The future of the baroque, ca. 1945: Panofsky, Stechow (and Middeldorf)

Andrew Leach
School of Environment, Griffith University

Abstract

This paper takes a brief correspondence in 1946 between Erwin Panofsky and William S. Heckscher as a starting point for considering the status of the baroque in the historiography of art and architecture at the very beginning of the post-war era. In his critical edition of Panofsky's most widely read contribution to this theme, Irving Lavin cites a letter in which Panofsky dispatches a copy of his then-unpublished lecture What is Baroque? (dating from ca. 1934), recommending as he does so two other attempts to reconsider the term. This literature attends, in Panofsky's eyes, to the expanded scope and renewed importance the baroque sustained in the interwar period at the hands of historians of painting and sculpture, literature and music. For a modern (and modernist) term that owes a great debt to the thinking done by Wölfflin and his contemporaries in the 1880s and 1890s, what had become of the baroque through its broader application to the arts? The reflections by Panofsky and Stechow—and the discourse they index offers a cross-section of thinking around this problem. This paper does not claim an undue influence of this body of work upon the post-war decades, but it does help historicise the possibilities that scholars saw in a term disarticulated from its formerly negative connotations, bound to cultural decay and the Counter Reformation project, and now operating within an expanded concept of the arts. It also raises as a question of timeliness the importance Stechow and his colleagues saw in regularising the meanings that had accrued to the term, and the importance Panofsky saw in the idea of the baroque in particular at that moment.

Introduction

In a letter dated June 22, 1946, Erwin Panofsky wrote to his former student and fellow art historian William S. Heckscher. A fellow alumnus of the Kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliothek Warburg, Heckscher was then teaching German language and English

Brisbane, Australia, 7-10 July 2011

literature courses at the University of Manitoba as the tail end of a wartime interlude between academic appointments in the history of art. Panofsky's letter reads thus:

Concerning Baroque as a style, I can only refer your friend to a forthcoming article by [Wolfgang] Stechow (Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio) but I do not know whether he already has proof prints and would be willing to give them avant la lettre. Another impending article by [Ulrich] Middeldorf (Chicago University) is concerned with the vicissitudes of the term and will certainly be of interest but has not appeared either so far as I know. In the meantime, I am sending along an unpretentious lecture of my own fabrication which you may pass on to Mr. Daniells if *you are sure that he will return it*. I may want to use it again if occasion offers. It is not very good and full of typographical and other errors but he may get some ideas, if only by way of opposition.¹

The three reflections on the baroque style to which Panofsky drew Heckscher's attention included his own lecture, 'What is Baroque?'. This was first prepared in the mid-1930s, revised over the course of several decades and first published posthumously in 1994 in an essay collection edited by Irving Lavin. Stechow's essay, 'Definitions of the Baroque in the Visual Arts', was published in 1946 in the *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 'A Special Issue on Baroque Style in the Various Arts'.² The paper of Middeldorf's to which Panofsky refers is introduced here only to set it aside. (Panofsky writes of it in his letter to Heckscher, but there is no evidence of it among Middeldorf's published works or among his papers, which are, like Panofsky's letter itself, held at the Getty Research Institute.³)

These reflections to which Panofsky points Heckscher and his correspondent Daniells, including his own, each attend to the 'vicissitudes of the term', as Panofsky put it, and to the expanded scope the idea of the baroque enjoyed after a period of inter-war reassessment within and beyond its traditional domain, namely the history of art. Over this time historians of painting and sculpture, literature and music made their own claims upon the term, in some cases accommodating it where it had not previously appeared in the critical lexicon, and in others recalibrating the meaning most popularly ascribed to it by Heinrich Wölfflin and his generation to understand the post-Renaissance developments of the classical tradition or by his predecessors to understand the stylistic consequences of the Counter-Reformation. In the light of an attempt to consider the critico-historical value of 'baroque' variously as an historical or platonic category for the history of letters, the visual arts, or music, the legacy of this 1930s expansion was a

decidedly more neutral image of the baroque than that which had entered the twentieth century—a term Panofsky already considered neutral in relation to the use made of it by writers of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.⁴ It was also a term increasingly open to projective manipulation by artists, critics and historians.

The reflections presented from the end of the Second World War—of which the brief essays considered here together comprise merely two examples—tend to synthesise those discursive shifts occurring in many different fields, including the history of art. As a consequence, the term baroque undergoes, from this time, one of the periodic recalibrations to which it has been subject over the course of its life. In this instance it owes something to the migration of terms and ideas from one discipline to another, to the migration of scholars from Germany and its neighbours to the United Kingdom and North America, and to the need to account for baroque in relation to the discourse on mannerism, which reshaped the field during the interwar decades. The essays briefly discussed here furthermore document a new standard against which we can now measure the uptake of a critico-historical and platonic baroque by the historical discourse on architecture among the visual arts in the 1940s and 1950s. This is simply one of those fields well prepared to accept the baroque and its conceptual baggage in order to compel it into service towards projective ends. Where the parameters sketched out for the baroque in the essays of Panofsky and Stechow might now seem obvious and granted, even dated to our eyes, they were once making sense of a field that, much more than now, was rife with ambiguities and contradictions as a result of inconsistencies within and between historical disciplines.

Stechow's 'Definitions of the Baroque in the Visual Arts'

Stechow first presented his contribution to the 'baroque' issue of the *Journal of Aesthetics* and *Art Criticism* to the annual conference of the Modern Language Association in 1945—an interdisciplinary humanities audience before whom he could claim art history's seniority on matters baroque and apologise for its abuses. He writes, 'We were the first to use the term, but we were also the first to make a mess of it.' Stechow's ambition is relatively modest: to account for how art historians use and have used the term 'baroque' in order to understand what is at stake in the way it appears in the vocabulary of other fields. He sidesteps the seemingly formulaic obligation to attend to the term's origins, noting merely that the stylistic meaning of baroque absorbs and, to an extent, neutralises a term that was originally derisive both in the contemporaneous reception of the buildings, paintings and sculptures to which it refers, and in the first phases of modern art

Brisbane, Australia, 7-10 July 2011

historiography. He instead addresses three distinct meanings that had accrued to the term since the end of the nineteenth century.

The first of these is as an expressive style, 'diametrically opposed to that classical composure and restraint which were considered indispensible by those using the baroque as synonymous with bad taste.' This sense of the word spans from outward displays of 'exuberance, dynamic stress, emotional grandeur' through to 'a predilection for unrestrained emphasis on outward emotion or even inward expression provided they are apt to sacrifice composure and formal equilibrium to those "baroque" qualities.'

The second significance is chronological. The baroque spans the period from between 1580 and 1600 to between 1725 and 1750. Stechow recalls the series of moves by which the term expanded from its application by Jacob Burckhardt to the architecture of this period through to the broader concept of a 'baroque music, baroque literature, baroque philosophy, baroque science'. He observes that Wölfflin, in *Renaissance und Barock* (1888), had followed Burckhardt's lead in restricting baroque as a term solely for architecture, reflecting the formal unity in Italian architecture that was not shared by painting and sculpture. He did, though, articulate between a Renaissance and a baroque manner of seeing the world and making form therein. Books by August Schmarsow (1897) and Josef Strzygowski (1898) took a clue from this distinction, reassessing the classical painting and sculpture of the long seventeenth century as baroque on the basis of the relatively greater internal coherence found in works of that period than with works of another period, however established historiographically. Wölfflin formalised this point in his *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe* (1915), and on *its* fulcrum the expanded, superartistic baroque turned. Writes Stechow:

if there is such a thing as an artistic *Zeitgeist*, it must be possible to see some essential unifying elements in all significant art works of a certain epoch [The] baroque in art is a unified style; but by the same token, it is also a partial expression of the *general Zeitgeist* of the seventeenth century.¹²

Hence, the relationship of baroque architecture to the baroque arts, and the reflection, in turn, of the baroque age.

The third meaning given to the baroque by interwar critics and historians, Stechow continues, is of a cyclic progression of the arts from a classical to baroque state, in which

baroque occurs as a recurrent 'late' phase. This idea, as we know well, was hardly Wölfflin's invention. It occurs, after all, in the way Burckhardt treats *rococo* in the history of the classical tradition. But it was Wölfflin, and especially his *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, whose work authorised the translation of a term of historiography and criticism to a term that might be applied as readily to the late Gothic as to the historical baroque. ¹⁴

Armed with the three usages of 'baroque' he calls to mind, Stechow presents two questions to his readers: 'First, is there any conceivable justification for retaining a term which has taken on so many different meanings? Second, if there is, which meaning shall we recommend for adoption?'15 In brief, his answer to the first problem is 'yes', on the proviso that there can be some normalised definition of the term within and between each of the arts and cultural fields in which it appears. His call for linguistic precision is made alongside an admission of the impossibility of a 'baroque' regularised on the basis of the term's alignment with 'grandeur, heroic sweep, or the like', which holds it fast to 'the original derogatory sense of the word.'16 Chronology offers no less ambiguous basis for a critical definition. Recalling the various time-spans invoked for the term he asks, 'What can we gain by calling this period—all of it—baroque?'17 Read ungenerously, his proposal seems to be that representatives of the history of art, architecture, literature, science, politics, music, etc might form a committee, which would reach some commitment about its super-disciplinary meaning. 18 His point is, naturally, slightly subtler, demanding care in the critical language used by a discipline to delineate and describe its territory. A term that can mean anything ultimately means nothing when the audience expands beyond those who agree upon its use and encounters another that uses it elsewise.

Stechow's 'working hypothesis' is that the content of those cultural manifestations that have been called baroque by their historians has a basic commonality that is not merely stylistic.

A more comprehensive, all-embracing definition of the Baroque in art history will have to stand the acid test of our increasing factual knowledge which tends to dissolve that unity, but it may come, I believe, in the wake of a more penetrating analysis of the *content* of the art of that epoch.¹⁹

Brisbane, Australia, 7-10 July 2011

On the grounds of content, a body of literature, painting, architecture and music will show itself to have a greater degree of internal coherence than it might have in relation to the Renaissance or the Empire (to give Stechow's coordinates on this point). His theory (to which he returns in later reflections on this theme) is that 'one mainstay of this undertaking will have to be the interpretation of this baroque epoch as one revealing a basically new and optimistic equilibrium of religious and secular forces.'²⁰

Stechow's key to a unified historical and trans-disciplinary definition of the baroque is the trading of form for content. It is not the unified appearance of the arts that holds together an age, but the culture those arts variously express. On this basis he remains sceptical of the value of the idea of a recurrent baroque as being something more than an historical reading of late style that recognises the verisimilitude in several cases with seventeenth-century forms. A truly recurrent baroque will be a cultural rather than morphological phase, drawing in all artistic expressions of culture. He leaves this issue open. His proposition does, however, rest upon a fundamental point: for so many disciplines to identify with the art historical term used to address the work of the period, the task remains to negotiate the various ways in which numerous historical fields describe a body of works or ideas as baroque in light of the basic nominalism at stake in seeing it as baroque in particular.

Panofsky's "What is Baroque?"

We can better understand the implications of this problem by turning to Panofsky's lecture, "What is Baroque?" The posthumous edition of this very general public lecture, edited by Irving Lavin, presents a somewhat, if not dramatically palimpsestic document reworked for various audiences over the course of nearly thirty years. "Italian Baroque Art" was among the first subjects Panofsky taught during his first visits to the United States as a guest of New York University's Institute for Fine Arts, and "What is Baroque?" was a question to which his American public lectures turned on numerous occasions from 1934 or 1935 onwards. Even earlier, he lectured on "Barock" in 1931 at the University of Hamburg and it is instructive to note how he tempered the once much broader scope and complex treatment of the subject for his teaching in New York. As a document principally of the 1930s, then, and principally prepared for an American audience, "What is Baroque?" still offered something to the question put to Panofsky by Heckscher on behalf of Daniells. In order to get closer to what Panofsky might have dispatched we can negotiate between the edited, published post-1960 version of the essay *and* the most widely distributed unpublished version of the lecture text. This latter version derives from

a lecture delivered in 1935 at Vassar College, recorded, typed and mimeographed by one of its students.²³

Evidence suggests that Panofsky did not think highly of his own work on this theme, and Lavin advises that we would be wise not to read too much of his characteristic, rhetorical self-deprecation into this warning of its overly general nature and of the obsolescence of its project to neutralise the baroque as a corrective to its characterisation, above all, by Wölfflin.²⁴ As Panofsky wrote in 1967, 'what made sense and even may have been necessary in 1938 would be entirely superfluous today.'²⁵

Panofsky reinforces many of the general points we have considered above in relation to Stechow's contribution on this theme. Extending it much further, however, he homes in on one operative failing of Wölfflin's dichotomies of classic and baroque art. Its rectification is, from Panofsky's perspective, crucial to understanding the inherent character of the baroque and its relationship to those other phases together comprising the long history of the Renaissance. He chastises Wölfflin's failure to 'mention [in his *Grundbegriffe*] a single work of art executed between, roughly speaking, the death of Raphael in 1520 and the full-fledged seventeenth century', noting that, indeed, when one compares the artistic production on either side of a century-long void one observes tendencies that can be systematically opposed. But when one accounts for the relation of those opposing periods *with* the work of the intervening decades then one must admit that 'a much more complex development had taken place.' He asserts that this manneristic interlude holds the key to understanding the role of the baroque in the development of Italian art and culture.

Panofsky regards the baroque as a properly Italian phenomenon, echoed elsewhere in Europe 'in partibus infidelium' in a way that does reinforce 'the customary categories of wildness, obscurity, etc., much better and more consistently than does the original, Italian version of the style.' Only in Italy do the visual arts fully explore the 'classical principles' to the extent that the baroque can be construed as their 'deliberate reinstatement' and, 'at the same time, a reversion to nature, both stylistically and emotionally.'²⁷

While Panofsky general endorses Wölfflin's efforts to periodise the historical development of the visual arts, his counter-scheme is predicated on the idea that the Renaissance constitutes a much longer epoch—extending to the death of Goethe and the widespread introduction of the railway—within which the historian might identify a series of internal

Brisbane, Australia, 7-10 July 2011

developments. The dichotomies do not exist for him between classic and baroque periods, but rather within those developments, which together constitute a four-phase Renaissance. These phases are, put simply, the classic Renaissance of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the mannerist phase extending to the end of the seventeenth century, the baroque, as conventionally defined for a long seventeenth century, and the neo-classical developments of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, opening out onto a modern era. Two peaks, two troughs; and all bound together by a rolling reassessment of the techniques and limitations of the classical tradition and the irreconcilable values of 'a classical revival and a quite nonclassical naturalism.'28 This, in turn, is informed by the complex interplay between the arts, society, economics, mentality, and so forth. If the baroque age is marked by melancholy and humour, then these traits fulfil the promise of the fifteenth-century rise of the individual in Italian society and overcome his suppression through the first band of reactions to the Reformation. If the baroque age advances self-consciousness and criticality, then this is predicated upon the historical consciousness of the Renaissance and surpasses the elementary, 'linguistic', games of the manneristic decades.

He casts the 'psychological' dimension as 'a fundamental aspect of Baroque art. A conflict of antagonistic forces merging into a subjective unity [elsewhere, 'intensification'], and thus resolved.'²⁹ He points to a drawing by Pontormo, a study for the *Deposition of Christ* (completed 1528), to demonstrate how the artist expresses the individual's awareness of the 'problems of the outer world and the problems of his or her own self'.³⁰ It conveys the disruptions of a world-view that failed to reconcile 'beauty and virtue, morality and freedom, humanism and Christianity, faith and science'. Panofsky argues that the formal descriptors of 'open, but disharmonious' can be applied to the psychological content of the work as well as to one's experience of it.³¹ His observations of Bronzino's *Descent of Christ into Limbo* have the same point to make: 'it is a consolidation, but a consolidation even more obstructive to classic harmony'; his movements are 'overgraceful and at the same time constrained and bashful'; '[the] whole of the composition becomes a battlefield of contradictory forces, entangled in an everlasting tension.'³²

The successive waves of mannerist artists working in the decades spanning from the Sack of Rome to the end of the sixteenth century—he draws extensively on Walter Friedländer to make this point—found the various means to express the anxiety of their age, the dissolution of certainties. The baroque, in contrast, documents the capacity of

seventeenth-century artists to absorb those same anxieties and to live with them through a new self-awareness of the artificiality of exactly that reconciliation. 'A baroque portrait,' he writes, 'is free and open to the world again.' He continues:

A modus vivendi had been found in every field; scientists were no longer burnt like Giordano Bruno ...; Roman sculptures were no longer hidden in cellars; the system of the church was now so powerful and undisputed that it could afford to be tolerant towards any vital effort, and more than that: it would gradually assimilate and absorb those vital forces, and finally allow the very churches to be filled with that visual symphony of gay putti, glimmering gold and theatrical sceneries as seen in the *Cathedra Petri*. 33

This self-awareness is akin, he goes on to observe, to the loss of innocence that made Adam and Eve 'like God', capable of surpassing one's reactions and sensations.³⁴ He sets aside the negative consequences of this to be found in sentimentality and theatricality, pointing instead to a new-found critical consciousness alongside a new capacity for humour, 'the sense of humour in the true sense of the term.'³⁵ These capacities and the artistic production they allow render the baroque, in this sense, 'the second great climax of this period and, at the same time, the beginning of a fourth era, which may be called "Modern" with a capital M.'³⁶ The baroque art knows its own internal conflicts—it celebrates them as it lays them bare in the syntheses of its art.

Conclusion

In light of the much finer-grained readings of the baroque now available to us through an historical recovery of the intellectual developments within the historiography of art and architecture, these positions of Stechow's and Panofsky's will seem naïve. They nonetheless serve to illustrate the role claimed for the baroque in the immediate post-war moment towards three ends that deserve our attention. In one sense, the baroque offered a repository for the complex development of the German-language discourse on art history for an academic culture that had hitherto paid scant attention to the subject and the conceptual questions it raised.³⁷ Wölfflin's *Grundbegriffe* had been available in English since 1932 and its reading treated authoritatively.³⁸ His widespread appeal and broad generalist readership among students and amateur historians allowed his views to dominate initial reception of the baroque. They continued to hold sway irrespective of the criticisms systematically mounted against them in academic literature and the lecture hall, and irrespective of the refinements made to them by his commentators.³⁹ Stechow,

Brisbane, Australia, 7-10 July 2011

Panofsky and many others (with NYU playing a pivotal part as a stage for this translation) set about to reconcile the complexity of the inter-bellum German-language scholarship of the baroque with the rather more caricatured historical image cultivated for the baroque by the English-speaking world. This caricature rested to a not inconsiderable extent upon the convenient agreement between Wölfflin's premises and the then still persistent cultural prejudices in Anglophone countries against the cultural and religious forces of the Counter-Reformation that were only partially counteracted by twentieth-century British writers. Although Wölfflin remained the popularly dominant historian of the baroque in the English-language world for many decades, these moves sought out a new, rectified ground plane for understanding artistic development after the Renaissance.

These essays also illustrate the imperative for history to act as a check on knowledge and its deployment—a key ethical theme in the wake of the horrific deformations of human reason embodied in the Holocaust. Parallel to the pre-war and wartime traffic of individuals from Europe to North America and Britain is evidence of a widespread reflection within the humanities and social sciences prompted by experience of the War itself. Among the most famous of these is Marc Bloch's meditation on the historian's tools and tasks, posthumously offered as an Apologie pour l'histoire 1949. 41 Testing the means by which knowledge is produced, organized and disseminated is intimately bound into the historian's choices, and Bloch had the responsibility succinctly in the introduction to his Apologie when he wrote: 'And, indeed, whenever our exacting Western society, in the continuing crisis of growth, begins to doubt itself, it asks itself whether it has done well in trying to learn from the past, and whether it has learned rightly.'42 It would not do to argue a causal relation between an atmosphere of cultural restitution read back into these postwar years and the reflections of art historians upon their tools and tasks, tested against the use and content of a specific term of criticism and history. It is nonetheless difficult to regard the efforts of scholars to consider the premises of their work through an examination of methods, frames and nomenclature as entirely divorced from this broader historical imperative. 43

The path from this moment and mode of reflection and restitution back to the architectural culture of the post-war modern movement is not easy to track systematically. Nevertheless the demand to test knowledge, terms, and the means and ends of history's instrumentalisation is made time and again in these decades. As much as the baroque offers formal and strategic suggestions for a humanist modernism or a postmodern architecture, it also offered thinkers on architecture and the arts the historically grounded

reassurance that Panofsky expressed in his lecture: peaks follow troughs, baroque follows mannerism, and humanity will work past the profound crisis presented by the war. Implicit to the post-war form of Panofsky's lecture is the question of the kind of artistic expression—encompassing architecture—capable of internalising the crisis of the war years and expressing the contemporary capacity to live self-consciously, self-critically, and with the reconciliation of contemporary socio-political and artistic conflicts. In some cases the baroque explicitly figures in this discussion over the 1940s and 1950s while in others it fades into the background as the question itself assumes greater significance. For its expression across the arts, this is a form of baroque recurrence with which Stechow might hold truck—even if he would wish for a banal form of the neutralisation of knowledge in light of the possibility of its instrumentalisation. It arises from a new perspective on the function of art historical knowledge, neither the reflection of a modernist programme nor as a reactionary view of the relationship between past and present, but as the means by which to move society and the arts past what was widely regarded as their darkest moment in recent history.⁴⁴

Endnotes

_

¹ Cited in Irving Lavin, 'Introduction', in Erwin Panofsky, *Three Essays on Style*, ed. Irving Lavin (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1994), 201f. This letter, held at the Getty Research Institute, does not appear in Erwin Panofsky, *Korrespondenz 1910 biz 1968: Eien kommentierte in fünf Bänden*, ed. Dieter Wuttke, vol. 2 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003).

² Erwin Panofsky, 'What is Baroque?', in Panofsky, *Three Essays on Style*, ed. Lavin, 17-88; Wolfgang Stechow, 'Definitions of the Baroque in the Visual Arts', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 'A Special Issue on Baroque Style in the Various Arts', 5, 2 (1946), 109-15. I have addressed the contributions to this thematic issue in 'Democratizing the Baroque, ca. 1945,' a paper delivered to the 64th Annual Meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians, New Orleans, April 2011.

April 2011.

3 I reach this conclusion after having consulted the Ulrich Alexander Middeldorf Papers, 1925-1981, Getty Research Institute, Research Library, Los Angeles, accession no. 840024; the Heckscher-Archiv, Warburg Haus, Hamburg; as well as Ulrich Middeldorf, Raccolta di scritti, that is Collected Writings, vol. 2, 1939-1973 (Florence: Studio per edizioni scelte, 1980). I have checked Lavin's flawless transcription against Panofsky's typed letter to Heckscher, dated June 22, 1946, as held at the Getty Research Institute, accession no. 850839 (Erwin Panofsky correspondence, 1913-1968). Lavin confirms that he has no direct knowledge of the essay to which Panofsky refers—pers. comm., Irving Lavin to Andrew Leach, November 10, 2010. On the scope of the Heckscher-Archiv, which actively informs the section concerning Panofsky's essay, below, see Charlotte Schoell-Glass and Elizabeth Sears, Verzetteln als Methode: Der humanistische Ikonologe William S. Heckscher, Hamburger Forschungen zur Kunstgeschichte VI (Hamburg: Akademie Verlag, 2008). Finally, although Middeldorf did publish a couple of methodologically minded essays, his specialization and interests appear to reside elsewhere than the baroque. See Ulrich Middeldorf, 'A Short Critique of Art Criticism: An Essay on Method' (1944), Studies in Iconography, 6 (1980), 137-65; and 'Martin Schongauers klassischer Stil' (1947), Raccolta di scritti, vol. 2, 123-46. The Roy Daniells I believe to have been the intended beneficiary of Panofsky's advice had a demonstrable interest in mannerism and the baroque in English literature, having in 1945 published 'Baroque Form in English Literature', University of Toronto Quarterly, 14, 4 (July 1945), 393-408, and in 1963—some years after Panofsky's letter to Heckscher—the book

Milton, Mannerism and the Baroque (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963), in which he demonstrates a working knowledge of the by then well-known discourse on the translation of the term baroque from the field of the fine arts to that of literature. Judging from subsequent letters from Panofsky to various correspondents and cited by Lavin, Mr. Daniells—later of the University of British Columbia—did not return the lecture. In reaching the above conclusions concerning Middeldorf I have not consulted Panofsky's papers at the Archives of American Art at the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC. They must therefore remain provisional.

- ⁴ Panofsky, 'What is Baroque?' 19-20. In his lectures (1942) on Baroque Architecture to New York University, Richard Krautheimer identifies the origins of baroque as a descriptive term with the *Encyclopédie française* (supplement of 1776), 'meaning bizarre, strange, something in contrast to good taste, a term likewise applied to Gothic.' James Ackerman papers [ca. 1942-1950], Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington DC. Thanks to Evonne Levy for sharing her research on this collection.
- ⁵ Stechow, 'Definitions of the Baroque in the Visual Arts', 110. The lesser known of the two authors considered here, Wolfgang Stechow (1896-1974) was an historian of seventeenth-century Dutch painting. He studied in Germany and taught alongside Nikolaus Pevsner at Göttingen before his forced migration to the United States in 1938. See 'Stechow, Wolfgang [Ferdinand Ernst Gunther]', *Dictionary of Art Historians*, online at www.dictionaryofarthistorians.org/stechoww.htm (accessed October 2, 2010).
- ⁶ Following an observation by Severo Sarduy—*Baroque* (Paris: Gallimard, 1972)—Gregg Lambert suggests that the term (along with the insecurity of its origins) is 'a proverbial bone in the throat of traditional baroque criticism.' Gregg Lambert, *The Return of the Baroque in Modern Culture* (London: Continuum, 2004), 1.
- ⁷ Stechow, 'Definitions of the Baroque in the Visual Arts', 110.
- ⁸ Stechow, 'Definitions of the Baroque in the Visual Arts', 110-11. His example in the latter case is Georg Dehio's identification of 'the Baroque with the "basic innate mood" of German art through the ages'. Stechow recalls Dehio's observation that German art prizes expression at any cost, even that of form. He cites from Georg Dehio, *Geschichte der deutscher Kunst*, 2nd ed., vol. 3 (Berlin, Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1931).
- ⁹ Jacob Burckhardt, *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien* (1860, Berlin: Deutsche Buch-Gemeinschaft, 1936); Heinrich Wölfflin, *Renaissance und Barock: Eine Untersuchung u*□*ber wesen und entstehung des Barockstils in Italien* (Munich: T. Ackerman, 1888).

 ¹⁰ August Schmarsow, *Barock und Rokoko: Eine Auseinandersetzung über das Malerische in der*
- ¹⁰ August Schmarsow, *Barock und Rokoko: Eine Auseinandersetzung über das Malerische in der Architektur* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1897); Josef Strzygowski, *Das Werden des Barock bei Raphael und Correggio: Nebst Einem Anhang Über Rembrandt* (1898, Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, 2010).
- 11 Heinrich Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Das Problem der Stilentwicklung in der neueren Kunst* (Munich: Bruckmann, 1915).
- ¹² Stechow, 'Definitions of the Baroque in the Visual Arts', 111.
- ¹³ Stechow, 'Definitions of the Baroque in the Visual Arts', 112. Stechow draws upon Wilhelm Waetzolt's study on Burckhardt in *Deutscher Kunsthistoriker* (Liepzip: E. A. Seeman, 1924), vol. 2, 172-209.
- ¹⁴ Heinrich Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 2nd ed. (1915, Munich: Hugo Bruckman, 1917), 249-51. Compare Paul Frankl, *The Gothic: Literary Sources and Interpretations through Eight Centuries* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1960); see, too, Margaret Lyttelton, *Baroque Architecture in Classical Antiquity* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1974).
- ¹⁵ Stechow, 'Definitions of the Baroque in the Visual Arts', 112.
- ¹⁶ Stechow, 'Definitions of the Baroque in the Visual Arts', 112-13.
- ¹⁷ Stechow, 'Definitions of the Baroque in the Visual Arts', 113.
- ¹⁸ On this point compare the essays in the 'Second Special Issue on Baroque Style in Various Arts', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 14, 2 (December 1955), esp. Wolfgang Stechow, 'The Baroque: A Critical Summary of the Essays by Bukofzer, Hatzfeld, and Martin', 171-74.
- ¹⁹ Stechow, 'Definitions of the Baroque in the Visual Arts', 114.
- ²⁰ Stechow, 'Definitions of the Baroque in the Visual Arts', 114.
- ²¹ I have consulted Heckscher's copy of Panofsky's NYU syllabus of this course (57pp) in box 18, Hechscher-Archiv.
- ²² Heckscher, typed lecture notes from Panofsky, 'Baroque, S. S. [June-July] 1931' (34pp) in box 9, Heckscher-Archiv.

²³ Box 18 of the Heckscher-Archiv contains a mimeographed copy of 'What is Baroque?' (12pp),

with the name and address of one Janice Loeb of New York marked on the rear cardboard cover. This may have been the same Janice Loeb as the painter and documentary film-maker who. having written on the topic of 'Surrealism' for the Vassar Review (February 1935, 5) and presumably studied at that College might also have been responsible for typing and distributing the 'Vassar version'. Lavin has kindly made a copy of the various privately held versions of the lecture available for my consultation.

²⁴ Lavin documents several letters pertaining to the latter lecture in his 'Introduction', 200-203ff. ²⁵ Pers. corr. Panofsky to Peter Chobanian, November 14, 1967. Cited in Lavin, 'Introduction',

- Panofsky, 'What is Baroque?', 20. To get specific, Panofsky writes in this same passage, Wölfflin himself did not commit the sin of commission to call Tintoretto or El Greco "Baroque", but he committed the sin of omission not to include them—and what they stood for—in his considerations at all.' His treatment of mannerism synthesises the work of his teacher and (later) colleague at Hamburg and NYU, Walter Friedländer. See esp. 'Der antimanieristische Stil um 1590 und sein Verhältnis zum übersinnlichen', Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg 1928-1929 (1930), 214-43; Engl. ed. Mannerism and Anti-Mannerism in Italian Painting (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957).
- ²⁷ Panofsky, 'What is Baroque?', 36.

- Panofsky, 'What is Baroque?', 25.

 Panofsky, 'What is Baroque?', 59, also 51.

 Panofsky, 'What is Baroque?', 59. He speaks of Jacopo Pontormo, *Study for the Deposition in* Santa Felicità, ca. 1528, Christ Church, Oxford.

 Panofsky, 'What is Baroque?', 59.

 Panofsky, 'What is Baroque?', 36. He speaks of Agnolo Bronzino, *Descent of Christ into Limbo*,
- 1552, Santa Croce, Florence.
- ³³ Panofsky, 'What is Baroque?', 67.
- ³⁴ Panofsky, 'What is Baroque?', 75.
- ³⁵ Panofsky, 'What is Baroque?', 80.
- ³⁶ Panofsky, 'What is Baroque?', 88. Lavin elsewhere notes that Panofsky had a passing familiarity with Walter Benjamin's Habilitationsschrift, later published as Ursprung des deutschen Trauerspiels (1928, Frankfurt-am-Main; Suhrkamp, 1963), Panofsky wrote disapprovingly of Benjamin's writing on Melancholy in a letter to Hugo von Hofmannsthal dated 1927: Momme Broderson, 'Wenn Ihnen die Arbeit des Interesses Wert erscheint ... Walter Benjamin und das Warbug-Institut; einige Dokumente', in Horst Brederkamp, et al. (eds), Aby Warbug; Akten des internationalen Symposions, Schriften des Warburg-Archivs im Kunstgeschichtlichen Seminar der Universitat Hamburg (Hamburg: Wiley VHC, 1991), 87-91; and Wolfgang Kemp, 'Walter Benjamin und die Kunstwissenschaft. Tiel 2: Walter Benjamin und Aby Warburg', Kritische Berichte, 3 (1975): 5-24. Lavin suggests that Panofsky's lectures may have constituted a long response to Benjamin's views on the literature of the period (his Hamburg lectures begin with a discussion of literature rather than painting) and that Panofsky repeated Benjamin's examples over time without citing his work directly. Irving Lavin, 'Going for Baroque: Observations on the Post-Modern Fold', in Sebastian Schütze (ed.), Estetica barocca. Atti del convegno internazionale tunutosi a Roma dal 6 al 9 marzo 2002 (Rome: Campisano, 2004), 429-30.
- Compare Tom Marder, 'Renaissance and Baroque Architectural History in the United States', in Elisabeth Blair MacDougall (ed.), The Architectural Historian in America: A Symposium in Celebration of the Fiftieth Annuversary of the Founding of the Society of Architectural Historians, Studies in the History of Art 35 (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art; Hannover and London: University Press of New England, 1990), 161-74.
- ³⁸ Heinrich Wölfflin. *Principles of Art History*, trans. M. D. Hottinger (London: G. Bell and Sons. 1932; New York: Dover, 1950).
- ³⁹ For example, Sigfried Giedion erroneously ascribes to his teacher Wölfflin the articulation of a spatialised aesthetic theory that ought to be properly understood as Schmarsow's domain. Giedion, Space, Time and Architecture: The Growth of a New Tradition, 5th ed. (1941, 1966, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2008), 2-3, 109.
- Martin Shaw Briggs. Baroque Architecture (London: Adelphi Terrace, 1913): Geoffrey Scott, The Architecture of Humanism: A Study in the History of Taste (London: Constable & Co., 1914).

⁴¹ Marc Bloch, *Apologie pour l'histoire ou métier d'historien* (Paris: A Colin, 1949), trans. Peter Putnam as *The Historian's Craft* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992). Compare Max Horkheimer & Theodor W. Adorno, *Dialektik der Aufklärung* (1944; Amsterdam: Querido, 1947).

⁴² Bloch, *The Historian's Craft*, 5.

⁴³ Compare the position explored by Thomas Munro in the first (wartime) issue of the *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*: 'Knowledge and Control in the Field of Aesthetics', 1 (1941), 1-12.
⁴⁴ This paper documents research funded by the Australian Research Council as Discovery Project DP0985834, 'The Baroque in Architectural Culture, 1880-1980'. This paper was first presented to 'Barock-Perspektiven: Kunstwissenschaft und Barockforschung ca. 1880-1945' at the Kunstgeschichtliches Institut of the Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt, February 12, 2011, convened by Hans Aurenhammer. Thanks particularly to Evonne Levy for her comments and criticism. Research on Middeldorf's papers was aided by Special Collections staff of the Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles. Research on the papers of Wilhelm S. Heckscher and Erwin Panofsky was aided by Charlotte Schoell-Glass and the staff of the Warburg Haus, Hamburg. Thanks to Irving Lavin and Elizabeth Sears for their generous responses to my questions about the Panofsky-Heckscher correspondence.