

## Baroque, New World Baroque, Neobaroque

### CATEGORIES AND CONCEPTS

*Lois Parkinson Zamora and Monika Kaup*

THE CUBAN WRITER José Lezama Lima begins his essay “Baroque Curiosity” in Baroque fashion, with a parody, quoting the globalizing claim of a critic he does not name: “The earth is Classical and the sea is Baroque.” Lezama’s purpose is to suggest that by the time of his own essay, published in *La expresión americana* in 1957, the Baroque had emerged from two centuries of oblivion (and opprobrium), only to become overexposed, overextended, whatever-you-please. For Lezama, the Baroque had been appropriated and generalized to the point of meaninglessness.

Of course, Lezama’s own project was also vast—not quite planetary perhaps, but certainly hemispheric—and it also involved appropriation: he would reclaim the Baroque for the New World, place it in its historical American contexts, and then make his own generalizing claims. Take this one, for instance, in the same essay, translated from the Spanish and included in our volume: “The literary banquet, the prolific description of fruits of the earth and sea, is rooted in the jubilant Baroque. We shall attempt to reconstruct . . . one of those feasts, as Dionysian as dialectic, ruled by the desire to possess the world, to incorporate the exterior world through the transformative furnace of assimilation” (*BNW* 222).<sup>1</sup> This statement is hardly less hyperbolic than that of the nameless critic whom Lezama parodies; at Lezama’s Baroque table, we are again offered both earth and sea. And why not? Self-parody, too, is characteristic of the Baroque, as is excess, exaltation, exuberance. Lezama’s style, as well as his subject, is Baroque: “as Dionysian as dialectic,” overflowing and yet articulated; globalizing and yet also specific to Latin American cultural and historical realities.

To share in Lezama’s Baroque banquet and help define it, we have selected twenty-nine essays that trace the reemergence of Baroque traditions and

forms of expression over the course of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first. In all cases, their purposes are distant from the monarchical, Catholic, colonizing origins of the Baroque, and yet they are also necessarily connected to those origins; they variously follow the Baroque from a colonial mode to a postcolonial one, from a seventeenth-century instrument of empire to a contemporary instrument of cultural revision and renewal. Historical continuity is balanced against historical rupture: our European authors engage seventeenth-century models to critique twentieth-century political and poetic practices, and our American authors weigh Old World Baroque forms against their New World uses. In large part, their concern is literature and literary culture, but their methods are interdisciplinary because, in their different ways, each engages Baroque aesthetics to define his or her subject. Some discuss visual and verbal arts specifically, others address historical cultures more generally, but all of them treat the multiple media of the Baroque as linked cultural formations. Our title, *Baroque New Worlds*, is intended to call attention to these multiple formations and to theorize a new set of possibilities in Europe and the Americas in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and again in the twentieth and twenty-first.

Baroque, New World Baroque, Neobaroque: we have organized our essays into three sections — “Representation,” “Transculturation,” and “Counterconquest” — that correspond to these categories, but only loosely, because the boundaries of their forms and histories cannot be neatly drawn. The competing etymologies of the word *baroque* will give an idea of the definitional difficulties. René Wellek summarizes various possibilities at the beginning of his essay in this volume: a three-syllable nonsense word (*baroco*) coined to represent and remember the structure of a particular scholastic syllogism;<sup>2</sup> a Portuguese word (*barrôco*) describing pearls that are lumpy and irregular; and a Tuscan term (*barocco*, *barrocolo*, or *barrochio*) referring to a medieval system of financial transactions, and more particularly to a usurer’s contract. These different usages are well documented, but which one branches into art history, and then into literature, in the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth? Bruno Migliorini, Marie-Pierrette Malcuzyński, and Gerhart Hoffmeister favor the irregular pearl theory, arguing that this meaning moved gradually into the realms of artistic and aesthetic form; on the other hand, Erwin Panofsky and George Kubler prefer the scholastic syllogism, noting that *baroco* had become pejorative by the end of the sixteenth century, meaning pedantic and convoluted, thus coinciding with the depreciation of the Baroque style in eighteenth-century Europe.<sup>3</sup> (No one seems to

favor the usurer's contract, though it is often cited—probably because of its baroque far-fetchedness.) Panofsky and Kubler have textual confirmation on their side, but for our purposes, the metaphor of the irregular pearl is useful because it suggests our critical categories. In fact, we might think of the Baroque, New World Baroque, and Neobaroque as a single, rather large, eccentric pearl with excrescences and involutions corresponding to their overlapping histories and forms in Europe and the Americas. Here at the outset, we offer an overview of these histories and forms.

## The Baroque

The Baroque flourished in seventeenth-century Europe as a Catholic response to the Protestant insurgency. It was rooted in Rome and adapted throughout Catholic Europe as a recognizable style and content in art, architecture, and literature—that is, as a recognizable Counter-Reformation aesthetic and ideology. In Protestant Europe, Baroque opulence, with its elaborate ecclesiastical and celestial hierarchies, was objectionable to Reformation sensibilities, and over time a more sober Baroque developed in Northern Europe alongside (and sometimes combined with) Counter-Reformation forms.<sup>4</sup> During the seventeenth century, the Baroque thus reigned in Europe in different modes and measures, and we include foundational essays by Heinrich Wölfflin, Walter Benjamin, René Wellek, and Mario Praz that describe the related media of European Baroque painting, literature, and architecture. Preceding each of these essays and the other foundational essays in this volume, we provide an introduction and a brief bibliography to place the authors in their historical and cultural contexts. Reading these introductions consecutively will signal their particular contributions to the revalorization of the Baroque, and often an overview of the process as a whole.

The Baroque was exported wholesale to areas of the world colonized by Catholic Europe throughout the seventeenth century, and well into the eighteenth. It is one of the few satisfying ironies of European imperial domination worldwide that the Baroque worked poorly as a colonizing instrument. Its visual and verbal forms are ample, dynamic, porous, and permeable; thus, in all of the areas colonized by Catholic Europe, the Baroque was itself eventually colonized.<sup>5</sup> In the New World, its transplants immediately began to incorporate the cultural perspectives and iconographies of the indigenous and African laborers and artisans who built and decorated Catholic structures. Cultural heresies (and heretics) often entered unnoticed, or were ignored

for reasons of expediency.<sup>6</sup> There were also Asian influences, arriving on the fleet of ships known as the *Nao de China* (the Manila galleon) with art and artifacts from Japan, China, the Moluccas, and the Philippines, destined for Europe but portaged across New Spain, thus joining the diverse cultural streams that over time came to constitute the New World Baroque.<sup>7</sup> And in turn, the European Baroque was transformed *in Europe*: its materials (silver from Mexico and Peru, ivory from the Philippines), its motifs (fauna and flora, often imaginary, from the Caribbean, the Orinoco, the Amazon), and its methods (artistic, doctrinal, indoctrinating). So the reciprocal relations of Europe and Latin America are the necessary starting point for any discussion of the Baroque.

Baroque and New World Baroque: both designate a historical period that mediates a vast complex of cultural encounters, and both were overshadowed and eventually eclipsed by the Enlightenment neoclassicism that followed. Beginning in the eighteenth century and continuing through the nineteenth, the Baroque went underground. In Latin America, it lasted longer than in Europe—through the third quarter of the eighteenth century and in some places into the first years of the nineteenth. But in Latin America, too, Baroque art and artifacts were sometimes destroyed and replaced by structures of a more sober neoclassical style; thus the supposed obscurantism of Baroque reason was supplanted by the supposed lucidity of Enlightenment reason. The literary masters of the seventeenth century—Spain's Golden Age writers (Luis de Góngora, Francisco de Quevedo, Pedro Calderón de la Barca, Miguel de Cervantes), Mexico's greatest poet (Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz), the English metaphysical poets and Jacobean dramatists (John Donne, Andrew Marvell, Richard Crashaw, John Webster), the German playwrights of the *Trauerspiel* (Andreas Gryphius, Daniel Casper von Lohenstein, Johann Christian Hallmann)—were excoriated and buried, or simply forgotten. Baroque's dynamism ceded to neoclassicism's restraint, and the optical exuberance and illusionism of the former to the realist and positivist perspectives of the latter.

In the last years of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth, however, writers and art historians—working simultaneously and influencing each other—began to (re)discover in the Baroque certain strategies of figuration and fragmentation that suited their own aesthetic and ideological purposes. The Nicaraguan poet Rubén Darío offered the first explicit (re)cycling of Spanish Baroque poets, referring to Góngora and Quevedo in his 1896 prologue to *Prosas profanas*.<sup>8</sup> In Spain, Federico García Lorca, Dá-

maso Alonso, Gerardo Diego, and others were also rereading Góngora and Quevedo (the name of their group, the Generation of '27, recognizes the tercentenary of Góngora's death), and in Mexico, another "generation" of experimental writers, the Contemporáneos, also studied these Spanish Baroque poets anew.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, the great Mexican literary intellectual Alfonso Reyes had been writing about Góngora for fully a decade, and he was well aware of the parallel efforts of the Generation of '27 to revalidate Baroque poetics, as we note in our introduction to Reyes's essay from 1928, "Savoring Góngora," included here.

In Germany, Walter Benjamin was studying Baroque drama known as the *Trauerspiel*; his book-length study was published in the same year, 1928, and we have included an excerpt from it in this volume. In Argentina, Jorge Luis Borges wrote several essays during the twenties, not only on Spanish Baroque writers (Quevedo, Cervantes) but also on English Baroque writers (John Milton and Sir Thomas Browne—including a translation of a fragment of Browne's *Urn Burial*, to which Borges famously refers, twenty years later, in the last sentence of "Tlön, Uqbar, Orbis Tertius").<sup>10</sup> And again, in England, T. S. Eliot was revisiting seventeenth-century English poets and playwrights, and celebrating them for their capacity to "amalgamate disparate experience."<sup>11</sup>

The reasons for such widespread interest in revalidating the European Baroque during this period vary according to writer and place, and the foundational essays in our first section reflect (and reflect upon) the differences. It is, however, safe to say that all combine, in relative measures, an increasing skepticism toward Enlightenment rationalism and realism with the desire for formal experimentation. The waning utility (not to say bankruptcy) of the Enlightenment principles of scientific reason, progressive history, individual agency, and stable identity (cultural, national, personal) made alternative modes of expression attractive, and pre-Enlightenment forms again came into view. Even before the writers mentioned above, Friedrich Nietzsche, in his brief essay of 1878 that begins our volume, recognizes the Baroque as rejecting harmony in favor of heterogeneity. In his *Genealogy of Morals*, written nine years later, he elaborated what he termed a genealogical method to challenge the Hegelian idea of history as linear, teleological, causal. For Nietzsche, the Hegelian model naively projected the outcome of an idea or practice back onto its beginning, imposing an analogy of organic growth from seed to plant to fruit. On the contrary, the object of the genealogical method was to record the accidental arising of things—their trans-

formations, appropriations, co-optations, and subversions — as they became the raw material for *different* ideas and practices. The Baroque seemed to respond to Nietzsche's preference for inconformity and contradiction: its forms exist in "the greatest dramatic tension" (BNW 45). Four decades later, Walter Benjamin engaged this idea as his theme and critical strategy, using Baroque drama to oppose the idea of history as progressive, continuous, and purposeful. The allegory and melancholy of the Baroque *Trauerspiel* (the "mourning play") provided the means to critique modernity: for Benjamin, modern history is marked by fragmentation, ruin, loss.

T. S. Eliot also saw the wasteland of post-Second World War Europe and, impelled by the desire to renovate figurative language, he looked to Baroque poetics to formulate his modernist aesthetic, as did Jorge Luis Borges in Argentina. Both focused on the operations of metaphor, and both were formalists who privileged tradition over individual talent (i.e., over the personality of the poet). René Wellek addresses this last point: "Subjectivism and baroque rarely go hand in hand. Góngora, though an extremely individual writer, did not therefore in any way become subjective: rather his most characteristic poetry became almost symbolic, 'absolute' poetry which could be welcomed and praised by Mallarmé" (BNW 107).<sup>12</sup> As it happened, Borges preferred Quevedo to Góngora, but Wellek's point remains: the different nature of Baroque originality — the brilliant engagement (and influencing) of one's precursors rather than the projection of idiosyncratic genius — was attractive to both Eliot and Borges as they worked to separate themselves from the Romantic poetry of personal emotion and to (re)establish a formalist poetics. Indeed, Octavio Paz notes the "striking" affinities between the Baroque and the modernist innovations of this period, and above all, the role played by form in both aesthetics.<sup>13</sup>

In Spain, too, the poets of the Generation of '27 engaged Baroque aesthetics to distance themselves from the sentimental, declamatory poetry of their precursors and to promote their own poetic innovations. García Lorca's essay of 1928, "La imagen poética de Don Luis de Góngora" (The Poetic Image of Don Luis de Góngora), surely belongs in this volume, but unfortunately we could not secure the rights to translate it. García Lorca celebrates Góngora as "el poeta padre de nuestro idioma" (the poet father of our language) and points to his strategies of derealization, which remove the poetic image from nature to create an alternative world of words. Góngora's metaphors do not awaken unknown similarities, but rather *create* similarities attainable only in language; they depend not on reality but *artifice*, not on resemblance but *dis-*

*junctions* that are extreme and yet united in the poetic image.<sup>14</sup> The Mexican intellectual Alfonso Reyes, in his essay “Savoring Góngora,” invokes Spain and the poets of the Generation of ’27 (Dámaso Alonso and Gerardo Diego) in his own reading of Góngora as a poet of “pure aesthetic contemplation,” even as he also finds Góngora to be a poet of “physical beauty” and “solid materials” (BNW 175). If the poets of the Generation of ’27 engaged Góngora as a figure of controversy and critique as well as a model for a new poetics, Reyes wrote with the future of Latin American literature in mind, a fact that altered his perspective in ways that we note in our introduction to his essay. Nonetheless, in both Spain and Latin America Góngora proved central to the recovery of the Baroque as an alternative poetics that could facilitate the renovation of modernist forms of expression.<sup>15</sup>

### The New World Baroque

If the Baroque was first recuperated in the twentieth century as a poetics and an aesthetic in art, it was soon to be recognized as an instrument of cultural politics. Inspired by the cultural regionalism and the emerging climate of decolonization after the Second World War, a new generation of Latin American and Caribbean intellectuals and writers returned to the colonial American Baroque, long neglected and dismissed, and they found new meanings there. We include a number of foundational essays by Latin American writers who, starting in the 1940s, began to reconceive the New World Baroque as an index of cultural identity. Why did the Baroque become newly visible, legible, and theorizable in Latin America during this period? And why did the New World Baroque come to be celebrated as an American expression (to use the title of Lezama’s collection), rather than depreciated as a colonizing imposition? The growing interest in the historical Baroque was motivated by the need to define local cultures against metropolitan norms. The recodification—we might even say the *reorigination*—of the New World Baroque provided a way to differentiate Latin American forms from European cultural models without denying Europe’s role in creating Latin American cultural realities.

The Argentine art historian Ángel Guido is perhaps the first to make this argument explicit. In an essay from 1936, translated and included here, he argues that New World Baroque art and architecture are models of “reconquest,” rebellious forms that take back the New World from its European colonizers. This essay becomes part of his monumental *Redescubrimiento de*



*América en el arte* (The Rediscovery of America in the Arts, 1940), a landmark study of New World Baroque art and architecture. For José Lezama Lima (who had surely read Guido), the New World Baroque becomes a “furnace of assimilation” that transforms European, indigenous, African, and Asian cultures into other ways of being and seeing—*American* ways. In his “Baroque Curiosity” of 1957, translated and included in this volume, the European Baroque—sign and signature of *conquest*—becomes the sign and signature of American *counterconquest*. The coinage is Lezama’s, and for him and many Latin Americans (and Latin Americanists), the transformation of the Old World Baroque by New World realities represents a retort to the colonizers, a declaration of cultural autonomy. Most twentieth-century theories of the New World Baroque celebrate cultural *mestizaje* and artistic resistance to colonizing norms, thus reclaiming histories and traditions and refashioning them for present use. The capacity of the Baroque to overarch contradictions and include oppositions has made it particularly useful for theorizing cultural difference, as well as for celebrating the hybridity of Latin American cultural products. Surely this is part of what Lezama means when he says that the Baroque feast is “ruled by the desire to possess the world” (BNW 222).

Lezama’s paragons of the New World Baroque are Mexican—the seventeenth-century poet Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz and her friend and intellectual equal, Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora—but Lezama’s cultural context is transatlantic. His New World Baroque is neither a mere *reflection of*, nor mere *resistance to* European colonizing structures—neither simple mimicry nor simple subversion. It is not solely Europe’s story but rather a multidimensional American aesthetic that includes mimicry and subversion, of course, but also the more ambiguous processes of selection, synthesis, exaggeration, sublimation, mediation, and revision—including the revision of European culture itself. Lezama’s American Baroque operates according to the multiple dynamics of confirmation, deformation, and transformation, and the archetypal American *señor barroco* described in his essay negotiates these dynamics in ways analyzed by Roberto González Echevarría, Maarten van Delden, and Christopher Winks in their essays in part 3 of this volume. Their essays, like Lezama’s, move back and forth between Europe and America, between past and present, asking us to weigh differences by discovering resemblances and relationships, however uneven, eccentric, or unjust.

Lezama’s compatriot and contemporary, Alejo Carpentier, defines the New World Baroque in even more broadly comparative and comprehen-



sive terms. In the two texts that we translate here, Carpentier places the Baroque alongside the *Popol Vuh* and the *Chilam Balam*, the Mesoamerican *codices* and Andean *guacos*, not to mention classical Caribbean columns, thus making “symbiosis” the basis of his New World Baroque.<sup>16</sup> European forms of expression certainly combined with prehispanic forms in America, but our intention is not to argue for an “indigenous Baroque” as stipulated by Carpentier. Rather, we intend to place his claim in the historical and cultural context in which it belongs, as a key part of the twentieth-century recodification of the Baroque as a New World mode. We understand Carpentier’s inclusiveness not as cultural appropriation but as the desire, strongly felt by the 1940s, to engage the Baroque as an instrument “to incorporate the exterior world through the transformative furnace of assimilation,” to repeat Lezama’s phrase. Carpentier’s New World Baroque, like Lezama’s, represents an impulse toward inclusion (itself a Baroque impulse), an effort to bridge historical and cultural rupture, to assemble disparate cultural fragments—past and present, European and non-European. Both Carpentier and Lezama construct theories of cultural becoming that reach across the boundaries of fixed identities toward the formulation of yet uncertain ones. This capacity makes their theories relevant to postcolonial contexts worldwide. Indeed, Lezama’s and Carpentier’s New World Baroque constitutes an Americanist ethnocultural analogue of the earlier vanguardist Neobaroque of Eliot, the poets of the Generation of ’27, and affiliated writer-critics.

Carpentier’s direct precursor is the Catalanian art historian and philosopher Eugenio d’Ors, whose study, *Le Baroque*, published in 1935, showed Carpentier how to transform the Baroque into an *American* way of becoming. We include an excerpt from d’Ors’s study in which he (re)defines the Baroque as a worldview rather than a period in European art history. For d’Ors, the Baroque consists of a recognizable set of cultural values and expressive strategies that recur throughout history in an array of world cultures; indeed, it may be d’Ors whom Lezama parodies with his “the earth is Classical and the sea Baroque.” D’Ors argues for what we might now think of as a cultural genome project—a kind of Baroque DNA that runs in given cultures.<sup>17</sup> Our metaphor is anachronistic, of course, but our point is that d’Ors’s idea of inherent cultural characteristics appealed to Carpentier as he began to intuit a *sui generis* American Baroque. D’Ors’s relation to Carpentier is seminal and yet also surprising, since the American Baroque never crossed d’Ors’s mind, and his metropolitan context is far indeed from Carpentier’s postcolonial Caribbean. And yet both theorists understood the Baroque as a style, a

spirit, a human constant, rather than as a particular historical period.<sup>18</sup> For both, Baroque temporality overarches discontinuities, and Baroque space is labyrinthine, an ambit in which forking paths diverge, cross, and conjoin.

### The Neobaroque

If Lezama located the Baroque in *Latin American* time and space, and Carpentier found Baroque elements in *all* cultures and periods, the third in the Cuban triumvirate of Baroque theorists, Severo Sarduy, dismissed both views, focusing not on cultural self-definition but on the uses of seventeenth-century Baroque rhetorical devices in contemporary literature that he calls Neobaroque.<sup>19</sup> Sarduy thus reconstituted the American Baroque once again, doing so in France during the 1970s and 1980s, having left Cuba in 1960 after the revolution to study art in Paris, where he stayed. Sarduy's concerns were neither Old World nor New World Baroque as such, but rather Baroque strategies of "artificialization" in language and literature, and their Neobaroque uses. His essay, "The Baroque and the Neobaroque," published in 1972 and included here in a new translation, contemplates tactics of displacement that make Neobaroque literature the site of "dethronement and debate." Our introduction to this essay assesses the nature and purposes of Sarduy's Neobaroque, and in part 3, the Mexican novelist and critic Gonzalo Celorio and the Brazilian theorist Irlemar Chiamp place Sarduy's theory in relation to the evolving forms of the Baroque in the Americas.

We also include chapter 3 of Sarduy's full-length study, *Barroco* (1974), which focuses on the seventeenth-century astronomer Johannes Kepler, and in particular on Kepler's dismissal of circular orbits in favor of elliptical ones. The circle, with its single center, is set against the double-centered ellipse and, by extension, Renaissance classicism is set against the Baroque: symmetry is jostled by eccentricity, (en)closure by infinity. Sarduy makes Kepler's ellipse a metaphor for Neobaroque decentering, and he makes the seventeenth-century scientist a figure for *twentieth-century* destabilization. To illustrate how this epistemology operates in all Baroque (and Neobaroque) media, Sarduy moves from astronomy to poetry, and on to painting and architecture: from *ellipse* to *ellipsis* (the suppression of one element to highlight another—in Góngora's work, in Caravaggio's chiaroscuro, in Velázquez's erasure of the subject in *Las meninas*), and then on to *anamorphosis* (images or spaces that change according to the observer's angle of vision—in Borromini's floor plan of the Roman church of San Carlino and, in another essay,

the oblong skull in Holbein's *The Ambassadors*).<sup>20</sup> Moreover, as always in Sarduy, the historical Baroque exists on a substratum of twentieth-century (Lacanian) psychology: Baroque ellipsis suggests repression and projection, and anamorphosis reflects the distortions of the unconscious mind, as does the "delirium" of Baroque language, both visual and verbal.

The Brazilian poet and literary theorist Haroldo de Campos represents a similar development of the American Baroque. His essay of 1981, "The Rule of Anthropophagy: Europe under the Sign of Devoration," is included among our foundational essays. As his title suggests, he mobilizes "anthropophagy" — cannibalism — as his metaphor for the transcultural operations of the Latin America Baroque. De Campos parodies Enlightenment reason, positing a "cannibal reason" by which renegade colonial subjects (*renegados*) appropriate imposed cultural forms, consume and digest them, and then incorporate them into the colonial body. As the lion is made of assimilated sheep, so Brazil feasts at "the banquet of . . . the jubilant Baroque," to repeat Lezama's phrase once more.

De Campos's theory of cannibal reason is related to the cultural regionalism of Lezama and Carpentier, but his poetry is aligned with Sarduy's post-structuralist Neobaroque. In fact, the term *Neobaroque* seems to have been de Campos's originally.<sup>21</sup> The literary critic Jacobo Sefamí observes that Brazilian concrete poetry, and particularly de Campos's influential collection of poetry, *Galáxias*, from 1984, gave crucial impetus to the Neobaroque.<sup>22</sup> De Campos's poetic practice converges with Sarduy's theory in its extravagant play with the materiality of the signifier, which strives to suspend the referential function of language. This *artificialization* recalls the appeal of Góngora and Baroque aesthetics to poets in the first part of the twentieth century, but now, in the 1970s and 1980s, the stakes have shifted. In Chiampi's formulation, such metalinguistic play represents a specifically Latin American postmodernist critique: it is "an intensification and expansion of the experimental potential of the historical Baroque recycled by Lezama and Carpentier, now accompanied by a powerfully revisionist inflexion of the ideological values of modernity. At once modern and countermodern, the Neobaroque functions within the postmodern aesthetic . . . as an archaeological project inscribing the archaism of the Baroque as a way of allegorizing Latin America's dissonance with modernity" (*BNW* 517).

Chiampi discusses both Sarduy and de Campos in the first chapter of her book, *Barroco y modernidad* (2000), translated and included here. As is clear in the quotation above, Chiampi's Neobaroque constitutes a postmodernism

suiting to Latin American cultural and historical experience: “The Baroque, with its historical and geographical, not to mention aesthetic eccentricity, challenges the historicist canon (the new ‘classicism’) constructed in the hegemonic centers of the Western world, thereby functioning to redefine the terms according to which Latin America enters into the orbit of Euro-American modernity. The Baroque, crossroads of signs and temporalities, aesthetic logic of mourning and melancholy, luxuriousness and pleasure, erotic convulsion and allegorical pathos, reappears to bear witness to the crisis or end of modernity and to the very condition of a continent that could not be assimilated by the project of the Enlightenment” (*BNW* 508). The Neobaroque (in Europe as in Latin America) is characterized by its *untimeliness*. In Latin America, its anachronisms challenge European periodization: Neobaroque texts are “the coming together of heterogeneities, brilliant surfaces where Baroque stylemes shine in an inflated swirl of strata and layers, simultaneities and synchronies that do not achieve unification” (*BNW* 519). In her essay, Chiampi contrasts the Latin American Neobaroque to Fredric Jameson’s postmodern “cultural logic of late capitalism”: “Unlike the postmodernism discussed by Jameson, this manipulation does not simply array its fragments as so many ‘commodities’ but rather unleashes the figures of a new form of tension” (*BNW* 520). This “new form of tension” recalls Nietzsche’s early appreciation of the “dramatic tension” of European Baroque forms, the metaphysical “tensions” in Benjamin’s Baroque *Trauerspiel*, the cultural “tensions” in Lezama’s New World Baroque, and the semantic “tensions” in Sarduy’s Neobaroque signifiers and sequences. All use the word and all show how Baroque forms thrive on oppositions, contradictions, cross-purposes. Not harmony but heterogeneity, not Hegelian historicity but “strata and layers, simultaneities and synchronies.”

As Chiampi implies, the Neobaroque has been most useful in cultural contexts with a history of Baroque representation. The application of (Sarduyan) Neobaroque theory to film and entertainment media is rapidly globalizing its purview, as is the extension of (Carpentierian) New World Baroque theory to areas in which the contact of diverse and sometimes conflictual cultures is the norm (William Faulkner’s South, for example, or U.S. Latino culture). In all cases, the strength of these theories remains their engagement of specific cultures and histories. Theories must be appropriate to the contexts they intend to elucidate, and this is particularly so in Latin America, where, since the 1920s, there has been a rich discussion of racial, social, and political structures — a postcolonialist discourse *avant la lettre*, one devoted

to particular regions, cultures, and nations. This tradition of cultural analysis in Latin America includes the Neobaroque and also extends beyond it, because there are many writers and theorists in this tradition who do not address Baroque ideology or aesthetics *per se*.<sup>23</sup> The Neobaroque shares with this larger tradition the imperative to address lived experience, and not just in Latin America.

The term *Neobaroque* is applicable to all reconstitutions of the Baroque and New World Baroque as twentieth-century aesthetics and ideologies. Walter Benjamin engages the seventeenth-century German *Trauerspiel* to collect Baroque fragments into meaningful (Neobaroque) constellations; Christine Buci-Glucksmann engages Venetian paintings to devise an alternative (Neobaroque) theory of seeing; Sarduy analyzes the structures of seventeenth-century European science to create a transgressive (Neobaroque) poetics of “debate and dethronement.” Indeed, new terms like *barroco contemporáneo* and *brut barroco* have begun to appear in newspapers and journals, presaging further recyclings of this tradition — a *neo*-Neobaroque, as it were — but we leave these evolving concepts for future consideration.<sup>24</sup> In this volume, our essays demonstrate that it is impossible to theorize the Neobaroque and *not* be steeped in the cultural formations and historical realities that the theorist or novelist or poet chooses to revisit, reconceive, “recycle.” We will return to this Neobaroque requirement of *participation* at the end of our introduction.

### Neobaroque and Magical Realism

There is a related category that should be mentioned before we proceed. Magical realism is akin to the Neobaroque in its European origins and its recent applications to Latin American fiction. As is often noted, the term was first applied to the visual arts in 1925, when the German art critic Franz Roh used it to describe a group of postexpressionist painters. What is less often noted is that Roh studied with Wölfflin, the first European art historian to systematically define the formal characteristics of the Baroque as a style in art history. It cannot be insignificant that Roh was Wölfflin’s student in Munich between 1915 and 1919, nor coincidental that Roh’s theory of magical realism, formulated in 1925, follows Wölfflin’s conception of the Baroque in essential ways. Wölfflin’s *Principles of Art History* was published in 1915, and we include an excerpt from the author’s introduction to this groundbreaking work. Wölfflin considers the Baroque an anti-objectivist representation

(the painterly), opposed to classical objectivism (the linear). He also regards Baroque forms to be open, a characteristic that enables the overarching of antitheses, whether nature and artifice, sensuousness and spirituality, surface and depth, or, we might add here, magic and real. Wölfflin's insistence on the capacity of Baroque aesthetics to accommodate contradictions and generate tensions among disparate elements underpins and impels Roh's theory of magical realism in art.<sup>25</sup>

Like the recuperation of Baroque poetics at the same time, Roh's theory begins as a European avant-garde aesthetics and later evolves into a Latin American instrument of cultural critique. His essay of 1925 was immediately translated from German into Spanish (in the symbolic year 1927) in José Ortega y Gasset's influential *Revista de Occidente* in Madrid.<sup>26</sup> Roh's argument about painting interested Ortega and his readership in the Spanish-speaking world for the same reason that Baroque poetics interested Spanish and Latin American avant-garde writers at the time: it offered a means of creating an alternative modernism (if not an alternative modernity, as the cultural theorists would later seek to do). Does Roh's parallel project make him a part of the Generation of '27 in Spain, or an honorary Latin American *modernista*? No, but his aesthetic and cultural ties to the postwar revalidation of Baroque aesthetics in Europe are significant for our purposes, as is the *transculturation* of his theory in later decades in Latin America. In our view, magical realism may be considered a Neobaroque flowering of the historical New World Baroque, a continuation of the impulse to engage cultural heterogeneities in form and content. Alejo Carpentier's conflation of the Baroque and *lo real maravilloso americano* (the American marvelous real) in an essay of 1975 is not without historical justification.

We have already mentioned Ángel Guido, the first *Latin American* art historian to revalidate the *American* Baroque as a style in art history. He, like Franz Roh, was directly influenced by Heinrich Wölfflin (see our introduction to Guido's essay of 1936). The same Wölfflinian insistence on the capacity of Baroque forms to supersede objectivism and to accommodate contradictions that inspired Roh's magical realism also inspired the Argentine Guido's formulation of the New World Baroque as the integral expression of disparate cultures. The Baroque complementarity of opposites identified by Wölfflin thus flows simultaneously during the 1920s into Roh's magical realism and Guido's New World Baroque, and from there to Lezama, Carpentier, Fuentes, Celorio, Chiampi, and Édouard Glissant, with their Neobaroque cultural ideology of inclusion devoid of homogenization. So we locate a



common German precursor; the subjects and intentions of Roh and Guido diverge from one another, but their shared antecedent, Wölfflin, with his emphasis on Baroque tensions of all kinds, begins to explain why both magical realism and the Neobaroque have proved useful critical categories in the discussion of contemporary Latin American fiction.

There are differences, too, of course. Magical realism is now generally applied to only one medium (fiction), whereas the Neobaroque encompasses the several media we have mentioned: literature, theater, music, film, and the media of popular entertainment, which are increasingly discussed in terms of a Neobaroque “aesthetic of astonishment.”<sup>27</sup> On the other hand, magical realism covers a far larger geographical terrain than the Neobaroque; novels worldwide have been analyzed in terms of magical realism, whereas Neobaroque theory has remained largely limited to cultural production in areas with a history of Baroque representation, for reasons that we have already suggested. And whereas Neobaroque theory as it applies to Latin America has been produced largely by Latin Americans, magical realism remains a term more applied from outside than from within, a fact that has led to charges of stereotyping and exoticizing. Any critical category can be carelessly applied, of course, but such charges do not vitiate the usefulness of magical realism as a critical category in Latin America, or cancel its historical filiation with the Latin American Neobaroque.

### Part 1 Representation: Foundational Essays on Baroque Aesthetics and Ideology

The first section of our volume contains sixteen foundational essays, all but one (Nietzsche’s) written in the twentieth century. Only one was originally written in English — René Wellek’s — and despite Lezama’s complaint in 1957 that the Baroque had been diluted by overuse, nine of our foundational essays are translated into English here for the first time. Our aim throughout has been to make essays available that have circulated widely in other languages but not in English. The first seven essays focus on Europe and, with one exception, were written in Europe (again, the exception is Wellek, who was, by 1945, living in the United States, having left Czechoslovakia in 1939). The nine essays in the second group focus on the New World Baroque and the Neobaroque, and all were written by Latin Americans. (There are four more foundational Latin American writers — Gonzalo Celorio, Irlemar Chiampi, Carlos Fuentes, and Édouard Glissant — whom we have placed in part 3 be-



cause they contribute to the “postcolonial positions” outlined there.) By gathering these sixteen essays in part 1, we aim to provide historical grounding for the new essays that follow in parts 2 and 3, and also to underscore the topic of this volume: the twentieth-century recovery and reconstitution of the Baroque. This tradition continues vigorously in the twenty-first century, and it remains essential to any discussion of contemporary Latin American literature and culture.<sup>28</sup>

Part 1 begins with three essays written in German, by Friedrich Nietzsche, Heinrich Wölfflin, who was Swiss, and Walter Benjamin. Early German scholarship on the European Baroque was profound and prolific, and indeed it goes back further than our first selection (the Baroque often overflows attempts to categorize and contain). We begin with Nietzsche’s essay of 1887, but the Swiss historian Jacob Burckhardt precedes him. Burckhardt was Nietzsche’s colleague at the University of Basel, and he was also Wölfflin’s professor there.<sup>29</sup> We touch on Burckhardt’s influence on Nietzsche and Wölfflin in our introductions to their essays, but Nietzsche, not Burckhardt, is our starting point because he foresees essential aspects of Baroque theories that were to follow. We then move to Wölfflin, whom we have already mentioned and whose importance in defining Baroque for the twentieth century cannot be overestimated. Until his definitive studies were published, Baroque art was considered merely a late, exhausted stage of Renaissance classicism, so his intellectual daring, as well as his scholarly care, are to be admired. We excerpt a passage from the introduction to his study *Principles of Art History* (1915); his first book and equally a watershed in the study of European art and architecture, *Renaissance and Baroque*, was published in 1888.

German scholars promoted the reconsideration of German Baroque poetry and theater, and several were forerunners in the revalidation of the *Spanish* Baroque. Benjamin’s study of seventeenth-century German Baroque drama, published in 1928, refers amply to Spanish Baroque theater of the same period, and the excerpts we include here refer in particular to the plays of Pedro Calderón de la Barca. Essays by the Catalan Eugenio d’Ors, the Czech/American René Wellek, the Italian Mario Praz, and the French Christine Buci-Glucksmann complete our foundational section on the European Baroque. In each case, their essays are interartistic and comparative, allowing us to consider the changing nature of Baroque representation across media, cultures, and centuries. Wellek’s essay of 1945 traces the development of Baroque studies, first in architecture and the visual arts, then in

music and literature. Referring to Oswald Spengler's two-volume *Decline of the West* (1918, 1923), he writes: "Spengler spoke of Baroque painting, music, philosophy, and even psychology, mathematics, and physics. Baroque is now used in general cultural history for practically all manifestations of seventeenth-century civilization" (*BNW* 96–97).<sup>30</sup> To which we may add many manifestations of twentieth- and twenty-first-century civilization as well.

Buci-Glucksmann follows Welles's interartistic lead, but if Welles is the consummate academic historian of the European Baroque, Buci-Glucksmann is its Neobaroque practitioner. In her book, *La folie du voir* (Madness in Vision, 1986), a chapter of which is translated here, the author concerns herself with Baroque painting, but her purpose is to theorize a Baroque aesthetic that overarches media and modes of perception, "an aesthetic universe of form-forces" (*BNW* 150). The "madness" to which Buci-Glucksmann refers describes the intention of the artist in, and the response of the viewer to, a particular set of paintings by Tintoretto (figures 7.1, 7.2, 7.3). These intentions and responses reflect the nature of Baroque seeing, and they are encoded in the paintings themselves—in their theatricality, dynamism, illusionism, eroticism, and otherworldliness. For Buci-Glucksmann, Baroque vision (and envisioning) operate across genres and media. "Madness in vision" is not limited to painting, or to Europe, or to the seventeenth century: in other essays in this volume, we will see that such "madness" animates the *soledades* of Góngora and the *sueños* of Sor Juana, the façades of Potosí and Puebla, the fiction of Cervantes and Lezama and Faulkner. In fact, Buci-Glucksmann theorizes seventeenth-century visual aesthetics by way of two twentieth-century thinkers, Maurice Merleau-Ponty and Jacques Lacan, and like many Neobaroque theorists, she uses Baroque forms to critique post-Enlightenment modernity.

The Baroque is still relatively underappreciated in the Anglo-American critical tradition, but essays by René Welles and Mario Praz remind us that it flourished nonetheless in seventeenth-century England, often under different rubrics. Praz's essay of 1960 looks back to Eliot's recovery of seventeenth-century "metaphysical" poetry (and to his own recovery of those poets during the same period), as well as to Milton, Marvell, and English Baroque architecture. Welles names the literary critics (largely German) who discuss William Shakespeare's work in terms of Baroque stylistics, and in his "post-script" of 1962, he calls for greater attention to the Baroque in English literary studies.<sup>31</sup>

The second section of part 1, "The New World Baroque and the Neo-

baroque,” traces the reawakening of Latin American writers and critics not only to their own New World Baroque but also to the European Baroque. Here we find the essays by Reyes, Guido, Lezama, Carpentier, Sarduy, and de Campos to which we have already referred, and also an essay by the Dominican literary critic Pedro Henríquez Ureña. Henríquez Ureña was a linguist as well as a literary critic, and he spent years in Mexico, Cuba, and the United States before settling in Buenos Aires in 1925. He studied the varieties of Spanish spoken throughout Latin America, as well as the varieties of its literatures, in part as a response to the pan-Americanism of the time, with its increasing efforts to conceive of Latin America as a geographical, political, and cultural entity that could be defined and defended from within. Theorizing the New World Baroque formed an important part of this project for Henríquez Ureña, as it later would for Lezama, Carpentier, Fuentes, Glissant, and others. For ideological reasons as well as aesthetic ones, then, this category of New World Baroque (*barroco de indias*, and in its earliest manifestations, *barroco indocristiano*) was intended to include a vast multihistorical and multicultural territory.

The balance between ideological and aesthetic claims is always a matter for critical negotiation, and especially with Baroque literature, since it began as an imperial discourse and was, in varying degrees, complicit with colonizing regimes in the Americas. If, as we have seen, the abstraction and complexity of Baroque poetic language appealed to early twentieth-century poets in Europe, and the discourse of *contraconquista* appealed to writers in midcentury Latin America, we should also recognize that there are important twentieth-century voices not interested in revalidating the New World Baroque but in exposing its function as an instrument of empire. For example, Ángel Rama, in his seminal work on colonial American literary culture, argues that the same Baroque strategies of artifice and derealization that appealed to modernist and avant-garde sensibilities in the early twentieth century served the purposes of imperial domination in the seventeenth and eighteenth: “One could say that the American continent became the experimental field for the formulation of a new Baroque culture. The first methodical application of Baroque ideas was carried out by absolute monarchies in their New World empires, applying rigid principles — abstraction, rationalization, and systematization — and opposing all local expressions of particularity, imagination, or invention. The overbearing power of the order of signs became most intense in those regions that much later received the name Latin America. Gathered together and cloaked by the absolute con-

cept called ‘Spirit,’ the signs allowed their masters to disregard the objective constraints of practicality and assume a superior, self-legitimizing position, where unfettered imagination could require reality to conform to abstract whimsy.”<sup>32</sup> It is precisely such “signs,” “unfettered” by reality, that proved attractive and useful to twentieth-century poets and writers as modes of cultural critique and aesthetic renewal.

The Mexican writer Rosario Castellanos also looks back to the repressive power of Baroque writing in New Spain, ironizing Lezama’s laudatory description of the American *señor barroco* as rendered in his essay in this volume. Castellanos writes:

Leisure offered the *criollo* the chance to refine, polish, embellish himself with all the adornments that wealth offers and cleverness can procure: the decorative quality of language, skillful word matches, verbal fencing. Virtuosity is practiced and, in order to demonstrate the multiplicity of recourses, difficulties are also invented. The sentence curls and breaks from its own subtlety. It is the height of the Baroque. . . .

The chatterers are too absorbed in the play of words that, to avoid the wind blowing them away, are pinned down, like butterflies, with the pin of writing. Here are the clerks busy at the task of constructing a sonnet that can be read from top to bottom, and bottom to top; from left to right and right to left; an acrobatic acrostic; a metric in which the jungle is petrified in Hellenic marbles. It doesn’t matter that the forest explodes or the stone rots. Words have not been vulnerable, because they were separate from and beyond the reach of stone or jungle. It was an eternal chipping away in the realm of pure sound.<sup>33</sup>

For Castellanos, Baroque forms were *not* porous but impervious, *not* participatory but exclusive, designed solely to extinguish local realities in the service of state power: “The Indian’s tongue was heavy enough already, due to his ignorance, and the mestizo’s because of his timidity.”<sup>34</sup> Neither Castellanos nor Rama acknowledges the transcultural processes of mediation and mitigation that were also underway, but neither altogether dismisses colonial Baroque literature either. In a wonderful short text on Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, Castellanos weighs elitist agendas against aesthetic values and ends by celebrating Sor Juana in twentieth-century terms while lamenting her lot in the seventeenth.<sup>35</sup>

The essayists in the section that follows, on “colonial practice,” will necessarily negotiate their own balance between ideology and aesthetics, and between the seventeenth century and the twenty-first. They are well aware of the catastrophic consequences of European conquest and colonization

for indigenous peoples and cultures, but they nonetheless differ from Rama and Castellanos in their view of the colonial American Baroque, treating its forms not as immutable institutional impositions but as dynamic networks of transcultural processes and relations. Their essays trace the movement of Baroque forms between and among cultures as they develop American ways of saying and seeing.

## Part 2 Transculturation: Colonial Practice

“How do we explain these rival interpretations of the New World Baroque as hegemonic imposition and yet also as the capacious life way argued by Lezama and Carpentier, or the expansive ‘being-in-the-world’ offered by Édouard Glissant in an essay translated in this collection?” (*BNW* 625). Timothy J. Reiss asks this question in his essay on the Cuban and Mexican Baroque, and then, as if to answer Rama and Castellanos, he gives his response: “Baroque style is not merely a pack of figurative, rhetorical, and narrative conceits, a ‘user’s manual,’ but rather a *process* that draws together disparate elements and consequent meanings. The New World Baroque develops an imposed history into an overlay, creatively *turned* by diverse techniques and to diverse purposes” (*BNW* 398).<sup>36</sup> The essays in part 2 are concerned with the process described by Reiss and with the “diverse techniques and diverse purposes” of New World Baroque literature and literary culture over almost three centuries of colonial rule.

Baroque poetic practice in New Spain and Brazil is the subject of essays by José Pascual Buxó and Jorge Ruedas de la Serna, respectively. The former addresses the nature of originality in the Mexican poet Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz and her Spanish precursor Luis de Góngora, both of whom exercised the Baroque poetics of *imitatio*, that is, the erudite, elegant, and often veiled allusion to works of “authority,” whether in philosophy, literature, the sciences, or the visual arts. Their strategies of indirection and incorporation depended on their understanding of “originality” as the integration of origins rather than their dismissal—as *return* in the service of (*re*)*novation*. Pascual Buxó focuses on Sor Juana’s inclusion of graphic emblems and other allegorical engravings, a device that attests to the intimate relationship in Baroque representation between seeing and reading, vision and interpretation. The transculturation of European poems and poetic practices in New Spain, and the signifying relations among verbal and visual media, are an essential part of the process that Reiss describes above.

In Brazil, Ruedas de la Serna follows the gradual neoclassicist curbing of Gongorism in Luso-Brazilian literature as a way of locating an authentic Brazilian Baroque. Góngora was himself the object of *imitatio*, his work enthusiastically replicated in Brazil until the second half of the eighteenth century, when modernizing reforms were instituted by the Marquis de Pombal in Portugal. (These paralleled the contemporaneous Bourbon reforms in Spain and Spain's overseas colonies. However, in colonial *Spanish America*, critics consider that the Baroque was *superseded* by neoclassical models, not *extended* by them, as Ruedas argues of the *Brazilian Baroque*.) To the seventeenth-century gongorine tradition of ornate poetry, Ruedas thus connects eighteenth-century Brazilian poetry of formal restraint, where imagination finds its outlet in daring conceptual and structural designs, rather than in sensuous surface overload. This distinction between an ornate Baroque and a more sober Baroque is also found in European literature, but with the two modes occurring simultaneously rather than serially. In *Versions of Baroque*, Frank J. Warnke's classic study of the European Baroque, he writes of "the spare, witty, intellectual, paradoxical trend typified by Donne, Herbert, Marvell, Sponde, Quevedo, Huygens, and Fleming; and the ornate, exclamatory, emotional and extravagant trend exemplified by Crashaw, Gryphius, Marino, d'Aubigny, Góngora, and Vondel."<sup>37</sup> Ruedas draws an analogous, but less familiar line within the Iberian and Iberian-American Baroque, separating Portugal and Brazil from Spain and its territories, not only in literature but also, importantly, in architecture.

We have said that the Baroque requires interdisciplinary and interartistic approaches. Ruedas's discussion of divergent Lusitanian and Hispanic Baroque styles leads him (inevitably, it almost seems) to a comparison between colonial Brazilian architecture and the architecture of New Spain. He refers to Ouro Preto (literally, "black gold") in Minas Gerais, "the eighteenth-century Brazilian Baroque city par excellence," as a way of defining poetic practice of the same period, and subsequent poetic practice as well. In fact, architecture is essential to the transcultural theories of the New World Baroque, and in particular to the work of two eighteenth-century architects: Antônio Francisco Lisboa, a Brazilian mulatto known as O Aleijadinho, "the Little Cripple," and José Kondori, an Andean known as "el Indio," or "el Quechua Kondori."<sup>38</sup> Our theorists do not explore the differences between these architects so much as celebrate their similarities, their Latin Americanness, that is, the Indo-Afro-Iberian character of their New World Baroque constructions. But Aleijadinho and Kondori also illustrate the *differences* be-

tween the Brazilian and the New Spanish Baroque to which Ruedas refers, so a closer look is warranted here.

Spanish architecture was deeply influenced by the Moorish tradition of treating buildings as enclosures facing inward to interior patios, rather than outward to the street, so it resisted the Roman Baroque style of crossing boundaries between inside and outside. Whereas in Rome, Gian Lorenzo Bernini and Francesco Borromini worked to overcome the isolation of individual buildings, developing elliptical plans and undulating walls to integrate structures into larger centralized systems and spaces, architects in Spain and its colonies refrained from translating Baroque dynamism into masses and spaces set in motion. Rather, they preferred to create dynamic effects with elaborately sculpted and painted surfaces, inside and out.<sup>39</sup> The Mexican folk Baroque churches mentioned by Carpentier and Celorio — Tonantzintla (figure 23.3), Acatepec (figure 12.6), the Chapel of the Virgin of the Rosary in Puebla (figure 13.3), and the Church of Santo Domingo in Oaxaca (figure 13.4) — are brilliant examples of this aspect of Hispanic Baroque style, but its epitome is Kondori's sculpted façade of San Lorenzo Potosí (1728–44) in Alto Perú, now Bolivia, mentioned by Guido, Lezama, and Celorio (figures 9.1, 9.2, 9.3).

In contrast, the Brazilian province of Minas Gerais followed Rome in developing curved floor plans and façades.<sup>40</sup> Structural dynamism, not ornamented surfaces, became the dominant form of Brazilian architectural expression, as witness Aleijadinho's Church of San Francisco (1766–94) and his sculpted figures, like Bernini's curving colonnade in front of St. Peter's, embracing the space in front of the Pilgrim Church of Bom Jesus do Matozinhos in Congonhas do Campo (1796–99) (figures 11.7, 11.8, 11.9). In his essay here, Ruedas de la Serna uses the Afro-Portuguese Baroque of Ouro Preto to predict modern poetry and art, and we would add that it also predicts — or, more accurately, is recuperated in — the modernist Brazilian architecture of Oscar Niemeyer, Lúcio Costa, and Roberto Burle Marx (figures 16.1, 16.2). Ruedas's affiliation of architecture and poetry echoes the interartistic comparisons in Haroldo de Campos's essay and recalls Sarduy's ellipse, Bucí-Glucksmann's "madness in vision," and Carpentier's "city of columns." Analogies among expressive media characterize Neobaroque theory, as they do the Baroque artifacts they adapt and revise.

In fact, Baroque artifacts are almost always mixed media, *ars combinatoria* in their aesthetic and formal continuities, and often in their materials as well. Baroque artists rarely worked in only one medium, as Kondori and Aleija-



dinho attest; besides applying themselves to architecture and sculpture, Kondori was a master woodworker and Aleijadinho a painter. The maximum New World Baroque form is the *retablo* (altarpiece), which fills the apse and side altars in village churches as well as cathedrals. The *retablo* is a complex architectural structure combining sculpted figures (*estofados*), framed paintings, silver and gold work, and mirrors, arrayed upon or embedded in elaborately carved wood (or stone, in the stunning case of the Carmelite church in San Luis Potosí, Mexico). The structure as a whole refuses the division between canvas, carving, cornice, and column, one element engendering the next and sometimes moving out into the frescoes or plaster reliefs on adjacent ceilings and walls. The *retablo* is an emblem of the Baroque compulsion for connectedness and the merging of forms, what Wölfflin calls the “painterly” quality of Baroque compositions, where volumes and outlines conjoin to create “the apprehension of the world as a shifting semblance” (BNW 50).

The remaining essays in part 2 address the relations of literary forms and practices in Old and New World Baroques. Timothy J. Reiss, William Childers, and Leo Cabranes-Grant explore how the Baroque facilitated transculturation and its representation in works by writers from Cervantes and Sor Juana to Carpentier and Fuentes. Dorothy Z. Baker’s essay reminds us that French Canada forms a part of Latinate America, if not Latin America as we now use the term. She focuses on the seventeenth century, and more particularly on Paul Le Jeune, a Jesuit priest, and Marie de l’Incarnation, a nun of the Order of St. Ursula, missionaries to Quebec who mold the poetic figures of the French Baroque to American purposes. Rhetoric has always been an instrument of empire, and in the letters of Le Jeune and Sister Marie de l’Incarnation, it also becomes a means of “Baroque self-fashioning,” that is, a means of engaging Native American cultures to create a transcultural identity. A detailed comparison of the Baroque self-fashioning of the Jesuits, Franciscans, Augustinians, Carmelites, and other religious orders in French, Spanish, and Portuguese America has yet to be written, and this essay points to one path along which such comparative study might proceed.

### Part 3 Counterconquest: Postcolonial Positions

Some of the essays in this section continue the discussion of colonial practice, while others focus on the twentieth century, but all are Neobaroque in engaging Baroque formations to critique what Charles Taylor calls the “acul-

tural theory of modernity.” According to this theory, all cultures go through the same processes of modernization—economic (industrialization, consumerism, etc.), social and political (democratization, bureaucratization, urbanization, etc.), psychological (individualism, etc.)—and depending on where they are in their “transition” to modernity, they can be labeled “developed” or “backward,” “advanced” or “underdeveloped.”<sup>41</sup> To the contrary, these essays are decidedly unwilling to detach historical processes from the cultures in which they operate. Gonzalo Celorio and Irlemar Chiampi trace the trajectory from Baroque to Neobaroque in specific Latin American cultural contexts. Both consider the Neobaroque as an alternative modernity produced by, and suited to, cultural and political contexts in Latin America, and both apply Sarduy’s Neobaroque to several works of contemporary Latin American narrative, the better to *locate* his theory by practicing it.

The Mexican novelist Carlos Fuentes is also a cultural historian, as his essay on Faulkner attests. Faulkner is widely acknowledged by Latin American writers as an essential precursor, a fact usually attributed to his thematic penetrations into the racism, poverty, decadence, and defeat in the US South. Certainly the thematic and cultural analogies exist, but Fuentes shows that Faulkner’s ornate Baroque style is equally important. Faulkner is the “Dixie Gongorist”—a tag used by Fuentes to emphasize Faulkner’s stylistic ties to Latin America: “Gongorism is the Baroque language of our great literary tradition” (*BNW* 543). Faulkner’s syntactical opulence and ambivalence, his convoluted narratives that defy linear temporality, the theatrical sound and fury of his characters, the historical spectacle of Yoknapatawpha County: these are Baroque forms with obvious attraction for Latin American writers. In fact, critics are now beginning to recognize Baroque tropes and techniques in Southern literature more generally: comparative *literary* topics include the proximity of the Southern Gothic to the dark imaginings of the Latin American Baroque; comparative *historical* topics include the shared racial and cultural structures of plantations, haciendas, *latifundios*, and their transcultural products.<sup>42</sup> The cultural encounters and shifting semblances of the US South are surely related to the New World Baroque as defined by Guido, Lezama, Carpentier, Celorio, and others.

Both Faulkner and Fuentes engage Baroque aesthetics for Neobaroque purposes, but Fuentes does so self-consciously in ways that Faulkner does not. Fuentes ironizes Baroque forms (in *Terra Nostra* and *Change of Skin*), or uses them as tacit historical substrata for his modern Mexican settings (in *Distant Relations*, *Aura*, and parts of *The Death of Artemio Cruz*).<sup>43</sup> His fiction

depends on the “abundance” of Baroque language even as he interrogates the “absence” created by the European invasion, an opposition he develops in relation to Carpentier and Faulkner in his essay included here. Fuentes refers to the Baroque *horror vacui*, the “horror of a vacuum,” that leaves no space unfilled: “The Baroque, Alejo Carpentier once told me, is the language of peoples who, not knowing what is true, desperately seek it. Góngora, like Picasso, Buñuel, Carpentier or Faulkner, did not know; they discovered. The Baroque, language of abundance, is also the language of insufficiency. Only those who possess nothing can include everything. The *horror vacui* of the Baroque is not gratuitous—it is because the vacuum exists that nothing is certain. The verbal abundance of Carpentier’s *The Kingdom of This World* or of Faulkner’s *Absalom, Absalom!* represents a desperate invocation of language to fill the absences left by the banishment of reason and faith. In this way post-Renaissance Baroque art began to fill the abyss left by the Copernican Revolution” (BNW 543). Fuentes has been essential in propagating Neobaroque theory, in part by describing it in his essays and in larger part by dramatizing it in his own fiction. So, too, Lezama Lima: three essays examine his contribution to the discourse of the Baroque. Roberto González Echevarría, Maarten van Delden, and Christopher Winks show how authors in Europe, the United States, and the Caribbean interacted with Lezama to create their own Baroque new worlds.

We conclude our volume with a short essay by the Martinican poet and cultural theorist Glissant. Like Buci-Glucksmann, Glissant privileges vision (and envisioning) as barometers of the Baroque; like Lezama and Carpentier, he makes cultural *métissage* its banner; and like Fuentes, he emphasizes the suitability of Baroque language (“the art of expansion”) to postcolonial contexts. Indeed, in three expansive, elliptical pages, Glissant tacitly includes the entire tradition we are tracing here. In the “unity-diversity” of his contemporary Baroque, he evokes de Campos’s anthropophagy and Lezama’s furnace of assimilation; in his reference to the “Baroque disturbances” in every culture, he exemplifies the fragmentation and nonlinear “tension” of Nietzsche, Benjamin, Sarduy, and Chiampi; and in his metaphors of “rerouting” and “relation,” he recuperates d’Ors’s idea of a transhistorical Baroque: “Therein lies the movement of the Baroque spreading into the world” (BNW 626).

The title of our volume, *Baroque New Worlds*, intentionally echoes the “brave new world” of Shakespeare’s Baroque play, *The Tempest*. The phrase is uttered

by the innocent Miranda, “O, wonder! / How many goodly creatures are there here! / How beauteous mankind is! O brave new world, / That has such people in’t!” (IV, i), and it is her father Prospero who conjures this wondrous world. Prospero’s brave new world is also a Baroque New World, with its embodied oppositions, Caliban and Ariel (now famously adopted by Latin American cultural theorists), its supernaturalism and illusionism, its self-reflexive concern for its status as theater and dream, and its themes of imperialism, colonization, enslavement, primitivism, utopia, political legitimacy, and usurpation, themes that embody an acute awareness of the transatlantic exchange fully underway by the time of the play (first performed in 1611). It is known that Shakespeare used contemporary chronicles from the Americas as the basis for his story of shipwreck, deceit, and reconciliation, including the report of a shipwreck off the islands of Bermuda in 1609—a ship on its way to the recently founded English colony of Virginia. As the various subplots of *The Tempest* move toward calm, Prospero recognizes that his “madness in vision” requires observation as well as epiphany, sensory contact as well as ecstatic imagining. He breaks his imperial staff, dismisses his airy servant, and vows to drown his book of magic “deeper than did ever plummet sound” (v, i). Henceforth he will behold his brave/Baroque New World with everyday eyes.

We recommend that you do the same. The Neobaroque cannot be theorized without being experienced, so drown this book, too, and walk instead through New World Baroque cities and villages, circulate in their public spaces and stand in their buildings, study their *retablos* and paintings and sculptures, touch the stone carvings of their doorways and façades, see how multiple cultures and histories are accommodated, including today’s. Listen for Sor Juana, who in her sonnet (our epigraph) traces a trajectory like that of her fictive forebear Prospero, concluding with her own call to sensory experience: “Que yo, más cuerda en la fortuna mía, / tengo en entrambas manos ambos ojos / y solamente lo que toco veo” (For I, in fortune mine more wise today / In my two hands both of my eyes retain / And only what I touch do I then see).<sup>44</sup> Despite the skepticism of the Baroque about the efficacy of the senses, despite its preoccupation with deceptive appearances and recurring themes of illusion and disillusionment—despite these undercurrents and also because of them, the Baroque celebrates sensory opulence, corporeal and material abundance, kinetic exuberance. Baroque forms invite *participation*; only then do sight and insight, thought and feeling, theory and

practice converge, as the Neobaroque requires. “Therein lies the movement of the Baroque spreading into the world.”

## Notes

- 1 All references to essays published in the present volume (*BNW*) will be cited in the text.
- 2 Medieval scholastics invented words to recall the three-part structure of a syllogism: the letter *a* in a syllable meant an affirmative universal proposition, the letter *o* an affirmative particular proposition. Erwin Panofsky gives as examples the words *barbara* and *baroco*: *barbara* stands for a syllogism with three affirmative universals (“All men are mortal; all mortals need food; therefore, all men must eat”) and *baroco* for a syllogism beginning with an affirmative universal followed by two affirmative particulars (“All cats have whiskers; some animals have no whiskers; therefore, not all animals are cats”). Panofsky, “What Is Baroque,” 19; for a further discussion of the implications of this etymology, see Zamora, *The Inordinate Eye*, 233–35.
- 3 Migliorini, “Etimologia e storia del termine ‘Baroco,’” 39–54; Malcuzyński, “(Neo)-Baroque Effect”; Hoffmeister, *Deutsche und europäische Barockliteratur*; Panofsky, “What Is Baroque,” 19; Kubler, *Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things*, 128. Migliorini and Malcuzyński go into detail about the theory of the usurer’s contract as a source of the word *baroque*.
- 4 For a comparative description of the Catholic and Protestant Baroque in Europe, see Hauser, *Social History of Art*, 172–225.
- 5 See Robert Harbison’s chapters on the architecture of “colonial Baroque” and “Neo- and Pseudo-Baroque,” in *Reflections on Baroque*, 164–221, in which the author moves from New Spain to Portuguese India (focusing on the Goan Baroque), and then to Russia, Japan, and the United States. His final chapter, “Baroque in the Twentieth Century,” focuses on the Neobaroque architecture of Frank Gehry and other architects usually termed modernist or postmodernist.
- 6 *Tequitqui* is the term used in Mexico to refer to Christian artifacts made by indigenous artisans. It is Nahuatl for *tributario*, someone who pays tribute to an imperial ruler, in this case the carvings, paintings, and construction done at the behest of the European colonizers. The term was first used to refer to these syncretic artifacts (*productos mestizos*) by José Moreno Villa in 1948 in *Lo mexicano en las artes plásticas*. See also Constantino Reyes-Valerio, *Arte indocristiano*.
- 7 Silk, ceramics, ivory carvings, and the like also stayed in New Spain, where vast wealth was being amassed and the market for Asian products thrived. Asian artifacts and media were also widely copied in local modes and materials: for example, painted screens (*biombos*), lacquer work, Chinese motifs in pottery and textiles (e.g., “chintz,” an inexpensive printed cotton produced in India after Chinese designs and imported into Mexico in great quantities). Then there were the Asian

artists who worked in the Americas. *Namban* designates the work of Japanese artists in colonial Mexico at the end of the sixteenth and into the seventeenth century. The word means “barbarians from the south,” referring to Europeans, and is another example of New World Baroque syncretism. See Rodrigo Rivero Lake, *El arte namban en el México virreinal*.

- 8 Irlemar Chiampi begins her essay in this volume by tracing four “insertions” of Baroque aesthetics into Latin American literary modernity. We place her essay in part 3 because she focuses on the fourth “insertion,” the Sarduyan Neobaroque beginning in the 1970s, but her account of the twentieth-century “modernization of the Baroque,” beginning with Rubén Darío, provides a useful overview of the “cycles and recycles” that we are tracing here.
- 9 See Oropesa, *Contemporáneos Group*, in which the author argues for the Neobaroque aesthetics of the writers in this group, among them Javier Villaurrutia, Jorge Cuesta, and Salvador Novo. Oropesa correctly credits their Mexican precursors Amado Nervo, Ermilo Abreu Gómez, and above all Alfonso Reyes with making Baroque poetry and poetics available to the Contemporáneos. Beyond their Baroque aesthetics are their Baroque thematics: for example, Novo’s *Nueva grandeza mexicana* (1946) recuperates and revises *La grandeza mexicana* (1604), the urban epic by the Mexican Baroque poet Bernardo de Balbuena. For a discussion of Balbuena, see Timothy J. Reiss’s essay in this volume.
- 10 See Borges’s early collections for his essays on these Baroque writers: *Inquisiciones* (1925), *El tamaño de mi esperanza* (1926), and *El idioma de los argentinos* (1928), which are reprinted together in *Textos recobrados, 1919–1929*. His story “Tlön, Uqbar, Orbis Tertius” was published in 1944, in *Ficciones*.
- 11 Eliot, “Metaphysical Poets,” 247. His full quote is as follows: “A thought to Donne was an experience; it modified his sensibility. When a poet’s mind is perfectly equipped for its work, it is constantly amalgamating disparate experience.” Eliot makes this statement about John Donne and Baroque poetry more generally, with its “conceits” that integrate heterogeneous ideas and images. Donne’s poetry precedes the “dissociation of sensibility,” that is, the separation of thought from feeling, that Eliot considered characteristic of his own times and of Enlightenment modernity. See Mario Praz’s essay in this volume, and our introduction to it, for a further discussion of the English Baroque and Eliot’s relation to it.
- 12 Federico García Lorca, Alfonso Reyes, Haroldo de Campos, and Octavio Paz also mention the French Symbolist Stéphane Mallarmé (1842–98) in the context of Baroque aesthetics. In her essay in this volume, Irlemar Chiampi explains the repeated linkage of Mallarmé to Góngora (and Baroque poetics generally): “The ‘discovery’ of the Gorgorine metaphor is tied to the postsymbolist critical context in Europe, where the aesthetic revalidation of Góngora begins through the parallel with Mallarmé. . . . It is only after the fin de siècle revolution in poetic language that Góngora becomes legible to modernity” (*BNW* 510). In this context, see the recent English translation of Góngora’s poems, *Selected Poems of Luis de Góngora*.
- 13 Paz’s full statement goes as follows: “This coincidence between baroque and avant-garde poetics is not a question of influences but rather a question an affinity operat-



ing as much in the sphere of the intellect as in sensibilities. The baroque poet hoped to astonish and astound; Apollinaire proposed exactly the same thing when he extolled surprise as one of the basic elements of poetry. The baroque poet attempts to discover the secret relationship among things, exactly as affirmed and practiced by Eliot and Wallace Stevens. . . . These similarities are all the more remarkable when one considers that the baroque and the avant-garde spring from totally different origins, one from mannerism, the other from romanticism. The solution to this small mystery is perhaps to be found in the role played by *form* in both baroque and avant-garde aesthetics. Baroque and avant-garde are both formalisms" (Paz, *Sor Juana*, 53; emphasis added). Evaluating Paz's parallel discussion of Baroque and avant-garde aesthetics, Irlemar Chiampi asserts that he has provided an "archaeology of modernity in its decisive moments." Clearly she offers her own "archaeology of modernity" in a similar spirit (*BNW* 524).

- 14 García Lorca, "La imagen poética de Don Luis de Góngora." For an account of the links that García Lorca intended to forge in this "manifesto" between Góngora's poetic practice and his own, see Hugo Friedrich, *The Structure of Modern Poetry from the Mid-Nineteenth to the Mid-Twentieth Century*, 110–14.
- 15 In art, too, Góngora's poetics of artifice and abstraction became fashionable, controversial, and useful. That Góngora became a kind of totem for the avant-garde is suggested by the fact that in 1948, Pablo Picasso "drew" a selection of Góngora's poems calligraphically, with illustrations in the margins. An English translation of Picasso's selections of Góngora now exists with Picasso's drawings accompanying them (the author being listed as Picasso!). See Picasso, *Gongora*.
- 16 In an essay not included here, "The Baroque and the Marvelous Real," Carpentier asks: "And why is Latin America the chosen territory of the baroque? Because all symbiosis, all *mestizaje*, engenders the baroque" (100).
- 17 This metaphor appeared not in reference to d'Ors but to a performance of the Lipiz-zaner stallions in Vienna; Herbert Muschamp finds the Baroque "still going strong" long after "the Hapsburg dynasty bit the dust in 1918." "Horse Play in Vienna," *New York Times*, March 25, 2007.
- 18 The argument for the Baroque as a worldview rather than as a period in European art history is reflected in the critical terminology: d'Ors's recurring cultural "eons," Lezama's "imaginary eras," Carpentier's "spirit," Buci-Glucksmann's "sensibility," Bolívar Echeverría's "ethos." In this regard, see Echeverría, *Modernidad, mestizaje cultural, ethos barroco*.
- 19 Why should Cubans play such an important role in theorizing the American Baroque? Cuba has been a port of entry and a principle site of mediation between Europe and Latin America for more than four centuries, and it may be this *habit of mediation* that explains the Cuban predominance in this area. Lezama and Carpentier take their key examples of the New World Baroque from elsewhere (Mexico, Peru, Brazil), and France, too, plays a major role for Carpentier (the French surrealism of the 1930s) and Sarduy (the *Tel Quel* group in the 1970s and 1980s). Lezama was the only one of the three who lived his whole life in Havana (he left the island only twice, briefly, for Jamaica and Mexico), but his theory is also impelled by out-



- side influences, namely, the Argentine art historian Ángel Guido, whose essay of 1936, as already noted, introduced the idea of the New World Baroque as a *reconquista* of American territory by and for Americans. Lezama develops Guido's *reconquista* into his own *contraconquista*, using the same architectural examples given by Guido: the churches of the Andean architect José Kondori in Potosí, Bolivia (figures 9.1, 9.2, 9.3) and the Brazilian architect and sculptor Antônio Francisco Lisboa (Aleijadinho) in Ouro Preto and Congonhas do Campo, Brazil (figures 11.7, 11.8, 11.9). What is being theorized by these Cuban writers, at least in part, is the *relation* of Cuba to the rest of Latin America, whether to its *shared colonial and postcolonial experience* (Lezama and Carpentier) or its *shared textual strategies* (Sarduy). On the Cuban Baroque, see Kaup, "'Vaya Papaya!'"
- 20 Sarduy discusses Holbein's anamorphosis and its rhetorical analogues in his essay of 1981, "La simulación," in *Obra completa*, ed. Gustavo Guerrero and François Wahl (Madrid: ALLCA XX, 1999), 2:1264–344. For a discussion of this spatial/rhetorical trope, see Gallo, "Sarduy avec Lacan."
  - 21 De Campos, "The Open Work of Art," 1955, in *Novas*, 220–22.
  - 22 Sefamí, "El llamado de los deseosos." The Neobaroque anthology *Medusario* (which includes excerpts from *Galaxias*), published in 1996, demonstrates that this movement continues to gather force, including poets from across the American hemisphere, from the Southern Cone (the Argentine Néstor Perlongher, the Chilean Raúl Zurita, the Uruguayan Eduardo Milán) to Latin American exiles in the United States (the Cuban José Kozer and the Uruguayan Eduardo Espina). See Echevarrén et al., *Medusario*.
  - 23 For an overview of this "transculturalist" tradition, see Spitta, *Between Two Waters*.
  - 24 See a discussion of Monsiváis as a *barroco contemporáneo* in a symposium on the occasion of his seventieth birthday; the speakers emphasize his use of verbal play, paradox, and allusion for the purpose of social and political commentary and critique (<http://www.jornada.unam.mx/2008/05/08/index.php?section=cultura&article=a05n1cul>, accessed September 3, 2009). For a theory of the *brut barroco* that focuses on the capacity of texts to chronicle the excesses, extremes, and contradictions of contemporary urban Latin America, and particularly Mexico City, see Zamora, "New World Baroque, Neobaroque, Brut Barroco."
  - 25 The German Romantic philosopher Novalis, as well as Wölfflin, stands as Roh's precursor. Novalis first used the term *magical realism* to describe an idealized philosophical protagonist—a "magical realist"—capable of integrating ordinary phenomena and metaphysical meanings. Novalis envisions such a protagonist in notebook entries in 1799, referring to a "magical idealist" and a "magical realist," the latter of whom overarches the oppositions of known and unknown, finite and infinite. Novalis, *Allgemeines Brouillon*, 1798–99, in *Werke*, ed. G. Schultz (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1969), 479. See Irene Guenther, "Magic Realism in the Weimar Republic," in Zamora and Faris, *Magical Realism*, 34, 64n15. See also Christopher Warnes, "Naturalizing the Supernatural: Faith, Irreverence, and Magical Realism," *Literature Compass*, vol. 2 (February 2005): 1–16; and "Magical Realism and the Legacy of German Idealism," *Modern Language Review* 101, no. 2 (2006): 488–98.

- 26 Roh, *Nach-Expressionismus, Magischer Realismus*; in Spanish (with the terms of the title reversed), *Realismo mágico, post expresionismo: Problemas de la pintura europea más reciente*, trans. Fernando Vela (Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1927). In fact, the essay version of Roh's text published in Ortega's magazine omits the term *post expresionismo* altogether. See *Revista de Occidente*, no. 16 (1927): 274–301. An excerpt from Roh's essay, "Magical Realism: Postexpressionism," is translated by Wendy B. Faris in Zamora and Faris, *Magical Realism*, 15–32.

Ortega's theory of the European avant-garde was strongly influenced by German art historians. Roberto González Echevarría, in his essay "Góngora's and Lezama's Appetites," included here, points out that Wilhelm Worringer's *Abstraction and Empathy* (1907) and *Form in Gothic* (1912) were important to Ortega. So was Wölfflin's *Principles of Art History*, which was translated into Spanish and published by Ortega's press Espasa Calpe between 1919 and 1926, just before Roh's essay in 1927. González Echevarría disagrees with René Wellek's idea (described in note 30, below) that the German revival of the Baroque, and particularly of Góngora, during this period paralleled the taste for expressionism's chaotic forms: "Góngora is clearly part of a given context, of an entire avant-garde aesthetic that sees him as the champion of a pure and hermetic poetry" (BNW 557). Indeed, Roh's "magical realist" painters (Henri Rousseau, Giorgio de Chirico, Alexander Kanoldt, Franz Radziwill, George Grosz, Otto Dix, etc.) would seem to reflect the German preference for Góngora in another medium: the hyperrealistic clarity of their painting, like Góngora's "pure" poetry, was taken as an *antidote* to expressionism and to the political and social chaos that it reflected. For a further discussion of Roh and Ortega, and the relations of Baroque and avant-garde aesthetics during this period, see Zamora, "Swords and Silver Rings."

- 27 Angela Ndalians connects the cinematic medium and other forms of popular entertainment to Baroque theatricality, Baroque spectacle: "The underlying concern with evoking an aesthetic of astonishment reveals the baroque heritage present in the beginnings of the cinema." *Neo-Baroque Aesthetics and Contemporary Entertainment*, 83. See also James Tweedie, "Caliban's Books: The Hybrid Text in Peter Greenaway's *Prospero's Books*," *Cinema Journal* 40, no. 1 (fall 2000): 104–26.

Neobaroque film has a large and varied repertoire: Derek Jarman's *Caravaggio* (1986), Raúl Ruiz's *Life Is a Dream* (1986), based on Calderón de la Barca's play of that title, and Peter Greenaway's *Prospero's Books* (1991), based, of course, on Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, to name only three examples. Mainstream films are increasingly driven by Neobaroque illusionist tropes and *trompe l'oeil* devices, notably those written by Charlie Kaufman (*Being John Malkovich* [1999], *Adaptation* [2002], and *Eternal Sunshine of the Spotless Mind* [2004]), and others such as Christopher Nolan's *Memento* (2000), Alejandro González Iñárritu's *Babel* (2006), Marc Forster's *Stranger than Fiction* (2006), and Steven Soderbergh's *Traffic* (2006). Serge Gruzinski begins his essay on the Baroque imaginary (historical and contemporary) with a list that includes Peter Greenaway, Pedro Almodóvar, Ridley Scott's *Blade Runner*, Paul Verhoeven's *Total Recall*, and Madonna. See Gruzinski, "From the Baroque to the Neo-Baroque: The Colonial Sources of the Postmodern

- Era (The Mexican Case),” in *El corazón sangrante/The Bleeding Heart*, 62–89. Also by the same author: *La Guerre des images de Christophe Colomb à Blade Runner (1492–2019)*.
- 28 There are a number of recent full-length studies of the emergence of this tradition: Calabrese, *Neo-Baroque*; Pauly, *Neobarroco*; Calloway, *Baroque Baroque*; Echeverría, *La modernidad de lo barroco*; Armstrong and Zamudio-Taylor, *Ultra-Baroque*; Harbison, *Reflections on Baroque*; Chiampi, *Barroco y modernidad*; Lambert, *Return of the Baroque in Modern Culture*; Spadaccini and Martín-Estudillo, *Hispanic Baroques*; and Zamora, *The Inordinate Eye*.
- 29 Burckhardt’s contribution is unquestionable. As senior colleague to Nietzsche and a mentor to Wölfflin, Burckhardt set the terms, whether to depart from them (in Nietzsche’s case), or to elaborate them (in Wölfflin’s). In his tour of Italian art, *The Cicerone*, Burckhardt presents sections titled “Architecture and Decoration of the Baroque,” “Sculpture of the Baroque,” and “Modern Painting,” the last of which includes discussions of Caravaggio and Rubens. In each medium, the Baroque appears as a negative foil to the Renaissance, symptomatic of a cruder sensibility and a decline in quality. Burckhardt never overcame his classicist’s prejudice against the Baroque, but he nonetheless offered detailed observations on Baroque styles. That Burckhardt, Nietzsche, and Wölfflin were at the University of Basel together begs for further consideration of a “Basel Baroque.” Surely these men would have discussed the Baroque from their different perspectives, as we imagine Alfonso Reyes, Pedro Henríquez Ureña, and Jorge Luis Borges to have done in Buenos Aires in the late 1920s, and as we now think of the Cuban triumvirate Carpentier, Lezama, and Sarduy, revising the New World Baroque and reacting to and against each other’s work. Thus we may also think of this Basel triumvirate—a historian, a philosopher, and an art historian—(re)defining European aesthetics against received norms and each other.
- 30 More generally, Wellek addresses the early German enthusiasm for the Baroque: “I would be hesitant to dogmatize about the exact reasons for this revival of German baroque poetry; part of it may be due to Spengler, who had used the term vaguely in *The Decline of the West*, and part is due, I think, to a misunderstanding. Baroque poetry was felt to be similar to the most recent German expressionism, to its turbulent, tense, torn diction and tragic view of the world induced by the aftermath of the war; part was a genuine change of taste, a sudden comprehension for an art despised before because of its conventions, its supposedly tasteless metaphors, its violent contrasts and antitheses” (BNW 98). As stated in note 26, González Echeverría disagrees, but the overarching point here is the rich exchange between Germany and Spain; artists and theorists in both countries worked to recuperate and reconstitute Baroque forms for reasons described in the foundational essays of our volume, and in our introductions to them.
- 31 The dismissal of the Baroque has also characterized Anglo-American art historical studies, where the heightened naturalism of Baroque painting has been treated as unattractive or unseemly, and its vertiginous movement, chiaroscuro depths, and densely decorated surfaces as overstated and melodramatic. Fortunately, this at-

titude is changing before our eyes, with several recent exhibitions in the United States and England on Baroque and New World Baroque art, each with a splendid catalogue. They include *Horacio and Artemesia Gentileschi* and *The Colonial Andes: Tapestries and Silverwork, 1530–1830*, both originating at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York; at the London Royal Academy of Arts, *The Genius of Rome, 1592–1623*; at the Denver Art Museum and traveling to the Meadows Museum in Dallas, *Painting the New World: Mexican Art and Life, 1521–1821*; at the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, *The Splendor of Ruins in French Landscape Painting, 1630–1800*, *The Grandeur of Viceregal Mexico: Treasures from the Franz Meyer Museum*, and *Inverted Utopias: Avant-Garde Art in Latin America*; and most recently, at the Philadelphia Art Museum, then traveling to Mexico City and Los Angeles, *Tesoros/Treasures/Tesouros: The Arts in Latin America, 1492–1820*.

It is worth noting a parallel trend in Baroque opera, which is now experiencing a major revival; operas by Claudio Monteverdi, Georg Friedrich Handel, and Henry Purcell are being performed as never before in the United States and Europe, often using period instruments or period performing styles. And in Mexico, interest in Baroque instrumental music has grown exponentially in the past ten years as scores for chamber orchestras, smaller ensembles, organ, and voice have been recuperated from ecclesiastical archives and recorded beautifully by a number of groups and individual musicians.

- 32 Rama, *Lettered City*, 10. José Antonio Maravall's classic study of seventeenth-century Spain supports Rama's contention, showing how Spain appropriated the historical Baroque for the Counter-Reformation's universalizing mission to restore Catholic dominance in Europe and the New World. See his *Culture of the Baroque*.
- 33 Castellanos, "Language as an Instrument of Domination," 251, 252. This essay appeared in *Mujer que sabe latín* (1973), a collection of essays primarily on women writers and feminist issues. The title of the collection comes from a rhyming jingle: "Mujer que sabe latín / Ni encuentra marido / Ni tiene buen fin" (A woman who knows Latin / won't find a husband / or come to a good end). This particular essay is an exception in finding Baroque language oppressive with respect to class and race rather than gender.
- 34 *Ibid.*, 251.
- 35 Castellanos, "Once Again Sor Juana."
- 36 Reiss's statement is made in response to the following Latin American colonial historians, who focus on the oppressive nature of the institutional Baroque and are discussed at the beginning of his essay: Picón-Salas, "Baroque of the Indies"; Leonard, *Baroque Times in Old Mexico*; Acosta, "El barroco de indias"; and Beverley, "Barroco de estado."
- 37 Warnke, *Versions of Baroque*, 12. These branches of Baroque style, known in the Spanish tradition as *culteranismo* and *conceptismo*, respectively, are discussed in several of the essays included in this volume.
- 38 Guido, Lezama, and Celorio refer to these architects in their essays included here. Carlos Fuentes, in his chapter "The Baroque Culture of the New World" in *The Buried Mirror* also writes about them, echoing Lezama's description of the façade of

San Lorenzo Potosí (see figures 9.1–3): “In the Indian quarter of the great mining capital of Potosí, hearsay has it, there once lived an orphaned Indian from the tropical lowlands of the Chaco. According to myth, he went by the name of José Kondori, and in Potosí he learned to work wood and the crafts of inlaying and furniture building. By 1728, this self-taught Indian architect was constructing the magnificent churches of Potosí, surely the greatest illustration of the meaning of the baroque in Latin America. Among the angels and the vines of the façade of San Lorenzo, an Indian princess appears, and all the symbols of the defeated Incan culture are given a new lease on life. The Indian half-moon disturbs the traditional serenity of the Corinthian vine. American jungle leaves and Mediterranean clover intertwine. The sirens of Ulysses play the Peruvian guitar. And the flora, the fauna, the music, and even the sun of the ancient Indian world are forcefully asserted. There shall be no European culture in the New World unless all of these, our native symbols, are admitted on an equal footing” (196).

As for Aleijadinho, Fuentes focuses not on his façades but on his life-size statues of Old Testament prophets (see figures 11.8, 11.9), deployed along the steps of the Pilgrim Church of Bom Jesus do Matosinhos in Congonhas do Campo: “In the same way that a Spanish American baroque came into being, from Tonantzintla in Mexico to Potosí in upper Peru, through the encounter of Indian and European, so the fusion of black and Portuguese created one the greatest monuments of the New World: the Afro-Portuguese baroque of Minas Gerais in Brazil, the most opulent gold-producing region of the world in the eighteenth century. There, the mulatto Antônio Francisco Lisboa, known as Aleijadinho, wrought what many consider the culmination of the Latin American baroque. The son of a black slave woman and a white Portuguese architect, Aleijadinho was shunned by both his parents, and the world: the young man suffered from leprosy. So instead of seeking the society of men and women, he joined a baroque society of stone. The twelve statues of the prophets he carved in the staircase leading to the Church of the Good Child Jesus in Congonhas do Campo reject the symmetry of classical sculptures. Like Bernini’s Italian figures (but how absolutely remote from them geographically!), these are three-dimensional, moving statues, rushing down toward the spectator; they are rebellious statues, twisted in mystical anguish and human anger” (200–201).

- 39 In his study of the Iberian-American Baroque (Portuguese and Spanish America), Yves Bottineau affirms that in Spanish America, “there is a marked scarcity of curved plans and undulating walls.” *Iberian-American Baroque*, 90. Nevertheless, in “Baroque Curiosity,” Lezama refers to Borromini’s influence on the cathedral in Havana and its relation to the surrounding streets (*BNW* 234). As these contradictory assertions suggest, no single trajectory of influence or argument suffices to encapsulate the proliferating forms of the New World Baroque.
- 40 After 1755, as a consequence of the gold and diamond rush that brought sudden wealth to the province of Minas Gerais, this region “monopolized building activity in Brazil” (Kubler and Soria, *Art and Architecture*, 117). On the Brazilian Baroque of Minas Gerais, see Smith, “Colonial Architecture of Minas Gerais in Brazil”; Tribe,

“Mulatto as Artist and Image”; and the various essays in the section titled “Baroque Brazil” in Sullivan, *Brazil*, 112–309.

- 41 Charles Taylor, “Two Theories of Modernity,” in *Alternative Modernities*, ed. Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2001), 172–96.
- 42 See, for example, Patricia Yaeger, “Circum-Atlantic Super-abundance”; and Jon Smith and Deborah Cohn, eds., *Look Away! The U.S. South in New World Studies* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2004).
- 43 See John Ochoa’s discussion of Fuentes’s ironized Baroque in his “Threats of Collapse.”
- 44 Cruz, *Sonnets of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz*, 26, 27.