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CHAPTER FOUR

THE NEAPOLITAN CAREER OF A PERIPATETIC PAINTER: MATTHIAS STOM (C. 1632- C.1639)

Over 230 paintings have been attributed to Matthias Stom (also called Stomer).¹ His style is considered very recognizable and made Benedict Nicolson exclaim in 1977: “It has to be admitted that Stomer no longer presents great problems of attribution. He will never mislead us by rising to the heights; will never take wing on a gust of air, strong enough to transform his vision of life and hence his style so that it becomes unrecognisable, as an artist of genius will do. He cultivates a well-trimmed garden; or to put it nastily, repeats himself over and over again. A full-scale Stomer exhibition would be a catastrophe.”² Despite the clear-cut idea art historians have formed of Stom’s style, the factual documentation we have about him and his work is surprisingly scarce. First of all, only four paintings are signed, one of which is lost.³ We have almost no information about his life: we do not know where he was born,⁴ with whom he learnt to paint or what he did.

¹ The correct spelling of his name is Stom, as he signed the Tobias and the Angel (Museum Bredius, The Hague) and the Supper at Emmaus (Museo Thyssen Bornemisza, Madrid) with ‘M. Stom’. In the accusation filed at the Neapolitan Sant’Ufficio, he is called ‘Matteo Stomps’. The ‘–ps’ was a way of the Italian scribe to deal with the difficult pronunciation of the Northern –m. (see below and BOK 1986, 33 n.1). New attributions appear on the market almost every year, such as the Young St John the Baptist with Grassi Studio (PORZIO 2013b), Sarah offering Hagar to Abraham and with Galerie Sankt Lucas (2011), the Feast of Absolon with Johnny van Haeften New York (2011) and Solomon Lilian (2012, in: HILLIGERS 2012), a St Matthew with Adam Williams (2011) and an Old lady with Jean Luc Baroni (2012).

² NICOLSON 1977, 230.

³ Tobias and the Angel, signed ‘M. Stom’ (Museum Bredius, The Hague); Supper at Emmaus, signed ‘M. Stom fecit’ (Museo Thyssen Bornemisza, Madrid); Miracle of St Isidorus Agricola, signed ‘Mathias Stom f.f. 1641’ (Chiesa Madre, Caccamo) and Martyrdom of St Cecilia, signed ‘Flandriae Stomus Coloribus Expressit’ (formerly in the Capuchin church of Messina, lost). The signature of the Martyrdom of St Cecilia was noted in: GROSSO CACOPARDO 1821, 180 n.2.

⁴ Hoogewerff (HOOGEWERFF 1942, 279 n. 2 ) noted that Stom was born in Amersfoort, but does not tell us the source of this information. Henri Pauwels reported in 1953 that Hoogewerff had told him it was based on documentary evidence (PAUWELS 1953, 142 n. 15). In 1986, Marten Jan Bok suggested that Hoogewerff had made a mistake about Stom’s birthplace, as Bok had been unable to retrieve the documentary evidence from the Gemeentearchief Amersfoort. (BOK 1986, 333). Bok furthermore suggested that the painter Augustinus Stom from Brussels, who is documented in Utrecht (1652), The Hague (1655), Amersfoort (1655) and Utrecht (1669 and registration of his decease in 1675), may have been a relative of Matthias Stom. (BOK 1986, 333-334 n. 17). I have not found conclusive evidence concerning Stom’s origin. In archival documents, both in Rome and Naples, he is always called ‘fiamengo’ (See Appendix 123-125, 127, 131). This is also the case in the inventory of Pietro Giacomo d’Amore of 1656 (Appendix 133). The early modern published sources alternate between different nationalities. Celano (1692) and Parrino (both editions of 1700 and 1725) call him ‘Fiamengo’, Orlandi (1719, in the entry on his son, Matteo) and De Dominici (1742-43) ‘Olandese’, Orlandi (1731), Sigismondo (1792) and Chiarini (1856-60) ‘tedesco’, to which Orlandi added that he was of Lutheran faith (Appendix 134-139, 141,142, Giannone (1740) does not mention a nationality). The only suggestion that he was from the Southern Netherlands instead of the Northern provinces, could be deducted from the accusation (Appendix 131), in which Stom is called ‘flamengo’, whereas the sailors are explicitly called ‘olandese’ – thus making a distinction between the nationalities.
(and where) before he is first documented as a painter in Rome in the parish of San Nicola in Arcione on Easter 1630 (and again in 1631 and 1632), when he was already thirty years old.\(^5\) Because of the Neapolitan documents recently discovered independently by Giuseppe Porzio and myself, we can now prove that Matthias Stom was physically present, and active as a painter, in Naples between 1635 and 1638. In August 1635, he made a payment at the Banco del Monte dei Poveri in Naples.\(^6\) In August 1637, an accusation was filed against him with the Neapolitan Sant’Ufficio.\(^7\) The court decided not to persecute Stom, and he was still in Naples the following July (1638), when he received an advance payment for paintings from Giovan Francesco Riario.\(^8\) Until we find proof otherwise, it is safe to assume that Matthias Stom arrived in Naples soon after Easter 1632 and moved to Sicily sometime between July 1638 and early spring 1639.\(^9\) He is first documented in Palermo in January 1640.\(^10\) He did not stay long in Sicily either, as he was present at the baptism of his (illegitimate) children in Venice in 1643 and 1645.\(^11\) He left Venice, and the children that were baptized there, behind after a couple of years as well,\(^12\) perhaps moving to Lombardy.\(^13\) After that, we lose track of his whereabouts.

In other words: Matthias Stom is both well-known and obscure. Most of all, he appears to have been perpetually on the move without ever really integrating in any of the places where he worked and gained success. This behavior makes Stom a good representative of a specific type of itinerant artist, a type which cannot be missing in this study, despite the problems posed by the lack of documentary evidence.

**Matthias Stom’s social integration in Naples**

Very few traces of Stom’s integration in Naples can be discerned, chiefly due to the lack of documentation.\(^14\) However, the information that is now at our disposal, based on the payments and the accusation, gives us some insight in the level of Stom’s social integration

---

\(^5\) HOOGEWERFF 1942, 279, see Appendix 123-125.
\(^6\) OSNABRUGGE 2014a & Appendix 128-130. I found this payment during archival research in the ASBN in April 2013.
\(^7\) OSNABRUGGE 2014a, the content of the accusation will be discussed shortly.
\(^8\) PORZIO 2013a, 94 n. 13.
\(^9\) Zalapi argued that Stom must have arrived in Palermo at least nine months before his son Matteo was baptized. She believes the mother of the child, who is not mentioned in the register, was local (ZALAPI 1996, 163).
\(^10\) ZALAPI 1996, 446, Appendix doc. 7; MAZZOLA 1997, 70.
\(^11\) See MORETTI 2008 for the reference to the baptismal records of Stom’s children in 1643 and 1645; PORZIO 2013b.
\(^12\) Orlandi described in his *Abecedario pittorico* how Matteo Stom or Stomma, the son of Matthias, was abandoned by his father at a very young age and learnt to paint battle scenes and landscapes with Orlandini in Parma (ORLANDI 1719, 318-9, see Appendix 136).
\(^13\) ZALAPI 1996, 202. Zalapi did not know about Stom’s Venetian sojourn and suggested that Stom travelled to Northern Italy to work there.
\(^14\) Apart from the documentary evidence of Matthias Stom Neapolitan sojourn, the documented presence of a large number of his paintings in Neapolitan collections and in two churches, testify of a certain success in the city. Up until this point, however, we never knew whether the paintings were produced in the city itself or send via agents and merchants. A last source of information on Stom’s Neapolitan sojourn are eighteenth-century biographies that mention Neapolitan artists who were inspired by Stom’s candlelit scenes (see below).
in Naples. The accusation, filed by his pupil Mattheus de Roggiero on 20 August 1637 provides us the most information. Twenty-year-old Mattheus states that he has lived with Matthias Stom (‘Matteo Stomps, pittore flamengo’) as an apprentice (Fig. 65). According to De Roggiero, Stom lived in the ‘strada di San Francesco, sotto il palazzo’, probably near the church of SS. Francesco e Matteo in the Quartieri Spagnoli. There is no mention of other pupils or a family living with him. Despite my efforts, I have not been able to find information on a possible marriage. In fact, it appears he was living a bachelor’s life, as he kept ‘the house of a soldier’ (‘…ho visto che in camera non tiene immagine sacre, perche tiene la casa come soldato per essere di quella natione’). With this curious statement, De Roggiero is referring to the fact that Stom has no religious images in his house, but Stom’s social behavior simultaneously implies that he was not married.

Apparently, a group of Dutch and English sailors and merchants frequented Stom’s house. These men are the focus of De Roggiero’s accusation, not his master Matthias Stom. During Carnival 1637, a sailor came up to De Roggiero in Stom’s house, and spoke ill about the Pope and the Eucharist – De Roggiero adds that he spoke good Italian. De Roggiero states that heretic discussions took place more frequently in Stom’s household. At the request of the interrogator, De Roggiero declares that Matthias Stom never participated in such discussions and that he is a good Catholic. Since De Roggiero is unable to identify the names of the Englishmen and since they have all left Naples, the court decided not to proceed to investigate these matters.

As proof of his master’s faith, De Roggiero mentions that he has seen his master join in the celebration of Mass, go to confession, pray the rosary and kneel for the Eucharist. De Roggiero admits that Stom does not have religious imagery in his room - this is explained by his nationality - and that he once saw him eat meat during Lent, but this was on doctor’s prescription. It is very well possible that the interrogators were most interested in this part of De Roggiero’s accusation. At that point, Stom had been living in Naples for a couple of years. He was an unmarried foreigner and there were sailors hanging around his house, the type of people not particularly known for their good behavior and moreover coming from heretic countries (England and the Dutch Republic). Ever suspicious of foreigners, especially those from Protestant or Muslim countries, the Neapolitan Curia encouraged the members of the parishes to come forward with any information regarding heretic activities. Mattheus De Roggiero states that his confessor, padre Gravina, advised him to file the accusation. The Sant’Ufficio-section in the

---

15 The fact that the child that was baptized on 6 January 1640 in Palermo was illegitimate, as were Stom’s children baptized in Venice in 1643 and 1645, suggests that he was never married. For references, see: Osnabrugg 2014a, 108 n.10. However, to be more sure, I have checked all the processetti prematrimoniali under the letter ‘M’, between 1632 and 1641 available at the ASDN. At the ASN, I checked the loose processetti in the ‘Cappellano Maggiore’ section.

16 Romeo 2004, 25. Giovanni Romeo suggests that during the seventeenth century confessors increasingly motivated their flock to come forward with information to incriminate others.

17 Probably fra Domenico Gravina (1573-1643), an important theologian at the San Domenico Maggiore in Naples, see: Miele 1969.
Archivio Storico Diocesano di Napoli is abundant with similar cases. It shows that foreigners always had to be aware of their behavior, especially in the period of the Counter-Reformation in Italy. Stom was not the only Northern artist to appear in this section of the archive; Jacob Van Swanenburg and Giambologna were persecuted by the Neapolitan Curia. Matthias Stom continued to live in Naples, at least for one more year, seemingly unharmed by the event.

Apart from his alleged bachelor status and his faith, the document teaches us more about Stom’s integration as an artist. By 1637, he was apparently reputable enough to attract a pupil from the Viceroyalty. Mattheus De Roggiero, twenty years old in August 1637, came from the Camerota, about 180 km south of Naples. To have a pupil of such an advanced age, meant Stom’s studio was successful enough to employ older pupils who could work as assistants. Although it is possible Matthias Stom had risen to this level between 1635 (when he is first documented in Naples) and 1637, De Roggiero’s apprenticeship is more likely a sign that Stom had arrived in Naples a bit earlier, closer to his last documented presence in Rome in 1632. The fact that Stom kept apprentices in his workshop is not only a sign of his reputation, it may also have been an additional form of income.

We do not know whether Stom had any other pupils in Naples or elsewhere. Onofrio Giannone mentions an apprenticeship of Giacomo Manecchia (or Mannecchia) with Matthias Stom. This Gian Giacomo Manecchia, born in Montemurro (near Matera) in 1597, was present in Naples from 1609 onwards; he was the pupil of Marco Mazzaroppi (1550-1620) and married in 1629. The fact that he was Matthias Stom’s senior by three years, makes it unlikely that Manecchia was his pupil, although he could have been his assistant. Between 1647 and 1650, Manecchia worked on the Adoration of the Magi and Wedding at Cana in the Santa Maria della Sapienza, which he signed and dated (Fig. 66). The bearded men in the Adoration come closer to the heads painted by Hendrick De Somer and Giovanni Ricca and the composition indeed points to Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione, as Ferdinando Bologna suggested. There is however a reason to assume that Manecchia was indeed interested in and familiar with Stom’s work. In the Neapolitan inventories, more precisely in the collection of Jan Vandeneeynden, two paintings by Manecchia ‘a lume di notte’ appear. The remark by Bernardo De Dominici, that Domenico

---

19 AMABILE 1890. Giovanni Romeo informs us that the document of Swanenburg’s court case can be found in the ‘fondo Amabile’ at the Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli, instead of at the ASDN (ROMEO 2004, 28 n. 13).
20 Onofrio Giannone (c. 1771) called Stom ‘Bartolomeo’ instead of Matthias: ‘... allor che la tradizione vuole che il Manecchia fusse discepolo di Bartolomeo Stomer, dilettandosi come n’ò vedute molte cose, al lume di notte.’ (GIANNONE 1941, ed. Morisani, 63-64, see Appendix 140).
21 The paintings were commissioned by the Prince of Montemiletto, Don Carlo di Tocco and paid on 12 April 1650 (D’ADDOSIO 1920, 79).
23 ‘Due quadri di pal. 4 e 5 con cornice indorata uno S. Maria Madalena, e l’altro la Cleopatra pittate a lume di notte, mano di Manecchia 30’ (GPI, I-233, inventory Giovanni Vandeneeynden, 2 December 1688, item 220a & 220b)
Viola (Naples c.1610 – 1696 Naples), a pupil of Andrea Vaccaro and Mattia Preti, worked ‘a lume di notte, ad imitazione di Matteo Stomer Olandese’ should be appreciated in a similar manner.\(^{24}\) Viola is documented in Rome in 1633 and became a member of the Accademia di San Luca in 1634, making a real apprenticeship with Stom, at least in Naples, unlikely.\(^ {25}\) The works attributed to Domenico Viola by Spinosa, amongst them two signed paintings. (Fig. 67), are in fact scenes by candlelight but there is very little resemblance to Stom’s oeuvre.\(^ {26}\)

At this point, we do not have the means to establish whether Stom was in direct contact with the Neapolitans who collected his work during his lifetime. The advance payment for an unspecified number of paintings by Giovan Francesco Riario in August 1638, constitutes the only certain contact with a Neapolitan patron.\(^ {27}\)

**Stom’s Neapolitan oeuvre**

Since there are no dated paintings, we should start from the few paintings with a clear Neapolitan provenance to define Stom’s Neapolitan oeuvre from the enormous number of paintings that have attributed to him by Nicolson and Zalapì and several other connoisseurs. An analysis of inventories from seventeenth and eighteenth-century Neapolitan private collections, leads to the identification of four paintings by Stom with reasonable certainty. Moreover, the data provided by the inventories on subjects, measurements and style can be connected to paintings in the corpus of attributions to give us an idea what the listed painting may have looked like. In addition, the paintings in the Museo Nazionale di Capodimonte appear to have a clear Neapolitan provenance and can also be added to Stom’s Neapolitan oeuvre.

**Paintings in Neapolitan churches**

In his notes on Matthias Stom, Bernardo De’ Dominici mentions that anyone can judge the quality of Stom’s work by looking at his paintings in two Neapolitan churches: in the choir of the Capuchin church of Sant’Eframo Nuovo, also known as the church of the Immacolata Concezione, and in the entrance of the Sacristy of the Gesù Nuovo:

"...Matteo Stomer Olandese (...) e fece in Napoli quadri non solo bellissimi, ma eccellenti in tal maniera con maestria di pennello, ottimo intendimento; e buen disegno, come ciascun può vedere da sui quadri, che fanno ornamento al Coro della Chiesa della Immacolata Concezione de' Capuccini nuovi; detta S. Effrem nuovo, e nell'ingresso della Sagrestia del Giesù nuovo…”\(^ {28}\)

---

\(^{24}\) De Dominici 1742, vol. III, 155.  
\(^{25}\) Herz 1996, 593.  
\(^{26}\) Spinosa 1984, cat. 873-876. Peculiarly, the paintings are dated after Viola’s presumed death in 1696.  
\(^{27}\) Porzio 2013a, 94 n. 23.  
\(^{28}\) De Dominici 1742-3, 155.
And indeed, the presence of paintings exposed in a public space was important for Stom’s reputation. What these paintings do not constitute, however, is proof of ecclesiastical patronage. Mariangeli Zalapi unearthed a document that describes how the paintings came into the possession of the Sant’Efremo. An unidentified ‘abate Rama’ made an ante mortem donation to the Capuchins in 1635. This means that they were produced for private commissions and that Stom did not work for the Capuchins directly. As the donation by Rama included paintings by painters who had been active in Naples, like Antonio Solario (Lo Zingaro), Fabrizio Santafede and Andrea Sabbatini (Andrea da Salerno), it is likely Stom’s paintings were produced for Rama in Naples. The document allows us to date the paintings to Stom’s early years in Naples, between 1632 and 1635. The painting(s) in the Gesù Nuovo, only mentioned by De Dominici, may have been painted directly for the Jesuit church. One of the paintings depicting the *Supper at Emmaus* in the collection of the Museo di Capodimonte (Fig. 68) came from the church of Gesù Nuovo.

In 1692, Carlo Celano was the first to mention paintings by Matthias Stom in the church of Sant’Efremo Nuovo in his description of the city: “... e molti dipinti ad attioni di notte, stimati opera di Matteo Tomar fiamengho, il quale, per ispendere il giorno con gli amici ed a riceressioni, si reduca a dipinger nella notte, in modo che quasi tutte l’opere sue sono in questa maniera.” Celano did not mention the subjects of the paintings, nor did subsequent writers like Parrino, Orlandi and De Dominici. Sigismondo was the first to identify the subjects of the paintings in 1789: ‘Dietro l’altare maggiore vi sono alcuni quadri, cioè Gesù alla Colonna, coronato di spine e Crocifisso con varj angeli d’intorno piantgenti, che furono dipinti da Giovanni Stomer Tedesco’.

Chiarini, in his edition of Celano (1856-1860), described the subjects as an *Ecstasy of St Francis*, a *St Anthony of Padova* and a *Christ at the column* and a *Mocking of...*
Both writers agree on the presence of two paintings with scenes from the Passion of Christ (Christ at the Column and the Mocking of Christ), but complement these with other works. As Zalapi suggested, the confusion about the subjects was probably caused by the fact that the paintings were placed out of public view, behind the altar (in the priest choir) and in the cemetery. This is confirmed by a letter of 1807, which states that the paintings were located ‘...nel privato coretto dei Religiosi di quel Monistero, rimoto dalla pubblica vista...’, before the canvases were moved to the Real Museo Borbonico, the predecessor of the Museo di Capodimonte. From the rest of the correspondence of 1807 of which this letter is part, it is apparent that the paintings by Stom in the collection of the Museo di Capodimonte (Capture of Christ, Supper at Emmaus, Holy family, Adoration of the Shepherds, Liberation of St Peter and Prophet Jeremia, Figs. 69-74) came from the priest choir of the Sant’Eframo. Half a century after these six paintings became part of the museum collection, the other four paintings mentioned by Chiarini in 1856 appear to still have been present in the church. These, and the Crucifixion mentioned by Sigismondo, were likely sold or lost when the church and monastery became a prison in 1865. If this reconstruction is correct, the Capuchins of Sant’Eframo might have owned as much as eleven paintings by Stom before 1807.

**Matthias Stom in Neapolitan inventories between 1656 and 1757**

In total, ten paintings in the GPI were attributed to Matthias Stom by the appraisers of Neapolitan collections. These inventories have a reasonably certain Neapolitan provenance ab antiquo, making it probable the paintings originate from Stom’s Neapolitan period. The inventories of the collections of Pietro D’Amore (1656) and Pompeo

---


37 ZALAPI 1996, 264 (cat. 57-62).

38 ‘... in the small private choir of the religious men of that monastery, away of the public view...’ (my translation). The letter of 13 September 1807, was discovered by Zalapi (ZALAPI 1996, 264 cat. 57-62).


40 See Appendix 133.

41 I have left out the paintings in the collection of Antonio Maria Lumaga (dated 1743, GPI, inv. 102) and Don Guglielmo Ruffo di Scilla (1748, GPI inv. 201), because it is unclear whether the collection was assembled in Naples or in their region of origin (Venice and Sicily respectively). The earlier the inventory, the bigger the chance that the owner had bought the paintings directly from Stom. This can be seen from the high quantity of early and mid-seventeenth century painting within these collections. Later collections were often put together by ancestors. Alternatively, they purchased them on the Neapolitan art market. Sometimes, collectors bought up collections integrally, for example together with the purchase of a palazzo. As the section of the Archivio di Stato that keeps the notarial deeds (Pizzofalcone) was closed for renovation at the time I started working on this chapter, I was unable to go over the original documents to see whether there was additional information that was not transcribed by Gérard Labrot.

42 GPI, inv. I-25; Labrot 1992, inv. 17. According to Labrot, D’Amore belonged to the urban bourgeoisie. The collection was housed in a building opposite the Gesù Nuovo, coincidentally one of the two Neapolitan churches that owned works by Stom.
D’Anna (1676) are the only two close enough to Stom’s documented presence in Naples to make it plausible the works were bought or commissioned directly from him by those owners. D’Amore owned a Samson and Delilah and D’Anna a Crowning of thorns. The Samson and Delilah in the D’Amore collection matches the size and description of the only attributed painting of this subject, currently in the Galleria d’Arte Antica in Palazzo Barberini in Rome (Fig. 75). Stom painted four versions of the Mocking of Christ (Figs. 76-78). It is most likely that all versions – with the exception of the one in Catania – were painted in Naples, but we cannot be certain which one was part of the collection of D’Anna since the size is not mentioned in the inventory. In the inventory of the large collection (c.631 paintings) of the nobleman Carlo II de Cardenas, the 41st Duke of Acerra, we find a ‘... S. Pietro che si sommerge, Mano di Matteo Stomer’. It is likely that most of paintings in the collection were bought by Carlo's father Alfonso IV, who was a scholar and well connected to the Spanish viceroys. No paintings with this subject have been attributed to Matthias Stom.

Pompilio Gagliano and Gaspar Roomer are the only Neapolitan collectors who owned more than one painting by Matthias Stom. No less than five paintings in the Gagliano inventory (1699) were attributed to Stom: a Sarah leading Hagar to Abraham, an Ecce Homo, an Incredulity of Thomas and two Half figures by night by Matthias Stom. All four descriptions can be matched to attributed paintings, not only because of their subject, but also because of their size. The Sarah leading Hagar to Abraham in the collection of the Musée Condé in Chantilly (Fig. 79) has almost the exact size as the painting in the Gagliano

43 GPI, inv. I-8; LABROT 1992, inv. 25. D'Anna traded with London, Lisbon, Cadiz and Livorno and also served as Regio Doganiere della Reale Dogana di Napoli (Head of Customs in Naples). In his house, situated at the end of Via Chiaia, he kept a relatively small collection.

44 The painting in the Galleria d’Arte Antica is 187.3 cm diagonally (= 7.1 palmi), which comes very close to the 7 palmi diagonally that are mentioned in the inventory (See Appendix 133).

45 Since the size of the painting is not mentioned in the inventory, we cannot be certain which version was in D'Anna's collection. The Mocking of Christ in Catania can be excluded because of its location and provenance, which makes it likely the painting was made in and for Sicily (NICOLSON 1977, cat. 123). This leaves us with the convincingly attributed paintings in Brussels, Passadena and Bloomington. (NICOLSON 1977, cat. 45, 46 & 124; ZALAPI 1996, cat. 84, 101 & 212. The Bloomington version shows great resemblance to the Death of Seneca (Capodimonte), whereas the other two resemble the Neapolitan Christ and the adulteress and Christ before Caiaphas.

46 GPI, inv. I-41; LABROT 1992, inv. 42. De Cardenas did not have a particular interest in art himself and inherited the art collection assembled by his predecessors. (LABROT 1992, 202). Only one of the paintings in the inventory of 1699 was by a living artist, whereas most were by artists active during the middle of the century.


48 See discussion of the subject below.

49 For the paintings in the collection of Gaspar Roomer, see below.

50 GPI, inv. I-242; LABROT 1992, inv. 41. Labrot believes Gagliano was a lawyer, as he is called ‘dottore’. Labrot argues that Gagliano bought the paintings himself, despite the fact that many of the paintings were by artists who were active in Naples in the 1630s, 1640s and 1650s. In my opinion, the consistency and high quality of the paintings listed suggest that one of Gagliano's (unknown) ancestors bought the paintings around the time they were produced. In the case of Stom this must have been during the 1630s.
MATTHIAS STOM

inventory;\textsuperscript{51} the \textit{Ecce Homo} in the same collection can be matched to the only painting of
this subject attributed to Matthias Stom, in the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam (Fig. 80).\textsuperscript{52}

Four paintings of the \textit{Incredulity of St Thomas} have been attributed to him.\textsuperscript{53} The version in
the Museo del Prado (Fig. 81), which is placed in Stom’s Sicilian period by all scholars
except Porzio and Penta, is almost a perfect match in size. Stom painted many figures by
candlelight: men and women, old and young, alone and in couples.\textsuperscript{54} In the case of the two
paintings in Gagliano’s collection, we know neither the gender nor age of the depicted half
figure, only the size (66 cm). In the oeuvre attributed to Stom by Nicolson and Zalapi we
can find no less than eighteen paintings with half figures lit by candlelight that roughly
match the size mentioned in the inventory.\textsuperscript{55}

When we move to the eighteenth-century inventories, the question whether the
paintings by Stom had been in Naples \textit{ab antiquo}, or were produced and bought elsewhere,
becomes even more pressing. The paintings in two collections appear to have been
assembled and remained in Naples. Dottore Salvatore Ciavarella owned a \textit{Christ at the column}
(inventory of 1707).\textsuperscript{56} The only known \textit{Christ at the Column}, now in the collection of the
Rhode Island School of Design in Providence, is too tall to be identified as the painting in

\textsuperscript{51} The Chantilly painting is a little bit too small: resp. 8 and 6 cm on each side. For the discussion of the
provenance of the painting, as well as the report of its restauration in 1998, see: \textsc{Adam & Garnier-Pelle} 1999.

\textsuperscript{52} Again, the identification is based on the similarity in size it seems this was in fact the painting mentioned in the
inventory of the Gagliano collection. The painting is 138x116 cm, instead of the 132 x 105 cm mentioned in the
inventory.

\textsuperscript{53} The version are in: the Coccoli collection in Brescia (Zalapi 1996, cat. 47), the Scotti collection in Bergamo
(Nicolson 1977, nr. 77; Zalapi 1996, cat. 98), the Museo del Prado in Madrid (Nicolson 1977, 135.1; Zalapi 1996,
149), and a second version of the same composition in the Franciosi collection in Rome (Nicolson 1977, nr. 135.2;
Zalapi 1996, cat. 150). The Scotti version is generally placed within Stom's Neapolitan period, although there is no
evidence besides its stylistic characteristics. It surely is not the version in Gagliano's collection, since the sizes do
not match (4 palmi = 105cm). The paintings in Madrid and the Franciosi collection, the former either a copy of or
the prototype for the Franciosi painting, approach the Gagliano Incredulity in size (resp. 125 x 99 cm and 127 x
102 cm). However, all but Penta placed these two in Stom's Sicilian period. Of course, it is possible Gagliano
bought the painting after Stom had left Naples, but I must say that the use of colour, the incarnate and in my
opinion the details of the faces are rather close to the \textit{Death of Seneca}. This would imply that the Prado version,
like the Seneca were painted at the end of Stom's Neapolitan sojourn. The way the incarnate of Christ is depicted
comes close to Battistello Caracciolo and Francesco Guarino (Porzio 2013b, 76; Penta 1990, 251).

\textsuperscript{54} In some cases, an allegorical subject (e.g. Avarice in the guise of an old woman counting coins, Fig. 82) has
been connected to the scene. Moreover, the different types of frames (i.e. one white carved and the other gilded)
leads me to believe that the two paintings were not bought and painted as pendants.

\textsuperscript{55} There are eighteen paintings with one side between 56 and 76 cm; with a smaller margin of 5 cm, we are still
left with eleven paintings, see Nicolson 1977 and Zalapi 1996. Zalapi, basing herself on the fact that for
example Ruffo is documented to have bought this type of paintings in the 1640s, did not agree with Nicolson that
the larger part of these small genre paintings were produced in Naples. She is probably right that Stom produced
them throughout his career. This, of course, makes it even harder to identify the two paintings in the Gagliano
collection. A last complicating factor is that it is possible that the paintings in Gagliano's collection are nowadays
identified with a narrative subject, which was not recognized as such by the appraiser (as was the case with the
\textit{Sarah leading Hagar to Abraham}).

\textsuperscript{56} GPI, inv. I-214. The relatively small collection (132 single paintings, 26 identified) seems to have been
assembled by the owner himself. Most of the paintings of which the artists are identified are from the second half
of the seventeenth century, or at its earliest from the mid-century. Stom’s painting is an exception and Ciavarella
probably purchased it from a previous owner or commissioner.
Ciavarella's inventory but probably also stems from Stom’s Neapolitan period.\(^{57}\) In the inventory of Andrea Bonito (1757) a *Christ and the adulterous woman* is attributed to Stom by the appraiser.\(^{58}\) The painting of this subject in the Algranti collection is probably the one listed in Bonito's inventory (Fig. 83).\(^{59}\) Lastly, we can include the *Death of Seneca* in the Museo di Capodimonte in Stom’s Neapolitan oeuvre, as its provenance appears to be Neapolitan (Fig. 84).\(^{60}\)

There are another seven cases of descriptions of paintings in inventories from the eighteenth-century where the name of the artist was distorted by the appraiser and is rather similar to ‘Matthias Stom’.\(^{61}\) The level of distortion differs and could be ascribed to the fact that the paintings were attributed over a century after Stom’s presence in the city. Zalapi has included these paintings in her catalogue, but I believe it is safer to exclude them, at least from my analysis.\(^{62}\) It might however be significant that Stom’s first name is changed into Bartolomeo in four different inventories. We have seen this name before: the alleged master of Giacomo Mannecchia was also called Bartolomeo by Onofrio Giannone.

**Stom in the collection of Gaspar Roomer**

One Neapolitan collector of Stom’s work deserves extra attention: the wealthy Antwerp merchant and ship owner Gaspar Roomer (Antwerp c. 1596/1606 – 1674 Naples). In 1990, Maria Teresa Penta argued that the artist named ‘Stopper’ by Giulio Cesare Capaccio in the description of the collection of Gaspar de Roomer in *Il Forastiero* (1634) should be identified as Matthias Stom.\(^{63}\) Recent research by Linda Borean and Isabella Cecchini on

---

\(^{57}\) The work in the RISD is 183 x 114 cm instead of 132 x 105 cm. Nicolson assumed this painting to be from Stom's Sicilian period, because of the lack of Caravaggesque drama: *"Here on the contrary all is peace and quiet. Even this fiery torch has not the strength to animate the tormentors, bent though they be on a dastardly act."* (NICOLSON 1977, 238). However, I do not think this necessarily means the painting was from Stom's later period. After all, another painting of this subject was present in the Neapolitan church of Sant'Eframo Nuovo and there is no reason to assume it looked very different from the painting in Providence. Zalapi argues this painting was made in Naples (Zalapi 1996, cat. 85).

\(^{58}\) GPI. inv. I-836; Labrot 1992, inv. 82.

\(^{59}\) The dimensions of the painting formerly in the Algranti collection in Milan (124 x 176cm) are very close to those mentioned in the inventory (132 x 184 cm).

\(^{60}\) ZALAPI 1996, 309-310 (cat. 112). Zalapi discovered that the painting was donated to the Real Museo Borbonico in 1854 by Anna Maria Rosa Ossoio y Figueroa, the widow of Saverio Maria Petroni, duke of Sessa. It was also cut down in size due to deterioration, from 221 x 361 cm to 161 x 323 cm. Although this is a 19th century donation, the Petroni is an old Neapolitan family name.

\(^{61}\) A *Resurrection of Lazarus* by ‘Bartolomeo Stoma’ in the inventory of Gennaro d’Andria (1710), a *Guardian Angel* by ‘Bartolomeo Stomo’ in the inventory of Antonio Capecelatro (1725), a *Cardplayers* by ‘Bartolomeo Thoma’ in the inventory of Carlo Maria Benestante (1726), an *Ecce Homo and David* by ‘Giovanni Battista Stomo’ in the inventory of Aniello Mosca (1736), a *Saint Andrew* in the inventory of Francesco Guerriaso (1742) and a *Judith and Holofernes* by ‘Bartolomeo Stomer’ in the inventory of Fabrizio Pignatelli (1751, found by ZALAPI 1996, 461: doc. 69). Except for the last one, all inventories can be found in the GPI.

\(^{62}\) Firstly, in order not to dilute the otherwise clear documentation found in the aforementioned records and secondly, because the paintings do not seem to match any attributed works anyway

\(^{63}\) PENTA 1990, 254 n. 2. MORETTI 2005, 39 does not agree with Penta, arguing that Stopper was the bentname of the artist Nicolaes Latombe. Moretti is certainly mistaken, since Latombe was born in 1616 in Amsterdam and it is therefore impossible that the paintings in De Roomer's possession in 1630 were by the underaged Latombe.
the collection of Giovan Andrea Lumaga in Venice (death 1672) has to my opinion implicitly proven Penta's assumption and at the same time given us further information on the nature of the paintings. Borean argues that the Venetian merchant bought a large number of masterpieces in Naples from the Antwerp merchant and sumptuously rich Gaspar Roomer. The paintings came into Lumaga's possession prior to Roomer's death in 1674, since Lumaga had already died in 1672. Gaspar Roomer and Giovan Andrea Lumaga were in contact throughout their comparable careers as international merchants; both traded in similar merchandise and operated repetitively as creditors to the Spanish Crown. Giovan Andrea himself traveled to Naples between 1648 and 1650, to take care of some of his investments and probably started to buy Neapolitan art during this period. Many of these paintings were originally owned by Gaspar Roomer, as is apparent from the fact that a number of the paintings in the vadimonio of 1677 coincide with those mentioned in the description of Roomer's collection by Capaccio, such as works by Valentin de Boulogne, David de Haen and Battistello Caracciolo.

This brief excursion on the Neapolitan provenance of a Venetian collection was necessary as, unlike Capaccio's description, the vadimonio provides us with the subjects of the paintings by 'Matteo Fiamengo'. Capaccio only mentions: “…e altri del Stopper,…”, while the appraisers of the Lumaga collection identify the subjects as: “Tredici con tutta la Passione del Signore pieni di figure quanto al naturale fino al ginocchio tutti di notte al lume del Matteo fiamengo - Due, uno dove Sara porta ad Abramo suo marito la schiava Agar et l'altra una Poesia figure come sopra del sudetto…”. As we have seen, these subjects were certainly familiar to Stom. Identification of the correct version of Sarah and Hagar is impossible right now, but since the versions of the subject so far known to us are quite similar, I would like to suggest that all of these stem from Stom's Neapolitan period (Figs. 85-87). He painted a number of paintings with scenes from Christ's passion for various Neapolitan collectors and for 'abate Rama' and many more are attributed to him. It seems reasonable to assume that the Passion scenes in the possession of Roomer (and later Lumaga) were similar to those works; I have tried to distill a series of paintings with a similar size from the vast oeuvre we now attribute to Stom, but thus far have not succeeded.

Borean & Cecchini 2002, 219-220. Lumaga thereby put an unusual emphasis on Neapolitan art in his Venetian collection. Generally Neapolitan, or for that matter naturalistic art was under-represented in 17th century Venetian collections.
Borean & Cecchini 2002, 185-186. He probably was more frequently in Naples than has been documented thus far. The fact that the Lumaga collection is not mentioned in Marco Boschini's Carta del navigare pitoresco (1660), or in the updated edition of Sansovino's Venetia città nobilissima (1663) could indicate that Giovan Andrea bought the paintings after 1660, although Borean suggests that the collection could also have been ignored because of its 'un-Venetian' content.
Borean & Cecchini 2002, 160. A Vadimonio is a legal act with which a Venetian widow could reclaim her dowry, or goods with the same value. For this act the value of the inherited property was valued.
See the analysis of Stom’s Sarah leading Hagar to Abraham in Pompilio Gagliano’s collection.
CHAPTER FOUR

Giovan Andrea Lumaga likely owned even more paintings by Stom, that were not identified as such by the appraisers in 1672. An 'antico. Un quadro rappresentante la Cena di palmi 6 e 8 di Stomer con cornice dorata, dicono esser bene antico' shows up in the inventory of 1743 of Giovan Andrea's son, Antonio Maria Domenico Lumaga (1663-1743). Antonio Maria moved to Naples around the end of the century and apparently carried some of the paintings he inherited from his father with him. The painting can possibly be identified as the Supper at Emmaus currently in Madrid (Thyssen-Bornemisza), since the measurements are close enough. On the other hand, perhaps the subject should be identified as a Last Supper, in which case we only have one version by Stom (Rome, coll. Pavoncelli) with unknown measurements.

The subjects of Stom’s Neapolitan oeuvre

Matthias Stom was almost exclusively a history painter. The two Half figures by night are the only exception. They are described in very general terms by the appraiser: 'Due mezze figure di notte di palmi due e mezzo mano di matteo Stomer con cornice in una bianca intagliata, e l'altra indorata'. Based on the many attributed paintings, Stom’s anonymous figures by candlelight can be categorized as the very typical Netherlandish genre of ‘tronie’. Tronies were quite extraordinary in Naples and Southern Italy and collectors likely saw them as a curiosity or novelty. From the attributed paintings, it is clear that these subjects formed a considerable part of Stom’s oeuvre.

All other subjects painted in Naples are based on a narrative from the Bible and include multiple figures. More than half of the paintings, not counting the works in the Lumaga-Roomer collection and the Neapolitan churches, are of stories from the New Testament, in particular from Christ’s Passion (Crowning of thorns, Ecce Homo, Incredulity of Thomas, Christ at the Column). The Ecce Homo was an extremely popular theme in Neapolitan collections. In the GPI alone, 116 paintings of the Ecce Homo appear. Only Samson and Delilah and Sarah leading Hagar to Abraham are based on the Old Testament. The theme of Samson and Delilah was not uncommon in Neapolitan collections; seven paintings with this subject are mentioned in Labrot, at least two of which were painted in Naples by artists who were active around the same time as Stom. The earliest Samson and Delilah is by Stom's compatriot Hendrick De Somer (inv. Diego de Uloa, 1680), the other by Giuseppe de Guido, another Ribera pupil also known as the Master di Fontanarosa (inv. Carlo II de Cardenas, 1699). Stom’s choice to paint this subject is therefore connected to contemporary developments in Naples and we should not exclude his role in further

69 LABROT 1992, 199 (inv. 41, nr. 70).
70 The authorship of most paintings was not mentioned by the appraiser, suggesting the paintings mostly served a devotional function (LABROT 1992).
71 See LABROT 1992, Index of Subjects, (Iconclass ) 71F37: ‘Story of Samson and Delilah’; 71F3761: ‘Sampson’s hairlocks are shaved, or cut off by Delilah’, 743.
72 For the most recent literature on the Master di Fontanarosa, see: PORZIO 2007; FORGIONE 2012.
popularizing the subject.\textsuperscript{73} Whereas \textit{Samson and Delilah} was rather common in Naples and can be connected with the popular ‘Weibermacht’ theme,\textsuperscript{74} the second theme (\textit{Sarah leading Hagar to Abraham}) was so rare that the appraiser had difficulty to understand what was represented. The subject of the painting is quite unusual both in Netherlandish and Italian art, which is perhaps why the appraiser could not identify it.\textsuperscript{75} In fact, Stom and Gerrit van Honthorst seem to have been amongst the very few to illustrate the first part of Hagar’s story, especially this early in the seventeenth century. In the Neapolitan inventories, six stories of Hagar, two of which certainly contained Abraham, are mentioned- besides Stom’s painting – which is not identified as such.\textsuperscript{76} Stom made four versions of the subject, two of which are found in inventories: this one and another one in the collection Lumaga in Venice, which probably stemmed from Gaspar Roomer’s collection. Stom's particular success in depicting the subject is remarkable and it would be interesting to know for whom he painted the other versions and why these patrons wanted such a specific and somewhat controversial subject.\textsuperscript{77} If all were produced for Neapolitan collectors, those patrons were probably had knowledge of the other version(s) by Stom.

The 'Sinking Peter', which would have represented St Peter as he is trying to reach Christ at the Sea of Galilee, is quite rare in seventeenth-century art, not only in Naples, but in all of Europe. It was seldom treated as a theme in itself, but was usually part of the depiction of the miracle in which Christ walked on water. Matthew is the only evangelist to describe the scene, immediately following the moment the disciples see a man standing on the water of the Sea of Galilee, and identify him as Christ (Matthew, 14: 28-31).\textsuperscript{78} The scene describes one of the miracles of Christ, simultaneously providing a warning to Peter to place all his faith in Christ. It is peculiar that the appraiser of the De Cardenas inventory noted St Peter as the subject of the painting, and not Christ. This suggests that St Peter

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{73} As will be discussed regarding the appreciation of Neapolitan painters of Stom’s work, Stom’s \textit{Samson and Delilah} served as an example for several late-seventeenth-century painters in Naples (see below).
\textsuperscript{74} See Chapter Three. Hendrick De Somer also painted themes of this type.
\textsuperscript{75} For Netherlandish paintings of Sarah leading Hagar to Abraham, see: SELLIN 2006, esp. Chapter 3: ‘Paintings of Sarah presenting Hagar to Abraham as wife (Gen. 16:2-4)’. For Italian art, no similar survey is available. Other scenes from the story of Hagar, like her expulsion by Abraham, as well as her solitary exile in the desert, where an angel came to her rescue, are far more common. If we compare the 74 paintings with iconclass code 71C119 that appear in a search in the Getty Provenance Database (25 sept. 2013) with the remaining paintings in which Hagar appears in the Zeri database and the RKD database, it is highly unlikely that a large part of the vaguely described ‘Hagar’ paintings in the inventories were of Hagar’s presentation.
\textsuperscript{76} Unfortunately, there is no way to establish which scene from Hagar’s story was depicted.
\textsuperscript{77} Sellin places the theme in contemporary discussions about polygamy in The Netherlands (SELLIN 2006, 70).
\textsuperscript{78} \textit{And Peter answered Him and said, “Lord, if it be Thou, bid me come unto Thee on the water.” And He said, “Come.” And when Peter had come down out of the boat, he walked on the water to go to Jesus. But when he saw that the wind was boisterous, he was afraid; and beginning to sink, he cried, saying, “Lord, save me!” And immediately Jesus stretched forth His hand and caught him and said unto him, “O thou of little faith, why didst thou doubt?”}
\end{flushright}
was central in the composition and that the ship with the disciples and Christ standing on water played a less important role in Stom's depiction of the subject.79

Another remarkable subject in Stom's Neapolitan oeuvre, this time because of its popularity in Naples, is Christ and the adulterous woman. Labrot lists no less than nineteen paintings with this subject, even more than for example the Mocking of Christ.80 The other paintings listed by Labrot are attributed to artists who were active in Naples, like Bernardo Cavallino, Viviano Codazzi, Giacomo Farelli, Luca Giordano, Andrea Miglionico, Francesco Mura, Niccolò de Simone, Mattia Preti and Ribera and to some foreign artists.81 If Stom indeed painted the work in the inventory of Bonito during his activity in Naples, he may very well have been the one to introduce the subject to Neapolitan collectors.

Stom shows a preference for compositions with half-figures. Caravaggio revolutionized this composition-type and it was one of the key features of Caravaggesque painting in the 1610s and 1620s, both in the Netherlands and in Italy.82 By the time Stom started painting half-figures, it had become a well-established tradition, particularly sought-after by collectors, as it was an attractive format for their art galleries. The format was introduced in Naples by Caravaggio in 1606 (e.g. the Magdalene in Ecstasy and Judith and Holofernes copied by Finson) and other artists like Louis Finson, Carlo Sellitto and Battistello Caracciolo further popularized it amongst Neapolitan collectors. Stom must have been well acquainted with this type of composition, as it was also produced in the Netherlands, both in Flanders and in Utrecht, by painters such as Gerrit van Honthorst.

**Stom’s style and working method**

The paintings that have been identified as belonging to Stom’s Neapolitan period, provide us with valuable insight in the visual repertoire that he had at his disposal. It is evident that the example of Gerrit van Honthorst and Peter Paul Rubens is important for Stom’s artistic development, while for certain subjects he shows knowledge of well-known prototypes by other artists. From this wealth of sources, Stom managed to create a very characteristic style with which he profiled himself successfully in Naples. In addition, I will pay attention to the very effective way in which Stom used these sources and to other aspects of his workshop efficiency.

In the inventories, the city guides and De Dominici, Stom’s paintings are explicitly described as night scenes: 'Due mezze figure di notte' (inv. Gagliano 1699), 'molti dipinti ad attioni di notte' (Celano 1692), 'molti di notte (...) cose d'oscura' (Parrino 1700), ‘a lume di notte’

---

79 Another possibility is that the painting was part of a cycle with scenes from St Peter's life, but the inventory gives no indication of this.
80 LABROT 1992, Index of subjects. Vincenzo Pacelli explains the popularity of the subject by relating it to the message of redemption for sinners, propagated during the Counter Reformation (PACELLI 2002).
81 LABROT 1992, Index of subjects. The artists who were not active in Naples are Federico Bianchi, Lucas van Leyden and Raphael.
82 GIANFREDA 2005.
(Orlandi 1731) and De Dominici associated the style of Domenico Viola with Stom, because the former also painted candlelight scenes.\textsuperscript{83} De Dominici clearly viewed the depiction of night scenes as characteristic for Matthias Stom. Carlo Celano gives an imaginative explanation why Stom painted such scenes: the painter spent his day hanging around with friends, enjoying himself, so he limited himself to painting at night.\textsuperscript{84} Orlando suggested an opposite, equally imaginative reason, namely that Stom painted night scenes because of his grim, melancholic nature.\textsuperscript{85} Apparently the Neapolitans were unfamiliar with other painters of candlelight scenes. Nowadays, we connect Stom’s candlelight scenes immediately to Gerrit van Honthorst, appropriately called Gerardo delle Notti (Gerard of the nights) in Italy. For the Neapolitans, however, it appears to have been Stom whom they associated with the introduction of this invention to Neapolitan art. Moreover, the aforementioned authors apparently experienced a clear distinction between these candlelight scenes and the work of artists like Caravaggio, Battistello Caracciolo and Jusepe de Ribera, with whose use of chiaroscuro they were familiar. Neapolitans recognized Stom’s use of light as ‘new’ or ‘foreign’.

No matter how it was perceived by Neapolitans, the strong resemblance between the work of the master from Utrecht and some of Stom’s Neapolitan paintings show that Stom had a thorough knowledge of a number of Honthorst’s paintings. Of the group of paintings we have identified as belonging to Stom’s Neapolitan oeuvre, the following subjects also appear in Honthorst’s oeuvre: Adoration of the Shepherds,\textsuperscript{86} Supper at Emmaus,\textsuperscript{87} Death of Seneca,\textsuperscript{88} Mocking of Christ,\textsuperscript{89} Liberation of St Peter,\textsuperscript{90} Samson and Delilah\textsuperscript{91} and

\textsuperscript{83} See Appendix, respectively numbers 133, 134, 135, 138 and 139.
\textsuperscript{84} CELANO 1692, vol. 7, 29, see Appendix 134: ‘Matteo Tomar fiamengho, il quale, per ispendere il giorno con gli amici ed a ricreationi, si riduceva a dipinger nella notte, in modo che quasi tutte l’opere sue sono in questa maniera ’ Celano’s explanation recalls the accusation filed against Stom and the sailors hanging around his house.
\textsuperscript{85} ORLANDI 1731, ed. Vocola, 455: ‘…sul genio d’una idea malinconica, e tetra, che lo tirò a dipingere a lume di notte, e cose serie e divote.’
\textsuperscript{86} JUDSON & EKKART 1999, 59-65 (cat. 20, 22, 23 and 24). The vertical composition in the Uffizi in Florence (cat. 22) was produced for the Guicciardini chapel in the Santa Felicità in Florence around 1620. The horizontal composition in the Uffizi (cat. 20) was made for the Grand Duke of Florence in the same year (both right before Honthorst left Italy). The version in the Wallraf-Richartz Museum in Cologne, dated 1622, (cat. 23) is perhaps closest to Stom’s interpretation. Judson suggests the idea to create a half-figure horizontal composition was based on the painting by Fiasella that Honthorst knew from the Giustiniani collection. The vertical composition in the Toledo Museum of Art (cat. 24) is dated 1632 and does not resemble Stom’s version at all.
\textsuperscript{87} JUDSON & EKKART 1999, 90-91 (cat. 69). The workshop copy in the Wadsworth Atheneum in Hartford suggests the existence of a painting with this subject by Honthorst. Judson believes the original was made shortly after Honthorst’s return from Italy (c. 1620-1623).
\textsuperscript{88} JUDSON & EKKART 1999, 139-140 (cat. 160); 336 (cat. D29). Like the Supper at Emmaus, the Death of Seneca by Honthorst is only known through workshop copies and a drawing Judson suggests that the two copies (Emmaus and Seneca) may have been produced by the same artist.
\textsuperscript{89} JUDSON & EKKART 1999, 83-88, 349, 351-2 (cat. 59, 60, 62 and Addendum). Judson lists five versions by Honthorst, three dating around 1614 (Getty Museum Los Angeles; Spiers collection London; church of Santa Maria della Concezione in Rome). He dated the version in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art to c.1617 and the Rijksmuseum version to c. 1622 because of its Amsterdam provenance.
numerous figures at night (Figs. 88-93). Stom did not only paint many subjects that have also been interpreted by Honthorst, he also used compositions and specific elements from the Utrecht master. Stom’s versions are never direct copies, but they could not have been conceived without knowledge of Honthorst’s oeuvre. The Death of Seneca, the different versions of the Supper at Emmaus and the Mocking of Christ are closest to Honthorst, mainly because he made use of very similar compositions. Stom’s Death of Seneca shows perhaps the greatest resemblance to Honthorst’s composition, including the kneeling figure blocking the light source, Seneca’s position and the presence of the boy in blue clothes. However, he also included specific elements that are only present in the version that Honthorst’s pupil Joachim Sandrart painted for Vincenzo Giustiniani in the early 1630s (Fig. 94), such as the scribe and the standing woman. Other elements, like the little child standing in front of the woman and the visibility of the fire on the torch, are specific for Stom. Stom’s Mocking of Christ in the Indiana University Art Museum bears the closest similarity to Honthorst’s version in the Rijksmuseum. Apart from the standard composition, he included specific elements from Honthorst’s painting, such as the man pulling on Christ’s cloak and the boy blowing a horn near His ear. Stom also incorporated elements from Honthorst’s other version in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art in his work, such as the kneeling figure handing the stick instead of laughing at Christ. The two half-figure versions in Brussels and Pasadena solely make use of Honthorst’s LACMA version (Fig. 95). The most important similarity of the different versions of the Supper at Emmaus with Honthorst’s work, today only known through a workshop copy, lies in the position of Christ in the composition. Honthorst and Stom placed Him at the head of the table -- on the right in Stom’s versions and on the left in the version from Honthorst’s workshop -- instead of in the center of the composition as is
usual for paintings of this subject. Stom’s painting moreover features the same figures types, although he did use different models.

Other Neapolitan paintings by Stom, like the *Adoration of the Shepherds, Samson and Delilah* and the *Liberation of St Peter*, are further removed from Honthorst’s interpretations. In those cases, Stom did not use the entire composition by Honthorst, but studied the works in order to use specific elements and, more importantly, Honthorst’s renowned use of (candle) light. In the case of the various half-figure compositions of the *Adoration of the Shepherds*, he gives the scenes a similar atmosphere of homeliness and adoration, but there are no elements that were taken directly from Honthorst. Something similar can be recognized for the *Samson and Delilah* in the Galleria d’Arte Antica in Rome. It has the same intimacy and sense of imminent danger of Honthorst’s version (c. 1614, Fig. 96) and includes the warning gesture of the old maid, but the general composition is very different. Stom’s *Liberation of St Peter* in the Museo di Capodimonte is an original work but also unmistakably ‘Honthorstian’. Stom knew the painting by Honthorst in the Giustiniani collection, as is apparent from the close resemblance of Stom’s other version of the *Liberation of St Peter* (Fig. 97). In the version in the Pinacoteca in Bari (Fig. 73), Stom used the pose of St Peter, grabbing his head in shock, from Honthorst. Much more than Honthorst’s painting, a sense of action and alarm is present in Stom’s painting. He reached this effect by using the candle as a direct light source, thereby emphasizing the facial expressions. The *Liberation of St Peter*, as well as the *Samson and Delilah*, show that he had mastered the way Honthorst uses direct and hidden candlelight. Stom employed light to create a sense of intimacy and depth in a similar way to Honthorst.

Remarkable about the selection of paintings by Honthorst that have been connected to Stom’s Neapolitan oeuvre, is the fact that all of them are related to the Roman sojourn of the painter from Utrecht. It is also clear that Stom had access to the Giustiniani collection, where both Honthorst and his pupil Joachim van Sandrart had lived and worked when each of them was in the eternal city. The question whether or not Stom was a pupil of Honthorst, either in Utrecht or in Rome, cannot be addressed here, fascinating as it may be, as it falls outside the scope of my research question. For our understanding of Stom’s artistic choices in Naples, it suffices to recognize that Stom’s type

97 The man with the pilgrims shell on his hat, the young boy waiting tables and the man raising himself up from his chair in amazement.
98 The figures have different poses and use other props, such as the pheasant hanging from the shepherd’s crook in one of Stom’s versions in the Museo Nazionale di Capodimonte.
99 Honthorst’s painting stayed much closer to Caravaggio’s use of light in the *Calling of St Matthew*.
100 Further research on Stom’s knowledge of the other works in the Giustiniani collection, may help us to understand Stom’s artistic development. Sandrart was in Rome between 1629 and 1635, partially overlapping Stom’s documented Roman sojourn (1630-1632). As both of them had a connection to Honthorst, it would be surprising if there were absolutely no contact between the two in Rome. Remarkably, Sandrart does not mention Matthias Stom in the *Teutsche Academie*. It has been suggested that the Matthias Meyvogel, who was given the bent name Meyvoghel in 1628, signed a Caritas Romana with this name and - according to Sandrart - died a terrible death, should be identified as Matthias Stom (SANDRART 1675, vol. 2, 313-314). This is a complicated problem, which will not be addressed here as it concerns Stom’s early career.
of Caravaggism, his compositions and use of light, was closest to Honthorst, although Stom was certainly no slavish follower of the master from Utrecht.

However close Stom’s art works are to Honthorst, other artists were also important for his artistic development, first and foremost Peter Paul Rubens. Different from Honthorst, Rubens was well-known and highly appreciated in Naples, although scholars may have placed too much importance on the presence of the Feast of Herod (Fig. 98) in the Neapolitan collection of the Antwerp merchant Gaspar Roomer.\footnote{In the important exhibition catalogue ‘Painting in Naples 1606 – 1705: From Caravaggio to Giordano’ (Martineau & Whitfield 1982), it often appears as if this one painting by Rubens changed the entire course of painting in Naples. In his review of the exhibition, Richard Spear stated that the importance attached to this singular painting by Rubens might be overrated by the authors of the catalogue (Spear 1983).} Matthias Stom turned to Rubens for his warm colour palette, his loose brushstroke and the interpretation of some specific subjects, especially those involving monumental muscular figures. Stom’s ‘Honthorstian’ night scenes may have been the innovation he introduced to Neapolitan art and for which he was mostly remembered, his familiarity with Rubens’ work was most likely also recognized and appreciated by Neapolitans. I believe Orlandi referred to these ‘Rubensian’ elements in Stom’s work: “…essendo egli stato valente nell’arte sua del dipingere; di maniera grande, di colore robusto, e di libertà di pennello…”\footnote{Orlandi 1731, ed. Vocola, 455 (See Appendix 138).} The lessons that Stom learned from the mastery Rubens displayed in painting large altarpieces with monumental figures are most developed in the altarpieces that Stom painted in Sicily and Northern Italy. The use of colour and brushstroke are however clearly visible in Neapolitan paintings like his Samson and Delilah and Liberation of St Peter. The warm glow and soft colors are close to Rubens’ warm incarnate and far removed from Honthorst’s more plain skin tones and harder colour contrasts. The loose brushstroke in these works also reminds us of the Flemish master.

Stom also used compositional solutions of Rubens in the depiction of specific subjects. Stom’s Incredulity of St Thomas in the Prado shows distinct resemblance to the painting that Rubens painted for Nicholas Rockox around 1613-1615 (Fig. 99).\footnote{Freedberg 1984, 81-87 (cat. 18).} In fact, his solution is much closer to the Antwerp master than to the horizontal composition by Caravaggio, which served as a prototype for countless Caravaggists. Stom’s Christ makes the same gesture as in Rubens’ painting, although mirrored.\footnote{The fact that Stom reverted the image made Zalapi believe that Stom only knew Rubens’ painting through a print, rather than seeing it with his own eyes. I do not know of an early print after the painting.} Stom’s different colour palette, which is in fact more Neapolitan than Northern, might be explained by the fact that he worked with a drawing after Rubens or from his memory. The painting in De Cardenas’ collection with the unusual subject of a Sinking St Peter, must have looked like Rubens' composition for the panel in the predella of the altarpiece for the Mechelen's fishmonger's guild of 1618-1619 (Fig. 100). Stom appears to have studied the altarpiece of the fishmonger's guild meticulously and the other altarpiece by Rubens for the St Janskerk
in the same city (an *Adoration of the Magi*, Fig. 101) as well, either in Rubens’ atelier or after its installation. He must have made precise drawings, perhaps even in colour, as he included several elements of these masterpieces in his later oeuvre. Stom used Rubens’ composition of the *Tribute Money* (Fig. 102), which is part of the Fishmonger’s altarpiece, without much adaptation for his versions of the subject (Fig. 103). Stom’s *Adoration of the Magi* in Stockholm (Fig. 104) shows many similarities with Rubens’ altarpiece. The colors of Stom’s paintings are similar to Rubens’ altarpieces, suggesting that he studied the original painting instead of prints. Interestingly, Carlo Cardenas also owned a *Tribute Money* attributed to Caravaggio, which hung in the same room. I would suggest that this *Tribute money* was by Stom and was a pendant of the *Sinking Peter*.

Something similar can be recognized in the numerous old, young, male and female figures at candlelight which were painted by Stom throughout his career. From 1621 onwards, Honthorst and the other Utrecht Caravaggists painted this type of half figures and Stom may have known some of their works. However, Honthorst was not the one who invented these attractive ‘tronies’. Therefore, it is just as probable Stom knew some of the paintings that had been the example for Honthorst, such as Rubens’ *Old woman and boy by candle light* (1616-8, Fig. 105) or El Greco’s *Boy Blowing on an Ember to Light a Candle* of the early-1570s (Fig. 106), which was part of the Farnese collection in Rome. In fact, the figure type of the old woman is much closer to Rubens.

Elements of Honthorst and Rubens are most prominent in Stom’s oeuvre. However, like most early modern artists, he appears to have had a good stock of studies and prints – apart from a strong visual memory. For example, it is clear that Stom knew Caravaggio’s two versions of the *Supper at Emmaus* (1601 and 1606) either directly or through one of the many copies. Caravaggio’s famous versions instigated Stom’s choice not to block the light of the candle with the seated figure, as Honthorst had done, but to place this apostle to the side of the table. Stom’s *Ecce Homo* version is a synthesis of many different interpretations of this very popular subject. He doubtlessly knew the two most famous Italian depictions of the *Ecce Homo*, by Cigoli (1607, Pitti, Fig. 107) and Titian (Dublin, c1560; Saint Louis Art Museum, c.1576, probably in Venice until 1644, Fig. 108) as well as the versions by Rubens (1612) and Van Dyck (1625-26, made for the Balbi family in Genova) and Van Dyck’s *Mocking of Christ* (1628-30, Princeton Art Museum). Complicating matters even further, Stom possibly only knew some of these paintings

---

105 Zalapi also made this comparison (ZALAPI 1996, 221, cat. 13) and suggests that Stom was active in Rubens’ workshop during the late-1610s.
106 Judson makes the connection between Honthorst’s paintings and El Greco’s famous painting. (JUDSON & EKKART 1999, cat. 231 - Boy blowing a firebrand).
107 In their turn, the Flemish masters took elements from the compositions by Titian and Cigoli.
through prints or drawings by himself or other artists. Moreover, we should not forget older prints like the *Ecce Homo* by Sebald Beham (1521) and Hieronymus Wierix (before 1619) (Figs. 109 & 110). Stom’s painting is an original mix of different elements from all of these sources. I have included this complex example, to make clear that artists from Stom’s generation were trained to work with a large visual repertoire, which they carried with them in the form of prints and drawings, or in their head.

The fact that he took the position of Samson’s body in the *Samson and Delilah* from a print by Palma Giovane (Fig. 111) is further proof that Stom used prints. Moreover, the presence of the young man and the muscular body of Samson suggest knowledge of Rubens’ painting, likely through Jacob Matham’s renowned print. The result is an original composition by Stom. Stom’s *Christ and the adulterous woman* is another example of the wide array of examples that were at Stom’s disposal. Stom's version with half figures comes particularly close to Palma Giovane's print in Odoardo Fialetti’s *Il vero modo et ordine per disegnar tutte le parti et membra del corpo humano*, printed in 1608 (Fig. 112). The painting by Matthias Stom conveys the same emotions as the print: Christ's calmness, the adulteress's sadness and the expectancy of the crowd accusing her. The group of four people (two accusing Pharisees, Christ and the adulteress) and the man in the background are also similar, as is Christ's pointing at her and holding his robe. The interplay of emotions and the selected moment from the story is very different from the far more common versions in which we see Christ drawing on the ground.

Stom had a large collection of prints and drawings after other masters at his disposal, as well as numerous studies after models by his own hand. He used the same figure types repeatedly, pointing to the existence of study drawings. Within the group of identified paintings, the young woman with dark hair is the most frequently re-used. In all three versions of *Sarah leading Hagar to Abraham*, the dark-haired woman is wearing a typical disc-shaped hat and is shown from the same angle (one of them mirrored). She appears as the

108 Except for the late Titian, which was not reproduced, and Van Dyck's *Ecce Homo*, which was first reproduced by Lucas Vorsterman II in c.1650. Ruben's version was reproduced by Cornelis Galle I in around 1620, and Van Dyck's Mocking of Christ by himself and Lucas Vorsterman I in 1630), see VERDI 2002.

109 The idea to give Pilate a turban-like hat as well as the way Pilate opens Christ's (red) cape seems to have its origin in Northern art and can be found in the Beham and Wierix prints. However, Cigoli and Rubens chose the same solution (the latter only the cape). Christ's pose seems to be based on Cigoli or on Van Dyck, Christ's muscular physique is closer to the latter. The inclusion of a soldier can be found in Rubens and Van Dyck's Mocking of Christ only. Titian is the only one before Stom to include a boy in the foreground, who is also holding a firebrand and a rope (albeit less present and functional than in Stom's version). Regarding Stom's working method, we can conclude that he was well aware of his predecessors in depicting the *Ecce Homo* and that he probably studied prints. Although some elements such as Pilate's turban and the opening of the cape, were perhaps standardized after centuries of depicting the Ecce Homo-scene and were part of most artist's vocabulary, others like the boy and the soldier seem to come from specific examples that were studied by Stom. Moreover, Stom's final solution is original and characteristic, mostly because of his use of warm colors and the functional use of the light of the firebrand.

110 Gianfreda suggests that the painting by Palma Giovane, on which the print is based, was a source of inspiration for Guercino’s half figure *Adulteress* (GIANFREDA 2005, 58).
adulteress in the *Christ and the adulteress*, the mother in the *Death of Seneca*, the Virgin Mary in the *Holy family with infant St John* and in the two versions of the *Adoration of the shepherds* in the Museo di Capodimonte. \(^{111}\) Other figure types that Stom used repeatedly are the blonde woman who acts as Delilah, the old man who is portrayed as Abraham in the *Sarah leading Hagar to Abraham*, and the young boy with golden locks (he ages as well). \(^{112}\) This reuse of models is a sign that Stom had a set of facial studies that he used to construct compositions throughout his career, a sign of workshop efficiency.

Lastly, Stom often painted different versions of the same subject. Several versions of the *Mocking of Christ*, of the *Incredulity of St Thomas*, *Sarah leading Hagar to Abraham*, *Christ and the adulterous woman*, have been attributed to Stom, not to mention many versions of the *Adoration of the Shepherds*. This is largely the reason why his analysis of Stom’s oeuvre gave Benedict Nicolson the impression that Stom kept ‘a well-trimmed garden’. \(^{113}\) In the case of the versions of the *Incredulity of St Thomas* and the *Mocking of Christ*, the composition and the poses of the figures are significantly different from one version to another, whereas the different versions of *Sarah leading Hagar to Abraham* are more uniform. However, even what the *Adoration of the Shepherds* is concerned, Stom never simply copied his earlier versions. He always made some small changes with regard to facial expressions, the poses of the figures, the models he used and the garments of the figures. Therefore, it is unlikely that Stom used cartoons or fixed preparatory drawings. On the contrary, he kept re-inventing the subject and improve on it. Stom possibly kept one sample of popular subjects for potential customers, either a design or a finished painting. On the other hand, it is also possible the buyers or commissioners were unaware of the previous versions and bought their painting under the assumption it was one of a kind. The existence of different versions is clearly the result of an efficient working method.

The efficiency of Stom’s workshop is perhaps unexpected for a restless itinerant artist like Stom, but it might very well be the exact reason why he was able to quickly set up a new workshop once he reached a new location and leave again just as easily.

**Stom’s success among artists and collectors in Naples**

Now that we have characterized Stom’s Neapolitan oeuvre and working method, it is time to establish how successful he was in Naples. First of all, we have seen that Stom’s paintings in Neapolitan churches were praised by several seventeenth and eighteenth century authors. \(^{114}\) Moreover, De Dominici and Giannone remembered the impression Stom made on the Neapolitan artists Domenico Viola and Gian Giacomo Mannecchia.

---

\(^{111}\) The woman also appears in a number of attributed paintings: the *Ceres in the Taunting of Ceres* (Munich), and in other versions of the *Adoration of the Shepherds* (Leeds, Florence, Vienna and two in Naples), see NICOLSON 1977.

\(^{112}\) These figure types occur throughout the paintings attributed to Stom by Nicolson and Zalapi.

\(^{113}\) NICOLSON 1977, 230 (see above).

\(^{114}\) In all cases, the praise is for the paintings that were on display in the Neapolitan churches (See above, the paragraph on the paintings in the Neapolitan churches).
This written proof can be complemented with some information on the reception of Stom’s work by painters in Naples and the appreciation of Neapolitan collectors. I will first describe some reactions of artists to Stom’s paintings and then see what the Neapolitan inventories can tell us about the appreciation by collectors, by looking at what else they collected and which place Stom’s paintings had within the collections.\textsuperscript{115}

Mattia Preti, who was active in Naples between 1653 and 1660, clearly studied the paintings by Matthias Stom that were present in Naples. An illustrative example is Preti’s reaction to Stom’s paintings in the collection of Pompilio Gagliano. Besides Stom’s \textit{Incredulity} (4 palmi x ? = 105 cm) and \textit{Ecce Homo} (4 x 5 palmi = 105 x 132 cm), Gagliano also owned an \textit{Incredulity of Thomas} and an \textit{Ecce Homo} by Mattia Preti, both of the same size (7 x 5 palmi = 184 x 132 cm). John T. Spike has suggested that Preti’s two paintings were conceived as pendants.\textsuperscript{116} Mattia Preti painted five versions of the \textit{Ecce Homo},\textsuperscript{117} of which the vertical composition in Montecassino shows some resemblance to Stom’s composition (Fig. 113).\textsuperscript{118} Three versions by Preti of the \textit{Incredulity of St Thomas} (Fig. 114) portray Christ in a very similar pose as in Stom’s version in the Museo del Prado.\textsuperscript{119} Preti either knew the painting by Rubens, or he studied the painting by Stom in the Gagliano collection. Since there are no early prints after the painting by Rubens, it is more probable that Preti looked directly at Stom’s painting. Indeed, it seems that Preti was trying to emulate his Northern example, at least in the case of the \textit{Incredulity of St Thomas}. We cannot prove that Gagliano intently ordered two versions of the \textit{Ecce Homo} and the \textit{Incredulity of St Thomas} by different

\textsuperscript{115} The Neapolitan inventories give very little factual information about the background of the owners. From the information that we do have, thanks to Gérard Labrot, it appears there were old (noblemen) and nouveaux riches (lawyers and merchants) amongst the collectors of Stom’s work. The sample is too small to form further conclusions about the type of collectors. See Labrot’s short introductions to the individual inventories in LABROT 1992. In his magnum opus on the economic aspects of Neapolitan paintings, Labrot describes the rise of the bourgeoisie (lawyers, government officials and merchants) in Naples and the difference in taste with the nobility (LABROT 2010).

\textsuperscript{116} SPIKE 1999, 189-191 (cat. 103 & 104). According to Spike, both subjects refer to Christ’s human incarnation. Spike gives the example of the Gagliano collection and another Neapolitan collection (Bernardino Corrado, inv. 1672). The paintings in Bernardino Corrado’s collection were 4,5 x 6 (\textit{Ecce Homo}) and 5 x 6 (\textit{Incredulity}). The size of the paintings in Montecassino does not coincide with that of the paintings in the Gagliano or Corrado collection, but it is possible Preti painted several versions, that are now lost. For the inventory of the collection, see LABROT 1992, inv. 22; GPI, inv. I-355.

\textsuperscript{117} cfr. SPIKE 1999.

\textsuperscript{118} The size does not match the dimensions mentioned in the inventory.

\textsuperscript{119} SPIKE 1999, cat. 104 (Montecassino), 288 (Vienna); the second version of the Viennese painting in the Pokrajinski Muzej in Ptuj (inv. G275s) is documented in the Fototeca Federico Zeri in Bologna (nr. 53454). The provenance of the Viennese painting disqualifies it for identification with the Gagliano painting, but it could be the slightly smaller version in Montecassino. The painting in Vienna measures 187 x 145,5 cm the one in Montecassino:173 x 129 cm. There is a second version, perhaps a copy, of the Vienna composition in the Pokrajinski Muzej in Ptuj in Slovenia (Fototeca Federico Zeri) of 170x174 cm which was once attributed to Gerard Honthorst. The Viennese painting was already in the Habsburg collection in Prague by 1685, whereas the Gagliano inventory stems from 1699 (SPIKE 1999, 356 (cat.nr. 288). Spike dates Preti’s \textit{Ecce Homo}’s in Montecassino to the 1660s, the Viennese \textit{Incredulity} to 1640-5 and the Montecassino version to the 1660s.
artists, especially since the commissions could not have taken place simultaneously. However, Preti was clearly aware of Stom’s paintings.

Apart from the direct connection between Mattia Preti’s Ecce homo and Incredulity of St Thomas, described above, and the night scenes painted by Domenico Viola and Gian Giacomo Mannecchia, there are very few examples to be found that show the reception of Stom’s paintings in Naples. As an exception, Stom’s Samson and Delilah seems to have been particularly well-known and popular amongst Neapolitan artists. The late-seventeenth-century versions by Luca Giordano, Nicola Malinconico and an anonymous Neapolitan painter (Figs. 115-117) all show knowledge of Stom's version, in terms of colour, composition and interaction amongst the figures.

An analysis of the various Neapolitan collections that held paintings by Stom yields some interesting results regarding the appreciation of Stom’s work by collectors. The inventory of the D’Amore collection deserves our special interest, because it is one of the few of which the value of the art works is estimated. The lucky coincidence that it is also the first known inventory to list Stom, gives us the opportunity to see what the estimate value of Matthias Stom’s work was as early as 1656, in comparison to the work of his Neapolitan contemporaries and other international artists. The D’Amore collection, appraised by the artist-dealer Giacomo de Castro, was relatively small (227 paintings) in comparison to later Neapolitan collections. Stom’s Samson and Delilah was ‘palmi sette per traverso’ (= ca. 184 cm diagonally) and valued at 100 ducats by De Castro. Only eleven paintings in the collection were set at a higher price. Other works, bigger and smaller in size, that were also valued at 100 ducats, were by a number of important artists, such as Alessandro Turchi, Massimo Stanzione (three paintings), Battistello Caracciolo, Orazio Borgianni, Luca Cambiaso and Aniello Falcone (three paintings). Apparently, the quality and characteristics of Stom’s work were still highly appreciated in 1656. Stom’s painting hung next to a set of paintings by Stanzione and Carracciolo, two of the most important masters of Neapolitan painting of the first half of the century. The two pendants were of the same price, but slightly larger than Stom’s Samson and Delilah. On the other side of

---

120 This situation recalls the case in which Ferdinand Vandeneeynden ordered a Feast of Herod from Mattia Preti, while his associate Gaspard Roomer owned a famous painting by Rubens of the same subject (De Dominici 1742-5, III, 344-345). The resemblance between the paintings by Rubens and Preti is such, that an attempt of emulation from Preti seems likely.

121 Giacomo de Castro, although an artist, mostly seems to have been active as an art-dealer on the higher end of the Neapolitan art market. Christopher Marshall gives us a quick overview of De Castro’s activities as a restorer, appraiser and art dealer. He also noticed that D’Amore bought paintings through De Castro on several occasions, first in 1637 (Marshall 2000, 20-23). Marshall also refers to Eduardo Nappi’s publication (1990) of the payment to De Castro by Gaspard Roomer for the Drunken Silen (Capodimonte, 1626).

122 A Pietà by Andrea da Salerno was valued at the high price of 2000 ducats, a painting by Orazio Borgianni at 1000, a St Bartholomew by Ribera and two works by Stanzione at 500 ducats each and two paintings by Caracciolo, two by Veronese, one by Falcone and one by Lanfranco at 200 ducats each.

123 That is, assuming D’Amore did not alter the place of the paintings after acquiring the Samson and Delilah and that he hung the paintings according to some degree of logic or taste.
the Stom hung a ‘Concettione’ by the Northern caravagesque painter Giusto Fiammingo.\textsuperscript{124}

The location of a painting within the collection also gives us an idea of how the collector appreciated it. The \textit{Samson and Delilah} by Stom is one of the thirty paintings out of the 115 paintings in the inventory of the collection of Pompeo D’Anna (1676) of which the artist is identified by the appraiser. According to Labrot, the paintings that hung in the antechamber of D’Anna’s palazzo, including those by Stom, should be seen as the showpieces of the collection, as the room functioned as a 'formal reception room'.\textsuperscript{125} The paintings in this room are amongst the few for which the author is identified and they were produced by some of the most important Neapolitan painters from the mid-seventeenth century, including Massimo Stanzione, Andrea Vaccaro, Ribera, Pacecco De Rosa. Similar to the location of Stom’s painting in the D’Amore collection, his work was placed amongst the big names of the Neapolitan school.

Pompilio Gagliano holds an important place amongst the Neapolitan collectors of Stom’s work, as he owned five paintings by him, suggesting that he, or his ancestor, had great appreciation for Stom’s paintings. Circa 191 paintings are listed in the inventory of 1699,\textsuperscript{126} almost all of them by local and foreign artists from the upper strata of the market. Most frequent are religious subjects, still lifes and landscapes. Some of the best local artists contributed to the collection, such as Ribera, Domenico Gargiulo, Mattia Preti (from Calabria) and Bernardo Cavallino, but we can also find foreign artists who were temporarily active in Naples such as Lanfranco and Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione. Gagliano had a certain interest in Netherlandish painters active in Naples; apart from the five paintings by Stom, he owned fourteen still life paintings by Abraham Brueghel and a \textit{Tobias} and \textit{St Barbara} by Hendrick De Somer.\textsuperscript{127} Stom’s \textit{Sarah leading Hagar to Abraham} and \textit{Ecce Homo} were both displayed in the second antechamber of Gagliano’s palace. The quality level of the collection was very high in general, but in this particular room, many important paintings were exhibited. In the \textit{seconda anticamera}, we can find work by important Neapolitan masters such as Domenico Gargiulo, Massimo Stanzione, Luca Giordano and Andrea Vaccaro and a number of immigrant artists who worked in Naples, such as Ribera, Viviano Codazzi, Goffredo Wals, Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione and Hendrick De Somer. In the eyes of Pompilio Gagliano, the two paintings by Stom apparently fit well into this ensemble. The \textit{Incredulity of Thomas} and the two \textit{Figures at candelight} were hung in the next room of Gagliano's palace, the third antechamber. In this

\textsuperscript{124} For the most recent discussion of the identification of this artist, possibly identified with Josse de Pape or Jean Ducamps, see: \textsc{Terzagli} 2009a.

\textsuperscript{125} \textsc{Labrot} 1992, 129. Labrot also suggests that the paintings in this room were large in scale, but the sizes are not mentioned.

\textsuperscript{126} The exact number of paintings in the collection is impossible to deduct from the inventory description.

\textsuperscript{127} Brueghel, active in Naples between 1672 and 1697, was more of a contemporary of Gagliano. For De Somer, see Chapter Three.
room, most paintings were of a small format. The two \textit{Figures at night} fit well amongst the other small cabinet paintings in the room and show that Stom was also successful with these smaller gallery pictures. The \textit{Incredulity} was hung between a painting by Andrea Vaccaro and one by Francesco de Maria of the same size. The Gagliano collection appears to be arranged and assembled with great care, which gives greater significance to the prominence of Stom’s paintings within the collection.

The eighteenth-century inventories should be treated with more caution, as there is more chance the paintings were moved around across distances. The fact that the appraisers were able to identify Stom’s work means that his reputation continued into the next century. Salvatore Ciavarella was probably the principal collector of the paintings in his Galleria and most works stem from artists active during his lifetime. In fact, together with Battistello Caracciolo and Francanzano (either Francesco or Cesare), Stom’s work was amongst the oldest identified paintings in Ciavarella’s collection. Stom’s painting was hung in the gallery of the palazzo, together with the larger part of the collection. I have excluded the painting owned by Antonio Maria Lumaga (ambiguously described as \textit{Cena}), from the general analysis because it is unclear where the work was produced and bought. However, the inventory does provide interesting information about the appreciation of Stom’s work in Naples. Only 29 of the 206 paintings were attributed by the appraiser, almost all of them to Neapolitan painters, or those active in Naples, with the exception of two Titians and an unspecified Venetian. Stom’s painting is one of the few that was attributed, arguably a sign of his fame. It is called ’antico’ and it was in fact one of the oldest of the attributed paintings in the collection, besides the two paintings by Titian.

This overview of the reception of Stom’s Neapolitan oeuvre by artists and the appreciation by Neapolitan collectors, that both painters and collectors held his work in high esteem. Preti was interested in Stom’s compositional solution for the \textit{Incredulity of St Thomas} and some important late-seventeenth-century painters showed equal interest in Stom’s \textit{Samson and Delilah}. In Neapolitan collections, Stom’s paintings were exhibited next to works by important masters from Naples and abroad. Moreover, it is a sign of Stom’s fame that his work was amongst the few paintings that were recognized and attributed by the appraiser in the case of the D’Anna and Lumaga collections.

\footnote{We find several other paintings of the same size (2 or 2,5 palmi): Satyrs by Geronimo Colones, battle scenes by Andrea de Lione, Michelangelo Cerquozzzi, Christian Reder and ‘Gieuita’, a Jacob by Bartolomeo Passante, a landscape by Vincent Adriaenssen, a Supper at Emmaus by Cornelis van Poelenburch and the pendants St John the Baptist and St John the Evangelist by Cavallino.}
\footnote{Typical for eighteenth century collections, Ciavarella collected many works from non-religious genres such as landscapes and still lifes, although images of saints are still the most frequent. Many still lifes are by famous artists (Ruoppolo – no first name -, Brueghel and Giuseppe Recco), suggesting that Ciavarella was particularly interested in investing in this genre.}
\footnote{GPI, I-102, inventory of Antonio Maria Lumaga.}
CHAPTER FOUR

Leaving Rome for Naples: a good move in the 1630s

Sometime after Easter 1632, when he still appears in the *Stati delle Anime* in Rome, Matthias Stom moved to Naples. As was the case with Mytens, Finson, Vinck and De Somer, we cannot reconstruct the exact reasons for his departure from Rome and his choice to move southwards to Naples. Artists moved around frequently in the seventeenth century and new artists arrived in Naples each year. However, the moment of Stom's departure from Rome and his choice for Naples should be placed into context. Several important artists settled in Naples between circa 1629 and 1636, such as Artemisia Gentileschi (1629),131 Domenichino (1631),132 Viviano Codazzi (before 1634),133 Giovanni Lanfranco (1634),134 Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione (1635)135 and Johann Heinrich Schönfeld (1636).136 Some of these artists (Artemisia, Domenichino, Lanfranco) were of a higher caliber than Matthias Stom and therefore the circumstances of their migration were somewhat different. Still, a trend seems to have developed which was surely followed by many less important artists of the middle segment of the market, like Stom. By studying explanations of experts about the reasons for the departure of these artists from Rome and their success in, I hope to gain some insight in the attractiveness to artists of Naples in the 1630s.137

All the aforementioned artists came to Naples after having spent considerable time in Rome. Artemisia and Lanfranco had been very successful in in the Eternal City prior to their departure, but taste had changed. According to Ward Bissell, Artemisia's style, her twist on Caravaggism, was no longer appreciated in Rome, despite her efforts to adapt to the latest developments.138 Likewise, by 1634 Lanfranco had started to realize that artistic taste at the Barberini court moved in favor of Pietro da Cortona and his followers

131 Artemisia Gentileschi (1593-1654) was the first important artist to move permanently to Naples in 1629. Her stay lasted until her death in 1654, only interrupted in 1639-40 by a visit to London.
132 Domenichino's stay in Naples, from 1631 until 1641 was intrinsically connected to his work on the Cappella del Tesoro.
133 Viviano Codazzi (c.1606-1670), arrived in Naples sometime between 1621 and 1634 and stayed until the Revolt of Masaniello in 1647 (MARSHALL 1993, 6).
134 Giovanni Lanfranco (1582-1647) was invited in 1634 by the Jesuits in Naples to paint the cupola of the Gesù Nuovo. Unlike Domenichino, however, Lanfranco was in little hurry to leave Naples after this commission was finished, he stayed until 1646.
135 Opinions vary about the length of Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione's Neapolitan sojourn. Recently, Timothy Standring agreed with the earlier viewpoint of Minna Heimbürger that it was most likely Castiglione only passed through Naples between Carnival 1635 and the next spring (HEIMBÜRGER 1994, 205; STANDRING & CLAYTON 2013, 39). The only document proving his stay in Naples stems from 1635 (STANDRING & CLAYTON 2013, 37 n.18). Standring argues that the bank payment for a painting for Giacomo d'Amore, handled by art dealer Giacomo di Castro of March 1637 is no proof of Castiglione's physical presence in Naples (idem, 38-9). Most scholars believe the sojourn was much longer, between 1635 and 1639 (when Castiglione is documented back in Genoa).
136 The German painter Johann Heinrich Schönfeld (1609-1684) left Rome, where he had been since 1633, for Naples around 1636. He would stay in Naples until 1647.
137 I will not discuss all the artists passing through Naples, such as Velazquez (autumn 1630), Joachim von Sandrart (December 1631) and Anthony van Dyck (1625), since these artists do not seem to have visited Naples with the prospect of working. For information on the Neapolitan stay of these artists, see: BROWN 2008, 391; DE VITO 2002; EBERT-SCHIFFERER 1994, 101; MENDOLA 1999.
138 WARD BISSELL 1999, 55. For a more elaborate analysis, see MARSHALL 2005, 7-8.
and that it had become increasingly difficult to obtain large commissions in the Papal city. Artemisia and Lanfranco worked in different, even opposing, styles and Artemisia never received public commissions and only worked for collectors. Nonetheless, their fortune in Rome changed simultaneously. With their strong connections outside of Rome, both of them quickly found a new place to settle down. Artemisia’s choice for Naples was guided by her network, in particular her contact with the Count of Alcalà, who became Viceroy in 1629. Lanfranco was initially invited to come to Naples by the Jesuits, through mediation of the next Viceroy, the Count of Monterrey, to work on the cupola of the Gesù Nuovo. He soon realized there was a high demand for fresco-painters in the Bolognese tradition and stayed until 1646. Their network helped Artemisia and Lanfranco to make a good assessment of their possibilities in Naples. The young ambitious artists Codazzi, Castiglione and Schönfeld had different options at their disposal, although they had obtained a certain level of success in Rome. For them, there was no certainty that they would find work in Naples. In fact, all scholars describe the reasons for these artists to move to Naples in fairly generic terms, such as ‘an extended Bildungsgreise’, the saturated and competitive Roman art market and unspecified opportunities for patronage. In the case of Viviano Codazzi from Bergamo, the presence of a successful compatriot, the important sculptor and architect Cosimo Fanzago (1591–1678, from Clusone, near Bergamo) may have played a role, as De Dominici mentions the two lived together in Naples. Similarly, contact with Domenichino might have stimulated Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione to travel further south and Johann Heinrich Schönfeld may have met Domenico Gargiulo in Rome, around 1635, when both artists were frequenting the circles of the Bamboccianti. Other Neapolitan artists, such as Aniello Falcone, Salvator Rosa and Batistello Caracciolo, also traveled to Rome during the first decades of the seventeenth century. Through these and other channels, tales about important collectors like the internationally-orientated Gaspard de Roomer and Ascanio Filomarino, as well as the religious and private

139 MOCHI ONORI 2001, 81.
140 The first to mention the relation to the Duke of Alcalà as a possible reason for moving to Naples was Mary Garrard (GARRARD 1989, 91).
141 Marshall does not explicitly discuss why Codazzi chose to go to Naples. All but Standing are silent about the reasons why Castiglione left Rome for Naples in 1635. He suggests it might have been out of artistic interest, to broaden his view and extend his formation, or because the Neapolitan artistic climate was less competitive than Rome (STANDRING & CLAYTON 2013, 37). Another possible connection might have been his contact with Domenichino in Rome (STANDRING 1996, 33). With regard to Schönfeld: according to Cécile Michaud and Brigitte Daprà, Naples simply meant another stop on the Bildungsgreise of Northern artists and at the same time offered plenty of opportunities for patronage of religious and private nature (MICHAUD 2006, 38-44; DAPRA 2009, 35).
142 MARSHALL 1993, 13. Fanzago arrived in Naples around 1608. As Fanzago was considerably older, there is the possibility of a pupil-master relationship between the two. The architect Fanzago may have instigated Codazzi’s specialism in painting architecture.
143 MICHAUD 2009, 56.
144 For Gaspard de Roomer, see: RUOTOLO 1982, MEIJER 1986, Chantelle Cercone-Lepine is currently finishing her dissertation on the collection of De Roomer (Queen’s University, Kingston, with Sebastian Schütze). For Filomarino, see: LORIZZO 2006.
building activity in the city, reached Rome, giving them enough reason to assume there would be work available in Naples. For example, the news that the current Viceroy Manuel de Acevedo y Zúñiga, Count of Monterrey, was commissioning artists to deliver paintings for the ambitious project of the Palace of Buen Retiro, probably spread quickly.

The length of their Neapolitan stay suggests at least some satisfaction with the new situation in which they found themselves. Furthermore, the success in procuring commissions is proof of the insightfulness of their choice to move to Naples. Artemisia built a Neapolitan network of patrons while she kept on working for international patrons. Around 1633-4, both Artemisia and Lanfranco were commissioned by the Viceroy, the Count of Monterrey, to work on the decoration of the Palace of Buen Retiro. Lanfranco would never be short of work during the years he spent in Naples (1634-1646), he mostly worked on large fresco commissions for Neapolitan churches as well as oil paintings, for example for Cardinal Filomarino. The work of Castiglione, Codazzi and Schönfeld was popular amongst Neapolitan collectors.

The initial artistic response of these artists to Neapolitan art is of importance. Artemisia fashioned herself as an innovator from Rome. She no longer had to compete directly with classicist and High Baroque developments as she had in Rome, as these were not yet as overpowering in Naples. Instead, she now had the freedom to incorporate elements from these styles while continuing to work in her Caravaggesque manner. Artemisia continued producing images of sensuous female nudes in a Caravaggesque style, which - despite the Spanish decorum - were very much appreciated in Naples. Riccardo Lattuada has shown how Artemisia managed to integrate Neapolitan artistic developments into her work as well. As Lanfranco had a monopoly in ceiling paintings in the grand Bolognese manner, he continued to work in the same style as he had in Rome with few adjustments. Castiglione and Schönfeld continued to paint histories with a strong emphasis on the landscape, the former in a large format, the latter in delicate small paintings, thereby adding something new to Neapolitan art (Figs. 118 & 119). With his

145 For an overview of the Neapolitan art market see the well-documented book by LABROT 2010, as well as his earlier studies (Also see MARSHALL 2000 and MARSHALL 2010).
146 Philip IV entrusted the viceroy with this project while still Ambassador in Rome and continued after he had become viceroy. See, most recently: ÚBEDA DE LOS COBOS 2005. Aniello Falcone, Ribera, Artemisia Gentileschi, Andrea di Lione, Cesare Francanzano, Giovanni Lanfranco, Paolo Domenico Finoglia, Viviano Codazzi, Domenico Gargiulo and Massimo Stanzi worked on the project in Naples. Domenichino painted his one work in both cities (p.20).
147 The commission for three paintings for the Cathedral of Pozzuoli (1640) was her most important public commission in Naples.
148 These commissions include: the Certosa di San Martino (1637-9), the Cathedral of Pozzuoli (1640), the ceiling of the church of Santi Apostoli (c. 1638-1646), the cupola of the Cappella del Tesoro (1643-6).
149 As we do not know when exactly Codazzi arrived in Naples and what he produced prior to his arrival, I have decided not to mention him here.
150 WARD BISSELL 1999, 72.
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large paintings featuring grand classicist architecture, Codazzi brought a new impulse to landscapes with ruins and buildings, a genre that had been originally been introduced by François de Nommé and Didier Barra and taken up by Filippo Napoletano. Castiglione had a great impact on Neapolitan artists, such as Andrea de Lione, Aniello Falcone, Nicolò de Simone and Domenico Gargiulo. Moreover, Castiglione would also use Neapolitan examples in his paintings, notably from Ribera and the Master of the Adoration of the Shepherds.

Scholars have paid relatively much attention to the social integration of these artists. In contrast to Domenichino, both Artemisia and Lanfranco possessed the social skills to integrate in the Neapolitan artistic scene. Codazzi also quickly integrated, both professionally and socially. In 1636, he married the Neapolitan woman Candida Miranda and around the mid-1640s, he had a Neapolitan pupil, Ascanio Luciano. As Michaud argues, Schönfeld managed to integrate better in the Neapolitan art scene than he had in Rome. The emphasis of these scholars on the successful integration of all of these artists is remarkable. The apparent smoothness with which they integrated is in harsh contrast with the famous story of the Cabal of Naples, the group Neapolitan painters that menaced Reni’s assistants and Domenichino during their work on the Cappella del Tesoro in the Cathedral of Naples. Further proof of integration, is the fact that all of them collaborated with local artists and each other. The most important artists with whom Artemisia collaborated were Domenico Gargiulo, Massimo Stanzione, Bernardo Cavallino, Onofrio Palumbo and Viviano Codazzi. All these painters were already established as masters in their own right at the time of collaboration; they worked with Artemisia on equal basis. In a similar manner, Codazzi worked with Johann Heinrich Schönfeld, Massimo Stanzione, Cosimo Fanzago and, very intensively, with Domenico Gargiulo. With Gargiulo, he worked for the Buen Retiro and for the Certosa San Martino. In all his collaborative projects, for small and large paintings, he focused solely on the execution of the architecture (vedute, ruins and contemporary palazzi). Schönfeld collaborated with other artists in Naples like Bernardo Cavallino, Aniello Falcone, Domenico Gargiulo, Viviano Codazzi and Salvator Rosa.

---
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Matthias Stom’s decision to move (temporarily) to Naples, should be placed within this context. Stom had little in common with Giovanni Lanfranco, who obtained the most important commissions in Naples as a monumental fresco painter in the Bolognese-Roman tradition. On a stylistic level, he was closest to Artemisia Gentileschi. Stom’s version of Caravaggism was not as refined as Artemisia’s or other late Caravaggists in Rome like Valentin de Boulogne, Giovanni Serodine and Nicolas Regnier (Fig. 120). Apart from the fact that he had not updated his style to the latest developments, there were few Caravaggesque painters left in Rome around 1630. The waning interest in the type of work he produced and the extreme competition in Rome must have been a great disillusionment. Although we know that he later, in Sicily, managed to adapt to local circumstances, Rome seems to have moved too fast for him. We should not see this as a decisive failure on his part, since not even an experienced and well-connected artist like Artemisia were able to adapt sufficiently to changing tastes. There is no reason to assume that Stom and Artemisia were in contact in Rome - or in Naples, for that matter - and he did not have access to the type of patrons that launched her into Neapolitan society. Still, the continued interest in Caravaggism and naturalism of Neapolitan collectors and artists such as Ribera, Caracciolo and Preti, which had been part of the attraction for Artemisia, could have convinced Stom of the feasibility of moving South.

Matthias Stom probably had the most in common with Viviano Codazzi, Giovanni Benedetto Castiglione and Johann Heinrich Schönfeld. All four had finished their formal education by the time they reached Rome. Whether out of artistic interest or to flee the tough competition, after having heard the good tidings, they soon moved South to try their luck. Apart from (hypothetical) initial contact with Neapolitan artists in Rome, neither of them had a network laid out in Naples. Despite this, they managed to win the interest of Neapolitan collectors by working in a specific manner. Stom’s particular use of chiaroscuro and his take on naturalism was much appreciated by Neapolitan patrons (and artists) and can be seen as an innovation introduced by him in Naples. The affirmation of the presence of Stom’s paintings in Gaspar de Roomer’s collection may point to a connection between Stom and the wealthy merchant from Antwerp. Roomer was part of a wide international trade network and is known to have imported paintings from other cities, especially from Rome. This leaves us with some questions and hypotheses. The fact that Capaccio mentioned Stom’s paintings in Il Forastiero poses a problem (as it is generally accepted that Capaccio had already finished the manuscript by 1630). In that year, Stom is documented in Rome. There are two options: he was present in, or visited,

163 LEMOINE 2007, 83. Annick Lemoine describes how Regnier attempted, at to a certain degree successfully, to adapt to the taste of the Barberini circles (p. 94).
164 Valentin and Giovanni Serodine died in 1632 and 1631, Regnier left Rome for Venice by 1626 and Artemisia moved in 1629.
165 Chantelle Lepine-Cercone is currently preparing a dissertation on Roomer’s collection at Queen’s University in Kingston (Canada). For more information about the network of the Roomer family and that of his business partners the Vandeneynden, see: TIMMERMANS 2008.
Naples prior to his Roman sojourn, or Gaspar Roomer heard about Stom before the artist’s arrival in Naples and imported his work.

On the level of social and professional integration, Stom differed from these other ‘newcomers’. Unlike them, we do not know of any collaboration projects with local artists, or even direct contact with other artists active in Naples, except for his apprentice Mattheus De Roggiero. Stom seems to have remained an outsider.