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Introduction

At the court of the Holy Roman Empire in Prague, in the period immediately preceding the Thirty Years’ War, sculptors, painters, and printmakers gathered from across Europe to serve as court artists for one of the greatest patrons of the era, Rudolf II. The court artists primarily created art for the emperor, who placed the works into the imperial Kunstkammer, which contained his collection of naturalia and exotica as well as fine art of the contemporaneous period and of the Renaissance.1 Rudolfine artists freely repeated elements of their work and whole compositions, exchanged ideas with other painters, and collaborated with printmakers who disseminated their art throughout the continent. In the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, copying served a practical purpose as a substitute for original works of art when they could not be acquired. Prints entered collections and art workshops, where they were additionally used as tools for instruction, providing examples of otherwise obscure works for students to imitate.2 Theorists, drawing on an antique rhetorical tradition, proposed that copying was only acceptable in the work of fully trained masters when hidden or when used as a display of the artist’s genius in willfully taking on the manner of an older artist. Among artists, however, copying was a common tool for education, self-promotion, and income. Although art theorists like Karel van Mander tended to neglect prints and their makers, in practice the status of printmaking grew increasingly throughout the sixteenth century as collectors accumulated the creations of a variety of artists. The Rudolfine court encouraged a culture of exchange in the

---

close associations of the artists, who used copies and reproductions as a source of income and as a way to promote their art and elevate their social standing. The emperor’s court art particularly derived from the collaboration of contemporaneous artists and the incorporation of earlier examples of famous works of art to promote his position as emperor. Rudolf commissioned a large quantity of propaganda and works with political iconography from his court artists, who often worked together and drew on one another’s works to fulfill the emperor’s political needs. Much of Rudolf’s propaganda spread throughout Europe through reproductive prints made as a collaborative effort or was created as the result of copying or emulating the works of earlier artists available in the Kunstkammer. In this thesis, I argue that the proliferation of reproduction and the frequency of collaboration in the creation of Rudolfine court art catered to the needs of both the artists and the patron.

In the literature on copies and reproductive prints, scholars debate the status of printmaking in the early modern period, the utility of copying and its acceptability among the artistic community, the origins of reproduction, and the reception and construction of these phenomena by art historians. In a study of the Renaissance print, David Landau and Peter Parshall propose that the reproductive print did not truly arise until the second quarter of the sixteenth century, after the collaborative process between painter and printmaker began to degenerate and the printmaker came to copy as faithfully as possible independent works of art initially made for different purposes. Rebecca Zorach argues against their definition of reproductive printmaking as inherently submissive, countering that early modern printmaking remained collaborative and assigning one artist as the sole creator simplifies a complex process.

---

Zorach widens the realm of the term “reproductive” beyond Landau and Parshall’s definition, including direct copies and forgeries as well as collaborative relationships between artists and printmakers in which the painter supplied the engraver with the image and aided in the translation of the composition and the circulation of the final print.\(^4\) In examining the relations between Raphael, Marcantonio Raimondi, and Albrecht Dürer, Lisa Pon also notes that the word for “reproductive” was never used in Italy in the sixteenth century and is in truth a modern construct. Pon contends that, although prints often served as publicity for the painter, modern belief in the inferiority of engraving continues to bias art historical scholarship and leads to a failure in the appreciation of “graphic intelligence,” the ability of artists to create compositions through solely graphic means.\(^5\)

Scholars have had serious objections to the term “reproductive” as a wide-scale label for prints created for a variety of purposes with different manners. In an editorial, Caroline Karpinski instead proposes that a new typology, based on Thomas M. Greene’s categories of Renaissance literary imitation, be applied to prints, encompassing five different designations of reproduction that range from prints recreating drawings to those antagonistic towards their sources.\(^6\) Primarily, Karpinski calls on art historians to immerse themselves in the unique qualities and codes of engraving without the biases of modern scholarship. Larry Silver names


\(^6\) Caroline Karpinski, “Preamble to a New Print Typology,” in *Coming About...A Festschrift for John Shearman*, eds. Lars Jones and Louisa Matthew (Cambridge: Harvard University Art Museums, 2001), 375-79. The other categories are those conceived for the print medium itself, those who recreate the quality of paint, and those who imitate another artist’s painting style in a new composition.
nineteenth-century art historians, specifically Adam Bartsch, as propagators of the superiority of the “peintres-graveurs,” or painters who also worked as printmakers, discrediting the efforts of the “craftsman-executors” who reproduced the designs of others. In attempting to counteract this historical prejudice, some historians like Jonathan Hay have assumed the extreme opposite position, arguing for the value of forgeries as independent works of art coauthored by the copyist and the creator.

Throughout this thesis, I use the term “reproductive” as a means of signifying prints based upon the initial work of another, encompassing the use of sketches, paintings, or sculpture as the original composition. Although negatively regarded by Bartsch and other early art historians, I apply the term with discussion of the collaborative nature of these engravings and the distinctive qualities of print as emphasized by Zorach. I also specifically examine the engraver Aegidius Sadeler’s style as particularly analyzed by the Rudolfine art historian Dorothy Limouze. The complications of the perception of reproductive printmaking, in Prague specifically and Europe as a whole, intertwine in my argument with the reputation of artists and the greater respect accorded to Spranger and painters in general, despite Rudolf’s appreciation for prints and their value as independent art objects.

In the first chapter, I examine the relationship among three works by Rudolfine court artists, two paintings by the Netherlandish artist Bartholomäus Spranger and one reproductive engraving by Aegidius Sadeler. Spranger reused the composition of his c. 1587-89 Epitaph of Nikolaus Müller, a commemorative image originally located at his father-in-law’s grave, in a

---

second painting, *Minerva Vanquishing Ignorance*, made a decade later c. 1596-1600 for the Kunstkammer of Rudolf II. Spranger’s reputation, formed in Italy and fostered as a court artist for Rudolf, spread throughout Europe aided by the dozens of prints of his compositions made by Netherlandish engravers like Sadeler. Prints made after Spranger’s art proliferated, including an adaptation of *Minerva Vanquishing Ignorance* by Sadeler, titled *Triumph of Wisdom* c. 1600.

The three images, although formally similar, contain variations in the identity and pose of the central figure and the role of the accompanying groups at both top and bottom. Within his own oeuvre, Spranger utilized the change of patron, Rudolf’s lack of awareness of the epitaph, and the obscurity of his first painting as an opportunity to reuse compositions. United by a theme of victory, the paintings share an expression of domination that justifies the repetition of the design. Transferring the Minerva painting to print necessitated changes to the composition, resulting in a less ambiguous image that serves to promote the arts and the Holy Roman Empire’s role as a protector of knowledge and honor. Reproductive prints like Sadeler’s held a precarious position in the hierarchy of the arts in Europe in the late sixteenth century; collectors and artists valued prints highly for their ease of transpiration, ability to transmit compositions, and unique artistic qualities considered to exhibit the force of line and design. Van Mander, while supporting the use of prints and extolling their virtues, continued to portray them as of lesser importance to painting in his influential art historical and theoretical book titled *Schilder-boeck*, although he conceded that engravers like Sadeler and Hendrick Goltzius elevated the art of reproductive printmaking. Reproductive engravings proliferated in Prague in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, allowing Rudolf’s court artists to enhance their reputation and establish themselves as innovative and influential artists, despite the fact that most of their paintings were kept in Rudolf’s Kunstkammer and thus unavailable to the general public. Prints further allowed
Spranger and other painters to earn prestige at court, resulting in the conferral of noble titles and diplomatic positions, as well as serving as an important source of income for the artists. In this chapter, I argue that Spranger’s deliberate repetition in two paintings of differing subjects exhibits the importance of the patron in the development of composition and meaning, reinforced by the changes made in the translation of the image from painting to print, Sadeler’s *Triumph of Wisdom*. Sadeler’s engraving further exemplifies the necessity of printmaking to the construction of artistic reputations and artists’ rise in social and economic status. Reproduction served the goals of the Rudolfine artists in the elevation of their status and the promotion of their career.

The second chapter considers the motivations behind the myriad copies and reproductions from the perspective of Rudolf as patron and emperor. Rudolf facilitated and encouraged collaborations among artists to promote his political position and spread his reputation as a connoisseur. Sadeler’s 1603 print *Rudolf II on Horseback* displays the character of both art and the political iconography produced at Rudolf’s court, resulting from a collaboration with the sculptor Adriaen de Vries and the painter Hans von Aachen, all working to emphasize the figure of the emperor as a triumphant military commander. The use of three artists in the creation of the propagandistic print demonstrates the frequency of reproductive and collaborative artistic relationships at court. The print further draws on the work of earlier artists, particularly Titian’s equestrian portrait of Charles V commemorating the 1547 Battle of Mühlberg. Artists’ usage of compositions and motifs of earlier famous Habsburg court artists, such as Titian, reinforced Rudolf’s claim to the empire as a descendant of a long line of successful and powerful rulers and collectors, visually connecting him to the tradition of imperial imagery present throughout his family’s history. Art and literature produced at court or dedicated to Rudolf often emphasized his Habsburg lineage as a justification for his reign and the longevity
of the Holy Roman Empire. Rudolf stressed his familial connection and his status as the inheritor of a great imperial tradition that encompassed not only his own direct ancestors, including Charles V and Maximilian I, but also powerful figures from antiquity, particularly the Roman emperor Augustus, as a method of garnering support for his war against the Ottoman Empire. Rudolf’s reign was plagued by a negative perception of his personal character, his imperial actions connected to the reignited conflict with the Turks, and his subsequent reputation as an ineffective leader primarily interested in the pursuit of the occult. Court artists like Sadeler and Adraien de Vries drew on works created for earlier members of the Habsburg dynasty to form representations of Rudolf as the latest in a great line of powerful and victorious emperors, the successor to the legacy of both the Roman and the Holy Roman Empire. The fusion of the works of artists, both past and present, thrived in the context of the Prague court, creating a culture of reproduction and serving to spread Rudolf’s propaganda presenting himself as a triumphant emperor and learned art connoisseur. Rudolf as patron heavily relied on the works of court artists and encouraged their collaboration to propagate and reproduce his selected self-representation.

Reproduction and collaboration facilitated the efforts of both the circle of court artists in Prague and Emperor Rudolf II as their patron to improve their status and spread their desired reputation throughout the continent.
Chapter 1

Patron and Profit: The Utility of Reproduction for Rudolfine Artists

Bartholomäus Spranger’s international character conformed to the culture of Rudolf II’s court, which united artists from across the continent and developed a distinctive Mannerist style that merged northern and southern artistic traditions. Rudolf II’s collection in Prague received lavish praise from across the continent for its breadth and wealth of extraordinary objects and artifacts; Spranger too earned an international reputation as one of the most gifted and successful of the emperor’s artists. The Netherlandish historian and theorist Karel van Mander described Spranger as one of those rare painters who, “apparently without effort, and gratefully, bear such fine, noble fruits whereas others, although working laboriously, hurt our eyes with nothing but deformed and onerous things…” Spranger came from Antwerp, travelling to Paris and then to Rome in his early twenties to seek artistic instruction, eventually gaining success and attracting the attention of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese and receiving commissions from Pope Pius V. Although first called to the service of Rudolf’s father, Emperor Maximilian II died in 1576 before Spranger completed any paintings for him in Vienna and Rudolf did not summon the artist to Prague himself until 1580. During the last years of the century, Spranger was a court artist residing in Prague and working closely with the emperor to satisfy his requests. Most of Spranger’s paintings were ultimately housed in the imperial Kunstkammer, Rudolf’s collection

11 Ibid., 34-41.
that encompassed not only the fine arts, but also natural, scientific, and exotic artifacts intended to represent a microcosm of the world, under the power of the emperor. One of Spranger’s works destined for Rudolf’s collection, painted at the end of the sixteenth century and titled *Minerva Vanquishing Ignorance*, echoes the theme and composition of an epitaph made for his father-in-law Nikolaus Müller nearly a decade earlier, despite fundamentally differing in subject, patron, and function. The restrictions placed on access to the court art of those such as Spranger led to the prolific creation of reproductive prints after Rudolfine paintings, such as Aegidius Sadeler’s *Triumph of Wisdom*. The spread of the engravings made by Sadeler and other associated printmakers allowed the artists to elevate their status and increase their influence beyond the boundaries of Prague.

In a painting dating almost a decade after the artist’s arrival in Prague, *The Epitaph of Nikolaus Müller* of 1587-89 (figure 1), Spranger depicts the resurrected Jesus Christ with putti fluttering around his head on clouds while Müller’s family stands below and looks out at the viewer. The epitaph decorated Müller’s grave in the St. Matthias cemetery chapel at the church of St. John in Prague, accompanied by a sculpture of two putti by Adriaen de Vries and an additional image of God the Father above the painting. Christ stands atop his tomb in the center of the composition, wearing a white loincloth and a red cloak slashing diagonally across his chest and a bright yellow halo encircling his head. The gold of the halo and the red of the cloth visually emphasize the figure of Christ and contrast with the dark colors that predominate in the rest of the painting. Christ’s right foot rests on top of a snake lying on a large sphere, the world, containing a skull, symbolizing vice and death respectively. He holds a white banner of

---


13 Ibid., 121.
resurrection in his left hand with his right outstretched and palm turned downwards towards the figures below. Müller and his wife stand below Christ, with their son and their daughter, Christina, flanking them on either side, while Spranger and Christina’s daughter offers a flower to her grandmother. The four adults gaze stoically out of the picture plane, confronting the viewer. Spranger depicts the family realistically and uses naturalistic colors and body proportions in contrast to Christ’s exaggerated pose, elongated torso, and overly saturated coloring. The group of putti surrounding Christ at the top of the image further creates a clear division between the divine world and the human sphere of the Müller family. The visual focus that Spranger places on Christ in the painting emphasizes the theme of triumph over death, further suggesting Muller’s own afterlife resulting from Christ’s sacrifice.

Christ’s posture and the circle of putti sitting among the clouds recall earlier resurrection scenes by other Italian and Northern artists working in Italy during the same period as Spranger. The strong contrapasto of Christ’s body in Santi di Tito’s Resurrection of Christ of 1574-75 (figure 2) with the white banner in hand and the bent leg appears similar to Spranger’s painting, although Spranger modifies the position of his right arm and adds the snake and skull underneath his foot. The format of Epitaph of Nikolaus Müller derives from earlier accepted compositions of the resurrection that would have been familiar to Spranger due to his travels in Italy in the 1570s. Spranger personalizes the imagery to suit the occasion of his father-in-law’s death and uses a dark and somber color palette in contrast to Santi’s painting. Spranger follows a tradition of resurrection imagery as a convenient resource for his own painting, adding the portraits of the

14 Marcin Fabiański, “Spranger and Italian Painting: Mannerism versus Early Baroque in Central Europe,” Apollo 141 (1995): 20. Although Karel van Mander’s Schilder-boeck, the main source of information on Spranger’s life, does not mention a visit to Florence where Santi’s painting was located in Santa Croce, Marcin Fabiański argues that Spranger would have visited during his travels across Italy when he went to Milan and Parma.
deceased and his family in particular to make a personal connection between the victory over death and the ultimate fate of all humans.

Concurrent to the Müller image in 1588, Spranger created *Epitaph of Michael Peterle* (figure 3), also known as *Christ Triumphant over Sin and Death*, and employed similar features in both paintings. In the Peterle epitaph, Christ again dominates the center of the composition, wearing a red cloak with his left foot on top of a skull and a bright halo encircling his head. Portraits of Peterle, a painter and publisher who lived near Spranger’s residence in Prague, and his family line up along the bottom edge of the painting. Peterle’s painting would have similarly been accompanied by an image of God the Father looking down on Christ and the family above the frame.  

The epitaph lacks the putti of the Müller painting and instead features angels standing behind Christ holding the Arma Christi, with the cross, nails, crown of thorns, and column of flagellation all prominently placed and clearly visible on either side. Spranger substitutes the stark contrast of light and dark and the Mannerist tones of the Müller epitaph for a more naturalistic coloring and shading. The figure of Christ more explicitly dominates the Müller painting in the size of the figure and the contrast of colors, emphasizing the divine figure of Christ rather than the symbols associated with the Passion. The existence of two epitaphs of the resurrection available for Spranger to draw on for his later painting *Minerva Vanquishing Ignorance* (figure 4) indicates the presence of a specific appeal to the Müller painting. Despite the similarities, Spranger chose the Müller epitaph as the basis for his later work as both place greater emphasis on the division of the central figure and the ancillary groups. Most prominently,

---

15 Metzler, *Bartholomeus Spranger*, 122. An earlier photo shows the painting with image of God the Father, although the pinnacle painting is now lost.  
the Peterle painting makes specific references to Christ’s iconography of the passion through the
display of the Arma Christi while Müller’s epitaph more heavily stresses the aura of victory in
Christ’s posture and appearance.

Minerva Vanquishing Ignorance c. 1596-1600 mimics the composition of the Epitaph of
Nikolaus Müller, closely repeating the pose of Christ, now in the guise of Minerva, and the
groups at head and feet. Minerva wears silver armor that follows the contour of her body and
reveals the skin underneath, cut off at the chest to bare her breasts. She grasps a lance in her right
hand with her head turned toward a putto flying alongside who bestows her with a crown. A
second putto hands her a palm frond on the other side, indicating her victory over the nude man
below, whose donkey ears signify his identity as an allegorical figure of Ignorance. The two putti
take the place of the divine audience that watches Christ in Spranger’s earlier painting. Like
Christ in Epitaph of Nikolaus Müller, Spranger stresses Minerva’s significance in the
composition not only through her central placement but also through the choice of colors.
Minerva’s armor and cloak appear bright in comparison to the rest of the figures and distinguish
her figure, while her light skin color further contrasts against the man and attendant group below.
Rather than stepping on a skull and snake as Christ does, Minerva’s foot presses against the
man’s throat. He lies with legs splayed, hands tied behind his back, shoulder popped at an
awkward angle, with head thrown back and face obscured by a figure in the foreground, Clio,
muse of history. Ignorance is dominated by Wisdom while figures of the Muses, gods, and
representations of the Arts surround him, standing below the plinth in the place of Müller’s
family in the epitaph, similarly acting as attendants and witnesses to the primary scene. Clio
reads a book in the bottom right corner while Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture gather in the
background. Bellona, Roman goddess of war, stands in the left foreground with a large group
behind her, including Urania, goddess of Astronomy, holding an astrolabe, and Mercury, a Roman god. Mercury here represents eloquence and refers to a common motif in allegorical imagery known as Hermathena, the combination of Minerva, or Athena, and Mercury, or Hermes, in the same image.\(^{17}\) Hermathena is often associated with the academy and the academic ideal and frequently appears in paintings of the Rudolfine court artists. Italian art theorist Gian Paolo Lomazzo discusses Hermathena’s antique roots in his *Treatise on Painting* 1584 and proposes that statues of the group decorate schools in imitation of ancient academies like Cicero’s that sought to unite wisdom and eloquence.\(^{18}\) Spranger’s painting alludes to the ideals of court and the prominence and ultimate victory of learning and knowledge in Prague, as well as throughout the Holy Roman Empire, under the purview of Rudolf II. The various figures below thus act as humanist symbols intended to communicate the meaning of the painting, while the group in the same position of the Müller epitaph serves a commemorative function for the deceased family member and is largely separated from the world of the primary subject. Although different in subject and meaning, Spranger’s later painting clearly draws on the epitaph of his father-in-law and equates Minerva with Christ.

The printmaker Aegidius Sadeler’s engraving *Triumph of Wisdom* (figure 5) modifies the composition of Spranger’s *Minerva Vanquishing Ignorance*, focusing on Minerva’s action and clarifying the arrangement of the group around the plinth. Sadeler’s upbringing and background parallel Spranger’s; he began as an apprentice in Antwerp before travelling and training throughout the continent. Many in Sadeler’s family also worked as engravers, including his uncle


Jan, who took him to Italy in the beginning of the 1590s.\textsuperscript{19} Sadeler settled in Prague in 1597, becoming the official imperial engraver and thereafter creating prints based on paintings by various court artists, including Spranger. In adapting Spranger’s painting of Minerva, Sadeler emphasizes the action of the central figure and captures the moment of Ignorance’s subjugation rather than the scene afterwards where Minerva has already relaxed her position as in the Spranger. Minerva here glares downward at Ignorance, right arm extended across her chest, gripping the rope binding his hands. Only one putto arrives to give her accolades and crowns her with a laurel wreath, while holding a palm frond that appears wing-like as it juts into the right half of the image at the level of Minerva’s shoulder. Fewer figures populate the group below, which reduces the chaos of their overlapping heads and the ensuing difficulty of identification. The figures in Sadeler’s print focus more heavily on Minerva and Ignorance; the Arts gaze upwards at Minerva, while Bellona turns around and watches the fallen man where the goddess has pinned him down, the positioning of her body inviting the viewer’s participation in the same activity. Urania and Mercury again appear behind Bellona with Mercury now holding his caduceus as an additional means of identification beyond the winged helmet of the Spranger painting. Clio reads a book while simultaneously taking a more active position than in Spranger’s version and reaching out of the frame of the print to write in the inscription. Sadeler’s print stresses the action of Minerva, focused on her domination of Ignorance and his subjugation, while Spranger’s figure is already eased and confident in her victory. The lance of Spranger’s Minerva relaxes in her hand while she holds him captive casually, not looking his direction and trusting that her one hand and the press of her foot onto his throat is enough.

The translation of the image from painting to print required changes and likely a collaboration between the original artist and the engraver. Spranger worked with numerous printmakers throughout his career, many based in Antwerp. Drawings and documents passed between Spranger and engravers like Jan Muller suggest the extent to which the painter was involved in the painting’s transition to print. Proofs sent to Prague by Muller returned covered with corrections in chalk, indicating Spranger’s influence over the composition. Spranger was able to ensure that his style was perpetuated in print, rather than the engraver’s own, and revise elements to promote his idea and interpretation of the subject. A similar collaboration likely ensued between Spranger and Sadeler, who lived in the same city and would have been readily available to create a print accommodating the needs of the medium and Spranger’s original intentions. The process of translation required the print to compensate for the loss of color and the subtle modulations of shade that painting facilitates. The basic transition of painting to print necessitated translation and was influenced by the printmaker’s own expertise although Spranger likely contributed to the alterations.

Underlying the three works of *Epitaph of Nikolaus Müller, Minerva Vanquishing Ignorance*, and *Triumph of Wisdom* is a theme of triumph, varyingly interpreted for the purposes of each work. The equation of religious and mythological themes corresponds to the use of gods and religious figures as allegorical models in iconographic programs in Europe. In particular, Spranger’s paintings share the theme of triumph, as Christ rises above death and Minerva defeats Ignorance, both proving their ascendency against adversarial forces. The poses in the Spranger

---


images that communicate their confidence, as well as the active victory of Minerva in Sadeler’s print, unite the different subjects and suggest that both the religious and the allegorical received similar treatment at Rudolf’s court. All three variations similarly serve a purpose of moral instruction; the epitaph consoles the mourning family and asserts the life after death awaiting Müller, while the Minerva images reinforce the importance of wisdom and the survival of the antique tradition in the Holy Roman Empire and encourage the audience to emulate the goddess lest they fall victim to ignorance. Despite the divergent subjects, locations, and purposes, the artists connected religious and secular painting, indicating the tenor of art in Prague and the importance placed on allegorical imagery by Rudolf II.

Practically, Spranger was able to repeat the composition of the Epitaph of Nikolaus Müller in Minerva Vanquishing Ignorance due to the change in patronage and the first painting’s lack of accessibility. The epitaph remained in a cemetery chapel in Prague, serving as a dedication to Müller’s soul and as a commemorative painting aimed at his family members. Although the epitaph was in a public setting, its interest was personal and dedicated to a small group of those with a connection to Müller. The patron of the second painting, Rudolf II, likely did not have knowledge of the epitaph and would have been unaware of the exact origins of Spranger’s composition. Other Rudolfine court artists participated in this tradition and repeated compositions made outside of the emperor’s commissions. The sculptor Adriaen de Vries created Theseus and Antiope (figure 6) around 1600 while in Augsburg, shortly before arriving in Prague. A few years later he made Hercules, Nessus, and Deianira (figure 7), which, aside from the addition of the centaur Nessus and its overall smaller size, exactly follows the Augsburg

---

22 Kaufmann, The School of Prague, 65.
sculpture. Like Spranger’s paintings, Rudolf would have been unaware of the repetition due to the inaccessibility of the original sculpture.

Artists before Spranger similarly reused figures and elements of composition in their work, creating a convenient tradition available for his own practice. Giorgio Vasari recycled the image of the Libyan Sibyl from Michelangelo’s fresco on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel and incorporated the figure into his own work, as Judith in the painting *Judith Beheading Holofernes*, and as *Pittura* in a fresco at his home in Arezzo. Vasari transcends the boundaries of genre and identity similar to Spranger’s transition of the figure from religious to allegorical. The Italian artist Francesco Salviati also repeated a grouping of five characters in two different altarpieces. His predecessor Raphael, who was a major influence throughout the sixteenth century, similarly participated in the repetition of figures across projects. Spranger’s time in Italy and immersion in its culture and artistic tradition while working in Rome and travelling to Milan would have likely exposed him to the practices utilized by many artists. The prints by Marcantonio Raimondi made after Raphael’s compositions, widely circulated not only in Italy but across the continent, displayed the repetition of figures in famous works of art and provided examples for Spranger’s own practice. The act of copying compositions recurred in artistic works of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, made possible by the change of patron and their lack of awareness of the repetition.

The meaning of Spranger’s design not only changes in the transition from religious painting to allegory, but also in its translation into print. The wider audience of the print

---

25 Ibid.
necessitated a clearer meaning, aided by the addition of the inscription and the purposes of prints that were personally connected to the emperor. Spranger’s painting has received various interpretations from scholars, with some disagreeing with Minerva’s identification or incorporating Rudolf’s interest in alchemy and the philosopher’s stone.\textsuperscript{26} Teréz Gerszi sees Minerva as a further allegory of “psychomachia,” referring to the conflict of the soul and the battle between good and evil.\textsuperscript{27} Jürgen Müller identifies Minerva as the star goddess Astraea, who heralds the beginning of the golden age, and argues that it is a depoliticized allegory, not intended as a piece of propaganda but rather as an allusion to the emperor’s involvement in the end of the world and ultimate salvation.\textsuperscript{28} Although the ambiguity of meaning remains, Rudolf’s involvement in the commission and personal promotion of the arts as an intellectual activity suggest that the image indeed shows Minerva and pertains to his devotion to the pursuit of knowledge. Paintings destined for the Kunstkammer like \textit{Minerva Vanquishing Ignorance} targeted the few erudite elite who were able to view Rudolf’s collection and often contained several layers of allegorical meaning as suited their tastes. The medium of the print immediately widened the audience and required greater clarity to communicate its message to a less educated audience without the assumed knowledge of allegory possessed by visitors to the Kunstkammer. The action of Clio, muse of history, writing the inscription and laying out the content and suggested meaning of the print calls attention to the constructed nature of the composition and its status as metaphorical commentary on societal and intellectual conditions. The inscription touts
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the power of art and proclaims that, “the ignorant will not be honored. But it is granted that the ignorant should lie down, trampled by spurned art, and should tumble down deprived of true honor.” The text identifies the subject and makes clear that the image should be interpreted as a statement on the power of art and the defeat of ignorance. The context of the Holy Roman Empire additionally situates the defeat of ignorance within the purview of Rudolf, widely known as an art patron, and here promoting himself as a protector of the arts. The addition of the inscription clarifies the identities of the figures in the print and suggests the intention that the print be legible to a wider audience beyond the educated elite.

In disseminating broadly across the continent, prints like Sadeler’s not only reached a larger audience but also came to enter the collections of nobles and were progressively valued as a medium. The popularity of reproductive prints grew throughout the sixteenth century as artists followed the example of famous painters like Raphael and Titian who successfully distributed their art by working directly with engravers, Marcantonio Raimondi and Cornelis Cort respectively. Collectors valued reproductive prints and displayed them among other works of art, exhibiting them as sources of knowledge and as representations of the works of famous contemporary artists. Prints also featured in Rudolf’s Kunstkammer and appeared in

29 Metzler, Bartholomeus Spranger, 317. The full Latin inscription is: “Non datur; exams veneretur ut INSCIVS ARTES. Solus was quaerens noscere gestit AMOR. INSCIVS NON HONORABITur. Sed datur; ut spreta iaceat calcatus ab ARTE/INSCIVS, et solido cassus honore ruat.” The full English translation: “It is not granted that the ignorant should have admiration for the beautiful arts. Love alone seeking them [the arts] eagerly desires to learn them. The ignorant will not be honored. But it is granted that the ignorant should lie down, trampled by spurned art, and should tumble down deprived of true honor.”


31 Pon, Raphael, Dürer, and Marcantonio Raimondi, 48.

inventories of the collection made at the beginning of the seventeenth century. These engravings allowed the emperor to have images of paintings unavailable for purchase, effectively displaying the value and believed accuracy of the reproduction in representing the original, and demonstrated his knowledge and appreciation of current art. Collectors and art connoisseurs primarily learned of famous works of art, especially antique sculpture that was predominantly in collections in Italy, through prints and other forms of reproduction like sketchbook drawings. Prints were used as a form of exchange among those involved in the art world, comparable to the epistolary relations of humanists that encouraged the cultivation of communities and friendships across the continent. Systematic print collecting flourished with the albums of prints published in Antwerp and Haarlem in the middle of the sixteenth century by Cornelis Bos, Dirck Coornhert, Hans Liefhrinck, and especially Hieronymus Cock. Cock’s firm was succeeded by the Galle family and then Gerard de Jode, whose son Pieter de Jode produced engravings made after Spranger’s paintings. Rudolf’s uncle, Archduke Ferdinand of Tyrol, amassed a large Kunstkammer of his own between 1565 and 1595, which held over 7,000 prints according to an inventory made in 1596, the year after his death. The prints, bound together in albums and ranging in purpose from the illustrative to the documentary to the practical, formed a part of the larger Kunstkammer, which altogether was meant to be an encyclopedic collection of the world’s
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Archduke Ferdinand acted as a model for the Kunstkammer of the emperor, who additionally attempted to preserve his uncle’s collection as a whole and maintain its prestige. Major art patrons like Rudolf valued prints and displayed them in their collections, indicating the value and utility of reproductive engravings as representations of the original painting. Impressions of Sadeler’s print would not only appear in Rudolf’s Kunstkammer but also in collections across the continent.

Engravings also carried prestige among other artists, especially those of the northern tradition who saw printmaking as part of their domain. Printmakers themselves grew in status throughout the sixteenth century; Sadeler was named imperial engraver, Martino Rota previously held an official court position in Vienna, and printmakers received privileges from Rudolf throughout his reign, including Hendrick Goltzius who made reproductive engravings after Spranger. Other artists advocated for the deserved prestige of printmaking, including the sixteenth-century Flemish humanist and artist Domenicus Lampsonius who promoted the northern art tradition when corresponding with his counterparts in Italy. In a letter to Giorgio Vasari, Lampsonius praises the works of earlier northern artists like Albrecht Dürer, promotes northern reproductive engravings, and laments the lack of copies of Michelangelo’s work, which he states is suited to imitation due to its perfection and clarity. Lampsonius attempts to cultivate the idea of a northern canon to Vasari following the publication of the second edition of his influential Le Vite de’ più eccellenti pittori, scultori, e architetti, and further champions
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printmaking as an essentially northern art form, with northern printmakers available to produce higher quality reproductive engravings than could be made by Italians. In the second edition of Vasari’s *Vite* of 1568, he primarily discusses prints in the context of its effect on the prestige of the work and the artist, claiming overall that printmakers and publishers are motivated by greed.\(^{43}\) Lampsonius by contrast frequently extolled the virtues of reproductive engraving and northern printmakers to Italian painters, praising the work of the engraver Cornelis Cort in letters sent to Titian and Giulio Clovio.\(^{44}\)

According to arguments Lampsonius laid out in his letters to Italian artists and theorists, the skill of northern engravers and their masterful control of the medium contribute to the process of the formation of the canon, thus transferring a degree of power to the printmakers who become instrumental in transmitting the achievements of the painter.\(^ {45}\) Northern engravers served this duty best and surpassed Italian printmakers in Lampsonius’s estimation in their ability to transfer the manner of the artist to the print and their mastery of the tools and physicality of printmaking. For Lampsonius, prints disseminated by northern publishers also served an educational purpose when gathered in specific programs and were able to represent a history of northern art for students to draw upon and emulate.\(^ {46}\) The informational element of the engraving parallels many of the actions of the collectors who hoped to use prints as a way to form an encyclopedic catalogue of the works of famous artists past and present.

The reproductive engraver Dirck Coornhert, after receiving a gift from the geographer Abraham Ortelius of a print by Philips Galle made after a painting by Pieter Brueghel, lavishly

\(^{45}\) Ibid., 150.
\(^{46}\) Ibid., 143.
praised the draftsmanship of Galle and his technique in engraving the image.\textsuperscript{47} Coornhert writes of the print that he “examined it with pleasure and admiration from top to bottom for the artistry of its drawing and the care of its engraving.”\textsuperscript{48} The print merits close consideration in the details of its technique according to Coornhert’s reply and excelled in the delineation of forms and the draftsmanship. His compliments of Galle’s engraving and Brueghel’s design ultimately reflect on Ortelius, who arranged for the collaboration and subsequently sent many of the prints to his friends.\textsuperscript{49} The gifting of an engraving among scholars and artists indicates the importance to their community and the assumed appreciation that prints would inspire.

The Flemish art theorist and historian Karel van Mander documented the history of northern artists in his influential \textit{Schilder-boeck} of 1604, particularly praising the work of Spranger and his patron Rudolf II. Van Mander mingled his account of northern painters alongside chapters on the biographies of Italian and ancient painters as well as theoretical tracts on the foundations of art and the depiction of figures. Like Lampsonius, Van Mander distinguished a unique northern tradition and hoped to establish a history of northern art akin to Vasari’s \textit{Vite}. Vasari’s heavy influence on Van Mander appears in the Italian section of the \textit{Schilder-boeck}, with most of the biographies deriving from the \textit{Vite} although occasionally adapted to focus primarily on the painting of an artist where Vasari also included information on sculpture and architecture.\textsuperscript{50} Van Mander ties in directly to the world of Rudolfine art; he was a personal friend of Spranger and aided the artist in spreading his paintings through reproductive engraving by initiating the connection between Spranger and one of his principal collaborators.

\textsuperscript{48} Parshall, “Art and the Theater of Knowledge,” 8.
\textsuperscript{49} Melion, “Theory and Practice,” 51.
\textsuperscript{50} Pon, \textit{Raphael, Dürer, and Marcantonio Raimondi}, 146.
Hendrick Goltzius.\textsuperscript{51} \textit{Epitaph of Nikolaus Müller} receives praise in the \textit{Schilder-boeck}, referred to as “among the best of the many coloristic works that [Spranger] painted.”\textsuperscript{52} Van Mander’s involvement in the art world of Prague extended beyond friendships with court artists to an admiration and promotion of the emperor himself. In the preface to the \textit{Schilder-boeck}, Van Mander writes that anyone who wants to see beautiful contemporary art should “go to Prague, the home of the greatest lover of art in the world” and, viewing his collection and the extraordinary and costly pieces Rudolf possesses, the visitor would “be obliged to confess that our Painting is a noble, excellent, magnificent, and virtuous exercise that does not need to yield to any science or liberal art.”\textsuperscript{53} Van Mander’s advocacy of Prague in the preface of his book and his praise of the emperor indicates his interest in the broader Mannerist court art and the pervasive influence of Rudolf and his retinue of artists beyond the borders of the city. The pronounced value placed on Spranger and the other court painters suggests the fame and success they enjoyed in Prague.

Van Mander’s documentation of a history of northern art also encompassed engraving, an area in which he, similar to Lampsonius, believed German and Netherlandish artists exceeded
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the Italians in skill.\textsuperscript{54} The subject of engravings recurs throughout his chapters on the lives of German and Netherlandish painters. The text on Lucas van Leyden references his engravings as demonstrative of his talent and indicates the ability of prints to circulate new models and show the distance between Netherlandish and Italian art.\textsuperscript{55} Mentions of the art of engraving persist into the sections on more recent artists, including the German painter Christoph Schwarz, who worked for Duke Maximilian I of Bavaria in Munich and died in 1592. In Schwarz’s biography, Van Mander records the “various clever prints” that reproduce his images, primarily executed by Aegidius’s uncle Jan Sadeler I.\textsuperscript{56} Schwarz’s fame extended outside of Bavaria and attracted the attention of Rudolf, who possessed several copies after Schwarz in his Kunstkammer and attempted to recruit him as a court artist in the 1580s. Van Mander’s section on the engraver Hendrick Goltzius effusively praises his natural artistic faculty, in part demonstrated by his prints. Van Mander proclaims that Goltzius’s prints provide “evidence of his insight and talent in the art of drawing.”\textsuperscript{57} Goltzius’s ability to adapt his engraving style to the painter he imitates prompts Van Mander to name him “a rare Proteus or Vertumnus in art.”\textsuperscript{58} For Van Mander, Goltzius represents the epitome of the contemporaneous printmaking tradition in the northern territories, displaying his skill as a draftsman and control over the medium.

Despite his praise of Goltzius, Van Mander’s appreciation for printmaking stems largely from its ability to reproduce a composition, allowing the viewer to see an image without requiring access to the original painting, and as a demonstration of the artist’s drawing ability.
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When discussing Goltzius, Van Mander states that, “I do not believe that anyone is so sure and quick at drawing a figure…with such great liveliness.”\textsuperscript{59} Goltzius’s engravings display his \textit{teyckenconst}, his capacity to compose a unified image and delineate figures and other forms of nature, similar to Vasari’s \textit{disegno}.\textsuperscript{60} Despite Van Mander’s appreciation of Goltzius’s talent as shown in his engravings, the \textit{Schilder-boeck} solely concerns painters and only integrates prints when it presents a painter’s composition otherwise unknown to Van Mander or as an example of the painter’s mastery over the art of drawing and design. Prints are ultimately inadequate in judging the true quality of a painting; in the same biography of Schwarz where Van Mander references Jan Sadeler’s clever prints, he also states that these reproductive prints give only “an inkling of his spirit in the arrangement and posing of figures.”\textsuperscript{61} Aegidius Sadeler himself receives one sentence from Van Mander in the \textit{Schilder-boeck}, in connection with his family, introducing him as an engraver who occasionally paints for the love of the art.\textsuperscript{62}

Although prints were valued for their representative capacities by collectors and theorists, and for their unique line qualities by other artists, prints remained lower on the hierarchy of the arts than painting. Sadeler and his \textit{Triumph of Wisdom}, which was instrumental in promoting the fame of Spranger, disseminated as a marketable product intended for profit, and connected with the prestige of the court of Rudolf II, still did not garner the same wide fame outside of the community of fellow artists as painters did. His print was less valued than either of Spranger’s paintings of \textit{Minerva Vanquishing Ignorance} or \textit{Epitaph of Nikolaus Müller} due to its medium and reproductive quality. Painting remained the highest art for Van Mander, who in the recount
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of the life of the Dutch painter and engraver Jacques de Gheyn, states that de Gheyn eventually learned that “painting is the most suitable approach to life or nature…so that he abandoned engraving and printing and lamented the time he had wasted.”63 This opinion is not exclusive to Van Mander and others prior to the seventeenth century and across Europe presented similar views in the paragone debates advocating for the supremacy of painting, as Leonardo da Vinci did when he argued that painting “cannot produce infinite offspring…Painting alone retains its nobility, bringing honors singularly to its author and remaining precious and unique.”64 The idea of the reproducibility of prints and their lack of singularity colored the debates on the status of printmaking and affected the artists who practiced it, ultimately resulting in greater respect given to painting over printmaking.

Sadeler, one of the most accomplished and successful printmakers of his time, received less monetary compensation from Rudolf as a court artist and ultimately enjoyed less fame during his lifetime. References to Sadeler in other literature of the time outside of the Schilderboeck, such as the cartographer Matthias Quadt van Kinkelbach, note his technical prowess as an engraver, his membership in the upper echelons of printmaking, and the utility of prints in general.65 Compared to other engravers, he was one of the most famous practitioners of his day and noted for his skill among the artistic community as one of the best printmakers of his generation, although his fame never reached the height of the painters at Rudolf’s court.

Sadeler’s reputation grew after his lifetime, with an assertion of his supremacy in the medium by
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the German art historian, and Sadeler’s pupil, Joachim von Sandrart in his text *Teutsche Academie* of 1675.66 *Teutsche Academie* was inspired by Van Mander’s *Schilder-boeck* and compiled biographies of artists from the late thirteenth century to the seventeenth century, with the information on the Italian artists largely derived from Vasari and many of the northern artists also coming from Van Mander. Sandrart did add new biographies, primarily of printmakers, German artists, and artists of the seventeenth century who worked following Van Mander’s death in 1606. In his biography of Sadeler, Sandrart writes that he raised the art of engraving to a higher dignity and stood as the premier example for printmakers of other countries to follow.67 Sandrart includes Sadeler’s work in the service of Rudolf II, again named one of the most virtuous and famous art lovers, as well as his collaborations with Spranger and friendships with other court artists.68 According to Sandrart’s interpretation, Sadeler’s superiority to other engravers derives from his interpretation of the composition, adapting the brush work to a new medium rather than directly copying the original painting.69 The perceived necessity of the elevation from the point of view of the latter half of the seventeenth century indicates the prior understood status of printmaking. Sadeler’s contemporaries, like Lampsonius, Coornhert, and Van Mander, remark on the virtuosity of burin work, the technical quality of his engravings, and the usefulness and value of prints as a whole, while later generations also discussed engravings in terms of their uniqueness in comparison to paintings and the changes and artistic ingenuity involved in the work of printmakers.

68 Ibid.
Beyond its use as an educational tool for young artists and as a representative image for collectors’ cabinets, Sadeler’s *Triumph of Wisdom* and other Rudolfine prints also served the original designer, increasing his reputation and providing a further source of income. Those who visited Prague took home original drawings, which were then transferred to engravers, who, although some never corresponded with the Rudolfine artists, also contributed to this phenomenon and compounded the reach of the court painters.\(^70\) The same painting could also be engraved multiple times by different printmakers and thus allowed a composition to spread more effectively and comprehensively. Sadeler and another engraver Johann Theodor de Bry both created engravings after the court artist Joseph Heintz’s *Diana Surprised by Acteon*, which was itself inspired by a Titian painting of the same subject held in Rudolf’s Kunstkammer.\(^71\) Rudolf II bestowed privileges, intended to restrict the copying of works of art or literature within his domain by others, to the works of some engravers as well, including Sadeler and Goltzius. Each print made under one of his privileges was sent to the Hofkammer at the imperial court, which served to spread the reputation of the artists among the denizens of Prague and visitors to court and further enabled artists to gain new patrons.

Sadeler’s reproductive engravings also augmented Spranger’s reputation in allowing the general public to see paintings normally restricted to the emperor’s personal collections.

Rudolf’s court artists primarily created works for his Kunstkammer, unavailable to be accessed by most patrons unless they visited Prague and were invited to view the collection. It was considered to be a great honor by visitors and ambassadors in Prague to see the Kunstkammer.

\(^{70}\) Ibid., 20.

\(^{71}\) Sandrine Vézilier, *Sensualité et volupté : le corps feminin dans la peinture flamande des XVIe et XVIIe siècles* (Milan: Silvana, 2010), 98.
given Rudolf’s interest in and personal devotion to collecting. Spranger produced a majority of his paintings for Rudolf, including *Minerva Vanquishing Ignorance*, which resided in the Kunstkammer and was originally intended primarily for Rudolf, thus also necessitating the changes Sadeler made in the transition to a wider audience. Spranger’s influence derived mostly from the prints of his engravers, dually contributing to his fame and wealth. Without Sadeler’s print, Spranger’s composition would be unknown at the time, as was the case with most of his paintings made after entering Rudolf’s service. Private paintings like the *Epitaph of Nikolaus Müller* frequently lacked translation into print due to the highly personal nature of the works, again restricting the scope and success of Spranger’s artistic career outside of Prague. Van Mander reported that Spranger even worked in the emperor’s chamber, without the aid of students or assistants, and created paintings made chiefly to suit Rudolf’s interests. Without the production of prints, Spranger would have lacked the level of influence and wealth he enjoyed during his lifetime.

The international spread of prints made after designs by Rudolfine painters also demonstrates the usefulness of prints and the influence that reproductive engravings held in the dissemination of their art. Spranger’s designs even found their way to the Mughal court in India, where Johannes Sadeler’s 1581 *The Holy Family with Musical Angels and Infant St. John the
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Baptist was copied by the miniaturist Abu’l Hasan Nadir al-Zaman c. 1600-05 as an opaque watercolor with gold and silver. Artistic exchange with India was led by Jesuit missionaries, beginning with Francis Xavier and continuing with the Mughal or “Mogor” mission founded in 1580 by Rodolfo Acquaviva and Jerónimo Xavier. Spranger’s work found its way to court among this context, as Sadeler’s print provided a religious image for the Mughal emperors which then inspired further reproductions of his work. The missionaries brought engravings, paintings, and statues, quickly inspiring the Mughal artists to adopt the designs and style and spread Catholic imagery in Mughal cities. The miniature was produced for Akbar’s son, Prince Salim, before he became Emperor Jahāṅgir in 1604. The quality of the miniature and the status of its patron indicate that the reproductive prints were able to be reinterpreted and subsequently used as a status symbol for the Mughal elite. The various copies after Spranger’s works, including parodies, European adaptations, and Mughal miniatures, displays the success of his prints and the international reputation he acquired by utilizing reproductive engravings of his works.

As a further indication of the painter’s awareness of the utility of printmaking, Spranger himself attempted to create prints of his own design, opting for etching over engraving due to the greater accessibility of the former for painters. In an etching, artists carve into a layer of wax and then dip the plate into acid, which bites into the metal of the plate where the lines have been
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79 Michael Cole and Larry Silver, “Fluid Boundaries: Formations of the Painter-Etcher,” in *The Early Modern Painter-Etcher*, ed. Michael Cole (University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 2006), 6. Spranger also followed in the long tradition of what has been dubbed the “peintres-graveurs,” those such as Albrecht Dürer who created both paintings and prints. Dürer particularly preferred printmaking to painting because he was able to make more engravings in a short amount of time and in greater quantity, both of which allowed him to earn a large income.
carved and dissolves the wax. The technique of the etching allowed Spranger to work actively on prints without the necessity of developing the skill of the burin. Spranger ultimately created three small etchings of religious figures: St. Bartholomew, St. Sebastian, and St. John the Evangelist. The inscription on the first print reads, “Bartholomeus Spranger of Antwerp made as first try in Prague 1589,” proclaiming his inexperience and the experimental nature of the set. Even without this statement, Spranger clearly displays his lack of knowledge in the reversal of the inscription on the first print, and the signatures and dating of the subsequent two. With these inscriptions Spranger shows that he was unaware that the text must be written backwards on the plate to be legible in the printed impressions. Spranger’s brief attempt at printmaking and his ultimate failure of execution demonstrate his interest in creating his own prints and learning the trade. The etchings act as an acknowledgment of the usefulness of prints and their interest for artists, although Spranger did not continue his experimentation to refine the sketchy quality of the lines and the reversed inscriptions. Spranger also likely chose to experiment with printmaking for monetary reasons; the quantity and quick production time of prints would have allowed the painter to make a large sum of money.

Beyond the utility of prints as a way to disseminate his compositions, reproductive prints served as a further source of monetary profit for Spranger and provided incentive for the myriad prints produced by Sadeler and others. In Prague, Spranger received 540 gulden per year, the highest paid artist at court, and was further raised to nobility by the emperor. Other artists did not fare as well, with the painter Joseph Heintz receiving 180 gulden per year when he first
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arrived in Prague in 1591. For court artists like Spranger and Heintz, prints served as a way to increase their income beyond the base stipend provided by Rudolf. Vladislav Hall in Prague, depicted in a print by Sadeler (figure 8), sold a variety of prints and was frequented by a large group of noblemen, guild masters, and others with access to the court. The print’s inscription compares the hall to an ancient Roman basilica in its dual commercial and political uses, indicating the extent to which Vladislav Hall served this function. As prints and printed books became easier to mass produce and grew in prominence throughout the fifteenth century, a commercial network arose of fairs, festivals, markets, and other venues that enabled publishers to sell their goods and artists to make more money off of prints than paintings. The beginning of the engraver Jan Muller’s collaboration with Spranger dates to around the period when Goltzius ended their exchange in the late 1580s, ensuring the continuity of regularly produced reproductive engravings. Although each individual print was low in cost, altogether they were able to provide a large profit for Spranger. Prints also, in expanding the name recognition of the designer, raised the prices of their original paintings and created higher demand. The use of a privilege indicated the importance of attribution and the desire of the artists to protect their prints and prevent forgers from profiting off of the design of another as transmitted through print.
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Sadeler and Goltzius both received long-term privileges from the emperor, as did many of the individual engravings made after Spranger’s paintings. Spranger’s paintings resulted in over seventy reproductive engravings made during his lifetime by over twenty printmakers. The surfeit of reproductive prints ties into their profitability and Spranger’s incentive to continue collaborating with engravers. Financial motivations enabling the production of prints practically and dually served both Spranger and Sadeler, performing successfully in the market.

The repetition of composition and motifs across three works of art by two artists, initially Spranger’s *Epitaph of Nikolaus Müller* to *Minerva Vanquishing Ignorance*, and subsequently the translation of the latter into the engraving *Triumph of Wisdom* by Aegidius Sadeler, exemplifies the status of copying and reproduction at the court of Emperor Rudolf II in Prague. The private nature of the initial painting and the difference of patron allowed Spranger to reuse the composition of the epitaph in his *Minerva Vanquishing Ignorance*, made for Rudolf’s Kunstkammer. The print, formed in a collaboration between painter and engraver, further necessitated changes to the composition, appealing to a wider audience and promoting the Holy Roman Empire as an art haven. Collectors and artists of the late sixteenth century valued prints for their representation of otherwise unknown paintings and their ability to demonstrate the art of drawing, although prints ultimately were placed lower in the artistic hierarchy than painting due to a perceived lack of originality. Spranger and other Rudolfine court artists heavily relied on reproductive printmaking to spread their reputations and designs to a wider audience, otherwise restricted by the highly private nature of Rudolf’s collection. The profitable nature of prints and their ability to disseminate across and beyond Europe encouraged court painters to collaborate with engravers and enabled the extensive production of prints made after the designs of Rudolfine artists. Repetition within an artist’s oeuvre and reproduction into print occurred
frequently in Prague’s artistic community, due to the lack of awareness of the patron and the practical motivations of both painters and engravers to earn a profit and elevate their status.
Chapter 2
Reproduction, Collaboration, and Dynasty in the Propaganda of Rudolf II

Rudolf II’s patronage of Spranger, Sadeler, and other court artists including the painter Hans von Aachen and the sculptor Adriaen de Vries allowed and even encouraged the production of copies and the reuse of motifs and compositions in Prague. The copies produced at Rudolf’s court abounded, beyond the scope of Spranger’s repetition of composition within his oeuvre or the numerous reproductive prints made after his works. Court artists produced autograph copies of their own works, copied older paintings from famous Renaissance artists, created independent paintings based on prints, and exchanged specific features and forms among those within the Prague community. Hans von Aachen, for example, painted *The Judgment of Paris* first in 1588; when he returned to the subject in 1590, he reversed the composition, using Sadeler’s reproductive print as a reference. The court artist Joseph Heintz painted *The Adoration of the Shepherds* and repeated the same composition three times. These types of copying and variation became commonplace at Rudolf’s court and indicate the reproductive culture that existed in Prague at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Rudolf supported participation in artistic exchange and replication among the artists, as well as the utilization of the art of their predecessors held in the Kunstkammer. Viewed in his own time as largely ineffective and eccentric, Rudolf attempted to counteract his poor political position by harnessing art. He established himself as the premier art connoisseur in the world and commissioned his court artists to use his collection to promote his image as a powerful emperor. Aegidius Sadeler’s print
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of 1603, *Rudolf II on Horseback* (figure 9), exemplifies Rudolf’s conscious connection with the past and the use of earlier artistic models and his dynastic lineage in the creation of political propaganda. The spread of propagandistic portraiture at Rudolf’s court as demonstrated by Sadeler’s print aimed at modifying his perception as a depressive and powerless ruler, providing an alternative reputation by emphasizing his art patronage and the prestige of his ancestry. Rudolf ultimately supported and helped to cultivate the culture of reproduction in Prague as it both appealed to his pronounced artistic inclinations as a collector and served political purposes in his role as the Holy Roman Emperor.

Sadeler’s 1603 engraving *Rudolf II on Horseback* depicts the emperor astride a bucking horse, dressed in armor with a lance in hand and a laurel wreath encircling his head. An eagle present in the upper right corner references the symbol of the Holy Roman Empire and Rudolf specifically with the small ribbon bearing his motto “ADSIT” directly below. ADSIT alluded to several meanings, including “Adiutorium Domini Sit Inimcis Timor,” translated as “The helper of the Lord is the fear of the enemies,” and “Adjuvante Domino Superabo Imperatorem Turcarum,” or “God helping, I will subdue the Emperor of the Turks.”91 Both of these interpretations pertain to this print and emphasize Rudolf’s militaristic quality and the war the Holy Roman Empire was engaged in at the beginning of the seventeenth century. The distant landscape in the background behind the central figure portrays the scene of the imperial army fighting against the Turks and contextualizes the emperor’s armor and victorious presentation. Although the emperor himself never participated in a battle, Rudolf’s stereotypically martial appearance symbolizes the power of the empire as a whole and the promise of their eventual
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victory. The figure of Rudolf and the horse dominate the length and width of the print, clearly focusing on the emperor and relegating the actual battle scene to a secondary position that fades in prominence as the landscape recedes. The imagery employed in the print functions as political iconography and represents both the emperor and the empire as victorious powers, despite the many difficulties and military losses they faced in reality in this war against the Ottoman Empire. Rudolf aimed for decisive victory over the Turks rather than peace and Sadeler’s print and other artistic propaganda of the period perpetuates this idea of Habsburg power. The engraving further received a privilege from the pope, which offered partial protection against unapproved forgery and intertwined the representatives of two of Europe’s largest powers in a political piece of art.

The composition of *Rudolf II on Horseback* derives from a drawing (figure 10) done by the Netherlandish sculptor Adriaen de Vries made specifically as a basis for this print. De Vries first arrived in Prague from Italy in 1589, although he had a period of absence from court from 1594 to 1601, after which point he returned to the city at the summons of the emperor’s agent Rudolf Coraduz. The drawing for the print would have been created shortly after this period, when Rudolf appointed him Kammerbildhauer, the court sculptor, a prestigious position that entitled De Vries to a higher salary and close access to the emperor. De Vries’s sketch appears in reverse to the print and confirms its position as a preparatory work for Sadeler. The drawing lacks the eagle in the upper right, the laurel wreath, the intricate detail of Rudolf’s armor, and,

---

93 Friedrich Polleross, “Portraiture at the Imperial Court in the First Half of the 17th Century,” in *The Holy Roman Empire, 1495-1806*, eds. Evans and Wilson, 353.
most prominently, the entirety of the battle scene behind him. The combination of the engraving and drawing evidences the collaborative relationship between Sadeler and De Vries as well as Rudolf’s use of multiple artists in the creation of propagandistic imagery.

The portrait head depicted by Sadeler in the final engraving additionally differs from De Vries’s drawing and comes from a third court artist, the painter Hans von Aachen. In the same year as the equestrian portrait, Sadeler engraved a portrait of Rudolf II (figure 11) based on a now lost painting by Von Aachen, afterwards frequently copied by other artists in various media. Sadeler’s print after Von Aachen presents a portrait bust of Rudolf in armor wearing a laurel wreath in the stereotypical martial fashion. Two figures of bound Turks appear at the bottom of the print along with representations of Bellona, goddess of war, and Fortuna on either side of the emperor’s portrait. The Von Aachen and Sadeler portrait print employs imagery of Rudolf as a triumphant emperor in his war against the Turks and forms a close connection with the equestrian portrait collaboration of the same year. The physical features of the emperor and the presence of the laurel wreath in *Rudolf II on Horseback* correspond more closely to this 1603 portrait bust engraving than the vaguely defined face in De Vries’s sketch. *Rudolf II on Horseback* thus results from the work of three different court artists, all serving the emperor’s political needs in the design and execution of the print.

The equestrian portrait type appeared most famously in another painting glorifying a Holy Roman Emperor made over fifty years prior, Titian’s 1548 *Equestrian Portrait of Charles V* (figure 12). In the latter half of the sixteenth century, the painting was held in Madrid in the collection of Rudolf’s uncle and Charles V’s son, King Philip II of Spain, with whom Rudolf
lived from the age of eleven to nineteen. Like Sadeler’s print, Titian’s painting shows the emperor in armor on horseback commemorating a military victory, here Charles’s triumph over the Protestants at Mühlberg in 1547. De Vries’s design originates from Titian’s precedent, although he modifies the position of the horse and instead directs Rudolf’s gaze out towards the viewer. Titian’s painting itself derived from earlier sources, ranging from Roman imperial portraiture and equestrian imagery to the art of the German Renaissance from engravers like Hans Burgkmair, the creator of a print of Emperor Maximilian I on horseback. Charles V specifically served as a model for Rudolf, who employed imagery from his grandfather’s reign frequently in his own commissions. Sadeler’s print additionally fell in line in a succession of equestrian portraits of Holy Roman Emperors; the printmaker Crispijn de Passe the Elder copied Sadeler’s engraving for his 1604 series of equestrian portraits of the Habsburg rulers, Romani Imperatores Domo Austria. This copy indicates the continuity of the equestrian theme among the Habsburg family and the visual tradition Rudolf was participating in. The equestrian format alludes to Titian and Emperor Charles V, connecting Rudolf with a powerful ancestor and drawing on an example undoubtedly personally familiar to the emperor and well-known across Europe.

Antonio Tempesta’s 1593 etching Equestrian Portrait of Henry IV, King of France (figure 13) provides another source for De Vries’s design, likewise depicting a king and military commander riding a bucking horse, gaze confidently directed outwards. The low horizon line,
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crowds of soldiers riding in the background far below, and the outcropping of rock on which the horse stands correspond to Sadeler’s engraving and confirms the use of Tempesta’s print as a model. The artistic variation of outside sources in Sadeler’s print extends outside of the Prague court and displays the use of motifs and compositions of other artists to create Rudolf’s representation. Both source compositions of Titian and Tempesta explicitly characterize the ruler as a victorious military leader and were subsequently translated to Rudolf’s fictive promoted identity despite his lack of military experience. Sadeler’s and De Vries’s use of earlier compositions displays the acceptance of copying at Rudolf’s court and its widespread utility across Europe for political purposes.

The basic composition recurs later in De Vries’s work as well, both in sculpture connected with Rudolf and made for other patrons. Two years after the completion of the drawing, De Vries created a sculpture of a horse without a rider and, four years after that in 1609, the same imagery appeared again in a relief of Rudolf II as a roman emperor in *Rudolf II Introducing the Liberal Arts to Bohemia* (figure 14). 101 The relief again recalls Roman imperial imagery and further connects with his promotion of and connection to the arts and worldly knowledge previously seen in Sadeler’s *Triumph of Wisdom*. De Vries recycled the design shortly after in 1610 for a different patron, Duke Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig-Lüneberg, transformed into a small bronze sculpture (figure 15). 102 In this sculpture, De Vries preserves the basic elements of the composition of the sketch, including the posture of the horse and the outward gaze of the rider, although the duke lacks the laurel wreath and the intricacy of the armor present in the 1603 print. The fundamental meaning of the Rudolf sketch remains in this
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later sculpture, both intended to cast the central figure as a powerful leader. De Vries’s sculptures again demonstrates that the persistence of copying in Rudolfine art and the boundaries of its reach extended far beyond Prague and continued in the work the artists made for other patrons even while employed by the emperor. In regard to *Rudolf II on Horseback*, Sadeler and De Vries’s use of universal imagery in the equestrian theme encouraged the frequency of the production of copies. Rudolf’s political propaganda in Sadeler’s print was simple to understand and, ultimately, to reproduce, both from earlier sources to Rudolf and to other rulers in the time following.

Portraiture traditionally served as an effective mode of propaganda, often replicated in large quantities and conveniently transportable. Artists turned out copies of portraits in large amounts in response to a high demand and tended to retain a base portrait off of which others could be quickly and efficiently made when needed.\(^{103}\) Rulers commissioned portraits in the highest numbers, allowing them to exercise control over their representation and spread their face and reputation both to the general populace of their domain and to foreign courts.\(^{104}\) Rudolf II’s great-great-grandfather Emperor Maximilian I commissioned a large quantity of portrait prints to circulate throughout Europe. Maximilian I explicitly supported the use of portraiture as propaganda in the text of his chivalric novel and disguised autobiography *Der Weisskunig*, stating that, “He who during his lifetime provides no remembrance for himself has no remembrance after his death…”\(^{105}\) Like Maximilian, Rudolf also heavily used prints as an independent medium to disseminate his image. *Rudolf II on Horseback*, intentionally and

---

\(^{104}\) Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits*, 196.
\(^{105}\) Ibid., 201.
initially designed as a print, employs the tradition of portraiture and the familiarity of the populace with the ideas and forms of the genre in general and the equestrian format in specific to glorify the emperor. The reproductive nature of portraiture suited the medium of the print and led to the popularity of engravings like *Rudolf II on Horseback*. Portraiture’s claim to truth and assertion of its direct link with the subject made it a powerful and practical tool for the highest-ranked court artists, including Sadeler and De Vries.

Rudolf’s political position at the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century especially necessitated the production of propaganda due to the instability of Central Europe as a whole and Bohemia in particular.\(^{106}\) The Holy Roman Empire was engaged in an ongoing war against the Ottoman Empire, which escalated at the end of the sixteenth century despite the defeat of Selim II in the battle of Lepanto.\(^{107}\) Battle between the two powers reignited after 1590 when the truce with the Persians concluded and endured until 1606. The war significantly impacted the culture and political stability of Central Europe and became a common topic in art of the region. The renewed blatant hostility against the Turks inspired a range of ideological works that affected the public opinion of the populace and encouraged support for the Habsburgs. The number of writings in favor of the Holy Roman Empire exploded, encompassing a range of types from the unsophisticated mass-produced news-sheets to scholarly defenses of the empire and rebuttals against the religion and ideals of the Turks.\(^{108}\) Habsburg military engagements inspired political works across media and on multiple levels of accessibility both to a general public and to a sophisticated elite. The entirety of this offense against the Turks from
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the 1590s to 1606 occurred during Rudolf II’s reign, who assumed the title of Holy Roman Emperor in 1576 and maintained it until his death in 1612. Sadeler’s print numbers among one of the many responses generated in the empire during the war against the Turks intended to foster support for the empire and suggest their ascendency over the Ottoman Empire, despite the uncertainty of the result of the conflict. Rudolf marshalled the collaborative effort of three of his court artists to work on the issue of the war against the Ottoman Empire.

Rudolf himself required the production of constructed imagery like Sadeler’s print due to his poor personal and political reputation within the European arena. Ambassadors in Prague reported that Rudolf was reticent, volatile, and depressed, prone to outbursts and swayed by his emotions. The Venetian ambassador Tommaso Contarini wrote in 1596 that Rudolf refused to hear about the problems of the war and preferred to remain ignorant rather than act and subject himself to emotional distress. Rudolf had a tentative relationship with these representatives from other countries, preferring to isolate himself and lacking faith in their ability to support him during his war. Residents in the castle during this time wrote of Rudolf’s depression and mental instability, as well as his own doubt in his position as emperor. The president of the Chamber of Finances, Wolf von Unverzagt, stated in correspondence with Rudolf’s cousin the Archduke Ferdinand of Styria, “Night and day he is tortured by the thought that he is abandoned, that he cannot have confidence in anyone, that his subjects have lost their respect…” Rudolf was,

however, able to perform diplomatic duties when he deemed them necessary, as was the case of his attempted alliance with the tsar at the end of the sixteenth century. Feodor I and Boris Godunov both sent ambassadors to Prague in 1595 and 1599 respectively to create a military alliance.\textsuperscript{111} The alliance centered on the war against the Ottoman Empire, whose defeat would also have been beneficial to the tsars as their enemies in the Khanates to the south were allies with the Turks.\textsuperscript{112} Although nothing came of this considered union, the diplomatic missions demonstrate that Rudolf could act in the name of militaristic gain and was capable of conducting political affairs despite the reports of others. Among residents of Prague and the political powers they reported to, Rudolf was seen as unstable and unreliable, a perception fueled by his personal ambivalence towards Catholicism, despite his position as the Holy Roman Emperor, and the doubts and disapproval this inspired in the papal ambassadors to court. Other rulers and political leaders refused to cooperate with Rudolf’s demands and support him in the war, frustrating his plans to defeat the Turks.\textsuperscript{113} Rudolf’s reputation among political powers required propagandistic imagery, commissioned by the emperor to counteract this negative perception.

The limitations placed on Rudolf’s power were known not only among the courtiers in Prague but also among the populace of Bohemia. In addition to his troubles with the war against the Ottoman Empire, Rudolf also had to contend with religious conflicts occurring among the denominations in Bohemia. In 1575 Rudolf’s father Emperor Maximilian II was presented with the \textit{confessio Bohemica}, a compromise crafted among several Protestant groups, which Maximilian was sympathetic to but never signed.\textsuperscript{114} Over three decades later Rudolf needed the
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support of those who wanted the *confessio Bohemica* to be official after Matthias attempted to usurp his power and signed the Peace of Zsitavatorok as a representative of all Habsburgs, although the role of peacemaker logically lay with the emperor.\(^{115}\) To maintain his crown in Bohemia against Matthias’s coup, Rudolf subsequently signed a Letter of Majesty in 1609 granting religious freedom and right of resistance to his Bohemian subjects in concurrence with the wishes of his Protestant supporters.\(^{116}\) The practical and symbolic significance of the Letter of Majesty, issued in the same year as De Vries’s *Rudolf II Introducing the Liberal Arts to Bohemia*, demonstrated Rudolf’s difficulty in retaining his crown and his need to make concessions as a restricted sovereign.

Europeans outside Bohemia came to characterize Rudolf as hedonistic, eccentric, and overly invested in the pursuit of the occult. The Scottish writer John Barclay’s book *Euphormionis Lusinini Satyricon* of 1605-07 includes a caricature of Rudolf as the emperor Aquilius of Scolimorrhodia.\(^{117}\) One of Euphormionis’s companions describes Aquilius’s chambers as filled with paintings of women more beautiful than physically possible in reality, who would not “disturb the delights of his privacy by the memory of wars.”\(^{118}\) Barclay connects the emperor’s obsession with art with his inability to accomplish affairs of governance, likely referencing here the war against the Ottoman Empire. Barclay interpreted Rudolf as first and foremost a lover of the arts, astrology, and mysticism.


\(^{116}\) The *Confession of Holy Christian Faith of All Three Estates (Bohemian Confession of 1575)*, trans. C. Daniel Crews and Andrew Slaby (Winston-Salem, NC: Moravian Archives, 2008), 5-30.


Rudolf’s patronage of the arts with political subject matter confirms Barclay’s assertion of his obsession with art, although the propaganda commissioned at court also indicates the emperor’s awareness of its necessity. Despite his disinterest in political machinations, Rudolf continued his attempts in winning the war against the Turks and demonstrated his awareness of his situation in Europe through the myriad works of art produced at his court based on the topic. Rudolf attempted to impede the spread of the negative opinions of ambassadors, scholars, and writers among the mass populace through the commission of works that contradict his characterization as unstable and disconnected from reality. Works of art from Rudolf’s court, including Sadeler’s *Rudolf II on Horseback*, directly address his imperial power and foster a representation of the emperor contrary to the scholarly opinion of his era. In the same year as Sadeler’s print, Rudolf also commissioned a painting from Von Aachen on alabaster, * Allegory on the Turkish Wars* (figure 16), featuring an image of the Roman Emperor Augustus accompanied by the gods. Augustus receives a palm leaf and olive branch, symbols of victory, from the god Mercury while a group of defeated Turks bows down below. The portrait of Rudolf II, present in Sadeler’s portrait print originally based on Von Aachen’s lost painting, appears on the other side of the alabaster sheet and thus explicitly links the emperor with Augustus.\textsuperscript{119} The frequent replication of the portrait displays its propagandistic use as an imperial symbol rather than a faithful depiction of the emperor. The allegorical scene of Augustus in Von Aachen’s painting derives from the *Gemma Augustea*, an engraved antique that came from the first century AD, at the time held in Rudolf’s collection. The repetition of compositions apparent in both aspects of the alabaster work extends into a relief sculpture of 1604-05 created by De Vries (figure 17),
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based on the *Allegory on the Turkish Wars* and several other allegories executed by Von Aachen in the same time period.

Propagandistic works of art of the period constituted a series in range of mediums that advertised the emperor’s victories in Gran, Raab, and Székesfehérvár, by Von Aachen, De Vries, Sadeler, Spranger, Joos van Winghe, and several others.\(^{120}\) The alabaster allegorical painting by Von Aachen and the later relief sculpture by De Vries celebrate the seizure of Raab in 1598. De Vries’s relief depicts the battle in allegorical and idealistic terms as the imperial eagle and lion attack a winged dragon, while Rudolf II in the guise of a Roman emperor watches from the left foreground. The composition includes several other symbolic triumphant features, including personifications of the rivers Danube and Sava, a battle scene in the background, and the crowning of a personification of Hungary with a laurel wreath.\(^{121}\) The complexity of the composition owes not only to the complications of combining twelve of Von Aachen’s paintings, but also the active choices of Rudolf. An inventory of the collection from 1621, after Rudolf’s death, reports that the relief was designed by the emperor.\(^{122}\) Rudolf actively involved himself in the production of propaganda, working closely with artists and dictating prominent aspects of his commissions. De Vries’s relief ultimately results from a collaborative effort with another artist, Von Aachen, and the patron and subject of the work, Rudolf. Rudolf’s participation in the process of composing the scene indicates his awareness of the negative reputation he had acquired throughout Europe, his desire to create opposing imagery, and his enduring fascination with art and its creation.

\(^{121}\) Scholten, *Adriaen de Vries 1569-1626*, 159.
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Representations of Rudolf’s victory reached beyond the circle of court artists in Prague, into other regions and other media. Pamphlets, poems, and letters glorify the event, referencing technical details of battles and celebrating the emperor’s victory.\textsuperscript{123} The Dutch printmaker Philips Galle’s \textit{The Conquest of Raab} (figure 18), made prior to the relief in 1598, depicts the battle in the mode of a map from an aerial view, displaying the troops approaching the city and the clashes between individual soldiers occurring within. The combination of works treating the subject of Rudolf’s military victories create an image of the emperor in stark contrast to the perception spread by ambassadors, scholars, and writers. Festivals and tournaments honored the emperor and cast Rudolf in the guise of a god, hero, and general who unites Europe against the enemy.\textsuperscript{124} The proliferation of material originating from and outside of Rudolf’s court fostered an image of the emperor as a triumphant leader. Rudolf counteracted his reputation as an eccentric and superstitious recluse, utilizing art and propagandistic material to combine his representation as an art connoisseur with the imagery of a triumphant militaristic leader.

Art became a central part of Rudolf’s personal myth, created by princes and rulers to prove legitimacy. The construction of an individual narrative pervaded among powerful families, promoted the legitimacy of the ruler and and justified titles, lucrative marriages, and wealth acquisition.\textsuperscript{125} The necessity of actively creating a personal and familial myth increased with the individual or family’s status.\textsuperscript{126} The Holy Roman Emperor claimed to be the successor of the Roman emperors and the actions of the imperial family thus had to correspond to their lofty
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ancestry to maintain power and influence. The Venetian ambassador Tommaso Contarini, who complained of Rudolf’s inattention to matters of state, also proclaimed that, “There remains in the Empire solely a kind of dignity and loftiness, which has to be preserved because…much good is maintained with that pre-eminence, which is shared by various people.”

The dukes of Berry and Burgundy, ancestors of the Habsburgs, first established art patronage and collecting as a field of social distinction associated with royalty. The collections presented the power and wealth of the duke in an overt manner that was designed to impress visitors and subjects with its breadth and luxurious nature. Patronage was a form of conspicuous consumption and was connected to ideas of limitless wealth and the power and influence to acquire luxury objects. The dissemination of Sadeler’s prints and the commission of works by De Vries and Von Aachen conformed to the trend of noble art patronage. Rudolf elevated himself among other nobles and rulers through his extensive collections and the fame of Prague as an art center in Europe that served as a model for other courts.

Rudolf’s encouragement of the participation of his court artists in the exchange of motifs and compositions among themselves and with past artists led to a sense of self-confidence that influenced their dealings with other patrons. The court artists attained a feeling of self-importance deriving from the patronage of the emperor and the support of the community in Prague. De Vries, for instance, created a bronze copy of *The Farnese Bull* for Count Ernst von Holstein-Schaumburg, valuing it at 3,000 Reichsthalers and claiming it was worth as much as the
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original antique sculpture.\textsuperscript{130} De Vries justified the high price by explicitly citing the opinions of fellow Rudolfine artists, including Sadeler who assured him of the quality of the sculpture and the acceptability of the cost.\textsuperscript{131} The community formed in Prague affected the artists who lived there and participated in a court culture that developed their personal feeling of importance and self-confidence. Rudolf cultivated a cultural climate that enabled the exchange of works of art among the artists and allowed access to his collection, the Kunstkammer, that encouraged the use of earlier examples and eventually led to a belief in the equal value of their copies with those of their famous predecessors.

The imperial Kunstkammer figured heavily into Rudolf’s self-representation as an art connoisseur, famed for its scope and splendor. Authors and travelers, including Van Mander, recorded their impressions of the Kunstkammer upon visiting Prague and contributed to the city’s reputation as an art center. The French writer Jacques Esprinchard de Rochelle travelled to Prague in 1597 and documented his findings in his journal, noting the cathedral, the gardens, and especially Rudolf’s castle.\textsuperscript{132} He received a tour of the collection from Von Aachen and Spranger, who he notes are prestigious painters employed by the emperor. During his visit, Esprinchard documented the bounty of art he encountered throughout the city and in his tour of the Kunstkammer. The viewpoint of an outsider come to court demonstrates the significance of the art collection held there for the artists and for Rudolf as a collector. Esprinchard states that Von Aachen and Spranger “led me through three rooms of the castle, and showed me the most excellent and rare paintings, as many ancient as modern, that are possible to be seen today
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anywhere in Europe.”¹³³ The comingling of the works of current and past artists demonstrates the prominence Rudolf gave to his court art and the equation that was made between eras. Contemporaneous court artists were able to draw on each other’s works and those of famous artists in the Kunstkammer without a hard distinction made between the value of either period in Rudolf’s display practices.

The paintings and sculptures of earlier celebrated masters that were housed alongside the works of court artists like Spranger, Von Aachen, and De Vries included one of Rudolf’s personal favorites, Albrecht Dürer. Rudolf aggressively collected Dürer’s paintings, using his influence and status as emperor to coerce others into parting with their collections. After the death of the cardinal Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle, his collection passed into the hands of his nephew François de Granvelle, comte de Chantecroy.¹³⁴ Rudolf chose thirty-three works from the collection that he wished to acquire and sent Hans von Aachen to François’s residence to gather them. Among these works was Dürer’s Martyrdom of the Ten Thousand Virgins, a painting which François wished to maintain and had already turned down multiple offers from other collectors. He hoped to provide the emperor with a copy rather than the original painting but Rudolf insisted and François eventually yielded. François ultimately relinquished the desired pieces from his collection, including the Dürer, as well as Leone Leoni’s bust of Emperor Charles V, and works by Titian and Hieronymus Bosch.¹³⁵ Rudolf acquired many famed works of art by wielding his influence over private collectors like François de Granvelle, as well as larger governmental groups like the city council of Nuremberg, from whom he eventually
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obtained Dürer’s *The Adoration of the Trinity*, despite their efforts, similar to François’s, to provide Rudolf with a copy rather than the original.\(^{136}\)

Beyond the scope of the fine arts, the Kunstkammer contained scientific artifacts, natural specimens, and artificalia; the variety and rarity of the objects served to represent the universe in miniature and alluded to Rudolf’s imperial power and mastery of the world at large.\(^{137}\) As with Sadeler’s and De Vries’s *Rudolf II on Horseback* and the works of his other court artists, Rudolf himself drew on famous predecessors to construct his own myth. Rudolf’s uncle King Philip II of Spain, with whom Rudolf lived during his adolescence, and his grandfather Emperor Ferdinand I both established important collections and provided a model for his own interest in art.\(^{138}\) Both collections, like the Prague Kunstkammer, expanded beyond the scope of paintings and sculptures and included books, manuscripts, jewelry, coins, and other objects. All of the earlier collections Rudolf based his own Kunstkammer upon would also have included several media of art, including painting, sculpture, textiles, and prints.\(^{139}\) Rudolf’s conspicuous emulation of prominent predecessors mirrored the trend of copying that proliferated among the circle of Prague’s court artists.

Acquisitions from the frequently forced purchases of other collections expanded Rudolf’s Kunstkammer and influenced contemporaneous art in Prague. Leone Leoni’s bust of Charles V
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\(^{139}\) The prints in the collection would also include reproductive engravings as discussed previously in the first chapter in regard to the actions of collectors and the Kunstkammer of Archduke Ferdinand of Tyrol. Ferdinand was another model for Rudolf’s Kunstkammer and inspired him to collect the variety of objects in the Kunstkammer, including prints along with other natural and scientific objects that all contributed to the idea of representing the macrocosm in microcosm.
(figure 19) entered Rudolf II’s collection among the purchased works from François de Granvelle. The presence of Leoni’s sculpture led to a commission of a portrait bust of Rudolf by De Vries (figure 20) that matched the earlier work in size, material, and basic iconography. Both portraits present the torso of the emperor in armor with a sash running across his chest, supported underneath by two bent nudes, women in Leoni’s and men in De Vries’s, as well as a large eagle symbolizing the empire. Although similar in basic conception and clearly intended to serve as pendant pieces, De Vries’s bust includes fictitious detailed armor decorated with symbols that attest to Rudolf’s power. Behind the eagle at the base of the bust, De Vries depicts a ram, alluding to the symbol of Capricorn and closely associated with the Roman emperor Augustus. The cuirass presents personifications of Victory and Fame on his shoulders, while two putti with representations of the heaven and the earth appear on the back. De Vries portrays a griffin and a lion in relief on the front, both of which traditionally allude to power and strength. De Vries further prominently features the symbol of the Order of the Golden Fleece, in the center of his cuirass at the top of his chest. Rudolf joined the Order in 1585, originally founded in 1429 by Duke Philip the Good of Burgundy as an exclusive group of knights dedicated to chivalry and nobility.\footnote{Marshall, \textit{The Magic Circle}, 49-59.} The Order of the Golden Fleece constituted one of the primary chivalric monarchical orders in Europe, meant to bind nobles together and increase the prestige of the members.\footnote{D’Arcy Jonathan Dacre Boulton, \textit{The Knights of the Crown: The Monarchical Orders of Knighthood in Later Medieval Europe, 1325-1520} (Woodbridge; Rochester: Boydell Press, 1987), 394.} The details of the bust all allude to Rudolf’s power, positive attributes, and imperial connections, explicitly promoting his character, in contrast to the more subdued portrait of Charles V. De Vries additionally tilts Rudolf’s head farther up and to the side than Charles V, intended to
communicate the emperor’s wisdom in a noble manner. With the portrait, both Rudolf and De Vries attempt to assert their supremacy over their earlier famed predecessors, Leoni and Charles V respectively, and display the perceived progress and improvement of their time. Charles V exemplified divine imperial power and thus became a model for Rudolf II, who hoped to transfer Charles’s association with victory and monarchy to his own myth. Connection to history, the reuse of earlier compositions and motifs, and an appeal to ancestry feature heavily in the commissioned propaganda of Rudolf’s reign.

The significance of genealogy thematically pervades both the art and literature commissioned by or dedicated to Rudolf II. A book of 1601, *Symbola Divina et Humana*, written by Jacobus Typotius, court historian for Rudolf II, with Octavio Strada and Anselm Boethius de Boodt, contains engravings executed by Sadeler. The book presents a series of rulers, including emperors, popes, and kings, paired alongside their devices, mottos, and symbols. The line culminates in Rudolf, who receives sixteen different emblems, the highest number among the imperial section of the book. Rudolf’s emblems generally feature the eagle and laurel wreaths, seen in De Vries’s portrait bust and Sadeler’s *Rudolf II on Horseback*, as well as various other symbols of victory. The Latin explanations that accompany the emblems frequently reference the fight against the Turks, referred to as “the enemies” and “the barbarians.” The devices and their accompanying Latin text are closely connected with Rudolf’s victory symbols and frequently make allusions to the Roman Empire or Emperor Augustus. The book emphasizes Rudolf’s lineage and places him in the context of the rulers who came before,
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displaying the longevity of the Holy Roman Empire and the frequency of many of the symbols used in his emblems. The court historian preceding Jacobus Typotius, the Hungarian Johannes Sambucus, who initially worked for Rudolf’s father Emperor Maximilian II, had previously combined Rudolf’s lineage and the war against the Ottoman Empire to prove his worthiness and power. Sambucus wrote a speech on the occasion of Rudolf’s coronation as King of Hungary in 1572, justifying his ascension to the throne based on his Austrian Habsburg heritage, then regarded as the only ones capable of fighting the Ottoman Empire. One decade later Sambucus created an extensive Austrian genealogy for the emperor and further gestured toward the importance of the Habsburg family. Books dedicated to Rudolf, like Michael von Aitzing’s *Pentaplus rengorum mundi*, acknowledge the significance of the prestigious ancestors of the empire as a whole as well. Von Aitzing’s book in particular contains an emblematic illustration that combines four animals from the Book of Daniel to represent the four greatest empires, the last being the Holy Roman Empire. The empire’s claim to legitimacy stemmed from the belief in their ancestry and required that this history be acknowledged. References to Rudolf’s lineage recurred throughout his reign, emphasizing the importance of his heritage and justifying the contemporary emulation of art commissioned by his ancestors, such as Titian’s equestrian portrait and Leoni’s bust of Charles V.

Rudolf consciously emulated the worlds of his ancestors, including not only his grandfather Charles V and the various portraits made of him, but also the artistic works
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connected to his great-great-grandfather, Emperor Maximilian I. Maximilian himself designed a complex program legitimating the Habsburg dynasty and took on an active interest in art for his self-representation comparable to Rudolf’s involvement in the creation of De Vries’s allegorical relief.\footnote{Christopher Wood, \textit{Forgery, Replica, Fiction: Temporalities of German Renaissance Art} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), 61.} Rudolf’s reign in turn occurred during the Dürer Renaissance, a revival of the work of Albrecht Dürer, who worked on commissions for Maximilian I.\footnote{Nagel and Wood, \textit{Anachronic Renaissance}, 62.} Rudolf again encouraged the copying phenomenon at court in the capacity of the Dürer Renaissance, particularly employing the painter Hans Hoffman, one of the most prolific of the artists involved in this trend who subsumed himself into Dürer’s style.\footnote{Koerner, \textit{The Moment of Self-Portraiture}, 49.} Many artists associated with Rudolf participated in the enthusiastic revival of Dürer’s art, including the printmaker Hendrick Goltzius, who created an original work in Dürer’s style that appeared so convincing as to fool famous art connoisseurs.\footnote{Eric Jan Sluijter, \textit{Rembrandt and the Female Nude} (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006), 257.} Sadeler himself engraved some of Dürer’s works, including \textit{Virgin and Child in a Landscape}, reproduced in print c. 1597. Dürer influenced Rudolf’s court artists, who emulated his work and his career; his impact can also be seen in Spranger’s three etching attempts, inspired by artists like Dürer who worked and were successful in both mediums. Rudolfine art and culture allude to several of Rudolf’s predecessors, with Maximilian I appearing prominently at court due to his association with Dürer and his enduring fame. Art was regarded as a way for Rudolf to draw visual connections with other emperors to enhance his image and associate himself with their achievements.
The allusions to dynastic lineage were not original or exclusive to Rudolf’s commissioned art, extending to past and future Habsburg rulers. The two immediate successors to the throne, his brothers Matthias, who assumed power on Rudolf’s death in 1612, and Ferdinand II, emperor from 1619 to 1637, both used portraits made by court artists during Rudolf’s reign. Hans von Aachen repeated a composition for the state portrait of Matthias, primarily changing the position of the right hand, which now rested on his hip in a gesture of confidence. Rudolf had attempted to fight his brother in 1611, recruiting troops and sending the army into the field, which subsequently justified Matthias’s invasion of Bohemia. Rudolf abdicated the Bohemian throne in 1611, the last of his individual kingdoms, and then solely retained the title of Holy Roman Emperor, although he now truly lacked all power and influence. Matthias’s immediate assumption of Rudolf’s portrait types and use of his court painters, like Von Aachen, indicates his desire to create a visual continuity of his own reign through the Habsburg rulers.

Sadeler’s 1603 print *Rudolf II on Horseback* ties together the temporal connections pervading the Holy Roman Empire. Matthias coopted Sadeler’s design to commemorate his coronation in Frankfurt in 1612 and the print was again copied seven years later for the next successor, Ferdinand II. Sadeler’s iconography, deriving initially from the Habsburg ancestor Charles V and relating to Roman symbolism frequently used in Habsburg court art, continued past Rudolf II into the future of the Holy Roman Empire, suggesting the utility of print designs and the lack of concern for the original purpose of compositions. Art created a visual lineage that the emperors frequently drew upon, connecting themselves to earlier rulers and emblems of
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power to ensure their legitimacy. Rudolf was not unique in this regard and himself served as a model for his brothers, as well as other rulers and aristocrats in the empire attempting to emulate the emperor. Propagandistic prints provided a model for his brothers and continued the tradition of reproduction that was prominent at Rudolf’s court.

The reproductive culture present in Prague during Rudolf’s reign served as system to promote the emperor as a military leader and as a tool for the creation of propagandistic imagery. Sadeler’s print *Rudolf II on Horseback* fashioned the emperor as a victorious commander, exemplifying the collaborative nature of Prague court artists through its compositional basis in the sketch by De Vries and the portrait by Von Aachen. The use of the imagery of Rudolf’s ancestor Charles V further expanded the frequent reproduction and appropriation of symbols and compositions to both the artists’ and the emperor’s predecessors. Contemporary court artists drew on the works of earlier famous court artists like Titian, Dürer, and Leone Leoni to create a visual link to Rudolf’s past. Rudolf also emphasized his Habsburg lineage and his family’s connection with the Roman Empire by utilizing Roman symbols and allusions to Augustus as well as explicitly linking himself with some of his most famous ancestors like Charles V and Maximilian I. The need for the extensive propaganda present among Rudolf’s artists resulted from his poor personal and political reputation due to his periods of depression and withdrawal and the war against the Ottoman Empire. The culture of reproduction in Prague enabled the creation of a representation of Rudolf intended to contradict his reputation as eccentric and ineffective, although his preoccupation with art also appeared as a negative to those who satirized him like John Barclay. Rudolf successfully fashioned himself as a connoisseur of the arts, seen in later generations as a famous patron and collector. While writing on the reign of Elizabeth I, the eighteenth-century historian Thomas Birch wrote that Rudolf was “a prince of
many amiable qualities and virtues, mild and humane, a lover and patron of arts and
sciences...”¹⁵⁶ Art successfully became a part of his princely myth, stretching past his lifetime,
beleaguered with a series of political and religious conflicts, and coming to act as the centerpiece
of his legacy. The court art that emerged out of political necessity relied on the collaborative
nature of the relationships among the artistic community and the deliberate reproduction and
 emulation of their predecessors.

¹⁵⁶ Thomas Birch, *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth: From the Year 1581 Till Her
Conclusion

The profusion of reproductions in print, painting, and sculpture among a close group of artists, particularly Sadeler, Spranger, Von Aachen, and De Vries, illustrates the court culture in Prague at the turn of the seventeenth century and the collaborations it fostered. Spranger’s recycling of his composition from the *Epitaph of Nikolaus Müller* to an allegorical commission from Rudolf II, *Minerva Vanquishing Ignorance*, exemplifies the culture of copying that existed at court, enabled here by the change of patron although occurring throughout the artistic community. The subsequent transfer to print in Sadeler’s engraving *Triumph of Wisdom* further demonstrates the collaborative nature of Rudolfine court art and the changes made according to the needs of the medium and the printmaker’s style. Prints were of the utmost importance for Rudolfine artists, often serving as the only way to disseminate their art outside of the exclusive Kunstkammer and allowing them to develop their reputations and supplement their imperial, often unreliable, income. Despite collectors’ and artists’ appreciation for prints, Sadeler’s reproductive engravings remained lower on the artistic hierarchy than Spranger’s paintings for theorists like Van Mander. Reproductive prints became a necessity for the international success of Rudolfine artists and allowed the spread of Prague’s reputation as an art center.

The emperor enabled the production of copies as concerned his need for propaganda in his war against the Ottoman Empire. Sadeler’s propagandistic print *Rudolf II on Horseback* resulted from a collaboration with De Vries and Von Aachen, all working with the goal of the promotion of the emperor. Rudolf suffered from a poor personal and political reputation in Europe and harnessed art, as well as literature, to encourage his self-representation as a military leader and descendant of earlier powerful Habsburg and Roman rulers. Rudolf encouraged the
link with his predecessors in art, as his artists drew on examples from the Kunstkammer commissioned by earlier emperors, such as Charles V, in their own works. Both the artists and the emperor simultaneously imitated and attempted to surpass those who came before. Art became a central part of Rudolf’s chosen self-representation and was utilized as a tool of propaganda in works that centered on the war against the Ottoman Empire. The culture of copying pervaded all levels of art production in Prague, from the independent works of art like Spranger’s two paintings, the creation of reproductive prints, and the commission of independent propaganda in Sadeler’s engraving, Von Aachen’s paintings, and De Vries’s sketches, sculptures, and portraits.

The frequent use of reproduction in the court art commissioned by the emperor ultimately served the needs of both the artists and the patron. Rudolf II's appreciation for art and poor political perception influenced the surge of reproductive prints during the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century. This culture of reproduction not only inflated the prestige of painters such as Spranger and elevated the status of engravers such as Sadeler, but relayed a constructed perception of Rudolf II as powerful emperor and art connoisseur that impacted the political landscape of both Prague and Europe throughout his reign.
Bibliography


Birch, Thomas. *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth: Form the Year 1581 Till Her Death:* in which the secret intrigues of her court, and the conduct of her favourite, Robert Earl of Essex, both at home and abroad, are particularly illustrated: from the original papers of his intimate friend, Anthony Bacon, esquire, and other manuscripts never before published, 2 vols. London: A. Millar, 1754.


Confession of Holy Christian Faith of All Three Estates (Bohemian Confession of 1575).


Typotius, Jacobus. Symbola divina et humana, pontificum imperatorum regum. Prague: s.n., 1601-03.


Figure 1. Bartholomäus Spranger, *Epitaph of Nikolaus Müller*, c. 1587-89, oil on canvas, 243 x 160 cm, Prague: Národní Galerie v Praze.
Figure 2. Santi di Tito, *Resurrection of Christ*, c. 1574-75, oil on wood, 430 x 290 cm, Florence: Basilica di Santa Croce.
Figure 3. Bartholomäus Spranger, *Epitaph of Michael Peterle (Christ Triumphant over Sin and Death)*, 1588, oil on panel, 150 x 120 cm, Prague: Tyn Church, Archbishop’s House.
Figure 4. Bartholomäus Spranger, *Minerva Vanquishing Ignorance*, c. 1596-1600, oil on canvas, 163 x 117 cm, Vienna: Kunsthistorisches Museum.
Figure 5. Aegidius Sadeler, *Triumph of Wisdom*, c. 1600, engraving, 50 x 35.7 cm, Chapel Hill: Ackland Art Museum.
Figure 6. Adriaen de Vries, *Theseus and Antiope*, c. 1600, bronze, 95.0 x 36.8 x 35.6, London: The Royal Collection.
Figure 7. Adriaen de Vries, *Hercules, Nessus, and Deianira*, 1603-08, bronze, 82 x 50 x 37 cm, Paris: Louvre.
Figure 8. Aegidius Sadeler, *Interior View of Vladislav Hall at Prague Castle during the Annual Fair*, 1607, engraving. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
Figure 9. Aegidius Sadeler, *Rudolf II on Horseback*, 1603-04, engraving, 48.9 x 37 cm, Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum.
Figure 10. Adriaen de Vries, *Emperor Rudolf II on Horseback*, c. 1603, pen and brush in brown over black and white chalk, 51.2 x 38 cm, private collection.
Figure 11. Aegidius Sadeler, *Portrait of Rudolf II*, 1603, after Hans von Aachen, engraving, 33.7 x 25.1 cm, New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
Figure 12. Titian, *Equestrian Portrait of Charles V*, 1548, oil on canvas, 335 x 283 cm, Madrid: Museo del Prado.
Figure 13. Antonio Tempesta, *Equestrian Portrait of Henry IV, King of France*, 1593, etching, 49.2 x 36.1 cm, Cambridge: Harvard Art Museums.
Figure 14. Adriaen de Vries, *Rudolf II Introducing the Liberal Arts to Bohemia*, 1609, bronze, 59.4 x 84.3 x 13 cm, Windsor: Royal Collection Trust.
Figure 16. Hans von Aachen, *Allegory on the Turkish Wars*, c. 1603-04, oil on alabaster, 14.4 x 10.3 cm, Nuremberg: Germanisches Nationalmuseum.
Figure 17. Adriaen de Vries, Allegory on the War Against the Turks in Hungary, 1604-05, bronze, 71 x 88.5 cm, Vienna: Kunsthistorisches Museum.
Figure 18. Philips Galle, *The Conquest of Raab*, 1598, etching, 24.2 x 30 cm, Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum.
Figure 19. Leone Leoni, *Bust of Emperor Charles V*, c. 1555, bronze, 112 cm, Vienna: Kunsthistorisches Museum.
Figure 20. Adriaen de Vries, *Bust of Emperor Rudolf II*, 1603, bronze, 112 cm, Vienna: Kunsthistorisches Museum.