, one year before Lucera received officially its manumission. The altar was built by Giovanni Ragguzzino, a member of a family of Neapolitan marble sculptors and painters active in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It shares similar motifs (the jeweled cross and the slightly archaic volutes along the front) with a number of Neapolitan altars, including ones at San Pietro a Maiello and the Gesù e Maria. The altar also contains a marble medallion sculpted with an effigy of the Madonna and Child enthroned (no likeness to the Patrona statue) on the right side. The records of two payments for the altar survive. On March 20, 1690, Flaminio Pagano, a cathedral canon who had moved to Naples in 1687 (along with the nobleman Agostino Del Vecchio), paid twenty ducats (up to that point 448.63 ducats had been paid) to the account of “Maestro Giovanni Ragguzzino” at the Banco dell’Annunziata (now the Banco di Napoli) for an altar “nella cappella di Santa Maria, patrona nella Cattedrale di Lucera di Puglia.” On March 31, 1692 an additional fifty ducats (548.33 of 900 now had been paid) were paid for the altar. This altar housed the Patrona statue until 1790 when the current altar, donated by a Luceran named Giuseppe Scassa, was dedicated. The cost of the second altar was 2,256 ducats and 93 grani. The dedicatory inscription beside it reads: “D.O.M. Bina Altaria in Augusto Regali Templo e Regione Posita Mariae Patronas unum Rocho Tutori Alterm Huic Dauniae Principi Civitati Inclitae Patronatus Iure Iampridem Servato Dicta Quo Longitorum Muncrum Testatius Extaret Monumentum SPQL Instauranda Curavit Anno &
donation reportedly was painted on the left side of the wall, this time depicting the Spanish king Philip IV kneeling before the Virgin and Child. It was whitewashed by the end of the eighteenth century, uncovered in 1880, but like the Charles II fresco, destroyed during restorations.\footnote{Gifuni, 30, note. 1. Monaco, “Il culto della Vergine Patrona,” 20; Morlaccho, “Il culto di Santa Maria Patrona,” 209.} No physical evidence or exact details of its composition remain.

The end of the seventeenth century marked also the first instance in which civic processions entered the textual sources. Writing in 1690, the local historian Rocco del Preite provided the earliest surviving reference to a solemn procession within the city. His report, however, focused on a different image as the center of procession. For Del Preite, a standard donated supposedly by Charles II upon a visit to the city on February 2, 1304 was the most prominent image in the processions. According to the chroniclers, it, like the fresco and decury prefatory page, depicted Charles II donating the cathedral to the Virgin and Child. In fact, the author argued that the cathedral fresco served as a replacement for an unexplained destruction of the original flag.\footnote{Del Preite, 105-106. The section on the standard reads: “Nell’anno poscia 1304 il Re Carlo II venne a vedere S. Maria, et avendo molto lodato l’ordine da Giovanni iposto sopra il reggimento della città, la quale per allora si governava dal consiglio di dieci persone, le più da bene che ivi si ritrovavano eligendi dal’istessi cittadini. E per dar qualche memoria estrinseca ai posteri che esso devote re convertisse l’aficana moschea di Maometto in vero tempio di Dio con dedicarla alla beata Vergine appese nella predetta chiesa un stendardo in cui si vede diponto esso Re Carlo II che sostiene la chiesa tra le mani e sta in atto di donazione all’intemerata vergine Madre di Dio, come anche la città; qual staendardo si ritrova distrutto, e se n’è fatta l’effigie nel muro a man sinistra della grande detta chiesa, dove si vede che deto Re Carlo donò la detta chiesa alla Vergine con la città, et altro, et l’infrascritta descrizione in versi: Protégé Diva Parens Caroli pia dona secundi hoc templum, hanc Urbem nomine clara tuo; Regia jura intent a annosque diplomata signant. Mille et tercerntum temporis atque duos.”} By introducing the supposedly lost and destroyed standard, Del Preite justified the presence, and the apparent important civic role of the fresco, by arguing that it had replaced an older, original Angevin image. Similar tactics would be employed in subsequent years to justify the presence or use of objects connected to the \textit{Patrona}. 

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
No evidence of the “lost” standard survives besides Del Preite’s text and the memory of the fresco he argues replaced it.\footnote{Charles II was present in Lucera February 2, 1304 according to the surviving summary of an Angevin diploma. On that day he awarded the bishop and curia of Lucera the feuds of Apricena and Guardiola and as an act of penance pledged to give to the cathedral a “parasside argentea” and fifteen pounds of wax for three years, one year at Christmas, another at Easter, and the third year at Pentecost. The text makes no mention of a standard, however. See \textit{CDSL}, no. 750 (February 2, 1304, summary). For Charles II’s presence at Lucera in February 1302, see Kiesewetter, “Das Itinerar König Karls II,” 246.} The author conceded that the standard already had disappeared by 1690. By then, Del Preite reported that the bishop and chapter led solemn processions carrying a new flag bearing the seal of the city. As noted in the analysis of the decury prefatory pages, this included an image of a lion carrying a standard that bore the image of the Virgin and Child on a cloud beneath a crown with two bunches of wheat.\footnote{Rocco del Preite argued that the wheat bunches represented the “first enterprise” of the city. See Del Preite, 106.} It is unclear exactly when this became the city’s symbol (before the Charles II fresco? After?), and it remains frustratingly uncertain whether the image was intended to be a representation of the idea of the Virgin and Child or a representation of the \textit{Patrona} statue itself. As will be discussed toward the end of the chapter, this is because the image contains no discernable attributes belonging to the statue, and because the exact status of the statue within Lucera’s sacred economies is unknown at that point. As a comparison, the modern communal seal, a slight variation of the seventeenth-century version, clearly depicts the \textit{Patrona} rather than the Madonna and Child, as it copies the posture, style, and attributes of the statue when dressed for the Assumption festivities (fig. 5–42). The seal in this form has been the same since the second half of the nineteenth century.

Overall, however, Del Preite’s text is useful. Reading between its lines reveals that the seventeenth-century Angevin revival in Lucera had been sustained and that the cathedral fresco remained quite important—so much so that a genealogy involving a lost standard was required to ensure its historical value. His text also reveals that the Assumption procession
was not yet a regular, solemn event where the cult of the *Patrona* and a cult of the Angevins had fused. This is indicated in his discussion of the city’s processions, which makes no mention of statues and employs the adjective *qualche* (some, a few) that suggests the city’s processions at the time, whatever the occasion, were not regular.

Further indication that no such, or at least regular, Assumption procession involving the *Patrona* is gathered from two early eighteenth-century sources. They do show, however, that the statue was called the *Patrona* by the time. The first source is the *Zodiaco di Maria* (1715), a survey by the Dominican Serafino Montorio of the most prominent devotional images within the Kingdom of Naples. Montorio wrote a few paragraphs on the *Patrona*, providing, most importantly, a detailed description of the statue. By this time the dark polychrome on the hands and faces had been added, indicating that archaism already was a desire, as well as the red, white, and blue polychrome on the clothing. Montorio noted that the statue bore a crown and keys, presumably those given by the decury in 1692 after the city’s liberation. He alluded also to a tradition surrounding the image. Calling the statue “S. Maria Padrona,” the Dominican reported that Charles II had built the cathedral following the Muslim purge and that the statue had been placed within the cathedral (when, he does not specify) after its construction to serve as the patron of the city.

Montorio’s description of the image suggests that he had seen it personally. As such, his lack of detail in regard to specifics surrounding the origins of the statue and his failure to mention an Assumption procession reveal that in 1715 the statue’s origins were unclear even to Lucera’s residents and that no regular Assumption procession of the statue was performed.

---

841 Ciancio, 145. “La prima port al titolo di S. Maria Padrona […] vien rappresentata in una statoa di legno, sedente in una sede della medesima materiale, col suo Figliuolo Bambino fra le braccia, e tiene in testa una corona d’argento, adorata in un gran cappellone lavorato di finissimi marmi nella cattedrale di Lucera…e perciò la detta statoa (che è alquanto bruna di volto, e con paneggiamento colorito di rosso ed azzurro) tiene nelle mani due grosse chiavi d’argento, quasi che come Padrona di quella, tocchi a lei tenerle la custodia.”
In fact, Montorio devoted most of his report on objects in Lucera to two other Marian images: the painting behind the main altar of San Francesco called the *Madonna della Pieta* \[^842\] (fig. 5–43) and a now-lost fresco within the cathedral referred to as *Santa Maria della Spica*. \[^843\] Montorio was less confident in his analysis of the *Patrona*, and noted that the “brevity and scarcity of information did not allow [him] to give particular information about the image.” \[^844\] He was able to provide some detail of current practice, however. He noted that some form of Assumption celebration existed and that the image was used in particular to protect the population in times of earthquakes, reporting that “there [was] not a house in Lucera that did not have attached to its door *cartoline* of the Virgin that protected it against earthquakes.” \[^845\] The manner in which the statue was venerated at this point, though, especially during the feast of the Assumption, appears to have occurred exclusively within the church. Montorio makes no mention of an August procession, and instead noted that the faithful prayed before the statue in the altar every morning “for at least five months.” \[^846\]

Events during 1731 would alter the status of the *Patrona* statue and the Assumption procession forever. Following the latest devastating earthquake on March 20, \[^847\] Lucera’s

\[^842\] Montorio noted that the fresco at San Francesco was responsible for miracles as early as 1554 when the image cured a blind man. Its veneration was said to have brought devotees from throughout Apulia who offered votive gifts to the painting. See Ciancio, 144.

\[^843\] The *Madonna della Spicca* was the protector of harvests and cured those ill from malaria. Farmers reportedly venerated the image every year on the first Sunday of July. The image no longer survives, but Montorio reported that the Virgin held the Christ Child in her arms while he played with a bird attached at the foot by a lead. See Ciancio, 145.

\[^844\] Ciancio, 145. The Italian reads, “e perché la brevità, e scarsezza delle notizie non mi dan campo di dare particolare ragguglio di due altre immagini.” Another image mentioned at the cathedral was *Santa Maria della Vittoria*, a fifteenth-century wood and polychrome statue also located within the cathedral at the time. Montorio reported that the statue was venerated on the first Sunday after the Easter Octave, reportedly “with great solemnity.” It currently is the main cult image for the Lucera parish San Giacomo Maggiore and Lucera writers that it was produced as a result of the popularity of the *Patrona* statue. On the cult, see Ciancio, 145. On the statue, see Calò Mariani, “Santa Maria Patrona di Lucera,” 82.

\[^845\] “onde non vi è casa in Lucera, che non tenga attaccata alle porte, colle solite cartoline contro i tremuoti, anche quella della Vergine.” See Ciancio, 145.

\[^846\] Ciancio, 145.

\[^847\] As noted above this earthquake, whose epicenter was in the immediate area, measured approximately 6.52 on the Moment Magnitude Scale. “Catalogo parametrico dei terremoti italiani (dal 1000 al 2006).”
decury established a stable Assumption procession. The parliament noted that “there never had been a stable fund . . . to venerate Santa Maria the Patron,” and therefore designated a portion of agricultural tract whose proceeds would be used every year to pay for the festival.\textsuperscript{848} The piece of land, called the Terraggio di S. Maria, amounted to 600 moggia, or approximately 504 acres southwest of the city, and was acquired from the former estates of citizens who had died without heirs.\textsuperscript{849} The document also gives an indication of the structure of the festival and procession. 163 citizens representing all social classes were chosen each year to organize the solemn festival that included “a procession with statues of the Protector Saints, the celebration of Mass, music, panegyrics, simulated combat with fireworks, and other solemnities encouraged for the great glory and praise of the most holy Virgin by the Deputies and the Electors for the time.”\textsuperscript{850}

The inspiration for the specific activities celebrated during the festival is unclear, and neither the decury document nor the previous writers on the cult provide much detail about how feasts, when they occurred, were celebrated before this point. This suggests that many of the ritual aspects either were invented at the time, or recycled from other civic events such as the occasional processions led by the bishop and canons mentioned by Del Preite. Despite a lack of knowledge on the specific motivations, the document does reveal that the festival was designed in its new incarnation to serve both as a symbol of the city’s continuous appeal

\textsuperscript{848} Biblioteca comunale di Lucera “R. Bonghi,” sezione Archivio comunale di Lucera, Registro delle deliberazione decurionali, May 3, 1731. Massimiliano Monaco has transcribed sections of the text. See Monaco, “Il culto della Vergine Patrona,” 23, note 43, and 15, note 9. On the text see also Gifuni 23; and Morlacco, “Il culto di Santa Maria Patrona,” 201, who noted that the document states that the statue was venerated for “l’antichità, che sin da quell tempo haveva, e di cui non vi era memoria.”

\textsuperscript{849} The Terraggio was sold at auction by the commune on May 25, 1920 to the noble Roberto Curato for 190,100 lira. See Monaco, “Il culto della Vergine Patrona,” 23, note 43.

\textsuperscript{850} “ processione delle Statue de’ Santi Protettori, celebrar messe, musiche, panegirico, spari di maschi e fuoco artificiale colla soldatesca ed alter solennità come meglio si stimeria dai Sigg. Eletti pro tempore e Deputati in maggiore Gloria e Lode dell a Vergine Santissima.” For the text, see Monaco, “Il culto della Vergine Patrona,” 23, note 43.
for the Virgin’s protection and a moment to commemorate Lucera’s special history.\textsuperscript{851} The commemoration of the \textit{Patrona}, like many ritual acts, was intended to be both planted within time and suspended out of it. This sentiment was expressed clearly in the wording of the document that states the festival was to be celebrated solemnly “in ogni anno e in perpetuo” (“every year and in perpetuity”).

Writing in 1767, Filippo De Iorio, a Lucera lawyer, historian, and auditor in the Royal Court of Appeals in Naples, provided an early narration of the Assumption procession following its codification in 1731.\textsuperscript{852} Details from his account show that aspects of the celebration outlined by the decury text of 1731 had become fixed. For example, he noted that civil and military authorities were involved in the procession and that the festivities, as had been reported by the decury, involved reenactments of battles as well as tournaments, carousels, and prizes.\textsuperscript{853}

De Iorio’s text also attempted to provide some historical contextualization for the rituals. In fact, this marks the second time following Rocco Del Preite’s discussion of the cathedral fresco that a local writer on the cult grew concerned with providing historical justifications for the current mode of celebrating the Assumption festival. The result was that Filippo De Iorio began to invent, or at least for the first time record invented, history.

\textsuperscript{851} This is shown especially in the simulated warfare commemorating the origins of \textit{Civitas Sanctae Mariae}. This tradition continues to this day. On simulated warfare, especially between Christians and Muslims, as commemorative ritual, see Guarino, 85-87.

\textsuperscript{852} Filippo De Iorio, \textit{Historia della città di Lucera}. Lucera, Biblioteca Comunale “R. Bonghi,” Sezione Manoscritti, 1767. Giambattista Gifuni appears to rely heavily on the work. In addition to his writing and his legal career, Filippo also was involved in the antinapoleonic counterrevolution at the end of the eighteenth century. See Anna Lisa Sannio, “Costruire la contrarivoluzione. L’associazionismo politico-culturale antidemocratico in Puglia e Basilicata alle fine del seicento,” in \textit{Patrioti e insorgenti in provincia: Il 1799 in Terra di Bari e Basilicata}, ed. Angelo Massafra (Bari: Edipuglia, 2002), 587-628.

\textsuperscript{853} Gifuni, 21, cited De Iorio here. It is uncertain whether his use of the term “carousel” implied the horse ballet or the Arab/Iberian meaning that involved two sides engaging in a simulated battle either with hollow earthen balls or hollow reeds. The latter seems more likely, however, given the emphasis on simulated warfare as a way to unify neighborhoods within Lucera and as a way to commemorate the city’s history. The Spanish introduced the Arab/Iberian version to the Kingdom. On the history of the carousel as simulated warfare, see Guarino, 85.
De Iorio, a lawyer who previously had written a history of Lucera’s legal history for the first ten centuries of its existence, was concerned with providing a tradition for the commune’s financial and material support of the festival. To provide an historical precedent for the Terraggio di Santa Maria, the new symbol of civic financial and administrative support of the festival, the local historian and patriot noted that in 1302 Charles II donated one hundred ounces of gold for the celebration of the Patrona’s cult. De Iorio, here, seems to refer to a number of privileges provided to the cathedral and the chapter in an Angevin diploma January 4, 1302 and confirmed in 1304. The 1302 text (Appendix F) is rich with imagery that could have been manipulated for the author’s purposes, yet it does not report what De Iorio interpreted. An examination of the document reveals as such. The diploma begins by noting that the confrontation with Lucera’s Muslims began “on the feast of the Assumption of the glorious Virgin in the month of August—(the Virgin) whose “Ave” reversed the mystery of the name of Eve.” The text also offers some form of image theory, as it notes that the Muslims of Lucera (and Muslims in general) were those who “venerated in mosques idols under the cult and name of Mohammed.” Initially, the text reads as if it will support De Iorio’s assertions. The charge of idolatry had been used as a

---

855 De Iorio, 57. “Sappiam di certo...però, che vi era a tempi di Carlo II di Angio, poiche, come stà registo nè sudetti Regis Archivis, scrivendo Carlo a capitani della Città di Maria olim la Lucera dice à bajuli, e cabellotti di quella presenti, futuri, che per riverenza di quella sagratissima statua (my emphasis), e per il di culto l’ha parso dotarla, e tra l’altre cose l’ha donato cento once d’oro l’anno dell’entrate sue Regali esistenti in la Città di Lucera, col corer degli anni poi mutarono i cittadini tali rendite in altre, ...stabilita come capo de cittidini anche feudatoria, assegndatale territorio.” Gifuni later cited De Iorio. See Gifuni, 32-33.
856 The source is CDSL, no. 655. De Iorio’s contemporaries commented the privilege as well. The local historian Domenico Lombardo devoted ten and a half pages to commentary on the privilege in a manuscript dated to sometime in the 1760s. See Domenico Lombardi, *In secundo diploma Caroli II: Andegavensis datum anno 1304: Commentario breviry*, Lucera, Biblioteca Comunale di Lucera, “R. Bonghi,” sezione Elementi di Storia Lucerina.
857 “…in festo Assumptionis Virginis gloriose de mense augusti, cuius Ave prefiguratum a Patribus signanter mutavit in horum mistério nomen Eve.”
858 “Sarracenos…que venerabatur ab illis sub cultu et nomine Machometti, Muscheta, templum scilicet ydolatre veneracionis eorum.”
means to justify Christian image veneration in the past. Suzanne Akbari, among others, has shown that in medieval theological and popular polemics Christians often defeated Muslim idolatry with the use of good or correct Christian images.\(^859\) Literary examples include Jean Bodel’s *Jeu de Saint Nicolas* (ca. 1200) and Alfonso X’s *Cantigas de Santa Maria* (1221-1284).\(^860\) The replacement of a Muslim idol at Lucera with a “proper” image very well could have been a re-enactment of this kind of literary trope. Was the *Patrona* statue, undoubtedly a product of Angevin artistic circulation, part of a group of images installed within the church to neutralize the idolatry that had occurred previously on the site?

This last section of the privilege, the part where the donation actually is made, however, reveals that De Iorio misused the text. The document does mention a donation of gold (two hundred instead of one hundred ounces of gold), and notes that Lucera’s bishop, at this time Stefano, “who govern(ed) and who w(ould) lead the church in the future . . . (would be given) two hundred ounces of gold both for tithes and other income due to the bishop, also for the life and sustainability of the of the bishop, for the protection (safeguarding) of the bishop, and for the celebration, *ut expedit*, of the sacred within the church.”\(^861\) However, despite the praise of the Virgin and her aid during the Feast of the Assumption and the

---


\(^860\) Jean Bodel’s *Jeu de Saint Nicolas* is a mystery play written in French around 1200. In the play, a gold Muslim idol called Tervagant is confronted head on by a simple wooden statue of Saint Nicholas. The simple Saint Nicholas statue is much more effective in performing miracles, so much so that at the end of the play the Muslim king converts to Christianity and destroys his ineffective idols. For the play, see Akbari, 203-216 and Michael Camille, *The Gothic Idol: Ideology and Image-Making in Medieval Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 129-135. In Alfonso X’s *Cantigas de Santa Maria*, a new statue of the Virgin presented to the re-Christianized city of Santa Maria del Puerto (Alicante) performed numerous miracles during the construction of the church dedicated to the Virgin. See Akbari, 203-216, 223-233, and 247-254.

\(^861\) “In primis Episcopo Civitatis eiusdem, qui preest et preerit eodem ecclesie in futurum, de fiscalibus iuribus regalibus et redditibus nostris in Civitate predicta c unc. au. pond. gen. tam pro demis et alii iuribus debitis olim eodem episcopo, ac pro vita et sustentatione ipsius episcopi, quam pro servandis episcopalibus suis et pro celebritate, ut expedit, divinorum in ipsa ecclesia...”
polemics involving Muslim idolatry, the text makes no mention of an image cult; the
donation of two hundred ounces of gold appears to have been provided for no specific aim
but for the general upkeep of the bishop and cathedral, “ut expedit” (as required, as needed,
as obtained?). There is no mention of specific cults or images and the document reads as if
spending power was given to the bishop at his discretion. A look at the privilege suggests
that De Iorio read too much into the document while supplying “factual” information that
justified current cult practices.

De Iorio’s tendency to invent is confirmed by his second historical “discovery.” The
lawyer reported a special donation to the Patrona by Angevin monarchs: a golden necklace,
by then lost, offered by Charles II’s queen, Mary of Hungary, upon a supposed visit to
Lucera by the king in 1302.862 Again, De Iorio’s statement reveals both a desire to provide
an historical precedent for one aspect of the cult (in this case the act of offering votive gifts)
as well as some intimate knowledge of actual Angevin events. As noted in the second
chapter, the Angevin crown did donate furnishings as well as precious metalwork to Lucera’s
cathedral. For example, a royal order survives from 1309 that notes a gilt silver cross was
donated to the cathedral by the future king Robert of Anjou (then the Duke of Calabria).863
The problem with Filippo’s claim, though, is that no corroborating physical or textual
evidence of the necklace donation survives. Moreover, there is no indication from Angevin
diplomas or other textual sources that Charles II was present in Lucera during the year

862 De Iorio, 55. On the necklace, the lawyer wrote, “Per commando di moglie donò alla Vergine Padrona della
città una gran collana d’oro, di cui non se ne vedono neppure le reliquie.”
863 Schulz, vol. 4, doc. 339. “(Robertus, Calabriae dux, vicarious etc.) Scriptum est eisdem
thesaurariis devotis
suis etc. Devotioni vestre precipimus, quatenus magistro Guilielmo Verdelay aurifabro regio debitas ei tam pro
argentu et auro immisisonis per eum in una cruce facta per ipsum de mandato et ordinatione reverendi domini
genitoriis nostri ad opus maioris ecclesie civitatis Sancte Marie, quam pro facture ipsius cruces et repositoriui ei
uncias auri quatuor tarenos viginti quinque et grana quatuor ponderis generalis de fiscali pecunia existente vel
future per manus vestras sine difficulitate solvates et recipiatis exinde apodixam, mandato vel ordinacione, que
forsitan impediret executionem presentium, non obstante. Datum Napoli in camera ducali anno domini
MCCCVIII die XXV Ianuarii V indictionis.”
1302. These assertions may have been more plausible if the item De Iorio described survived, but it did not even in the time the chronicler wrote. Furthermore, De Iorio was the first writer to mention a necklace supposedly donated by Mary of Hungary. Montorio, who provided the most detailed physical description of the Patrona, mentioned only that the statue wore a crown and held the silver keys donated in 1691.

A similar donation story was invented to explain the significance of keys in the celebration of the Patrona cult. Its origins now are lost, but it appears to have been solidified around the time of De Iorio’s Lucera history. By the end of the eighteenth century the Patrona’s keys had become one of the most important symbols of the statue’s role as patron and protector of Lucera and center of an Angevin commemorative cult. In their initial negotiations with French troops in 1799 examined during the first section of this chapter, the Lucera delegation led by the noblewoman Maddalena Candida Mazzacara first brought to the French camp the Patrona’s keys rather than the statue. In this case the keys appear to have been employed to represent not only the statue itself, but also the idea that whoever bore the keys served as the protector of the city. It only was after a reported misunderstanding on the significance of Lucera’s bell ringing—the French interpreted the act as a call to war whereas Lucera’s citizens reportedly rang the bells in thanksgiving of the settlement made with their potential conquerors—that city officials led by the Bishop took the statue on a procession toward advancing troops. Today, the ritual that involves the bishop “emulating” Charles II by placing the keys over the arm of the Patrona marks the most solemn moment in the Assumption festival.

---

864 For an itinerary of Charles II drawn Angevin diplomas and other textual sources, see Kiesewetter, “Das Itinerar König Karles II.,” 85-283.
865 Whether the keys were offered to the French or employed solely as a symbol of Maddalena’s authority to represent Lucera is unknown.
866 Prignano, 239-243.
Searching for historical precedent, by that period local legends recounted that the tradition of conferring keys onto the statue began with the donation of an iron set in 1304 by Charles II.\textsuperscript{867} The actual conference of keys onto the \textit{Patrona} dates only to the previous century, however. There is no mention of keys, whether donated by Charles II or the commune, until 1691 following civic manumission. In perhaps the most telling indication that the use of keys as a symbol of the statue’s civic patronage not yet had entered the visual lexicon before 1691, the fresco from roughly fifty years earlier that commemorated Charles II’s privileges depicted the monarch presenting a model of the cathedral, not a pair of keys, to the Virgin and Christ child. In fact, the new local legend of the 1304 gift of keys replaced the old legend of the 1304 gift of a royal standard, turned fresco, recounted by Del Preite.

The reference to the keyless seventeenth-century fresco is important because the emphasis on keys, especially after the eighteenth century, comes into shape not only as part of the celebration of the cult, but also through the visual culture surrounding the \textit{Patrona}. On August 15, 1806, a little more than a year after Lucera was spared from the region’s most recent devastating earthquake, the Vatican chapter donated a triple crown and silver keys to the \textit{Patrona}, replacing the older crown and silver-plated keys reported by Montorio.\textsuperscript{868}

\textsuperscript{867} Gifuni, 25. Gifuni, writing in 1933, records for the first time a much older oral legend.

\textsuperscript{868} As noted earlier the latest earthquake (July 26, 1805), whose epicenter was in Molise, measured a 6.62 on the Moment Magnitude Scale. See “Catalogo parametrico dei terremoti italiani (dal 1000 al 2006).” The keys donated by the Vatican chapter were stolen in 1946. The current keys and crowns used in the procession, which are modeled after the 1806 donations, date to the third or fourth decade of the twentieth century. The current keys include an image of the Virgin and Child and the inscription \textit{Civitas Luceriae}. The 1806 event in itself—the offering of votive gifts by a foreign corporation—indicates the fame and perceived efficacy of the statue beyond Lucera’s borders by the time. The statue would continue to be recognized by the Vatican two centuries after this event: once in March of 1987 when Pope John Paul II prayed before the statue while visiting Lucera’s cathedral and another time on September 24, 2003 when the statue, in Rome for the 700\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the consecrated of Lucera’s cathedral, was crowned by then-Vatican Secretary of State and vice dean of the College of Cardinals (and Current Dean of the College of Cardinals), Angelo Sodano. On the Vatican donation, see D’Amelj, 228; Coletti, 126; Gifuni, 207; Monaco, “Il culto della Vergine Patrona,” 25; and Morlacco, “Il culto di Santa Maria Patrona,” 206. On the keys and crowns currently in use, Giovanni Boraccesi, \textit{Gli argenti della cattedrale e del museo diocesano di Lucera} (Foggia: Claudio Grenzi Editore, 2003), 102-103. On the twentieth-
early lithograph that commemorated this event and now is held at the Museo Civico “G. Fiorelli” di Lucera conflates the history of the Patrona cult up to this time (fig. 5–44). Three registers define the image. The Virgin and Child, clothed in red, blue, and white like the actual Patrona statue, are depicted in the clouds above the city of Lucera between Saint Roch and the Blessed Augustine Kažotić. Two angels crown the Virgin with the triple crown donated at that time by the Vatican chapter. Four additional angels flank the Virgin and Child, carrying other attributes including a mirror and possibly a votive tablet that since has been lost. Below, a scene from “history” occurs, as Charles II, flanked by a crowd of standing soldiers and onlookers (clothed in contemporary dress rather than medieval) outside of the city walls, kneels in supplication beneath the heavenly coronation. A pillow on which his crown rests and a chest—perhaps used to transport the keys or the chest in which the statue supposedly was found—rests to the left of the kneeling king. The two angels who carry up to the Patrona statue a scepter or rose and a pair of keys just offered by the kneeling Angevin king fill the middle register.

The image clearly is based on of the seventeenth-century fresco. The difference between the two, however, is that whereas the fresco addresses the Virgin Mary’s protection of the city in general (seen through Charles II’s gift of the cathedral), the 1806 lithograph participates in the actions surrounding, and the writings in reference to the Patrona cult. The scene is located outside of time as both Charles II and the crown just recently donated by the Vatican are present. This active participation of the image in the practice of the cult is intensified even further through the copies of the work made for numerous occasions and in a century events involving the Vatican, see Monaco, “Il culto della Vergine Patrona,” 29; Morlacco, “Il culto di Santa Maria Patrona,” 206.

869 On the votive tablet supposedly lost by the end of the eighteenth century, see Monaco, “Il culto della Vergine Patrona,” 18, note 25.
variety of media, including prints, embroideries, bronze plates, and even so-called terraggio maps used by the commune to track agricultural plots for taxation (fig. 5–45, fig. 5–46, fig. 5–47, and fig. 5–48). These images circulated throughout the various strata of Lucera society beginning in the first half of the nineteenth century. The copies capture the essence of the 1806 work, although some add to or subtract from certain elements of the image. In many instances the chest is removed, Charles’s crown on the pillow remains, and Lucera’s cityscape is altered. The 1806 representation of the city, which was not completely accurate but evocative of Lucera’s real cityscape, was replaced in many of these copies by a cityscape marked by the architectural styles of Roman antiquity. The inscription across the gate in these images bears the words “Civitas S. Mariae.”

At least five moments in time are depicted in these images. The first, technically not a specific moment in time but rather the representation of time in perpetuum, is marked through the depiction of the Patrona statue, not on earth but in the heavens with the “santi protettori” of Lucera. This period symbolizes the Patron’s and her co-protector’s active and unwavering role in the salvation of Lucera. The crowning of the statue by angels, which is re-enacted every year by the city’s bishop, falls both within the realm of perpetuity as well as (through the accurate rendering of the crown) the second moment commemorated: the 1806 Vatican donation of this particular tiara. Charles II’s “donation” of keys before Civitas Sanctae Mariae falls within the third moment in time, and the depiction of a Roman Lucera, perhaps an evocation of Lucera’s ancient past, represents the fourth moment.

---

870 Many examples of these copies dating from the middle of the nineteenth century through 2006 were gathered together for a 2008 exhibition entitled Le immagini della Regina held at episcopal palace in Lucera. The images fall generally into two iconographic groups: those that present the entire history of the cult like the 1806 image and those that depict just the Patrona statue. In one example dating to 2006, Pope Benedict XVI replaces Charles II in offering the keys to the Patrona. Augustine Kažotić and John Paul II flank the statue in the heavens. On the exhibition, See Vincenzo Francia, “Le immagini di Santa Maria Patrona di Lucera,” in Santa Maria Patrona di Lucera: Storia, arte, devozione, ed. Massimiliano Monaco (Foggia: Grenzi Editore, 2008), 31-79.
The fifth moment is noteworthy because it adds a new, and until this instance unmentioned moment in the “history” of the Patrona’s cult. In both the 1806 original and the subsequent nineteenth-century copies, Charles’s donation to the Virgin takes place outside of the city gates marked in the copies with the inscription “Civitas Sanctae Mariae.” This is not wholly undifferent from the 1674 decury image that uses the city’s walls to represent the urban project of Civitas Sanctae Mariae. However, in copies of the 1806 image the location of the donation outside of the walls in combination with the introduction of throngs of soldiers preparing for battle evoked, or at least inspired evocations of, the very “first” Assumption procession in 1300.

The events surrounding the supposed first Assumption procession were a topic of concern especially for a number of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century historians. They appear to be the first writers who recorded this event, and therefore it seems plausable that the 1806 depiction of the donation outside of the city walls in part sparked this historical inquiry. Giambattista D’Amelj (1861), seeking historical continuity with the current celebration of the festival that began on the vigil of the feast day, argued that the initial battle and the subsequent procession outside of the walls occurred on the evening of August 14 rather than the date of August 15 date supported by Angevin documents.871 Benevento Colasanto, who wrote a history of the procession at the end of the nineteenth century (1894), reiterated D’Amelj’s timeline.872 Later writers, including the local historians Giambattista

871 D’Amelj, 225. See also Morlacco, “Il culto di Santa Maria Patrona,” 203, note 16.
872 Colasanto wrote that the battle began on the fourteenth and on that same night the soldiers brought out the image of the Virgin, processing it as has been done every year since. Benevento Colasanto, Storia dell’antica Lucera (Lucera: Tip. Scepi, 1894), 209-210. See also Morlacco, “Il culto di Santa Maria Patrona,” 203, note 16.
Gifuni and Vincenzo Coletti, moved D’Amelj’s timeline up a day to the fifteenth but continued to argue that the first night of battle was marked by a procession of the statue.  

All of these writers engage directly with the 1806 image and its copies. Whereas it is unclear whether these images, in their depiction of the “first procession” outside of the city walls responded to earlier but now lost verbal or written traditions, the surviving writers concerned with the first Assumption procession who wrote after the creation of the 1806 image and its copies found themselves negotiating within a new world where images that succinctly showed the cult’s past, present, and future circulated widely amongst the populace of the city. In these instances the image took the active rather than reactive role in shaping a history for the cult and it was up to these writers, as has been shown throughout this study of the cult’s history and historiography, to fill the genealogical gaps left in the wake of the *Patrona’s* increasing popularity.

The nineteenth and early-twentieth century historians, inserting the missing puzzle piece of the very first procession, marked the last phase in the creation of the Assumption procession’s genealogy. At this point the full genealogy of the cult as known today was established. By the very end of the historiographical tradition, the *Patrona’s* writers had created a complete narrative. The statue, originally from the East and brought to Lucera after 744, had been uncovered from its hiding place on August 15, 1300. It then was led in procession that same night, and subsequently every year on August 14 in commemoration of

---

873 Gifuni argued that the initial procession occurred on the evening of August 15 when the Bishop Aymardus, who wanted to solemnize the initial Angevin victory. He continued that tradition had it that the soldiers of Giovanni Pipino brought triumphantly through the streets of the city the statue of the *Patrona* that the Christians had guarded in a temple of wood. He noted that the procession has been held on the evening of August 14 ever since. See Gifuni, 20; and Coletti, 113.

that night. The Angevin crown supported subsequent festivals celebrating the Virgin’s role during the Muslim purge, as Charles II donated two hundred ounces of gold to support the festival every year. Funds like the *Terragio di Santa Maria* continued this tradition. The cult of the statue, already a stable and important civic ritual by 1304, received iron keys from Charles II and a golden necklace from Mary of Hungary. These no longer survived by the end of the seventeenth century for reasons unrecorded, but the keys were replaced in 1691 following the restoration of Lucera into the royal domain and again in 1806 when two crowns also were donated to the *Patrona*.

Post-war writers concerned with the topic, including Dionisio Morlacco, Massimiliano Monaco, Vincenzo Di Sabato, and Enrico Venditti to name a few, have relied on this genealogy, accepting at times the writings of their predecessors as historical fact rather than attempts to justify genealogically the forward momentum of an increasingly codifying cult.\textsuperscript{875} What I have done instead is disentangle the genealogies created *ex post facto* from the actual historical events recorded contemporaneously. In doing so the internal dialogue between events surrounding the cult and later histories reacting to those events has been exposed. What remains now no longer is a neat chronology of ritualistic continuity but rather a discontinuous, convoluted, and at times opaque history whose very lack of clarity and continuity motivated the creation of the historiographical tradition that survives today.

\textsuperscript{875} Monaco is the most rigorous and critical of the later writers. The only writer not mentioned up to this point in the footnotes is Vincenzo Di Sabato. See Vincenzo Di Sabato, *Storia ed arte nelle chiese e conventi di Lucera* (Foggia: Cappetta, 1971).
4. Conclusions

As stated previously, the history of the *Patrona* statue and its relationship with the city of Lucera is complex. This chapter has addressed essential historical and art historical issues that concern this relationship; however, these questions could be illuminated further through work from scholars in the fields of anthropology of religion and ritual, early modern studies, the Risorgimento, and folklore. The primary concern of this chapter has been to expose the tension that has risen between the *Patrona* statue as an artistic product of the Angevin realm and the celebration of the *Patrona* festival as an Angevin festival. These two phenomena often have been presented as mutually exclusive, as the power of the festival as a ritual instituted by the Angevin crown requires that the *Patrona* statue already had been important, and therefore much older, when supposedly first used in procession on August 15, 1300. Confronted with the modern notions of artistic authenticity and scientific artistic restorations, Lucera’s current writers have tried to reconcile old traditions with the fact that the *Patrona* statue is much later in date than once thought. Using a similar tactic as Filippo De Iorio in the case of necklace or Rocco del Preite in the case of the Angevin standard, one recent writer has suggested that the older Byzantine image was lost or discarded after the Muslim purge and replaced by the current late medieval *Patrona* statue.\(^{876}\)

Despite its concern with the modern notion of artistic authenticity, this new argument continues to operate within a realm that is neither modern nor *unmodern*: the sacred.\(^{877}\) It concedes that the *Patrona* statue essentially is a copy of an older statue—an assertion we now known not to be the case—without reducing any of the power it gained from when it

---

\(^{876}\) See Monaco, “Il culto della Vergine Patrona nella città di Lucera,” 18.
\(^{877}\) In the realm of relics, Geary noted that “authenticity” meant less in regards to identity with a particular saint’s body than with the efficacy in terms of communal needs. See Geary, “Sacred Commodities,” 181. On sacred objects and artistic authenticity, or lack thereof, see Appadurai, 46; and Belting, *Likeness and Presence*. 
was believed to be of Byzantine origin.\textsuperscript{878} In this sense the statue is just like its major attribute the keys, which have been replaced at least twice, and in the historiographical tradition thrice, without losing any of their value as symbols of the *Patrona’s* protection.

The powers of these reproductions, both the real reproductions in the case of the keys and 1806 image legacies and those images now thought of as reproductions including the “new” *Patrona* statue, contradict the notions of authenticity and aura put forth most famously by Walter Benjamin’s “The Work of Art in the Mechanical Reproduction.”\textsuperscript{879} The replica copies of the *Patrona* stored in niches during the air bombardment of Foggia and the prints, embroideries, carvings, and bronze plates that circulated throughout Lucera depicting the “vera e miracolosa effigie di Santa Maria Patrona” expose his system most thoroughly. None of these copies contaminated or diminished the aura of the *Patrona* statue. In fact, as I have argued earlier, the copies and the circulation of the 1806 image contributed to the mystique of the statue and the completion of its cultic genealogy. Rather than diminishing the “authentic” image’s aura, they have expanded it, acting as individual nodes that project and reinforce the space into which the cult operates.\textsuperscript{880} In this sense they act very much in the

\textsuperscript{878} On image copies, which remained as powerful their prototype due to their contact with the original, see Belting, *Likeness and Presence*, 53 and 68; and Gary Vikan, “Ruminations on Edible Icons: Originals and Copies in the Art of Byzantium,” in *Sacred Images and Sacred Power in Byzantium* (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 2003).

\textsuperscript{879} Various scholars have critiqued Benjamin’s essay since the publishing. Recently, and most relevant to the discussion of Lucera, Kajri Jain has challenged the idea that in modernity the sacred icon belongs either to the past or “inhabits cultic spaces concealed from public view.” In her opinion this relegates publically circulating contemporary religious images either to “low culture” or “classical” or “folk” art. She has suggested that a large part of the problem “is that these terms of aesthetic value are predicated on the suppression of the sacred: on its relegation to a private, anterior, and/or nonworldly sphere.” This modern theorization of the aesthetic “developed in conjunction with that of the fetish, which was informed in its turn by trading encounters with “primitive” others cast as anterior within a civilizational telos.” See Kajri Jain, *Gods in the Bazaar: The Economies of Indian Calendar Art* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007), 17-18 and 181-182; and Kajri Jain, “Divine Mass Production,” in *Medium Religion: Faith. Geopolitics. Art*, eds. Boris Grays and Peter Weibel (Cologne: Walter König, 2011), 143-154. See also Ian Knizk, “Walter Benjamin and the Mechanical Reproducibility of Art Works Revisited,” *British Journal of Aesthetics* 33 (1993), 357-366.

\textsuperscript{880} Jain has argued that modern Indian Calendar art, for instance, worked in the same way. Placing these images within the social, cultural, and commercial economies in which they circulate, she wrote that “the annual distribution of calendars by a business house is a means of keeping its social-commercial networks lubricated,
same way as the Angevin arms discussed in the third chapter. The circulation of copies of the 1806 work, in effect, placed a stamp upon every territory in which the Patrona’s cult is active.

This lack of concern for “authenticity” in almost every nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century copy of the Patrona statue plays out in other ways as well. While reporting to be sign markers for the “true and miraculous image of the Patrona,” most of these images do not include representations of the statue in its exact likeness. In many cases the Patrona’s attributes including crown, keys, and sometimes the color of the dress are repeated, yet stylistically the recreations diverge widely from the prototype. More recent prints of the Patrona that date approximately after the first restoration in 1936—including the 2006 Benedict XVI print completed after the last restorations—reveal a modern interest in portraying artistic likeness while at the same time rejecting any notion that sacrality or aura is lost through copy (fig. 4–49 and fig. 5–50).

How are these aesthetic divergences rectified? Nagel and Wood have suggested that some representations of the Virgin Mary did not need to be exact likenesses because pilgrimages were focused on the place where the image worked rather than the image itself. The two authors discuss this phenomenon within the context of fifteenth-century house or chapel relics (they cite specifically the Holy House in Loreto) where the stones and bricks of a building rather than an iconic image served as the devotional material. But are
iconic images like the *Patrona*, the patron of a city, not also primarily markers of space and place? An examination of the *Patrona* cult throughout its ritual history reveals yes. In fact Lucera, supposedly saved by the statue from Muslims, earthquakes, infeudization, French troops, cholera, and Allied bombs, has remained the common denominator throughout the history of the cult. The statue is paraded through its streets and gates, in the past was used to bless its crops, and is housed within its cathedral. The relationship between object and place is mutually beneficial. The statue continues to offer the city favor, but that is because Lucera is a special place for the *Patrona*, a place where a miraculous image desires to be adored. In this sense, in the end the *Patrona* cult might be called more properly a cult of Lucera rather than an Angevin cult or a cult of the Angevins.

---

882 To my knowledge the statue never was reported to come the aid of an individual for individual gain. 883 As scholars including Geary and Belting have noted, medieval rhetoric of sacred images and relics argued that effective objects were too powerful to be held in a location against their will. Their very presence meant that they were pleased with their locations. Conversely, relics and sacred images allowed themselves to be taken when the site that housed them was “unworthy.” See Geary, “Sacred Commodities,” 186; and Belting, *Likeness and Presence*, 314-317.
Part III

Conclusion

This dissertation has provided a history of the Angevin state through its art, architecture, and urbanism at Lucera. As such I have argued that Lucera’s destruction and subsequent reconstruction resulted from the rise of Angevin centralization, and I have examined how this process affected the city’s fourteenth-century art and architecture. Two major outcomes resulted from the phenomenon. The first, belonging to the realm of architecture, is that centralization meant that the crown controlled building projects administratively through its corps of noblesse de robe who procured funds and materials for projects, directed workers, and reported back to the kings on building progress. However rigid certain aspects of this system were, this “architecture by remote control” was short on detail in the realm of specific aesthetic guidelines and in almost every case employed local builders. This meant that workers often produced vernacular architecture not necessarily because of a lack of funds, too few laborers skilled in constructing “French Gothic” monuments, or a desire to appease local populations, as has been argued in the past, but because of the very process of administrative centralization that systematized the manipulation of workers and materials in the ways that have been revealed. In the end, the priorities of soundness and efficiency far outweighed the desire for “symbolic meaning through specific (architectural) forms.” The same phenomenon occurred in other centralized and colonial contexts during the Middle Ages—the most closely related were the

884 Toker, “Gothic Architecture by Remote Control.” For this concept, see also the introduction of this dissertation.
885 Trachtenberg has rejected this idea for medieval buildings. See Trachtenberg, “On Brunelleschi’s Choice,” 169.
bastides of southwest France—and continued even through the twentieth century in examples such as the new towns of Mussolini’s Fascist Italy.

The second outcome pertains to art objects. Through Angevin centralization that promoted intraregional commercial exchange, made migration from territory to territory easier, and maintained transport infrastructure, small-scale art objects and the individuals who created them—which operated under a completely different production system than architecture—circulated throughout the Regno. This meant that the art of the Angevin capital Naples, the center of well-documented court patronage of painters, sculptors, illuminators, and metalworkers from other parts of Italy and France, spread throughout the Regno, reaching cities within the crown’s economic, diplomatic, and cultural networks. These important centers included L’Aquilla, Manfredonia, Bari, the towns along the Amalfi Coast, and Lucera. If architectural products were in almost every case vernacular (i.e. culturally and geographically specific), art commissions decidedly were more modern, more cosmopolitan, and they expressed the crown’s political, economic, cultural, and genealogical ties both within its borders and beyond.

These two divergent aesthetic results, which rarely have been considered in relation to one another, can be illuminated by the technological restraints of building by “remote control” during the Middle Ages, a reality to which I alluded in the previous paragraphs, as well as through new architectural, archeological, and spatial theories that view meaning

---

886 From 1928 until 1943, Mussolini’s fascist government built at least twelve new towns and approximately sixty smaller villages, mostly in southern Italy. Mia Fuller has argued that no two stylistically were the same even though all contained a “a formulaic representation of the agents of social order” that included a central piazza, a market, a Fascist Party office, a town hall, a church, a school, a medical clinic, a supply store, offices of the Balilla youth organization, the voluntary militia (Milizia volontaria di sicurezza nazionale), the maternal and child welfare organization (Opera nazionale maternità e infanzia), and an “after-work” center (dopolavoro). The smaller village held only the essentials: the Fascist-Party office, a church, a school, a medical clinic, and a police station. See Mia Fuller, “Tradition as a Means to the End of Tradition: Farmers’ Houses in Italy’s Fascist-Era New Towns,” in The End of Tradition?, ed. Nezar AlSayyad (London: Routledge: 2004), 171-186.
within medieval buildings not as fixed or self-evident, but as amorphous and contextual. Through these new theories and considerations, the Angevin crown’s use of vernacular buildings in relation to their patronage of modern courtly art works can be viewed as complementary rather than idiosyncratic or problematically inconsistent. A building’s shell needed not look like it was from France, or from Naples, or built by Constantine to identify it as Angevin during this period. Court art, liturgical objects, and the most important semiotic marker, Angevin heraldry, ensured that viewers who encountered the building knew who had built it, who had ordered it built, or who now controlled it. Angevin architectural commissions are paradigmatic examples of what twentieth-century architects Robert Venturi, Denise Scott Brown, and Steven Izenour termed “decorated sheds,” or systems of structure and space that apply symbols independently of forms. In this sense the structural aspects of the buildings that the crown possessed served more than anything as signs of Angevin presence, and as stage settings were a host of various images, activities, identities, and priorities interacted.

The role of art and architecture within these Angevin economies was laid out carefully through five chapters that examined the destruction and reconstruction of Lucera as part of the consolidation of the Angevin state. All of these chapters examined Lucera’s art and architecture within a wider historical lens in order to provide an anchor for stylistic and iconographical outcomes. In chapter one I showed how the purge of Lucera’s Muslims was

---


not the result of short-term financial needs, as has been argued in the past, but because of the rise of what R.I. Moore called a persecuting society that combined the forces of Christian orthodoxy with the bureaucratic apparatus of the late medieval state to create a common identity at the expense of a marginalized other. For centralizing states such as the Angevin kingdom, Christian orthodoxy formed the glue that held together heterogeneous communities and legitimized their own rule. The destruction of an outsider group, especially one so symbolically powerful as the Muslim settlers at Lucera, aided in the Angevin crown’s claim as miles Christi that continuously was employed as a unifier for the various groups, cities, and populations under its dominion.

But Lucera’s destruction is only one part of the story in regard to increasing Angevin consolidation. An important commercial center and agricultural region while a Muslim settlement, the immediate reconstruction of the city to recapture previous economic output reveals that Lucera’s re-Christianization was as important quantitatively as it was qualitatively. Chapter two began by examining the repopulation of the city, which included the immigration of merchants, Angevin functionaries, and Calabrians previously displaced by the Vespers rebellion. The organized manner in which the Calabrians in particular were forced to migrate to Lucera reveals the level of Angevin bureaucratization and the presence of fluid networks that already connected and consolidated the Regno. The remainder of the chapter was devoted to an examination of the art and architecture of the cathedral, the single most important monument politically, socially, and culturally within Angevin urban plans. I argued that while certain aspects of the structure revealed a level of architectural systematization across Angevin commissions, a deeper examination of the built form shows that the cathedral is tied to the local landscape. On the other hand, the cathedral’s surviving
interior decoration, including a fourteenth-century tomb sculpture, a wooden crucifix that may have formed part of the original liturgical donation by Charles II, metalwork, and heraldry reveals that small-scale objects or individual artists circulated throughout the Regno on the same networks that transported Calabrian refugees, materials for the construction of the cathedral, and the commercial goods merchants at Lucera would later exchange. Finally I surveyed the career of Pierre d’Angicourt and argued that he was not an “architect” as he so often anachronistically is identified. Rather, a reexamination of the building documents reveals that he was one of the most powerful members of the Angevin noblesse de robe who were more adept at administrative duties of building than those pertaining to construction or style. These individuals, in nearly every surviving royal diploma, controlled local builders responsible for actual construction. As I have argued in the chapter, the very nature of this bureaucratization of architectural production provided a profound amount of agency to the dozens of workers who constructed these buildings. This accounts for the profusion of vernacular architectural forms throughout Angevin construction projects at the time. In the end, this realization should reshape how we evaluate meaning within these structural forms.

Chapter three very much was a continuation of the previous chapter. The mendicant orders played a vital role in Angevin territorial, political, and cultural consolidation; and their presence was felt strongly at rebuilt Lucera. Franciscan, Dominican, and Augustinian houses were founded all within the early years of reconstruction. Using this phenomenon as a framework, I examined the surviving churches, which, like the cathedral display vernacular structural forms combined with circulated small-scale arts. Moreover, responding to previous scholarship on the “ascetic or mendicant turn” of Angevin buildings, I argued that Angevin architecture and mendicant architecture of the period share so many traits not
because of a desire by the crown to model their buildings on “mendicant symbolism,” but because both groups, sometimes working together, constructed their monuments under similar conditions, aims, and expectations within centralized structures.

Lucera was re-urbanized through four significant events: the forced repopulation of the city, the construction of the cathedral, the installation of the mendicant orders, and the establishment of the annual regional market fair. In chapter four I argued that this process had been systematized during the previous century by examining three comparative Angevin urban projects at L’Aquila, Manfredonia, and Cittaducale. The urban projects at all four cities display remarkable continuity. These projects rarely have been examined together by historians or art historians, though, for two reasons. The first is that Angevin urban projects rarely have been viewed as part of a network within the context of territorial consolidation. This is a consequence of southernist literature. Each project has been examined on its own, or part of very local clusters of urban development. The second reason, tied to the first, is that the bureaucratic process in which the architectural monuments were constructed means stylistic cohesion lacks between cities. For those looking for signature Angevin architectural forms, no connections can be made. However, examining these urban projects in relation to one another reveals that the true opus andegavinus was not building type, but rather the process in which these cities were formed.

Historiographical exceptionalism is a major obstruction to examining the roles of art, architecture, and urbanism within Angevin economies. Chapter five focused specifically on one Angevin art object, the wooden Madonna and Child known as the Patrona. The statue currently forms the center of celebrations at Lucera occurring every August 15 that commemorates the purge of Muslim Lucera. Within that ritual, the statue is viewed as
Byzantine rather than Angevin. Local legends contend that the statue has been present within Lucera since the eighth century and processed around the city every year since August 15, 1300. Through stylistic analysis and a reexamination of the history and historiography of the cult, I argued that a verifiable tension exists between the Patrona as an actual Angevin art object, a Gothic stylized statue present in the city because of the circulation of “court styles” after consolidation of the Regno, and the Patrona as the center of a cult devoted to memorializing Angevin presence within Lucera. History, historiography, and territorial exceptionalism have fused within the performance of the cult, making the life of the Patrona statue emblematic of the methodological hindrances affecting the study of Civitas Sanctae Mariae within Angevin state making.
Appendices

The following appendices comprise a collection of six royal diplomas pertaining to the reinhabitation of Lucera and the establishment of the city’s markets, the conference of royal support for the cathedral and its canons, and Angevin patronage of the mendicant orders within the rebuilt city. The diplomas originally were preserved within the registers of the Angevin chancellery housed in Naples. Containing over 250,000 transcripts of Angevin correspondence from the reigns of Charles I to Joanna I (1266-1382), the more than 375 registers were the most extensive collection of late medieval royal documents until their destruction during the Second World War. Thankfully for studies of Lucera, the Italian historian Pietro Egidi had compiled and transcribed in 1917 over 750 chancellery diplomas in relation to Lucera’s destruction and reconstruction for his *Codice diplomatico dei saraceni di Lucera (CDSL)*. The six diplomas included and translated for the appendices were taken from his collection. Egidi arranged the texts, which date from 1286 to 1343, chronologically and included the original Angevin register number and folio for each diploma. As claimed by the historian, the transcriptions mostly are true to the originals. All fourteenth-century spelling has been retained and ellipses represent places where abrasions and erosions made parts of the parchments illegible. Egidi’s main alterations were the addition of modern punctuation, the inclusion of the monarch’s name at the top of the diploma (transcriptions within the registers generally omitted this detail), and the omission of lengthy titles and honorifics when written within the middle of the text.

**Appendix A.** The following text is a diploma dated August 24, 1300 from Charles II to Giovanni Pipino that praises the familiar for his role in Lucera’s destruction. Originally it was Angevin chancellery register no. 97, folio 371 B and Angevin chancellery register no. 101, folio 300. It is no. 318 in Egidi, ed., *CDSL*.

Karolus II Johanni Pipino de Barolo, militi, magne nostre Curie magistro racionali, directo consiliario, familiari et fid. n. etc. -- Si nostrorum erga Deum devotio predecessorum actenditur, si quam catholici fuerint, et quam vehementes fidei ortodosse coltores in considerationem adducitur, non erit unquam ambiguum quin nos, ex tam sollemplni origine ac tam fidelis tantorum procerum stipite derivati, pre cunctis mentis nostre desiderabilibus incrementum catholice fidei auxie cupiamus. Porro, a longo iam preterito tempore, cognoscentes quod fovere in Regno nostro Sicilie sarracenos, inhabitantes hucusque Luceriam, dedecebat non modicum, immo predicte quodammodo derogare fidei videbatur, iugiter in animo gessimus depopulare et exhabitare terram ipsam Sarracenis eisdem, deinde christicolis habitandam. Et sic, quod semper in hac parte pectore clausimus, quod mente nutritivimus, captata nunc habilitate, promentes operis per effectum, te illuc, cuius revera indutriam ac circumspectionem et perspicaciam ipsa diuturna et familiaris apud nos

---

355

---

889 Reconstruction of the registers has been ongoing since the end of the war and as of 2010 the registers from
experientia comprobat, prosecuturum et compleeturum propositum nostrum huiusmodi duximus destinandum. Cumque, actento quam prudenter et quam virtuose illud ad quod profecto, si vi temptatum fuisset, multe imo inopinabiles laborassent vires, in actum deduxeris, spes nobis certissima repromictat quod quicquid pendet de ipsius nostri propositi complementum, habebit per te eque bone prosecucionis et executionis effectum, deliberate providimus tui fore prudentie de omnibus inherendum. Ad honorem igitur Regis regnum, per quem vivimus et regnamus, cui omnes actus nostros offerimus, cui omnes quo bene agimus imputamus, atque ad reverenciam pie Matris eius, humane utique condicionis tutele, cuius auxilium in hiis que iam per te acta sunt et cepta in die nuper preteriti festi Assumpcionis eius miraculose tibi non ambigimus astitisse, mutato nomine dicte terre dataque illi denominatione ab eadem gloriosissima Virgine ut Civitas Sancte Marie de cetero nominetur, commictimus discretioni provisioni ordinacioni et disposicioni tue ac arbitrio tuo fiducialiter vices nostras in faciendo terram ipsum christianis habitari, in dividendo inter illos eis tenimento et in concedendo eis, nomine et pro parte nostra, immunitates et libertates quas et prout noveris expedire. Set specialiter inter cetera tibi hoc unum imponimus quod locum illum notatum arabice musquitum, in quo saraceni prudenter et ad orandum convenerit, statuas et facias servari et haberi pro maiori eccl. inibi construenda, denominacionem a prefata Domina n. humani patrona generis habitura, et quod similiter domus que sunt circiter locum ipsum, de quibus et pro parte nostra, exinde indulgeris et feceris fulcita pateant vigoris presidio et debito firmitatis effectu, has literas nostras exinde fieri et pendenti Maiestatis nostre sigillo iussimus communiri. -- Datas Neapoli, per Nicolaum Fricziam, locumtenentem prothonotarii regni Sicilie, anno domini etc., die XXIIII Augusti, XIII indictionis regn. nn. XVI.

Appendix B. The following text is a royal privilege dated August 27, 1300 that grants the Angevin familiar Giovanni Minutolo of Naples a house in Lucera. The privilege first was granted on August 27, 1300 and later copied into a diploma dated June 1, 1301. It was Angevin chancellery register no. 102, folio 33. It is no. 519 in Egidi, CDSL.

Karolus II Universis. – Post desolatam, sicut et desolari promeruit, terram vocatam hucusque Luceriam et finalem, prout optavimus, depopulationem consumptam, nostris conceptis ab hactenus succurrat affectibus terram ipsum populare fidelibus et christianorum incolatu ad Dei gloriam facere habitari. Et sic Johanni Pipino de Barolo, cuius industria et vigore de mandato quod et beneplacito nostro terra ipsa purgata est sorde habitat et deips ac inde petisque sarracenice pravitiatis, potestatem concessimus habitationis illius per illum modum et formam quam ipsa conspiceret oportunam. Ex cuius quidem auctoritate ac licentia potestatis Iohannes ipse in terra predicta, vocata nunc Civitae Sancte Marie, infrascripta bona stabilia donavit atque concessit qd. Iohanni Minutulo de Neapoli, militi, fid. n., per suas patentes exinde licteras in serie subsequenti. “Nos Iohannes Pipinus de Barolo, miles, ma. re. Cu. mag. rat., notum facimus universis presentes licteras inspecturis, quod, dum diebus istis tumultus preconceperit perfidie sarracenorum Lucerie fervet, nos per serenissimum principem d. n. Carolum II...illuc missi, tumultu ipso per nos, favente divine potenca dextera, in eadem terra sedato, ac de ipsius d. beneplacito et mandato Sarracenis eisdem ab
inde per viam depopulacionis nobis commisse ab excellencia Regia prorsus eiectis, ex concessa nobis commisse ab excellencia Regia prorsus eiectis, ex concessa nobis per eiusdem domini Regis licteras...quas pene nos habemus, potestate plena ordinandi Christi fidelibus habitacionem ipsius terre nunc Civitatis Sancte Marie vocate ac distribuendi et assignandi habitaciones domorum eiusdem terre, prout et quibus ex ipsis Christi fidelibus nobis expediens videretur, ut terra ipsa que nidus perfidie ac pestilentie et nequitie fuerit novis de cetero Christicolarum incolis sit refecta, per quod succrescat...inibi cultus catholice fidei, rei puplece sucedat utilitas et civitas ipsa liberae ac probis civibus frequentetur. Considerantes quod per habitationem d. Johannis Minutoli de Neapoli in eodem terra, qui nobis fuit in depopulacione ipsius terre, ac ibi contra sarracenos ipsos viriliter strenueque se gessit, magnum Cu. commodum...non modicum incrementum continue poterit procurari, concessimus dedimus atque tradimus nomine et pro parte Regia eidem domino Johanni Minutolo ac suis heredibus imperpetuum in eadem terra domum que fuit Boabdille Indulti sarraceni, sitam in ruga de Barbara, iuxta viam puplicam a duabus partibus ipsius domus aliasque confines, cum iardinello contiguo eidem domo cum omnibus iuribus rationibus et pertinentitiis suis, tenendam possidendam et habitandam per se ipsos vel alios suo nomine in burgensaticum, liberam utique ac exemptam ab omni censu redditu seu servicio eadem r. Cu. inde prestanto, transferentes in eos nomine et pro parte ipsius Cu. omne ius dominum et actionem quod iam ipsis Curie competit aut posset competere in domo predicta ac dantes ei facultatem liberam apprehendendi auctoritate presentium corporalem possessionem domus eiusdem. Hoc tamen adiecto, quod idem Iohanes et dicti heredes suae domus ipse vendere donare aut quocumque alio titulo alienare non debeant infra infima continentum decennium a die quo ipsam inhabitaverint seu per alios inhabitari fecerint in antea numerandum. Completo vero ipso decennio liceat eis libere illam in toto vel in parte vendere aut donare et quomodolibet eis placenter alienare, liberam simuliter et exemptam a quovis censu redditu seu servicio, nt prefertur. Ac etiam de domo ipsa et in ipsa id facere quod rebus suis facere possunt alii veri et legtimi domini et patroni. Ita etiam quod si hinc ad annum unum ex nunc in antea numerandum dictus Iohannes non habitaverit domum ipsum vel alium custodem in ea dimiserit, liceat Curie regie domum eandem revocare aliisque concedere seu donare. In cuius rei testimonium futuramque memoriam ac dictorum domini Iohannis et heredum suorum cautelam presentes licteras sibi exinde fieri fecimus pendentii sigillo nostro munitis. Datum in Civitate predicta, anno Domini MCCC, die XXVII Augusti, XII indictionis...”

Igitur...prefatem concessionem dationem et traditionem...roboramus...—Neapoli. in absencia Cancellarii regni Sicilie per magg. ratt., I iunii, XIII ind.

Appendix C. The following royal diploma, dated August 22, 1301, outlines the rights, privileges, and obligations of the new settlers of Civitas Sanctae Mariae. Copied and re-sent multiple times during the early rebuilding of the city, it originally was Angevin chancellery register no. 101, folio 85B, register no. 106, folio 109 B, register no. 112, folio 50, and register no. 116, folios 39 and 85. It later was copied in the Liber privilegiorum, folio 5, held at the Archivio Comunale di Lucera and is no. 611 in Egidi, ed., CDSL.

Karolus secundus, Dei gratia rex Ierusalem et Sicilie, ducatus Apulie et principatus Capue, Provincie et Folcalquerii comes...Universis presentis indulti seriem inspecturis tam
presentibus quam futuris.—Summa provisio superue potencie, cuius sunt profunda consilia et ininvestigabiles vie eius, sic excelsa prospeciens quod providere de infimis et inferioribus non omittit, nostris diebus preteritis sensibus indidit et precipuum dedit spiritui nostro meditacionis instinctum, ut nidum pestilencie et dampnate secte cubiculum, gentem feritatis barbarice ac sarracenice nationis, que terram Lucer in Apulie partibus incolebat, tamquam christiane fidei emulam et omnis sordide infectionis alumpnam, nocivam quoque proximis, tediosam conversantibus et remotis infestam, de medio tolleremus, ut, expurgato veteri fermento malicie et nequicie arabice, scilicet pravitatis eiusdem, in terra ipsa novella fidei orthodoxe propago consurgeret, et, exterminato nido tam perniciose volatilis tetri vulturis et ingluviose cornicis, avis ibi sobera, que volat ad Christum, christianae progenies, accubaret. Et sic, misso pridem illuc de latere nostro viro industrio et prudenti Iohanne Pipino de Barolo, milite, magne nostre Curie magistro racionali, domestio consiliario nostro, familiari dilecto probatoque fidei, ut circa hec sua sagacitate perfectius vota nostra copleret, affuit sic illi divina prospectio quod per mirabilis et laudande circumspectionis astuciam ac non minus per vigorosam animi probitatem per diversos circuitus processus et opera terram ipsam finali exterminio civium et prefate nationis orrenda depopulacione vastavit. Sed vir ipse probabiliter providus et notorie circumspectus in hoc non solu vare fecit, ut ipsa zizania pessima et surculum venenosum evelleret, immo sic statuit, sic providit quod, eradicando vicia et plantando virtutes, deleta Luceria quam Civitatem Sancte Marie titulavimus digniori vocabulo, terram ipsam de mandato nostro populus gente scenamis christianis subsequenter inhabitavit uberrime, ac incolarum fidelium multitudine copiosa replevit; ubi quidem profanto ritu sinagogae dampnabilis et principis Magomecti sancta mater veneratur Ecclesia et ad dei laudem fides excolitur christianae. Sane quia dignum erat et congruum, ut, amotis sic omnibus ritibus dicti Sarracenici cultus, inoleant alii vivendi modi, morum observancie et consuetudinem instituta, providit ante inhabitacionem dicte terre ipse Iohannes, tamquam provisorum omnium ex permissione Domini dux et actor, subscripta ordinare Capitula consuetudinaria dicte terre. Nos ergo, qui processus dicti Iohannis ad omnia supradicta laudamus, dinoscentes merito congruum quod ipse de dictis Capitulis in hac parte providit, Capitula ipsa, que diligenter inspici fecimus et examinari discrete, tamquam utilia et accepta de certa scientia nostra et speciali gratia confirmamus, decernentes illa valere ac durare perpetuo et inconcussa continue firmitate gaudere. Capitula vero ipsa sunt hec, videlicet:

1] In primis quod quilibet habitator dicte Civitatis Sancte Marie qui observaverit et observare promiserit infrascripta, habeat in civitate ipsa domum pro se ac sua familia competenter, actenta familia et conditionibus singulorum; que domus immunes sint ab omni redditu sive censu. Sic tamen quod si ante decennium domos ipsas deseri contingat, ita videlicet quod nobiles per se vel per alium, alii vero per se domos ipsas non inhabitent, domus taliter deserte ad Curiam revertantur. Post decennium vero domus ipse libere sint a condicione ipsa, ita quod hii quibus assignate fuerint et heredes eorum libere postmodum de dominibus ipsis faciant quod placebit.

2] Item, quod huiusmodi novi habitatores et heredes eorum in civitate ipsa potiantur immunitate decennii, numerandi a primo instantis mensis septembris quintdecime in antea continue usque per totum annum primo future none indicationis, ab omnibus subvencionibus datis exactionibus donis et collectis quocumque nomine censeantur. Abolitae eciam imperpetuum iuribus canonis terarum, gysie, barberie, cabelle vini et quibuslibet aliis iuribus
in quibus sarraceni eiusdem terre preter generalem Regni ritum regie Curie tenebantur; exceptis tamen ac reservatis regie Curie in terra ipsa et eius territorio veteribus iuribus et novis statutis, que semper integre presolvantur prout hactenus soluta sunt et solvuntur in Barolo et adiacentibus terris.

3] Item, quod habeant terras pro faciendis vineis et ortis, quilibet secundum condicionem suam, habita consideracione ad familiam et statum. Ita tamen quod plantent vineas ipsas usque ad triennium, et quod terras ipsas non possint convertere in alios usus, alias revocentur ad manus Curie. Quas quidem terras tam persone ecclesiasticæ quam nobiles ac plebee pro huīusmodi vineis et hortis habebunt sub anuo censu dimidii tareni pro quilibet vineali quattuorquingenali, sic etiam quod usque ad quinquennium, a die assignacionis terrarum pro vineis et hortis suis, modi in antea numerandum, tum ob novam habitationem eorum tum eciam quia interim fructus non percipient ex eisdem de solucione census huiusmodi sint immunes.

4] Item, quod cuilibet de cívitate ipsa licear habere in dominibus suis molendinum, furnum, tabernam et quilibet alia sibi accomoda, prout licet alii civibus terrarum demanii regionis ipsius in domibus suis.

5] Item, si quis recesserit ab incolatu dictae terre infra decennium, numerandum a die primo septembris instantis quintedecime indictionis in antea, domus vineæ et orti quos habuerit, remanebunt Curie; a decennio vero in antea possit inde facere quod voluerit, licet de rebus burgensaticis et liberis, salvo censu predicto vinearum et ortorum.

6] Item, cum ecclesie ac ecclesiastice persone terras laboratorias infra territorium cívitatis predicte habere dicantur, cultas hactenus per sarracenos predictos, sine quibus nec dicti sarraceni potuissent, nec alii novi habitatores eiusdem terre possent commode substentari, propter quod nec novi habitatores illuc facile perduci possent, aut perduci necessario discedere cogerentur, provisum est quod ecclesie aut persone ipse terras habentes infra territorium supra lictum eam tantummodo quantitatem terrarum ipsarum ad opus suum excoli faciant, que deductis expensis sufficiat pro usu personarum et animalium que in domibus vel locis suis infra civitatem ipsam et territorium suum esse contigerit; reliquas vero terrarum ipsarum, exeris quisbuslibet ab earum cultu prorsus exclusis, coli permissant per huiusmodi novos habitatores Civitatis ipsius sub terragio consueo; maxime cum satis habundaverint et habundent in terris allis pro maxariis eorum, et iniquum sit eos crudelius nunc agere cum Christianis quam hactenus egerint cum sarracenis in terras ipsas excoli permittendo.

7] Item, ut plebey habilius possint eorum facere massarias, ordinatum est quod nullus baro vel nobilis per duo miliaria in circuitu dicte terre faciat massariam, sed hoc spacium dimictatur specialiter pro plebeys.

8] Item, cum pre licte ecclesie aut ecclesiastice persone sic habundaverint et habundent in paschis animalium alibi potius quam in territorio dicte terre, quod eciam aliorum animalium recipiebant et recipiant ad pasca ipsa, provisum est quod ad pascaus eiusdem terre non liceat eis ducere seu duci facere aliqua de armentis vel gregibus suis aut alificius, nisi ea tantummodo de animalibus suis domitis, que necessaria sunt usui et commoditatis personorum domorum et locorum suorum sitorum infra territorium eiusdem terre, maxime
cum ipsi sic habundaverint in gregibus et armentis, quod vix eis solis sufficerent pascua Civitatis ipsius: quo fieret ut affidature sue crescerent in aliis locis, pascua vero Civitatis ipsius absorberentur omnino per greges et armenta ipsorum in artacionem civium eiusdem terre ac Curie detrimentum. Et hoc idem intenditur observandum esse per nobiles et barones aut ecclesiasticas personas que in terra ipsa receperunt aut recipiunt incolatum; scilicet quod non liceat eis ducere seu duci facere aliqua de armentis vel gregibus suis aut alienis, nisi ea tantummodo de animalibus suis domitis que necessaria sint usui et comoditatis suis et personarum domorum eorum sitarum infra territorium eiusdem terre, maxime cum ente tempora ista sic habundaverint et habundent pascuis aliosis, ut est dictum, quod plerumque affidabant in pascuis suis animalia aliorum, propter quod nunc preter pascua sibi necessaria possent plura quam hactenus affidare ad annuum censum vel alio modo, sed ecclesie ac persone ecclesiasticæ per procuratores suos eas faciant procurari. Et si per ecclesias seu personas ecclesiasticas, nobiles aut plebeus fuerit in aliquo de toto presenti Capitulo contrafactum, cadant a iure domorum et terrarum eis assignatarum vel assignandarum et a participio civilitatis eiusdem terre; cum sub ista condicio quecumque persona ecclesiasticæ vel secularis recepta sit, et eidem facta concessio intelligatur, si praemissa et infrascripta observaverit et promiserit efficaciter observare, et hec fuit mens et intencio concedentis. Omnibus enim donacionibus, si que facte sunt et faciendis in posterum de quibuscumque domibus iuribus possessionibus et terris dictae terre hec condicio…et inesse sine expressione alia intelligatur, si is in quem confertur donacio seu qui ad habitandum terram admittatur, observare statuta et ordinaciones predicta et infrascripta promiserit et observaverit cum effectu.

9] Item, quod nulli seculari vel ecclesiasticæ persone liceat facere infra territorium eiusdem terre, nisi de illa tantummodo quantitate que competenter et bono modo sufficiat pascuis et bovum et aliorum animalium suorum domitorum: et hoc habet discernere ille quo preerit habitacioni terre predicte.

10] Item, quod huiusmodi ecclesiis et personis ecclesiasticis ac baronibus et nobilibus non assignentur aliqua domicilia vel loca infra Civitatem predictam, immo si assignata vel designata sunt aliqua revocentur, nisi se sollemniter obligent ad observanciam præmissorum et aliorum facientium ad bonum statum Civitatis ipsius; quam obligacionem recipiat predictus qui preerit habitacioni Civitatis predicte.

11] Item, quod cives eiusdem terre habeant liberam comunitatem in pascuis aquis lignis et aliis habilitatibus cum terris vicinis nostri demani, scilicet Troya et Fogia, et e converso homines iuribus terrarum comunitate ipsa utantur in territorio Civitatis predicte. In aliis vero terris et locis vicinis et continguis, ecclesiarum scilicet, comitum et baronum, gaudeant illa libertate pascuarum aquarum et lignorum, qua Sarraceni gaudebant; et e converso vicini iœdem in territorio dicte terre, prout tempore Sarracenorum extitit consuetum.
12] Item, qualibet septimana fiat in terra ipsa forum rerum venalium, die videlicet Martis, et quolibet anno nundine generales fiant durature per octo dies, quatuor videlicet precedentes et quatuor subsequentes festum beati Bartholomei.

13] Item, confirmamus ex certa nostra scientia assignaciones domorum ac terrarum pro vineis iardenis et ortis factas et faciendas per dictum Iohannem et eius locumtenentem incolis civitatis predicte.

14] Item, quod omnia et singula spectantia circa premissa, et alia facientia ad comune bonum Civitatis predicte habitatorum ad illum qui preterit habitacioni Civitatis eiusdem, fiant per eum cum consilio decem hominum de maioribus mediocribus et minoribus Civitatis ipsius, quos Universitas civitatis eiusdem duxerit eligendos.

Datum Anagnie, per Bartholomeum de Capua, militem, logothetam et prothonotarium regni Sicilie, anno domini MCCCCI primo, die vicesimo secondo augusti, quartedecime indictionis, Regnorum nostrorum anno septimo decimo.

Appendix D. The following diploma is a mandate dated September 27, 1300 from Charles II to Rainaldo Cognetti of Barletta, treasurer, and Guilielmo de Ponaico, master rationalis of the court, ordering the aid of two Dominicans, two Franciscans, and two Augustinians in the accounting of foodstuffs confiscated from Muslims in Lucera. It originally was Angevin chancellery register no. 106, folio 16 and is no. 347 in Egidi, ed., CDSL.

Karolus II Raynaldo Cugnecto de Barolo, thesaur., et Guilielmo de Ponciaco, ma. n Cu. mag. rationai, militibus, dil. consil., fa. et fi. n. -- Ex relatione Abdelasis, Sarr. de Luceria, mil., et aliorum Sarr. de ead. terra Luc., nunc vocata Civitate S. Marie, datum est nobis nuper intelligi magnum esse in ead. terra victualium quantitatem et maiorem etiam quam per aliquos crededatur hucusque, ex qua prosequi magnam partem negotiorum presentis guerre speramus. Cupientes igitur ut in effossione inventione ac mensuratione ipsorum victualium dicte terre legaliter procedatur, subaptos sex religiosos, duos videlicet de ord. Predicatorum, duos de ord. Minorum et alios duos de ord. Heremitarum, ad eand. terram nuper providimus destinandos, qui presentes sint, una cum procuratore fisci n. ac Helisiaso, Ca. n. valleti, et alios statuis n., inventioni effossioni et mensurationi victualium dicte terre. Ita quod in ipsorum presentia et cum eorum notitia, victualia quelibet eiusd. in domibus Manfridoniam destinandis, per viam aut in exoneracione ipsorum in domibus Manfridonie fraus aliqua, que in hiis fieri consuevit, aliquatenus commictatur, volumus et m. ut in deferendis victualibus ipsis ad dcam terr. M. ac eis exonerandis in domibus eiusd. terre huiusmodi cautela servetur: quod, statuis per vos in dereferndis victualibus ipsis ad dcam terr. M. viris probis industriis ac fidelibus, de quibus sit merito confidendum, deinde in exoneracione ac mensuratione ipsorum vict. in domibus eiusd. terre intersint prior predicatorium et guardianius minorum eiusd. terre M., sei illi scriptis redigant singulas exoneratorum mensuratorum ac repositorum in eisdem domibus dce terre
ipsorum victualium quantitates, cum expressione dierum et nominum ac cognominium illorum qui victualia ipsa inibi exoneraverint ac mensuraverint; nec non de his que in ipsius terre domibus repotentur, habeant claven consimilem illi clavi quam habituri sint hii quos super recipiendis et custodiendis deis victualibus inibi duxeritis pro parte Cu. deputandos. Ita quod in victualibus ipsis fraus aliqua commicti non possit. Quibus priori et guardiano singulas quantitates decorum victualium, quas vice qualibet ad eand. terr. M. mietendas duxeritis, et per quos, districte et particulariter significare curetis. Et cum de Manfridonia per mare Brundusium victualia ipsa miseritis, eandem cautelam in mensurandis victualibus et habenda clave consimili ac premissis aliis per priorem et guardianum Brundusinos, quibus inde speciales lict. v. dirigimus, volumus observari. Ceterum quia, sicut alias in fraudem Cu. factum esse didicimus, victualia ipsa possent per delatores eorum in damnum ipsius Ci. in deterius commutari, maxime cum victualia dce. t. Luc., sicut communis habet assertio, sint victualibus aliorum locorum Apulie meliora, fraudem huiusmodi precaveri volentes, subiugendo m. ut de singulis victualibus que missuri estis Manfridoniam sumatis monstram, eamque sub sigillis vestris deis priori et guardiano ipsius terre M., quibus etiam exinde scribimus, nec non statutis et statuendis ibidem super recipiendis deis victualibus, destinare curetis, ut secundum eandem monstram eadem victualia inibi assignetur. Cum vero victualia ipsa de Manfridonia Brundusium vel Cathania, aut primo Brundusium et deinde de B. ad eand. terr. Cat. devehentur, tunc etiam monstram ipsorum vict. priori et guardiano Brundusii nec non aliis statutis ad recipiendum victualia ipsa tam in Brund. quam in Cath., per vos volumus simili modo transmitciti, ut secundum monstram ipsam in qualibet terrarum ipsarum fiat assignatio victualium eorum. Insuper quia in variacione mensure solita est per aliquos magna fraus plerumque commicti, ad obviandum huic fraudi adicimus et iubemus, ut ad mensuram dce terre Manfridonie et non aliam faciatis omnia dea victualia tam in Luceria quam in Manfridonia Brundusio et Cathania mensurari; ad cuius similitudinem plures alias mensuras fieri facientes, de illis aliquas Brundusium et aliquas Cathaniam sub sigillis vestris mictere procuretis, ut ad mensurationem decorum vict. per mensuras ipsas et non alias procedatur, ne occasione diversitatis mensurarum damnum in eisd. victualibus Cu. nostrus incurrat. Quod si in sigillandis predictis mensuris ac premissis alis exequendis vos ambo simul semper non poteritis interesse, alter vestrum ea nichil minus exequatur. Et si neuter vestrum ad ea vacare potuerit, statutis ad executionem eorum aliquos, loco vestri, de quibus plene fiduciam habebatis, cum de omni damno quod inde Curie n. continget, non dictis statuendis per vos sed vobis totaliter incumbamus. Predictis vero sex religiosis, singulis videl. duobus de quolibet ordinum predcorum, pro expensis ipsorum duorum et unus famuli eorum, tar. au. II gen. pond. per diem, quamdiu in dcis n. serviis fuerint, tu prestate Raynalde de quacumque pec. Cu., que per ma. t. fuerit, sine aliqua diminutione ac diffuculta persolvias. Nomina vero et cognomina ipsorum sex religiosorum sunt hec, videlicet: fres Johannes de Fugio et Gregorius de Yscla, de ord. Predicatorum; fres Johannes Amphora et Julianus, de ord. Minorum; fres Petrus de Teramo et Matheus de Teaano, de ord. Hermitarum. -- Datum Neapoli, per magg. ratt., die XXVII septembris, XIII ind.
Appendix E. The following diploma dated October 21, 1300 orders the castellan of Lucera’s fortress to send bells to the construction sites of Lucera’s cathedral and Franciscan, Dominican, and Augustinian foundations. It originally was Angevin chancellery register no. 101, folio 108 and is no. 392 in Egidi, ed., *CDSL*.

Karolus II Castellano Lucerie. -- Intelleximus noviter quod in quodam loco prenominati castri quamplures campane pro pa. Cu. n. servatur, quibus nullius existentibus profectus vel commodi dum inutiliter inibi servatur, providimus, tibi expresse mandantes, ut earum maiorem epo ipsius terre pro maiori eccl. et ex reliquis tres alias fratribus minoribus, predicatoribus et augustianis pro locis eorum qui inibi construuntur, pro quolibet scilicet locorum unam, auct. presentium, statim post earum receptione debeas assignare, nam illas eis duximus gratiose donandas. Quod si forte penes [te] non haberes clavem predci loci ubi sunt campane ipse reposite, ipsamque haberet Johannes de Monteforti, Squillacii comes, cum comes idem ad ca. ipsum accesserit, dicas ei ex parte n., ostensis sibi presentibus, quod illas tibi faciat assignari, post quarum receptionem facias quod tibi superius est inunctum. De assignatione autem campanarum ipsarum a prefectis epo et religiosis pro tui cautela recipias apodixas…Neapoli, per magg. ratt., XXI oct., XIII ind.

Appendix F. The following is a royal diploma dated January 10, 1302 granting rights and privileges to Lucera Cathedral’s bishop and canons. It was copied and resent multiple times and is Angevin chancellery register no. 256, folio 256 (contains in its margins the phrase “pro episcopo civitatis S. Marie”) and chancellery no. 116, folio 70b. It is no. 655 in Egidi, ed. *CDSL*.

Karolus II ad perpetuam rei memoriam. -- Celestis altitudo consilii, cui sicut dies hesterna que abit est omne futurum, provida disposicione constituit ut sarracenorum Luceria, lurida conca fecis et iam in oculis omnium facta volutabrum contagionis infecte, immo et totius Apulie dura pestis atque contagium maculosum, post decursum temporis et dierum apostatice sortis sue, tamquam statua fictilis evenerat. Et quidem ipsa suprema provisio non sine causa disposuit, ut cito Luceria luceret; quod per eius mala non modica multi de circumanpositis Christi fidelibus dispendingo ludgeant, nam damnosa facta iam omnibus tamquam nocens in abhominacionis nauseam venerat et tedium omni carni, de quo et in nostris ab olim sensibus quevis conceptio faciens mansionem ad exterminium ultimum gentis eius nostra iugit interiora vexabat, usque dum, temporis oportunitate capata possemus illum educere in effectum. Sicque, prospecto quod gens ipsa viperea, grex infectus, in opus malum et noceum combatabur assidue venenum producere quod latebat, et iam contextam materiam paulatim profererebat in causam proditionis actus et signa notoria propalando, Johannem Pipinum de Barolo, mil. ma. n. Cu. mag. rat. dil. cons. fam. et fid. n., de nostro illuf latere misimus, qui ad mandatum et ordinationem nostram, diuus te ultra preconceptione, sua sic facit industria et vigore, non sine divini operatione misterii, quod in anno dominice Nativitatis M.CCC jubileio terram ipsam Lucerie, populo numeroso confertam, preface gentis fortitudine rabiosa collisa, in festo Assumptionis Virginis gloriose de mense augusti, cuius Ave prefiguratam a Patribus signanter mutavit in horum misterio nomen Eve, pro maiori parte vastavit, suorum in multo viribus Arabum consternatis, totali tamen eius deinde infra breves dies, sicut patet vulgo
notorum, desolatione secuta. Set ne in eius deleti nominis litura tam utili futurum omen, quod inerat, deliteret, Civitatem sancte Marie in eiusdem reverentiam Virginis illam decrevimus appellari. Verum quia in ipsa deleta Luceria, post partim cesos partim eictos abinde quoslibet sarracenos, inventa est, que venerabatur ab illis sub cultu et nomine Machometti, muscheta, templum scilicet ydolatre veneracionis eorum, providimus merito ut, ipsa in quamdam solum memoriam preterite forme eius remanente inibi, viduata, utpote absorba voragine sui patriarche dyaboli quem, colebra, nominis eius, et omni figure, mutata in caput Anguli fieret, qui est Ecclesie celebris Christus deus; ita ut non iam muscheta prevaricationis et scismatis, set domus orationis domini et ecclesia fidei caritatis et spei, sub eiusd. Virginis gloriose vocabulo, cuius ut predictur dies festus et nobis in sarracenorum ipsorum strage peracta celeber extitit et funestus eisdem, ad Dei laudem et gloriam perpetuo veneretur in Christo; proviso consultius ut et ipsa sit dicte Civitatis Cathedralis Ecclesia, non quidem acephala sicut olim, set capud et episcopl mater et titulus Civitatis eiusdem. In hiis igitur omnibus nomen Domini dilatando, qui hec ita permisit, ecclesiam cathedralem eandem taliter institutam ad ipsius reverentiam Virginis et ad cultum perpetuum divinorum de certa nostra scientia et proprii motus instinctu dotar duximus, ut inferius continetur.
canonicos ipsos ordinare providimus observandum, ut ex eis quatuor qui dociles censeantur possint cum licentia dicti episcopi in generali studio moram trahere et studere, nec. dum inibi fuerint, pro non residentibus in eadem ecclesia reputentur, immo et interim non priventur perceptione predicti beneficii, seu prebende, cum ipsos dignum sit pro presentibus et residentibus reputari. [4] Predictas autem utrasque centum uncias singulis annis de iuribus et super iuribus baiulationis Civitatis eiusdem seu regalibus memoratis per baiulos seu procuratores illorum per singulos tres menses anni cuiuslibet iuxta ratam summe vendictionis seu perceptionis in credenciam iurium eorumdem, servato ritu videlicet catamini sicut acciderit, tam ipsi episcopo donec vivat quam dictis canonicis ibi continuis integre sine defecto diminutione ac difficultate qualibet ex nunc pro perpetuo iubemus decrevimus et volumus exhiberi. Sed quia plerumque contingit ordinationes nonnullas et mandata diversa per Curiam nostram et officiales nostros fieri per que pecunie fiscalis solutio frequentius impeditur, solucioni dictarum unc. cc illa iam facta vel in posterum facienda quantumcumque contraria obsistere nolumus vel in aliquo refragari; sed volumus quod illa quo ad id pro cassis et irritis habeantur, cum intentionis nostre non sit, Nos aut heredes vel officiales nostros ordinationes aut mandata edere que tam pio nostro proposito adversentur. -- Datum Neapoli, per Nicolaun Frictiam de Ravello etc., die x ianuarii, XV indictionis.
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