

Renaissance architecture evolved in the city state of Florence, around 1420, under such economic, political and cultural conditions, which were quite unique indeed in the history of Europe. The new style confined itself first to Italy and Dalmatia and only from the first decades of the sixteenth century on did it spread across Europe. Hungary was an exception, where, thanks to Matthias Corvinus (King Matthias, 1458–1490), Renaissance architecture took root much earlier, around 1479, because of very favourable conditions present at the time to receive the new art.

Hungarian Renaissance architecture is different from its early counterparts found in other countries of Europe north of the Alps in the sense that its surviving architectural ornaments are distinctly classical in the Italian Renaissance way, *all'antica* in their character, as it was called at the time. We do not find these characteristic signs on the first works of French, German, etc., Renaissance which evolved two to three decades later. This phenomenon deserves our attention because in fifteenth-century Hungary, as well as in other European countries outside Italy, Gothic was the dominant style in architecture. To assume, then, that Early Hungarian Renaissance architecture was entirely the work of Italian masters, while local artists were left out completely from the realization of the projects, would be quite inconceivable, if not only because of the volume of the construction that took place.

There are a number of factors behind the unusually early appearance of Renaissance architecture in Hungary. Beginning with the fourteenth century, for instance, some of the Italian states and Hungary became linked by political, dynastic and cultural bonds, which were steadily growing stronger. The greatest impetus, however, for transplanting the Renaissance style onto Hungarian soil proved to be Matthias Corvinus's policy towards Italy between 1463 and 1484. The basis for such a policy was provided by attempts to centralize power within the monarchy, which had begun at an unusually early stage due to the threatening presence of the Turkish Empire. The King turned to Italy in order to secure a more effective defence against the Turks. In Italy at the time Pope Pius II—following the policy of his predecessors—was busy promulgating a crusade against the infidels and, for the sake of that cause, he was

very anxious to form a league with the countries of Europe. It was the planned marriage of Matthias Corvinus with Battista Sforza, Francesco Sforza's daughter, which would have consolidated his participation in the league against the Turks. Both the marriage and the crusade, however, came to nothing, although its idea was not given up completely, either by Pope Paul II or by Sixtus IV.

A closer connection between Matthias and the Italian states was established, however, at a later date when he got in touch with the new *Lega* in 1474. This *Lega* was an internal alliance among Italian states, led by Pope Sixtus IV, and its members were Ferdinand of Aragon, King of Naples, Lorenzo de' Medici, of Florence; Federigo da Montefeltro, Duke of Urbino, and Ercole d'Este, Duke of Ferrara. After the engagement in 1474 to Beatrice of Aragon, daughter of the King of Naples, and with the succeeding marriage in December 1476, Matthias "married into" this alliance, where the members commissioned the greatest Early Renaissance painters, sculptors and architects. These circumstances greatly influenced the "export" of architecture. Since the architects also worked as military engineers, they were the jealously guarded confidants of their masters. Therefore, whenever the mighty employers decided to part with the services of their architects for a certain period of time, they would only do this in favour of their political allies and never for the benefit of their opponents.

The Florentine architects, sculptors and inlay-makers in the 1470s were still holding on, like in any monopoly, to the secrets of certain methods of the new style. They brought them eventually, however, into general use in other parts of Italy where they were free to go now, frequently on the recommendation of Lorenzo de' Medici, since he was not initiating at that time any big construction projects in Florence. During these years, many Tuscan master builders worked in Rome on the palaces of the Pope and of the Cardinals. Around 1480 the Sistine Chapel's sculptural ornamentation was completed. Many Florentine artists were employed by the duke of Urbino, Federigo da Montefeltro, who had his palace constructed and decorated between 1468 and 1482. The duke's Florentine cabinet-makers finished his famous *studiolo*, decorated with magnificent intarsia, in 1476. Some of the sculptors from Florence were also work-

ing for the royal court of Naples, even before the more ambitious building projects of the Aragon family got under way in the second half of the 1480s. Matthias Corvinus could find many masters in the courts of his allies in the second half of the 1470s, who had just been released from some of the major artistic endeavours. Answering Matthias's call the Florentines happily came to Buda\* where many merchants from Florence had lived since the fourteenth century. The latter found the flourishing commercial relations between the two cities very profitable. During the reign of Matthias and subsequently, during the time of the Jagiellon dynasty in Hungary (1490–1526), the Florentine merchants had already formed a colony in Buda. These merchants and the agents of the banking houses were quite familiar with the conditions in Hungary and they knew the safe roads leading in and out of this country. They were hence of great service to the Italian craftsmen who had taken up employment there, far away from home. They occasionally even took over settling accounts for the craftsmen. In 1489 Bernardo Vespucci, for instance, rendered this particular service to Chimenti Camicia who was Matthias's Florentine architect. Thus, the Italian merchant colony in Buda assured the existence of such an "imported" economic background, which was indispensable to the early development of the Renaissance. The political and economic connections were complemented by the friendly relations between the Italian and the Hungarian Humanists.

The Italian Humanists of the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries encouraged development of Renaissance art first of all in their own country. They fostered the conviction among citizens of the city-republics as well as in the papal and princely courts that Italy would only become strong and mighty again, as her glorious ancestor, ancient Rome, used to be, if the country could be reborn and experience a *rinascimento* not only in literature, which once flourished before it became extinct during the Dark Ages, but also in the fine arts and architecture. The Humanists were, from the beginning, searching for

the popularizing writings of classical authors on both painting and sculpture, in order to revive these dormant arts. Then, from the end of the fourteenth century, they were also trying to find out for certain, from inscriptions as well as on the basis of medieval tradition, which of the Italian buildings could be called genuinely Roman to serve as a model for the builders, whose task was to revive the architecture of antiquity. Since they were lacking experience in both the history of architecture and archaeology, they frequently made mistakes. Around 1400, for instance, the Florentine Humanists mistook such prominent works of art of the Tuscan Proto-Renaissance as the San Miniato al Monte in Florence or the Battistero for antique Roman buildings. This error was not without consequences, as it will soon become apparent.

The Humanist movement appeared in Hungary almost at the same time as it appeared in Italy, since the Hungarian kings in the fourteenth century came from the Neapolitan branch of the House of Anjou (Charles I or Caroberto, 1308–1342; Louis I "the Great", 1342–1382). Due to such close historical links, the first Humanist ideas showed up in Hungary not later than a few decades after Petrarch's time. The full development of the movement, however, did not take place before the beginning of the fifteenth century. An important role belonged to Pier Paolo Vergerio, who was one of the most distinguished representatives of North Italian Humanism. He entered the service of the Hungarian king, Sigismund of Luxemburg, at the Council of Constance in 1417. Sigismund was King of Hungary from 1387 until 1437, also German king from 1410 and Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire from 1433. Vergerio lived in a Hungarian milieu until his death in Buda in 1444. He spent long enough time in the Hungarian royal court to become greatly instrumental in widening the basis of Humanism in Hungary. Besides him, János Vitéz, subsequently Archbishop of Várad (Nagyvárad), had become a Humanist. He eventually grew into the most impressive and the most powerful representative of the movement. The first Humanist court in Hungary was his residence in Várad. From the fifteenth century on, more and more young Hungarians went to study at Italian schools and universities. After their return home, they held important ecclesiastical as well as governmental po-

sitions and contributed to the spreading of Humanist ideas everywhere in the country. The most prominent Hungarian Humanists studied in the famous private school of Guarino Veronese in Ferrara, which played an especially important role in the formation of the Hungarian Humanist movement. Many Humanists, who studied there and at the universities of Padua and Bologna, became—following in the footsteps of Matthias Corvinus—patrons of the Renaissance art.

Matthias Corvinus's tutor was János Vitéz, who taught him Latin and directed his attention to appreciate the classical authors, especially the historians. Being inspired by Humanist ideas, Matthias looked upon the great heroes and emperors of the ancients, like Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, Trajan, as his examples. After having been elected king, his court Humanists helped Matthias to follow the example of his ancient predecessors in art patronage also.

It was probably Janus Pannonius, Bishop of Pécs (1458–1472), nephew of János Vitéz, who drew Matthias's attention for the first time to the works of Renaissance art. During his studies in Padua, Janus Pannonius became a great admirer of, and an expert in, Mantegna's art as well as a friend of the artist. It was probably due to his inspiration that Matthias ordered a portrait by Mantegna.

After 1472, when both János Vitéz and Janus Pannonius died, Matthias's Humanist milieu had changed. Starting in 1474, at the persuasion of the leaders of the Italian *Lega* mentioned above, Humanists from Italy came to Hungary. Some of them were especially apt to encourage the King to patronize the new architecture. The Florentine Francesco Bandini was originally a member of Marsiglio Ficino's Neo-Platonic circle. But times had changed, and when he arrived in Buda, where he was to spend fourteen years, it was at the encouragement of King Ferdinand of Naples. Bandini belonged to the permanent retinue of Matthias Corvinus probably until the King's death and acquired, during all this time, more authority and influence. The King had possibly found a very reliable adviser in the person of Bandini. The latter had been closely watching the development of the artistic life in Florence during the 1470s. According to a letter written in Naples, he frequently queried the masters, who erected the marvellous buildings in that city, about their work and acutely contem-

plated the conditions of their art. Bandini, living in the Neapolitan royal court, could also learn of a king's requirements for architectural representation. In questions concerning architecture, Matthias could confidently rely upon Bartolommeo della Fonte, who also spent some time in the court of Buda and, as it was generally known, had a keen interest in Roman archaeology. Between 1486 and 1490, Antonio Bonfini was the King's court historian. At his side, Matthias must have grown into no less than an expert on *prisca architectura*, the architecture of the ancients, since it was precisely upon his request that the Humanist Bonfini in 1488 translated Filarete's (Antonio Averulino) *Trattato d'architettura* from Italian into Latin. Filarete intended his work explicitly for princely patrons of architecture. He popularized L. B. Alberti's *De re aedificatoria* (1452) by putting it in a more entertaining form. Alberti's work had been the first treatise of architecture written with scholarly thoroughness, in Latin, but primarily for architects. The famous Corvinus library had both works on its shelves. We cannot neglect the vital influence of both the books and the Humanists in the King's entourage towards patronizing Renaissance art, because Matthias Corvinus never set foot in Italy and he therefore did not see one single Renaissance building of that country. He could not count on Beatrice either to give him any practical advice in the field of architecture. The Queen had left Naples at the age of nineteen and, from all the other big cities of Italy, she had only seen Ferrara before coming to Hungary.

The appearance of Hungarian Renaissance architecture at an unusually early time and its classicizing, i.e. *all'antica*, character are of course related. It is worthwhile, however, to take a closer look at the latter, since Matthias's palace constructions represent the only isolated examples of the *all'antica* character in Europe north of Italy and Dalmatia. The reason for this is closely related to the way in which Renaissance architecture spread outside Italy, where conditions for constructions were expensive and less feasible than for the expansion of Humanism. The Italian (mostly Tuscan) building mode was basically different from the Gothic building mode which was at the time widespread in Europe. The differences were not only in form and proportion, but also in the theoretical basis and in the practical approach to how the work was organized and what

\* Old Buda, extending on the right-hand side of the Danube, is the historic core of today's Budapest. Since the thirteenth century it has been the seat of the Hungarian kings. Buda and Pest, on the opposite side of the river, were two autonomous cities until their unification in 1873.

building methods and materials were used. Although these latter were radically different, they both stemmed from the great traditions of their respective origins. For these reasons, the adoption of Renaissance architecture in Western and Eastern Europe in the last quarter of the fifteenth century was taking shape in two fundamentally different ways.

Hungary, where Renaissance architecture took root in about 1479, represented one of the two ways, which followed the Tuscan ideal closely even in its realization. The early Tuscan Renaissance construction in the fifteenth century was called "Romana et alla antica" (Manetti), that is, Roman building style which follows the ancients.

The other typical early way of adopting Renaissance architecture evolved after 1495 in France. The new architectural style's decorative motifs and characteristics of its ground-plans took root at a rather early stage, while in both stone-carving and masonry the Gothic tradition was retained. French builders were referring to this type of construction as *à la mode Françoisé* (French building style) even as late as in the middle of the sixteenth century. The essence of this style is that the façade of a building, as far as it goes up to the top of the arches, is constructed of chiselled ashlar stones (*ex sectis lapidibus*).

The comparison of the Hungarian and French examples should be confined to the differences solely in the execution of the framing of openings. It would be inappropriate in all other respects because in France there still exist a great number of magnificent and stately buildings, which exemplify the interpretation of the Italian style in the French manner. In Hungary, out of an originally smaller number of *all'antica* buildings erected in the fifteenth century, nothing but fragments survive, and we find only traces of superimposed orders. However, in their method of realization, both countries became centres radiating examples toward the neighbouring countries. The impact of Hungarian *all'antica* constructions can also be illustrated by buildings still existing in good repair mostly in Poland and, to a lesser extent, in Czechoslovakia.

The *all'antica* method of Tuscan Renaissance architecture is called repetitive modular architecture (*Gliederarchitektur*) in modern architectural terminology. Its inventor was Brunelleschi, who developed his architectural style from 1417 on the basis of his studying Roman ruins and Tuscan Proto-Renaissance, i.e.

Romanesque, buildings that were supposed to be antique structures according to local Humanist tradition. L. B. Alberti, who understood Latin remarkably well, reconciled the already developed practice of Brunelleschi's architectural order, from the point of view of architectural theory, with the teachings found in Vitruvius's *De architectura*, the only still extant Roman technical treatise. Alberti found in Vitruvius's work many laws and rules, which were the indispensable bases for the revival of classical architecture, but he could not find there any theoretical point of support to explain Brunelleschi's repetitive modular architecture as it evolved in practice. In order to complement this missing link, Alberti developed an entirely new ornament theory. Although he took the concept of the ornament itself from Vitruvius, he expanded it. Within the category of ornaments he named Brunelleschi's architectural components *apertionum ornamenta*, opening ornaments. He included in this category, besides the architraves of doors, windows, etc. (*apertiones fenestrarum, hostium*), the orders of columns in "traversable" openings (*apertio pervia*), that is, of porticoes, loggias; thus the column itself became an ornament. The third group of opening ornaments decorated the "false openings" (*apertio afficta*); orders of columns applied onto wall faces, pilasters, architraves, cornices, etc., of the repetitive modular architecture. Thus the term "opening ornament" included every kind of sculpted architectural decorations, even those which are regarded in modern terms as functional elements.

Filarete goes into even more detail than Alberti when he recites the rules according to which one should treat ornaments, especially opening ornaments. These large-size, decoratively carved architectural members were made of colourful stones or marbles with a quality often different from that of the wall itself. They appeared in sharp contrast to the wall, not creating a tension with it; in fact, they functioned autonomously. When they were finished, the carved stone blocks or slabs were lifted into place by means of hoists, which were usually constructed by the architects themselves.

The *ornament* as a theoretical category at Alberti, and the *pulchritudo*, a mathematical system of harmonic proportions, are both parts of the *venustus* or beauty. The difference between the two is that while the beauty of proportions is inherent in the

building, the ornament is something added and fastened onto the building, rather than proper and innate. Alberti, compared to Vitruvius—as more recent research has pointed out—formulated for the first time in the history of architecture the opposition between structure and ornament. In his *De re aedificatoria* he deals with the usefulness and strength of the building and with the ornamentation in two different divisions. This seemingly insignificant separation of the ornament from the wall structure in the history of architecture was a revolutionary innovation indeed, with respect to the Gothic building style which, in contrast to the classical Roman architecture, did not accept such a differentiation either in theory or in practice. In Italy, apparently even the practice of antique architectural sculpture survived.

Not only did the architects and sculptors of the Early Renaissance in Italy face an antique (or supposedly antique) building and Roman decorative motifs in *all'antica* style at every street corner, but the working methods that the decorative sculptors, i.e. the "ornamentalists", had inherited from antiquity also survived in many respects within the framework of their medieval architecture. Such was the case because the ashlar masonry was never completely accepted: Italy had an abundant supply of colourful stone and marble which were in no way suitable to be carved into ashlar stone. Therefore, in the Middle Ages, there was always employment for marble-cutters, *marmorarii*, who could carve at any time architectural ornaments as well. Ornamentalists in the Early Renaissance also inherited the kind of work organization which had evolved side by side with the craftsmanship of their trade. They worked in small groups under the guidance of learned masters, and their phase in the work process was always separate from the construction of the wall structure itself. In the fifteenth century the decorative sculptors were called *scarpellini*, or *scarpellatori*. Sculptors who excelled in the figural work in stone and for bronze were the *intagliatori*. Many of them were also skilled in wood-carving; these masters of woodworks were called *legnaiuoli* (*lignarii* in Latin). Among them, the cabinet-makers possessed the most thorough knowledge of their trade. The task of making scaffoldings and hoists was left to the carpenters. In the early period of the Renaissance, decorative sculptors were usually Florentines, since in the beginning the trade could

only be learned in this city, close to Brunelleschi and his fellow workers, then beside his followers.

The masons who were responsible for building the structure, according to Filarete, worked in groups of ten under the direction of a master (*magistro di muro, murorum magister*). They built the walls as well as the vaults and placed the stones and marbles that had been cut and shaped by the *scarpellatori*. Essentially, Alberti's dual concept of structure and ornament was reflected in the twofold division of the work organization which had been the practice in earlier times.

The law of *concinntas*, the fundamental theory of beauty of Renaissance architecture, is defined as "a harmony and concord of all the parts, so that nothing could be added or subtracted except for the worse" (Alberti). This law was valid in guiding the implementation of both the structure and the ornament. Its uniform application between the two groups of executors was assured by the designer, the *architectus*.

Following Vitruvius, Alberti has drawn the intellectual profile of the Renaissance architect: he had to be well educated, to know the *artes liberales*, especially geometry, arithmetic, the principle of the perspective and the classical theory of proportion, but primarily he had to have a good knowledge of how to draw. It fell within his competence to design military installations, aqueducts, gardens and bridges, as well as to draw blueprints for war engines, hoists, mills, pumps, etc. By emphasizing the role of education, Alberti wanted to re-establish the intellectual status of the *architectus*, which existed, or at least was assumed to have existed, in antiquity, but had become neglected in the Middle Ages. In reality, however, it was possible only through compromises, since no academy existed up to the sixteenth century where this profession could have been studied. The greatest master builders of the Renaissance (including Palladio) apprenticed in the studio of a sculptor, painter, goldsmith or carpenter. They acquired the necessary Humanist culture by studying Vitruvius and contemporary treatises in manuscripts. They could learn the practice of architectural design by studying local Roman remains and apprenticing by the side of a senior architect. They became designer architects only at an advanced age, when the requirements of a patron have turned them to building. They could in that way receive commissions, usually

for a certain period of time, for directing some major building constructions.

It becomes evident that Italy was the *only* place at the end of the fifteenth century as well as at the beginning of the sixteenth, where one could acquire sufficient knowledge to become an architect or an ornamentalist. This limited the possibility of the "exportation" of Renaissance architecture. Acceptance of the new style, if it was to retain its *all'antica* character, demanded, as a paradox, the greater sacrifice from the "importing" country, the more developed happened to be there the local Gothic architecture. It is, therefore, understandable that in countries like Hungary, where Gothic architecture was relatively less developed, the circumstances proved to be quite favourable for the diffusion of the Renaissance style. An important precondition existed in Hungary where for a building construction of major size not only an architect, an inlay-maker, a landscape-gardener were hired, and also perhaps a decorative sculptor, but an entire group of ornamentalists. In France and in other countries of Western Europe, employers rejected this solution because they failed to realize that their superb master builders, trained in the Gothic style and consequently with a craftsmanship of a totally different nature, could not adopt the "new fashion" in its pure *all'antica* manner even if they had thought themselves as being capable of doing so. Theory and practice in Gothic architecture differed substantially from their Renaissance counterparts. Nothing short of a fundamental reform of the former could succeed in bringing the two styles closer together. The French master builders and stone-carvers, grouped into powerful guilds to safeguard their own interests, disapproved of employment being given to even only a few Italian masters, and did not realize the necessity of a basic reform.

The tradition of the Gothic architectural theory as opposed to Early Italian Renaissance did not distinguish the structure from the ornament, neither in designing a project nor in its realization. This applied especially to architectural decoration used for opening ornaments (like framing an opening, or articulating a wall surface). In the Italian building method, sculpted, prefabricated stone or marble blocks were employed as massive embrasures in the wall structure that was interrupted to give place to the opening. The Early Renaissance opening ornaments were

autonomously functioning in contrast to the ones of the Gothic tradition where the ornament was inherent in the wall. The appropriate Gothic decorative motifs and mouldings were carved onto the ashlar stones, which were set in place at the same time as the construction of the wall structure itself. These decorative elements were joined in truss and level with the ashlar stones that made up the wall face without differing from them either in their material or the way their surface was treated. Except for the routine work of the mason, the Gothic building manner was defined by the principle of *maçonnerie*, which differed drastically from that of the Tuscan *all'antica* way.

The *maitre maçon* was the pivotal man in Early French Renaissance architecture. At the end of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth, the first Italianate constructions in France were still directed by stone-carver masters who had excellent knowledge of empirical geometry but were nevertheless always on the site to supervise the work personally and, on occasion, to use the hammer themselves, when some very delicate problems arose in stone-dressing as the result of the two styles concurring. Most of these master masons were illiterates. The kings, nobles, prelates, or members of the big bourgeoisie often commissioned an Italian architect and also hired some decorative sculptors from Italy, usually very few in number compared to the size of the particular construction. The latter were mainly supposed to carve decorative motifs onto ashlar stones, of which the quality and shape had been specified by local masters, or they sculpted smaller individual objects, like fountains, tombs, etc. The local masters worked on the basis of Italian drawings and after the designs of such excellent Italian masters as Fra Giocundo, Domenico da Cortona, Leonardo da Vinci. These artists made sketches as well as scale models of the projects, but since the Italians could not keep a firm hand on guiding local works, these plans changed while in the process of being realized. The first buildings of the French Renaissance, among them some of the famous *châteaux* in the valley of the Loire, were erected of local ashlar stones, under the direction of French masters in accordance with the traditional work organizations and working methods of the Late Gothic period. Adherence of the French to the Gothic tradition did not become detrimental to the general

impression from an aesthetic point of view. The legendary charm of Blois, Chambord, Chenonceaux, Azay-le-Rideau can to a large extent be attributed to the fortunate blending of the Gothic and Renaissance styles.

The situation in Hungary differed from that in France before the arrival of the Italian masters. One of the characteristics of Hungarian architecture in the Late Gothic period, which happened to influence quite favourably the acceptance of the Renaissance style in the country, had been that stone-dressing as such was less important in the building process than masonry itself. Guilds of the building trade were not yet sufficiently developed. Many came into existence only in the fifteenth century. There also existed the masonic lodge association. That, partly because of political reasons, was functioning quite ineffectively right at that time when the Renaissance style was spreading throughout the country. The Italian masters, who arrived in Hungary around 1479, did not meet any significant resistance from local stone-carvers, if only because these newcomers enjoyed Matthias Corvinus's unlimited support.

There was, however, another contributing factor to the implantation of the *all'antica*-type Renaissance style in Hungary. In the fifteenth century a fine, crimson-shaded limestone had already been in use for centuries; we call it red marble. This was quarried on the estate of the archbishops of Esztergom, at Süttő and Tardos (approximately 50 kilometres from Buda), situated on the banks of the Danube, the river guaranteeing an ideal route for its transportation. Since a group of local stone-carvers had great experience in working with this red marble, Hungary, similarly to Italy, had also certain traditions in the *marmorarii*'s trade. The roots of that tradition date back to the end of the thirteenth century. It was then for the first time that red marble was used as an architectural element by a group of Italian marble-masons, who sculpted the ornaments of the Saint Adalbert Cathedral in Esztergom (no longer in existence). After the Italians left, a local group of masters continued to quarry the stones and dress them. Until the second half of the fifteenth century, however, practically nothing but tombstones were made of this beautifully coloured material. Master builders of the Italian Renaissance rediscovered this stone with its qualities remarkably suitable for carving opening ornaments,

and they used it accordingly to decorate the palaces in Buda and Visegrád. The Hungarian tombstone-carvers, quite familiar with marble-dressing, were understandably the first among the local stone-carvers to use in their work Renaissance decorative motifs and participated in making *all'antica* opening ornaments as well.

It can be assumed that some of the local masons, who constructed the structure of a building, had already become acquainted with the practice of Renaissance building around 1470 since several architects and masons from Northern Italy and Dalmatia had already been working for King Matthias between 1466 and 1469. Ambrosius de Cappel, Petrus Antonius de Suigo, Laurentius de Canturio, Christoforus de Panigatis and Antonio de Pallanza, the five master masons, *murorum magistri*, sent by Giangaleazzo Maria Sforza, the Duke of Milan, had arrived in Hungary in 1466. They may have been commissioned to carry out the plans of Dalmatian military engineer Paschoe Michelievich, who was also working in Hungary between 1466 and 1469. The possibility that they were linked in some ways to Aristotile Fioravanti's activities cannot be ignored either. Fioravanti, the military engineer of the Sforza's from Milan and the city engineer of Bologna, spent six months in Hungary, from January 1467 until June. We do not know, unfortunately, what kind of work they had been commissioned to do. They might have had something to do with military installations since Matthias Corvinus invited Aristotile Fioravanti because, in his own words, "in the war that we are fighting against the Turks quite a few men like him are needed". According to some sources, Fioravanti was building bridges and also making medals. It is most likely, however, that all of them worked on the fortifications in Southern Hungary erected against the Turks and perhaps even took part in expanding Zengg (Senj), Matthias's sole Adriatic port. The activities of the Italian and Dalmatian architects and stonemasons in Hungary between 1466 and 1469 were important preliminaries to the eventual process of having the Renaissance architectural style implanted in Hungary. On the other hand, there are neither documents nor relics indicating if they had already brought with them the vocabulary of ornamented Renaissance architecture. It is undeniable, however, that within the second half of the 1460s one could

already find inscriptions made by local masters in Roman capitals as well as some Renaissance motifs on carvings of that period, as for instance on the tomb slab of Albert Vetési, Bishop of Veszprém, dated 1467.

The *all'antica* character of the Early Hungarian Renaissance architecture appeared for the first time on Matthias Corvinus's palace at Buda. The Turkish regime, from 1541 to 1686, the repeated sieges, and finally the Baroque reconstructions almost entirely destroyed the palace. This loss is irretrievable since the large-sized group of buildings which disappeared in Buda had served as a model for the secular architecture in Hungary during several decades as well as for Bohemia and Poland where Renaissance architecture evolved from 1493 and 1502 respectively. Excavations in Buda after the Second World War were very successful in uncovering the Renaissance relics. Some three thousand architectural parts were brought to light in fragmentary form. Only a very small portion of the excavated material, although of a very high artistic quality, can be seen today at the exhibition of the Historical Museum of Budapest in Buda Castle, some in forms of reconstructed architectural units. The bulk of the unearthed relics, like fragments of door and window-frames, parts of pilasters, cornices and balustrades, etc. are to be found in museums of stonework remains. Every one of the relics bears evidence of the *all'antica* working method (Plates 1-9, 11-14, 24-31, 33-36). For the implantation of the Renaissance architectural style in Hungary, Matthias Corvinus and his wife, Beatrice of Aragon, had taken a decisive step shortly before 1479: they invited an architect from Italy and several ornamentalists from Florence and Dalmatia to Buda. The employment of Dalmatian masters was justified by the fact that the northern part of Dalmatia belonged to Hungary under the name of Croatia in the second half of the fifteenth century. Since Tuscan Renaissance had already established itself in Dalmatia around 1460, and a large group of Dalmatian sculptors and builders worked continually in Italy, the King could find trained ornament carvers even among his own subjects.

Matthias and Beatrice together organized the constructions as did other ducal couples of the Early Renaissance in Italy, like Lodovico Sforza and Barbara of Brandenburg, or Federico da Montefeltro and

Battista Sforza, who commissioned artisans for their projects. With the support of Matthias and Beatrice, the Italian masters also could conveniently maintain their routine working conditions in Hungary. The realization of the superstructure itself was presumably entrusted to Hungarian masons (we do not know of any Italian mason from that period), while the sculpting of the ornaments was undertaken, under the direction of the architect, by about twenty odd Italian, five Dalmatian and a few Hungarian stone-cutters, the latter familiar with the dressing of red marble.

Chimenti Camicia was the first Renaissance architect of Matthias Corvinus commissioned to build not only fortresses but also magnificent royal residences with beautiful gardens surrounding them. A contract signed in Florence on 29 July 1479, which happens to be the earliest document denoting the commencement of Hungarian Renaissance architecture, is linked with his name. In this document, five Florentine cabinet-makers (*lignarii*), Johannes Antonius Dominici, Vectorius Petri Simonis, Bartolomeo del Citto, Albizus Laurentii and Dominicus Dominici, promised to serve Master Camicia for one year in Buda. Since Johannes Antonius Dominici entered the contract for the highest salary, we can assume that he was the foreman of the entire group.

When the Florentine craftsmen arrived in Buda, Camicia had already been there. He probably had, by that time, completed models of the buildings where constructions were to start. A significant number of the door architraves that were supposed to receive the inlaid panelled doors were already built. The walls of the premises were also standing while the rooms were covered with decorative coffered ceilings. It is possible that a group of marble-carvers have arrived sooner in Buda, but on the other hand, it is also true that between wood-carvers and stone-carvers, no insurmountable vocational differences existed: the inlay-makers in principle could work with stone, too. The case of Benedetto da Majano shows this very well, who, in a more exactly indefinable period, also spent some time in Buda. According to Vasari, Majano decided during his stay in Hungary to relinquish cabinet-making and to occupy himself full-time with the art of marble sculpting. Some fragments are associated with his name on the basis of comparative stylistic analysis.

Chimenti Camicia was born in Florence in 1431. He learned the wood-carving trade, inlaid cabinet-making in particular. He had his own workshop, *bottega*, in Florence in 1464. Vasari refers to Camicia as an architect *par excellence*, who designed palaces, gardens, fountains, churches and mighty fortifications as well as ornamented wooden ceilings in the service of the Hungarian king. It was Baccio Cellini who realized all these projects. Vasari also mentions that Camicia drew up plans for a *mulina* on the Danube as well, which is a water-mill (water-wheel) or hydraulic engine. It was also Vasari who quoted Camicia's epitaph which survived in Florence. According to the inscription, Camicia had acquired a reputation in the field of the *architectura* comparable to that of Vitruvius. Hungarian research in general does not give much credit to Vasari's descriptions since it seems somewhat contradictory that the remaining archival records in Florence and Hungary mention him either as an inlay-maker or simply as an architect. There is, however, no contradiction at all: Chimenti Camicia happened to be a genuine Early Renaissance architect, like Giuliano da Sangallo or Baccio Pontelli, who had, like him, been carpenters at first before becoming builders as they received commissions for building projects. Since the records are uninformative about the period of Camicia's life between 1464 and 1479, we can only speculate from the remains at Buda that he must have acquired his practice in the building trade also outside Florence, before he came to Hungary. The fact that in 1488 he received four hundred and fifty ducats for one year, an extremely large amount, is also an indication of Camicia's position as an architect.

Matthias Corvinus's illustrious sculptor—*statuarius sive marmorum sculptor* (bronze and marble-sculptor)—was Giovanni Dalmata, who is mentioned in the records under the name of Johannes Duknovich de Tragurio. This Dalmatian artist, native of Trogir, became famous in Italy. At the end of the 1470s he made, in collaboration mostly with the Florentine Mino da Fiesole, several renowned marble tombs commissioned by Pope Sixtus IV. He even marked the tomb of Pope Paul II with his initials. We do not know the date of his arrival in Hungary. In all probability, he worked in Rome, immediately before his arrival, within the Vatican, on the sculptured architectural ornaments of the Sistine Chapel which

was finished in 1480. King Matthias raised Dalmata to noble rank in 1488, probably after a major work project had been completed, and bestowed upon him the castle of Majkovec. The deed of gift does not give any details about his sculptural works. The most famous among Dalmata's remaining sculptures in Hungary is the so-called Madonna of Diósgyőr (Plates 39-40). Among the relics and fragments found at Buda and at Visegrád, several can be linked on stylistic grounds to his name or to his workshop (Plates 5, 6, 19). There are some sculptured ornaments among them as well (Plates 11, 31, 36), which suggest that he may have directed the work of the marble-sculptors or perhaps he was even a *superstans marmorarii*, head-master of that group.

The five Dalmatian stonemasons who worked in the courtyard of the castle at Buda in 1487 probably belonged to Giovanni Dalmata's circle. Their leader was Lucas de la Feste de Spalato, *magister lapicida Serenissimi Regis de Monte Budense* (His Majesty's master mason on the Castle Hill of Buda). One of the Dalmatians, Johannes Grubanich, died in December 1487. It seems that his death led to the breaking up of the group because two masons, Franciscus de Zara and Petrus Radi Busanini de Tragurio, returned to Dalmatia and only Marinus de la Braza and Michael de Lesina stayed at Buda with Master Lucas for an indefinite period of time. Stonemason Petrus is the only one whose life can be traced further in Dalmatia. In 1490, he was working on the sculpted ornaments of the cathedral on the Island of Rab. The ornamental carving on some of the smaller objects from the island, like a baptismal font, an altar with ciborium, the architrave of the church's west gate, bear a resemblance to the sculpted works at Buda and Vác. It can be assumed therefore that the Dalmatians also participated in carving the balustrade decorated with garlands of fruits (Plate 5).

Antonio Scarpellino, whose name is known only from documents, can be included among the decorative sculptors. He must have been an important master because in 1487 he received 264 ducats for a year, evidently for himself and his large group of ornamentalists.

Some records have remained from the period between 1487 and 1489 of the red marble quarries at Süttő and Tardos, which were indispensable to sculpting the ornaments. The marble was floated down

on the Danube by ships for the construction of the royal palace at Buda. The quarries belonged to Ippolito d'Este between 1487 and 1495. He was at that time Archbishop of Esztergom. From the account books of Modena we know the name of Ambrogio incisore (quarryman Ambrose), who worked on the site, while we also know that four *lapicidae* participated in the work there as well. Their job was probably to cut the huge stones to size. The expenses of both the master craftsmen and the shipping itself were charged to Queen Beatrice's account. It was therefore assumed that the ships loaded with marbles from the quarries arrived at Beatrice's castle in Óbuda instead of that at Buda (Óbuda or Old Buda in the Middle Ages was sometimes simply called Buda). This assumption is unlikely, however, because red marble fragments were found during the repeated archaeological excavations at the Queen's castle in Óbuda in insignificant quantities whereas the unearthed number of red marble sculptured architectural fragments reach into the thousands at the royal palace in Buda.

On stylistic ground it has been proved that a Florentine sculptor (a disciple of Desiderio da Settignano), who was known as the "Master of the Marble Madonnas" and usually identified with Tommaso Fiamberti, also worked for Matthias Corvinus. This master probably came to Hungary through the intervention of the ducal court in Urbino (Plates 17-18, 21).

The fact that most of the masters came from Florence makes it understandable that the motifs of the sculpted architectural ornaments are Tuscan in their origin, since in Italy, even in the 1470s, the assistance of the trained Florentine masters was still very much in need everywhere. There is something at this point, however, which has to be explained. In spite of the above fact one should not imagine, after reconstructions of ornament fragments and findings from the sites as well as comparisons made among the remaining illustrations of palaces from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, that the façades of Matthias Corvinus's palace at Buda were designed on the model of palaces built for Florentine patricians, like the Palazzo Medici or the Palazzo Rucellai. The design of its front, for instance, bore much more resemblance to the Palazzo Venezia, the palace of Pope Paul II in Rome. As with the latter, the orders applied to the façades are missing on the palace in Buda as

well and a horizontal articulation with simple string-courses appears instead. The *piano nobile* of the buildings were not articulated by the Florentine-style round-headed two-light windows, *biforas*, but by square cross-mullioned windows called *finestre a croce guelfa* in contemporary Italian terms. The latter type of window is also medieval in its origin, which Alberti and his followers altered in the 1450s for papal representation to be an *all'antica*, autonomously functioning opening ornament (Plate 11). On the other hand, Matthias Corvinus's new residence bore resemblance to the Ducal Palace at Urbino in the sense that its fortified castle character was emphasized by a high substructure, articulated by semicircular blind arcades. In addition, this substructure served, as we are going to see, to buttress the hanging garden on the south-west side which was modelled on the basis of Federigo da Montefeltro's example again, on his *giardino pensile*, as it was known, and appeared actually as terrace garden within the building. (Fig. 1/3)

All this shows that the leading masters at the palace in Buda had already belonged to the third Tuscan generation of builders whose members worked not only in Florence but also participated in the construction and ornamentation of palaces in Rome, Pienza and Urbino, buildings that were erected for Corvinus's allies. These buildings were no longer constructed to serve Florentine patricians but to suit the exigences of popes and princes. The architects then working in Buda were able to construct such a palace for Matthias Corvinus which was appropriate to his character as military leader and Humanist prince as well as to his monarchical policies. They proceeded according to Alberti's instructions which the great Humanist architect elaborated by adopting Cicero's principle of *decorum* for the art of architecture, by which a building can only be accepted as "moral" if its structure and ornaments suit (*debet*) the character, and political and social status of the owner. The skill acquired outside of the city of Florence by these Tuscan masters who came to Buda became evident not only in the architectural motifs but also in their sculpting of decorative elements (Plates 8, 11, 14, 24, 29, 31).

Matthias Corvinus's Renaissance constructions altered the palace's earlier Gothic appearance a great deal, although the ground-plan itself did not become typically Renaissance as a whole even after consider-

able reconstruction. The alterations respected the ground-plan with several courtyards, which had already been developed earlier. In the time of Sigismund of Luxemburg (1387-1437), the architectural framework had already been worked out, which was quite decisive in itself for the particular form of the slightly trapezoid-shaped formal courtyard (Fig. 1).

We usually receive a more complete picture only when comparing contemporary descriptions with the unearthed relics, and with fifteenth-sixteenth-century engravings representing Buda Castle. When at the end of the fifteenth century a traveller approached the palace at Buda from the direction of the burgher quarter of the city, he came across the first Renaissance building on the side towards the Danube of the so-called Sigismund courtyard. A double flight of stairs, flanked by bronze candelabra, led up to the main entrance of the building. The door wings of the red marble main entrance were decorated with bronze panels with a relief representing the Twelve Labours of Hercules. Red marble cross-mullioned windows articulated the façade (Plate 11). Elaborately carved red marble doors and windows adorned the halls; on some of the panels of the coffered wooden ceiling "the planets were dashing along wonderfully in their carts through the sky", according to Bonfini's description. This part of the Renaissance palace was built probably towards the end of Corvinus's reign, between 1487 and 1490. It was never completely finished since sources sometimes refer to it as "King Matthias's uncompleted palace" (Fig. 1/4).

The most important part of the Renaissance palace was the so-called formal courtyard. The central courtyard—with the exception of its almost 70 metres long west wing (Fig. 1/3), which the King may have had built around 1484—emerged around 1479 through the alteration of the Gothic buildings. At the level of the ground floor, from at least three sides, arcades enclosed the courtyard, while on the upper floors, there were columned loggias, bordered with balustrade (Plate 2). Onto the loggias' wooden ceiling on the upper floor, the inlay-makers carved the twelve signs of the zodiac. Detailed descriptions of the functions and the decorations of the halls enclosing the courtyard remained, but these descriptions are often contradictory from the topographical point of view, since the mental image they create was not always identifiable with the actual ground-plan from the excava-

tions. King Matthias's famous library has been situated by scholars unanimously into the wing facing the Danube beside the chapel (Fig. 1/1). The library consisted of two vaulted chambers. In one of the chambers the Latin, in the other one the Greek codices were presumably kept in intarsia wardrobes. Tradition believes that a capital with an inscribed band found in the last century at Buda used to be part of the library structure (Plate 4). Around the formal courtyard, on the red marble doorways, visitors of the time could see some inscriptions bearing the dates 1479 and 1484, commemorating Corvinus's victories. Coats of arms were carved on the doorways and fireplaces (Plates 12, 35). There were stoves made of coloured tiles in some of the halls, fireplaces in others, the crest of which, according to Bonfini, was decorated with quadrigas and Roman symbols (Plate 30). Frescoes covered the walls of the vaulted halls: allegorical figures of the Virtues in the Queen's chamber, murals of astrological subjects in the library. The latter showed the constellation of celestial bodies at certain significant points in time: at Corvinus's birth (1440), at the occupation of Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, Lausitz (1469), etc.

Bonfini left for posterity a detailed description of the Renaissance garden laid out west of the castle with fish-pond, labyrinth and even with a marble villa (*villa marmorea*) built beside it. The water supply for the garden was ensured through leaden conduits partly from the Cisterna Regia, one of the biggest cisterns of the entire fortified castle. The cistern (now Albrecht cellar) is also noteworthy because originally it was the substructure of a Renaissance hanging garden. This terrace garden has since been destroyed, but the way it looked at the time is represented in Erhard Schön's engraving from the sixteenth century. In it one can see the enclosing screening wall breached with round-headed windows, which rested upon the huge blind arcades of today's "Courtyard of the Rampart Walk". There lay behind the wall the Renaissance hanging garden surrounded by three wings with a well in the middle. (Fig. 1/3). The pit of the well, since destroyed, reached down to the Cisterna Regia, which was built around 1484 and still exists today. The water was collected from the layers of the hanging garden and the roofs of neighbouring buildings through the openings in the barrel vault of the cistern. It was then filtered by

letting it seep through the piled-up layers of gravel and stones in the inner space of the cistern and collected in well-pits. It was finally drawn up again to water the hanging garden.

The Cisterna Regia is nothing more than a rather insignificant substructure. As a source of information, however, it is quite important together with the hanging garden constructed on high stone walls within the building. From them we can learn a lot about the structure of the Renaissance palace and at the same time they give us at least a basis for trying to find the Italian relatives of the Renaissance architecture at Buda.

The ingenious as well as commonsense solution of combining a hanging garden situated within a building with a water supply system had been developed in Italy during the second half of the fifteenth century, between 1462 and 1476. The closest example of it would be the hanging garden in the Ducal Palace at Urbino, the work of Francesco di Giorgio Martini, painter-sculptor, and architect and military engineer of the duke of Urbino, from between 1474 and 1478.

Designing the hanging garden must have been a task for an architect well versed in hydraulic constructions and also possessing a certain amount of knowledge in mechanics. As far as we know, there was only one such man in Corvinus's court: Chimenti Camicia. The way the hanging garden was laid out suggests that this eminent architect, who had been a cabinet-maker before, may have gained the sufficient practice for the construction of the fortified castle at Buda in the palace at Urbino.

Corvinus's interest lay primarily in the construction of forts and palaces, but towards the end of his reign he also made plans in the field of urbanization. It was after 1486 that the King's library acquired the works of Alberti and Filarete. We know from Bonfini's accounts that the King was so taken by the pictures showing bridges and towns that he asked Bonfini to translate Filarete's work into Latin. Bonfini was ready with the translation in three months because, as he tells us in the introduction to his translation, he wanted the King "to understand the method of symmetry and construction of all the buildings".

Among the illustrations of the Filarete manuscript was a part of an ideal city showing a building called "the House of Virtues and Vices", which must

have hit the King's fancy since he then wanted Buda's college, the *Schola*, built on a model of that structure. On each floor of the centrally planned seven-storeyed building one of the Liberal Arts would have been taught. Corvinus wanted to have the strange-looking round building constructed on the bank of the Danube on the Buda side, but he did not get further than laying its foundations. According to remaining sixteenth-century records of the building, he also had made plans for a minor quarter of an "ideal" town surrounding the round-shaped *Schola*, which would have contained the students' hostels, professors' homes and some other related scholastic establishments.

The other important centre of the Early Hungarian Renaissance was Corvinus's summer residence at Visegrád, built around 1484. The building itself showed mostly the Late Gothic style, while the sculptured ornaments reflected largely Renaissance influence. In the chapel, the Carrara marble tabernacle made by Benedetto da Majano may already have been standing by 1484. The master probably transported it in its finished form from Florence. A red marble doorway led into the chapel: the so-called Madonna of Visegrád adorned its tympanum (Plate 17).

Matthias Corvinus's constructions in Visegrád, just as in Buda, were connected to older buildings. In Visegrád, however, the basic layout had a Renaissance-like character with its employment of terraces and buildings already existing from the Angevin-Luxemburg period of the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries. Thus all the additions during the second half of the fifteenth century conformed quite easily and naturally to the older buildings. The unique setting of the summer residence, located on the hillside, offered a natural site for garden terraces. Therein stood fountains from the Angevin period: their construction was actually quite easy since there is a source abounding in water immediately above the residence, and it was therefore possible to supply water simply by gravity, with conduits built along the slope. After 1473, Matthias had changed all the fountains on the terraces from the Angevin period for Late Gothic and Renaissance fountains. The most beautiful among them is the elaborately carved Renaissance red marble fountain excavated in the middle of the square inner courtyard, built before 1484 (Plate 16). The balustrade on top of the reconstructed Late

Gothic arcaded wall that surrounds the courtyard belongs to those Renaissance ornaments which were carved by local craftsmen (Plate 15).

The excavations at Visegrád are still going on and thus we should not expect to find completely reconstructed buildings among the unearthed remains. The easiest way to visualize the original palace on this site of the ruins and the fragments scattered all over is to recall the Humanist Bishop Miklós Oláh's description of this place from 1536: "Before the eyes of the visitor entering the gate suddenly unfolds an extensive open space enamelled with all sorts of green plants and wild flowers, from where stairs, 16-17 metres wide and built of squared stones, lead through 40 steps and into a quadrangular hanging garden. There are lime trees in the garden, planted equidistant from each other, with a red marble fountain rising in the middle. The fountain itself is made with wonderful skill, decorated with the sculptured images of the Muses. The statue of Cupid sits at the top of the fountain upon a marble winebag and sprays water."

About the same time, during 1483 and 1484, when the construction of the palaces at Buda and Visegrád were under way, Renaissance craftsmen were also working for Miklós Báthory, Bishop of Vác, and also a Humanist. Remnants of former constructions at Vác, like the balustrades, are placed today secondarily in the sanctuary of the city's cathedral (Plate 20). A seventeenth-century source, in reference to Miklós Báthory's constructions, mentions a Dalmatian-born Jacobus Tragurini, architect and sculptor, who also worked for the bishop.

While excavating the fifteenth-century walls of the fortress of Nógrád, a red marble panel turned up, bearing the date 1483 and the Báthorys' coat of arms (Plate 22), proving that Renaissance fort and castle constructions were already going on at that time. Another memorial tablet, this one on the fort of Ecsed, is decorated with András Báthory's coat of arms and bears the date 1484.

Cardinal Giovanni of Aragon, brother of Queen Beatrice, was the Archbishop of Esztergom between 1479 and 1485. He resided rarely at his archsee, did little building and has been commemorated by only two red marble carvings (Plate 10).

The number of constructions decreased somewhat after Matthias Corvinus's death (1490), but the Tuscan-

Urbino stylistic character continued to show up, which was quite unprecedented in Europe during the first decades of the sixteenth century. Outside Hungary, elsewhere in Europe, Upper Italian and Lombard stone-cutters and builders were commissioned at that time to introduce the new style. These masters represented the Renaissance already transformed from its Tuscan ideal into a Lombard version, imbued with Gothic tradition similarly to the German or French Early Renaissance style. In Hungary, on the other hand, during the Jagiellonian period (1490-1526), survival of the Tuscan *all'antica* tradition was ensured by the Italian ornamentalist colony, where a good many members had settled during Corvinus's reign. Some returned home, but new masters arrived to take their places. Noticeably slight changes in style of the surviving remnants show that the fluctuation had been quite constant until about 1520. The masters received commissions from King Wladyslaw (Hung. Ulászló, Boh. Vladislav) Jagiello II (1490-1506)—who succeeded Matthias Corvinus as the ruler of Hungary—several archbishops of Esztergom (Ippolito d'Este, Tamás Bakócz, György Szathmáry) as well as from many prelates and nobles.

Fragments adorned with the Jagiellonian coat of arms unearthed during the excavations at Buda carry the mark of Italian hands that worked for Wladyslaw Jagiello II. On one of the red marble doors of the Renaissance palace at Buda the contemporaries could see the date 1502 and an inscription referring to Wladyslaw. The greater part of Wladyslaw's Renaissance constructions probably took place during the period before his marriage in 1502 with Anne de Candale, a French princess, Anne de Bretagne's cousin.

Wladyslaw also continued the Renaissance constructions on the game preserve of Nyék in the environs of Buda, which had begun during Corvinus's reign, around the end of the 1480s and apparently finished before 1502. Here were excavated the foundations of two villa-like hunting lodges as well as about a thousand six hundred decoratively sculpted Renaissance architectural fragments. Some of the sculpted limestone ornaments from the villas of Nyék can be restored and also analysed to a certain extent. The façades were diversified, just as in Buda, by autonomously functioning cross-mullioned *all'antica* windows. The ground floor of one of the villas was apparently enclosed by columned loggias (Fig. 3), the

other popular opening ornament from Corvinus's period. Their balustrade (Plate 46) was articulated by small ornamental pillars adorned with Wladyslaw's coat of arms in the Jagiellonian period. The Renaissance composite capitals, which were so typical of Corvinus's constructions, could not be found here any more. For the first time in Hungary, Ionic orders were employed as columns of the loggias. The high-quality carvings of the villas of Nyék (Plate 42) make up the connecting link between the architecture of the palace at Buda and that of the Bakócz Chapel (1506), which will be reviewed below.

The royal palace at Buda and the villas at Nyék, first works of the Early Hungarian Renaissance, had become a model, an example, for the neighbouring countries. Wladyslaw II was the first to have the new style transplanted to his Bohemian royal residence, to the castle of Prague. When he moved to Buda in 1490, he ordered the Italian masters to continue the constructions they had already started. He also commissioned Benedikt Ried, this excellent master of Late Gothic architecture, to come from Prague to Buda to study the Renaissance structures erected there and to transplant their style to his Bohemian residence. He instructed Ried to decorate the façades and the opening ornaments of the Vladislav Hall, to be built in the castle of Prague, in a fashion similar to the Renaissance constructions at Buda. It seems that Benedikt Ried made sketches of the Renaissance buildings at Buda and presumably brought some Italian drawings to Prague, too. The north and the south façades of the Vladislav Hall reached completion between 1493 and 1502. Ried accepted on the south front as the dominant architectural motif the double variation of a cross-mullioned window articulated with fluted pilaster and foliage capital from the palace of Buda (Plate 28). Following Ried's designs, however, the stone-cutters of Prague executed the windows according to the Gothic tradition, that is, built of ashlar stones and joined functionally with the wall structure. This was similar to the method used by the French Renaissance stonemasons; thus clearly showing that Italian craftsmen from Buda, who would have been well versed in carving *all'antica*, did not participate in the works. The so-called Louis wing in the Hradčany of Prague, built between 1500 and 1510, also resembles the façades of the palace in Buda.

There is no mention in Hungarian sources of any Italian builders or ornamentalists or of local masters who worked for Wladyslaw II at Buda. Circumstantial evidence renders it probable that "Franciscus Italus" was also one of his commissioned craftsmen, who, from 1502, was carving the tomb of King Jan Olbracht (John Albert) in the cathedral of Cracow. This master was brought to Cracow from Buda possibly by the Polish Prince Sigismund (he was the younger brother of Wladyslaw II). Sigismund, having received a Humanist education, spent three years between 1498 and 1501 in the royal court of Buda. There he had the opportunity to be impressed not only by the Renaissance palaces already completed, but also to witness the Italian ornamentalists expertly at work, here as well as at Nyék. He had implanted, first through Franciscus Italus, the *all'antica* style in Cracow, where the first phase of the Wawel's Renaissance reconstruction is also connected with the name of Franciscus Italus. On numerous carvings from the Jagiellonian period in the palace at Buda and also on the tabernacles of the parish church of the Inner City of Pest (Plates 58–62), one can find a few decorative motifs (pilaster capitals, candelabra on pilasters with hanging pearls on both sides, spiry banderole also on pilaster, etc.), very similar to ornaments on Jan Olbracht's tomb in Cracow.

Somewhat later, Prince Sigismund, then as Polish king (1506–1548), invited from Hungary not only the Italian ornamentalists but also insisted on importing the Hungarian red marble in spite of its costliness. The red marble was mainly used for decorations of the so-called Sigismund Chapel in Cracow, built beside the cathedral. The builder of the chapel was the Tuscan Bartolomeo Berrecci who apparently came to Cracow in 1516, also through Hungary.

The other large group of Italian ornamentalists from the Corvinian and the Jagiellonian periods, and some of the local masters who were becoming more familiar with the Renaissance practice, found work in the court of Ippolito d'Este, Archbishop of Esztergom. A good many marble-carvers and carpenters were working between 1487 and 1495 in the archbishop's residence at Buda and at Esztergom, on the cathedral of that latter city, on the villa in Marót as well as on other buildings. Among the Italians, the group of the *legnaiuoli* was the most numerous; several of them worked as marble-masons or archi-

itects. The "Chlementij mensatore" or "Clemente mensatore", who made the two windows for the villa in Marót, was in all probability an architect, perhaps Chimenti Camicia himself. This master received, between 1492 and 1494, such a high salary (a hundred ducats a year) that he obviously performed architectural tasks as well. His two assistants and his son also worked with him. We know the names of master *legnaiuolo* Giovanni (Zuane mensatore?) as well as of carpenters Stagio and Bolognino. "Bartholamjō da lj buzintorj" worked on the repairs of the archiepiscopal residence at Buda; "Alberto Fiorentino" built a sculpted marble holy water basin; and "Ceccone scarpellino" made presumably opening ornaments.

Thanks to Ippolito d'Este's books of accounts held in the archives of Modena, we know a number of names in addition to the Italian masters mentioned above. On the basis of these notes, partly Italian, partly Latin, it is not always possible to decide which "maistro" was local and which one was Italian. It is certain that a "maistro Michele a rason" or "Michele lapicida de Maroto" referred to Mihály Rázsonyi, who was Hungarian and did some significant work. Dénes Gyarmati master carpenter was also Hungarian: "Maistro Dionisio de Gyarmath, carpentario, marangone". The accounts cover many works in timber architecture but regrettably not a single building survived. We can rarely connect the masters' name from the constructions of Ippolito d'Este with surviving works of art. Among the red marble architectural sculptures excavated at Esztergom there is a fragment of a frieze decorated with dolphin (Plate 32), which can be linked to the works mentioned above.

The tabernacles in the parish church of the Inner City of Pest do not differ greatly in their style from the Italian works at Esztergom. One of the tabernacles was commissioned by András Nagyrévi, parish priest in Pest, vicar general of Ippolito d'Este, around 1504–1505 (Plates 58–60); the other one, decorated with the coat of arms of Pest, was made in 1507 (Plates 61–62). The surviving fragments of a relief from an altar belong to the same stylistic group. The latter was also made for the parish church of the Inner City of Pest in the years around 1510.

The tabernacle of the church at Egyházasgerge in Nógrád County (Plates 51–52) was made more or less at the same time as the tabernacles of the Pest Inner City parish church, bearing very similar stylistic

characteristics. This is perhaps the earliest surviving example of the smaller tabernacles. Through this type of carving the Italians in the first decade of the sixteenth century often demonstrated their artistic skill. Their examples were followed by local craftsmen, as we see from the tabernacles of Tereske, Sajókaza and Pomáz.

The names of several Italian marble and stone-masons as well as inlay-makers from Buda and Pest are known from the period between 1505 and 1507. In 1505 "Martinus Kewmyves Italus" lived in Buda, the "Italus de Pest" marble-mason was at work in Pest, carving a figural tombstone for Ippolito d'Este, appointed Bishop of Eger after 1495. "Niza Florentinus" also worked for him making a model of a stall (*formam stalli*); it was on the basis of this model that cabinet-maker János Kassai carved a since lost stall in 1507 for the cathedral of Eger.

Dated works from 1483 on bear witness to the fact that the Hungarian red-marble carvers became acquainted very early with the rich vocabulary of the Renaissance decorative motifs, and several of them participated in sculpting opening ornaments, too (Plates 22, 23, 26, 27, 35, 73, 76). The sculpting of tombstones also continued in the Renaissance style. Numerous tombstones are preserved from the period 1490–1497; the finest among them is the tombstone of Bernardo Monelli, Queen Beatrice's castellan, from 1496.

It was more difficult for the Hungarian stone-cutters to adopt the new style, since they were bound more firmly to the Gothic tradition in their craft. In the beginning, inevitably, compromises had to be made in adopting the new style, and consequently such variations struck root which Hungarian art history calls by a comprehensive name "transitional style". Our scholars have not yet offered a more detailed analysis of this style. An early example for the treatment of a typical Renaissance architectural motif as a wall structure without any opening ornaments, that is, constructed in the Gothic manner, is in the castle of Vajdahunyad, on the two-storeyed loggia with round-headed arcades (Plates 37–38), built shortly after 1482, where only the balustrade represents the Renaissance decoration. The Hungarian stonemasons were very fond of using this architectural detail, as we will see further on, since integrating the balustrade into the entirety of the wall structure did

not cause any problem even within the scope of the Gothic work organization (*Plates 67, 89, 104*).

As far as it can be established on the basis of fragments and scarce buildings heavily damaged and some reconstructed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the Hungarian stone-cutters had begun relatively quite early, in the 1490s, the practice of treating Renaissance door and window-frames in the correct *all'antica* manner, as compared to the other European Gothic stonemasons of the Early Renaissance period. Even these Hungarian stonemasons, however, effectuated certain alterations in accordance with the Gothic tradition; thus, for instance, they converted, on the model of the Gothic design, into triple windows the classically shaped and moulded cross-mullioned windows on the castle of Kőszeg (1490). During the excavations of the castle in Buda, such door and window-frame fragments were found from the Jagiellonian period which bore a classical profile, yet their executor had interpenetrated in the Gothic manner the edges of the *fascia* mouldings at the corners.

The Archbishop of Esztergom, Tamás Bakócz, a Humanist prelate and a resolute politician, ordered the construction of the first ecclesiastical building entirely in the Renaissance style. Bakócz belonged, since about 1480, to Matthias Corvinus's most intimate entourage; in 1491, beside Wladyslaw II, he already held the office of both Privy and Lord Chancellor. Although it was from King Matthias that he had learned how to patronize the art of architecture, he started his important Renaissance constructions only during the time of Wladyslaw, when he came into possession of great wealth and almost absolute power. In his character, as a prelate and also as a patron of art, he came much closer to the popes of the Italian cinquecento than his famous Hungarian predecessor, János Vitéz. The latter patronized the collection of books and the art of painting, but did not think, at the time, as Bakócz already did, of having a sepulchral chapel built for himself, covered entirely with red marble revetments.

The archbishop erected the famous building known today as the Bakócz Chapel, dedicated to the Annunciation of the Virgin (*Plates 53-57*). Its foundation stone was laid in 1506 beside the north aisle of the medieval cathedral in Esztergom. The chapel is a well-known work of art of both the Hungarian and the European Renaissance architecture north of the Alps, since it is the

earliest remaining example, outside Italy, of the centrally planned chapel with a dome, which actually represented one of the most important ecclesiastical themes of the Italian quattrocento.

The chapel endured the Turkish regime, but it was demolished in 1823, when ruins of the old cathedral were destroyed and the nineteenth-century Neo-Classical cathedral built. Using its stones again, the chapel was rebuilt by incorporating it into the new cathedral; in this layout the altar was placed on the west side and not on the east. Among other things, both the old sacristy and the former red marble portal of the chapel, which opened from the aisle of the cathedral, were victims of the translocation. Some fragments of the portal are kept in the crypt of the Neo-Classical cathedral and in the new sacristy.

The Bakócz Chapel is an elaborate variation of the centrally planned chapel type, a landmark in the history of architecture, which Brunelleschi worked out in 1419 in Florence and on the Old Sacristy of San Lorenzo. This type of building, founded upon the spatial harmony of the architraves, the archivolt, the pilasters and the dome, includes within its small frame every important feature of Brunelleschi's quite original architectural system.

The chapel at Esztergom is built on a Greek cross plan (*Fig. 20*). The walls of its central area are divided into three horizontal zones (*Fig. 21*). Opening ornaments articulate the lower zone: huge fluted corner pilasters support the entablature with inscription, and archivolt framing the openings of the niches are resting on smaller pilasters. The second zone is divided by round-headed archivolt connecting the pilasters below, with round windows set into the lunette. The third spatial zone, the dome, is supported by pendentives that form a kind of transition from the square plan of the lower zones to the dome. The original dome, since destroyed, had a slightly elliptical shape and was crowned by an octagonal lantern with still another, smaller, lantern on top.

The centrally planned chapels of Antonio Rossellino and Giuliano da Sangallo represent the stages in the course of development from the Brunelleschian archetype to the Bakócz Chapel. Among Rossellino's works are the chapel of the Portuguese cardinal in Florence (San Miniato al Monte, 1461-1466) and the Piccolomini Chapel (after 1470) beside the Santa Maria di Monte Oliveto in Naples. In respect of its

arrangement of the corner pilasters, the Bakócz Chapel comes closer to the latter. On the other hand, among the centrally planned chapels of Giuliano da Sangallo, it is the small Barbadori Chapel in the Santo Spirito in Florence which can be considered as the closest predecessor to the Bakócz Chapel in Esztergom. The uniform panelling of the interior with red marble in the Bakócz Chapel, beside some other tectonic features, indicates already the High Renaissance style.

According to the inscription on the frieze of the entablature, the chapel reached that height by 1507, while the completion of the building and the erection of the dome, which had been destroyed since, apparently required a longer period of time. The work was finished in 1519 with the installation of Andrea Ferrucci's altar made of Carrara marble. The names of either of the chapel's architect or its decorative sculptors had not been kept in our sources. On the grounds of stylistic analysis it can be assumed that its architect belonged to the Florentine Giuliano da Sangallo's and Salvi d'Andrea's artistic circle. It cannot be proved that Bartolomeo Berrecci, the architect of the Sigismund Chapel in Cracow (who apparently went from Hungary to Cracow in 1516), would have been the builder in charge during the finishing phases of the work on the Bakócz Chapel, when the construction of the dome was actually carried out. He may have worked in Esztergom, however, since according to Polish sources, as late as perhaps in 1526, while in Cracow, he still insisted upon obtaining the Hungarian red marble, although its import had become by that time quite expensive and complicated on account of the Turkish peril. It is therefore quite possible that he did stay in Hungary earlier and became used to employing red marble. The Bakócz Chapel was in many respects the model of the Sigismund Chapel in Cracow. Certain features similar to both structures, as well as the relationship among some of the decorative motifs, also support this assumption. The influence of Berrecci's style can be noticed on some of the carvings in Pécs (*Plate 74*). Berrecci's stay in Hungary might have been linked to the ordering of Andrea Ferrucci's altar, since the two masters knew each other very well; they served their apprenticeship in the same workshop in Florence.

Some decorative details of the Bakócz Chapel are attributed on grounds of stylistic analysis to Ioannes

Fiorentinus, who most likely sculpted the lavabo of the sacristy (*Plate 57*) and carved the console of the organ. He probably participated in the realization of the doors of the sacristy (*Plate 56*) as well. A work signed with Fiorentinus's name has survived from 1515: the baptismal font of the church of Menyő, a village in Szilágy County. For the same place he also carved a door with lunette (*Plate 85*), a tabernacle and a panel with a coat of arms. The works of Fiorentinus and his circle, such as red marble tomb slabs, found their way to Ráckeve, Felsőelefánt, Buda and Gniezno in Poland, too. His works got to this latter place through the commission of Archbishop Jan Laski who was on good terms with Tamás Bakócz.

The red marble was cut and sculpted presumably in Esztergom and then transported by land to the different parts of the country and to Poland, respectively. The practice of transporting the finished works by land evolved in Hungary quite early, since the regular transportation of sculpted works from Italy to Hungary had already begun in Corvinus's time. That is how the following works arrived to Hungary: the white marble tabernacle of Visegrád, some fragments of which survived; Verrocchio's since destroyed white marble fountain; the carved ornaments of the castle at Gyálu, also made of Carrara marble; the above-mentioned altar of Andrea Ferrucci and a marble fountain, which he transported also, according to sources, in 1516 to King Louis II.

After 1508, members of the Italian ornamentalist colony accepted commissions from several prelates and nobles besides working in the archiepiscopal court of Esztergom. On the orders of György Szathmáry, Bishop of Pécs, they made a tabernacle after 1510, which is presently in the cathedral of Pécs. The artistic quality of this tabernacle is higher than the ones in the parish church of the Inner City of Pest and it stands closer to the Lombard-Venetian decorative style (*Plates 63-65*), which also characterizes Berrecci's works in Poland between 1516 and 1536. The architectural fragments found in the bishop's villa on the Tetye (a hill in Pécs) represent the local variation of the very same style (*Plate 75*). The sculptured architectural fragments in the villa on the Tetye are also worthy of our attention for the added reason that in this period of the sixteenth century, the bishop's villa was probably the only place, beside the archiepiscopal residence in Esztergom, where

red marble was used for profane purposes, like framing door and window openings. Szathmáry became Esztergom's archbishop in 1521, after the death of Bakócz. There are some carvings representative of that period among the relics also excavated at the palace in Esztergom.

Mózes Buzlay had his fortified castle at Simontornya reconstructed around 1508. In the courtyard of the castle there stands today, partly in re-established form, Hungary's oldest surviving *all'antica* loggia (Plate 71). A group of *scarpellini*, who had been employed at the construction of the hunting lodges at Nyék, presumably worked here as well, since the exquisitely carved Ionic capitals, the fireplaces with stone corbelling, the fluted vault brackets, all support this possibility. Similarly treated vault brackets such as the above can be found at Gyalu in Transylvania as well as at Pápa on the Corvinus House (Plates 94-95).

The castles at Siklós and Ónod, the latter long destroyed, were rebuilt by both Italian and Hungarian stonemasons on the orders of Imre Perényi, Palatine of Hungary. We know the name of one of the Italians: he appears as Petrus Italicus stone-cutter in the sources. It is certain that he worked at Ónod but he may possibly have also worked at Siklós, like his two companions mentioned in the sources under the names "lapicidae Italici de Soklios" (Siklós). The oratory window at Siklós (Plates 91-93), the fireplace with a coat of arms (Plate 88) and a few fragments sculpted in *all'antica* style, among them some parts of a beautiful cornice with egg-and-dart moulding, are the works of Italians.

During the first decade of the sixteenth century some very interesting carvings were ordered by the Báthory family for the church at Nyírbátor, such as the tripartite sedile (Plates 97-98) and the tabernacle (Plate 96). The carvings of Nyírbátor are not as rich as the relics of Esztergom and Buda, they were not made of red marble but of limestone; their style indicates one of Mino da Fiesole's followers as their artist. Fragments bearing witness to the *all'antica* decorative style were also found in Veszprém and Komárom counties.

The other large group of Italian ornamentalists were the inlay-makers, masters of the Italian intarsia art, who came to work in Hungary. Among their remaining works in the country the most beautiful

is the stall in the church of Nyírbátor (Plates 78-81). This splendid relic compensates somewhat for all the lost Italian intarsia works which were made in Hungary between 1479 and 1511, and whose existence remains only in the sources. The master of the stall was presumably F. Marone who left his signature on a book carved on one of the inlaid panels of the stall. Considerably later, in the 1520s, "Nicolaus carpentarius" and "Petrus pictor et sculptor", that is, Miklós carpenter and Péter painter as well as sculptor, were commissioned by László Gerzenczei to fabricate a stall for the cathedral of Zagreb. This stall shows certain similarities in its form with the stall in Nyírbátor.

Cabinet-makers in Hungary adopted relatively early the style of the Italian inlay-makers. Both the sunken inlaid panels of the town hall door of Bártfa and the archive-cupboard in the same building were made in *all'antica* in 1509-1511 by "Johannes mensator". A Saxon cabinet-maker carved the stall of Benedek Bethlen (Plate 101) in Beszterce, employing some Italian illusionistic motifs.

From the period 1508-1512 two Renaissance buildings survived in fairly good condition where the constructions' supervision had already been entirely in the hands of local masters. One of the two buildings is the Town Hall of Bártfa, constructed between 1508 and 1510 (Plate 66). That was the first public building in Hungary where the adoption of the Renaissance style was taken into consideration (Fig. 4). In the contract, made with Master Alexius in 1507, it was stipulated that the windows of the building should be Italian windows, "*fenestras ytalices*", that is, stone cross-mullioned windows made according to the ratio of 2:3. Both Alberti and Filarete found this ratio, together with other similar ratios, suitable for designing windows. The windows of the Town Hall, however, did not quite become classical opening ornaments, in spite of their Italian ratios: their execution followed the Gothic tradition. The general character of the richly carved exterior staircase is also a mixture of the Gothic and the Renaissance styles.

Early Renaissance building with an ecclesiastical designation also survived in Transylvania: the Lázói Chapel at Gyulafehérvár. The chapel was built by local masters and it has a very individual style (Plate 82). Its model must have been, without a doubt, the Bakócz Chapel at Esztergom, but it seems that for

the treatment of its façade, architectural drawings of Lombard origin were also used. It seems almost certain that the chapel was built under the direction of a Hungarian master, since the interior of the chapel is covered with an intricate Late Gothic net vaulting and the opening ornaments are not autonomously functioning, explained by the fact that the façade had been covered with ashlar stones according to the Gothic tradition. Most of the decorative motifs were known from the Early Hungarian Renaissance period (cherub heads, candelabra, putti holding garlands of fruits, etc.). The stone-carvers, following their own ingenuity, employed these features in modified forms. The most interesting sculptural elements are the chapel's figural reliefs: their iconographical programme probably came from the Provost János Lázói, the patron of the building. Lázói was a well-known poet and a leading personality in the Humanist circle of Gyulafehérvár.

The Hungarian red-marble masons of the sixteenth century came the closest to the Italian style. One can include among their works the opening ornaments from about 1516 to 1521 made on both Szathmáry's residence in Pécs and his villa on the Tettye (Plates 73-75). Already during the first quarter of the sixteenth century, the Hungarian stonemasons participated more intensively at the above-mentioned baronial constructions in Transdanubia and in the territories east of the river Tisza. Their work is probably the portal of the Minorite church at Nyírbátor and the windows on the outer façade of the castle of Simontornya as well as some of its other sculpted ornaments. It is also probable that the Hungarian masters, known from the period 1514-1519 since they are mentioned in the documents referring to the castle at Ónod, also worked at Siklós: "Magister Blasius de Dyosgyewr", "Ambrosius lapicida de Myskolcz", "magister Franciscus lapicida de Buda", "Georgius lapicida de Miskolc". Magister Paulus lapicida de Soklios (Siklós), judging from his name, certainly worked in the castle of Siklós. The works of the Hungarian stonemasons at Siklós include the stone cross-mullioned windows, adorned with coats of arms, as well as the Renaissance balustrade of the Late Gothic castle chapel (Plate 89). Although the windows had been altered to become tripartite windows of the Gothic tradition, their execution was correctly *all'antica*.

The acceptance of the *all'antica* style among the Hungarian masters in the period lasting until 1526 is indicated rather precisely by the employment of autonomously functioning opening ornaments and the adoption of Italian decorative ornaments. Between 1515 and 1526 a considerable number of the Hungarian red-marble masons and stonemasons had already acquired the practical experience in sculpting Renaissance opening ornaments, and this shows that they had a good comprehension of the essence of the *all'antica* style in the treatment of architectural objects. By the 1520s, the architraves were built as self-sustaining members not only at Pécs and in its vicinity (Ötvöskónyi) or at Nyírbátor in the Báthory castle (Plate 104), but also in the architecture for the citizenry of towns far away from the traditionally Renaissance centres, for instance at Szeged. The stone-cutters learned this practice, however, not from training within the guild but by keeping a watchful eye on the working methods of the Italian ornamentalists who, for their part, were, of course, jealously guarding their professional secrets. At such an exceptionally early stage in Europe, where the Late Gothic style was still prevalent, the adoption of the classical treatment of the opening ornament was considered undoubtedly to be the most important characteristic feature of the realization of the Renaissance style. The new treatment, however, did not mean either the transformation of the local work organization in accordance with the Renaissance spirit or the fulfilment of the classical theoretical requirements in practice. The sporadic data concerning the carpenter and stonemason guilds in Hungary from the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth centuries make no reference to any Renaissance reform in the work organization. The unaltered survival of the Late Gothic guilds during the first half of the sixteenth century was the guarantee that coexistence of the Gothic and the Renaissance styles was to remain in Hungary, too. Correctness among Hungarian stonemasons in adopting the *all'antica* decorative motifs varies almost from craftsman to craftsman. Sometimes there is not more than a shade of a difference between their decorative style and the carving of the Italians, while at other times, distinctly provincial features appear in their ornaments (Plates 103, 104).

The year 1526 brought about a sudden stop in the

history of Renaissance architecture in Hungary, with the Hungarians' loss of a decisive battle against the Turks at Mohács. The Sultan Suleyman II marched victoriously to Buda but after a short stay (and a ravage of the town) he withdrew again to the southern frontiers of the country. The *all'antica* trend, which had dominated at the beginning, weakened as the continuity of the Tuscan ornamentalist colony at Buda became interrupted. From 1526 we know only the name of a Lombard master who worked in Buda: Nicolaus de Milano, who renovated Péter Perényi's house in Buda, and even this master was not an ornamentalist but a mason. Local masters, however, still spread the style itself within wide limits, sometimes getting help from one or two Italian stonecutters who became members of a guild. The centre of gravity in architecture, however, was shifting, quite understandably, more and more towards military constructions, a gloomy sign that an era of fightings and struggles was about to begin.

During recent years, various sculpted architectural ornaments were excavated in large quantities at Márévár, in Baranya County. An extension of the castle between 1527 and 1537 changed the style of the medieval building into Renaissance: the local masters who did the work respected the rules of ornament sculpting *all'antica* style in its almost perfect correctness. The design of their decorative motifs follows the style of the stone and marble-masons who worked at Pécs around the 1520s. Many excavated opening ornaments have already been reconstructed and they are now exhibited in the Janus Pannonius Museum of Pécs.

Around 1526 Kolozsvár, in Transylvania, became the other important new centre of Renaissance architecture. In 1534–36 Adrianus Wolphard's house was built on the main square of the town. The design of the house is traditionally Gothic (Fig. 7), but the treatment of the opening ornaments gives a perfect example of the Tuscan decorative sculpting. Their masters were the members of the stonemasons' guild of Kolozsvár. An Italian master, called "Iacobus Olaz", also belonged to the guild in 1526. A triple, cross-mullioned window, bearing the date 1534, one of the earliest among the windows on the Wolphard house, is adorned with a coat of arms enclosed in a frame of ribbons and carved in the way that was typical of the Jagiellonian period (Plate 109). The

tabernacle of Ágostakövesd was made by the workshop of Kolozsvár, which also bears witness to the earlier Tuscan tradition in tabernacle carving. A door-frame in the Wolphard house bearing the date 1541 demonstrates quite clearly that the *all'antica* tradition was doggedly surviving. We will come back later to the activities of the stonemasons' guild of Kolozsvár, which played a significant role in the evolution of the Late Renaissance architecture in Transylvania.

The German Early Renaissance style, which had evolved by that time, is represented by the sacristy portal of Saint Michael's Church at Kolozsvár (Plates 106–107), made in 1528. The carved portal, commissioned by parish priest Johannes Clyn, was brought to Kolozsvár in its finished form; it was presumably made in the workshop of sculptor Adolf Daucher in Augsburg.

During the period between 1526 and 1541, local stonemasons were not lacking in Northern Hungary either, who followed the trend of Tuscan ornament carving. In Lőcse, on the first floor of the house at 42 Fő tér (Main Square), a door architrave, bearing the date 1532, remained, its style similar to the works of Ioannes Fiorentinus, who had worked in Esztergom. In Pozsony, in the 1530s, a local stonemason, who happened to have quite a knowledge about the works of the German Renaissance, beside having been familiar with the style of the Tuscan ornamentalists as well, constructed the south portal of the cathedral (Plate 108).

Domenico da Bologna, the architect of the last independent Hungarian king, János Szapolyai (1526–1540), worked on the fortifications of Buda between 1531 and 1541. He is considered to have been the designer also of the castle at Szamosújvár (Fig. 6), where the bastion and the gate tower with Szapolyai's coat of arms had already been completed by 1540. After the death of Szapolyai, György Martinuzzi continued the constructions of the castle. The architraves and their ornaments, made in 1541–42, come very close to the works realized by the masters of Kolozsvár.

A decisive turn in the accustomed way of life in Hungary, and at the same time in the history of Renaissance architecture, took place in 1541 when the Turks captured Buda and the central part of the country. In the western, northern and eastern parts of Hungary, free from the Turkish conquest, two political conglomerates evolved which included three

geographical regions: the western part of Transdanubia (today the western part of Hungary and Burgenland in Austria), Northern Hungary (Slovakia and Carpathian Ukraine today) and Transylvania (presently part of Rumania). Transdanubia and Northern Hungary became "Royal Hungary" under the rule of the Habsburg dynasty, while Transylvania emerged as an independent principality under the auspices of the Turks. In Royal Hungary and in Transylvania the Renaissance architecture lived on. In the part of the country under Turkish rule there was some sporadic building activity in a few country towns, however nothing survived. As a consequence of the great political upheaval, both the character of Renaissance architecture and also its position in Europe had been significantly altered. Hungary was, in earlier times, a centre of Renaissance architecture with its influence spreading over even to neighbouring countries. In Royal Hungary under Habsburg rule, on the other hand, after 1541, such Renaissance architecture evolved which came to Hungary from the immediate vicinity and was adjusting itself to general trends of the style prevalent in Central Europe. In Transylvania the earlier *all'antica* traditions continued in a more functional way and became even richer with accomplishments of the sixteenth century's Italian architecture. A great number of castles, manor-houses and burgher houses in the towns survived, but their artistic standards were in most cases rather low. Military constructions, however, with an almost full participation of Italian military architects and engineers as well as manual workers, consequently reached the highest European standards for this period.

The beginning of the Late Renaissance period was heralded by the construction of the castle at Sárospatak, which territorially belonged to Northern Hungary, but kept at the same time a very close link with Transylvania. Here, around 1540, we find architecture in quite a unique and heterogeneous atmosphere. In the employment of Péter Perényi, a nobleman, local stone-carvers worked alongside the trained Italian masters. The latter had already begun to introduce Italian Mannerist elements in their Lombard style, dominant all over in Europe by that time. The Hungarian stonemasons, on the other hand, bore witness to apprenticeships in Gothic workshops not only with their stone-carver marks but also by

not respecting fully the laws of the Renaissance style in ornament carving (Plate 113).

Péter Perényi began his constructions at Sárospatak in 1534, when he announced that he was going to fortify the castle and requested from the town of Kassa stonemasons who knew something about building fortifications. It is not known if the stonemasons of Kassa ever arrived in Sárospatak and we have no specific knowledge about the activities of the twelve masons (*murator*) either, whom Palatine Peter Knyta, of Cracow, sent to work for Péter Perényi in 1540, under the leadership of Master Laurentius. The event is significant, in any case, in showing that in the new era it was no longer Hungary who provided master craftsmen for constructions in Poland but rather the other way round. The most important builder of the castle at Sárospatak was the Lombard Alessandro Vedani who served the Perényis from 1534 until his death. He wrote in 1571 that "whatever is nice and strong at Patak" he built it "in the name of God, with his own two hands and talent". The many remaining records call Vedani a mason (*murator*) in 1534; after 1555 they mention him as both mason and stone-carver (*lapicida*). He was already the chief master builder of the castle construction about that time; the Perényis raised him from serfhood and acknowledged his merits with many gifts as well.

We have no knowledge of Renaissance carvings at Sárospatak from the period around 1534. Some red marble module fragments, made around 1506, in the time of the previous owner, Antal Pálóczy, however, witness the fact that the Renaissance style had already appeared, to a lesser extent, earlier on the castle (Plate 72). Péter Perényi remodelled the medieval donjon, the so-called Vöröstorony (Red Tower), in Renaissance style between 1534 and 1540 and had a wing built onto it (Fig. 5). The latter is adorned, in secondary position, by the Lombard-style triple window (originally an open arcade; Plate 117). Fragments akin to the profile heads in medallions of the triple arcade were also found during the excavations of the castle at Kisvárda.

It was around then that the west and east windows were built of the assembly hall in the Vöröstorony, as well as the most beautiful opening ornament in Sárospatak: the framing and pediment of the donjon's gate, adorned with the Perényi coat of arms held by an angel (Plate 114). The window ornaments on the

outside of the tower's façade are of quite different types (Plate 113) where several favourite motifs survived from the Corvinian and Jagiellonian periods, such as rosettes with dolphins shown back to back. These traditional motifs remained quite popular among the decorative elements employed by the sixteenth-century local stone-carvers in other towns of Northern Hungary as well, for instance in Körmöcbánya and Lőcse.

The fireplace dated 1542 (Plate 112) is perhaps the latest among all the sculpted works executed in Péter Perényi's time, since in 1542 Ferdinand I of Habsburg had Perényi arrested and held him prisoner almost until his death (1546). Around the beginning of the 1560s his son, Gábor Perényi, continued the construction. The ground floor of the Perényi wing is adorned with a recarved round-headed Lombard two-light window (its original fragments are exhibited in the museum of Sárospatak). The inner side of this window bears the date 1563 and a distich about Gábor Perényi's buildings.

The huge outwork around the donjon is an important monument among Gábor Perényi's constructions. Its architect was probably also Alessandro Vedani. Besides him, between 1554 and 1570, local serfs were working as stonemasons (1554: stonemasons Georgius and Antonius; 1567: stonemason Stephanus). The sources refer to Blasius and Thomas Alch (*ács*)\* as *architectus arcis*, which plainly means "carpenter of the fort"; they use the word *ács* in its Late Gothic sense. Consequently, the word "architect", as the Renaissance concept of *architectus*, had not yet struck root. In our records from the sixteenth century, the appellation *architectus* means architect only if it accompanies the name of an Italian master. The work organization of the construction at Sárospatak, or on any of the nobles' estates in general, was quite informal and loose. This is supported by the fact that Alessandro Vedani could be stonemason, lapidary and master builder of fortresses at the same time, even his social position could change according to his talent, development of his faculties and his master's wish.

The stone-carvers of Kolozsvár had, on the other hand, gathered into a very strict guild system. The rules of their guild, enacted in 1525, determined not

only the relations between patrons and stone-carvers but also regulated the conditions under which they were allowed to work. The rules and regulations of the masons' guild, assented to in 1589, refer in the sixteenth century for the first time to the transformation of the local guild system in the Renaissance spirit as well as to the acceptance of the Italian architectural theory. We have good reason to assume that the individual paragraphs had already been drawn up earlier, in the 1540s and 50s. They only became enacted, however, much later, since the rules and regulations affected the rigid medieval social structure and their acceptance therefore had probably run into firm opposition.

The guild regulations of 1589, by emphasizing the basic differences between the Gothic and Renaissance work organizations, draw a sharp and clear dividing line between tasks performed by the *murarii*, masonlayers in today's sense, with no knowledge about carving, fabricating stones (*fabricatio*), and the *lapicidae*, who are the stone-dressers or stone-carvers. The guild regulations made unmistakably clear the ignorance of the *murarii* in carving stones and the monopoly of stone-cutters in sculpting *ianua capitulata* (door-frame with capital) as masterpiece made in a separate phase of the work. The most important evidence of the Renaissance reform taking place within the guild system was the official acceptance of the theory of proportions from the Italian Renaissance, which made possible to declare the work of the *murarii* as inferior to that of the stone-cutters. The position of the stone-cutter was supported by the peculiar application of Alberti's theory of *concinnitas* whereby the sculptor's profession contains motifs alluding to an intellectual status in the Liberal Arts. According to the wording in the regulations, "the capitals must be made in the right proportions and in such a way that all of their dimensions would fit in well with each other".

In the style of the master stone-carvers of Kolozsvár two tendencies can be noticed in the period between 1550 and 1590. Also several elements of the Tuscan ornamental sculpting remain from the transition period. The doorway framing of the Básta house from 1553 is an example of the particular decorative style where the candelabra-relief motif indicates Lombard influence. The portal of the Bognner house from 1560 (Plate 119) can also be placed into this category

because of its closeness to the former style. From the 1570s this style appears, endowed with tectonic features, for which a wide-ranging application of elements of the Doric order is characteristic as well as the kind of rustic treatment from Italian Mannerism. Serlio's essay on architecture probably also influenced the spreading of this style in Transylvania. Its most beautiful examples are the door and window-frames on the Wolphard (Kakas) house's façade (Fig. 7) facing the courtyard and the door of the Püspöky house, probably sculpted by János Seres *insignis sculptor* in the 1570s. Many names of masons survived in sources from Kolozsvár but they rarely can be linked to existing works and then only by assumptions. It is probable on stylistic grounds that the fireplace of the Wolphard (Kakas) house was made in 1582 by guild master Máté Berkenyessy.

The forms employed by masters of Sárospatak and Kolozsvár, bearing the stylistic character of Northern Italy and of Italian Mannerism, spread all over Transylvania. In sixteenth-century Transylvanian architecture we know about several more or less similar variations of the Lombard window on the castle at Sárospatak, bearing the date 1563. We can also mention here the recently restored windows on the façades facing the courtyard in the fortified castle at Fogaras. This form appears at more than one place, like on the castle of Marosvécs, and on certain sixteenth-century parts of the Bethlen castle at Keresd. The castle at Szentbenedek from 1593, largely destroyed since, was also built with Lombard two-light windows. Many stonemasons from Kolozsvár worked between 1577 and 1596 on the fort at Nagyvárad as well.

As we have seen, sixteenth-century Renaissance architecture in both Transylvania and the eastern part of Northern Hungary shows quite a few similarities in several respects. The continuation of the former *all'antica* traditions as well as the connection with the new, sixteenth-century North Italian and Mannerist trends are characteristic to both, though in a slightly different way. That relation might have been influenced by Italian pattern books and also from printed illustrations. The influence of Italian military architects cannot be neglected either since they had been in and out of Transylvania a good deal, from 1550 on.

Architecture during the second half of the sixteenth

century in the western parts of both Northern Hungary and Transdanubia, territories belonging to Royal Hungary, remains the closest to the development pattern prevailing in Austria, Bohemia and Southern Germany. Similarly, a great number of Italian architects, masons and stone-cutters, usually Lombard in their origin, who worked in Royal Hungary, had arrived from the above-mentioned parts of the Habsburg Empire or Germany and did not come directly from their native countries.

The type of castle, fortified with a bastion at each corner and enclosing a rectangular arcaded central courtyard, appeared in fifteenth and sixteenth-century military architecture. That kind of architecture gradually spread through Hungary during the period of 1550–1570.

In the second half of the sixteenth century, castle constructions on the estates of Tamás Nádasdy in Transdanubia were going on at more than one place at the same time. Reconstruction of the fortified medieval castle at Sárvár and building the bail with its Italian bastions started in 1552. That phase of the construction was finished by 1560. In the course of the reconstruction an additional wing was built, with pillar-arcaded portico at the ground floor level and stone-carved windows articulating its façade. The gate tower was also built in this period (Plate 120). A group of Italian stonemasons carved the decorations. In 1559, Petro Plenio, Petro Francesco and Petro Spatio worked there as well as Donato Grazioli, "sárvári kő Myes" (stonemason from Sárvár), who probably also participated in designing the bail. The names of several Hungarian and German masons are also known. The present-day pentagonal ground-plan of the fortified castle was developed during the constructions which were started by Ferenc Nádasdy in 1588, and were finished in Pál Nádasdy's time, in 1615. The decorative ceremonial hall was also added during the last phase of the construction: its ornaments were made by master plasterer Andrea Bertinelli and the battle scenes on its walls and ceiling were painted by Hans Rudolf Müller from Vienna, in 1655.

The designer's name of the fortified castle at Sárvár is not known. A letter written by Palladio, which the great Italian architect sent presumably to Tamás Nádasdy in 1560, has survived. The name of the addressee is missing and it is also uncertain as to

\* *ács* means carpenter in Hungarian.

which building's arcaded loggia he refers to in the letter. Since the gatehouse of the castle was built then and the rusticated gate does show certain characteristic features of Palladio, that is perhaps the part of the castle which can be linked to the activities of the famous Italian architect.

Some of the masons from Sárvár worked on other Nádasdy castles as well, e.g. at Léka and at Sopronkeresztúr. The latter had first been extended in the 1560s following the orders of Tamás Nádasdy but received its final form in the seventeenth century only. Two storeys of arcaded loggias decorate the courtyard: on the ground floor Tuscan columns are employed. Spacious and perspective sight results from the arrangement, brightening up and counterbalancing the sternness of the castle's outside appearance, which no doubt implies a stout readiness for defence at all times (Plates 162-164).

The castle at Egervár, built by Kristóf Nádasdy in 1595, and the castle at Sopronkeresztúr, already mentioned above, as it was reconstructed between 1621 and 1643 in the time of Pál and Ferenc Nádasdy, give the best idea of the architecture in Transdanubia around the turn of the century.

The loggia of Tuscan order, overlooking the courtyard, was not only popular in castles but in the towns as well. A seventeenth-century loggia, where the arches rest on columns, adorns the round fire watch-tower of Sopron (Plate 197). Beautiful courtyard loggias survived from the seventeenth century in houses of Sopron, Győr and Kőszeg. The decorative sgraffito works on the façades of the Renaissance houses in Kőszeg have recently been restored (Plate 191).

In Transdanubia the Nádasdy family had the greatest number of fortified Renaissance castles built, while in the western part of Northern Hungary, it was the Thurzó family. Ferenc and György Thurzó had the castle at Nagybiccse built between 1571 and 1605. Its ground-plan is an example of the type of castle with round towers at each corner, which actually originated from Italy but became very popular throughout Central Europe (Fig. 14). The square courtyard is enclosed by arcaded loggias; a round tower is attached to each outside corner of the wings, and a square tower rises over its main entrance. The round bastions as well as the sgraffito wall decoration and the sculptured ornaments linked to the repertoire

of the northern Mannerism segregate it from other structures built at the same time in Transdanubia. Mason Kilian Syröth from Milan is thought to have been the master builder of the castle: some records have remained from 1571 localizing his activities at Biccse. The names of several stone-carvers and masons who might have partaken in the making of the opening ornaments and the wall decorations of the castle are known from the period between 1567 and 1570 (1565: Stephanus, Alexander, Luca, Franciscus, Ambrosius, all stone-cutters; around 1570: Georgius, Johannes masons and Josephus Mikulin).

The castle scheme with four round corner towers, without a central courtyard, became very popular in Northern Hungary at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Such a ground-plan characterizes the Beniczky's castle at Alsómicinye where the façade with the loggia was added at a later date (Plate 189). Further examples of the type are the Máriássy family's castle at Márkusfalva (Fig. 18) from 1643 and also some other seventeenth-century castles at Vöröskő, Zayugróc, Csetnek, Zboró and Nagysáros.

The castle at Zólyomradvány was originally built around 1600 also with square towers at the angles, but these disappeared during successive constructions. The arcades enclosing the courtyard were added in the seventeenth century to the former main building (Plate 150). Similarly, secondary structures, added later, are responsible for upsetting the Renaissance character of the castle at Kistapolcsány. The spacious loggia above the ground floor in the inner courtyard, articulated with stubby columns, has fortunately survived in its original form (Plate 187).

In Northern Hungary the outside loggias and porticoes also appeared relatively very early on the towns' public buildings. In the realization of these architectural elements the Tuscan order was generally preferred, like in the construction of castles. The portico on the ground floor of the Town Hall at Lőcse was built around 1550 (Plate 123); the loggias on the upper floor were added later. The outside loggias on the upper floor of the old Town Hall in Besztercebánya were also erected relatively early, in 1564. The loggias on the façades facing the courtyard of the Town Hall in Pozsony were built in 1581 (Plate 138).

Façades of the burgher houses in the towns of Northern Hungary were frequently decorated in the

sixteenth and seventeenth centuries with sgraffito works or painted motifs. Sgraffito work with geometric designs was always used but the representational, figural wall painting, or that with floral patterns, became later more frequent. The second floor of the Thurzó-Fugger house in Besztercebánya, as well as its Italianate parapet and original diamond-shaped sgraffiti, were made in 1580. On the main square of Besztercebánya the Beniczky house stands with its refined colours and a frontal loggia (Plate 186) as well as the Ébner house, embellished with elaborate northern Mannerist ornaments (Plate 175).

On account of the Turkish peril in both Royal Hungary and Transylvania, the construction of new forts and castles as well as the reconstruction of already existing ones were very intensive indeed. Their exhaustive enumeration would exceed by far the scope of this work. One should still mention, however, the castle of Pozsony, as one of the most important military constructions, where the Habsburg monarchs commissioned many Italian architects between 1552 and 1563, for instance Giovanni Spazio and Pietro Ferrabosco. The latter designed the fortifications at Győr in 1581, commissioned by the Thurzó family, and also took part in reinforcing the castle of Árva in 1583. Eger was at the time an extremely important frontier fortress; its defences were built according to the plans of Paolo Mirandola and Ottavio Baldigara between 1573 and 1583. Master Baldigara also participated with Carlo Ridolfini and Simone Genga in reinforcing the fort at Nagyvárad. It is rather unfortunate that we cannot name its designer since sixteenth-century Hungarian military architecture reached its peak with the construction of the fortifications at Nagyvárad. This is the first fort built with corner bastions on a central pentagonal plan which does not follow any previous arrangement (Fig. 12). Baldigara designed a centrally planned pentagonal fort between 1569 and 1575 in Eger too, but his plans were never completely realized. In the same period Giulio Baldigara designed the fort at Szatmár with a pentagonal layout and the hexagonal-shaped fortifications at Érsekújvár. These forts and towns with a centralized plan are the late realizations of the Renaissance ideal town.

As a result of reconstructing historical monuments in Hungary during the last few years, some very impressive forts, built with Italian bastions, regained

their original forms in cities like Eger, Tata, Gyula and Sümeg.

Renaissance architecture with parapet or cresting as it evolved in Northern Hungary (Plates 127, 138-142, 147, 149), was regarded as a typical Hungarian phenomenon in the older Hungarian art history. The presentation of this decorative motif, however, in such a summary fashion, would very much simplify an extremely complex course of development. It is possible that this motif also appeared in the Italian designs of Corvinus's palaces before 1490 (as it did on his models in Italy, e.g. the Palazzo Venezia in Rome and the Ducal Palace in Urbino). It can be further assumed that an early Italian-Hungarian model induced the development of the parapet into the Renaissance architecture of Bohemia, Silesia and Poland which belonged to the same political sphere between 1469 and 1526 as Hungary. In Poland this element became quite popular by the beginning of the sixteenth century. On the other hand, however, it seems certain that Renaissance architecture with the more decorated parapet, which began to appear in Northern Hungary during the second half of the sixteenth century, was already connected to a different level of development which had primarily taken shape in Poland. Its characteristic feature is the horizontal cresting (not the gable type) which disguises a sunken roof.

In the construction of buildings with a parapet and in the spreading of this type throughout Poland and Hungary, the sixteenth-century Northern Italian masters played an important role. The most characteristic variation of the parapet architecture in Northern Hungary developed in the region of Szepes-Sáros around 1563-64. The parapet of Saint Giles's Church in Bártfa may have been one of the earliest examples from the region, the work of Johannes and Bernhardus of Lugano from 1564, together with the market hall of the town, built by Ludovicus and Bernhardus Pel in 1563. Both works had been destroyed since. There is surviving decorative sgraffito with a dolphin pattern and a coat of arms on the cresting of the town's ramparts. According to its inscription, the sgraffito work was made by Bernhardus Pel de Lugano in 1582.

The parapets from Northern Hungary can be divided into three groups according to their forms, although there are some very individual variations

as well. The oldest type of parapet is composed of semicircular merlons, or Italian merlons in the form of a swallow-tail, usually placed alternately with the former (Plates 128, 140, 153). In the other popular parapet form (Plates 139, 140, 160) the merlons feature a so-called *aedicula* design (small-house-shaped). In the parapet of the Polish type the composing merlons are actually volutes leaning against each other and crowned with vases. This "Polish parapet" (Plates 148-149) is the most characteristic of some of the houses on the main square in Eperjes.

The local character of the Renaissance parapet in the Szepes-Sáros region is enhanced by additional motifs, not typical of the Polish models, like the attic storey with blind arcades (Plate 148) or series of volute brackets (Plates 147-148) supporting the cresting. These characteristics can mainly be found on buildings constructed in Bohemia of the time. Ornaments made of carved stones are not much used in this kind of architecture; wall decorations are achieved with sgraffito works composed of flower and stylized animal motifs, coats of arms and architectural (less frequently figural) elements extending over the frontal wall face as well as the parapets.

The Thurzó-Faigel Castle at Betlenfalva, built between 1564 and 1568, represents the earliest surviving baronial Renaissance landmark with parapet in the Szepes region (Plate 127). The 1:2 ratio applied to the side walls in the ground-plan (Fig. 11), its symmetrical division and the *all'antica* execution of its doorway (Plate 129), show to some degree the survival of the former Corvinian tradition.

The castle at Frics has a similar ground-plan (Fig. 17), a massive block without an inner courtyard, but because of its two corner towers, it represents an enlarged version of the castle at Betlenfalva. The castle at Frics (Plates 160-161) had been built on the orders of Bálint Bertóthy between 1623 and 1630. Its ground-plan is very similar to the seventeenth-century Polish examples, like the castle at Symbork and at Frigyesvágása. The latter belonged to Poland during the Renaissance period. The castle at Nagyőr was built on a square ground-plan with four corner towers (Plates 141-142). The Thököly castle at Késmárk has an irregular plan (Plate 153). Today, since only a few traces remained of its sgraffiti wall decorations, the crestings in the parapet have become even more pronounced.

In the ecclesiastic architecture of the Szepes region one should not fail to mention the colourful bell-towers. Stubby-looking in their proportions, they form a rather homogeneous group in terms of both architectural design and decoration. An Italian master, Ulrich from Késmárk, built the bell-tower for that town, bearing the date 1586 (Plates 139-140) as well as the bell-tower in Poprád in 1592. A master with the monogram HB initialled the sgraffito ornaments at Késmárk. The towers of Master Ulrich have a characteristic parapet whose cresting is shaped as a series of small gables alternating with volute-shaped dolphins. The crestings are built in the same way on both the bell-tower at Podolin and at Nagyőr (Plate 172).

The parapet of façades facing the streets may sometimes be treated in a very individual fashion on houses in towns, where the attic storey is usually supported by a series of brackets and decorated with sgraffito works. The so-called Thurzó House in Lőcse has an especially complex parapet, Mannerist in its form (Plate 147).

The sculpted stone decorations in the burgher houses of Northern Hungary were usually placed in the courtyards and stairways. The long courtyards follow the medieval practice of lot-divisions by reaching far back beyond the houses. They are flanked with column-arcaded loggias (Plate 201). The gateways are built into columned entrance halls from where single flights of stairs are usually set off with carved columns supported by balustrades.

The parapet did not confine itself solely to Northern Hungary but during the first quarter of the seventeenth century it appeared in Transylvania as well. These motifs, however, are only secondary in importance in the golden age of architecture which reached its peak during the reign of Gábor Bethlen, Prince of Transylvania (1613-1629). Among Bethlen's constructions, especially among the more important ones, only few survived in both good condition and original form. Giacomo Resti, referred to as Jakab Veronai in Hungarian, was at work around 1620 on the princely palaces at Gyulafehérvár and at Nagyvárad. The major construction at Nagyvárad, which had started earlier, was finished in the time of Bethlen with the completion of the last bastion of the pentagonal-shaped fortifications. The inner castle was built then, also on a pentagonal plan, on the site of the former episcopal

residence and the cathedral. The fort remains for us in distorted form, reconstructed more than once during modern times. Giacomo Resti also rebuilt the fortified castle at Alvinc by giving the structure a hexagonal ground-plan. At Szamosújvár Giovanni Landi was in charge. Members of the mason and stone-cutter guild of Kolozsvár were also working on the realization of plans drawn up by the Italian architects. Mason István Diószegi and master carpenter Péter Kassai were renowned masters among members of the guild. Márton Lindtner from Eperjes also worked for Bethlen, while painters, joiners and master plasterers were commissioned from Kassa.

Among the few remaining buildings with parapets located in Transylvania, the Late Renaissance parts of the castle at Törösvár were probably built around 1624 on the orders of Gábor Bethlen. The parapet that survived here is the Italian version where the cresting consists of swallow-tailed merlons (Plate 169). The castle at Küküllővár, built between 1615 and 1624, was probably also crowned with a parapet of the same type. The partial remains of the attic storey with a blind arcade on the fortified church at Prázmár bear witness that the structure had once been crowned with a parapet (Plate 157).

The ruined castle of István Lázár, a courtier of Bethlen, was built around 1630 at Szárhegy. Quite a diversified treatment and a tectonic structure characterized its parapet (Plate 173). That crowning element with its Mannerist design probably comes the closest to buildings with parapets in the Polish Renaissance. In view of the fact that the Lázár family had Polish links, it can be assumed that a Polish master participated in the construction of the castle.

The castle of György Sükösd at Alsórákos as well as the one at Küküllővár were built in 1624, in the Bethlen era. The ground-plan of the Küküllővár castle with four corner towers and without a central courtyard recalls North Hungarian designs of the seventeenth century (Plate 165).

The fortified castle at Aranyosmeggyes was built in 1630, at the beginning of the Rákóczi epoch. It is a good example of the Transylvanian version of the prototype with four corner towers that had developed at the end of the sixteenth century in Hungary. Its frontal treatment reveals a touch of monumentality; the octagonal central tower was probably originally adorned with a parapet. Nothing bears witness to

the former cresting today except an attic storey with blind arcature under the tower cap.

Architecture's golden age of the Bethlen period continued under the reign of Prince György Rákóczi I (1630-1648). Rákóczi commissioned Italian architects as well as Hungarian master builders. It was during his time that the princely residence at Gyulafehérvár was extended and the assembly hall of Transylvania (*országgház*) was built following his orders. The fortified castle at Sárospatak gives the best example of the activities of György Rákóczi I and his wife, Zsuzsanna Lorántffy, as patrons of architecture. During recent years, extensive search for monuments and material that was found in archives made it possible to cross-check buildings with pertinent information from documents. The castle itself was part of Zsuzsanna Lorántffy's dowry when she married György Rákóczi, even before he became the Prince of Transylvania. The so-called "Perényi wing" of the castle had only a ground floor originally, with three coupled windows. In 1616-17 it was extended with an upper floor designed presumably by Márton Fundáló, stonemason of Lőcse (Leochiej keofarago Medues Márton). In order to have a commanding appearance, a new wing, the so-called "Lorántffy wing", was added during 1624-43. (Fig. 5). The building's designer was Mátyás Kőmives (Keomies, Fundáló) of Gyulafehérvár, the overseer of the Prince's new constructions in that town. He was also the builder during 1643-45 of the manor-house at Mezőörményes. At Sárospatak, István and Mihály, masters from Transylvania, and their journeymen were carving stone works under the direction of master mason Mátyás (Plates 180, 181). The "sub rosa" room was built about then. Its delightful wall decorations were painted by a German painter somewhat later, probably in 1651. Master mason Mátyás died in 1645 of the plague. However, by that time he had already drawn up the designs for the extension of the "Perényi wing" and had planned one of the nicest Renaissance parts of the castle at Sárospatak, the "Lorántffy loggia" of the inner courtyard (Plate 179). But he was unable to direct the actual construction itself. A German master from Vienna and Imre Sárdi, designer apprentice, gave the sectional plans to the masons and the stone-cutters commissioned from Segesvár, Brassó, Kolozsvár to create the carved columns of the loggia as well as its balustrade.

György Rákóczi I gave special attention to the building of strong fortifications and to reinforce castles. Giacomo Resti, already known from the Bethlen era, did some of the planning (Sárospatak; bastions of the fortified castle at Ónod), but he had Hungarian designers as well. Gábor Haller belonged to the latter group. His studies in mathematics and arithmetic during the university years in Leyden gave him the basis for his activity in architecture. He designed essentially the bastions at Fogaras, at Gyalu and the fort at Görgény. The expertise of the above-mentioned apprentice designer, Imre Sárdi, became very useful towards building the walls for the fortifications at Székelyhid, Nagyvárad, Gyalu and Munkács.

At the constructions of Bethlen and György Rákóczi I, we frequently come across the term *fundáló* which meant already in sixteenth, seventeenth-century Hungarian the design architect, in the Renaissance sense of the word. The Transylvanian Humanist Gáspár Heltai might have been the first to use this Hungarian expression in his chronicle, published in Kolozsvár in 1575. The word *fundáló* is probably the Hungarian version of the Latin *fundator*. The latter we have already noted as early as 1540, in documents from Transylvania; the architect of King János Szapolyai, Domenico da Bologna, is called as *edificiorum regaliorum fundator*, the designer of the ground-plan, the creator of the royal buildings. The extensive use of the term *fundáló* indicates that the architect's profession, the most important "key trade" of the Renaissance work organization, became implanted. One group of Hungarian designers was composed of noblemen, who had attended universities and had been all over in Europe, like Gábor Haller, or by clerks with some education in the Liberal Arts (mainly in mathematics and arithmetic), like Imre Sárdi. Their primary interests were forts and fortifications. Designers in the other group were eminent master masons who could draw and had an excellent knowledge in their trade. They were elevated to the rank of architect by their employer on the basis of their practical experience and ability. György Kőműves Fundáló, Márton Fundáló of Lőcse and perhaps the most important, Mátyás Kőműves, were such masters in the service of György Rákóczi I.

A remarkable work of art in wood-carving and in decorative sculpting from that period is the pulpit of the Calvinist church in Farkas utca in Kolozsvár,

commissioned by György Rákóczi I. It is the collective work of the Saxon Elias Nicolai and Benedek Kőfaragó (Plate 177).

Treatment of the Bethlen castle's "spacious veranda" or frontal portico at Keresd recalls the "Lorántffy loggia" in the castle of Sárospatak (Plate 199).

Prince György Rákóczi II (1648–1660) had the castle with four corner towers built at Radnót, which the Venetian architect Agostino Serena designed around 1651. The important new feature of the building is the façade on the south side with a two-storeyed loggia based on Italian models. This is its first example in Transylvania.

In 1660 Turkish armies swarmed over Transylvania. That event put an end to the blooming Late Renaissance architecture and it meant at the same time the destruction of the most beautiful and the most important buildings. The last large-scale work of that period is the castle at Betlenszentmiklós, built under extremely unfavourable circumstances (Fig. 19). Its completion rested upon the stubborn persistence of Miklós Bethlen, who was the patron as well as architect. In his memoirs, with staggering force and genuine self-revelation, he tells the "history of his pride in building". He was a cultured, widely travelled nobleman who had also studied the basic disciplines of architecture in Utrecht and Leyden. As a designer, he put together a plan from reminiscences of buildings which he had seen while travelling in France and Italy and also from architectural elements of the Late Renaissance in Transylvania. The realization itself, for want of executors, became extremely difficult. He had only one trained mason, "the good old German Tóbiás" who came to Transylvania during the time of Bethlen, before 1626. Construction of the castle at Betlenszentmiklós started in 1668, and was finished only in 1683.

The ground-plan of the castle at Betlenszentmiklós represents the traditional square type with corner towers, without an inner courtyard. The door and window-frames are adorned with tendril ornaments, where certain motifs of the so-called Late Transylvanian "flowery Renaissance" already appear. The two-storeyed south loggias bring to mind Venetian features (Plate 195). It is significant that the castles lost their fortress character in Transylvania only after the Turkish peril had eased, during the last quarter of the seventeenth century. It represents the new

phase in stylistic development when the fundamental condition of Renaissance theory, separation of ornament and structure, and the sculpting of autonomously functioning opening ornaments became extensively accepted and widely used even by the master craftsmen of villages. In selecting decorative motifs to adorn the rationally simplified architectural elements, the stone and wood-carvers drew upon not only the ornamental vocabulary of antiquity or the "grand style", but began to look into the treasure-house of floral vernacular motifs. The characteristic flower-shaped ornaments appear as early as the Rákóczis' time on windows decorated with foliated scrolls of the castle at Aranyosmeggyes. Among the most beautiful relics of the style are carved wooden balustrades and columns in the stairhall of the Kornis castle at Szentbenedek, the works of Albert Molnár from 1673. The pulpit of the Calvinist church at Fogaras (Plates 192-193) and the one in the church at Magyarvalkó (Plate 204) illustrate the rich variety of motifs. The nicest Renaissance decorative flower-works do not date from before the eighteenth century; outstanding compositions among them are the window-frames on the goldsmith Gábor Újhelyi's house in Kolozsvár. Dávid Sipos made them in 1724.

Painter-carpenters make up the other group of masters in the Hungarian vernacular Renaissance art, who decorated the puritan, rational structure of the village churches with coffered ceilings, choirs, pulpits and stalls. The true homeland of ceiling painting was Transylvania, mostly Kalotaszeg and the Székely land (in Eastern Transylvania), but it was not unknown in Royal Hungary, either. The painter-carpenters turned the coffers of the ceiling into a colourful dreamland as if by magic; in their decorative motifs popular forms of the Renaissance united with symbols of the Old Testament, with creatures from the flora and the fauna of folk fantasies as well as with geometric ornaments (Plates 204-206, 208-209). The names of these painter-carpenters are frequently recorded on the inscriptions. Humanist self-consciousness, Renaissance and Calvinist at the same time, irradiates from the inscriptions written in savoury Hungarian, rich in locutions, where the patrons, the leaders of communities, who had commissioned the artists, transmitted their names down to us.

Village houses with porches had also developed under the influence of the Renaissance. Masters of

monuments from the secular timber architecture were the millwrights who were also well versed in technical works.

The development of the Hungarian Renaissance architecture did not submit to a fixed pattern. The character of its style and its position in Europe changed fundamentally after 1541 under the Turkish occupation. At the beginning of the Renaissance epoch in Hungary, around 1479, its character was exceptional in respect to the other European countries. The Renaissance building style took root first in Hungary among all countries north of the Alps and its links to the *all'antica* technique of execution to the Early Tuscan Renaissance was the closest here. This situation developed thanks to the colony of artists composed mainly of Tuscan architects and decorative sculptors. The Italian colony stayed in Hungary until 1520, with newcomers continually succeeding the ones who had left the country. In Hungary, members of the colony found the local red marble to be an excellent material for carving Tuscan-style ornaments; they also found here local marble-carvers who could be taught and employed in implanting the new style. In addition to close political and economic links to Italy, an intensive Humanist movement also paved the way for the early appearance of the Hungarian Renaissance architecture, which enabled the first buildings, Matthias Corvinus's palaces and villas, to be built in conformity with the Humanist notion that his residences had to be appropriate to the social status and policy of a monarch. In the realization of the first and biggest building of the style in Hungary, the royal palace at Buda, Tuscan examples were followed. In the selection of the architectural motifs those Renaissance palaces of Rome and Urbino were looked upon as examples which L. B. Alberti and his followers had developed between 1450 and 1476 with the idea of designing residences appropriate to the Popes and Italian princes. The palaces at Buda (1479-1490) and at Visegrád (1479-1484) as well as the villas at Nyék (before 1490-1502) served as examples for the Hungarian Humanist nobles and dignitaries of the Church and later, from the beginning of the sixteenth century, for the burghers as well. Corvinus's constructions also influenced the development of Early Renaissance architecture in Bohemia and Poland. The Bakócz Chapel at Esztergom (1506-1519) proved to be the first centralized Renaissance

chapel north of the Alps, influencing similar architecture especially in Poland. The Tuscan ornamentalist colony began to dissolve commencing with the 1520s, their sphere of action filled by Hungarian stone-carvers. A good number of the stone-carvers, who at the beginning worked side by side with the Italians, gradually acquired the practice of Tuscan ornament-dressing, without comprehending, however, its theoretical substance or adopting its peculiar work organization. They were primarily striving for an *all'antica* character in the carving of opening ornaments, and it is thanks to them that the Renaissance architectural style became current before 1540 in the whole of Hungary.

The architecture of the period from 1541 to about 1660, which can be summed up as the epoch of the Late Renaissance, had changed and its unique position in Europe ceased as a result of the Turkish occupation as well as the separation of parts of the country. Architecture in Royal Hungary adjusted itself to the typical Central and Eastern European Renaissance style (as it appears in Austria, Poland and Bohemia). It was through these countries that from now on the propagators of the new Northern Italian and Mannerist trends arrived in Hungary: architects and stonemasons of Lombard origin. The continuity

of the Early Renaissance period is the most noticeable in Transylvania. The autochthonous development, however, is only relative, since communication, on the one hand, never ceased among the separate parts of the divided country, and design and ornament of the buildings, on the other hand, were influenced by common guidelines of Renaissance treatises and pattern books on architecture as well as by the presence of the many Italian military architects working in Transylvania. Architectural achievements of the Late Renaissance rarely showed the same artistic quality as Early Renaissance works. Military architecture, however, reached the highest European standards in the sixteenth century as a necessary outcome of the ever present danger of war which accompanied that epoch all along.

The last phase of the Hungarian Renaissance is characterized by a second blooming and a long survival of the Renaissance style in an abundance of floral motifs and vernacular patterns. Artistic execution in the grand style as well as fabrication of its ornaments were taken over, especially in the Transylvanian Protestant church architecture, by village masons, "millwrights", painter-carpenters who enriched even the simplest rational structure with elements from the treasure-house of decorative vernacular motifs.