

КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ ІМЕНІ ТАРАСА ШЕВЧЕНКА

TARAS SHEVCHENKO NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF KYIV

TEXT & IMAGE

ESSENTIAL PROBLEMS IN ART HISTORY

2021 2 (12)

ТЕКСТ І ОБРАЗ:

актуальні проблеми
історії мистецтва



txim.history.knu.ua

ISSN: 2519-4801

TEXT AND IMAGE: ESSENTIAL PROBLEMS IN ART HISTORY

scientific electronic journal

2021, volume 2 (12)

Founder: Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

Year of foundation: 2016

Field of study: History

Language of publishing: Ukrainian, English, German, Polish, Russian, French.

Frequency: twice a year

Editorial board:

Gennadii Kazakevych, Dr. of Sc., Professor, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine) – editor-in-chief

Petro Kotliarov, Dr. of Sc., Associate professor, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine) – deputy editor-in-chief

Oleksandr Okhrimenko, PhD, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine) – managing editor

Iryna Adamska, PhD, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine) – executive editor

Stefaniia Demchuk, PhD, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine) – executive editor

Anna Kaluher, MA, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine) - editor of Art Criticism section

Natalia Burdo, PhD, Institute of Archaeology, National Academy of Sciences in Ukraine (Ukraine)

Volodymyr Dyatlov, Dr. of Sc., Professor, Taras Shevchenko National Pedagogical University of Chernihiv (Ukraine)

Maxim Fomin, PhD, Senior lecturer, University of Ulster (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)

Nathalie-Cécile Ginoux, PhD, Maître de conférences en art et archéologie des mondes celtes, Université Paris-Sorbonne (Paris IV) (France)

Rostyslav Konta, Dr. of Sc., Professor, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine)

Oleg Mashevskiy, Dr. of Sc., Professor, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine)

Pedro Reyes Moya-Maleno, PhD, Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Spain)

Antoni Moyer, Dr. of Sc., Professor, Bukovinian State Medical University (Ukraine)

Aneta Pawłowska, Dr. Hab., Professor, Instytut Historii Sztuki Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego (Polska)

Andrii Puchkov, Dr. of Sc. Professor, Modern Arts Research Institute (Ukraine)

Matthew Rampley, PhD, independent scientist-researcher, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University (Czech Republic)

Sergei Ryzhov, PhD, Associate professor, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine)

Ihor Sribnyak, Dr. of Sc., Professor, Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University (Ukraine)

Arno Strohmeyer, PhD, Professor, University of Salzburg (Austria)

Oleksandr Symonenko, Dr. of Sc., Senior Researcher, Institute of Archaeology, National Academy of Sciences in Ukraine (Ukraine)

Mykhailo Videiko, Dr. of Sc., Senior Researcher, Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University (Ukraine)

Daqing Yang, PhD, Associate Professor, The George Washington University (U.S.A.)

Editorial board address: 01601, Ukraine, Kyiv, Str. Volodymyrska, 60, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Faculty of History, Art History department; tel. +380442393407; e-mail: arthistory@univ.net.ua

The journal is published by the authority of the Academic Senate of the Taras Shevchenko National University. Decision №17. June, 29, 2016.

The journal is included in the Ukrainian list of specialized scientific publications (Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, decision №374. March, 13, 2017)

ISSN 2519-4801

Image on the cover: Stuttgart Psalter, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Cod.bibl.fol. 23

DOI: 10.17721/2519-4801.2021.2

ЗМІСТ
CONTENTS

ANCIENT, MEDIEVAL AND EARLY MODERN ART

Зелінський А. Морські мозаїки з Тмуїсу, цариця Береніка II
та мендеські пахощі: новий погляд на стару проблему
Zelinskyi A. Sea Mosaics from Thmouis, Queen Berenice II
and Mendesian Aromas: A New Look at the Old Problem..... 5

Друздєв О. Біблійні та місіонерські сюжети
в оздобленні Гарнізонного храму святих апостолів
Петра і Павла у Львові (колишній костел єзуїтів)
Druzdiev O. Biblical and missionary plots
in the decoration of Saints Peter & Paul
Garrison church (former Jesuit church)..... 25

Гуцул В. Проторицарство? Франкська армована
кіннота VIII – X століття у візуальних джерелах
Hutsul V. Protochivalry? Frankish Armored Cavalry
in 8th-10th Centuries as They Depicted in Visual Sources..... 37

Demchuk S. Late Gothic (Antwerp) Mannerism: Its Origins,
Nature And Decline (A Review of the Literature)
Демчук С. Пізньоготичний (Антверпенський) маньєризм:
його витоки, характер та зникнення (нарис історіографії)..... 83

MODERN AND CONTEMPORARY ART

Адамська І. Візуальні матеріали журналу «Шлях до здоров'я»
як інструмент антитуберкульозної кампанії в УСРР (1920-ті роки):
просвіта і пропаганда
Adamska I. Visual materials of the journal «Shliakh do zdorovia» («Path to Health»)
as a tool of an anti-tuberculosis campaign in the Ukrainian SSR (in the 1920s):
Education and propaganda..... 95

Зубар М., Магдич О. Спроба створення нових музеїних наративів
у виставковому дослідницькому проекті «Шевченко мовою міста»
Zubar M., Mahdych O. An attempt of creating new museum narratives
by the example of the exhibition project «Shevchenko by the urban tongue»..... 112

ART CRITICISM

Каленська І. Концепція кориди в живописному циклі
«Ole!» Леся Подерв'янського
Kalenska I. The concept of a bullfight in the painting cycle
«Ole!» by Les Podervianskyi..... 124

**LATE GOTHIC (ANTWERP) MANNERISM: ITS ORIGINS, NATURE AND DECLINE
(A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE)**

Stefaniiia Demchuk

**Пізньоготичний (Антверпенський) маньєризм: його витоки,
характер та зникнення (нарис історіографії)**

Стефанія Демчук

У цій статті я прагну не дати вичерпну характеристику усієї історіографії Антверпенського маньєризму, але підсумувати основні дискусії щодо нього та окреслити перспективи для подальших досліджень. Більшість дослідників розглядають Антверпенський маньєризм як пізньоготичний стиль, який зазнав впливу італійського Кватроченто. Походження стилю, однак, все ще залишається предметом дискусій. Якщо Хоогеверф наполягає на його німецькому корінні, то Ванденбрук вбачає у ньому результа́т притоку до Антверпена художників з різних провінційних міст. Вочевидь, Хоогеверф може мати рацію, адже експресіонізм антверпенських форм не був властивий живопису раннього нідерландського Відродження. Намагання ж антверпенських маньєристів поєднати експресіонізм з «реалізмом» фланандських примітивів (Яна ван Ейка, Рогіра ван дер Вейдена, Робера Кампена) можна розглядати як революційний прорив після художньої кризи 1480-тих років.

Антверпенський маньєризм має спільні риси з більш пізнім європейським маньєризмом. Тому для подальших його досліджень може бути виправданим звернення до концепції маньєризму Макса Дворжака та його послідовників, які фокусувалися на духовних витоках стилю та співвідношенні між спіритуалізмом та художньою формою, так як такі питання поки залишаються на маргінезах дослідження маньєризму в Антверпені.

Малодослідженім залишається і змістовий аспект творів антверпенських маньєристів. На сьогодні, іконографія (один сюжет – «Поклоніння волхвів») досліджується лише Деном Евінгом. Тому зауваження щодо її характеру обмежуються критичними судженнями, подібними до виказаних Полем Філіппо. Залишається відповісти, які сюжети були популярними і чому, чи справді маньєристи не звертались до світської іконографії чи як іконографія демонструє взаємозв'язки і взаємовпливи між маньєристами різних нідерландських шкіл.

Ключові слова: маньєризм, Антверпен, Макс Фрідлендер, готичний маньєризм, Ренесанс.

Introduction

In 1915 Max Friedländer, a renowned art historian and museum curator, who focused on the Netherlandish art introduced a new term - 'Antwerp Mannerism' (Friedländer 1915, p. 65–91). In the eleventh volume of his *opus magnum* 'Early Netherlandish Painting' published in 1933 Friedländer elaborated his approach by creating notnames for anonymous Antwerp artists and

attributing their disparate artworks (Friedländer 1933). Relying on his abilities as a connoisseur, he tried to solve a crucial problem in the research of early Sixteenth century Antwerp art: the majority of paintings of the period were neither dated nor signed although we do know many painters by their name thanks to the scrolls of the Guild of St. Luke. Therefore, on the one hand, scholars have many artworks which cannot be unequivocally attributed to any particular painter and, on the other hand, many artists without any attributed artworks. Friedländer decided to rely on the high-quality works of art and form a group of stylistically close works around them. He came up with five major groups: in the centre of group A was "The Adoration of the Magi" from München with a phony signature of Henricus Blesius; in the centre of the group B he placed "The Adoration of the Magi" from Milan; the group C was formed around another "The Adoration of the Magi" which belonged to Freiherr von Groote (now in Kitzburg); the group D was named after the Master of the Antwerp Adoration and the group E – after the Master of 1518 (to whom the Life of the Virgin from Lübeck was attributed) (Born 2004-2005, p. 36).

Friedländer's opinion about the newly described style in particular and Mannerism more generally was rather pessimistic. However, he broke a large number of mostly anonymous paintings down into five groups in accordance with their stylistic adherence: thus, he shaped the core of the present-day corpus. Other important works on the subject emerged in the 1930s authored by a Dutch art historian Godefridus Hoogewerff (Hoogewerff 1939) and an Austrian art historian and Max Dvořák's understudy Ludwig Baldass (Baldass 1937).

'Antwerp Mannerists' argued that the Renaissance began with Peter van den Brink, whose ground-breaking research dwelling on the newly acquired technical data shed light on the artistic routines adopted in workshops of Antwerp painters and paved way to new, scientifically based attributions. The exhibition «ExtravagAnt! A Forgotten Chapter of Antwerp Painting, 1500-1530» (2005) and the catalogue with his foreword and the essay by Annick Born that introduced the second period in historiography of Antwerp Mannerism. A special edition of the Annual of Antwerp Royal Museums was published the same year. In a number of contributions, scholars approached Antwerp Mannerism from different perspectives. For example, Paul Vandenbroeck attempted to define and explain the uniqueness of this style, while Dan Ewing addressed the changes in iconography, which betray the shifts in identity of artists and their patrons (Ewing 2004-2005; Vandenbroeck 2004-2005). In addition to these studies, the chapter from the monograph 'Painting in the old Netherlands' ('La peinture dans les anciens Pays-Bas') by a French art historian Paul Phillipot also deserves a particular heed (Philippot 1998).

In this paper, I undertake to not only outline major focal points of discussion but also expose the lacunas and perspectives for further studies. To be consistent, I commit myself only to cover the topic of origins, nature and decline of the Antwerp Mannerism and shall not analyse recent brilliant studies in workshop practices of Antwerp painters nor relations between drawings and painted production, leaving them for a closer exploration in reviews to come (Van den Brink, 2004-2005; Van den Brink 2005; Van den Brink 2018; Jansen 2003; Leeflang 2004-2005; Leeflang 2015).

Antwerp or Late Gothic? Dubbing the style

Style is one of the key categories in art history. Since the foundation of the discipline, the history of art has been mostly a history of a succession of styles. The style itself is an aesthetical response of artists, as Keith Moxey succinctly put it (Moxey 2000, p. 17). Shape, line, colour can be considered as a material embodiment of the evolution of Hegelian 'Geist'. Changes in aesthetical response signal shifts in political, social and cultural discourses that art historian has to take into consideration. The Marxist version of Hegelian dialectic offers a further interpretation: the succession of styles follows the triad of thesis-antithesis-synthesis. Thus, the next style evolves as an opposition to the previous one, which is quite close actually to the binary oppositions of

Heinrich Wölfflin (Wölfflin 2012, p. 18–221). Mannerism for Wölfflin is an anti-classical style that inevitably opposes the Renaissance and its classical aesthetics. However, this model tends to simplify the creative process: artists in any age derive their ideas from the artistic language of their predecessors. They do not discard but rather transform the shapes to fit them into new demands.

When defining Antwerp Mannerism as a distinctive style, Max Friedländer aspired, too, to structure the history of the Netherlandish Renaissance that lacked consistency. After the glorious moment of the so-called Flemish Primitives (Robert Campin, Jan van Eyck, Rogier van der Weyden, Petrus Christus and Hugo van der Goes) the crisis began to set in in the 1480s. Formulaic repetition of compositional schemes of Jan van Eyck or Rogier van der Weyden in the art of the 'small masters' from Bruges or Brussels shows a lack of creativity resulting in stiff and livid artistic shapes. Therefore it is easy to see an antithesis in the full of motion and expression art of the Antwerp Mannerists. Their paintings seem to break with the 'realistic' tradition of the Flemish Primitives.

Antwerp Mannerism being antithetical to 'realism' of Jan van Eyck and other early Netherlandish painters had as a direct predecessor – the international Gothic style. Hence, the term 'Gothic Mannerism' proposed by Paul Philippot in 1994 who strove to replace a geographically limited Friedländer's notion. 'Gothic Mannerism' can be regarded as a trade-off between the latter and Ludwig Baldass who argued that Antwerp painters were not Mannerists but late Gothic artists (Baldass 1937, p. 117 as cit. In Born 2004-2005, p. 37). Baldass insisted that the late Gothic style should be divided into two different periods: the largely anonymous art of the end of the 15th century and the art of the early 16th century. (Baldass 1937, p. 117 as cit. In Born 2004-2005, p. 38). According to Baldass painters of the second period of the late Gothic style renounced naturalism of the first period and tried to provoke and disconcert (Baldass 1937, p. 117 as cit. in Born 2004-2005, p. 38).

Annick Born and Paul Vandenbroeck both adopted the views of Paul Philippot and liked the term he had introduced. As Born put it: 'It [the term. – S.D.] has the merit of emphasising the polarity of the movement with its roots in fifteenth-century conventions and, at the same time, its quest for innovation. It also avoids any confusion with the Mannerism that developed after the death of Raphael in 1520 and spread to the Low Countries after 1535' (Born 2005, p. 15). Paul Vandenbroeck adherence to Philippot's term is already traceable in the title of his essay of 2005 'Late Gothic Mannerism in Antwerp: On the Significance of a 'Contrived' Style' (Vandenbroeck 2004-2005, p. 301). Referring to it as 'contrived', however, was not meant to diminish the style itself, but to argue with the author's predecessors and to challenge their prejudices.

Nevertheless, Philippot's term does not reflect the interest of the Antwerp Mannerists in the first 'import' of the Italian Renaissance visible in architectural ornaments and grotesques originating from Italian drawings and engravings. As Paul Philippot pithily put it, one can state the triumph of pictorial space over architectural one (Philippot 1998, p. 129). The Antwerp Mannerists tended to deprive the architecture of its structural soundness uniting different ornamental elements into one fantastic scenography: one might call them 'bilingual' as Gothic shapes coexisted with Renaissance décor (Philippot 1998, p. 129). The latter however was not integrated properly into composition remaining purely ornamental. Expressionism in Antwerp paintings, Philippot argues, was far from spontaneity and inventiveness of their German counterparts being more artificial and forced (Philippot 1998, p. 130). After analysing the shape, the French art historian goes on with criticising iconography that is quite rare in the historiography of Antwerp Mannerism and, therefore, deserves mentioning. German masters, according to him, successfully endowed expressionist shapes with the new meaning renewing religious imagery. Antwerp painters, he argues, brought nothing to iconography but a couple of anecdotes and 'pictorial

grafts' and dwelling on mostly the same 'battered but popular subject' of the Adoration of the Magi went for pure theatrical effects (Philippot 1998, p. 131).

Despite the introduction of more precise terms like 'Gothic' or 'late Gothic Mannerism', Friedländer's term still exists. Even the scholars, who argued against it, use it because the German art historian captured the very essence of the style highlighting its connection to the Antwerp school of painting. Nevertheless, art historians try to go beyond the spell of Antwerp and to define it more broadly than a mere local style. Therefore, one should overcome the limits imposed by Friedländer. Godefridus Hoogewerff was one of the first who ventured to reject the exclusivity of style. In the third volume of his 'De noord-nederlandse schilderkunst' (1939), the Dutch art historian argued that the late Gothic style evolved in Germany and then spread to the Netherlands manifesting itself for the first time in Utrecht, Amsterdam and Leiden before reaching Antwerp (Hoogewerff 1939, p. 25–155 as cit. in Born 2004–2005, p. 39).

Born does not completely agree with Hoogewerff since neither German late Gothic panels, nor Netherlandish ones were dated or signed, which made it virtually impossible to reconstruct how exactly did Mannerism spread. Of course, this does not topple the argument for widening the geographical scope (Born 2004–2005, p. 39). Certainly, the activity of Bernard van Orley in Brussels, the Master of Amiens in Northern France or Jacob van Oostsanen in Amsterdam provides a sufficient evidence to prove the wide dissemination of late Gothic Mannerism. Nevertheless, Born pointed out that all roads lead to Antwerp (Born 2005, p. 14).

Paul Philippot, too, did not contradict Hoogewerff. Germany, according to him, was a birthplace of expressionism that had been foreign for a long time to the Low Countries: one can just recall the harmony and realism of the Flemish primitives (Philippot 1998, p. 128). Thus, expressionism was not inherent to Netherlandish art. Antwerp Mannerism for Philippot is a mere episode in a bigger chapter addressing Gothic Mannerism and the first Renaissance (Philippot 1998, p. 127).

Paul Vandenbroeck's standpoint seems to be a more balanced one. Even though in the title of his essay, he branded the style 'Late Gothic', he did mention its Antwerp variation (Vandenbroeck 2004–2005, p. 310). He shifted the focus from the geographical aspect to the essence of the style as a whole. Of course, there are always local variations of every style, but they all have something in common.

Antwerp and Pan-European Mannerism: connections and ruptures

The very nature of Antwerp Mannerism is still a matter of debate. Scholars continue to discuss whether Antwerp and Italian Mannerisms were related or had at least something in common; or to what extent Antwerp art of the early Sixteenth century can be regarded as mannerist *avant la lettre*. But these discussions have a rather limited scope. In the majority of essays, scholars highlight the ruptures between Antwerp and Italian art and merely mention Max Dvořák or Walter Friedländer as initiators of the 'rehabilitation' of European Mannerism (Dvořák 1984; Friedländer 1957; Panofsky 1968). These two common features, however, do not tell us a lot about the nature of Mannerism in Antwerp or Italy.

In my opinion, the term 'Mannerism' when used to describe the Antwerp art of the early Sixteenth century can shed light on its scope, origin, the spiritual and intellectual nature even though Paul Vandenbroeck denied its ability to have one. As he put it in the essay of 2005, 'One can draw a parallel between Antwerp Mannerism and macaronics to a certain extent, as they were both regional movements. However, macaronic verse was very much an intellectual cultural expression whereas the Mannerist artistic production was definitely not.' (Vandenbroeck 2004–2005, p. 317). Vandenbroeck considered Antwerp Mannerism as a regional mode of expression

recognizable for its unfamiliar shapes, exuberant ornamentation, 'couleurs changeantes' and cluttering of the pictorial space etc. (Vandenbroeck 2004-2005, p. 302, 307, 308, 312).

Yet, if we agree with Max Dvořák, that Mannerism was more than a mode of expression with distinctively unusual forms and hyper-emotionality of expression, it was a particular worldview; the term itself can work as a heuristic tool. In his essays on Michelangelo or El Greco, Dvořák distinguished several key features of such a worldview: spiritualism, expressionism, sensuality and eschatological overtones (Dvořák 1984). Maybe, one should try to look for similar intellectual and spiritual context in early Sixteenth century Antwerp? Because it seems unlikely that a mode of expression existed completely detached from the inner life of its creators and clients.

Paul Vandenbroeck himself presumed the similarities between Italian and Northern late Gothic Mannerism even though he had not elaborated on the subject: 'While there is no immediate or causal relationship between these religious and artistic movements, they may have drawn energy from the same sense of unrest' (Vandenbroeck 2004-2005, p. 325). But if we assume that these two currents with striking stylistic differences and similarities had the same trigger, why do not we look for a trigger that was similar to the one of Italian Mannerism? I.e. for the state of religious and political unrest in the early Sixteenth century Netherlands may have caused the changes in taste and the shift from van Eyckian 'realism' to German expressionism. Here we go once more back to Dvořák, for whom artistic shape was a product of the 'revolution of Spirit'. The Mannerism in his paradigm was an 'art of expression', which complemented two other aesthetic categories of naturalism and idealism (Aurenhammer 2014, p. 197).

Thus, the attempts to break with the tradition of the Flemish Primitives had to be a result of tectonic changes in religious and social discourses that occurred in the first half of the Sixteenth century. As Dvořák argued, the shape had to follow the worldview, because art was a product not only of artistic but also intellectual expression to no lesser extent than religion, philosophy or poetry (Лепорк 2001, c. 324).

Apart from 'rehabilitating' Mannerism, Dvořák also merged Expressionism and Mannerism into one. Scholars often draw parallels between the political and religious crisis of the late Renaissance and the dramatic dissolution of Austria-Hungary that affected Dvořák, who while being a Czech had identified himself, however, with the Austrians (Vybíral 2017). Mysticism, instability, wars – all of these were triggers for Dvořák responsible for the naissance of whimsical Mannerist shapes (Дворжак 1978, c. 10–44; Дворжак 2001, c. 299 – 315).

Therefore, one might question the scope of Mannerism in the Netherlands. Was it any close to the Italian?

Annick Born, Paul Vandenbroeck or Dan Ewing mentioned only stylistic or socioeconomic factors that might have influenced early Sixteenth century Antwerp art: the migration of provincial artists to the blooming centre of trade, the growing demand for artistic production because of the spectacular growth of population and opening of new foreign trade routes, mass art production *on spec* that replaced individually ordered large and complex altarpieces (Vandenbroeck 2004-2005, p. 316; Born 2005, p. 13–14).

In his truly illuminating essay, Dan Ewing questioned iconographic changes that had occurred in the first three decades of the Sixteenth century. He focused on the Adoration of the Magi, the most popular subject amongst Antwerp Mannerist painters. He aptly noted how they put 'new gloss on the traditional story' that he called 'the iconography of commercial transport' (Ewing 2004-2005, p. 282). As Ewing summed up, 'the driving force in Antwerp, on the other hand, went beyond identifying the Magi as analogues of the city's foreign merchants and vice versa, The underlying reason the Magi theme was so popular in early sixteenth-century Antwerp art is that the subject itself and even more the Mannerists' customised iconography of it, embodied Antwerp identity as a trading city' (Ewing 2004-2005, p. 293) No matter how true these conclusions might

have been, they seem to lack addressing the intellectual or religious discourses behind the Mannerist movement. Economic success or the 'commercialization of subject matter in Antwerp painting' were hardly the only drivers for the introduction of Expressionist, dramatic shapes (Vermeylen 2003, 161). Therefore, in the studies to come, one should have a closer look at the early sixteenth-century piety that could be another reason behind agitation and unrest expressed in Mannerist shape.

At first glance, it might seem that the Netherlands unlike Italy had not been shaken by political or spiritual unrest in the first three decades of the Sixteenth century. They did not go through tumultuous events like *Sacco di Roma* of 1527, although due to the activity of printers in Antwerp the ideas of the German Reformation spread quickly over the country. Thus, the sense of religious unrest might have pushed the painters to make alterations in the old subjects and to introduce new ones in their art. It is highly unlikely that the images of catastrophes or dramatic gestures were the result of the mere 'love for special effects' as Paul Philippot argued (Philippot 1998, p. 127–128.). Political and administrative consequences of the integration of the provinces into the Habsburg Empire, demographic evolution, the late medieval spiritual movements as modern devotion, the ideas of early Reformation had to leave their mark on Antwerp art. Nevertheless, one can easily find essays that address the influence of modern devotion or affective piety on fifteenth-century Netherlandish art (Ridderbos 1990, p. 137–152; Roodenburg 2017), but not on Mannerists.

Paul Vandenbroeck's analysis of 'redundant' ornamentation, almost *horror vacui* along with repetitive and highly ornamented poetry of *rederijkers* remains rather exceptional. The comparison between Antwerp artists and urban self-taught but enthusiastic rhetoricians was natural for the main chamber of rhetoric in Antwerp 'Gillyflower' ('Violieren') known for its connection to the painters Guild of St. Luke. One might go even further and attempt to look at this interconnectedness with a 'period eye' as Michael Baxandall did in 'The Limewood Sculptors of Renaissance Germany' (Baxandall 1980). The uniqueness of Mannerism in the Netherlands can be analysed through similar lenses as Renaissance in Germany (Baxandall 1980, p. 143–234).

Thus, there is sufficient evidence to corroborate the connections between the two Mannerisms. They do seem to be two shoots from the one stem as Paul Vandenbroeck pithily put it (Vandenbroeck 2004-2005, p. 325). They have formal similarities like unclassical proportions, whimsical composition and ornamentation, 'couleurs changeantes' as well as similar spiritual triggers for it seems like there were early adherents of religious reforms amongst the Antwerp Mannerists (Demchuk 2018).

Ruptures, however, were of no lesser importance. Italian Mannerism, on the one hand, dwelled on the art by Raphael (the so-called 'classicistic' Mannerism) that manifested itself within the newly founded academies of art. On the other hand, the late Michelangelo inspired another wave of Mannerism famous for its elongated, expressionist shapes. Antwerp Mannerism in its turn was not inspired by the art by Jan van Eyck, Rogier van der Weyden, Dieric Bouts or another figure of the early Netherlandish Renaissance, although one might trace occasional borrowings from the most iconic paintings. Antwerp painters drew their inspiration from late German Gothic, Italian Quattrocento (especially in architecture and ornamentation) and in reinterpreted formulas of schools of Bruges and Brussels. Therefore, Antwerp Mannerism was more of a complex synthesis of tradition and innovation. The ratio of the new and old depended on particular painter and their workshop.

One can sum up the differences between the two Mannerisms just reminding that the Netherlandish Mannerism was for a reason named 'Gothic', while Italian can easily go as 'Renaissance': these labels help to trace the differences in use of pictorial space and shapes in composition. However, they going to still have a lot in common.

Perished like a wildfire

Not only origins of Antwerp Mannerism, but its disappearance too, remains quite controversial and understudied. The reasons for its decline in the 1530s are usually summed up in several sentences. Paul Philippot who compared the intensity of Antwerp Mannerism with wildfire stated that the style disappeared swiftly without trace because of its archaic character (Philippot 1998, p. 127). He refused to see any connections but only marginal ones between the Antwerp Mannerists and the most important painters of early Sixteenth century as Quentin Massys, Jan Gossaert or Barent van Orley (Philippot 1998, p. 127). Thus, he diminishes Mannerism to the style of anonymous workshops totally deprived of personalities. However, his conclusions are highly dubious, especially in the context proposed by Dan Ewing in his monograph on Jan de Beer (Ewing 2016).

Annick Born, too, argued that 'From the onset, Gothic Mannerism contained the seeds of its own destruction, which explains the brevity of the movement' (Born, extra, p. 17). In the footsteps of Philippot, she mentioned that the archaic formulas of the Fifteenth century Mannerist painters could not prevail amongst such 'seeds' (Born 2004-2005, p. 31). 'A fashionable style' just like regular fashion was doomed to a short if intense life.

Paul Vandenbroeck made an observation, which pointed to another aspect of the evolution and decline of Antwerp Mannerism: «The style persisted up to the fourth decade of the 16th century. By that time, since around 1520, Italy had already witnessed the rise of 'Renaissance' Mannerism [...]. For that matter, some 'typically Mannerist' stylistic elements actually originated in the High Renaissance, including the striking 'changeante' colouring in Michelangelo's frescos in the Sistine Chapel (1505)» (Vandenbroeck 2004-2005, p. 324). Thus, by the 1520s, Italian 'Renaissance' Mannerism enriched its Gothic counterpart with new techniques and *invenzione*. Hence, Gothic Mannerism had been mutating over the decades of its existence. Certainly, artists reacted to the changes in different ways. Some of them decided to stick to the commercially successful formulas, while others experimented with compositions and iconography. These two currents within one style obviously provoked the confusion: Mannerist artists like Pieter Coecke van Aelst or Joos van Cleve whose production stood out of the corpus of medium and low quality paintings produced for mass-market were excluded from the group of the Antwerp Mannerists. Even if these artists were more inventive than their anonymous peers were, their approach was quite similar. Just as other Antwerp Mannerists, both Pieter Coecke's and Joos van Cleve's workshops reproduced multiple times successful subjects with the aid of cartoons. Conrelis van Cleve, the son of the latter who inherited the workshop after his father's death in 1540/1541, continued to use father's cartoons (Leeflang 2015, p. 197 – 198).

Speaking of the decline of Late Gothic (Antwerp) Mannerism we cannot help discussing its 'afterlife' too if there was any. Paul Philippot denied it, insisting that Late Gothic Mannerism was replaced with more creative and innovative style of painters like Jan Gossaert, who visited Italy and was inspired by the genuine Antiquity. Annick Born merely stated that Antwerp Mannerism 'facilitated the assimilation of the Italian models' (Born Extra, p. 17). One can designate this hypothesis as a 'dead-end' one: the style had not had any afterlife being only a facilitator for the acceptance of Italian formal language, which resulted in Romanism several decades later.

Nevertheless, these assumptions do not take in account the persistence of formulas and iconographic innovations nor do they deal with the fact that as Micha Leeflang pointed out, sometimes painters adapted their style to particular commissions, which means that the style was a much more flexible category (Leeflang, 2004-2005, p. 272). If particular ornaments or architectural extravaganzas were left out from the later paintings it does not necessarily mean that no Mannerist formulas survived. Thus, the evolution of style seems to be the second option to consider. Antwerp Mannerism certainly went out of fashion in the 1540s, but it did not

disappear without any trace. Expressive gestures, striking or whimsical details, dramatic images of catastrophes can be found in the artworks by renowned artists as Barent van Orley, Jan Gossaert or Pieter Coecke that were created long after the reference period of Antwerp Mannerism. This aspect of its 'afterlife' is still to be addressed in further studies.

It would be of interest, too, to track down the transformation of the subjects introduced by Antwerp Mannerists. Their iconographic innovations are rarely mentioned with the exception for Dan Ewing's essay on the Adoration of the Magi. Meanwhile, Mannerists invented visual formulas for the Old Testament subjects that had not been addressed before and modified the ones that had already existed (like the Last supper and the Christ in the House of Simon). Instead of following the paradigm of the 'costume realism' they chose to highlight exotic component that Yao-Fen You branded as 'the calculated display of a range of textures, bright colours, and fabrics of differing weights' (You, 2004-2005, p. 157).

The intermediality of the Antwerp Mannerists, in its turn, offers a unique possibility to study how different subjects were altered when adapted to different media. As Peter van den Brink observed, '[...] around a quarter of the corpus of Antwerp drawings from the first quarter of the sixteenth century is formed by roundel drawings suggesting that the production of glass roundels must have been very extensive' (Van den Brink, 2004-2005, p. 230). Thus, it would be of interest to look how artists treated the same subject while making designs for paintings, glass roundels or tapestries.

Conclusions

This essay does not strive to give a comprehensive review of literature on Antwerp Mannerism, but rather to summarize the focal points of discussions and to outline key roadmaps for further studies.

The majority of scholars consider Antwerp Mannerism as a late Gothic style influenced by Italian Quattrocento. Its genesis, however, remains a subject of hot debates. If Hoogewerff argued on the German origins, Vandenbroeck attributed it to an inflow of provincial artists. Whatever were the origins, Expressionist shapes were not inherent to the early Netherlandish painting and the attempt to fuse them with 'realism' of the Flemish Primitives seemed a revolutionary breakthrough following the pictorial crisis of the 1480s.

Despite a rift in chronology, the Antwerp Mannerism has irrefutable similarities with the later Italian Mannerism. Thus exploration of intellectual and religious context of early sixteenth-century Antwerp art similar to Max Dvořák's approach can be another direction for further research of the Italian and Spanish Mannerism.

The subject matter of Antwerp Mannerist art, too, remains largely unexplored. Dan Ewing's breakthrough essay showed that the changes in iconography (such as reinvention of the well-known subject) could mark shifts in identity. By no means they are merely 'anecdotic' as Paul Philippot stated. What subjects were popular beyond the Adoration of the Magi and why? Were there any secular subjects? How did the iconography of Antwerp art reflect the intersection of different Netherlandish schools of art? How did later artists incorporate the pictorial inventions of Antwerp Mannerists? Finding an answer to these and similar questions can provide a rich context for further studies on this 'contrived' but unique style.

Список джерел та літератури

ДВОРЖАК, М., 2001, *История искусства как история духа*. Санкт-Петербург: Гуманитарное агентство «Академический проект».

ДВОРЖАК, М., 1978, *История итальянского искусства в эпоху Возрождения, Т. II*. Москва: Искусство.

ЛЕПОРК, А., 2001, От редактора [From the editor]. В: М. Дворжак, *История искусства как история духа*. СПб: Гуманитарное агентство «Академический проект», 321–325.

AURENHAMMER, H., 2014, Inventing “Mannerist Expressionism”: Max Dvořák and the History of Art as History of the Spirit. In: K.A. Smith, ed. *The Expressionist Turn in Art History*. London: Routledge, 187–208.

BALDASS, L., 1937, Die niederlandischen Maler des spätgotischen Stiles. *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien*, 11, 117–138.

BAXANDALL, M., 1980, *The Limewood Sculptors of Renaissance Germany*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

BORN, A., 2004-2005, Antwerp Mannerism: a fashionable style? *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen*, 21–46.

BORN, A., 2005, Antwerp Mannerism: a fashionable style? In: *ExtravagAnt!: A Forgotten Chapter of Antwerp Painting, 1500-1538: Catalogue*. Antwerp: Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, 10–19.

DEMCHUK, S., 2018, Two suppers: Illustrations by Jacob Cornelisz. van Oostsanen to Passio Domini Nostri Jesu Christi (1523) and the Eucharistic Controversy of the Early Reformation, in: *Modus: Prace z historii sztuki*, Vol. 18, 35–48.

DVOŘÁK M., 1984, *The History of Art as the History of Ideas*, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

EWING, D., 2004-2005, Magi and merchants: the force behind the Antwerp Mannerists’ Adoration pictures, *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen*, 275–299.

EWING, D., 2016, *Jan de Beer. Gothic Renewal in Renaissance Antwerp*. Turnhout : Brepols.

FRIEDLÄNDER, M. J., 1915, Die Antwerpener Manneristen von 1520, *Jahrbuch der königlich preußischen Kunstsammlungen*, 36, 65–91.

FRIEDLÄNDER, M. J., 1933, *Die Altniederländische Malerei 11. Band: Die Antwerpener Manieristen Adriaen Ysenbrant*. Berlin: Bei Paul Cassirer.

FRIEDLÄNDER, W., 1957, *Mannerism and Anti-mannerism in Italian Painting*. New York: Columbia University Press.

HOOGWERFF, G., 1939, *De noord-nederlandse schilderkunst*. Volume 3. The Hague: M. Nijhoff.

JANSEN, L., 2003, The Last Supper as a starting point for the study of the workshop practices in the group Pieter Coecke van Aelst. In: H. Veroustraete & R. Van Schoute, ed. *Jerome Bosch and its entourage and other studies*. Leuven: Peeters, 165–174.

LEEFLANG, M., 2004-2005, Workshop practices in early sixteenth-century Antwerp studios, *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen*, 233–273.

LEEFLANG, M., 2015, Joos van Cleve. A Sixteenth-Century Antwerp Artist and his Workshop. Turnhout: Brepols.

MOXEY, K., 2000, *The practice of Persuasion. Paradox and Power in Art History*. New York: Cornell University Press.

PANOFSKY, E., 1968, *Idea: A Concept in Art Theory*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

PHILIPPOT, P., 1998, *La peinture dans les anciens Pays-Bas. XVe-XVIe siècles*. Paris: Champs Arts.

RIDDERBOS, B., 1990, Die ‘Geburt Christi’ des Hugo van der Goes: Form, Inhalt, Funktion. *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen*, 32, 137–52.

ROODENBURG, H.W., 2017, Continuities or Discontinuities? Exploring Affective Piety in the Sixteenth-Century Low Countries, in: A-L. Van Bruaene, & M. Kavaler, eds. *Netherlandish Culture of the Sixteenth Century: Urban Perspectives*. Turnhout: Brepols, 311–328.

VAN DEN BRINK, P. & EWING, D., 2018, Two 'New' Paintings by Jan de Beer: Technical Studies, Connoisseurship, and Provenance Research, in: *Technical Studies of Paintings: Problems of Attribution (Symposium XIX for the Study of Underdrawing and Technology in Painting, Bruges, 11-13 September 2014)*, Paris-Louvain-Bristol: Peeters.

VAN DEN BRINK, P., 2004-2005, The Artist at work: the crucial role of drawings in early sixteenth-century Antwerp workshops, *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen*, 159–231.

VAN DEN BRINK, P., ed., 2005, *ExtravagAnt!: A Forgotten Chapter of Antwerp Painting, 1500-1538: Catalogue*. Antwerp: Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten.

VANDENBROECK, P., 2004-2005, Late Gothic Mannerism in Antwerp: On the Significance of a 'Contrived' Style. *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen*, 301–330.

VYBÍRAL, J., 2017, Why Max Dvořák did not become a Professor in Prague, *The Journal of Art Historiography*, 17, 1–21.

WÖLFFLIN, H., 2012, *Principles of Art History*. Mineola: Dover Publications Inc.

YOU, Y.-F., 2004-2005, Antwerp Mannerism and the fabricating of fashion, *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen*, 141–157.

References

AURENHAMMER, H., 2014, Inventing "Mannerist Expressionism": Max Dvořák and the History of Art as History of the Spirit. In: K.A. Smith, ed. *The Expressionist Turn in Art History*. London: Routledge, 187–208.

BALDASS, L., 1937, Die niederländischen Maler des spätgotischen Stiles. *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien*, 11, 117–138.

BAXANDALL, M., 1980, *The Limewood Sculptors of Renaissance Germany*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

BORN, A., 2004-2005, Antwerp Mannerism: a fashionable style? *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen*, 21–46.

BORN, A., 2005, Antwerp Mannerism: a fashionable style? In: *ExtravagAnt!: A Forgotten Chapter of Antwerp Painting, 1500-1538: Catalogue*. Antwerp: Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, 10–19.

DEMCHUK, S., 2018, Two suppers: Illustrations by Jacob Cornelisz. van Oostsanen to Passio Domini Nostri Jesu Christi (1523) and the Eucharistic Controversy of the Early Reformation, in: *Modus: Prace z historii sztuki*, Vol. 18, 35–48.

DVOŘÁK M., 1984, *The History of Art as the History of Ideas*, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

DVORZHAK, M., 1978, *Istoria italianskogo iskusstva v epokhu Vozrozhdenija, T. II* [History of Italian Renaissance art. V. II]. Moskva: Iskusstvo.

DVORZHAK, M., 2001, *Istoria iskusstva kak istoria dukha* [History of Art As a History of Ideas]. Sankt-Peterburg: Gumanitarnoe agentstvo «Akademicheskiy proekt».

EWING, D., 2004-2005, Magi and merchants: the force behind the Antwerp Mannerists' Adoration pictures, *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen*, 275–299.

EWING, D., 2016, *Jan de Beer. Gothic Renewal in Renaissance Antwerp*. Turnhout: Brepols.

FRIEDLÄNDER, M. J., 1915, Die Antwerpener Manneristen von 1520, *Jahrbuch der königlich preußischen Kunstsammlungen*, 36, 65–91.

FRIEDLÄNDER, M. J., 1933, *Die Altniederländische Malerei 11. Band: Die Antwerpener Manieristen Adriaen Ysenbrant*. Berlin: Bei Paul Cassirer.

FRIEDLÄNDER, W., 1957, *Mannerism and Anti-mannerism in Italian Painting*. New York: Columbia University Press.

HOOGEWERFF, G., 1939, *De noord-nederlandse schilderkunst. Volume 3*. The Hague: M. Nijhoff.

JANSEN, L., 2003, The Last Supper as a starting point for the study of the workshop practices in the group Pieter Coecke van Aelst. In: H. Verougstraete & R. Van Schoute, ed. *Jerome Bosch and its entourage and other studies*. Leuven: Peeters, 165–174.

LEEFLANG, M., 2004-2005, Workshop practices in early sixteenth-century Antwerp studios, *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen*, 233–273.

LEEFLANG, M., 2015, Joos van Cleve. A Sixteenth-Century Antwerp Artist and his Workshop. Turnhout: Brepols.

LEPORK, A., 2001, Ot redaktora. In: M. Dvorzhak, *Istoria iskusstva kak istoria dukha*. Sankt-Peterburg: Gumanitarnoe agentstvo «Akademicheskiy proekt».

MOXEY, K., 2000, *The practice of Persuasion. Paradox and Power in Art History*. New York: Cornell University Press.

PANOFSKY, E., 1968, *Idea: A Concept in Art Theory*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1968.

PHILIPPOT, P., 1998, *La peinture dans les anciens Pays-Bas*. Paris: Champs Arts.

RIDDERBOS, B., 1990, Die 'Geburt Christi' des Hugo van der Goes: Form, Inhalt, Funktion. *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen*, 32, 137–52.

ROODENBURG, H.W., 2017, Continuities or Discontinuities? Exploring Affective Piety in the Sixteenth-Century Low Countries, in: A-L. Van Bruaene, & M. Kavaler, eds. *Netherlandish Culture of the Sixteenth Century: Urban Perspectives*. Turnhout: Brepols, 311–328.

VAN DEN BRINK, P. & EWING, D., 2018, Two 'New' Paintings by Jan de Beer: Technical Studies, Connoisseurship, and Provenance Research, in: *Technical Studies of Paintings: Problems of Attribution (Symposium XIX for the Study of Underdrawing and Technology in Painting, Bruges, 11-13 September 2014)*, Paris-Louvain-Bristol: Peeters.

VAN DEN BRINK, P., 2004-2005, The Artist at work: the crucial role of drawings in early sixteenth-century Antwerp workshops, *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen*, 159–231.

VAN DEN BRINK, P., ed., 2005, *ExtravagAnt!: A Forgotten Chapter of Antwerp Painting, 1500-1538: Catalogue*. Antwerp: Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten.

VANDENBROECK, P., 2004-2005, Late Gothic Mannerism in Antwerp: On the Significance of a 'Contrived' Style. *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen*, 301–330.

VYBÍRAL, J., 2017, Why Max Dvořák did not become a Professor in Prague, *The Journal of Art Historiography*, 17, 1–21.

WÖLFFLIN, H., 2012, *Principles of Art History*. Mineola: Dover Publications Inc.

YOU, Y.-F., 2004-2005, Antwerp Mannerism and the fabricating of fashion, *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen*, 141–157.

***Late Gothic (Antwerp) Mannerism: its Origins, Nature and Decline
(a Review of the Literature)***

This essay does not strive to give a comprehensive review of literature on Antwerp Mannerism, but rather to summarize the focal points of discussions and to outline key roadmaps for further studies.

The majority of scholars consider Antwerp Mannerism as a late Gothic style influenced by Italian Quattrocento. Its genesis, however, remains a subject of hot debates. If Hoogewerff argued on the German origins, Vandenbroeck attributed it to an inflow of provincial artists. Whatever were the origins, Expressionist shapes were not inherent to the early Netherlandish painting and the attempt to fuse them with 'realism' of the Flemish Primitives seemed a revolutionary breakthrough following the pictorial crisis of the 1480s.

Despite a rift in chronology, Antwerp Mannerism has irrefutable similarities with the later Italian Mannerism. Thus exploration of intellectual and religious context of early sixteenth-century Antwerp art similar to Max Dvořák's approach can be another direction for further research of the Italian and Spanish Mannerism.

The subject matter of Antwerp Mannerist art, too, remains largely unexplored. Dan Ewing's breakthrough essay showed that the changes in iconography (such as reinvention of the well-known subject) could mark shifts in identity. By no means they are merely 'anecdotic' as Paul Philippot stated. What subjects were popular beyond the Adoration of the Magi and why? Were there any secular subjects? How did the iconography of Antwerp art reflect the intersection of different Netherlandish schools of art? How did later artists incorporate the pictorial inventions of the Antwerp Mannerists? Finding an answer to these and similar questions can provide a rich context for further studies on this 'contrived' but unique style.

Keywords: Mannerism, Antwerp, Max Friedländer, Gothic Mannerism, Renaissance.

Stefaniia Demchuk, PhD, Assistant Professor, Department of Art History, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine)

Стефанія Демчук, кандидат історичних наук, асистент кафедри історії мистецтва, Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка (Україна)

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3477-1316>

Received: 26-05-2021

Advance Access Published: December, 2021