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The Baroque in Dorfles

Andrew Leach
Griffith University

This paper pursues the observation made recently by Evonne Levy and Jens Baumgarten (2009) that historians of art and architecture have since the end of the nineteenth century consistently posed questions of the methods and objectives of their discipline/s through the study of the architecture of the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and by negotiating the specific historiographical and theoretical problems posed by this period. The paper specifically addresses the work of Italian painter and aesthete Gillo Dorfles (b.1910), who in the post-war period defined a series of terms on which architecture of the late-sixteenth and seventeenth centuries could be understood to resonate with that of the twentieth century as a ‘neo-baroque’. Most important of his writing on the problem of history’s recurrence in contemporary architecture is the 1951 book Barocco nell’architettura moderna. Through a reading of this book’s key arguments, this paper considers Dorfles’s contribution to twentieth-century reflections on the relation of architectural history and historiography to architectural invention through the specific lens of the baroque. Specifically, during the centenary year of Dorfles’s birth the paper will claim for him a place among those architects and historians who together conceived as a project the role of historicising the post-war efforts of the of the modern and post-modern stages of contemporary architecture by deferring to the historical examples spanning from Michelangelo to Neumann to the colonial baroque as a fluid baroque periodization permitting a series of clarifications concerning the place of history in the twentieth-century architect’s practice,
Historiography and the Baroque

In a survey conducted in the wake of the conference Moving Worlds of the Baroque (2007), art historians Evonne Levy and Jans Baartman asked scholars of the history of art and architecture, ideas, and letters of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries a series of questions intended to map the vast and diverse terrain covered by the term 'baroque' as it is used in present-day teaching and research in their respective fields.1 It quickly becomes evident how little common ground baroque enjoys as a transdisciplinary, interdisciplinary and transgeographical term. Whereas Renaissance and Modern/Modern retain some (fluctuating) currency among historians of art, architecture, literature, and coterie, baroque is regularly set aside by scholars in favour of a cleaner chronological association. Baroque might, conversely, be dismissed along with all other periodizing terms as a misleading way to approach problems of technology and technique, patronage and economics, transmission and influence. Yet curiously, among the respondents to Levy and Baumgarten's survey number several historians of the period, both fresh and established, for whom the term is useful in their teaching—even if it remains problematic for their research. To quote Luisa de Moura Sobral, its use is regularly regarded as being limited to 'titles of books, lectures and university courses'.2 Baumgarten argues the converse, that 'the term Baroque is one of the founding terms of art history as a discipline'—by exercising it one comes close to the field's fundamental intellectual and methodological problems.3 Around these two positions a basic issue concerning the baroque begins to coalesce.

For all its problematic complexity as a term of historical scholarship concerning the architecture of the long period spanning from 1580 (the date on which Heinrich Wolfflin famously assumed he would find consensus among his peers) to the 1770s or 1780s, there remains a set of core formal, aesthetic and semantic values accruing to the term as applied to (or better, found within) the body of historical architecture. It has been used to describe at any given time—a different set of buildings for Wolfflin in the 1890s than for Christian Norberg-Schulz in the 1970s, as we would expect.4 There remains, too, a number of key chronological markers of varying degrees of importance to the delineation of those artistic values insofar as they bracket the baroque as a coherent phase of architectural history, even if any chronology will appear inconsistent across such geographical fields as France, Italy, Bohemia, Portugal, Mexico or Brazil.

These would merely be questions of frame and method, matters for the history of architectural historiography, were we not to find that among those fundamental intellectual and methodological problems invoked by use of the term baroque were the relationships of architecture to its history, of architectural design to architectural historiography, and of the architect to the historian. The lexicon, values and ambitions of modern architecture have regularly drawn from the baroque as it has been presented by modern (and modernist) historians of architecture—a general historiographical mechanism that has proven important for defining the nature of architecture's recent engagement with its history.5 Such modern themes as mass, movement, plasticity and space, empathy, expression, criticality and so forth have drawn from studies of the baroque by architects and historians and critics of art who were ignorant neither of the place of modern architecture in history nor of the concerns and ambitions of modern architects. It is possible to demonstrate that historical knowledge of baroque architecture—constructed with a high degree of fluidity since the first instances of its systematic study in the 1890s—can be found to figure in the debates and works of the anti-historicist architecture of the fin de siècle, in the debates concerning functionalism and expressionist modernism alike, in their post-war humanist reconciliation, in the rise and fall of both post-modernism and the neo-avant-garde. A recent spate of books and events concerning the historicity and characteristics of what some have termed the 'neo-baroque' in architecture and in other arts have again invoked this trans-historical rotation and the possibility of the recurrence of super-historical values given their first full expression in the late-sixteenth and seventeenth-century architecture of Rome.6 By observation or invitation, these have exposed to fresh analysis a pattern of reception, adaptation and uptake in the twentieth-century critical fortunes of baroque architecture.

Ours is not, however, the first moment to appreciate this relationship. We can find an early attempt to understand the role of baroque architecture and its historiography in the development of modern architecture in the book Barocco nell'architettura moderna, written by Gino Dorfles and published in 1951.7 In this paper I wish to position Dorfles's book as an overlooked model for engaging with the twentieth-century afterlife of the historical European baroque—a book that recognizes the intertwined state that architecture and its historiography have long enjoyed. Barocco nell'architettura moderna treats the baroque as a trope against which (Italian) critics of contemporary (Italian) architecture might measure the work of their moment. It lays bare the complex intersection of artistic forces and tendencies that had gathered around the term baroque at that time, figuring historiography and its reception into the story of what Dorfles describes as the 'neo-barocco'—a term encompassing all modernist works that recall or resonate with the historical (and aesthetic) baroque such as it is known and interpreted by modernist historians of art and architecture. Dorfles understands that the historian had long served as an active agent in shaping the nature and implications of the modernist works and theory that he calls 'neo-baroque'; this awareness he reflects in the structure of his case, each part of which I will consider in turn.

Defining the Neo-Baroque

Section One, entitled 'Per una nuova concezione plastico-spaesiale dell'architettura' (Towards a New Plastic-Spatial Conception of Architecture) engages the legacy of Heinrich Wolfflin through one of the first historians to activate the ideas of his contemporary August Schmarsow concerning space and its apprehension (over Wolfflin's preoccupation with mass and movement), namely Albert Brinckman in his 1917 book Barokskulptur.8 In Dorfles's view, Brinckman is the first historian of the architectural baroque to deploy the synchronic overlaps of spatiality and plasticism in the period's historiography, thereby establishing the terms on which the baroque foreshadows the modern: in the first instance as a developed exploration of spatial modeling and spatial modulation; in the second, as a mature command of those same values.9 Dorfles addresses the question of whether or not baroque can be understood as an a-temporal form, existing outside of historical time, as it would appear to do for Henri Focillon. Dorfles favours treating the baroque as an historical phenomenon, as a stylistic and iconographical epoch that emerged from specific conditions and was manifest in different ways in different places over a period of two centuries.
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He dismisses the 'felicie and arbitrary parallelism' to which many writers of his moment were drawn, under which anything can be made to appear connected to almost anything else under the most loose formalistic criteria. The formal recurrence of the baroque in the twentieth century is difficult to document along lines other than arguable similarity. It is one thing to admit the co-existence of various styles in various places, but quite another to allow that one style might exist in many places at many times under quite different social and technological circumstances. This is Dorflies's main contention with Foucault's Le vis des formes (1934) and its insistence on the autonomous and mobile existence of formal laws. What, then, is the nature of the recurrence that Dorflies is prepared to call neo-baroque?

He proposes that we can find a return to certain 'baroque constants' in the post-war era that relate to the 'spiritual' state of man and society. Baroque is not a form given licentiously at one time, but a form given licentiously at any time (as he understands a licentio to claim); nor is it a perpetually recurring son (as Eugenio D'Ors has it), decontextualised from any historical and geographical specificity. It is, however, in relation to an historical, artistic, particular baroque that one can speak either of its diffusion or of its return as a neo-'form'. In Dorflies's estimation, D'Ors succumbs to the temptation to regard any 'curved', non-rectilinear, asymmetric, disordered, romantic, or nebulus architecture as baroque, which Dorflies teasingly translates into a basis for treating 'baroque' as a highly mobile generic 'archaicus, romaneus, buddicus, palaeagrus, gothicus et disordus.' Instead he proposes an internal baroque toology for architecture that meets an ideal set of technological and social conditions in the mid-twentieth century. He identifies a continual experimentation with aesthetic concepts and with the limits of artistic creativity first given complete expression in the seventeenth century with the work of Gianlorenzo Bernini, Francesco Borromini, Guarino Guarini and Johan Balthasar Neumann. Against form and son he isolates the return to baroque 'patterns' as the basis of a neo-baroque architecture that fully accounts for the new possibilities of knowledge, materials and methods of construction in the twentieth century. In this sense Dorflies claims a greater fidelity to history in his neo-baroque than in the architecture of Alvar Aalto, the scuplture of Jean Arp and Henry Moore, the painting of Juan Miró and Wadsily Kandinsky, and the music of Alban Berg and Béla Bartók.

Especially light in the new possibilities of reinforced concrete, the neo-baroque engages the limits tested in the seventeenth century as they concern the play of constructive masses, the boundaries of verticality and horizontality, the possibilities of three- and four-dimensionality (movement)—the characteristics, in other words, isolated by Wölfflin of the perfect ground of the baroque, but now confronted by new social and technological conditions allowing its practitioners to pursue novelty to a new extent. The baroque, therefore, and the neo-baroque in its wake, rest less on the formal possibilities of particular materials than upon the capacity to operate at their technological and conceptual limits. As for the historical baroque working at the limits of marble and plaster, so too for the modern neo-baroque working at the limits of ferro-cement, steel and glass—and even light.

This neo-baroque is not, however, a simple matter of materials. It also rests on the recurrence of the social theme, again given full expression in his version of seventeenth-century culture, concerning the individual's 'conflicted' relation to society.

Architecture is the social art par excellence of both epochs, in which can be clearly read the crises, aspirations, symbolic systems, and structures of society—both baroque and modern. The baroque, argues Dorflies, tracks the rise of the individual and the modernist tension between the cosmos and the monument, between the house and housing, is a crucial predicate for an artistic neo-baroque given expression in architecture.

Next, Dorflies contrasts the great monuments of the nineteenth century with the new monumental possibilities of the twentieth: Joseph Paxton's Crystal Palace (1851), the Eiffel Tower (1889), the Hamburg Central Station by Heinrich Reinhart and Georg Sößenguth (1900-1906), Eugene Freyssinet's Airship Hangars at Orly (1916-1923), and the Buildings at Antoni Gaudí, Hans Poelzig and Peter Behrens all demonstrate a commendable agreement of their individual parts to monumental effect, Wölfflin's abstract definition of classical linearity. The capacity for harmony he observes in these works does not add up to the greater effects of concinnitas and of unity in monumentality that could be found in the work of a later generation of architects who advanced those earlier achievements: the Chihilis (Hamburg, 1922-1924) by Fritz Höger, the Goetheanum by George Steiner (Dornach, 1913-1919), the Bauhaus by Gropius (Dessau, 1925-1932), Erich Mendelsohn's Einstein Tower (Potsdam, 1919-1921), and Aalto's Baker House at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1947-1949). Dorflies disagrees with Wölfflin's judgment of the baroque as an age of decadence and decline, but he does so while deferring to Wölfflin's own aesthetic proclivities. Dorflies proposes that Wölfflin left us all the tools we need to understand how a historical baroque might return in the domain of contemporary architecture as a neo-baroque. The play of masses, the effect of movement, the monolithic character, the irregular distribution of plastic forms: all establish a capacity, realised in the historical baroque of which Wölfflin wrote, for rhythm, motif and counterpoint. Dorflies adds a rider to this definition, specifically that those characteristics and qualities that reside in form necessarily respond to the social and intellectual contexts of architectural invention.

Where Wölfflin turns to the analogy of architecture to music, Dorflies proposes that two other intersections offer a more pregnant relationship, naming the connections between architecture and history, and between architecture and painting. He represents the former with Giedion's consideration of the 'undulating wall' in Borromini's San Carlo alle Quattro Fontane (1634-1641), tagada 1665-1676), demonstrating the now familiar point that the values against which Giedion analyses Borromini's work correspond to those that inform the work of the modernist masters: Mies, Aalto, Gropius and Le Corbusier. Giedion deploys a contemporary concept of spirituality in order to show how the spatial consciousness and formal invention of the baroque age relates to the modernist exploration of space and of building form as mass. From one direction it is easy enough to allow for the over-exertion of Giedion's appreciation of the Zeitgeist and the responsibilities its recognition places upon the historian. From another, it seems that for the baroque to recur in twentieth-century architectural culture as a neo-baroque, such histories as Giedion's Space, Time and Architecture (1941) function to massage its intellectual bedding to render the baroque available to a modernist worldview. Without reaching the modern concepts of space and form back into the architecture of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, the baroque remains locked into a past condition by its historical specificity. Instead, Giedion's account relies on anachronisms that serve a distinct purpose—to open the field of architectural history to the
modern architects as a contextualising move intended to counteract the a-historicism of a generation of architects who demonstrated the historicity of their efforts through a rhetorical rejection of history.22

Alongside a modern historical consciousness, the return of the baroque in post-war architectural culture relies upon the relation of this (historiographically constituted) baroque to a plastico-spatial modernist visuality, which Dorfles next identifies with the 'spatial' underpinnings of cubist painting. Wölflin located the baroque 'effect' with the variation of expressions of movement through the manipulated irregularity of the shifting datum against which the baroque frontage was composed.23 His example is the façade of Santa Susanna, by Carlo Maderno (1565-1603), but Dorfles appreciates its correspondence with the cubist-era work of Le Corbusier, JJP Oud, Gerrit Rietveld, André Lurçat and Robert Mallet-Stevens. As Dorfles puts it, cubism here mediates 'a geometrical-spatial polarisation'.24 This work adds up to a precedent for the neo-baroque in the sense that, informed by the visuality of modern painting, it nascentiates the baroque capacity to playful mould what would later be understood as plastic space and scale, and this in such broad terms as to encompass the functionalist, expressionist and organicist strains of the modern movement.

Dorfles concludes this discussion by identifying three stages in the modernist development of a neo-baroque register. The first is represented by Le Corbusier, Mallet-Stevens and Lurçat, who manipulate space and multiple points of view, playing the fragment off against the monolithic and modulating the 'constructive line'. The second explores the 'plastic exigencies' of modern architecture through the technical mastery of reinforced concrete: Bruno Taut, Mandlesohn, Héctor Guinard—he does so in light of their forebears—Hans Gropius, Victor Baltard, Gustav Eiffel—and the technological gains of this generation underpinning the aesthetic advances realised in the first years of the twentieth century: the realisation of a monumental scale retaining formal unity and legibility, the abolition of interior partitions, the development of Raumdurchdringung between interior and exterior conditions and the manipulation of light as material and value alike.25 These two sets of architects and the work for which they stand comprised two necessary steps towards a modern architecture that would, in light of Dorfles's historical development, open on to the neo-

In Preparation for the Neo-Baroque

The historiographical thesis of Dorfles's book is contained in its first half. The second part of the book, which we will consider with relative brevity, surveys what Dorfles calls the 'preparatory movements' of the neo-baroque. It will be clear by now that what Dorfles calls the 'neo-baroque' largely coincides with the humanist modernism that took hold in the post-war decades, and which opened out on to the formal postmodernism Charles Jencks would champion a generation later. The semantics of this development are murky, to say the least. What Dorfles calls neo-

Dorfles launches into a series of reflections on the various movements, from Art Nouveau (called Liberty in Italy) to the proto-Wright organic functionalism championed by Zevi in Verso un'architettura organica (1945).26 His search is for evidence of the principles of the neo-baroque in the movements spanning from the end of the nineteenth century to his own present moment. If the baroque is so important to the development of modern architecture, he appears to ask, where can we find evidence of a persistent baroque mentality underpinning the work of architects not sufficiently developed to be considered 'neo-baroque'? To the extent that this search is diagnostic, its trajectory seems heavily on Giedion's History of Architecture, a decade beforehand, of the aesthetic predicates Dorfles locates in the work of Brinckmann and of the fundamental work (in turn) of Wölflin and his contemporaries.27 The significance of his approach to the problem of finding those cohesive movements and exemplary individuals for whom the neo-baroque would come to comprise a legacy is that Dorfles understands the neo-

Therefore, when Dorfles presents the architects of Liberty—Victor Horta, Henry van de Velde, Joseph Maria Olbrich, Hector Guimard—he does so in light of their forebears—Hans Gropius, Victor Baltard, Gustav Eiffel—and the technological gains of this generation underpinning the aesthetic advances realised in the first years of the twentieth century: the realisation of a monumental scale retaining formal unity and legibility, the abolition of interior partitions, the development of Raumdurchdringung between interior and exterior conditions and the manipulation of light as material and value alike.25 These two sets of architects and the work for which they stand comprised two necessary steps towards a modern architecture that would, in light of Dorfles's historical development, open on to the neo-

In the same sense, projects by Walter Gropius, Eric Mendelsohn and Rudolf Steiner, each in substantially different ways, show up this chronology. Gropius, for instance, recalls the themes of the individual versus the collective and the limitations of materiality while engaging the major spatial currents in contemporary painting and its theoretical armature.26 Mendelsohn, too, demonstrates the capacity to finely balance 'modern materials' and 'aesthetic concepts' in his expressive buildings.27 Even Steiner's Goetheanum (I and II), which Dorfles lists alongside Mendelsohn's Einsteinturm as 'one of the most curious documents of the art of construction' gives shape to what we might now be tempted to regard as a formal proto-postmodernism: neo-baroque tendencies that would be explored to their full technical and formal extension from the 1970s to the present moment. Dorfles dedicates a number of paragraphs to understanding Steiner's architectural credo, but on the basis of one point in particular he returns his analysis clearly to the devices of baroque composition. As the second Goetheanum is called upon to illustrate, Steiner shows that baroque value of rhythm demands more than attention to geometrical subdivision in realising a neo-baroque modernism. In Steiner's work these enjoy an inter-dependence whereby the
plasticity lends form to rhythm, which in turn lends movement to the harmonious form.\textsuperscript{32}

The work of these architects does not overly participate in a strong genealogy, even if Dorfles's enthusiasm from time to time gives away his wish that they would. It instead adds up to a series of tendencies toward the neo-baroque, repetitions of baroque patterns, all activated by the historiographical and anachronistic mechanics to which Dorfles earlier attended, and given full expression (or so it would seem) in the architecture of the immediate post-war moment.

Indeed, in this moment Dorfles identifies the culmination of a clear desire to "renovate the architectural line" within a wider judgement that the International Style and the functionalism promoted by CIAM had not served society or the art of architecture as well as they might—this notwithstanding the importance Dorfles places on the work of Oscar Niemeyer and Alvar Aalto as signals of a way beyond the modern functionalist position.\textsuperscript{34} This judgment coincides with Bruno Zevi's agenda for an organic architecture, and Dorfles is at pains to seek some correspondence between his neo-baroque and Zevi's organic functionalism, exemplified in the discourse of Frank Lloyd Wright. Dorfles's attention is, however, drawn to Aalto and to the architects of Scandinavian Neo-Empricism, like Erik Gunnar Asplund and Sven Markelius. While endorsing Giedion's enthusiasm for Aalto, Dorfles introduces a correction. Giedion, he says, writes that Aalto "applied the rational-functional to the irrational-organic": it would be more correct, Dorfles counters, to say that he traded one rational approach for another, functional for organic. Aalto, he suggests, abandoned "the abstract and rigid schemes of rationalism to embrace the more sinuous and fantastic modulations of the organic."\textsuperscript{35} Dorfles acts to break the connection between reason and functionalism by arguing that Aalto gives up functionalism, regular geometry and rectilinearity for an organic rationalism that exhibits all the characteristics of his neo-baroque.

Dorfles reinforces this assessment of the emergence of a sustained "organic" response to interwar functionalism by turning next to the regional architectural developments of the American West Coast, of Switzerland, and again of Scandinavia, and in doing so makes no new claims upon a field of examples to which post-war architectural culture would be drawn. He looks, too, at the engineering feats realised in by Eero Saarinen, Carlo Mollino, Pier Luigi Nervi and others who fully explored in their time the plastic properties of reinforced concrete to extraordinary formal effect. In this discussion he also rehauses a series of points and examples that are now familiar to us for being so key to the post-war transitions from inter-war to post-war modernism—and require no further elaboration here.

A Neo-Baroque Architecture?

Dorfles begins his conclusion with a question: "does there exist today such a thing as a neo-baroque architecture?"\textsuperscript{36} His answer is clear and negative. If we were looking for a school of thought, a tendency, or a style worthy of the name, we would come up short. There is no systematic neo-baroque "doctrine." There are, however, tendencies, amorphous impulses, still embryonic, suggesting a "novus ordo" in contemporary architecture. At the risk of proposing a new critical category, Dorfles contends that by regarding modern architecture in its long historical contexts it becomes evident that critics, historians and architects alike (as well as the "pubblico profano") can appreciate parallels between the historical baroque and the contemporary world—parallels that operate beyond coincidence.\textsuperscript{37}

The main task of the interwar period, he asserts, was to wage war with decoration and excesses. This fight was clearly won, and functionalism and its various agencies played a major role in shaping the fortunes of contemporary architecture for those decades. The post-war era constitutes a new "historical, ethical and spiritual" epoch forming an extension of the historical baroque age to the extent that it architecture is not "post-rational" in the same sense that the baroque is not "post-classical". Both extend the architectural traditions on which they are based while responding to shifts in the social, aesthetic and ethical contexts of artistic and architectural practice. So what are the tendencies of which this neo-baroque is comprised? Dorfles tells us: dynamism against the static, plastic against geometrical modulation, humanization and organicity against rigid mechanized and technical aridity, and a new sense of monumentality that binds all of these in unity. The bridge, the factory, the school, the hospital are the new "monuments of a socially and technically progressive age." This forms the activities of the 1940s and 50s would "develop in their pursuit of functional utility those ethical characteristics distinguishable from the construction of the past to become the documents of a new and facet constructive era."

Dorfles finishes on an optimistic note, then, one that he shares with many writers of his moment. This is of some interest for a comparative analysis of post-war commentary on the diminished support for CIAM and the rationalist functionalism it endorses in the inter-war years, but Dorfles activates, for us, a more specific theme. He is largely overlooked among 1950s writers on modern architecture, but he sets up an important precedent for making the commonly drawn comparison of the baroque age to the post-war era. In particular, his work is significant for recognising and testing this historical relationship against both architectural values and the historiography that supports them. Dorfles understands very well how the language and values of modern architecture extend out of those traditions that legitimate it artistic scope and techniques on historical grounds. As in the functionalist rhetoric of a rejection of history, this patrimony is sometimes spurned, just as it is sometimes embraced. Dorfles understands, too, how the language and values of modern architecture had, since the nineteenth century, been mediated by the historiography of architecture, where historians had come to assume the role of the treatise-writer in mediating historical knowledge of architecture for the contemporary architect. For his recognition of this mechanism Dorfles presents us, in Barocco nell'architettura moderna with a poignant, if flawed, model for understanding the place of the historiography of baroque architecture in the development of modern architecture. He thus sheds light on larger historiographical questions, to which architectural discourse is occasionally drawn, concerning the finer operations of historical consciousness and historiographical production within architectural culture.
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