

Reprinting and republishing Wölfflin in the 1920s

Andrew Hopkins

A surprising number of art historical texts written before, during and just after the first world war were republished in the 1920s. The fourth edition of *Renaissance und Barock: eine Untersuchung über Wesen und Entstehung des Barockstils in Italien* by Heinrich Wölfflin (1864–1945) was published by Bruckmann in Munich in 1926 with an additional hundred and fifty pages of new text added to it by Hans Rose (1888–1945).¹ Rose had been chosen by Wölfflin to undertake the task and his approach differed quite markedly from the majority of reprints that appeared in this decade [See the Appendix to this article].²

Except for Rose's 1926 edition of *Renaissance und Barock*, all the other volumes were principally reprints with corrections, minor additions and emendments, new or additional photographs, or collected editions of earlier essays with introductions. The reason why things had to be different for Wölfflin and Rose in the mid 1920s was that Wölfflin had, in the first instance, deliberately shied away from directly reacting to the posthumous publication by Schroll in Vienna of the text by Alois Riegl (1858–1905) *Die Entstehung der Barockkunst in Rom* in 1908, presumably because he knew or guessed it would vie directly with his *Renaissance und Barock*, originally published in 1888.³

For the purposes of Italian Ministry of Education accounting procedures, it is hereby stated that in addition to this essay Andrew Hopkins was responsible for pp. 34–77 of the translation and Arnold Witte for pp. 1–33.

¹ For Rose see Christian Fuhrmeister, 'Hans Rose: Eine biographische Skizze', in Pablo Schneider and Philipp Zitzlsperger, eds, *Bernini in Paris: Das Tagebuch des Paul Fréart de Chantelou über den Aufenthalt Gianlorenzo Berninis am Hof Ludwig XIV*, Berlin: Akademie, 2006, 434–48, noting that Rose was classified by the National Socialists as homosexual and therefore persona non grata. See also Stefanie Harrecker, *Degradierete Doktoren. Die Aberkennung der Doktorwürde an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München während der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus*, Munich: Utz, 2007, 347–48.

² Rose was well qualified for the task. Following Hans Rose, *Die Baukunst der Cisterzienser*, Munich: Bruckmann, 1916, he published Paul Fréart de Chantelou, *Tagebuch des Herrn von Chantelou über die Reise des Cavaliere Bernini nach Frankreich*, ed. and trans. Hans Rose, Munich: Bruckmann, 1919, and then Hans Rose, *Spätbarock: Studien zur Geschichte des Profanbaues in den Jahren 1660–1760*, Munich: Bruckmann, 1922.

³ Max Dvořák, 'Alois Riegl', *Mitteilungen der k.k. Zentral-Kommission für Erforschung und Erhaltung der Kunst- und historischen Denkmale*, III Folge, 4, nos. 7/8, 1905, 255–76. See now Alois Riegl, *The Origins of Baroque Art in Rome*, ed. and trans. by Andrew Hopkins and Arnold Witte, with essays by Andrew Hopkins, Alina Payne and Arnold Witte, Los Angeles: Getty Research Center, 2010. Evonne Levy, 'Riegl and Wölfflin in dialogue on the baroque', in Andrew Leach et al, eds, *The Baroque in architectural culture 1880-1980*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2015, 87–96.

What else can have prompted him in the autumn of 1906 to bring out a new edition of *Renaissance und Barock* with the assistance of Hans Willich (1869–1943)?⁴ There is no doubt that it was his knowledge of the impending publication of Riegl's text by Arthur Burda and Max Dvořák (1874–1921) that pushed Wölfflin to republish in 1907.⁵ A slightly revised text and new and improved photos are the main changes as announced on the title page and in the forward written by Wölfflin, where he disarmingly explains that he had given Willich a free hand to make whatever changes he deemed necessary, although without being drastic.⁶ Yet for almost two decades Wölfflin had not seriously returned to *Renaissance und Baroque*, except for the annotations he made in his own copy and presumably passed to Willich, in contrast to the extensive and immediate revisions and corrections to his *Die klassische Kunst*:

⁴ At the Technischen Hochschule in Munich Willich was 'Assistent an der Architekturabteilung' 1901–03, 'Privatdozent für Geschichte der Baukunst' 1911–14 and 'außerordentlicher' or extraordinary Professor 1914–35. In 1919 he came third, after Karl Wulzinger (1886–1948) and Wilhelm Worringer (1881–1965), who were considered equal first, for a job application at Karlsruhe in 1919. See the 'Gutachten der Berufungskommission', 18.12.1919, and the subsequent opinion of 27.01.20 of the Staatsministerium an das Ministerium des Kultus und Unterrichts (Generellandesarchiv Karlsruhe 235/30473), cited in Katharina Büttner and Martin Papenbrock, eds, *Kunst und Architektur in Karlsruhe: Festschrift für Norbert Schneider*, Karlsruhe: Universitätsverlag Karlsruhe, 2006, 190, nos. 69, 72.

⁵ For Dvořák see Hans Aurenhammer, 'Inventing 'Mannerist Expressionism': Max Dvořák and the history of art as the history of the spirit', in Kimberly Smith, ed., *The expressionist turn in Art History: a critical anthology*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2014, 187–208. Almost nothing is known of Arthur Burda except that by the 1920s he had become a senior civil servant, 'Herrn Regierungsrat Arthur Burda', as noted in the second edition of 1923 and he agreed to the production of the new edition which was undertaken by Karl Maria Swoboda (1889–1977) and Johannes Wilde (1891–1970).

⁶ 'Zweite, vollständig neu illustrierte Auflage bearbeitet von Hans Willich'. He perfectly well qualified as he had written, Hans Willich, *Giacomo Barozzi da Vignola*, Strassburg: Heitz, 1906. Later he would publish the important survey, Hans Willich, *Die Baukunst der Renaissance in Italien (Handbuch der Kunstwissenschaft)*, Berlin: Athenaion, 1914. For Wölfflin and Riegl see Ute Engel, *Stil und Nation: Barockforschung und deutsche Kunstgeschichte (ca. 1830 bis 1933)*, Paderborn, Fink, 2016, forthcoming. For Wölfflin see Michela Passini and Francesco Peri, 'Heinrich Wölfflin and the German sense of form', in Smith, *The Expressionist Turn*, 237–51. Evonne Levy, *Baroque and the political language of formalism (1845 - 1945): Burckhardt, Wölfflin, Gurlitt, Brinckmann, Sedlmayr*, Basel: Schwabe, 2015, 96–170. 'Vorwort zur zweiten Auflage [...] Ich habe ihm [Herr Dr. Willich in München], der von Hause aus Architekt und als Biograph Vignolas ein trefflicher Kenner der Epoch ist, vollständig freie Hand gelassen, zu ändern und zuzusetzen, was und wie es ihm dienlich schiene, doch war es andererseits sein Wille, nicht mit durchgreifenden Änderungen der Schrift ein anderes Gesicht zu geben als wie es nun einmal ist [...]. Berlin, im Herbst 1906. H.W.'. Wölfflin by 1899 had a new publishing house Bruckmann instead of Ackermann. See also Joseph Wulf, *Literatur und Dichtung im Dritten Reich. Eine Dokumentation*, Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1966. For Bruckmann Verlag see Anne Bechstedt, 'Kunstgeschichte im 'Dritten Reich'', in Ruth Heftrig et al, eds, *Kunstgeschichte im 'Dritten Reich': Theorien, Methoden, Praktiken*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2008, 280–311.

eine Einführung in die italienische Renaissance that he made when republishing it in 1901, just two years after the first edition had appeared with Bruckmann in Munich.⁷

Even more surprising is the appearance of a third edition in 1908, which already acknowledges in its opening pages Riegl's work, although Wölfflin also stated that he could not react to this material in his own text but would do so in a review.⁸ Anyone who has worked in academia will know how ingenuous such a statement sounds. Wölfflin did review Riegl's volume in 1908 and, as Arnold Witte has noted, he started out with a strikingly positive evaluation and praised Riegl's power of visual perception and his descriptions of works of art, but he also criticized the absence of synthetic reasoning. He also felt Riegl's editors were overly reverential about the importance of his work, they being ex-pupils, suggesting that Wölfflin did not grasp the import of Riegl's methodological innovations shifting focus from abstract stylistic development to historical objects and the circumstances of their creation.⁹

Fast-forwarding to the 1920s and the series of reprints undertaken in this decade or so, the significance of Hans Rose's contribution to the Wölfflin re-edition becomes clear. Rose not only adds 150 pages of entirely new text, but in his conclusion he directly engages with Riegl.¹⁰ In fact, Rose's closing words specifically mention Riegl several times: 'To begin with, Alois Riegl formulated the opposition between tactile and optical artistic formation, which to my judgment establishes a too narrow relation between the ideal and the respective artistic disciplines'.¹¹ Rose goes on to conclude:

Even more importantly, Riegl was guided by this antithesis toward another issue, namely that of the artistic method of thinking. A further development of Riegl's thoughts in a conceptually precise way, with a particular relevance for the Baroque, I find with Erwin Panofsky in his essay on the Scala Regia in the Vatican (Jahrb. d. Preuss. Kunstsamml. vol. 40, p. 257). There, the Renaissance as a style of creating objectivity is distinguished from the High

⁷ For Wölfflin's annotated copies see Andrew Hopkins, 'Heinrich Wölfflin's Annotated Books', *Getty Research Journal*, 17, 2015, 177–84.

⁸ 'Vorwort zur dritten Auflage. Bei der unerwartet rasch verlangten dritten Auflage hat es sich nur um einen Neudruck des vorhandenen Textes handeln können. Vorlesungen, die den gleichen Stoff behandeln, sind eben aus dem Nachlass von Alois Riegl herausgegeben worden (Die Entstehung der Barockkunst in Rom. Wien 1908), ohne dass es möglich gewesen wäre, sie hier noch zu berücksichtigen. Ich werde das Buch im laufenden Jahrgang des Repertoriums für Kunstwissenschaft zu würdigen versuchen. Berlin, Winter 1908. H.W.' Heinrich Wölfflin, review in *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, 31, 1908, 356–57.

⁹ Arnold Witte, 'Reconstructing Riegl's Barockkunst in Rom', in Riegl, *The Origins*, 50–1 and notes 52–3.

¹⁰ Hans Rose in Heinrich Wölfflin, *Renaissance und Barock: eine Untersuchung über Wesen und Entstehung des Barockstils in Italien*, 4ed., Munich: Bruckmann, 1926, 181–323.

¹¹ 'Zunächst hat Alois Riegl den Gegensatz taktischen und optischen Kunstgestaltung aufgestellt, der meines Ermessens das Begriffliche zu eng mit einzelnen Kunstdisziplinen verknüpft', Rose, *Renaissance*, 324–25.

Baroque as a style of varying appearances, while the Early Baroque counts as an intermediate phase toward its characteristic expression.¹²

Rose was able to add a new, innovative and original text to Wölfflin's earlier text. In his *Habilitationsschrift* of 1920, written under Wölfflin's direction and published in 1922 as *Spätbarock*, Rose addressed the question of the late Baroque through a history of secular architecture between 1660 and 1760. As a sort of sequel to *Renaissance und Barock*, in the preface Rose explains that he was pursuing Wölfflin's systematically developed set of contrasting concepts for distinguishing Renaissance and Baroque, here transposed to define the successive contrast between high and late Baroque. That Wölfflin's student adopted his methodological approach may indicate that although in hindsight Wölfflin's contrasting concepts appear somewhat dated, their perception as such only slowly became apparent in the 1920s. A key turning point may be the preface to *Spätbarock*, where Rose seems at pains to point to one of the few moments of congruence between Wölfflin's and Riegl's texts, citing both authors with regard to 'the decorative style':

Says Wölfflin 1915, p. 165: 'In principle, the Baroque no longer reckons with a multiplicity of coordinate units, harmoniously interdependent, but with an absolute unity in which the individual part has lost its individual rights. But thereby the main motive is stressed with a hitherto unprecedented force.' Alois Riegl, in *Die Entstehung der Barockkunst in Rom*, examines the same subject (p. 33): 'The compositional unity of everything that comes into view constitutes the main character of the Baroque style. In the Middle Ages, various styles were consistent with one another because each part needed to be and, indeed, was considered separately: the different surroundings were not considered disturbing. The Baroque style always moves away from details to the whole (which means the distant view), and it aims at forming a unified whole for all the parts with one dominant element to which everything else is subordinated. For this reason, the Baroque destroyed so much Medieval art. This Baroque tendency is seen for the first time with Michelangelo, the first subjective artist: such intolerance is quite characteristic of this [Baroque] tendency.'¹³

¹² 'Wichtiger ist, dass Riegl durch seine Antithese auf ein anderes Problem hingelenkt worden ist, nämlich das der künstlerischen Denkrichtung, Eine begrifflich präzise Weiterbildung der Gedanken Riegls, die speziell auf den römischen Barock Bezug nimmt, finde ich dagegen bei Erwin Panofsky in seiner Abhandlung über die Scala Regia im Vatikan (Jahrb. D. preuss. Kunstsamml. Bd. 40, S.257). Dort wird die Renaissance als ein objektkonstruierender Stil unterschieden von dem Hochbarock als einem erscheinungsvariierenden Stil, zwischen deren typischer Ausprägung der Frühbarock als eine Übergangsphase zu gelten habe', Rose, *Renaissance*, 325.

¹³ Rose, *Spätbarock*, 3, citing Heinrich Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Das Problem der Stilentwicklung in der neueren Kunst*, Munich: Bruckmann, 1915, 165, and then Riegl, *Barockkunst in Rom* 1908, 33: 'rechnet grundsätzlich nicht mehr mit einer Vielheit selbständiger Teile, die harmonisch zusammengreifen, sondern mit einer absoluten Einheit, in der der einzelne Teil sein Sonderrecht verloren hat. Dabei akzentuiert sich aber das Hauptmotiv mit einer bisher unerhörten Kraft.' Zum demselben Resultat kommt Alois Riegl in seiner 'Entstehung der Barockkunst in Rom.' Es heisst dort 'Dieses Zusammenstimmen

Rose's was one of the most significant responses to the republication of Riegl's *Barockkunst in Rom* in 1923. It was a late attempt by Wölfflin to keep his earlier work up-to-date although, astoundingly, as Arnold Witte notes, Wölfflin never even bothered to look through any of the additions.¹⁴ The project was undertaken in the face of a methodological shift toward focusing on sources and documents, monographs on individual buildings, architects and artists and their graphic oeuvre, approaches rewardingly championed by scholars including Eberhard Hempel (1886–1967) and Oskar Pollak (1883–1915) who concentrated on art history based on archival source material. Even within the restricted context of formalist analysis, already by 1925 Edgar Wind (1900–71) thought it would be plausible to reduce Wölfflin's five pairs of contrasting categories to Riegl's single pair of optic and haptic.¹⁵

Dagobert Frey (1883–1962), who embraced a methodological approach based on close attention to historical source material and close analysis of the works themselves, as had been adumbrated by Riegl in his *Barockkunst in Rom*, decided to write a long essay in 1924 on Roman Baroque architecture that was based on enjoying privileged access to Pollak's unpublished *Nachlass*. Not only did it help establish Frey's reputation, but his failure to cite Riegl's *Barockkunst in Rom* (republished in 1923) is evidence of his ambitious aim to dominate this field. The publication of Frey's significant and lengthy study of Roman Baroque architecture in 1924 was just one of the plethora of important new texts in the field that made it difficult for Wölfflin to merely reprint his original text in 1926 without any substantial alterations or additions, hence his engaging Rose, who was up to speed on all the latest and most significant literature and well as the new methodologies being used, to research and write the extended new text that stands alongside Wölfflin's own, practically a new book published alongside an old book under the original title of a volume that first appeared in 1888.

Appendix: Selected list of art-history books reprinted in the 1920s by scholars who remain central to art-historiography today.

von allem, was in den räumlichen Gesichtskreis fällt, ist nun ein Hauptcharakterzug des Barockstiles. [...] Der Barockstil sieht vom Einzelnen stets hinweg auf das Ganze (Fernsicht); er will immer alles aus einem Gusse haben und ein Dominierendes, dem sich alles andere unterordnet. [...] Diese Tendenz findet sich zum ersten Male bei Michelangelo, beim ersten subjektivistischen Künstler; die Unduldsamkeit ist dieser Tendenz besonders eigen'. See also Rose's closing remarks dealing with the problem of periodicity, Rose, *Renaissance*, 278–81. Michael Hatt and Charlotte Klonk, *Art History: A Critical Introduction to Its Methods* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006, 65–95, note that in Germany in the early decades of the twentieth century Riegl's influence was greater than Wölfflin's.

¹⁴ Wölfflin, *Renaissance und Barock*, IX (Vorwort zur vierten Auflage): 'Für die Erweiterungen, in die Herr Geheimrat Wölfflin keinen Einblick genommen hat, trage ich die Verantwortung allein.'

¹⁵ Edgar Wind, 'Zur Systematik der künstlerischen Probleme', *Zeitschrift für Aesthetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft*, 18, 1925, 439–86, especially 482–84; translated by Fiona Elliott as Edgar Wind, 'On the Systematics of Artistic Problems', *Art in Translation*, 1/2, 2009, 248–49.

1920 Heinrich Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Das Problem der Stilentwicklung in der neueren Kunst*, 3d ed., Munich, Bruckmann, 1920. (1ed. Munich, Bruckmann, 1915. 2ed Munich, Bruckmann, 1917). 4ed. Munich, Bruckmann, 1923. 5ed. Munich, Bruckmann, 1929.¹⁶

1923 Alois Riegl, *Die Entstehung der Barockkunst in Rom*, Schroll, Vienna, 1923 (1ed. Schroll, Vienna, 1908).

1923 Alois Riegl, *Stilfragen: Grundlegungen zu einer Geschichte der Ornamentik* 2ed. Schmidt and Company, 1923, with 197 additional illustrations (1ed., Berlin, Siemens, 1893).¹⁷

1924 Heinrich Wölfflin, *Die klassische Kunst: eine Einführung in die italienische Renaissance*, Bruckmann, Munich, 1924 (1ed. Bruckmann, Munich, 1899. 2ed. Bruckmann, Munich, 1901. 3ed. Bruckmann, Munich, 1904. 4ed. Bruckmann, Munich, 1908. 5ed. Bruckmann, Munich, 1912. 6ed. Bruckmann, Munich, 1914).

1924 Max Dvořák, 'Über Greco und den Manierismus,' in Max Dvořák, *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte: Studien zur abendländischen Kunstentwicklung*, ed. Johannes Wilde and Karl M. Swoboda, Munich, Piper, 1924, 261–76, with a note by the editors (p. xi) that this talk 'ist ein im Österreichische Museum im Oktober 1920 gehaltener Vortrag' (1ed. in Dagobert Frey ed., *Max Dvorák zum Gedächtnis*, Vienna, Österreichische Verlagsgesellschaft Eduard Hölzel, 1922, 22–42).¹⁸ 3ed. reprint of *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte*, Munich, Piper, 1928, 259-276.

1926 Heinrich Wölfflin, *Renaissance und Barock: eine Untersuchung über Wesen und Entstehung des Barockstils in Italien*, Munich, Bruckmann, 1926. (1ed. Munich, Ackermann, 1888. 2ed. Munich, Bruckmann, 1907. 3ed. Munich, Bruckmann, 1908).

1926-27 Max Dvořák, *Geschichte der italienischer Kunst im Zeitalter der Renaissance*, eds Johannes Wilde and Karl Swoboda, 2 vols, Munich, Piper, 1926–27.

¹⁶ For all the subsequent editions and ramifications see David Summers, 'Art History reviewed II: Heinrich Wölfflin's *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 1915', *The Burlington Magazine*, 151/1276, 2009, 476–79. See also Heinrich Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History: the problem of the development of style in early modern art*, trans. Jonathan Blower, with essays by Evonne Levy and Tristan Weddigen, Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2015. See also Arnold Witte, 'Wölfflin's Grundbegriffe as a psychological palimpsest?', *Journal of Art Historiography*, Number 13, December 2015.

¹⁷ Translated as Alois Riegl, *Problems of Style: Foundations for a History of Ornament*, trans. Evelyn Kain, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

¹⁸ Max Dvořák, 'El Greco and Mannerism', in idem, *The History of Art and the History of Ideas*, trans. John Hardy, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984, 97–108.

1927 Alois Riegl, *Die spätrömische Kunst-Industrie, nach den Funden in Österreich-Ungarn*, 2ed., Otto Pächt ed., preface Emil Reisch, Vienna, Österreichisches Staatsdruckerei, 1927 (1ed., Vienna: K. K. Hoff- & Staatsdruckerei, 1901).¹⁹

1929 Alois Riegl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, ed. Karl M. Swoboda, Augsburg: Filser, 1929, with the now infamous essay by Hans Sedlmayr, 'Die Quintessenz der Lehren Riegls', xii–xxxii.²⁰

[1931 Alois Riegl, *Das holländische Gruppenporträt*, ed. Karl M. Swoboda, 2 vols., Vienna: Österreichischen Staatsdruckerei, 1931 (1ed., *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien* 23 (1902): 71–278).²¹]

Andrew Hopkins is associate professor of architectural history at the University of L'Aquila. *Baldassare Longhena and Venetian Baroque Architecture* was published by Yale University Press in 2012 and *La città del Seicento* by Laterza Editore in 2014.

hopkins@cc.univaq.it

¹⁹ Translated as Alois Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, trans. Rolf Winkes, Rome: Bretschneider, 1985.

²⁰ Hans Sedlmayr, 'The quintessence of Riegl's thought', in Richard Woodfield, ed., *Framing formalism: Riegl's work*, Amsterdam: G + B Arts International, 2001, 11–31.

²¹ Translated as Alois Riegl, *The Group Portraiture of Holland*, trans. Evelyn Kain and David Britt, Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art & the Humanities, 1999.