VOL. V *DECEMBER, 1946* NO. 2

THE JOURNAL OF
AESTHETICS & ART CRITICISM

THE CONCEPT OF BAROQUE IN LITERARY SCHOLARSHIP

RENÉ WELLEK

I

All students of English will realize that the use of the term "baroque" in literature is a recent importation from the continent of Europe. A full-scale history of the term, which has never been attempted,[1] would be of considerable interest, even though I do not believe that the history of any term needs to be decisive for its present-day use, and though I realize that a term cannot be returned to any of its original meanings; least, of course, by the dictum of one man.

"Baroque" as Karl Borinski and Benedetto Croce have shown by convincing quotations,[2] is derived from *baroco*, the name for the fourth mode of the second figure in the scholastic nomenclature of syllogisms. It is a syllogism of the type: "Every P is M; some S are not M, hence some S are not P"; or to give Croce's example: "Every fool is stubborn; some people are not stubborn, hence some people are not fools." This type of argument was felt to be sophistical and far-fetched as early as 1519 when Luis Vives ridiculed the Parisian professors as "sophists in *baroco* and *baralipton*."[3] Croce gives several examples of the use of such phrases as "ragioni barrochi" from 1570 on. The etymology found in the *New English Dictionary* and elsewhere which would derive the term from the Spanish *barrueco*, an oddly-shaped pearl, must apparently be abandoned. In the eighteenth century, the term emerges with the meaning of "extravagant", "bizarre." In 1739, it is used thus by the President de Brosses, and in the sense of "decorative, playfully free" by J. J. Winckelmann in 1755.[4] In Quatremère de Quincy's *Dictionnaire historique de l'architecture* (1795–1825), it is called "une nuance du bizarre" and Guarino Guarini is considered the master of the baroque.[5] Jakob Burckhardt seems to have stabilized its meaning in art-history as referring to what he considered the decadence of the High Renaissance in the florid architecture of the Counter-Reformation in Italy, Germany and Spain. In 1843, he had used the term *rococo* in exactly the same sense as he later used baroque, and suggested that every style has its *rococo:* a late, florid, decadent stage.[6] This suggestion of Burckhardt's of an extension of the term was taken up by Willamowitz-Moellendorf, the famous classical philologist, who in 1881 wrote about "ancient baroque," i.e., Hellenistic art. L. von Sybel, in his *Weltgeschichte der Kunst* (1888)[7] has a chapter on ancient Roman Baroque. The same year is the date of Heinrich Wölfflin's *Renaissance und Barock*, a detailed monograph chiefly concerned with

the development of architecture in Rome. Wölfflin's work is highly important not only because it gave a first reliable technical analysis of the development of the style in Rome in appreciative terms, but because it also contains a few pages on the possibility of applying baroque to literature and music. With Wölfflin began the revaluation of baroque art, soon taken up by other German art-historians such as Gurlitt, Riegl, and Dehio, and soon to be followed in Italy by Giulio Magni and Corrado Ricci, and in England by Martin S. Briggs and Geoffrey Scott. The latter wrote a fervent defence, oddly enough called *The Architecture of Humanism* (1914).[8] After the first World War, admiration and sympathy for even the most grotesque and tortured forms of baroque art reached its peak in Germany; there were a good many individual enthusiasts in other countries, such as Eugenio d'Ors in Spain, Jean Cassou in France, and Sacheverell Sitwell in England.[9] In art history, today, baroque is recognized as the next stage of European art after the Renaissance. The term is used not only in architecture, but also in sculpture and painting, and covers not only Tintoretto and El Greco but also Rubens and Rembrandt.

Baroque is also fully established as a term in the history of music. It was apparently well-known in the eighteenth century, as Rousseau's *Dictionnaire de Musique* (1764) lists it as a term for music with "confused harmony" and other vices.[10] But the Czech music historian, August W. Ambros, seems to have been the first to use it as a period term, in 1878.[11] Today it is the current label for seventeenth century music and seems to be applied widely to Schütz, Buxtehude, Lully, Rameau, and even Bach and Handel.[12] There are now also baroque philosophers: Spinoza has been called baroque and I have seen the term applied to Leibniz, Comenius, and even Berkeley.[13] Spengler spoke of baroque painting, music, philosophy, and even psychology, mathematics, and physics. Baroque is now used in general cultural history for practically all manifestations of seventeenth century civilization.[14]

So far as I know, Wölfflin was the first to transfer the term baroque to literature. In a remarkable page of *Renaissance und Barock* (1888)[15] he suggests that the contrast between Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* (1516) and Tasso's *Gerusalemme liberata* (1584) could be compared to the distinction between Renaissance and baroque. In Tasso, he observes a heightening, an emphasis, a striving for great conceptions absent in Ariosto, and he finds the same tendency in Berni's reworking of Bojardo's *Orlando inamorato*. The images are more unified, more sublime; there is less visual imagination (*Anschauung*), but more mood (*Stimmung*). Wölfflin's suggestions do not seem to have been taken up for a long time. A search through a large number of writings on marinism, gongorism, euphuism, *préciosité* and German *Schwulst* has failed to produce more than one or two passages where a literary work or movement is actually called baroque before 1914, though baroque art was discussed as a parallel phenomenon under that name.[16] This seems to be true of the writings of Benedetto Croce before the first World War. In *Saggi sulla letteratura italiana del Seicento* (1910), the literature is never called baroque, though Croce discusses the parallel with baroque in the arts and even warns against the "exaggeration" in the appreciation of seventeenth century literature "to which the present fashion which in the plastic arts has returned to the baroque could easily seduce us."[17]

In 1914, however, a Danish scholar, Valdemar Vedel, published a paper "Den digteriske Barokstil omkring aar 1600".[18] He draws there a close parallel between Rubens and French and English poetic style between 1550 and 1650. Literature is, like the art of Rubens, decorative, colorful, emphatic. Vedel lists favorite themes and words in literature which he considers applicable to the art of Rubens: grand, high, flourish, red, flame, horses, hunt, war, gold, the love of show, swelling bombast, bragging blank-verse. But Vedel's article, possibly because it was in Danish, was, I think, completely ignored. The radiating point for the spread of the term was Germany and especially Munich where Wölfflin, a Swiss by birth, was professor. His colleague in German literature, Karl Borinski, wrote a long book, *Die Antike in Poetik und Kunsttheorie* (1914), with the subtitle for Volume I, *Mittelalter, Renaissance und Barock*, where he discusses especially the conceptist theories of Gracian and sketches the history of the term in a learned and substantially accurate note.[19]

In 1915, Wöfflin published a new book, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*,[20] where Renaissance and Baroque are contrasted as the two main types of style, and criteria for their distinction are worked out very concretely. This book made a tremendous impression on several German literary historians struggling with the problem of style. It seemed to invite imitation and possibly transfer to literary history. In 1916, without mentioning Wölfflin, Fritz Strich gave a stylistic analysis of German seventeenth century lyrical poetry which he called "baroque".[21] Oscar Walzel, in the same year, followed with a paper which claimed Shakespeare as belonging to the baroque.[22] In 1917, Max Wolff rejected Walzel's claim but admitted baroque in Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*, in the *Rape of Lucrece* and in Lyly.[23] In 1918, Josef Nadler published the third volume edition of his *Literaturgeschichte der deutschen Stämme und Landschaften*,[24] an original attempt to write the history of German literature "from below", from the local literature of the German cities and provinces. Nadler, whose orientation was then strongly Austrian and Roman Catholic, used the term baroque very prominently to describe the Jesuit Counter-Reformation literature of Southern Germany.

But all these items I have described up till now are comparatively isolated. The enormous vogue of baroque as a literary term arose in Germany only about 1921-1922. In 1921, Rudolf von Delius published an anthology of German baroque poetry and in the next year no fewer than four such anthologies were issued.[25] Joseph Gregor wrote a book on the Vienna Baroque theater[26] and Arthur Hübscher started the long line of philosophers on the baroque with a piece, "Barock als Gestaltung antithetischen Lebensgefühls".[27] Herbert Cysarz, one of the most prolific and pretentious of the German writers on literary baroque, published his first large, boldly conceived book, *Deutsche Barockdichtung*, in 1924.[28] Since then, interest in the German seventeenth century has risen by leaps and bounds and produced a large literature permeated by the term baroque. I would be hesitant to dogmatize about the exact reasons for this revival of German baroque poetry; part of it may be due to Spengler who had used the term vaguely in the *Decline of the West*,[29] and part is due, I think, to a misunderstanding: baroque poetry was felt to be similar to the most recent German expressionism, to its turbulent, tense, torn diction and tragic view of the world

induced by the aftermath of the war; part was a genuine change of taste, a sudden comprehension for an art despised before because of its conventions, its supposedly tasteless metaphors, its violent contrasts and antitheses.

German scholars soon applied their newly found criterion to other European literatures. Theophil Spoerri was, in 1923, I believe, the first to carry out Wölfflin's suggestions as to the difference between Ariosto and Tasso.[30] Ariosto is shown by Wölfflin's criteria to be Renaissance; Tasso, baroque. Marino and the marinists appeared baroque. Spain was also easily assimilable, since gongorism and conceptism presented clearly parallel phenomena which had but to be christened baroque. But all other Spanish literature, from Guevara in the early sixteenth century to Calderón in the late seventeenth century, was soon claimed as baroque. Wilhelm Michels in a paper on "Barockstil in Shakespeare und Calderón" (1929)[31] used the acknowledged baroque characteristics of Calerón to argue that Shakespeare also shows the same stylistic tendencies. There seems to be only some disagreement among the German writers as to the status of Cervantes: Helmut Hatzfeld, as early as 1927, had spoken of Cervantes as "Jesuitenbarock"[32] and had argued that his world-view is that of the Counter-Reformation. In a later paper, "El predominio del espíritu español en las literaturas del siglo XVII",[33] Hatzfeld tried to show that Spain is eternally, basically baroque and that it was historically the radiating center of the baroque spirit in Europe. The permanently Spanish features which are also those of baroque were only temporarily overlaid by the Renaissance. Ludwig Pfandl, however, who wrote the fullest history of Spanish literature during the Golden Age,[34] limits baroque to the seventeenth century and expressly exempts Cervantes. Both Vossler and Spitzer, however, consider even Lope de Vega baroque (in spite of his objections to Góngora).[35]

French literature was also described by German scholars in terms of the baroque. Neubert and Schürr[36] talked, at first somewhat hesitatingly, of baroque undercurrents and features in seventeenth century France. Schürr claimed Rabelais as early baroque and described the *précieux*, the writers of the sprawling courtly novels and of burlesques, as baroque, a style which was defeated by the new classicism of Boileau, Molière, LaFontaine and Racine. Others advocated the view that these French classics themselves are baroque. Apparently Erich Auerbach, in 1929, was the first to voice this view.[37] Leo Spitzer endorses it with some qualifications. In a brilliant analysis of the style of Racine,[38] he has shown how Racine always tones down baroque features, how Racine's baroque is tame, subdued, classical. Though Hatzfeld does not completely deny the obviously striking distinctions of French classicism, he is the one scholar who most insistently claims all French classicism as baroque. In an early paper[39] he discusses the French religious poetry of the seventeenth century, showing its similarity to Spanish mysticism and its stylistic similarities to general baroque. In a long piece in a Dutch review,[40] he has accumulated many observations to show that French classicism is only a variant of baroque. French classicism has the same typically baroque tension of sensuality and religion, the same morbidity, the same pathos as Spanish baroque. Its form is similarly paradoxical and antithetical, "open" in Wölfflin's sense. The dis-

cipline of French classicism is simply a universal characteristic of the "rule over the passions", recommended by the Counter-Reformation everywhere.

English literature, even outside of the attempts to claim Shakespeare as baroque, was also soon brought in line. As far as I know, Friedrich Brie's *Englische Rokokoepik* (1927) is the first attempt of this sort.[41] There Pope's *Rape of the Lock* is analyzed as rococo, but in passing a contrast to the baroque Garth and Boileau is drawn. Fritz Pützer in *Prediger des englischen Barocks stilistisch untersucht* (1929) then claimed almost all English pulpit oratory from Latimer to Jeremy Taylor as baroque.[42] F. W. Schirmer in several articles and in his *Geschichte der englischen Literatur*[43] uses the term for the metaphysicals, Browne, Dryden, Otway and Lee, excluding Milton from the baroque expressly. This was also the conclusion of Friedrich Wild[44] who called even Ben Jonson, Massinger, Ford and Phineas Fletcher baroque. The idea of an antithesis of sensualism and spiritualism in English seventeenth century poetry was, in the mean time, carried out, in a rather mechanical fashion, by Werner P. Friederich,[45] a work which was accepted as a Harvard Ph. D. thesis under J. L. Lowes. There are a good many other German theses on English literary baroque: Jünemann[46] has compared Dryden's Fables with their sources to show how Dryden translated, e.g., Chaucer into a baroque style; Wolfgang Mann[47] has examined Dryden's heroic tragedies as an expression of courtly baroque culture. A recent piece by Elisabeth Haller[48] analyses the baroque style of Thomas Burnet's *Theory of the Earth* in comparison with its Latin and German translations. The view that all English seventeenth century civilization is baroque has been pushed farthest by Paul Meissner,[49] who includes also Milton and who has devised a whole scheme of contraries covering all activities and stages of the English seventeenth century. In a piece which stresses the Spanish influence in England, Hatzfeld goes so far as to call Milton "the most hispanized poet of the age, who to the foreigner appears the most baroque."[50] Bernhard Fehr finally has extended the frontiers of English baroque by finding it in Thomson and Mallet and even tracing it in the verse-form of Wordsworth.[51] Thus all literatures of Europe in the seventeenth century (and in part of the sixteenth century) are conceived of by German scholars as a unified movement. E. g., in Schnürer's bulky volume, *Katholische Kirche und Kultur der Barockzeit* (1937),[52] Spain, Portugal with Camoëns, Italy, France, Germany, Austria, but also Poland, Hungary and Yugoslavia are treated as baroque. It is a coherent view which needs discussion, acceptance, refutation or modification.

I have reviewed the Germans first because they were the originators and instigators of the movement (if one ignores the isolated Dane, Vedel). But the idea was taken up soon by scholars of other nationalities. In 1919, the term made its first conquest outside Germany. F. Schmidt-Degener published a piece on "Rembrandt en Vondel" in *De Gids*[53] where Rembrandt is made out an opponent of baroque taste, while the poet Vondel, Flemish by descent and a convert to Catholicism, is drawn as the typical representative of the European baroque. The author looks with distinct disfavor on the baroque, its sensual mysticism, its externality, its verbalism in contrast to the truly Dutch and at the same time universal art of Rembrandt. To judge from a little book by

Heinz Haerten, *Vondel und der deutsche Barock* (1934)[54] the revaluation of baroque has also triumphed in Holland. There Vondel is claimed as the very summit of Northern, Teutonic baroque. In general, seventeenth century Dutch literature seems by the Dutch themselves to be now described as baroque.

The next country to succumb to the invasion was Italy. Bertoni had reviewed Spoerri without showing much interest;[55] Venturi early expounded Wölfflin.[56] But late in 1924, Mario Praz finished a book *Secentismo e Marinismo in Inghilterra*[57] which, in its title, avoids the term baroque, but in its text, actually two monographs on Donne and Crashaw, freely refers to baroque in literature and to the literary baroque in England. Praz studied especially the contacts of Donne and Crashaw with Italian and Neo-Latin literature, and he knew the work of Wölfflin. In July 1925, Benedetto Croce read a paper in Zurich on the concept of the baroque[58] which was then published in German translation. There he discusses the term without, it seems, much consciousness of its newness in literature, though he vigorously protests against many of the current German theories and pleads for a revival of the original meaning of baroque as a kind of artistic ugliness. Though Croce tried again and again to defend his negative attitude to the baroque, he himself adopted the term as a label for the Italy of the seventeenth century. His largest book on the period, *Storia della età barocca in Italia*,[59] has the term on the title page. Since 1925, he discusses even his beloved Basile in terms of baroque.[60] Baroque thus seems victorious in Italy.

The history of the penetration of the term into Spain is not so clear to me. Eugenio d'Ors, in an extravagant book, *Du Baroque* (1935), known to me only in the French translation,[61] includes reflexions and aphorisms which are carefully dated but of which I have no means to find out whether they were actually printed at that time in Spanish. One piece, dated 1921, calls Milton's *Paradise Lost* baroque, and in the later sections d'Ors finds baroque all throughout history in Góngora and Wagner, in Pope and Vico, in Rousseau and El Greco, in the Portugal of the fifteenth century and today. A less purely fanciful application of the term appears in Spain since 1927, the tercentenary of Góngora's death. There was an anthology in honor of Góngora which spoke of him as a baroque poet.[62] Then Dámaso Alonso published an edition of the *Soledades*[63] which has a page on Góngora's *barroquismo* with an express recognition of the novelty of the term. In the same year, Ortega y Gasset, in reviewing Alonso called "Góngorism, Marinism and Euphuism merely forms of baroque." "What is usually called classical in poetry is actually baroque, e.g. Pindar who is just as difficult to understand as Góngora."[64] Another famous Spanish scholar, Américo Castro, has also begun using baroque, first I believe for Tirso da Molina, but also for Góngora and Quevedo. In a forthcoming paper on the "Baroque as Literary Style" Castro rejects the view that Rabelais or Cervantes are baroque, but accepts Pascal and Racine, as well as Góngora and Quevedo.[65]

France is, I think, the one major country which has almost completely refused to adopt the term. There are a few exceptions. André Koszul calls Beaumont and Fletcher baroque in 1933, and refers in his bibliography to some of the German work.[66] A French student of German literature, André Moret,[67]

wrote a good thesis on the German baroque lyric adopting the term as a matter of course. The one French book I know which makes much of the term is de Reynold's *Le XVIIe Siècle: Le Classique et le Baroque* (1944).[68] M. Reynold recognizes a conflict between the baroque and the classic in seventeenth century France: the temperament of the time, its passion and its will seem to him baroque; Corneille, Tasso and Milton are called so, but the actual French classicists appear as victors over something which endangered their balance and poise. One should note that Gonzague de Reynold is Professor at Fribourg, where the late Schnürer was his colleague and that he taught for years at the University of Bern, to which Strich had gone from Munich. Most French literary historians, such as Baldensperger, Lebègue and Henri Peyre,[69] have raised their voices vigorously against the application of the term to French literature; I have not found any evidence that even the new French defenders of *préciosité* and its historical importance, such as Fidao-Justiniani, Mongredien, and Daniel Mornet[70] have any inclination to use the term even for their *protégés*. Recently, Marcel Raymond in a volume in honor of Wölfflin has tried to distinguish Renaissance and baroque elements in Ronsard with subtle, though extremely evanescent results. Madame Dominique Aury edited an anthology of French baroque poets which elicited a fine essay by Maurice Blanchot.[71]

Baroque as a literary term has also spread to the Slavic countries with a Catholic past. It is used in Poland widely for the Jesuit literature of the seventeenth century,[71a] and in Czechoslovakia there has been a sudden interest in the half-buried Czech literature of the Counter-Reformation which is always called baroque. The editions of baroque poets and sermons and discussions became especially frequent in the early thirties. There is also a small book by Václav Černý (1937),[72] which discusses the baroque in European poetry, including in it even Milton and Bunyan. The term seems to be used in Hungarian literary history for the age of Cardinal Pasmány, and by Yugoslavs to denote Gundulić and his great epic *Osman*. I have found no evidence that the Scandinavians speak of any period of their literature as baroque, though Valdemar Vedel, the Danish scholar who wrote the first article on poetic baroque back in 1914, has since written a book on Corneille which analyzes his style as baroque and though there is recent Danish work on German baroque drama.[73]

To England and America the term, as applied to literature, came late, much later than the revival of interest in Donne and the Metaphysicals. Grierson and T. S. Eliot do not use it, though Eliot apparently spoke of a baroque period in his unpublished Clark lectures on the metaphysical poets.[74] In an epilogue to a new edition of Geoffrey Scott's *Architecture of Humanism* (1924)[75] the parallel between Donne and Thomas Browne on the one hand and baroque architecture on the other is drawn expressly, though the literature itself is not called baroque. A rather flimsy essay by Peter Burra, published in *Farrago* in 1930, is called "Baroque and Gothic Sentimentalism"[76] but uses the term quite vaguely for periods of luxuriance as an alternative for Gothic. The more concrete literary use seems to come from Germany: J. E. Crawford Fitch published a book on Angelus Silesius in 1932 which uses the term occasionally;[77] and in 1933, the philosopher E. I. Watkin, a close student of German Catholic literature,

discussed Crashaw as baroque.[78] Watkin, of course, must have known the book by Mario Praz. Crashaw is again, in 1934, the center of a study of the baroque by T. O. Beachcroft.[79] In 1934, F. W. Bateson published his little book *English Poetry and the English Language*,[80] where he applied the term baroque to Thomson, Gray and Collins. He uses Geoffrey Scott's *Architecture of Humanism* quite independently, without being aware of the Continental uses, and without realizing that Scott is dependent on Wölfflin. Since then the term baroque occurs in English scholarship more frequently, but not, it seems to me, prominently. Recently F. P. Wilson[81] used it to characterize Jacobean in contrast to Elizabethan literature, and Tillyard[82] applied it in passing to Milton's epistolary prose.

In this country, as early as 1929, Morris W. Croll christened a very fine analytical paper on seventeenth century prose style "baroque".[83] Before, in several papers on the history of prose style, he had called the same traits of the anti-Ciceronian movement "Attic", a rather obscure and misleading term. Croll knew Wölfflin's work and used his criteria, though very cautiously. In the next year, George Williamson, in his *Donne Tradition*, singled out Crashaw as "the most baroque of the English metaphysicals" and calls him a "true representative of the European baroque poet, contrasting with Donne therein."[84] Williamson, of course, had read Mario Praz. Since then, Miss Helen C. White in her *Metaphysical Poets*[85] used the term for Crashaw, and Austin Warren's book on Crashaw has the subtitle: *A Study in Baroque Sensibility* (1939).[86] Quite recently the term seems to be used even more widely and broadly. Harry Levin has applied the word to Ben Jonson, Wylie Sypher included the metaphysicals and Milton, and Roy Daniells, a Canadian, has argued that the later Shakespeare is baroque as well as Milton, Bunyan and Dryden.[87]

The term is also used for the echoes of English seventeenth century literature in America. Zdeněk Vančura, a Czech scholar who visited Mr. Croll's seminar in Princeton, applied his description of baroque style to seventeenth century American prose,[88] to Nathaniel Ward and Cotton Mather. Austin Warren finally has brilliantly analyzed the newly discovered early eighteenth century American poet, Edward Taylor, as Colonial baroque.[89] One circumstance seems to augur well for the further spread of baroque in America: some of the most prominent scholars who have used the term are now at American universities. Viëtor and Alewyn, two German specialists in the baroque, are at Harvard and Queen's College, respectively. Spitzer is at Johns Hopkins, Hatzfeld at the Catholic University of America, and Américo Castro at Princeton. Thus baroque is everywhere used today in the discussion of literature, and is likely to spread even more widely.

II

This brief sketch of the spread of the term may have suggested the various status of baroque in the different countries—its complete establishment in Germany, its recent success in Italy and Spain, its slow penetration into English and American scholarship, and its almost complete failure in France. It is possible to account for these differences easily enough. In Germany the term

succeeded because it found a vacuum: terms such as the First and Second Silesian school, which were used before, were obviously inadequate and purely external. Baroque has become a laudatory term in the fine arts and could easily be used for the literature whose beauties were discovered during the change of taste caused by Expressionism. Furthermore, the general revolt against positivistic methods in literary scholarship enhanced interest in period terms. Discussions as to the essence of the Renaissance, Romanticism, and Baroque occupied German literary scholars tired of the minutiae of research and eager for sweeping generalizations. In Italy, there had been long recognized the phenomenon of Marinism and *Secentismo*, but baroque seemed a preferable substitute, as not being associated with a single poet and as not a mere century-label. In Spain, baroque has also superseded *gongorismo*, *culteranismo*, *conceptismo*, as it is a more general term, free from associations with a single style or with some peculiar critical doctrine or technical device. In France, baroque has been rejected, partly because the old meaning of "bizarre" is still felt very vividly, and partly because French classicism is a distinct literary movement inimical to the ideals of contemporary baroque movements in Spain and Italy. Even Hatzfeld, who is no doubt right in stressing some affinities with the general European Counter-Reformation and some concrete influences of Spain on French classicism, has to speak of the French "Sonderbarock",[90] a prefix which seems to weaken his thesis considerably. The *précieux*, whatever their affinities with Spain and Italy may have been, are also clearly distinct in their lightness and secularity from the heavier, predominantly religious art which one associates with Southern Baroque. In England, the reluctance to adopt the term has somewhat similar reasons: the memory of Ruskin's denunciations of baroque seems to be lingering in English minds, and this distaste cannot be corrected by the sight of any considerable baroque architecture in England. The term "metaphysical" is too well established (though admittedly misleading), and today too honorific to be felt in any serious need of replacement. As for Milton, he seems too individual and Protestant to be easily assimilated to baroque, still associated in most minds with Jesuits and the Counter-Reformation. Besides, the English seventeenth century does not impress the historian as a unity: its earlier part up to the closing of the theaters in 1642 is constantly assimilated to the Elizabethan Age; its later part from 1660 on has been annexed by the eighteenth century. Even those who would sympathize with the view that there is a continuity of artistic tradition from Donne and Chapman to the last writings of Dryden, cannot overlook the very real social changes of the Civil Wars which brought with them a considerable change of taste and general "intellectual climate". Here in America, where we are unimpeded or uninspired by the sight of baroque buildings and even pseudo-baroque imitations and can think of baroque only as an episode in Colonial literature, nothing prevents the spread of the term. On the contrary, there is the danger, to judge from a few recent loosely worded review-articles, that it will be bandied about too freely and will soon lose any definite meaning. Thus an analysis of its possibilities may be welcome.

III

In discussing such a term as baroque, we have to realize that it has the meanings which its users have decided to give to it. We can, however, distinguish between those meanings and recommend those which seem to us most useful, that is, which best clarify the complexity of the historical process. It seems to me, it would be an extreme and false nominalism to deny that such concepts as the baroque are *organs* of real historical knowledge, that in reality there are pervasive styles, or turning-points in history which we are able to discern and which such terms help us in distinguishing. In such an analysis, we have to take up at least three different aspects of meaning: the extension of the term, the valuation it implies on the part of the speaker, and its actual referent.

There is, first of all, the important distinction between those who use baroque as a term for a recurrent phenomenon in all history and those who use it as a term for a specific phenomenon in the historical process, fixed in time and place. The first use really belongs to a typology of literature, the second to its history. Croce, Eugenio d'Ors, Spengler and many other Germans consider it a typological term. Croce argues that the term should be returned to its original meaning: "a form of artistic ugliness" and that the phenomenon can be observed among the Silver Latin poets as well as in Marino or in D'Annunzio. Rather curiously, however, Croce abandoned this use for practical purposes and prefers to call baroque only "that artistic perversion, dominated by a desire for the stupefying, which can be observed in Europe from the last decades of the sixteenth to the end of the seventeenth century."[91] In Germany, Spengler and Worringer and, following them, Walzel in literature, used baroque as an alternative term for Gothic and Romanticism, assuming an underlying identity of all these periods opposed to the other sequence of Classical Antiquity, Renaissance and Neo-Classicism.[92] Georg Weise has argued that the baroque is rather the specifically Nordic tendency towards arbitrary inorganic decoration which occurs in the history of the arts and of literature always at the end of a period. Baroque becomes in him a synonym for the florid, precious, decorative style recurrent in all ages and countries. Old Irish poetry, Wolfram von Eschenbach, the French *Rhétoriqueurs* and Góngora are some of the examples cited.[93] Eugenio d'Ors has called such pervasive stylistic types "eons" and sees baroque as a historical category, an *idée-event*, a "constant" which recurs almost everywhere. He even indulges in drawing up a table of the different variants or subspecies of *homo barocchus*,[94] where we find an archaic baroque, a Macedonian, an Alexandrian, a Roman, a Buddhist, a Gothic, a Franciscan, a Manuelian (in Portugal), a Nordic, a Palladian (in Italy and England), a Jesuit, a Rococo, a romantic, a *fin-de-siècle* and some other varieties of baroque. It pervades all art-history from the ruins of a Baalbek to the most recent modernism, all literature from Euripides to Rimbaud, and all other cultural activities including philosophy as well as the discoveries of Harvey and Linné. The method is pushed to absurd extremes: half of the world's history and creations are baroque, all which are not purely classical, not flooded by the dry light of the intellect. The term thus used may have the merit of drawing attention to this recurrence of an emotional art of of stylistic overelaboration and decoration, but it has become

so broad and vague when cut off from its period moorings that it loses all usefulness for concrete literary study. To divide the world of literature into Renaissance and Baroque or Classicism and Baroque is no better than dividing it into Classicism and Romanticism, Realism and Idealism. At the most, we achieve a segregation into sheep and goats. The historian of literature will be interested far more in baroque as a term for a definite period.

In discussing baroque as a period-term we should, however, realize that, also as a period-concept, baroque cannot be defined as a class-concept in logic can be defined. If it were, all individual works of a period could be subsumed under it. But this is impossible, as a work of art is not an instance of a class, but is itself a part of the concept of a period which it makes up together with other works. It thus modifies the concept of the whole. We shall never define Romanticism or baroque or any other of these terms exhaustively, because a period is a time-section dominated by some system of literary norms. Period is thus only a regulative concept, not a metaphysical essence which must be intuited nor, of course, a purely arbitrary linguistic label. We must be careful in such an analysis not to fall into the errors of medieval realism or of modern extreme nominalism. Periods and movements "exist" in the sense that they can be discerned in reality, can be described and analyzed. It would, however, be foolish to expect a single noun or adjective such as baroque to carry unimpeded and still clearly realized, a dozen different connotations.[95]

Even as a period-term the chronological extension of its use is most bafflingly various. In England it may include Lyly, Milton, and even Gray and Collins. In Germany it may include Fischart, Opitz, and even Klopstock. In Italy, Tasso as well as Marino and Basile; in Spain, Guevara, Cervantes, Góngora and Quevedo as well as Calderón; in France, Rabelais, Ronsard, Du Bartas, the *précieux* but also Racine and even Fénelon. Two or even almost three centuries may be spanned; or at the other extreme, the term may be limited to a single author in English, Richard Crashaw, or to a single style such as Marinism or Gongorism. The widest use, which includes the most heterogeneous authors of several centuries, should obviously be discouraged as there is always the danger of sliding back into a general typology. But the limitation to a single literary style seems not broad enough. There the existing terms like conceptism, marinism, gongorism, metaphysical poetry, might serve as well and serve with less confusion. The term baroque is most acceptable, it seems to me, if we have in mind a general European movement whose conventions and literary style can be described fairly concretely and whose chronological limits can be fixed fairly narrowly, from the last decades of the sixteenth century to the middle of the eighteenth century in a few countries. Baroque points out that Sir Thomas Browne and Donne, Góngora and Quevedo, Gryphius and Grimmelshausen have something in common, in one national literature and all over Europe.

IV

Baroque can be used pejoratively, or as a neutral descriptive term, or as a term of praise. Croce advocates a return to the pejorative use and goes so

far as to say that "art is never baroque and baroque is never art."[96] He recognizes that Du Bartas and Góngora and some German poets of the seventeenth century were real poets, but considers that by this very fact they raised themselves into the realm of the one and indivisible realm of poetry where there cannot be different styles and diverse standards. Croce is quite alone, however, in this use, which must be mostly influenced by the low opinion he has of seventeenth century Italian poetry. Baroque as a descriptive neutral term prevails. There is no need to follow Croce in suspecting all baroque enthusiasts of setting up a "heretical" standard of poetry expressly got up to include the great works of the baroque style. As in all styles, there may be great baroque artists, imitators and mere bunglers. There are good and bad baroque churches as there are good and bad baroque poems. There is Góngora, Théophile, Donne, Herbert, Marvell, Gryphius, but also the mass of quibbling conceited verse which fills Saintsbury's *Minor Poets of the Caroline Period*, Croce's *Lirici marinisti* and Cysarz's three-volume *Barocklyrik*.[97]

Among the Germans, baroque has assumed an honorific meaning, if only because it appears on the side of the angels in the series of Gothic-Baroque-Romanticism against Classical Antiquity, Renaissance and Neo-classicism. Enthusiasm for German baroque literature seems to have gone very far in Germany: especially Herbert Cysarz and Günther Müller are the sinners who have written in oracular adoration of works which seem to me derivative and frigid as well as formless and sprawling. Günther Müller especially accepts the German baroque *in toto* as a great *geistesgeschichtlich* achievement.[98] As its art appears to him communal, an expression of courtly culture, he feels relieved of the duties of a critic. A scholarly movement which had begun in praise of the baroque because of its supposed affinities with subjective expressionism has ended in the reduction of baroque art to a mere sociological category, "the courtly". There are other absurdities. Nadler prefers Bidermann's *Cenodoxus* to the *Divine Comedy* and Müller thinks the *Aramena* of Duke Anton Ulrich von Braunschweig is a greater work of art than Grimmelshausen's *Simplizissimus*. These excesses which could be paralleled by some of the extravaganzas which have been written in recent years on Vondel, Góngora, and Donne seem to confirm the view that baroque itself is neither good nor bad, but a historical style which had its great and small practitioners.

V

The most important question remains: What is the precise content of the word baroque? Two fairly distinct trends of description can be observed: one which describes it in terms of style and one which prefers ideological categories or emotional attitudes. The two may be combined to show how certain stylistic devices express a definite view of the world.

The use of the term baroque in literature began with a transfer of Wölfflin's categories to literature; Walzel took one of the pair of contraries in Wölfflin, closed and open form, and applied it to Shakespeare.[99] Studying the compositions of Shakespeare's plays, he came to the conclusion that Shakespeare belongs to the baroque. The number of minor characters, the unsymmetrical

grouping, the varying emphasis on different acts of a play, are all traits supposed to show that Shakespeare's technique is the same as that of baroque, i.e. is "asymmetrical, atectonic", while Corneille and Racine (later to be pronounced baroque by other Germans) belong rather to the Renaissance because they composed their tragedies around a central figure and distributed the emphasis among the acts according to the Aristotelian pattern. Walzel's slogan of the baroque Shakespeare has caught on amazingly in Germany: there is even a book by Max Deutschbein, *Shakespeares Macbeth als Drama des Barock*,[100] which presents us with a graphic picture of the composition of Macbeth. An ellipse is drawn with the words "Grace" and "Realm of Darkness" written around it and "Lady Macbeth" and the "Weird sisters" placed at the focal points. We are then told that this represents the "inner form" of *Macbeth* and that the play is baroque since the baroque style "has a predilection for the oval groundplan, as shown frequently in the groundplans of baroque churches and castles." To dismiss the whole preposterous undertaking of construing a parallel on the basis of a completely arbitrary pattern of "inner form", it is not even necessary to doubt whether the ellipse is as frequent in baroque churches as Deutschbein's theory demands. Similarly Bernhard Fehr [101] has argued that Thomson and Mallet and even Wordsworth wrote baroque blank verse since Fehr represents its run-on-lines and subclauses by graphic patterns which remind him of the serpentine lines and even of the corkscrew pillars of baroque churches. He does not face the conclusion that any run-on-line verse and any prose or verse with subclauses from Cicero to Fehr would have to be pronounced baroque by his criteria. But even the more sober transfer of Wölfflin's categories seems to have achieved very little for a definition of the baroque. Among these categories, four—"painterly", "open form", "unity", "relative clarity"—can be applied to baroque literature fairly easily, but they achieve little more than ranging baroque literature against harmonious, clearly outlined, well-proportioned classical literature. The dangers of this transfer become obvious in F. W. Bateson's argument that Thomson, Young, Gray, and Collins are all baroque since they answer the Wölfflinian categories of picturesqueness and inexactness and in their diction show the equivalent of "baroque ornament".[102] If their personifications, invocations and stock phrases are baroque, then any poetic diction from the Silver Latin poets through the Scottish Chaucerians and the Italian sonneteers has to be classified as baroque. Baroque becomes simply a term for anything decorative, tawdry, and conventionalized. The transfer of the Wölfflinian categories to literature must lead to the giving up of a clear period-concept and sliding back into a typology which can achieve only a most superficial and rough classification of all literature into two main types.

Even the many attempts to define baroque in terms of its most obvious stylistic devices run into the same difficulty. If we say that baroque literature uses conceits or is written in an ornate prose-style, we cannot draw any kind of line which shall rule out the predecessors of the baroque and even styles which historically arose without any connection with the baroque. Thus conceits can be found in Lucan, in the Church Fathers, and in the mystics of the thirteenth

century. Ornate, labored, and figured prose flourished throughout the Middle Ages, especially in the tradition of the Latin *cursus*. If we consider conceit the "elaboration of a figure of speech to the farthest stage ingenuity can carry", then we cannot distinguish between many forms of Petrarchism of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and the cult of Marinism. Petrarch himself must then be called baroque. If an ornate mannered prose is baroque, then many Church Fathers were baroque. This is a very real issue for all the many scholars who have tried to trace the sources and antecedents of Gongorism and Marinism. D'Ancona and D'Ovidio decide that Marinism was caused by Spanish influences, Belloni and Vento consider it a development of Petrarchism, Scopa traces it back to the Church Fathers, and Gobliani has found baroque in Seneca and Lucan:[103] in short, no clear line can be drawn on such grounds between the baroque and a good half of the world's preceding literature.

Far more useful and hopeful seem the attempts to narrow down the repertory of stylistic devices characteristic of the baroque to a few specific figures or specific types of schemes. It can be said that antithesis, asyndeton, antimetabole, oxymoron, and possibly even paradox and hyperbole are favorite figures of baroque literature. But are they peculiar to the baroque? Viëtor and Curtius[104] have traced the supposedly baroque asyndeton back through the Middle Ages to Quintilian, Cicero and even Horace. The same could be done easily for the other figures. This objection is also fatal to the paper of Wilhelm Michels[105] who claims Shakespeare and Calderón as baroque on the basis of a stylistic analysis which lists parallels, bombast, mythology, hyperbole as expression of the quantitative urge and word-play, dissection, allegory, antithesis, abstraction, the use of *sententiae* as expression of the qualitative urge (*Trieb*).

Individual stylistic devices can, however, be defined fairly clearly at least for some baroque authors or schools. The metaphysicals and their use of "conceit" seem to lend themselves very well to such sharp discrimination from the Elizabethans or the Neo-classicists. If one, however, examines the definitions proposed, scarcely any one seems to set off the metaphysicals clearly from the preceding or following styles. John Crowe Ransom, Allen Tate and Cleanth Brooks favor the view that a metaphysical poem is coextensive with its imagery, that it contains a "single extended image to bear the whole weight of the conceptual structure" or, at least, has a conceptual development in imaginistic terms.[106] But this type of definition fits only a very few poems such as Henry King's "Exequy" and is true only of the last stanzas of Donne's "Valediction: forbidding mourning" where the famous metaphor of the compasses is first introduced. It does not fit, at all, an undoubted metaphysical poem such as Donne's "Twicknam Garden" which does not contain a single extended image. Miss Rosemond Tuve[107] has argued that metaphysical imagery was caused by the vogue of Ramist logic, but she, herself, cannot draw a clear distinction between the imagery of Sidney and Donne with her criteria. The most convincing analysis is a variation and elaboration of Dr. Johnson's suggestion that "*discordia concors*: a combination of dissimilar images, or discovery of occult resemblances in things apparently unlike"[108] is characteristic of metaphysical wit. Henry W. Wells spoke of the "radical image" by which he means a metaphor where vehicle and

tenor meet only at one point;[109] Douds and others speak of conceit when its terms are "imaginatively removed to the farthest possible degree;"[110] Mrs. Brandenburg prefers the term "dynamic image" stressing the neutrality of the minor terms and the imaginative distance between the major and minor terms.[111] Leonard Unger in an unpublished thesis[112] has analyzed many poems by Donne to show that they do not fit the definitions hitherto propounded and that a "complexity of attitudes" is rather the pervading characteristic of most of Donne's poems. But such a well-known piece as "Go and catch a falling star" shows no such complexity. His analysis is probably true only of a certain type of Donne's dramatic monologues in the *Songs and Sonnets*. Among other traditionally baroque authors, Góngora has attracted most interest for his very definite style. Dámaso Alonso, Leo Spitzer, and Walther Pabst[113] have written careful analyses especially of the imagery and the syntax of Góngora. Alonso speaks of Góngora's metaphors as achieving "the erection of an unreal wall between meaning and object," while Pabst draws elaborate charts of the enormously intricate relationships among the metaphorical clusters of Góngora. But these analyses apply only to one very individual artist and among his works only to two poems, the *Polifemo* and the *Soledades*.

Also in the study of baroque prose style much concrete work has been accomplished. Croll has demonstrated that the style of *Euphues* is derived from medieval Latin prose and is based on *schemata verborum*, on sound-figures.[114] It thus has nothing whatever to do with the new anti-Ciceronian movement in prose style which modeled itself on the style of Tacitus and Seneca and which Croll at first called "Attic" and later rechristened baroque.[115] The epigrammatic "terse" Senecan style and the asymmetrical, non-Ciceronian, sprawling period, which Croll calls "loose" style, came to dominate the seventeenth century and can be illustrated from Montaigne, Pascal, Bacon, St. Evremond, Halifax, and Sir William Temple as well as from Sir Thomas Browne, Fuller, and Jeremy Taylor. This style was ousted at the end of the seventeenth century by the simple style recommended by the Royal Society and inspired by scientific ideals of clarity and objectivity. But if we accept the results of these careful analyses in the history of imagery and prose style, are we prepared to accept their consequences for the term "baroque"? Some of these run completely counter to accepted usage. For instance, if we exclude all Petrarchan imagery from baroque, we arrive at the paradoxical conclusion that Marino himself was not baroque but merely an overingenious Petrarchist. The most baroque, in the conventional view, of all German poets, Lohenstein and Hoffmannswaldau, who were very close to Marino, would not fit the definition. Only Góngora, the best metaphysicals, and a few poems in Théophile, Tristan l'Hermite and in Gryphius and possibly a few other Germans would live up to these specifications, which approximate baroque imagery to symbolist techniques. In prose style, it is true, we would succeed in excluding *Euphues* and the *Arcadia* from the baroque but we would have to exclude also most baroque preachers and orators in Italy, Austria and elsewhere, such as the well-known Abraham à Santa Clara who, like Lyly, were primarily using schemes of sound.[116] Are we prepared to call the style of Montaigne, Bacon and Pascal *baroque*? We are definitely on the horns of dilemma: either we take

baroque in a wide sense and open the door to the inclusion of Petrarchism, Euphuism, and thus of Shakespeare and Sidney, or we narrow it down and then we exclude some of the traditionally most baroque authors such as Marino and the Second Silesian school.

VI

It is probably necessary to abandon attempts to define baroque in purely stylistic terms. One must acknowledge that all stylistic devices may occur at almost all times. Their presence is only important if it can be considered as symptomatic of a specific state of mind, if it expresses a "baroque soul". But what is the baroque mind or soul? A majority of the discussions of baroque have been frankly ideological or socio-psychological. Baroque, first, has been associated with specific races, social classes, professions of faith or a political and religious movement, the Counter-Reformation. Obviously, post-Tridentine Catholicism is, at first sight, closely related to the rise of baroque; and there are many scholars who simply identify baroque and Jesuitism.[117] Actually, this point of view cannot be upheld without ignoring most obvious literary affinities and relationships. The cases of Germany, Bohemia, and America need only be considered. In all three countries there is an unmistakable Protestant baroque which cannot be dismissed by a specious label such as "Pseudo-Renaissance"[118] and cannot be reduced to Catholic influences, as Martin Sommerfeld has tried to argue.[119] Though there are German scholars such as Nadler and Günther Müller who magnify the Catholic share in the baroque and there are others like Schulte who refuse to recognize the existence of Protestant baroque, the counterarguments seem to me completely convincing, even though I would not go to the extreme of considering, as Cysarz does, baroque primarily a Protestant creation. Certainly Gryphius and the Silesians were Protestants and a convert such as Angelus Silesius did his most characteristic writing when he was still a Lutheran. In Bohemia there is a similar division. The last Bishop of the Bohemian Brethren, Jan Amos Komenský (known as Comenius), was a radical Protestant who died in exile in Holland, but was still a very baroque writer. Of course, there were also Jesuits in Bohemia who wrote in the baroque style. In America there was at least one metaphysical poet, Edward Taylor, who was a Congregationalist. I believe one can speak of Dutch baroque which is Protestant and Calvinist even after excluding Vondel, who became a convert to Catholicism. Among the English poets, most were Anglicans and thus can be argued to be in the Catholic tradition; but it seems impossible to dissociate Andrew Marvell, the successor of Milton as Cromwell's Latin Secretary, from the metaphysicals. It can hardly be denied that there are, at least, baroque elements even in Milton. The French are also divided between the two professions of faith, especially if we consider Du Bartas and D'Aubigné, two staunch Huguenots, to be baroque. Certainly neither Théophile, who was condemned to death for atheism, nor Tristan-L'Hermite, the two possibly most gifted French poets who could be called baroque, strike one as inspired by the Counter-Reformation. We must conclude that baroque was a general European phenomenon which was not confined to a single profession of faith. Nor can it, to my mind, be limited to one national spirit or

one social class. Günther Müller calls baroque the expression of "courtly culture", and it has been frequently thought of as aristocratic and upper-class. But there is a definitely *bourgeois* baroque, especially in Northern Germany and in Holland, and baroque has widely filtered down to the peasant masses in Germany and in Eastern Europe. E.g., much of the popular poetry of the Czechs comes from this age and shows baroque traits in style, in verse-form, and in religious feeling. It seems to me also impossible to claim one nation as the radiating center of the baroque or to consider baroque a specific national style. Since Strich's first article, which tried to discover a similarity between the German baroque lyric and Old Teutonic poetry, some Germans have claimed baroque as *urdeutsch* or at least peculiarly Nordic or Teutonic. Others have, it seems to me, rightly protested against this identification of German and baroque and have pointed out its obvious foreign origins and analogues.[120] Another German scholar, Helmut Hatzfeld, has, on the other hand, argued that all baroque is the effect of the Spanish spirit,[121] which, since Lucan and Seneca, has been essentially baroque. According to Hatzfeld, even French classicism and most Elizabethan and English seventeenth century literature illustrates the dominance of the Spanish spirit in seventeenth century Europe. *Lo hispanico* and the baroque have become almost identical.[122] One need not deny the importance of Spanish influences in order to come to the conclusion that this type of argument is a gross exaggeration: baroque obviously arose in the most diverse countries, almost simultaneously, in reaction against preceding art-forms. The metaphysicals are not reducible to Spanish influence, even though Donne may have traveled in Spain besides taking part in the burning of Cadiz. There was simply no Spanish poetry at that time which could have served as model for Donne.

Much better chances of success attend the attempts at defining baroque in more general terms of a philosophy or a world-view or even a merely emotional attitude toward the world. Gonzague de Reynold speaks of baroque voluntarism and pessimism.[123] Eugenio d'Ors characterizes it in terms of pantheism, a belief in the naturalness of the supernatural, the identification of nature and spirit.[124] Spitzer makes much of the baroque feeling that life is a dream, an illusion or a mere spectacle.[125] None of these formulas and labels can, however, be seriously considered as peculiar to baroque. Arthur Hübscher was, I believe, the inventor of the slogan about the *antithetisches Lebensgefühl des Barock*,[126] which has found much favor and has given rise to a number of German books which all describe baroque in terms of one opposition or a number of oppositions. Thus Emil Ermatinger[127] describes the baroque as a conflict between asceticism and worldliness, the spirit and the flesh. W. P. Friederich[128] has applied the same dichotomy of spiritualism and sensualism to English seventeenth century poetry. Cysarz[129] operates largely with the tension between the classical form and the Christian *ethos* and sentiment of baroque literature. Hankamer,[130] in a less obvious way, describes the tension as that between Life and Spirit, out of which the baroque knew only two ways of escape—ascetic denial of life or irony. Ludwig Pfandl has written a large book on the Spanish literature of the Golden Age[131] which speaks of the supposedly innate Spanish dualism of realism and idealism which during the baroque age was "expanded and exaggerated" into an antithesis

of naturalism and illusionism. Possibly the *reductio ad absurdum* of this method is reached in Paul Meissner's book on the English Literary baroque.[132] Meissner defines baroque as a conflict of antithetic tendencies and pursues this formula for the "time spirit" relentlessly through all human activities from technological inventions to philosophical speculation, from traveling to religion. Meissner never stops to ask the question whether we could not impose a completely different scheme of contraries on the seventeenth century and even on exactly the same quotations culled from his wide reading, or whether the same contraries would not apply to almost every other age. While one need not deny a general impression of the violent disharmonies of the baroque age and even of the intensified conflict between the traditional Christian view of the world and the newly rising secularism, it is by no means clear that these tensions and conflicts on which these scholars have based the schematism of their books are peculiar to baroque. For instance, the supposedly baroque feeling for the physical horrors of death and putrefaction can be easily matched and even surpassed in the late fifteenth century, as Huizinga or Mâle show with ample documentary evidence.[133] Theodore Spencer has devoted a whole chapter of his book on *Shakespeare and the Nature of Man* to the "Renaissance conflict"[134] describing the tensions and contradictions of the Renaissance very much in the fashion in which the Germans describe the baroque age. What appears baroque to many observers may be also medieval or simply universally Christian, such as the paradoxes of the Christian faith, or even generally human, like the fear of death or lust for the other sex. Attempts to reduce the nature of the baroque to one contrary dichotomy like that of sensualism and spiritualism, fail to take account of the fact that there are definitely baroque poets who do not show this particular conflict or show it only peripherally. Marino seems a tension-free, very unspiritual sensualist, and many religious poets such as Traherne scarcely know the temptations of the flesh even in the disguise of mystical love.

VII

The most promising way of arriving at a more closely fitting description of the baroque is to aim at analyses which would correlate stylistic and ideological criteria. Already Strich had tried to interpret them in such a unity. The ideological conflicts, the "tensions of the lyrical motion," find expression in stylistic antitheses, in paradoxes, in syntactic contortions, in a heaving up of the heavy burden of language.[135] Américo Castro derives the style of the period from the division of the man of this age which he perceives in himself. The precious and rare style of the baroque artists is an expression of aggression, a sublime form of independence, of the conflict between the individual and the insecure world.[136] But all these and similar formulations, while true as far as they go, lack the requirement of specific application exclusively to the baroque. Conflicts between the ego and the world, conflicts within the individual combined with a tortuous or precious style can be found all over the history of literature from Iceland to Arabia and India. Some more concrete analytical studies seem to me more convincing. In a paper on the baroque style of the religious classical lyric in France,[137] Helmut Hatzfeld has made an attempt to interpret stylistic character-

istics such as gemination, "chaotic" asyndeton and a phenomenon which he calls "veiled antithesis" in relation to such attitudes as the melting-together of Heaven and Earth, the glorification and exaltation of God, the morbid eroticism of the time. One can be critical of Hatzfeld's conclusions as to the baroque nature of French classicism, as his material is confined to a very specialized genre, the religious lyric and within it to modernizations of medieval hymns, the psalms and the *Song of Songs*, but it is scarcely possible to doubt the skill with which style and mind, device and spirit are brought together. It seems to me that the later articles which expand Hatzfeld's analysis to the whole of French classicism and finally to the whole European movement of the baroque conceived by him as dominated by the Spanish spirit, never achieve again the same admirable concreteness and close integration of formal and ideological analysis. Austin Warren in his book on Crashaw also succeeds in closely correlating aesthetic method and religious belief. Crashaw's imagery "runs in streams; the streams run together, image turning into image. His metaphors are sometimes so rapidly juxtaposed as to mix. The effect is often that of phantasmagoria. For Crashaw, the world of the senses is evidently enticing; yet it was a world of appearances only—shifting, restless appearances. By temperament and conviction he was a believer in the miraculous: and his aesthetic method may be interpreted as a genuine equivalent of his belief, as its translation into a rhetoric of metamorphosis."[138] For many other writers it will be possible to see an indubitable connection between the emblematic image and their belief in the pervasive parallelism between macrocosmos and microsomos, in some vast system of correspondences which can be expressed only by sensuous symbolism. The prevalence of synaesthesia which in the Renaissance apparently occurs only under such traditional figures as the music of the spheres, but during the baroque boldly hears colors and sees sounds,[139] is another indication of this belief in a multiple web of interrelations, correspondences in the universe. Most baroque poets live with a world picture suggested by traditional Christian gradualism, and have found an aesthetic method where the imagery and the figures "link seemingly alien, discontinuous spheres."[140]

Such analyses will be most successful with poets like Crashaw where the integration of belief and expression is complete. But it seems to me impossible to deny that this connection is frequently very loose in the baroque age, possibly more so than in other ages. In Hatzfeld's long piece on French classicism a peculiarity of baroque literature and all baroque art is seen in the "paradoxical relation of content and form." "French classicism with its noble and simple language which disguises the passions burning behind it"[141] is proved baroque on the basis of this tension between content and form. Leo Spitzer characterizes Racine in similar terms and stresses elsewhere, in connection with an analysis of Lope de Vega's *Dorotea*, the baroque artists' sceptical attitude toward language. He comes to the conclusion that baroque artists were conscious of the "distance between word and thing, that they perceive the linkage between meaning and form at the same time as they see its falling-apart." To quote Spitzer's paradoxical formulas: the baroque artist "says something with full consciousness that one cannot actually say it. He knows all the difficulty of translation from inten-

tion to expression, the whole insufficiency of linguistic expression."[142] That is why his style is precious, cultist, *recherché*. A case in point seems to me also German baroque poetry which by many Germans since its rediscovery has been interpreted as expressing a turbulent, torn, convulsed soul struggling with its language, piling up asyndetons and epithets. Strich considers even antithesis, word-play, and onomatopoeia as evidences of an intense lyrical impulse.[143] But surely the attempt to see an anticipation of Romantic subjectivism in the baroque is doomed to failure. The figures and metaphors, hyperboles and catachreses frequently do not reveal any inner tension or turbulence and may not be the expression of any vital experience (*Erlebnis*) at all, but may be the decorative overelaborations of a highly conscious, sceptical craftsman, the pilings-up of calculated surprises and effects.

We may solve this final difficulty by distinguishing two main forms of baroque: that of the mystics and tortured souls such as Donne and Angelus Silesius and another baroque which must be conceived as a continuation of rhetorical humanism and Petrarchism, a courtly "public" art which finds its expression in the opera, the Jesuit drama and the heroic plays of Dryden. Possibly this dualism is not so sharp as it has been stated just now. It can be argued that the autobiographical content of even such an extremely unusual artist as Donne has been very much exaggerated by critics like Gosse[144] and that even the most ardently mystical poets like Crashaw or Angelus Silesius share in a communal, traditional and ritualistic religion. Even their description of personal experiences and conflicts are symbolic of man and would be misinterpreted if seen as anticipations of the romantic ego. Thus Faguet seems to me mistaken when he interprets French poetry around 1630 by comparisons with Lamartine.[145] Similarly Viëtor[146] sees the seventeenth century too much through the spectacles of Goethe's subjective poetry, when he discovers a trend towards modern subjectivism and irrationalism in German baroque poetry which, after all, culminated in the very impersonal art of the Second Silesian school. A poet such as Fleming has been shown to have developed toward a more personal, subjective expression, but stylistically he broke away from the baroque antithetical, hyperbolical style and tended towards the simple, the concrete, and popular.[147] Subjectivism and baroque rarely go hand in hand. Góngora, though an extremely individual writer, did not therefore in any way become subjective: rather his most characteristic poetry became almost symbolistic, "absolute" poetry which could be welcomed and praised by Mallarmé. The question of the correlation between style and philosophy cannot be solved, it seems to me, by the fundamental assumption of modern stylistics that a "mental excitement which deviates from the normal habitus of our mental life, must have coordinated a linguistic deviation from normal linguistic usage."[148] One must, at least, admit that stylistic devices can be imitated very successfully and that their possible original expressive function can disappear. They can become, as they did frequently in the baroque, mere empty husks, decorative tricks, craftman's *clichés*. The whole relationship between soul and word is looser and more oblique than it is frequently assumed.

If I seem to end on a negative note, unconvinced that we can define baroque either in terms of stylistic devices or a peculiar world-view or even a peculiar re-

lationship of style and belief, I would not like to be understood as offering a parallel to Lovejoy's paper on the "Discrimination of Romanticisms". I hope that baroque is not quite in the position of "romantic" and that we do not have to conclude that it has "come to mean so many things, that by itself, it means nothing."[149] In spite of the many ambiguities and uncertainties as to the extension, valuation and precise content of the term, baroque has fulfilled and is still fulfilling an important function. It has put the problem of periodisation and of a pervasive style very squarely; it has pointed to the analogies between the literatures of the different countries and between the several arts. It is still the one convenient term which refers to the style which came after the Renaissance but preceded actual Neo-Classicism. For a history of English literature the concept seems especially important since there the very existence of such a style has been obscured by the extension given to the term Elizabethan and by the narrow limits of the one competing traditional term: "metaphysical". As Roy Daniells has said, the century is "no longer drawn apart like a pack of tapered cards".[150] The indubitable affinities with contemporary Continental movements would stand out more clearly if we had a systematic study of the enormous mass of translating and paraphrasing from Italian, French and Spanish which was going on throughout the seventeenth century even from the most baroque Continental poets.[151] Baroque has provided an aesthetic term which has helped us to understand the literature of the time and which will help us to break the dependence of most literary history from periodisations derived from political and social history. Whatever the defects of the term baroque—and I have not been sparing in analyzing them—it is a term which prepares for synthesis, draws our minds away from the mere accumulation of observations and facts, and paves the way for a future history of literature as a fine art.[152]

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WRITINGS ON BAROQUE IN LITERARY SCHOLARSHIP

N.B.: This bibliography contains only items which definitely use the term Baroque applied to literature. No attempt, however, has been made to list every item referring to German seventeenth century literature, as this would mean listing practically all recent scholarship in the period. Early German items, German items referring to non-German literatures and of general theoretical interest have been included. The order is chronological to show the spread of the term. Please inform me of omissions and mistakes. I cordially thank Richard Alewyn, Américo Castro, Helmut Hatzfeld, Leo Spitzer, Karl Viëtor, Austin Warren and Arthur Wormhoudt for their help.

R. W.

Abbreviation: *DVJ—Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte*, Halle, 1923–1940.

1888: Wölfflin, Heinrich, *Renaissance und Barock*, Munich.

1890: Landau, Max, Zur Geschichte des Barockstils in der Literatur. Beilage der *Allgemeinen Zeitung*, No. 63f.

1912: Ricci, Corrado, *Baroque Architecture and Sculpture in Italy*, New York, p. 1.

1914: Borinski, Karl, *Die Antike in Poetik und Kunsttheorie*, Vol. I. *Mittelalter, Renaissance, Barock*, Leipzig.

Vedel, Valdemar. Den digteriske Barokstil omkring aar 1600, in *Edda* II, 17–40.

1915–16: Lichtenstein, Erich. Deutsche Barockdichtung, in *Der neue Merkur* II, 194–.

1916: Strich, Fritz. Der lyrische Stil des 17. Jahrhunderts, in *Abhandlungen zur deutschen Literaturgeschichte. Festschrift für Franz Muncker*, Munich, 21–53.

Walzel, Oskar, Shakespeares dramatische Baukunst, in *Jahrbuch der Shakespearegesellschaft* LII, 3–35. Reprinted in *Das Wortkunstwerk*, Leipzig, 1926, 302–25.

1917: Wolff, Max J. Shakespeare als Künstler des Barocks, in *Internationale Monatsschrift* XI, 995–1021.

1918: Nadler, Josef, *Literaturgeschichte der deutschen Stämme und Landschaften*. Vol. III, Regensburg.

1919: Schmidt-Degener, Frederik. Rembrandt en Vondel, in *De Gids*, LXXXIII, 222–275, German translation: *Rembrandt und der holländische Barock, Studien der Bibliothek Warburg*, IX, Leipzig, 1938.

1921: Delius, Rudolf von. *Die deutsche Barocklyrik*, Stuttgart.
Weisbach, Werner. *Der Barock als Kunst der Gegenreformation*, Berlin.

1922: Gregor, Joseph. *Das Wiener Barocktheater*. Vienna.
Hübscher, Arthur. Barock als Gestaltung antithetischen Lebensgefühls: Grundlegung einer Phaseologie der Geistegeschichte in *Euphorion* XXIV, 15. Ergänzungsheft. 517–62; 759–805.
Pirker, Max. *Das deutsche Liebeslied in Barock und Rokoko*. Zurich.
Spörri, Theophil. *Renaissance und Barock bei Ariost und Tasso. Versuch einer Anwendung Wölfflin'scher Kunstbetrachtung*, Bern.
Strich, Fritz. Die deutsche Barocklyrik, in *Genius* (Munich) III, 106.
Unus, W. *Die deutsche Lyrik des Barock*. Berlin.
Wiener, R. *Pallas und Cupido. Deutsche Lyrik der Barockzeit*. Vienna.

1923: Bertoni, Giulio. Review of Spörri in *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* LXXXI, 178–80.
Brom, G. *Barok en Romantiek*.
Cysarz, Herbert. Vom Geist des deutschen Literatur-Barocks, in *DVJ* I. 243–268.
Francke, Kuno. *Die Kulturwerte der deutschen Literatur in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*. Vol. II, Berlin.
Hatzfeld, Helmut. Dante und Tasso als religiöse Epiker. In *DVJ* I, 230–242.
Richter, Helene. *Shakespeare der Mensch*. Halle.
Viëtor, Karl. *Geschichte der deutschen Ode*. Munich.

1924: Baesecke, Georg. Zur Periodisierung der deutschen Literatur, in *DVJ* II, 770–776.
Cysarz, H. *Deutsche Barockdichtung*, Leipzig.
Kutscher, Arthur. *Das Salzburger Barocktheater*, Vienna.
Weisbach, W. Barock als Stilphänomen, in *DVJ* II, 225–256.

1925: Croce, Benedetto (ed.) Basile, Giambatista, *Lo Cunto de Cunti*, 2 vols. Bari.
—, *Der Begriff des Barock. Die Gegenreformation. Zwei Essays*, Zurich.
Cysarz, H. Zur Erforschung der deutschen Barockdichtung, in *DVJ* III, 145–76.
Hübscher, A. Das Problem der geistesgeschichtlichen Pseudomorphose in Renaissance und Barock, in *Euphorion* XXVI, 367–72.
Müller, Günther. *Geschichte des deutschen Liedes*, Munich.
Praz, Mario. *Secentismo e Marinismo in Inghilterra*. Florence.
Vento, Sebastiani, L'Essenza del Secentismo, in *Rivista d'Italia*, XXVII, 313–335.
Walzel, Oskar. *Gehalt und Gestalt im Kunstwerk des Dichters*. Wildpark-Potsdam, in *Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft*. ed. O. Walzel.

1926: Alewyn, Richard. Vorbarocker Klassizismus und grieschische Tragödie, in *Neue Heidelbelberger Jahrbücher, N.F.*, 3–63, also, Heidelberg.
Eckhardt, E. Gehört Shakespeare zur Renaissance oder zum Barock? in *Festschrift für Friedrich Kluge*. Tübingen, 21–29.
Ermatinger, Emil. *Barock und Rokoko in der deutschen Dichtung*. Leipzig.
Schulte, W. Renaissance und Barock in der deutschen Dichtung, in *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft* II, 47–61.
Viëtor, Karl. Vom Stil und Geist der deutschen Barockdichtung, in *Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift* XIV, 145–84.

1927: Alanso, Dámaso, review of Diego, in *Revista de Occidente* XVIII, 396–401.
Alanso, Dámaso, ed. Góngora, Luis de, *Soledades*, Madrid.

Brie, Friedrich. *Englische Rokoko-Epik.* Munich.
Diego, Gerardo, ed. *Antología poética en honor de Góngora,* Madrid.
Gebhardt, Carl. Rembrandt und Spinoza. Stilgeschichtliche Betrachtungen zum Barockproblem, in *Kant-Studien* XXII, 161–81.
Hatzfeld, Helmut, *Don Quixote als Wortkunstwerk,* Leipzig.
Müller, Günther. *Deutsche Dichtung von der Renaissance bis zum Ausgang des Barock.* Wildpark-Potsdam, in *Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft.* ed. O. Walzel.
Ortega y Gasset, Góngora, 1627–1927, in *Espíritu de la letra,* Madrid, 153–187.
Spitzer, Leo. Die Kunst Quevedos in seinem *Buscón,* in *Archivum Romanicum* XI, 511–580. Reprinted in *Romanische Stil- und Literaturstudien,* Marburg, 1931. Vol. II, 48–125.
1928: Benardete, M. J. Góngora revaluated, in *Revista des Estudios Hispanicos* I, 365–89.
Cossio, José de, Juan de Mairana y el barocco. (Antonio Machado, Poesías completas) in *Revista de Occidente* XX, 287–89.
Flemming, Willi. Die Auffassung des Menschen im 17. Jahrhundert, in *DVJ* VI, 403–46.
Friedell, Egon. Die Seele der Barocke, in *Die neue Rundschau* XXXIX, 190–98.
Joël, Karl. *Wandlungen der Weltanschauung.* Vol. I. Tübingen.
Klemperer, V.-Hatzfeld, H.-Neubert, F. *Die romanischen Literaturen von der Renaissance bis zur französischen Revolution.* Wildpark-Potsdam, in *Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft,* ed. O. Walzel.
Prat, A. Valbuena. Camoens y Góngora, o Greco-romano y Barroco, in *Revista de las Españas* III, 259–62.
Praz, Mario. *Isola Pentagonale.* Milan. English tr. *Unromantic Spain.* London, 1929. 114–16.
Schürr, Friedrich. *Barock, Klassizismus und Rokoko in der französischen Literatur. Eine prinzipielle Stilbetrachtung.* Leipzig.
Spitzer, Leo. Die klassische Dämpfung in Racines Stil, in *Archivum Romanicum* XII, 361–472. Reprinted in *Romanische Stil- und Literaturstudien,* Marburg, 1931, I, 135–268.
Viëtor, Karl. *Probleme der deutschen Barockliteratur,* Leipzig.
Walzel, Oskar. Barockstil bei Klopstock, in *Festschrift Max H. Jellinek,* Vienna.
1929: Budde, Illa, *Die Idylle im holländischen Barock,* Köln.
Croce, Benedetto. *Storia della età barocca in Italia,* Bari.
Croll, Morris, W. The Baroque Style in Prose, in *Studies in English Philology. A Miscellany in Honor of Frederick Klaeber.* ed. K. Malone and M. B. Rund. Minneapolis, 427–56.
Epstein, Hans. *Die Metaphysizierung in der literaturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung und ihre Folgen. Dargelegt an drei Theorien über das Literaturbarock. Germanische Studien.* 73. Berlin.
Frey, Dagobert. *Gotik und Renaissance.* Augsburg.
Hatzfeld, Helmut. Der Barockstil der religiösen klassischen Lyrik in Frankreich, in *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft* IV, 30–60.
Kleiner, Julius, *Die polnische Literatur,* Wildpark-Potsdam.
Michels, Wilhelm, Barockstil in Shakespeare und Calderón, in *Revue Hispanique* LXXV, 370–458.
Müller, Günther, Barockromane und Barockroman, in *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft* IV, 1–29.
Naumann, Hans and Müller, Günther. *Höfische Kultur,* Halle.
Pfandl, Ludwig. *Geschichte der spanischen Nationalliteratur in ihrer Blütezeit.* Freiburg im Breisgau.
Pützer, Fritz. *Prediger des englischen Barock, stilistisch untersucht.* Diss. Bonn.
Sperber, Hans, Die Sprache der Barockzeit, in *Zeitschrift für Deutschkunde,* XLIII, 670–684.
Spitzer, Leo. Zu Góngoras *Soledades,* in *Volkstum und Kultur der Romanen* II, 244ff. Reprinted in *Romanische Stil- und Literaturstudien,* Marburg, 1931, II, 129–13.

Winkler, M. Der Mensch des Barock, in *Preussische Jahrbücher* CCXVI, 297–312.
1930: Burra, Peter. "Baroque and Gothic Sentimentalism", in *Farrago* (London) I, 59–82. Reprinted, London, 1931.
Eberle, Oskar (ed.) *Barock in der Schweiz.* Einsiedeln.
Flemming, Willi (ed.) *Barockdrama.* 6 vols (1930–33) in *Deutsche Literatur. Sammlung literarischer Kunst-und Kulturdenkmäler in Entwicklungsreihen.* ed. Heinz Kindermann. Leipzig.
Joseph, A. *Sprachformen der deutschen Barocklyrik, dargestellt durch Analyse von Oden des Horaz in deutschen Uebersetzungen des 17. Jahrhunderts.* Rottach.
Müller, Johannes. *Das Jesuitendrama in den Ländern deutscher Zunge,* 2 vols. Augsburg.
Pabst, Walther. Góngoras Schöpfung in seinen Gedichten *Polifemo* und *Soledades,* in *Revue Hispanique.* LXXX, 1–299.
Pfiester, Hans. *Die Worthäufung im Barock.* Bonn. *Mnemosyne* 7.
Viëtor, Karl. Das Zeitalter des Barock in *Aufriss der deutschen Literaturgeschichte* (ed. H. A. Korff and W. Linden) Leipzig.
Williamson, George. *The Donne Tradition,* Cambridge, Mass.
1931: Ham, Roswell Gray. *Otway and Lee: Biography from a Baroque Age.* New Haven.
Merker, Paul. Die Anfänge der deutschen Barockliteratur, in *Germanic Review* VI, 109–24.
Praz, Mario. Donne's Relation to the Poetry of his Time, in *A Garland for John Donne,* 1631–1931, ed. Theodore Spencer, Cambridge, Mass. 53–72.
Schirmer, F. W. Die geistesgeschichtlichen Grundlagen der englischen Barockliteratur, in *Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift* XIX 273–84.
Spitzer, Leo. Zur Auffassung Rabelais'; Saint-Simons Portrait Ludwigs XIV, Einige Voltaire-interpretationen, in *Romanische Stil- und Literaturstudien.* Marburg, 1931. I, 109–34; II, 1–47.
Vossler, Ernst. Die Einheit von Raum und Zeit im barocken Drama, in *Zeitschrift für Aesthetik* XXV, 144–52.
Wellek, Albert, Renaissance- und Barock-Synästhesie, in *DVJ* IX, 534–84.
1932: Alewyn, Richard. *Johann Beer, Studien zum Roman des 17. Jahrhunderts.* Leipzig.
Fitch, J. E. Crawford, *Angelus Silesius,* London.
Friederich, Werner P. *Spiritualismus und Sensualismus in der englischen Barocklyrik. Wiener Beiträge.* Vol. 57. Vienna.
Jünemann, Wolfgang. *Drydens Fabeln und ihre Quellen. Britannica.* vol. 5. Hamburg.
Kayser, Wolfgang, *Die Klangmalerei bei Harsdörffer. Palaestra.* Vol. 179. Leipzig.
Mann, Wolfgang. *Drydens heroische Tragödien als Ausdruck höfischer Barockkultur.* Diss. Tübingen.
Pyritz, Hans. *Paul Flemings deutsche Liebeslyrik. Palaestra* vol. 180. Leipzig.
Rütsch, Julius. *Das dramatische Ich im deutschen Barocktheater. Wege zur Dichtung.* Vol. XII. Leipzig.
Spitzer, Leo. *Die Literarisierung des Lebens in Lopes Dorotea,* Bonn. *Kölner Romanistische Arbeiten.* IV.
Vančura, Zdeněk. Euphuism and Baroque Prose, In *Časopis pro moderní filologii* (Prague) Vol. XVIII, 291–6.
Vogt, Erika. *Die gegenhöfische Strömung in der deutschen Barockliteratur,* Leipzig. *Von deutscher Poeterey.* XI.
Weise, Georg. Das "gotische" oder "barocke" Stilprinzip der deutschen und der nordischen Kunst, in *DVJ* X, 206–243.
1933: Fricke, Gerhard. *Die Bildlichkeit in der Dichtung des Andreas Gryphius. Neue Forschung.* Vol. 17. Berlin.
Hiller, J. E. Lessing und Corneille: Rokoko und Barock, in *Romanische Forschungen* XLVII, 159–76.
Keller, Wolfgang and Fehr, Bernhard, *Die englische Literatur von der Renaissance bis*

zur Aufklärung. Wildpark-Potsdam, in *Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft*. ed. O. Walzel.
Koszul, André. Beaumont et Fletcher et le Baroque, in *Cahiers du Sud* X, 210–216.
Lützeler, Heinrich. Der Wandel der Barockauffassung, in *DVJ* XI, 618–36.
Pfandl, Ludwig. *Historia de la literatura nacional española en la edad de oro* (translated Jorge Rabió Balaques). Barcelona.
Vančura, Zdeněk. Baroque Prose in America, in *Studies in English by Members of the English Seminar of Charles University*, Prague, vol. IV, 39–58.
Watkin, E. J. Richard Crashaw in *The English Way: Studies in English Sanctity from St. Bede to Newman* (ed. Maisie Ward), London, 268–296.
Ziemendorff, J. *Die Metapher bei den weltlichen Lyrikern des deutschen Barock. Germanische Studien*. Vol. 135. Berlin.

1934: Bateson, F. W. *English Poetry and the English Language*. Oxford, 1934.
Beachcroft, T. O. Crashaw and the Baroque Style, in *Criterion* XIII, 407–25.
Haerten, Heinz. *Vondel und der deutsche Barock. Disquisitiones Carolinae. Fontes et Acta Philologica et Historica*. ed. Th. Baader. VI. Nijmegen.
Hirsch, Arnold. *Bürgertum und Barock im deutschen Roman. Eine Untersuchung über die Entstehung des modernen Weltbildes*. Frankfurt am Main.
Meissner, Paul. *Die geisteswissenschaftlichen Grundlagen des englischen Literaturbarocks*. Munich.
Rehm, Walter. Römisch-französicher Barockheroismus and seine Umgestaltung in Deutschland, in *Germanisch-romanische Monatschrift* XXII, 81–106; 213–239.

1935: Cysarz, Herbert. Zur Zeit-und Wesensbestimmung des dichterischen Barockstils, in *Forschungen und Fortschritte* XI, 409–11.
Hankamer, Paul. *Deutsche Gegenreformation und deutscher Barock*, in *Epochen der deutschen Literatur*, Stuttgart.
Hatzfeld, Helmut. Die französiche Klassik in neuer Sicht. Klassik als Barock, in *Tijdschrift voor Taal en Letteren* (Tilburg) XXIII, 213–281.
Ors, Eugenio d'. *Du Baroque*, Paris.
Vedel, Valdemar. *Deux Classiques français: Corneille et son temps——Molière*. Traduit du Danois par Madame E. Cornet, Paris.
Vincenti, Leonello. Interpretazione del Barocco tedesco, in *Studî Germanici* (Florence) I, 39–75.
—, *La letteratura tedesca nella età barocca*, Turino.
Wild, Friedrich. Zum Problem des Barocks in der englischen Dichtung, in *Anglia* LIX, 414–422.

1936: Cysarz, Herbert. *Deutsches Barock in der Lyrik*. Leipzig.
Deutschbein, Max. *Shakespeares Macbeth als Drama des Barock*. Leipzig.
Faber du Faur, Kurt von. *Barocklyrik*. Salzburg.
Fehr, Bernhard. The Antagonism of Forms in the Eighteenth Century, in *English Studies* XVIII, 115–21; 193–205 and XIX (1977), 1–13; 49–57.
Krempien, Hans H. *Der Stil der Davideis von Abraham Cowley. Britannica*. XI. Hamburg.
Moret, André, *Le Lyrisme baroque en Allemagne*, Lille.
Rohlfs, Gerhard. Racines *Mithridate* als Beispiel höfischer Barockdichtung, in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen* CLXVI, 200–12.
Schirmer, F. W. Das Problem des religiösen Epos im siebzehnten Jahrhundert in England, in *DVJ*, 60–74.
White, Helen C. *The Metaphysical Poets. A Study in Religious Experience*, New York.

1937: Baldensperger, Fernand. Pour une Révaluation littéraire du XVIIe siècle classique, in *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France* XLIV, 1–15.
Boerner, O. Shakespeare und der Barock, in *Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift* XXV, 363–81.

Castro, Américo, El Don Juan de Tirso y el de Molière como personajes barrocos, in *Homage a Ernest Martinenche*, Paris, 93–111.
Černý, Václav. *O básnickém baroku.* Ars. Vol. 18, Prague.
Cysarz, Herbert. (ed.) *Deutsche Barocklyrik.* 3 vols. in *Deutsche Literatur. Sammlung literarischer Kunst-und Kulturdenkmäler in Entwicklungsreihen.* ed. Heinz Kindermann, Leipzig.
Cysarz, Herbert, Der dichterische Stil- und Zeitbegriff Barock, in *Bulletin of the International Committee of Historical Sciences* IX, 338–47.
Eppelsheimer, Hans W. *Handbuch der Weltliteratur*, Frankfurt am Main.
Isaacs, J. Baroque und Rococo: A History of Two Concepts, in *Bulletin of the International Committee of Historical Sciences* IX, 347–8.
Lebèque, Raymond. (on Baroque in France), *Ibid.* 378.
Markwardt, Bruno. *Geschichte der deutschen Poetik.* I. Berlin.
Milch, Werner. Deutscher Literaturbarock. Der Stand der Forschung. *Zeitschrift für deutsche Geistesgeschichte* III, 80ff.
Moret, André, Vers une solution de problème du baroque, in *Revue Germanique* XXVIII, 373–7.
Müller, Richard, *Dichtung und bildende Kunst im Zeitalter des deutschen Barock. Wege zur Dichtung* XXVIII, Frauenfeld.
Schirmer, Walther F. *Geschichte der englischen Literatur.* Halle.
Schnürer, Gustav. *Die katholische Kirche und Kultur in der Barockzeit.* Paderborn.
Trunz, Erich. Weltbild und Dichtung im deutschen Barock, in *Zeitschrift für Deutschkunde.* Vol. LI, 14–30.
1938: Bell, Aubrey F. G. *Castilian Literature*, Oxford.
Closs, August. *The Genius of the German Lyric. An Historic Survey of its Formal and Metaphysical Values.* London.
Crémieux, Benjamin. Review of Emile Clermont's *Amour Promis* in *La Novelle Revue Française.* L, 1026.
Gobliani, H. *Il barocchismo in Seneca e in Lucano.* Messina.
Levin, Harry (ed.) Jonson, Ben, *Selected Works*, New York.
Lunding, Erik. *Tysk Barok og Barokforskning*, Kopenhagen.
Mark, James. The Uses of the Term "Baroque", in *Modern Language Review* XXXIII, 547–63.
Schücking, Levin L. *The Baroque Character of the Elizabethan Tragic Hero.* London, 1938. Annual Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy. Also in *Proceedings of the British Academy* XXIV. 85–111.
Vašica, Josef. *České literární baroko.* Prague.
1939: Croce, Benedetto. Góngora, in *La Critica* XXXVII, 334–49.
Sommerfeld, Martin. The "Baroque" Period in German Literature, in *Essays contributed in honor of William Allan Neilson, Smith College Studies in Modern Languages.* XXI, 192–208.
Tindelnot, Hans. *Barocktheater und barocke Kunst.* Berlin.
Warren, Austin. *Richard Crashaw: A Study in Baroque Sensibility.* University, Louisiana.
Bitnar, Vilém. *Zrození barokového básníka.* Prague.
1940: Haller, Elisabeth. *Die barocken Stilmerkmale in der englischen, lateinischen und deutschen Fassung von Dr. Thomas Burnets Theory of the Earth. Swiss Studies in English.* IX, Bern.
Lunding, Erich. *Das schlesische Kunstdrama.* Copenhagen.
Milch, Werner. Deutsches Literaturbarock. Der Stand der Forschung, in *German Quarterly* XIII, 131–6.
Plaja, Díaz Guillermo. *El espíritu del barroco.* Barcelona.
Trunz, Erich. Die Erforschung der deutschen Barockdichtung, in *DVJ* XVIII. Referatenheft, 1–100.

1941: Curtius, Ernst Robert. Mittelalterlicher und barocker Dichtungsstil, in *Modern Philology* XXXVIII, 325–333.
Hatzfeld, Helmut. El predominio del espíritu español en las literaturas del siglo XVII, in *Revista de Filología Hispánica* III, 9–23.
Kalista, Zdeněk. *České baroko. Studie, texty, poznámky.* Prague.
Reinhardt, Kurt F. The Cultural Background of the Literary Baroque in Germany, in *Stanford Studies in Language and Literature*, 49–58.
Warren, Austin. Edward Taylor's Poetry: Colonial Baroque, in *Kenyon Review* III, 355–371.
Aury, Mme. Dominique (ed.). Les poètes précieux et baroques du XVII[e] siècle. Introduction by Thierry Maulnier. Angers.
Heuser, Nelly. *Barock und Romantik. Versuch einer vergleichenden Darstellung.* Frauenfeld. *Wege zur Dichtung.* XXXVIII.
1942: Peyre, Henri. *Le Classicisme français.* New York. cf. 181–3.
Proll, E. Popularismo and barroquismo in the poetry of Rafael Alberti, in *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* (Liverpool) XIX, 59–86.
Wellek, René. The Parallelism between Literature and the Arts, in *English Institute Annual*, 1941, New York, 29–63.
1943: Alewyn, Richard. Baroque, in *Dictionary of World Literature*, ed. Joseph T. Shipley, New York, p. 66.
Aury, Mme. Dominique. *Anthologie de la Poésie religieuse française.* Paris, vi–vii.
Blanchot, Maurice. Les poètes baroques du XVII[e] siècle, in *Faux Pas.* Paris, 151–56.
Casalduero, Joaquin, *Sentido y forma de las 'Novelas ejemplares.'* Buenos Aires.
Kettler, Hans K. *Baroque Tradition in the Literature of the German Enlightenment, 1700–1750. Studies in the Determination of a Literary Period.* Cambridge, England.
Brock-Sulzer, Elisabeth. Klassik und Barock bei Ronsard, in *Trivium* (Zurich), III, 148–55.
1944: Raymond, Marcel. Classique et Baroque dans la poésie de Ronsard, in *Concinnitas: Festschrift für Heinrich Wölfflin*, Bâle.
Reynold, Gonzague de. *Le XVIIe siècle: Le Classique et le Baroque.* Montreal.
Sypher, Wylie. The Metaphysicals and the Baroque, in *Partisan Review* XI, 3–17.
Arland, Marcel. Un poète baroque: Jean de Sponde, in *1. Cahier de Poésie 44*, 32–39.
1945: Daniells, Roy. Baroque Form in English Literature, in *University of Toronto Quarterly*, XIV, 392–408.
Peyton, Myron A. Some Baroque Aspects of Tirso de Molina, in *Romanic Review* XXXVI, 43–69.
Wilson, F. P. *Elizabethan and Jacobean*, Oxford, p. 26.
1946: Mainland, W. F. An Example of 'Baroque' Elaboration, in *Modern Language Review* XLI, 298–305.

NOTES

[1] J. Isaacs, "Baroque and Rococo: A History of Two Concepts," in *Bulletin of the International Committee of the Historical Sciences* IX (1937), 347–48, is only a very brief abstract of an unpublished lecture.

[2] Karl Borinski, *Die Antike in Poetik und Kunsttheorie* Vol. I. [Leipzig. 1914], 199, 303. Benedetto Croce, *Storia della Età barocca in Italia*, Bari, 1929, 20ff.

[3] Quoted in Gustav Schnürer, *Katholische Kirche und Kultur in der Barockzeit*, Paderborn, 1937, 68, from *In pseudodialeticos.*

[4] Charles de Brosses, *Le President de Brosses en Italie*, ed. R. Colomb. Paris, 1885, Vol. II, 15, quoted by W. Weisbach, note 117. J. J. Winckelmann, *Sendschreiben* (1744), 113, quoted by Borinski, *loc. cit.* 303 and *Gedanken über die Nachahmung der grieschischen Werke*, Dresden, 1756, 87.

[5] Quoted by Heinrich Wölfflin, *Renaissance und Barock*, Munich, 1888, 10.

[6] Wölfflin, *loc. cit.* refers to Burckhardt's "Über die vorgotischen Kirchen am Niederrhein," in Lerschs *Niederrheinisches Jahrbuch* (1843).

[7] See Note 5.

[8] Cornelius Gurlitt, *Geschichte des Barockstils in Italien*, Stuttgart, 1887. *Geschichte des Barockstiles und des Rococo in Deutschland*, Stuttgart, 1889. Alois Riegl, *Barockhunst in Rom*, Vienna, 1908. Magni, Guilio, *Il Baroco a Roma*, 3 vols. Turin, 1911-13. Corrado Ricci, *Baroque Architecture and Sculpture in Italy*, London, 1912. Martin Shaw Briggs, *Baroque Architecture*, London, 1913. Geoffrey Scott, *The Architecture of Humanism*, London, 1914 (Second ed. New York, 1924).

[9] Eugenio d'Ors, *Du Baroque*, Paris, 1935. Sacheverell Sitwell, *Southern Baroque Art*, London, 1931; *Spanish Baroque Art*, London, 1931; *German Baroque Sculpture*, London, 1938. Jean Cassou, "Apologie de l'art baroque" in *L'Amour de l'Art*, September, October 1927.

[10] Amsterdam, 1769. Vol. I, 62 (First ed. 1764).

[11] *Loc. cit.* 85–86.

[12] Thus e.g. in Oscar Thompson's *Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, New York, 1943. Leichtentritt, Paul Láng, McKinney and Anderson and apparently most other current histories of music have sections on the baroque. W. August Ambros, *Geschichte der Musik*, Vol. IV, Breslau, 1878. Cf. also Robert Haas, *Die Musik des Barocks*, Potsdam-Wildpark, 1929.

[13] Carl Gebhardt, "Rembrandt und Spinoza, Stilgeschichtliche Betrachtungen zum Barockproblem", in *Kant-studien* XXXII (1927), 161–181, argues that Rembrandt and Spinoza are both baroque and closely similar. Karl Joël's *Wandlungen der Weltanschauung* (Vol. I Tübingen, 1938) has a chapter on baroque philosophy. See Hermann Schmalenbach, *Leibniz*, Munich, 1921, especially 11–18. Dietrich Mahnke, "Der Barock-Universalismus des Comenius" in *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Erziehung*, XXI (1931), 97–128, and XXII (1932) 61–90. "Der Zeitgeist des Barock und seine Verewigung in Leibnizens Gedankenwelt", *Zeitschrift für deutsche Kulturphilosophie* II (1936), 95–126.

[14] Oswald Spengler, *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*, Munich 1923, Vol. I, 400 (First ed. 1918). Egon Friedell, *Kulturgeschichte der Neuzeit*, Munich, 1929, Vol. II. Willi Flemming, *Deutsche Kultur im Zeitalter des Barocks*, Potsdam, 1937. Schnürer in Note 3.

[15] *Loc. cit.* 83–85.

[16] Corrado Ricci, *Baroque Architecture and Sculpture in Italy*, New York, 1912, calls Marino "the Baroque poet *par excellence*". (p. 1). This would be the first use of the term applied to literature known in English.

[17] Bari, 1910, cf. XIX, XX, 404 etc.

[18] In *Edda* II (Kristiana, 1914), 17–40.

[19] See Note 2.

[20] Munich, 1915. 7th ed. 1929. English translation: *Principles of Art History* by M. D. Hottinger, New York, 1932.

[21] "Der lyrische Stil des 17. Jahrhunderts", in *Abhandlungen zur deutschen Literaturgeschichte, Festschrift für Franz Muncker*, Munich, 1916, 21–53.

[22] "Shakespeares dramatische Baukunst," in *Jahrbuch der Shakespearegesellschaft* LII (1916), 3–35, reprinted in *Das Wortkunstwerk, Mittel seiner Erforschung*, Leipzig, 1926, 302–25.

[23] "Shakespeare als Künstler des Barocks", in *Internationale Monatsschrift* XI (1917), 995–1021.

[24] Regensburg, 1918. Vol. III.

[25] *Die deutsche Barocklyrik*, Stuttgart, 1921. Pirker, Max, *Das deutsche Liebeslied in Barock und Rokoko*, Zurich, 1922. Fritz Strich, "Die deutsche Barocklyrik" in *Genius* (Munich) Vol. III. (1922). W. Unus, *Die deutsche Lyrik des Barock*, Berlin, 1922. R. Wiener, *Pallas und Cupido. Deutsche Lyrik der Barockzeit*, Vienna, 1922.

[26] *Das Wiener Barocktheater*, Vienna, 1922.

[27] "Grundlegung einer Phaseologie der Geistesgeschichte" in *Euphorion*, XXIV, (1922), 15. Ergänzungsheft, 517–62; 759–805.

[28] Leipzig, 1924; see his earlier article, "Vom Geist des deutschen Literaturbarocks",

in *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* I (1923) 243–368.

[29] *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*, Munich, 1923, 236, 308, 399–400, etc.

[30] *Renaissance und Barock bei Ariost und Tasso. Versuch einer Anwendung Wölfflin'scher Kunstbetrachtung*, Bern, 1922.

[31] *Revue Hispanique* LXXXV (1929), 370–458.

[32] *Don Quixote als Sprachkunstwerk*, Leipzig, 1927, 287.

[33] *Geschichte der spanischen Nationalliteratur in ihrer Blütezeit*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1929, 289.

[34] In *Revista de Filología Hispánica* III (1941) 9–23.

[35] Karl Vossler, *Lope de Vega und sein Zeitalter*, Munich, 1932, especially 89–105. Leo Spitzer, *Die Literarisierung des Lebens in Lopes Dorotea*, Bonn, 1932.

[36] V. Klemperer, H. Hatzfeld, F. Neubert, *Die romanischen Literaturen von der Renaissance bis zur französichen Revolution*, Wildpark-Potsdam, 1928. Friedrich Schürr, *Barock, Klassizismus und Rokoko in der französischen Literatur. Eine prinzipielle Stilbetrachtung*, Leipzig, 1928.

[37] Reported by Leo Spitzer, "Klassische Dämpfung in Racines Stil", in *Romanische Stil- und Literaturstudien*, Marburg, 1931. I, 256.

[38] Cf. Note 27. The paper appeared first in *Archivum Romanicum* XII (1928), 361–472.

[39] "Der Barockstil der religiösen klassischen Lyrik in Frankreich", in *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft* IV (1929), 30–60.

[40] "Die französiche Klassik in neuer Sicht. Klassik als Barock", in *Tijdschrift voor Taal en Letteren* XXIII (1935), 213–281.

[41] Munich, 1927.

[42] Diss. Bonn, 1929.

[43] "Die geistesgeschichtlichen Grundlagen der englischen Barockliteratur", in *Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift* XIX (1931), 273–84. "Das Problem des religiösen Epos im siebzehnten Jahrhundert in England", in *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* XIV (1936), 60–74. *Geschichte der englischen Literatur*, Halle, 1937.

[44] "Zum Problem des Barocks in der englischen Dichtung", in *Anglia* LIX (1935), 414–22.

[45] *Spiritualismus und Sensualismus in der englischen Barocklyrik. Wiener Beiträge*, Vol. 57, Vienna, 1932.

[46] *Drydens Fabeln und ihre Quellen, Britannica*, No. 5. Hamburg, 1932.

[47] *Drydens heroische Tragödien als Ausdruck höfischer Barockkultur*, 1932. Diss. Tübingen.

[48] *Die barocken Stilmerkmale in der englischen, lateinischen und deutschen Fassung von Dr. Thomas Burnets Theory of the Earth, Swiss Studies in English* IX, Bern, 1940. See a review by this writer in *Philological Quarterly* XXI (1942), 199–200.

[49] *Die geisteswissenschaftlichen Grundlagen des englischen Literaturbarocks*, Munich, 1934.

[50] *Loc. cit.* in Note 34, page 22.

[51] "The Antagonism of Forms in the Eighteenth Century", in *English Studies* XVIII (1936) 115–21, 193–205 and XIX (1937), 1–13, 49–57.

[52] See Note 3.

[53] LXXXIII (1919), 222–275. A German translation by Alfred Pauli was published as *Rembrandt und der holländische Barock, Studien der Bibliothek Warburg*, No. 9, Leipzig, 1928.

[54] *Disquisitiones Carolinae. Fontes et Acta Philologica et Historica*, ed. Th. Baader, Vol. VI, Nijmegen, 1934.

[55] In *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* LXXXI (1923), 178–80.

[56] In *L'Esame* I (1922).

[57] Florence, 1925. The preface dated, November 1924. cf. pp. 94, 110n, 113.

[58] *Der Begriff des Barock. Die Gegenreformation. Zwei Essays.* (translated by Berthold Fenigstein), Zurich, 1925. Practically identical with Chapters II and I of *Storia della Età barocca in Italia*, Bari, 1929.

[59] See Note 58.

[60] Introduction to Basile's *Lo Cunto de li Cunti*, 2 vols, Bari, 1925. The paper on Basile in *Saggi sulla Letteratua Italiana del Seicento*, Bari, 1910 does not use the term. The English Translation by N. M. Penzer, introducing the *Pentamerone of Giambatista Basile*, London, 2 vols, 1932 contaminates the two pieces.

[61] Paris, 1935. 6th ed.

[62] Diego, Gerardo, *Antología poética en honor de Góngora*, Madrid, 1927. Reviewed by Dámaso Alonso in *Revista de Occidente* XVIII (1927), 396–401.

[63] Madrid, 1927. 2nd ed. 1937. Especially pages 31–32.

[64] "Góngora, 1627–1927", in *Espíritu de la Letra* (Madrid, 1927) quoted from Ortega y Gasset, *Obras*, Madrid, 1943, II, 1108–09.

[65] "El Don Juan de Tirso y el Molière como personajes barrocos", in *Hommage a Ernest Martinenche*, Paris (1937), 93–111. Castro refers to an older paper of his in *Tierra Firma* (1935) which I have not been able to see.

[66] "Beaumont et Fletcher et le Baroque" in *Cahiers du Sud* X (1933) 210–16.

[67] *Le Lyrisme baroque en Allemagne*, Lille, 1936. cf. also "Vers une solution du problème du baroque" in *Revue Germanique* XXXVIII (1937) 373–7.

[68] Montreal, 1944.

[69] Fernand Baldensperger, "Pour une révaluation littéraire du XVIIe siècle classique", in *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France* XLIV (1937) 1–15, especially 13–14. Raymond Lebèque, *Bulletin of the International Committee of Historical Sciences*, IX (1937), 378. Henri Peyre, *Le Classicisme français*, New York, 1942 (cf. pp. 181–3).

[70] F. Fidao-Justiniani, *L'esprit classique et la préciosité*, Paris, 1914. Georges Mongredien, *Les précieux et les précieuses*, Paris, 1939. Daniel Mornet, "La Signification et l'évolution de l'idée de préciosité en France au XVIIe siècle" in *Journal of the History of Ideas* I (1940) 225–31 and *Histoire de la littérature française classique, 1600–1700*, Paris, 1940.

[71] "Classique et baroque dans la poésie de Ronsard", in *Concinnitas: Festschrift für Heinrich Wölfflin*, Bâle, 1944. Mme. Dominique Aury, *Les poètes précieux et baroques du XVII^e siècle*. Paris 1942. Maurice Blanchot, "Les poètes baroques du XVII^e siècle, in *Faux Pas*, Paris, 1943, 151–56.

[71a] Julius Kleiner, *Die polnische Literatur*, Wildpark-Potsdam, 1929, uses the term, e.g. of Casimir (Sarbiewski), the Neo-Latin poet (p. 15).

[72] Studies and editions by J. Vašica (e.g. *České literární baroko*, Prague, 1938). V. Bitnar, Zdeněk Kalista, F. X. Šalda, Arne Novák etc. Václav Černý, *O básnickém baroku*, Prague, 1937.

[73] *Deux Classiques français: Corneille et son Temps——Molière.* Traduit du Danois par Madame E. Cornet, Paris, 1935. cf. pp. 6, 7, 189, 190, 235. I have not seen Erik Lunding's *Tysk Barok og Barokforskning*, Copenhagen, 1938, or *Das schlesiche Kunstdrama*, Copenhagen, 1940.

[74] Mario Praz, "Donne's Relation to the Poetry of his Time", in *A Garland for John Donne*, ed. T. Spencer, Cambridge, 58–59.

[75] See Note 8. Second ed. p. 268, New York, 1924.

[76] Reprinted independently, London, 1931.

[77] *Angelus Silesius*, London, 1932.

[78] In *The English Way: Studies in English Sanctity from St. Bede to Newman*, ed. Maisie Ward, London, 1933, 268–296.

[79] "Crashaw and the Baroque style" in *Criterion* XIII (1934), 407–25.

[80] Oxford, 1934, 76–77.

[81] *Elizabethan and Jacobean*, Oxford, 1945, 26.

[82] Milton, *Private Correspondences and Academic Exercises:* Cambridge, 1932, XI.

[83] "The Baroque Style in Prose" in *Studies in English Philology: A Miscellany in Honor of Frederick Klaeber*, ed. K. Malone and M. B. Rund, Minneapolis, 1929, 427–56. cf. "Juste Lipse et le mouvement anticicéronien en la fin du XVIe et au debut du XVIIe siècle", *Revue du Seizième Siècle* II (1914), 200–242; "Attic Prose in the Seventeenth Century", *Studies in Philology* XVIII (1921), 79–128; "Attic Prose, Lipsius, Montaigne and Bacon"

in *Schelling Anniversary Papers*, New York, 1923, 117–50. "Muret and the History of Attic Prose" in *PMLA* XXXIX (1924), 254–309.

[84] Cambridge, Mass. 1930, p. 116, 123.

[85] New York, 1936, pp. 84, 198–9, 247, 254, 306, 370, 380.

[86] Louisiana University Press, 1939.

[87] Roswell Gray Ham, *Otway and Lee: Biography from a Baroque Age*, New Haven, 1931, 70. Harry Levin, Introduction to *Ben Jonson: Selected Works*, New York, 1938, 30, 32. Wylie Sypher, "The Metaphysicals and the Baroque" in *Partisan Review* XI (1944) 3–17. Roy Daniells, "Baroque Form in English Literature" in *University of Toronto Quarterly* XIV (1945) 392–408.

[88] "Baroque Prose in America" in *Studies in English by Members of the English Seminar of Charles University*, IV (Prague, 1933) 39–58.

[89] "Edward Taylor's Poetry: Colonial Baroque" in *Kenyon Review* III, (1941) 355–71.

[90] See Note 40, 222.

[91] *Loc. cit.* in Note 2, 32–33.

[92] Oskar Walzel, *Gehalt und Gestalt im Kunstwerk des Dichters*, Wildpark-Potsdam, 1925, 265ff, 282ff.

[93] "Das 'gotische' oder 'barocke' Stilprinzip der deutschen und nordischen Kunst" in *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* X (1932) 206–243.

[94] See Note 9, pp. 161ff.

[95] For a more detailed discussion of the theoretical problems involved see this writer's "Periods and Movements in Literary History" in *English Institute Annual, 1940* (New York, 1941) 73–93.

[96] *Loc. cit.* Note 2, 37.

[97] 3 vols, Oxford, 1905–21. Croce, *Lirici marinisti*, Bari, 1910. The introduction for this volume published only in *Saggi sulla letteratura italiana del seicento* (Bari, 1910) as "Sensualismo e Ingegnosità nella lirica del seicento", 353–408. H. Cysarz, *Barocklyrik* 3 vols, Leipzig, 1937. The introduction to Vol. I is substantially identical with *Deutsches Barock in der Lyrik*, Leipzig, 1936.

[98] Günther Müller, *Deutsche Dichtung von der Renaissance bis zum Ausgang des Barocks*, Wildpark-Potsdam, 1928, and "Höfische Kultur der Barockzeit" in Hans Naumann and Günther Müller, *Höfische Kultur*, Halle, 1929.

[99] See Note 22.

[100] Leipzig, *s.d.* (1936) 26–28.

[101] See Note 51.

[102] See Note 80.

[103] Alessandro d'Ancona, "Del' secentismo della poesia cortegiana del secolo XV," in *Studi sulla letteratura italiana dei primi secoli*, Ancona 1884, 151–237. F. d'Ovidio, "Un Punto di Storia Letteraria; Secentismo Spagnolismo?" in *Nuova Antologia* LXV (1882), 661–668. Antonio Belloni, *Il Seicento*, Milano, s.d. (1899), 456–66. Sebastiano Vento, "L'Essenza del Secentismo" in *Rivista d'Italia* XXVIII (1925) 313–335. B. Scopa, *Saggio di nuove ricerche sulla origine del secentismo*, Napoli, 1907. H. Gobliani, *Il barrochismo in Seneca e in Lucano*, Messina, 1938.

[104] Viëtor, K. "Vom Stil und Geist der deutschen Barockdichtung", in *Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift* XIV (1926) 145–84. *Probleme der deutschen Barockliteratur*, Leipzig, 1928. E. R. Curtius, "Mittelalterlicher und barocker Dichtungsstil" in *Modern Philology* XXXXVIII (1941) 325–333.

[105] See Note 31.

[106] J. C. Ransom, "Honey and Gall" in *Southern Review* VI (1940) 10. Allen Tate, *Reason in Madness*, New York, 1941, 68. Cleanth Brooks, *Modern Poetry and the Tradition*, Chapel Hill, 1939, 15, 39, 43, etc.

[107] "Imagery and Logic: Ramus and Metaphysical Poetics" in *Journal of the History of Ideas* III (1942) 365–400.

[108] "Life of Abraham Cowley" in *Lives of the English Poets.*

[109] *Poetic Imagery*, New York, 1924

[110] John Beal Douds, "Donne's Technique of Dissonance" in *PMLA* LII (1937) 1051–1061.

[111] Alice Stayert Brandenburg, "The Dynamic Image in Metaphysical Poetry" in *PMLA* LVII (1942) 1039–45.

[112] *Donne's Poetry and Modern Definitions of 'Metaphysical'*, State University of Iowa, August, 1941.

[113] See Note 63. Also Dámaso Alonso, "Alusion y elusion en la poesia de Góngora" in *Revista de Occidente* XIX (1928), 177–202; *La Lengua poetica de Góngora*, Madrid, 1935. Walther Pabst, "Góngoras Schöpfung in seinen Gedichten *Polifemo* und *Soledades*" in *Revue Hispanique* LXXX (1930), 1–229. Leo Spitzer, "Zu Góngora's *Soledades*" in *Volkstum und Kultur der Romanen* II (1929) 244ff, reprinted in *Romanische Stil- und Literaturstudien*, Marburg, 1931, II, 129ff. "La Soledad Primera de Góngora", in *Revista de Filología Hispánica* II (1940) 151–176.

[114] Introduction to Harry Clemon's ed. of *John Lyly, Euphues: His Anatomy of Wit, Euphues and his England*, London, 1916.

[115] See Note 83.

[116] See the well-known imitation of his style in Friedrich Schiller's *Wallensteins Lager* (*Die Kapuzinerpredigt*).

[117] e.g. Werner Weisbach, *Der Barock als Kunst der Gegenreformation*, Berlin, 1921, and "Barock als Stilphänomen" in *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* II (1924) 225–56.

[118] W. Schulte, "Renaissance und Barock in der deutschen Dichtung" in *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft* II (1926) 47–61.

[119] "The Baroque Period in German Literature" in *Essays contributed in honor of William Allan Neilson, Smith College Studies in Modern Languages* XXI (1939) 192–208.

[120] Carl Neumann, "Ist wirklich Barock und Deutsch das nämliche?" in *Historische Zeitschrift* CXXXVIII (1928) 544–46.

[121] See Note 34.

[122] See Note 9.

[123] See Note 68.

[124] See Note 9.

[125] e.g. in "Zur Auffassung Rabelais'", in *Romanische Stil und Literaturstudien*, Marburg, 1931, 133–34, and in *Die Literarisierung des Lebens in Lopes Dorotea*, Bonn, 1932, 58.

[126] See Note 27.

[127] *Barock und Rokoko in der deutschen Dichtung*, Leipzig, 1926. Second ed. 1928.

[128] See Note 45.

[129] See Note 28.

[130] *Deutsche Gegenreformation und deutsches Barock in der Dichtung*, Stuttgart, 1935, 101, 217, 253.

[131] See Note 33.

[132] See Note 49. A fuller discussion of this and the preceding book in the writer's "The Parallelism between Literature and the Arts" in *English Institute Annual*, 1941, New York, 1942, 37–39.

[133] *The Waning of the Middle Ages*, London, 1937, 129–35, or Emile Mâle, *L'art religieux de la fin du moyen âge en France*, Paris, 1908, 375ff.

[134] New York, 1942, 21–50.

[135] See Note 21.

[136] See Note 65.

[137] See Note 39.

[138] See Note 86, p. 192.

[139] Albert Wellek, "Renaissance- und Barock-synästhesie", in *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* IX (1931) 534–84.

[140] From Austin Warren, "Edward Taylor's Poetry" in *Kenyon Review* III, (1941) 356.

[141] *loc. cit.* in Note 40, 263. Hatzfeld quotes Fritz Neubert "Zur Wort und Begriffskunst der französischen Klassik", in *Festschrift für Eduard Wechsler*, 1929, 155.

[142] *Die Literarisierung des Lebens in Lopes Dorotea*, Bonn, 1932, 11–12. Spitzer refers to Franz Heinz Mautner's "Das Wortspiel und seine Bedeutung" in *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* IX (1931) 679.

[143] See Note 21.

[144] Cf. e.g. Allen R. Benham, "The Myth of John Donne the Rake" in *Philological Quarterly* XX (1941), 465–873.

[145] Emile Faguet, *Histoire de la poésie française de la Renaissance au Romantisme*, Paris, s.d. II, 145, 171ff, III, 185, and *Petite Histoire de la littérature française*, Paris, s.d. 100–101.

[146] See Note 104.

[147] Hans Pyritz, *Paul Flemings deutsche Liebeslyrik*, Leipzig, 1932, in *Palaestra* 180, especially 209 ff.

[148] Leo Spitzer, "Zur sprachlichen Interpretation von Wortkunstwerken" in *Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Jugendbildung* VI (1930), 649.

[149] In *PMLA* XXXIX (1924) 229–253, especially 232.

[150] See Note 87, 407–08.

[151] The edition of Drummond of Hawthornden by R. Kastner, (Manchester, 1913), his scattered papers on his sources; R. C. Wallerstein's "The Style of Drummond in its Relation to his Translations" in *PMLA* XLVIII (1933) 1090–1177; the work of Mario Praz and Austin Warren on Crashaw (see Notes 57, 86), of Pierre Legouis on Marvell (*André Marvell, Poète, Puritain, Patriote*, Paris, 1928); Praz's "Stanley, Sherburne and Ayres as Translators and Imitators" in *Modern Language Review* XX (1925), 280–294, 419–431; H. Thomas, "Three Translators of Góngora and other Spanish Poets during the Seventeenth Century", in *Revue Hispanique*, XLVIII (1920), 180–256 are some of the studies which would be useful for such a monograph.

[152] For surveys of scholarship, mostly German see Leonello Vincenti, "Interpretazione del Barocco Tedesco", in *Studi Germanici* I (1935), 39–75. James Mark, "The Uses of the Term *baroque*" in *Modern Language Review* XXXIII (1938) 547–63. Erich Trunz, "Die Erforschung der deutschen Barockdichtung", in *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* XVIII (1940), Referatenheft, 1–100. See two unfavorable discussions: Hans Epstein, *Die Metaphysizierung in der literaturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung und ihre Folgen, Germanische Studien, 73*, Berlin, 1929, and Hans K. Kettler, *Baroque Tradition in the Literature of the German Enlightenment, 1700–1750. Studies in the Determination of a Literary Period*, Cambridge, s.d. (1943).

DEFINITIONS OF THE BAROQUE IN THE VISUAL ARTS

WOLFGANG STECHOW

The following remarks were occasioned by the request of a group of philologists for a brief statement of what historians of the visual arts mean when they use the term Baroque.[1] I wish this statement could be not only brief but also

[1] This paper is substantially identical with a lecture delivered on December 27, 1945, at the sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Modern Language Association of America in Chicago (General Topics Group, IX: Language and the Arts of Design; Chairman: Ruth Wallerstein, University of Wisconsin).

precise. As it is, I shall have to be extremely careful lest I create more confusion than clarification; for there is hardly any humanistic discipline that is as much hampered by the vagueness of its terminology as is the history of art.

We art historians may claim, on the basis of seniority, a right to tell our colleagues in related fields something about the Baroque as a stylistic term. I hardly need to add that it is a poor claim. We were the first to use the term, but we were also the first to make a mess of it. What is more, we have passed the mess on to other disciplines. We have not even now seriously tried to formulate a policy to regulate our own usage.

Being an historian, I firmly believe that some clarification is bound to result from a brief survey of the history of the term, however complex and confused even that history may be. I must leave to philologists the analysis of its origin[2] and of its early history, when it was used as a synonym for bizarre, strange, absurd, or in bad taste; that is, in a purely derogatory sense; and everyone knows that it is still being used in that sense by some writers. However, like many other words which were originally used in a disparaging sense, such as Gothic, or, to choose a more recent example, Mannerism, Baroque gradually emerged as a stylistic term which denoted good as well as bad qualities. But within this development, important ramifications have taken place; and as we try our hand at a closer analysis, we find that the term has taken on three basically different meanings, one of which has but little to do with chronology, whereas the other two are of a definitely chronological character.

The first still conveys an inkling of the original derogatory sense: the term is used to designate a style quality diametrically opposed to that classical composure and restraint which were considered indispensable by those using the word baroque as synonymous with bad taste. However, the disparaging sense has been abandoned, and the term indicates exuberance, dynamic stress, emotional grandeur and the like, mainly as found in various (though not all) works of the seventeenth century, but occasionally transferred to works of other epochs.[3] Thus, Rubens is baroque, and so are Bernini and Lebrun, but not Rembrandt (at any rate, not the mature Rembrandt) or Vermeer van Delft or Poussin. On the other hand, it would be permissible, according to this usage of the term, to call baroque all works which show 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. An extreme example of this usage is found with so sober and reticent a scholar as the late Georg Dehio who identified the Baroque with the "basic innate mood" of German art through the ages because according to him, "Baroque strives for expression—expression at any price, even at the price of form" and "the innate tendency of

[2] It seems that the derivation from the Italian syllogistic term is preferable to the one from the Spanish word for an irregularly shaped pearl.

[3] This is the sense which Thomas Munro has called "abstract recurrent" style or type, as distinct from "historic" style. See his article, "Form in the Arts: an Outline for Descriptive Analysis," in *The Journal of Aesthetics*, vol. II, no. 8, Fall 1943, p. 23. Also Helmut Hungerland's comment on it in "Problems of Descriptive Analysis in the Visual Arts." *Ibid.*, vol. IV, no. 1, Sept. 1945, p. 20.

Germanic art demands the unrestricted right to express freely that which moves the soul."[4] (For similar reasons, others have claimed the term Gothic for the German way of artistic expression—which was an even less fortunate choice).

The other two definitions are more decidedly chronological; the first, however, might be called absolutely chronological, the second relatively so.

In the first sense, Baroque simply designates a certain period of Western European art, mostly the period between 1580 or 1600 (more correctly the latter, I believe) and 1725 or 1750. Although this definition was originally based on the history of architecture only, it was soon applied to the representational arts as well, and after a good deal of hesitation has eventually been widely accepted as covering practically every work of art of that period, the works of Bernini as well as of Coyzevox, of Caravaggio and Rubens as well as of Rembrandt, Vermeer and even such decidedly "classicistic" painters as the Carracci and Poussin. It is not difficult to see why architecture should have paved the way for this purely chronological usage of the term. The architecture of that period is indeed of a much more unified style than is painting or even sculpture, despite such works as Perrault's classicistic Louvre façade. It all started in the 1850's with Jacob Burckhardt, who later became increasingly fond of the Baroque as a whole, but who originated the definition in question as a purely architectural one;[5] next came the early Wölfflin (1888)[6] to whom we owe the basic analysis of baroque architecture as contrasted with Renaissance architecture; in 1897, August Schmarsow published his *Barock und Rokoko;* in 1898, Strzygowski wrote a book with the daring title *Das Werden des Barock bei Raphael und Correggio*; finally, the same Wölfflin (1915)[7] found a way of characterizing all painting of the seventeenth century as baroque through the application of his famous categories of distinction between sixteenth and seventeenth manners of seeing and forming. While Wölfflin's main criterion was a morphological one, it is readily understood that other tendencies towards recognizing and analyzing a unified taste or style of a given period should have led to a similar attempt at unification: 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. In other words, 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. Consequently, it is only one step from here to the recognition of the same *Zeitgeist* in music, literature, philosophy, science, etc. of the same epoch, which, therefore, becomes baroque music, baroque literature, baroque philosophy, baroque science.

[4] Georg Dehio, *Geschichte der deutschen Kunst*, second ed., Berlin and Leipzig, 1931, III, p. 290: "Der Barock [ist] die deutsche Ur-und Grundstimmung. . . . Das eingeborene germanische Kunstgefühl fordert ein unbeschränktes Recht für den freien Ausdruck seelischer Bewegung. . . . Barock will Ausdruck—Ausdruck um jeden Preis, auch um den der Form."

[5] See Wilhelm Waetzoldt, *Deutsche Kunsthistoriker*, Leipzig, 1924, II, pp. 199 f.

[6] Heinrich Wölfflin, *Renaissance und Barock*, Munich, 1888.

[7] Heinrich Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, Munich, 1915; *idem*, " 'Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe', eine Revision," in: *Gedanken zur Kunstgeschichte*, Basel, 1941.

The third definition I have called one of relative chronology. Its essence is implied in the statement that every Occidental style has its classical epoch and its Baroque.[8] This definition of Baroque as a recurrent phase, or, it should at once be added, as a typically *late* phase of every Occidental style, was again originally based on an investigation of architecture and later transferred to the representational arts. It has been applied to the relationship between the "historical" Baroque and the High Renaissance, to Greek Baroque (hellenistic art) and Greek classical art, Gothic Baroque and High Gothic, even Romanesque Baroque and High Romanesque, etc. The concept of the "recurrent" Baroque dates farther back than is usually assumed; it is found, under the name of *Rococo,* in the earliest writings of Jacob Burckhardt.[9] Recently, it has been very much overworked by various (especially German) writers. Positivistic and morphological speculation is as evident in this definition as it is in Wölfflin's analysis of baroque (seventeenth century) versus High Renaissance (sixteenth century) art; *Zeitgeist* theories have been applied to it as well, but its essential point is the recurrence of baroque (late) phases.

Two main problems, or so it seems to me, emerge from this rather bewildering survey. 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? Evidently, the two questions belong closely together and can be separated for analytical purposes only.

The first question I should like to answer in the affirmative provided an agreement on terminology can be reached, not only among art historians (which is no mean task), but among all of us. As long as one art historian applies the term baroque to Rubens and Bernini only, pointing to the contrast between them and Rembrandt and Poussin, while another applies it to the entire seventeenth century, a third to Michelangelo and Correggio, and a fourth to Grünewald and German expressionism, the situation is hopeless. The same is true when to some historians of literature baroque means not only the late Shakespeare, Milton, and Vondel, but also Jakob Boehme and Corneille, while to others it means only a handful of decadent poetasters, and while to a philosopher[10] Baroque (and Rococo) are "suspended as it were between two contrary insights: that in the service of love and imagination nothing can be too lavish, too sublime, or too festive, yet that all this passion is at once a caprice, a farce, a contortion, a comedy of illusions"; or when one historian of music calls Bach baroque, while another calls him gothic.[11] By the same token, confusion in both the

[8] See Heinrich Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe,* third ed., Munich, 1918, p. 250, who adds the following interesting stipulation: "Die Entwicklung wird sich aber nur da vollziehen, wo die Formen lange genug von Hand zu Hand gegangen sind oder, besser gesagt, wo die Phantasie lebhaft genug sich mit den Formen beschäftigt hat, um die barocken Möglichkeiten herauszulocken."

[9] W. Waetzoldt, *op. cit.,* II, p. 192.

[10] George Santayana, *The Middle Span,* New York, 1945, pp. 2 f. I am indebted for this reference, as well as for valuable help in wording this paper, to my colleague Andrew Bongiorno.

[11] The fascinating problem implied in this particular terminological dilemma has been touched upon in the chapter "Künste als Generationen" in Wilhelm Pinder's *Das Problem*

visual arts and literature is likely to mount, if one scholar considers all of Rembrandt's and Vondel's works baroque, while another[12] bases a most discerning comparative analysis of these two artists on the notion that one remained baroque throughout his life, while the other ceased to be baroque in the 1640's. Only if all disciplines can be persuaded to accept one clearly defined concept of the term baroque, can its continued application be recommended.

I, for one, believe that a universal acceptance of the term is impossible if we continue to use it as synonymous with grandeur, heroic sweep, or the like, in other words, in line with the first of the three definitions to which I have called the reader's attention, the one which conveys no chronological implications of importance. I have pointed out that this definition is still an outgrowth of the original derogatory sense of the word. Its continued use as a less chronological term gave it an even greater vagueness which has never been remedied and is not likely to be remedied in the future, the less so as it is constantly being confused with the older disparaging definition. It is perfectly feasible to use other and much more clearly defined terms for the phenomena in question; in fact, nothing can be gained, but much can be lost, by calling baroque such diverse things as insincerity, bombast, and grandiloquence on the one hand, heroic passion and dynamic grandeur on the other, let alone profound emotional intensity or the like. On the other hand, if it should be suggested that the term should be restricted to designate one of these qualities, we should be entitled to ask: why speak of baroque when we mean pompous, bombastic, grandiloquent, grandiose, heroic, dynamic or deeply emotional?

But the rejection of this sense of the term imposes a serious responsibility upon us as we try to defend the continued use of it in any other sense. Would it not be just as easy and commendable to drop both of the chronological meanings of the term as it is to drop the one we have just discussed? Only if we should succeed in showing that this is not the case, are we justified in recommending any continuation of its use. Let us reconsider those two chronological applications from this particular point of view.

The first such application was to the entire seventeenth century, plus the first two or, in some countries, even five decades of the eighteenth. What can we gain by calling this period—all of it—baroque? One advantage of this procedure is rather obvious; it makes for brevity. It is definitely less time-consuming to speak of "the Baroque" than to speak of "the-period-between-approximately-1600-and-1725-or-1750-as-the-case-may-be". However, this obvious gain would at once be more than canceled out if we were not quite certain that this period was really, in some rather definite fashion, a unified period: unified as to its most important aspects of style in literature, the visual arts, music, philosophy, theology, science etc., unified to such an extent that seemingly

---

der Generation, second ed., Berlin, 1928, pp. 96 ff. To the present writer, this chapter is easily the most valuable part of a book otherwise weighted with many distortions and an utterly confusing terminology as far as the Baroque is concerned.

[12] F. Schmidt-Degener, *Rembrandt und der holländische Barock* (*Studien der Bibliothek Warburg*, IX), Leipzig and Berlin, 1928 (first published in Dutch in *De Gids*, LXXXIII, 1919).

large discrepancies of individual style can still be understood and analyzed as varieties and multiple facets of one style. Everything hinges upon this point; if that stylistic unity of the entire epoch turns out to be a delusion, we are not justified in proposing for it one stylistic term. At this juncture, I can do little more than affirm my belief that there is a great deal of truth in that theory—at any rate, a sufficient amount of truth to justify the continued investigation of that period under the guidance of the *working hypothesis* that that unity is really there (working hypotheses, properly handled, have a way of producing real enlightenment and not necessarily, though all too frequently, the kind of thing which Erwin Panofsky has so properly called a "boa constructor"). In the realm of art history, Burckhardt, Wölfflin, and some others have pointed out methods of recognizing that stylistic unity, though mainly on a morphological basis. 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.[13] This analysis will have to settle the question whether or not the works of Caravaggio and Rembrandt, of Bernini and Poussin, show similarities which *define* them as being characteristic products of that epoch, in clear contradistinction to products of the Renaissance or of the Empire. If this is so, we should be able to prove that, to adduce a striking example, a work by Poussin is basically more closely related to one by Rubens or Rembrandt than to one by Raphael or David, and this not only with regard to form but also with regard to content. More: if, in logical expansion of this concept as a *Zeitgeist* concept, the term Baroque is likewise to be applied to literature, philosophy, music, science of the same epoch, it will also have to be proved that, in some important aspects at least, Descartes and Leibniz were closer to Rembrandt and Poussin than to Giordano Bruno or to Kant, Monteverdi and Purcell closer to Milton and Vondel than to Palestrina or Mozart, and so forth and so on. Even in the face of such seemingly overwhelming obstacles, I would still be ready to stand by my conviction that through the well-organized collaboration of all of us, such proof might be forthcoming. I also believe 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. This era tended to harmonize the humanistic, the religious, and the scientific realms into one integrated whole deliberately, yet often with a passionate zeal and dynamic power of which the Renaissance had not been capable, and its new equilibrium was possible of attainment only thanks to the progressive revolution of the Reformation on the one hand and the conservative revolution of the Counter-Reformation on the other.

There remains the problem of the second chronological definition of the term Baroque, the one which asserts the recurrence of a baroque phase in all styles, ancient, Romanesque, Gothic, and the like. Clearly, this would be justified

[13] See Nikolaus Pevsner in *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, XLIX, 1928, and in his *Die Malerei des Barock in Italien* (*Handbuch der Kunstwissenschaft*), 1928, pp. 104 ff.; Erwin Panofsky, *Italian Baroque Art*, unpublished lecture at Vassar College, 1932.

only if we can convince ourselves that *essential* features of the Baroque of the seventeenth century are found also in other phases of style to be so designated. In other words, if it is true that the term Baroque is acceptable for the seventeenth century only on grounds which transcend purely morphological categories, we should speak of, say, ancient Baroque only if this particular phase of ancient art shows more than morphological resemblances to the Baroque of the seventeenth century. Put differently again, the term "ancient Baroque" would have to be more than a partially valid metaphor in order to be acceptable. I am inclined to think that this is the case, but I must make reservations regarding such terms as gothic Baroque. Ancient art belonged to a cultural cycle different from that of Western civilization of the Christian era, while the Gothic was part of the latter. The general development of ancient art from the archaic to the classical, and from the classical to the hellenistic and the neoclassical cannot but remind one of the general development of Christian art from the middle Ages to the Renaissance, Baroque, and Empire. This has often been observed though again mainly on a morphological basis. Will that parallel stand the test of an investigation that takes into consideration more elements than the morphological? More decisive still: will it stand the test of an investigation applying also to religion, philosophy, music, literature, science? If it does, ancient Baroque may well turn out to be a sound term, something more than a metaphor, something immensely revealing to all scholars. I cannot foresee a similar result in the case of such phenomena as the so-called gothic Baroque. This may well remain a purely morphological metaphor, divorced from essential aspects of content and devoid of fruitful parallels with literature, music etc., confined, in other words, to similarities based on what might be called physiological rather than spiritual changes. However, I may easily be wrong about that, and my scepticism with regard to this problem might well be explained by my pointing to the fact that we have hardly begun to tackle the tremendous difficulties which confront us on the road to the solution of the more important and more immediate problems.

ENGLISH BAROQUE AND DELIBERATE OBSCURITY

ROY DANIELLS

In spite of all that has been said about Baroque (and the *London Times Literary Supplement* has recently been full of it), there is still some doubt as to the application of the term. Should this word be limited in its use to the criticism of the plastic and graphic arts? or used for the arts in general, including music and literature? May it be applied to the artistic sensibility of a particular chronological period? or to the general sensibility of that period? (May we, for instance, speak of seventeenth-century warfare, of its tactics, strategy and fortification, as Baroque?) May the word stand for a kind of sensibility which can occur

at any time in history, as the word Romantic is often made to stand? The search for a suitable meaning can take the inquiring student over a lot of territory; even so he will not find absolutes. "Suitable meaning" is a better description of the object of his search than "accurate meaning" for, as one of the *Times* reviewers has said, "There is nothing sacrosanct about such terms as 'Baroque' and 'Rococo'. They stand and fall with their serviceability".

The meanings of the word Baroque may be regarded as circles within circles, the system being more or less concentric; we may think of Baroque applied to English literature as part of a set of meanings which also permits its application to ecclesiastical architecture in the upper valley of the Danube. At the moment we are concerned with a use of Baroque which will be in harmony with the English point of view (that is, not an arbitrary imposition of a German point of view); which will be useful in finding one's way through English literature of the seventeenth century (that is, a concept which can be used simply, without dragging after it a mass of erudite controversy); which will fit the facts (that is, will not use authors and texts as pawns in the game: it is a bit distressing to see Lyly's *Euphues*, a characteristic mid-Elizabethan work, called Baroque); and, finally and above all, a use of Baroque which will renew and increase our delight, our sense of joy and wonder, as we see the familiar landscape in a slightly altered perspective.

We have, of course, already many terms which are useful in the exploration of seventeenth-century literature: "late Renaissance", "Cavalier", "Puritan", "metaphysical". We owe a great deal to those who have elucidated the last of these. But it does not perform the same services as Baroque. The need for some such term as Baroque is felt acutely after a perusal of Professor Grierson's admirable book, *Cross Currents in English Literature of the XVIIth Century*; the student of Baroque is concerned with the *results* of the conflux and intermixture of traditions.

Elsewhere[1] I have tried to say something about the English modification of Baroque and the nature of Baroque dualism in England, as seen against a background of the fundamentals of the style. Briefly: that though there is so little indisputably Baroque form in English architecture, yet this does not invalidate the search for Baroque form in literature, especially as seventeenth-century English literature is so consciously formal. However, England's geographical position on the outskirts of Europe and the traditional English habit of compromise do serve to complicate the problem: the Classical Renaissance and the Protestant Reformation proceed together in England along the same few decades; the Tudor monarchy and the Anglican Church are both moderating influences. We have not in England some of the conditions which stimulated Baroque art in Italy and Germany: independent princes, a triumphant Papacy, successful movements led by Jesuits, an already fully developed technique of Renaissance art. Baroque in England is somewhat elusive and concealed. Special problems arise; for example, the continuation of mediaeval ("gothic") elements into Renaissance times may give rise to some false identifications.

[1] v. *University of Toronto Quarterly*, July 1945.

Nevertheless, a quite simple definition of Baroque will suffice for the student who wishes to make a few excursions into seventeenth-century prose and verse. Baroque may be regarded as the logical continuation and extension of High Renaissance art, with conscious accentuation and "deformation" of the regular stock of techniques. These become more dynamic and (in both good and bad senses of the word) theatrical. Baroque is developed as a complete art form of wide influence and application, the expression of a specific artistic sensibility of which some of the marks are well known: a sense of triumph and splendour, a strenuous effort to unify the opposite terms of paradoxes, a high regard for technical virtuosity.

The commencement of English Baroque is not as hard to fix as at first appears. 1590 is a spot where one might well drive in a tentative peg. By 1600, certainly, there is a well-defined Baroque sensibility. In the 90's the verses of Jack Donne are being passed from hand to hand. The flood-tide of the Italianate sonnet-sequence ebbs with extreme rapidity and after the turn of the century song-books and miscellanies are often mere compilations. If we think of sonnet-cycles, songs translated or adapted from French or Italian, and pastoral pieces, then it would appear that in the ten or twelve years succeeding the publication of *Musica Transalpina* (1588) the English High Renaissance has achieved and completed its expression. And, without hanging too much on any one fact, it is interesting to see that, while Greene's *Mamillia* represents the type of romance popular about 1580, in 1591 he brings out his *Art of Conny Catching*; realism develops in the prose pamphlets and in collections of epigrams; a new interest in human psychology expresses itself in "characters" (Casaubon's Latin translation of Theophrastus comes out in 1592) and expresses itself too in the drama of humours. In the 1590's, also, Donne, Hall and Marston are bringing out their classical satires. The appearance of the malcontent, of the melancholy strain in Chapman and Webster, and the subsequent development of two avenues of escape from melancholy—the piety of a Herbert on one hand and the cheerful sensuality of a Herrick on the other: this appears to indicate the growth of a Baroque sensibility which has lost the fragile unity and tentative balance of the best Elizabethans, of Spenser, of Lyly, of Hooker. The literary careers of Fulke Greville and Marston as they approach 1600 are interesting in this connection. The whole enquiry into the turning point between High Renaissance and Baroque is an exciting one.

Baroque prose styles may be grouped according to the formal intentions of their writers as either *condensed* or *expanded*. And a *plain* style may be observed developing in opposition to both modes. This plain style is nurtured by the Royal Society, which naturally feels that Baroque styles are unsuitable for scientific statement. It desires a manner of writing, to quote Glanville:

> Not rendered intricate by long Parentheses, nor gaudy by flaunting Metaphors; not tedious by wide fetches and circumferences of Speech, nor Dark by too much curtness of Expression. (*Plus Ultra*, pp. 84–5)

The deliberate rejection of Baroque on the part of the Royal Society, together with the absence of Baroque features from the styles of, say, Addison and Swift,

makes it easy to mark the end of the century as effectively the end of Baroque dominance in the field of prose.

The examination of the Baroque element in seventeenth-century poetry is facilitated by the same concept, of an expanded style and a contracted one, each developed out of familiar Renaissance forms, in the interest of greater expressiveness. T. S. Eliot's distinction between "wit and magniloquence" in his essay on Marvell is beautifully relevant here. The metaphysical poets and Milton thus come together without any forcing: indeed, they represent respectively the specialized application of the term "metaphysical" and its more general and normal use. Donne, Crashaw and Milton all take on fresh interest when regarded as Baroque craftsmen. It is particularly rewarding to watch *Paradise Lost* articulate itself as a piece of Baroque structure. Baroque lyricism comes to an end about 1700, as can be seen by turning the pages of Mr. Norman Ault's anthology, which has a chronological arrangement of poems. Prior is definitely Rococo and so, as Dr. Friederich Brie has shown, is *The Rape of the Lock*. Dryden is master of a very late, rationally handled Baroque style.

To speak of Dryden is to be reminded of the heroic play. Drama is outside the scope of this paper. But it would seem that the bold and successful asymmetries of late Shakespearian plays are in a genuinely Baroque mode and that the vigorous unreality and resounding rodomontade of Dryden's heroic drama are also Baroque—as Versailles is Baroque. The stagecraft of Webster, Ford, Tourneur, Lee and Otway demands attention. And much else quite beyond these limits. But who will deny to Millamant the distinction of Rococo?

* * * * *

One of the best approaches to English literary Baroque is through the criticism of Wölfflin,[2] who differentiates the forms of Baroque art from those of the High Renaissance according to five categories. These categories are suggestive in the extreme, if the dangers of dogmatic and rigorous application to literature are avoided. The fifth category is concerned with a change from absolute clarity, in which the artist aims at explicitness, to relative clarity where beauty is perceived in the very darkness which modifies the forms. A brief inquiry into the corresponding literary phenomenon will show the usefulness of Wölfflin's concepts.

Skirting the matter of seventeenth-century melancholy and its tenebrous states of mind, a subject which has received much attention, we might consider for a moment the intimate association between the seventeenth-century sense of fundamental mystery and some of the literary styles. The enemies of Baroque (who, incidentally, characterize it very acutely) are not slow to see such a connection. Glanvill, in his *Seasonable Defence*, makes a significant protest:

A man does not shew his wit or learning by rolling in metaphors, and scattering his sentences of Greek and Latin, by abounding in high expressions, and talking in clouds, but he is then learned, when his learning has clear'd his understanding, and furnisht it with full and distinct apprehension of things; when it enables him to make hard things plain; and con-

[2] Heinrich Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, München, 1915, translated as *Principles of Art History*, London, 1932.

ceptions that were *confused, distinct* and *orderly*; and he shews his learning by speaking good, strong, and plain sense.[3]

It is instructive to compare this rational protest, at the end of the Baroque period, with the characterization of "parabolicall" style made by Bacon in his *Advancement of Learning*:

Poesy Allusive, or Parabolicall, excells the rest, and seemeth to be a sacred and venerable thing; expecially seeing Religion it selfe hath allowed in a work of that nature, and by it, trafiques divine commodities with men. . . . And it is of ambiguous use, and applied to contrary ends. For it serves for Obscuration; and it serves also for Illustration: in this it seems there was sought a way how to teach; in that an Art how to conceale. . . . There is another use of Parabolicall Poesy, opposite to the former, which tendeth to the folding up of those things; the dignity whereof, deserves to be retired and distinguisht, as with a drawn curtain.

Similarly, we find Sir Richard Baker in the Preface to his translation of the *Discourses* of Malvezzi upon Tacitus, asserting that Tacitus' "very obscurity is pleasing to whosoever by labouring about it, findes out the true meaning; for then he counts it an issue of his own braine, and taking occasion from those sentences, to goe further than the thing he reads, and that without being deceived, he takes the like pleasure as men are wont to take from hearing metaphors, finding the meaning of him that useth them".

It is a commonplace that the crabbed, significant obscurities of Persius and Juvenal become exemplary to satirists like Marston, Hall, Donne and Cleveland; seventeenth-century English poets were well acquainted with Italian critics, such as Tesauro, who greatly admired the metaphor, with its attendant multiplicity of meaning, as a poetic device: the desire for ingenious and obscure literary forms was fostered by many influences. The sacerdotal, the bardic, the prophetic, the aristocratic elements in society felt a need—a need traditional with each of them—for special and distinctive expression. "For to handle things darkly, as if they were mysteries, and with respect and shame", wrote Charron, "giveth taste and estimation unto them". And even Bunyan, who is so explicit in tagging his characters, is moved to remark that "words obscure" and "a cloudy strain" allure the godly mind the more.

The development of a cult of significant darkness, parallel to the deliberate obscurity in graphic and plastic design of which Wölfflin makes so convincing an analysis, goes on throughout the early seventeenth century. The varieties of deliberate and meaningful obscurity are many and the relation among them is itself obscure. We find Chapman, in his preface to *Ovid's Banquet of Sense*, setting forth a principle:

Obscurity in affectation of words and indigested conceits is pedantic and childish; but where it shroudeth itself in the heart of his subject, uttered with fitness of figure and expressive epithets, with that darkness will I still labour to be shadowed. . . . I know that empty and dark spirits will complain of palpable night; but those that beforehand have a radiant and lightbearing intellect, will say they can pass through Corinna's garden without the help of a lantern.

[3] v. R. F. Jones, "The Attack on Pulpit Eloquence in the Restoration", *J.E.G.P.*, XXX (1931), 201 fn.

And in his *Hymnus in Noctem* come the beautiful and summary lines:

> Rich-taper'd sanctuary of the blest,
> Palace of ruth, made all of tears, and rest,
> To thy black shades and desolation
> I consecrate my life.

For Fulke Greville, another exponent of the same theme, the approach is somewhat different. Obscurity is for him an intellectual and stylistic habit. Metaphor is "a way of veiling thought to add to its significance, an appeal to the subtler and more mystical reason, a kind of labyrinthine device guarding the mysteries of truth from indifferent approach".[4] And when we think of literary styles which guard the mysteries of truth from indifferent approach, who comes to mind before Henry Vaughan? He practises a traditional mystery (that of alchemy) with its own technique, which he heightens through the eagerness of his emotional nature. He quotes, in justification of deliberate reticences, the charge given to the fraternity by Raymund Lully:

> I swear to thee upon my soul that thou art damned if thou shouldst reveal these things. For every good thing proceeds from God and to Him only is due. Wherefore thou shalt reserve and keep that secret which God only should reveal, and thou shalt affirm thou dost justly keep back those things whose revelation belongs to his honour. For if thou shouldst reveal that in a few words which God hath been forming a long time, thou shouldst be condemned in the great day of judgment as a traitor to the majesty of God, neither should thy treason be forgiven thee. For the revelation of such things belongs to God and not to man.[5]

The nearest approach to a contemporary seventeenth-century explanation of the cult of significant darkness would seem to be a tract entitled *Mythomystes* published by Henry Reynolds in 1632. The moderns, says Reynolds, read the works of their great predecessors superficially, "never looking farther into those their golden fictions for any higher sense, or anything diviner in them infolded and hid from the vulgar, but lulled with the marvellous expression and artful contexture of their fables". But, Reynolds continues, these fables really show deep insight into celestial and carnal love and other mysteries. The Ancients, esteeming their knowledge highly, guarded it carefully under symbols—the hieroglyphics of Egypt, Pythagoras' numbers. In Homer, in Aristotle, in Plato, in the Latin poets and in the books of Moses the instructed reader looks for a sense behind the surface; for the ancient writers possessed, as the modern do not, an approach to the mysteries and hidden properties of Nature. They knew how to reach God through a careful search into His works, and their fables really refer to mysteries such as the generation of the elements, and to the great typical characters of Scripture.

It is difficult to agree with Professor J. E. Spingarn, who included *Mythomystes* in his valuable collection, *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, that Reynolds, after a good start, moves off into needless obscurantism, that because *Mythomystes* makes no formal analysis of the conceit it misses the central principle of metaphysical poetry. For that principle rests upon deeper foundations

[4] M. W. Croll, *The Works of Fulke Greville*, (U. of Penn., 1901), pp. 56–7.
[5] *Works*, ed. Waite (London, 1919), p. 212.

than stylistic qualities, and is no more dependent upon a taste for conceits than the principles of Jesuitism depend upon a taste for casuistry. Reynolds' feeling for the mystery behind all life and his entanglement in neo-Platonic mysticism, together with his desire for figurative expression, are common characteristics of a Baroque outlook. They spring moreover from the fundamental organic processes—or, if we prefer it, organic disorders—of the age.

The opposition to Baroque thought and Baroque styles, which becomes abundantly vocal in the period of the Restoration, may receive one more illustration, from John Wilkins' *Ecclesiastes* (1669):

> . . . there are some other Writers that are stiled Mystical Divines, who pretend to some higher illumination and to give rules for a more intimate and comfortable communion with God. And these of late have been by some much cryed up and followed; but they do, in the opinion of many sober and judicious men, deliver only a kind of Cabalistic or Chymical, Rosicrucian Theology, darkening wisdom with words; heaping together a farrago of obscure affected expressions, and wild Allegories.

The theme of significant darkness is, of course, only one of several suggested by Wölfflin's set of categories. But it may have served to illustrate how certain elements of the Baroque aesthetic reveal themselves in English literature.

* * * * *

The usefulness of Baroque as a concept in the study of English is that it advances fresh relationships, permits new perspectives, leads to a better understanding of the formal intentions of the authors, gives to the English-speaking student a link with Continental Baroque, forges links between types of sensibility and kinds of style, and generally acts as a catalyst to combinations of critical ideas. Above all, it adds to our pleasure in the seventeenth-century, and what in this day and age could be more useful than the fresh sense of wonder and renewing of delight?

THE ELEMENT OF MOTION IN BAROQUE ART AND MUSIC

WILLIAM FLEMING

A new and progressive art style rose in the early 17th century like a phoenix out of the ashes and broken columns of classical culture. It was an aesthetic expression of the early image of modern man as he searched in his world for a new philosophy of life, new scientific achievements, new mechanical inventions, and for new social and political patterns. Baroque art emerged out of this struggle for freedom from old shackles and inhibitions and spoke with an energetic and highly eloquent rhetoric of progress, of expanding the range of human activities, of grandiose achievements, of ceaseless activity and motion. It is in the direction of this element of motion that the significance of this first truly modern art style is to be found. The element of motion runs as a rhythmical undercurrent through all the arts from architecture to music. The machine is the symbol

which distinguishes our modern civilization from all others, and it was the Baroque period which first began to think in terms of machines and the various mechanical aspects of motion.

The Baroque period in the minds of many eminent critics and historians of the 19th century was thought to be the result of a decline in the Renaissance spirit, and a degeneration away from the nobility of the classic aesthetic ideal. Ruskin, for instance, labeled it the "Grotesque Renaissance". "On such a period, and on such work," he said, "it is painful to dwell. . ."[1] More recently there has been a re-evaluation, and historians of the calibre of Wölfflin and others show that it is a "totally different art"[2] from the Classic and Renaissance styles. Nevertheless there are some roots of the Baroque style in certain tendencies of the Renaissance artists. The germinal elements were present in the work of Leonardo, Caravaggio, and Tintoretto. In fact in the late Renaissance there seemed to be two entirely separate directions of thought. One gravitated toward the ancient classic ideal and was for that reason a backward and retrogressive view. The other was a forward progressive viewpoint which utilized all the then modern ideas in the intellectual and scientific world and translated them into artistic media. It is out of this latter trend that the Baroque develops. The Baroque artists never failed to pay lip service to the classic idea, but they succeeded in utilizing classical forms and models in a highly unclassical manner. The aesthetic path they traveled was away from serenity and repose toward the progressive, the striving, the aspiring, the becoming. The perfect, completed, self-contained forms of the Classic and Renaissance periods gave way before the restless, struggling, forceful elements of this new attitude toward life and the world. The *Cicerone* crystalizes the essence of the new aesthetic by the dictum: "Emotion and movement at all costs."[3]

The Baroque period brought about a quickening of the pulse of human affairs. It was an age of movement, activity, exploration. Time is of utmost importance. The mechanical clock becomes the dominant symbol of this period and performs the unique function of translating the movements of time into spatial dimensions. This spatializing of the flow of time is a part of the essence of this period. The medieval preoccupation with the concept of the eternal gradually gave way to preoccupation with the transitory. Regularity had been the keynote of the monastic life; and it was devoutly believed that since God had divinely ordered the cosmic forces, it was a religious duty of man to bring his movements into harmony with this cosmic regularity. This stimulated thought along the line of measuring time. Since the sun dial was unsatisfactory at different seasons, and primitive water clocks froze in cold weather, a mechanical clock was devised in the 14th century which had dials and hands for the purpose of translating the flow of time into movements in space. Thus the clock, according to Lewis Mumford in his *Technics and Civilization*, not the steam engine or any other machine, is the key of the modern age. His view upholds the thesis that the turning point in modern civilization comes when the clock and watch become common property. Eter-

[1] John Ruskin. *Stones of Venice*. Vol. 3, Ch. 3.
[2] Heinrich Wölfflin. *Principles of Art History*.
[3] Jacob Burckhardt. *Der Cicerone*. Leipzig, 1910.

nity is then no longer the dominant unit of time, but rather hours and minutes. Consequently there is a speeding up of human activity. Life here and now no longer seems a lengthy wait before the beginning of life in the next world. The time now seems all too short for the multifarious human possibilities and ambitions.

Baroque society first adopted this symbol of the flow of time and made it a part of everyday living. The bourgeois ideal of making life as regular as clockwork and translating time into wealth is derived from this earlier period. One has only to look at the early clocks to grasp their Baroque connection. They were amazingly ingenious. In some the hours were represented by mythological images in the form of dolls which paraded with automatic movements. In others the hours were twittered off by gilded birds or the tinkling sounds of music boxes. So much did the mechanical idea of time take hold of their thinking that the deists and Voltaire even projected the image of God as the Eternal Clockmaker who created, wound up, and regulated the universe.

The philosophical speculation about the universe was done in mechanical terms. Descartes, who defined the real world as one of matter in motion, thought that all phenomena could be understood in terms of the laws of mechanical motion. The impetus of this dynamic thinking is seen in all fields. The technical progress between the Renaissance and the end of the Baroque period around 1750 laid the foundation for the present machine age. In addition to the mechanical clock, Galileo's telescope confirmed and popularized Copernicus' earlier discovery of the heliocentric solar system with the completely novel notion that the earth was not fixed but moved freely in space. Further speculation continued throughout the Baroque period with the unsolved problems of planetary motion, and Newton was absorbed in working out the intellectual architecture of a universe which was based on planetary attraction and repulsion. The impetus for exploration is revealed by the invention at this time of the submarine boat, flying machine, parachute, paddle wheel boats, diving bells, and balloons. Even a toy helicopter made its first appearance in 1796. The concern of the scientists with the laws of motion is apparent from their writings, experiments, and inventions. Leibniz' differential calculus, Gilbert's Treatise on *Terrestrial Magnetism and Electricity*, Galileo's First Law of Motion, Newton's Law of Gravitation, and the first thought along the lines of thermodynamics come at the end of the 17th century. The telescope and microscope are devised to explore distant and minute regions of space. The barometer is invented to measure fluctuations in air pressure, and the thermometer to translate heat changes into upward and downward movements in space. Both of these and a device known as the anemometer which measured the force of the winds were all contributions of the early 18th century. The inventive spirit of this time was ceaseless, and the idea of motion runs through it all.

In brief the scientific thinking of this time was concerned with movement in calculation, in measurement, in exploration, in transportation. Is it then any wonder that movement is of dominant importance in the art of the Baroque? The classical ideal of repose is displaced in aesthetic as well as in scien-

tific thought. Progress is in the wind and there is no nostalgic longing for the classical serenity of antiquity. There was a much closer working agreement between the arts and sciences of this time than is generally realized. The vitality and dignity of art, however, never suffered because of the scientific speculations of a Leonardo or a Goethe. Much in the early Baroque period was done by the musician Vincenzo Galilei on the science of acoustics and the laws of vibration. It was perhaps the primary aesthetic impulse of these interesting investigations that spurred his illustrious son on toward his astronomical investigations of the music of the cosmos. Even at the end of the period we see the great J. S. Bach carrying the scientific method into musical composition in his last work, *Die Kunst der Fuge*. In this opus he carefully controls his variables by building all types of fugues and classifying them by using only one highly simple theme, thus bringing into sharp focus the form of the fugue as distinct from the thematic content. In the visual arts we have Leonardo speculating on acoustics, movements, and weights. He also spent much time devising flying machines, and wrote an extended treatise on how birds, bats, fishes, animals, and insects fly, together with a detailed analysis of the mechanism of flight and the many variations of movement while in flight. In the Baroque period movement is clearly indicated in each of the arts. The angel and bird motifs become prominent in the visual arts. Sculpture flies, architecture grows wings, paintings seem hardly to stay on the wall, and even buildings seem to soar.

In Baroque painting the beholder sees the play of lights and shade rather than formal contours. The horizontal line of the Renaissance gives way to the off-balance diagonal accent. Rubens will serve as an example. Violently active subject matter as well as emotional content, climactic battle scenes, dramatic moments, nervous movements, curved forms, and interplay of lights characterize his canvases. In Murillo's paintings the Madonna no longer sits on her solid renaissance thrones, but she is at times in flight or stands precariously with one foot on a crescent moon or is born aloft surrounded by cherubs. Typical of the painting of the period is its delight in escaping the limitations of two-dimensional space on perpendicular walls by using the giddy angles and perspectives afforded by ceiling murals, painted sometimes on concave surfaces and intended to be viewed from odd angles. Here angels float more realistically on clouds, and the limitation of the perpendicular vanishes. However, with all its extravagances the style has both tremendous vigor and extraordinary animation.

Ceaseless activity and motion are also the chief characteristics of Baroque sculpture. There is an element of the eccentric and even at times of the grotesque. The Baroque caryatids, far from the serenity of their classical models, are satyrs and fauns in dizzy ballet-like attitudes. They balance their balconies so giddily that their ancient forebears must have turned over uneasily in their museums. The Baroque develops the free-standing active figure, which is independent of niche and wall. It escapes, as Wölfflin says, "from the spell of the plane. . . ." The sculpture of this period reaches its highest point in Bernini's plastic compositions. He said at one time that the most important

thing for sculpture was to depict movement, and the living, wavelike, undulating lines of his creations are pure line for the sake of linear movement. His figures defy gravitational limitations and are often, as in his *St. Teresa in Ecstasy,* freely suspended in space. With his fluid, flamelike lines he goes as far as possible in the sculptural medium, and the restless Baroque spirit looks for further movement toward the more malleable media of painting and music.

In architecture the sharp contours of the Renaissance façade with its balanced opposition of horizontal and vertical outlines give way to rounded figuration and curved, undulating lines. This and the profuse ornamentation activate the static architectural masses and increase its rhythmic pulsation. Baroque architecture is essentially a secular and worldly type of art. The shift in the social and economic center of gravity is away from the church and toward the courts and the large cities where the activities of the aristocracy were carried on. The church was forced to compete with this tendency, and during the time of the counter-reformation adapted many of the worldly aspects of the Baroque to its purposes. The art of the Baroque period was not as diffused as that of the Romanesque and Gothic times, but became centralized in the cities which gradually became world centers of culture. It strove for the magnificent and the stupendous. Display, not comfort, was its goal. More decorative than structural, its buildings were restless and loaded with ornamentations, but the style shows a tremendous exuberance and zest for life. As one writer of the period put it: "It showed the happy audacity of the conqueror, the irrepressible eccentricities of the victor and autocrat." The palace as a symbol of the pompous, worldly splendor of the nobility becomes the typical architectural form and goes hand in hand with the acquisition of riches and the developmeant of grandeur. Music continued its movement away from the cloistered halls to the salons of the aristocracy, and the typical forms of opera houses remain Baroque to the present day. This testifies to the partnership of the architectural and musical forms of the period, both of which developed simultaneously under aristocratic patronage. The secularization of music correlates directly with the development of Baroque palace architecture, and this alliance gave rise to the many related musical forms such as the *sonata da camera,* the *musiche da camera,* and the concerto style. The life within the Baroque palace walls brought into being the dance forms which are the parts of the larger form known as the suite. As a collection of dances the suite showed the importance of movement and patterns of activity to the spirit of the times. The alternation of slow and dignified tempi with fast and spirited ones served to intensify rhythmic contrasts. Indeed it is not by accident that the separate units of the sonata and suite forms are referred to as movements.

As a lively complement to the massive palace exteriors, we find a favorite form of Baroque architectural embellishment in fountains and pools. Here the images of the buildings were reflected in wavy movement, and the watery mirrors integrated with the architectural scheme to give depth to the façades. Just as mirrors were used to increase the perception of space in interiors, so the pools performed a similar function for the exteriors and by their rippling reflections activated the static lines and masses of the structures. The fountains

with their splashing music had active figures playing, spouting, and swimming. The water was diverted in a hundred ingenious ways so that it would spout in living patterns, cascade over artificially constructed falls toward pools populated with porcelain dolphins and water sprites, where stony nymphs fled from marble satyrs through the realistically splashing water. In the Baroque fountain the actual motion of the playing waters was an integral part of the sculptural design. The Baroque desire for movement was here realized in a unique way.

A close relationship exists between the growth of the Baroque palace and the concerto as a contemporary musical form. The factor of repetition tended to shift Baroque architecture from classical repose toward more dynamic rhythmic emphasis. The alternation of individual units of ornamentation with larger structural masses, as in the façades of the palaces, is strikingly similar to the opposing of the lighter sonorities of the *concertino* with the larger masses of the *tuttis* in the *concerto grosso*. The sense of progress in space and time is achieved through the throwing back and forth of the grouped instrumental sonorities produced by the smaller bodies of instruments opposing larger ones. Also, in the concerto the spotlighting of certain instrumental combinations allows the activation of one part moving on the background of the whole. This shift of tonal balances heightens the effect of the relative mobility of the parts in respect to the whole.

The palace and the concerto are essentially worldly and pompous in design and feeling and a distinct contrast to the ecclesiastical emphasis of earlier forms. In the early 17th century the term *concerto* was indicative of a style or a texture rather than a definite form, and it implied the opposing of qualities, volumes, and intensities, and melodic direction, just as the palace contrasted textures, spatial rhythms, and masses. The root meaning of the word clarifies the essential tendency of this style. *Certare* means simply to strive. The modern solo concerto in the virtuoso style is an opposition between the many and the one— between the orchestra and the individual. The concerto grosso represented a striving, but a striving together between the many and the few. J. S. Bach has given a witty definition in one of his titles in which he calls a piece the "Vereinigte Zwietracht der wechselnden Saiten", which might be translated, the "Unified Dissension (or striving) of the Shifting Strings." The two striving elements are the full orchestra called the *ripieno* and the smaller concerting group of instruments which are called the *concertino*. The term ripieno meaning full and ripe is in itself in the best Baroque tradition. Through the thick, energetic sonorities of the tuttis or ripienos a massiveness of sound volume is achieved which is related to the massive and heavy aspect of the style in other art forms, and has a direct relation to the juxtaposition of the chiaroscuro and light and shade techniques of such painters as Tintoretto, Caravaggio, Rembrandt, and the Dutch School.

Above all, however, it is the grandiloquence of the operatic expression that permeates the whole of the music of this period. The opera fascinated the Baroque mind. This is evident from both the interiors and exteriors of the opera houses of this time; and indeed it has become so much a part of the operatic

tradition that practically all opera houses at present within and without are pure Baroque structures. The stage techniques of the operas of this time were "mechanical marvels" and have not been surpassed up to the present. The revolving theatre stage was invented in the year 1597 and employed in the operatic productions of the 17th century. These early operas were noted for their elaborate and sumptuous scenic effects. There were gadgets to produce the illusion of angels in flight, derricks to afford the gods a comfortable passage between heaven and earth, and ingenious mechanisms for floating whole choirs of saints and angels across the stage on papier maché clouds. The restless urge for movement is evidenced by the constant changes of scene. Cesti's *Pomo d'Oro*, for example, called for a continuous shifting of some sixty-seven scenes and episodes which moved all the way from the underworld through the earth and up into seventh heaven. Literary parallels exist in Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, Voltaire's *Candide*, and Goethe's *Faust*, Part Two. But beyond these rather external appearances was the genuine desire for heightening the dramatic progress and feeling. A close tie exists between this *motional* and *emotional* expression, and the opera style of Monteverdi and the Neapolitans establishes this form as an intensely dramatic medium which reaches its culmination at the end of the period with Gluck. The dramatic essence of this music was designed to appeal to the affects, temperament, and passions of the listener and participator. It desires through its motions to awake emotions. As it was stated by a philosopher of the early 18th century: "Musick hath two ends, first to please the sense, . . . and secondly to move ye affections or excite passion."[4]

The growth of the instrumental style is another of the distinctive contributions of this period. New instruments are invented and older ones perfected by the new mechanical processes. The violin reaches the pinnacle of its development at this time. This was in keeping with the trend away from the vocal, toward a more purely instrumental type of expression. The violin was the coloratura among coloraturas. It satisfied the Baroque need for faster tempi, greater technical agility, more florid embellishments. Here speed and movement were realized more freely and completely when unencumbered by the limitations of the human vocal mechanism. In addition the expressive possibilities of each instrument are thoroughly explored until the Baroque culmination is reached in the instrumentation of Gluck. This trend toward dramatic orchestral effects continues until, with Beethoven and the Romantic school, "purely instrumental music became more dramatic than any drama."[5]

We thus see that the accentuation of the element of motion runs through the entire gamut of Baroque expression. The style is first apparent in the modern progressive view of a certain aspect of the Renaissance culture. This is revealed in the scientific and mechanical achievements of the late 16th and early 17th centuries. Then as an art style it first finds expression in architecture and develops other facets through the media of sculpture and painting. But it is most of all in music that the Baroque style finally finds its natural spiritual

[4] Francis Hutcheson, Irish metaphysician.

[5] Donald Francis Tovey. *Articles from the Encyclopedia Britannica*. p. 124.

medium. The motions of music, which move through the time dimension free from the limitations of space, are ideal for conveying the essence of the Baroque spirit. No matter how rhythmic, how active the visual arts became, they were limited by the use of concrete symbols. But the abstract symbolism of music enabled it to take wings and fly through the temporal dimension unimpeded by static materials. In this way both its material and spirit were synonymous with the dynamics of free movement. All forms of rigidity and authoritarian control, which gradually were diminishing from medieval times through the religious polyphony of the Renaissance, were finally overthrown, and the secular Baroque becomes thoroughly plastic and fluid. Baroque concerti teem with a new energy. The tempi are speeded up, and fast, busy lines are woven into their texture. Secular adornments such as the trill and other similar embellishments adorn the paths of their musical progress.

In all the Baroque art forms there are always elements of the fantastic, the illogical, the imaginative. The decorative element in its architecture, the flamelike sense of movement in its sculpture, and the active lines of its painting, however, all exist at the expense of serenity and complete plastic unity. Only in music does this restless, undulating style find its natural spiritual medium. Especially is this true in the busy expression of the tuttis of the Baroque concerto, and the florid lines of the aria style. Baroque music, like the other artistic manifestations of the period, is the product of a moving dynamic image of the world. The flowering of music as a completely emancipated and independent art could not have taken place in an age which produced the serene repose of the Parthenon or the frozen forms of the medieval times. Only in a time such as this, which was thinking in terms of the dynamics of motion, could this art finally come of age and reach its full maturity.

STYLE IN THE ARTS: A METHOD OF STYLISTIC ANALYSIS[1]

THOMAS MUNRO

PART ONE: THE NATURE OF STYLES, AND WAYS OF STUDYING THEM

A. *Traits, types, and styles.*

1. *Descriptive and evaluative terms.* Some words refer to observable traits in works of art (e.g., red in color; high in pitch), as distinguished from qualities

[1] This outline is intended as an aid in the study of artistic styles. It can be applied to any art, and to any style and period of art, in such problems as (a) defining a particular historic style; (b) describing the style or styles of a given period; (c) determining the stylistic affinities of a given work of art. It was developed in the author's courses on comparative aesthetics in the Graduate School of Western Reserve University. A brief summary of the general approach to aesthetic morphology, of which this article is a part, was published as "Form in the Arts: an Outline for Descriptive Analysis." *Journal of Aesthetics*, Vol. II, No. 8, Fall 1943, pp. 5–26. A fuller outline was published as *Form in the Arts: A Syllabus in Comparative Aesthetics*, Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland, O., 1945.

implying value judgments or affective responses (e.g., beautiful, well-proportioned, sublime, ugly, debased). Concepts of types are based on the recurrence of examples possessing a certain trait or quality. "The beautiful" is an evaluative type or category. "Red textile" and "soft music" are descriptive types. Descriptive traits and types may involve qualities and relations directly observable by the senses (e.g., red), or those apperceived as culturally established meanings (e.g., Christianity as suggested by a cross), or both. The former are *presented*, the latter *suggested* traits. "Landscape," "tragedy," "cathedral," "sonata," and "sonnet" are descriptive types of art, and of aesthetic form.

2. *Simple and compound descriptive types.* Simple traits: e.g., red. Compound traits, involving several specifications: e.g., large, oblong, red, and smooth. A simple type is defined in terms of one trait, or very few. E.g., red textiles; curvilinear furniture; music in $\frac{3}{4}$ time. A compound descriptive type is one whose definition requires several specifications. E.g., furniture with curving lines, gilt finish, and silk brocaded upholstery.

3. *A style of art is a compound descriptive type which requires a comparatively large number of specifications for clear definition.* It consists of a *combination of traits or characteristics which tend to recur together* in different works of art, or have done so in the art of some particular place and period. It is a recurrent *trait-complex*; a distinctive cluster or configuration of interrelated traits. E.g., in Gothic architecture: pointed arches, high vaults, pitched roofs, slender piers, thin walls, large stained glass windows, flying buttresses, etc. Also, Wölfflin's definition of Baroque as painterly, recessional, open, with "unified unity" and relative clearness.[2]

4. Not all *trait-complexes* are recognized as *styles.* Some occur only once, in a single work of art. To be considered as a definite style, a trait-complex usually has to recur in many works of art which are regarded as important by historians and critics. It has to be regarded as an influential principle of organization in these works, rather than as a set of trivial, superficial aspects. Comparatively few recurrent trait-complexes in art have been recognized as styles, and fewer still as major, or great historic, styles. Occasionally, a style is distinguished on the basis of a single work of art, as when only one work by a certain artist is known.

5. A *historic* style is conceived in terms of the traits of art which are believed to have existed in some particular period of history, or in the works of some specific people, artist, or group of artists, as distinguished from others. Some styles are *abstract or recurrent*, being defined so as to apply to works of several different periods and places.

6. A *stylistic trait* is a trait regarded as characteristic of a style, and used as one of the specifications in defining it. (It may be characteristic of the style only when found together with certain other traits). In a particular work of art, a stylistic trait is one which tends to identify it as an example of some style.

7. *Essential and non-essential traits.* Some traits are usually regarded as basic and essential to the style, involving many other traits and determining

[2] Wölfflin, H., *Principles of Art History: the Problem of the Development of Style in Later Art.* Holt, N. Y., 1932.

their distinctive mode of interrelation. (E.g., "painterly," in Wölfflin's theory of Baroque). Others are regarded as less essential or non-essential; as superficial, variable, optional, dispensable, atypical, or not peculiar to the style in question.

8. *Quantitative comparisons.* Styles, periods, and works of art are often described in terms of "more" and "less," by comparison with others. (E.g., the Louis XV style is more curvilinear than the Louis XVI).

9. Stylistic traits, when analyzed and defined clearly, are usually found to be complex and variable in themselves. They are, in other words, *constituent trait-complexes*, which combine and cooperate to produce a style. Each can in turn be analyzed into other traits, which may also occur in different contexts. E.g., Wölfflin's "painterly" is not a unitary trait but a combination of independently variable traits of line, light and dark, color, shape, etc. A style consists in the comparatively persistent, conspicuous recurrence of such a configuration.

10. A constituent trait-complex may be recognized as determining an important variety of a style, even though not essential to the general definition of the style. E.g., Bannister Fletcher distinguishes "the Palladian motif" within Italian Renaissance architectural style. It consists of "superimposed Doric and Ionic orders which, under the main entablature, frame intervening arches supported on smaller free-standing twin columns, and there are circular openings in the spandrels."[3] This is an occasional, variant feature, not essential to Italian Renaissance style in general.

11. Disagreement exists as to proper *definitions* of chief historic styles; i.e., as to what traits are to be regarded as essential and basic in the Baroque, Gothic, Romantic, Classic, and other styles in various arts.

12. Need for *objective, descriptive study* of styles. For non-evaluative definitions of styles. (Many definitions are controversial because evaluative; e.g., Baroque as "over-decorated.") Need for description of styles as observable in works of art, apart from theorizing about their causation and deeper, spiritual meaning, or about the underlying mental and emotional attitudes—the "spirit of the age"—which they are thought to express. Study of styles hitherto has been hampered by confusion with these related problems. Many of these problems are highly important in their own right, but require a different approach. Their relation to stylistic analysis will be discussed below.

13. Suggested *intellectual meanings, ideologies, and emotional attitudes* can themselves be integral parts of a work of art and of a style. They can become essential traits of a particular style. The concept of style should not be limited to superficial devices or narrowly formalistic aspects of art. E.g., in literature it can include the ideas, beliefs, and attitudes expressed (philosophical, religious, ethical, scientific, etc.) as well as the manner of expressing them.

B. *Style-names and their meanings; various bases for distinguishing styles.*

1. The following bases are frequently used:

a. Period (including reigns and dynasties): e.g., Sung style; Empire style; Renaissance style; Louis XV style.

[3] *History of Architecture on the Comparative Method.* Scribner's , New York, 1931, p. 659.

b. Place. E.g., European style; north Italian style.

c. People or person (including racial, national, or religious group). Tibetan Buddhist style; Japanese style; Islamic style; style of Wagner, Rubens, or Milton.

d. Product. E.g., Parthenon style.

e. Whichever is used as name, some of the others are usually implied.

2. Styles are also named and distinguished on the basis of certain abstract types or traits: e.g., Baroque, Romantic, Impressionist, Polyphonic. Sometimes on the basis of subject represented: e.g., "The Animal Style."

C. *The field of distribution of a style; extensive and restricted styles. The definition and extension of a concept of style.*

1. The *distribution* of a style is its occurrence or embodiment in works of art. It can be wide or narrow, extensive or restricted. Such extension occurs along various lines; a style can extend or spread in some ways and contract in others.

a. *Cultural* distribution: extensive, semi-extensive, or restricted, as to different arts and other branches of culture; e.g., in music, painting, and poetry, or in music only. As to different types within an art (e.g., chairs and tables, in furniture). Frequent lag in certain arts; minor arts following major in adoption of a style.

b. *Geographic, ethnic, and national* distribution: in the art of various places, peoples, races, nationalities.

c. *Chronological* distribution; persistent and ephemeral styles. Duration of a style. Fads and fashions. Persistence of Greek architectural styles. Declines and revivals of a style.

d. *Social* distribution; classes of society in a given area or people; age-levels, occupations, sexes, etc., which produce and use the style. E.g., costume styles for boys of noble families; wedding attire for peasant girls. Sailors' chanteys.

e. The *productive* distribution or field of production of a style is its occurrence in the making or composition of art; the provenance of works of art embodying it. (Performance, as of music, may or may not be regarded as a part of production.) The *consumptive* distribution or field of consumption is its occurrence in the use or enjoyment of art. They may coincide or diverge considerably, as when products are exported for use elsewhere. They often diverge as to social class: e.g., the manufacture or performance of art by lower-class artisans or actors, for use and enjoyment by aristocrats; manufacture by women, use by men.

f. *Biographical* distribution: occurrence of a style in the career and works of an individual artist, or a portion of them. E.g., in Leonardo's Milanese period.

2. The *total distribution* of a style is its distribution in all the above ways.

a. Major styles or great historic styles are highly extensive in several ways. (E.g., Renaissance style.)

b. Minor styles are comparatively restricted in all or most of these ways. (E.g., El Greco's third style; 19th century Arlesian woman's headdress.)

3. The *field of distribution* of a style is the general realm of culture and history

within which it has occurred, as marked off in any or all the above ways. Not all works of art within that field are necessarily examples of it. E.g., the chronological and geographic field of Baroque style may be defined as "about 1550–1750 in Europe." This does not imply that all art therein was Baroque. Several styles may be distributed in one field, perhaps to varying extents.

4. The *main field of distribution* or main extension of a style is that in which its greatest distribution or most important examples have occurred. Importance may be measured by one or a few outstanding artists, rather than by number of products. (This may involve debatable evaluations.) The main field of distribution is distinguished from *subordinate* fields; e.g., late extensions.

5. The *most typical* special field or subfield of a style is that in which it is thought to appear most clearly, fully, and purely. E.g., Rococo in Louis XV furniture. (This is often debatable).

6. The *primary special field, or field of origin,* is that in which the style or definite anticipations of it first appeared. This too is often debatable; e.g., early manifestations of Romanticism appeared in poetry, music, garden art, etc., and in Germany, England, France, etc.

7. With respect to their distribution and resemblance, two or more styles can be related as historically *neighboring or remote* styles (geographically, chronologically, culturally, etc.). 17th c. European Baroque in sculpture is a neighbor of 17th c. European Baroque in architecture. It is remote from 17th c. Indian sculpture, geographically.

8. Styles can be related as *inclusive and included*; *substyles* or phases of more extensive styles. Restricted styles are usually phases or variants of some extensive style, or mixtures of two or more extensive styles; not isolated occurrences. Florentine style is a substyle in relation to Italian Renaissance style; Botticelli's style is a substyle of Florentine.

9. *Similar styles;* those having important traits in common, even though their occurrence is historically remote. (Influence or causal connection is not necessarily implied).

10. *Opposite or antithetical* styles: those whose essential traits are opposite or strongly contrasting. *Antithetical examples:* objects displaying opposite styles.

11. A *style-group* is a set of styles closely related to each other as neighboring, inclusive, or similar. An extensive style, such as "Renaissance," is sometimes regarded as a single style including many others (e.g., Florentine, Raphaelesque); sometimes as a group of distinct, related styles.

12. The same or partly similar styles in different places are often called by different names: e.g., picturesque, romantic, moribana, free, naturalistic. The same name is often applied to different or partly different styles: e.g., "classical."

13. *Extensive and restricted styles in various arts.* Recent trends in theories of style.

a. The visual arts. The nature of historic styles has been most thoroughly studied here. Recent trend to more extensive conception of styles.

b. Music; provincial nature of much theorizing; mostly restricted to modern European styles; neglect of oriental and primitive.

c. Literature; backwardness of style theory. Confusion between various meanings of style: e.g., the epic style or type; style as good writing.

d. General trend, esp. in Germany, to extensive definition of certain styles, such as "Baroque." I.e., as applicable to several arts, and even to non-artistic fields such as philosophy, science, and government.

14. The distribution of a style depends in part on the way in which that style is *abstractly defined*; the traits in which it is said to consist. Many style-names are defined in various ways. According to one definition, the style n ay be restricted to a narrow field; according to another, the specified traits may be found elsewhere also. Very broad or vague, abstract definition tends to make the concept more extensive, by implication. I.e., it will probably cover more different examples.

15. The abstract definition of a style is (from a logical standpoint) its *intension or connotation.* Its concrete distribution or occurrence in art is its *extension or denotation.* The distribution to which a definition of a style would theoretically apply is its *implied* distribution. (This is not always clearly recognized.) Its *alleged* distribution consists of objects or fields which are commonly regarded as exemplifying it. (Actually, they may not do so.)

16. The alleged distribution of a style is sometimes *inconsistent* with its abstract definition as currently accepted. This produces confusion in theory. Theoretical studies should aim to revise either (a) the definition or (b) the account of how the style is distributed; its field and concrete examples, or both, so as to make them coincide. Alteration in the name may also help; e.g., to specify "northern Baroque." Ideally, the concept of a style should apply clearly to all alleged examples of it. (These constitute its *verified* distribution). The concept should not apply, at least in equal degree, to objects in other fields, not classed as examples of it. (E.g., if we define "Classical" very broadly as "balanced, restrained, unified," we should not treat it as restricted to a certain European period. It will apply to many periods and places).

17. *Fields of investigation.* These are subjects, areas of knowledge, or groups of phenomena which are marked off for study, research, writing, teaching, etc. Some fields are commonly recognized as distinct realms of nature or social culture, or as sciences in which these are described and interpreted; e.g., the ethnology of bronze age Europe. An investigator can mark off his own field in any way he wishes, as a career or temporary study. He may have a *general field* (e.g., history of painting) and one or more *special fields* of emphasis (e.g., 17th c. Dutch and Flemish landscape painting). *Subfields* can also be marked off: e.g., "with special reference to the early works of Hobbema."

a. *Problems of style* may be raised with special reference to such a field or subfield of investigation. To what extent does a certain style, as defined in a certain way, occur within it? E.g., "to what extent does Baroque style occur in Elizabethan drama, or the works of Bach?" To what extent does the actual, historic distribution of a certain style coincide with a certain field of investigation, as arbitrarily marked off by the student in advance? Does it cover all of this field? Is it restricted to this field?

b. A field of investigation may itself be marked off on a basis of style, or of the supposed examples of a style within a certain area of culture and history. E.g., one may decide to study and describe "the development of Rococo style in 18th c. French art." This assumes in advance a general conception of

Rococo style and its distribution. A subfield would be "the development of Rococo style in northern French domestic architecture after 1770."

c. A field of investigation may be marked off on a purely abstract, conceptual basis: e.g., "the concept of Rococo style." One may then bring in examples from various arts, times, and places.

D. *Three ways of defining a style-name:* as a *period of history;* as a *historic style;* as an *abstract recurrent type.* Resulting confusions in theory.

1. Names of major styles (Gothic, Baroque, Romantic, etc.) usually have several meanings. Name used in *3 or more senses.* Starts in one, spreads to others.

a. *Periods.* The name may refer to some field, historic division or period: e.g., Greek; the Louis XV or Romantic period. Implying a certain time-span, place, people, and group of art-works produced therein.

b. *Historic styles; period styles.* The name may refer to certain traits, supposed to characterize the art of that period. E.g., "Romantic" as a historic or period style or trend, occurring in a certain division of history. May be understood as restricted to one art such as architecture, or as extending through several arts.

c. *Abstract styles or types.* The name may refer to some *recurrent or persistent type,* not limited to any one period; a trait or set of traits appearing in different historic periods. E.g., "Romantic" as a type occurring in many periods, arts, and cultures. Usually defined more briefly and abstractly than a historic style; involving only a few selected traits. (Often spelled without capital: romantic).

2. Resultant confusions in theory: Over-simplified conceptions of historic periods. Ambiguity: e.g., of "Renaissance." Ambiguity of "Baroque": as a period; as a historic style; as an abstract recurrent type.

3. Need of distinguishing three alternative senses or types of definition for each major style-name or period-name. E.g.,

a. The Baroque *period*; the Baroque age in Europe.

b. The Baroque *style*; the Baroque period style.

c. The Baroque *type*; the recurrent, abstract, or general Baroque style.

4. Each sense stands for a different line of inquiry:

a. Historical periodization; division of history into periods. Divisions of history. (See § E below).

b. Definition and description of period styles. (See §§ F, G, H, I).

c. Recognition and description of abstract recurrent types or styles, through comparison of remote styles. (See § J below).

5. The *history of a style-name* is often different from that of the style it now signifies. A certain name may be applied successively to different types and styles. Change and extension in the application of a style-name has proceeded in various directions: (a) From a historic division to a concept of style. (b) From a style or movement to a historic division in which it flourished. (c) From a historic style to an abstract, recurrent type (by extending the definition to cover similar examples in remote periods or places), or vice versa. (The term "baroque" was applied to an abstract type—extravagant or bizarre—before it was applied to a historic style or period).

E. *The division of history into periods; epochs in the history of culture and of art.*

1. A style-name can be defined as a certain *historical division*; a field or "period" in the sense including specification as to period, place, and people. "Gothic period." "Gothic" as meaning North European, esp. German, French, English, between 1100 and 1500 A.D. Includes many different styles. "Gothic" applied to a work of art then indicates its provenance; not necessarily its style.

2. *History and prehistory.* Geologic and biologic (evolutionary) epochs. The vastness of human prehistory.

3. Divisions in the historical process are made in different ways, and into sections of different magnitude, size, and duration, as follows: (a) Into arbitrary chronological periods or time-spans; e.g., centuries, millennia. (b) Into places, regions; spatially or geographically. (c) Into peoples; racial, political, linguistic, and religious groupings. (d) Combined basis: period-place-people.

4. *Political epochs.* History written, and divisions marked off, on basis of rise and fall of empires, dynasties, etc. Conquests, dominations, boundaries, rules. Individual reigns. History as political history.

5. *Culture-epochs.* Historic divisions marked off in accordance with supposed main divisions in cultural evolution. Crucial turning-points; epoch-making events. Supposed continuity and similarity within an epoch.

a. Past theories of culture-epochs; philosophies of history. Supposed laws and patterns of history. E.g., Buddhist cycles; the "old and new dispensations" of medieval Christianity.

b. Modern theories of stages in cultural evolution. Anthropological periods (e.g., neolithic). Socio-economic (e.g., feudal period; industrial revolution). Intellectual and artistic (e.g., Dark Ages, Renaissance; Enlightenment).

c. Relatively active and inactive cultural epochs. Cultural flowerings; florescences; "great periods"; ages of greatest productivity and progress. Movements; schools. Lives of individual leaders. Particular achievements; discoveries, inventions, productions, works of art. Culture-epochs as marked off on the above bases. Inclusive and included; more and less active. Principal culture-epochs, selected on basis of cultural activity, esp. flowerings. Marked off on combined period-place-people basis.

d. Selective cultural history, with emphasis on principal culture-epochs. Relations to political history. Cultural divisions do not always correspond with political (e.g., with dynasties and reigns), but are often so designated: e.g., Sung dynasty, Louis XV, as periods in culture and art. Obscuring of culture-epochs through demarcation in political or other extraneous terms. Need of unprejudiced periodization into culture-epochs, major and minor: e.g., on a framework of arbitrary space-time and political divisions, but with accurate indication of intrinsic cultural divisions, whether or not conforming to these others.

e. The problem of *characterizing* the principal culture-epochs, in terms of culture-patterns, achievements, modes of living, and major trends therein. Gradual revision and clarification of concepts of culture-epochs, through increasing knowledge. Need of redefinition of old names of periods; abandonment of some; new names.

6. *The history of special cultural factors; especially of the arts.*

a. The division of cultural history into the histories of various threads or factors; of persistent types of human activity. E.g., religion, art, philosophy, science, law, industry, the family. History of a particular art or type of art: e.g., the chair.

b. Different periodization in the history of different factors: e.g., of different arts and sciences.

c. *Art epochs* as divisions in the history of an art, group of arts, or phase in art.

d. *Fields* for investigation, and their cultural "backgrounds." E.g., Japanese prints and their cultural background. Special fields as emphasized or focal areas of discussion.

e. The problem of characterizing the principal art epochs. *Concepts of styles as answers thereto.*

f. Frequent diversity of styles within a given period. Resultant problems of name and definition.

F. *Defining a historic or period style; general stylistic analysis. The styles of individual artists.*

1. A style as a set of traits in the art of a certain field or period; as its most distinctive, important traits. E.g., the Gothic style as the dominant style of the Gothic period, but not the only style practiced therein. "Gothic" (e.g., as applied to a chair) indicating both style and provenance.

2. Style as distinct from period of origin; as capable of revival and imitation. Non-period examples of a style. Extending the definition of a style, to cover a larger field. "Gothic" as indicating style but not provenance, as in a modern "Gothic" chair. "Gothic adaption"; "neo-Gothic." Need of clarity as to which meaning (1 or 2) is intended.

3. The style of an *individual artist or school* (e.g., Corot; Barbizon) is usually a subject for general stylistic analysis, and is to be defined as in the case of a period style. It usually involves generalizing on a number of works of art (unless one alone exists), and sometimes on various periods. An individual or personal style represents a division of history, and is a very restricted period style.

4. In the revision of old concepts of styles and the development of new ones, there are two basic *types of problem*; one of art history and one of terminology:

a. What is the *historical correlation* between certain trait-complexes in art and certain fields of distribution (groups of art-works, locations, periods of history, etc.)? To what extent is a certain trait-complex historically connected with a certain field (realm of art, period, place, etc.)?

b. Assuming the existence of such a correlation, what is the most expedient *name* for the trait-complex or style concerned? Can some traditional name such as Baroque or Romantic be effectively used, in spite of its ambiguous associations, through precise redefinition and qualifying terms? (E.g., not simply "Baroque" but "late 17th c. Spanish architectural Baroque"). Or should a new name be coined for the trait-complex? The answer will depend on the extent of present ambiguity and confusion, the possibility of authoritative redefinition or renaming, etc.

5. *Requirements of a thorough description of a historic style.* Definition of a *style-name* such as "Gothic" or "style of J. S. Bach." (Brief dictionary definitions must be more abridged).

a. Specification of the *main field of distribution* of the style; the place, period, division of history, art or arts, etc., in which the style is regarded as having flourished. *General* field: e.g., late medieval European arts. Main *special* fields or subfields, regarded as presenting distinct and important stylistic traits, requiring separate description: e.g., French Gothic, Spanish Gothic; Gothic architecture; Gothic book illumination. Bach's early works, late works; works for organ; cantatas, etc. *Typical examples* in each special field.

b. Specification of *stylistic traits* regarded as constituting the style. Detailed traits and modes of combining them. Trait-complexes or connected sets of traits. Include basic, integrative principles as well as list of detailed traits. *General essentials:* traits regarded as most characteristic, basic, necessary and distinctive for the style in general, conceived extensively, as applied to the whole main field of distribution. E.g., traits most characteristic of Gothic style in general, and pervading all subdivisions of it. Basic to "the Gothic spirit." Applying to Gothic style in all arts, regions, early and late phases, etc., and distinguishing Gothic from other styles therein. Often these can best be described by contrast with previous or subsequent, opposite styles. *Specific essentials:* traits regarded as most characteristic of the style in a particular special field or subfield. E.g., for Gothic architecture, flying buttresses; for Gothic book illumination, partly naturalistic ornamentation and pictorial backgrounds, rather than flat geometric. Specific essentials may be regarded as different means to the same general essentials or basic, common style-traits. (E.g., flying buttresses in architecture, and certain traits of Gothic sculpture, painting and music, may be various ways of achieving "the Gothic spirit" through different mediums and techniques). Specific essentials may also be given for main geographic, chronological, or cultural divisions: e.g., early and late Baroque; northern and southern Baroque; Catholic and Protestant Baroque. These are constituent trait-complexes or substyles, characteristic of the style in a certain special field only. (E.g., the essential traits of late French Gothic, and Gothic style in furniture, are substyles of Gothic in general). Stylistic traits peculiar to a special field or subdivision of the style are to be regarded as non-essential, variable, or optional for the style in general; as somewhat characteristic but not universally so. Predominance of vertical lines is essential for the Perpendicular style (a late variety of English Gothic), but not for all Gothic.

c. *Typical examples.* Particular works of art should be cited to illustrate each main *special field* of the style, and each *trait* regarded as essential to the style in that special field. (E.g., Wölfflin gives Bernini's "Ecstasy of St. Theresa" as an example of the painterly quality in 17th c. sculpture. He contrasts it with earlier Italian examples, so as to emphasize period rather than nationality).

d. *Clear naming.* Current style-names are usually vague and ambiguous. The name should briefly indicate the special field or substyle intended, if any.

E.g., Perpendicular Gothic in English architecture. Traits essential only to this special field should be distinguished from those common to other varieties of Gothic. If a style has been defined on basis of a narrow field, that should be evident in its name or designation. E.g., do not generalize about Baroque in general from a study of early 18th century south German Catholic church interiors. A broad general name such as Baroque should not be used without qualifying terms if conceived in a restricted way, unless for occasional abbreviation where context makes the restricted definition clear.

6. *Comparison of styles.* Essentials may be listed in various *orders:* In order of importance, as they are believed to be distinctive and fundamental to the style. One style at a time; i.e., all essentials of Style 1, then all essentials of Style 2, etc. In parallel columns, or otherwise comparing two or more styles at once, point by point. (Wölfflin contrasts Classic and Baroque under five pairs of opposite traits. Under each pair as a heading, he contrasts them in one special field after another: sculpture, architecture, etc., with examples of each trait). If the works of art concerned are similar in basic framework, style essentials can be contrasted with reference to different parts of the framework. Bannister Fletcher thus contrasts in parallel columns Gothic and Renaissance cathedrals, as to how they treat windows, roofs, floorplans, etc.

7. Try to eliminate ambiguous, evaluative, and unnecessarily controversial terms. Do not define one style in terms of others, if possible. E.g., do not list "Classic" or "Baroque" as traits, unless these terms have been precisely defined. State essentials in terms of descriptive traits and types of form, medium, and technique. Traits may be described in terms of tendency to emphasize or minimize a certain other trait, or in terms of a certain range of variation between extremes. What is the minimum of a certain trait which a work of art must possess to exemplify the style? The maximum which it may possess, and still exemplify the style?

8. Include the following kinds of traits if possible: Traits concerned with use of certain *materials, mediums, or techniques*, in so far as observable in the finished product or performance. (E.g., gilt, ormolu, silk, fresco, divided color, impasto, airbrush, piano, male chorus). Traits concerned with treatment of certain *components* in form. (E.g., emphasis on line or surface texture; on curved lines, with frequent changes in direction; on rhythm or frequent key modulation; on suggestions of calmness or agitation; on intellectual content or sense-imagery). Traits concerned with modes of *composition.* E.g., thematic (complex patterns; ABA framework patterns); utilitarian (for defense against swords and arrows; for political propaganda; for magical rites); representative (Greek mythical figures; naturalistic landscapes; satirical portraits); expository (mystic symbolism; explicit logical argument); relations between modes (degree of specialization; sacrifice of representation to design).

9. Ask whether current definitions are *too broad and vague* to exclude other styles as intended; or *too narrow and specific* to include all the examples and varieties intended. Definitions can be altered by changing connotation, denotation, or both.

G. *The empirical approach to definitions of historic styles.* Developing new con-

ceptions of styles. Inductive emphasis. Valuable for fresh, open-minded observation and generalization, unprejudiced by past theories. May involve much detailed research.

1. Mark off a certain field, period, or group of products: e.g., South German pottery from 1400 to 1450. Note its subfields: e.g., localities, decades, chief artists, schools, factories.

2. Compare the products therein. Classify them according to similarities and differences of form, material, technique, etc. Look for recurrence of certain combinations of traits.

3. Name these in some neutral, tentative way: for example, as *Trait-complex A*, Trait-complex B, etc. Define each: e.g., Trait-complex A consists in traits 1, 2, 3, etc. (Do not be too quick to call these by traditional style-names; even by names currently applied to these fields and traits. The ambiguity of the traditional concepts may confuse and prejudice fresh comparison and generalization).

4. Note extent to which a given trait-complex is associated with a certain *special field* or subfield. E.g., Trait-complex A with works in a certain medium, produced in a certain region, period, factory, etc.

5. If there is high correlation, one may *name* it, tentatively, as the style or one of the styles of that special field. E.g., 18th century Dresden porcelain style; style of John Smith, in his early or Plymouth period. Use traditional style-names cautiously, with specific definitions.

6. Generalize on *more extensive* styles or trait-complexes, as characterizing larger fields. E.g., the Rococo style in porcelain statuettes as including various substyles—French, German, Austrian, English, etc. Distinguish substyles from each other in terms of variable, constituent trait-complexes.

7. Note occurrence of *more than one* trait-complex or style in a given field, as contemporary, coextensive. Which is dominant? Are fields identical or partly divergent? E.g., distributed on different social or economic levels, as in costumes, furniture and utensils of upper and lower class in a given place and time. Do they coincide chronologically? Is one declining while the other rises? Are they in competition or supplementary?

H. *The conceptual approach to definitions of historic styles.* Applying and revising existing concepts. Deductive emphasis. Observation limited and directed by hypotheses. Valuable as utilizing previous theories.

1. Begin with a given *style-name*, and find how it has been defined by leading authorities, including dictionaries and art historians. Note its abstract definition; its alleged distribution and typical examples, according to each authority.

2. Note also various theories as to which styles are *antithetical* to or radically different from each other. (E.g., Wölfflin's contrast of Classic and Baroque; Bannister Fletcher's of Gothic and Renaissance). Note alleged field and typical examples of each style, according to each theory. Note how examples are said to illustrate essential traits.

3. Apply and test these theories by systematic *observation*. Take each trait-complex which is used to define a style. Consider each of its constituent traits, one at a time and in combination.

4. Do they really exist to a high degree throughout the *alleged field* and *typical examples* of that style, as maintained by the theory under discussion? Watch out for examples "hand-picked" to prove a theory, and not really representative of the field. Watch out for generalizations about a larger field than the examples presented justify. Alleged typical examples should be typical, not only of the abstract traits held essential, but also of the *whole field* which is said to manifest the style. If other styles are admited to exist therein, this should be stated. Does Baroque as defined exist only in *some* 17th c. European painting? In what special fields therein? Are there some important painters (e.g., Poussin) who do *not* exemplify all the traits defined by Wölfflin as essentially Baroque, but who belong to the *field* indicated by him as covered by Baroque? To what extent do *all* works by the artists he mentioned actually exhibit the alleged essentials? If such traits do not exist in these cases to a fairly high degree, the abstract definition of the style is inconsistent with its alleged denotation.

5. If so, how should the theory be revised? By correcting the description of field and distribution, so as to recognize the existence of diverse or variant styles therein? By restating list of essential traits so as to cover a wider variety of examples? By changing name of style so as to restrict it to a smaller field, where alleged essentials actually occur? (E.g., "Northern, Protestant Baroque" and "Southern, Catholic Baroque").

6. Possible *extensions* of a style-concept to broader fields: e.g., extension of "Baroque" from visual arts to 17th century literature and music. Take a given trait-complex, proposed as a definition of the style in general, or in regard to Special Field 1 (e.g., 17th c. visual arts). Ask, in regard to each trait, to what extent it applies also to Special Field 2 (e.g., to 17th c. music) and Special Field 3 (e.g., 17th c. literature). Which of the traits are applicable to certain special fields only? Which to all special fields, hence suitable as general essentials of the style? How must the general definition be revised to cover all special fields?

7. Styles once regarded as *antithetical* are often found to have much in common. This requires more precise definition of each as to essential traits, special fields and typical examples. Traits must often be defined in terms of a relatively higher or lower degree or frequency, rather than of total presence or absence. Intermediate, borderline, or transitional substyles may be discovered. One must ask, in regard to alleged essentials of Style 1: are they also to be found in the field and examples of Style 2? (E.g., can some alleged Baroque traits be found in some early 16th century painting, supposedly Classic? To what extent?) If Baroque is defined in terms of a trait which is not peculiar to it, the definition is faulty as not really differentiating it from other styles. Early style concepts are often thus through excessive generality. E.g., Winckelmann's phrase about Greek art: "noble simplicity and silent greatness." Does all Greek art have these traits? Does no other style have them to a like extent?

8. The history of a style theory often begins with a vague, broad conception: e.g., "the Greek style," or "the Japanese style," as consisting in certain general traits which are assumed to characterize that entire field. Later, the field is found to contain more diversity of styles. The original concept was over-

simplified. Scholars then come to think more in terms of specific styles or substyles within various divisions of the field. What they can say about the whole field (e.g., all Greek art) has to be increasingly general and subject to exception. A trait-complex originally regarded as characterizing the whole field may be found to characterize only a subfield (e.g., late Greek sculpture). This requires more specific names for styles and substyles, and more exact specification of the field, examples, and essential traits therein. Different substyles or variant styles, each a complex of traits, must be specified for different subfields.

9. *Comparison of various theories of a certain style;* definitions by various authors. (E.g., of Baroque by Wölfflin, by Preserved Smith,[4] and by P. H. Lang.[5]) After testing each individually through application to examples, ask:

a. To what extent and how do the theories agree and disagree on abstract definition or general essentials of the style?

b. On general field of distribution? How extensively is the style conceived by each? (E.g., by one as restricted to visual arts; by another as in music and literature also).

c. On special fields of distribution, in which the style is said to occur? On specific essential traits or abstract definition of the style with respect to each special field? (E.g., how do authors A and B agree on nature of Baroque traits in music?)

d. On typical examples of the style in each field? (E.g., is Bach regarded as Baroque? All or some of his works? In what respects?)

e. On antithetical styles; their fields (general and special) and typical examples? (E.g., Baroque and Classic).

f. On similar styles, substyles, variants, transitional and borderline styles, late extensions, etc.? (E.g., is Rococo a variety of Baroque or a separate style? Is Impressionism?)

g. How can historical inaccuracies, inconsistencies and inadequate nomenclature best be corrected? To what extent should previous theories and usage be followed?

h. Proposed revision or new theory of the style, or pair of contrasting styles. Include statement as to general field and essentials; special fields and specific essentials for each; typical examples for each special field, and how they illustrate essentials; relations between similar and antithetical styles, variants and borderline styles.

I. *Describing a work of art in terms of styles; particular stylistic analysis.* (See Study Outlines 1 and 2).

1. *Aims and uses.* Particular stylistic analysis as a special kind of form-analysis or morphological description. It describes the object, not only in terms of abstract traits and types such as red, blue, tragic, comic, etc., but in relation to concepts of recognized styles—combinations of traits which have tended to recur together in the history of art. Use of concepts of styles for abbreviated description of a work of art. (To say "a typical impressionist painting" says

[4] *A History of Modern Culture.* Holt, N. Y., 1930, Vol. I, Ch. XIX.
[5] *Music in Western Civilization.* Norton, N. Y., 1941. Chs. 10, 11.

much in a few words). This depends on existence of clear, accepted definitions of styles. Use as means of locating the work of art in relation to art history and general history, and to a systematic classification of types and styles of art. Use as approach to definite characterization of the object, through locating it under more and more headings, with differentiae. E.g., as an example of two or more styles at once, or as intermediate between two. Testing of hypothetical definitions of styles, and hypotheses as to typical or standard examples of various styles. Reciprocal relations between general and particular stylistic analysis.

2. *Typical examples* of a style, embodying all of the traits regarded as essential to that style in a specified field. *Atypical or partial examples*, involving some only. *Antithetical* examples; i.e., objects antithetical to a certain style, as embodying the opposites of its essential traits.

3. Judgments of more and less in comparing works of art. Extent to which they exemplify one or another style. (See § L). Standard examples as measuring-rods for comparison.

4. *Style and historical provenance.* (a) Style as distinct from "authenticity"; it may be described apart from knowledge about origin of the work of art. (b) Method of analysis may differ, however, according to whether provenance has been demonstrated on other grounds. Tentative application of stylistic hypotheses where origin is known or presumed.

J. *Abstract recurrent types; non-period styles.*

1. A style-name is sometimes extended to cover similar styles in *remote* periods and places. E.g., "Gothico-Buddhist sculpture in Central Asia";[6] "Baroque style in East Indian sculpture and architecture".[7] (The explanation of such resemblance is a separate problem: e.g., as due to influence or parallelism).

2. *Narrow and broad definitions* of a style-name; i.e., with many or few specifications; as implying a complex of many traits, or only one or two. (a) As defined with many specifications, a style is less likely to recur in remote divisions of history. (b) As defined very broadly, in terms of one trait only, it becomes a simple, abstract type, likely to recur often. (c) As defined in intermediate way, with few specifications, occasional recurrence is possible.

3. Historians of art and culture, noting occasional surprising resemblances between remote styles of art, sometimes describe them by extending the concept of a familiar historic style (esp. European) to cover such remote but similar styles. Replacing former different names for similar styles, or supplementing them. A phase in the broad, comparative approach to cultural history.

4. Frequent vagueness as to definition of style-name and list of traits which are held to recur. Danger of confusion through using style-name in a broader sense than usual.

5. Confusion from dubious philosophies of history (e.g., Spengler), asserting regular "laws" of recurrence and parallelism.

6. Need of unprejudiced observations and comparative analysis. Descrip-

[6] See Grousset, R., *Civilizations of the East.* Knopf, New York, 1931, 1934. *India*, p. 124f; *China*, p. 177f. Strzygowski, J., "The Afghan Stuccos of the N. R. F. Collection." Stora Gallery, New York. N. D.

[7] Cohn, William, *Indische Plastik.* Cassirer, Berlin, 1923, p. 45. G. Jouveau-Dubreuil, *Archeologie du sud de l'Inde*, Paris, 1914.

tion of analogies and recurrences can be given in terms of form-traits, with facts on distribution (period-place-people), without theorizing on causal explanations. (E.g., on diffusionism or parallelism).

7. There are innumerable names of abstract types in art. We consider here only those also applied to historic styles: e.g., romantic, classic.

K. *Trends in style; the historical sequence of types and styles. Constituent style-trends.*

1. Historical studies of art. Stylistic descriptions plus information on provenance of art (period, place, people, artist) allow *charting of trends* and successive changes in style. What changes have occurred? When? Where? Among what groups and individual artists?

2. Such studies are commonly mixed with (a) *evaluative* judgments and (b) theories or assumptions about the *causal* explanation of these changes, the "why" of styles and style trends. The mixture often involves confused thinking. There is need of more purely morphological accounts of style-trends, which can later on be interpreted causally and otherwise. Description of changes without raising difficult questions of explanation. Such accounts should describe the following:

3. Sequences in the styles produced by various individual artists: e.g., Picasso's Blue period, Cubist period, etc.

4. Sequences in the growth, change, and decline of historic styles. The chronological order, geographical and ethnic distribution of the principal styles.

5. General patterns, if any, in the growth and decline of historic styles. Alternation of Classic and Romantic trends. Recurrent sequences in the art of various peoples: e.g., Geometric, Archaic, Classic, Baroque, Rococo. Recurrent phases in the life history of a style. E.g., early or archaic; high, developed, or ripe; late or decadent. Do analogous phases of different styles resemble each other in any way? "Baroque" as name for a late phase in any style.[8]

6. Resemblances between remote styles; their chronological and other distribution; when and where analogous style-trends have occurred.

7. The widening distribution of a style as it spreads from one art to others; from one social class to others; from one age-level to others; from one region or nation to others. Its narrowing distribution during decline. E.g., spread from upper to lower classes or vice versa, with earlier decline in class of origin. Peasant styles resembling earlier aristocratic styles.

8. Differences among arts and regions as to speed of change, extension or restriction of styles. E.g., certain arts relatively static and others in rapid flux. (Egyptian official religious sculpture; recent post-impressionism). Differences among styles as to speed of change; persistent and ephemeral styles. Persistence of certain styles amid surrounding change, as conservative, retardés, academic, archaistic. Radical, new style-trends, avancés. ("Il dolce stil nuovo"; "art nouveau.")

9. What styles and types tend to flourish together, in same division of history.

[8] See Cohn, W., *op. cit.*, p. 20.

Which seem more inconsistent, incompatible. Actions and reactions, from one extreme to another; where and how they occur.

10. Differences between culture-epochs as to what arts, what types of art, and what styles of art are dominant therein. Sequence in growth and decline.

11. Relative priority among styles of individual artists. To what extent one antedated the other. Originality apart from possible influence or derivation.

12. *Constituent style-trends or trend-complexes* as variables within a general style-trend. E.g., the change from Gothic to Renaissance involved specific trends in many arts, types of form, compound parts, etc. Specific, correlated changes within a given area or subfield. Architectural trends in buttresses, in walls, in windows, etc. Pictorial trends in subject, color, perspective, etc. Musical trends in harmony, rhythm, orchestration, etc., as from Classic to Romantic. Wölfflin's five "developments" from Classic to Baroque: e.g., "from the linear to the painterly."

13. A style does not change all at once, at a uniform pace. In some respects, *opposite* trends may occur: e.g., increasing Classicism in some respects along with increasing Romanticism in others. Need of detailed, unprejudiced comparison between earlier and later phases of a style. Concomitant variations; positive and negative correlations among variables.

14. A *culture-epoch* or art-epoch thus regarded will appear dynamically, as a spatio-temporal continuum within which many diverse changes are taking place, in various respects and directions.

15. A *style* will appear as a distinctive and relatively persistent set of important correlated traits during a certain period. It is an unstable system of variable factors in art which has reached a condition of temporary, partial equilibrium.

16. Possible regular series, patterns, recurrences, to be noted in constituent style trends, through chronological plotting of changes in specific traits. Recurrent phases and cycles.

17. Main or comprehensive trends as made up of many constituent trends, with some oppositions canceling out. Short-range and long-range trends in style. Minor reactions from the main trend.

18. History of specific traits or trait-complexes (e.g., geometric linear shape) as entering successively into various styles or larger trait-complexes; as associated first with one context, then another. E.g., geometric patterns in tribal art and in modern cubist art. Note differences.

19. History of a style includes noting where and when it occurs *as a whole* or nearly so; its florescence. Also, where and when it occurs as a variant or partial revival; where and when its main constituent trends occur in other contexts—e.g., as partial anticipations or surviving vestiges of the style in question.

L. *Description of style in quantitative terms; the measurement of art.*

1. *Importance of quantitative measurement* as indicating stage of advancement of a subject toward scientific status. To what extent applicable to art?

a. Transition from qualitative to quantitative relations as a goal of science. But qualities and their relations are essential phenomena of art. Not necessary to destroy or ignore them in studying them quantitatively; i.e., in inquiring what aspects of aesthetic form are susceptible to measurement.

b. Danger of error through premature, specious application of quantitative methods in aesthetics; esp. of methods devised for use in other fields. Deceptive claims to accuracy.

c. Opposite danger from indiscriminate antagonism toward all quantitative investigation of art. Mystic, romantic attitudes. No harm in introducing measurement when possible and useful.

d. In no science, aesthetic or other, can an object or event be measured in all respects, or in many at once. Need of arbitrary simplification; selection of certain attributes or modes of variation, such as heat or rise and fall in prices. In all fields, some phenomena can be easily detached and measured; others are bound up in complex variables and hard to observe or measure separately.

2. *Presented factors in form more easily measured than suggestive, on the whole.*

a. Presented factors in form are those directly observable; presented to sense-perception. They can be compared with standard norms.

b. Measurement possible of presented spatial development in general; especially of sizes and shapes. E.g., of pictures, statues, vases, etc., in 2 or 3 dimensions. Sizes of parts; ratios between them; intervals or voids between parts; e.g., columns in building. Shapes of areas, solids, voids, and complex objects made of them, whether regular or irregular. Relations of symmetry, asymmetry. E.g., in painting, ceramics, sculpture, architecture.

c. Temporal developments. Durations, when determinate in forms as sets of directions, or in actual performance. E.g., of musical tones and durations; motion-picture shots and scenes; radio plays. Parts and wholes, relations of sequence and simultaneity. Tempo; rhythm.

d. Qualitative scales. E.g., color (hue, value, chroma); pitch, loudness, timbre.

e. Intensity, strength, purity, etc., of certain qualitative stimuli—brightness of illumination; intensity of color; loudness of sound, purity or mixture of timbre, etc.

f. Magnitudes and frequencies of specified traits or combinations of traits within a work of art. E.g., relative amounts of red in two pictures; extent of red area; amount of red contained in purples and oranges; number of red spots in relation to size, as compared with other colors. Frequency in music of certain chord-progressions, cadences, modulations, etc.

g. Amounts of resemblance and difference among units of a group, as to specified traits; e.g., relative amounts of contrast in hue, in two pictures or textiles. Amount of thematic repetition; variation; regularity or irregularity.

h. Such magnitudes, frequencies, and orders can be measured in a single work of art; in a group of them (e.g., in those produced in a certain period or locality, or by artists of a certain type); or in comparing two or more groups or series of them. Such measurements may provide basis for partially quantitative description of styles and trends. E.g., the relative frequency and curvature of curved lines in Louis XV and Louis XVI furniture styles. Frequency of modulation in Bach and Stravinsky.

i. *Correlations* between variable factors in art form. Tendency of certain traits to occur together, or not to occur together. E.g., relative sizes of walls,

windows, vaults, buttresses, in Romanesque and Gothic architecture. Basis for causal inferences, but these lead outside morphology.

3. *Measurement of suggestive factors.* (E.g., poetic imagery; suggested emotions in music; representation and symbolism in painting).

a. Direct, full observation impossible. Variable individual and cultural factors involved. Suggestive stimuli often vague and ambiguous. Hard to measure amount, size, intensity, etc.

b. Numerical groups and series of ideas, events, etc. E.g., series of 12 heroic exploits in literature.

c. Calculation of *relative frequencies* of certain types of suggestion in art. E.g., use of a certain type of image in Shakespeare, or in Elizabethan literature. Frequency of certain words, types of character, situations, incidents, as clues to nature of styles and trends. Relative frequency of certain types of plot and of causal organization: e.g., those involving magic or divine intervention, in early and late tales in "Arabian Nights."

d. Trait or type whose frequency is to be counted must be clearly defined, and recognizable with some objectivity; not one whose existence in a particular case is open to debate. If trait vague or dubious, all resultant statistics are specious. (E.g., Sorokin on "sensate" art).

e. Correlations between frequencies of two or more traits or trends, suggestive or presentative. Prediction of future trends in style on basis of comparative frequencies.

4. Some *types and styles* of art are more easily measurable than others, in both presented and suggestive factors.

a. "Musica mensurata." "Geometric" and other highly regular types in all arts are more easily measurable than romantic types. In romantic types, measurement harder because of irregularity, vagueness, apparent incommensurability, extreme variety, subtle and blurred transitions. Presented factors can be measured nevertheless. Irregular, biomorphic lines in painting can be mathematically described.

b. Classic art combines regular and irregular, easy and hard to measure. Much Greek, Roman, and Renaissance art produced by numerical measure and ratio. Vitruvius; Hambidge. Birkhoff on Chinese vases.

c. Tendencies toward rational, scientific development usually go with regularity and measurability: e.g., in utilitarian form; Greek architecture; modern tools and machines.

5. *The refinement of quantitative estimates* as an approach to measurement, where numerical accuracy is impossible. Judgments of more and less. Rough estimates of joint effect, average, or over-all trend in a set of complex factors.

a. Can be used in comparing two or more *works of art,* as to specified traits or types. E.g., conformity to a certain *style.* (This picture is more Baroque than that). Ambiguity of style-names now makes accurate estimate difficult. Conformity to a certain type; degree to which a certain trait is present or emphasized. E.g., ornateness or plainness; subordination of decoration to utilitarian framework; emphasis on color or on line; degree of complexity of pattern.

b. Can be used in comparing two or more *styles*. E.g., Louis XV furniture is more ornate than 17th century American colonial.

c. Can be used in comparing two or more *style trends, periods, localities*, etc. E.g., the Renaissance trend to naturalism in painting was earlier in Italy than in Germany.

d. *The method of comparative ranking.* A means of securing the following: more precise grading, in the opinion of an individual observer; gradual introduction of numerical terms; i.e., of "first, second," etc., instead of "very, slightly," etc.; comparison and consensus of opinion among different observers; estimate of individual's ability to observe and compare traits of form. (Not a problem of morphology, but of aesthetic psychology).

e. *Requirements for reliable estimate.* E.g., objectivity and clear definition of the trait, criterion, or basis of comparison. The trait used should not be evaluative or otherwise highly controversial. E.g., more beautiful; more romantic; more realistic; more unified. Many traits are vague or ambiguous as currently defined, hence hard to apply in estimates. These can sometimes be clarified through analysis into two or more distinct traits. E.g., different kinds of realism (visual, psychological, social; realism of perspective; of anatomy). Then work A may be judged higher in one kind of realism, B in another.

f. *Use of standard examples for more definite comparison.* Vagueness in casual conversation as to what constitutes "very," "moderately," or "slightly." E.g., as to a crowded street; a heavy snow. Reference to vague standards based on past experience. Slight increase in definiteness through comparison to familiar examples; e.g., "as heavy as the blizzard of 1888." Still more definite if in terms of standard units such as inches. Use of familiar, accessible *works of art* for comparison: e.g., Chartres Cathedral, Hamlet, Beethoven's 5th, Mona Lisa. But form-traits, even of these, not generally agreed upon. Also, each is different in different parts. Need of thorough analysis and discussion of these, to serve as standards. Use of individual *artists* for comparison. E.g., more or less than in Mozart, Whitman, Renoir. This often involves dubious generalization on individual styles.

g. *Antithetical examples; opposite poles in a specified respect.* (E.g., Byzantine and late Renaissance, as to emphasis on deep space in pictures). Difficulty of finding absolute extremes in art. Moderate degrees more common. Possibility of constructing artificial examples to illustrate various extremes and degrees, without any necessary claim to artistic merit. Opposite examples help in grading in such terms as: completely, highly, moderately, slightly, not at all.

h. *Standard units* produced by regularly subdividing interval between two arbitrarily chosen extremes. E.g., between freezing and boiling points of water; divided arbitrarily into 100^0, to make Centigrade thermometer. Extremes do not necessarily involve completeness or total lack. Rough approximations are frequently used in history and criticism of art. E.g., "halfway between Duccio and Raphael as to development of perspective." Possibility

of refining such judgments through recognition of opposite and intermediate types in certain respects. Exactness usually impossible.

6. *Quantitative analysis of aesthetic form.* (*Summary*).

a. Quantitative analysis of a work of art or a style consists in the attempt to describe it in fairly definite quantitative terms; to observe and describe its traits and their interrelations, and the extent to which certain traits exist therein, in terms of number, amount, magnitude, frequency, size, intensity, duration, proportion, etc.

b. *Rough quantitative estimate:* when definite numerical measures are not attempted, but descriptions are made in vague quantitative terms such as: completely, extremely, highly, moderately, slightly, more than, or less than. Numerical terms such as half, twice as much, first or second stage or degree, may be used in rough estimates and comparisons, without attempt at exact measurement.

c. *Numerical or mathematical analysis* involves measurement or estimate in terms of precisely and objectively defined standard units. These may be units developed in some other field, such as millimeters, seconds, candlepowers, decibels, etc., or units devised with special reference to art. Numerical measurement is not necessarily correct or significant. Units and devices for measuring may be incorrectly or misleadingly applied. It is not necessarily exact or precise. Numerical terms can be used for approximate estimates, as in guessing at actual amounts. Where exact measurement is impossible because of extreme complexity and variability, controlled mathematical estimates or approximations can be made, as in statistical correlations.

d. Description of a work of art or a style can involve any or all these types of quantitative analysis. Certain parts or factors in the form may be capable of exact measurement, others not.

7. *Applications and uses.*

a. Quantitative measures, or careful estimates, can help toward *more exact definitions of styles and descriptions of particular works of art*, when needed. It has been noted in previous chapters that descriptions often have to be in terms of more and less; high, low, or medium degree, since many works and styles may possess some of the trait in question. E.g., most visual styles contain some curves, but Louis XV extremely curvilinear as a rule. Some Louis XV pieces are a little less so than others. How much?

b. More exact descriptions of *trends in style* and hence in taste, culture-patterns, etc. Increases in certain traits, decreases in others. Possible approach to numerical graphs, as for prices.

c. Such morphological studies can be combined with other data for *causal influences*. Correlation of style trends with other variables: in cultural history, economic and social conditions; in the life of an individual artist. E.g. trends in an artist's style as related to increasing prosperity, illness, etc. Children's drawing: increasing visual realism in relation to maturation; correlation of stages with age levels.

d. *Prediction of future trends* in style, taste, demand, etc. More accurate

when based on quantitative studies, as in economics. For use in commerce; in social control; in education (e.g., to prepare students for successful meeting of future demands). Such prediction requires study of psychological and social factors, in addition to morphological. As in actuarial science, prediction of general future trends, averages, percentages, etc., can be much more accurate than prediction in regard to a particular case.

e. Uses in *art production.* These differ greatly, in different arts, styles, and types of individual artist. Quantitative measurements, and control of production in terms of them, have long been used in certain *arts:* architecture, furniture, industrial arts, textiles, etc. Less so in painting, drawing, sculpture, literature, music. Used in all arts in certain *periods* and *styles.* Esp. in geometric and classical periods; romanticism avoids them as chilling to free inspiration. Used by planful, rationalistic types of artist more than by emotional, impulsive. Examples: use of Hambidge's dynamic symmetry; of Schillinger's methods of musical composition. Systematic variation and combination of components, series, etc.

f. Use in *evaluative criticism* of art. Most artistic evaluation is expressed in terms of "too much," "not enough," or "just enough," etc. Also in terms such as "balance," "economy," which have quantitative implications. To refine such judgments, one should be able to say, more exactly, how much there actually is of the trait in question; how much there should be; how much one wants.

g. *Psychological, therapeutic, and educational applications.* E.g., in the studies of the effects of certain types or styles of art on certain types of person. Such effects may also be measurable, and correlated with measurements of art works used. E.g., how much suggestion of fear and evil is desirable in stories for children? How much jazz rhythm will make patients cheerful but not nervous? *Tests of creative talent, aptitude, achievement, maturity,* etc. To measure these, one often needs to use the individual's art products as data. A child's drawings, stories, poems, songs, block arrangements. Degree of realism in perspective or anatomy. Correlation with associated factors. *Tests of ability to perceive, analyze and describe form;* to recognize types of form. In so far as works of art can be objectively described, classified, or measured, one can also investigate people's ability to do so: to recognize form-traits, to apply descriptive terms and classifications in accord with stated definitions. Uses in teaching "appreciation" of visual art, music, literature, etc.

M. *Causal problems in the investigation of styles;* theories concerning the determining factors in stylistic evolution. The relation of styles to other factors in cultural history. *General problems* and theories regarding causation of style trends. Supposed "principles" of art history and cultural evolution.

1. Such questions and answers are not integral parts of aesthetic morphology or style analysis. Frequent confusion: e.g., resemblances between an earlier and later style described as "influences" of one on the other, without recognition of causal assumptions involved.

2. Divine inspiration. Stages in development of cosmic mind or will, etc. Transcendental theories of the "spirit of the age" as expressed in styles.

3. Individual artistic genius as spontaneous, inexplicable, uninfluenced, obeying own laws.

4. Evolutionary viewpoints; question of analogy of biological species with artistic styles and other cultural trait-complexes. Differences between styles and biological species; e.g., all cultural traits are acquired and can be transmitted. Resemblances; descent with adaptive modification in the realm of art history.

5. Heredity vs. environment as main determining factor in art history. Racial and national theories of the genesis of styles; inner biological determination (hereditary). Geographic, climatic theories (environmental).

6. Diffusionism vs. parallelism. Theory that culture has originated in one or a few creative sources, and spread to others. Tendency to explain styles as due to imitation of similar, earlier styles. Other styles as "influences." Theory that analogous cultural traits develop independently in remote times and places, as result of similar inner drives, outer conditions, or both. (Hereditary or environmental). Tendency to explain many similarities in style on other grounds than direct influence and imitation.

7. To what extent do art styles result from and "express" the general social and cultural pattern of the age and group? To what extent are they a causal factor, influencing the latter? To what extent are certain recurrent types of styles correlated with certain stages in social evolution, such as tribal, urban, etc., and explainable accordingly?

8. Economic determinism; Marxian "materialistic" interpretation of history. Art styles as expressing class ideologies, and as instruments in class struggle. Aristocratic, bourgeois, proletarian, revolutionary art; for and against the status quo.

9. Style as the expression of an underlying world view or "spirit of the age"; of a distinctive mental and emotional attitude. Much dubious speculation along this line. Need of objective comparison between art styles and other cultural manifestations: e.g., possible correlation with trends in philosophy, religion, science, government, invention, exploration, social institutions, etc. Unprejudiced morphological descriptions of styles themselves are required for such wider generalizations.

10. Correlations between styles and social attitudes, cultural settings, etc., should be as specific as possible. Not merely the general "spirit" of the whole age, but specific attitudes, motivations, assumptions, interests, etc., of a particular locality, social class, or other group at a certain time.

11. *Special problems of causal explanation.* On each of these, note how necessary methods differ from those of pure stylistic and morphological analysis. Need of additional information and evidence. Frequent confusion with stylistic analysis. Need of systematic cooperation between aesthetics and art history.

a. Why a particular historic style, such as Rococo, developed when and where it did. Causes of its extension, duration, decline, etc.

b. Particular resemblances between styles (e.g., European Gothic and "Buddhist Gothic"). Recurrences of abstract types. Why?

c. Differences between neighboring styles; causes of divergence. E.g., between German, French, Italian, and Spanish Gothic.

d. Style-trends; why a particular change, then and there?

e. Prediction of future style-trends; forecasting; prolonging a present trend into future. For commercial and theoretical reasons. Involves causal problems.

f. Individual artists' styles. States or periods in one artist's style (e.g., Picasso's Blue Period). Their causation, as due in part to prior artistic influences; to inborn personality, environment other than art, etc. Problems of the biographer of an artist. Estimation of the artist's originality or derivativeness in relation to predecessors and contemporaries; his influence on other artists.

g. Particular works of art as examples of a style or styles, or as non-conforming to current styles. Why produced in this way?

h. Associated problems of attribution, authenticity, authorship, provenance. Of originality or derivativeness in relation to other works of art. Types of evidence used. Aesthetics relies on art history for information on date, place, and authorship of works of art. Such facts not ascertainable by form analysis alone, but require supplementary information: e.g., from contemporary documents, geological, chemical and X-ray studies. Without this, aesthetics cannot generalize on historic or individual styles, trends, developments, etc. Historians and art experts, however, often decide on attribution of a piece, largely or wholly because of its style. I.e., it looks like the work of a certain period or artist. Reasoning in a circle; question of correctness of assumptions regarding styles. Vague dogmatism of much "expertising." Stylistic traits as distinct from non-stylistic attribution-marks (e.g., hallmarks, signatures, handwriting, type of paper, microscopic peculiarities of brushstroke).

N. *Relations between styles; classification and history.*

1. Need in aesthetics and art history for logical, significant, convenient methods of grouping styles for study and reference. For organizing histories and theoretical surveys of styles.

2. Thorough description of any particular style requires account of its relation to others; overlappings and inclusions; borderline and intermediate styles and trends, etc. Definition of a style requires reference to its *genus* (larger class or style to which it belongs); its *differentiae* (ways it differs from others within that genus); examples of it. E.g., "the style of Rubens is Baroque; it differs from other Baroque styles in the following ways. . . . It is illustrated in the following paintings, with the following traits. . . ." Such definition involves classification.

3. Styles and organic *species*. Biological methods of nomenclature and classification. Taxonomy as a branch of biology; its methods. Possible applications in aesthetics.

4. Classification of styles on basis of art or medium; on basis of technique or mode of production (e.g., hand or machine). Limitations.

5. Classification on basis of *form-traits emphasized*. Grouping of *similar* styles regardless of historic origin. E.g., styles emphasizing clear outlines of

line and mass (Wölfflin, "linear"); styles emphasizing blurred, flowing color, light, atmosphere, texture (Wölfflin, "painterly"). Ornate and plain, severe styles. Styles with functional decoration only, or with non-functional. Simple and complex; geometric and biomorphic, naturalistic. Each style involves emphasis on several different traits.

a. Aids systematic description of inclusions, overlappings, exclusions, and oppositions or antitheses among styles.

b. Certain kinds of trait and similarity can be selected as fundamental for classification. Cf. Linnaeus' use of stamens and pistils. Presence or absence of spinal cord in animals. Problem of what aesthetic traits are most fundamental in distinguishing styles. Which ones imply and indicate many other connected traits; carry others with them.

c. Practical uses: e.g., in interior design, grouping examples of different arts which will harmonize through similarity, regardless of period. Modern eclectic ensembles; e.g., African Negro and cubist.

6. Classification on *historical basis;* provenance; time and place of origin.

a. Grouping styles as neighboring in history; chronologically, geographically; ethnically.

b. Two-dimensional charts and tables; e.g., Cox's in *Encyc. Brit.*, "Periods of Art." Simultaneous indication of time axis and spatial-ethnic division.

c. Books and articles on art history usually choose one basis as primary, if covering extensive area of space and time. Primarily chronological, with geographic subdivisions. Primarily geographic, with chronological subdivisions. Varying, shifting combinations.

d. Arrangement of styles on above historical frameworks, pointing out distribution of each; its extension in various ways. Sequences of styles and trends. Causal interpretations are usually desired.

PART TWO: STUDY OUTLINES

OUTLINE 1, FOR PARTICULAR STYLISTIC ANALYSIS (*See Part One, §I*)

First method, for analysis of a single work of art in relation to various styles

A. *Identity of the object.* I.e., of the work of art to be analyzed. Known or accepted facts about it. (Note when statements are based only on stylistic evidence; such evidence is to be questioned in the present study. Avoid reasoning in a circle).

1. Name of artist if known, people and place of origin. (E.g., Rembrandt; Greek; Central Asia).

2. Customary title of object. (E.g., Macbeth; Madonna of the Goldfinch; Sonata in G major, op. 100).

3. Approximate date and relation to other events (e.g., 5th c. B.C.; Sung Dynasty; pre-Columbian; before artist's trip to Italy).

4. Religious and social context (e.g., Buddhist; aristocratic).

5. Art, medium, technique (e.g., sculpture, cast bronze; wrought iron; music, piano).

6. Basic framework type (e.g., sonata; still-life painting; throne; satirical essay).

7. Miscellaneous: (e.g., broken and partly restored; translated by...; transcribed from piece for orchestra).

B. *Styles* to be considered in relation to the object. (Mention briefly)

1. Style 1.

2. Style 2, etc.

C. *Previous stylistic classifications of the object.* (Brief summary).

1. References to authoritative writings, which describe it as an example of a certain style or styles. (Give book or article sources).

2. Are these classifications explicit and systematic or vague and casual? With reasons and detailed analysis, or casual application of the style-name? With explicit reference to this work of art or by implication, in alluding to the artist, period, or school?

3. What reasons, if any, are given for the classification?

4. Is there much disagreement among authorities on the style classification of the work? What consensus of opinion?

5. Is the object considered a *typical* or a partial, atypical example? Why?

6. In what terms is the style *named* or indicated? How is it defined in terms of one or more trait-complexes or groups of essential characteristics, and what ones is this object said to possess?

7. What other important critical or historical *comments* have been made about this object? (Include evaluative comments if significant reasons are given).

D. *Introductory notes on method.*

1. Begin with the style which the object seems to exemplify *most fully and typically.* Then proceed to those neighboring styles which it exemplifies less and less. Finally mention one or more to which it is antithetical.

2. A work of art can exemplify *two or more styles about equally:* (a) if intermediate, transitional between two different styles; (b) if one style is included in another. (E.g., "Rembrandt's late style" is included in "17th c. Dutch style," and this at least partly in "Baroque style"). In such a case, begin with either the *most restricted* style or the *most extensive*, and systematically widen or narrow down the stylistic classification.

3. Traits can sometimes be expressed in terms of marked difference from some other, contrasting style. E.g., Renaissance traits may be expressed as a lack or small degree of certain traits recognized as essentially Gothic; e.g., lack or slight use of pointed arch and flying buttress. When possible, express in more positive terms.

4. In describing traits, try not to use words which are themselves used as names of *styles.* (E.g., "it is Renaissance in being very Classic.") Avoid words with strongly *evaluative* associations, or else define them so as to exclude these. Use preferably the names of more *objective* types and traits of form.

5. Statements regarding actual place and time or *origin*, authorship, authenticity, etc., should be omitted if the study is purely stylistic. Avoid describing traits in terms of "influence," "effect," "derivation," "trend," "increase," "decrease," "rise," "decline," "improvement," "degeneration," etc., as implying assumptions about causation, chronological sequence, and value, which are apt to prejudice observation.

6. If two or more styles are similar and closely connected (e.g., one included in another) they may be considered together as "Style-group 1, 2," etc. (E.g., "Monet's style" and "impressionism.") However, watch out for differences between them.

E. *The object's relation to Style 1 (or Style-group 1):*

1. *Brief definition of this style as follows:*

a. Indicate whether same as definition quoted in C; if not, give reasons for change.

b. Supposed *field or denotation* of the style, in terms of period, place, people, artists, art or medium, framework-type, etc.

c. Its *general essential traits,* most characteristic of the style as broadly applied. (E.g., to Gothic as an extensive style in many arts).

d. Its *specific* essential traits, most necessary and universal within the restricted field to which the object belongs. (E.g., flying buttresses as characteristic of Gothic style in architecture only).

e. *Standard* (recognized) *examples*: e.g., Parthenon for Doric style.

f. Chief substyles or varieties of the style.

2. *Essential conformities:* ways in which the object conforms to this definition; general and specific essentials of the style which it manifests. Resemblances to standard examples.

a. *Conformity 1;* a style essential which the work manifests most clearly. *Typical details;* parts or structural features in which this trait is most evident or emphatic. Is the conformity limited to these, or pervasive and consistent? If concerned with general structure or pervasive quality, try to explain by diagram or otherwise.

b, c. *Conformities 2, 3, etc.* (Same).

3. *Essential non-conformities;* ways in which the object lacks or violates essentials of the style; in which it differs from standard example and resembles contrasting styles. *Atypical* details, in which non-conformity is most evident. Degree of stylistic consistency in the object as a whole. (Not necessarily a standard of value).

a. *Non-conformity 1.*

b. *Non-conformity 2, etc.*

4. *Distinctive non-essentials* of the object; ways in which it differs from many examples of the style, but which do not disqualify it as an example of the style. Ways which mark it as an example of some special variety or *substyle* of Style 1. Peculiarities consistent with the style; unusual variations of essential traits. (These are "non-essential" only from the standpoint of style definition, and may be highly important from others; e.g., as determining originality).

5. *Doubtful, debatable traits* which may be regarded as either conforming or non-conforming; because of vagueness or uncertainty in the definition, doubt as to complete or original nature of the work, etc.

6. *Conclusions on relations of the object to Style 1.* To what extent is the object a typical example? A partial or borderline example? Do conformities outweigh non-conformities, or vice versa? How many, and how important, essential traits does it possess? How many does it lack or violate? To what substyle or special variety of the style does it belong?

F. *Relation of the object to Style 2 (or Style-group 2).* (As in E).
G. *Relation of the object to Style 3,* etc.
H. *Summary on stylistic affiliations of the object.*

1. To what style or styles does it conform most *completely*? To what extent is it typical of one or more of them? If to more than one, how are these styles related? Is one included wholly or largely in another? Do they overlap, with this object as a borderline example?

2. What style or styles does it resemble more *slightly,* in fewer or less essential traits? How are these styles related?

3. To what style is it most opposed or *antithetical*?

4. To what extent does this confirm or revise the *previous classifications* noted in C? With what remaining uncertain or debatable aspects?

OUTLINE 2, FOR PARTICULAR STYLISTIC ANALYSIS

Second method, for point-by-point comparison of two or more works of art

I. *Identity of the objects,* as in first method.
  A. Identity of Object 1.
  B. Identity of Object 2.
  C. Identity of Object 3, etc.
II. *Styles to be considered, in relation to these objects.*
III. *Previous stylistic classification.*
  A. Of Object 1.
  B. Of Object 2.
  C. Of Object 3, etc.
IV. *Relation of all the objects to Style 1.*
  A. Brief *definition* of this style.
    1. Field or denotation of the style.
    2. General essentials.
    3. Specific essentials for the special fields to which these objects belong. There may be as many fields as objects; e.g., if all objects belong to different arts. Or several may belong to same special field. Number all specific essentials consecutively):
      a. For special field 1: specific essentials 1, 2, etc.
      b. For special field 2: specific essentials 3, 4, etc.
      c, d. For other special fields, if any: specific essentials 5, 6, etc.
  B. *Relation of all the objects to general essentials of the style.*
    1. *To general essential 1:*
      a. To what extent and how does *Object 1* conform to the style in this respect?
      b. Same for Object 2.
      c. Same for Object 3, etc.
    2. *To general essential 2: same.*
    3. *To general essential 3, etc.: same.*
  C. *Relation of all the objects to specific essentials of the style.* (Note: objects in different special fields often, but not necessarily, differ from each other as to specific essentials).

1. *To specific essential 1:*
   a. To what extent and how does Object 1 conform in this respect?
   b, c. Same for other objects.
2. *To specific essential 2:* same.
3. *To specific essential 3*, etc.: same.

D. *Summary on relation of all the objects to Style 1:*

1. Which object conforms most closely to the *general essentials* of the style? List others in order, from greater to less conformity. Which are *entirely outside* the limits of the style?

2. Which conforms most closely to the *specific essentials* for its own field? List others in order on this basis.

3. To what specific varieties or *substyles* of Style 1, if any, do the works belong?

4. To what borderline styles or substyles, *partly outside* Style 1?

V. *Relation of all the objects to Style 2.* As in *IV*. Under *A, Brief definition,* add:

4. *Note on theoretical relation of this style* to Style 1 and to other styles discussed above. To what extent are they defined as synonymous, inclusive, overlapping, or antithetical?

VI, VII, etc. *Relation of all the objects to other styles, if any.* (Same).

VIII. *General summary: stylistic relations between all the objects.*

A. To what extent are they stylistically *similar*? *Related* through common membership in one or more styles: i.e., through possessing certain stylistic essentials in common? (Not necessarily through influence or causal connection).

B. To what extent do they differ and diverge stylistically? I.e., through exemplifying antithetical styles?

C. Which of the objects are *most closely akin* as to style, and which most unrelated?

D. To what extent do they resemble or differ from each other in stylistic *non-essentials*? I.e., in traits not essential to the definition of any of the styles discussed above.

E. *Undecided aspects* of the problem. E.g., because of uncertainty on definitions, nature of objects, etc. Suggestions for future inquiry.

OUTLINE 3, FOR GENERAL STYLISTIC ANALYSIS

For testing and revising theories of style. (Conceptual approach. See Part One, § H)

Introduction

A. *Name of style*

B. *Theories of the nature of this style, to be analyzed and compared:* their authors, titles, chapter and page references. Include original statements and important later revisions or extensions. List as Theory A, Theory B, etc.

C. *Field or fields of investigation:* art and type of art, place, period, social group, artist's works, etc., on which this study is to be focussed. Field from

which chief examples are to be taken for applying and testing theories. (May be same as the style's alleged field of distribution, or a part of it, or a different field, not covered explicitly by previous theories of the style. E.g., to what extent can concept of Baroque be applied to a certain artist, not hitherto regarded as Baroque?)

I. *Study of Theory A.*

A. *Analytical summary of the theory.*

1. *Trait-complex A;* abstract definition of the style. (May be stated for this style alone, or in point-by-point contrast with some other style. If the latter, describe as Style I (e.g., Gothic); Style II (e.g., Renaissance). Various theories of both styles can thus be compared. "Style I, Trait-complex A" is Author A's theory of the essential traits in which the style consists. "Style I, Trait-complex B" is another author's definition of the same style). "Style II, Trait-complex A" is the first author's definition of Style II. Each trait-complex should be analyzed into traits regarded as essential.

a. If only one style is being studied (e.g., Baroque as defined by Wölfflin), list traits as "General essential 1" (e.g., painterly); "General essential 2" (e.g., recessional), etc.

b. If two styles are being studied, list as follows:

Style I (Classic)	*Style II (Baroque)*
Trait-complex A (Wölfflin's definition)	*Trait-complex A (Wölfflin's definition)*
General essential 1 (linear)	*General essential 1 (painterly)*
" " *2 (plane)*	" " *2 (recessional)*

2. General field of distribution; extension or denotation of the style or styles according to this theory.

3. Most typical examples, and how each is said to illustrate the general essentials.

4. Alleged important relations of the style or styles to others, as antithetical, similar, neighboring, inclusive or included, transitional, etc.

5. Special fields manifesting the style or styles, according to this theory. Specific essentials for each, including point-by-point contrast with other styles if given. Relation of specific to general essentials. Typical examples of the style or styles in each field; how they are said to illustrate essentials for that field.

a. For special field 1 (e.g., painting, or 1st half of century): Specific essentials *a*, *b*, etc. Typical examples.

b. For Special field 2: Specific essentials *a*, *b*, etc. Typical examples.

c. Likewise for other fields.

B. *Summary of criticisms* of this theory by other writers, as suggestions for present inquiry.

C. *Application, testing, and criticism of the theory.*

1. To what extent are general essentials *actually found* in alleged typical examples? To what extent are they found throughout all the alleged field

of distribution of the style or styles according to this theory? (Include other examples from the field, not cited by the author).

2. To what extent are specific essentials for each special field actually found in alleged typical examples for that field? To what extent are they found in other examples of that field, not cited by the author?

3. To what extent are alleged general and specific essentials of the style found in *other fields*, especially those said to be antithetical or strongly contrasting in style? Do these essentials really serve to distinguish this style and field from others?

4. To what extent are statements regarding each style's relation to neighboring styles verified by observation? What similarities are observed between it and neighboring styles, substyles, variants, etc.?

5. Preliminary conclusions on Theory A: Ability of this concept of style to cover accurately examples within the alleged field, and to distinguish them from other styles and fields. Inconsistencies, if any, between abstract definition and denotation or alleged field of distribution. Adequacy of the name of the style, as used in this theory, to indicate clearly the trait-complex and field intended.

II. *Study of Theory B*

(as in I. Likewise for other theories. List essentials as Trait-complex B, etc.)

III. *Comparison of Theories*

A. Extent of agreement and disagreement on extension of the style; general field and main special fields.

B. On general and specific essentials; especially on essentials and typical examples for the same special field.

C. On antithetical or contrasting styles.

D. On relation to similar styles, substyles, variants, etc.

IV. *Suggestions for Revision of Theory of this Style (or of Each Style Examined)*

A. Its name; or a group of more specific names for more specific styles.

B. General and special fields for each.

C. General and specific essentials for each.

D. Typical examples for each special field.

E. Relation to other styles.

LETTERS PRO AND CON

TO THE EDITOR:

Some of the points raised by Mrs. Victoria K. Ball in connection with my article "Some Associational Aspects of Color" may warrant comment.[1] Unlike Mrs. Ball, I do not wish to "take up the cudgel" to defend or to attack any formulation. The brief comments which follow are entirely for purposes of clarification.

My formulations regarding color systematization will soon appear at some length in a mimeographed treatment of the subject. Meanwhile a few remarks concerning existing systems may be in order. My statement that "color systems are in general too arbitrary, insufficiently relativistic and elastic" would not seem to require any very sweeping retraction. It is hoped that the chronic controversy of Munsell vs. Ostwald need not be reopened. It threatens to go on interminably like the argument *re* the rice vs. the prunes in Daudet's Swiss boarding house.

The thirty color circle was constructed over a period of years with older circles used constantly as frames of reference and comparison. The result was arrived at experimentally through collaboration on the part of some scores of artists and color technicians. There was unanimous agreement among the experimenters, that, from their point of view, both the Ostwald and Munsell circles showed obvious gaps. The construction of our circle was carried out upon a predominantly psychological basis. Such is the basis upon which color systems to date are considered as being too arbitrary.

No claim is made that a thirty color circle is "ideal". We have simply found no better basis as yet for dealing with a limited set of problems. It would seem that any system which is erected in a *symmetrical* manner may prove to be metaphysical in theory rather than scientific. Unconscious assumptions and an intensional rather than an extensional approach are to be suspected. Current systems were evolved in the pre-relativistic era. For this reason any modifications would be influenced by the premises. Until an opportunity is found to erect a system from a relativistic point of view we must do the next best thing; advance hypotheses and subject them to experimental control. The sense in which the term "relativistic" was used may not have been clarified in my article. No intersystem relationship was meant to be stressed but rather the rigid nature of present systematizations.

A system may be considered as a map of the territory of a portion of the world of color. The structure, order, and relationships which exist in this *territory* (outside of our skins in the form of electro-chemical activity) do not exhibit much similarity to existing systems. This seems so even "when these have been studied and amended for many years".

I hoped that it was made abundantly clear that my effort dealt with the psychology and aesthetics of color. If so, Mrs. Ball misquotes Bond and Nickerson (*op. cit.*). Her implication as to the superiority of the Munsell system is not to be deduced from their conclusions.

The fact that I have returned to current terminology for a few basic color names would scarcely disqualify the relations of this terminology to the world at large even if it might not agree at all points with some other arbitrarily established names, no matter how "official".

My system can readily be duplicated with standard pigments. The number of these required for such duplication is few. All the procedures "in the commercial world" are not "trade secrets". It is just as simple to reproduce surface colors for an agreed upon and limited set of requirements as I indicated. This claim is subject to experimental control and demonstration rather than to verbal discussion. I am at all times very happy to submit it to coincidence observation.

All psychological color approaches are not possible with any given set of premises or frame of reference. There is a high degree of conditionality involved; the factors are never

[1] Mr. Hiler's article appeared in this *Journal*, vol. IV, no. 4, June 1946. Mrs. Ball's letter appeared in vol. V, no. 1, September 1946. *Ed.*

exactly the same for any two situations. Perhaps it was this sort of approach to which I alluded in my use of the term relativity.

No question of our sincerity or detachment seems valid through the mere fact that we are not all able to work under *the* accepted system. I was not aware that I had "denounced" any system or systems. Mrs. Ball's statement that my terminology "would contain whimsical fashion names" is not entirely warranted as it in no way fits into the facts. As far as the symbols are concerned I must continue to use my subscripts and superscripts until some *simpler* device has been advanced . . . none seems presently discernable.

It might be fairer on the part of critics to examine the work in more detail before making evaluations as to its "inadequacy". Mathematics and the instruments of the physicist are not the only considerations involved. It would indeed be "better to utilize our particular talents, to strengthen positions which are weak and untenable," but one way to do this is to preserve our rights to freely criticize as we may deem relevant. This criticism might be carried on with a minimum of emotional involvement in the problems under discussion. My acquaintance with scientific methodology leads me to believe that from this point of view no system is "official"; no cow sacred.

HILAIRE HILER

TO THE EDITOR:

From the review of my *World as Spectacle* in the June number of this *Journal*, I learn that it is "written from the viewpoint of absolute idealism". For the reviewer, who believes that the scientific method can handle all problems, this book, not being scientific, inferentially can handle no problems. Its argument is "weak", its structure "spasmodic", its style "metaphorical", and there is a "culmination" in the last chapters—which are the most relaxed.

I know that I am weak against a boxing champion, but what is a "weak" argument? "Weak" and "spasmodic" are psycho-physical, "culmination" is an artistic metaphor. I rejoice that the reviewer, in spite of her belief in an all-sufficient scientific method, is still capable of metaphors to express her feeling. Is my joy and her negative feeling scientifically important? Not at all.

And what sort of scientific statement is the assertion that this book is written from "the viewpoint of absolute idealism"? According to the high-priests of The Scientific Method, who occupy in our time a position analogous to the decadent scholastics of the 16th century, such a sentence is not a scientific statement, because it does not describe and analyze an observable datum. It is, according to those authorities, a "meaningless proposition". In order to be scientific it would have to be a report, a quotation of my words. But I have not claimed to write from "the viewpoint of absolute idealism".

If the scientific method is sufficient to handle all problems, why then is "it" insufficient to handle even a book review? If the method had been followed a factual report would have been the result.

The "standpoint" of the book is plainly stated in the first sentence, and elaborated throughout: "Scientific books inform you on matters of fact as they instruct you in general rules of how to handle and control things; such books are, or should be, impersonal. A philosophical book, on the other hand, is a human being addressing you". Now, human beings address each other on art and other aesthetic problems with all kinds and manners of method. The variety and levels of such dialogues are found—a "Hegelian" truth—in the history of aesthetics. Such expressions are intuitive, artistic, reminiscent, descriptive, analytical, metaphysical, deductive, religious or irreligious, critical, demanding, and so on. This sequence roughly corresponds to the sequence of my chapters). The conscious evaluation and deliberate use of such different levels and perspectives is dialectic. As used in this book dialectic produces a concrete whole of tensions in its own logical medium. There are hints warning the reader of change in method; but the book evidently needs an additional chapter on The Art of Reading.

To drag in "Santayana, Prall, Dewey, or Ducasse" is quite irrelevant. I have learned from all of them. I have shown that scientific, practical, positivistic etc. methods have

their place and function. If their representatives are skeptical with reference to the one ontological problem—which is not "the universe at large", but the being of beauty—that skepsis does not diminish their merits and contributions on other levels.

The trouble with one-dimensional scientism is that it incapacitates for multi-dimensional distinctions.

GUSTAV MUELLER

NOTES AND NEWS

(Readers are invited to send in items for publication in this department. They may deal with activities of the Society, personal news about individual members, or events of general interest in the field, such as academic appointments, research projects, lectureships, and publications.)

THE 1946 CONVENTION

The third annual meeting of the *American Society for Aesthetics* was held on September 5, 6, and 7 at the Chicago Art Institute. All sessions were held in the Institute by invitation of its Director, DANIEL C. RICH. At the dinner on Friday evening, the presidential address was read by C. J. DUCASSE, retiring President, on "Aesthetics and the Aesthetic Activities." The Editor of the *Journal* reported on its progress and plans. The program was as follows:

First session: Aesthetics, the Art Museum, and the Visual Arts. Presiding: C. J. DUCASSE (Brown University). DANIEL C. RICH (Director, the Chicago Art Institute): The Art Museum's Responsibility to Aesthetics. THOMAS MUNRO (Cleveland Museum of Art): Aesthetic Problems Met in Art Museum Work. CARL THURSTON (Pasadena Art Inst.): The Art Exhibition as a Work of Art. HELMUT HUNGERLAND (Calif. College of Arts and Crafts): Contributions to a Theory of Art Criticism. CHARLES E. GAUSS (George Washington Univ.): Cézanne on the Relation of Nature to Art. IVY CAMPBELL-FISHER, (Wells College): Psychological Processes by which Content or Expression is Achieved in the Different Types of Art. WOLFGANG STECHOW (Oberlin College): Creative Copies.

Second session: General Aesthetic Theory: the Semantic and other Approaches. Presiding: KATHERINE GILBERT (Duke Univ.). BERTRAM MORRIS (Northwestern): Referential and Aesthetic Meaning. MAX RIESER (New York): Signs and Symbolic Facts. ELDER OLSON (Chicago U.): The Concept of Beauty. MILTON C. NAHM (Bryn Mawr): The Theory of the Artist as Creator. MAXIMILIAN BECK (U. of Illinois): Existential Aesthetics. LUCIUS GARVIN (Oberlin): The Problem of Ugliness in Art.

Third session: The Arts and Social Culture: Philosophical and Psychological Problems. Presiding: MAX SCHOEN (Carnegie Inst. of Technology). GEORGE BOAS (Johns Hopkins): The Classification of the Arts and Criticism. EURYALO CANNABRAVA (Colegio Pedro II, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil): A Problem of the Philosophy of Culture. KATHARINE GILBERT (Duke): Art Between the Distinct Idea and the Obscure Soul. LESTER D. LONGMAN (State U. of Iowa): The Concept of Psychical Distance. GUSTAV E. MUELLER (Oklahoma U.): The Value of Perception in Hegel's Aesthetics. LYNN D. POOLE (Johns Hopkins): The Dance—Aesthetics' Step-child. M. EMMETT WILSON (Ohio State): The Metaphysics of Feeling.

Fourth session: The Psychology and Criticism of Particular Arts. Presiding: ELISEO VIVAS (U. of Chicago). KATHI MEYER-BAER (New Rochelle, N. Y.): Appreciation of Music in the Writings of Nicholas of Cusa. HENRY SCHAEFFER-SIMMERN (U. of California): A Creative Approach to the Understanding of Artistic Structure of Form. ALLAN H. GILBERT (Duke): The Absolute Plot in Dramatic Criticism. G. E. REAMAN (Ontario Agricultural College): Great Literature as a Textbook on Human Relations. WILLIAM E. HENRY (U. of Chicago): Symbolism and Art—A Framework for Research. BOB RAINEY

(Canton, O.): The Artist is Autist. PAUL R. FARNSWORTH (Stanford U.): Musical Eminence.

The Board of Trustees met on September fifth, morning and evening. After hearing and accepting the Treasurer's report, it voted that the President be empowered to name one or more associates to promote the *Journal of Aesthetics* and membership lists. VINCENT A. TOMAS of Brown University was appointed Circulation Manager of the *Journal* , and HELMUT HUNGERLAND Associate Editor. It was voted that the *Journal* inaugurate a placement service to act as a clearing house for openings in aesthetics and related fields.

MRS. KATHARINE GILBERT of Duke University was nominated as President for the two-year term beginning January 1, 1947. GEORGE BOAS of John Hopkins was nominated as Vice-president. HELMUT HUNGERLAND and WOLFGANG STECHOW were nominated as trustees, to fill the places of IRWIN EDMAN and THEODORE M. GREENE, whose terms expire. These nominations have since been duly ratified by the membership of the Society.

IN BRIEF

Present regional chairmen and secretaries of the American Society for Aesthetics are as follows: HENRY D. AIKEN, Cambridge, Mass.; PAUL ZUCKER, New York City; PAUL TRAVIS, Cleveland, Ohio; BERTRAM MORRIS, Chicago, Ill; HELMUT HUNGERLAND, Piedmont, Calif.; STEPHEN C. PEPPER, Berkeley, Calif.; EURYALO CANNEBRAVA, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

HELMUT HUNGERLAND spoke on "Kandinsky, Klee, and the Bauhaus Idea" at the first fall meeting of the *Cleveland Society for Aesthetics*, at the home of Mr. and Mrs. PAUL TRAVIS, on October 12. During the summer (August 11–17), he conducted a conference on aesthetics at the Dominican College in San Rafael, Calif. Speakers were guests of the College during the conference. The following talks were given, and were followed by discussion in which members of the faculty of the College participated. ABRAHAM KAPLAN: Aesthetic Ambiguity and Aesthetic Appraisal. ISABEL C. HUNGERLAND: Linguistic Analysis and Art Criticism. DAVID R. SEARS: Art and Psychiatry. THOMAS MUNRO: Art Styles and Cultural Psychology—Recent Scientific Developments. JAMES CRAIG LA DRIÈRE: Theory and "Principle" in Literary Evaluation. CHARLES JONES: Analysis of "Sonata for Piano" by Charles Jones. HELMUT HUNGERLAND: The Problem of Relevance in Art Criticism.

C. J. DUCASSE has been appointed to the Flint Visiting Professorship of Philosophy at the University of California at Los Angeles for the Spring semester of 1946–47. H. G. SCHRICKEL is Visiting Professor of Psychology at the University of Nebraska during 1946–47.

ELIAS KATZ is director of Art Films, which announces a series of motion pictures on art for purchase or rental. Address 650 Ocean Ave., Brooklyn 26, N. Y.

RAY FAULKNER is head of the art department at Stanford University. FRANK ROOS has a similar position at the University of Illinois in Urbana, and EDWIN ZIEGFELD is head of the Department of Fine and Industrial Arts at Teachers College, Columbia University. ABRAHAM KAPLAN is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at the University of California in Los Angeles, and is giving a course on aesthetics there.

Subscriptions to the *Journal of Aesthetics* are now going to Soviet Russia, Palestine, India, Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, France, Italy, Denmark, and England.

The College Art Association will meet in New York from January 29 to February 1. A session on aesthetics in relation to the visual arts is being arranged by JOHN ALFORD. Papers will discuss the variety of artistic values.

At the September, 1946 meetings of the American Psychological Association, three papers were delivered under the auspices of the Division of Aesthetics. The members of the division re-elected PAUL R. FARNSWORTH as divisional president and NORMAN C. MEIER as secretary and the same two men as the division's representatives to the parent organization's council.

Because of the length of this special issue on Baroque style, the selective current bibliography and reviews have had to be omitted. They will appear in the March issue instead.

PLACEMENT SERVICE

Readers of the *Journal* are requested to notify the Editor of college or other positions open in aesthetics and related fields; also of persons available for appointment in such positions. Names and addresses will not be published, but aid will be given in placement.

1. A *New England liberal arts college* for men requires an instructor or assistant professor of philosophy, able to teach aesthetics and a course in one of the following: fine arts, music, drama.

CONTRIBUTORS

René Wellek is Professor of Comparative and Slavonic Literature at Yale.

Wolfgang Stechow is Professor of Fine Arts at Oberlin.

Roy Daniells is Professor of English at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B. C., Canada.

William Fleming is Professor of Fine Arts at Syracuse University, New York.

Hilaire Hiler, author and painter, is now in Hollywood, Calif.

Gustav Mueller is Professor of Philosophy at the University of Oklahoma.