

Formalism and formalized theories of architecture.
Robert Venturi and Roman Mannerism and Baroque

1. Introduction

On the very first page of *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture* (1966), Robert Venturi states his predilection for ‘Mannerist, Baroque and Rococo architecture?’¹ This statement is easily confirmed by even a cursory look at the text and illustrations of the book. Venturi refers to the work of Baldassare Peruzzi, Michelangelo, Palladio, Vignola and Giacomo della Porta. While paying little attention to the architects of the early 17th century, the high baroque masters Gianlorenzo Bernini and Francesco Borromini are given an equally important share of attention, just like the work of Pietro da Cortona. Venturi also incorporates a surprisingly extensive range of late 17th- and early 18th-century Roman baroque, an architectural production that even today hasn’t received the attention it deserves. If, in *Complexity and Contradiction*, Roman and Italian examples are prominent, 17th- and 18th-century architecture from France, England and Bavaria is represented as well; finally, the neo-baroque architecture of Armando Brasini appears twice.²

Together with examples from other periods, especially Modernism, this mannerist and baroque corpus constitutes the primary matter of *Complexity and Contradiction*. From this set of buildings the book extracts the formal principles characteristic of a complex and contradictory architecture, that is, an architecture whose formal richness invites active interpretation. By means of a set of historical and contemporary examples, the book develops a theory of design. Venturi distinguishes two aspects of this design theory, one regarding the medium of architecture, the other the architectural program. Architecture as a medium is the focus of chapters three to five (Ambiguity; Contradictory Levels: the Phenomenon of “Both-And” in Architecture; and The Double-Functioning Element), the architectural program of chapters six to ten (The Conventional Element; Contradiction Adapted; Contradiction Juxtaposed; The Inside and the Outside; The Obligation Toward the Difficult Whole).³ Even so, the distinction between medium and program is not always clear cut, and these eight chapters follow a logical order. I will return to this point below.

This paper examines the role and position of mannerist and baroque architecture in Venturi’s theory of design by proposing a preliminary assessment of his uptake of contemporary views of especially Italian Mannerism and Baroque. Venturi’s interest in Mannerism and (to a lesser extent) Baroque is very explicit, and not confined to *Complexity and Contradiction* (nor to Italian examples, as noted above);⁴ the scholarship on Venturi has frequently drawn attention to the importance of Mannerism and Baroque for his theory and work.⁵ This paper attempts to contribute to this scholarship

by specifying Venturi's notions of Mannerism and Baroque from the perspective of the contemporary historiography of early modern architecture and literature.

It will be argued that Venturi's views of Mannerism and Baroque are indebted to contemporary literary theory rather than architectural history. Venturi adopted the Mannerism and Baroque of authors who more or less closely adhered to the principles of New Criticism, the formalist current in literary theory and criticism that emerged in the USA from the late 1940s onwards. Venturi's indebtedness to New Criticism is well-established, not in the least because *Complexity and Contradiction* explicitly and frequently quotes from New Critical literature. The Preface of the book is built around quotes of T.S. Eliot, one of New Criticism's major voices, and Venturi writes that 'analysis and comparison', proposed by Eliot as tools of literary criticism, 'are valid for architecture too.'⁶ Specific notions central to *Complexity and Contradiction* are indebted to New Critical theory, such as 'the difficult whole', the desirable intrinsic unity of a formally complex work, or the idea that the meaning of a work resides in its specific, particular form, independently from 'external' (contextual) meanings.⁷

If Venturi scholarship has readily recognized his alliance with New Criticism,⁸ less attention has been paid, I believe, to the fact that this alliance could help explain the position and function of mannerist and baroque architecture in the construction of his argument. In the section on Ambiguity of *Complexity and Contradiction*, Venturi recalls how '[i]n literature, too, critics have been willing to accept complexity and contradiction *in their medium*. As in architectural criticism, they refer to a Mannerist era, but unlike most architectural critics, they also acknowledge a "mannerist" strain continuing through particular poets, and some, indeed, for a long time have emphasized the qualities of contradiction, paradox and ambiguity as basic *to the medium of poetry*, just as Albers does with painting.'⁹ [my italics] Venturi here explicitly mentions the literary critics Eliot, Cleanth Brooks and William Empson, but (at least in this passage) confines their area of expertise to the medium of poetry. Yet another literary critic, not cited here but at the outset of chapter 5 of *Complexity and Contradiction* as the source for the notion of the 'double-functioning element',¹⁰ did consider Mannerism as a complex 'form' equally present in all the different arts. The book in question, Wylie Sypher's *Four Stages in Renaissance Style* of 1955, may well be implied in the previous quote, as one of the critics who 'acknowledge a "mannerist" strain continuing through particular poets.' In any case, Sypher himself notes the formative role of early modern literature for modern criticism.¹¹

In this paper, I will single out Sypher's *Four Stages in Renaissance Style* as a point of reference for Venturi's conception of Mannerism and Baroque. The analysis presented here of the interaction between Venturi' and Sypher's work is a first step in what should become a more comprehensive survey of the impact of literary criticism and theory on Venturi's thinking, and the respective contributions of architectural history and literary

theory in the formation of his design theory. Sypher's work seems a legitimate point of departure, since *Four Stages in Renaissance Style* attempted to define the formal principles of literature by constructing analogies with the visual arts and architecture. As such, on the most basic of levels, it must have helped to convince Venturi of the validity of literary critical tools for the analysis of architecture. Moreover, I believe that Sypher's book motivated Venturi to offer a different reading of Mannerist and Baroque architecture and architectural symbolism than the branches of architectural history that were available to him at the time. Venturi himself recalls how his interest in historical, and especially Baroque architecture was at first very much inspired by Siegfried Giedion's *Space, Time and Architecture*, and concerned 'space', not 'symbolism' (this would earn Giedion an explicit dismissal in *Learning from Las Vegas*).¹² When 'symbolism' entered Venturi's view of architecture, his interest shifted from the Baroque to Mannerism. Says Venturi in an interview of 1997: 'In our day we had a bias toward the Baroque and piazzas. And we looked at form and space rather than symbol and meaning. But during my last months in Rome, I realized that Mannerist architecture was what really meant most to me, and I reexamined a lot of Italian historical architecture for its Mannerist qualities. This was important when I came to write *Complexity and Contradiction* in the following years.'¹³ Venturi's 'symbolism' did not imply an interest in the 'meanings' associated with baroque architecture that had become a major concern of the architectural historiography contemporary to the research of *Complexity and Contradiction*. Indeed, the book contains few, if any, hints to the instrumentality of baroque architecture to political or religious agendas. When, for instance, the Baldacchino in Saint Peter's is mentioned – if anything a built symbol of papal authority – it is as 'a room as a space in space.'¹⁴

The symbolism of Mannerism is to both Sypher and Venturi a formalist symbolism, a play with the elements and codes of design; symbolism is inherent to the object, be it a poem or a building, and does not depend on that object's relation with an external world. As Sypher makes explicit, this rejection of context as a source of meaning establishes a fundamental parentage between the different art forms, since they are no longer distinguished by different forms of referentiality.¹⁵ A very similar view of the relation between form and symbolism allows Venturi to distance himself from a programmatic view of architecture (both historical and contemporary) and indeed helps to understand why, in *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*, the distinction between medium and program in architecture is of so little importance. Moreover, it enables Venturi to stress the extent to which design decisions are defined by means of conventions, rules and systems. But this view also leads to a highly specific, and in a certain sense narrow, conception of architectural symbolism, a view that would become broadened and expanded only in *Learning from Las Vegas*.

2. *Venturi in context*

In the preface to *Complexity and Contradiction*, which was written mostly in 1962, Venturi explains what he likes in baroque architecture.¹⁶ His predilection is determined by what he, 'as an artist,' is 'easily attracted' to, namely complexity and contradiction. As an architect 'rather than a scholar', Venturi seeks to understand within this historical architecture 'the inherent characteristics of specific buildings,' 'in the expectation of feeding more amply new sensibilities that are wholly the product of the present.' Venturi proceeds to stress that he is interested in 'talk[ing] about architecture, not around it' and to 'accept architecture's inherent limitations' to 'concentrate on the difficult particulars within it rather than the easier abstractions about it.'¹⁷

This condensed citation of Venturi's declaration of intent implies that *Complexity and Contradiction* has two ambitions. First of all, Venturi wants to talk about architecture, that is to say, he wants to engage with buildings and not their social, religious or even historical contexts. Second, architecture is examined in order to discover the design principles that Venturi finds appealing and employs in his own work, specifically complexity and contradiction. These two ambitions intersect on Mannerist, Baroque and Rococo architecture. It is suggested not only that these forms of architecture are complex and ambiguous, but also characterized by particularity and a resistance to the kind of abstraction that would occur for instance through contextualization. The immanence of 'baroque' buildings both invites analysis and defies generalization. In sum, Baroque and Mannerism trigger the kind of critical activity defined by T.S. Eliot and quoted by Venturi in the opening paragraph of his book, 'the labor of sifting, combining, constructing, expunging, correcting, testing.'¹⁸

This appreciation of Mannerist, Baroque and Rococo architecture is seemingly clear cut and self-contained: Venturi writes about this architecture because it provides him with insight into his own work and ultimately himself. As *Complexity and Contradiction* explicitly acknowledges, however, external factors shaped Venturi's interest in these architectures as well. Venturi gathered first hand knowledge of Roman Mannerist and Baroque architecture as a Rome Prize winner at the American Academy in Rome in the years 1954-55. As Venturi himself recalls, he was greatly assisted by the architectural historian Richard Krautheimer, who acted as a generous mentor to the fellows of the American Academy and willingly shared his vast knowledge of Roman and Bavarian baroque.¹⁹ Krautheimer, whom Venturi thanks in the second edition of *Complexity* (repairing an omission in the first print),²⁰ undoubtedly provided Venturi with a more thorough knowledge of this part of architectural history than was readily available to the non-specialist and even to the specialist; after all, Rudolf Wittkower's *Art and Architecture in Italy 1600-1750*, a groundbreaking synthesis that would shape architectural history of the baroque until today, was published only in 1956, after Venturi's stay at the

American Academy, and Paolo Portoghesi's *Roma barocca* would appear in 1966, the same year as *Complexity and Contradiction*.

It remains to be seen, however, whether Krautheimer contributed more to Venturi's notion of the baroque than by providing expert access to a by then not yet fully charted corpus of buildings. In the early 1960s, Richard Krautheimer was already an eminent architectural historian. While he apparently taught a course on baroque architecture at the Institute of Fine Arts at New York University in the 1950s,²¹ the main body of his publications up to that moment concerned medieval, Byzantine and classical architecture. When Krautheimer did publish on the baroque from the late 1970s onward, his work had little if anything to do with Venturi's view of the same corpus. James Ackerman has rightly characterized Krautheimer's work on the 17th century as 'urban history.'²² For instance, the immensely influential *Rome in the age of Alexander VII* (1989) is a multi-faceted study of the different interventions undertaken by pope Alexander VII in order to understand his instrumentalisation of architecture and urban planning in the construction and propagation of a specific image of the Roman papacy. Krautheimer's architectural history is all about 'attempting to relate architecture to other things,' to paraphrase Venturi's description of what *Complexity and Contradiction* is not about.²³

At the time of Venturi's stay at the American Academy, however, an important volume appeared that attempted to reframe the instrumentality of baroque art in terms that were far more closely aligned with Venturi's. In the introductory essay to a conference volume titled *Retorica e barocco*, published 1955, the Italian art historian Giulio Carlo Argan argued that Baroque art was founded in rhetoric.²⁴ While this idea in itself was hardly new, Argan now proposed rhetoric, or rather rhetoricality, as the central feature of all Baroque: the arts assumed the character of a 'technique, a method, a type of persuasion.' In other words, if in Argan's view Baroque is rhetorical, the real centre of Baroque art does not lie in religion or Catholicism, but in its instrumentality itself. This instrumentality is moreover not confined to any particular medium. Its finality, Argan argues, resides in mediating the new and equally complex social structures of the 17th century.

Venturi does not refer to Argan in *Complexity and Contradiction*, nor is there any indication that he knew the essay or found it important; nonetheless, the idea that formal complexity in architecture helps to mediate the complexity of society would surface in *Learning from Las Vegas*, a point I will briefly develop in my concluding remarks. Here it should be noted that Argan's text provides an important contextual element because it indicates where baroque studies in art and architectural history stood at the time of Venturi's stay in Rome. By the 1950s, art and architectural history were less preoccupied with understanding whether or how architecture and the arts operated in subservience to political or religious agendas, than with defining the artistic

principles that were active and important within that context; according to Argan these principles were essentially literary. Still, context mattered, for Argan ascribed the emergence of an ostentatious technicality and rhetorical vigor in expression to specific historical circumstances. His baroque is a function of the 17th century.

3. Venturi and Sypher

Sypher's *Four Stages in Renaissance Style* proposes an entirely different view of the relation between artistic forms and historical era, in a way that actually harks back to early 20th-century art and architectural history, and especially the work of Heinrich Wölfflin. If Wölfflin, according to Sypher, rightly discerned an alternation between Renaissance and Baroque phases in the development of the arts and especially architecture, this binary scheme 'fails to reckon with an intervening form of vision now widely known [among Continental art historians] as mannerism.'²⁵ Indeed, as a contemporary reviewer of Sypher's book noted, 'the great discovery for professor Sypher is mannerism. ... Art historians have sedulously investigated mannerism since the second decade of this century, but this book represents the first attempt to carry their discoveries and principles over to literature.'²⁶

If the category of mannerism had been available in art and architectural history from the early 20th century onwards, Sypher's transposition of the notion onto the field of literature generated a critical apparatus and vocabulary that would feed back into architectural discourse, notably so in *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*. Since *Four Stages in Renaissance Style* came out after Venturi's stay at the American Academy, when he studied Roman architecture *in situ* and discovered Mannerism, but before he wrote the bulk of *Complexity and Contradiction*, it seems plausible that Sypher's book may have helped Venturi to conceptualize his own intuitions and provided one additional point of departure for the architectural analyses that constitute the core of *Complexity and Contradiction*.

It is however less relevant to discuss Sypher's presence in Venturi's book as a possible source (since it is only one source among many), than as an indication of how Mannerism and Baroque architecture operate within Venturi's book, and how that architecture helps to define Venturi's notion of architectural form and meaning. In fact, it could be argued that Sypher's cross-fertilization of literary and art historical discourse (transposing art historical notions from the 1920s and 30s onto literature) draws Venturi back to a view of Baroque and Mannerist architecture as it was held in early 20th century architectural history, most notably by Wölfflin.²⁷ As such, a preliminary reading of *Complexity and Contradiction* against *Four Stages in Renaissance Style* helps to specify the relation of Venturi's theoretical framework to contemporary architectural history and literary criticism.

Sypher's *Four Stages in Renaissance Style* sets out to define a perennial cyclical evolution of artistic forms which develops in four stages:

One might, indeed, say that styles in renaissance painting, sculpture and architecture run through a full cycle of change in which we can identify at least four stages: a provisional formulation, a disintegration, a reintegration and a final academic codification – a cycle roughly equivalent to a succession of art styles or forms technically known as “renaissance” (a term, here, of limited meaning), mannerism, baroque, and late-baroque.²⁸

As already noted, one of Sypher's points is to establish the crucial role of a mannerist phase in this cycle.

[M]annerism in European literature is a perennial overgrowth of ornate, clever, strained, abnormal phrasing that perverts the canon of classic rhetoric. There is mannerism in antiquity, in the Middle Ages, and in the seventeenth century. A cycle of mannerism-baroque-rococo seems to repeat itself during the renaissance and the nineteenth-century...²⁹

This notion of Mannerism finds its way into *Complexity and Contradiction*:

The desire for a complex architecture, with its attendant contradictions, is not only a reaction to the banality or prettiness of current architecture. It is an attitude common in the Mannerist periods: the sixteenth century in Italy or the Hellenistic period in Classical art, ...³⁰

The idea of a ‘perennial mannerism’ wasn’t new by the 1950s, but in Sypher’s work it served to argue the central point of his book, namely that there exist formal ‘analogies’ between works of art in different media of the same period. These analogies cannot be identified with ‘style’, because Sypher argues that forms are always particular to specific works.³¹ To discern these forms, the critic should engage in a close-reading of the very fabric of each artifact, an attitude that Sypher shared with New Criticism. This reading is assisted by a long list of binary terms or oppositions that Sypher defines in the final pages of the introduction to *Four Stages in Renaissance Style*.³² Mannerism then serves to denote the moment when the immanent forms of art lapse into the ‘ornate, clever, strained, abnormal’ etc. As such, Mannerism is clearly distinct from Baroque:

The controlling laws of baroque are especially significant as a counteraction to the dissonant forces in mannerist art; for baroque style openly and *formally* resolves the mannerist tendency in dense masses of material, redundant statement, kinetic energy, an elevated centre of gravity, a broadening and consolidating of the foreground plane, a monumental academic balance, and flashing color and light. Baroque is indeed an extravagant style; but it is no mere explosion. There is a “law for exuberance,” so to speak, and having fixed this point of view, the baroque artist adopts a tactic of first, negation, then strong affirmation, which gives a special illusion of release into “distance” and “infinity.” It becomes increasingly clear that there is no necessary opposition between baroque and academic art, since both academism and baroque obey the same laws of structure.³³

To Sypher, baroque is an art of ‘certainties’; contradiction firmly belongs with Mannerism. Similarly, when Venturi finds contradiction in architecture, he qualifies it as mannerist. As he puts it himself: ‘I reexamined a lot of Italian historical architecture for its Mannerist qualities.’³⁴ Similarly, if Venturi is interested in the British Classicism

of Wren or Lutyens, it is because, to quote Venturi, 'the genius of British Classicism in architecture derives largely from its deviations from the norm.'³⁵ In Mannerism, form acquires meaning because it is the playground of the cunning and dexterous artist.

It is Sypher's treatment of Mannerism that explicitly serves as a source of inspiration to Venturi. He references the '*double functioning of members*' of *Four Stages in Renaissance Style*, to propose 'the double-functioning element' in *Complexity and Contradiction*. Sypher explains the concept in reference to architecture and especially façades in the following passage:

In mannerist façades there is a frank display of illogicality in the frequent *double functioning of members*, particularly where there appears a kind of architectural pun, a single member having a duplex use – a molding, for example, used as a sill. There is also a "principle of inversion" in mannerist façades, for the customary relation of orders is reversed by "permutations" of elements, conflicting directions, shifts in scale, or other overingenious devices that are learned but irresponsible. Often the closed units are not really bounded but placed in doubtful adjustment to the open units.³⁶

Venturi's treatment of the same notion does echo Sypher's, as in the following passage:

The double-functioning element can be a detail. Mannerist and Baroque buildings abound in drip mouldings which become sills, windows which become niches, quoin strips which are also pilasters, and architraves which make arches.³⁷

This phrase is however part of a much more expanded examination of such elements in a vast array of examples that only tangentially touches Sypher's corpus. Moreover, as Sypher acknowledges, his views of Mannerist architecture heavily depend upon Pevsner's *Outline of European Architecture* (still a reference for Venturi, too). But, again, Sypher's reading of Mannerist architecture is less important as a model for Venturi's own historical-critical practice, than as a theoretical framework defining the relation of form to meaning as predicated upon the fact that forms are intrinsically significant.

It is against this background that we should consider Venturi's use of notions like meaning, rhetoric or convention. When Venturi writes that '[t]he vestigial element discourages clarity of meaning; it promotes richness of meaning instead,'³⁸ 'meaning' is entirely generated within a codified system of design, not by means of referentiality or symbolism understood as a form of allegory or metaphor. If 'the function of ornament is rhetorical', this is not – as in Argan – because the ornament is an appropriate technique within a socially determined economy of communication, but because it exceeds the minimum; it is an 'architectural fanfare.'³⁹ This fanfare is 'expressive', 'communicates', incites 'interpretation', yet the sphere of this interaction between a architecture and its beholders is design, not politics or religion.

4. By means of conclusion: Architecture and Meaning

If in *Complexity and Contradiction* 'Mannerism' labels the category of forms that – contrary to orthodox modernist forms – incite an interpretative urge confined to elements and conventions of design, *Learning from Las Vegas*, published in 1972 and

written by Venturi, Denise Scott Brown and Steven Izenour explicitly develops a theory of architectural symbolism that takes into account ‘signs and symbols, denotation and connotation, heraldry and physiognomy, meaning and expression.’⁴⁰ In fact, when it is stated, in dismissal of the Modernist uses of history as exemplified by Giedion, that ‘the symbolic complexities and contradictions of Mannerist architecture were appreciated for their formal complexities and contradictions,’ it is hard not to hear a note of self-criticism. In *Learning from Las Vegas*, Mannerism is hardly prominent as a period or a category, and references to Eliot, Sypher or New Critical voices no longer figure. Yet there are, of course, many and diverse connections between the two books. One particular point, quite central to the final section of *Learning from Las Vegas* seems deeply indebted to a notion of ‘formal symbolism’ as developed in *Complexity and Contradiction* and *Four Stages in Renaissance Style*. When discussing the difficulty of mediating the desires of different actors involved in city planning and social housing, Venturi and his co-authors seem to remember how Mannerist, complex and contradictory forms indeed operate to address the requirements of a complex society:

Irony may be the tool with which to confront and combine divergent values in architecture for a pluralist society and to accommodate the differences in values that arise between architects and clients. Social classes rarely come together, but if they can make temporary alliances in the designing of building of multivalued community architecture, a sense of paradox and some irony and wit will be needed on all sides.⁴¹

¹ I have used the following edition: Robert Venturi, *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*, second edition, NY, MOMA, 1977 (reprint 1998), p. 13.

² Robert Venturi would return to Brasini in ‘Armando Brasini revisited,’ in: Robert Venturi, *Iconography and Electronics upon a Generic Architecture*, Cambridge (Mass.): MIT, 1996, pp. 59-61.

³ *Complexity and Contradiction*, p. 41.

⁴ See, for instance, Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown, *Architecture as signs and systems. For a mannerist time*, Cambridge (Mass.), Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2004, esp. pp. 12-40.

⁵ For instance, Irina Davidovici, ‘Abstraction and Artifice,’ *Oase* 65 (2004), pp. 100-141.

⁶ *Complexity and Contradiction*, p. 13.

⁷ One target of New Critical practice was the paraphrase as a vehicle for interpretation.

⁸ See, for instance, Linda N. Groat, ‘Rescuing Architecture from the Cul-de-Sac’, *Journal of Architectural Education*, 45, 3 (1992), 138-146.

⁹ *Complexity and Contradiction*, p. 20.

¹⁰ *Complexity and Contradiction*, p. 34, n. 27.

¹¹ Wylie Sypher, *Four Stages in Renaissance Style. Transformations in Art and Literature 1400-1700*, Garden City (NY), Doubleday, 1955, p. 5.

¹² Robert Venturi, Denise Scott Brown, Steven Izenour, *Learning from Las Vegas: The forgotten symbolism of architectural form*. Revised edition, Cambridge (Mass.) and London, MIT Press, 1977, p. 100.

¹³ Phillipe Barriere; Sylvia Lavin, 'Interview with Denise Scott Brown and Robert Venturi', *Perspecta*, 28, (1997), pp. 126-145: 127. See also Venturi's writings quoted below in note 19.

¹⁴ *Complexity and Contradiction*, p. 70.

¹⁵ Sypher, *Four Stages*, p. 12.

¹⁶ It should be noted that this preface is not included in the prepublication of sections of *Complexity and Contradiction* in *Perspecta* 9 (1965), pp. 17-56.

¹⁷ *Complexity and Contradiction*, pp. 13-14.

¹⁸ *Complexity and Contradiction*, p. 13.

¹⁹ My thanks to Robert Venturi for his kind elucidations on this point. On Venturi's stay in Rome, see also Robert Venturi, 'Notes for a Lecture Celebrating the Centennial of the American Academy in Rome Delivered in Chicago' and 'Adorable Discoveries When I was a Semi-Naive Fellow at the American Academy in Rome That I Never Forget,' in: Venturi, *Iconography and Electronics*, pp. 47-58. Martino Stierli, 'In the Academy's Garden: Robert Venturi, the Grand Tour and the Revision of Modernism,' *AAFiles* 56 (2007), pp. 42-55.

²⁰ *Complexity and Contradiction*, p. 14.

²¹ The Getty Archives contain: Richard Krautheimer: Lectures on Baroque architecture, ca. 1950. Description: 94 p. Biographical or Historical Notes: Architectural historian. Summary: Notes by a professional note-taker on Krautheimer's course at the Institute of Fine Arts, N.Y.U., containing detailed architectural analyses, bibliographies, etc. Provenance: Given by Howard Saalman to Patricia Waddy. My thanks to Evonne Levy for this reference.

²² See James Ackerman, 'In Memoriam Richard Krautheimer', *JSAH*, 54, 1 (1995), p. 6.

²³ *Complexity and Contradiction*, p. 14

²⁴ G.C. Argan, 'La "Rettorica" e l'Arte Barocca'; and Guido Morpurgo, 'Aristotelismo e Barocco', in: *Atti del III Congresso internazionale di Studi Umanistici: Retorica et barocca*. Fratelli Bocca, Rome, 1955, pp. 33-46. See also Evonne Levy, *Propaganda and the Jesuit Baroque*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 2004, pp. 50-52.

²⁵ Sypher, *Four Stages*, p. 4.

²⁶ Robert Alexander, 'Four Stages of Renaissance Style: Transformations in Art and Literature 1400-1700 by Wylie Sypher', *College Art Journal*, 15, 3 (1956), pp. 279-281.

²⁷ A slightly earlier, yet apparently unrelated, transposition of Wölfflin's methodology onto literature is proposed by Fritz Strich, see for instance his 'Die Übertragung des

Barockbegriffs von der bildenden Kunst auf die Dichtung', in: Rudolf Stamm (ed.), *Die Kunstformen des Barockzeitalters*, München, Lehnen Verlag, 1956, pp. 243-265.

²⁸ Sypher, *Four Stages*, p. 6.

²⁹ Sypher, *Four Stages*, p. 9.

³⁰ *Complexity and Contradiction*, p. 19

³¹ Sypher, *Four Stages*, pp. 5, 17-18

³² Sypher, *Four Stages*, pp. 18-30.

³³ Sypher, *Four Stages*, pp. 184-85.

³⁴ cf. the quote referred to in note 13.

³⁵ Robert Venturi, 'From invention to convention in architecture,' in: Venturi, *Iconography and Electronics*, p. 238.

³⁶ Sypher, *Four Stages*, pp. 124-5.

³⁷ *Complexity and Contradiction*, p. 38.

³⁸ *Complexity and Contradiction*, p. 38.

³⁹ *Complexity and Contradiction*, p. 40.

⁴⁰ *Learning from Las Vegas*, p. 100. Venturi himself makes the same point in: Venturi and Scott Brown, *Architecture as signs and systems*, p. 8.

⁴¹ *Learning from Las Vegas*, p. 161.