

STARÉ A NOVÉ

STARÉ JAKO VÝCHODISKO, ČI PŘEKÁŽKA?

Sborník příspěvků mezinárodní
konference studentů doktorských programů

Editoři: Magdalena Nová – Marie Opatrná
Univerzita Karlova. Katolická teologická fakulta, 2016



OLD AND NEW

ARE OLD WORKS OF ART A STARING-POINT
OR AN OBSTACLE?

The proceedings of the international
conference for doctoral students

Editors: Magdaléna Nová – Marie Opatrná
Univerzita Karlova. Katolická teologická fakulta, 2016

Pantheon, Řím, Foto: © Wojciech Jarosz, photoblog.wojciechjarosz.com

Camera Picta, Palazzo Ducale, Mantova, Foto: © Complesso Museale di Palazzo Ducale.
Su concessione del Ministero dei Beni e delle Attività Culturali e del Turismo.

Recenzovali:

doc. PhDr. Martin Zlatohlávek, Ph.D.
doc. Ing. Mgr. Aleš Opatrný, Th.D.
doc. PhDr. Mireia Ryšková, Th.D.
PhDr. Vladimír Czumalo, CSc.
PhDr. Petra Oulíková, Ph.D.
PhDr. Milan Pech, Ph.D.
PhDr. Markéta Jarošová, Ph.D.
PhDr. Magdalena Nespěšná Hamsíková, Ph.D.
PaedDr. Helena Kupcová
Mgr. Michal Charypar, Ph.D.
Mgr. Miroslav Šmied

Vydala: Univerzita Karlova. Katolická teologická fakulta, Praha 2016

© Autoři příspěvků, 2016

© Univerzita Karlova. Katolická teologická fakulta, 2016

Autoři odpovídají za původnost svých příspěvků a za vypořádání reprodukčních práv.

ISBN 978-80-87922-07-1

OBSAH

ÚVOD / INTRODUCTION

Staré a nové. Staré jako východisko, či překážka?
Mezinárodní konference studentů doktorských programů 13

Magdaléna Nespěšná Hamsíková
Lze prostřednictvím dějin umění dojít k pravdě?
Metodické přístupy k dílu Lucase Cranacha st. 15

UMĚNÍ STŘEDOVĚKU / MEDIEVAL ART

Barbora Holečková – Karlova univerzita v Praze
K pojmu „italianismus“ v kontextu středověkého umění 14. století
a jeho pojetí v proměnách uměnovědného diskurzu 35

Andrea Huczmanová – Karlova univerzita v Praze
Architekti Konrád Pflueger, Wendel Roskopf a jejich tvorba
při Via regia ve svědectví písemných pramenů 41

Veronika Knotková – Karlova univerzita v Praze
Staré a nové v spišskéj tabuľovej malbe na prelome 15. a 16. storočia 49

Lucie Kodišová – Karlova univerzita v Praze
Identifizierung von Edelsteinen bei ausgesuchten Goldschmiedearbeiten
aus dem Umkreis Karls IV., die in österreichischen Sammlungen
aufbewahrt werden 57

Roman Kučsa – Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci
Mezi tradicí a reformou: sv. Bernard z Clairvaux a jeho pojetí
architektury a umění 67

Romana Meluzínová – Karlova univerzita v Praze
Madona s dítětem z městského muzea v Bolzanu 75

Jana Peroutková – Karlova univerzita v Praze
Otázky k pražskému parlérovskému stylu a jeho hmotová a barevná
rekonstrukce na příkladu bust dolního triforia chrámu sv. Víta v Praze 83

Michaela Ramešová – Karlova univerzita v Praze
Dvojí smysl historismu v portálové architektuře okruhu Benedikta Rieda 91

Ema Součková – Karlova univerzita v Praze
Poznámky k ornamentální výzdobě chorálních rukopisů 16. století 99

Štefan Valášek – Jagiellonian University in Cracow
Človek a stredoveké nástenné malby. Vzťah v dimenzii času (1300–dodnes)
a priestoru (Liptov) 105

UMĚNÍ NOVOVĚKU / MODERN ART

Alice Bartůšková – Karlova univerzita v Praze
Paolo Piazza na pomezí doznívajícího manýrismu a vycházejícího baroka 115

Carlotta Brovadan – Università degli Studi di Roma “Tor Vergata”
Avoiding “facilità” and “speditezza”. Art in Late-Baroque Florence
As Seen by Francesco Maria Niccolò Gabburri (1676–1742) 121

Alice Fornasiero – Karlova univerzita v Praze
The Copy in Drawing: Artistic Training, Inspiration, Repertoire 129

Anna Hamrlová – Karlova univerzita v Praze
Živoucí renaissance: Přežívání slohu v nástenné malbě na příkladu děl
z Českomoravské vysočiny 137

Jindřiška Havlicová – Karlova univerzita v Praze
Umění ve službách práva: Poslední soud, Ctnosti a Spravedlnost
spojené se soudnictvím v českých zemích v 16. století 145

Joanna Kaźmierczak – University of Wrocław
Wiping Out the New – Restoring the Old: the Motif of the Cleansing
of the Temple in the 16th Century Visual Arts 153

Jacqueline Klusik-Eckert – Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nürnberg
“Pictorialization” – A New Work of Art or Merely a Copy? 163

Magdaléna Nová – Karlova univerzita v Praze
Boční oltář Ukřižování z kostela Panny Marie Andělské. O přenosu
jednoho italského motivu do obrazů českého porudolfinského umění 171

Serena Quagliaroli – Sapienza Università di Roma
Emilian Mannerism and Provocative Irony:
New Resources for Artistic Development after the Sack of Rome? 181

Diana Urriagli Serrano – Complutense University of Madrid
An Epilogue for Giulio Romano: The Fructus Belli Tapestries 189

UMĚNÍ OD 19. STOLETÍ DO SOUČASNOSTI / ART FROM THE 19TH CENTURY TO THE PRESENT

Kateřina Holečková – Karlova univerzita v Praze
Místa české minulosti očima Karla Würbse a jeho současníků 199

Mara-Lisa Kinne – Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen
Adopting Foreign Forms? – Junimea’s Critique of Cultural Appropriation
in Romanian Modernization 207

Martina Knapová – Karlova univerzita v Praze
Ferdinand Maxmilián Brokoff a rezonance jeho díla
v českém sochařství 19. století 215

Chara Kolokytha – Northumbria University
Metamorphoses of the Past: The Iconographic Stimuli of Picasso’s Creative
Imagination and Their Critical Interpretation by Christian Zervos 225

Alice Němcová – Karlova univerzita v Praze
Středověk jako inspirace pro pražské metro 233

Maja Piotrowska-Tryzno – University of Warsaw
Anamnesis of Color in the Context of Some Findings in the
Field of Contemporary Cognitive Developmental Neuroscience 243

Kateřina Štroblová – Karlova univerzita v Praze
Dějiny jako východisko: Historiografický obrat v současném umění 251

Kristýna Zajícová – Vysoká škola uměleckoprůmyslová v Praze
„Tři ošatky zrní a pět pařezů na pařížské výstavě.“ Československo
na světových výstavách v Paříži v letech 1925 a 1937 259

ARCHITEKTURA / ARCHITECTURE

Antonella Antonazzo – Università degli Studi di Roma “Tor Vergata”
Archaeology, Cultural Heritage and Development.
Promote the Past to Make a Territory Grow 271

Jana Bodnárová – Karlova univerzita v Praze
Kostel Navštívení Panny Marie v Poštorné 279

Jana Breuste – Paris Lodron University Salzburg
The Palace of Altenau as a Nucleus for the castle of Mirabell in Salzburg –
Expansion in Stages from a City Palace with a Belvedere in Suburban
Location to a Baroque Four-wing Complex within the Fortifications 285

Francesco Del Sole – Università del Salento Le Meraviglie del mondo: come ricordare opere distrutte	291	Jan Petrášek – Slezská univerzita v Opavě Proměna obrazu husitské hereze v polské renesanční historiografii	383
Irene Di Pietro – Università di Bologna Pinacoteca Nazionale of Bologna: A Project for a New Museum from the City	301	Alexandra Popovičová – Univerzita Pavla Jozefa Šafárika v Košiciach Horizonty digitálnej literatúry	391
Lenka Kerdová – Karlova univerzita v Praze Postoj k tradici a novému v díle pražských německy mluvících architektů	307	Jana Šlancarová – Masarykova univerzita Žalmista Karel Hlaváček	401
Miroslav Šmied – Karlova univerzita v Praze Proměna starého benediktinského opatství v moderní aristokratické sídlo. Ke stavebním úpravám Sázavského kláštera v 19. století	315	Iveta Tůmová – Karlova univerzita v Praze Umělecký mecenát Kryštofa Bettengela z Neyenperka	409
Erzsébet Urbán – Budapest University of Technology and Economics Value Saving on the Roman Catholic Church's Building Complexes in the 21 st Century. Case study: The Reconstruction of the Archbishop's Palace in Eger	323	TEOLOGIE / THEOLOGY	
Žaneta Vobořilová Kadlecová – Karlova univerzita v Praze Protiletectká opatření architektonických památek na území Prahy v letech 1939–1945	331	David Cielontko – Karlova univerzita v Praze The Enochic Myth in the Letter of Jude	419
HUDBA – LITERATURA – DĚJINY / MUSIC – LITERATURE – HISTORY		Veronika Cívínová – Univerzita Pardubice Ikonopis současné Koptské ortodoxní církve v návaznosti na tzv. „koptský revival“ v Egyptě 20. století – „národní obrození v koptské ikonografii“	427
Nadia Amendola – Università degli Studi di Roma “Tor Vergata” Elementi di rottura con il passato nella lirica da camera di Ghedini: il sacro, l'arcaico e il popolare	339	Petr Nohel – Karlova univerzita v Praze Could the Code of Cannon Law from 1983 be an Acquisition in nowadays Discussions about Family?	437
Jindřich Čeladín – Karlova univerzita v Praze Císař a velkokníže na piedestalech. Smysl obnovování památníků panovníků v Česku a na Litvě	349	Luiz Felipe Ribeiro – University of Toronto From Care of the Emotions to Apatheia of the Passions: A New Pastoral Politics of Emotions in Paul	445
Petra Kolátorová – Karlova univerzita v Praze Staré, či nové v <i>Serenádě pro dechové nástroje op. 44</i> Antonína Dvořáka	357		
Hana Kólová – Masarykova univerzita Proměny autorky v současné české literatuře	365		
Marie Matěásková – Karlova univerzita v Praze Staré vs. nové pojetí bezectnosti. Každodennost „snížených lidí“ v prostoru měst 17. století	373		
Eva Myslivcová – Karlova univerzita v Praze Overtura k první verzi opery <i>Král a uhlíř</i> Antonína Dvořáka	379		

Resumé

THE SIDE ALTAR OF THE CRUCIFIXION IN THE CHURCH OF OUR LADY QUEEN OF ANGELS. THE TRANSFER OF AN ITALIAN MOTIF TO POST-RUDOLFINE BOHEMIAN PAINTINGS

The altar of the Crucifixion, on which nothing has so far been published in the specialist literature, can be dated almost exactly, thanks to the history of its genesis. The coats-of-arms in the cartouches in the side paintings indicate the name of the patron who commissioned it. The creation of the altar is related to the death of the wife of the patron in 1663. The concept of the scene of the Crucifixion enables us to place the central painting among works produced in Prague after the mid-17th century. The popularity of this typology for the Crucifixion is documented by paintings by Karel Škréta and Anton Stevens. The figure of Mary Magdalene also has interesting art-historical connections. It is undoubtedly connected with the figure in Correggio's painting of the Madonna of St. Jerome. This S-shaped bent figure with lavish drapery is repeatedly included in many paintings by the artists mentioned. The paper indicates the possible journey taken by this motif from Correggio's painting via Frederico Barocci and graphic production into the transalpine lands and the Bohemian artistic environment.ⁱ

EMILIAN MANNERISM AND PROVOCATIVE IRONY: NEW RESOURCES FOR ARTISTIC DEVELOPMENT AFTER THE SACK OF ROME?

Serena Quagliaroli

In an article of 1979 Claudio Strinati wondered about the possibility of identifying and rebuilding a context of figurative and speculative research aimed at obtaining “*una revisione generale del mondo michelangiolesco*”¹ in the Rome of the third quarter of the 16th century, starting from the production of the painter and sculptor Giulio Mazzoni (Piacenza 1519–1590). More recent studies² based on surveys of archival and stylistic nature enhanced the knowledge of Mazzoni's artistic work. They partially refuted Strinati's article, which focused too much on a Neoplatonic interpretation of Buonarroti's art, but preserved its aim in terms of a reflection revolving around the peculiar experiments of a small group of artists with a common reference to the artistic production of the Po Valley. Building on such critical awareness and for the purpose of the brief analysis to be put forth, some preliminary considerations on the historical and social context, on the peculiarity of the Emilian art and on irony as interpretative category are necessary.

First and foremost, we should consider how artistic criticism interprets the issues of Mannerism in the overall historical and political situation of the 16th century, in order to avoid the risk of proceeding solely with an exegesis of Neoplatonic or Existentialist array. As a matter of fact, one of the fundamental problems of Mannerist art is the risk of overestimating the consequences of the Sack of Rome in terms of figurative research: very often artists – traumatised by the event – are said to have transposed their disillusionment and their awareness of the Renaissance crisis onto their works. Some remarks by Federico Zeri can help restore the balance as far as this topic is concerned.

“*Gli studiosi recenti più aggiornati e obiettivi [...] hanno denunciato come la corrente inter-*

1 Claudio Strinati, Giulio Mazzoni da Piacenza nella Roma di metà Cinquecento, *Bollettino d'Arte* LXIV, 1979, No. 1, pp. 27–36, esp. p. 27.
2 Gonzalo Rédin Michaus, Giulio Mazzoni e Gaspar Becerra a S. Giacomo degli Spagnoli. Le cappelle del Castillo e Ramirez de Avellano, *Bollettino d'arte* LXXXVII, 2002, No. 120, pp. 49–62. – Patrizia Tosini, La Cappella Alicorni Theodoli e la decorazione di Giulio Mazzoni da Piacenza, in: Ilaria Miarelli Mariani – Maria Richiello (eds.), *Santa Maria del Popolo. Storia e restauri*, Roma 2009, pp. 491–507.

pretazione del manierismo continui a ricalcare la falsariga [...] dell'esegesi proposta tra la prima e la seconda guerra mondiale a Berlino e a Vienna – un'esegesi che amava riversare sulle opere d'arte di quattro secoli addietro le ansie, le paure e le distorsioni intellettuali espresse dal disfacimento delle società di Prussia e dell'Austria. Quando invece al termine di manierismo venga restituito il suo originario significato, voluto dal suo inventore, l'abate Luigi Lanzi (di maniera, cioè quale civile raffinatezza di modi), quello stile apparirà come il riflesso di un'iperanutrizione culturale, il portato di un concetto dell'arte quale sfoggio di sapienza formale e letteraria, di bravura tecnica spericolata, acrobatica. Come del resto è logico e attendibile, trattandosi di un'arte al servizio di una élite.”³

These remarks expressed some concepts which prove central to our analysis: the society of the 16th century as a civilisation organised around a court – be it aristocratic, papal or imperial; sophistication and refinement were a distinctive element of its cultural policy, as it resorted to hyper-cultivated citations from ancient times and by contemporary artists conventionally elevated to the rank of distinguished models.⁴ And Michelangelo fell undoubtedly under such category.

The imitation of Buonarroti and the “Michelangelism” were problems which arose early and found their roots in the complexity of the research carried out by the Master as well as in the lack of a workshop or a school, but even more so in the superhuman, divine character acknowledged to Michelangelo's artwork. Since the early days, this last aspect in particular has prompted many critics to believe that some intrinsic reasons relating to his artistic vision prevented Buonarroti from training some disciples of his own. Furthermore, such followers could not have aspired to anything but becoming mediocre imitators of the visible forms and not of essence that made his art grand.

“Michelangelo stesso sapeva che qualcosa d'interno alla propria arte le impediva di trasmettersi per le vie normali dell'esperienza: dalla sua arte sarebbero nati soltanto goffi maestri: l'ispirazione non si insegna, l'ispirazione simulata è goffaggine.”⁵

3 Federico Zeri, *La percezione visiva dell'Italia e degli italiani nella storia della pittura*, Torino 1989, p. 19.
4 Konrad Oberhuber, Parmigianino e gli artisti alla corte di Rodolfo II a Praga, in: *Parmigianino e il manierismo europeo* (exh. cat.), Galleria Nazionale Parma 2003, pp. 135–139.
5 Giulio Carlo Argan, *Il Michelangiolismo*, in: *Atti del convegno di studi michelangeloeschi*, Roma 1966, pp. 398–402, esp. p. 398.



Giulio Mazzoni and workshop, Galleria degli Stucchi, 1552–1553, Capodiferro-Spada Palace in Rome. Photo: Polo Museale del Lazio – Archivio fotografico. Under licence from Italian Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali

An alleged, widespread “clumsiness” is the critical point Paul Barolsky too insists on in his review of Teresa Pugliatti's text dedicated to the artists revolving around Daniele da Volterra:

“Pugliatti writes about a number of artists who rose from a kind of provincial ungainliness – goffezza or gofferia, as it was called in the Renaissance – to attain, in varying degrees, maniera or sophistication of style [...] Often we find a certain goffezza within the maniera, unwittingly caricatural exaggerations of manner. Although Mazzoni, like Daniele and Tibaldi, can make images of remarkable finesse and wit, aspects of his Michelangelism are also goffi.”⁶

The most recent critical readings are inclined to reassess Mazzoni's production,⁷ hence emphasising that his peculiar style – not free from grotesque and sometimes puzzling aspects – should be understood as a deliberate choice and not as representative inadequacy or a symptom of his frustrated inability to represent a higher ideal. In particular, this apparent

6 Paul Barolsky (review), Teresa Pugliatti, Giulio Mazzoni e la decorazione a Roma nella chiesa di Daniele da Volterra, *The Art Bulletin* LXVIII, June 1986, No. 2, pp. 334–336, esp. p. 335.
7 Roberto Cannatà, Novità su Giulio Mazzoni, Leonardo Sormani, Tommaso del Bosco and Siciolante da Sermoneta, *Bollettino d'arte* LXXVI, 1991, No. 70, pp. 87–104, esp. p. 95: “si tratta di un artista meritevole di una diversa valutazione critica, una volta acquisita la consapevolezza dell'equivoco che circonda l'arte del piacentino confusa con quella di seguaci o collaboratori meno dotati o almeno nel migliore dei casi con qualità artistiche specifiche differenti dalle sue.”

“clumsiness” derives from a stylistic syncretism resulting from Mazzoni’s complex education: on the one hand the Raphael and Vasari’s heritage and on the other hand the Emilian tradition. Therefore, it could be interpreted as the result of a precise aesthetic attitude characterised by irony.

The concept of irony as interpretative category has been long investigated by literary studies. As far as the 16th century is concerned, some critics mainly highlight its crucial role in the development of *Orlando Furioso* by Ludovico Ariosto. As noted by Barolsky, the art world has not paid enough attention to it:

“The wit and humour in sixteenth-century art has been noted by various writers but has not been the topic of sustained discussion. In some recent writing, the humour of the mannerists is acknowledged, but only in a cursory way.”⁸

If we want to use the definition that literary analysis provided for irony, we should first point out that it aims at targeting the general linguistic structure and not a single piece, as parody does. Irony is exercised by seizing other artists’ general patterns for expressive codes, then manipulating and stressing them and hence attacking their basic ideological and behavioural values. Moreover, elusiveness is one of its distinctive features, which makes it completely absurd for anyone to claim to be able to get to a univocal decoding: irony can never be prevented from flowing in parallel along the double track of those who cannot understand and those who can understand. Hence, it relies on mechanisms such as transfer, polysemy, simulation and dissimulation, and sometimes even denial.⁹

Just as in Ariosto’s poems, such recourse to irony “nasce proprio dal desiderio di selezionare tramite la sua azione i lettori, separando quelli capaci di capirla da quelli che si abbandonano più o meno passivamente al fascino della parola poetica.”¹⁰ The same aim can be found in the rich decoration of Capodiferro-Spada Palace (1550 – around 1553), for which the role of Giulio Mazzoni as designer and leader of the works carried out by large teams of artists seems to be well established. The complex iconographic programme interpreted by Lionello Neppi from a Neoplatonic viewpoint unfolds along the walls and ceilings of

the rooms on the *piano nobile*.¹¹ However, it is the so-called *Galleria degli Stucchi* which represents its creative apex. As a matter of fact, this room is embellished with a highly refined decoration which creates an elegant illusion of techniques and materials through the continuous contrast of protruding all-round sculptures, white and gold stucco reliefs and paintings deceptively represented as *quadri riportati*. Critics have highlighted the continuity between this decoration and a series of Roman experiences descending from – and further elaborating – the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel. Yet, an exhaustive stylistic analysis of Mazzoni’s stuccoes cannot be provided without taking due account of a crucial precedent, i.e. the *Sala Regia*. In this hall the eclectic artwork by Perin del Vaga and Daniele da Volterra’s “Michelangioliism” meet and are cleverly blended. A second, valid reference point strongly advocated by scholars is the sumptuous stucco and painting cycle adorning some rooms in the Francis I’s Palace of Fontainebleau, realised by Italian and French workers at first led by Rosso Fiorentino (1530 to 1540) and after his death by the Emilian Francesco Primaticcio and Nicolò dell’Abate.¹²

It is difficult to clearly establish the ties between Giulio Mazzoni and the French castle: what is known for sure is that Cardinal Girolamo Capodiferro – who commissioned the *Galleria degli Stucchi* – had sojourned several times at the court of Francis I. However, no evidence proves that he employed plasterers with Bellifontian backgrounds. Most probably, Mazzoni became acquainted with the works by Rosso and Primaticcio through the intense circulation of drawings, prints and engravings.¹³ Though French creations were soon appreciated in Italy and Primaticcio himself travelled to Rome as frequently as to cities in the Po valley,¹⁴ I believe it is more appropriate to agree with Nicolas Cordon’s remarks: “cette corrélation témoigne plus d’une réflexion commune sur les possibilités apportées par le stuc que d’un rapport d’influence.”¹⁵

Mazzoni’s research is virtuosically exposed in the *Galleria degli Stucchi* and it should therefore be interpreted as a personal response to a series of aesthetic matters affecting the Roman and international cultural circles. Cordon himself pointed out how the complex decoration of Capodiferro Palace can be fully understood only if inserted into a debate

11 Lionello Neppi, *Palazzo Spada*, Roma 1975.

12 *Le Roi et l’artiste. François Ier et Rosso Fiorentino* (exh. cat.), Château de Fontainebleau 2013.

13 Henri Zerner, *Ecole de Fontainebleau: gravures*, Paris 1969.

14 Vittoria Romani, *Primaticcio, Tibaldi e la questione delle “cose del cielo”*, Padova 1997.

15 Nicolas Cordon, *Stuc et ornement dans les décors italiens du XVI^e siècle: le cas de la Galleria degli Stucchi du palais Capodiferro à Rome*, in: Ralph Dekoninck – Caroline Heering – Michel Lefftz (eds.), *Questions dormements. XV^e – XVIII^e siècles*, Turnout 2013, pp. 212–220, esp. p. 219, N. 4.

8 Paul Barolsky, *Infinite Jest: Wit and Humor in Italian Renaissance Art*, Columbia – London 1978, p. 101.

9 Giulio Ferroni, *Ironia e parodia*, in: Idem, *Il comico: forme e situazioni*, Catania 2012, pp. 97–109.

10 Franco Musarra, “*L’antiqua damigella*”, *dell’ironia nell’Orlando Furioso*, Firenze 2013, pp. 30–31.

on the comparison of the arts (*Paragone delle Arti*) – a thorny issue, as is known, rekindled in the middle of the century by Benedetto Varchi.¹⁶ The significance of Mazzoni's operation within such discussion is indeed confirmed by the fictitious ambiguity of his artistic production, which is designed to confuse the observers' eyes making them unable to gather at first glance the subject, the technique and the intertwined references to ancient and contemporary masterpieces.

Some articles argue that the comparison between Michelangelo's sculpture and Titian's painting (Vercellino worked in Rome for Pope Paul III from 1545 to 1546) established in Farnese circles and already noted by Vasari should be further elaborated.¹⁷ It should include a broader reflection aimed at developing an innovative concept of *grazia* that could link the physical attributes of both female and male gender through “una certa avvertita dissimulazione”, as Baldassarre Castiglione calls it in *The Courtier*. This recalls the idea of a shrewd and subtle link among different elements implemented in order to intensify the meaning of the artwork and consequently the spectator's appreciation. Cardinal Capodiferro was a member of the Farnese circle: this certainly made him a witness of such educated disquisitions, prompting him to entrust Mazzoni with the creation of a decoration closely connected to “la nuova idea della dimora nobile [...] intesa quale luogo di contemplazione colta di un patrimonio di dottrine complesse, esplicitabili soltanto a determinati livelli di consapevolezza.”¹⁸

Mazzoni staged a sensory stimulation – stucco nudes vivified through an amazing variety of attitudes and expressionistic facial characterisation – and malicious combinations of identity and gender – in the frame *The Death of Adonis* the naked body of Venus is inspired by the *Apollo Belvedere*, whereas Adonis' pose comes from the masculine protagonist of the painting *Venus and Cupid* housed in the Galleria dell'Accademia in Florence. He resorted to a distinct ironic touch, formally obtained through the skilful fusion of forms inherited from Raphael and Michelangelo (as it had been progressively defined in Perino and Daniele's researches), as well as a certain sensitivity or sensuality typical of the Emilian art. In fact, we are used to describe Emilian art as characterized by “un legame più direttamente viscerale al corpo come oggetto fisicamente gravante, al sentimento come estroversione”¹⁹

insisting on a direct relationship with reality and “sul senso di uno spazio inteso come densa corposità, sulla forza del sentimento e il raptus della fantasia.”²⁰ In particular, the two major interpreters of the Emilian Cinquecento, Correggio and Parmigianino, taught Mazzoni how to create “un'intensa partecipazione dei protagonisti ai fatti narrati favorendo lo stabilirsi di un'innovativa relazione emozionale fra figure e riguardante”;²¹ a technique he could then exploit to please his erudite public.

In conclusion, Mazzoni played a protagonist role in the linguistic experimentation developing in Rome in the third quarter of the 16th century and which had its foundations in the union of “istanze formali di radice michelangelolesca, nordica, e di maniera emiliana [...] espresse, [...] nella cappellina di S. Maria degli Angeli, [...] nella cappella Sistina e su alcuni muri del Gonfalone”;²² i.e. the places where Matteo da Lecce, Domenico da Modena and Heinrich van der Broeck were active. Also thanks to Jacopo Bertoja's personality and artwork, this heritage was passed down to Bartholomäus Spranger, Hendrick Goltzius, Joachim Anthonisz Wtewael and to many further interpreters of what is defined as Court Mannerism or International Mannerism.²³

20 Giuliano Briganti, La natura lombarda, le idee romane, i demoni etruschi e l'antico, nella pittura emiliana del Cinquecento e del Seicento, in: *Nell'età di Correggio e dei Carracci* (exh. cat.), Pinacoteca Nazionale Bologna 1986, pp. XV–XXXII, esp. p. XV.

21 Giancarla Periti, Nota sulla “maniera moderna” di Correggio a Parma, in: Lucia Fornari Schianchi (ed.), *Parmigianino e il manierismo europeo. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi*, Parma 2002, pp. 298–303, esp. p. 298.

22 Fabrizio D'Amico, Una singolare congiuntura di Michelangioloismo “fuori tempo”, in *Storia di Roma* (see note 18), pp. 211–220, esp. pp. 219–220.

23 Bert W. Meijer, *Parma e Bruxelles. Committenze e collezionismo farnesiani alle due corti*, Milano 1988, esp. p. 46. – Oberhuber (see note 4), esp. pp. 137–139.

16 Idem, Giulio Mazzoni et les débats sur l'art dans la cercle de Farnèse, *Artitalies* XXI, 2015, pp. 6–15.

17 Fredrika Herman Jacobs, Aretino and Michelangelo, Dolce and Titian: Femmina, Mascolo, Grazia, *The Art Bulletin* LXXXII, 2000, No.1, pp. 51–67. – Mary Pardo, Artifice as Seduction in Titian, in: James Grantham Turner (ed.), *Sexuality and Gender in Early Modern Europe, Institutions, Texts, Images*, Cambridge 1993, pp. 55–89.

18 Claudio Strinati, La scultura a Roma nel Cinquecento, in: Idem – Daniela Gallavotti Cavallero – Fabrizio d'Amico, *Storia di Roma. L'arte in Roma nel secolo XVI. La pittura e la scultura*, Bologna 1992, pp. 299–432, esp. p. 382.

19 Francesco Arcangeli, Introduzione, in: *Natura ed espressione nell'arte bolognese-emiliana* (exh. cat.), VIII Mostra Biennale d'Arte Antica Bologna 1970, 17–62, esp. p. 58.

Claudio Strinati se při analýze umělecké tvorby Giulia Mazzonihho ptá po možnosti rekonstrukce figurativního a společenského prostředí, které se v Římě objevilo v polovině 16. století. V rámci něj se umělci snažili dosáhnout „*souhrnného zhodnocení Michelangelova světa*“. Michelangelova umělecká tvorba zůstala nezpochybnitelným *exemplum*, ale někteří umělci zpochybňovali jeho novoplatonský ideál a odvolávali se na jiné umělecké tradice, zejména Emilie-Romagni: studiem Correggia a Parmigianina a jejich obohacením o mezinárodní zkušenosti Primaticcia či Niccola dell'Abate se skupina umělců snažila rozvinout novou linii studia a tvorby, která by byla konsistentní s politickou a sociální situací Říma po jeho vyplenění. Proto by mohly být tyto umělecké zkušenosti interpretovány jako výsledek precizního estetického přístupu charakterizovaného ironií.

AN EPILOGUE FOR GIULIO ROMANO: THE *FRUCTUS BELLI* TAPESTRIES

Diana Urriagli Serrano

The design of tapestries at Raphael's workshop was a fact of importance for the *all'antica* style at Giulio Romano's workshop in Mantua from c. 1529 until the death of Federico Gonzaga in 1540.¹ As the historiography has noted, the antiquarian legacy had a critical evolution derived either from the visits of the emperor Charles V to the Mantuan court in 1530 and in 1532,² the investiture of Federico Gonzaga as the first duke of Mantua, and the imperial triumphal journey through Italy after the campaign of Tunis in 1535, which entailed a number of designs for the ephemeral paraphernalia of these festivities.³ In the style and subjects of the decorative programmes in the Palazzo Te and in the Palazzo Ducale – from the Camera dei Giganti to the Gabinetto dei Cesari,⁴ the last decorative commission before Federico Gonzaga passed away – is characteristic its monumentality, similar to the *fa grande*, in Pietro Aretino's words,⁵ originated from Raphael's *Acts of the Apostles* tapestries.⁶ The traditional literary and poetic vision on the antiquity of the first programmes Giulio devised in Mantua gave way to an antiquarian and historical re-enactment. A source of importance in this process, as Oberhuber suggested, was the reusing of the designs for the tapestries of the *Deeds of Scipio* executed in Rome by Giulio Romano and Gianfrancesco Penni, which were eventually completed with new models representing the *Triumphal Cortege of Scipio* for the set known as the *Grand Scipion* commissioned by the king Francis I of France in 1531.⁷

Ferrante Gonzaga commissioned the set of tapestries known as the *Fructus Belli* c. 1544 during the cardinal Ercole Gonzaga's regency of Mantua,⁸ an artistic period characterized by Giulio Romano's architectural and religious works, as well as the decoration of his own house completed by 1544. The set comprises eight panels depicting a realistic vision on the consequences of wars combined with a triumphal tone remarked either by the armouries and the

1 Konrad Oberhuber, Giulio Romano pittore e designatore a Mantova, in: Konrad Oberhuber – Sylvia Ferino, *Giulio Romano* (exh. cat.), Milano 1989, pp. 160, 163–164. – Thomas P. Campbell (ed.), *Tapestry in the Renaissance, Art and Magnificence* (exh. cat.), New York 2002, pp. 341–363.

2 Frederick Hartt, *Giulio Romano*, New York 1981, p. 147. – Sylvia Ferino Padgen – Konrad Oberhuber (eds.) *Fürstenhöfe der Renaissance. Giulio Romano und die Klassische Tradition* (exh. cat.), Vienna 1989, pp. 134sq.

3 A brief account of sources in Hartt (see note 2), pp. 269–263.

4 A comprehensive account in Egon Verheyen, *The palazzo del Te in Mantua. Images of Love and Politics*, Baltimore – London 1977, pp. 24–38, 50–53.

5 Pietro Aretino, *Lettere I* (ed. Paolo Procaccioli), Roma 1997, No. 84, p. 145. – Fernando Checa Cremades, *Tiziano y las cortes del Renacimiento*, Madrid 2013, pp. 54–55.

6 For the *Acts of the Apostles* the study of John K. Shearman, *Raphael's Cartoons in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen, and the tapestries for the Sistine Chapel*, London 1972.

7 Oberhuber (see note 1).

– Emmanuel d'Astier de la Vigerie, *La belle tapisserie du Roy (1532–1797) et les tentures de Scipion l'Africain*, Paris 1907. – Frederick Hartt (see note 2), pp. 227–231.

– Bertrand Jestaz – Rosalind Bacou (exh. cat.), *Jules Romain. L'Histoire de Scipion*, Paris 1978.

8 The original eight-piece set was in the Gonzaga collections from 1547 until 1709. *The Triumphal Cortege*, with its original borders, at the Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire in Brussels; *The Artillery, The Battlefield* and the central fragments of *The Reward and Punishment* at the Edward

Staré a nové. Staré jako východisko, či překážka?

Sborník příspěvků mezinárodní konference studentů doktorských studijních programů

Editoři: Magdaléna Nová, Marie Opatrná

Grafická úprava: Magdaléna Nová, Marie Opatrná, Eliška Zlatohlávková

Obálka: Magdaléna Nová, Marie Opatrná

Sazba: Eliška Zlatohlávková

Jazyková úprava: Foxie translation, Tereza Lišková

Překlady: Foxie translation, Peter Stephens, autoři příspěvků

Vydala:

Univerzita Karlova. Katolická teologická fakulta

Thákurova 3, 160 00 Praha 6

Tisk: MH Tisk, s.r.o., Praha

1. vydání, náklad 150 výtisků

Praha 2016

ISBN 978-80-87922-07-1