Simone Martini's St. Louis of Toulouse

SIMONE MARTINI'S ST. LOUIS OF TOULOUSE

Art historians have been at something of a loss to categorize the great panel of *Saint Louis of Toulouse crowning Robert of Anjou* in the Museo di Capodimonte at Naples.[1] It might be said that they have not always perceived the existence of a problem. Iconographically an unicum, in both form and function the painting also evades easy classification. We possess the semblance of a date, or at least a *terminus ante quem non*, the signature of the artist, Simone Martini, and a little evidence which suggests that the painting was originally in the great Angevin foundation of Santa Chiara at Naples. Quite apart from its outstanding quality as a painting, Simone's *Saint Louis* possesses many features worthy of investigation – too many for a short paper such as this. It is the first visual document of the saint and as such it represents the initial establishment of his iconography, albeit in a highly idiosyncratic context. Further, as it will be argued, the painting reveals some of the ideas and aspirations of its likely donor Robert of Anjou, who kneels at Saint Louis' right. I shall examine first the formal sources of the design and afterwards their deeper implications.

It will be necessary in this examination to pursue a slightly circuitous route, for although many of the painting's themes are well-nigh inextricably interwoven, for clarity's sake they have to be treated successively. First of all, however, it is essential to begin with the structure of the painting itself.[2] Despite abrasive cleaning and the loss or replacement of some frame elements, the integrity of the work is surprisingly well preserved. It retains its original frame save for the loss of the twin attached pilasters with their finials, whose setting and to some extent whose design may be traced by their 'shadows' of unpainted gesso at the sides of the panel. The back too yields additional information. It is decorated with gold *fleur-de-lys* on a blue ground. The five major vertical support planks are fastened together by eight horizontal wooden braces, the third of which retains the two original iron rings which helped to support the panel. The uppermost of these rear braces is pierced by two narrow rectangular openings, which prove, to my mind indisputably, that another panel was set on top of the Coronation, in a manner reminiscent of Pietro Lorenzetti's polyptych of 1320 in the *Pieve* at Arezzo.[3] I shall return to this problem later. On structural grounds alone this

upper panel must have contributed considerably to the original iconographical programme.

The main image of the enthroned Saint Louis crowning Robert set above a predella of five scenes from the saint's life has lost a good deal of its pristine opulence. While the great morse standing out in relief from the surface of the panel with a gilt glass inset of the arms of Jerusalem halved with Anjou still survives, almost all the paste gems which encrusted the saint's robes have been lost, and the applied silver foil which originally must have conferred an iridescent shimmer to the cope has now oxydized to a reddish brown. Thus, the original tonality of the painting has been irremediably falsified and its splendour dimmed.

Formerly, the broad frame with the *fleur-de-lys* built out in gilded stucco was a rich blue colour. It was certainly designed by Simone Martini himself, for it plays an essential part in the design of the whole by establishing the front diaphragm of the pictorial space within which Saint Louis sits enthroned. What is most immediately striking is its heraldic aspect – indeed it is the first panel painting where heraldry is elevated to a major role in the iconography and the design. There could have been no mistaking that this was an Angevin monument, with the great metal addition at the top completing the bearings of the Angevins, *France ancient with a label.*

Louis of Toulouse was the second son of Charles II.[4] Born in 1274 at Nocera dei Pagani near Salerno, he had probably become committed to Franciscanism during his captivity in Catalonia as a hostage with his brothers under the terms of the Treaty of Canfranc (1288). With the extension of the Angevin power into Hungary on the death of the childless Ladislas IV, and Charles II's refusal to permit the succession of Carobert, heir of his eldest son Charles Martel to the Neapolitan throne, Louis of Toulouse became heir apparent.[5] However, Louis' determination to embrace the Rule of Saint Francis, and very probably the manifestly greater worldly competence of his younger brother Robert, prompted Charles II to accede to Louis' renunciation of his claim to the throne by right of primogeniture. This renunciation appears to have taken place at Naples in about January 1296. Louis' decision was confirmed by Boniface VIII on 24th February, 1297.[6] The young prince, whose appointment to the administration of the archbishopric of Lyons in 1294 at the instance of Celestine V had been annulled by Boniface's wholesale abrogation of Celestine's bulls, was proposed as successor to Hugh Mascaron,

the bishop of Toulouse who had died at Rome in early December 1296. Louis seems to have used this as a lever to gain papal consent for his reception into the Minors.[7] He was secretly professed on the 24th December of the same year, and the bull nominating him to the large and troubled see of Toulouse was promulgated six days later.[8] After barely five weeks in his diocese Louis died at Brignoles in Provence on 19th August, 1297.

Having reconciled himself, not without difficulty and fits of petulant rage, to his son's vocation, Charles seems to have determined to push Louis' ecclesiastical career energetically. Years later John XXII, (who as Jacques Duèze had been a member of Louis' episcopal *familia* in Toulouse and who testified in the *Processus Canonizationis)* remarked to the papal legate to Aragon, Vitale da Villanova, that the king had wished Louis a cardinal during his brief lifetime. Dead, sainthood was a highly desirable substitute.[9] Johannes de Rocca Guilelmi was appointed procurator at the *Curia* in 1300 to expedite the campaign for Louis' canonization. Yet the process was formally initiated by Clement V only in 1307. After Charles II's death in 1308, Robert promoted the cause of the Angevin candidate.[10] France already had a saint in the royal family and there seems little doubt that emulation of Saint Louis IX spurred Charles' ambitions for his son. Robert's motives probably differed in part. It is also very likely that Louis IX's example, and his noted predilection for the Franciscans influenced the young Angevin prince in his vocation.[11] The canonization of Louis of Toulouse like that of Louis IX are parts of the same pattern.[12]

Much has been made of the young prince's contacts with Pier Giovanni Olivi, the leader of the Spiritual wing within the Franciscan order, and the probable Spiritual temper of the saint's own belief, borne out by the phrase in Clement V's charge to his inquisitors, the bishops of Saintes and Lectoure which speaks of Louis *'Christi pauperis vestigia persequens'*.[13] However, it seems to me that rather little of this may be read legitimately into the painting by Simone Martini. Such an interpretation has been taken to such lengths recently that one is reminded of Richard Ellmann's dismissal of psycho-historical investigations of Luther's so-called identity crisis – that it perhaps only demonstrated the banality of anality in early sixteenth-century Germany.[14] It is assuredly to reasons of state rather than states of mind that we must turn for a satisfactory explanation of Simone's painting.

Louis' canonization in the bull *Sol oriens mundo* of April 7th, 1317, provides us almost certainly with a *terminus ante quem non* for the panel.[15] In 1317 the payment to a certain Simone Martini of the unusually large annual pension of fifty gold ounces is entered in the Angevin Registers for 23rd July, but the identification of the recipient with the famous Sienese artist is far from certain. Other homonyms occur.[16] A series of letters was despatched by John XXII in the days immediately following the ceremony of canonization to the parties most immediately concerned.[17] The interval between the arrival of the news of Louis' canonization and the celebration of his Feast on 19th August is somewhat brief for a major artistic commission such as the Coronation panel. None of the available evidence appears to yield a demonstrable date for the painting, or even perhaps the artist's presence in Naples. Yet despite these chronological difficulties the purpose of the painting is clear, and it is to this that we must now turn.

The Hungarian branch of the Angevin line had not entirely abandoned their claims to the Neapolitan succession, as is shown by Carobert's actions on the death of Charles II, and by the succession negotiations of 1328 – 1330.[18] It is not surprising, therefore, that the need for the essential message of Louis' surrender of his succession rights to be made absolutely plain should have been felt. A whisper of usurpation or worse survived even Robert's death.[19] In the panel, therefore, Robert is depicted as kneeling at the feet of the mitred Franciscan bishop and is invested with the worldly crown, while two angels place a heavenly crown on the head of Louis. It is central to any interpretation of Simone's painting that Louis' renunciation and the transmission of the crown to Robert should be unmistakable. The coronation is symbolic and the manner of transmission ruthlessly abridged. In actuality Robert set out swiftly for Avignon at his father's death to be crowned by Clement V, a ceremony which took place amidst considerable precautions in August 1309.[20]

It seems most probable that Robert himself may bear a good deal of responsibility for the iconographical programme of the panel. The little boy who in his captivity in Catalonia had been very fond of throwing stones[21] had grown up into an inveterate sermonizer and one of the most erudite of contemporary monarchs.[22] Characterized by Dante as the '*Re da sermone*'[23], Robert composed a rhythmical office in honour of his elder brother and several sermons for the feast of Saint Louis of Toulouse.[24] One of these sermons was on the happily apposite text of Ecclesiasticus *xlv*, 14: '*Corona aurea super*

mitram eius expresso signo sanctitatis, gloria honoris et opus virtutis . . .'[25] The concept of the priest and king cannot have been unfamiliar to one so steeped in Biblical allusion. As the layers of meaning in the painting become clearer, Robert's candidature as deviser of so syncretist a programme becomes stronger.

While the Angevin and royal overtones of the painting as physical object are plain, the full significance of the major image requires more interpretation. In essence, a bishop is represented crowning a kneeling king. This is, however, no ordinary coronation such as can be found illustrated in numerous Pontificals: it is also the depiction of a royal succession from elder to younger brother. So many nuances are compact in the incomplete image which has been preserved that the skein must be disentangled thread by thread.

Saint Louis sits on a claw-footed throne placed on a rich oriental carpet of a type commonly used in paintings of the period to represent a papal or even a celestial locus for the scene.[26] At this date seated frontal representations of bishops are unusual and there can be little doubt that the model was a ruler image of more conventional cast. Frontal, seated rulers on animal headed thrones were not unknown in earlier Angevin iconography, for Charles I had been represented on such a throne by Arnolfo di Cambio in a large scale marble portrait from the Capitol in Rome.[27] Charles' statue itself reflects in some measure that of Frederick II of Hohenstaufen from the Capua Gate, of which a mutilated fragment survives.[28] Certainly, the model for the enthroned Saint Louis is monarchical rather than episcopal. The kneeling Robert, with his strong nose and bulbous forehead is familiar from other portraits, such as that in the Bible now at Malines and the *Illuminated Address from Prato* in the British Museum.[29] His posture is reminiscent more of contemporary donor portraits, for it was only in the presence of divinity that kings customarily knelt.

The seated figure of Saint Louis and the heavily draped throne present suggestive similarities to the seals of Charles II and Robert of Anjou, a circumstance which can hardly be coincidental.[30] The image of the enthroned ruler on his seal, the *sigillum maiestatis* as it is termed in Robert's own documents, possessed an authority of which the painted image also partakes.[31] Unlike the cross-legged kings of contemporary narrative illumination the seal figure is frontal and hieratic and commanding.

On an entirely different level however, is a comparison which may be drawn between Simone Martini's panel and much earlier manuscript illuminations. The great eleventh century *Sacramentary of Henry II*, a masterpiece of Ottonian book-painting now in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek at Munich, has a miniature of the Emperor being crowned by Christ with the assistance of Saints Emmeran and Ulrich.[32] The tradition of divine coronation of which this is but one splendid example makes it almost certain that the missing panel at the top of Simone's painting, mentioned earlier, represented the Blessing Christ, of which reflections (if hardly the original fragment) survive at Naples and in the Vatican Gallery.[33] Louis by the grace of God heir to the crown of Sicily could, with the sanction of Boniface VIII, transfer the crown to his brother Robert. An upper panel with Christ would have implied divine sanction for the act, and also have removed any suggestion of a purely episcopal investiture.

At this period in France the Capetian Coronation *ordo* was being revised, but it is not in this direction that we must look: rather toward the symbolic aspect of coronation than to actual ceremonial.[34] In Sicily in the great foundations of the Norman rulers a number of images of divine coronation survive. At Monreale such a scene is set above the royal throne and its implication is unequivocal.[35] Similarly, the monarch kneeling before Christ had a long tradition in Byzantium.[36] Robert in *proskynesis* would have been effectively crowned by Christ. It seems possible that the reminiscence of the coronation of the Norman rulers of Sicily was deliberate, for the reconquest of the island was one of Robert's major preoccupations, indeed it has been termed his '*tâche primordiale*'.[37] The legitimacy of Robert's claim to the Sicilian throne is perhaps alluded to in this way as a riposte to the divine coronation iconography used by Peter of Aragon in the *Cappella dell'Incoronata* at Palermo, the chapel in which the soverigns of Sicily from Roger II onwards had been crowned.[38] There, in the vault of the tribune and above the entrance door of the chapel appeared representations of Peter of Aragon receiving the crown from God the Father. These images could scarcely have been unknown to Robert of Anjou.

One feature of the iconography which should not be ignored is that no human hand places the crown on Louis' head. It is the crown of sanctity. Such images are uncommon in comparison with those of mundane coronation ceremonial, but their influence on Simone's design is important. A striking resemblance exists between the *Trecento* panel painting and the 'apotheosis' miniature of another

royal saint, King Edmund of England whose life is sumptuously illustrated in a manuscript now in the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York.[39] Here the hieratic, frontal, enthroned saint receives his crown from two angels who flutter above his head in a manner uncannily similar to those in Simone's panel. Two religious kneel at Edmund's feet as Robert does in the presence of Saint Louis. Professor Pächt, who devoted a penetrating analysis to this manuscript, pointed out that the crown type with its curved bar across the head was unknown in England, and postulated an Ottonian model for the illuminator of the Morgan manuscript. Is it mere coincidence that in 1316 Robert was himself negotiating to buy the crown and regalia of the Emperor Henry VII, who had died at Pisa three years previously?[40] There can be little argument about the resemblance between miniature and painting, although the likelihood of a direct connection can almost certainly be excluded. Again it argues strongly for a learned programme underlying the painting, a programme moreover where all the models and resonances were royal, and even imperial – with almost no emphasis on the Franciscanism of Saint Louis of Toulouse. Renunciation of the rights of primogeniture, divine coronation and approbation, the apotheosis of the Angevin saint: these are the dominant themes rather than the celebration of mendicant poverty.

Thus far the emphasis has been on the nature of the models underlying the design of the main scene. These models by their very nature could only have been placed at the painter's disposal by a royal patron, with a knowledge of Sicilian or related monuments. What must now be considered is the contribution of the painter, confronted with the rare problem of creating a new iconography for the recently canonized saint. Simone's range of models is entirely different and their sources lie in a distinct social and artistic milieu. But before we discuss these models in more detail it will be as well to define the limits of similarity, bearing in mind that such an analysis crudely exaggerates the mechanistic element of the compositional design and does an injustice to Simone's conception.

The richly encrusted surface and heraldic ornament of Simone's *Maestà* commissioned in 1315 for the *Palazzo Pubblico* at Siena shows that prior to the commission for the Saint Louis panel, the painter was working in a courtly idiom easily adaptable to the royal image.[41] The elaborately punched haloes and borders, imitation gems and gilt glass represent an increase in the level of decoration in comparison with earlier Tuscan panels, although the use of *pastiglio* or built up gesso ornament in the Saint Louis panel is perhaps an innovation.

Technically, therefore, Simone was already perfectly capable of producing the extreme degree of luxurious ornament required in the Angevin commission.

Similarly, one can point to prototypes for his solution of the hierarchical iconographical programme. As Bertelli suggested, considerable formal resemblances exist between the design of the Naples panel and an early work of the Sienese sculptur Tino da Camaino, the altar of San Raniero.[42] In this altar relief the gabled shape and the predella are reminiscent of the painting. In some later tomb sculpture the truncated gable and upper scene can be found also, as can the hierarchy of the sacred personnages.[43] That Simone was only prompted to employ a seal image by the patron should perhaps not be too easily assumed, for already beneath the image of the Madonna in the *Sala del Mappamondo* of the *Palazzo Pubblico* at Siena appears the seal of the Commune meticulously recorded by Simone's hand.[44] The leading Sienese goldsmith of the day was responsible for the seal's design. Yet enthroned ecclesiastics are almost absent from contemporary Italian seals; by the second half of the thirteenth century the standing figure had become the norm in Italy as in France.[45]

In Tuscan painting of the *Duecento* occur numerous examples of a saint enthroned among scenes from his life or miracles, and Sienese painters were responsible for several works of the type.[46] In the Saint Louis panel, possibly for reasons of clarity, but more likely as a reflex from current Roman practice, the scenes from the saint's life were set beneath the main image in a predella of five scenes. The first surviving example of a narrative predella beneath an enthroned saint is the nave side of Duccio di Buoninsegna's *Maestà* for the cathedral at Siena. There, however, the scenes are not arranged systematically about a central perspectival axis as is the case with the Saint Louis panel. Duccio's subject matter, too, is more conventional. This indeed is one of the cruces of Simone's design, the creation of a novel iconography. An adherence to strict chronology, as evidenced in the *Processus canonizationis* is apparent in the first scene, where the young saint makes acceptance of the mitre conditional upon permission to join the Franciscan Order.[47] But the structural skeleton of the scene is a variant of the *Approbation of the Franciscan Rule*, as represented for instance in the *Vita*-retable by the Bardi St. Francis Master, or later in the Upper Church of S. Francesco at Assisi.[48] Simone has given a different psychological twist to the narrative by the backward torsion of the kneeling figure of Louis, vividly expressive of his either/or attitude to the episcopate of

Toulouse. Boniface VIII is clearly identifiable by the hangings with the Caetani coat of arms which decorate the papal chamber. An insistence on chronology continues in the second scene which is subdivided architecturally, thus muting the effect of the somewhat archaic device of continuous narrative, Louis being received into the Minors prior to receiving the mitre at the hands of Boniface VIII. The axial central scene, the only one which punctuates the architectural horizon line of the predella (and which may reflect the gabled top of the missing upper panel), shows Louis ministering at the friars' meal in the convent of Aracoeli in Rome. Here, however, the narrative differs from the evidence of eye-witnesses as recorded in the *Processus*: Louis' desire as the newly incepted brother to serve at table was frustrated by another young friar of noble birth, the Count of Montefeltro.[49] In a somewhat comparable way the incident in Saint Francis' career where he was given a kind reception by the Sultan instead of the martyrdom he so ardently desired is transformed in Franciscan iconography into the Saint's triumphant confrontation with the court necromancers in the *Trial by Fire*.[50] The penultimate scene of the predella shows Louis laid out on a bier, attended by ecclesiastics and friars. Already his corpse has begun to work miracles – a circumstance confirmed by one of the witnesses at the *Processus* Raymond de Baux.[51] Simone's composition here seems to presage the more elaborate *Funeral of St. Martin* in the *Cappella San Martino* in the Lower Church at Assisi, and more exactly the *Funeral of Saint Francis* in the nave of the Upper Church.[52] At the far right of the predella, in a second posthumous miracle Louis intervenes to resuscitate a child still-born – perhaps that miracle which according to the *Processus canonizationis* took place at Marseilles, when the merits of the saint revived the infant Johannes Massolto.[53]

The scenes of the predella represent an attempt to create a coherent and convincing iconography for the newly canonized Angevin saint. The materials at the painter's disposal may be fairly regarded as exiguous. The *Processus* records no miracle in any part of Italy or Aragon before 1308, and the early cultus was a purely Provençal phenomenon.[54] Few of the miracles could be said to depart markedly from a multitude of other miraculous interventions or cures. Thus, the iconographic models were derived to a considerable degree from the earlier models established for the life of Francis himself. It is difficult to judge how conscious the imitation was on Simone's part. Such a parallelism would hardly have been unwelcome to the patron. Yet the backward twist of Louis' body in the first predella scene is re-employed by the painter to express a comparable psycholgical

state in the fresco where the young Saint Martin renounces a military career in the Montefiore chapel at Assisi.[55] This perhaps suggests that Simone had used conventional models where he could, but where he had been compelled to innovate would then use the newly created prototype in another narrative sequence radically different in content and historical period. Appropriate but unmemorable might well describe the iconographical content of the predella scenes. They fit the biography of Louis, but they also draw heavily on the common repertory of wonders and prodigies which may be found in mediaeval hagiography and mediaeval art.

One final problem which briefly must be examined is the function of the panel painting itself. The painted reverse indicates that the panel was at least partially visible from the rear. Therefore, the earliest recorded position of the painting – as hanging between two chapels in San Lorenzo in Naples – is most unlikely to have been the original one.[56] The preserved iron rings indicate one of the methods by which the panel was held upright, but the restored base moulding and predella sides prevent us from judging if it was ever socketed into an altar top. An altarpiece it must surely have been, but its iconography and dimensions imply that it was originally located in a chapel. It is highly unlikely that it could have been a high altarpiece, where its iconography would surely have been predicated on the dedication of the church, and its dimensions (2m. × 1.385m.) are too small for either of the great Neapolitan ecclesiastical foundations of the Angevin dynasty.[57] S. Chiara the major Franciscan church in Naples, which has the strongest claim to have been the original site intended for the panel, had been begun in 1310 and was incomplete when the painting was executed.[58] However, as was the case at S. Croce in Florence, the chapels were finished earlier than the nave, and it is possible that the ninth chapel on the right of the nave of S. Chiara, the *Cappella Sancti Lodovici* was the original location of Simone's altarpiece.[59] But for so 'revolutionary' a painting the breaking of yet more of the conventional rules cannot be entirely excluded. The canonical image of the new Angevin saint, the immensely complex painting would have provided an opulent focus for his cultus. In every sense a royal picture, yet with its strange conjunction of royal and Franciscan iconographical and formal antecedents, it well reflects the conflicting ideals of Robert's court, and is perhaps fully comprehensible only within such a setting.

Warwick University JULIAN GARDNER

NOTES

[1] All books on Simone to some extent discuss the panel. Two recent studies are: F. Bologna, *I pittori alla corte angioina di Napoli 1266-1414*, Rome, 1969, chapter IV ***passim***. [= Bologna]. C. Bertelli, 'Vetri e altre cose della Napoli Angioina', *Paragone* 23 (1972), pp.89-106. [= Bertelli].

[2] By far the most satisfactory account is to be found in the catalogue IV *Mostra di Restauro. Napoli Palazzo Reale 1959*, pp.32-8 (R. Causa).

[3] Cf. M. Cämmerer-George, *Die Rahmung der toskanischen Altarbilder im Trecento (Zur Kunstgeschichte des Auslands 39)*, Strasbourg, 1966, pp.147 ff and Taf. 24d.

[4] M.R. Toynbee, *S. Louis of Toulouse and the Process of Canonisation in the fourteenth century (British Society of Franciscan Studies 15)*, Manchester, 1929. [= Toynbee] remains the standard work. Some important new material is added by E. Pásztor, *Per la storia di San Lodovico d'Angiò (Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo. Studi Storici 10)*, Rome, 1955. Cf. also M.H. Laurent, *Le culte de S. Louis d'Anjou à Marseille au XIVe siècle. (Temi e Testi 2)*, Rome, 1954. Further information is contained in the *Processus Canonizationis et Legendæ Variæ Sancti Ludovici O.F.M. Episcopi Tolosani (Analecta Franciscana VII)*, Quaracchi, 1951, pp.1-254. [= PC]. Laurent's critical review of the PC is in *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique 46* (i), 1951, pp.786-91.

[5] B. Homan, *Gli Angioini di Napoli in Ungheria (1290-1403)*, Rome, 1938, p.143. E. Léonard, *Les Angevins de Naples*, Paris, 1954, p.197. [= Léonard]. R. Caggese, *Roberto d'Angio e i suoi tempi*, Florence, 1922, 1930, I. p.99. [= Caggese].

[6] C. Digard, M. Faucon, A. Thomas, R. Fawtier (eds), *Les Registres de Boniface VIII*, Paris, 1907-1939. No.1977 (24 February, 1297). [= Reg. B. VIII]. Toynbee, p.98.

[7] PC, p.103; p.113. Toynbee, p.112.

[8] Reg. B. VIII. No. 1521.

[9] H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia*, Berlin, 1908, 1922. II, Doc. 378, p. 588: *El rey* [Charles II] *feu tot son poder, que Sent Loys fos feyt cardenal et nuylls temps non poch obtenir.*

[10] Toynbee, p.200.

[11] L.K. Little, 'Saint Louis' involvement with the Friars', *Church History* XXXIII (1964), pp.125-48.

[12] Elizabeth of Thuringia (1207-1231), daughter of Andrea II of Hungary, canonized in 1235 provided an additional cause for emulation in Charles II and Robert.

[13] Pásztor, *op.cit.*, pp.39 ff; p.47. Toynbee, pp.201 ff.

[14] R. Ellmann, *Literary Biography*, Oxford, 1971, p.12.

[15] PC, pp.87,106,116.

[16] Bertelli, p.102.

[17] Oddly the first letter (8 April) was to Sancho of Majorca: cf. Laurent (*supra* note 4). Doc. XII. The next day letters were sent to Mary of Hungary (Doc. XIII) and Phillippe V (Doc. XIV). For Robert etc., cf. Laurent, p.42, note 40.

[18] Léonard, pp.315 ff. Caggese, I, pp.661 ff. Homan, *op. et loc. cit.*

[19] A.A. Pelliccia (ed), *Raccolta di varie croniche, diarii... appartenenti alla storia del regno di Napoli,* I, Naples, 1780: *Cronica de' Re della casa di Angio,* pp.99-106; p.103. Toynbee, p.89. Caggese, I, pp.5 ff.

[20] Caggese, I, p.99; pp.105 ff.

[21] PC, p.50: '...dominus Robertus... iactabat lapidem frequenter'. Toynbee, p.49.

[22] Léonard, pp.282 ff.

[23] *Paradiso* VIII, 148.

[24] Pásztor, *op.cit.*, pp.66 ff.

[25] The full verse ends: '...et gloria honoris, opus virtutis et desideria oculorum ornata.'

[26] Bertelli, p.94, compares it to a Konya carpet. But K. Erdmann, *Seven Hundred Years of Oriental Carpets,* London, 1970, p.49, identifies it as an Anatolian Animal Carpet datable *c* 1270-80.

[27] V. Mariani, *Arnolfo di Cambio (Quaderni d'Arte 6)*, Figs. 8,9.

[28] C.A. Willemsen, *Kaiser Friedrichs II. Triumphtor zu Capua,* Wiesbaden, 1953, Figs. 31-33.

[29] Malines, MS Seminaire, 1, fol. 1. Cf. Bologna, pp.276 ff. Tav. II. A detail of the *Address from Prato* (BM MS Royal 6 E. IX, fol. 10b) is reproduced in A. Smart, *The Assisi Problem and the Art of Giotto,* Oxford, 1971, Fig. 54b.

[30] L. Blancard, *Iconographie des sceaux... des Archives départementales des Bouches-du-Rhône,* Paris, 1860, I, pp.22 ff. esp. nos. 11, 16; II, Planches 11, 2 (recte 1) (Charles II, 1307), 13, 1 (Robert, 1324), B. Cole, 'Old and

New in the early Trecento', *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* XVII (1973), pp.229-48; p.241. St. Louis' throne is here compared with that on a coin of Robert.

[31] C. Minieri Riccio, *Saggio di Codice Diplimatico. Supplemento. Parte seconda,* Naples, 1883, publishes documents which indicate that Robert's great seal was made between 5 May, 1309 (Doc. XLIII, p.50) and 6 June (Doc. XLV, p.52).

[32] G. Swarzenski, *Die Regensburger Buchmalerei des X. und XI. Jahrhunderts,* Leipzig, 1901, pp.64 ff, Taf. VIII, no.19.

[33] G. Paccagnini, *Simone Martini,* Milan, 1955, Fig. 1, reproduces the Vatican panel. B. Molajoli, *Notizie su Capodimonte,* Naples, 1964, Fig. 4, reproduces that at Capodimonte.

[34] P.E. Schramm, 'Ordines-Studien II: die Krönung bei den Westfranken und Franzosen', *Archiv für Urkundenforschung* XV, n.f. I (1937), pp.3-55; 33 ff.

[35] S. Friedberg, 'I ritratti dei Re Normanni in Sicilia', *La Bibliofilia* XXXIX (1937), pp.1-29 *(separatim)*; Fig. 8. E. Kitzinger, 'The Gregorian Reform and the Visual Arts', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 22 (1972), pp.87-102.

[36] J. Scharff, 'Die Kaiser im Proskynese. Bemerkungen zur Deutung des Kaisermosaiks im Narthex der Hagia Sohia von Konstantinopel', *Festschrift P.E. Schramm,* Wiesbaden, 1964, I, pp.27-35.

[37] Léonard, p.224.

[38] P. Gramignani, 'La Cappella dell'Incoronazione in Palermo', *Archivio Storico Siciliano,* n.s. 54 (1934), pp. 227-59; pp. 237 ff. For the coronation ceremonial of Roger, cf. R. Elze, 'Zum Königtum Rogers II. von Sizilien', *Festschrift Schramm,* pp.102-116; p.111,

[39] MS 736. Cf. O. Pächt, C.R. Dodwell and F. Wormald, *The St. Albans Psalter, (Studies of the Warburg Institute 25),* London, 1960, pp.118,140,167.

[40] Minieri Riccio, *op.cit.,* II, Naples, 1879, Doc. XVI (20 September, 1316), p.15.

[41] I. Hueck, 'Frühe Arbeiten des Simone Martini', *Münchner Jahrbuch* XIX (1968), pp.29-60; pp.33 ff; pp.55 ff. P. Toesca, *Il Trecento,* Turin, 1950, p. 526 (note 20).

[42] Bertelli, p.93. Cf. W.R. Valentiner, *Tino da Camaino,* Paris, 1935, pp.8 ff, Plate 1.

[43] In the tomb of Cino da Pistoia. Cf. I.B. Supino, *Arte Pisana,* Florence, 1904, pp.255 ff, Fig. 152. A comparable truncated gable occurs in the tomb of Ligo Ammanati: cf. Supino, Fig. 153.

[44] Hueck, *art. cit.,* Fig. 22.

[45] G.C. Bascapè, 'Lineamenti di sigillografia ecclesiastica', *Scritti storici e giuridici in memoria di Alessandro Visconti,* Milan, 1955, pp.53-144.

[46] E.B. Garrison, *Italian Romanesque Panel Painting. An Illustrated Index,* Florence, 1949, Nos. 363,375,376,379; esp. 376 and 379.

[47] PC, pp.15,103,113.

[48] Garrison, *op. cit.,* No. 405. For a better reproduction *v.* Smart, *op.cit.,* Fig. 54a, and L. Coletti, *Gli Affreschi della Basilica di Assisi,* Bergamo, 1948, Fig. 66

[49] PC, p.97: '. . . *comes quondam de Monte Feltro*'.

[50] For instance, in Giotto's fresco in the Cappella Bardi in S. Croce at Florence. Cf. G. Previtali, *Giotto e sua bottega,* Milan, 1967, Fig. 377.

[51] PC, p.97. Toynbee, pp.151 ff. For the correct form of the name, cf. Laurent's review (*supra,* note 4), p.791.

[52] Paccagnini, *op.cit.,* Fig. 68. Coletti, *op. cit.,* Fig. 81. Hueck, *art.cit.,* p.54.

[53] PC, pp.122 ff.

[54] Toynbee, pp.214 ff.

[55] Paccagnini, *op.cit.,* Fig. 62.

[56] A. de Rinaldis, 'Tavole di S. Lorenzo Maggiore nel Museo di Napoli', *Napoli Nobilissima,* n.s. II (1921), pp.97-104; p.99.

[57] For S. Lorenzo, cf. R. Wagner-Rieger, 'S. Lorenzo Maggiore in Neapel und die süditalienische Architektur unter den ersten Königen aus dem Hause Anjou', *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Hertzianae (Römische Forschungen der Bibliotheca Hertziana XVI),* Munich, 1961, pp.131-43. For S. Chiara, cf. T.M. Gallino, *Il complesso monumentale di Santa Chiara in Napoli,* Naples, 1963.

[58] Gallino, *op.cit.,* p.52 (Plan facing p.56).

[59] *Ibid.,* note 17.