CHAPTER 9

The Neugebäude

Figure 9.1 Nicolas Neufchatel, Emperor Maximilian II, 1566, Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum.
9.1 The Tomb of Ferdinand I and Anna in Prague; Licinio’s Paintings in Pressburg

While in the act of drawing his proposals for the Munich Antiquarium, Strada appears to have been quite busy with other concerns. It is likely that these concerns included important commissions from his principal patron, the Emperor Maximilian II [Fig. 9.1], who had been heard to express himself rather dissatisfied with Strada’s continued occupation for his Bavarian brother-in-law. Already two year earlier, when Duke Albrecht had ‘borrowed’ Strada from the Emperor to travel to Italy to buy antiquities and works of art and to advise him on the accommodation for his collections, Maximilian had conceded this with some hesitation, telling the Duke that he could not easily spare Strada, whom he employed in several projects.¹

Unfortunately Maximilian did not specify what projects these were. They certainly included the tomb for his parents in St Vitus’ Cathedral in Prague, that was to be executed by Alexander Colin, and for which Strada had been sent to Prague already in March of 1565 [Figs. 9.2–9.3]. As with his earlier involvement in the completion of the tomb of Maximilian I in Innsbruck, his role is not specified, but in both cases it probably included specific advice on Imperial iconography as well as more general artistic expertise.²

Strada’s advice may have been sought likewise on the decoration of the Castle at Pressburg/Bratislava, which functioned as Royal residence in Hungary since

---


² Doc. 1565-03-28; on the Maximiliangrab, cf. above, Ch. 6.2.
Buda had fallen to the Turks. The rather attractive decorations in stucco and painting in the chapel that were executed between 1563 and 1569 by Giulio Licinio, Cesare Baldigara and Ulisse Romano have recently been uncovered and restored [Figs. 9.4–9.5]. With his colleagues, the medallist Antonio Abondio and the sculptor Mathias Manmacher, Strada was sent there in April of 1569 to examine them in order to provide an estimate for the payment of Licinio's work, and he may earlier have been involved in formulating Licinio's commission.\(^3\) The sophisticated architecture of the chapel and the type of decoration chosen strongly suggests that Strada had been involved in some capacity: it is derived from Raphael's Vatican Loggia, and must have been directly inspired by the detailed documentary drawings which Strada had commissioned a decade earlier [cf. above, Figs. 3.92–3.93 and below, Figs. 13.102–13.107].\(^4\)

9.2 Kaiserebersdorf and Katterburg

Though positive evidence is lacking, it seems likely that Strada's tasks at court included expert advice and perhaps designs for interior decoration, principally in the Hofburg itself, in the Stallburg and in the castle at Kaiserebersdorf, in all of which work was continually going on. Apart from the Stallburg,

\(^3\) Doc. 1569-04-00. Licinio's paintings in oil on panel that filled the stucco compartments were destroyed in a fire in 1811. Licinio was greatly offended that his own estimate was questioned and left Pressburg in a rage; cf. Vertova 1976, p. 561 ff; Podewils 1992, pp. 132–135. I am very grateful to Annemarie Jordan-Gschwend to have shared with me the images she has obtained of the remains of this remarkable work of art.

\(^4\) Cf. above, Ch. 3.8.2, and below, Ch. 13.8.1.
Kaiserebersdorf was the principal commission for a largely new-built residential construction initiated by Ferdinand I. It was the only country and hunting residence close to Vienna that was sufficiently large to lodge a substantial portion of the Imperial entourage, and it must have played a significant role in Imperial representation. Its relative importance is indicated by the fact that it was included in the selection of Austrian sites—the principal cities of the Erblande—depicted on the walls of the Palazzo Vecchio in Florence when in the autumn of 1565 this was richly decorated to serve as a welcome for Ferdinand’s daughter, Archduchess Johanna of Austria, bride of Francesco, eldest son and heir of Cosimo I de’ Medici [Fig. 9.6].

The earliest reliable image we have is much later, a print by Georg Matthäus Vischer of 1672 [Fig. 9.7], but coupled with the evidence provided by recent detailed research of the remaining fabric, it is clear that the castle as rebuilt by Ferdinand and Maximilian from 1551 onward was a square block consisting of four wings around a small inner courtyard. It may have been designed by Lorenzo Ferrabosco, a master mason who died shortly after the ceremonial laying of its foundation stone on 15 February 1551, when he was succeeded by his brother Pietro. As we have seen, the painter Pietro Ferrabosco would change career and become one of the principal executive architects at court. Its structure and the sober, regular articulation of its facades relate Ebersdorf both to the restructuring of the Hofburg in the late 1540s and to the Stallburg. Structural building went on until about 1565, when the ‘steinmetze’ Bartholomäus Bethan

---

5 Kaiserebersdorf, nowadays a high-security prison, has recently been subjected to detailed structural and archaeological research, the results of which were lavishly published in Müller/Krause 2008.

6 The death of his brother, forcing Pietro to take over his responsibilities, may have been a prime motif for his change of direction. Later Schallautzer and Thomas Eiseler appear to be coordinating construction at Ebersdorf; cf. Müller/Krause 2008, pp. 44 and 46.
and Antonio Pozzo were still providing window- and doorframes. Payments in the years following to glaziers, carpenters, plasterers, locksmiths, furniture-makers, stove-makers and so on, suggest that it was being decorated and finished about this time. Unfortunately, as in the Hofburg itself, next to nothing of all this has survived, and the earliest description of its interiors dates only from 1660. This mentions a number of portraits and quantities of stuffed heads and antlers, hunting trophies that filled almost every room—as was fitting for what was essentially a hunting lodge—but says nothing about any fixed decoration.7

The modest size of Kaiserebersdorf, the simplicity of its design, and the apparent sobriety of its decoration are remarkable for an Imperial residence that was quite intensively used both for representative purposes and for private recreation. A ferry and later a bridge crossed the arm of the Danube separating it from the Prater and its Lusthaus. Maximilian’s interest in animal life was expressed by his laying out, from 1566 onward, a Fasangarten or pheasant preserve, in the river meadows immediately west of Ebersdorf, halfway along the road connecting the castle with this bridge. Both the Prater Lusthaus and this new Fasangarten were favourite excursions for the Emperor, as is clear from his private account book for 1568 and 1569.8

Maximilian’s fondness of nature as exemplified in Tanner’s panegyric on the Prater Lustgarten finally found an expression in his acquisition, in 1569, of another small-scale retreat, the Katterburg [Figs. 9.11–9.12]. This was a modest manor house that had been built twenty years earlier for Hermann Bayr, a Bürgermeister of Vienna, as a tenant of Klosterneuburg monastery. Located to the west of Vienna on the banks of the Wien river, next to a ‘schönen Brunnen’, that is a ‘beautiful spring’, it was the nucleus from which, in the seventeenth century, the palace of Schönbrunn would develop. At the time it consisted of two simple rectangular blocks placed at a straight angle, one of which was topped by a clocktower, and a garden entered by means of an ornamental gate. Within easier distance of the Hofburg as either the Prater Lusthaus and Kaiserebersdorf, its modest size made it more convenient for the personal, private recreation of the Emperor and his consort, whose ownership was marked by the beautiful stone bearing a double M under an Imperial crown, for Maximilian II or, more likely, for Maximilian and Maria, which is still preserved at Schönbrunn. The same monogram was used in the dedication of

7 Travel diary of Johann Sebastian Müller, reporting visits made in April 1660; quoted in Müller/Krause 2008, p. 49.
8 The Prater Lusthaus discussed above, Ch. 5.3; on the Fasangarten, see Lietzmann 1987, pp. 59–64; she cites (p. 61 and note 21) the Geheimes Kammerrechnungsbuch of Maximilian II for 1568–1569 (ÖNB-HS, Cod. 9089).
Georg Tanner’s ms. description of Maximilian’s Prater Lusthaus [Fig. 9.8–9.9].

The connection of this double monogram with both the Prater Lusthaus and the Katterburg suggest that the love of gardens was a shared interest of the couple, a suggestion underlined by the charming relief in the Kunsthistorisches Museum showing them together in an open pavilion set next to a fountain in the middle of a luscious garden or park, inhabited by red deer as well as by the exotic animals Maximilian prized so much, including his famed elephant [Fig. 9.10].

As at the Prater, the garden and the Tiergarten or game preserve were its principal attraction: Maximilian left the house as it was, but had its demesne first fenced in and then, shortly before his death, surrounded by a wall. The monumental gate within this wall visible in Visscher’s print was probably constructed at this same time [Fig. 9.12].

Neither for Kaiserebersdorf nor for Katterburg there are any documents indicating that Strada may have been involved in their development. Even had he been, it seems likely that his intervention remained limited to some advice, or at most some sketches for decorative elements, such as this portal.

**Figures 9.8–9.9** Stone with the monogram of Emperor Maximilian I and Empress Maria, from their hunting lodge at Katterburg (now Schönbrunn) near Vienna, and their monogram under the Bohemian crown as included in the dedication of Tanner’s treatise of the Prater Lusthaus; Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek.

---

9 The stone has earlier been attributed to the Emperor Matthias, but Hassmann 2001, p. 444 and note 55, rightly interprets it as referring to Maximilian I, as it was used on the marble plaque covering the casket in which Maximilian’s intestine was buried in Regensburg cathedral after his death. Its use in Tanner’s ms. is certainly conclusive (ÖNB-HS, Cod. 8085, fol 2v.; cf. above, Ch. 5.3). Compare its use with the famous monogram HD of King Henri II and Diane de Poitiers at the Louvre, Fontainebleau and elsewhere.

10 Hassmann 2001, p. 444.

11 The monumental gate of the Katterburg visible in Fig. 9.12 appears to owe something to designs for portals such as those illustrated in Serlio’s *Extraordinario Libro*. 
**Figure 9.10** Severin Brachmann, King Maximilian II and his consort Maria of Spain in a pavilion in one of their gardens, limestone relief, ca 1560; Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum.

**Figures 9.11–9.12** View of Schönbrunn, engraving by Georg Matthäus Vischer, 1672: on the left the original Katterburg, on the right the wing built in 1640–45 for Eleanora Gonzaga, widow of Emperor Ferdinand II, later incorporated in the central block of the present Schönbrunn palace; the detail shows the Katterburg, with an ornamental gate commissioned by Maximilian II.
9.3 Sobriety versus Conspicuous Consumption

In view of Maximilian’s passion for gardens and gardening, it should not surprise that his one act of patronage on a really imperial scale again was the laying out of a garden, and the construction of a Lusthaus within it: the Neugebäude, plans for which began to be made in the course of 1568 [Fig. 9.13].

The tremendous scale of this project is indeed surprising: up till this time, except for festive occasions, all pomp and circumstance at the Imperial court, any conspicuous consumption in general, seems to have been restricted to interior furnishings and hangings, to sumptuous dress and armour, to precious gold- and silverware, to collector’s items and to ephemeral pomp on festive occasions.12 During his father’s reign Maximilian used the scanty funds at his disposal mostly for projects which were really necessary. Thus his architectural patronage was primarily directed towards realizing decent and representative lodgings for himself, his household and his guests, and any display of architectural pomp or luxury was dispensed with.

The sober, functional style of the Stallburg is exemplary for this attitude, to which even the Prater Lusthaus conforms: basically a modest hunting lodge, its practical use is explicitly stressed in Tanner’s description. Therefore the huge scale of the Neugebäude project comes as somewhat of a surprise, in particular because its principal element, the huge, open colonnade of a length of a hundred and eighty meters, appears to have had no practical function other than

---

12 Note that the expense of ephemeral architecture for festive occasions could be phenomenal, witness the wooden apparatus planned by Ferrabosco at Pressburg/Bratislava for the celebration of Rudolf’s coronation as king of Hungary, discussed above, Ch. 4.3.4; the wood alone for the ephemeral apparatus and temporary town built to lodge the participants would cost about 6,000 Gulden (Doc. 1572-009-03).
display [Fig. 9.14]. It is plausible that Maximilian's change of heart was largely caused by his accession to the Imperial throne: he may well have felt that his status required greater display than before. But I suspect that a subconscious wish to compensate the disillusion he suffered in the summer of 1568, with his failure in the inconclusive military campaign against the Turks, may have played some role. The fact that the Neugebäude was laid out exactly on the spot where Suleiman the Magnificent had pitched his tents during his siege of Vienna in 1529 certainly does not contradict this.\textsuperscript{13} In contrast to the Katterburg and perhaps even Kaiserebersdorf, it was a project of sufficient scale to be consulted with all resident experts, including Jacopo Strada.

\textbf{9.4 Hans Jakob Fugger's Letter}

That Strada was involved in some way in the genesis of the Neugebäude was first suspected by Renate Wagner-Rieger, chiefly on the basis of the French and possible Ottoman influences in its design, both of which she explains with reference to Strada's career. A strong argument for this hypothesis was provided by Renate von Busch, who found and published a passage in a letter by Hans Jakob Fugger to Strada which appears to corroborate Strada's participation. In her monograph on the Neugebäude Hilda Lietzmann accepts this interpretation of the source, and critically discussed what Strada's contribution

\textsuperscript{13} The significance of this fact was recognized by Renate Wagner-Rieger and Renate von Busch, and amply discussed by Hilda Lietzmann, whose findings, however, have met with little appreciation.
might have been. Since then Strada’s contribution to the design of the Neugebäude is generally accepted, though no further attempts have been made to define this contribution more precisely. In the following I will first discuss the passage in Fugger’s letter, and then describe the complex and its architectural and iconological sources. On the basis of those I will try and summarize the ways in which Strada may have influenced the genesis of the Neugebäude. It is necessary to quote, to translate and to discuss the passage in Fugger’s letter in detail, because in earlier literature it has not always been correctly read or interpreted.

In the midst of their strenuous activities relating to the acquisition of the Loredan statues for the Duke of Bavaria and the design of the Munich Antiquarium, Fugger and Strada, who were old business associates and friends, also informed one another about other matters. Thus it appears that Strada had told Fugger about an architectural design he had prepared for the Emperor, who had been pleased with the result. In a letter written from his castle at Taufkirchen of 13 November 1568 Fugger compliments Strada on his success in the following words:

I am pleased no end that you have succeeded so well with your design for His Majesty the Emperor, although I have never doubted what you could do, having known you for so many years; and the site of the palace being by its nature so suited to the purpose, he was lucky to find someone who could well design the building. I thought it was in the city, but now I understand it is in the country, please let me know in what place it is, and whether it will be merely a palace for pleasure, or whether it will be provided with some sort of fortification.

From this passage Renate von Busch and Hilda Lietzmann concluded that it referred to Maximilian’s plans for the Neugebäude, and that seems a natural

---

14 Rieger 1951, pp. 142–143; Von Busch 1973, pp. 207 and 343, n. 102; Lietzmann 1987, pp. 110 and 127–128. Lietzmann’s contention (p. 118, n. 109) that the present author merely quoted this source from Von Busch in a note (Jansen 1982, p. 67, n. 25) without recognizing its implications, is contradicted by the passage on the Neugebäude to which this note refers: ‘Renate von Busch had discovered, moreover, that in 1568 Strada made a design for it which was well received’ (ibidem, p. 59).

15 Doc. 1568-11-13: ‘<...>Io me rallegro infinitamente che siate cosi ben reusci to col Vostro disegno per la Maestà del Imperatore, benchè non dubito punto di fatti Vostri, havendoVi conosciuto tanti anni; et essendo la piazza del palazzo di natura così accomodata, ha havuto ventura di trovare chi sapesse ben disegnar la fabrica. Io pensava che fusse nella città, però intendo che è in campagna; Vi prego avisarme in che luacho sia, et se’l sara solamente palazzo di piacere, o pure con qualche fortezza appresso. A tanto Iddio da mal Vi guardi’; first published in Von Busch 1973, p. 343, n. 102.
conclusion, since we know of no other projects at that time that would fit the bill. The conclusion that Strada had made some design connected with Maximilian’s plans for the Neugebäude seems perfectly warranted, but it has been questioned nevertheless. To my mind, the passage permits the following conclusions:

– Strada had earlier informed Fugger by letter that an architectural design he had made for the Emperor had been well received.

– The tenor of Fugger’s letter suggests that Strada had mentioned the project to Fugger in passing at an earlier occasion, either in conversation or in correspondence, and now kept him informed of developments.

– On this earlier occasion Fugger had received the impression that the project was planned within the city—probably Vienna—but now he understood—that it was intended for the countryside.

– Fugger was sufficiently interested to wish to know its precise location and details about its character.

– The design was for a secular building of a residential character (though ‘palazzo’ can also be just ‘building’, Fugger’s reference to a ‘palazzo di pia-cere’ suggest that it was residential, not utilitarian)

– It was to be built for the Emperor Maximilian II; the reference to the site presupposes a new construction, rather than the adaptation of an existing building.

– This building was planned in the countryside.

All in all it is warranted to assume Strada had indeed made a design for the Neugebäude, and that it had been well received by the Emperor. But the

16 For instance in the unpleasantly biased, negative review of Lietzmann’s book by Bernt von Hagen, which is itself full of mistakes and inconsistencies (Hagen 1991, p. 167). Karl Rudolf (Rudolf 1995, p. 177, n. 131) has rightly corrected Lietzmann’s reading of the passage, pointing out that Fugger is not writing about a hypothetical ‘palazzo di natura’, whatever that might be, but about a site (for a palace) which is ‘by its nature’ so well adapted to its purpose: ‘Die Stelle et essendo la piazza di natura cosi accomodata kann nur als Ort von derart passender Natur für den Palast verstanden werden und nicht als Palast in der Natur wie bei Lietzmann’. He is right that the passage seems to refer to a palace, rather than to a garden lay-out, but ignores that it is also quite clear that it refers to a palace in the countryside, which presupposes the inclusion of gardens. In any case, even if Strada here talks about a design for the building, this is no reason to assume that he may not have been asked to make designs for the gardens as well; on the contrary, it makes it all the more likely. In his otherwise illuminating article on the Neugebäude, Wolfgang Lippmann (Lippmann 2006–2007, p. 147 and note 164, notes 37–41) misreads the passage in an even more alarming way than Lietzmann, not only echoing her ‘Palast in der Natur’, but also implying that Fugger referred to another, unidentified draughtsman who was to execute the finished designs, which is not warranted by the actual text: it is clear that Fugger refers to (and compliments) Strada himself.
passage does not tell us whether Strada had presented his design on his own initiative or whether the Emperor had explicitly asked for it, though Fugger’s formulation suggests the latter. Neither does it give any indication of the nature of the design. To get some idea in what way Strada’s design may have contributed to the development of the Neugebäude, it is necessary to provide a sketch of its layout and of its early history.

9.5 Description of the Complex

The earliest and best impression of the Neugebäude as it was planned and partly finished by Maximilian II is Lucas van Valckenborch’s conversation piece of 1593 [Fig. 9.15–9.16]. It shows Emperor Rudolf II with his two brothers Ernest

---

**Figures 9.15–9.16** Lucas van Valckenborch, Rudolf II and his brothers in front of the Vienna Neugebäude, ca 1593, and a detail showing the huge extent of the complex; Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum.

17 Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv.nr. 9863; a second version has recently come to light and was acquired by the Vienna Historical Museum (Wien Museum), Inv. nr. 206.670; cf.
and Matthias and his good friend Duke Julius of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel taking a walk in a wood on the outskirts of Vienna; in the background, through the threes, can be seen a huge complex of towers, walled gardens and a huge gallery. This is the Neugebäude, the huge complex begun in 1568 by Rudolf’s father close to the castle at Kaiserebersdorf, hardly visible in background to the left.

The painting gives a good impression of the size and the context of the complex, on the southern edge of the Donauauen, the meadows bordering the Danube to the east of Vienna, between the village of Simmering and the Imperial hunting lodge at Kaiserebersdorf. With the Prater, immediately across the branch of the Danube to the north—past the left margin of the painting—this territory formed the principal hunting preserve for the Emperor, his guests and his court, which explains the construction of his new Lusthaus in this area. The exact site of the building, moreover, is perfectly suited to its purpose, as stated in Fugger’s letter: its principal element, the long gallery, is constructed exactly on the edge of a ridge sloping steeply down towards the meadows. Before the twentieth century it afforded a wonderful view over the hunting grounds, the river landscape and far beyond.

The order in which the various elements of the complex were built and the extent to which it was actually finished at Maximilian’s untimely death in 1576 can be partially reconstructed on the basis of Hilda Lietzmann’s archival research as published in her 1987 monograph, and the results of archaeological research and technical analysis of the remaining fabric done around and since that time, which however have been only published in abstracts. From this information it appears that two years after Maximilian had begun his ‘Fasan-garten’, his bird-preserve in the Donauauen, he began realizing his plans for a new and large garden complex close to Kaiserebersdorf. Payments suggest that the site had been surveyed and the plan laid out towards the end of 1568, when the engineer Hans Gasteiger was ordered to procure iron pipes for the water conduits of the gardens, and that building began early in 1569.

The engraving by Matthäus Merian of 1649 [Fig. 9.17] gives a more precise impression of the composition of the complex, and helps to visualize its genesis. The complex is symmetrically arranged around a north-south axis—that

---

18 This summary is based on Lietzmann 1987; Seebach/Schreiber 1989; Wehdorn 2004.
19 What is probably the original print is illustrated in Lietzmann 1987, p. 13, Fig. 3; Ilg 1895, p. 109, illustrates the slightly divergent version taken from Hortorum viridariumque noviter in Europa praecipue adornatum elegantes et multiplices formae ad vivum delineatae, published by the Cologne printers Overadt in 1655. Here the cartouche with the legenda is
The Neugebäude is at right angles to the edge of the plateau and the ridge falling down steeply towards the Danube—and is composed of three principal sections. At its centre a narrow, extremely elongated building consists of a central pavilion connected by huge arcades to two polygonal pavilions at either end. It is built on the edge of the ridge on a podium consisting of two stepped terraces above the lower gardens to the north of it, and is backed by the rectangular entrance courtyard, accessible through monumental entrance gates on either end: from Vienna on the west, and from Kaiserebersdorf to the east.

At the bottom of the ridge a flower garden, the 'Untere Blumengarten', is situated between the terraces below the main building and a huge rectangular fishpond, which closes off the complex towards the north. In this garden the French humanist and diplomat Jacques Bongars (1546–1612), who visited the

---

20 In the course of the rehabilitation of the complex the lower garden, which had long since disappeared, has now been replaced by a modern garden suggesting its original outlines.
Neugebäude in April 1585, noticed ‘parterres faicts a chifres et armaris’, that is flowerbeds formed as monograms and coats of arms. It is surrounded by walls articulated by piers or pilasters, whereas the sustaining walls of the terraces were provided with round-headed wall niches, possibly intended for the collocation of sculptures. Some remains found during the excavation show that initially waterworks of some sort were planned at either end of these long terraces, but these were never executed.

The third element of the complex is situated on top of the plateau to the south of the entrance courtyard. It consists of a huge enclosure of $375 \times 335$ meters, entirely surrounded by a crenelated wall of over five meters high. This wall is interrupted at regular intervals and at the corners by in total ten round towers topped by peaked roofs. In the centre of its southern wall a tower-like pavilion topped by three similar pointed roofs, now demolished, once housed the pump works designed to feed the fountains. The outer section of this enclosure was planted with trees, but its centre, immediately adjoining the entrance courtyard, was filled by a second enclosure, the inner garden, an ample rectangle of 196 x 155 meters.

The four corners of this giardino segreto were marked by huge hexagonal towers of three levels, topped by cupola’s surrounded by a narrow walkway marked by pinnacles placed at the angles: they are clearly recognizable in Valckenborgh’s painting. The excavation has shown that the tower in the north-east corner was slightly larger than the others. They were largely finished by the end of 1570, since by that time their roofs had been covered in copper from Neusohl (now Banská Bystrica in Slovakia). The towers were connected on three sides of the rectangle by arcades carried on stone columns, topped with flat walkways, ‘Spatziergang oben auff den Schwibbogen’.

\begin{figure}[h!]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{figure9.18}
\caption{Andreas Altmann, Design for the frame of a green tunnel for the garden at Prague Castle, 1563 and detail from an anonymous plan of the garden.}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h!]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{figure9.19}
\caption{The green tunnel at the Villa d’Este in Tivoli, detail from an engraving after Etienne du Pérac (1571).}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h!]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{figure9.20}
\caption{Hans Vredeman de Vries, design for garden labyrinth, ca 1587.}
\end{figure}
From these walkways one looked down upon the inner garden, which was divided by garden paths into four identical sections, each of which in its turn was divided into four compartments and had a fountain at its centre. It probably included a green tunnel, similar to the ‘tria amoenissima cubicula’, the ‘three most pleasant chambers’ of evergreen shrubs that Maximilian had had constructed fifteen years before in his Prater garden.21 Such a green tunnel soon became a standard element in gardens of the late Renaissance: one of the best examples is that in the garden of the Villa d’Este in Tivoli [Fig. 9.19].22 A similar green tunnel in the Royal Gardens at Prague castle had been commissioned by Ferdinand I only a few years before, for which not only the documents, but even the designs have been preserved [Fig. 9.18]. The finished result may have looked a little like the ‘galleries de charpenterie’ at Montargis, bowers in carpentry intended to be overgrown with ivy, illustrated by Jaques Androuet du Cerceau [Fig. 9.21].23

Bongars described the outer garden which surrounded the giardino segreto as ‘un parc d’arbes fruitiers bien plantez à ligne et un beau labyrinthe’. The

---

21 Hagen 1874. Bongars described ‘palissades, fleurs, etc’, which Lietzmann translates by ‘Sträuchern, Blumen usw’, that is ‘shrubs, flowers and so on’; but Bongars’ ‘palissades’ more likely referred to the wooden railings dividing the compartments, and the frame of wooden posts and latticework supporting climbers or evergreens.

22 This famous engraving by Etienne du Pérac was commissioned in 1571 by Cardinal Ippolito d’Este in response to a request from Maximilian I.

23 Prague, National Archives, CDKM IV, Kart. 191, fol. 457v, 452, 457r., published in Dobalová/Hausenblasová/Muchka 2008; a megalomaniac version is illustrated in Hans Puechfeldner Ein Nützliches Künstbüech der Gärtnerey, one of three volumes full of idealized gardens designs presented to Rudolf II between 1591 and 1594, which to some extent reflects the practice at the Imperial court, cf. De Jong 1998 and Dobalová 2005, p. 46, Fig. 7; Androuet Du Cerceau 1576, pl. 33.
labyrinth may have looked something like the one illustrated by Hans Vrede-
man de Vries [Fig. 9.20] and it was particularly noted by early visitors. The outer garden was divided in two sections separated by a moat or canal of three to four paces wide, which at the time of Bongars’ visit still was to be lined

An eleven-year old Czech noble, Ladislav Velen z Žerotína, visited the garden with his tutor on 13 July 1590, and described it in his diary, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Regin. Lat. 613, fol. 6r–7 r, as cited in Lietzmann 1987, p. 44 and n. 12: ‘There are most beautiful buildings, long and high courtyards [“atria”] adorned with most high columns of white stone; an ample stable underground and some fishponds within the walls; fountains constructed of precious English alabaster; towers covered in copper and adorned with various paintings and statues. In one of the towers is a very deep well, from which water is carried in some hundreds of buckets, attached to a long chain, up to a very high place, built to be used for baths, and is there poured into a big cistern similar to a well. In the gardens the arms [“insignia”] of his Imperial Majesty, of all the Electors and of the first Princes [of the Holy Roman Empire] are depicted in all their colours by means of various flowers. There is also a maze [“Labyrinthus”] which it is not easy to get out of without making mistakes. From a storeroom [“cella”] an underground corridor [“cuniculus”] leads into the Castle [“in Arcem”] in Vienna [= the Hofburg], which is a whole mile away <...> At lunch we went to Ebersdorf, half a mile under beautiful trees; there we saw the castle, lions, some other bears of stupendous size, and two tigers.’
with stone, and which was to receive water carried to the Neugebäude from a mountain a mile and a half away. It is recognizable in Merian’s print, where it is identified as ‘Ein kleiner Graben umb den Thiergarten’. Bongars paid special attention to the water tower, of which he both gives its German name, and an explanation of its functioning.

Not shown on Merian’s print is a fourth component, the service court, a complex of asymmetrically placed secondary buildings immediately to the east of the principal block, along the road of access from Ebersdorf. Some of these certainly date back to the original construction: they can be seen in a topographical print from 1715 by Johann Adam Delsenbach, after a design by the architect Joseph Emanuel Fischer von Erlach [Fig. 9.22–9.23]. They included several buildings, and a tennis court surrounded by high walls, which apparently was roofed over only in the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century. Its long north side is flanked by an arcade opening over a set of five stone-lined fish ponds or aquaria (not represented in Delsenbach’s print) [Fig. 9.24]. More to the east a complex of other constructions included the still existent monumental stable [Fig. 9.25].
Figures 9.24–9.25 The service court of the Neugebäude with the fishponds (on the left); the stable.

To the north these buildings are preceded by a service courtyard surrounded by brick walls articulated by blind arcades echoing the arcade opposite. On its west side it provided access to the terraces of the main building and to the lower gardens. To the west of the principal building some other outhouses
may have been built.\textsuperscript{25} While the building of all this was going on, the gardens and orchards were already being planted, for instance with fruit trees sent to Vienna from the Royal gardens in Prague, doubtless under the supervision of the two (chief) gardeners, Claude Rennart and Carl de Seiniß, both of French origin, who had meanwhile been appointed.

The upper gardens, their surrounding walls and the various towers and galleries seem more or less to have been constructed as initially planned. This was not the case, however, for the construction of the building that was to provide the focus of the whole lay out. While work in the gardens continued, exactly in the centre of the long terraces new foundations were dug for a building apparently as wide as the central part or ‘Mittelrisalit’ of the Neugebäude as it was eventually built. The few remains of this project, soon abandoned, suggest that at least at the north and south side this building was to rest on a substructure consisting of an arcade carried on heavy piers. This is a construction which suggests various possible models among the villa architecture of the Italian Renaissance, such as Giuliano da Sangallo’s Villa Medici at Poggio a Caiano [Fig. 9.26], Raphael’s Villa Madama, Gerolamo Genga’s Villa Imperiale at Pesaro, or Falconetto’s Villa dei Vescovi at Luvigliano [Fig. 9.27].\textsuperscript{26}

When laying the foundations of this villa had hardly begun, its plan was abandoned in favour of a larger and more monumental concept: apart from the central building this would include two pavilions on either side, on the location of the present corner blocks or Eckrisalite. The existing upper terrace

\textsuperscript{25} The existence of the adjuncts to the west only to be deduced ‘auf grund baulicher Indizien’ (Seebach/Schreiber 1990, p. 376), it is not indicated whether these are remains of the foundations or traces preserved in the existing fabric of the main building.

\textsuperscript{26} Discussed by Holzschuh 1990 and Seebach/Schreiber 1989, pp. 375–376.
initially was only dug away where the foundations for these pavilions were to come, so at this point a connecting gallery was not yet envisaged. The substructures were constructed in very heavy, massive masonry, and already included the two grottoes in either corner pavilion.

This plan, in its turn, was abandoned for, or adapted to a new concept. First the ground floor level of the whole building was raised considerably, and for this reason the vaulting of the grottoes was demolished and replaced at a higher level. The corner pavilions were now connected to the central block by long and wide corridors, the floors of which were laid on the new level. The walls were built not in the massive masonry of the central and corner pavilions, but by using piers buttressing a lighter curtain wall. Pierced by round-headed niches, these piers carried wide arches cutting into a huge but shallow barrel vault—creating two very long and relatively low halls on the ground floor [Figs. 9.28]; though much smaller, they are very reminiscent of the Munich Antiquarium. On the courtyard side foundations have been found for what

---

**Figure 9.28** Neugebäude, ‘Schöne Saal’ on the ground floor of the west gallery.

---

27 Seebach Schreiber 1989, p. 376, ‘Bauphase IV’; from this it is not quite clear whether the foundation of the corner pavilions preceded those of the connecting arcades. Wehborn 2004, pp. 20–21 seems to assume that the ‘corner towers’, or at least the grottoes in them, had been begun even in an earlier phase.
must have been a low vaulted gallery, probably carrying a terrace accessible from the principal gallery on the *piano nobile*.

This principal gallery on the *piano nobile*, stretching for fifty meters on either side of the *Mittelrisalit*, was the most spectacular and unprecedented among the many eccentric features of the Neugebäude. When Maximilian died the west gallery had begun to be built, the east gallery would only be completed in 1579. We know what it looked like thanks to the drawings made in 1601 by the Imperial Architect Anton de Moys to indicate the damage due to infiltration of rainwater through a defective roof [Figs. 9.29 and 9.30]. It is possible also to reconstruct it because the paired columns and appertaining entablature blocks were reused in the construction, in 1775, of the *Gloriette* on the hill behind Schönbrunn Palace. Its design, by Johann Ferdinand Hetzendorf von Hohenberg, can be considered as a conscious memorial to the Neugebäude, which Hetzendorf had dismantled on the orders of Empress Maria Theresa [Figs. 9.31, 9.33–9.35].

The two galleries which connected the central pavilion or *Mittelrisalit* to the two end pavilions or towers each consisted of nine arches carried on paired doric columns. These column pairs each carried a complete doric entablature consisting of architrave, frieze of two triglyphs flanking a bucranium, and cornice. Though almost pedantically correct, this solution looks very odd and unclassical: instead of stressing the horizontal lines of the facade, the openings

---

28 Vienna, HHStA, Sammlung der Karten und Pläne, Ra-940-2.
29 Lietzmann 1997, pp. 100–101. The *spolia* of the Neugebäude reused at Schönbrunn have been identified and discussed in Knöbl 1988, pp. 102–118.
Figure 9.30  Anton de Moys, drawings of the interior of the gallery of the Neugebäude, indicating the damage to its vaulting, 1601.

Figure 9.31  Johann Ferdinand Hetzendorf von Hohenberg, the Gloriette at Schönbrunn, built 1775 reusing the Neugebäude arcades.
of the arches alternating with these rather heavy blocks of entablature give a rhythmical and sculptural effect to the facade. One of these entablature blocks has remained in situ in the Neugebäude [Fig. 9.32–9.33]. The gallery was covered by a simple barrel vault, which undoubtedly was intended to be decorated in stucco.30

In the last phase before Maximilian’s untimely decease, further changes were initiated: heavy foundations were laid in front of the central block or Mittelrisalit on the courtyard (south) side, suggesting the construction of a shallow vestibule section and a monumental facade, work on which was immediately stopped after Maximilian’s death. But even the remains of the foundation provides indications of several changes in plan during its construction. Now the western arcade was put into place, and the western wing largely completed, and some of it perhaps already decorated.

After Maximilian’s unexpected death—he had left no will, and staggering debts—his elder son Rudolf succeeded him as Emperor, and inherited the responsibility to complete his father’s project. It is clear that, however straitened his means, he intended to do what was possible. He almost immediately requested the architect Pietro Ferrabosco and the treasurer David Hag to come to Linz to discuss the project with him. In the following years the eastern gallery of the main block was completed, but the construction of the terraces and the projecting monumental facade on the courtyard side was discontinued.

---

30 The vaulting appears to have had a flat surface, which presupposes a very lightweight stucco decoration, perhaps similar to that in Hvězda, rather than a coffered ceiling. But the decoration was probably never executed.
By the end of 1580, when the copper for the roof of the eastern gallery was ordered, the Neugebäude was more or less as complete as it ever would be, though some work at the decoration still went forward: the last, third fountain Maximilian had ordered from Alexander Colin a year before he died, was delivered and placed by the artist only in 1584. Visitors in the following years, such as Jacques Bongars, give the impression that the complex was well kept up. When the eleven-year old Czech noble Ladislav Velen z Žerotín visited the garden with his tutor in 1590, he saw the coats of arms of the Emperor, the Electors and most important princes of the Empire beautifully figured in colours by the flowers planted in the various compartments, a fact which presupposes knowledgeable and industrious gardeners.31

But such was not to last for long: Rudolf had moved his court to Prague, and slowly lost interest in the unfinished building. The huge size of the Neugebäude—its facade is 185 meters long, as long as that of Schönbrunn—coupled to the fact that, in contrast to its gardens, it had no practical function, made it a liability for the Habsburg Emperors rather than an asset. Nevertheless it remained standing more or less until the end of the eighteenth century, when Maria Theresa decided to have it dismantled and transformed into a munitions depot. It was stripped of its decorations, sculpture and even its

---

31 Quoted above, note 24.
architectural features, which would be reused to some extent in the embellishment of Schönbrunn.\textsuperscript{32}

9.6 The Personal Involvement of Emperor Maximilian II

Both written sources and the building itself provide evidence that the Emperor closely followed the development of his new project. His assiduous personal involvement is reported by the Mantuan envoy, Guglielmo Malaspina, in a letter to his master written in April 1569:

After the dispatch of business His Imperial Majesty attends to a garden he is newly planting, and it seems that he spends as much time there as he can spare from business in which he is involved, for he doesn't care about wind or rain, but continuously goes to that place; the Duke of Ferrara has sent him several crates of trees, and likewise Archduke Ferdinand, considering this is his [the Emperor’s] [principal] pastime.\textsuperscript{33}

Maximilian’s personal interest is mentioned in similar terms by the Venetian ambassador, Giovanni Michiel, in a dispatch of 1571; discussing Maximilian’s occupations, he relates that at present the Emperor:

<...>has another one, which is greatly to his taste, and in which he spends all the time he can spare from business; this is the building of a garden, half a league from Vienna; which will be, once it is finished, of truly regal and imperial aspect.\textsuperscript{34}


\textsuperscript{33} Vienna, 13 April 1569; ASMn, Archivio Gonzaga, busta 451, filza 1 -3, ff. 115–117; published in Venturini 2002, nr, 48, p. 197. The formulation is not quite clear: ‘Sua maestà cesarea atende doppo gli negocii a un giardino che pianta di nuovo et tanto vi atende che par che possa robar tempo alli negocii in che assiduamente si trova, che non cura né di vento né di pioggia, ma continuamente va a questo lucho; il duca di Ferara li ha mandato parechie casse d’arbori inseriti, medemamente l’arciduca Ferdinando a tal che questo è il suo passatempo<...>’.

\textsuperscript{34} Fiedler 1870, p. 280, as cited in Lietzmann 1987, pp. 34–35: ‘al presente [ha] un altra [occupazione], di grandissimo suo gusto, nella quale vi mette tutto quel più tempo, che può robbare alli negotij, che è la fabrica d’un giardino, una meza lega lontano da Vienna; cosa per dover riuscire, finita che sia, regia veramente et imperiale’.
Maximilian himself explicitly formulated his personal concern in a letter of 4 December 1568 to Count Prospero d'Arco, his ambassador in Rome, asking for detailed information on garden projects in Rome:

Because in the grave and manifold cares and troubles we sustain for the benefit and safety, not only of our own kingdoms and dominions, but of the whole Christian world, we are used to seek for recreation and relaxation of the soul in the cultivation of gardens, we desire to see plans and images both of gardens and of pleasure houses and other garden ornaments that can be found in Rome.\(^\text{35}\)

He stresses that these should include both plans and elevations, and he asked in particular for designs for ‘artificial fountains and grottoes’. Maximilian moreover asked Count d'Arco to try and obtain as many antiques suitable for the decoration of gardens as he could lay his hands on in Rome. Similar requests for information on other projects, especially gardens and garden buildings, for plants and seeds, for animals, and for antiquities and works of art to be used in his own new garden were sent to his representatives in Venice, in Mantua and in Genoa. He employed his envoy in Madrid, Adam von Dietrichstein, to the same purpose (commenting on a plan of Aranjuez which Dietrichstein sent him), as he did his officials within his own territories.\(^\text{36}\)

Maximilian did not only look for inanimate objects, but also for lively talents who might contribute to the success of his undertaking. His letters to his envoy repeatedly ask them to be on the lookout for good architects who might be tempted to come to Vienna. In most cases these requests have been motivated by his need to improve the defence of his lands against the Turks largely dictated this initiative: most of the names that crop up in this correspondence were military engineers, of whom only a few actually arrived in Vienna. The foremost

\(^{35}\) Maximilian 11 to Prospero d'Arco, Linz, 4 December 1568, printed in *JdKS* 13, 1892,2, pp. xlvi–xlviii, *Regest* 8805; cf. Lippmann 2006–2007, p. 162 and cited in Lietzmann 1987, p. 29 en pp. 164–165; Podewils, 1992, p. 25, n. 88; from the following correspondence it appears that Count d'Arco did indeed succeed in obtaining a number of antique statues and also commissioned some modern sculpture, some of which was explicitly intended for use in one or more fountains. On Arco’s acquisition and transport of sculptures, cf. Lietzmann 164–166; Podewils 1992, pp. 25–33.

\(^{36}\) ‘La traza del jardin de aranjues dunkt mich saie nach geleghnait des platz wol aufgetaill glaihwol kan mans also gar nit wol sehen. Sino poco mas o menos’, as given in Rudolf 1995, pp. 180–181; the relevant passage (p. 181, n. 176) gives some inkling of Maximilian’s way of thinking—in his informal letters to what was also a close personal friend he freely mixes German, Spanish and Latin—and demonstrates that he himself did critically think about the architectural aspects of gardening. Maximilian also asked the supervisors of mines in his territories to send him ‘Handsteine’ to decorate his grottoes and fountains (Lietzmann 1987, p. 70).
of these was Giovanni Sallustio Peruzzi, the son of Baldassare, the architect of the Farnesina and the Palazzo Massimo alle Colonne, and himself a renowned military engineer. Soon after he arrived in Vienna in 1567, he was appointed superintendent of the fortification on the Croatian borders. But he certainly also was an accomplished architect, as is evident from the gate of the castle at Ptuj/Pettau in Slovenia, which was executed after his design of 1570 [Fig. 9.36].

37 On Sallustio Peruzzi, see now the detailed and richly documented monograph by Wolfgang Seidel (Seidel 2002).
Whether Peruzzi was asked to contribute to the plans of the Neugebäude is not clear: in December 1568 Maximilian asked Veit von Dornberg, his envoy in Venice, if he knew about some outstanding architect that might be available, and in the same letter he also asked for information about the sculptor Alessandro Vittoria and the architect Giacometto Tagliapietra. Since he cannot have intended to employ Vittoria in his fortifications, his letter must have been motivated by his plans for the Neugebäude, work at which was about to begin just at this time. So at least in this case it seems that his quest for an architect was related to this, rather than to any military project. But if so, his attempts to entice competent Italian architects to come to Vienna were rather half-hearted: when in his reply Dornberg reported extensively on Tagliapietra, gave some information about another, better known architect, Giovanni Antonio Rusconi, and proposed an attempt to persuade Andrea Palladio to come to Vienna for a month or two ‘to compose and draw the plan of some building’, the Emperor seems not have reacted to this: none of these three names crop up in the Vienna sources again.38

On the other hand it may be that Giacomo Barozzi da Vignola, a theorist as important as Palladio, and architect of, among other masterpieces, the Gesù in Rome and the Palazzo Farnese at Caprarola, did contribute in some way to Maximilian’s project. That at least is suggested by a substantial payment to his son and heir, the architect Giacinto, ordered by Rudolf II almost immediately after Maximilian’s death.39 But if so, we do not know what this contribution may have been; it may well have consisted of sets of drawings of one or more of the villa and garden projects for which he had been responsible. Besides Caprarola these included the Orti Farnesiani and the Villa Giulia in Rome and the Villa Lante in Bagnaia, all key monuments in the history of garden design.

The fact that Maximilian collected such information and source material for his pet project in person, instead of leaving it all to a trusted underling, again suggests that he was himself closely involved in the development of his project. Evidence that has come to light during the excavations of parts of the Neugebäude in the late 1980s confirms that he must have critically followed what was done. Whereas the upper and lower gardens of the Neugebäude,

38 Podewils 1992, pp. 43–46. This does not mean that there may not have been further contact through other, more informal channels, but we have no indication for that.

39 JdKS 7, 1888, 11, p. cclxxviii, Regest 5357, cited by Lietzmann 1987, pp. 190–191, who points out that the payment was not made to Giacomo (†573,) but to his son Giacinto. It was a substantial sum, 100 Kronentaler, paid ‘aus besonderer Gnaden’, without giving a concrete motivation.
including their surrounding walls and the towers, appear to have been built more or less according to plan, without substantial changes during the execution, the project for the central building developed rapidly while it was actually executed. This led to many smaller and larger adaptations that can still be traced in the existing brickwork, and which occasionally even entailed demolishing parts that had already been constructed. It is unthinkable that the local master masons would have been allowed to exercise their fantasies in such a way: on the contrary, it is likely that these continual changes in plan, which must have been expensive, may have led to some irritation with those charged with their execution. So it is highly probable that these changes must have been not only condoned, but were instigated by the patron, Maximilian II, himself. They indicate the importance the project had for him, and how far he was prepared to go to realize his ideal. A good example is the change in floor level of the Neugebäude proper, which altered the relation of the central building to its surroundings, as a consequence of which the terraces were restructured and the level of the whole of the northern garden was raised appreciably (which implied that it also had to be planted anew).  

It is true that the documentation on the artistic patronage at the Imperial court in the sixteenth century is extremely scanty and incomplete; yet it remains very odd that even for a project of the size and the extraordinary character of the Neugebäude no name of a designing architect should have come down to us. To my mind this indicates at the very least that no one single professional was responsible for the project as a whole. Coupled to Maximilian’s amply documented personal involvement and the changes to the project realized during actual construction this suggests that he not only supervised, but personally participated in the designing process. Though doubtless the final designs were prepared for execution by one or more of his professional architects, such as Ferrabosco, the general concept of the complex and many of its eccentric details—such as the four hexagonal corner towers of the inner garden—may well be due to Maximilian himself. That he should have himself sketched out some of his ideas is not so strange at it may seem to some historians, if he also worked with his hands in various crafts, as has been documented of many other princes of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, including his own great-grandfather Maximilian I, whose splendid working bench and

---

40 Seebach/Schreiber 1989, p. 376, ‘Bauphase v’; of course there may have been other reasons to raise this garden: lying at the bottom of the ridge, it may have been waterlogged in autumn and winter.
lathe has been preserved [Fig. 9.37]. From the reports of several envoys at the Imperial court we know that Maximilian II likewise filled his ‘otium’ by similar forms of manual and technical workmanship, and that he also engaged in drawing and in various alchemical experiments:

His Majesty is most inimical to idleness; and he never loses an hour in which he does not do something, and if he has no other things to do, he is used to work with his hands, making things in gold and silver<...>.

---

**Figure 9.37** The workbench for turning wood made for the Emperor Maximilian I, ca. 1518; Burg Kreuzenstein, Lower Austria.

**Figure 9.38** Reliquary of the True Cross; the mount of the actual relic was made by Maximilian II; Madrid, Monastery of the Descalzas Reales.

---

41 In the collection of Dr. Hans Graf Wilczek, Burg Kreuzenstein; cf. Walcher-Molthein 1925, pp. 17–22; Ausstellung Maximilian I - Innsbruck 1969, p. 159, cat. nr. 592, fig. 129; on turning of wood and ivory as a popular princely occupation, see Paravicini 2004, nr. 1, pp. 39–44. Another example is the splendid machine for various types of metalwork made for Maximilian’s close friend, Elector August of Saxony, now in the Musée National de la Renaissance at Écouen.

42 ‘Si diletta grandemente oprar di mano sua, et disegna, et lava al torno et altre cose tali’ (report from Giacomo Soranzo, 1563); ‘S. Mta. C. è inimicissimo quanto piu dell’ ocio;
The Carmelite Monastery of the Descalzas Reales in Madrid preserves a relic of the True Cross, which is set in a small reliquary that was made by Maximilian II, as is attested by an inscription on the foot of the monstrance in which it is placed [Fig. 9.38].\textsuperscript{43} The inventory of the Munich Kunstkammer drafted by Johann Baptist Fickler in 1598 likewise lists some objects that were made by Maximilian himself.\textsuperscript{44} We have seen above that Maximilian had collaborated in the physical creation of his earlier garden in the Prater, not only plotting its outlines himself, but actually planting some of its trees with his own hands. And we know that even before that, when acting as Charles V’s viceroy in Spain, he had been personally engaged in the plans to improve the course of the Pisuerga and the water supply of his capital, Valladolid.

It is difficult to imagine that someone with these interests would have left the fun of the planning of his grandest project to someone else. On the contrary, it can be expected that he participated in its planning and supervised its execution as closely as his heavy political responsibilities allowed. Certainly this is not contradicted by Giovanni Michiel’s report quoted above, which explicitly lists the ‘building of a garden’ among Maximilian’s preferred occupations.\textsuperscript{45}

So it is quite possible that perhaps the general plan or concept of the Neugebäude and at least some of its more eccentric features should be considered as the fruits of Maximilian’s leisure hours, of precisely ‘quel più tempo, che può robbare alli negotij’, as the Venetian Ambassador phrased it. These fruits ripened by spurts and starts—whenever Maximilian found some time to spend on his plans, when Dietrichstein or Arco had sent some interesting material, or a visiting dignitary gave an account of a rival project elsewhere in Europe. They were fertilized by the scientific and scholarly literature Maximilian perused,

\textsuperscript{43} Rudolf 1995, p. 166, pl. 144. He may have made it for his wife, who would spend the last years of her life in the Descalzas Reales; it was presented to the monastery by their daughter, Archduchess Margaretha.

\textsuperscript{44} One of these was an artificial vivarium, a habitat filled with plaster casts of all sorts of animals (Diemer 2004, p. 129, nr. 1455); the other a ‘Schauessen’, a faience plate decorated in the manner of Bernard Palissy with casts or naturalistic representations of various fruits and ‘Lebkuchen’ (ibid. pp. 131–132, nr. 1457). The technique of casting animals from life was also extensively used by Wenzel Jamnitzer, Maximilian’s favourite goldsmith and Strada associate.

\textsuperscript{45} ‘Oltre le quali occupazioni ne ha al presente un altra, di grandissimo suo gusto, nella quale vi mette tutto quel più tempo, che può robbare alli negotij, che è la fabrica d’un giardino, una meza lega lontana da Vienna; cosa per riuscire (finita che sia) regia veramente et Imperiale.’ (Fiedler 1870, p. 280, as cited in Lietzmann 1987, pp. 34–35).
the classical and contemporary literature he read, and not least the discussions with the scholars and artists who, with some congenial spirits among the court nobility, made up what has been called Maximilian's Hofakademie.46

This is very much the same soil from which sprouted the themes, the texts, the iconography and the designs for the courtly festivities that occasionally were organized at court; before his accession some of these had been directed by Maximilian himself. The Neugebäude was the result of a similar collective effort as was needed to organize such representative triumphs. Just as the physical components of the building were carried to Vienna from all over Maximilian's territories, and its contents arrived from all over Europe and beyond, so the ideas informing its conception and the visual forms chosen to realize this had very heterogeneous origins. As in the creation of the Prater Lusthaus, many of these ideas and forms must have been provided by the intellectuals and artists at Maximilian's court, but unlike the Prater, which is so well documented in Tanner's treatise, their individual contributions cannot be attributed with any certainty.

What is certain is that such heterogeneous ideas and forms were combined in quite unusual ways, and it is the resulting eclectic mixture which gives the Neugebäude its very individual, even eccentric character, and provides the strongest argument to attribute the final responsibility of its concept, its overall design and even many of its details to its patron himself, rather than to any one hypothetical master designer. A detailed analysis of these various elements and their sources is indispensable for a better comprehension of this exceptional work of art, its purpose and its patron's intentions. It might moreover help to tentatively attribute the responsibility for some of its individual features to plausible candidates. Because such an analysis would amply transcend the limits of this study, here I will discuss only those features of the complex and their probable sources when these can be connected with Jacopo Strada and the materials in his Musaeum.47

Strada contributed to the development of the Neugebäude in two ways. In the first place he contributed a least one concrete design, either for the general lay-out of the project, or for one or more of its individual components.

---

46 This term, first used in connection with Maximilian in Aschbach's history of Vienna University, should not be taken too seriously: it merely indicates the presence of a large number of learned men connected with Maximilian's court, who doubtless regularly exchanged information, ideas and opinions; but there is no evidence that this happened in any institutional setting (other than Maximilian's Kammer and the University); cf. Aschbach 1888, p. 349; Mühlberger 1992, p. 212, n. 35; Almási 2009, p. 99.

In the second place his expertise and his huge collection of documentation provided inspiration, concrete examples and technical solutions, again both for the project as a whole and for individual components. Perhaps most important was that he could comment most of the drawings in his collection often on the basis of his own personal experience of the constructions they documented. When the example was Antique, he could cite from his background knowledge of antiquarian and literary sources; when the model was modern he could comment on its raison d’être, its form and function, often on the basis of his personal acquaintance with the artists that had created, and sometimes even with the patrons that had commissioned it. Before attempting to individuate what concrete features of the Neugebäude may be due to Strada, it is good to discuss some of the sources—both iconological and formal—that Maximilian and his architects could have seen in Strada’s Musaeum. I divide them into three sections: Ottoman, Ancient Roman and contemporary Italian architecture.

9.7 Ottoman Influence?

Over the course of time the odd, mysterious, slightly lugubrious complex of the Neugebäude has given rise to several legends. Principal among these is the story that the gardens, laid out on the exact spot where Suleiman the Magnificent had pitched his tents during his siege of Vienna in 1529, were intended as a reconstruction in stone of the Sultan’s sumptuous ‘Zeltburg’, the bivouac or camp that served as his headquarters and personal residence. This would explain both the odd plan and the many towers topped by their tent-like pavilion roofs. In the first serious publication on the Neugebäude Albert Ilg discarded the story as a ridiculous fabrication, also because the earliest sources mentioning it only date from the later seventeenth century. Renate Wagner-Rieger conceded that a direct imitation of Ottoman example was out of the question, but suggested that oriental culture might nevertheless have provided some

---

48 Ilg 1895. For a survey of the sources of the legend, see Lietzmann 1987, pp. 9–23; the earliest mention she found is in Thomas Crowe, A True relation of all the Remarkable Places and Passages observed in the travels of the right honourable Thomas Lord Howard, London 1637 (reprint as Travels of Thomas Lord Howard, Amsterdam/ New York 1971), who reports Lord Arundel’s visit to Vienna in 1636, where he ‘went to see a garden of the Emperours a Dutch mile off, called Nigobath, upon which place the Turke once intrenched himself, when he would have taken Vienna, and was then two hundred thousand man strong, in the Emperour Rodolphus his time, an after they were driven out of the countrey, the Emperour built this on their works for a memorial’. 
inspiration for the Neugebäude, as it did for various festivals at court. She was the first to attribute the design to Jacopo Strada, and pointed to his apparent knowledge of the Near East, suggesting that he even may have visited Constantinople. In his small monograph on the Neugebäude Rupert Feuchtmüller largely followed Ilg, discarding any possible Ottoman influence.⁴⁹

In contrast Hilda Lietzmann took the legend as point of departure for her detailed and carefully documented study, and referred to it in its title. She pointed out that the Turks themselves did recognize Suleiman's bivouac in the Neugebäude, witness the romanticized travel journal of Evliya Çelebi, who visited Vienna in 1665.⁵⁰ Lietzmann indicated some typological sources in Cairo and Istanbul, but also suggested a direct derivation from Suleiman's actual encampment, documentation of which was in Strada's possession. Unfortunately neither this nor any other similar material has been preserved or identified, so Lietzmann can show little convincing evidence. Of course she uses the print of Kara Mustafa's tent, among the spoils captured after the 1683 siege, merely to explain how by the second half of the seventeenth century even people in Europe could actually recognize a Turkish tent in the Neugebäude. Lietzmann's contention has not found much acceptance—in Vienna itself it is contradicted or, more often, ignored.⁵¹

It is true that there are no contemporary sources explicitly linking the Neugebäude and Suleiman's headquarters, but in view of the extreme scantiness of contemporary documentation on the raison d'être of the building that can hardly be taken as evidence that such a link has not existed. And in view of the importance of the Ottoman Empire and the memory of the 1529 siege for Maximilian's politics, it seems plausible that the fact that he constructed his Lusthaus exactly on the spot were Suleiman had pitched his tent would have had some special significance for the Emperor, in which case it well might have influenced its appearance in some ways.

⁴⁹ Rieger 1951; Feuchtmüller 1976.
⁵⁰ Lietzmann 1987, pp. 14–16. During the 1683 siege of Vienna the Turkish commander Kara Mustafa or his entourage explicitly linked the Neugebäude with Suleiman's camp, reason why he forbade his soldiers to plunder and damage it, this in contrast to other imperial castles and villas around Vienna.
⁵¹ Zimmermann 1987 does not refer to the Bausage at all; Wehdorn 2004, p. 10, merely mentions, but does not discuss it. Lippmann 2006–2007, p. 160 holds that the occidental idiom of its forms, classical (or ‘antique’) for the arcades, contemporary (or ‘modern’) for the upper gardens, precludes any wish to refer to Turkish culture and traditions. In September 2010 the present author attended a long, competently guided tour of the building: though this was very interesting, the 1529 siege was never mentioned, let alone the location of Suleiman's camp and its possible influence on the Neugebäude.
Given that, it still remains the question what form such influence would have taken: it might, for instance, have remained limited to using the exact site of the Sultan's camp for the Neugebäude. But the fact that Çelebi in 1665 and Kara Mustafa in 1683 saw a sufficient resemblance to Suleiman's headquarters suggests at least some imitation of Ottoman models in its lay-out.\textsuperscript{52} It is here that the material collected by Jacopo Strada—some of it obtained with the help of Imperial envoys to Constantinople—may have played a role. In his \textit{Index sive catalogus}, the list of works he hoped to publish or to sell, no less than five items relate to Ottoman military matters: a clear indication of the importance of the theme for his patrons. They documented the battle-order of the Sultan and his ‘castrametatio’, the manner in which his armies organized their bivouacs. The first item in the list was ‘a large table or map of the castrametatio of Suleiman, the Emperor of the Turks, before the city of Vienna in Austria’. It was a detailed copy of a painting in the possession of the Duke of Mantua that had been painted by a Flemish master at the time of the siege, and showed the tents of the Sultan and the various ranks of the Ottoman army. It is perhaps significant that when Strada asked Guglielmo Gonzaga to borrow this painting in order to copy it, he explained his wish by the affection he had for it, because it documented ‘all these surroundings of the villa which I know particularly well’. His use of the word ‘villa’, rather than ‘città’ implies that he specifically refers to the surroundings of Neugebäude or perhaps of Ebersdorf, rather than to those of Vienna in general. In any case his initiative makes clear that the historical significance of this particular spot had not yet been forgotten at court.\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{52} During the 1683 siege of Vienna the Grand Vizier Kara Mustafa or his entourage explicitly linked the Neugebäude with Suleiman's camp, reason why he forbade his soldiers to plunder and damage it, this in contrast to other imperial castles and villas around Vienna (Lietzmann 1987, pp. 14–16). Veronika Szűcs has argued that Strada, to whom she attributes the concept for the entire complex, intended to represent the Sultan's camp by using ‘units and forms of a Roman military camp, forms which generally can be observed in any—also Turkish—military camp or fortress’ (Szűcs 2012). Her article contains other valuable ideas and insights, but her unquestioning acceptance of Strada's single responsibility for the Neugebäude's concept is at the least simplistic, and she is unaware of much essential background information, especially on Strada and his activities.

\textsuperscript{53} \textit{Index sive catalogus} (= App. D), nr. 8. In March 1571 Strada had asked Duke Guglielmo to borrow the original, which he described as ‘una pittura in tela colorita a guazzo da un fiamingo, molto guasta per la vecchiezza, nelle quale viè l'assedio di Vienna dal Turcho, et io perché conoscho tutti quelli contorni della villa, li porto molta etizione’ (Doc. 1571-03-19). Though Strada had to repeat his request (Doc. 1571-11-20), the loan was conceded (Doc. 1577-10-04: Strada to Duke Guglielmo, 4 October 1577: ‘Doppo ch'io mandai la pittura di Vienna costì a vostra altezza, al quale fu a me prestata da parte sua<...>’). The painting arrived in Vienna too late to have influenced the lay-out of the Neugebäude, but Strada...
Had we still had this painting or Strada's copy of it, we might have drawn some conclusions as to the extent in which the Neugebäude was reflecting Suleiman’s otağ-i hümayun, his imperial tent complex, as perceived by his Christian opponents. As it is, the only correspondence shown in the few available contemporary images—both European and Ottoman—is that the Sultan's tent was surrounded by some improvised, crenelated wall of canvas, the ‘zokak’, interrupted, in Barthel Behams view, by pavilion-like tents [Fig. 9.39 and 9.40].

knew it very well because on one of his visits to Mantua he had been lodged for several months in the room where it was kept, and presumably already had sketched it on that occasion. The Index describes other Turkish ‘Castrametationi’ under nrs. 9 and 39: two large tables illustrating the Turkish battle order under nrs. 10 and 11. Some of the material Strada had obtained through the Imperial ambassadors Vrančić (nr. 9) and Busbequius (nr. 11).

Drawing in pen and wash, Wien, Museen der Stadt Wien; cf. Kaiser Ferdinand I 2003, cat. nr. VI.17, pp. 411–411. Suleiman’s Zeltburg must have been a quite extraordinary spectacle, somewhat akin to the celebrated ‘field of cloth of gold’ of Francis I and Henry VIII: ‘During military campaigns the Ottomans established nomadic tent cities, just as the Turks had done in much earlier times. In these cities the tents of the janissaries took the place...
With a lot of imagination this zokak might be considered as model for the wall and the round towers surrounding the upper garden at the Neugebäude. Certainly it is the tent-like roofs of these wall-towers that most contributed to the idea of the Neugebäude as an image of the Sultan’s camp.\(^5^5\) Less convincing as potential models are the desert castles suggested by Renate Wagner-Rieger or the Ibn Tulun mosque at Cairo suggested by Hilda Lietzmann.\(^5^6\) Nevertheless the possibility that Ottoman architecture provided a source for the concept of the Neugebäude must not be completely discarded; more detailed research might possibly provide more convincing models.

9.8 Classical Sources: Roman Castrametatio and the Fortified Palace of Diocletian at Split

9.8.1 The Imperial Theme

On the other hand Maximilian may well have opted to express the superiority of his rule over that of Sultan Selim I, by replacing the camp of his opponent’s predecessor, Suleiman the Magnificent, by a building evoking the importance of his own illustrious predecessors, the rulers of the Roman Empire. Identification of contemporary rulers with the Emperors of ancient Rome—in political theory, in historiography, in the arts, in short in any sort of representation—had become almost a commonplace in the Renaissance. Clearly members of the House of Austria who bore the Imperial crown that had come to down to them from Charlemagne had even more right and reason to identify themselves with the Roman Emperors than other monarchs. This revival of the universal aspirations of the Holy Roman Empire was mainly due to Habsburg
dynastic policy and the forceful personality of Charles V.\textsuperscript{57} Jacopo Strada's decision to seek patronage at the Imperial court, rather than in Spain, in France or with one of the lesser but factually more powerful princes of the Empire on either side of the Alps, may have had something to do with the mystique of the Emperor as universal monarch: certainly Strada was very well aware of the status he derived from it, if he pointedly referred to himself as ‘servidor del primo signore del mondo’.\textsuperscript{58}

Maximilian himself was naturally interested in the history of the Emperors. Such interest was in any case a commonplace of intellectual life of the Renaissance, witness the hundreds of series of imperial portraits decorating palaces and public buildings all over Europe and the many publications, often illustrated, dedicated to the lives of the Emperors—including Strada's own *Epitome thesauri antiquitatum*. The Imperial court fully partook of this tradition, as has been well sketched in a paper by Friedrich Polleross.\textsuperscript{59} This helps explain the great importance that Ferdinand I and his elder son accorded to the imperial coin collection and its catalogue. Strada's letter to Maximilian of June 1559 includes a detailed interpretation of a coin of Mark Antony which presupposes a high level of interest and expertise in its recipient.\textsuperscript{60} This interest remained with Maximilian to the end of his career: in November 1572 he sent the painter Giovanni de Monte to Mantua to have copies made of Titian's famous portraits of the first twelve Emperors in the *Gabinetto de' Cesari* in the Palazzo Ducale and at some date he also acquired an exquisite series of modern gesso busts of the twelve Emperors from Strada's own collection.\textsuperscript{61} More in general the

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{57} Kaufmann 1978(a), p. 14: ‘It is at the imperial court that imperial themes were obviously crucial.’
\bibitem{58} Doc. 1568-00-00, undated draft of a letter by Strada to an unknown correspondent.
\bibitem{59} Haskell 1993; Cunnally 1999; Polleross 2006: ‘Romanitas in der habsburgische Repräsentation von Karl V. bis Maximilian II’; I am obliged to Dr Polleross for an offprint of his paper and an interesting discussion of the theme.
\bibitem{60} Doc. 1559-06-00; published in Jansen 1993a, pp. 233–235.
\bibitem{61} Discussed in detail by Jürgen Zimmer, who adds an excursus on the career of the court painter Giovanni de Monte (who should not be confused with the sculptor Hans Mont): Zimmer 2010; Maximilian II to Guglielmo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua, Vienna 26 November 1572, ASMn, Archivio Gonzaga, *busta* 431, *filza* VIII, f. 210–211; published in *JdKS* XVI, 1895, *Regest* n. 14,000 and in Venturini 2002, nr. 106, pp. 223–224 (and cf. *ibidem*, nr. 114–115, pp. 226–227); on Strada's commission, for the Duke of Bavaria, of Giulio Romano's scenes from the lives of the first twelve Emperors, painted to go under Titian's famous portraits, see below, Ch. 12.5. Strada's gesso heads are mentioned in the account of a payment made to him; he had acquired them in Venice: they are mentioned in the Stopio-Fugger correspondence and a letter from Strada to Hans Jakob Fugger, see below, Ch. 12.4.2.
\end{thebibliography}
Imperial theme was the recurrent motive in the festivals organised at court both by Maximilian himself, his siblings or occasionally his subjects.⁶²

⁶² Discussed in Kaufmann 1978, passim.

**FIGURE 9.41** Sebastiano Serlio, Plan of Polybius' *Castrametatio* adapted to a fortified town; München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek.
9.8.2 Roman Castrametatio

Given that this Imperial theme was very much alive at court, it is probable that Maximilian intended that the Neugebäude included explicit references to his Roman predecessors. Given the spot and its historical association, the most obvious way to do this was to imitate, instead of the Sultan’s camp, the castrum of a Roman army. Maximilian can at least have had an inkling of what that may have looked like, if not directly from the historical sources such as Polybius, Vegetius or Caesar, than from contemporary popularizations or from discussions with humanist experts. But even had he not, in Strada’s collection he disposed of expert visual documentation. Not only was Strada himself studying Caesar’s wars, in order to be able to provide his planned complete edition of the Commentaries with detailed and reliable illustrations, but fifteen years earlier he had explicitly commissioned Sebastiano Serlio to prepare a detailed reconstruction of the castrametatio of the Romans as described by Polybius, which he intended to publish likewise.63

Serlio had been working on this theme earlier: at the behest of Francis I, he had made a huge plan (of nine feet square) of Polybius’ entrenched camp, and a similar map of a modern fortified town based on Polybius’ plan, intended for two fortified garrison-towns the French king intended to build at his borders with Piedmont and Flanders. These projects had likewise been acquired by Strada, and thus were accessible to Maximilian [Fig. 9.41].

The square plan, the round towers at the corners and along the walls which consist of piers buttressing a curtain wall are features that correspond to the upper garden of the Neugebäude; the location of the staff headquarters, the Praetorium or Principium, might be related to that of the main building of Maximilian’s palace. These correspondences suggest that Serlio’s drawings did influence Maximilian to some extent when he was conceiving his new garden. Nevertheless it is very questionable that Maximilian intended a more or less precise imitation of a Roman camp: in that case he doubtless would have also imitated its most salient feature, its inner division in more or less equal

63 Index sive catalogus, nr. 33. Strada had these illustrations engraved in Venice; in his preface to the Settimo Libro he describes them as Serlio’s ‘Eight book’. A set of drawings from Fugger’s library, now in the Staatsbibliothek München, Cod. Icon. 190, doubtless acquired through Strada’s mediation, may have been his source, but in view of the differences in his description it is more likely that Strada owned a second, slightly different version; see Serlio/Fiore/Carrunchio 1994. On Strada’s illustrated edition of Caesar (Caesar 1575(a), which is paralleled by Palladio’s project, which came out in the same year (Caesar 1575(b), see Jansen 2004, pp. 188–191. It should be noted that Strada’s Lyon friend Guillaume du Choul also published a treatise, Discours sur la castrametation et discipline militaire des Romains (Lyon 1554), which was repeatedly reprinted and translated in Italian (1559).
sections by *cardo* and *decumanus*, two streets crossing at right angles and connecting the gates in the centres of each side.

### 9.8.3 The Fortified Palace of Diocletian at Split

It is interesting that Serlio himself says that he based his plan on the description he had been given by Cardinal Marco Grimani, Patriarch of Aquilea, of the remnants of a Roman *castellum* he had seen in Dacia, the former Roman province in present Serbia and Romania. This *castellum*, a permanent garrison town basically planned along the same lines as the temporary *castra*, has been identified with Pontes, one of two fortified settlements built to protect the bridgeheads of the spectacular bridge across the Danube built by Trajan near present-day Kladovo on the Serbian-Romanian border. It is not totally impossible that Maximilian may have been aware of this rather remote and obscure monument.64 There was, however, one monument in one of the north-eastern provinces of the Roman Empire that was still standing and was reasonably accessible: the fortified palace built in the first years of the fourth century by the Emperor Diocletian at Split, close to his birthplace Salona (Solin) in Dalmatia.

---

64 BSB-HS, Cod. Icon. 190, f. 1r; quoted in English translation and discussed in Hart 1998, p. 76. In view of the argument on dilettante architects it is interesting to note that Grimani had himself ‘measured it and put [it] in a design to the best of his abilities’ (*ibid*). The bridge is illustrated on the shaft off Trajan’s column in Rome commemorating the Dacian campaign, of which Strada possessed complete and detailed documentation.
Split had a huge influence on the development of the Neoclassical style in the eighteenth century, thanks to the splendid, very detailed documentation that was prepared by the English architect Robert Adam and published in 1764 [Figs. 9.42–9.43; 9.49–9.52, 9.54]. But we know surprisingly little about how far it was known to and perhaps studied by the architects and antiquaries of the Renaissance. However, John White’s suggestion that the Palace inspired the background architecture in Giotto’s frescoes in the Arena Chapel in Padua is convincing. Two detailed measured drawings dating from middle of the sixteenth century traditionally attributed to Andrea Palladio, providing a plan of Diocletian’s mausoleum and an elevation of its doorway, indicate that its significance was known by that time [Figs. 9.53 and 9.46].65 Serlio illustrated other monuments in Dalmatia, such as the triumphal arch in Pola/Pula. If he also owned material documenting Split, this passed into Strada’s hands with his other manuscript material.66

Apart from the Strada/Serlio connection there are two further ways in which knowledge of Split could have reached Maximilian’s court. In 1553 the

---

65 Adam 1764; White 1973, pp. 443–445.
66 That holds as well for the copies of Marco Grimani’s drawings in Serlio’s possession referred to above. In view of both Grimani’s and Serlio’s own classical erudition the suggestion in Dinsmoor 1942(a), p. 90, that Serlio’s reference to ‘Dacia’ was his own or his scribe’s spelling mistake for ‘Dalmacia’, and that Grimani’s drawings in fact documented Split, rather than any hypothetical Roman ruin in Transylvania, seems unlikely, but it cannot completely be discarded. The mistake might have been the printer’s: the description fits Split like a glove.
Croatian-Hungarian diplomat and prelate Antun Vrančić had been sent to Constantinople as Imperial ambassador; with Busbequius, who headed the delegation that arrived to support and replace him in 1555, he discovered the Monumentum Ancyranum. As a native of Šibenik (Sebenico), the medieval successor to Diocletian’s birthplace Salona, which is quite close to Split, Vrančić certainly would have been aware of Diocletian’s palace and could have given a report on it to Maximilian and his architects. The engraver Martino Rota (Martin Rota Kolunić, 1520–1583), who worked at and for the Imperial court, also was a native of Šibenik. He had worked as an engraver in Rome and Venice in the 1560s; his antiquarian interest is documented by prints of Roman antiquarian topics, his knowledge of his native country by a set of maps of Šibenik and its region, including one of Split [Fig. 9.44]. Like Vrančić, of whom he made two engraved portraits [Fig. 9.45], he must have been very much aware of the principal Roman monument in his fatherland. Moreover both Vrančić and Rota were close associates of Strada. Vrančić was a friend and colleague-antiquary who contributed to Strada’s collection, as we have seen above, and greatly respected his expertise and culture. Rota worked as a draughtsman and engraver in Strada’s projects, as is clear from a letter by Ottavio Strada to his father of November 1574 and his engraved portrait of the young Ottavio (Ch.11, Fig. n.o8). Finally, a third learned Croatian from Šibenik, the Protonotarius apostolicus Stefano (Stjepan) Pisani, had an influential position in Vienna as Canon and Cantor of St Stephen’s Cathedral.

---

67 Illustrated and described in Pelc 1997, nr 179–182, pp. 229–232: Il Vero retractor di Zara et di Selenic co(n) diligenza ridotte in questa forma a commodita de lettori si come elle si ritro-vano al presente del anno MDLXX da Martino Rota Sebenzan(o) ac Reverendissimo Domino Marco Loredano Episcopo Enonien(si) D(edit), Venice 1570; the map of Spalato (Split) is nr. 181 (p. 231). Earlier, less detailed maps of the region had been printed in 1560 by the Venetian cartographer Paolo Forlani. Among Rota’s antiquarian subjects a.o, a set of 24 engravings of portrait busts of Roman Emperors, published by Claude Duchet stands out: Imperatorum, Caesarumque, vigintiquatuor effigies, A Iulio usque ad Alexandrum Severum ex antiquis marmoribus ac numismatibus desumptae, (ibidem, nr. 77–101, p. 161 ff); the por-trait of Vrančić dating from ca 1570 (ibidem, nr 127–128, pp. 189–192).

68 Doc 1558-12-04. On their relationship, see below, Ch. 11.3.

69 Doc. 1574-12-05: Ottavio Strada to his father, Nuremberg 5 December 1574: ‘Del Martino non è pacato, se ben è povero homo e superbo; Voi vedrete che Dio lo castigara. Et se lui non vi vole render quelli danari che li prestai bisogno far conto che li abbia per ’l mio ritratto. Quando havera fame ’l vera a lavorare, et fate lavorare in la Series se’ll vora lavorar; più presto ci daria di più queche [sic] coseta per rame, acciò che andasi inanti’. This passage suggests that other works by Rota—such as the Emperor’s portraits cited in the preceding note—may have been commissioned by or through Strada.

70 His portrait was also engraved by Rota in 1573, see Pelc 1997, nr. 141, p. 204.
It should be noted that even before any of these Dalmatians had arrived at court, Georg Tanner, in his panegyric on Maximilian’s Prater gardens, had noted Diocletian’s voluntary abdication and retirement to his native region. Citing how political circumstance recalled Diocletian ‘from his Dalmatian gardens’, he explicitly considered him one of the young king’s illustrious predecessors in the practice of horticulture.\(^7^1\) Notwithstanding his persecution of the Christians, Diocletian was considered a ‘good’ Emperor, so worthy of emulation: his palace has been cited as a possible source for elements of Charles V’s palace at Granada and for the Escorial.\(^7^2\) Since the mid-1550s he was, moreover, of particular interest to the dynasty in providing the only precedent for Charles V’s peaceful abdication. In all, it is quite probable that Maximilian and his advisors, such as Strada, were aware of the existence of Diocletian’s palace, and may have had some idea of what it looked like.

The first to suggest a connection between Split and the Neugebäude was Renate Wagner-Rieger, who in a note suggests that the huge arch on the south facade of the Neugebäude, which was later closed [Fig. 9.47], may have been intended as the central part of a huge Serliana or, as she called it, a ‘Palladiomotiv’, a central arch flanked by lower straight-topped apertures, all covered by a continuous entablature which is curved over the central arch. She related

\(^{71}\) ÖNB-HS, ms. Lat. 8085, fol. 50 verso: ‘DIOCLETIANVM iam senem ab Herculio atque Gallerio ad Romani Imperij gubernationem. qua se sua sponte abdicaverat ex Hortis Dalmaticis revocatum. Eutropius Historicus scribit. in hunc modum respondisse: Utinam SALONAE possetis visere olera nostris manibus instituta. Profecto nunquam istud tentandum iudicaretis’.

\(^{72}\) Rosenthal, pp. 166, 208, 254; Kubler 1982, part 1, Ch. 4.
this to the similar motifs on the south or harbour front of Diocletian’s palace [Fig. 9.49–9.50].

Rieger’s suggestion is not very forceful, since the source for a hypothetical ‘Palladiomotiv’ can easily be found in Italian Renaissance architecture. Basically a variation on Bramante’s rythmic bay as used in his design for the Belvedere gardens at the Vatican, many variations on this motif can be found in Serlio’s treatise, which explains its more common name, ‘serliana’. Moreover, though the central arch of the Neugebäude could well have been preceded by a portico in the form of such a serliana, it can just as well be reconstructed in other ways: the triumphal arch motif chosen by the architects who designed the existing scale model seems more plausible [Fig. 9.48]. Hilda Lietzmann makes no mention at all of Split. Lippmann, in his excellent analysis of the possible sources of the Neugebäude, mentions Rieger’s suggestion in passing, but he merely uses it as a stepping stone to his discussion of other possible classical models. Neither Rieger nor Lippmann mention what is surely the Neugebäude’s most obvious resemblance to Split, its typology: a huge square surrounded by high crenelated walls interrupted by towers, but opened on one side to the view, of the Adriatic and the Danube respectively, by means of a long porticus or arcade over a high closed socle zone. The splendid remains of this gallery overlooking the sea must have made a tremendous impression on anyone who saw it and had some knowledge of and interest in architecture [Fig. 9.49].

A further similarity is the use of arches carried on columns each topped by an individual entablature, in the blind arcade in the facade of the Porta Aurea,

---

73 Rieger 1951, p. 137, n. 3a.
the principal gate of the palace [Fig. 9.51]. In this respect it is interesting that
the *peristylium* serving as anteroom to the entries of the Imperial residence
and Diocletian’s mausoleum is lined with huge arcades, in which the arches
rest immediately on top of the capitals [Fig. 9.52]. This is one of the earliest ex-
amples of a practice which would become more common in Late-antique and
Byzantine architecture. Being undoubtedly antique, it legitimizes what could
be considered a sin against Vitruvian precept. If we would know for certain
that the designer of the Neugebäude knew Diocletian’s palace, his choice not
to imitate this ‘sin’ would perhaps have some significance.

Another correspondence is the use of polygonal towers: octagonal towers
flank the entrance gates at Split, unusual hexagonal towers mark the corners
of the Neugebäude’s upper garden [cf. Figs. 9.22–9.23]. The polygonal motif is
repeated in Diocletian’s mausoleum, which is octagonal and surrounded by a
lower exterior colonnade [Fig. 9.53]. Its interior is articulated by a double order
of Corinthian and Composite columns framing alternating square and round
niches; the columns are placed at some distance from the wall, to which they
are united by a continuing entablature strongly projecting over the individual
columns, stressing the vertical element [Fig. 9.54]. Certainly the mausoleum
made some impression in the sixteenth century: it was the subject of a detailed
measured drawing by an as yet unidentified draughtsman from the middle of
the sixteenth century [Fig. 9.53].

Likewise the interior of the hexagonal towers at the Neugebäude was articu-
lated by columns placed in front of the wall, though here the distance was suf-
ficient to create some form of ambulatorium, according to a description from
1708: ‘[These towers] are three stories high, and present on every floor a round

---

**Figures 9.51–9.52** Robert Adam, views of the Porta Aurea and of the peristyle of Diocletian’s palace in Split.
temple, in which a row of columns is placed in a circle, so that in the centre a rather large space [remains open], but between column and wall a gallery.74

So both the Neugebäude towers and Diocletian’s mausoleum are centrally planned polygonal spaces lined with freestanding columns, and possibly the sight of the mausoleum, which had remained intact as the principal church of Split, or a design of it, may have inspired the designer of the Neugebäude. But it remains a correspondence, a possible source of inspiration at the most, for the towers are certainly no straightforward imitation of the mausoleum:

---

whereas that is octagonal, the towers are hexagonal; whereas the columns in
the mausoleum are engaged, those in the towers are freestanding and create a
concentric aisle or gallery around the central space. Moreover for both char-
acteristics earlier examples can be found elsewhere either in ancient remains
or in contemporary design. Hexagonal spaces are found for instance among
Baldassare Peruzzi’s designs and also in Serlio’s *Quinto Libro, On Temples*, first
published in Paris in 1547.

Circular colonnades are found in many places and were often inspired by
Santa Costanza in Rome. Built by Constantine the Great in ca 350 A.D. as a
mausoleum for his daughters, this earliest Christian sanctuary was illustrated
by Serlio as a ‘Temple of Bacchus’ [Fig. 9.55]. An interesting contemporary ex-
ample in a domestic setting is the design for a ‘palazzo circolare’, last of the
‘capricci’ in Pietro Cataneo’s *I quattro libri dell’Architettura* of 1554 [Fig. 9.56].
So by itself the resemblance between towers and Diocletian’s mausoleum pro-
vides no conclusive evidence for a possible dependence of the concept of the
Neugebäude on Split.

The same holds, finally, for what is probably the most obvious correspon-
dence between Split and the Neugebäude, the long and monumental gallery or

---

75 Cataneo 1554, pp. 54; on Cataneo, cf. above, chs. 5.2.3 and 5.3.1
porticus constructed over an equally monumental closed substructure or cryptoporticus. Because of their massive masonry and often subterranean location, many ancient cryptoportici had been preserved sufficiently intact to allow some inkling of the pomp of the palaces their huge concrete walls and piers had once supported. Such monumental remains contributed substantially to the image of ‘the grandeur that was Rome’ in the mind of the lesser mortals of the Renaissance.

Type and function of the cryptoporticus were, moreover, known from descriptions in classical literary sources, such as Pliny the Younger’s descriptions of his villas at Laurentinum and in Tuscany. They were imitated by Renaissance patrons and their architects: the porticoed terraces at the Villa Medici at Poggio a Caiano and the Villa dei Vescovi at Luvigliano mentioned and illustrated above can be considered adaptations of the type [Figs. 9.26–9.27]. Substructures such as these were imitated by contemporary architects: thus the substructure of Pasqualini’s palace in the Jülich Citadel looks surprisingly similar to the substructure of Split, though in this case dependence on a more accessible example—perhaps the cryptoporticus at Reims, dating from the third century AD—is more probable [Figs. 9.57–9.59].

An elegant, ornamental imitation of the type on a small scale is the cryptoportique at the Château d’Anet, designed and built in 1547–1552 by Philibert de l’Orme for Diane de Poitiers, mistress of King Henry II of France [Fig. 9.60].

In a description of his villa in Tuscany in his letter to Domitius Apollinaris Pliny the Younger gives the classic reference of the cryptoporticus: ‘Underneath this room is an enclosed portico resembling a grotto, which, enjoying in the midst of summer heats its own natural coolness, neither admits nor wants external air’ Epistulae, 11, 17, 16–17; v, 6, 29–30].

Jülich is interesting because it also imitates the ancient cryptoporticus carrying a loggia or peristyle surrounding a courtyard or atrium, examples of which can be found in Rome and many other places, such as Hadrian’s villa at Tivoli.
This is very close in design and feeling to the so-called ‘Schöne Säle’ located under both the colonnades of the main building of the Neugebäude [Fig. 9.61]. Taking the place of the substructure of the South Gallery at Split, these can be considered as a Renaissance interpretation of the antique cryptoporticus, as at Anet doubtless a conscious interpretation.\(^{78}\)

### 9.9 Classical Sources: Monuments of Ancient Rome

Though the Neugebäude does not imitate elements of Diocletian’s Palace exactly, there is some correspondence in its general lay-out and some similarity in various individual elements. The remnant of similar ancient monuments in Rome itself were much better known than Split, through countless learned, often illustrated publications, as well as through many topographical prints. Moreover Maximilian could consult the huge quantity of visual documentation in the field in Strada’s collection, including sketches and reconstructions by Raphael, Giulio Romano and Sebastiano Serlio and also including a set of measured drawings of ancient monuments prepared by Strada himself.\(^{79}\)

---

\(^{78}\) To avoid confusion, I should note that in the literature on the Neugebäude the term ‘Kryptoporticu’ is occasionally used for the subterranean corridors leading down to the Lower garden from the Mittelrisalit. I will refrain from using the term *cryptoporticus* to refer to any of the existing spaces in the Neugebäude, using ‘Schöne Säle’ or ‘lower halls’ for the principal spaces on the lower level of the main building, and ‘garden passages’ for the corridors to the garden.

\(^{79}\) *Index sive catalogus*, nr 34: ‘Item aliquot libri, manu delineati, de aedificiis et architectura, quibus imprimis deector, et quos ipsemet delineavi de antiquissimis aedificiis, et quantum fieri potuit in unum contraxi; una cum partibus dimensuratis’.
Wolfgang Lippmann noted a correspondence between the main building of the Neugebäude and the huge loggia interpreted as a tribuna, a sort of imperial box or grandstand, in Sallustio Peruzzi’s reconstruction drawings of the Circus of Maxentius on the Via Appia [Fig. 9.62], and the similarly monumental gallery framed by tower-like pavilions, overlooking the Circus Maximus, shown in Onofrio Panvinio’s fanciful reconstruction of the imperial palace on the Palatine hill [Fig. 9.63]. He relates this correspondence to the possible function of the oblong courtyard of the Neugebäude as a tiltyard, in which the main building, in particular the planned south facade of the centre block would have fulfilled a similar function.\(^80\) He also relates the Neugebäude to the impressive arcades of the celebrated monument at Tivoli identified at the time with the villa of Maecenas or of Augustus, but now recognized as the sanctuary of Hercules Victor, dating back to Republican times [Fig. 9.64].

Clearly these monuments, images of which Maximilian could have seen among Strada’s material, may have influenced his ideas, but I am not convinced that the Neugebäude is directly derived from them. The stepped structure of the equally famous sanctuary of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste (Palestrina) with its terraced structure leading up to a monumental block-like central pavilion [Fig. 9.65] would be a better candidate, as it was a source for important monuments such as Pirro Ligorio’s completion of Bramante’s Belvedere courtyard in the Vatican for Pope Pius IV (1562–1565), and Philibert de l’Orme’s Château Neuf at Saint Germain, built for Henry II and Catherine de Medici (1556–1559). But even here it should be noted that the Neugebäude conspicuously lacks the external ramps leading up from one terrace level to the next.

---

Instead it shows three closed levels or terrace steps rising one above the other, virtually inaccessible were it not for the small centrally placed porches giving access to internal ramps and staircases: internal, that is hidden to the eye.

9.9.1 *Roman Gardens as Reconstructed by Pirro Ligorio*

Examples of reconstructions of ancient gardens, none of which had survived, are included in Jacques Androuet du Cerceau’s *Livre des édifices antiques romains* of 1584. These of course can have had no influence on the plans for

---

81 Androuet Du Cerceau 1584.
the Neugebäude, but they were mostly derived from Pirro Ligorio’s *Anteiquae Urbis Imago*, his famous detailed plan of ancient Rome, printed in 1561 and consisting of 15 separate sheets together measuring 149 x 126 cm. This plan was basically a bird’s eye view of Rome and its immediate surroundings and illustrated the individual buildings in detail. Since these were often identified on the basis of literary sources, it offered an ample choice of authoritative models. It is significant that almost every garden illustrated was surrounded by a continuing *porticus*, interrupted by higher pavilions on a square, a circular or a polygonal ground plan.

Particular striking are the plans of the ‘Horti Bassiani Antonini Aug.’ (i.e. the gardens of the Emperor Caracalla) and the *Horti Caesaris*. The plan of the former [Fig. 9.66] is quite close to the Neugebäude: a huge rectangular garden surrounded on three sides by colonnades interrupted by round and square pavilions or towers, and on the fourth side by a long building consisting of a central block and connected with a two-story arcade to square pavilions at either end.

In the reputed garden of Caesar [Fig. 9.67] the gallery enclosing the central garden is flanked at either end by towers which appear to be hexagonal rather than octagonal. This provided an authority for the hexagonal towers of the Inner garden of the Neugebäude. Another monument of some interest is the ‘Domus Petronii’, the principal facade of which (on the right in the illustration) consisted of a huge open colonnade over a closed, rustic socle zone between two corner pavilions; possibly this provided some of the inspiration for the Neugebäude’s principal building [Fig. 9.68].

---


---

82 Mandowksy/Mitchell 1963, p. 41; Burns 1988. Ligorio was also the first to publish a reconstruction of the Villa of the Emperor Hadrian at Tibur (Tivoli).
83 Other plates of possible interest are ‘Lucus Petilinus’, ‘Collis Hortulorum’ (i.e. the gardens on the Palatine), the ‘Horti Domitiorum’ (included twice), and the ‘Monumentum sextanniorum’. I have used the digital version accessible on the site of the Institut National d’Histoire de l’Art: http://inha.divvalib.net/collection/365-livre-des-edifices-antiques-romains/?n=9.
The most spectacular resemblance, however, is that with Ligorio’s reconstruction of a *Vivarium*, that is a place to keep live exotic animals, a functioned it shared with the Neugebäude [Fig. 9.69]. Here a rectangular space is surrounded on two sides by crenelated walls interrupted by square towers and by a colonnade (actually part of Rome’s city walls), and closed off by a huge loggia carried by coupled columns over a closed rustic zone: again very similar to the Neugebäude’s main gallery.

### 9.9.2 Roman Baths

If the *Vivarium* shared a function with the Neugebäude, the same is true for the *Thermae*, the Roman Imperial baths or *Thermae*. Maximilian’s poor health required him regularly to have recourse to bathing, and one of the towers of the Neugebäude is identified as ‘Badeturm’, ‘bath-tower’. More in general, the

---

84 During one visit to Kaiserebersdorf he is reputed to have spent about sixty hours in his bath (Fichtner 2001, p. 207). The ‘Badeturm’, with some of its sumptuous decoration, was
Figure 9.70  Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum, after Sebastiaan van Noye, plan of the Baths of Diocletian, from the print series *Thermae Diocletiani imperatoris*, Antwerp 1558.

Figure 9.71  Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum, after Sebastiaan van Noye, section of the central part of the Baths of Diocletian, from the print series *Thermae Diocletiani imperatoris*, Antwerp 1558.
functions of the Roman *thermae* both as places of physical and mental recreation or regeneration and of social and cultural exchange, and as an expression of imperial splendour and munificence, made them suitable examples on which to draw for the Neugebäude project. Their existence and their character were well known from classical sources, conveniently summarized in, for instance, *Des bains et antiques exercitations grecques et romaines*, written by Jacopo Strada’s Lyon associate Guillaume du Choul, first printed in 1554 and repeatedly reprinted and also translated into Italian in 1559.

Their imposing physical remains allowed a good idea of what they originally had looked like, and these remains were assiduously studied, measured and sketched by Renaissance antiquarians, architects and artists. Just as Bramante’s design for St Peter’s and many other Renaissance buildings, the ‘Massivbauweise’ or massive brick construction of several elements of the Neugebäude was derived from such Roman monuments. Apart from material doubtless included in Strada’s collection, the architecture of the Roman baths was known in Vienna through the suite of 25 plates engraved by Joannes and Lucas van Doetecum after drawings by Sebastiaan van Noye. Published by Hieronymus Cock in 1559, these illustrated the Baths of Diocletian in detail [Figs. 9.70–9.72 and 9.74].

A comparison of a detail of one of these prints with the huge reception hall in the West pavilion of the Neugebäude [Figs. 9.72–9.73] strongly suggests that the latter was a direct imitation of the former: note the huge window niche and the equally large blind niches in the corners (perhaps intended for fountains?), but also a detail such as the simple but elegant cornice dividing the wall from the vault. Van Noye’s print provides a hint as to what further architectural articulation may have been intended for this space. Also the plan of Diocletian’s

---


86 Unfortunately the wooden construction that once carried the floors of the later munitions depot obstructs the view in my photograph. Perhaps a similar wall articulation of columns and entablatures was envisaged, which could have carried galleries for
The Neugebäude thermal complex, a huge rectangle surrounded by walls interrupted by wall towers and exedrae [Fig. 9.70], may have had some influence on the planning of the Neugebäude.

Perhaps equally significant is the presence in this reconstruction of arcades consisting of free-standing columns carrying arches [Fig. 9.74]. As we have seen, this is a signature feature of Diocletian architecture, but unlike the arcades in performances by Maximilian's chamber singers and instrumentalists during banquets or other festivities (see below).
the Peristylium at Split, their capitals carry blocks of an (abbreviated) entablature, consisting of frieze and cornice. These arcades are the closest antique parallels to the Neugebäude’s colonnade of coupled columns carrying arches.

9.9.3  **Serlio: The Tomb of the Kings of Jerusalem**

Finally there is one more possible ancient—though perhaps not antique—source of inspiration for the Neugebäude, and for one of its most extraordinary features, the immense grotto in the basement of the western pavilion of the main building [Figs. 9.76–9.79]. Maximilian was certainly aware of the grottoes constructed in Italian gardens, and he had obtained drawings and even three-dimensional models of a few of these. But the plan of a subterraneous tomb in Jerusalem, which Serlio included in his *Third Book* [Fig. 9.75], is sufficiently close to suggest that it may have influenced Maximilian’s concept as well [Fig. 9.76 and 9.77]. It is a not very regularly shaped room consisting of a central space the roof of which is carried by heavy piers in solid rock left standing. This is surrounded by exedra-like spaces the walls of which are pierced by shallow niches or capellette which were ‘places where they buried the Kings of Jerusalem, as was told me by the Patriarch of Aquileia’. So again Serlio based his design on a drawing by Marco Grimani, Patriarch of Aquileia, who, perhaps repeating a local tradition, interpreted it as the tomb where a number of the Kings of Jerusalem had been buried. From Serlio’s description it is not clear whether he understood this as the Jewish, Biblical Kings of Judah or Israel, or the Crusader Kings of Jerusalem.  

---

87 ‘e queste capellette erano luoghi, dove si sepellivano i Re di Gierusalemme, per quanto mi disse il Patriarca di Aquileia’. The passage is discussed by Daly Davis 2011, who interprets...
Though in the planning and design the awareness of ancient precept is self-evident, except perhaps for Split there are actually no really convincing immediate parallels between the Neugebäude and any one particular ancient monument. As Lietzmann has pointed out, the planning of the Neugebäude was not based on one or a few examples, ‘vielmehr führte die Summe zahlreicher desparater Anregungen zu der Wiener Neuschöpfung’. As in the planning of the Prater Lusthaus, these manifold stimuli may have included the recent projects by Maximilian’s peers and rivals elsewhere in Europe. Probably these were of far greater importance than classical example: it is significant that in all his requests of information Maximilian always asked for drawings and plans of existing or planned villas and garden projects, rather than of ancient monuments and ruins.

Lietzmann rightly stressed that the Emperor’s choice of examples was partly determined by a certain awareness of the rank of their respective patrons: ‘It is obvious that the Emperor would orient himself on the residences of the members of his rank, rather than, for instance, the villa’s of Venetian patrician families’, and she even uses this argument to explain Maximilian’s preference for a second-rate Sallustio Peruzzi, a former servant of the Pope, over a genius is as ‘the tomb of the Israelite Kings in Jerusalem’ (p. 10–12), but unfortunately does not identify the actual rock tomb.

---

88 Lietzmann 1987, p. 185 (referring this plan to Strada).
such as Palladio, servant of a mere city republic. Though this corollary is not convincing, the theorem itself is quite plausible, and it is borne out by the examples that in general have been suggested as possible sources for the design of the Neugebäude, almost without exception residences built by popes, kings, princes and cardinals. Many of these were famous projects, the repute of which influenced patrons all over Europe. I will limit my discussion to those examples where the correspondence with aspects of the Neugebäude appear to me more than merely generic or functional.

9.10.1 Contemporary Roman Villas: Villa d’Este
The terraces system of the lower garden of the Neugebäude, which has already been compared to the ancient sanctuary at Palestrina, can also be compared with the various contemporary projects derived from it: the Belvedere courtyard, the Orti Farnesiani on the slope of the Palatine hill, and the Villa d’Este at Tivoli, all of which could be known in Vienna through prints and by repute even if they would not have been documented in Strada’s collection. As with Praeneste, if the system served as an inspiration at all, it was not imitated exactly, since the connecting external ramps and staircases, crucial element in all of these designs, are lacking at the Neugebäude. The drawing of the gardens of Pirro Ligorio’s Villa d’Este, made for Maximilian II by Etienne du Pérac, and the accompanying description arrived too late to influence this part of the design.

On the other hand Du Pérac’s drawing possibly played a role in the conception of the central pavilion of the Neugebäude: the long promenade creating a transverse axis immediately below the casino at the Villa d’Este, which could double as a tiltyard, just possibly influenced the design of the oblong courtyard.

91 Above, Ch. 9.5. But doubtless Strada possessed some information on the complex and may have visited it during his visit to Rome in 1566.
in front of the south facade of the Neugebäude. The most interesting parallel, however, is the spectacular *Gran Loggia* constructed at the end of this promenade, allowing a splendid view towards the sea and the Eternal City, on a clear day to be located by the grey bulk of the dome of St Peter’s. This Loggia was intended as an external banqueting hall: it now functions as a bar or restaurant [Fig. 9.80]. It consists of a central bay opening unto the terrace and unto the view by one really huge central arch on either side, which is flanked by two slightly narrower bays in two levels, filled by niches. This is basically the scheme of the triumphal arch, and one of the earliest modern examples of the independent use of this motif in a permanent structure. The presence of a similar huge arch in the centre of the south facade of the Neugebäude strongly suggests that a comparable solution was envisaged for the *Mittelrisalit*, which then could have likewise functioned as a combined belvedere and banqueting hall ‘al fresco’. As such it has been interpreted by the makers of the modern reconstruction model [Fig. 9.81].

9.10.2 **Contemporary Roman Villas: Villa Madama**

Another borrowing from an important Roman villa has been generally accepted. Its source was the villa on the slope of the Monte Mario designed by Raphael for Cardinal Giulio de’ Medici, afterwards Pope Clement VII, and continued after Raphael’s death by Antonio da Sangallo the Younger. Through Alessandro de’ Medici, Duke of Florence, in 1537 it became the property of his widow

---

92 Lippmann 2006–2007 suggests a similar function, but takes as a (later) parallel the *arcone* in the Villa Aldobrandini in Frascati, built 1598–1604 after designs by Giacomo della Porta.
Margaret, natural daughter of Emperor Charles v. Known as Madama d’Austria, she gave the name to both this villa and the Medici Palace in Rome, which she brought into the Farnese family through her second marriage to Ottavio Farnese, Duke of Parma, the following year. Though the Villa Madama was never finished and was very heavily damaged in the Sack of Rome, it remains one of the principal and most influential monuments of the High Renaissance, not only for its extraordinary planning, but also for its exquisite decoration all’antica, executed by Raphael’s best pupils, including Giulio Romano and Giovanni da Udine. Both its architecture and its decoration were very well known to Strada, who must have known about it from Giulio even before his first stay in Rome in the 1530s. Doubtless he possessed visual documentation of the building and its decoration, possibly even in original drawings from among the remains of Raphael’s estate he had acquired with the graphic material he bought out of the estates of Raphael’s own direct and indirect heirs, Giulio Romano and Perino del Vaga.

Maximilian II would in any case have been aware of the Villa Madama as the property of his first cousin, an important and influential member of his dynasty. Certainly a number of aspects indicate its influence on the development of the Neugebäude. The most obvious of these are the fishponds or peschiere in the service court of the Neugebäude and the retaining wall opening up into niched recesses above them [Fig. 9.83–9.84]. They are an obvious and immediate imitation of the peschiere and the contiguous niches in the retaining wall of the giardino segreto of Villa Madama [Fig. 9.82]. Raphael derived the motif, huge masonry arches carried on massive piers pierced by niches, from his study of the ruins of the Palatine and the Imperial Baths in Rome. It can be considered as a sober variation of the repeated triumphal arch motif used by Bramante in his Belvedere courtyard (often indicated as serliana, because of the repeated use of this motif in Serlio’s treatise), and it was
very influential: Philibert de l’Orme’s cryptoportique at Anet, illustrated above, is another variation on the theme [Fig. 9.60].

The rhythm of this solution appealed so much to the designer of the Neugebäude that he used variations of the motif elsewhere, sufficiently often for it to be named ‘the Neugebäude motif’ in the more recent literature.\(^93\) Thus the brick wall surrounding the service court in front of the peschiere consists of square piers carrying alternating wide segmental arches and narrow, round arches framing blind niches [Fig. 9.84].

Finally the walls of the two huge halls under the arcades of the main building, the so-called ‘Schöne Säle’, are articulated in a similar manner. In combination with the low wide vaulting they create a quite monumental, though not particularly Italian or even classical effect [Fig. 9.85]. The close resemblance of these halls with the Munich Antiquarium as actually executed at about this same time [Fig. 9.86] may reflect the close connection of Maximilian’s court with that of his sister Anna and his brother-in-law, Duke Albrecht V of Bavaria. In that case Strada, being involved in both projects, was probably the channel by which knowledge of the solution chosen for the vault of the Antiquarium came to Vienna.\(^94\)

There is another parallel between the Villa Madama as planned and the Neugebäude: that is the long and narrow courtyard or hippodrome in front of the building, overlooked from a huge open loggia in the centre of the main floor (and from the other windows of the villa), and fronted on the other side by a long colonnade or arcade behind which was found stabling for no less than

---

\(^94\) But note that the niches in the piers of the Antiquarium were fruit of a refurbishment at the end of the sixteenth century.
228 horses! [Fig. 9.87]. This parallel strengthens Lippmann’s hypothesis that the semi-subterranean rooms in the main building of the Neugebäude, the ‘schöne Saale’, were intended as stables, and the courtyard as a ‘giostra’, that is a tiltyard or space for chivalrous display: a fruitful suggestion in view of the representative functions for which the Neugebäude was possibly intended.95

95 Lippmann 2006–2007, p. 153. This hypothesis will be further discussed in a more detailed analysis of the Neugebäude, its sources and its intended functions significance I hope to accomplish in the future.
9.10.3 *Palazzo del Principe in Genoa and the Villa Gonzaga in Milan*

Maximilian never visited Rome, and had seen very little of Italy. He did, however, know three important monuments of the Italian High Renaissance at first hand, two of which have been mentioned in connection with the Neugebäude. The first of these is the Palazzo Doria at Fassolo, a *villa suburbana* built on the shore of the Mediterranean, just outside the city walls of Genoa, for Andrea Doria, virtual prince of that maritime republic: the villa’s more common name is Palazzo del Principe [Figs. 9.88–9.89]. As we have seen above, Maximilian visited Genoa four times, in his trips to Spain and back again in 1548, 1550 and 1551. On each occasion Andrea Doria, as Imperial Admiral, was charged to arrange and safeguard the passage to and from Barcelona of the young King and his suite, and it was natural that he would offer his hospitality while awaiting a favourable wind. It was here that, in July 1548, Maximilian first saw the Mediterranean, and it was here that, in November 1551, he spent a week with his beloved wife, his young family, and the elephant he had been given by the King of Portugal. So it is not impossible that memories of this spot played a role when he was shaping his own villa suburbana.96

The typological similarity between the Palazzo del Principe and the Neugebäude is striking: both complexes are centred upon extremely elongated buildings, in itself a quite unusual concept at the time. Both of these buildings are provided with arcaded promenades opening towards an ample view, over the Mediterranean at Genoa, towards the Danube in Vienna. Both are placed

![Figures 9.88–9.89 The Palazzo del Principe in Genoa, built for Andrea Doria, seen from the South, in prints dating from the early and mid- eighteenth century.](image)

96 Renate Wagner Rieger was the first to suggest a link between the Palazzo Doria and the Neugebäude, an intuition ignored by Lietzmann in her 1987 monography, but taken up by Lippmann 2006–2007, p. 155. On the Palazzo del Principe, see Stagno 2005. The coupled columns of the logge on both end facades cannot have influenced the Neugebäude, because they date from the extension of the villa under Giovan Andrea Doria in the late sixteenth century (Gorse 1985–1986, p. 35, n. 97).
between two gardens, one of which is enclosed within crenelated walls, surrounded partly or wholly by covered walkways, and decorated by statuary: in Genoa at least two white marble fountains were already in situ at the time of Maximilian’s visit. Both buildings were—or were planned to be—very richly decorated: the Palazzo del Principe by one of Raphael’s favourite pupils, Perino del Vaga. Commenting on the decoration and furnishing Andrea Doria had prepared for the visit of Charles V in 1533, Ludovico da Bagno, the Mantuan ambassador, told Isabelle d’Este that ‘the said decoration is not that of a nobleman, but rather of a great king’. The richly planted gardens of the Palazzo del Principe and others in Genoa, favoured as they were by the extraordinary mild climate of the Italian Riviera, also must have made a big impression on Maximilian, who had never seen anything similar before. They were singled out for particular praise in Ludovico da Bagno’s letter, who thought the Genoese gardens were so beautiful that ‘it seems to me that being born in Genoa much obliges its inhabitants to Nature’.

Thanks to Charles V’s visit, Andrea Doria’s splendid villa was well known at the Vienna court even before Maximilian’s own visits: we have seen how Ferdinand asked his architect Paolo della Stella to bring back drawings or a model of it from Genoa, which influenced the appearance of the summer palace he had built in the gardens of the castle at Prague. This model probably was still available in Prague or Vienna. Moreover, if Maximilian would have wished to refresh his memories, he could have recourse to Jacopo Strada. Though we have no positive evidence that Strada visited Genoa, this is not unlikely: if he had not visited it during his peregrinations in his youth, he may have passed it when he travelled from Lyon to Rome in 1553. In any case he

97 Particularly interesting is the galleried hall providing a splendid ceremonial space protruding from the garden out unto the quay edging the shore: consisting of an open arcade above a closed podium, which possibly inspired the more ambitious, though not more monumental principal arcade of the Neugebäude. Its position and its concept remind one of the monumental arcade at Split: could Andrea Doria, familiar as he was with the shores of the Mediterranean, have known Split and have used it as an example? A splendid portal in the rustic zone under the loggia opens unto a breakwater or jetty thrown out into the water, so possibly it also functioned as a ceremonial entrance: Doria’s flagship and the state galley he had had built on purpose for Maximilian’s and Philip’s 1548 visit could be anchored there.


99 Ibidem: ‘ogni di andanno in brevibus a veder giardini, che son tanto belli che me par ch’el esser nasciuto a Genova oblighi molto li habitanti alla natura’.

100 Cf. above, Ch. 5.2.1. When Maximilian asked his agent in Genoa, Marc Antonio Spinola, for drawings and models of gardens and pleasure houses, he probably expected material relating to projects dating from after his own last visit.
would have heard about the Palazzo del Principe from Perino del Vaga himself, ‘in vita sua mio amicissimo’, and would have obtained drawings of it, possibly with the graphic remains from Perino’s studio he acquired from his widow in 1554–1555.

Just as Maximilian was received in and was shown around the Palazzo Doria at Fassolo by its owner, Charles V’s admiral, he must have been shown around the Villa Gonzaga in Milan while passing through the city on his travels to and from Spain: its patron was Ferrante Gonzaga, governor of Milan for Charles V, and therefore Maximilian’s host.101 During Maximilian’s first trips the villa, now named Vila Gonzaga-Simonetta, was still under construction; but as at Genova there can be no doubt that Maximilian would have been shown it on one of his later visits, if he was not actually lodged there: receiving high-ranking guests was one of the principal functions of such representative residences. Like the Palazzo del Principe, the Villa Gonzaga, built by the Tuscan architect Domenico Giunti, opens up towards its gardens and surrounding landscape by means of ample loggias [Fig. 9.90–9.91], in this case consisting of colonnades, rather than columns carrying arcades. It was thus more Vitruvian and up-to-date than the Palazzo del Principe. Both these loggias and the twin fishponds in front of the garden facade may later have stimulated Maximilian’s ideas for the Neugebäude.

9.10.4  *Palazzo del Te, Mantova*

The third relevant example Maximilian knew at first hand was Giulio Romano's Palazzo del Te at Mantua. Like Genoa and Milan Maximilian visited Mantua four times on his trips to Spain, and his relationship with its owner, and his host, was even closer than with Andrea Doria. During his first visit Francesco Gonzaga, second Duke of Mantua, was betrothed to his sister Catherine, whom he would marry in 1549. Francesco's younger brother Guglielmo, who succeeded him after his premature death in 1550, would eventually marry another of Maximilian's sisters, Eleanora. The splendour of the Gonzaga court was known to Maximilian by repute even before he first arrived in Mantua in June 1549: two years before he had spent ten days in Landshut, and had thus come to know the brand new imitation of the Palazzo del Te built and decorated for Duke Ludwig X of Bavaria-Landshut by Mantuan artisans and after a Mantuan design.

Apart from his own experience of the Palazzo del Te, Maximilian could study the set of extremely detailed measured drawings documenting the plan, the facades and the decoration of every single room that had been commissioned by Jacopo Strada in the summer of 1567: a study which would be accompanied Strada's first-hand account of the history of the building and his expert comment on its various features. Nevertheless the Palazzo del Te did not greatly influence the design of the Neugebäude: probably the two were too different in conception. For Maximilian the gardens were the *raison d'être* of the complex, whereas in Mantua it was the building itself. Yet there are some features of Giulio's creation that may have influenced the ideas of Maximilian and his architect: significantly, these are all related to the garden facade of the Palazzo del Te.

The most evident and important example is the extended garden facade [Fig. 9.92]. This consists of a *piano nobile* opened up by arcaded galleries over a rusticated substructure which is similar to that of the Neugebäude, though

---

**Figure 9.92**  Ippolito Andreasi, the garden facade of the Palazzo del Te, drawing, 1567.

102  Discussed and illustrated below, Ch. 12.5.2.
the facade of the Te—blind galleries consisting of a screen-like series of interconnected *serliane* flanking a huge central loggia of three arches resting on coupled columns, and topped by a monumental attic actually masked by an airy gallery—is far more inventive and sophisticated. It is so unusual that the eighteenth-century restorer, Paolo Pozzo, decided to replace Giulio’s playful *capriccio* by a more strictly correct classical facade [Fig. 9.93]. Like the Neugebäude this facade has been compared to Split; one should note, however, that whereas Split and the Neugebäude consciously use the socle zone as a podium elevating the principal level of the building and emphasizing its prestige, the substructure at Mantua overlooks a set of fishponds conceived as a deep but narrow moat separating the building from the garden, which is situated at the same level as the *piano nobile*, to which it is connected by a wide bridge in the centre. In this way Giulio succeeded in making this stupendous palace, which contains three floor levels, look like an elegant, one-story garden pavilion. As such the palace may have appealed to Maximilian, and his visit may have inspired him with the idea of adding architecturally framed fishponds to his

![Figure 9.93 The garden facade of the Palazzo del Te, as adapted by Paolo Pozzo in the late eighteenth century.](image)

103 But note that Andreasi’s drawing does not indicate the water level, and thus strongly suggests a socle zone similar to those in Split and Vienna.
own complex, though the form these would take was derived from those at the Villa Madama, as we have already seen.\textsuperscript{104}

9.11 Strada’s Contribution

This summing up of possible sources confirms Hilda Lietzmann’s observation that the design of the Neugebäude was not based on one or even a few individual models. On the contrary, it is eclectic, merging many disparate elements into what is in fact a quite extraordinary and rather original creation. Much of the material documenting such models was already in print, and could have been available at court through other channels than Jacopo Strada. So there is no positive evidence indicating which particular features he may have contributed to the design of the Neugebäude. Nevertheless it seems quite likely that Maximilian, his advisers and the architects who had to execute the working-drawings for the building had made ample use of the material in Strada’s collection: as an Imperial Architect and Antiquary he could be expected to make the relevant documentation available to his patron and his colleagues. Moreover, as none other—except possibly Sallustio Peruzzi—he could explain and comment on this material, on the basis of his expertise and his first-hand acquaintance with many of the monuments illustrated.

Of course the use of material from Strada’s \textit{Musaeum} by no means allows the conclusion that Strada would have been responsible for all or most of the designs for the complex and its various elements; but neither does it exclude that possibility. The only concrete evidence which links Strada with the design of the Neugebäude is the Fugger letter cited at the beginning of this chapter. From its date and its wording it can be concluded that Strada either made a design or a plan for the lay-out as a whole, work on which would begin shortly afterwards, or that he made a first design for the principal building planned in it. The latter option may be the most likely. If so, we don’t know what this design looked like, but the results of the excavations in the 1980s indicate that it may have consisted of a complex of three separate pavilions, rather than one huge and monumental block. The planning of the project as a whole probably

\textsuperscript{104} Those at the Palazzo del Te were themselves perhaps influenced by those at the Villa Madama, where Giulio had assisted Raphael; \textit{peschiere} appear to have been a standard feature of Italian villa’s, as Maximilian saw them also at the Villa Gonzaga at Milan. Moreover, pisciculture as such was widely known also in his own territories, especially in Bohemia: the powerful Rožmberk family derived a very substantial part of their revenue from it, and already in the fifteenth century had had dug the fishpond called Rožmberk near Třeboň, for long the largest artificial lake in Europe.
was a collective effort, to which many members of Maximilian II’s entourage—including Strada—may have contributed.

We don’t have written sources that confirm that Strada remained involved in the development of the project after this initial stage; but again, in view of Strada’s formal appointment as architect, his expertise and his tremendous collection of source material, it is very unlikely that this would not have been the case. Moreover, certain stylistic elements of the principal building of the Neugebäude do suggest that he remained the architect chosen to draft the new designs necessary when the Emperor decided to expand his project: chiefly the decision to connect the three separate pavilions by two huge and monumental arcades, carried on a substructure containing two low but almost equally monumental halls.

Galleries or loggias looking into a garden, sometimes interrupted or combined with pavilions or towers, were not rare in the Renaissance as such, and were found also outside of Italy. A very good example which is close to the Neugebäude in spirit is the walled private garden laid out in 1555–1556 as a separate entity beside the Château de Vallery [Fig. 9.94]. It was commissioned by Jacques d’Albon, Maréchal de Saint-André, favourite of King Henry II of France, and designed by the king’s architect, Pierre Lescot. One side of the garden is closed off by an elegant arcade, flanked on either side by equally elegant pavilions of two stories, provided with huge chimney’s and thus offering the possibility of enjoying the garden even in winter. These pavilions served as banqueting halls and could be used for musical performances, and probably also housed a choice collection of works of art.

**Figure 9.94** Pierre Lescot, the private garden of the Château de Vallery, built 1555–1556; from Jacques Androuet du Cerceau, Les plus excellents bastiments de France, 1576.

That was certainly the case at the private garden laid out for Maximilian II’s sister Anna, by her husband Duke Albrecht V of Bavaria in about 1560. Here a quite similar open gallery carried on red marble columns was flanked on one side by a similar Lusthaus. On its first floor this contained a huge and richly decorated banqueting and dancing hall which held up to four hundred people, and which gave access to a promenade on top of the arcade. Its ceiling was painted with mythological scenes by Melchior Bocksberger; adjoining spaces were also richly decorated with inlaid wooden ceilings, and doubtless contained some works of art; at a later date its small chapel was provided with an altarpiece by Hans von Aachen.106 It were such models that Maximilian had in mind when planning the Neugebäude.

Coupled columns ... carrying arches
So in themselves the various galleries of the Neugebäude are by no means exceptional. What is exceptional, apart from its huge scale, is the concept of a gallery consisting of arcades carried on freestanding coupled columns [Fig. 9.96]: this can be considered the single most distinctive feature of the Neugebäude. The most likely source of inspiration for this is the Loggia di Davide, the central feature of—again—the garden facade of the Palazzo del Te [Fig. 9.95].

Though the rhythmic placement of columns such as in Bramante’s Belvedere courtyard, and in the serliana derived from it, was quite common in Renaissance architecture, the use of coupled columns—that is, two columns (or pilasters) placed as close together as possible—was quite rare. The motif was

---

106 Except for the gallery the complex was demolished early in the nineteenth century, but measured plans and descriptions survive: see Hartig 1933(a), pp. 190–198.
not considered antique, unless used to stress the corners of a (section of) a facade, in particular town gates and triumphal arches, such as the arch of the Sergii at Pola (Pula) illustrated in Serlio’s *Third Book* [Fig. 9.97]. In his *Extraordinario libro* Serlio provides several designs for such portals [Fig. 9.98]. But he gives only a few examples where coupled columns are used to articulate a loggia or *porticus*. In his *regole generale* he motivates such lavish use of columns, where ‘ornament exceeds necessity’, as a means of expressing the wealth of the patron [Fig. 9.99]; typical for his practical approach, he presents another example as a good solution to dispose of any surplus columns accidentally left over [Fig. 9.100].

Using coupled columns or pilasters to articulate a complete (section) of a facade is found occasionally in Raphael’s circle: in the Palazzo Caprini and the Palazzo Stati-Maccarani mentioned above [Figs. 7.14 and 7.18] and, most tellingly in this context, in the central section of the facade of Charles V’s Palace at Granada [Fig. 5.36]. A rare instance outside of Raphael’s immediate circle is Sanmicheli’s Palazzo Canossa in Verona, begun in 1527.

Coupled columns occasionally were used also in French sixteenth century architecture, notably in the courtyard of the Hôtel d’Assézat in Toulouse (Nicolas Bachelier, 1552–1556), and in the ‘gallerie dans la court’ of the Château de Verneuil, built from about 1558 onward for Philippe de Boulainvilliers, *comte* de
Dammartin, ‘homme fort amateur de l’architecture’ according to Du Cerceau. It was probably designed by the patron himself and/or his close friend, the Pléiade poet Etienne Jodelle [Fig. 9.101]. Another instance is the central section of the facade of the Château de Saint-Maur, originally built for Cardinal Jean du Bellay, Archbishop of Paris, by his protégé Philibert de l’Orme, but later adapted by Cathérine de Médicis for her son Charles IX [Fig. 9.102]. Its coupled rustic pilasters supporting the two superior arcades are of particular relevance in this context, since they carry arches instead of a straight entablature. In any case none of these possible precedents can compare in scale with the colonnade on coupled columns as realized at the Neugebäude, nor was it equalled until the construction of Claude Perrault’s celebrated east facade of the Louvre, a century later. Moreover, the concept of a continuing series of paired columns or pilasters carrying arches instead of architraves makes it unique: I have not been able to find one single earlier example, and even later it is a relatively rare phenomenon.

---


108 Perrault, who had earlier published his learned translation and commentary of Vitruvius, devoted some space to the coupled column, defending its use against critics who condemned it as unknown in ancient architecture; a full discussion in Berger 1993, pp. 94–99, appendix B: ‘The Coupled Columns Debate’.

109 Later examples are, for instance, the logge at the end facades of the Palazzo del Principe in Genoa and, significantly, Ippolito Pedemonte’s galleries surrounding the Giardino Pensile at the Palazzo Ducale in Mantua of the 1570s: since the Duchess was Maximilian’s sister, this is probably a conscious citation of the Neugebäude.
Even Giulio’s Loggia di Davide, though it doubtless inspired the design of Neugebäude gallery, is sufficiently different not to consider it as an exact model. The Loggia di Davide is still basically a variation on the serliana: Giulio contracted the width of the bays flanking the three central arches to create a strong contrast with the more regular proportions of the screen-like series of serliane articulating the facade on either side [Fig. 9.103]. But there remains some space in between the columns, and their capitals do not touch, whereas in the Neugebäude the columns were set as close together as possible [Fig. 9.104].

In Mantua, moreover, the sets of coupled columns are doubled: each deep arch is carried by a set of four columns placed in a square, and these sets should be read as replacing the piers supporting an arcade in a more traditional building, giving a quite solid and sculptural quality to the loggia, whereas in Vienna the sets of coupled columns are single, and provide what is basically an elongated screen, the lightness of which is emphasized by each pair being placed on separate pedestals, which are interconnected by balustrades. This effect is strengthened by the full entablatures topping the coupled columns, instead of the abbreviated entablature, lacking its frieze, used by Giulio. The Schönbrunn Gloriette, incorporating the columns and entablatures of the Neugebäude galleries, also imitates this aspect, and gives at least some idea of the effect.

All in all, the Neugebäude’s main building, consisting of a gallery of coupled columns carrying arches set upon a huge, closed socle zone, is an original concept for which no clear-cut precedent can be cited. As we have seen, the documents do not give any indication of the designer responsible, but the use of coupled columns strongly suggests that Jacopo Strada had a hand in it. Coupled pilasters and columns are a signature feature of the two buildings he certainly designed. In his own house the upper levels of the facades are articulated by flat coupled pilasters [Figs. 7.11–7.13]. In the Munich Antiquarium the
top floor of the exterior is articulated by coupled half columns [Fig. 8.15], and the interior by coupled freestanding columns carrying a continuous entablature, from which spring the vaults of the window niches. In Strada’s design [Fig. 8.20] the effect of the long sides of the Antiquarium interior would be very much like a colonnade of coupled columns carrying arches.

Another Mantuan feature, prominent in the Palazzo del Te and elsewhere, can also be related to Strada’s influence. This is the use of prominent continuous, heavy stone stringcourses stressing the base and the frieze level which accentuate the horizontal aspect of the facades [Fig. 9.105–9.106]. Since the Neugebäude was never finished, there are no indications what this finish would have looked like. There seem to be no indications for a brickwork relief

110 It is also found in his own house and, less prominently, in his Antiquarium design.
supporting a stucco *bugnato* finish, as was the habitual technique in Mantua, and is suggested in Strada’s design for the Antiquarium. Perhaps a stucco rendering decorated with *sgraffito* grotesques such as those of Bonifaz Wolmut’s Prague *Ballhaus* was intended; if so, it was never executed.\textsuperscript{111}

\section*{9.12 Conclusion: Strada’s Role in the Design of the Neugebäude}

Apart from Strada many other architects at court must also have contributed to the development of the Neugebäude project, in any case the architects or master-masons who were charged to supervise its actual construction. Had Strada been its sole designer he would probably have mentioned it somewhere, for instance in his preface to his 1575 edition of Serlio’s *Settimo Libro*.\textsuperscript{112}

Above I have already listed the arguments for the hypothesis that Maximilian himself closely supervised the designing process, regularly communicating his ideas and his wishes to his collaborators. The conception of the Neugebäude presupposes a wide and profound study of an ample range of technical, artistic and literary sources and models. Even if Maximilian did not himself commit his ideas to paper, there is a real possibility that he can be considered the *auctor intellectualis* of the Neugebäude to a greater extent than was habitual for a patron of his rank.

The idiosyncrasies of the Neugebäude would hardly have been proposed to a patron by a professional architect: at the very least they presuppose some consultation between designer and patron, resulting in the first sketches and drafts of the general lay-out and the most salient components of the building. But the definitive designs, as well as the working-drawings for the building-site derived from these, may have been drawn by the architects and/or the master masons charged with the execution of the several elements. Here Ferrabosco seems to be the principal candidate, because he is documented in connection with the Neugebäude, because he was more often engaged in civil (as opposed to military) projects at the Imperial court than other architects working there, and because he can have been expected to better understand the Emperor’s artistic ambitions than most of his German colleagues. Moreover it was Ferrabosco who was asked to come and report to Rudolf II on the project...

\textsuperscript{111} This is understandable, since the building was never really finished; the south front does show traces of an original, very thin layer of stucco covering the brick, too thin for a *sgraffito* decoration, probably applied merely to protect the brickwork and to give it a pleasingly smooth appearance (Wehdorn 2004, pp. 54–55).

\textsuperscript{112} He did refer to his participation in the Munich Antiquarium in his dedication to Albrecht V of his edition of Caesaer’s *Commentaries* of the same year.
shortly after Maximilian’s death. But it is unlikely that he was the only expert involved. In view of the scope of the project, the most ambitious artistic commission he undertook, Maximilian would probably have involved many people, including the various architectural and other professionals at his court.

Among those who may in various ways have contributed to Maximilian’s plans for the Neugebäude, Jacopo Strada is the only one who is documented as having made a design for it, which was, moreover, well received by its patron. Given the time when he made it, probably in the autumn, at the earliest in the summer of 1568, it must have been a design related to Maximilian’s earliest plans for the Neugebäude, since the first preparations for its laying out began only in the last month of this year. But if Strada had made the original design for the central building, he was probably also involved in working out the later adaptations required by his patron, and several stylistic features of the main building do seem to confirm that supposition.

On the other hand there are also features which do not invite an attribution to Strada, such as the odd, irregular plan of the two end pavilions of the main building, which seem quite un-Italian and un-classical. Having lived in and travelled throughout Germany Strada knew the German architectural tradition and he was of course aware of fortification architecture, the probable source for the odd plan of the two end pavilions. Yet his Antiquarium design, his own house, his efforts to publish Serlio’s treatise on architecture, his insistence in his letter to Archduke Ernest that he was competent in designing palaces ‘al modo di Roma o Napoli, con bel modo et ordine di architettura’ make clear that he considered himself a champion of the correct, Vitruvian style. The final designs of such elements may have been due to one or more of the other architects or engineers Maximilian involved in the development of his project.

We cannot be certain how Strada’s consultancy in this project functioned, but we can hazard a guess. We know that there seems to have been a relationship of mutual respect and confidence between Emperor and his Antiquary,

---

113 On Ferrabosco’s role at the Neugebäude, see Lietzman 1987, pp. 107–110, who does not realize that the permanent supervision of the execution of the project, which she rightly concludes cannot have been Ferrabosco’s task, does not preclude his having prepared drawings for it. Ferrabosco is documented working at the castles of Pressburg, Kaiserebersdorf and the Hofburg in Vienna; after Maximilian’s death he was occupied with the construction of the residence for Archduke Ernest (the Ernestinische Trakt or Amalienburg of the Hofburg). It is doubtful that he was the architect of Bučovice Castle in Moravia (cf. below Ch. 10. 4).

114 In June Strada was still in Venice (Doc. 1568-06-16), but presumably already back in Vienna for some time by the middle of August, when he was paid his salary as Imperial Antiquary (Doc. 1568-08-17).

115 Doc. 1579-05-00 (Strada to Archduke Ernest); the letter quoted and discussed in Ch. 4.4.1.
which was expressed in various favours Maximilian accorded Strada and members of his family, and in the support he gave him for some of his editorial projects. Strada's house and *Musaeum* could be reached from the Imperial apartment by means of a three minutes walk along a covered way on top of the battlements. From a letter by Strada to Jacopo Dani we know that Maximilian occasionally availed himself of that possibility, and called it ‘the delight and museum of Strada, because he saw there so many rare and various things as ever struck the eye’.116

Strada's studio included the workshop where he prepared his *libri di disegni*, such as the numismatic drawings he made for Hans Jakob Fugger and the Duke of Bavaria and for other patrons, including Ferdinand I and Maximilian II. For Strada the design was central to his activities, and a faculty indispensable for all artistic, scientific and technical endeavour; and also to gain a better understanding of the world, as he explained to Adam von Dietrichstein, preceptor of the young Archdukes Rudolf and Ernest:

In truth, my lord, by drawing one gains knowledge of an infinite number of things, and one's judgment in all fields is far more excellent, and amply transcends that given by any other discipline, the more so when engaged by a literate gentleman such as you.

If the Emperor had sent his two eldest sons to study drawing under Strada's guidance, as this letter implies, it appears that Strada had convinced him of this point of view.117 As we have seen, Strada's *Musaeum*—an amalgam of studio, library and *Kunstkammer*, of artist's workshop, and of bookshop and emporium of works of art and antiquities—housed an immense quantity of documentation in drawings and prints both of Roman antiquities and of the contemporary Italian architecture that was inspired by them. Titian's portrait gives an indication of Strada's enthusiasm, of the conviction with which he presented his choicest objects to his august visitors. In the same way he will have shown his drawings, his prize possession documenting the canonical examples of his own profession. In view of Maximilian's interest in architecture and engineering, such meetings must have increased his understanding of architecture and have stimulated his ambitions to create at least one monument that could compete with those commissioned by his peers in Italy and elsewhere in Europe. As a cosmopolitan courtier who was at the same time an expert in the field of the most up-to-date architecture and design, Strada is the

116 Doc. 1581-11-02 (Strada to Jacopo Dani).
117 Doc 1566-03-01 (Strada to Adam von Dietrichstein); cf. below, Ch. 11.6.
most likely candidate to have guided Maximilian’s steps in the development of his project for the Neugebäude. Thus he may have suggested possible models, searched for additional documentation in his own collection or tried to obtain it through his contacts in the book- and print trade, and he may have provided an appreciative but critical sounding board for the Emperor’s ideas.

Subsequently Strada was one of the professionals charged to translate the Emperor’s ideas into workable designs. His Antiquarium designs give an impression of what such drawings may have looked like. Then he may have discussed these with the masters charged with the execution of the project in order to ensure that they well understood the Emperor’s wishes. This means that, as an agent of his patron, he may have instructed and to some extent supervised the Imperial architects, the master-masons and other contractors—a task that would fall well within the scope of his function as a courtier and a court-antiquary, and for which his ample knowledge and exclusive experience coupled to his formal appointment as an Imperial architect gave him sufficient authority. But there are no indications that he ever directly managed or even supervised the masons, carpenters and gardeners doing the actual work.

This may have been different for the decoration of the complex. Not much is known about the decoration of the Neugebäude, and in any case very little was completed at the time of Maximilian’s death.\footnote{118} Strada’s humanist erudition coupled to his practical artistic expertise made him the ideal intermediary to develop decorative programmes, to select suitable artists and to supervise their work, in the same way as he helped organize and direct the team of artists that prepared the costumes for the tournament organized in Pressburg on the occasion of the coronation of Archduke Rudolf as King of Hungary in 1572.\footnote{119} Strada’s acquaintance and sometime close connections with many artists, particularly in Venice but also in Mantua, in Nuremberg, and in Vienna itself, point in this direction, as does the fact that he himself employed numbers of artists: scribes, miniaturists and draughtsmen working on his libri di disegni, engravers such as Martino Rota and Jost Amman preparing the illustrations for the publications he planned, sculptors restoring the antique sculptures bought for Duke Albrecht v of Bavaria and stonecutters incising the black marble plaques identifying these.\footnote{120} He probably also owned a small goldsmith’s workshop where he could occasionally practice this craft in so far as it related to his numismatic

\footnote{118} Aspects of the decoration and furnishing of the Neugebäude will be included in my planned, more detailed analysis of the Neugebäude project.\footnote{119} Cf. above, Ch. 4.3.4.\footnote{120} Cf. below, Ch. 12.3.2.
pursuits, as he described in his letter to King Maximilian cited above. And his own house included at least one sumptuous room, decorated with a set of plaster bust of Roman Emperors and Empresses cast from the best exemplars to be found in Italy, which he had explicitly commissioned in Italy for that purpose. Altogether it is rather likely that he was involved as an advisor in the splendid decoration of the interiors of at least one tower of the Inner Garden, and of one pavilion of the main building of the Neugebäude, executed in painting and stucco by the painters Giulio Licinio and Bartholomaeus Spranger and the sculptor Hans Mont; what they realized may have been but a fraction of what Maximilian intended.

It is equally likely that Strada was involved in the selection of sculpture, both antique and contemporary, that was acquired or commissioned to decorate the gardens and galleries. Great attention was paid to the fountains, which were commissioned from Alexander Colin, the Flemish sculptor who was responsible for the completion of the tomb of Maximilian I in Innsbruck and for the tomb of Ferdinand I and his consort in Prague. Of the many fountains commissioned, in the end only three would actually be delivered, some years after Maximilian’s death; only recently one of them has been rediscovered and reconstructed at Schönbrunn [Fig. 9.107].

Figure 9.107 Alexander Colin, fountain for the Neugebäude, now in Schönbrunn.


Figure 9.110 Jacopo Strada, drawing of an antique female marble statue now in Munich (shown in reverse).

121 Doc. 1559-06-00
122 Cf. below, Ch. 12.4.2.
123 On these, Lietzmann 1987, pp. 139–160.
Strada had been involved in the commissions for both tombs, and must have known Colin personally; he probably granted him access to his own antiquarian and artistic documentation. He must have regularly shared his knowledge and documentation with him, as with other artists working at or for the Imperial Court: at least that is suggested by a design, now attributed to Giuseppe Arcimboldo, for one of the several fountains Colin was commissioned to execute for the Neugebäude. Now in the Tiroler Landesmuseum, this drawing shows a beautiful two-tier fountain, the upper basin of which is carried by four female herms, with their arms interlaced and their breasts spouting water. It is topped by the statue of a goddess, accompanied by two putti, carrying a water jar on her head [Figs. 9.108–9.109].\footnote{Innsbruck, Tiroler Landesmuseum Ferdinandeum, inv. nr. DM 62; Lietzmann 1987, pp. 145–146; I am grateful to Rosanna Dematté, who drew my attention to the plausible attribution of this drawing to Arcimboldo: ARCIMBOLDO: ARTISTA MILANESE 2011, p. 200.} This goddess is an adaptation in reverse of a statue of a canephore now in Munich, which is illustrated in Jacopo Strada's Statuarum antiquarum, an album of drawings of classical statues still preserved in the Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek [Fig. 9.110].\footnote{ÖNB-HS, Cod. min. 21,2, fol. 151.}

To sum up: in the development of the Neugebäude Strada acted as an artistic advisor for his patron, as a designer, as an iconographer and as an agent. These activities represented only the artistic and antiquarian aspects of his patron's brief. In practice decisions were taken and problems were solved in small committees meeting on the spot, such as we have earlier seen discussing the tomb for Maximilian I, the ceiling of the Goldene Saal in Innsbruck, and the Vienna Hofspital. In view of Maximilian's close involvement in the project, such meetings may have taken place when he could be present in person; but often he would be absent from Vienna, and hoped to see something finished when he returned. Such informal meetings would be attended on the one hand by those responsible for the execution of the project: the managing architects, the master masons, the 'Bauschreiber' who administered the available funds and materials and, not least, the head gardener. On the other hand the patron would be represented by a group of counsellors, trusted members of the Emperor's immediate entourage, representing the courtly and the financial interests, and including Strada as the adviser best versed in the designs.\footnote{One of the likely candidates is Reichard Strein von Schwarzenau, who as Hofkammerpräsident would have represented Maximilian's financial interests; but he was also an intellectual, a dedicated historian and antiquary and an important patron of architecture in his own right (see below, Ch. 10.6).} Strada may have occupied a key position in this constellation: speaking the language...
of both groups, he was well placed to mediate in case of misunderstandings, and to help find efficient solutions to practical problems.

So Jacopo Strada was involved in the realization of the Neugebäude complex in three ways. In the first place he made available his huge collection of visual documentation of ancient Roman architecture and of contemporary Italian architecture, which itself was strongly inspired by classical Antiquity, and from the 1540s onward the style generally preferred by a cosmopolitan avant-garde consisting of princes and a happy few of their close associates. In the second place Strada provided expert advice: on the basis of his own ample first-hand experience of ancient and contemporary architecture he commented on the designs prepared for the project; this may have included technical advice, for instance on the waterworks necessary for the various fountains. In the third place he prepared at least one—but probably more—designs for the project himself.

When in his letter to Archduke Ernest Strada claimed that Maximilian ‘continually had employed him in his building projects’, that statement must have had at least some foundation in fact. Strada’s principal task as Imperial architect must have been to inspire and critically follow the imperial building projects, and advise on them both informally and formally in the manner described above. The palace ‘in the manner of Rome or Naples’ Strada offered to design for the Archduke reads almost as a succinct description of the Neugebäude: not only is its design in accordance with up to date, Italianate architecture, but it is provided with ‘beautiful gardens, fishponds, fountains and other delights that are suitable for a great Prince such as Your Highness’. He could offer that with such assurance because earlier he had been involved in the realization of Maximilian’s most prestigious project, the Neugebäude.

127 Doc. 1579-05-00 (Strada to Archduke Ernest); the letter quoted and discussed in Ch. 4.4.1.