RUDOLF WITTKOWER

Rudolf Wittkower
1901–1971

WHEN RUDOLF WITTKOWER DIED, at the age of seventy, on 11 October 1971 he was the Avalon Foundation Professor Emeritus in the Humanities at Columbia University. Columbia was the setting for the final chapter of his distinguished and energetic career as an art historian; in the course of that career he transformed our understanding of Renaissance and Baroque art and architecture. A full appreciation of Wittkower's achievement, however, must acknowledge, along with his formidable record of pioneering scholarship, his special talents as educator. A most generous man, large of person physically and socially, he was an ideal teacher, one who inspired confidence in his students through his own demonstrated faith in their ability. With an enormous capacity and zest for work, he was able to conduct his own research and write even as he meticulously organised his lectures and seminars, supervised the research of graduate students and guided their careers, and, as Chairman, led the Department of Art History and Archaeology at Columbia to its position of pre-eminence among international centres of art historical teaching and research.

Born on 22 June 1901 in Berlin, he was the second of four children of Henry and Gertrude Ansbach Wittkower; his family lineage could be traced back to the distinguished Jewish community of eighteenth-century Berlin. Wittkower studied first at the University of Munich and then at Berlin, where he received his Ph.D. in 1923 under Adolf Goldschmidt. His thesis was on painting in quattrocento Verona, then very much art-historical *terra incognita*, and his first publications were

devoted to Domenico Morone and his followers (*Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft*, 1924–5, 1927). Although he was to re-engage the art of the Veneto later in his career, Wittkower's scholarly attention was turned to Rome in 1923 with his appointment as Research Assistant at the Bibliotheca Hertziana. This was to be the site of his early development as an independent scholar; promoted to Research Fellow in 1928, he remained there until 1932. It was at the Hertziana that the major concerns of Wittkower's scholarship took shape — above all, the art of Michelangelo and Gianlorenzo Bernini.

Wittkower's first important project at the Hertziana was the organisation and completion of the monumental Michelangelo bibliography that had been initiated by the institute's director, Ernst Steinmann, some twenty years earlier. Under their joint authorship, *Michelangelo-Bibliographie, 1510–1926* appeared in 1927 as the first volume in the series 'Römische Forschungen der Bibliotheca Hertziana.' It was the younger collaborator's energy and organising intelligence that proved catalytic in bringing this great project to fruition. These were the qualities that Wittkower also brought to the ordering of the Hertziana itself, creating the bibliographies that make it such a hospitable research facility. During these years began Wittkower's engagement with lesser-known Italian sculptors, as he began to write the entries for Thieme-Becker, *Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenden Künstler* (1925–34), and to publish fundamental studies on Camillo Rusconi (1926–7), Alessandro Algardi (1928), Stefano Maderno (1928–9), Melchiorre Caffà (1928–9), Lorenzo Ottoni (1929), and Francesco Mochi (1930–1). Like their subjects, these articles radiated from the creative master at the core of Wittkower's interests, Gianlorenzo Bernini — the artist with whom the scholar was to become most closely identified.

As a necessary foundation for a full monograph on Bernini, Wittkower set out to study the drawings and the working methods of this central figure of Baroque art. His collaborator on the project was Heinrich Brauer, who had written his dissertation on the rich collection of Bernini drawings at Leipzig. Their two-volume *Die Zeichnungen des Gianlorenzo Bernini*, published in 1931, did indeed provide that foundation. Once again, Wittkower found himself pioneering in a field that had been neglected by contemporary art history, or, worse, rejected as unworthy of serious study. (In his preface to the reprinted edition of 1970, Wittkower recalls that Bernard Berenson, upon being shown photographs of drawings by Bernini, confessed to feeling physically ill.) 'Rubens, Caravaggio, Rembrandt, Velasquez and Poussin have

found their interpreters and a larg appreciative public,' Wittkower wrote in the preface to *Gianlorenzo Bernini, The Sculptor of the Roman Baroque* (1955). 'Only Bernini, once the brightest star amongst the great artists of the seventeenth century, still suffers from comparative neglect.' This book summarised only a part of Wittkower's own extensive research on Bernini, which had begun with work on *Die Zeichnungen*. He had already written major entries on Bernini's architectural and planning projects — the Baldachin of St Peter's, the Palazzo Barberini, the Piazza of St Peter's, and the fountains.

Wittkower's commitment to Bernini came to be founded on more than the obligations of historical scholarship, for the very magnitude of the artist's enterprise, the variety of his projects and the energy with which they were undertaken, found a special resonance in the ambition and personality of the scholar. Between the scholar and his subject there seemed a perfect fit (Wittkower's students often noted the physiognomic resemblance of their teacher to the portrait bust of Scipione Borghese carved by Bernini); admiration for the creativity and originality of the artist clearly inspired the art historian.

The triumphal monument of Wittkower's own scholarship, the culmination of his work on the Baroque, was his contribution to the Pelican History of Art series, the volume on *Art and Architecture in Italy 1600–1750* (1958). Here the scholar's creative response to a daunting challenge demonstrates an ambitious reach and precise control worthy of his favourite artist. In this magisterial and beautifully written study (which was awarded the Banister Fletcher Prize) Wittkower organised for the first time an incredible range of art-historical material — painting, sculpture, and architecture. Shaping his complex subject with critical intelligence and methodological awareness, he effectively returned the Italian Baroque to the history of art. Declaring the organisational structure of the book, the table of contents itself is a model of art historical clarity. Establishing the guiding parameters of style, setting the co-ordinates of chronology and geography, balancing centre and periphery, adjusting focus on individual artists and local schools and on the several media and genres, it testifies to the historical imagination and skill of the author himself. (Wittkower's talent for clear historical synthesis informs his chapter on 'The Arts in Europe: Italy' for the first volume of *The New Cambridge Modern History* (1957), a twenty-five page introduction to the High Renaissance in the visual arts remarkable for the intelligence of its vision, its perspective and sense of proportion, and for its precision of expression.)

In meeting the challenge of the Pelican volume, setting forth the rationale for his choices, and acknowledging the implications of the results, Wittkower articulated the principles that guided him as a scholar. These same principles accounted for his success as a teacher, for they reveal the particularly personal dimension of his historical criticism. Within the constraints of format and space, he explained in the Foreword,

> It was necessary to prune the garden of history not only of dead but, alas, also of much living wood. In doing this, I availed myself of the historian's right and duty to submit to his readers his own vision of the past. I tried to give a bird's-eye view, and no more, of the whole panorama and reserved a detailed discussion for those works of art and architecture which, owing to their intrinsic merit and historical importance, appear to be in a special class. Intrinsic merit and historical importance — these notions may be regarded as dangerous measuring rods, and not every reader may subscribe to my opinions: yet history degenerates into chronicle if the author shuns the dangers of implicit and explicit judgements of quality and value.

He went on to make explicit his own judgement of the relative importance of the media in the history he was writing: 'Excepting the beginning and end of the period under review, i.e. Caravaggio, the Carracci, and Tiepolo, the history of painting would seem less important than that of the other arts and often indeed has no more than strictly limited interest — an ideal hunting-ground for specialists and ''attributionists''.' Wittkower recognised that the great achievements of the Italian Baroque, the truly original work, were in architecture and in sculpture, that Italian painting made its real contribution 'in conjunction with, and as an integral part of, architecture, sculpture, and decoration.' 'The works without peer,' he concluded, 'are Bernini's statuary, Cortona's architecture and decoration, and Borromini's buildings as well as those by Guarini, Juvarra, and Vittone. But it was Bernini, the greatest artist of the period, who with his poetical and visionary masterpieces created perhaps the most sublime realisation of the longings of his age.'

Wittkower's first project at the Hertziana, the Michelangelo bibliography, provided another foundation for his subsequent scholarship. In particular, he began to address the problem of Michelangelo as architect, and two articles of fundamental importance followed quickly upon the publication of the bibliography: one on the dome of St Peter's (*Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* (1933)), the other on the Laurentian Library (*Art Bulletin* (1934)). Confronting the problem of Mannerism in

architecture, and countering the Wölfflinian notion of Michelangelo as a Baroque architect, his approach to the Library vestibule combined close measured analysis and interpretive response to the 'ambiguous, conflicting energies' of Michelangelo's creation. 'The Laurenziana,' he concluded, 'stands at the beginning of a completely new approach to architecture. The ideas conceived and carried out here went far beyond anything that other architects dared imagine. Here is the key to a wide area of unexplored or misinterpreted architectural history, and the explanation of much that was to happen in the next two centuries and beyond.' Typically, a bifocal critical vision informed Wittkower's approach, as he looked beyond the object of his immediate investigation to discern the larger field of its situation and to plot the dimensions of further inquiry.

Wittkower left the Hertziana in 1932 to assume a temporary position as lecturer at the University of Cologne. The following year he, his wife, the former Margot Holzmann (whom he had married in 1923), and their son Mario (born in 1925) left Germany for England. His father having been born there, Wittkower could claim British citizenship. The move was, of course, part of that larger wave of intellectual migration inspired by the rise of National Socialism. With the transfer of the Warburg Library from Hamburg to London in 1934, Wittkower found a new centre for his scholarship; he was appointed by the director, Fritz Saxl, to an unsalaried position at what was to be known as the Warburg Institute, with which he was to remain affiliated, as research member and lecturer, throughout his career in London. The new situation offered Wittkower a new set of challenges and opportunities as he turned to the kinds of broad iconographic problems that had inspired Aby Warburg and informed the organisation of his library. The first volume of the *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* (1937–8) carried four articles by him that mark this new direction in his work and attest to his expanding range: 'Patience and Chance: The Story of a Political Emblem'; 'Physiognomical Experiments by Michelangelo and his Pupils'; 'Miraculous Birds, 1. "Physiologus" in Beatus Manuscripts; 2. "Roc": An Eastern Prodigy in a Dutch Engraving,' and 'A Symbol of Platonic Love in a Portrait Bust of Donatello.' Indeed, the early volumes of the journal are filled with articles by him on an impressive array of subjects, from the 'Marvels of the East' through symbolic motifs in the classical iconography of the West to problems in the history, style, and iconography of architecture.

The Warburg library led Wittkower's curiosity beyond the traditional borders of European art history and iconography, especially to Egypt and the Near East, as he studied the migration and interpretation of symbols. As at the Hertziana, so here too did he lay the foundations for future research, much of which would be presented in lectures and in his teaching — and only published posthumously in a volume of selected lectures, *The Impact of Non-European Civilizations on the Art of the West* (1989).

Still, at the core of Wittkower's interests remained the problems generated by his early projects on Michelangelo and Bernini and his engagement of the figures and monuments of the Italian Baroque. In 'Carlo Rainaldi and the Roman Architecture of the Full Baroque' (*Art Bulletin* (1937)), perceiving a revival of certain Mannerist tensions, he, explored 'the problem of orientation in centrally planned buildings' and extended the inquiry to include buildings by Bernini, Cortona, and Borromini. Then, as he traced it back to its earlier articulation in Renaissance architectural practice and theory, the theme provided the first part of what was to become perhaps Wittkower's most broadly influential book, *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism* (1949; rev. ed., 1962). In the Warburg journal he had already published 'Alberti's Approach to Antiquity in Architecture' (1940–1) and 'Principles of Palladio's Architecture' (1944, 1945), which would comprise the two core parts of the book. The final part was the most ambitious, 'The Problem of Harmonic Proportion in Architecture.'

'When this book first came out,' Wittkower wrote in the introduction to the American edition (1971), 'it was unexpectedly given a very friendly reception. To my surprise it caused more than a polite stir'. Sir Kenneth Clark wrote in the *Architectural Review* that the first result of this book was ''to dispose, once and for all, of the hedonist, or purely aesthetic, theory of Renaissance architecture,'' and this defines my intention in a nutshell.' *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism* did indeed establish an entirely new foundation for our understanding of Renaissance architecture. Wittkower had set out to dispel the notion that this art, inspired by the pagan forms of classical antiquity, was essentially profane and unfit for a truly Christian culture. He cited Ruskin's moralising criticism of an architecture 'pagan in origin . . . in which intellect is idle, invention impossible, but in which all luxury is gratified and all insolence fortified' (*Stones of Venice*) and Geoffrey Scott's hedonistic defence of it as 'an architecture of taste, seeking no logic, consistency, or justification beyond that of giving

pleasure' (*The Architecture of Humanism*). Wittkower demonstrated instead that Renaissance architecture, like every great style of the past, was based on a hierarchy of values culminating in the absolute values of sacred architecture.' He insisted that 'the forms of the Renaissance church have symbolical value or, at least, that they are charged with a particular meaning which the pure forms as such do not contain. Both the theory and the practice of Renaissance architects are unambiguous in this respect.' Through Wittkower's probing studies, then, the sacred purpose of this architecture was redeemed and the probity of its designers reaffirmed.

Wittkower's recourse to the theoretical writings of the Renaissance, his search for the articulation of values and the justification of practice, came with his own distance from the monuments themselves. Closer to library resources than to the buildings during these years, he himself found new rhetorical purpose in his research: to define and defend the architectural culture of the Renaissance, to establish the principles and aspirations of its architects. In so doing he effectively returned the art to its culture. Renaissance architecture could be seen in its highest ambition as a grand imaginative effort to reconcile the nobility and commensurability of classical form with the purity of Christian purpose — the equivalent in stone of a *theologia platonica*.

However much Wittkower developed his thesis on the basis of Renaissance theory, his critical vision remained focused on the kinds of practical problems faced by designing architects, above all in their effort to understand ancient Roman architecture and adapt its forms to new ends. By focusing on problems like the adaptation of the freestanding classical column to a wall architecture or of the classical temple front to the façade of a Christian basilica, he reformulated both the precise professional issues and the larger cultural dynamic. The creative response was what interested him, the effort of the Renaissance architect to understand the past in light of the present and its immediate needs. Wittkower recognised in the architecture the kind of creative dialogue with classical antiquity that lies at the very core of the Renaissance as an historical and cultural phenomenon.

Like Alberti, Palladio was a publishing architect, and Wittkower's exploration of his culture led to a remarkably wide range of relevant issues: from the social making of the architect and his professional status, architectural patronage and cultural tradition, to the geometry of planning and the phenomenology of architectural experience. Each section of 'Principles of Palladio's Architecture' opened a new path for

further exploration. In the investigation of harmonic proportion in architecture, Wittkower confronted the practice and theory of architectural imagination and signification. Following the mathematical traditions of architectural theory and practice, he demonstrated their powerful hold on Renaissance thought and shaping influence on Renaissance culture. Palladio, in particular, proved responsive to developments in musical theory, and the proportions of certain of his buildings deliberately declared their consonance with the larger, Pythagorean order of the universe. Although subsequently questioned by a more materialist and less idealising generation of architectural historians — students more interested in the socio-economics of building patronage than in the architect's imagination and inventiveness — Wittkower's findings have been vindicated by recent sophisticated mathematical analysis of Palladio's designs.

Studying the 'optical and psychological concepts' underlying Palladio's church of the Redentore, and extrapolating from his own experience and analysis of its space, Wittkower discerned the operations of a 'scenographic' principle in this architecture. It is this experiential dimension that gives special force to his critical account, which articulates the viewer's own mobile encounter with architecture. From such deep understanding of Palladio, Wittkower traced the further development of this scenographic approach to the greatest Venetian monument of Baroque architecture. His analysis of Longhena's S. Maria della Salute (*Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* (1957), and *Saggi e memorie di storia dell'arte* (1963)) alerted us to a continuing tradition in Venetial architecture, one based on the articulation of space as the controlling element in a design intended to be felt by eye and body.

Students in Wittkower's courses on English architecture recall the enthusiasm with which he narrated his explorations of architectural space; the image of this large man climbing the narrow steps into Wren steeples confirmed in the most human way this scholar's personal responsiveness to the works that he studied with such energy and delight.

Wittkower's involvement with English art was, of course, a direct consequence of his move. Cut off from direct contact with the Italian monuments that had commanded his attention, he quickly took advantage of new opportunities offered. In 1941, with the great art collections of England in safe hiding and the Warburg Institute itself transferred out of London, he and Saxl organised a travelling exhibition of photographs devoted to British art and its roots in older cultures of the Mediterranean; Wittkower prepared the sections on the post-medieval

period. The images and accompanying explanatory texts were published as a book after the war, *British Art and the Mediterranean* (1948; reprint 1969). It was indeed this exploration of the Mediterranean roots of art in England that led to his first publication on the Palladian tradition, 'Pseudo-Palladian Elements in English Neo-classical Architecture' (*Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* (1943)). Sensitive to the migration of forms, he outlined the emergence of an English style out of the transformation of Italian motifs — what we might today call creative misprision. He went on to publish studies of Inigo Jones, Lord Burlington, and William Kent.

The collections and libraries of England afforded Wittkower new fields for exploration. From his early experience working on Bernini, he expanded to make the art of drawing a special area of his expertise, especially, of course, Baroque drawings. In 1937 he collaborated with Tancred Borenius in writing the catalogue of the collection of old master drawings formed by Sir Robert Mond. He also collaborated with Anthony Blunt on the preparation of the first two volumes of Walter Friedlaender's *The Drawings of Nicolas Poussin* (1938, 1949). At Windsor Castle he sorted out the problems of the Carracci drawings, laying the foundation for our understanding of the three different hands of the two brothers and their cousin. *The Drawings of the Carracci in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen at Windsor Castle* (1952) provides a model of modern connoisseurship, rich in both critical observation and art historical scholarship.

Connoisseurship was not an end in itself for Wittkower. His interest in drawings was an integral part of his concern with artistic production, a way of following the artist at work. One of the exhibitions he inspired at Columbia was *Masters of the Loaded Brush: Oil Sketches from Rubens to Tiepolo* (1967), for which he wrote the introduction to the catalogue. Through this exhibition a wider public was introduced to the challenges as well as the pleasures of the *bozzetto*, and the very concept of the 'loaded brush' became more clearly articulated as an aesthetic and art-historical problem in creative process. The Slade Lectures Wittkower delivered at Cambridge in 1970–1 were devoted to the sculptor's practice; his death unfortunately prevented revision of the preliminary text, which was published posthumously as *Sculpture: Processes and Principles* (1977).

A remarkable combination of intelligence, imagination, energy, and good humour made Wittkower an ideal scholarly collaborator. It seems only fitting that his last works of collaboration should have been with

his wife, who had worked closely with him throughout his career and shared especially his interest in the eighteenth century. Their first book together was *Born under Saturn: The Character and Conduct of Artists — A Documentary History from Antiquity to the French Revolution* (1963), a survey that organised a wealth of documentary and anecdotal material — and that has been translated into every major European language plus Japanese. Typically, Wittkower's involvement with such powerful artistic personalities as Michelangelo and Bernini led to a wider systematic exploration of the artist as an individual in society. Together, the Wittkowers translated and edited *The Divine Michelangelo: The Florentine Academy's Homage on his Death in 1564*, published in the quadricentennial year (1964), and Wittkower himself continued to explore the problem of the creative individual in 'Francesco Borromini: personalità e destino,' published in the acts of the conference sponsored by the Accademia Nazionale di San Luca in Rome, *Studi sul Borromini* (1970), and more generally in 'Genius: Individualism in Art and Artists,' his contribution to the *Dictionary of the History of Ideas* (1972).

In London, in addition to his association with the Warburg Institute from 1934, he was appointed Durning Lawrence Professor at University College in 1949; he held that position until 1956, when he departed for New York to assume the chairmanship of the Department of Art History and Archaeology at Columbia, where he had been a visiting professor the previous year. Wittkower had already experienced the American university scene, having taught at Harvard in the summers of 1954 and 1955. Howard Hibbard was a student in those seminars, and in the warm and detailed obituary notice he published in the *Burlington Magazine* (CXIV (1972), 173–7) he recalled that experience: 'I shall never forget my first impression of that awesome figure, who immediately proved to be so gentle, so generous, and so kind. Wittkower gave seminars that drew a self-selected group of students, all of whom, like the writer, were profoundly and permanently influenced by the seriousness, range, and enthusiasm of his scholarship. But it must be said that Wittkower too was impressed with his new students — perhaps our combination of enthusiastic naïveté and admiration was a novelty.'

Wittkower recognised the potential of this American enthusiasm. His new appointment offered the kind of major challenge that brought out the best qualities in the man and inspired his best talents; he saw the opportunity to build and he welcomed it. He enjoyed recounting the story of his negotiating with the dean of the graduate faculties at

Columbia: Wittkower warned him that his appointment would cost the university dearly, for he did indeed intend to build. (The department's annual budget reportedly rose from $50,000 to over $600,000 during his tenure.) A central aspect of Columbia's attraction was the Avery Memorial Library, the best collection for architecture and archaeology in the country. The department faculty already boasted some major scholars — most notably, Otto Brendel, Julius Held and Meyer Schapiro — but it lacked leadership and direction. Seeing the potential, Wittkower began to expand the faculty by opening new fields — with the appointment of Edith Porada in ancient Near Eastern art — and inviting a younger generation of outstanding scholars to Columbia — including Robert Branner, Howard Hibbard, and Theodore Reff. He recognised that an art history department in the City of New York — with its formidable art collections, research facilities, and professional resources — had both the opportunity and the obligation to study the world history of art. At Wittkower's retirement in 1969 the programmes of the department did indeed encompass the world — from Europe and the Americas to Africa and Asia, from the ancient Near East to the contemporary scene in New York. In addition to new appointments, he invited a series of distinguished visitors — including his old professional adversary, Charles de Tolnay, who taught graduate seminars on a regular basis, and connoisseurs like Philip Pouncey, Janos Scholz, and Federico Zeri. He created seminars in co-operation with museum curators and collectors to assure that his students had the opportunity to study works of art directly. There was no aspect of the study of art that did not find its place within the generous arena of the curriculum as envisioned by Wittkower.

Beyond the curriculum itself, Wittkower created an Advisory Council, a group of friends from the New York art world dedicated to supporting the goals and programmes of the department. Typically, that support came from projects that involved students and contributed to their education: a series of loan exhibitions (including *Masters of the Loaded Brush*) prepared in graduate seminars, the catalogues written by students. The aim was to raise funds for scholarships to enable students to travel. Wittkower wanted his students *in situ*. (As a young beneficiary of such a travel grant, I recall his very clear instructions about rising early in Venice to make the most efficient use of the morning light in visiting churches; the later afternoon and evening hours were, of course, to be reserved for reading and writing. He was also very clear about

what manuscripts my wife, then a graduate student in musicology, should be exploring in the Marciana.)

Wittkower was proud of his achievement in transforming the Department of Art History and Archaeology at Columbia; he was an empire-builder. Columbia's sister institution and main competitor was the Institute of Fine Arts of New York University, which had itself been built with a faculty of emigrant scholars from Europe, among them Richard Krautheimer. Wittkower recalled his vision of somehow co-ordinating the programmes of the two departments. Realisation of that vision seemed perpetually frustrated by the personal ambitions of the scholars themselves: both Wittkower and Krautheimer were scheduled to teach seminars on Rome, and neither was willing to cede to the other. 'Had we been able to agree,' I remember Wittkower reporting to his faculty in the mid-1960s, with a chuckle but also with gleam in his eye, 'then we would have created the greatest art historical machine in the world!'

Colleagues and students will remember Rudi — as obituary notice becomes reminiscence, that is the name that seems most natural — as a genial and generous giant. He had faith in the ability of students, was always encouraging and supportive. He allowed the intellectually ambitious student to reach out, testing new fields and trying new methods; he was prepared to offer the less secure student ideas and topics that he knew were realisable, projects that would be gratifying because he knew that they would yield genuinely interesting and even important results. Any measure of his contribution to art history must inevitably take into account the scholarship that he enabled, that is, the achievements of his students and younger colleagues. His effect was at once inspiring and catalytic.

The courses he offered were themselves exploratory, even though his students may have assumed that he had already written the book on the subject, for his lectures were so clearly organised, the learning so sure. It was his ability to shape material, to present it coherently, that made his lectures so accessible — whether he was setting out the typologies of Renaissance architecture, the personalities of Baroque sculptors, or the complexities of the classical tradition in the Renaissance. In seminars his students found themselves at the frontiers of art-historical knowledge — for example, probing seventeenth-century Venetian painting when it was still relatively uncharted territory. Wittkower himself was constantly pushing the limits of his own scholarship, in courses like 'The Impact of Non-European Cultures on European Art', which had its roots in his earliest involvement with the Warburg

tradition but was further enriched by his subsequent engagement of eighteenth-century problems (for example, 'Piranesi e il gusto egiziano'). At the time of his death he was expanding the scope of his own studies in preparing the Matthew Lectures at Columbia; these were published posthumously as *Gothic vs. Classic: Architectural Projects in Seventeenth-Century Italy* (1974), and honored by the Society of Architectural Historians with the Alice Davis Hitchcock Award (1976).

Wittkower was not a spectacular or mesmerising lecturer; he was, rather, both formal and accessible, inviting his audience to accompany him and to follow the logic of his presentation. With full confidence in their ability to follow — but ever aware of his pedagogic responsibility to assure that they did — he taught his students the ways of art history, how it was done.

In the spring of 1968 the Columbia campus was in turmoil. Student rebellion against a university administration out of touch with changing social and political realities escalated to a provocative level, culminating in violent police intervention. Several prominent members of the faculty, distinguished scholars who remembered the university violence of their own earlier careers in Germany, could only view the current events with dismay as a rehearsal of that past. Although he had shared their pilgrimage, Rudi Wittkower maintained a clearer and more objective vision; his calm offered an important ethical example. And that example, as well as a very definite political acumen, held his department together; marshalling peers like Otto Brendel and Meyer Schapiro, he managed to bring conflicting generations together and to turn a time of crisis into a shared moment of self-reflection. The events of 1968 only confirmed Rudi's rare wisdom and benevolence as a leader.

Following his retirement from Columbia Wittkower assumed a series of honorary appointments; he was Kress Professor in Residence at the National Gallery of Art in Washington (1969–70), Slade Professor at the University of Cambridge (1970–1), and, in the year of his death, he was a member of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton. His institutional energies extended well beyond his own department — to programmes like that of the Centro Internazionale di Studi di Architettura Andrea Palladio in Vicenza.

He had since 1958 been a Fellow of the British Academy — which had awarded him its Serena Medal the previous year — and in 1959 was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. In Italy he was a member of the Accademia dei Lincei (1960), the Accademia di Belle Arti in Venice (1959), and the Accademia Olimpica in Vicenza (1970).

Posthumously, he was named Commendatore of the Ordine al Merito della Repubblica d'Italia (1972) and was recipient of the American Institute of Architects Award (1986). He received honorary degrees from Duke University (1969), Columbia University (1970), Cambridge University (1970), and the University of Leeds (1971).

The honours and awards, however, hardly offer adequate measure of the man who took such joy in his work, in both his scholarship and his teaching. He took similar deep satisfaction in the achievements of his students and younger colleagues. His generosity was indeed large, and he delighted in it. For myself, I can recall that satisfaction as he watched over my own development from student to colleague, continuing to nurture a fresh Ph.D. — joking that had he remained in the Veneto and not proceeded to Rome in his own youth I might not have had a field. I will never forget the image of his arrival in Venice in 1963 — I was then a graduate student working on my dissertation: a *motoscafo* (*linea* 2) slowly approached the Accademia *pontile*; there he was, standing in the open prow, a cigar in his mouth, surveying the aquatic urban spectacle before him with appropriating gaze and satisfaction — Rudi *trionfante*.

<div align="right">

DAVID ROSAND
Columbia University, New York

</div>

Bibliographic Note

A bibliography of Wittkower's publications up to 1966 was included in the two-volume Festschrift published on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday: *Essays in the History of Art Presented to Rudolf Wittkower on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* and *Essays in the History of Architecture* . . . , edited by Douglas Fraser, Howard Hibbard, and Milton J. Lewine (London, 1967). It was supplemented in the obituary notice by Howard Hibbard in the *Burlington magazine* (CXIV (1972), 173–7).

In 1989, to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of his retirement from Columbia, the Department of Art History and Archaeology sponsored a symposium; the papers were published as 'Essays in Honor of Rudolf Wittkower' in a double issue of *Source: Notes in the History of Art* (VIII–IX (1989)). On that occasion the Department and the Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana published a full bibliography: *The Writings of Rudolf Wittkower*, edited by Donald M. Reynolds — which also reprints Hibbard's moving obituary notice.

Many of Wittkower's individual studies have been reprinted in four volumes of his collected essays: *Palladio and English Palladianism* (London, 1974), *Studies in the Italian Baroque* (London, 1975), *Allegory and the Migration of Symbols* (London, 1977), *Idea and Image: Studies in the Italian Renaissance* (London, 1978), and in *Selected Lectures of Rudolf Wittkower: The Impact of Non-European Civilizations on the Art of the West* (Cambridge, 1989).