Defining the Rožmberk Residence of Kratochvíle

The Problem of its Architectural Character*

Ondřej Jakubec

The “chateau” of Kratochvíle was built at the end of the 16th century as an occasional residence for the Rožmberk family, whose members were among the most important Czech aristocrats. It represents a unique work of architecture within the network of residences in the South-Bohemian territory that belonged to the last members of this family. The isolated and rationally designed building with a deer park attached to it, features sophisticated fresco and stucco decoration depicting themes inspired by Ovid and Livy. Kratochvíle’s architectural design is unique and raises questions concerning its meaning and function. The conception follows from the Italian villas of the Renaissance and Classical periods, although it reveals other influences (Austrian, French etc.) as well. This exceptional artistic form corresponded with the prestigious role Kratochvíle played in the social and political life of the Rožmberk family, who often used the hunting reserve as a background to meetings with their political partners. The refined concept of the villa suggests the influence of Jacopo Strada, who presented Vilém of Rožmberk, the chateau’s owner, with the Latin edition of Serlio’s Sevenths Book of Architecture. In the wider Central-European context, Kratochvíle – together with Neugebäude and Hellbrun – is an exceptional work, preceding by a hundred years the architectural type of occasional residences such as Lustgebäude or maison de plaisance.
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In the present day, the late-Renaissance residence of the House of Rožmberks near Netolice in South Bohemia falls within the general category of a “state chateau.” However, this modern-day label tells little about the character of the building. Which term, then, should we use to define the building? Moreover, how can the definition tell us something of the purpose and character of the building? Our inquiry looks in two directions. We study the terms used by the residence’s inhabitants and with the help of those terms reconstruct what the building represented for them. We also attempt to place the building within the typological classification of early modern architecture. This attempt, however, causes a number of interesting difficulties, and the existing literature cannot quite define Kratochvíle. Authors tend to use several different terms, even within one text. It is not a result of inconsistent thinking but perhaps of uncertainty about the character of the residence. Jarmila Krčálová, one of the most important authors who wrote about Kratochvíle defines it as a “summerhouse,” which is the most common definition of this building. At the same time, Krčálová characterizes Kratochvíle as an “equivalent of the Italian villa,” and somewhere else, she simply writes “villa.” Similar parallel uses of different definitions occur in texts by other authors as well. Erich Hubala calls Kratochvíle a “hunting villa” but in the same publication, he also uses the terms “Lustschloss” or “Schloss”. For the central, residential part of Kratochvíle, Hubala uses simultaneously (in one paragraph) the terms “Villenbau” and “casino”. Ivan Muchka applies similarly varied terminology and adds also the traditional “chateau.” In his more recent text, Muchka is aware of the problems with the terminology and – quoting available literature – alternates between several definitions: “casino”, “summerhouse” and “Lusthaus” and, with reservation, “villa”, which he describes as a different economic-administrative model. Muchka points to the necessity of deriving the definition of the building from its function, that is, from the purpose it served its inhabitants. The residence was primarily designed for warmer months.
and for the hunting season but was comfortable enough to be inhabited the whole year round. A number of archival records show that the Rožmberks kept Kratochvíle fully supplied and heated. Petr Vok’s sojourn at Kratochvíle during the plague epidemic between June 1598 and May 1599 also confirms the long-term use of the residence. These and other pieces of information can help us understand the way the Rožmberks perceived and used the residence. First, we will characterize Kratochvíle itself, whose remarkable architecture connects artificial and natural elements with sophisticated fresco and stucco decoration into a remarkable, autonomous whole, isolated within the remote South Bohemian landscape.

The Architecture of Rožmberk Kratochvíle

A different residence – a manor-house called Leptáč near Netolice – originally stood in the place of today’s Kratochvíle. Jakub Krčín of Jelčany, the Rožmberk regent, had it built after he purchased the plot from Vilém of Rožmberk in 1569. The manor house or citadel was built between 1577 and 1579 and featured an interesting decoration – “he had his Leptáč painted with peculiar skill and ingeniousness”. In the beginning of 1580, Vilém acquired the citadel back from Krčín in exchange for the town of Sedlčany. The value of this exchange suggests the exceptional nature of the place. The Rožmberk ruler did not hide his reasons for this acquisition; it was meant to provide a “divertissement” for him, which soon reflected itself directly in the new name of the residence. Vilém immediately built a “rabbit reserve” as well as a large deer park. By 1581, he and his third wife, Anna Marie of Rožmberk and Baden, were already staying in the “new building”. At the same time, construction work on Krčín’s old citadel continued, lead by Baldassare Maggi from Arogno, Ticino. However, the residence still lacked capacity and splendor and at the turn of 1582, Vilém decided to construct a new building near the old one. In this period, the Rožmberk ruler started to gather building material and hire artisans. Presumably, he already had an architectural plan at his disposal. It is probable that in 1582, he showed the plan to his brother Petr Vok, told him about his intention to “erect a glorious building” and asked for his advice. The expression “glorious” (“slavný” in Czech) in the sense of “exceptional”, “famous,” or “celebrated” implies that from the very beginning, Vilém of Rožmberk perceived his residence as something extraordinary, which would draw the desirable attention.

The construction began following the plan of “bau­meister Balcar” (Baldassare Maggi) in May 1583, when Mertl, a carpenter from Krumlov, carried out the complicated job of
laying foundations on oak and alder wood pilots in the muddy terrain. The initial construction of the “new Rožmberk manor” or “new building by the deer park” happened quickly.\(^{13}\) In 1589, Vilém of Rožmberk founded a church or a chapel – the *little church in the deer park of Kratochvíle* – in the south-west corner of the property, and consecrated it in July 1589. By that time, the construction must have been finished because in 1589 and the following years the painters decorated the facades and interiors, as is documented in a design for the completed building by painter Georg Widmann.\(^{16}\) The death of Vilém’s wife Anna Marie of Baden may explain the slow pace or perhaps a pause in the construction work. Vilém’s new marriage with Polyxena of Pernštejn in 1587 probably stimulated the completion and decoration of the residence. In November 1590, small adaptations were on-going: carpenters were finishing the roofs of “these new buildings” (probably the pavilions in the wall around the premises).\(^{17}\) In the same year, Vavřinec, the clock-maker from New Town of Prague, installed the tower clock.\(^{18}\) Between 1590 and 1591, the Rožmberks expended great sums (3,500 three-scores of groschen) for “building of the new chateau of Kratochvíle”, and further investments continued until 1595. It is likely that even during Petr Vok’s ownership of the residence some work was still taking place at Kratochvíle.\(^{19}\) The Rožmberk era at Kratochvíle ended in 1602, when the emperor Rudolph II purchased the whole property, together with the manors of Krumlov and Netolice.

The Rožmberk Kratochvíle enjoyed the great attention of its contemporaries. The Rožmberk chronicler Václav Březan highly valued both its construction and ornamentation.\(^{20}\) However, he is critical of the construction costs and his note from 1586 mentions “water dolls” – hydraulic mechanisms (automatons) in the garden, which he describes as “peculiar water machines and effigies, through which water would run…they were costly and there was nothing lasting about them. This way, foreigners swindled the owners out of a lot of money.”\(^{21}\) Even though Kratochvíle provided accommodation mainly in the summer and during hunting season, we have evidence that the Rožmberks and their guests used the mansion year-round.\(^{22}\) High state administrators of the Kingdom of Bohemia counted among the most frequent guests, but foreign aristocrats often stayed here too; for example, the Archduke Ferdinand of Tyrol and his wife Anne Catherine Gonzaga with their retinue visited Kratochvíle in July 1588. One year later, pope’s nun-
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2 – Ground-plan of the whole premises of the Kratochvíle villa
cio Antonio Puteo came to consecrate the chapel. The glory of Kratochvíle resonates in records from as late as the 17th century. At the beginning of the 17th century, Pavel Stránský praises its architecture and writes about its “charming summer house with large orchards” tastefully complemented by the “exquisite artful garden.” In his Miscellanea Historica Regni Bohemiae, Bohuslav Balbín compares Kratochvíle to the gardens of Rudolph II. He writes admiringly of “the majestic hunting chateau of Kratochvíle [...] where they built a delightful quadrangular chateau [...] with a beautiful courtyard and exquisitely decorated menagerie. He [Vilém of Rožmberk] boasted that he would add a garden to it with which he would surpass the emperor Rudolph II himself.” Rudolph II was aware of Kratochvíle’s exceptional character; soon after his acquisition of the mansion, he commissioned the Krumlov painter Bartoloměj Beránek-Jelínek to create vedutae of the building from all four sides. The documentation comprised ground plans of all floors of both Leptáč and Kratochvíle and perspective depictions of the chapel interiors and the interiors of several other rooms. The need for such detailed documentation shows the complicated character of the building and its decoration. This complexity manifests itself also in our problems with defining the mannerist residence of the last Rožmberks. Bartoloměj Beránek’s vedutae have not survived but they were likely similar to paintings by Giusto (Justus) Utense, who created views of Medici villas in Tuscany. Utense’s views, like the ones from Kratochvíle, show distinctly the “mannerist composition” of these villas and the elusiveness of their architecture. Only the bird’s eye view allows one to observe the complicated building complexes of the villas, while from inside, new spaces one after another open up to the visitor, who can acquire only a limited idea of the overall character of the buildings and their gardens. It is possible that the surviving painting of Kratochvíle and Netolice by Henry de Veerle from 1686 follows from Beránek’s vedutae. De Verle’s painting offers a bird’s eye perspective that reveals the remarkable and generous plan of the villa. The present state is not identical with the original ground plan, surroundings and roads, but, in its basic features, the villa is almost intact. The premises of Kratochvíle with the original fenced-in deer park in its vicinity is oriented approximately along the North-South axis. An uninterrupted wall, strengthened with a double wall in front of the entrance wing, encircles the central part of the premises. The one-storey entrance wing with a carriageway tower has been transformed into a residential unit. On either side of the entrance wing are the church and a small house (pavilion) with hipped roof. Similar pavilions, incorporated into the wall are placed symmetrically in opposite corners, as
well as in the connecting sections of the wall. Even though their present state does not correspond with the original plan, it is important to ascertain the purpose of these buildings, mentioned in the 1602 inventory as “bastions”. They likely served as residences the whole year round because they have chimneys and the historical records mention furniture (tables, chairs, beds). Březan’s term “attached rooms with beds” perhaps refers to these dwellings, which researchers sometimes regard as accommodation for the Rožmberk guards (“the trabant dwellings”). It is certain though that in 1592, Daniel Švarc of Semanín, a member of the Unity of Czech Brethren stayed in one of these dwellings during his service as court preacher. The elaborate decoration with its frescoes (which in one pavilion depicts an elephant) and inscriptions confirms the residential function of these buildings. One of the fragments of these inscriptions reads “In silentio et spes erit fortitudo vestra”, alluding to the personal motto of Petr Vok of Rožmberk. Incorporating the residential pavilions into the surrounding wall is quite an unusual solution. Later, frescoes were added to the wall, when a series of painted figures replaced the original sgraffito cuboids. These later frescoes probably represented mythological and historical warriors and other
allegorical figures, such as Fame or, interestingly, Poverty. The symbolic figure of the Rožmberk equestrian dominated the centre of the back façade of the wall.\textsuperscript{32}

The wall encloses the whole premises and the central residential building itself stands isolated in the middle of the moat on an island accessible only across the bridge. The rectangular, two-storey central “palace” of Kratochvíle intersects the axis of the premises. The ground floor and first floor layouts are almost identical. The rectangle of the building is divided into three parts with identically-sized halls on the edge parts. The front halls on the ground floor are in the same position as the halls on the first floor. Behind the front halls are staircases and smaller utility rooms. Researchers compare this layout to projects by Francesco di Giorgio Martini or to the ground plan of Villa Farnesina in Rome by Baldassare Peruzzi. Still, this similarity, based on analogies in ground plan is unimportant, or rather, misleading, because the typology of the Italian residences is completely different from that of Kratochvíle.\textsuperscript{33} However, the concept of a two-storey building divided into three parts is interesting as it is characteristic of the gradually establishing type of the Renaissance Italian villas.\textsuperscript{34} This concept is reminiscent of Palladio’s villas, which elaborate on the tradition of compact three-part buildings. In Kratochvíle, the villa forms a solid block with no accentuation of the side wings, a feature which appears in the entrance block of Sansovino’s Villa Garzoni in Pontescale (around 1540). The Rožmberk residence lacks one distinctive element of all these Italian villas: the loggia, probably a result of different climactic conditions. However, painters who decorated the façade of Kratochvíle creatively evoked the loggia by using the motif of tromp l’œil pillars that encircle the whole first floor of the building.

The entrance into the main building leads across the bridge directly into the great hall where there is a fireplace; this is similar to the situation in Palladio’s villas where the central hall follows immediately after the entrance portico. This arrangement shows the refinement of Kratochvíle’s architecture, designed to meet high demands of the Rožmberk court on a relatively small space. In general, the interiors are rendered with unusual generosity, not only in fresco and stucco decoration but also in the

\textsuperscript{32} Georg Widman from Brunswick, Fresco decoration depicting hunting scenes and themes from Ovid, around 1590.

Kratochvíle villa – Main-Floor Entrance hall
construction of the rooms themselves. The wide span of
the barrel and trough vaults of semi-elliptical section cre-
ates an impression of airiness. The interior of Kratoch-
ville contains four large public halls: the entrance hall fur-
nished with fireplace and adjoining “trabant” hall on the
ground floor, and the central space with fireplace adjoin-
ing the so-called “golden hall on the first floor.” This con-
figuration thus forms “two palaces,” meeting the demands
of either small or large company of guests (similar arrange-
ment exists in the chateaux of Bučovice and Kostelec nad
Černými Lesy). Apart from these large public halls, the
residence provides three comfortable apartments. In Petr
Vok’s lifetime, the rooms on the right side of the ground
floor served as a separate flat for his nephew Jan Zrinský of
Seryn. On the first floor, there are two apartments on each
side of the staircase: one smaller two-bedroom apartment
that belonged to Vilém, and the second, larger one belong-
ing to Vilém’s wife Polyxena, with a small room (probably
for a maid) attached to it. The apartments adjoin to both
large festive halls, but provide sufficient private space to
the owners. At the same time, this arrangement reflects
the social practice of functionally dividing male and female
worlds in aristocratic residences.

The hierarchical organization of space embodies
the very essence of Kratochvíle. The multi-layered con-
finement of the central building within several fences, turning
it into an isolated island, is exceptional in both Czech and
international contexts. The structure follows the princi-
ple – characteristic of all aristocratic residences – of gra-
dation according to accessibility or relative inaccessibility
of individual spaces. In Kratochvíle, the visitor enters the
core of the residence through several barriers: the en-
trance tower, the bridge leading to the main hall, the
adjoining “trabant” hall – the Warststuben, which, like in
other aristocratic residences, served as a place for the rul-
erg’s personal guard and for visitors to leave their weapons.
The apartments follow a similar spatial sequence. There
are no specialized ante-rooms to precede them but both
the “trabant hall” on the ground floor and the large room
with the fireplace on the first floor could serve as an anti-
chambre the kind of which had started to appear in many
of the important rulers’ and aristocratic residences of that
period. The same hierarchical differentiation is apparent
in the church, accessible for “laymen” from the outside;
the Rožmberk ruler, however, used to enter independently
from one of the wall pavilions straight to the oratory at-
tached to the choir. These limitations not only provided
the necessary privacy, but also carried a symbolic meaning
in the court ceremonies, where the presence of the ruling
authority was only gradually revealed. The spatial arrange-
ment of the residence reflects the structure of the owner’s
social milieu.

In an exceptional way, the new building of the
Rožmberk Kratochvíle connects social structure – the pub-
lic festive halls on the one side and the private spaces on
the other – with rational architectural form. In relation to
on another, the rooms are in proportion; we can again re-
collect Palladio’s idea of beauty inherent in the proportional
relationship between the parts and between the parts and
the whole. Palladio’s villas consistently work with the room
dimensions derived from one proportion. In Kratochvíle,
the same logic is apparent in the ratios between the widths
and lengths of the main rooms. The sequencing of windows
symmetrically spaced out along the facades is similarly well
calculated; it is apparent from the inside as well, despite
the varied interior layout of the building. This shows the
exceptionally consistent and coherent plan of this seem-
ingly simple building fully linking the exterior with the in-
terior. The only exception is the different rendition of the
windows of the staircase on the back façade. The painted
trompe l’œil rustication highlights the outside of the stair-
case, suggesting a cylindrical bastion. This characteristic
un-Italian motif interestingly emphasizes the inner stair-
case to allude to the trans-alpine habit of placing the winding staircases outside the buildings (Wendelstein).

The whole site including the garden is exceedingly coherent and in a small space, it offers an interesting combination of Italian and perhaps French inspiration.\(^\text{42}\) Despite the looseness of the term mannerism – especially in the Czech milieu\(^\text{43}\) – it is possible to define Kratochvíle as mannerist architecture following in an interesting way from Italian villas of the 16th century. Starting with Raphael’s Villa Madama in Rome, the architecture of many of these villas is characteristically elusive. Without the view from above, it is difficult to get a general idea of the whole premises; the visitor reveals the logic of the site only gradually. The building of Kratochvíle is in a peculiar way both enclosed and open. The openings in the surrounding wall offer views of the landscape but this landscape is “unattainable” from the confined microcosm of the villa.\(^\text{44}\) The real landscape is available only bounded by the openings or in the form of deer park (barchetto) next to the premises of the villa. The painted architecture on the façades of the main building refers to Raphaelesque Mannerism. Its atectonic stereonomy resembles the Roman palace by Branconio dell’Aquile from the beginning of the 16th century. The architecture of the palace uses the same “willful” elements, especially the characteristic motif of the colonnade on the first floor, where one of the half-columns stands on top of the niche on the ground floor, thus illogically overloading the concave space of the niche.

**Typology and the Definition of the Rožmberk Residence**

Having introduced the architecture of Kratochvíle, we now start exploring the way the Rožmberks themselves perceived and referred to their residence. It is interesting how heterogeneous and sometimes seemingly contradictory the contemporary terminology was. One of the most commonly used names was the neutral term “building” (“bau”), usually with an attribute “new.” In 1581, Vilém arrived “in the Netolice deer park, in the new building.”\(^\text{45}\) Another attribute was “glorious:” “the ruler decided to erect a glorious building.”\(^\text{46}\) Its contemporaries often described the building with the words “a very expensive and beautiful building.”\(^\text{47}\) In the Rožmberk milieu, the name Kratochvíle first

8 – View of the back façade of the central villa and its fictitious painted bastion (“staircase tower”)
appeared in 1581: “in that year, the building was named Kratochvíle”. The name – for example in the phrase “knightly pastime” (“ritterlicher khurtzweil”) – refers to a popular collective entertainment of the 16th century aristocrats. The Rožmberks used to connect the word Kratochvíle primarily with hunting, which is reflected in the rich hunting iconography of the interior decoration. In April 1561, both last Rožmberks organized a festivity for Ferdinand of Tyrol and a large retinue of aristocrats near Veselí nad Lužnicí. This festivity was described in the records as a demanding “hunt and pastime”. One can sense that “pastime” is different from hunting; it is not a synonym but a more general term. The old Czech “kratochvíliti” (to pass time) means to entertain oneself. Similarly, the expression “to play dice or backgammon for entertainment (kratochwyl)” demonstrates that “kratochvíle” can, but does not have to, denote a particular activity. It simply refers to the time of entertainment and relaxation. The name Kratochvíle therefore does not designate the South Bohemian Rožmberk residence as a place for hunting in a sense of a leisure-time activity but rather as a refuge providing background for “noble relaxation,” which corresponds with the classical tradition of aristocratic country residences. When Vílem of Rožmberk called his project “a glorious, celebrated building”, he meant that the building would make him famous but it also implied that it would serve as a place for courtly celebrations. We can therefore understand both the decoration of the villa and the garden with its fountains in the context of the ceremonies and celebrations of the Rožmberk court. It bears mentioning that the “hunting entertainments” of the early modern era included – apart from the actual physical activities – many ritualized acts that expressed aristocratic majesty and authority. Hunting as a noble activity became the subject of several theoretical treatises, for example Il cacciatore signorile (1548) by Domenico Boccamazzo, Pope Leo X’s court hunter, who describes the ideal of the noble hunter – “principe cacciatore”; or The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting (1575) by George Gascoigne. Correspondingly,
the “hunting chateaux” were not simply low-key, utilitarian buildings for occasional hunting sessions but impressive and luxurious residences, such as the French royal chateau of Chambord.⁵⁴

Next to the words “building” and “Kratochvíle”, the period documents use other, surprisingly variable expressions. The phrase “chateau of Kratochvíle” was quite common and in the 17th century, the chroniclers still talk about the “old chateau” when they want to distinguish Krčín’s old citadel from the later Rožmberk building. In the inscription to his series of vedute, the painter Bartoloměj Beránek refers to Kratochvíle as a chateau.⁵⁵ Sometimes, however, the residence was called a “castle”: Václav Březan uses an expression “Netolice deer park with the castle.” This may remind us that Krčín’s citadel in Křepenice near Příbram, which in its disposition resembles Kratochvíle, was also called a “new castle”.⁵⁶ To complete the list of expressions, we need to add “citadel,” used in another of Březan’s reports: “that year the building was named Kratochvíle and founded as a citadel”.⁵⁷ This diverse terminology could have resulted from the subjective approach of the authors, even though most of these expressions come from the Rožmberk chronicler Václav Březan, who witnessed to the construction of Kratochvíle. A certain vagueness to many of the terms complicates matters: the Latin word “arx” denoted both castle and chateau and for a long time, these words functioned as synonyms.⁵⁸ Yet, we know that the choice of one or the other equivalent was often intentional and logical, and that the definition of an architectural type evolved from particular local terminological tradition.⁵⁹ In the case of the Rožmberk residence, it seems there was no tradition to follow and its contemporaries were not able to find a definite word to describe its typology. The hesitance of present-day historians thus reflects similar problems in the past.

These problems result from the fact that not only the premises as a whole but also the main residential building itself is hard to describe with a definite term. The complicated architecture of aristocratic residences belonged to the Mannerist topoi: Castiglione calls the Urbino residence “a city in the form of a palace” and Palladio defines the architectural type of a villa as follows: “because the city is nothing else but a large house, and conversely, a house is a small city”.⁶⁰
Claudio Sorina, the Mantuan legate at the court of the Emperor Matthias captured this feature of Kratochvile in the following description: “a prominent place for relaxation, which the master of Rožmberk had built...From the windows of the palace one can see a large park enclosed within a wall, with more than 500 stags and roe deer”.

His expression “palazzo nel parco” is not surprising as it reflects the way contemporaries referred to the enclosed inner residential building. The Medici often called their villas “pallazzetto suburbano”, and the residential buildings in the centre of the villa premises were referred to as “palazzi”.

Following the late Renaissance tradition, Joseph Furttenbach calls a similar building in his ideal Lustgarten a “palazotto”. In 16th-century England, the term “palace” was a synonym for an Italian villa. In addition, Bedřich of Donín in his travel book from 1594 describes the North Italian villas along the Brenta River as “palace”. He creates a typological hierarchy within which the summer houses – “lusthäuser” – formed only a part of the villa-palace compounds. In the Czech milieu, the term palace appeared in an even narrower sense: it referred to the central, most prominent and often the largest spaces within a residence. In Vyškov chateau, the historical records include the phrase “higher palace” referring to the first floor of the main building. The inventory of the chateau in Kostelec nad Černými Lesy refers to the largest hall on the second floor as the “palác”. Similarly, the Bučovice chateau inventories from the beginning of the 17th century call the largest halls on the first floor and the second floor “lower and upper palace”. In Kratochvile, the large hall with a fireplace on the first floor was also called a “palác”. Like in Kostelec, it probably served as banquet hall and was adjoined to the neighboring dining space, the so-called golden hall; after dinner, the guests would proceed to the “palace” for dance and conversation. In the Czech milieu, the tradition of accentuating and delimiting the central residential space within the wider complex of an aristocratic residence dates back to the 15th century, when the central palace used to be called “chateau.” Josef Macek quotes the 16th-century source which talks about “the castle of Prague with that chateau”.

The same term was used to describe the central building in Kratochvile; in 1605, the emperor’s clerks reported that “there is a moat around the chateau.” The present-day art historians sometimes feel the need to use diverse terminology to describe the main residential building at Kratochvile and come up, in a rather unsystematic way, with terms such as “casino”, “Villenbau” or “small chateau”.

The terms “palace” and “citadel,” the former of which is probably suitable for the central building of the Rožmberk Kratochvile, bring us close to the terminology of Sebastiano Serlio. Art historical literature relates his term “palazzo in fortezza” (palace in the style of a fortress) to a similar expression “building within a citadel”, which Jan Sembera of Boskovic used to describe his chateau in Bučovice. This sounds quite similar to the way the Rožmberks describe their construction plan in Kratochvile in 1581: “to build the house as a citadel”. Here too, like in Bučovice, the entire inner residential complex is isolated within the wall and the moat, which restricts access to this insular area, like in the case of several Italian villas. The terms “castle” and “chateau” mentioned above thus refer to this self-contained character of the Rožmberk residence. The personality of Serlio may have a special meaning because in 1575, Jacopo Strada, the Hapsburg antiquarian, art counselor and architect dedicated his Latin translation of Serlio’s I sette libri dell’architettura (Seven Books on Architecture) to Vilém of Rožmberk. The treatise deals mainly with problems of countryside architecture and contains an introduction, the end part of which introduces the projects of “palaces to be built in the countryside for great princes and noblemen”. It is interesting that Serlio’s original text does not include the passage about palaces; Strada himself wrote this addition. Serlio’s architectural examples themselves do not directly relate to Kratochvile, where only the structure of the apartments may show traces of inspiration from Serlio’s treatises. The role of Strada is probably more important in the architecture of the Neugebäude suburban villa near Vienna, built in the 1560s by Maxmillian II and later by Rudolf II; Strada could have influenced the owners to draw inspiration from the complicated architectural complex of Palazzo Te in Mantua. The layout of the large compound with its elongated palace building and enclosed inner garden quite resembles Kratochvile. In both Neugebäude and Kratochvile, the position of the central “palaces” on the longitudinal axis of the premises is shifted towards the entrance to the premises. In addition, the interior decoration bears similar iconographic elements (classical Roman history scenes, hunting scenes, and portraits of “illustrious men”).

The decorative artistic program of the Rožmberk residence had two main layers: hunting and natural motifs and scenes from Ovid’s Metamorphoses referred to “poetry”, and stucco illustrating Livy’s History of Rome on the first floor represented “history”. As a whole, both iconographic programs were meant to express the owner’s social status and they also accentuated an idea of ancestral continuity connected with the fictitious Roman origin of the Rožmberks. However, the decoration had a moralizing dimension as well. Numerous personifications of virtues constitute Vilém’s image as the virtuous knight abounding with Christian and Classical-Roman virtues. Both Kratochvile and Neugebäude raise questions about the type or function of their architecture. As for Neugebäude, researchers usually define it as a suburban aristocratic resort (villa suburbana), summerhouse, or a place for art collections, but the residence occasionally served as a hunting lodge and as a symbol of its owner’s power. The latter function corresponded with the intentional choice to
build the residence in the place where in 1529, Sultan Süleyman I camped during his unsuccessful siege of Vienna.\textsuperscript{83} Neugebäude introduced the main ethos of the Italian villa in Central Europe: it represented the comfortable dwelling that creates a social environment and at the same time is isolated from the bustle of the city. In his treatise \textit{Le ville del Doni} (1566), Anton Francesco Doni describes this feature: “these villas are furnished in such a manner that there is no difference between them and the city palaces”.\textsuperscript{84} It is possible that Jacopo Strada had introduced this idea to the owners of Kratochvíle; he might even have been an author of the entire ideological conception of the residence, as he was also an architect. In 1568, he designed a remarkable Antiquarium for the library and sculptural collections in the Wittelsbach residence in Munich.\textsuperscript{85} In our context, Strada’s connection with the chateau of Bučovice is interesting; he stayed there for several months in 1583–84.\textsuperscript{86} Wherever he was, Strada acted as artistic counselor and author of ideological conceptions: he proposed an idea for a project, consulted with building contractors, or designed particular plans. He created a program of artistic decoration and designed hydraulic water fountains for gardens (we have records of existence of such water works in Kratochvíle).\textsuperscript{87} Even though Strada’s participation in the Rožmberk building project is highly hypothetical, it is clear that the architecture of Kratochvíle is in many respects close to the design of Neugebäude. Compared to the latter residences, Kratochvíle represents a “minimal” version of the luxurious aristocratic dwelling, which is in its essence inspired by Italian villas. Kratochvíle is remarkably original, as it does not cite any of its prototypes, creating a distinctive variation.\textsuperscript{88}

However, let us come back to the question of Kratochvíle’s architectural type. What building task did it represent for Vílém of Rožmberk? Despite all the information, the true sense and typology of the building is elusive. Art historians usually compare Kratochvíle to the luxurious residences in Landshut, Munich, the residential complexes of the Schleißheim chateaux near Munich, Hellbrun near Salzburg, or the above-mentioned Neugebäude.\textsuperscript{89} This comparison rates Kratochvíle among the most important aristocratic dwellings of the period, even though these dwellings are somewhat different. They are urban or suburban palaces and villas, while the Rožmberk residence is essentially rural and isolated. Researchers most often refer to Kratochvíle as a “summerhouse” pointing to its limited and seasonal function. From the perspective of architectural typology, this term does not fit completely. Kratochvíle is architecturally and functionally autonomous, unlike the typical summerhouses, which always form a part of a larger architectural ensemble. The term summerhouse
opaceous garden building was, in transalpine regions, synonymous with the "ancillary character" of these buildings. They often stood in a garden or a park, as supplements to the overall residential structure. One of the encyclopedias defines the term casino as a “small house in the grounds of a larger house”. That is why the word “casino” is not suitable for Kratochvíle. For example, the Vatican casino of Pius V and the Farnese casino in Caprarole are both garden pavilions subordinate to the residential complex as a whole. Similarly, the “hunting casinos” of the Italian renaissance villas were not designed as autonomous dwellings. Sometimes even larger buildings can have such a supplementary function, for example the “chateau” Gottesau in Karlsruhe, in the residence of Markgrave Ernst Friedrich. This “Lustbaw” is a large three-storey building (it was adapted from a former monastery) and yet, it served merely as a recreation space near the main residence. The summerhouse near the chateau in Saarbrücken built in 1577 for Philip of Hesen had a similarly dependent function. There are other buildings that fall under the same category: the Lusthaus of Count Wilhelm IV of Hesen near Kassel, the exquisite summerhouse of the Württembergs near Stuttgart from the end of the 16th century or the “belvedere” in the residence of the humanists in the 16th century. The term “summerhouse” was generally used for various garden houses and pavilions, such as the so-called Roundel in the garden of the Lednice chateau. Similar summerhouses exist near the residences in Opočno or Česká Lípa, both in Bohemia. In the 16th century, the term “summerhouse” was generally used for various garden houses and pavilions, such as the so-called Roundel in the garden of the Lednice chateau (sometimes also referred to as “Lusthaus”). At the beginning of the 17th century “Lusthaus” was a common expression for small wooden garden houses of the type that Petr Vok had built in the garden of the Třeboň chateau. In the 1750s, the same word was used to denote the small garden buildings in the grounds of the Lednice chateau. In our context, it is interesting that in 1563, during his journey to the Netherlands, Petr Vok visited the French royal residence in Château de Bussy-Rabutin and in his description of it, he distinguished the “chateau” itself from the adjoining “beautiful summerhouse with a nice garden”. That is why we should probably rid Kratochvíle of the label “summerhouse” and designate it as a type of autonomous villa, which had, in the trans-Alpine context, its analogy in the so-called “Lustgebäude”, a residence without any direct complementary connection to another building. The autonomous character of Kratochvíle is apparent from the fact that its owners used it year-round, including in the winter months. The inventories list winter equipment and both the central villa and the wall pavilions had fireplaces. However, this does not solve the terminological uncertainty. The term “Sommerhaus” as a smaller, “dependent” garden building was, in transalpine regions, synonymous with “villa”. For example, the Duke Maurice of Hessen, who designed a number of such buildings himself, used both terms as synonyms. Moreover, the above-mentioned P. Stránský regarded Kratochvíle as a “summerhouse”. All such debates must necessarily hit upon the limited terminological consistence of the 16th century sources. Freedom in use of “architectural terms” was typical for this period; the humanists especially used the term villa in a relatively wide sense. It did not refer to a specific architectural type but reflected the intention of the owners and other persons involved, who in various manners morphologically adapted the “idea of the villa”. Neither late-renaissance observers nor today’s art historians agree upon the exact typological character of Kratochvíle. Does it make sense, then, to try finding such an exact term? The true meaning of the building certainly lies somewhere else. Yet, we believe it is necessary to call attention to problems caused by using diverse and sometimes contradictory terms, such as “casino” and “summerhouse”. The latter term is particularly loose. In certain respect, it is analogical to the German “Lusthaus” meaning a subordinate building. In this sense, some encyclopedias call buildings “dependent” on a larger residence a “Festsaal” or a “pleasure palace”, which are more general but express well enough
the non-autonomous character and function of these buildings. Things become complicated when we perceive the term "summerhouse" as synonymous to the German "Lustschloss", or when we freely alternate between these terms. The meanings behind architectural nomenclature in both 16th-century and present contexts may shift quite distinctly. The existing literature about Kratochvíle shows that writers sometimes tend to interchange these terms or their meaning in a confusing manner.

The Task behind Kratochvíle's Architecture

If the terminological considerations do not lead to definite conclusions, we should define the meaning of Kratochvíle on a functional or semantic basis. If we define Kratochvíle as a villa or a variation of the Italian villa, what type of villa is it? It cannot be a "copy" of a certain villa because of the difference in geographical and cultural contexts. Moreover, even in Italy the aristocratic villas starkly differed from one another: the Tuscan villas represented a different type than the Roman villas surrounded by "urban parks", and both had little in common with the type of villa rustica in Veneto. That is why some researchers avoid using, even formally, the term "villa" for transalpine regions and prefer other terms such as "villa-type dwelling" or "second house". The Italian villa, unlike the trans-alpine "Lustgebäude" did not create space for ceremonial court life (although this does not apply in all cases). The transalpine regions created a "different way" of building an aristocratic villa, but in principle, followed from Italian examples, which drew inspiration from the classical topoi of the ideal simple rural life as celebrated by Ovid or Horace. In the 16th century, the poet Annibale Caro praised the idea of "dignified relaxation". His works reflected the older tradition of suburban villas, represented especially by the Medici residences, where humanists such as the poet Angelo Poliziano or the neo-Platonist Marsilio Ficino reanimated the classical ideal of bucolic life lived in isolation from worldly duties. The villas did not simply mean a place of rest. They also contained the essential desire to express one's social status; the architecture transferred the comfort of the urban palace into the country, while also demonstrating the power of its owner. The villa embodied the owner's territorial dominance. The same feature is apparent in Kratochvíle, whose social-status potential manifests itself in the luxurious ideological decoration celebrating the virtues of the Rožmberk ruler and his clan, and in the space it provided for social activities and political meetings. Palladio's concept of the villa aptly sums up the functions of the renaissance rural residence. It connects practical functions with those pertaining to social status and at the same time maintains the ethos of the classical ideal. The aristocrats greatly benefit from "the country houses where they will spend the rest of their time supervising and perfecting their property [...] where by exercise [...] they preserve their health and their strength, and where their spirits, tired of the agitation of the city, can finally take great refreshment and consolation. They can attend quietly to the study of letters, and contemplation, as for that purpose the wise men of old times used often to follow the practice of retiring to similar places, where they were visited by good-hearted friends, and their kin, having houses, gardens, fountains and similar places for entertaining, and especially their virtue, they could easily live a life as blissful as one can attain down here".

In Central Europe, similar "places of relaxation" started appearing quite early, in the second half of the 15th century. In this period, Sigismund of Hapsburg built several "hunting villas", which were fittingly called "places of pleasure" - "luoghi di diletto". Their other names, such as Sigmundsrut, Sigmundsfreud or Sigmundslust, expressed, like Kratochvíle, their character of a country refuge and a place of rest. However, there are not many of these autonomous recreational dwellings. The early villa of Annaburg in Lochau built by the Saxonian Elector Friedrich the Wise is one such predecessor of Kratochvíle; it was built at the beginning of the 16th century approximately twenty kilometers from Torgau, the Elector’s main seat. This Lusthaus functioned as a hunting lodge, but it also had a sumptuous artificial garden, reflecting the new way aristocrats were spending their time in the country. Much later, in 1620, Santino Solari designed an Italian-style villa near Salzburg called Hellbrunn for the Archbishop Markus Sittikus of Hohenems. Much before that, as early as at the end of the 15th century, the Salzburg church dignitaries started building small mansions with gardens.

23 – Breda, water chateau after the renovation during the reign of Henry III of Nassau-Breda, in 1530s. Thomas Ernst van Goor, Beschryving der stad en lande van Breda, 1744.
referred to as “lusthaws”. Some time later, Duke Wilhelm V of Wittelbach built a small chateau in Schleißheim in Bavaria (from 1628 on, rebuilt by Maximilian I), where he spent a large part of the year, isolated from the hectic residential city. In the 16th century, Polish aristocrats and the king built similar country residences (e. g. Woła Justowska and Łobzowie near Krakow, the Myszkowski villa in Księt Wielki from the Florentine architect Santi Gucci, or the residence of Plock bishops in Brok) as did the rich burghers. The Hapsburg estates near Vienna – especially those from the times of Maximilian II – seem to be architecturally closest to the building of Kratochvíle. After 1569, the mansion called Katterburg was erected on the grounds of today’s Schönbrunn and served as a hunting villa with a deer park. The so called “grüné lusthaus” (on the grounds of today’s Prater) drew inspiration from the “maison verte” in Brussels, owned and rebuilt by Maximilian’s uncle Charles V. Above all, Maximilian II’s Neugebäude, is similar to Kratochvíle in ground plan and decoration.

From the formal point of view, these comparisons are quite loose. The above-mentioned “villa” of the Saxonian Elector Friedrich the Wise does not resemble the Italian villas and similarly, the architecture of Kratochvíle differs considerably from both its Italian and transalpine analogies. The moat around the main building makes Kratochvíle exceptional because neither the Italian villas nor the Central-European Lustschlösser ever assumed this form. Hypothetically, this motif could have been drawn inspiration from water castles common in French and Dutch milieus. Before the start of his building project, Vilém of Rožmberk consulted with his brother Petr Vok, who had experiences with the Dutch milieu during his “Dutch journey” at the turn of 1663. In the Netherlands, he could have seen a number of smaller or larger residences, for example the chateau in Breda, owned by Vok’s Dutch host, the Prince William of Orange. The rectangular mass of the chateau is surrounded with a moat and, like Kratochvíle, accessible across the bridge. Petr Vok brought a collection of graphic prints from his travels, which could have inspired this type of dwelling, too. Vok’s graphic prints probably resembled those produced by Jacque Androute du Cerceau, whose Livre d’architecture (1582) contains designs with a ground plan similar to Kratochvíle (e.g. plate XIX or IX). These designs could have later inspired Kratochvíle’s architecture.

Aside from the art-historical approach, based on research of the architecture, we can also focus on the functional meaning of Kratochvíle, examining it from the “sociological” or semantic point of view. What was the role of the residence for people who built it and inhabited it? Kratochvíle was not a manor house in the sense of an administrative centre of feudal territory and it was not a “dependent summerhouse” either. Neither does it represent a type of occasionally-used hunting chateau (sometimes referred to as barco), such as the less luxurious mansion called New Castle in Nesovice that belonged to the Prusínovský family, or the Žerotín building in Tatenice, which were both closer to the Renaissance citadel. It is possible to see Kratochvíle as a variation of the Italian suburban villa, but this approach does not take into account the specific conditions of the transalpine milieu, where the nobility ruled over larger areas and owned several country residences. This situation was starkly different from the one in Rome, Tuscany or Veneto. Unlike the Italian villa suburbana, its transalpine equivalent – Lustschloss or Landschloss – was not dependent on the city, but complemented the rich residential structure of the manor. Another key feature of the transalpine country residences was the fact that – unlike the Italian villa rustica, common especially in Veneto – they lacked the economical status of a farm. On the contrary, the presence of the court and court culture was characteristic for these residences. Because of the year-round use and the high standard of living, as well as the busy social life, we can regard
these residences as “alternative dwellings” – Nebenresidenzen. Friedrich Carl von Moser used this term for German mansions in his Teutsches Hof-Recht (1755). These “satellite residences” within the particular manors formed an important part of the residential net and provided the aristocrat with the space for relaxation. At the same time, they were as luxurious and socially dynamic as the main residences. The largeness of these dwellings and their distance from the main seat was always directly proportional to the power and stability of the owner and they often played an important role in the ceremonies of official visits. There are many examples of the villas, summerhouses or hunting chateaux that have come down to us from the early modern era. For example, Dobrá Mysl near Lomnice or the villa in Červený Dvůr, designed by B. Maggi. The name of the former [Good Spirit, transl. n.] evokes the names of Italian Renaissance villas. These dwelling were to a certain degree “specialized”, like the “hunting” mansion of Kratochvíle, but next to “relaxation”, they served other purposes, especially in evoking social status. In this sense, we can compare Kratochvíle to the English Renaissance architectural type of “hunting lodge”, which although functioning as a private refuge, gradually extended its functional scope, accentuating the owner’s social status. It is therefore not surprising that these buildings often became the central family residences.

Around 1600, there were other similar buildings in England, following from the older tradition of the hunting villa and often called “secret house”, “garden lodge” or significantly, “villa lodge”, which implied the Italian inspiration (e.g. the Queen’s House in Greenwich or Francis Bacon’s Verulam House in Gorhambury).

During his visit to Kratochvíle in 1614, Claudio Sorina referred to the mansion (by then already owned by Rudolf II) as “gran luogo di ricreazione”, that is a “splendid place of relaxation.” If we gave up looking for the “exact term” for Kratochvíle, we could use the more general concept “recreational architecture” – architettura recreationis, coined by the Ulm architect Joseph Furttenbach in his book of the same title (Architectura...
This term corresponds with both the idea of Italian villeggiatura – the broader area of the villa farmstead – and its antique predecessor, the classical villa. Like in the case of Italian examples, the Rožmberk land around Netolice formed a compact property, and Kratochvíle was both the actual and symbolical centre of local executive power. At the same time, it represented the Italian-Renaissance cultural and social ideal of rural life, which the Rožmberks lived on their own or with their guests. It is not a coincidence that later, similar buildings were called maison de plaisance. Characteristically, Erich Huhalá regards Kratochvíle as the prototype of the chateau of Marly by J. Hardouin-Mansart. Even though the building task of Lustschloss or maison de plaisance gained importance from 17th century on, there are exceptional examples from the 16th century. Kratochvíle, next to Neugebäude and Hellbrun, represents this type of a building, regardless of whether we call it Lusthaus, Lustschloss, Lustgebäude or Landeshaus (maison de campagne), terms which were, from the 17th century on, practically synonymous. The essential fact is that Kratochvíle represents a residence firmly anchored in court culture and ceremonial activities connected with social status and at the same time, despite the ceremonial courtly order, it embodied a freer, recreational spirit. The theoreticians of the 17th and 18th centuries emphasized that this kind of residence provided relief to its owner, who could temporarily throw off the burden of the strict courtly ritual. That is why one of the main features of these dwellings is their separation from central residences. The Lustschloss type of dwellings was not involved in the economics of manor administration and their function was mainly “recreational”, but the quality and ideational richness of the decoration equaled the central residences, as there was a great emphasis on festiveness and the demonstration of power. The social happenings in these dwellings were essential and in spite of the casual natural or garden environment, these happenings reflected the majestic character of the residence, ruled directly or symbolically by princeps absolutus.

Despite all above-mentioned formal-typological analogies, the essence of Kratochvíle still eludes us. In the “sociological” and semantic interpretation of the villa, the best method is to study how the users and visitors defined the building. Vilem of Rožmberk, on the one hand, strove to build a “glorious building” as a manifestation of his majesty, but, on the other hand, defined its function in the sense of the knightly “kratochvíle – divertissement.” Behind this function is the idea of “noble relaxation,” expressed at the beginning of the 17th century by the Mantuan legate Sorina. Kratochvíle is a Lustschloss rather than an Italian villa; it has a different genesis, context and form. However, in the Rožmberk dominion, it functioned in the manner similar to that of the Italian villa: its sophisticated building task connected the idea of a private aristocratic refuge with the public function of a status symbol. The refined decoration is essentially intended for public viewing. It portrays to maximum effect Vilem of Rožmberk as an ideal, virtuous ruler. In this sense, Kratochvíle fits into the context of other Rožmberk residences whose late-renaissance additions and decoration show diverse forms of symbolic communication and self-presentation. However, Kratochvíle had an exceptional function within this residential net. The meaning of Kratochvíle therefore lies somewhere between the Italian ideal and the transalpine reality of an alternative country mansion that assumes the symbolic and social functions of the central residences. However, if we wanted to apply the “Italian villa theory” to an analysis of Kratochvíle, we could again use the writings of A. F. Donni. In his Le ville del Doni, he distinguished several types of country dwellings according to their social principle. The first rank belonged to the villa of an important aristocrat: villa – casa di signore, which is a description that corresponds well with the residence of Kratochvíle.

Facit

The Rožmberk Kratochvíle will probably always be referred to as a “summerhouse” or “chateau” or “hunting chateau”. This is not objectionable provided these terms are used with the understanding of Kratochvíle as an autonomous, even though occasional Lustschloss type of residence that connects – in Italian style – an ideal of a recreational refuge with status-symbolic functions. If it were necessary after all to choose the most fitting term for Kratochvíle, I would simply choose one of the expressions used by its owners and inhabitants. In Václav Březan’s chronicle, Vilem of Rožmberk chooses words such as “glorious building” or “building and house”. “House” refers to the patriarchal context of the building that comprises both its residential function and the idea of family continuity. The glorification of the Rožmberks distinctly manifests itself in the iconographic program of Kratochvíle: the Livian histories and Ovidian poeses celebrate the virtues and the reign of the Rožmberk ruler. Like his Italian contemporaries, Vilem intended his “villa” to be mainly a luxurious mansion that would represent the high social status of its owner. Kratochvíle reflects the position of the Rožmberk ruler as the highest-ranking aristocrat and consciously (and confidently) compares itself with similar buildings of other eminent European aristocrats and rulers. (This is still apparent in the 17th-century remark of Bohuslav Balbín about competition between the Rožmberk villa and Rudolph II’s building projects). At the same time, the complex architectural form and the decorative program of this “Netolice Arcadia” reflect the utopian and imaginative spirit of the Italian villas. In Kratochvíle, the Italian architectural form meets the idea of la vita in villa, which draws inspiration from the classical writings of Cato, Columella or Cicero who praise the re-creative power of nature isolated from the urban (or officially residential) environment. In this sense Kratochvíle, as an occasional and to a certain
degree “impractical” building, while at the same time luxurious and symbolic corresponds with the “ideology” of Italian villas.\textsuperscript{12} In the Czech milieu, the Rožmberk Kratochvíle is unique. Even within the larger context of Central Europe it belongs – together with Neugebäude and Hellbrunn – among the exceptional buildings that precede the building task of Central-European temporary country residences referred to as Lustgebäude or maison de plaisance that become common almost a hundred years later.\textsuperscript{13} The unique and singular work of Kratochvíle’s creators – Vílém of Rožmberk, Baldassare Maggi, Antonio Melano, Georg Widman, and perhaps Jacopo Strada – enriched the humanistic aspects of villa architecture, and offered a unique manifestation of its owner’s power and social status.\textsuperscript{14}

Translated by Hana Logan
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Redakční poznámka

Stavební úloha rožmberské Kratochvíle a její architektonický charakter

Ondřej Jakubec

Pozdně renesanční rožmberské sídlo Kratochvíle u jihočeských Netolic je bezesporu výjimečnou památkou pozdně renesanční architektury a rezidenční kultury. Neupoutá přitom jen dochovanou a jedinečnou malířskou a sochařskou (štukovou) výzdobu interiérů i exteriérů (čerpající z ovidiovských a liviovských předloh), ale také svým architektonickým typem, potažmo architektonickou úlohou. Text se tedy zamýšlí nad tím, jaký měl tento zámek či letohrádek, jak je Kratochvíle nejčastěji označována, význam jak pro svého stavebníka, Viléma z Rožmberka (1532–1592), tak nad tím, jak vlastně definovat tuto architekturu v rámci raně novověkého rezidenčního stavitelství. Pro interpretaci této stavby je klíčové, že se nejednalo o stavbu sídla s nějakou administrativně-správní funkcí v rámci daného panství, stejně jako její příležitostný lovecký charakter bezmála zdánlivý, kdy sídlo nabízelo nejen komfortní zázemí a vybavení pro celoroční pobyt rožmberských vladařů. Svým konceptem architektury, ale především způsobu využívání, bezmála v duši italské villeggiatury, vychází z ideje italské renesanční, respektive antické vily, nezapře však další inspiраční vlivy (rakouské, francouzské ad.). Můžeme tedy o Kratochvíli mluvit jako o autonomní vile, případně jako o stavební úloze středoevropských příležitostných sídel typu Lustgäbäude či maison de plaisance. Tyto pojmy sice užíváme až pro pokročilejší 17. století, přesto i ve střední Evropě 16. a počátku 17. století vznikala sídla, která tento typ bezešmírnosti předjímají – zejména Hellbrunn u Salzburgu a předměstská vila Neugäbäude u Vídně. Především poslední sídlo, snad realizované dle ideového návrhu mantovského Jacopa Strady (1507–1588) od šedesátých let Maxmiliánem II. (1527–1576) a později Rudolfem II. (1552–1612), nabízí zajímavou analogii. Nejen pro svou dispoziční a kompoziční architektonické hmot, ale i pro analogické tematické vrstvy výzdoby a vůbec formu využívání. Vztah možného „inventora“ ke stavebníkovi Kratochvíle, Vilémovi z Rožmberka nemusí být přitom nijak odtahový, kdy uvážíme, že právě tento habsburský antikvář a architekt věnoval roku 1575 svou latinskou edici Serliovy Sedmí knih o architektuře právě Vilémovi. Na Kratochvíli můžeme bez jakékoliv úporné snahy po jednoznačné slovní definici nahlížet především jako na „slavné stavení“, jak ji výstižně definoval rožmberský kronikář Václav Březan, který ve formě příležitostné rezidence typu Lustschloss propojuje v italizujícím stylu ideál útočiště pro odpočinek aristokrata v českých zemích.