

eScholarship

California Italian Studies

Title

Artists, Patrons, and Trust in Seventeenth-Century Naples: The Case of the Certosa di San Martino

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6jn0b7tz>

Journal

California Italian Studies, 3(1)

Author

Napoli, J. Nicholas

Publication Date

2012

DOI

10.5070/C331009017

Supplemental Material

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6jn0b7tz#supplemental>

Copyright Information

Copyright 2012 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

Artists, Patrons, and Trust in Seventeenth-Century Naples: The Case of the Certosa di San Martino

J. Nicholas Napoli

Introduction

In his 1739 essay on commerce, “Del Commercio del Regno di Napoli,” presented as a letter addressed to Don Francesco Ventura, the newly appointed President of the Magistrate of Commerce under Charles of Bourbon, Paolo Mattia Doria reflected on the city’s economic development during the period of Spanish viceregal rule and suggested possibilities for present-day and future reform. He argued that the regime fostered several practices in the civil life of the kingdom—including usurious rates of interest, the inconsistent registration and enforcement of loans and contracts, and the resultant lawsuits of hopeless complexity and interminable duration—that fed widespread distrust of commerce in the realm.¹ For Doria, trust in each of these exchanges was critical in establishing and maintaining commerce, and ultimately rendered civil life possible.² In *Lezioni di economia civile*, Doria defined trust as the reciprocal confidence of one citizen in another. In terms of commerce, it was the voluntary participation in economic exchange made possible by freedom and security of contracts.³

Doria developed his thinking about trust in the academic circles of late seventeenth-century Naples where the Accademia degli Investiganti and the Accademia Medina Coeli fostered intellectual exchange and allowed for the dissemination of the emerging philosophical trends in Europe.⁴ As a member of the Accademia Medina Coeli, Doria presented and listened to papers, or *lezioni*, alongside Giuseppe Valletta, Luc’Antonio Porzio, and younger members who would become the most prominent thinkers in the Neapolitan Enlightenment, including Niccolò

¹ Paolo Mattia Doria, “Del Commercio del Regno di Napoli,” *Il Pensiero Civile di Paolo Mattia Doria negli Scritti Inediti*, 1739, edited by Enrico Vidal (Milan: A Giuffrè Editore, 1953), 178-79, 205.

² Doria, “Del Commercio del Regno di Napoli,” 162. Id., *Della vita civile*, second ed. (Augusta: Daniello Höpper, 1710), part I, chapter III, 93. Also see Anthony Pagden, “Trust in Eighteenth-century Naples,” *Trust. Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*, edited by Diego Gambetta (Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1988), 129.

³ Paolo Mattia Doria, “Lezioni di economia civile,” in *Il Pensiero Civile di Paolo Mattia Doria negli Scritti Inediti*, edited by Enrico Vidal, 233-34: “Niente è più necessario ad una grande e pronta circolazione, quanto la fede pubblica. In effetto dove la fede è per niente, sia in quella parte che costituisce la reciproca confidenza degli uni cittadini negli altri, sia nella certezza delle contrattazioni, sia nel vigore delle leggi e nella scienza e integrità de’ magistrati, ivi non si possono neppure ritrovare i due primi fondamenti della civile società e vita, i quali sono la giustizia e l’umanità; . . .” Id., “Del Commercio del Regno di Napoli,” 162.

⁴ Anthony Pagden, *Spanish Imperialism and the Political Imagination* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990), 65-69; John Robertson, *The Case for Enlightenment: Scotland and Naples 1680-1760* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 101-109. Members of the Investiganti and the Medina Coeli academy were especially interested in René Descartes and Pierre Gassendi’s revival of the atomist natural philosophy of Democritus, Epicurus, and Lucretius. The large private libraries of Cardinal Francesco Maria Brancaccio and the lawyer Giuseppe Valletta complemented the mission of the academies. These collections were frequently updated with the most recent writings in philosophy in northern Europe including the Parisian *Journal des Sçavans* (first published 1665), Pierre Bayle’s *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* (1684-87), and Jean Le Clerc’s *Bibliothèque universelle et historique* (1686-93). See Robertson, 104-108.

Capasso, Niccolò Cirillo, and Giambattista Vico.⁵ Born the year of the Revolt of Masaniello (1647), Doria grew up in the shadow of a political episode that exposed the shortcomings of Spanish imperial policy in Naples, and refined his political and economic outlook in a progressive intellectual community that, like the rest of the Kingdom, was anticipating the death of the sickly Charles II, the consequent conclusion of Spanish rule in Naples, and the opportunity for a changed government that would pay more attention to the Kingdom's economic needs.⁶

The development in Doria's thinking about trust, or *fede*, is discernible in his earlier treatise, *Della Vita Civile*, published in 1710. In a chapter dedicated to how rulers should sustain trust, Doria noted that while force could conquer a republic, trust ensured the republic's stability.⁷ The recent transfer of power in the Kingdom from Spain to Austria resonates in his discussion of trust in relation to forcible conquest and the stability of the state.

The psychological underpinnings of trust and its extension from individual and kin relationships to economic and political force were elaborated later in the eighteenth century by Antonio Genovesi. He distinguished between two types of trust: the private and the public (*fede privata* and *fede pubblica*).⁸ He defined private trust, also called "ethical trust," as "an exchange of confidence between persons, between families, [and] between the [social] orders founded upon an opinion of the virtue and the piety of the contractees."⁹ He characterized public trust as having a political and economic aspect; where economic trust is "the security that derives from the security of funds from which all loans are made," political trust is "that which is born of the conventions and promises sustained by the civil law, by the laws of religion, and by public custom and norms."¹⁰ While *fede privata* was distinct from *fede pubblica*, the latter could not exist without the former. In other words, private faith was the "private moral basis on which all forms of public exchange are made."¹¹

Given the political and intellectual context of late seventeenth-century Naples, Doria's conceived trust as a requisite for a prosperous civil society and the distinguishing feature of successful rule (to be sought by Joseph I and Charles VI Habsburg and by Charles of Bourbon), and its absence, consequently, was indicative of *malgoverno* (Spanish Habsburg rule in Naples). In important respects, this outlook oversimplified Spanish policy during the viceregal period and the kingdom's economic problems.¹² Despite the oversimplification, he identified a mechanism

⁵ Robertson, 103-104.

⁶ Pagden, *Spanish Imperialism*, 69; Robertson, 92.

⁷ Doria, *Della Vita Civile* (Augusta: Daniello Höpper, 1710), 406. Pagden cites this passage in *Spanish Imperialism*, 70.

⁸ In his later treatise, "Del Commercio del Regno di Napoli" (1740), Doria mentioned trust in relation to civil law and referred to this as *fede pubblica*. While he suggests that *fede pubblica* needs a foundation in the private good, "La legge civile c'insegna questa massima e cioè: bonum publicum praefertur bono privato," he does not make a more elaborate distinction between *fede privata* and *fede pubblica*. See Doria, "Del Commercio del Regno di Napoli," 180-181.

⁹ The citation and translation of Antonio Genovesi, *Lezioni di economia civile* (1803) was taken from Anthony Pagden, *Spanish Imperialism*, 72.

¹⁰ Antonio enovesi, *Lezioni di economia civile* (1803), in Pagden, *Spanish Imperialism*, 72.

¹¹ Pagden, *Spanish Imperialism*, 72.

¹² Having grown up in the decades after Masaniello, Doria did not assess the positive aspects of Spanish rule in Naples nor the more complex dynamics behind the Revolt. See John Marino and Antonio Calabria, "Introduction: Good Government in Naples?," in *Good Government in Spanish Naples*, edited by Antonio Calabria and John A. Marino (New York: Peter Lang, 1990), 5-10. This assessment is based on Benedetto Croce's fundamental *History of the Kingdom of Naples*, 1925, translated by Frances Freneye (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970); Giuseppe Galasso's study of the rural economy in Calabria, *Economia e società nella Calabria del Cinquecento*

whereby an apparently simple economic transaction between individuals assumed macroscopic importance in the prosperity of the Kingdom.

The present article explores the theme of trust, as conceived by Doria and Genovesi, with reference to the professional relationships forged between artists and patrons at the Carthusian monastery in Naples, the Certosa di San Martino, during the seventeenth century. This specific case study is of particular relevance for several reasons. First, it falls within the chronological scope of Spanish viceregal rule observed by Doria. Second, the Carthusian monks at San Martino employed a large number of painters, sculptors, architects, embroiderers, and silversmiths in redecorating their monastery, and they kept careful records of their payments to these artists. The payments, conserved in the Archivio di Stato in Naples, provide a body of recorded transactions that can rarely be reconstructed in any other industry in the city during this period.¹³ Third, the amount of money spent by the Carthusians on refurbishing and redecorating their monastery assumes macro-economic proportions. The Carthusian monks paid the premier sculptor-architect in Naples, Cosimo Fanzago, a total of 57,000 ducats over the course of 33 years of work at San Martino, thereby an average of 1,900 ducats worth of architectural sculpture at the monastery per year. In comparison, the *Dogana delle Pecore* of Foggia, the principal wool exchange of the Kingdom of Naples, averaged 140,000 ducats of wool sold per year in the seventeenth century (1625-1684).¹⁴ With these figures in mind, Fanzago's production at one institution in one year is statistically significant, (1.4%) compared to the aggregate wool production in the entire Kingdom of Naples. Given the monetary value of Fanzago's work alone, the professional relationships formed between the Carthusians and their decorating artists—sculptors, painters, embroiderers, and silversmiths among them—had sizeable repercussions on the Kingdom's economy. For Pietro Giannone, a fellow reformer of Doria's in the eighteenth century, the monetary sums generated from church decoration like San Martino's represented a significant infringement of ecclesiastic institutions into the civil and economic life of the Kingdom.¹⁵ Fourth, lawsuits between the Carthusians and their artists were a frequent occurrence in the seventeenth century. Fanzago's lawsuit in particular, a forty-year-long case that lasted from 1660 until 1700, seems to epitomize Doria's lament over inconsistent contract practices that resulted in extended lawsuits.

By presenting the ways in which the Carthusian monks interacted with their commissioned artists, this article seeks to present how trust was forged in day-to-day transactions in Naples. Given that trust emerges as a reciprocal relationship between individuals, and ultimately between the individual and the larger community, the article begins by presenting the social and economic landscape of art production in early modern Naples. This landscape presented a set of shared expectations among artists and patrons, ultimately shaping the patron-artist interactions at the Certosa di San Martino. The article proceeds by outlining a process by which trust was forged and sustained between the Carthusian monks and their artists, and it

(Naples: L'Arte Tipografica, 1967); and Rosario Villari's analysis of Masaniello, *La rivolta antispagnola a Napoli. Le origini (1585-1657)* (Bari: Laterza, 1973).

¹³ An important exception to this is John Marino's study of the wool exchange, or *Dogana delle Pecore, in Foggia*. See John A. Marino, *Pastoral Economics in the Kingdom of Naples* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988).

¹⁴ This figure is taken from Marino, *Pastoral Economics*, 204-205.

¹⁵ Pietro Giannone, *Istoria Civile del Regno di Napoli*, 1723, edited by Antonio Marongù, 6 vols. (Milan: Marzorati, 1970-71). For Giannone, any discussion of Naples' civil history needed to be intertwined with its ecclesiastic history given the Church's deep incursion into the civil life of the kingdom. *Istoria Civile*, see vol. 1, 26. Giannone repeatedly appealed, "the priests and Clerics should be granted what is God's, and the Empire that which is Caesar's." (*Ibid.*, 1: 24).

concludes by considering this process in light of Doria's theorization of trust. As conceived by Doria and refined by Genovesi, the concept of trust provides a model for assessing the larger social and economic significance of the Carthusian monks' collaboration with their decorating artists. The case of the Certosa di San Martino, in turn, provides an interrelated series of financial transactions that closely correspond to the ground-level economic and social realities of Naples during viceregal Spanish rule, inviting a reassessment of a central concept in the political economy of Doria and Genovesi.

The Landscape of Neapolitan Art Production

Recent research on the economic and social lives of artists in the urban centers of seventeenth-century Italy, including Naples, provides critical background information on how art markets, the perceived social status of the artist, and the prices paid for paintings in different urban centers in Italy established a framework of shared expectations between patrons and artists, ultimately shaping the specific interactions between artists and the monks at San Martino.¹⁶ In Rome, working in the household of an aristocratic patron in a traditional patron-client relationship remained the most economically secure and socially prestigious form of employment for artists. However, the emergence of an art market provided new opportunities for economic advancement and gave rise to a class of dealers and collectors, many of whom also painted.¹⁷ Whether as a producer or as a dealer, the participation of an artist in the public market was looked upon with disdain by patrons, established artists, and the Academy of St. Luke. Contemporary accounts by artists frequently cast the practice of art dealing as demeaning to the noble and intellectual aspirations of artists, and the academy forbade its members to engage in art dealing at the risk of expulsion from the institution.¹⁸

Like Rome, the city of Naples provided a community of ecclesiastic and aristocratic patrons who generated an ample demand for art and architecture, and employment with a noble patron or prominent institution was the most economically secure and socially advantageous means of professional advancement for artists.¹⁹

¹⁶ These studies include Francis Haskell, *Patrons and Painters; A Study in the Relations Between Italian Art and Society in the Age of the Baroque*, revised and enlarged edition (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1963, 1980); Simonetta Cavaciocchi, ed., *Economia e Arte Secc. XIII-XVIII*, Atti della "Trentatreesima Settimana di Studi," 30 aprile-4 maggio 2000 (Florence: Le Monnier, 2002); Marcello Fantoni, Louisa Chevalier Matthew, and Sara F. Mathews Grieco, eds., *The Art Market in Italy, Fifteenth-Seventeenth Centuries: Il mercato dell'arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII* (Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003); Patrizia Cavazzini, *Painting as Business in Early Seventeenth-Century Rome* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008); and Richard E. Spear and Philip Sohm, eds., *Painting for Profit: The Economic Lives of Seventeenth-Century Italian Painters* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2010).

¹⁷ Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 3-23; Patrizia Cavazzini, *Painting as Business*, 126-131. Agostino Tassi, the painter who was accused of raping Artemisia Gentileschi, was a prominent example of an artist who also made money by selling paintings. See Cavazzini, 128-129.

¹⁸ Christopher R. Marshall, " 'Senza il minimo scrupolo' Artists as dealers in seventeenth-century Naples," *Journal of the History of Collections* 12, no. 1 (2000): 15-16. Marshall also observed that a similar prejudice existed in Genoa. The aristocratic painter Giovanni Battista Paggi argued that only painters that worked exclusively on commission from their own residences should be exempted from guild laws.

¹⁹ Since the late-sixteenth century, both the older contemplative monastic orders, such as the Carthusians and the Benedictines, and the more recently incorporated orders and confraternities of the Catholic reform, including the Jesuits, Theatines, and Oratorians, had been expanding and furnishing their monastic complexes. This process

In contrast to Rome, a more entrepreneurial attitude towards artistic production prevailed in the city that condoned if not encouraged an artist's participation in the art market as both a producer and a seller. There was no painter's academy in the city, and so there was no institution that could denounce the practice of art dealing as detrimental to the noble status of painting as a liberal art.²⁰ In addition, the painters' corporation in Naples never made injunctions against art dealing.²¹ Painters, sculptors, and architects in the city still sought academic titles to confirm their professional competence and the nobility of their profession, but this did not preclude them from participating in the art market.

Cosimo Fanzago frequently served as a dealer for his patrons, including the Carthusians at San Martino; and the painters Carlo Sellitto and Paolo Finoglio, early painters in the Caravaggesque tradition in Naples, sold the works of other artists out of their own studios.²² Even the eighteenth-century champion of the Neapolitan artistic tradition, Bernardo de' Dominici, presented the mercantile activities of artists as an integral part of artistic practice in the city.²³

While the environment of artistic production in Naples induced an entrepreneurial savvy among its community of artists, the perception of the visual arts as an artisan (as opposed to a noble) pursuit contributed to lower compensation of artists with respect to Rome and other centers on the Italian peninsula. Where the top artists working north of Naples could receive as much as 508 scudi for large gallery paintings, like Guercino's compensation for his *Meeting of David and Abigail* of 1637, his counterparts in Naples, including Jusepe de Ribera and Massimo Stanzione, received payments no higher than 300 ducats (the Neapolitan ducat being valued slightly less than the Roman scudo) for a comparable or even larger painting.²⁴ As Christopher Marshall argued, the community of patrons—both lay and ecclesiastical—viewed paintings as a standardized good. As such, their prices could be fixed by relatively simple criteria including size of the canvas and the number of human figures included in a work. Additional compensation for the unique talents of a specific artist was not recognized in this pricing model.²⁵

This said, the Carthusians paid some of the highest prices for the works of the leading painters in Naples. They paid 400 ducats for Ribera's altarpiece-sized *Pietà* in 1637 (**Fig. 1**), 300 ducats for Stanzione's *Pietà* in 1638, 1,300 ducats for Ribera's choir panel *Last Communion of the Apostles* in 1651 (**Fig. 2**), and 1,000 ducats for Stanzione's choir panel *The Wedding Feast at Cana* in 1639.²⁶ The only higher prices Ribera received for his works were 530 ducats for an altarpiece in the Palazzo Reale, and 1,400 ducats for the oil-on-copper altarpiece, *San Gennaro Emerging Unharmful from the Furnace* (**Fig. 4**), painted for the Treasury Chapel in 1647. As

intensified in the early decades of the seventeenth century. In addition, the Spanish crown's policies of exempting the capital city from direct taxes and requiring the kingdom's aristocrats to spend part of every year in Naples concentrated the kingdom's nobility in the city. See Christopher Marshall, "Naples," *Painting for Profit: The Economic Lives of Seventeenth-Century Italian Painters*, Richard E. Spear and Philip Sohm, eds., 117.

²⁰ Marshall, "Senza il minimo scrupolo," 15-16.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 15-16.

²² *Ibid.*, 23-26.

²³ *Ibid.*, 27-29.

²⁴ Marshall, "Naples," 137. Don Antonio Ruffo, the Messinese art collector, paid Ribera 270 ducats for a *Pietà* and paid Stanzione 300 ducats for a large canvas depicting the *Judgment of Paris* in 1636.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 137.

²⁶ Excepting Ribera's compensation of 1,300 ducats for the *Last Communion of the Apostles* (which will be discussed below), these figures were taken from table 9 of Marshall, "Naples," 121-122.

Christopher Marshall has noted, these prices were exceptionally high for the city, and not within the usual range paid by other lay and ecclesiastical patrons for comparable panels.²⁷

These features of the Neapolitan artistic landscape structured the interaction between artists and patrons at San Martino in several ways. First, both patrons and artists actively engaged the art market. For patrons, it provided a way to acquire works by artists who were otherwise too busy to accept a more specialized commission; for painters, exhibiting and selling works on the market provided both income and professional exposure to the community of patrons. Second, artists in Naples used academic and aristocratic titles less to signal their belief in painting, sculpture, and architecture as noble pursuits and more to enhance their professional exposure to patrons and to confirm their artistic skill. Third, given that the art-consuming community in Naples priced art in a more mechanical fashion, both patrons and artists used paintings as fungible entities that could be interchanged and even be used for compensation and settling accounts.

Neapolitan Claims of Compensation and its Importance to Professional Trust

The Carthusian monks at San Martino initiated an intensive campaign of pictorial, sculptural, and architectural decoration at their complex during the middle decades of the seventeenth century. From the 1620s through the 1650s, they employed or ordered canvasses from no fewer than thirteen different painters and their workshops. These painters were among the finest artists working in Europe: Giovanni Lanfranco and Guido Reni were established painters in Rome, Parma, and Bologna; Jusepe de Ribera executed several commissions for export to Spain; and Massimo Stanzione enjoyed the esteem of the preeminent lay and clerical patrons in Naples. The monastery became the primary staging ground for the premier sculptor-architect in the city, Cosimo Fanzago, who supervised and collaborated with no fewer than twenty-two different specialists in marble cutting, *piperno* (a local Neapolitan stone) cutting, and *rotatori* (specialists in cylindrical sculptural components like balustrade shafts). Beyond painters and sculptors, embroiderers like the Frenchman Nicolas de la Fage executed altar frontals (*paliotti*), liturgical vestments (including chasubles and pianeti) and chalice covers; and bronze casters including Biase and Gennaro Monte collaborated in the production of life-size statues for the monastery.²⁸ The execution of every one of these commissions required reciprocal trust between the Carthusians and the artist: the Carthusians needed to trust that each artist would produce an object of suitable quality, and the artists needed to trust that the Carthusians would appropriately compensate them for their work.

The requirements for trust were articulated explicitly when this reciprocal tie was called into question. On 27 February 1660 Cosimo Fanzago (often called *il Cavaliere*, a title granted to him in 1627) appeared in the court of the Papal Nuncio in Naples and sued the Carthusians for underpayment. He had been refurbishing their monastery for thirty years and argued that the Carthusians paid him for only 74% of his work. The monks, on the other hand, were left with a

²⁷ Marshall, "Naples," 133.

²⁸ For a chronology of artists who worked at the Certosa di San Martino during these years, see Raffaello Causa, *L'Arte nella Certosa di San Martino a Napoli* (Naples: De Mauro Editore, 1973), and J. Nicholas Napoli, "Fashioning the Certosa di San Martino: Ornament, Illusion, and Artistic Collaboration in Early-Modern Naples," 2 vols. (PhD Thesis, Princeton University, 2003), see vol. 1, 11-107.

veritable quarry of sculptural and architectonic components in their monastery and had no idea of where or how they should be installed. They also complained that Fanzago installed pieces originally intended for their monastery in other churches and public monuments in the city. For these reasons, the Carthusians refused to further compensate the sculptor, igniting a lawsuit that ultimately found its way to the dockets of the Papal tribunal, the Sacra Romana Rota, and lasted for forty years. The *Cavaliere* died in 1678, but his daughter, Vittoria Fanzago Corrado, his son-in-law, Giovanni Corrado, and his grandsons, Giuseppe and Alessandro Corrado, pursued the case until its resolution in 1700.²⁹

This lawsuit generated copious documentation that survives in the state archives of Naples (in the records related to the suppressed monasteries) and the Rota archives of the Vatican. The documents included reviews of the contracts, written agreements, and liquidation of accounts between Fanzago and the Carthusians; appraisals of Fanzago's work at the Certosa; the legal challenges presented by the Carthusians to the validity of these appraisals; and the courts' decisions.

The common title given to these records. Neapolitana præpensæ Mercedis, or [the] Neapolitan [case or lawsuit concerning] Claims of Compensation, reveals the Vatican court's determination of the central premise, or *dubium*, in the case and articulates the positions of Fanzago and the Carthusians.³⁰ With this title, the Roman Rota characterized a complex patron-artist interaction as a simple contractual relationship. As a sculptor and architect, Cosimo Fanzago performed a service and provided a product for a client; the clients, the Carthusians of San Martino, in turn, should compensate him appropriately.

For the Rota auditors, this relationship was an arrangement of purchase and sale; therefore, it was governed by the ethical ideal of commutative justice. In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle presented justice as a unique virtue in its completeness: it needed to be practiced both within the individual and in relation to one's neighbors. In its governing of an individual's relations to others, justice pertained to the maintenance of equality, or a suiting proportionality, between two persons and to two corresponding things. Justice becomes central to the act of economic exchange because the use of money insures that equal values of goods and services would be exchanged. Ultimately, the use of currency was an example of economic reciprocity.³¹ Building upon Aristotle's notion of justice, Thomas Aquinas defined the virtue as "a habit whereby a man renders to each one his due by a constant and perpetual will."³² While arguing that commutative and distributive justice were parts of the same virtue, he distinguished between them by observing that where commutative justice consists in rendering something to one

²⁹ Fanzago originally sought 20,000 ducats from the Carthusians. The first appraisal of his work at the monastery concluded that the monks owed him only 13,908 ducats. The Carthusians paid his daughter Vittoria 7,364 ducats in 1687, an adjusted sum based upon a later appraisal by Mattia de' Rossi. Combined with the payment of 1,700 ducats in 1700, the Carthusians paid the sculptor/architect and his heirs 9,064 ducats, nearly 4,000 ducats short of the amount sought after the first appraisal. See J. Nicholas Napoli, "The Art of the Appraisal: Measuring, Evaluating, and Valuing Architecture in Early Modern Europe," *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 54 (2009): 209.

³⁰ As mentioned above, claims of compensation by an architect from a patron were not uncommon. Claims per *mercede* have been noted by Paola Ferraris in her article on legal disputes between architects and patrons in the eighteenth century in Rome. See Paola Ferraris, "Il Contenzioso Legale tra Architetti e Committenti" in *In Urbe Architectus: Modelli, Disegni, Misure. La professione dell'architetto Roma 1680-1750*, edited by Bruno Contardi and Giovanna Curcio (Rome: Argos, 1991), 239.

³¹ Aristotle, "Nicomachean Ethics," Book V, Chapter 4, *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, edited by Richard McKeon (New York: Random House, 1941): 1003-1004, 1006-1007, 1010-1012.

³² Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Second Part of the Second Part, Question 58, Article 1. Second and Revised Edition (English Dominican Province, 1920).

person, distributive justice consists of giving something to many.³³ By the early modern period, the virtue of commutative justice had become the ethical foundation of all acts of exchange. In his 1673 treatise on civil and canon law, the Neapolitan lawyer Giovanni Battista De Luca observed that legal agreements of purchase and sale—the fundamental instruments of commerce—were specific instances of distributive and commutative justice.³⁴ This ideal was the fundamental moral principle for all parties, lay and clerical, who engaged in any activity involving the commercial exchange of goods and services. With this ideal in mind, trust becomes the prerequisite for such an exchange to transpire: Fanzago, the Carthusians, and any other artist needed to be reasonably confident that this ideal would be honored by all parties participating in the exchange.

Considered alone, Fanzago's lawsuit does not necessarily indicate a systemic breakdown in trust. However, Fanzago was not the only artist who disputed the compensation of the monks. The sculptor Giovanni Michelangelo Caccini, the painters Giovanni Battista Caracciolo, Giovanni Lanfranco, Jusepe de Ribera, Viviano Codazzi, and the silversmiths Giandomenico Vinaccia and Gennaro Monte also believed that they were underpaid by the Carthusians; Lanfranco, Ribera, Codazzi, Vinaccia, and Monte all sought the intervention of the ecclesiastic courts of Naples to recoup missing funding for their work at the monastery.³⁵ While their cases were not as lengthy or as complicated as Fanzago's, they attest to the common difficulty of determining the just compensation for a decorating artist and to the delicacy of establishing a professional relationship that would be satisfactory to both artist and patron.

The Rota auditors sought to resolve this conflict by focusing on three questions. (1) Contracts: what were the terms of Fanzago's employment with the Carthusians, and did both parties honor these terms? (2) Appraisals: what was the monetary value of Fanzago's work at the monastery? Finally, (3) does the value of the appraisal correspond to Fanzago's compensation in the contracts? In trying to answer these questions, the Rota auditors cast the patron-artist relationship as a sequence that included drafting a contract for a commission, assessing the value of the completed commission, and reconciling accounts of the artist and patron based on the assessed value. The sequence was a carefully orchestrated interaction designed to establish and sustain the bonds of professional reliability and personal trust between the parties.

Documentation related to other artists who worked at the Certosa—in their service to the Carthusians, work for other patrons, and more private, familial lives—expands the sequence

³³ *Ibid.*, Second Part of the Second Part, Question 61, Article 1, Objection 5.

³⁴ Giovanni Battista De Luca, *Il Dottor Volgare; ovvero Il Compendio di Tutta la Legge Civile, Canonica, Feudale, e Municipale, nelle cose più ricevute in pratica; Moralizzato in lingua Italiana per istruzione, e comodità maggiore di questa Provincia*, 15 vols. (Rome: Giuseppe Corvo, 1673) vols. 7-8: 15-16.

³⁵ Caccini's heirs had appraisers value his work at San Martino, and they concluded that the monks owed Caccini's family 174 ducats. See Archivio Storico di Napoli (ASNa), *Monasteri Soppressi*, fasc. 2142. The relevant documents were published in Nunzio Federigo Faraglia, "Notizie di Alcuni Artisti che Lavorarono nella Chiesa di S. Martino e nel Tesoro di S. Gennaro," *Archivio Storico per le Province Napoletane*, 10, no. 3 (1885): 436. In the last will and testament of Giovanni Battista Caracciolo, dated December 19, 1635, the artist mentioned a missing payment of 175 ducats to be collected by his heirs. The document was published by Michael Stoughton, "Giovanni Battista Caracciolo: New Biographical Documents," *The Burlington Magazine* 120, no. 901 (April 1978): 211. For Lanfranco's litigation, see Archivio di Stato, Napoli (ASNa), *Monasteri Soppressi*, fascicolo 2142, 129r-168v. These pages were published in part by Faraglia (1885), 441-442. The documents related to Viviano Codazzi's activity at the Certosa and the subsequent litigation with his heirs, ending in 1695, is found in ASNa, *Monasteri Soppressi*, fasc. 2161, and published in Faraglia (1885): 443-445. Litigation with Giandomenico Vinaccia and Gennaro Monte was mentioned by Causa, *L'Arte nella Certosa di San Martino*, 42-43. Ribera's litigation with the Carthusians will be discussed below.

suggested by the Rota documents. The formulation of a contract was not the point of initial contact between an artist and a patron. Rather, it documented the articulation of professional expectations that developed through more informal ties between the communities of patrons and artists working in Naples and within these communities themselves. Ultimately, the contract, the appraisal, and the final settling of accounts were only the three most formalized steps in a much more extensive process of establishing and sustaining bonds of professional and personal trust between artists and patrons. This article will analyze this sequence paying special attention to the following interactions: (1) forging ties of kinship that bonded painters, sculptors, and architects in Naples, establishing the upstanding character and professional competence of the individual artist, (2) recommending artists to patrons by both artists and other satisfied clients, (3) articulating expectations between artists and patrons in a contract, and (4) fulfilling the contract. In describing this sequence, this article seeks to discern how both artists and patrons constructed a relationship of trust, permitting a shared conviction in the ethical ideal of commutative justice, and outlining a moral psychology of interaction between artist and patron at the Certosa and in baroque Naples.

Forging Ties of Kinship and Achieving Titles

Forging a professional connection with a patron in Naples first required establishing a reputation as a competent practitioner within the community of artists in the city. The community's perception of the professional competence and moral character of an individual formed an artist's reputation, which was inherently a statement about both the public and private life of an artist. Both aspects were vital to establishing an artist's place within the professional circles of painting and to bolstering their recommendation to potential patrons. Artists built, established, and defended their reputations through both familial alliances with other artists and through titles of nobility.³⁶

Entering into familial bonds with other artists through marriage and baptism was a guarantor of upstanding character and professional reliability—two qualities that established the personal honor and good reputation of the craftsman or artist.³⁷ Mutual ties of marriage and baptism bonded the Neapolitan artists into a tightly knit community: painters, sculptors, and architects intermarried, were witnesses to the marriage of colleagues, and served as godparents for each other's children. These ties are especially evident for the artists who decorated San Martino. Paolo Finoglio, who completed commissions in the chapter room and the chapel of St.

³⁶ The economist Partha Dasgupta defined reputation as a capital asset which can be built up by pursuing certain courses of action and also destroyed by pursuing other courses. See Partha Dasgupta, "Trust as a Commodity," *Trust. Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*, edited by Diego Gambetta (Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1988), 62. With this definition in mind, the forming of familial alliances and pursuit of noble and academic titles can be seen as capital investments in professional reputation. The anthropologist Julian Pitt-Rivers defined reputation as the communal acknowledgment of an individual's honorable behavior. See Julian Pitt-Rivers, "The Anthropology of honour," in *The Fate of Schechem, or the Politics of Sex* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 1-17.

³⁷ Good marriage, along with sexual propriety in marriage and the defense of one's ancestors and descendants in the face of insult were central to the establishment of honor. See James R. Farr, *Hands of Honor: Artisans and Their World in Dijon, 1550-1650* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1988), 184, 192, 193.

Martin, was the godfather to one of Giovanni Battista Caracciolo's grandchildren.³⁸ Caracciolo, in turn, served as a co-witness along with Jusepe de Ribera to the marriage of Ribera's pupil, the Valencian Giovanni Dò. The bride, Grazia de Rosa, was the adopted daughter of the local painter Filippo Vitale and sister of Pacecco de Rosa, who painted the altarpiece in the old sacristy at the monastery.³⁹ As a native of Jativa, a town near Valencia, and having come to Naples after brief stints in Parma and Rome, Jusepe de Ribera's marriage to Caterina Azzolino, the daughter of Giovan Bernardino Azzolino—a painter and sculptor active in the city—facilitated the Spanish painter's entry into the Neapolitan artistic community.⁴⁰

Even though no painter's academy would exist in the city until the mid-eighteenth century,⁴¹ artists in Naples perceived the bequest of a noble title and membership in an academy as a means to bolster one's professional reputation. Both Battistello Caracciolo and Jusepe de Ribera had formalized ties to the Roman Academy of St. Luke. Battistello was recorded as a member of the Academy of St. Luke from 1617-1619,⁴² and St. Luke's registers record that Ribera paid dues in 1616.⁴³ On occasion, Ribera included the title "accademicus" when signing paintings: among these was his final piece at the Certosa di San Martino, *The Communion of the Apostles*.⁴⁴ The achievement of one title, furthermore, was often the way to obtain additional

³⁸ Michael W. Stoughton, "The Paintings of Giovanni Battista Caracciolo" (PhD Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1973), 2.

³⁹ Caracciolo and Ribera's witness to the marriage of Giovanni Dò was first published by Lorenzo Salazar, "Documenti inediti intorno ad artisti napoletani del secolo XVII," *Napoli nobilissima* 4 (1895): 185-187. Ribera's participation in this marriage was also observed by Gabriele Finaldi, "A Documentary Look at the Life and Work of Jusepe de Ribera," *Jusepe de Ribera 1591-1652*, edited by Alfonso E. Pérez Sánchez and Nicola Spinosa, ex. cat., New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art; Madrid: Museo del Prado, Naples, Museo e Gallerie Nazionali di Capodimonte (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992) 3-8, 4. For Pacecco De Rosa's work in the old sacristy (also called the sacristiola or the Chapel of St. Nicholas) see Causa, *L'Arte nella Certosa di San Martino*, 53, and Vincenzo Pacelli, *Giovan Francesco de Rosa detto Pacecco de Rosa 1607-1656* (Naples: Paparo Edizioni, 2008) 11-13, 33, 119-120, 302.

⁴⁰ Finaldi, "A Documentary Look at the Life and Work of Jusepe de Ribera," 3-4. The Duke of Osuna's support of Ribera, who served as viceroy in Naples from 1616-1620, also helped Ribera gain entrance to the Neapolitan scene.

⁴¹ In his biographies of Neapolitan artists in the 1740s, Bernardo De Dominicis reported that the painter Aniello Falcone (son-in-law to the painter Filippo Vitale and brother-in-law to the painter Pacecco de Rosa) held an academy for drawing the nude figure, an *accademia del nudo*, in his house. See Bernardo De Dominicis, *Vite de' pittori, scultori ed architetti napoletani, 1742-1745*, 3 vols., edited by Fiorella Sricchia Santoro and Andrea Zezza (Naples: Paparo Edizioni, 2003, 2008), see vol. 2, 133; Vincenzo Pacelli, *Giovan Francesco de Rosa*, 13; Sebastian Schütze and Thomas C. Willette, *Massimo Stanzione. L'opera completa* (Naples: Electa Napoli, 1992): 176, n. 7.

While it was not formally an art academy, the Academy of the Oziosi in Naples, which included Giovanni Battista Basile, Giovanni Battista Manso, Giulio Cesare Capaccio, Francesco De' Pietri, and Giovanni Battista Marino, was an important force in the cultural life of Naples and its aristocracy. The Oziosi frequently discussed the visual arts and aesthetics, and several Neapolitan painters, including Giovanni Battista Caracciolo, Giovan Bernardino Azzolino, Cesare Fracanzano, and Massimo Stanzione were allied with the academy. See Schütze and Willette, *Massimo Stanzione*, 33-41.

⁴² Battistello's membership in the Roman Academy of St. Luke was observed by Stoughton (1973), 30.

⁴³ The document mentioning Ribera's dues to the Academy of St. Luke was published by Jeanne Chenault, "Ribera in Roman Archives," *The Burlington Magazine*, 111, no. 798 (September 1969): 561. Ribera's dues to the Academy of St. Luke are mentioned in Craig Felton, "The Paintings of Ribera," in *Jusepe de Ribera lo Spagnoletto 1591-1622*, edited by Craig Felton and William B. Jordan, ex. cat., Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth, 1982 (Seattle and London: Washington University Press, 1982), 46.

⁴⁴ Ribera's signature on the *Communion of the Apostles* reads, "Joseph de Ribera Hispanus Valentinus accademicus romanus F. 1651." See Nicola Spinosa, *Jusepe de Ribera 1591-1652*, ex. cat. Naples (Naples: Electa Napoli, 1992): 308, cat # 1.113. Other paintings that Ribera signed as "accademicus" include *Drunken Silenus* and an early portrayal of St. Jerome. See Jeanne Chenault, "Ribera in Roman Archives," 561.

honorifics. An endorsement of Ribera's request for entry into the religious and military order of Christ of Portugal, in fact, calls attention to his membership in the Roman Academy of St. Luke as confirmation of his status as a *pittore eccelente* and thus worthy of knighthood.⁴⁵ Nearly all of the prominent artists who decorated at San Martino—including Cosimo Fanzago, Battistello Caracciolo, Jusepe de Ribera, and Massimo Stanzione—had been knighted either before or during their tenures at San Martino.⁴⁶

Recommendation to a Patron

While the achievement of a noble title established an artist's ties to the aristocracy and confirmed an artist's skill, the connection between establishing a good professional reputation and winning a commission was never a straightforward affair. Nothing could recommend an artist more effectively, however, than the successful completion of a commission. Giovanni Lanfranco's entry into the Neapolitan scene illustrates this point.⁴⁷ In the early 1630s he was one of the most sought after painters in Rome. He had worked for Cardinal Odoardo Farnese, protector of the Carthusian order, frescoing his private oratory, the *Camerino degli Eremiti* behind the Farnese palace. He completed the dome frescoes for the Theatine church of S. Andrea della Valle, and he was employed by both the Capuchin order and the *Fabbrica di San Pietro*. In addition to these completed projects, he also established close relations with the Father General of the Jesuits, Muzio Vitelleschi, and the Spanish Ambassador to the papacy, Manuel di Zuñiga e Fonseca, Count of Monterey and Fuentes, who became viceroy of Naples in 1631.⁴⁸ These ties facilitated

⁴⁵ This document was published by Jeanne Chenault, "Jusepe de Ribera and the Order of Christ: New Documents," *The Burlington Magazine* 118, no. 878 (May 1976), 307.

⁴⁶ Battistello was knighted in the Order of Christ of Portugal sometime in the late 1620s. Two documents, a dowry payment for his daughter Chiara, and a payment for the altarpiece of the chapel of the Assumption at San Martino in 1631 record him as "Cavaliere." See Nunzio Federigo Faraglia, "Notizie di alcuni Artisti che Lavorarono nella Certosa di S. Martino sopra Napoli," *Archivio Storico per le Province Napoletane* 17 (1892): 660-661; Stoughton, "The Paintings of Giovanni Battista Caracciolo," 5. Massimo Stanzione received the honor of knighthood three times during the 1620s. In 1621 he was knighted Cavalier of the Ordine dello Speron d'oro e Conte Palatino. In the 1625 baptism record of his son, Gregorio Urbano, he was recorded as Cavaliere di S. Giorgio (Schütze believed that this was the Sacred Constantinian Military Order of St. George, which was headed by Marino Caracciolo, Prince of Avellino, in the 1620s), and in 1627, he was awarded the Cavaliere dell'Ordine di Cristo. See Pierluigi Leone de Castris, "Massimo Stanzione," *Civiltà del Seicento a Napoli*, 2 vols., ex. cat., Naples, 1985 (Naples: Electa Napoli, 1984, 1998), 178; and Sebastiano Schütze and Thomas Willette, *Massimo Stanzione. L'opera completa*, 49-50. Ribera received the Croce di Cavaliere dell'Ordine di Cristo in 1626 while in Rome. See Jeanne Chenault, "Jusepe de Ribera and the Order of Christ: New Documents," 306; Alfonso Emilio Pérez Sánchez, "Jusepe de Ribera," in *Civiltà del Seicento a Napoli*, 2 vols., ex. cat. Naples, 1985 (Naples: Electa Napoli, 1984, 1998), 172. Fanzago's elevation to knighthood is more uncertain. While he was certainly referred to as Cavaliere in documents after 1627, Gaetana Cantone speculates that he obtained the title in 1627 in large part in recognition of his work at the Certosa di San Martino. See Gaetana Cantone, *Napoli Barocca e Cosimo Fanzago* (Naples: Banco di Napoli, 1984), 15.

⁴⁷ This was first observed by Christopher Marshall, "Naples," in *Painting for Profit*, 123.

⁴⁸ For more on Lanfranco's clients see Erich Schleier, *Giovanni Lanfranco. Un pittore barocco tra Parma, Roma e Napoli*, Ex. Cat. Parma, Naples, Rome 2001-2002 (Milan: Electa, 2001); for Lanfranco's work on the Camerino degli Eremiti and the Carthusians, see Sebastian Schütze, "The *Vita S. Brunonis Cartusianorum Patriarchae* and its Interpretation by Massimo Stanzione in the Certosa di S. Martino in Naples," in *Parthenope's Splendor: Art of the Golden Age in Naples*, edited by Jeanne Chenault Porter and Susan Scott Munshower, Papers in Art History from the Pennsylvania State University, vol. 7 (1993): 194-229; and Fabio Barry, "'Pray to thy Father which is in Secret:' The tradition of coretti, romitorii and Lanfranco's hermit cycle at the Palazzo Farnese," *Barocke Inszenierung:*

Lanfranco's introduction to the Neapolitan branches of the Jesuit, Theatine, and Carthusian orders and to the lay aristocratic patrons of the city. By 1634 he was a resident in Naples with his family and won commissions with the premier institutions and religious orders in the city including the Jesuits at the Gesù Nuovo (1634-36), the Theatines at the church of the Holy Apostles (SS. Apostoli) (1638-46), the Deputation of the Treasury of San Gennaro (1643), and the Carthusians at San Martino (1637-39).

In most cases, historians can only extrapolate the content of the conversations that transpired between members of these orders in their chapters in Rome and Naples. One surviving document linked to Massimo Stanzione, however, provides precious insight into the decision-making process of the patrons when selecting artists. In a letter dated June 1, 1630, a priest resident in Rome, Carlo Felipe de Ferrariis, wrote to a colleague of his order in Naples:

To My Most Honorable Lord

I respond to your letter [to say that] I have come to know the Signor Cavaliere Maximo Stanzione, a painter of most distinguished and bright fame, and now he could fresco the church of our order, given that here he has produced truly excellent works. You have excellent men in Naples who are skilled in the said art of painting, but Stanzione is of a much superior [quality].

For other affairs of the order I will send a priest from here.

Rome, 1 June 1630

the most dedicated servant of your Highness
father Carlo Felippo de Ferrariis.⁴⁹

Mio Signore Colendissimo

A la sua lettera respondo di aver conosciuto lo Signor Cavaliere Maximo Stanzione de pentore et clarissimo et illuminata fama, e desso lui potrebbe affrisicare la icclesia de nostro ordine, perocché quivi ha data lavori veramente eccelenti. A Napoli havete homini ottimi et esperti in dicta arte de pictura, sed lo Stanzione è di molto superiore.

Per altri negotii de l'Ordine mitterò un patre de qui.

Roma à di primo di Giugno 1630

de vostro Signore obligatissimo servitore
padre Carlo Felippo de Ferrariis

Akten des Internationalen Forschungssymposiums an der Technischen Universität Berlin, 20-22 June, 1996, edited by Joseph Imorde, Fritz Neumeyer, and Tristan Weddigen (Emsdetten/Zürich: Edition Imorde, 1999), 190-221.

⁴⁹ The letter, in the personal collection of Franco Strazzullo, has been published in Magda Novelli Radice, "Precisazioni cronologiche su Massimo Stanzione," *Campania sacra* 5 (1974): 98-103; Sebastian Schütze and Thomas Willette, *Massimo Stanzione. L'opera completa*, 56.

Scholars familiar with this document surmise that the letter was addressed to the Carthusians at San Martino given that it was dated in 1630, the year before Stanzione began work on the chapel of St. Bruno (**Fig. 4**), and because it explicitly makes reference to painting in fresco.⁵⁰ The letter's connection to San Martino aside, it confirms that patrons recommended artists to their colleagues in other cities based on successfully completed commissions.

Artists were also known to recommend their colleagues to a patron. In his 1742-45 *Lives of the Neapolitan Painters*, Bernardo De Dominici reported that Massimo Stanzione recommended Pacecco de Rosa to the *principe di Conca* who needed a painter to copy the “molte belle figure e teste” of Guido Reni as a gift.⁵¹ Furthermore, it is feasible that Stanzione—who had been working to the monks' satisfaction in the chapel of St. Bruno—made a comparable recommendation to the Carthusians when they needed a painter for the altarpiece of their old sacristy in 1636.⁵²

Formalizing a Working Relationship in a Contract

Once an artist was recommended to a patron, the parties agreed upon a working relationship. This agreement could vary in formality from a written contract that would spell out the obligations of the artist and the patron before a project began to an informal understanding, communicated verbally or even tacitly, of what a project and rate of payment would entail. For painters working in Rome, the use of a written contract was more the exception than the rule; instead, patrons and painters initiated a project with a verbal agreement. To cite a prominent example, there is no contract that outlines responsibilities between Pietro da Cortona and Cardinal Francesco Barberini (who kept thorough records) for his fresco of *Divine Providence* in the salone of Palazzo Barberini (**Fig. 5**).⁵³ The commissioning of the Altar of St. Petronilla to Guercino, the first new altarpiece commissioned in the rebuilt St. Peter's Basilica, did not begin with a written contract either.⁵⁴ It should be noted that a relationship of professional trust had already been established—Pietro da Cortona had successfully completed several commissions

⁵⁰ Schütze and Willette, 56-57. Schütze noted that this hypothesis is also maintained by Franco Strazzullo.

⁵¹ De Dominici, “Vita de' Discepoli di Massimo Pittori,” in *Vite de' Pittori, Scultori ed Architetti Napoletani* 3, 196, in Pacelli, *Giovanni Francesco de Rosa*, 33.

⁵² For the dating of De Rosa's altarpiece, St. Nicholas of Bari, see Faraglia (1892), and Pacelli, *Giovanni Francesco de Rosa*, 119, 301-302.

⁵³ Patrizia Cavazzini observed the absence of a notarized contract for this commission in *Painting as Business in Early Seventeenth-Century Rome*, 122. For the initial documents connected to this commission, see John Beldon Scott, *Images of Nepotism: The Painted Ceilings of Palazzo Barberini* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991), 128-130. The initial documents record payments for the scaffolding for the vault and to the masons and stuccoists (*muratori* and *manovali*) who applied the preliminary layer of *arriccio* (rough plaster) to the vault.

⁵⁴ The first documents on the altarpiece, from December 18, 1621, are in reference to money paid to Guercino (Giovanni Battista da Cento) in account for “painting to be done in St. Peter's.” See Louise Rice, *The Altars and Altarpieces of New St. Peter's: Outfitting the Basilica, 1621-1666* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1997) 52-54, 175-182. Rice observed, however, that in the following decades the Congregation became much more systematic about the awarding of commissions, and later altarpiece projects would be assigned to artists by the Congregation. See Rice, 64-77.

for the Barberini, and Guercino was a favorite of Pope Gregory XV—before the commissions were awarded.⁵⁵

This said, we do have records of prominent commissions, Caravaggio's canvasses for the Cerasi Chapel in the Church of Santa Maria del Popolo in 1600 (**Fig. 6**) and Rubens' altarpiece for the Chiesa Nuova in 1606, for which a written contract was made before work began. In both of these cases, the patron had reason to be cautious: by 1600 Caravaggio was already known to be a difficult character, and Rubens was relatively unknown in the Roman scene in the early-seventeenth century. Only with the emphatic advocacy (and financial support) of Monsignor Giacomo Serra did he win the commission.⁵⁶

Written contracts were much more common when commissioning sculpture in Seicento Rome. In her research on Roman baroque sculpture, Jennifer Montagu observed that contracts for monumental sculpture, like the 1634 contract between the sculptor Alessandro Algardi and Cardinal Roberto Ubaldini for the tomb in St. Peter's to commemorate Pope Leo XI (Alessandro de' Medici was Cardinal Ubaldini's uncle), included provisions that stipulated three different degrees of personal involvement of Algardi with the project. Algardi needed to personally manufacture the figurative components of the tomb. He was required to make the drawings and models of the tomb, though not necessarily his own hand; and he only had to direct the production of its architectural parts. In outlining the degrees of Algardi's involvement, the contract acknowledged the inherently collaborative nature of monumental sculpture that required a more formalized stipulation of Algardi's responsibilities as a sculptor, draughtsman, and director of assembly.⁵⁷

The Carthusians at San Martino used both written contracts and informal understandings in their dealings with artists. The nature of their agreements depended on the professional reputation of the artist and whether or not the artist had previously worked for the monks. In dealing with relatively inexperienced artists, the documentation indicates that the Carthusians drafted written contracts that framed projects of modest scope and defined them in careful detail. If the project was completed to the monks' satisfaction, written stipulations for further work became more open-ended as they developed trust in the artist. Modern scholarship characterizes the Carthusians at San Martino as notoriously stingy and severe patrons, and their contracts with artists and the ensuing lawsuits over compensation seem to confirm this profile.⁵⁸ The surviving documents also suggest, however, that after the satisfaction of the initial contract, the monks became patient and loyal sponsors of artists.

⁵⁵ John Beldon Scott, *Images of Nepotism*, 128-130; Louise Rice, *The Altars and Alterpieces of New St. Peter's*, 175-182.

⁵⁶ These two episodes were mentioned by Francis Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 11, 70. For Caravaggio's contract for the Cerasi Chapel, see Walter Friedlaender, *Caravaggio Studies* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1955), 302. For Rubens, see Michael Jaffé, *Peter Paul Rubens and the Oratorian Fathers*, offprint from *Proporzioni*, 4 (Florence: Sansoni, 1959), 4.

⁵⁷ For this commission, see Jennifer Montagu, *Alessandro Algardi*, 2 vols. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985), see vol. 2, 434-5; Jennifer Montagu, *Roman Baroque Sculpture: The Industry of Art* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989), 99.

⁵⁸ With reference to the momentousness of Stanzione's fresco commission in San Martino, one the first large-scale fresco projects awarded to a Neapolitan painter of the baroque, Sebastiano Schütze characterized the Carthusians as being "very severe" ("si erano mostrati sempre molto severi") in the granting of commissions to artists. See Sebastian Schütze and Thomas Willette, *Massimo Stanzione. L'opera completa*, 56-57. In his monograph on the Certosa, Causa, *L'Arte nella Certosa di San Martino*, 42-43, 55, noted that, with reference to their lawsuit with Fanzago, "the monks defended their habit of paying little and paying inconsistently until the end," "discord between the monks and artists was by now the rule."

A review of early modern legal theory, especially the fundamental treatise of Giovanni Battista De Luca (a Neapolitan lawyer who had served in the Sacra Romana Rota), helps to place the complex and often nebulous nature of the Carthusians' agreements with their artists into the context of legal and economic theory in seventeenth-century Naples. Contemporary legal theorists recognized the potential open-endedness and ambiguity of sale contracts. In his 1673 treatise on canon and civil law, Giovanni Battista De Luca outlined three fundamental requirements for an agreement of purchase and sale. The first requirement was that of consent: all parties needed to agree to the exchange. The second dealt with the good or service being exchanged: the nature of the good or service needed to be precisely defined. The third was price: the good or service needed to have an established price, preferably quantified in monetary units.⁵⁹

Key components of a contract could also be ambiguously defined. The nature of the good or service and price could be ever-changing entities, and De Luca recognized this. The jurist cited several examples of contracts that consisted of uncertain entities including inheritances of privileges, debts and credits, and of various kinds of usufructs of property that include fishing and mining rights, the purchase of a single draught of fishes (*un tiro dalla rete dei pescatori*), and the catches from a day's hunt.⁶⁰ In these cases, De Luca proposed two principal resolutions: the cancellation of the contract or the use of a third-party arbiter to establish a fair price of the goods exchanged.⁶¹ For the Rota auditors who presided over Fanzago's case and Giovanni Battista De Luca, a judge who had served on the Rota and was intimately familiar with both Roman canon law and Neapolitan civil law, the open-ended structuring of many of the Carthusians contracts with their artists made the process of professional appraisal especially important. An expert appraisal of a comprehensive decorative and architectural commission, however, was more than just a mechanical recording of inventory: it was a sophisticated set of observations in which quality, quantity, and value were held in balance.⁶² Given that colleagues often appraised on another's work, as Domenico Gargiulo and the silversmith Gennaro Monte did with Ribera's *Communion of the Apostles*, the act of appraisal could also be pivotal in the establishment and preservation of an artist's professional reputation.

A review of the contracts related to the work of Giovanni Battista Caracciolo, Jusepe De Ribera, and Cosimo Fanzago reveals the full range of agreements used by the Carthusians in their dealings with artists. The transactions between the Carthusians and Caracciolo began with a cautious first agreement, drafted in careful detail in a written contract, and then followed by increasingly informal understandings. Battistello Caracciolo's initial contract with the Carthusians in April of 1622 for the choir panel, *Christ Washing the Feet of the Apostles* (**Fig. 7**) was a prominent commission framed as a trial project. In the contract, undersigned by Caracciolo and the Prior Don Bernardino d'Attenasio, the painter was given an advance of one hundred ducats to begin work on the choir panel, but with the caveat that the advance would be returned

⁵⁹ De Luca, *Il Dottor Volgare*, vols. 7-8, book VII, 10-11.

⁶⁰ De Luca, 7-8, book VII, 20.

⁶¹ De Luca, 7-8, book VII, 21, 26-27. If no agreement could be made on price, but the good or service had already been consumed by the buyer, creating equity in this good or service, then the intervention of third-party arbiters would be obligatory.

⁶² The seventeenth-century physician in the circle of Pope Urban VIII, Giulio Mancini (1558-1630), recognized the delicacy of appraising painting. He noted that the appraiser needed to assess both the quality of a completed commission by comparison to previous works of the same master and the quantity of labor expended upon the completion of a commission. See Giulio Mancini, *Considerazioni sulla Pittura*, edited by Adriana Marucchi, 2 vols. (Rome, 1956) see vol. 1, 141.

to the monks should they be dissatisfied with the painting. If the piece was acceptable, the monks would award the painter with additional commissions including the frescoing the vaults of the side chapels. The panel was mounted in the choir on September 12, 1622. Keeping with their promise, the Carthusians granted him the commission for frescoing the vault of the chapel of the Assumption and eventually commissioned him to execute panels and frescoes for the chapel of St. Gennaro.⁶³

The Carthusian contract with Battistello had two key components: the arrangement of a trial commission that stipulated a full monetary refund in the event of unsatisfactory work, and the prospect of additional commissions upon the satisfactory completion of a trial piece. These two features suggest that the Carthusians understood that he was a painter of some repute and promise, but young enough to require a trial commission before further projects could be awarded. Battistello's dossier in the 1620s, however, included several prominent commissions in Naples and Florence,⁶⁴ and the circumspect framing of the contract ultimately attests to the

⁶³ Here is the contract as transcribed by Faraglia (1892): 660. The document comes from the Archivio Storico di Napoli. See ASNa, *Monasteri Soppressi*, fascicolo 2142:

“Die Decimo mensis aprilis 1622.

Gio: battista Caraciolo promette fare il quatro nominato quanno nostro signore lavò lipiedi alli discipoli alto palmi quindici et mezzo Incirca, et largho palmi quindici che ha dastare nel primo quatro del Coro a mandritta vicino l'altare maggiore ad oglio tutto de mano d'esso Gio: battista et non daltra persona finito per tutta la fine d'agosto prossimo venturo del presente anno 1622 Il tutto a spese d'esso Gio: battista.

Et questo per lo prezzo che si Convenerà trà detti Gio: battista et li R.di Patri di detto Monasterio Inconto del quale prezzo detto Gio: battista presentialmente riceve ducati cento de Contanti et il restante prezzo secondo se Conveneranno detto Padre Don Bernardino detto nomine promette pagarli et farli pagare adetto Gio: battista statim finito serà detto quatro Come di sopra senza replica nec parte altera et con patto che mancando detto Gio: battista de fare detto quatro nel modo Come ha promesso desopra fra detto tempo o vero che detto quadro non piacessa a detti R.di Padri si anco non fossero d'accordio del prezzo sia obligato detto Gio: battista Come promette statim de restituire adetto monasterio detti ducati Cento, et pigliarse detto Gio: battista detto quatro, senza che detto Monasterio fosse obligato a farli buono ne pagarli Cosa alcuna et per la consequtione de quali ducati Cento lo presente Instrumento se possa con Gio: battista liquidare con la lite alla Curia.

Et mancando per defetto di detto Gio: battista sia lecito a detto Monasterio fare fare detto quatro d'altri a tutti danni spese et Interesse d'esso Gio: battista.

Et promette de piu detto Priore D. Bernardino farli fare a Detto Gio: battista tucta la pittura della Cappella difora a frisco quale detto Gio: battista promette et s'obliga farla per quello prezzo che seranno d'accordio et Incominciarla a fare statim finito sera detto quatro et mentre detto Gio: battista haverà da finire detta Cappella de non andare a lavorare ad altre parte ma di Continuare et finire detta opera. Et sini è fatto Instrumento per mano di Notare Francesco Antonio Imperato In Curia De Notar Jacopo Antonio d'Auremma etc.”

The clause that refers to frescoing the other chapels is ambiguous because it states, “*Cappella di fora a frisco*.” In Causa, *L'Arte Nella Certosa di San Martino*, speculated that this could mean the Women's Church. Wolfgang Prohaska believed that it referred to the Chapel of the Assumption, “Beiträge zu Giovanni Battista Caracciolo,” *Jarhbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien* 74 (1978): 223-224. He noted that it would be impossible for the chapel designated in the 1622 document to be the Chapel of S. Gennaro because the frescoed episodes in the chapel include the 1631 votive procession following the eruption of Vesuvius and contain a portrait of the Viceroy Count of Monterrey who assumed the post in 1631. The identification of the “*Cappella di fora a frisco*” as the Chapel of the Assumption is the most convincing one. A notarized document of September 12 (found in the Archivio Storico di Napoli (ASNa), Notar. Francesco Antonio Imperato (1621-22)) marks the concluding payment for Battistello's choir panel. It was published by Franco Strazzullo, *Documenti inediti per la storia dell'arte a Napoli* (Naples, 1955), 18. Also see Wolfgang Prohaska, “Beiträge zu Giovanni Battista Caracciolo,” 213.

⁶⁴ In the decade before his commission at San Martino, he had successfully completed several high profile commissions in Naples and beyond. These include the *Freeing of St. Peter* for the Pio Monte della Misericordia (1615) (to be installed alongside Caravaggio's *Seven Acts of Mercy*) in 1615, the *Trinitas Terrestris* for the church of the Pietà dei Turchini (1617), frescoes for the church of S. Teresa degli Studi illustrating episodes from the history of the Carmelite order (1617), and a panel of the *Rest on the Flight into Egypt* (1618) in the reliquary chapel of the

monks' extreme caution in commissioning a painter, even an experienced one, for the first time. The contract also carried financial incentives for the monks: it minimized the financial risk to the Carthusians while providing incentives for Battistello to complete the trial panel to the best of his ability.

Immediately after the completion of *Christ Washing the Feet of the Apostles*, Battistello devoted his time to the Treasury chapel of San Gennaro and even moved his residence to a location closer to the cathedral to facilitate his work for the Deputation of the Treasury.⁶⁵ The chapel of the Treasury appears to have offered the promise of an even more prestigious commission and further projects, but relations with the deputies soured after they decided to replace his work in the pendentives with frescoes by the Bolognese painter Domenichino.⁶⁶ Caracciolo ultimately sued the Deputation for the underpayment of 750 ducats—the impending settlement featured prominently in the painter's last will and testament of 1635.⁶⁷

Despite leaving the Certosa in pursuit of a more prestigious patron, the Carthusians honored their promise to the painter by granting him further commissions after the choir panel. By the mid-1620s he was busy with paintings in the chapter room and the altarpiece for the chapel of St. Martin, *St. Martin and Four Angels*,⁶⁸ and by the end of his employment at San Martino, Battistello had completed panels and frescoes in the chapel of the Assumption and the chapel of San Gennaro.⁶⁹ While surviving documents record payment for the altarpiece of the chapel of the Assumption, the absence of any further contractual stipulations suggests that the Carthusians made more informal agreements with the painter for further projects. Battistello's trial canvas, *Christ Washing the Feet of the Apostles*, made these informal agreements possible.

While the Carthusians felt the need to give Battistello a trial commission, they appear to have been more assured about Jusepe de Ribera's reputation. In fact, they had to wait for their opportunity to employ Ribera and could only procure his work through the Neapolitan art market

Palazzo Pitti in Florence. See Wolfgang Prohaska, "Beiträge zu Giovanni Battista Caracciolo," 161, 213; Vincenzo Pugliese, "Un 'Opera Prima' di Battistello Caracciolo. Altre Considerazioni sull'Attività Giovanile del Pittore," *Napoli Nobilissima* 29, fasc. 5-6 (1990): 133-158, 133-136; Ferdinando Bologna, "Battistello e gli altri: Il primo tempo della pittura caravaggesca a Napoli," *Caracciolo e il Primo Naturalismo a Napoli*, edited by Ferdinando Bologna, ex. cat. Naples: Castel Sant'Elmo and the Certosa di San Martino (Naples, 1991): 15-180, 26.

⁶⁵ Battistello's change in residence was noted by Stoughton, "The Paintings of Giovanni Battista Caracciolo," 47-48. Stoughton estimated that Battistello was working for the treasury, frescoing the pendentives of the dome in collaboration with Fabrizio Santafede, from 1623 to 1624.

⁶⁶ Stoughton, "The Paintings of Giovanni Battista Caracciolo," 47-48.

⁶⁷ The last will and testament, coming from the Notary Diego de Crescenzo (conserved in the ASN), was published by Michael W. Stoughton, "Giovanni Battista Caracciolo: New Biographical Documents," *The Burlington Magazine* 120, no. 901 (1978), 211.

⁶⁸ This altarpiece replaced one that was recently commissioned from Paolo Finoglio. There is no secure dating for Battistello's altarpiece for the chapel of St. Martin, but both Raffaello Causa and Wolfgang Prohaska dated the piece on stylistic grounds to the mid-1620s. Causa, *L'Arte nella Certosa di San Martino*, 60, dated it tentatively to 1625. Prohaska, "Beiträge zu Giovanni Battista Caracciolo," 236-239. Prohaska dated the altarpiece to 1626, the same year as Battistello's paintings in the chapter room of the monastery that include portraits of *St. John the Baptist*, *St. Martin*, and an *Adoration of the Maji*.

⁶⁹ According to Prohaska, "Beiträge zu Giovanni Battista Caracciolo," 226, he frescoed the vault of the Chapel of the Assumption sometime after 1627. The Carthusians paid him for the altarpiece of the chapel, *The Assumed Virgin in the Glory of Angels*, in 1631; and in the following years composed the side panels, altarpiece, and vault frescoes for the chapel of St. Gennaro. For the documentation of payment, see Faraglia (1892), 660-61. Records of payment to Cosimo Fanzago for the stucco framing for the vault of the chapel of S. Gennaro provides us with an approximate date, September 1632, after which Battistello must have executed the vault frescoes in this chapel. See Causa, *L'Arte nella Certosa di San Martino*, 57, 104f (#119). As with the Deputation, Battistello claimed underpayment (175 ducats) for his work with the Carthusians. See Stoughton, "Giovanni Battista Caracciolo," 211.

and their agent, Cosimo Fanzago.⁷⁰ Ribera began working for the Carthusians at San Martino in the 1630s with a panel of the *Pietà* (**Fig. 1**) that was originally installed in the sacristy (but presently in the new treasury of the church).⁷¹ Upon completing the *Pietà* in late 1637, the Carthusian prior, Giovanni Battista Pisante, awarded Ribera with a series of larger-scale commissions: these included a large panel depicting *The Communion of the Apostles* (**Fig. 2**) to be installed in the choir, a series of fourteen portraits of prophets to be placed in the spandrels over the arches of the side chapels and in the niches of the counter facade, a pair of saint portraits (Saint Sebastian and Saint Jerome), and a smaller bronze panel of Saint Bruno.⁷² While the painter completed the prophets for the counter facade and the nave spandrels between 1638 and 1643, a serious illness prevented him from completing the choir *Communion of the Apostles* until 1651.⁷³

The record of contracts and liquidation of accounts related to Cosimo Fanzago reveals how the Carthusians outlined a carefully detailed contract for the young and rising sculptor in 1623; but over the decades they allowed him to work with increasing autonomy as he became the most sought-after sculptor architect in baroque Naples. Fanzago joined the team of marble workers active at the Certosa in 1623, working under the architect Gian Giacomo Conforto, and was assigned by the Prior Pietro Odorisio to work with Nicola Botti to complete the *loggia* of the large cloister (**Fig. 8**).⁷⁴ He arrived with the professional title *scultore* at the Certosa working *in solidum* with Nicola Botti, but the Carthusians stipulated that despite the *in solidum* relationship, Fanzago would be in charge of the large cloister project.⁷⁵ Three years later (1626), the monks

⁷⁰ This was noted by Marshall, “Senza il minimo scrupolo,” 18. Fanzago’s provision of these canvases was noted in the lawsuit between the sculptor/architect and the monks. It appears in R. P. D. Guaxardo, *Neapolitana praetensae Mercedis. Pro Ven. Carthusia Sancti Martini Neapolis. Summarium* (Rome, 1683) in ASNa, *Monasteri Soppressi*, fascicolo 2051, 3v. The documentary excerpt was published by Vittorio Spinazzola, “La Certosa di S. Martino,” *Napoli Nobilissima* 11, no. 2 (1902) 97-103, 116-121, 133-139, 161-170, 170. The Carthusians eventually returned the two canvases to Fanzago.

⁷¹ Payments for Ribera’s *Pietà*, dated to October 1637, record that it was originally installed in the sacristy of the church. See Faraglia (1892): 670.

⁷² Nicola Spinosa, “Ribera a San Martino,” *Jusepe de Ribera 1591-1652*, Ex. cat. Castel Sant’Elmo, Certosa di San Martino, Cappella del Tesoro di San Gennaro, 1992 (Naples, 1992), 290.

⁷³ Nicola Spinosa, “Ribera a San Martino,” *I Profeti di Ribera a San Martino*, edited by Nicola Spinosa and Denise Maria Pagano (Naples: Elio de Rosa Editore, 1992), 14-15. The two canvases for the counter-facade, Moses and Elias, and one of the spandrel canvases, Noah, were signed “1638.” The prophet Joel was signed and dated “163_”, strongly suggesting a date sometime before 1640. The Prophet Amos was signed and dated 1640. The remaining eight prophets: (Obadiah?) Abdia, Odea, Habbakuk, Sofonia, Jonah, Daniel, Micah, and Ezechiel, were probably finished sometime between 1640 and 1643. Ribera’s illness also affected his ability to complete commissions for other clients in addition to the Carthusians. In a letter dated 22 September 1650, Ribera explained his slow progress executing a painting for a *Pietà* for Don Antonio Ruffo, Principe di Scaletta: “El quadro de la pieta he finito poco apoco con tuta la mia ynfermita oprocurato usarche oñi diligentia conforme V. S. vederà.” See Ulisse Prota-Giurleo, *Pittori Napoletani del Seicento* (Naples: Fausto Fiorentino Libraio, 1953), 99. This also could have been the reason for Ribera’s delayed completion of the *Nativity* for the Protonotary of the Kingdom of Sicily, Cristofaro Papa, in the early 1640s. See Vincenzo Pacelli, “Processo tra Ribera e un Committente,” *Napoli Nobilissima* 18, no. 1 (January-February 1979), 28-36, 34.

⁷⁴ The Carthusians appointed Conforto as supervising architect in 1618, nine years after Giovanni Antonio Dosio’s death in 1609. See Causa, *L’Arte nella Certosa di San Martino*, 38; Maria Ida Catalano, “Per Giovanni Antonio Dosio a Napoli: il puteale del chiostro grande nella Certosa di San Martino,” *Storia dell’Arte* 50 (1984): 35-42.

⁷⁵ Fanzago’s initial contract (and *only* contract) with the Carthusians was notarized by Francesco Positano in 1623 and two nearly identical copies of it are conserved. One is in the Archivio Notarile (a branch of the Archivio di Stato) in Naples. ASNa, Notario Francesco Positano di Napoli 834/7 ff. 323r-326v. The other is in the Archivio di Stato, *Monasteri Soppressi*, fascicolo 2143. Portions of it have been transcribed and published by Vittorio Spinazzola, “La Certosa di San Martino,” appendix II, 169.

redrafted the terms of collaboration between Fanzago and Botti: both workers were still active, but now Nicola Botti worked “*fuori della compagnia del Signor Cosmo*,” executing the stone doorways for the Chapter Room, the Colloquio, carving two basins for the Chapter Room and transferring rough hewn stone to the monastery archive.⁷⁶ Fanzago worked with increasing autonomy into the 1630s as Gian Giacomo Conforto last appeared in the monastery’s records in 1629,⁷⁷ and his former collaborator Nicola Botti died in 1630.⁷⁸

By 1631 the monks apparently no longer felt the need to draft a contract with Fanzago. Instead, they established an open account with the sculptor/architect and paid him after appraising his completed work. The first reconciliation of accounts was completed in 1631 and the second was begun in 1656. These itemizations reveal that Fanzago’s initial responsibility centered on the large cloister, but quickly expanded to encompass nearly every space in the complex. This included furnishing spaces with statuary, inlaid marble (**Fig. 9**), and gilt stucco; incorporating older pieces into the decorative ensemble (**Fig. 10**); and sculpting new components for installation (**Fig. 11**).⁷⁹

Fanzago’s liquidation of accounts with the Carthusians is an unusual practice in the commissioning and compensating artists. While the Deputation of the Treasury of San Gennaro

Partnerships, or *compagnia* relationships, however, appear with other sculptors, stone workers, and other building specialists in seventeenth-century Naples. Fanzago’s first professional contract in 1612 outlined the terms of a *società* with Angelo Landi, who would supervise the young sculptor’s work. The agreement included the terms of Fanzago’s wedding to Landi’s daughter Felicia. The professional partnership was also a document of familial union. See Paola D’Agostino, *Cosimo Fanzago Scultore* (Naples: Paparo Edizioni, 2011), 29, 399, doc. 1.

⁷⁶ ASNa, *Monasteri soppressi*, fascicolo 2142, 230, as recorded by Gaetana Cantone, *Napoli Barocca e Cosimo Fanzago*, 58. The section of the new contract between Fanzago and Botti and describes Botti’s responsibilities as follows: “. . . fece la più parte delle porte e finestrini del Chiostro à Carlini 3 il palmo quali furono posti nei Conti del Sig.r Cosimo fece le due porte di marmo bardiglio l’una del Capitolo, et l’altra del Colloquio, et anco d.o Nicola fece li due fonti di Marmo bardiglio nel Capitolo de Monaci, et anco detto Nicola fece la porta di pietra di massa all’archivio.”

⁷⁷ Conforto (or Di Conforto) appears last in the records in 1629 when he appraised stucco work done in the large cloister. ASNa, *Monasteri Soppressi*, fasc. 2160, in Mario de Cunzio, “I Documenti sull’opera di Cosimo Fanzago nella Certosa di San Martino,” *Napoli Nobilissima* 6, nos. 1-2 (1967): 98-107, 103f (#3).

⁷⁸ Botti died sometime between 1626 and 1631. Causa, *L’Arte nella Certosa di San Martino*, 43, 100f (#81), insists that Botti died of natural causes. The story of his death is one of the most intriguing mysteries of the Certosa because in the course of litigation with Fanzago, the Carthusians accused him of killing Botti. ASNa, *Monasteri Soppressi*, fascicolo 2142, foglio 22, n. 57. References to the homicide are found at least four times in the Carthusian records: especially in ASNa, *Monasteri Soppressi*, fascicolo 2157, F. 25 N 18. Anthony Blunt believed that these accusations were fabricated by the Carthusians. See Cantone, *Napoli Barocca e Cosimo Fanzago*, 23f (#23).

⁷⁹ Of the eight statues that crown the cornice of the cloister that were begun in the late-sixteenth century by Giovanni Michelangelo Caccini and Giovanni Perasco, Fanzago completed seven of them. He crowned the well begun by Dosio and De Felice in the large cloister with a framework and two obelisks, and supervised the removal of Girolamo Santacroce’s Monument to Carlo Gesualdo and its reinstallation in the women’s church. See Causa, *L’Arte nella Certosa di San Martino*, 43,47-48. Several documents itemize Fanzago’s interventions at the Certosa di San Martino: they are related to the liquidation of accounts between Fanzago and the monks in 1631 and 1656. The 1631 appraisal of Fanzago’s work at the monastery is conserved in the ASNa, *Monasteri soppressi*, fasc. 2160, f. 26, n. 24; and appears in Mario De Cunzio, “I documenti sull’opera di Cosimo Fanzago nella Certosa di San Martino,” appendix 1, 104-106; and J. Nicholas Napoli, “Fashioning the Certosa di San Martino: Ornament, Illusion, and Artistic Collaboration in Early-Modern Naples,” 450-54.

settled their accounts with Fanzago in a comparable fashion,⁸⁰ this practice has no counterpart in the art world of Naples or Rome.

One must look in other industries for comparable practices. Examples of similar open-ended contracts between buyers and sellers can be observed in other industries in the early modern Kingdom of Naples. In his analysis of the wool industry and pastoral economics in the kingdom of Naples, John Marino observed five types of agreements that could transpire between buyers and sellers to formalize the act of exchange.⁸¹ One of these agreements, a *contratto a liquidazione*, stipulated an arrangement in which a wealthy borrower would buy a product and deliver it to a middleman who would ultimately sell the merchandise at optimum market prices. Ultimately, seller, borrower, and merchant middleman would share both the risks and the profits of the final sale.⁸²

Marino presented a *contratto a liquidazione* in his discussion of the pastoral economics of the Foggia fair. In this contract, three parties—financiers, wool merchants, and wool sellers—bound themselves together for a fixed term of two years in order to market Foggian wool in northern Italy. In this arrangement, the wool merchants—Cesare de Cesare of Sancte Anatolie and his brothers Petro Paulo, Geronimo, and Lucantonio—borrowed money from two Neapolitan public bankers, Carlo Marocco and Giovan Giacomo Casola, to buy wool from the wool-seller Giovan Maria Pascale of Bugnara for 9,819.9 ducats. The de Cesare brothers agreed to ship to wool “to Senigalia or another port in the Gulf of Venice in order to sell it at the best possible price.” After repayment of the initial purchase price, interest, and services of the merchants, all the parties would share profits from the market sales.⁸³

Beyond Naples, a liquidation of accounts was a common feature of Florentine banking in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The partners of the Peruzzi banking and mercantile company, one of the largest in Florence, renewed their articles of association on six separate occasions in the early-fourteenth century. Each renewal was accompanied by a *saldamento generale*, or a liquidation of accounts, in which profits would be divided among the company’s partners. Because of adjustments related to ongoing ventures of the partners during the liquidation, the final distributions would often transpire years after the renewal.⁸⁴ With the case example of the Peruzzi in mind, Fanzago’s agreement with the Carthusians bears a resemblance

⁸⁰ The documents related to Fanzago’s liquidation of accounts with the deputation are conserved in the treasury’s archive, Archivio del Tesoro di San Gennaro (ATSG), fascio DC N. 14, 1282, fols. 33-40. See Angelo Borzelli, “La Guglia di S. Gennaro,” *Napoli Nobilissima* 6.5 (1897): 78-80, 79.

⁸¹ Marino, *Pastorial Economics*, 205. First, there was the relatively simple letter of exchange that facilitated monetary transfers. Second, contracts known as *censi* stipulated the transfer of non-money entities such as property and dowries. Third, *voce* contracts, or verbal agreements, were common for sales of cash crops such as olive oil and grain. Fourth, *contratti di società*, or contracts with joint-stock companies (*societas*), consisting of partnerships of silent capital investors and active merchant factors, were used in numerous kinds of artisan and commercial affairs.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 205.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 205-206. In the initial financing, Marocco and Casola paid the wool seller, Giovan Maria Pascale, 10,353 ducats (9819.9 ducats for the wool plus 5% for preparing the wool for storage and exportation) and 2,400 ducats (9% compound interest on the total purchase price for services and promises to ship the wool) to the De Cesare merchants. The De Cesares could exchange raw wool for cloth from the Marches and Umbria, but the risks were lower because they were forbidden to ship it back to Naples by sea. If the raw wool was unsold by 30 April 1584 contract termination, the De Cesares could make one last effort at the Salerno fair of September 1584. The profits and losses would be divided into fifths: two shares each to the financiers and procurators/merchants, one share to the seller.

⁸⁴ For a review of the Peruzzi arrangement, see Raymond De Roover, “The Organization of Trade,” *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe*, vol. 3, *Economic Organization and Policies in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 42-119, 75-77.

to limited partnerships in the Florentine mercantile and finance industry. Fanzago and the Carthusians renewed their partnership in 1631 and concluded it in 1656.

While Fanzago's contracts with the Carthusians concluded with a *liquidazione*, neither Fanzago nor the Carthusians sought to leverage an advantageous market exchange for the Cavaliere's sculpture and decoration. The *liquidazione*, however, reflects the assumption of both parties that Fanzago's decoration in the monastery was a commodity of fluid value that would only be known upon completion, or liquidation, in a final reconciliation of accounts.

Fulfilling the Contract

When paying for a large-scale project, the patron frequently paid the artist in a series of installments, which usually began with an initial deposit and then a series of monthly payments.⁸⁵ The records of payments frequently appeared in the patron's registers as payments to the account of the artist and usually signaled that work was ongoing for the project. This was the case for projects of monumental sculpture as it was for painting, and can be seen in Naples and in other cities in Italy. The payment registers of the monks at San Martino also record payments in kind, including food (wine and grain) and artistic supplies (marble dust, and lapis lazuli).⁸⁶ Problems in fulfilling the contract only appear when the artist brought claims against a patron in the courts or, in the case of Jusepe de' Ribera, when the artist's illness rendered him unable to complete a commission.

Ribera's illness was also seen as a danger to his relationship of trust with the Carthusians.⁸⁷ It is within the context of preserving this relationship that the advocacy of the painter Domenico Gargiulo and the silversmith Gennaro Monte, both of whom worked at the Certosa during these years, assumes heightened importance. In a document from the early 1650s that summarized the Carthusian payments to Ribera, the monks noted that in 1651 Gargiulo and Monte formally petitioned to allow Ribera to complete the choir panel (**Fig. 2**), and copied the artists' letter verbatim in their records. The artists presented the following reasons for allowing Ribera to finish. First and foremost, given that Ribera had already been paid three hundred ducats for the panel, the monks should allow the painter to finish so as not to lose money already paid to him. In addition, Gargiulo and Monte observed the following:

. . . that for having the painting by him (Ribera), already greatly fallen from his skill and vigor because of his long illnesses, against which he has struggled greatly, it would be, as they commonly say, for showing the world that he was

⁸⁵ This convention is described in the context of seventeenth century Rome by Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 13.

⁸⁶ Between 1641 and 1643, Carthusian registers record payments of a barrel of "vino Greco", eight *tomoli* of marble dust, and grain to Jusepe de Ribera, payments of 60 *tomoli* of grain to Massimo Stanzione (received by Giuseppe Stanzione). See ASNa, *Monasteri Soppressi*, fascicolo 2142, 44r, 72r. The Carthusians also paid Fanzago 36 *libre* of lapis lazuli. See ASNa, *Notai del Seicento*, Notario Giovanni Pino di Napoli, 8 June, 1656 (294/22), 41r.

⁸⁷ Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, 12, discusses the importance of time constraints in contracts between painters and patrons. While large fresco projects would be expected to take several years, patrons in general would expect a quick turnaround for canvases, even relatively large ones like Ribera's.

still alive and not dead. And this he (Ribera) would do with great pleasure for recovering his extinguished fame.⁸⁸

With this request, Gargiulo and Monte reveal the interests of both the Carthusians and Ribera in completing the choir panel. Despite the time lag of over a decade for a panel painting, allowing Ribera to complete the painting enabled the Carthusians to collect on their investment of three hundred ducats. While there is certainly a direct financial incentive for Ribera to complete the canvas, the recovery of fame or reputation (*fama*) was the crucial benefit. A painter's reputation was crucial to winning future commissions and projects with other patrons; thus his completion of the *Communion of the Apostles* had an inherently public implication, "showing to the world that he was alive and not dead."

As they did with Battistello Caracciolo, the Carthusians' allowed Ribera to finish this painting even though he undertook new commissions from other patrons. They commissioned the panel in the late 1630s, and despite Ribera's protracted illness in the 1640s, alluded to in the appraisal of Gargiulo and Monte, the artist was busy completing commissions for other clients during these years. He completed a major altarpiece for the Treasury chapel, *San Gennaro Emerging Unharméd from the Furnace* (1647, a commission given to him in 1641), was painting another altarpiece, *The Immaculate Conception*, in the Palazzo Reale in Naples, and accepted a commission from Antonio and Flavio Ruffo for a panel of the *Pietà* (1649-50).⁸⁹ Ribera made the Carthusians wait even as he was working on and completed commissions for other clients, but in the end the monks allowed him to complete the canvas. He completed the painting in 1651, the year before his death on September 3, 1652.⁹⁰

After Ribera's death, his heirs, Don Antonio and Don Francesco de Ribera, submitted a formal complaint against the Carthusians in December 1652 before the Apostolic Nuncio in Naples.⁹¹ They claimed that the Carthusians underpaid their deceased father for the choir painting, and requested a reappraisal of the completed canvas. The heirs based their claim on the circumstances surrounding their father's submission of the panel. When their father first

⁸⁸ The document, from ASN, Monasteri Soppressi, Fascicolo 2142, 50r-v, was published by Faraglia (1892), 670-71, and Gabriele Finaldi, "Documentary Appendix: The Life and Work of Jusepe de Ribera," *Jusepe de Ribera 1591-1652*, edited by Alfonso E. Pérez Sánchez and Nicola Spinosa., ex. cat., New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art; Madrid: Museo del Prado, Naples, Museo e Gallerie Nazionali di Capodimonte (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992), 231-256, 252. The section of the document reads as follows: l'anno 1651 rihavutosi alquanto delle sue infermità fè istanza voler finire il quadro, al quale ne anco se ci pensava ne inclinava ma per le relatione del signor Domenico Gargiulo pittore, e Gennaro Monte quali asserivano che erano più di ducati 300 in mano del detto Ribera in cunto di detto quadro, si diede orecchia à farlo finire più per non perdere li detti denari, che per haver il quadro da lui già Caduto assai dalla sua virtù e forza per le sue lunghe infermità, per rispetto delle quali lui si sforzò assai, come soleva dire per far vedere al Mondo ch'era vivo e non morto; e ciò faceva con gusto grande per ricuperare la sua estinta fama.

⁸⁹ The documents relevant to these commissions were published by Finaldi, "Documentary Appendix," 246-249.

⁹⁰ The final date of completion of the choir panel is unclear. Ribera made three requests to the monks for additional funds on June 20, June 23, and September 6 of 1651: he seemed to have had difficulties making household payments (or at least did not have ready cash). On September 6, the death of his son-in-law, Giovanni Leonardo Sersale, prompted the need for another request to the monks to pay for funerary and mourning expenses. The documents are published in Faraglia (1892), 673-74, and Finaldi, "Documentary Appendix," 251. Two parish records, Santa Maria della Neve, and San Giovanni Maggiore, recorded the death of Jusepe de Ribera on September 3, 1652. See documents published by Finaldi, "Documentary Appendix," 253.

⁹¹ The document, from ASNa, fascicolo 2142, 56r-v, was published in Faraglia (1892), 675; and Finaldi, "Documentary Appendix," 253. It appears transcribed and translated in the appendix to this article.

submitted the completed painting, the monks did not have liquid funds ready for the price at which the painting appraised, but they needed it installed right away in preparation for the upcoming feast of St. Bruno. Given that they had installed the painting without having completed payment on it, the monks assured Ribera that they would give him the price he requested. The heirs claimed that the monks did not fulfill this promise, and they further alleged that the Carthusian monks deliberately delayed payment to the painter, knowing that the former nuncio would side with them in the event of a lawsuit. With this collusion:

the said Carthusian Monks imposed their power in such a way that [Jusepe de Ribera] did not only not receive justice that they owed to him, but they had done [it] in a way that the transaction was no longer even spoken of. The said defunct Giuseppe had died only a few months ago because of the many offenses received from the said Carthusian monks.⁹²

With this statement, the painter's heirs suggest that the Carthusians were accustomed to legal wranglings with artists, and exploited their relationship with the papal nuncio to defend their prerogative.

The efforts of Ribera's heirs to extract further payment did not end with the request to the nuncio. In a letter of 1655, dated just weeks before the final resolution of the case, the painter's son Antonio sought to negotiate further payment for the "quadro grande" by including an additional painting, a depiction of St. Luke, which would bring the total sum owed by the Carthusians to five hundred ducats.⁹³

The monks replied to the allegation by first questioning the status of Don Antonio and Don Francesco de Ribera as the legitimate heirs of Jusepe de Ribera—only legitimate heirs could pursue a settlement of a deceased parent. Second, they noted that Ribera's first agreements with the Carthusian priors Don Giovanni Battista Pisante and Don Lorenzo Candela set out clear terms for payment to the painter: he would be paid fifty ducats for half figures (as was the case with the portraits of Moses, Elias, Sebastian, and Jerome), three-quarters figures for eighty ducats (as was the case with the twelve pendentive prophets), and that the large panel (the *Communion of the Apostles*) would be valued at the same rate. While the panel was appraised as having no more than eight full figures, the monks noted that they had nonetheless paid the painter 985 ducats.⁹⁴

Given the positions of Ribera heirs and the Carthusians, the lawsuit grew from discrepancies between the written agreements and the verbal understandings between the two parties. Where Ribera's heirs claimed that the Carthusians' assured the painter that they would pay "all of which he requested," the Carthusians held to the formally drafted aspects of the agreement.

The documents related to the lawsuit also paid attention to Ribera's moral character while in the employment of the Carthusians. In what appears to be a summary of the issues at stake in the lawsuit, two clauses focus on the painter's comportment with his patrons. First, they sought

⁹² See Appendix.

⁹³ ASNa, Monasteri Soppressi, 2142, f. 63r-64r. This document was published by Finaldi, "Documentary Appendix," 254-55.

⁹⁴ ASNa, fasc. 2142, was published in Faraglia (1892), 675-676, and Finaldi, "Documentary Appendix," 253-54.

to ascertain whether Ribera maintained good relations with the monks in completing his commissions promptly and with good will towards the monastery. Second, the judges sought to determine whether Ribera had behaved with pious character and acted as a friend to the monks, proceeding with respect (*amorevolezza*) and without quarrel “beyond just being a skilled practitioner (*Valent’huomo*) who works with great facility and completes paintings in very little time.”⁹⁵ These clauses indicate that the legal decision extended well beyond the simple honoring of a contract or agreement. While the contract and agreement set guidelines to help secure the relationship of trust between patron and client, the moral character of the painter could present an indication of whether this relationship could mature over years of activity in a series of ongoing projects.

Litigation concluded in 1655 with the Carthusian payment of 111 ducats and 2.10 tari to Ribera’s widow, Caterina Azzolino, for her deceased husband’s work at the monastery. While no documentation of a new appraisal of Ribera’s work survives, the additional funds paid by the Carthusians suggest that such an appraisal, as requested by Ribera’s heirs back in December 1652, was indeed made. In this document, the rates the monastery paid Ribera for his work had changed significantly: his spandrel pictures were now valued at one hundred ducats (as opposed to the original agreement of eighty ducats) and the choir panel was valued at 1,300 ducats.⁹⁶ In the determination of just price, even the original stipulations of the contract were subject to retroactive revision. In Ribera’s dealings with San Martino, contracts, informal verbal agreements, and the painter’s personal comportment (which revealed moral character) shaped the resolution of his professional relationship with the Carthusian monastery.

Between Family Ties and Professional Reputation: Giovanni Lanfranco and the Carthusians

Giovanni Lanfranco’s career at San Martino epitomizes the ways in which all of the factors—family ties among artists, professional reputation, and informal contractual arrangements—that contributed to the selection of an artist for a commission guided the expectations of the patron and, ultimately, steered the successful (or unsuccessful) completion of a commission. In the case of Lanfranco, even a rejected proposal for intermarriage by Cosimo Fanzago carried consequences for his relations with the Carthusians at San Martino.

Lanfranco came to Naples in the 1630s with an outstanding record of successfully completed commissions in Rome, and executed the nave vault of the Certosa in Naples (**Fig. 13**) to the apparent satisfaction of the Carthusian monks. Despite the successful completion of the

⁹⁵ ASNa, fasc. 2142, in Faraglia (1892), 676-677, and Finaldi, “Documentary Appendix,” 254. The passage in the document reads as follows: “5. Item se il detto Giosepepe essendo stata persona pia et amica de religiosi et con Chiese procedeva con molta amorevolezza e senza tiratura è tanto più che quello per essere Valent’huomo lavorava con molta facilità et in pochissimo tempo perfettionava la pittura.”

⁹⁶ ASNa, fasc 2142, in Faraglia (1892), 677, and Finaldi, “Documentary Appendix,” 249. There is a debate about the appraisal of Ribera’s painting for the Chapel of the Treasury of San Gennaro, *San Gennaro Emerging Unharmful from the Furnace*. It is mentioned by Ulisse Prota-Giurleo, *Pittori Napoletani del Seicento*, 102-104, as a self-appraisal by Ribera. Also, see Alfonso Emilio Pérez Sánchez, cat. #2.207, in *Civiltà del Seicento a Napoli*, 2 vols., Ex. cat, Naples, 1984-1985 (Naples: Electa Napoli, 1984) vol. 1, 419-420. More recent studies have argued, more convincingly in my mind, that the Deputation appraisal was made for Domenichino’s altarpiece, *The Martyrdom of San Gennaro*, placed in the chapel of the Treasury in the early 1640s. See Richard E. Spear, *Domenichino*, 2 vols. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1982), vol 11, 335, and Finaldi, “Documentary Appendix,” 249.

most extensive pictorial project at San Martino, Lanfranco's choice of family alliance—through the marriage of his daughter—proved to be his undoing. Just as securing family ties could bolster personal esteem and trust, the failure to do so also carried consequences for an artist's reputation with a patron. In 1639 they rejected his altarpiece for the chapel of saints Hugh and Anthelm and withheld the payment of eight hundred ducats.⁹⁷

Lanfranco's relations with the Carthusians deteriorated in part because his relationship with their supervising sculptor/architect, Cosimo Fanzago, had taken a turn for the worse. Fanzago sought to ally his family with Giovanni Lanfranco by offering his son in marriage to the painter's daughter. Lanfranco, however, believed that the sculptor's son was too young for his daughter, and gave her in marriage to Giuliano Finelli, a Roman sculptor active in Naples in the 1630s instead. In a 1639 letter to his compatriot Ferrante Carli, secretary to Cardinal Scipione Borghese and a long-time confidant and advocate, the painter lamented that he has recently come under attack by the Carthusian monks. Lanfranco reported that when he arrived at San Martino he was greatly esteemed by Fanzago and was consequently accepted by the monks. Apparently insulted by Lanfranco's decision, Fanzago "was not a friend to me, and consequently the monks, who do not move forward nor backward [with affairs of decoration] if it is not that which the said architect says."⁹⁸ Lanfranco's letter to Ferrante Carli is an example of how establishing familial ties cemented relationships of professional trust.⁹⁹ The painter's failure to make such ties ultimately hurt his professional relationship with a key patron in the city; the artists active in Naples were an equally important constituency with whom to cultivate sound professional relations.

⁹⁷ For Lanfranco's rejected altarpiece, see Faraglia (1885), 457. The comprehensive history of this panel is presented by Schleier (2001), 308-311. The rejection of the painting fueled tensions between Lanfranco and the Carthusians, resulting in a lawsuit that was not resolved until the late-seventeenth century. Later biographers, including Bellori (1672), note that Lanfranco donated the panel to the Neapolitan church of Sant'Anna dei Lombardi. The chapel in which the altarpiece hung was sold to a noble Venetian family, the Samuelli, in 1677. The sale of the chapel was recorded in a 1677 document and noted that two of the original figures were changed by the painter Luca Giordano. (While the document recorded a change to the figure of the Virgin, there appear to have been no substantial alterations to the Virgin in the painting. Today the painting, on display at the National Museum of San Martino, presents the Virgin and Child with Saints Gennaro and Dominic). See Schleier (2001), 310, and Antonio Delfino, "Documenti inerenti a Luca Giordano tratti dall'Archivio di Stato di Napoli," *Ricerche sul '600 napoletano: saggi e documenti per la storia dell'arte dedicati a Luca Giordano* (Milan, 1991), 27. The painting was moved to the church of the Rosary in Afragola after an earthquake destroyed the church of S. Anna dei Lombardi in 1805, and now resides in the museum of San Martino, on loan from the church of the Rosary in Afragola. See Schleier (2001), 310-311. The document related to Stanzione's altarpiece for the chapel of Saints Hugh and Anthelm was published by Faraglia (1892), 666.

⁹⁸ The excerpt of this letter was published by Erich Schleier, *Disegni di Giovanni Lanfranco (1582-1647)* Ex. cat. (Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editors, 1983), 178. The passage from the letter (dated 11 September 1639) reads as follows: ". . . il Priore mi ha risposto con male parole, e dipi attaccatomi una lite anzi più liti, con tali strapazzi, che non v'è esempio . . . la causa del disgusto che patisco, viene, che siccome nel principio del lavoro ero amato assai dall'architetto o scultore de' monaci di S. Martino (il Fanzago), per il medesimo capo i monaci amavano me, ma poiché io maritai la mia prima figliuola nel sig. Giuliano Finello, la quale era desiderata dal suddetto architetto per un suo figliuolo (troppo inferiore), ma però garbato giovane, non mi è stato amico, e conseguentemente li Padri, li quali non fanno né più innanzi, né più indietro se non quello che dice il detto architetto."

⁹⁹ These relationships are discussed in Jennifer Montagu, *Roman Baroque Sculpture: The Industry of Art* and Farr, *Hands of Honor*.

Conclusions

In summarizing the Carthusians' dealings with artists at San Martino, or how both the monks and the artists sought to nurture and sustain a relationship of professional trust, a complex moral profile of both patrons and artists emerges. In comparison to prices received for comparable works on the Neapolitan art market and for other patrons, the Carthusians paid artists well, and after the successful completion of an initial project, as with Battistello Caracciolo and Jusepe de Ribera, the Carthusians proved to be loyal patrons. While they paid good rates, they also had a tendency to underpay on these rates or stop payment altogether, as attested by the legal complaints filed by the heirs of Battistello and Cosimo Fanzago. Ribera and his heirs, in turn, are arguably guilty of trying to change the terms of their original agreement with the monks. In other cases, the monks abruptly terminated their relationships with artists, as was the case with Giovanni Lanfranco, based on the recommendation of other artists with whom they developed particularly close relations. It merits mention that lawsuits with artists were not unique to the Carthusians. Lanfranco also litigated with the Jesuits and the Theatines in Naples concerning his final fees,¹⁰⁰ and Fanzago was sued by Antonino Firrao, who commissioned him to furnish his family chapel in the church of S. Paolo Maggiore, for breach of contract.¹⁰¹

This article opened by assessing how the lawsuit between Fanzago and the Carthusians articulated a set of mutual expectations between patron and artist, using it as a starting point for outlining a process through which Carthusian monks and their artists developed a relationship of professional trust. In exploring this process, Fanzago's lawsuit was set in the context of art production in early modern Naples and other contracts, lawsuits, and interactions between the Carthusians and artists at San Martino. All of these transactions reveal the delicate process of establishing professional trust that relied on overlapping patron-artist interactions of varying levels of formality from written agreement to verbal understanding. This process has also revealed details of the economic, social, and ethical lives of artists and patrons in early modern Naples: it affirms that Francis Haskell's pioneering study of patronage was aptly subtitled "Art and Society in Baroque Italy."

In terms of fostering commerce and prosperity in eighteenth-century Naples, the development of trust in patron-artist transactions at San Martino presented features that epitomize Doria's concerns. His vision of a *fede pubblica*, the state-sponsored promotion of commerce based on a uniform registration of all business contracts, did not exist in Spanish Naples. Conversely, the inconsistent contract practices and frequent lawsuits (many of them lengthy) seem to exemplify the problems created by the absence of such a state-sponsored system of trust.

Other aspects of the relationships at San Martino, however, escape Doria's analysis. Using a combination of kin relations and other guarantors of professional reputation, strategies that could be seen as the foundation of *fede privata*, the consumers and producers at San Martino forged more informal and flexible avenues for establishing reciprocal trust. These strategies, furthermore, had significant impact on the city and the Kingdom's economic life. The numerous lawsuits between the monks and artists assume a different meaning in light of these mechanisms. They are products of a system whose parties honored the principle of commutative justice and

¹⁰⁰ This is referenced in Marshall, "Naples," 123; and Schleier (2001), 46-52, 314, 382.

¹⁰¹ Antonio Delfino, "Il documento per la statua di Antonino Firrao di Cosimo Fanzago in San Paolo Maggiore," *Ricerche sul '600 napoletano: Saggi e documenti 1999* (Naples, 1999), 15-17.

allowed a higher court, even an ecclesiastic one, to adjudicate cases where this principle was called into question.

This said, Doria wanted a system that did not need interminable lawsuits to resolve conflicts: instead, trust and justice could depend on something larger than the personal reputation of artists and patrons. Two of his principal reform proposals were the establishment of a Kingdom-wide archive for loans and contracts, and rigorous and uniform contract enforcement.¹⁰² Doria's concerns were echoed much later in the century by Alessio De Sariis. In his treatise on the laws of the kingdom (1792-97), De Sariis recorded the repeated attempts of both the Habsburg and Bourbon monarchs to establish public archives for contracts and initiatives to prohibit the use of speculative contracts such as the purchase of agricultural goods before harvest.¹⁰³ For De Sariis, these initiatives would provide stability to commerce in the kingdom and curtail the "lawsuits that constantly disrupt the peace and tranquility of families and the state."¹⁰⁴

These proposed reforms exemplify what the economist Avner Greif has called "an institutional development that led to the rise of impersonal exchange and modern markets."¹⁰⁵ In his conception of personal liberty as a vital condition for trust in commerce and his proposal to create an archive for contracts, strengthening the state's ability to enforce commercial agreements, Doria sought to create a national economy that had two other modern characteristics: the communal responsibility for just exchange would be contract-based, not dependent on personal reputation, and individual participation in this system would be voluntary.¹⁰⁶ Given the importance that personal reputation played in the relations between the Carthusians and their artists, the case of the Certosa di San Martino was not modern, but the attention that both parties (and their adjudicating courts) paid to the execution of justice in commercial exchange was a crucial precursor to the political economic thinking of Enlightenment Naples.

Bibliography

- Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologica*. Second and Revised Edition. English Dominican Province, 1920.
- Aristotle. "Nicomachean Ethics." In *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, edited Richard McKeon. New York: Random House, 1941.
- Barry, Fabio. "'Pray to thy Father which is in Secret': The Tradition of Coretti, Romitorii and Lanfranco's Hermit Cycle at the Palazzo Farnese." In *Barocke Inszenierung: Akten des Internationalen Forschungssymposiums an der Technischen Universität Berlin*. 20-22

¹⁰² Doria, "Del Commercio del Regno di Napoli," 178-79, 205.

¹⁰³ Alessio De Sariis, *Codice delle Leggi del Regno di Napoli*. 12 vols. (Naples: Presso Vincenzo Orsini, 1792-97) see vol. 11, 129-130, 150.

¹⁰⁴ De Sariis, vol. 11, 129-130. The quotation reads as follows: "La mancanza però di tale utilissima, e vantaggiosissima opera ha sempre tra i nostri amatissimi sudditi fatto sentire un grave ostacolo al Commercio, ed è stata, ed è la sorgente delle molte liti, che tutto giorno disturbano la quiete, ed il riposo delle famiglie, e dello stato."

¹⁰⁵ Avner Greif, "History Lessons: The Birth of Impersonal Exchange: The Community Responsibility System and Impartial Justice," *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 20, no. 2 (Spring 2006): 221-36, 232.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 233.

- June, 1996, edited by Joseph Imorde, Fritz Neumeyer, and Tristan Weddigen, 190-221. Emsdetten/Zürich: Edition Imorde, 1999.
- Bologna, Ferdinando. "Battistello e gli altri: Il primo tempo della pittura caravaggesca a Napoli." In *Caracciolo e il Primo Naturalismo a Napoli*, edited by Ferdinando Bologna, 15-180. Ex. cat. Naples: Castel Sant' Elmo and the Certosa di San Martino, 1991.
- Borzelli, Angelo. "La Guglia di S. Gennaro." *Napoli Nobilissima*, 6.5 (1897): 78-80.
- Cantone, Gaetana. *Napoli Barocca e Cosimo Fanzago*. Naples: Banco di Napoli, 1984.
- Catalano, Maria Ida. "Per Giovanni Antonio Dosio a Napoli: il puteale del chiostro grande nella Certosa di San Martino." *Storia dell'Arte* 50 (1984): 35-42.
- Causa, Raffaello. *L'Arte nella Certosa di San Martino a Napoli*. Naples: De Mauro Editore, 1973.
- Cavaciocchi, Simonetta, ed. *Economia e Arte Secc. XIII-XVIII*. Atti della "Trentatreesima Settimana di Studi," 30 aprile-4 maggio 2000. Florence: Le Monnier, 2002.
- Cavazzini, Patrizia. *Painting as Business in Early Seventeenth-Century Rome*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008.
- Chenault, Jeanne. "Ribera in Roman Archives." *The Burlington Magazine* 111, no. 798 (September 1969): 561-62.
- . "Jusepe de Ribera and the Order of Christ: New Documents." *The Burlington Magazine* 118, no. 878 (May 1976): 304-307.
- Croce, Benedetto. *History of the Kingdom of Naples*, translated by Frances Freneye. 1925. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Dasgupta, Partha. "Trust as a Commodity." In *Trust. Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*, edited by Diego Gambetta, 49-72. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1988.
- De Luca, Giovanni Battista. *Il Dottor Volgare; ovvero Il Compendio di Tutta la Legge Civile, Canonica, Feudale, e Municipale, nelle cose più ricevute in pratica; Moralizzato in lingua Italiana per istruzione, e comodità maggiore di questa Provincia*. 15 vols. Rome: Giuseppe Corvo, 1673.
- De Roover, Raymond. "The Organization of Trade." In *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe*. Vol. 3, *Economic Organization and Policies in the Middle Ages*, 42-119. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- De Sarii, Alessio. *Codice delle Leggi del Regno di Napoli*. 12 vols. Naples: Presso Vincenzo Orsini, 1792-97.
- Delfino, Antonio. "Documenti inerenti a Luca Giordano tratti dall'Archivio di Stato di Napoli." In *Ricerche sul '600 napoletano: saggi e documenti per la storia dell'arte dedicati a Luca Giordano*. Milan, 1991.
- . "Il documento per la statua di Antonino Firrao di Cosimo Fanzago in San Paolo Maggiore." In *Ricerche sul '600 napoletano: Saggi e documenti 1999*, 15-17. Naples, 1999).
- Doria, Paolo Mattia. "Del Commercio del Regno di Napoli." In *Il Pensiero Civile di Paolo Mattia Doria negli Scritti Inediti*, edited by Enrico Vidal. 1739. Milan: A Giuffrè Editore, 1953.
- . *Della vita civile*. 2nd edition. Augusta: Daniello Höpper, 1710.
- . "Lezioni di economia civile." In *Il Pensiero Civile di Paolo Mattia Doria negli Scritti Inediti*, edited by Enrico Vidal. Milan: A Giuffrè Editore, 1953.

- Fantoni, Marcello, Louisa Chevalier Matthew, and Sara F. Mathews Grieco, eds. *The Art Market in Italy, Fifteenth-Seventeenth Centuries: Il mercato dell'arte in Italia, Secc. XV-XVII*. Modena: F. C. Panini, 2003.
- Faraglia, Nunzio Federigo. "Notizie di Alcuni Artisti che Lavorarono nella Chiesa di S. Martino e nel Tesoro di S. Gennaro." *Archivio Storico per le Province Napoletane* 10, no. 3 (1885): 435-61.
- . "Notizie di alcuni Artisti che Lavorarono nella Certosa di S. Martino sopra Napoli." *Archivio Storico per le Province Napoletane* 17 (1892): 657-678.
- Farr, James R. *Hands of Honor: Artisans and Their World in Dijon, 1550-1650*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1988.
- Felton, Craig. "The Paintings of Ribera." In *Jusepe de Ribera lo Spagnoletto 1591-1622*, edited by Craig Felton and William B. Jordan. Ex. cat., Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth, 1982. Seattle and London: Washington University Press, 1982.
- Ferraris, Paola. "Il Contenzioso Legale tra Architetti e Committenti." In *In Urbe Architectus: Modelli, Disegni, Misure. La professione dell'architetto Roma 1680-1750*, edited by Bruno Contardi and Giovanna Curcio, 239-271. Rome: Àrgos, 1991.
- Finaldi, Gabriele. "Documentary Appendix: The Life and Work of Jusepe de Ribera." In *Jusepe de Ribera 1591-1652*, edited by Alfonso E. Pérez Sánchez and Nicola Spinosa, 231-256. Ex. cat., New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art; Madrid: Museo del Prado, Naples, Museo e Gallerie Nazionali di Capodimonte. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992.
- . "A Documentary Look at the Life and Work of Jusepe de Ribera." In *Jusepe de Ribera 1591-1652*, edited by Alfonso E. Pérez Sánchez and Nicola Spinosa, 3-8. Ex. cat., New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art; Madrid: Museo del Prado, Naples, Museo e Gallerie Nazionali di Capodimonte. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992. 3-8.
- Friedlaender, Walter. *Caravaggio Studies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1955.
- Galasso, Giuseppe. *Economia e società nella Calabria del Cinquecento*. Naples: L'Arte Tipografica, 1967.
- Giannone, Pietro. *Istoria Civile del Regno di Napoli*. Edited by Antonio Marongiu. 6 vols. 1723. Milan: Marzorati, 1970-71.
- Grief, Avner. "History Lessons: The Birth of Impersonal Exchange: The Community Responsibility System and Impartial Justice." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 20, no. 2 (Spring 2006): 221-36.
- Haskell, Francis. *Patrons and Painters: A Study in the Relations Between Italian Art and Society in the Age of the Baroque*. 1963. Revised and enlarged edition, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1980 [1963].
- Jaffé, Michael. *Peter Paul Rubens and the Oratorian Fathers*. Florence: Sansoni, 1959. [offprint from *Proporzioni*, 4].
- Leone de Castris, Pierluigi. "Massimo Stanzione." *Civiltà del Seicento a Napoli*. 2 vols. Ex. cat., Naples, 1985. Naples: Electa Napoli, 1998 [1984]. 177-179.
- Mancini, Giulio. *Considerazioni sulla Pittura*. Adriana Marucchi, ed. 2 vols. Rome, 1956.
- Marino, John. *Pastoral Economics in the Kingdom of Naples*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.
- , and Antonio Calabria. "Introduction: Good Government in Naples?" In *Good Government in Spanish Naples*, edited by Antonio Calabria and John A. Marino, , 1-12. New York: Peter Lang, 1990.

- Marshall, Christopher. "Naples." In *Painting for Profit: The Economic Lives of Seventeenth-Century Italian Painters*, edited by Richard E. Spear and Philip Sohm, 115-144. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2010.
- . "'Senza il minimo scrupolo' Artists as dealers in seventeenth-century Naples." *Journal of the History of Collections* 12, no. 1 (2000): 15-34.
- Montagu, Jennifer. *Alessandro Algardi*. 2 vols. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985.
- . *Roman Baroque Sculpture: The Industry of Art*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Napoli, J. Nicholas. "The Art of the Appraisal: Measuring, Evaluating, and Valuing Architecture in Early Modern Europe." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 54 (2009): 201-244.
- . "Fashioning the Certosa di San Martino: Ornament, Illusion, and Artistic Collaboration in Early-Modern Naples." 2 vols. Ph.D. Thesis: Princeton University, 2003.
- Novelli Radice, Magda. "Precisazioni cronologiche su Massimo Stanzione." *Campania sacra* 5 (1974): 98-103.
- Pacelli, Vincenzo. *Giovan Francesco de Rosa detto Pacecco de Rosa 1607-1656*. Naples: Paparo Edizioni, 2008.
- . "Processo tra Ribera e un Committente." *Napoli Nobilissima* 18, no. 1 (January-February 1979): 28-36.
- Pagden, Anthony. *Spanish Imperialism and the Political Imagination*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990.
- . "Trust in Eighteenth-century Naples." In *Trust. Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*, edited by Diego Gambetta, 127-41. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1988.
- Pérez Sánchez, Alfonso Emilio. "Jusepe de Ribera," *Civiltà del Seicento a Napoli*, 2 vols. Ex. cat., Naples, 1985. Naples: Electa Napoli, 1984, 1998, 171-172.
- Pitt-Rivers, Julian. "The Anthropology of honour." *The Fate of Schechem, or The Politics of Sex*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1977, 1-17.
- Prohaska, Wolfgang. "Beiträge zu Giovanni Battista Caracciolo." *Jarhbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien* 74 (1978), 153-269.
- Prota-Giurleo, Ulisse. "Un Complesso Familiare di Artisti Napoletani del Secolo XVII." *Napoli. Rivista Municipale* 77, ser. 2, no. 7-8 (1951): 19-32.
- . *Pittori Napoletani del Seicento*. Naples: Fausto Fiorentino Libraio, 1953.
- Pugliese, Vincenzo. "Un 'Opera Prima' di Battistello Caracciolo. Altre Considerazioni sull'Attività Giovanile del Pittore." *Napoli Nobilissima* 29, fasc. 5-6 (1990), 133-158.
- Rice, Louise. *The Altars and Altarpieces of New St. Peter's: Outfitting the Basilica, 1621-1666*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Robertson, John. *The Case for Enlightenment: Scotland and Naples 1680-1760*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Salazar, Lorenzo. "Documenti inediti intorno ad artisti napoletani del secolo XVII." *Napoli nobilissima* 4 (1895): 185-187.
- Schleier, Erich. *Disegni di Giovanni Lanfranco (1582-1647)*. Ex. cat. Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editors, 1983.
- . *Giovanni Lanfranco. Un pittore barocco tra Parma, Roma e Napoli*. Ex.cat., Parma, Naples, Rome 2001-2002. Milan: Electa, 2001.

- Schütze, Sebastian. "The *Vita S. Brunonis Cartusianorum Patriarchae* and its Interpretation by Massimo Stanzione in the Certosa di S. Martino in Naples." In *Parthenope's Splendor: Art of the Golden Age in Naples*, edited by Jeanne Chenault Porter and Susan Scott Munshower. Vol. 7, 194-229. Papers in Art History from the Pennsylvania State University (1993).
- , and Thomas Willette. *Massimo Stanzione: l'opera completa*. Naples: Electa Napoli, 1992.
- Scott, John Beldon. *Images of Nepotism: The Painted Ceilings of Palazzo Barberini*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- Spear, Richard E. *Domenichino*. 2 vols. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1982.
- Spear, Richard E., and Philip Sohm, eds. *Painting for Profit: The Economic Lives of Seventeenth-Century Italian Painters*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2010.
- Spinazzola, Vittorio. "La Certosa di S. Martino." *Napoli Nobilissima* 11, no. 2 (1902): 97-103, 116-121, 133-139, 161-170.
- Spinosa, Nicola. *Jusepe de Ribera 1591-1652*. Ex. cat. Castel Sant'Elmo, Certosa di San Martino, Cappella del Tesoro di San Gennaro, 1992. Naples: Electa Napoli, 1992.
- . "Ribera a San Martino." *Jusepe de Ribera 1591-1652*. Ex. cat. Castel Sant'Elmo, Certosa di San Martino, Cappella del Tesoro di San Gennaro, 1992. Naples: Electa Napoli, 1992.
- . "Ribera a San Martino." In *I Profeti di Ribera a San Martino*, edited by Nicola Spinosa and Denise Maria Pagano, 14-15. Naples: Elio de Rosa Editore, 1992.
- Stoughton, Michael. "Giovanni Battista Caracciolo: New Biographical Documents." *The Burlington Magazine*. 120, no. 901 (April 1978). 204-214.
- . "The Paintings of Giovanni Battista Caracciolo." PhD Thesis, University of Michigan, 1973.
- Strazzullo, Franco. *Documenti inediti per la storia dell'arte a Napoli*. Naples, 1955.
- Villari, Rosario. *La rivolta antispagnola a Napoli. Le origini (1585-1657)*. Bari: Laterza, 1973.