

Architectural History and the History of Art

A Suspended Dialogue

ALINA A. PAYNE
University of Toronto

It is a sad but inescapable truth that for some time now academic disciplines have been drifting apart, carried along by the energy of their increased specialization. The recent rise in the number of conferences, publications, and exhibitions that attempt to bridge the gaps and that proclaim a new awareness of the merits of crossdisciplinarity is only the paradoxical confirmation of a status quo and the discomfort it has engendered. In this scenario architecture's slow but sure distancing from the center of art history as a discipline is a fact so well known that it requires little restating. One need only think of the session slates for the College Art Association, the International Conference for Art History, or the Renaissance Society of America, or of theme-based conferences like "The Renaissance in the 20th Century" (I Tatti, 1999), where architecture is virtually (and often entirely) absent. Nor is architecture present at the sites where the rethinking of the discipline of art history is in progress. Publications such as the volumes edited by Norman Bryson, Michael Holly, and Keith Moxey (arising from Getty Summer Institutes in Art History and Visual Studies at the University of Rochester) or by Donald Preziosi (*The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology*, 1998), to name only two examples, amply attest to this fact.¹

No one can dispute the fact that some specialization is inevitable and indeed desirable and that, as result of the discipline's growth over the past century, neither publications nor conferences can encompass the whole field any longer. Indeed, the division of the field by media or historical peri-

ods, vividly displayed by the numerous societies gathering ancient (American Institute of Archaeology), medieval (International Congress of Medieval Studies), Renaissance (Renaissance Society of America, Sixteenth Century Studies), architecture (Society of Architectural Historians), and other specialist scholars, is a natural response to a complex condition. However, if the presence of specialized scholarly sites is a positive and inevitable feature of a developed discourse, the absence of dialogue among them is not. To be sure, isolation is problematic in all cases, but that this absence of dialogue should be particularly true of architectural and art history—especially the closer we get to the modern period—calls for an assessment because it reflects on the state of the discipline as a whole and raises some important questions. Is this split a recent phenomenon, or was it built into the very foundation of the discipline? Are its causes methodological, or is it due to the different natures of the objects studied, whose research demands specialized techniques and expertise? What are the consequences of this split for architecture and the academy? And finally, is it endemic, or can (and should) it be checked?

Of course, the gradual withdrawal of architecture from the heart of academic art history should not be read in negative terms only, for if there have been losses, there have also been gains. Thus, in the centrifugal movement that has swept the humanities in the past two or three decades, architectural history has found a second home in the schools of architecture and in the discourses they foster.² Unlike art

history, whose relationship with the practice of contemporary art has remained distant, architectural history has been able to operate in two arenas and so to address a wider audience in a variety of contexts and ways.³

In itself, this development need not have brought about the simultaneous distancing of architectural history from the history of art. Yet both the way a discipline is taught and its location in the university affect its discourse; more importantly, they also constitute important public statements about its aims and thus shape its reception by the academy. In this case, the fact that since the 1970s architecture schools have embraced history once more in their curricula, after a hiatus of several decades, has paradoxically contributed to the fragmentation of the discipline. For example, such an association with the professional schools suggests that specialized expertise is required to engage the study of architecture and raises psychological barriers that often discourage students and scholars from entering the field. The appropriation of history by a profession-driven discourse has also added fuel to the perennial debate on the relationship and location of history vis-à-vis theory and criticism, traditionally the domain of architects since Vitruvius at the very least. The presence of an alternative vantage point from which to examine architecture's past has certainly enriched the discourse, but it has also caused a divide within the field. It is true that in a world that has lost its faith in the Archimedean vantage point of the historian, the separation of history from theory and criticism and their location in different university departments and publication venues is ever more difficult to defend. Yet, old sins have long shadows, and the limitations placed upon the objects of art history at the height of its positivistic self-definition still cause drawn lines within the field.⁴

However, one of the most serious consequences of the reinsertion of history in architecture schools has been the reconfiguration of the modern field. Most often, the history and theory of modernity (variously defined as the period from c. 1750 or c. 1900 to the present) are claimed away from art history departments and are thus separated from the study of architecture of earlier periods. Split between two homes, the discourse of architecture thus loses its unity, and the internal logic of a self-referential art that requires both a synchronic and a diachronic study is obscured from view. This temporal split also effectively severs architecture from the research and teaching of the modern period in the field of art history, yet in the last decades this has been the real growth industry for the academy, and the separation has been a loss for both.⁵

Publication venues have come to mirror and therefore reinforce this split. Important architecture journals such as



Figure 1 Giorgio Vasari, *Cosimo I and His Artists*, 1559. Sala di Cosimo I, Palazzo Vecchio, Florence. Courtesy of the Soprintendenza per i Beni Artistici e Storici, Ministero per i Beni Culturali et Ambientali, Florence

Oppositions (in the 1970s and early 1980s) or *Assemblage* and *ANY* (in the 1980s and 1990s), as well as architecture-oriented presses such as MIT or Princeton Architectural Press and architecture museums such as the Canadian Centre for Architecture or the Deutsches Architekturmuseum in Frankfurt, tend to focus predominantly on modern and contemporary material, both in their collections and in the exhibitions they initiate. While this has substantially increased the visibility of architecture, it has also created a dominant site for modernist architectural scholarship and has developed a readership and a discourse that is increasingly isolated from academic art history.

However, the "continental drift" of disciplines has also had a deeper and more longstanding cause at its origin. A traditional sister art to painting and sculpture, architecture was officially associated with them from the time of the founding of the Accademia del disegno (1563) and was therefore also a component of art history as presented by Giorgio Vasari in his inaugural *Le vite de' piu eccellenti architetti, pittori, et scultori italiani* of 1550 (Figure 1). However, with each generation the definition of architecture has



Figure 2 Jacket cover, Sigfried Giedion, *Bauen in Frankreich, bauen in Eisen, bauen in Eisenbeton* (Leipzig, 1928). Courtesy Archiv S. Giedion, Institut für Geschichte und Theorie der Architektur, ETH-Hönggenberg, Zürich

also changed and consequently also its location within the academy. In a move that accelerated in the nineteenth century, architecture gradually embraced the world of science and technology, so that by the 1930s, to the image of the engineer as culture hero, modernist critics and theoreticians like Sigfried Giedion held up a refashioned architect who had left the world of the Beaux-Arts behind and inhabited that of the social sciences, environmental and urban planning, and industry (Figure 2).⁶ Inevitably this shift in the definition of architecture also affected history writing, even when the scholars themselves were not campaigning for a cause and even when the object of their study was not modernity. It affected the questions asked, the projects chosen, the vocabulary used.⁷ Although in the 1960s architects initiated a radical revision of earlier modernist agendas, the growing autonomy of architectural discourse was further reinforced. To check a functionalism run riot meant redeeming history (as memory) for the practicing architect;

but the path to the development of such a discourse did not lead to art history.⁸ Studies of typologies, the columnar orders, mass culture, tectonics, materials, the vernacular, urban issues, and professional tools and processes took precedence over the issues of style and iconography that loomed large in art-historical studies and thus signaled a divergence of interests.⁹

It cannot be denied that the modern redefinition of architecture and history's location within it has broadened our spectrum of concerns and even contributed to the discipline's health and growth by expanding its field of action. However, the realignment of architectural history within the academy has also resulted in a real breach in the discourse—not an outward breach, but a fissure, more serious because not immediately apparent. Split between fields, architectural history appears to be a conflicted academic terrain and thus it mystifies students and scholars alike. In a world of diminishing resources such a perception has also had less intellectually based (but more dangerous) repercussions. At a moment when art history departments have embraced non-Western cultures, contemporary art, and historiography, new positions in these fields are not created but are reassigned away from the traditional core. In such a zero-sum game architectural history has often been the loser. With twentieth-century and contemporary architecture firmly located in the professional schools, one or at most two architectural historians are deemed sufficient for most art history programs to add what remains essentially a lateral perspective on a predominantly painting- (and less sculpture-) oriented curriculum.

But cultural pressures, university administration trends with their economic and political origins or publication policies, are ultimately only the superficial signs of a deeper rupture. What is more alarming is the absence of architecture from the core of art-historical inquiry, or, better put, the absence of conversation and a shared problematic between the two fields.¹⁰ This has not always been the case. At the turn of the century, when the historical study of art became established as an academic discipline, architecture made a substantial contribution to the ways art historians set out to interrogate the past. Indeed, architecture played a prominent role in the imbrication of *Stilgeschichte* (history of style), *Geistesgeschichte* (intellectual history), and *Kulturgeschichte* (cultural history) that shaped art-historical discourse in the first decades of this century. Thus Alois Riegl took architecture as his departure point in establishing the concept of *Kunstwollen* that revolutionized the discipline of art history (1901);¹¹ and Dagobert Frey in his *Gotik und Renaissance als Grundlagen der modernen Weltanschauung* (1929) and, even more famously, Arnold Spengler in his

Untergang des Abendlandes (1918) used conceptions of space as a historical ordering device.¹² Similarly, it was to architecture that Heinrich Wölfflin turned in the 1880s when he translated theories from aesthetics and psychology into his own seminal empathy concept.¹³ From Bernard Berenson's "tactile forms" (1896) to Wilhelm Worringer's "abstraction and empathy" (1908), the notion swept the visual arts, affecting both historical scholarship, connoisseurship, and the course of art making itself.¹⁴

There was also a more *sachlich* (objective) trend to the inaugural scholarship of the discipline. Works by Heinrich von Geymüller or Hans Willich and Paul Zucker on the Renaissance, for example, or the pioneering architectural archaeology of medieval historians fall more readily into the category of *Baugeschichte* (building history).¹⁵ This direction was more akin to that of classical archaeology, itself notoriously difficult to locate in the academy. Yet, though *Baugeschichte* survived and blossomed in architectural scholarship and added to the perception of architecture itself as a technically intensive discipline, it also was the fountainhead of much art-historical methodology. In the years that saw the fledgling discipline of art history attempting to position itself within the academy as *Kunstwissenschaft* (science of art), the technical rigor of architectural scholarship, well established since the mid eighteenth century, was particularly appealing.¹⁶ Art historians Adolf Goldschmidt and Wilhelm Vöge, who trained Erwin Panofsky, Rudolf Wittkower, and others of their generation, started their own research careers with the study of medieval architecture. The *Baugeschichte* tradition of careful firsthand study of monuments was translated by them into an art-historical methodology that paid close attention to documents and primary sources and shaped the field for generations to come.¹⁷

Architecture also played an important role in the fine-tuning of historical/stylistic periodization that preoccupied scholars from the 1920s onward. The amorphous "classical period" that stretched from the dawn of the Renaissance to the eighteenth century and beyond was gradually broken up into periods distinguishable by their apparent stylistic unity. In order to confirm their validity, it was imperative to show the Hegelian *Zeitgeist* (or, alternatively, Riegl's *Kunstwollen*) at work and thus to find similar characteristics and trends across the arts. A case in point is the invention of Mannerism as an intermediary phase between the Renaissance and the Baroque. Proposed for the mimetic arts by Walter Friedländer and Max Dvorak (1922), Mannerism was also shown to have affected architecture by Pevsner (1925) and Wittkower (1930s).¹⁸ Thus established, its application could then be expanded to include all aspects of culture and serve

as a fixed coordinate in its historical unfolding.¹⁹ Although Mannerism was ultimately found to be unhelpful for the study of architecture and was in effect discarded as a central concern, architecture had played its part in establishing an important category for art-historical research.²⁰ The definitions of Baroque, Neoclassicism, and Rococo were reached by way of a similar cooperative effort between architectural and art history—the proliferation in the 1960s of books on these period styles marks its apogee—before each field went on to refine its respective applications.²¹

Finally, the vocabulary of art history itself, its lexical field, is partly indebted to architecture. The prominence of the monument as object of study and the ensuing categories for its analysis stem from a tight imbrication of discourses that goes back to Johann Joachim Winckelmann and the classical tradition that he inherited. Since bodily qualities were understood to constitute a bond across the arts, categories developed initially for the analysis of sculpture traveled easily to architecture.²² The impulse to privilege the monument and its features could find no better home, and it is here that much of the critical vocabulary to describe it was developed, sharpened, and refined. Reabsorbed into the larger discourse of the visual arts, it furnished the field with a critical/analytical language that bespoke a shared problematic and invited exchanges among fields.

Architecture's early use of photography offered a visual counterpart to this verbal orientation toward the monument. Architectural photography itself was an offshoot of a preservation campaign, particularly that of the *Monuments historiques* with its focus on the medieval French heritage. However, photographs such those by Edouard Baldus that recorded, aestheticized, isolated, and monumentalized buildings institutionalized a genre of representation that survived in the ubiquitous art history slides and thus affected the very tools with which the field was studied and the lens through which the art objects were seen.²³

However, if in the first half of the century architecture and art history were at work on a common project, their paths soon diverged. Over the subsequent decades other issues took over the attention of the art history academy: among them iconography and style held pride of place, and from the later 1960s on social history and linguistic theory have also much affected its course. In the last two decades iconography has been recast into image theory and visual/verbal issues,²⁴ and the cultural "other" (as defined in gender and colonialism studies)²⁵ along with historiography have joined a renewed panopticum of art-historical concerns.²⁶ Yet not all these trends find easy or relevant application to architecture, the exceptions being social, gender, and colonialism issues. In fact, even when concerns such as

these are shared, art-historical research rarely intersects with architectural scholarship.²⁷ Elsewhere, the continued relevance of once shared methodologies has been diverse. Despite a steady stream of patronage studies, the social history of art has lost the leadership role it once held in art history.²⁸ In architecture, however, social history and Marxism in particular have not only furnished powerful models for its historical discourse ever since the 1960s, but they continue to do so.²⁹ As an eminently public art form, more directly affecting social and political behavior than the other visual arts, architecture remains an ideal subject for the application of Marxist and social-history methodologies.

The embrace of wider cultural issues within art history has also led to a sustained effort to reconfigure its discourse (and the departments where it is taught) into visual and cultural studies. Architecture does not fit easily in this expanded field. The painted or printed image can be readily consumed as one among many exempla of material culture, unlike buildings, which are complex, three-dimensional objects that often take generations to build. Such a process unfolding over the *longue durée* causes authorship and period style to recede and consequently makes architecture far less useful as a snapshot of cultural trends and mindscapes.

If image production and reception studies have claimed the lion's share of attention in art history of late, recent work in cultural history on the history of practices—collecting, reading, writing, gifting, scientific inquiry—are now slowly finding their way into the discipline. Yet, here too, architecture and art history are moving on parallel but separate courses. For example, the relationship between science and the arts is dealt with in separate volumes in two recent collections of essays, *Picturing Science, Producing Art* (1998) and *Architecture and Science* (1999), although they share both an editor and similar themes.³⁰

Yet, despite moving on a different course from art history, architecture has not been isolated from the shifts shaping contemporary discourse in the academy. In an intellectual environment where sociology and cultural anthropology have led the way, architecture has figured prominently. However, because of its relevance as a form of cultural "deep structure," it has developed stronger ties with the social sciences. After all, Michel Foucault's seminal first essays took architecture as their departure point: the clinic, the asylum, the prison may have been institutions according to his definition, but what made them apparent and materially present were the buildings in which they were housed.³¹ In these narratives architecture becomes the ultimate document: not only does it represent, but it contains, codifies, and shapes behavior and therefore cultural and social practices. These new perspectives have been very

fruitful for architectural history in giving a new orientation and impetus to building-type studies.³² Yet they have done little to reconnect it to an art history more concerned with the *representation* of society and culture than with the *active agents* of societal change.

Of course, these are only a few instances of a disjunction within the discipline undertaken primarily from a North American perspective; the list cannot even begin to be exhaustive. But they describe a pattern where opportunity and loss stand side by side. On the one hand, art history has developed discourses and tools—particularly relating to representation, image construction, and visual narrative—that architectural history has been less attentive to but which may serve it well; on the other hand, both fields have tended to ignore the exchanges among the arts, the sites that facilitated such exchanges, and their consequences. Ultimately, the slowly widening chasm between architectural and art history does not seem to arise either from any particular technical expertise that they require or from a diversely defined historian's craft (where we find evidence and how we marshal our arguments). The real divide lies in the nature of the objects we study, for they guide what we choose to raise to the status of problem and where we find our conceptual models.

It also lies in our different relationship to the present. "If historical narratives are inevitably freighted with the ideological assumptions of the period in which they are composed, what is the cultural function of history?" This question, raised at the 1999 Getty Summer Institute in Art History and Visual Studies at the University of Rochester, expresses art history's conundrum at the turn of the millennium. For architectural history—that is, for a field that continues to be relevant for the practice of architecture—this question may have an answer: history interacts with the present and its discourses actively, through dialogue, in a Habermasian sense.³³ The history of architectural history shows that the discipline has always been closely tied to the *performance* of architecture: its migration in and out of architecture schools and art history departments has always coincided with upheavals within the profession itself. It is not a coincidence that architectural history entered art history departments in America in the 1940s just as it was eliminated from its traditional home in the schools of architecture; it is also no coincidence that the Society of Architectural Historians separated itself from the College Art Association in the early 1970s, at the very same time when history was reclaimed by the schools of architecture, when journals like *Casabella* and *Oppositions* reasserted the importance of history and claimed an autonomous discourse for architecture, and when the star of architectural history

within art history began to fade. Indeed, it is this fundamentally self-referential nature of architecture that causes the constant reinvention of history in the present and inevitably and productively offers new insights and questions not only for critics and theoreticians but for historians as well. That history *matters* to practice in the present propels us all forward, below the surface of discourse, regardless of whether we work on the Renaissance, antiquity, or the modern period. Perhaps sharing this insight into the workings of our own field with art history could be the beginning of a renewed dialogue at a moment when the discipline stands poised to turn a new page at the beginning of a new millennium.

Notes

1. Donald Preziosi, ed., *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology* (Oxford and New York, 1998); Norman Bryson, Michael Holly, and Keith Moxey, eds., *Visual Theory* (New York, 1991). In this respect, Michael Baxandall's *Patterns of Intention* (1987), which includes a chapter on architecture, is a noteworthy exception.
2. For an account of the phenomenon of history's reinsertion into the architectural school curriculum, see Gwendolyn Wright, "History for Architects," in G. Wright and J. Parks, *The History of History in American Schools of Architecture* (New York, 1990); for a history of architectural history in America, see Elisabeth Blair MacDougall, ed., *The Architectural Historian in America*, Studies in the History of Art, no. 35 (Washington, D. C., 1990).
3. The separation of studio from art history studies within most university curricula testifies to this chasm, as does the absence of a dialogue between criticism and history even when performed by the same scholar. There are exceptions, of course, for example, Craig Owens, *Beyond Recognition: Representation, Power and Culture* (Berkeley, 1992), in which categories of currency in recent art-historical studies are applied to contemporary art.
4. In 1988 Trachtenberg noted that this antagonism impoverishes the field and concluded his review of architectural scholarship with a quotation from James Ackerman: "willingly or not, we [architectural historians] are all in the same boat with the critics and not mere practitioners of a mythical *Kunstwissenschaft*." Marvin Trachtenberg, "Some Observations on Recent Architectural History," *Art Bulletin* 70 (1988): 208–241.
5. There are important exceptions to this pattern, as evident in the work of Rosalind Krauss, Yve-Alain Bois, and Hal Foster or in exhibitions like *Metropolis* (Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, 1992). However, such examples are few and twentieth-century scholarship remains fragmented. See, for example, leading journals like *October* or the interdisciplinary *Critical Inquiry*, where the issues of modern and contemporary architecture are generally missing; similarly, the important Getty Texts & Documents series locates German architectural theory in the intellectual culture of the period though not in that of the other visual arts.
6. Sigfried Giedion, *Space, Time and Architecture* (Cambridge, Mass., 1941); idem, *Mechanization Takes Command* (New York, 1948). The most powerful statement of this idea is to be found in Le Corbusier, *Towards a New Architecture* (1st ed., 1923).
7. For a case study of this phenomenon as it concerns Renaissance history writing and for bibliography on the subject, see Alina Payne, "Rudolf Wittkower and Architectural Principles in the Age of Modernism," *JSAH* 53 (September 1994): 322–342.
8. Seminal for the development of this discourse (especially of historical typology) was Colin Rowe and in the 1960s and 1970s the School of Architecture in Venice, particularly Saverio Muratori, Aldo Rossi, Carlo Aymonino, and Massimo Scolari. See Colin Rowe, "The Mathematics of the Ideal Villa," in *The Mathematics of the Ideal Villa and Other Essays* (Cambridge, Mass., 1976), 1–28 (first published in *Architectural Review*, 1947). A later statement of the importance of history for practice was made by Demetri Porphyrios in his introduction to a volume of *AD* exclusively devoted to the topic: "This experience led me to a growing realization of the need to raise the level of consciousness of the epistemological foundations of the various architectural histories; especially in a period like ours, burdened as it is with ephemeral, ad hoc and surreptitious 'theory-hunting'. Bearing this in mind, it becomes clear that the study of the methodology of architectural history is as important for the non-theoretically oriented designer as it is for the student of architecture himself." Demetri Porphyrios, "Introduction," *On the Methodology of Architectural History. Architectural Design* 51 (1981): 2.
9. For example, see the proliferation of mass-culture-oriented studies that span the spectrum from Robert Venturi's polemical *Learning from Las Vegas* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972) to Richard Longstreth's investigation of new "building types" such as the highway or the commercial strip: Richard Longstreth, *City Center to Regional Mall. Architecture, the Automobile, and Retailing in Los Angeles 1920–1950* (Cambridge, Mass., 1997). The prototypical study for the genre remains Nikolaus Pevsner, *A History of Building Types* (London, 1976). For a comprehensive and still valid review of trends in architectural history scholarship, see Trachtenberg, 208–241.
10. Symptomatic of this situation is the fact that Trachtenberg (as he himself notes) was invited to review all architectural scholarship for the *Art Bulletin* State of Research series because the art historians who reviewed the literature on the individual historical periods had left architecture out entirely: Trachtenberg, 208. Another symptom of the absence of communication between fields is evident in the reference apparatus used by scholars: the works cited in architectural and art history publications rarely intersect even on the occasions when they are published in the same journal.
11. "... aber nicht alle Gattungen sind diese Gesetze [des Kunstwillens] mit gleich unmittelbarer Deutlichkeit zu erkennen. Am ehesten ist dies in der Architektur der Fall und des weiteren Kunstgewerbe, namentlich soweit dasselbe nicht figürliche Motive verarbeitet: Architektur und Kunstgewerbe offenbaren die leitenden Gesetze des Kunstwillens oftmals in nahezu mathematischer Reinheit" [... but these laws [of *Kunstwillen*] cannot be identified with equal clarity in all artistic media. It is most readily apprehensible in architecture and the decorative arts, that is, to the extent that the latter do not develop figure-based motifs: frequently architecture and the decorative arts display the leading laws of *Kunstwillen* with a near mathematical purity.—author's translation]. As a result, Riegl starts his *Spätromische Kunstindustrie* with a chapter on architecture. See Alois Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie* (Darmstadt, 1976; 1st. ed., 1901), 19.
12. Much was owed to neo-Kantian trends in contemporary philosophy. See especially the impact of Cassirer on art-historical inquiry: Ernst Cassirer, *Das Erkenntnisproblem in der Philosophie und Wissenschaft der neueren Zeit*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1906–1908). Schopenhauer's *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung* (especially his concept of *Anschaulichkeit*, of *forma substantialis* as ultimate knowledge, *Erkenntnis*) also marked art-historical discourse.
13. Heinrich Wölfflin, "Prologomena zu einer Psychologie der Architektur (1886)," in *Kleine Schriften*, ed. J. Gantner (Basel, 1946), 13–47. Some of the sources Wölfflin cites are Friedrich Th. Vischer, *Asthetik oder Wissenschaft des Schönen* (Reutlingen/Leipzig, 1856–1858); Hermann Lotze, *Geschichte der Aesthetik in Deutschland* (Munich, 1868); idem, *Mikrokosmos*.

- Ideen zur Naturgeschichte und Geschichte der Menschheit* (Leipzig, 1856–1865); Robert Vischer, *Über das optische Formgefühl* (Leipzig, 1872); and Johann Volkelt, *Der Symbolbegriff in der neueren Ästhetik* (Jena, 1876).
14. August Schmarsow, *Unser Verhältnis zu den bildenden Künsten* (Leipzig, 1903); Wilhelm Worringer, *Abstraktion und Einfühlung. Ein Beitrag zur Stilpsychologie* (Munich, 1908); Bernard Berenson, *The Florentine Painters* (1896); David Morgan, "The Idea of Abstraction in German Theories of the Ornament from Kant to Kandinsky," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 50 (Summer 1992): 231–242; Payne, "Rudolf Wittkower."
15. Hans Willich and Paul Zucker, *Baukunst der Renaissance in Italien* (Wildpark-Potsdam, vol. 1, 1914; vol. 2, 1929); Carl von Stegmann and Heinrich von Geymüller, *Die Architektur der Renaissance in Toscana*, 11 vols. (Munich, 1885–1908).
16. The rigor of early archaeological studies of ancient Greece (e.g., John Stuart and Nicholas Revett, *The Antiquities of Athens*, 1763, or the subsequent *Antiquities of Ionia* published by the Society of the Dilettanti starting in 1797) was picked up into similar archaeological enterprises focused on Roman and later also on medieval monuments.
17. On Goldschmidt's contribution to the discipline, see Marie Roosen-Runge-Mollwo, *Adolph Goldschmidt 1863–1944 Lebenserrinerungen* (Berlin, 1989); on the impact of medieval scholarship at the turn of the century on the discipline of art history, see Catherine Brush, *The Shaping of Art History. Wilhelm Vöge, Adolph Goldschmidt, and the Study of Medieval Art* (New York, 1996). The career of Arthur Kingsley Porter, whose first works were on medieval architecture (1909 and 1915), is an eloquent example of the path that led from architecture to the study of the other visual arts (sculpture in his case).
18. Max Dvorak ("Über Greco und den Manierismus," *Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* I [1921/22]) and Walter Friedländer ("Mannerism and Antimannerism in Italian Painting," *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 47 [1925]); for the place of architecture in this cross-cultural phenomenon, see, for example, Nikolaus Pevsner, "Gegenreformation und Manierismus," *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 46 (1925): 259–285; Rudolf Wittkower, "Zur Peterskuppel Michelangelos" (1933) and "Michelangelo's Biblioteca Laurenziana" (1934), the most comprehensive formulation of the phenomenon as it affected architecture is Manfredo Tafuri, *L'architettura del Manierismo nel Cinquecento Europeo* (Rome, 1966).
19. For example, Gustav-Rene Hocke, *Die Welt als Labyrinth* (Hamburg, 1957); Arnold Hauser, *Der Manierismus. Die Krise der Renaissance und der Ursprung der modernen Kunst* (Munich, 1964).
20. Wolfgang Lotz, "Mannerist Architecture," in *The Renaissance and Mannerism, Studies in Western Art* (Princeton, 1963), vol. 2, 239–246; Ludwig H. Heydenreich and Wolfgang Lotz, *Architecture in Italy 1400–1600* (Harmondsworth, 1974).
21. See, for example, the Penguin series *Style and Civilization*, edited by John Fleming and Hugh Honour, in which appeared Hugh Honour, *Neoclassicism* (Harmondsworth, 1968), and John Shearman, *Mannerism* (Harmondsworth, 1967). Such cross-cultural definitions are still noticeable in the field whenever a period previously conceived as one unit becomes too complex to be defined by one overarching definition. Thus, at the other end of the historical spectrum, the term "postmodernism" was originally coined and defined by Charles Jencks to serve architectural criticism; similarly "deconstruction" (though not a stylistic period) embeds a reference to building (and dismantling) in all the contexts where it is to be found.
22. On the origins and importance of the concept of monument for art history and for architectural criticism, see Anthony Vidler, "The Art of History: Monumental Aesthetics from Winckelmann to Quatremère de Quincy," *Oppositions* 25 (1982): 53–67.
23. See especially Richard Pare, *Photography and Architecture 1839–1939* (Montreal, 1982), and Barry Bergdoll, "A Matter of Time: Architects and Photographers in Second Empire France," in *The Photographs of Edouard Baldus*, exhibition catalogue (New York, 1994), 99–119.
24. Seminal in the area of image theory have been Norman Bryson, *Vision and Painting. The Logic of the Gaze* (New Haven and London, 1983); Jonathan Crary, *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1990); Hans Belting, *Bild und Kult* (Munich, 1990), translated as *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image before the Era of Art* (Chicago, 1994); Louis Marin, *Des pouvoirs de l'image: Gloses* (Paris, 1993); David Freedberg, *The Power of Images* (Chicago, 1989); Victor Stoichita, *L'instauration du tableau* (Paris, 1993). For studies on the imbrication between visual and verbal practices, see especially Michael Baxandall, *Giotto and the Orators: Humanist Observers of Painting in Italy and the Discovery of Pictorial Composition* (Oxford, 1971); Clark Hulse, *The Rule of Art, Literature, and Painting in the Renaissance* (Chicago, 1990); W.J.T. Mitchell, *Picture Theory. Essays in Verbal and Visual Representation* (Chicago, 1996). Scholarly journals like *Word and Image* and *Representations* created in this same period testify to a high-density point of interest in these issues for the field as a whole. A related body of scholarship addressed issues of visual narrative. Trendsetting texts in this area have been: Mieke Bal, *Narratology* (Toronto, 1985; first published 1980); Svetlana Alpers, *The Art of Describing* (Chicago, 1983); and Mieke Bal, *Reading Rembrandt* (New York, 1991).
25. Scholarship in this area was deeply indebted to the work of Julia Kristeva, Homi Bhabha, and Edward Said.
26. Seminal for scholarship in this area was Hayden White, *Metahistory* (Baltimore and London, 1973). For studies on art history, see especially Hans Belting, *The End of the History of Art?* (Chicago and London, 1987), and Michael Ann Holly, *Panofsky and the Foundation of Art History* (Ithaca, 1984), and idem, *Past Looking: Historical Imagination and the Rhetoric of the Image* (Ithaca, 1996).
27. See, for example, the exclusive focus on architecture in volumes like Beatriz Colomina, ed., *Sexuality and Space* (Princeton, N.J., 1992); Diana Agrest et al., eds., *The Sex of Architecture* (New York, 1996); Mark Crinson, *Empire Building. Orientalism and Victorian Architecture* (London, 1996); Jean-Louis Cohen and Monique Eleb, *Casablanca. Mythes et figures d'une aventure urbaine* (Paris, 1998).
28. For seminal studies in this area, see especially Linda Nochlin, *Realism* (Harmondsworth, 1971), and T. J. Clark, *The Absolute Bourgeois: Artists and Politics in France, 1848–1851* (London, 1980). For a statement on the eclipse of social history from current art-historical concerns, see Marc Gotlieb, "Whatever Happened to the Social History of Art?" *Abstracts. College Art Association* (New York, forthcoming).
29. For the impact of social history on architectural studies, see, for example, the Penguin 1960s series *The Architect and Society* edited by John Fleming and Hugh Honour of which James Ackerman, *Palladio* (Harmondsworth, 1968), is an outstanding example. For seminal contributions to a Marxist discourse in architecture, see especially Manfredo Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture* (New York, 1980), and idem, *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development* (Cambridge, Mass., 1976); for Marxism's continued relevance for the field, see most recently Eve Blau, *The Architecture of Red Vienna, 1919–1934* (Cambridge, Mass., 1999). The popularity of Theodor Adorno and the Frankfurt School with architectural theorists and historians is another manifestation of the recognition of the political role of architecture.
30. Caroline A. Jones and Peter Galison, eds., *Picturing Science, Producing Art* (London, 1998); Peter Galison and Emily Thompson, eds., *Architecture and Science* (Cambridge, Mass., 1999). For an example in the reception of culture studies, see Jill Kraye, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Humanism* (London, 1996), which contains no essay on architecture.
31. Michel Foucault, *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Per-*

ception (New York, 1973; first published 1963), *Madness and Civilization* (New York, 1965; first published 1961), and *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York, 1973; first published 1963).

32. See, for example, Chandra Mukerji, *Territorial Ambitions and the Gardens of Versailles* (London, 1997); Sharon Marcus, *Apartment Stories. City and Home in Nineteenth-Century Paris and London* (Berkeley, 1999).

33. See Jürgen Habermas, *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity* (Cambridge, Mass., 1987), 296–298. I am referring to Habermas's theory of the

participant in his critique of Foucault's emphasis on the observer. Habermas attacks Foucault's focus on the reflexive attitude of the subject and argues instead that a performative situation exists, an interaction akin to speech of "reciprocally interlocked perspectives among speakers" and a "reflection undertaken from the perspective of the participant." This position should not be confused with the long tradition of militancy in architecture's historical discourse, of which Giedion and others have been outspoken apologists. See, for example, Giedion, *Space, Time and Architecture*, 5–7.