

## Introduction

Archduke Ferdinand II of Austria, also called Ferdinand II of Tyrol, was born into the House of Habsburg in 1529 (d.1595) and became famous during his lifetime not only as a politician and ruler, but even more so as a fervent collector of armour, creator of a world-famous *Kunst- und Wunderkammer*, an organiser of splendid festivities with luxurious costumes, and finally as the owner of a huge library. He was an educated man interested in the natural sciences, and also a dilettante architect who designed the unique Star Summer Palace in Prague, which still stands today. Paradoxically however, in the present time he is mainly remembered for his secret morganatic marriage to a beautiful burgher, Philippine Welser.

Ferdinand II was the second son of Emperor Ferdinand I of the House of Habsburg (1503–1564). His position as the second-born son was highly significant in determining Ferdinand's fate and ambitions. His unclear dynastic and economic position within the Habsburg family, as well as rivalry with his older brother Emperor Maximilian II (1527–1576), and later with Emperor Rudolf II (1552–1612), influenced his politics and subsequently also his cultural strategy. At the beginning Ferdinand II's adult life, both his political and cultural interests were concentrated within the Bohemian lands, especially Prague, where he served for 20 years in the office of Governor of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown. Later this focus shifted to the Tyrol (in particular Innsbruck and Ambras) where Ferdinand reigned from 1564 to his death. With his personal contacts and artistic commissions, however, he contributed significantly to the interconnections between the Lands of the Bohemian Crown, Tyrol, and the Austrian countries, as well as with the other economic and cultural centres of Western and Southern Europe.

At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Archduke Ferdinand II was a relatively famous personage. At the Austrian castle of Ambras in Innsbruck, Tyrol, a permanent exhibition devoted to his person and legacy was opened in 1880 by Wendelin Boeheim and Albert Ilg, curators of the museum there. These researchers also devoted themselves to studying the history of the castle itself. In the 1880s, a two-volume monograph on Ferdinand II was also written by Tyrolean historian Josef Hirn, and this remains the only detailed publication to this day.<sup>1</sup>

The interest shown in Archduke Ferdinand II by the Austrians was echoed during the last third of the 19<sup>th</sup> century in Bohemia, where an effort arose to save the unique Star Summer Palace in Prague, a building connected precisely with the archduke's name.<sup>2</sup> The subsequent decrease in academic interest for historical research into Arch-

---

1 Josef Hirn, *Erzherzog Ferdinand II. von Tirol. Geschichte seiner Regierung und seiner Länder*, 2 vols. (Innsbruck, 1885–1888); Albert Ilg and Wendelin Boeheim, *Das k.k. Schloss Ambras in Tirol. Beschreibung des Gebäudes und der Sammlungen* (Vienna, 1882).

2 Important sources on this summer residence have been published by David von Schönherr, 'Ezherzog Ferdinand von Tirol als Architect', *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 1 (1876), pp. 28–44.

duke Ferdinand II's life and work might be explained by the fact that as the second-born son of Ferdinand I, he did not become king or emperor. In terms of European political history, he remained a man in the background. The importance of his twenty years' residence in Prague was eclipsed by his nephew Rudolf II (1552–1612), whose activity in the Bohemian metropolis produced a second golden age: the first is recognised as the era of the city's blossoming under Charles IV (1316–1378).<sup>3</sup> Similarly, Tyrol, which stabilised and experienced an economic boom thanks to the arrival of Archduke Ferdinand II, still lived rather with the legacy of Ferdinand's great-grandfather, Emperor Maximilian I (1459–1519), founder of the modern Habsburg monarchy "on which the Sun did not set". Ferdinand could hardly compete with the legendary Maximilian I, who devoted the majority of his attention to Innsbruck specifically, as his seat.<sup>4</sup> By contrast, the archduke built upon Maximilian's legacy, protecting and developing it.<sup>5</sup>

The existing publications (exhibition catalogues, journal studies and so on) have been exclusively devoted to certain aspects of Archduke Ferdinand II's legacy, most particularly his activities as a collector of art and curiosities.<sup>6</sup> Such scholarship has naturally dealt with him mostly in connection with the ongoing research at Ambras castle, which was transferred to the ownership of the Austrian Republic at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and in 1950 came under the administration of the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna. Some valuable, but nonetheless very specialised publications were issued upon the opening of the new installations at Ambras during the 1970s, under the direction of Elizabeth Scheicher.<sup>7</sup> In 1974, the *Kunst- und Wunderkammer* was opened as a permanent public exhibition, followed by the Habsburg portrait gallery, and finally the armoury or *Rüstkammer*. The above-mentioned sections of the Ambras collections have received exhaustive scholarly attention in a large body of published works.<sup>8</sup> Archduke Ferdinand II has also been given great attention

3 Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *The School of Prague: Painting at the Court of Rudolf II* (Chicago, 1988).

4 Larry Silver, *Marketing Maximilian: The Visual Ideology of A Holy Roman Emperor* (Princeton, 2008), p. ix; Hermann Wiesflecker, *Maximilian I. Die Fundamente des habsburgischen Weltreiches* (Vienna, 1992).

5 *Werke für die Ewigkeit. Kaiser Maximilian I. und Erzherzog Ferdinand II.*, ed. by Wilfried Seipel, exh. cat. (Innsbruck, 2002).

6 First emphasized by Julius von Schlosser, *Die Kunst- und Wunderkammern der Spätrenaissance. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Sammelwesens* (Leipzig, 1908).

7 Elizabeth Scheicher, Ortwin Gamber, Kurt Wegerer and Alfred Auer, *Die Kunstkammer*, Führer durch das Kunsthistorisches Museum, 24 (Innsbruck, 1977); Elizabeth Scheicher, Ortwin Gamber and Alfred Auer, *Die Kunstkammer*, Führer durch das Kunsthistorisches Museum, 30 (Vienna, 1981); Elizabeth Scheicher, Ortwin Gamber and Alfred Auer, *Die Rüstkammern auf Schloß Ambras* (Vienna, 1981).

8 For example, Laurin Luchner, *Denkmal eines Renaissancefürsten: Versuch einer Rekonstruktion des Ambraser Museums von 1583* (Vienna, 1958); Günther Heinz and Karl Schütz, *Porträtgalerie zur Geschichte Österreichs von 1400 bis 1800* (Vienna, 1976).

in the wider context of Tyrolean history, and his construction works have been analysed as a part of the greater inventory of Innsbruck's monuments.<sup>9</sup>

A relatively stereotypical image of Archduke Ferdinand II took root in Czech historiography at the beginning of the 20th century. His appointment to the post of Bohemian vicegerent was one of a number of measures used by Ferdinand I, as King of Bohemia, to punish the estates that had denied the crown their obedience in 1547 and failed to support the crown in the battles against the Schmalkaldic League. Ferdinand II's task was to execute the Habsburg anti-Reformation religious policies throughout the Lands of the Bohemian Crown in the sovereign's absence.<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless, his role was also understood to be administrative and economic,<sup>11</sup> and his successes in defending crown lands against the Turks were also highlighted in scholarship at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>12</sup> In the decades after World War II, and the installation of the Communist regime in the new Czechoslovakia, historical research on the rulers from the House of Habsburg was generally not supported. For this reason, one of the first targeted studies was a text by Jaroslav Pánek, who in the 1980s pointed out the Habsburg ruler's political and cultural ambitions during his residence in the Bohemian lands; his well-founded study on Archduke Ferdinand II emerged in 1993.<sup>13</sup>

It was only with the international exhibition "Rudolf II and Prague" (1997), preparations for which began in Prague right after the so-called Velvet Revolution in 1989, that the significance of Archduke Ferdinand II as a person was emphasised in terms of his role in preparing the way for the ambitious cultural programme of Rudolf II in Prague.<sup>14</sup> The catalogue and conference proceedings from this exhibition also played an important part in disseminating this new perspective. The analysis presented by Petr Vorel followed fundamental sources for the history of Archduke Ferdinand II's

- 
- 9 E.g. Josef Riedmann, *Geschichte Tirols* (Vienna, 1982); Rudolf Palme, 'Frühe Neuzeit. 1490–1665', in *Geschichte des Landes Tirol*, II, *Die Zeit von 1490 bis 1848*, ed. by Josef Fontana et al. (Bozen, Innsbruck and Vienna, 1986); Elisabeth Scheicher, 'Schloß Ambras', in *Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Innsbruck: Die Hofbauten*, ed. by Johanna Felmayer, Österreichische Kunsttopographie, 47 (Vienna, 1986), pp. 509–623; Ricarda and Karl Oettinger, 'Hofburg', in *ibidem*, pp. 55–208; Johanna Felmayer, 'Silberne Kapelle', in *ibidem*, pp. 427–448; Johanna Felmayer, 'Ruhelust', in *ibidem*, pp. 626–639.
- 10 Ferdinand Hrejsa, *Česká konfese, její vznik, podstata a dějiny* (Prague, 1912); Rudolf Říčan, *Dějiny Jednoty bratrské* (Prague, 1957); Jan Smolík, 'Jan Augusta na Krivoklátě', *Středočeský sborník historický* 8 (1973), pp. 167–180.
- 11 Václav Pešák, *Dějiny Královské české komory od roku 1527. Část I.: Začátky organizace české komory za Ferdinanda I.* (Prague, 1930); Miloslav Wolf, 'Boj o solný monopol v Čechách v XVI. a na počátku XVII. století', *Český časopis historický* 39 (1933), pp. 297–326, 505–536.
- 12 František Kameníček, 'Výprava arciknížete Ferdinanda na pomoc obleženému od Turků Sigtetu roku 1556', *Sborník historický* 4 (1886), pp. 321–331; *Idem*, 'Účastenství Moravanů při válkách tureckých od r. 1526 do r. 1568', *Sborník historický* 3 (1885), pp. 15–29, 65–77, 157–175, 193–206, 271–284.
- 13 Jaroslav Pánek, *Stavovská opozice a její zápas s Habsburky 1547–1577 (K politické krizi feudální třídy v předbělohorském českém státě)* (Prague, 1982); *Idem*, 'Der Adel im Turnierbuch Erzherzog Ferdinands II. von Tirol. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Hoflebens und der Hofkultur in der Zeit seiner Statthalterschaft in Böhmen', *Folia Historica Bohemica* 16 (1993), pp. 77–96.
- 14 *Rudolf II and Prague: the Court and the City*, ed. by Eliška Fučíková et al. (London, 1997); *Rudolf II, Prague and the Word. Papers from the International Conference, 2–7 September 1997*, ed. by Lubomír Konečný, Beket Bukovinská and Ivan Muchka (Prague, 1998).

court in Prague.<sup>15</sup> The studies by Václav Bůžek, which later formed the basis for a monograph, followed the relations between the archduke, his court, and the Bohemian aristocracy, and summarised the most important episodes of his rule in the Bohemian lands and Tyrol. These texts were outstanding in terms of their broad social and cultural-historical scope.<sup>16</sup>

The exhibition “Rudolf II and Prague” instigated the establishment of the Research Centre for Arts and Culture in the Age of Rudolf II at the Institute of Art History of the Czech Academy of Sciences. To this day the Research Centre provides a platform for connecting many Czech and foreign experts in the cultural history of the 16<sup>th</sup> and first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The continuity of our “Ferdinandian” research within the long-term activities of the Centre is proven by the number of publications prepared here: a two-volume monograph created under the guidance of Ivo Purš on the library of Archduke Ferdinand II (2015),<sup>17</sup> and the monograph on the Star Summer Palace written by Ivan P. Muchka, Ivo Purš, Sylva Dobalová and Jaroslava Hausenblasová (English version 2018).<sup>18</sup> Of course, it is therefore perfectly logical that the book which you now hold in your hands was also created at the Research Centre for Arts and Culture in the Age of Rudolf II.

The publication presented here is one of the results of the grant project of the Czech Science Foundation: “Archduke Ferdinand II of Tyrol (1529–1595) and his cultural patronage between Prague and Innsbruck”, no. 17-2538S (2017–19). The Institute of Art History of the CAS received this grant, allowing the large group of researchers to collaborate under the guidance of Sylva Dobalová. The core of the team further comprised Jaroslava Hausenblasová and Petr Uličný. Other employees of the Institute of Art History also participated, namely Ivan Muchka, Beket Bukovinská and Ivo Purš. This team was expanded by our young colleague Markéta Ježková and several external specialists (Eliška Fučíková, Blanka Kubíková, Jan Baťa, Annemarie Jordan Gschwend, Stanislav Hrbatý and Marta Vaculínová).

The year 2017 was significant for our research, because it marked the 450<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Archduke Ferdinand II’s effective relocation of his court from Prague to Innsbruck. Veronika Sandbichler, director of Ambras Castle Innsbruck, was the initiator and chief organiser of the exhibition “Ferdinand II. – 450 Jahre Tiroler Landesfürst”, which opened first at Ambras in 2017, and then in winter 2017/2018 was also shown in Prague.<sup>19</sup> This exhibition provided the impetus for intensive international collabora-

15 Petr Vorel, Místodržitelství dvůr arciknížete Ferdinanda Habsburského v Praze roku 1551 ve světle účetní dokumentace, *Folia Historica Bohemica* 21 (2006), pp. 7–66.

16 Václav Bůžek, *Ferdinand von Tirol zwischen Prag und Innsbruck. Der Adel aus den böhmischen Ländern auf dem Weg zu den Höfen der ersten Habsburger* (Vienna, Cologne and Weimar, 2009).

17 *Knihovna arcivévody Ferdinanda II. Tyrolského*, 2 vols., ed. by Ivo Purš and Hedvika Kuchařová (Prague, 2015). The book contains more than 100 pages of German summaries and a list of books in Ferdinand II’s library, along with their identification in Austrian libraries.

18 Ivan Muchka, Ivo Purš, Sylva Dobalová and Jaroslava Hausenblasová, *The Star: Archduke Ferdinand II of Austria and His Summer Palace in Prague* (Prague 2018) (in Czech, 2014).

19 *Ferdinand II. 450 Jahre Tiroler Landesfürst. Jubiläumsausstellung*, ed. by Sabine Haag and Veronika Sandbichler, exh. cat. (Innsbruck and Vienna, 2017) (also in an English version, which is quoted here

tion culminating in the international conference “Archduke Ferdinand between Prague and Innsbruck” (Prague, 2018), which was financially supported by the above-mentioned grant from the CSF and also aided in terms of both funding and organisation by the National Gallery in Prague.<sup>20</sup> The conference participants enjoyed an unforgettable experience, discussing the exhibits and exchanging their academic knowledge and opinions in a unique setting of Wallenstein Riding Hall.

Foreign scholars were also called upon to contribute to this book. First and foremost, our Austrian colleagues from Ambras in Innsbruck collaborated with us on this project – director Veronika Sandbichler, and the curators of the exhibitions there dedicated to Archduke Ferdinand II, Thomas Kuster and Katharine Seidl. This team, all of whom were of such great assistance during our research, even managed to bring together younger researchers still working on their doctoral dissertations, and here we present the work of two such doctorands, Elisabeth Reitter and Eva Lenhart Putzgruber. This group was finally joined by our long-term co-workers Joseph Patrouch and Václav Bůžek. Without their collaboration, this volume could not have hoped to thoroughly cover all the important aspects, with such a geographically diverse material, or to provide this field of research with so many new findings.

The catalogues produced for the above-mentioned exhibitions could be listed among those publications that provide a certain amount of ‘competition’ for the present volume. However, the format of an exhibition catalogue limits articles in terms of length and the number of references to the sources and literature, and often provides only very brief catalogue entries. For this reason, we consider the present volume to be both unique and academically valuable. Otherwise, there is one academic monograph in the form of a dissertation by Madelon Simons that deals directly with this topic. Simons, a Dutch scholar, had already cooperated with the Research Centre for Arts and Culture in the Age of Rudolf II during the above-mentioned Rudolfine exhibitions. However, her work, entitled *‘Een Theatrum van Representatie?’ Aartshertog Ferdinand van Oostenrijk, stadhouder in Praag tussen 1547–1567* (University of Amsterdam, 2009) was exclusively devoted to the Prague residence of Archduke Ferdinand II, and this approach is different to that of our publication.

The present volume could be better categorised alongside studies such as Dagmar Eichberger’s *Leben mit Kunst. Wirken durch Kunst. Sammelwesen und Hofkunst*

---

in this volume: *Ferdinand II. 450 Years Sovereign Ruler of Tyrol. Jubilee Exhibition*, ed. by Sabine Haag and Veronika Sandbichler, exh. cat. [Innsbruck 2017]); *Arcivévoda Ferdinand II. Habsburský. Renesanční vladař a mecenáš mezi Prahou a Innsbruckem / Ferdinand II. Erzherzog von Österreich aus dem Hause Habsburg. Renaissance-Herrscher und Mäzen zwischen Prag und Innsbruck*, ed. by Blanka Kubíková, Jaroslava Hausenblasová and Sylva Dobalová (Prague, 2017). The German version of a catalogue from Prague does not have pictures and it is intended as a supplement to the Czech version.

20 Two papers were published as: Michaela Pejšochová, ‘*Am Indianisch tuech, darauf Indianische heuser gemalt*. Revisiting the Chinese Paintings in the Kunstkammer of Archduke Ferdinand II at Ambras Castle’, *Studia Rudolphina* 19 (2019), pp. 34–49; Frederik Pacala, ‘Georgius Handschius and Music: Notes on the Role of Music in the Life of the Humanist Scholar’, *Hudební věda* 2 (2019), pp. 293–317.

*unter Margarete von Österreich, Regentin der Niederlande* (Turnhout, 2002), Robert J. W. Evans' *Rudolf II and his world: a study in an intellectual history* (London, 1997), or the work of a group of scholars guided by Friedrich Edelmayer and Alfred Kohler (eds.), *Kaiser Maximilian II.: Kultur und Politik im 16. Jahrhundert* (Vienna and Munich, 1992). If we compare research on the Habsburgs with research into the lives of non-aristocratic patrons and collectors, the concept of our book would for example correspond to the anthology of articles devoted to the Welser family edited by Mark Häberlein and Johannes Burkhardt: *Die Welser. Neue Forschungen zur Geschichte und Kultur des oberdeutsches Handelshauses* (Berlin 2002). Recently a two-volume monograph was published by Dirk Jansen on Jacopo Strada<sup>21</sup>: this work deals with the person and life of the famous antiquarian and architect, who was of course also a contemporary of Archduke Ferdinand II (Ferdinand also tried to employ Strada). As in our publication, Jansen introduces the antiquarian's historical personage and life at the Habsburg courts in terms of several specialised fields, wherein the main role is played by Renaissance culture as a whole.

This book aims to present Archduke Ferdinand II in the role of a creator, investor, and inventor in the context of formative processes within Central European culture, and this is a role that has not yet been the subject of systematic research. Our research team faced a series of desiderata from the beginning of their work on this project. One particular problem was presented by the fragmentary nature of the existing research. This fragmentation resulted in the first instance from the fact that the necessary sources are mainly dispersed among the archives in Prague, Vienna and Innsbruck, and are therefore difficult to access for a unique scholar. Moreover, many of the sources cited in the earlier literature (for example, those used by Josef Hirn in his monograph or those published in the form of regesta in the *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*), had to be sought again because their signatures had been changed in the intervening years. Only then could the information in them be verified, supplemented, and re-interpreted. The second cause of this fragmentary state of research is simply that Czech and Austrian scholars worked completely separately for a long time, until the beginning of the 1990s.

Because of this situation, it has not yet been possible to sufficiently demonstrate one fact that forms a very important premise for our research. We know that the archduke built up the basis of his later court in Prague, and not only began to accumulate his emerging collections, but also gathered artists and humanists around himself. However, when he moved to Innsbruck after 20 years in Prague, he certainly did not go there alone, forsaking all his former activities and connections. From that point on, his activities between the seats of Innsbruck and Prague remained tied, not only by his personal experience, acquired during the first half of his life in Bohemia and later applied to his duties in Innsbruck, or by the objects that he brought to Tyrol. The two seats were now also connected by the people of Archduke Ferdinand II's court, and his

21 Dirk J. Jansen, *Jacopo Strada and Cultural Patronage at the Imperial Court. The Antique as Innovation*, 2 vols. (Leiden and Boston, 2019).

favoured artists. In Tyrol, he also took advantage of the relationships he had established in Bohemia. His residence in Innsbruck became renowned for its busy social life, and was visited by Bohemian and also foreign aristocrats and diplomats traveling between Central Europe and Italy. Thanks to the dynastic policies of the House of Habsburg, the archduke was also engaged in the networks of political communication that spread throughout Europe at this time, including Portugal and Spain. He managed to utilise these networks to further the interests of the Habsburg dynasty, but also to serve his own needs. The present volume aims to capture and communicate these extremely important relationships.

Our research also aims to contribute to the evaluation of Habsburg rule in the Bohemian lands, which, despite intensive research over the past thirty years, has not yet completely lost its national tint. The role of the first Habsburgs, who ruled on the Bohemian throne in 1526–1619, is of primary concern, as its perception in Czech scholarship is still generally inconsistent. In terms of the Habsburgs' internal policies, Czech historians usually regard all of the ruling house's efforts towards centralisation as detrimental to the unique rights of the Bohemian estates. The connected anti-Reformation measures are likewise seen in a similar light in Czech scholarship. However, in terms of the Habsburg cultural contributions, there is a tendency towards the opposite view. The Habsburg sovereigns of the 16<sup>th</sup> century are perceived as the main bearers of Renaissance culture into Central Europe. The administrative-political networks they created during the formation of the Danube monarchy were simultaneously socio-cultural networks. Working in a targeted manner from the individual centres of their seats and strengthened by a dynastic sense of family, these rulers managed to fundamentally shape the administrative networks not only in Bohemia, but also between Bohemia and Austria. Their activities in the fields of construction, collection, and patronage were an expression of the dynasty's need for representation. Despite this, it has not been sufficiently proven that these were not merely isolated activities, but rather components in a long-term plan. The research gathered and presented in this volume supports the latter hypothesis.

From the perspective of art history, it is possible to appreciate the increasing number of articles, monographs, and volumes devoted to the dynamics behind the coexistence of Gothic and Renaissance forms in mid-16th century Central Europe, with Bohemia at its 'heart'.<sup>22</sup> Austria was nevertheless a significant component of Central Europe, which consequently increased the significance of alpine Tyrol, an area that today spreads across the territory of both Austria and Italy. From our point of view, the pioneering monograph by Jan Białostocki *The Art of the Renaissance in Eastern Europe: Hungary, Bohemia, Poland* (Ithaca NY, 1976) is flawed in its geographical delimitation: it gives insufficient attention to relations between Prague and the Habsburg territories, which were crucial for Bohemia from the middle of the 16<sup>th</sup> century on. It is also necessary to add that whereas the art and culture of so-called East Central

22 For an overview see chapters about the art of the Early Modern period in: *Art in the Czech Lands 800–2000*, ed. by Tatána Petrasová and Rostislav Švácha (Řevnice and Prague, 2017), pp. 343–441.

Europe has attracted specialised international attention, research on Renaissance art within the territory of modern-day Austria has remained primarily within the scope of local scholarship.<sup>23</sup> The Austrian lands were always mainly considered to be an important transit area, through which Italian artistic, architectural, and artisanal models flowed into the transalpine lands. South Tyrolean Trento was an especially important centre for the development of Italian culture in this region.<sup>24</sup> In terms of the Renaissance within the territory of Bohemia and Austria, broader international attention has only really been paid to certain use of art connected precisely with the Habsburg dynasty and its representation. The publication presented here falls within the same spectrum of academic research, in that it takes courtly art as its subject, but nevertheless includes articles that overlap and examine the lives of court artists, workshop management, competition and collaboration of artists and scholars of different nations.

The period defined in this volume, particularly the years of active engagement of Archduke Ferdinand II, is seen as a particular watershed between the Renaissance and the Baroque within the mosaic of 16<sup>th</sup> century Central European art history. It is a stage which lacks so-called ‘great names’ – those artists whose production became a measure of quality and unified the activities of the individual courts and interests of the patrons. This phenomenon, for example, can be observed in a maintenance of the legacy of Albrecht Dürer during the first half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Although many names have been preserved in the sources, we are unable to identify these names with any specific works of art. On the other hand, the authorship of the most important works of art from this period and region is most often unclear. Instead, the period studied here is usually thematised by certain topics and the problematic ‘circles’ of discussion arising from them. These include the aforementioned phenomenon of court patronage and collecting.<sup>25</sup> Other topics used to raise questions about the shifting dynamics that influenced the arts during this period include: the view of the centre of

- 
- 23 See e.g. the very few references to Austria in Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann’s works, *Court, Cloister & City: The Art and Culture of Central Europe 1450–1800* (Chicago, 1995); research of the GWZO centre in Leipzig is focused on “East Central Europe”, and has published numerous books and proceedings more focused on historical research, nevertheless the centre is also planning an encyclopaedic publication *Handbuch zur Geschichte der Kunst in Ostmitteleuropa* (the first and so far only published volume from 2017 is dedicated to Romanesque art).
- 24 One volume specifically concentrated on the Tyrolean Renaissance is *Kunst in Tirol, I: Von der Anfängen bis zum Renaissance*, ed. by Paul Naredi-Rainer and Lukas Madersbacher (Innsbruck, 2007). Extraordinary recent publications devoted to the Austrian Renaissance include: *Geschichte der Bildenden Kunst in Österreich, III: Spätmittelalter und Renaissance*, ed. by Arthur Rosenauer (Vienna, 2003), and the projects of the ÖAW on Hofburg under the guidance of Herbert Karner; Austrian and Bohemian researchers were also working together under the ESF programme *Palatium*.
- 25 Schlosser 2008; Elisabeth Scheicher, The Collection of Archduke Ferdinand II at Ambras: its purpose, composition and evolution, in *Origins of Museum: The cabinet of curiosities in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe*, ed. by O. R. Impey and Arthur MacGregor (Oxford, 1985), pp. 29–38 (with a bibliography); Veronika Sandbichler, “souil schönen, kostlichen und verwunderlichen zeügs, das ainer vil monat zu schaffen hette, alles recht zu besichtigen vnd zu contemplieren”: die Kunst- und Wunderkammer Erzherzog Ferdinands II. auf Schloss Ambras’, in *Das Haus Habsburg und die Welt der fürstlichen Kunstkammern in 16. und 17. Jabreshundert*, ed. by Sabine Haag, Franz Kirchweger and Paulus Rainer, Schriften des Kunsthistorischen Museums 15 (Vienna, 2015), pp. 167–193.



culture (Italy) versus the periphery (transalpine lands) as a methodological perspective on the process of the adaptation of the Italian Renaissance; the contrasting of Italian and German art (welsch versus deutsch); the preference for sculpture versus painting; the Reformation and its influence on sacral art; the consequences of the Council of Trent; the growing role of graphic art and book-printing; ephemeral architecture and symbolic communication; the relationship between the court and the urban milieu, and especially that of court artists and the guild organisations. This list is not exhaustive – we could name many other relevant areas,<sup>26</sup> and a comprehensive list of recommended literature could be added to each of the above-mentioned topics. In this volume, we have gathered a wealth of scholarship providing insight into the fascinating process that shaped the educated cultural atmosphere that Archduke Ferdinand II deliberately created: his court was a real phenomenon that touched on all the topics outlined above to a certain degree. Despite that, it is clear that in practice, some areas of the archduke's interest were much more significant than others, and it is precisely these areas that this volume aims to draw greater attention to.

The selection of the themes dealt with in this volume was not primarily influenced by any methodological theory. Nevertheless, the main mode of scholarship can be described as 'comparison', because the articles presented here not only compare Archduke Ferdinand II's activities in two different regions, i.e. in the Bohemian lands and in Tyrol, but also compare the range of his activities during particular, individual periods of his life. This comparison is based, in all cases, on a profound knowledge of the archival sources, both written and material.

Taken as a whole, the volume forms a consistent testimony; the majority of the articles were conceived to provide a holistic view and facilitate the reader's orientation in the broader context of the outlined topics. However, the book also includes several micro-studies or 'case studies' that we considered to be very beneficial. It was not possible to avoid overlapping themes between certain texts, however, where there is overlap, there is also always contrast in terms of perspective on a given issue. Most important to note is that to fully benefit from the volume's holistic approach to the problems outlined earlier in this introduction, the book should be read as a whole.

Recently, there has been a decline in the claim that research in Central European art is only published in Slavic languages.<sup>27</sup> Nonetheless, in the deeply Anglophone milieu of international academic research, not even German can compete as a 'universal' language, and for this reason we have chosen English as the language for this publication.

26 E.g. Marina Dmitrieva sees the phenomenon of "the ideal city", artistic patronage (under Ferdinand II of Tyrol), triumphal gates, and sgraffito as transmitters of the Italian influence; see Marina Dmitrieva, *Italien in Sarmatien: Studien zum Kulturtransfer im östlichen Europa in der Zeit der Renaissance* (Stuttgart, 2008).

27 Larry Silver, 'The State of Research in Northern European Art of the Renaissance Era', *Art Bulletin* 68:4 (1986), pp. 518–535; Larry Silver, 'Arts and Minds? Scholarship on Early Modern Art History' (Northern Europe) *Renaissance Quarterly* 59:2 (2006), pp. 351–373; Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *Art and Architecture in Central Europe. An Annotated Bibliography* (Marburg, 2003); Milena Bartlová, 'Renaissance and Reformation in Czech Art History. Issues of period and Interpretation', *Umění/Art* 59 (2011), pp. 2–19.

The book features the biography of Archduke Ferdinand II, which was written by Jaroslava Hausenblasová. This piece summarises the important periods of Ferdinand's personal life. These undoubtedly included his youth and common upbringing with his older brother Maximilian, who was destined to inherit their father's throne, and the as-yet unexplained circumstances of his secret wedding in Bohemia to the burgher Philippine Welser, as well as his later dynastic marriage with his own niece, Anna Caterina (Juliana) Gonzaga. It also focuses on his role as the representative of his father Ferdinand I in the Bohemian lands, and finally his activity as the ruler of Tyrol.

The first collection of articles in this volume has been entitled *Dynasty, Court, and Court Festivities*. This opening chapter deals particularly with questions surrounding the archduke's life in Prague, without ignoring his residence in Tyrol. The crucial theme outlined here is the question of how Archduke Ferdinand II became financially, politically, and culturally independent of his father King Ferdinand I, namely in terms of the process of forming his own court, the creation of his collections, and his practice of organising and financing festivities celebrating the political successes of the Habsburgs. The text by Jaroslava Hausenblasová concerns precisely the question of the formation of the court, which included both the archduke's own smaller personal household, as well as a wider circle of courtiers, intellectuals, artists, and artisans, ensuring the cultural and artistic life of the court. The issue of the status of Archduke Ferdinand II's court artists is very revealing, as the artists resident at the Prague court were, with some exceptions, actually employed by King Ferdinand I, and not by the archduke himself.

In another article, Markéta Ježková presents evidence of two trips to the Netherlands undertaken by the archduke just before his arrival in Prague. Until now, almost nothing was known of these journeys. Ježková therefore broaches the fundamental question of how these visits to the court of the governess in the Spanish Netherlands Mary of Hungary could have influenced the archduke's approach to collecting art and curiosities, and whether it was in fact here that he gained his inspiration for organising celebrations at his own court, many of which he probably helped arrange himself.<sup>28</sup>

If Archduke Ferdinand II received new impulses in the Netherlands for organising celebrations, tournaments, and so on, he also needed a certain basis for organising his own festivities and hunts in the Bohemian lands. However, the Habsburgs were not surrounded by a permanent group of artists and artisans in Prague whose services they could simply use at any time. The archduke therefore had to begin organising everything from scratch. The problems he faced from 1547 on, as he tried to create a crucial collection of arms and armour for his own needs in the entirely new milieu of Prague, is described in the text by Stanislav Hrbatý. This piece answers the long-standing absence of research into the initial formation of the pre-eminent Ambras armoury, in

28 Cf. his own theatrical play *Speculum vitae humanae*, published by Jacob Minor (ed.), *Speculum vitae humanae – Ein Drama von Erzherzog Ferdinand von Tirol, 1584. Nebst einer Einleitung in das Drama des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Halle an der Saale, 1889).

Prague.<sup>29</sup> The study by Hrbatý also provides new evidence regarding specifics of the transfer of the collection from Prague to Innsbruck in 1567.

Hunting was an essential part of the archduke's self-presentation, and was also his personal passion. In his text, Václav Bůžek analyses the diaries of Ferdinand II with regard to his hunting practices. However, he also asks to what extent the hunt was a dangerous entertainment and how should we understand the role hunting played in the allegorical and symbolic communication typical in Renaissance society.

Although festivities are counted among the ephemeral arts, in the case of Archduke Ferdinand II's achievements, a great deal of unique visual documentation has been preserved, especially from his time in Tyrol (in Innsbruck, the wedding of the archduke's chamberlain Kolowrat in 1580, and of course his own second wedding to Anna Caterina Gonzaga in 1582).<sup>30</sup> From the period in Prague, records of tournaments for knights and several descriptions of the ceremonial entry of the newly crowned Emperor Ferdinand I into Prague in 1558 have been preserved. Detailed analyses of this theme have already been published, in particular by Veronika Sandbichler.<sup>31</sup> For this reason, festivities are not the subject of a separate, targeted article within this volume, but rather appear throughout all the texts in the first chapter, as well as in some articles included in later chapters. Jan Baťa purposefully devotes himself to the musical component of these festivities, for which only a few records have been preserved. This is in contrast with the scrolls containing detailed costume processions and textual descriptions. For this reason, Baťa attempts to reconstruct the music based on comparison with music known from similar Renaissance ceremonies held at other European courts. The text by Joseph F. Patrouch, which concludes the first section of the volume, could be thematised via his closing motto "No man stood alone in Renaissance Europe". It draws attention to the familial relationships between the Habsburgs and the family's marital policies, with a special focus on the powerful women who played an important role in the life of Archduke Ferdinand II around the key transitory year of 1567.

The second chapter of the volume is devoted to the theme of Architecture. The archduke was an educated dilettante in the art of architecture, and he could therefore theoretically have had a fundamental influence on the shaping of Prague Castle. Moreover, Ferdinand I delegated the main supervision of the castle's construction to him – although the archduke still had to consult with his father on all building issues. The existing research tends to conclude that with a single exception – The Star Summer

29 See most recently Thomas Kuster, 'Die Plattnerie in Prag and in Innsbruck zur Zeit Erzherzog Ferdinands II. (1529–1595)', in *Turnier. 1000 Jahre Ritterspiele*, ed. by Stefan Krause and Matthias Pfaffenbichler (Vienna, 2018), pp. 217–221.

30 Elisabeth Scheicher, 'Ein Fest am Hofe Erzherzog Ferdinands II.', *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Museums in Wien* 77 (1981), pp. 119–154; Veronika Sandbichler, 'Der Hochzeitskodex Erzherzog Ferdinands II.', *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Museums in Wien* 6/7 (2004/2005), pp. 47–89.

31 *Wir sind Helden. Habsburgische Feste in der Renaissance*, ed. by Wilfried Seipl, exh. cat. (Vienna, 2005); Veronika Sandbichler, 'Er hatte es zum Vergnügen Seiner Majestät veranstaltet': höfische Feste und Turniere Erzherzog Ferdinands II. in Böhmen', *Studia Rudolphina* 9 (2009), pp. 7–21.

Palace – Archduke Ferdinand II did not receive many chances to implement his opinions. The question of whether or not some of the archduke's more 'advanced' ideas were therefore lost is presented by Petr Uličný. These advanced ideas can be observed in the archduke's sense for Italianizing architecture and its decoration, discussed by Uličný against the background of an overview of Prague Castle's development. Uličný's text follows the special contrast that characterised the Habsburg attitude towards construction works: on the one hand, the mid-16<sup>th</sup> century Habsburgs supported a very pragmatic approach to construction in terms of their own dwellings and offices. However, they also devoted extraordinary attention and financial means to representative summer residences. The author provides an interesting evaluation of Archduke Ferdinand II's contribution to the Royal Summer Palace at Prague Castle.

The complicated situation emerging from the organisation of construction works, and the problematic relations between the Italian and German builders are both examined in another article, which provides a detailed study of the life of a court artist at Prague Castle: in this case the builder, Hans Tirol. Eliška Fučíková has created an exceptionally illustrative depiction of this problematic employee, and the way in which he sought to earn his livelihood.

Ivan Muchka's article discusses the building activities of Archduke Ferdinand II in Tyrol, especially the effort he devoted to rebuilding numerous hunting lodges around Innsbruck. Ferdinand's main seat – the wooden palace "Ruhelust", built next to the Hofburg residence – also comes into question here. Muchka asks what the proper functions of all these buildings were, and proposes answers based on his consultation of the archduke's 1596 estate inventory.

The third collection of articles in the volume is devoted to the fine arts. The initial article by Sylva Dobalová thematises the seeming paradox that painting was not a priority for the Habsburgs during this developmental phase of Central European Renaissance art. Their interest was rather concentrated on the three-dimensional arts and reliefs, which the Habsburg rulers used to decorate their buildings (in Prague the Royal Summer Palace and the Star Summer Palace), as well as on bronze objects: fountains, for example. The monumental project of establishing the memorial of Emperor Maximilian I in Innsbruck fell to his grandson Ferdinand I, but was finally assumed by Archduke Ferdinand II during his rule in Tyrol. In executing this highly demanding project, the archduke demonstrated his good organisational abilities in the face of the complicated coordination of many specialised artists, and the long time-period over which various elements of the work were completed. This essay also demonstrates how drawing as a medium had a special position in the communication between patron and his artists.

In contrast with the preceding article, Blanka Kubíková's text concentrates on portraiture: portraits of living and possibly even deceased ancestors and heroes can certainly be considered the dominant form of painting commissioned by the Habsburgs. During his residence in Prague (but also Innsbruck) Archduke Ferdinand II commissioned many portraits; these comprised both paintings of himself, and cycles depicting important personages and his Habsburg ancestors (in the form of graphic art, paint-

ings, and murals). Kubíková demonstrates how the archduke's plans were shaped within the Bohemian milieu and focuses on how they were subsequently implemented and realised at his Innsbruck residence and at Ambras castle. Elisabeth Reitter's contribution concerning Archduke Ferdinand II's court artists and artisans in Tyrol supplements the texts by Jaroslava Hausenblasová and Eliška Fučíková. Only when he became an independent ruler, no longer financially dependent upon his father, could the archduke employ artists based on his own preferences. Reitter raises many specific questions, for example the archduke's methods for seeking out artists, where these artists came from, and whether trouble-free collaboration between artists of diverse nationalities was truly a reality (as presented by Hirn), or if in fact the Italian artists really received the most prestigious commissions. Reitter's research also demonstrates that many masters did not have any interest in becoming 'court artists', but would rather simply give priority to the archduke whenever he commissioned something from them.

At the court of Archduke Ferdinand II, science and scholarly literature represented an important cultural component, a fact particularly well evidenced by the famous inventory of his library deposited at Ambras. The comprehensive text by Ivo Purš explains the reasons behind Ferdinand's preference as a patron for individual fields, and also maps the activities of the humanists and scientists within his court circle. Several interesting questions arise here: to what degree did these people reflect the archduke's own interests? To what extent were the printed and manuscript texts actually related to his material collections? Finally, did Archduke Ferdinand II also support the spread of the Catholic faith by literary means? The study by Lucie Storchová presents the physician Georg Handsch, one of the most important scholars at the archduke's court, from a completely unconventional point of view. Storchová examines a collection of Handsch's poetry, and looks at the way this occasional poet wrote and disseminated his work in order to expand his group of potential patrons and friends. In a similar way, Marta Vaculínová focuses on "the poetizing physician [Dichtertartz]" Laurentius Span, who wanted to attain a permanent position at Archduke Ferdinand II's court. His poem celebrating the Star Summer Palace (*Ferdinandopyrgum*, 1555) was not, however, financially supported by the archduke. Vaculínová clarifies the reasons for this, and discusses the strategies that motivated Span and other humanists to dedicate their manuscripts to the archduke as their ruler. Katharina Seidl presents humanism in a close relation to objects from the *Kunstkammer* that were associated with novelties in the area of botanical discoveries, as well as exotic plants and crops. Archduke Ferdinand II supported the study and furthering of botanical knowledge, especially in connection with medicine and healing, as is demonstrated by his employment of Pietro Andrea Mattioli in Prague, as well as in Innsbruck.

The final chapter of this volume is devoted to Archduke Ferdinand II's *Kunst- und Wunderkammer*, which is generally considered one of the most famous landmarks in the history of Central European culture. Of course, no volume dedicated to issues of collecting art and curiosities can afford to ignore Ferdinand II's collection. Here, Veronika Sandbichler's article summarises the basic facts known about the *Kunst- und*

*Wunderkammer* at Ambras, and highlights the unique aspects which set it apart from the collections held by other European courts. The other texts in this section, all produced by specialists on the subject, build on this initial article. These texts elaborate upon selected questions that have not yet been dealt with in the existing scholarship. Annemarie J. Gschwend utilises recently discovered archival materials to reveal how exotic objects and animals were transferred to the collection from overseas, having been especially sought and acquired for the archduke by the agents Anthonio Meyting and Hans Khevenhüller working in Spain. Eva Lenhart devotes herself to the specific technique used in the production of small glass objects (so-called ‘lampworking’), which the archduke successfully imported from Venice to Innsbruck.

After the death of Archduke Ferdinand II in 1595, his property was immediately sealed and placed under guard at the order of his uncle, Emperor Rudolf II. However, the estate inventory (a manuscript deposited in the ÖNB) was created only a year later, and this became the fundamental instrument for all research into the archduke’s collections, including for example the library and the armoury, as well as the *Kunstammer* and art collections. Thomas Kuster analyses the little-known second version of the inventory (in the holdings of the Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien), explaining the circumstances of its creation and summarising the new information that this version of the inventory contains. Kuster’s article therefore raises the question that concerns the final contribution to this chapter of the volume: Rudolf II naturally sought to acquire some items from Archduke Ferdinand II’s collection for his own holdings, even though he was not the in fact rightful heir. In her contribution, Beket Bukovinská examines selected items from Rudolf’s collections, especially the so-called exotica, and basing her investigations on the inventories of the holdings in Innsbruck and Prague reaches some surprising conclusions about their journey through the Habsburg collections.

It is clear from the content outlined above that this volume broaches some general, but also many specific questions. The answers to these questions are summarised in the closing chapter, which concludes with a retrospective overview of Archduke Ferdinand II’s life and his activities in the role of patron and collector. The amount of archival material available has provided us with the opportunity to determine his aims quite accurately. Were these aims consistent, and did he manage to achieve them? Did the archduke actively shape his cultural milieu, and apart from creating the collections that made him famous, which other areas of cultural activity did he prefer? Or were his choices opportunistic, based on those possibilities most easily accessible to him? Does this then imply that he may have regarded his artistic achievements outside of the *Kunstammer* and the armoury as mere ‘accessories’? Were his activities ‘original’, the result of his own personal interest and impetus, or did these activities simply represent the fruit of the famous ‘Habsburg upbringing’? Can we really prove that Archduke Ferdinand II began to gather his collections during his residency in Prague as vicegerent? How did his lifestyle in Prague and in Innsbruck differ? Did he manage to harmonise his obligations as a ruler with his known tendency towards a life of pleasures and entertainments? And most particularly, what were the motivations behind his

actions and decisions? In the conclusion, we finally come to the phenomenon of the “second-born son” indicated in the volume’s title. It is our belief that Archduke Ferdinand II’s position as a second son, and hence second in the line of succession following his father, the King and later Emperor Ferdinand I, and indeed second in line for any of the other European thrones that may have been accessible to him, influenced his representational strategy. The effort to prove himself in competition, especially against his brother Maximilian II, who as the first-born was destined to inherit their father’s throne, was a stimulating factor that guided Ferdinand’s hand in his selection of architects, artists, and artisans, as well as scientists and humanists, and in his awarding of ambitious commissions. Archduke Ferdinand II’s desire to be seen and to legitimise his political aims and dynastic plans gradually gave birth to a number of projects, through which the archduke did indeed acquire fame throughout Europe, even during his own lifetime.

Sylva Dobalová and Jaroslava Hausenblasová

For the editorial help on this book, special thanks go to Markéta Ježková (Bibliography) and Marta Vaculínová. We are also most grateful to Beket Bukovinská, Thomas Kuster, Blanka Kubíková, Ivan Muchka and other colleagues for sharing their expertise on various questions, and to Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna for their generosity in composing the pictorial accompaniment of the book. We owe a particular debt of gratitude to Maya Jaeck Woodgate, a conscientious and tireless English language editor, and to all translators of texts collected in this book.