

**DOI: 10.7596/taksad.v9i2.2570**

**Citation:** Romanenkova, J., Bratus, I., Kuzmenko, H., & Streltsova, S. (2020). Art during the Reign of Rudolf II as Quintessence of Leading Mannerism Trend at Prague Art Center. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 9(2), 395-407. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v9i2.2570>

### **Art during the Reign of Rudolf II as Quintessence of Leading Mannerism Trend at Prague Art Center**

**Julia Romanenkova <sup>1</sup>, Ivan Bratus <sup>2</sup>,  
Halyna Kuzmenko <sup>3</sup>, Svitlana Streltsova <sup>4</sup>**

#### **Abstract**

This article is devoted to Rudolfine art as one of the style-forming components and a significant trend in European Mannerism of the 16-17th centuries. A general overview of this style, necessary preconditions that led to its emergence in the artistic culture of Europe, Mannerism major trends and its vectors of spreading in Europe, the role of Rudolfine artists in this process, are laid out in this work. We emphasized the lack of adequate research made in the field of Art History. The personal influence of Emperor Rudolf II on the formation of court art at that time was pointed out. We looked into the background and circumstances at which the Prague Art Center was established by the Emperor and how he provided patronage to the arts and science. The importance of works by prominent artists of the Rudolfine era who worked at the Prague Art Center is highlighted. The main directions of Mannerism distribution through European countries, mainly its further adaptation and style transformation depending on the geographical location, grounds on why the art was so influenced by the Italian movement, the approach and tools of Mannerism in one of the leading European courts. The main characteristics of the Rudolfine art style is highlighted. Its main representatives are defined and their individual creative styles are separately analyzed, including Giuseppe Arcimboldo, Roelant Savery, Bartholomeus Spranger, Joris Hoefnagel, Adriaen de Vries, Joseph Heintz the Elder, and Hans von Aachen. It is pointed out that there was a tendency in the synthesis of Italian, French, and German trends which formed the foregrounds of individual styles of major representatives in Rudolfine art that have been a significant element of Mannerism. General characteristics of stylistic features of Rudolfine artists as representatives of Mannerism who contributed to its fast proliferation in Europe are laid out.

**Keywords:** Mannerism, Rudolfine Artists, Renaissance, European court, Style, Subtrends, Prague Art Center.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Kyiv Municipal Academy of Variety and Circus Arts. E-mail: libraryOM@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup> Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University. E-mail: i.bratus@kubg.edu.ua

<sup>3</sup> Institute of Talented Child at the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine. E-mail: glnkuzmenko36@gmail.com

<sup>4</sup> Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University. E-mail: s.strieltsova@kubg.edu.ua

## Introduction

An era that succeeded the Renaissance and precedes Baroque, is a chronological period of time which plays an important part in understanding the style's nature, its characteristics and formation in the subsequent artistic periods. During this time span, a new style emerged in the European Art, known as Mannerism. The fast and widespread extension of Mannerism in Italy was strengthened by the theoretical treatises of Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo, Giovanni Battista Armenini, Vincenzo Borghini, and Federico Zuccaro. They became apologists of Mannerism, their works were invaluable due to the fact that they understood the art in a way that not many theorists could do. They were painters themselves and knew the subject better than any theorist. Each style of Mannerism, depending on the geographical location, had its own features and specific diversity which defined characteristics of the unique local style variation. In each case, the fundamentals of Italian concepts were left intact; they were only enriched with national identities. Italy as the main center of artistic development set off a vast spread of Mannerism further across Europe. Italian Mannerist ideas spread all over Europe very quickly. The artists, influenced by this movement and who were summoned to European courts, contributed to this process. They brought to each local Mannerism an Italian component and at the same time when returned home to Italy, they enriched the Italian art with newly acquired trends. Not all of them returned home though, a lot stayed at courts of countries which offered better conditions to work, thus in this way, they not only expanded the Italian artistic movement to the majority of European countries, but also they experienced a massive surge in their own creative life, becoming a prominent artists in a number of countries.

There were a couple of directions in which Mannerism spread out through Europe. The main noticeable stylistic trends emerged in French, German, Flemish, and Spanish Art. During the reign of Emperor Rudolf II, Prague became one of the leading art centers in Europe of the 16th century. Before Rudolf's reign, brothers of Emperor Maximilian II, Charles the Archduke of Tyrol and Archduke of Styria gathered a unique collection of art at their courts which included mechanical moving devices, precious antiques in Cabinets of curiosities (Kunstkammer). These Cabinets of curiosities had very chaotic collections but it was all based on the interest to all exotic and unique, on honoring the beauty of nature and man-made art pieces. Later on, Maximilian II started to contribute to this collection, and over time - his son Rudolf. Rudolf II was brought up at the court of uncle Philip II of Spain, that favorably disposed him to Catholicism and he supported the start of the Catholic Reformation in the Empire. He, along with his father Maximilian II and Francis I became the most influential figures in the formation of an artistic culture of that era and not only on the German territories.

Although there is evidence that after the death of Maximilian II, the court had ceased its support for artists as Rudolf did not have much interest in the arts (Zeri, 2001, p. 40), but it is more obvious from his contributions that his love for arts was infinite. After the court was moved into Prague, it became one of the leading arts centers under Rudolf's guidance.

Rudolf II contributed to the development of science, arts, urban planning (during his reign Prague experienced vast growth). The most prominent artists were invited to the court from different countries. The Emperor, who was quite shy and manneristic by nature, prone to depression and surreal ideas surrounded himself with notable artists. Obviously, those personal characteristics, along with attraction to the art enabled him to create his own artistic and illusory world, where everything was the way he wanted. Allocating the greater part of the palace to artistic workshops, he obtained an unreal world with artificial and fabricated reality which completely satisfied him. Francis I, King of France had a similar «universal workshop» in Fontainebleau, Rudolf had his own in Prague, where he moved in the 1583 year. The Emperor religious politics, confrontations between Catholics and Protestants, hostilities with the Turks all these brought to massive uprisings and deprivation of power.

He ceded the crown to his brother Matthias and after an illness caused by an unstable mental state he soon died. The psychological type of the Emperor's personality was very typical for the Reformation period and it played a significant part in the formation of the Rudolfiner art phenomenon.

### **Literature Review**

Mannerism for a long time was considered as non-sufficient style and regarded as a bridge between the Renaissance and the Baroque period. Also it is known as a crisis stage or a late phase of the Renaissance decline and a forerunner of Baroque Mannerism. It was neglected for a very long time and only less than half a century ago it was rediscovered. The bibliography on Mannerism, in particular of Rudolfiner Artists has been very scarce before and left incomplete by now. The existing sources which help to develop knowledge of this phenomenon can be divided into several groups: exhibition catalogs (*L'art maniériste, formes et symboles. 1520–1620*, 1978; *Catalogue du Seconde Exposition sous les auspices du conseil de l'Europe*, 1955, etc.), monographic researches (Ambrois Dubois à Fontainebleau, 1987; Mander, 1940; Romanenkova, 1996; Romanenkova, 2008; Romanenkova 2009; Tananayeva, 1996, etc.), works of general interest on Mannerism Art History (Benesh, 1973; Byalostotskiy, 1987; Châstel, 1968; *La crease de la Renaissance. 1520–1600*; Matveyeva, 2008; Vasilenko, 2009; Tervarent, 1944; Vasil'yeva, 2008; Vel'flin, 2004; Vipper, 1956; Voronina & Mal'tseva & Starodubova, 1994, studios L. Dimier, S. Beguin, L. Campbell, etc.), researches with philosophical and aesthetic focus (Losev, 1998; Panofsky, 2006; works of M. Dvorzhak). The researchers often when referring to the problems of Philosophical values of Renaissance either avoided analyzing the Era of Mannerism separately in their works or they treated it as a final stage or crisis period of Renaissance. A particularly noticeable and biased analysis of this phenomenon was in the Soviet Union. During the 1950–1970 period, the works of such authors were published: V. Lazarev, M. Alpatov, B. Vipper, O. Losev, later on, L. Tananayeva, V. Turchin, V. Dazhina, N. Maltseva, M.Sviderskaya and others. In their works, mainly dedicated to the Renaissance, they covered the subject of Mannerism Art. Only for the last couple of decades Mannerism and its certain segments like Rudolfiner Art was reevaluated and obtained a right to be considered as a separate trend in Art History. Only in the late 20th and early 21st century, neglected artists were rediscovered and their individual styles appreciated.

### **Discussion**

The Rudolfiner art trend itself is called Mannerism. It emerged from the mingling traditions that came from Italy on one side and from the Netherlands and Germany on the other site. But this was not only an interchange of traditions, it was also their synthesis. The Rudolfiner art culture became the main trend among several in spreading Mannerism style, it combined above all Roman, Florentine, Mantuan, Amsterdam, Antwerp style versions, making another deviation of international Mannerism which flourished since Italian version came to its end (Zeri, p. 18). Prevalent for this style was decorative art, frequent scenes with erotic content, a continuous reference to mythological, allegorical compositions which help to admire the beauty of a nude body. Another field of creative expression for the invited artists (this was more important than fulfilling certain orders locally) was to decorate festive events at court in the way they could ensure that the Monarch of the Habsburg House was competitive in the areas of fashion and art.

Italian technique, in this style, was dominant not only because this style originated in Italy, but also because all the masters that came here went through Italian schooling and got educated in Italy. A lot of painters, scientists, poets and musicians were invited to Prague. All of these personalities possessed common characteristics - they synchronized scientific and artistic thoughts, they all tried to answer global questions through their work thus interlacing scientific discoveries with artistic methods for understanding reality. The scientific view of the Rudolfiner world was depicted in their art pieces. In Rudolfiner culture, the process of merging scientific-artistic thought and creative work was backed up

by the fact that at courts there were a lot of scientific instruments (clock mechanisms) created, which are considered by researchers not only as an artistic expression of scientific thought but also as art masterpieces with practical application. An important feature of Rudolfine art that makes it synonymous with Mannerism is that it can embrace opposites. On one hand, it tends to the exact sciences and on the other it has a passion for hypersensitivity of exquisite art, exaltation, and admiration.

The research approach of the arts was also observed among numerous artists in the era of the Renaissance. Leonardo da Vinci was a researcher and practical naturalist. A number of Rudolfine artists like Joris Hoefnagel, Giuseppe Arcimboldo, and Roelant Savery studied the nature, flora, and fauna, showed interest in the Ornithology. Thus the presence of common features between the artist of the Renaissance and Rudolfine style cannot be denied. But it should not be forgotten that Leonardo expressed his own creative potential on his own initiative, and in the case of Rudolfine artists, they were all led by the Emperor. He himself being an inspirational figure in the art life, set the trends and directions at Prague court. Moreover, we can make an opposite statement that Leonardo, more than any other Renaissance artist, was far from Mannerist art, even in his restrained and science-based works, because his creativity is mainly characterized by moderation, balance, rationality, while Mannerism is based on dissonance, asymmetry, and disharmony. For example, Leonardo created studies of weird faces, etudes, and facial drawings distorted by a grimace, a large number of projects of various devices, studies of a bird body and anatomy of a horse, similar as those created by Rudolfine artists. A. Dürer, for example, has also animal drawings and research records; Donatello has, in his artistic heritage, an image of Mary Magdalene, so distorted by grief and age that you can see the start of a manneristic vision in it. But it is not enough to say that A. Dürer or Maestro Donato were direct representatives of Mannerism, it is possible only to emphasize that manneristic constants can be found in any artistic works in any historical period.

The Italian component of the Rudolfine culture is represented by the masters, who came directly from the homeland of Mannerism to Prague, or they might have been invited to the Viennese court first and later moved to Prague. Among the Italians who visited the court of Rudolf II, was mentioned, for example, P. Piazza (d. 1621) but unfortunately not much is known about him. The main attention is focused primarily on the famous J. Arcimboldo.

### **Giuseppe Arcimboldo**

Master Arcimboldo (1527–1593) is an artistic embodiment of the Mannerism doctrine, we can say, its best representation. And the most notable fact about it, that he spent most of his life outside Italy. L. Tananayeva (1996) named him a «prelude and a program of Rudolfine art». The talent of Arcimboldo is unique even nowadays, his inclination to Anamorphosis, a specificity of artistic vision, unusual interpretation of the form and its expansion to components were admired by the Rudolfine artistic court. F. Zeri statement that «the internal tension of Arcimboldo's works reflects the drama of a decline of a certain era and its ideals» (Zeri, p.18) The researcher notes that the nature of the Master's works was utopian because he tried to capture and convey the unity of the Divine Beginning and to recreate this unity in multiple ways (Zeri, p. 26). The utopian ideas were expressed by all Mannerists, but in Arcimboldo artworks, it became a symbol of pursuit and vain illusions. He did not see the whole in any form, everything fell apart in his imagination. He pictured those broken parts on a dark or black background and this technique brought him closer to the mysticism of Northern European paintings. There's a reason why F. Zeri mentioned that Giuseppe Arcimboldo could have seen the works of A. Altdorfer, H. Bosch, P. Bruegel, and L. Cranach in Prague. (Zeri, p. 2) In his works G. Arcimboldo did not inherit an obvious and superficial tragedy which was a typical character of these painters. Instead his works were sophisticated like any other work by Italian artists of those days but

not tragic. His artistic language was allegorical, complicated, full of secret meaning and multiple versions of reading, but it was far from eschatology or religious culture like we observe in works of Bosh or Altdorfer. Presumably all manneristic guidelines like escapism, a wish to escape to the world of illusion and to recreate mistakes of nature, did not always characterize G. Arcimboldo paintings. His artworks like «reversible paintings» were intended to be humorous, they are mind games which were professionally and masterly brought to life. The reversible painting by Arcimboldo allows for a dual interpretation of depicted, if turned upside-down it creates another mirrored image. The paintings «The Cook» (1570) or «The Vegetable Gardener» (around 1590) were created using this technique.

The Arcimboldo artistic vision, seen as the epitome of the Mannerist trait was not exclusive. Unique and qualitative was the way of bringing this vision to life, its visualization. Anamorphoses, which made the Milanese artist so popular, became the hallmark of his overall style. It was the best way to escape from reality into the world of illusion. This characteristic of his paintings led to a provoked interest in Arcimboldo works in a later period and revived it in Surrealism. In fact, Surrealism is Mannerism of the 20th century and Arcimboldo is Mannerism with Anamorphoses as a dominant language. It should be noted, that there is a lot of opinions in respect of the Arcimboldo stylistic followers. L. Tananayeva stated that there were no artist who followed the artist in his techniques, he created his own trend but he also put an end to it. But F. Zeri used the word «Arcimboldism» and emphasized that even though the interest to his works declined after his death, he still had been appreciated and followed by artists. Since 1930 owing to surrealists, his creative works have been rediscovered and considered as a forerunner of a new, contemporary art. (Zeri, p. 42) Probably, the truth is somewhere in between these two points of view. Of course, G. Arcimboldo has been followed by contemporaries as well as by the artists of 17–20th centuries. They turned to and adopted his techniques and concepts of seeing the form. But excellence in his works was beyond all, his way of creative vision is impossible to replicate or copy because it was not technique or method per se, but his way of vision combined with the specific ideology of the Manneristic era. So we can claim that to achieve that level of skill in this anamorphosis technique is only possible if the reinforcing element is provided. In this case that element happened to be the Manneristic crisis of the mindset which mostly observed during the turn of the centuries. In other circumstances, this method of artistic thinking would not be so crucial and its appearance would be more of a spontaneous character.

G. Arcimboldo was not just a typical representative of Mannerism, aristocratic and refined in his artistic language. The fact that contemporary researchers see his works as the source for surrealist inspirations, primarily explained by the unusual vision and form interpretation, its transformations and imaginaries, which take place only in the subconscious of the viewer who absorbs these visions. The viewer is an active collaborator with the artist. He interprets, reproduces the form from the pieces of a puzzle, fragments which the creator offers to him. This method of collaboration with the viewer will be indeed a foundation for some styles and trends in the 20th century, thus Arcimboldo with his artistic «prophecies» can be considered as a progenitor of Surrealism, or even partially Cubism because he also decomposes the shape into the geometric components that made up something new. Moreover, Arcimboldo is a perfect example of the fact that the Manneristic style is timeless and transversal. It appeared in different styles and trends long before the contemporary artistic process which interpreted Mannerism more than just a style but a state of a creative personality.

Not much is known about Arcimboldo's schooling period, except that he was a son of an artist in Milan. From his early period it is known only that he started working with his father at the construction of the cathedral in Milan, then – at the cathedral of Como, he made sketches for carpets, and there are also references to his work in Ferrara. But his main creative biography is related to Bohemia, where he was mentioned since 1562, first in Vienna as a portrait copyist at the court of Ferdinand I, and then at the court of Maximilian II, Rudolf II of the Habsburgs. But as a portraitist who

used the conventional methods, G. Arcimboldo is not interesting, and his professional level in such paintings is considerably low. Some paintings created by G. Arcimboldo for the imperial court, were influenced by northern artists ((«Maximilian II and His Family», 16th c.), a portrait of Ferdinand family members where he served in 1562–1563.) There are a number of portraits that illustrate a somewhat different manner of the Master, a kind of intermediate between the naturalistic and the anamorphic, resulting in «combined» images, where a part of the face, for example, created in an anamorphosis style and another part in a realistic way. The «Portrait of Adam» and «Portrait of Eve» (16th c.) were created in this way. But this method was used less frequently and eventually G. Arcimboldo radically abandoned it. He remained a naturalist, a documentarian, but focusing on the language of allegories, on symbols with anamorphosis. He spent 26 years at the court of Habsburg, which is almost all of his creative life. But because he had been educated in Italy he brought the original Italian version of Manneristic aesthetics to the Prague court. The hesitations and creative search, which belong to the aesthetics of Mannerism, accompanied G. Arcimboldo – he could return to the same motif several times, creating different variations of one image. For instance, his famous «The Seasons» being an apotheosis of his symbolic language, he changed five times: the first sequence appeared between 1562 and 1563, in 1569 – his second one, in 1572 - the third one, and a year later – the fourth and the fifth (1560-1570). It is interesting that these images, which can be interpreted endlessly, G. Arcimboldo carried through all his creative life and it is possible to see the transformation of his style through the pictures as replicas were not quite identical. Among the favorite allegorical images of Arcimboldo as an artist-naturalist were «The Four Elements» (1569). In these pictures, researchers see the artist's intention to honor the Emperor (Arcimboldo portrayed him also in his own style, it was a portrait of Rudolf II re-imagined as Vertumnus (around 1590), as he was considered as a Lord of the world which was symbolically depicted as four seasons and four elements. Each of the pictures is composed of dozens of birds, plants according to the element they symbolize and they are replicated surprisingly accurately with a photographic level of details.

In 1587, the Master decided to return home and settled again in Milan, although he continued to work for Rudolf II. Paradoxically, being one of the leading Italian Mannerist, he with his a versatile personality as an inventor (he invented a harpsichord and a perspectiflauten (lute)) and as an artist, put all his talent into the formation of a foreign culture and almost did nothing for his motherland Italy. But this was often the case because the birthplace of Mannerism was no longer able to provide a proper environment for such artists as G. Arcimboldo (so-called «Nostradamus of Art») because the level of artistic life there was already low and there were not enough artists with such potential to recover it. Hence Italy pursued its own path and its numerous mannerists headed towards France, Spain, and Great Britain. That resulted in another ideological conflict of Mannerism Era – the Era of Contradiction. On one hand, artists had left Italy because they would never be able to meet the professional level of their predecessors thus heading to the places where they would have been appreciated. On the other hand, the decline in Italy of that time was provoked by the fact that not the best artists remained in the country. It was certainly a dominant trend but there were exceptions. Many mannerists not only remained in the country for their whole life but some even never left the country. And the number of those who did not stay was enough to turn that era into a «Great Artist Migration» era which brought to such a variety of trends and to an international character in the art.

Thus, thanks to Arcimboldo, the Italian segment of Rudolfine art was very significant. But more than that, Flemish component can also be considered as main and formative, leading to analytical, precise in detail tendencies. Not without a reason, Rudolfine artists are known as naturalists. The vast majority of Flemish people still have been taught as miniaturists, so the tendency to pedantic, detailed approach and creative research methods was typical for most Rudolfine artists. And this was reflected not only in the creative method of drawing but also (importantly) in the method of artistic vision of the

world in general. They were real «art scientists». The Flemish component of Rudolfine art is strengthened by German component, as some of the Masters (J. Heintz) were of German origin, but this only emphasizes the distinctive tendencies built on the common Italian basis. Even those artists who avoided the Italian periods in their creative works (and there were a few) still had an Italian education because they received it from their teachers, they studied artworks of contemporary artists, impregnated with Italian tendencies and antiquities.

In this case, we will address only those trends of Rudolfine art that helped to spread Mannerism in Europe, we will focus only on certain artists who contributed to the process of propagation and transformation of the style, on mutual enrichment of traditions and their synthesis which played a significant part in the style formation of different local versions of European art in the following period. Thus we can identify two trends in the formation of Rudolfine style according to the unique geographical characteristics – Italian-Prague and Dutch-Prague. The following artists can be referred to the Italian-Prague trend: Bartholomeus Spranger, Joris Hoefnagel, Joseph Heintz, even though they were not Italians by origin but came to Prague after their Italian periods. A separate group of artists who determined Rudolfine art consisted of those who came to Vienna, or straight to Prague, without traveling to Italy. They are forming a special trend group not great in numbers but who created a trend with more of a local character. These were primarily – Hans Vredeman de Vries, Adriaen de Vries, Peter Stevens, Jan van Ravesteyn.

### **Bartholomeus Spranger**

Bartholomeus Spranger arrived at the court of Emperor Maximilian in Vienna (d. 1611) and served there for 5 years. Unlike his Italian period, when the religious genre was the leading for the artist in Vienna, as well as in Prague, he was engaged mainly in the creation of mythological scenes, demonstrating his talent in a manneristic manner. Researchers refer him to the group of «Baroque style» (Benoit, 2004, pp. 134-138), in his works, there are elements inherent to the successive new style. According to K. van Mander, the artist was appointed to decorate the tower arcs of a new building near Vienna, known as «the Pheasant Garden», he also painted on religious subjects at that time (Van Mander, 1940). After the death of Maximilian and coronation of Rudolf II, Spranger was employed to decorate a festive celebration of Rudolf's ceremonial entry to Vienna, constructing a triumphal arch for this occasion. The artist, being among other prominent court artists with recognized credibility, was engaged in the organization of important festivities. Hans Mont who had come with the Emperor to Vienna left the city and Spranger became an Emperor's favorite artist who influenced much on the ruler's aesthetic preferences. In 1582 Spranger was summoned by the Emperor to Augsburg, then he moved back to Vienna and only after a while moved back to Prague again.

The Spranger's legacy, which made a very significant impact in the process of style synthesis combining Flemish, French and Italian traditions, was huge. The larger part of his works was created in Vienna and Prague. Even though he created numerous paintings with religious allegories, his artistic manner was mainly evaluated on his mythological themes. Most of the paintings with mythological subjects were created starting from 1580. These are just a few examples of manneristic style in his works influenced by Italian and mostly French traditions: «Vulcan and Maya» (1575–1580), «Venus and Adonis» (c. 1587, 1697 or 1600), «Venus and Volcano» (1610), «Hercules and Omphalos» (1600), «Diana and Actaeon» (1610), «Minerva Triumphs Over Ignorance» (1591), «Salmacis and Hermaphrodite» (c. 1580–82), «Hercules, Dejanira and the dead centaur Ness» (c. 1580–1585). All the features that characterize Mannerism – elegant poses, contradicting composition, unnatural, distorted, elongated proportions were all inherent in these artworks. Particularly noteworthy is the «rhythm» of scenic compositions. Spanger's artworks are extremely musical in rhythm but it is overcomplicated, multi-layered. The diversity of rhythmic mythological compositions of the Flemish

Mannerist is brought to a climax in these works. *Linea serpentinata*, which were so common in Italian Mannerist's creations, can be found in the vast majority of Spranger's paintings. The curves and the figures are so hypertrophied in some places that they look contrived. As a prime example of the artist's considerable attention to the rhythm and his propensity to the principle of «*linea serpentinata*» can be mentioned in his work «*Salmacis and Hermaphrodite*». The serpent-like lines are employed repeatedly in detail and in general. Women's figures in whimsical and tense poses, with elongated proportions and short legs, a tree at the background painted in the intense «rhythm», the restless folds of draperies which cover the nymph's figure, the serpentine shape of a hairstyle – all of these bring an ornamental pattern to the painting. The disproportions of figures are particularly revealing on «*Diana and Actaeon*» painting, (a version of 1600), where the flow of the rhythm is quite smoother, softer but not without capriciousness. All mentioned (as well as many other) mythological compositions were created on the subjects which imply the use of nudity, by the attitude to which one can always evaluate the progressiveness of a particular master and the extent of Italian influence in his works. In this case, the influence of Italian Mannerism with its undisguised eroticism is combined with the charm of the French sensuality of Fontainebleau style. It is very noticeable, easily observed in the works of «*Volcan and Maya*», «*Venus and Adonis*», «*Venus and Volcano*». In these paintings, the influence of the French version of Mannerism even prevails, the master's acquaintance with the works of François Clouet and «*Fontainebleau's anonymous artists*» is evident, which is noticeable not only by the similarity of interpretation of similar plots, compositional decisions but also primarily by the implementation of the motif of jewels, which was widely used (especially - pearls) in the French court art of the 16th century («*Venus and Adonis*» (1600 version), references to the «*motifs of a ring*», which were very popular among Masters of Fontainebleau school and with whom Spranger had worked for some time («*Hercules and Omphalus*», «*Venus and Volcano*», «*Salmacis and Hermaphrodite*»). A number of compositions also indicate the author's acquaintance and appreciation of Leonardo's art: in several paints («*Venus and Adonis*», (version 1597), «*Volcano and Maya*») he reused poses of figures from the Da Vinci «*Leda and the Swan*» painting (an early 16th century). Last years of his Life, Spranger spent time in Prague, embodying the principles of RudolFINE culture. He worked solely for the Emperor and had an opportunity to influence and form Rudolf's artistic taste and to dictate the artistic trends in the court.

### **Joris Hoefnagel**

The works of Amsterdammer artist Joris Hoefnagel (d. 1600) are the best illustration of the exploratory and analytical nature of the Flemish school art in RudolFINE culture. The artist, being of a versatile character which was very relevant to the spirit of that age, became known not only as a self-taught painter but also as a good poet. He traveled throughout Europe in search of knowledge, visited a lot of countries (Tananayeva, 1996, p. 248) among them Italy, Spain, Germany. After another trip to Venice in 1578, and after his stay in Augsburg and Munich, he entered the service of the Bavarian duke William V, and later – Archduke Ferdinand II of the Tyrol. At the same time, Cardinal Farnese proposed to him to remain in his service in Italy, which we can consider as an evidence of the priest's interest in the work of the miniaturist, although J. Hoefnagel did not identify himself as an artist at all. He dedicated eight years of his life for illumination of «*Missale Romanum*». He entered the service of Rudolf II mainly because of his work as an illustrator creating miniatures for four books on animals, reptiles, birds, and fish. O. Benoit stated that the last years of his life he spent working for the Emperor court (Benoit, 2004). But he had to move to Vienna in order to escape the busy life at the court (Benoit, 2004). K. van Mander mentioned small miniature portraits created by Fleming (van Mander, 1940) but mostly Hoefnagel painted and engraved plants and animals, landscapes with great details, similar to the work of a documentalist («*View of Candia and Corfu*», etching, circa 1572; Praha Hoefnagel, 1595). These works provided grounds to analyze RudolFINE's character as analytical. The main virtue of his



work was not the artistic quality, but the accuracy of the naturalist, these works were of informative, instructive value. Thus, J. Hoefnagel became the founder of one of the most controversial tendencies in the formation of a local variant of Mannerism. Despite that by all formal principals, the artist can be referred as Mannerist, he still lacks the artistic qualities inherent for this style, even though he might have learned them during his journeys. J. Hoefnagel was neither prone to the neurotic exalted drama nor to the exquisite eroticism and picturesque style, which were the main characteristics of each local Mannerists versions. He was not obsessed with self-frustration or with the surrounding world, penchant for self-flagellation and reflection. He has a versatile personality but he was not a person of extremes. It can be elucidated by the fact that he was not an artist primarily, he acquired creative abilities and subsequently developed them but that also meant he lacked the emotional foundation for artistic creativity as an artist. Also, J. Hoefnagel worked in such genres and techniques, that implicate tranquility and an absence of emotional centerpiece. Thus, though the artistic creative activity even of an episodic character, the phenomenon of J. Hoefnagel led not only to the extraction of a separate trend in Rudolfine style but also in Mannerism in general, which we can formulate as «Analytical Rudolfine Mannerism». This style is perceptible in the works of Roelant Savery (1576-1639).

### **Roelant Savery**

A representative of the creative dynasty, Savery, laid the foundation for the so-called Dutch National School (Benoit, 2004, p.157). Since he spent the later years in the north in Utrecht, he made a significant influence on the Dutch Landscape Masters. Above all, Savery was a good animal-painter and landscape-painter, but his landscapes were deprived of the emotional coloration. However, some of them made up a certain exclusion. Having a specific rather gloomy, dark coloring, which was in sharp contrast with the tranquil tone of the scenery, it resulted in somewhat restless and heavy atmosphere of the pictures: «Landscape with Wild Animals» (early 17th c.), «Horses and Oxen Attacked by Wolves» (early 17th c.). All these works can be considered as inter-genre-al because the landscapes themselves were very artificial even though the artist drew a lot in life, depicted staffage, included numerous animals and birds. They are all bundled with a specific storyline, which makes it possible to transform a landscape image into a methodological or biblical scene. «The Garden of Eden» (beginning of 17th c.), «The Paradise» (1618). The landscapes are distinguished by a picturesque beauty, which reinforces their Manneristic characteristics. The animals and birds are, even though depicted in detail, do not look realistic. It indicates that the artist had not seen the majority of animals in real life or in nature. Most Savery's paintings, according to O. Benoit, densely filled with animals (Benoit, 2004, p.157) and have one interesting detail – in the paintings, most of the time the animals and birds are pictured in pairs, bringing us to a Noah's Ark concept of animal choice: two dogs, two pelicans, two lions, two leopards in the painting «Paradise»; two pelicans, two ostriches, swan pairs – in «The Landscape With Birds» (1622), two lions, two parrots, duck pairs, two pelicans, a swan pair – in another version of this painting: two leopards and two lions – in «Landscape with Wild Animals» etc. As an architectural staffage, most of the paintings have almost identical antique buildings overgrown with greenery that reminds of a tribute of Rudolfine artists to Antique culture: «The Landscape With Birds» (1622), «Landscape with Wild Animals» (1629 version). Besides color and attraction to contre-jour artistic technique, which added a dramatic tone by contrast, Savery resorted to another method that brought more drama to his painting – in a number of his paintings Savery pictured the scenes of animal fighting. Blood, expressive movements, the pain of wounded or dying animals pictured in corresponding colors, they all form a contrast to a pastel mood, serenity, and luminosity in «The Paradise» or «The Landscape with Birds» (1622), already mentioned «Horses and Oxen Attacked by Wolves», «Landscape with Wild Animals». In terms of mood and intensity, these works are closer to the aesthetic of Mannerism.

Roelant Saver spent several years in the service of Rudolf II, then he was resigned to Tyrol, and after his return, he settled in Utrecht, although his origins came from Kortrijk. In 1639, the artist died,

having ended his days being mentally ill – such an artist's fate is not rare in the Mannerist era, because this period was too difficult for creative personalities and their vulnerable minds.

### **Adriaen de Vries**

Among the Dutch Rudolphe sculptors, Adriaen de Vries (1556-1626) occupies a prominent place. Being a student of Giambologna he absorbed the most typical traits of Italian Mannerism and brought them to German lands starting working at the court of Rudolf II since 1593. Originally from The Hague, he was trained in Italy, but little was known about him until 1581 when the master started his work in Giambologna studio. His style absorbed harmonically influences of Benvenuto Cellini (that would be revealed in a couple of Rudolph's busts – 1601, 1607, 1609) and of Giambologna, which can be proved by Mythological subjects in bronze: graceful, elegant composition «Mercury and Psyche» (1593), Psyche with Three Cupids (or «Psyche with Pandora's Box» (1593), figures of the Hercules fountain in Augsburg (1596–1602), «Hercules, Deianira, and Nessus» (1603–1608). The bronze relief, created in 1609 dedicated to Rudolf's victory over the Turks (1609), is very interesting. In this composition, all the style characteristics can be seen. In the background, allegorical figures are placed around the column with an eagle, which completely replicates the scene from H. von Aachen's composition «The Liberation of Hungary» (early 17th c.). This compositional model from the work of the German Master was just copied by Adrian de Vries as a mirrored reflection. Adriaen de Vries became a follower of Giambologna's style, sometimes resorting to identical copying but also transforming it and enriching it with his own characteristics which came from his Dutch origins and earlier experience gained before his Italian period.

### **German element in Rudolfine culture**

The German influence on Rudolfine culture was also very important. Rudolf II didn't invite artists from outside of his Empire and also carefully chose the masters from his own reign: Hans Hoffmann, Hans von Aachen, Jeremias Günther, Joseph Heintz, Hans Rottenhammer, Johann Liss, Czech artists S. Gutzky, D. Alexius, and others worked there. Almost all of them were trained with Italian cultural values, which enriched their local element of Rudolfine style with Italian tendencies. But in addition to that, the German masters were also influenced by the Dutch artists with whom they often collaborated and the creativity of which they could observe in the centers of Dutch emigration.

### **Hans von Aachen**

To the circle of leading Rudolfine artists, who influenced the development of the court culture, belongs Hans von Aachen (d. 1615). His style was quintessential in all possible traits - Italian, Flemish, and French which were dominant in the fine art of that time. Hans von Aachen became exquisite, similar to Raphael in his Mythological scenes, uninhibited in the Italian manner, in Flemish traditions tending to color, in German was attracted to naturalism, which was a specific feature of all Rudolfine artists. His style was influenced by Parmigianino, Francesco Primaticcio and Pontormo; from them he inherited elongated, refined figures with outer beauty, Raphael's grace and fragility of women characters. He traveled a lot but his schooling was utterly Italian. At the age of 22, the master came to Venice, then to Rome, later visited Florence and returned to Venice, and later to Cologne. From his hometown, he moved to Venice again, and then to Munich. From there the artist moved to Rudolf II, who invited him to service in the court for four years. But after creating only one painting he moved back to Bavaria (Tananayeva, 1996, p. 323). After working for some time in Munich and Augsburg, the artist accepted another invitation from the Emperor in the 1601 year and moved to Prague, where he lived up to his death, fulfilling a lot of commissions and provided training. Rudolf II facilitated further studies of Hans von Aachen, the artist traveled to the homeland of the Renaissance in search of artworks for imperial collection. He also perfected his skills in portraits, making paintings of royal daughters to facilitate the choice of a fiancée for the future Emperor's marriage (Matveeva, 2009, p.

114). Aachen was accepted to the circle of the Dutch masters, which were quite a few in Italy and perfected his techniques with their help. From Venetians, he adopted bright colors, a palette with a specific pearl coating that enriched his works with charm and lightness. He did not use this palette in all of his works, he employed it mainly in mythological scenes.

Hans von Aachen went down to the history of Rudolfiner culture as representative of all of its main characteristics. He was some sort of a universal person for Rudolf, similarly as Peter Paul Rubens for Isabella, Titian for Charles V, Diego Velázquez for Philip IV. He fulfilled Emperor's commissions, collected art pieces for the court, had contributed to the search of a fiancée for Rudolf II, worked as a portraitist (created a range of portraits of the Turkish war heroes, portraits of potential brides of Rudolf II, Rudolf's II portraits), portrait maker of Emperor Matthias (1612), whom he served after the death of Emperor). He was a master of allegory («The Triumph of Justice», 1598), historical subjects (in 1598 Rudolf commissioned him to paint scenes of The Turkish wars, the artist created a 7 part series, but they were not historically authentic they were allegories: «The Liberation of Hungary», «Allegory of the Turkish war» (early 17th c., etc.), mythological scenes, which were very popular. After moving to Prague, religious subjects were less of importance («Judith», 1600). Mythological scenes, allegories of Hans von Aachen express not only his individual manner but also emphasized certain characteristics of Rudolfiner art in general which he influenced so much himself: «Pallas Athena, Venus and Juno» (1593), «The Amazement of the Gods» (1590), «Jupiter and Antiope» (1598), «Abduction of Proserpine» (1590), «Pan and Selena» (1605), «Bacchus, Ceres and Amor» (1610). The tendency of Hans von Aachen to allegoric language combined with his excellence in depiction of exquisite erotic characters («Bacchus, Ceres and Amor», «Pan and Selena») made him more of Italian style than any other German artist at the court of Rudolf II. His style did not bear resemblance almost in anything with medieval traditions, which were widely common in the manner of his colleagues of the previous generation. Thus Hans von Aachen made not only a significant influence on the spread of Italian compounds and the Flemish trend in Mannerism on the territories of Germany but also he eliminated that «border» between local versions of the style, creating a single consistent style with the name Rudolfiner.

### **Joseph Heintz the Elder**

Joseph Heintz the Elder (1564–1609) was one of the most influential German Rudolfiner masters, whose individual style was inspired by Italian traditions. The tendencies of local German traditions were hardly noticeable in his artworks. He was one of the most virtuoso artists whose style was exquisitely courtly with a touch of French elegance. Although the artist did not visit the French court, he might have been familiar with the works of the Fontainebleau style. At that time in French art, the traits were set by the Fontainebleau School with the Flemish dominative component. The artworks of Joseph Heintz are mannerly, musical, elegant, exquisitely sensual, mostly mythological, and based on a long-term study of Italian art. In 1584 the artist came to Rome and spent three years there, during which he, from being a twenty-year-old young artist, turned into a diligent student. He completed his first apprenticeship in Italy and moved to Florence and Venice. But the impressions that he received in Rome city, later deepened and became entrenched during his second voyage to Italy – in 1591. This time Joseph Heintz was sent there by Rudolf II, at whose court he served at that time. The artist returned to Prague from Rome (in 1595) and during his later period, he worked between Prague and Augsburg. He left his homeland at the age of twenty years, then spent almost all his life abroad, dividing his creative career into alternating periods in Prague and Italy. Leaving Prague, Joseph Heintz traveled to Italy, from there he returned to Augsburg or Prague there again he left to visit schools in Rome, Florence or Venice. Thus his creative manner was constantly being refined because he had an opportunity to learn from Italian culture and improve his style. The artistic style of Joseph Heintz (not only as a painter but also as an architect, drawing artist and decorator) is characterized by the inner coldness of the images which was typical for Mannerism but at the same time, the outer beauty is very

expressive and eloquent: the characters are very picturesque where real beauty is substituted by superficial. Joseph Heintz borrowed and mastered the Raphael's ideal of feminine beauty, lyrical and constrained in its outlines, some of his characters of nymphs or goddesses as if they were copied from «The Triumph of Galatea» or «The Fall of Phaeton» (1596) or from «The Abduction of Proserpina» (1598-1605). But in his other works, the influence of Jacopo da Pontormo, Tintoretto, is particularly noticeable in the paintings «Diana and Acteon» (16th c.), «Adonis Parting from Venus» (c.1590). Heintz's manner was also shaped by Michelangelo, even though the «sculptural component» had the least impact on his work, but some works demonstrate the master's acquaintance with the works of the Florentine master. This is perceptible in the complicated angles of the figures, sculptural modeling of volume, working on the details of muscles in man's figures («The Fall of Phaeton»). But it is evident that Raphael's ideals prevailed Michelangelo vision. His art was not distinguished by Michelangelo's inner strength or power of the spirit. In other words, Heintz resolved the inner contention between Raphael's and Michelangelo's styles of that time by giving preference to the artistic methods of Raphael. And this once again illustrates the contradictory nature of Mannerist art, along with the victorious tendency of Raphaelism there were masters who gave privileges to another tradition.

### Conclusion

In the 16th century in Europe, the struggle of different trends and movements within each local style led to the formation of a very colorful, variegated picture of artistic life, where the character is determined primarily by the presence of borrowed components and their role in relation to the local ones. Accordingly, the newly created style is spread across the European territory due to the active artistic migration. The Prague Art Center, the phenomenon of «Rudolfine art», which includes Italian, German, French, Flemish trends, played an important part in its formation. Even after European Mannerism of the 16-17th centuries was succeeded as a style by the following stylistic phenomena, its techniques, aesthetic doctrine, methods of artistic vision continued to be popular.

### References

- Benesh, O. (1973). *Iskusstvo Severnogo Vozrozhdeniya [Art of the Northern Renaissance]*. Moscow: Iskusstvo.
- Benoit, A. (2004). *Istoriya zhivopisi vseh vremen i narodov: v 5 t. [History of painting of all times and peoples]: in 5 v., v. 2*. Saint-Petersburg: Izdatel'skiy dom «Neva».
- Byalostotskiy, Ya. (1987). Problema man'yerizma i niderlandskaya peyzazhnaya Zhivopis' [The Problem of Mannerism and the Dutch Landscape painting]. *Sovetskoye iskusstvoznaniye*, 22, 68-182.
- Châstel, A. (1968). *La crease de la Renaissance. 1520-1600*. Genève: Skira.
- Hauser, A. (1986). *Mannerism: The Crisis of the Renaissance and the Origin of Modern Art*. London: Belknap Press.
- L'art maniériste, formes et symbols. 1520-1620: Catalogue d'exposition* (1978).
- Le triomphe du Maniérisme Européen de Michel-Ange au Greco (1955). In: *Catalogue du Seconde Exposition sous les auspices du conseil de l'Europe, Rijksmuseum*. Amsterdam, 54-57.
- Losev, A. (1998). *Estetika Vozrozhdeniya [Aesthetics of the Renaissance]*. Moscow: Mysl'.
- Mander, K. van (1940). *Kniga o khudozhnikakh [Book of Artists]*. Moscow: Iskusstvo.

- Matveeva, Ye. (2008). *Flamandskaya zhivopis' XVII veka [Flemish painting of the 17th century]*. Moscow: Belyy Gorod.
- Matveeva, Ye. (2009). *Germanskaya zhivopis' XV-XVI vekov [German painting of the XV-XVI centuries]*. Moscow: Belyy Gorod.
- Panofsky, E. (2006). *Renessans i «renessansy» v iskusstve Zapada [Renaissance and “Renaissances” in the Art of the West]*. Saint-Petersburg: Azbuka-klassika.
- Revunenkov, N. (1988). *Renessansnoye svobodomyслиye i ideologiya Reformatsii [Renaissance freethinking and ideology of the Reformation]*. Moscow: Mysl'.
- Romanenkova, Yu. (2006). Krugovorot man'yerizma v Yevrope: osnovnyye napravleniya diffuzii stilya [Mannerism cycle in Europe: the main directions of style diffusion]. *Cogito. Al'manakh istorii idey*, 1, 249-262.
- Romanenkova, Yu. (2009). Styl'outvoryuyuchi chynnyky mystetstva Druhoyi shkoly Fontenblo (part 1) [Style-forming Factors of the Art of the Second School of Fontainebleau]. *Visnyk Derzhavnoyi akademiyi kerivnykh kadriv kul'tury i mystetstv*, 2, 53-58.
- Romanenkova, Yu. (2009). Styl'outvoryuyuchi chynnyky mystetstva Druhoyi shkoly Fontenblo (part 2) [Style-forming Factors of the Art of the Second School of Fontainebleau]. *Visnyk Derzhavnoyi akademiyi kerivnykh kadriv kul'tury i mystetstv*, 3, 76-81.
- Tananayeva, L. (1987). Nekotoryye kontseptsii man'yerizma i izucheniye iskusstva Vostochnoy Yevropy kontsa XVI i XVII veka [Some concepts of Mannerism and the study of art Eastern Europe at the end of the 16 and 17 centuries]. *Sovetskoye iskusstvoznaniye*, 22, 123-167.
- Tananayeva, L. (1996). *Rudol'fintsy [Rudolfintsy]*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Tervarent, G. (1944). Flemish influence in Italian Art. *Burlington Magazine*, LXXXV, 290.
- Vasil'yeva, N. (2008). *Niderlandskaya zhivopis' XVI veka [Dutch painting of the 16 century]*. Moscow: Belyy Gorod.
- Vasilenko, N. (2009). *Severnoye Vozrozhdeniye (Khudozhestvennyye napravleniya i stili) [Northern Renaissance (Artistic directions and styles)]* Moscow: OLMA Media Grupp.
- Vel'flin, G. (2004). *Renessans i Barokko [Renaissance and Baroque]*. Saint-Petersburg: Azbuka-klassika.
- Vipper, B. (1956). *Bor'ba techeniy v ital'yanskom iskusstve XVI veka [Struggle of currents in the Italian art of the 16th century]*. Moscow: Izd-vo AN SSSR.
- Voronina, T., Mal'tseva, N., & Starodubova, V. (1994). *Iskusstvo Vozrozhdeniya v Niderlandakh, Frantsii, Anglii [The Art of the Renaissance in the Netherlands, France, England]*. Moscow: Iskusstvo.
- Zeri, F. (2001). *Archimboldo. Vesna [The Spring]*. Moscow: Belyy Gorod.