4 Principles of Art History

HEINRICH WÖLLFLIN

Born of a wealthy family near Zurich in 1864, Heinrich Wölflin studied art history and philosophy at the universities of Munich, Berlin, and Basle, where his doctoral dissertation on Renaissance architecture was accepted in 1886, when he was 22. In 1893, he came to succeed his teacher Jacob Burckhardt (1818-97), the great historian and art historian of the Italian Renaissance, in the chair of art history at Basle. Soon after, he accepted the chair of art history at Berlin, which to this day many people regard as the pinnacle of a scholarly career. He retired from teaching in 1934 and died eleven years later.

Wölflin's great persuasion and fame as a teacher and public lecturer were international. Overflow crowds of admirers were attracted to his public lectures and are reported to have been held spellbound. One of the techniques used in his lectures was the simultaneous projection of two lantern slides on a screen, a device he introduced to art history.

His most influential book was Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe: das Problem der Stilentwicklung in der neueren Kunst, "Fundamental Concepts of Art History," published in 1915. Its seventh edition was translated by M. D. Hottinger in 1932 as Principles of Art History, and the selection that is republished in this anthology is taken from that translation. These pages introduce Wölflin's well-known fundamental concepts for dealing with the history of style. His avowed purpose as an art historian was to reduce the individual to the general—to the law. To remain simple at all times was the most important lesson he learned from his great teacher, Burckhardt. Wölflin was convinced that seeing or beholding, like knowledge, has a universal meaning, and he thus formulated his concepts as universal forms of beholding. From an astute empirical observation of individual works of art—indeed works of great artistic significance—he conceived of his universal forms as schemata or polarities for describing the transformation of style. Specifically, his antithetical categories provide the art historian with analytical tools with which he can grasp and articulate fundamental stylistic distinctions between the Renaissance and the Baroque. As enormously influential as the book was, it received an avalanche of criticism that Wölflin ignored until 1933, when he revised some of his views; but his recantation had little impact on art history (see his "Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe": Eine Revision," Logos XXI [1933], pp. 210–24; repr. in his Gedanken zur Kunstgeschichte [Basle, 1941], pp. 18–24).

While Wölflin's Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe had a far-reaching influence on art history and criticism, as well as on the history of literature, musicology, and even economics, his finest book was Die klassische Kunst: eine Eingührung in die italienische Renaissance (Munich, 1899 [Classic Art; An Introduction to the Italian Renaissance, trans. Peter and Linda Murray, New York, 1952]), published when he was only 35. Describing in masterly prose the salient formal features of individual paintings and sculpt-

tutes of the High Renaissance, it has been a source of inspiration for scholars and critics in both sides of the Atlantic and is widely used as a textbook in American colleges. The noted English formalist art critic Roger Fry (1866–1934) fell under its spell and assimilated some of its points of view (see Fry’s Cézanne: A Study of His Development [London, 1927; Noonday paperback]). In this country, Renaissance art historian Sidney Freedberg of Harvard University seems to have continued and extensively refined Wölfflin’s visually rooted approach (Painting of the High Renaissance in Rome and Florence, 2 vols. [Cambridge, Mass., 1961]).

Wölfflin himself was influenced at first by both Robert Vischer and his theories of empathy, and Konrad Fiedler (1841–95) and his aesthetic theories, and later by the views of his friend the German sculptor Adolf von Hildebrand (1847–1921), whose little pamphlet The Problem of Form in Painting and Sculpture (trans. Max Meyer and Robert Morris Ogden [New York, 1907; orig. pub. Strassburg, 1893]) is readily acknowledged by Wölfflin in his Classic Art, especially in the passages on the paintings of Raphael.

Yet Wölfflin’s method was at all times rooted in the keen observation of the formal qualities of individual works of art rather than in theoretical speculation, and it discloses the capacity to distinguish easily the relevant from the irrelevant, the masterpiece from the second-rate work. So intense was his artistic experience that he was fully able to convey clearly his points of view to his audience.

**The Most General Representational Forms**

This volume is occupied with the discussion of these universal forms of representation. It does not analyse the beauty of Leonardo but the element in which that beauty became manifest. It does not analyse the representation of nature according to its imitative content, and low, for instance, the naturalism of the sixteenth century may be distinguished from that of the seventeenth, but the mode of perception which lies at the root of the representative arts in the various centuries.

Let us try to sift out these basic forms in the domain of more modern art. We denote the series of periods with the names Early Renaissance, High Renaissance, and Baroque, names which mean little and must lead to misunderstanding in their application to south and north, but we hardly be ousted now. Unfortunately, the symbolic analogy bud, bloom, decay, plays a secondary and misleading part. If there is in fact a qualitative difference between the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, in the sense that the fifteenth had gradually to acquire by labour the insight into effects which was at the free disposal of the sixteenth, the (classic) art of the Cinquecento and the (baroque) art of the Seicento are equal in point of value. The word classic here denotes no judgment of value, for baroque has its classicism too. Baroque (or, let us say, modern art) is neither a rise nor a decline from classic, but a totally different art. The occidental development of modern times cannot simply be reduced to a curve with rise, height, and decline: it has two culminating points. We can turn our sympathy to one or to the other, but we must realise that that is an arbitrary judgment, just as it is an arbitrary judgment to say that the rose-bush lives its supreme moment in the formation of the flower, the apple-tree in that of the fruit.

For the sake of simplicity, we must speak of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as units of style, although these periods signify no homogeneous production, and, in particular, the features of the Seicento had begun to take shape long before the year 1600. Just as, on the other hand, they long continued to affect the appearance of the eighteenth century. Our object is to compare type with type,
the finished with the finished. Of course, in the strictest sense of the word, there is nothing "finished"; all historical material is subject to continual transformation but we must make up our minds to establish the distinctions at a fruitful point, and there to let them speak as contrasts, if we are not to let the whole development slip through our fingers. The preliminary stages of the High Renaissance are not to be ignored, but they represent an archaic form of art, an art of primitives, for whom established pictorial form does not yet exist. But to expose the individual differences which lead from the style of the sixteenth century to that of the seventeenth must be left to a detailed historical survey which will, to tell the truth, only do justice to its task when it has the determining concepts at its disposal.

If we are not mistaken, the development can be reduced, as a provisional formulation, to the following five pairs of concepts:

1. The development from the linear to the painterly.1 i.e. the development of line as the path of vision and guide of the eye, and the gradual depreciation of line: in more general terms, the perception of the object by its tangible character—in outline and surfaces—on the one hand, and on the other, a perception which is by way of surrendering itself to the mere visual appearance and cannot abandon "tangible" design. In the former case the stress is laid on the limits of things: in the other the work tends to look limitless. Seeing by volumes and outlines isolates objects: for the painterly eye, they merge. In the one case interest lies more in the perception of individual material objects as solid, tangible bodies; in the other, in the apprehension of the world as a shifting semblance.

2. The development from plan to recession.2 Classic3 art reduces the parts of a total form to a sequence of planes, the baroque emphasizes depth. Plane is the element of line, extension in one plane the form of the greatest explicitness; with the discounting of the contour comes the discounting of the plane, and the eye relates objects essentially in the direction of forwards and backwards. This is no qualitative difference: with a greater power of representing spatial depths, the innovation has nothing directly to do; it signifies rather a radically different mode of representation, just as "plane style" in our sense is not the style of primitive art, but makes its appearance only at the moment at which foreshortening and spatial illusion are completely mastered.

3. The development from closed to open form.4 Every work of art must be a finite whole, and it is a defect if we do not feel that it is self-contained, but the interpretation of this demand in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is so different that, in comparison with the loose form of the baroque, classic design may be taken as the form of closed composition. The relaxation of rules, the yielding of tectonic strength, or whatever name we may give to the process, does not merely signify an enhancement of interest, but is a new mode of representation consistently carried out, and hence this factor is to be adopted among the basic forms of representation.

4. The development from multiplicity to unity.5 In the system of a classic composition, the single parts, however firmly they may be rooted in the whole, maintain a certain independence. It is not the anarchy of primitive art; the part is conditioned by the whole, and yet does not cease to have its own life. For the spectator, that presupposes an articulation, a progress from part to part, which is a very different operation from perception as a whole, such as the seventeenth century applies and demands. In both styles unity is the chief aim (in contrast to the pre-

---

1 Notes to this selection begin on page 164.
Plane is depth. Plane is the extension in one dimension. The contour comes to be an extension in three dimensions, the eye in the direction of this extension. This is no longer the case with a greater spatial depth, the eye does not see the object directly to do: it has different modes and styles of primitive appearance only at the classical age. The classical style of primitive classes of beings or whatever name is classical, the yield to the presentation is to be relatively a great all-embracing mode of representation, first entered the history of art at the moment at which reality is beheld with an eye to other objects. Even here it is not a difference of quality if the baroque departed from the pre-purposive and Raphael, but, as we have said, a different attitude to the world.

**Imitation and Decoration**

The representational forms here described are, as such general signification that even widely divergent natures such as Terborch and Bernini can find room within one and the same type. The community of style in these two painters rests on what, for people of the seventeenth century, was a matter of course — certain basic conditions to which the impression of living form is bound without a more special expressional value being attached to them.

They can be treated as forms of representation or forms of beholding: in these forms nature is seen, and in these forms nature manifests its contents. But it is dangerous to speak only of certain "states of the eye" by which conception is determined: every artistic conception is, of its very nature, organized according to certain notions of pleasure. Hence our five pairs of concepts have an imitative and a decorative significance. Every kind of reproduction of nature moves within a definite decorative schema. Linear discussion is permanently bound up with a certain idea of beauty and so is painterly vision. If an advanced type of art dissolves the line and replaces it by the restless mass, that happens not only in the interests of a new verisimilitude, but in the interests of a new beauty too. And in the same way we must say that representation in a plane type certainly corresponds to a certain stage of observation, but even here the schema has obviously a decorative side. The schema certainly yields nothing of itself, but it contains the possibility of developing beauties in the arrangement of planes which the recessional style no longer possesses and can no longer possess. And we can continue in the same way with the whole series.

But then, if these more general concepts also envisage a special type of beauty, do we not come back to the beginning, where style was conceived as the direct expression of temperament, be it the temperament of a time, of a people, or of an individual? And in that case, would not the only new factor be that the section was cut lower down, the phenomena, to a certain extent, reduced to a greater common denominator?

In speaking thus, we should fail to realise that the second terms of our pairs of concepts belong of their very nature to a different species, in so far as these concepts, in their transformations, obey an
inward necessity. They represent a rational psychological process. The transition from tangible, plastic, to purely visual, painterly perception follows a natural logic, and could not be reversed. Nor could the transition from tectonic to a-tectonic, from the rigid to the free conformity to law.

To use a parable. The stone, rolling down the mountain side, can assume quite different motions according to the gradient of the slope, the hardness or softness of the ground, etc., but all these possibilities are subject to one and the same law of gravity. So, in human psychology, there are certain developments which can be regarded as subject to natural law in the same way as physical growth. They can undergo the most manifold variations, they can be totally or partially checked, but once the rolling has started, the operation of certain laws may be observed throughout.

Nobody is going to maintain that the “eye” passes through developments on its own account. Conditioned and conditioning, it always impinges on other spiritual spheres. There is certainly no visual schema which, arising only from its own premises, could be imposed on the world as a stereotyped pattern. But although men have at all times seen what they wanted to see, that does not exclude the possibility that a law remains operative throughout all change. To determine this law would be a central problem, the central problem of a history of art.

Multiplicity and Unity

The principle of closed form of itself presumes the conception of the picture as a unity. Only when the sum of the forms is felt as one whole can this whole be thought as ordered by law, and it is then indifferent whether a tectonic middle is worked out or a freer order reigns.

This feeling for unity develops only gradually. There is not a definite moment in the history of art at which we could say—now it has come: here too we must reckon with purely relative values. A head is a total form which the Florentine Quattrocentists, like the early Dutch artists, felt as such—that is, as a whole. If, however, we take as comparison a head by Raphael or Quentin Massys, we feel we are confronted by another attitude, and if we seek to comprehend the contrast, it is ultimately the contrast of seeing in detail and seeing as a whole. Not that the former could mean that sorry accumulation of details over which the reiterated corrections of the art master try to help the pupil—such qualitative comparisons do not even come into consideration here—yet the fact remains that, in comparison with the classics of the sixteenth century, these old heads always preoccupy us more in the detail and seem to possess a lesser degree of coherence, while in the other case, in any detail, we at once become aware of the whole. We cannot see the eye without realising the larger form of the socket, the way it is set between forehead, nose, and cheekbone, and to the horizon of the pair of eyes and of the mouth the vertical of the nose at once responds; the form has a power to awaken vision and to compel us to a united perception of the manifold which must affect even a dense spectator. He wakes up and suddenly feels quite a new fellow.

And the same difference obtains between a pictorial composition of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. In the former, the dispersed; in the latter, the unified: in the former, now the poverty of the isolated, now the inextricable confusion of the too much; in the latter, an organised whole, in which every part speaks for itself and is comprehensible, yet makes itself felt in its coherence with the whole as a member of a total form.

In establishing these differences between the classic and the pre-classic period, we first obtain the basis for our real subject. Yet here we at once feel the painful lack of distinguishing vocabulary:
at the very moment at which we name unity of composition as an essential feature of Cinquecento art, we have to say that it is precisely the epoch of Raphael which we wish to oppose as an age of multiplicity to later art and its tendency to unity. And this time we have no progress from the poorer to the richer form, but two different types which each represent an ultimate form. The sixteenth century is not discredited by the seventeenth, for it is not here a question of a qualitative difference but of something totally new.

A head by Rubens is not better, seen as a whole, than a head by Dürer or Massys, but that independent working-out of the separate parts is abolished which, in the latter case, makes the total form appear as a (relative) multiplicity. The Seicentists envisage a definite main motive, to which they subordinate everything else. No longer do the separate elements of the organism, conditioning each other and holding each other in harmony, take effect in the picture, but out of the whole, reduced to a unified stream, individual forms arise as the absolute dominants, yet in such a way that even these dominant forms signify for the eye nothing separable, nothing that could be isolated.

The relationship can be elucidated most satisfactorily in the composite sacred picture.

One of the richest motives of the biblical picture-cycle is the Descent from the Cross, an event which sets many hands in movement and contains powerful psychological contrasts. We have the classic version of the theme in Daniele da Volterra’s picture in the Trinità dei Monti in Rome. This has always been admired for the way in which the figures are developed as absolutely independent parts, and yet work together that each seems governed by the whole. That is precisely renaissance articulation. When later Rubens, as spokesman of the baroque, treats the same subject in an early work, the first point in which he departs from the classic type is the welding of the figures into a homogeneous mass, from which the individual figure can hardly be detached. He makes a mighty stream, reinforced by devices of lighting, pass slanting through the picture from the top. It sets in with the white cloth falling from the transverse beam; the body of Christ lies in the same course, and the movement pours into the bay of many figures which crowd round to receive the falling body. No longer, as in Daniele da Volterra, is the fainting Virgin a secondary centre of interest detached from the main event. She stands, and is completely absorbed, in the mass round the Cross. If we wish to denote the change in the other figures by a general expression, we can only say that each has abdicated part of its independence to the general interest. On principle, the baroque no longer reckons with a multiplicity of co-ordinate 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.

It must not be objected that these are less differences of development than differences of national taste. Certainly, Italy has always had a preference for the clear component part, but the difference persists too in any comparison of the Italian Seicento with the Italian Cinquecento or in the comparison between Rembrandt and Dürer in the north. Although the northern imagination, as contrasted with Italy, aimed rather at the interweaving of the members, a Deposition by Dürer, compared with Rembrandt (Fg. 1),* provides the absolutely pronounced opposition of a composition with independent figures to a composition with dependent figures. Rembrandt focusses the story on the motive of two lights—a strong, steep one at the top left-hand corner, and a

* Illustrations accompanying this selection appear on page 469.
weak, horizontal one at the bottom right. With that, everything that matters is indicated. The corpse, only partially visible, is being let down, and is to be laid out on the winding-sheet lying on the ground. The "down" of the deposition is reduced to its briefest expression.

Thus there stand opposed the multiple unity of the sixteenth century and the unified unity of the seventeenth: in other words, the articulated system of forms of classic art and the (endless) flow of the baroque. And, as is evident from previous examples, two elements interact in this baroque unity—the cessation of the independent functioning of the individual forms and the development of a dominating total motive. This can be achieved plastically, as in Rubens, or by means of more painterly values, as in Rembrandt. The example of the Deposition is only characteristic of an isolated case: unity fulfils itself in many ways. There is a unity of colour as well as of lighting, and a unity of the composition of figures as of the conception of form in a single head or body.

That is the most interesting point: the decorative schema becomes a mode of apprehension of nature. It is not only that Rembrandt's pictures are built up on a different system from Dürer's, things are seen differently. Multiplicity and unity are, so to speak, vessels in which the content of reality is caught and takes form. We must not assume that just any decorative system was clapped over the world's eyes: matter plays its part too. People not only see differently, they see different things. But all the so-called imitation of nature has only an artistic significance when it is inspired by decorative instincts and produces in its turn decorative works. That the concept of a multiple beauty and of a unified beauty also exists, apart from any imitative content, is borne out by architecture.

The two types stand side by side as independent values, and it does not meet the case if we conceive the later form only as an enhancement of the former. It goes without saying that baroque art was convinced that it had first found truth and that renaissance art had only been a preliminary form, but the historian judges otherwise. Nature can be interpreted in more than one way. And therefore it came about that it was just in the name of nature that, at the end of the eighteenth century, the baroque formula was ousted and again replaced by the classic.

The Principal Motives

The subject of this chapter, therefore, is the relation of the part to the whole—namely, that classic art achieves its unity by making the parts independent as free members, and that the baroque abolishes the uniform independence of the parts in favour of a more unified total motive. In the former case, co-ordination of the accents; in the latter, subordination.

All our previous categories have led up to this unity. The painterly is the deliverance of the forms from their isolation; the principle of recession is no other than the replacement of the sequence of separate planes by a uniform recessional movement, and a-tectonic taste dissolves the rigid structure of geometric relations into flux. We cannot avoid partly repeating familiar matter the essential viewpoint of the consideration is all the same new. It does not happen of itself and from the outset that the parts function as free members of an organism. Among the primitives, the impression is checked because the component parts either remain too dispersed or look confused and unclear. Only where the single detail seems a necessary part of the whole do we speak of organic articulation, and only where the component part, bound up in the whole, is still felt as an independently functioning member, has the notion of freedom and independence a sense. That is the classic system of forms of the sixteenth century.
and it makes no difference, as we have said, whether we understand by a whole a single head or a composite sacred picture.

Dürer's impressive woodcut of the Virgin's Death (Fig 2: 1510) outstrips all previous work in that the parts form a system in which each in its place appears determined by the whole and yet looks perfectly independent. The picture is an excellent example of a tectonic composition—the whole reduced to clear geometric oppositions—but, beside that, this relationship of (relative) co-ordination of independent values should always be regarded as something new. We call it the principle of multiple unity.

The baroque would have avoided or concealed the meeting of pure horizontals and verticals. We should no longer have the impression of an articulated whole: the component parts, whether the bed canopy or one of the apostles, would have been fused into a total movement dominating the picture. If we recall the example of Rembrandt's etching of the Virgin's Death (Fig. 3), we shall realise how very welcome to the baroque was the motive of the upward streaming clouds. The play of contrasts does not cease, but it keeps more hidden. The arrangement of obvious side-by-side and clear opposite is replaced by a single weft. Pure oppositions are broken. The finite, the isolable, disappear. From form to form, paths and bridges open on which the movement hastens on unchecked. But from such a stream, unified in the baroque sense, there arises here and there a motive so strongly stressed that it focusses the eye upon it as the lens does the light rays. Of this kind, in drawing, are those spots of most expressive form which, similarly to the culminating points of light and colour, in which we shall speak presently, fundamentally separate baroque from classic art. In classic art, even accentuation; in the baroque, one main effect. These motives which bear the main accent are not pieces which could be broken out of the whole, but only the final surges of a general movement.

The characteristic examples of unified movement in the composite figure picture are given by Rubens. At all points, the transposition of the style of multiplicity and separation into the assembled and flowing with the suppression of independent separate values. The Assumption is not only a baroque work because Titian's classic system—the main figure opposed as vertical to the horizontal form of the group of the apostles—has been transformed into a general diagonal movement, but because the parts can no longer be isolated. The circle of light and angels which fills the centre of Titian's Assunta still re-echoes in Rubens, but it only receives an aesthetic sense in the context of the whole. However regrettable it is that copyists should offer Titian's central figure alone for sale, a certain possibility of doing so still exists: with Rubens, such an idea could present itself to nobody.

In Titian's picture, the apostle motives to left and right mutually balance—the one looking up and the other with upstretched arms. In Rubens, only one side speaks, the other is, as far as content is concerned, reduced to insignificance, a suppression which makes the unilateral right-hand accent much more intense.

A second case—Rubens' Bearing of the Cross (Fig. 4), which has already been compared with Raphael's Spasimo. An example of the transposition of plane into recession, but also an example of the transposition of articulated multiplicity into unarticulated unity. In the Spasimo, the soldier, Christ, and the women—three separate, equally accented motives; in Rubens, the same, as regards subject matter, but the motives knitted together, and foreground and background carried into each other in a uniform drift of movement, without casura. Tree and mountain work together with the figures and the lighting completes the effect. Everything
is one. But out of the stream the wave rises here and there with surpassing force. Where the herculean soldier rams his shoulder under the cross, so much strength is concentrated that the balance of the picture might seem menaced—not the man as a separate motive, but the whole complex of form and light determines the effect—these are the characteristic nodal points of the new style.

To give unified movement, art need not necessarily have at its disposal plastic resources such as are contained in these compositions of Rubens. It needs no procession of moving human figures: unity can be enforced merely by lighting.

The sixteenth century also distinguishes between main and secondary light, but—we refer to the impression of a black and white plate such as Dürer’s Virgin’s Death—it is still an even weft which is created by the lights adhering to the plastic form. Pictures of the seventeenth century, on the other hand, readily cast their light on one point, or, at any rate, concentrate it in a few spots of highest light which then form an easily apprehended configuration between them. But that is only half the matter. The highest light or the highest lights of baroque art proceed from a general unification of the light-movement. Quite otherwise than previously, the lights and darks roll on in a common stream, and where the light swells to a final height, just as there it emerges from the great total movement. This focussing on individual points is only a derivative of the primary tendency to unity, in contrast to which classic lighting will always be felt as multiple and separating.

I must be a pre-eminently baroque theme if, in a closed space, the light flows from one source only. Ostade’s Studio (Fig. 5) gives a clear example of this. Yet the baroque character is not merely a question of subject: in his St. Jerome engraving, Dürer, as we know, drew quite different conclusions from a similar situation. But we will leave such special cases out of the question and base our analysis on a plate with a less salient quality of lighting. Let us take Rembrandt’s etching of Christ Preaching (Fig. 6).

The most striking visual fact here is that a whole mass of conglomerated highest light lies on the wall at Christ’s feet. This dominating light stands in the closest relation to the other lights. It cannot be isolated as an individual thing, as is possible with Dürer, nor does it coincide with a plastic form: on the contrary, the light glides over the form, it plays with the objects. All the tectonic elements thereby become less obvious and the figures on the stage are, in the strangest way, dragged apart and reassembled as if not they but the light were the element of reality in the picture. A diagonal of light passes from the left foreground over the middle through the archway into the background, yet what meaning does such a statement have beside the subtle quiver of light and dark throughout the whole space, that rhythm by means of which Rembrandt, more than any other, imparts to his scenes a compelling unity of life?

Other unifying factors are, of course, at work here too. We disregard what does not belong to the subject. An essential reason why the story is presented with such impressive emphasis lies in the fact that the style also uses distinctness and indistinctness to intensify the effect, that it does not speak with uniform clearness at all points, but makes places of most speaking form emerge from a groundwork of mute or less speaking form.

The development of colour offers an analogous spectacle. In place of the “bright” colouring of the primitives with their juxtaposition of colour without systematic connection, there comes in the sixteenth [-century] selection and unity, that is, a harmony in which the colours mutually balance in pure oppositions. The system is perfectly obvious. Every colour plays its part with reference to the whole. We can feel how, like an indispensable
pillar, it bears and holds together the building. The principle may be developed with more or less consistency, the fact remains that the classic epoch, as an epoch of fundamentally multiple colouring, is very clearly to be distinguished from the following period with its aiming at tonal relations. Whenever we pass from the Renaissance room in a gallery to the baroque, the surprise we feel is that, whereas a juxtaposition ceases and that colours seem to rest on a common ground a which they sometimes sink into almost complete monochrome, in which, however, they stand out clearly, they remain mysteriously moored. We can, even in the sixteenth century, denote single artists as masters of tone and attribute to individual schools a generally tonal style; that does not hinder the fact that, even in such cases, the “painterly” century introduces an enhancement which should be distinguished by a word of its own.

Tonal monochrome is only a transitional form. Artits soon learned to use tonality and colour simultaneously, and in so doing, to intensify individual colours in such a way that, similarly to the highest lights, a spots of strongest colouring they radically reshape the whole physiognomy of paint in the seventeenth century. Instead of uniformly distributed colour, we now have the single spot of colour — it can be a chord of two or three colours — which unconditionally dominates the picture. The picture is, as we say, pitched on a definite hue. With that is connected a partial negation of colouring. Just as the drawing abandons uniform clearness, so it promotes the focusing of colour effect to make the pure colour proceed from the fullness of half or no colour. It breaks out, not as a thing which happens once, but is isolated, but as one long prepared. The colourists of the seventeenth century handled this “becoming” of colour in various ways, but there is always this distinction from the classic system of coloured composition, that the classic age to a certain extent builds with finished units, while in the baroque the colour comes and goes and comes again, there louder, here lower, and the whole is not to be apprehended save through the idea of an all-pervading general movement. In this sense, the foreword to the great Berlin picture catalogue states that the mode of description of colour tried to adapt itself to the course of the development. “From the detailed notation of colour, there was a gradual transition to a description envisaging the whole of the colouristic impression.”

But it is a further consequence of baroque unity that a single colour can stand out as a solitary accent. The classic system does not know the possibility of casting an isolated red into the scene as Rembrandt does in his Susanna in Berlin. The complementary green is not absent, but works only softly, from the depths. Co-ordination and balance are no longer aimed at, the colour is meant to look solitary. We have the parallel in design: baroque art first found room for the interest of the solitary form — a tree, a tower, a human being.

And so, from the consideration of detail, we come back to the general principle. The theory of variable accents, which we have here developed, would be inconceivable unless art could show the same differences of type as regards content. A characteristic of the multiple unity of the sixteenth century is that the separate things in the picture are felt to be relatively equal in material value. The narrative certainly distinguishes between main and secondary figures. We can see — in contrast to the narration of the primitives — from far off where the crucial point of the event lies, but for all that, what have come into being are creations of that relative unity which to the baroque looked like multiplicity. All the accessory figures still have their own existence. The spectator will not forget the whole in the details, but the detail can be seen for itself. This
can be well demonstrated by Dirk Vellert’s drawing (1524), showing the child Saul
coming to the High Priest (Fig. 7). The man
who created this work was not one of the
pioneer spirits of the sixteenth century,
but he was not a backward one either.
On the contrary, the representation, articu-
lated through and through, is purely
classic in style. Yet every figure has its
own centre of interest. The main motive
certainly stands out, yet not so that the
secondary figures find no room to live
their own lives. The architectonic element
too is so handled that it must claim some
interest for itself. It is still classic art,
and not to be confused with the scattered
multiplicity of the primitives: everything
has its clear relation to the whole, but
how ruthlessly would an artist of the
seventeenth century have cut down the
scene to the points of vital interest! We
do not speak of qualitative differences,
but even the conception of the main motive
lacks, for modern taste, the character of
a real event.

The sixteenth century, even where it
is quite unified, renders the situation
broadly, the seventeenth concentrates it
on the moment. But only in this way does
the historical picture really speak. We
make the same experience in the portrait.
For Holbein, the cloak is as valuable as
the man. The psychic situation is not
timeless, yet cannot be understood as the
fixation of a moment of freely flowing
life.

Classic art does not know the notion
of the momentary, the poignant, or of the
climax in the most general sense: it has
a leisurely, broad quality. And though
its point of departure is absolutely the
whole, it does not reckon with first
impressions. The baroque conception has
shifted in both directions.

NOTES
1 In the German, das Lineare and das Malerische. The term malerisch, here translated as
“painterly,” has no exact English equivalent.—Ed.
2 In the German, Fläche and Tiefe.—Ed.
3 Klassisch. The word “classic” throughout this book refers to the art of the High Renaissance.
It implies, however, not only a historical phase of art, but a special mode of creation of which
that art is an instance.—Trans.
4 In the German, Geschlossene Form and Offene Form—what Wölfflin defined elsewhere in
this book as tektonisch and atektonisch.—Ed.
5 In the German, Vielheit und Einheit; later in this book, Wölfflin defines these terms as vie-
heitliche Einheit und einheitliche Einheit.—Ed.
6 In the German, Klarheit und Unklarheit; in a later chapter of this book, these terms are further
defined as Unbedingte and bedingte Klarheit.—Ed.
7 In the German, geistigen Sphären.—Ed.
8 Wilhelm von Bode, in Könighche Museen zu Berlin. Die Gemäldegalerie des Kaiser-Friedrich-