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Panofsky’s synthesis…will certainly stimulate, and form a point of
departure for new research…it will remain among the basic works
which determine turning points in the history of our discipline.¹

These words by Jan Białostocki on reviewing Erwin Panofsky’s *Tomb Sculpture* in the
*Art Bulletin* in 1965 were prescient. There are few publications of the last fifty years that
deal with the Western tradition of funerary monuments that do not refer to Panofsky’s
book, and no comparable synthesis of the subject of this scope has as yet superseded it.
The works Panofsky chose to discuss in his survey established a canon for this genre,
particularly for the medieval and renaissance periods, and a way of categorising funerary monuments that remains highly influential. In this introductory essay my purpose is not, however, to trace the impact of his publication via the development of the literature in the field. I will instead consider the conception and creation of his book—that is its genesis, scope, language, illustration and immediate reception—in the belief that there is a value in contextualising the monuments of art historical scholarship, as well as in contextualising the monuments themselves.\(^9\)

_Tomb Sculpture, Four Lectures on its Changing aspects from Ancient Egypt to Bernini_ was published in 1964, when Panofsky was seventy two years old, just four years before he died.\(^3\) With its vast chronological range, and just ninety six pages of text, limited footnotes, and a select bibliography structured around extremely copious images numbering no less than 446 black and white plates, this was a different type of book in its physical and intellectual incarnation from any Panofsky had written before.\(^4\) The US publisher, Harry Abrams, was a relative newcomer in the early 1960s, a house that specialised in what were then somewhat disparagingly called ‘art books’: indeed the unusual format (25 cm x 29 cm) suggested, to some reviewers, that it was a strange cross between a coffee table book and an academic tome. They found its size ‘pretentious’ and its square shape ‘inconvenient’.\(^5\) As the reviewer in the _Times Literary Supplement_ of 5 April 1965 observed, _Tomb Sculpture_ was not ‘the usual picture book, or indeed a popular picture book’: its combination of academic erudition, and what was seen as almost excessive, decadent, illustration caused some reviewers to feel a mixture of regret and admiration in equal parts for the volume and its author.\(^6\)

Panofsky himself clearly had great reservations about the final product. In his correspondence he frequently refers to it as a ‘book’, in inverted commas; ‘if book it can be called’ is also a phrase he uses in the preface to the publication itself.\(^8\) Indeed, he apologised for its text and appearance to those who wrote to congratulate him on it.\(^9\) His advice to Egon Verheyen, on sending him a copy was ‘please don’t read the rather superficial text… Just look at the pictures which are, for the most part, quite nice’,\(^10\) while to Jan Bialostocki he wrote ‘Do not expect too much from the book on funerary sculpture which should appear later this year. It is….. very superficial (only the abstract of three or four public lectures), in part misleading and horrible to look at’.\(^11\) Its main merit, in his eyes, was its pictures. These are certainly generous, in number and size, but often disorientating: they frequently swim free of context (which can be literally blacked out) and scale, their captions lacking dates as well as material and measurements which can make certain juxtapositions vertiginous (for example his figs 237-39, here fig. 1.2). Given the date at which _Tomb Sculpture_ was published it is unsurprising that none of the plates is in colour, though this remains, regrettably, a too-frequent practice for illustrations of all sculpture, not just tombs. Also unsurprising is the reliance on stock images for the illustrations (as is clear from the credits at the end), and thus on well established and canonical viewpoints, but Panofsky was not insensitive to the problems of this, and on one occasion where a particular angle of view was vital for his argument new photographs were made (his figs 224, 225, here fig 1.3).\(^12\)
1.3
Tomb Sculpture, figs 224-25: Effigy of Bishop Wolfhart von Roth, seen from above and from foot of tomb.
Tomb Sculpture may have been extensively illustrated, but it does not have the type of academic apparatus that distinguishes many of Panofsky's other major publications: the lack of a general bibliography means the wider literature Panofsky drew on is often invisible; the captions to the plates are full of errors; and the index, according to Panofsky himself was ‘produced by an idiot who has made it practically impossible to locate anything in the book’ which, he goes on to add ‘is perhaps just as well.’ His irritation may well have been over such baffling entries as ‘Art’ and ‘Bible’, or Saint-Denis being listed only under A for ‘Abbey Church’, though these are perhaps not as perplexing as ‘existence, Post mortal,’ apparently only dealt with on page 13. In comparison to the awe-inspiring authority of the article-length footnotes in Early Netherlandish Painting, and the erudite index that Panofsky himself compiled for that same book, Tomb Sculpture could, perhaps, seem lightweight.

Panofsky often wrote somewhat self-effacingly of his lectures and publications, so we should be cautious of taking his dismissal of this book at face value. However, in the case of Tomb Sculpture this dismissal was consistent and insistent. The first line of the preface even reads ‘The text of this volume was not intended for publication’. Faced with his apparent displeasure with it, and his feelings about its superficiality, it is perhaps ironic that his ‘unfortunate book on Tombs’ continues to be read, and cited. Its longevity and impact are however unsurprising, given the reputation and erudition of its author, the originality of many of its observations, the eloquence and wit with which it is written, and its enormous chronological scope. This scope was one of the reasons Panofsky was so concerned about its reception and tended to play down its contribution to the field: in a letter of 1964 to Horst Janson (who was editing the volume) he admitted ‘I am looking forward to the reviews, if any, with considerable apprehension. If the reviewer is a classical archaeologist, he will say that the other parts of the book may be alright but that everything said about Greek, Roman and Etruscan monuments is all wrong; and the same will apply, mutatis mutandis, to medievalists, Renaissance scholars and, above all, to Egyptologists.’

While Panofsky worried about how the reach of his endeavour left him open to criticism, the longue durée set out in Tomb Sculpture, starting with Ancient Egypt and finishing with the work of Bernini, is one of its most impressive elements, and was seen as such at the time. As one reviewer noted, ‘We feel as if we were shown a huge landscape from a mountain top’; and it is mostly the peaks, to paraphrase another reviewer of another book by Panofsky, that we visit, rather than the troughs: the tombs that form the central part of his narrative are canonical works found primarily in Paris, Florence and Rome, and monuments of the humanist tradition predominate. This makes Tomb Sculpture typical of Panofsky’s approach in general; throughout his life, he had wanted to ask questions concerning the meaning of what he considered the very greatest art, and the greatest artists. He had written his doctoral thesis on Albrecht Dürer; the subject of his notorious lost—and recently re-found—habilitation was Michelangelo and Raphael; his book on
Early Netherlandish painting is effectively centred around Jan van Eyck; and in his last years he produced a study of Titian. It is unsurprising then that the narrative thrust of *Tomb Sculpture* moves emphatically and inexorably towards Michelangelo, and ends with what is effectively a post-script on Bernini. Characteristically, Panofsky justified stopping at this point on the grounds that funerary art after this time was simply not very good, a point of view he expressed with one of his more memorable formulations: ‘All those that came after Bernini were caught in a dilemma—or rather a trilemma—between pomposity, sentimentality and deliberate archaism’.  

The chronological sweep of *Tomb Sculpture* is presented in four parts, a format that Panofsky was committed to since the book was, emphatically, a publication of four lectures given at the Institute of Fine Arts (IFA) in New York in the autumn of 1956, on the invitation of the director Craig Smyth. Unsurprisingly, they were hugely well attended: the secretary at the IFA informed him she was ‘trying to figure out a way of suspending chairs from the ceiling to accommodate your devoted audience’. Panofsky at the time clearly enjoyed the experience of giving this particular series, on this particular topic, and to this particular audience, since he wrote to Janson on 5 December 1956, following his last lecture saying ‘I am very happy indeed that I accepted Craig Smyth’s invitation to give those lectures. Not only was it great fun, but it resulted, as hardly ever before, in really fruitful discussions, corrections and amplifications; and this is the best that can be said of any enterprise of this nature’. While no recording of the lectures exists, the audio tapes of his later series on Titian at the IFA give some sense of the style of Panofsky’s delivery.

The slow progress of producing the book in the following years at times dampened Panofsky’s immediate enthusiasm: by March 1960 when he was still trying to field queries on particularly elusive material, he suggested to Janson that a motto for the flyleaf might be a quote from the German classical scholar Theodor Mommsen ‘Es gibt nichts Leichtsinnigeres auf der Welt als das Kolleglesen’ (‘There is nothing more irresponsible in the world than giving lecture courses’). Be that as it may, many of Panofsky’s major publications had begun life as lecture series, including *Studies in Iconology* (1939), *Early Netherlandish Painting. Its Origins and Character* (1953) and *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art* (1960). These had involved years of further research and intensive rewriting. In 1949 while working up his Charles Elliot Norton lectures into *Early Netherlandish Painting*, he observed: ‘if you write a book, you do the work first, and write the text afterwards. In a case like mine you have a text, but must change every word of it as you do the work’. This transformation for *Renaissance and Renascences* was still ongoing during the period 1956-58, and perhaps because of this he was unwilling to devote similar energy to *Tomb Sculpture*. Indeed, in the preface Panofsky claimed that this book was in effect the lectures as delivered; he states that he agreed to put at the disposal of the IFA a legible but essentially unaltered typescript of his talks, a list of illustrations and notes ‘as I had happened to jot them down’. It was to be for the ‘younger members of the institute’ to
edit the texts—correcting palpable errors, as he called them, chasing down photographs and checking citations. Horst Janson, an old friend and specialist on Donatello, was the editor in chief ‘imparting to the book its final shape’. In case we should forget, the table of contents reminds us once more of their origin, as we have ‘Lectures’, not ‘Chapters’ (fig. 1.4). And with his opening sentence of the first page, ‘An art historian can approach the subject of these lectures only with the greatest trepidation’, Panofsky underscores their nature yet again.27

Although the reviewers seemed to take this assertion concerning the genesis of the text at face value, it is much more than the lectures as he gave them. While the rewriting was not as extensive, prolonged and agonised as the process Panofsky went through transforming other lecture series into published form, *Tomb Sculpture* is far from a barely altered transcription of his lectures, despite the language of the text retaining a sense of the spoken word. This is evident just from their uneven length, if nothing else: ‘Lecture’ IV (The Renaissance, Its Antecedents and Its Sequel) at thirty pages is double the length of ‘Lecture’ I (From Egypt to the “Tomb of the Nereids”) for example, and with three times as many accompanying images. In addition, Panofsky’s correspondence in 1957 and early 1958, the two years after he gave the lectures, and leading up to its submission as a draft in May 1958, reveals that he spent this period, by his own account ‘worrying
those tombs like an old dog does a bone’. He told Bob Delaissé in the spring of 1957 that ‘Tombs are my latest hobby, so much so that the whole field of Netherlandish painting … has receded into the background’ and to Jan van Gelder in July of the same year he admitted that ‘I have, as you rightly surmised, the ‘obsession des tombeaux’. Indeed, while there seems little trace of this interest, in his correspondence at least, leading up to the lectures, after their delivery there is a lively exchange with knowledgeable friends and colleagues like Adolf Katzenellenbogen, asking for opinions on tomb-related issues, such as when the first examples of the virtues appear on tombs (origins were a constant preoccupation). There is also correspondence with Horst Janson, acting as editor, which indicates various additions and changes made even to the revised text as late as 1960, as new publications and evidence about old problems that Panofsky was worrying about came to light.

Most significantly for the final scope and focus of the book, Panofsky spent the summer of 1957 in Europe, based for a while in Paris, where he passed most of his time, as he asserts, going to visit tombs. This included a trip to Brou to see Margaret of Austria’s foundation, and other (unspecified) things in the region. That the tombs at Brou, at Saint-Denis and in the Louvre were all fresh in his visual memory, and recently experienced first hand is clear in his text, and it is these works that are among the most fully contextualised, and are particularly lyrically described, and analysed. Indeed, the extensive illustrations of the tombs at Brou, showing both details and fuller context, and Panofsky’s discussion of the ingenious solution to the dilemma of funerary etiquette presented by the placement of the tombs of Margaret, her husband and her mother-in-law in the church there, is one of the most insightful passages in the book, addressing as it does hierarchy of decoration, location, access and viewpoint, foreshadowing the type of work to be done so effectively by later writers.

Panofsky’s research at this period between the delivery of the lectures and their publication was often with an eye to prove the narrative force and ‘rules’ that he had already decided upon as central to his story, and which, as one reviewer noted, he was so fond of formulating. In his correspondence we see him trying to establish first occurrences, and assessing the significance of any exceptions to his rules. When, after his last lecture, Janson drew his attention to the tomb slab of Antonio Amati in Santa Trinita in Florence, whose skeletal effigy seemed to undermine Panofsky’s categorization of the transi as an iconography confined of the north of Europe, he admitted ruefully ‘… how careful one must be in making general affirmations or negations without an escape clause…’. However he soon found just such an escape clause in this instance: Amati—whom he could find out nothing about—must have had, Panofsky averred, northern connections not least because the ‘inscription is written in a kind of script that would have made the other people buried in Santissima Trinita turn in their graves’. He subsequently went on to transform the Amati exception into a support for his argument about the fundamental
distinction between Renaissance Italy and the ‘Gothic north’, one of his key binary constructs in *Tomb Sculpture*. ‘Upon analysis’ he wrote to Janson in April 1957 ‘Amati’s tomb has turned out to confirm my case (when we meet next week I will explain how)’. His explanation, as we have it in the book, is that the effigy is still given all the dignity of life, since it is not shown naked: thus Panofsky turned the witness for the prosecution into a witness for the defence, and uses it as a clinching argument for the closing line of Chapter III, where he writes ‘Here, as in a flash, we see the difference between the Northern Middle Ages and the Italian Renaissance’.

While Panofsky may have expanded and finessed certain elements of the material he presented in the initial lectures, the formation of his fundamental ideas about the development of funerary sculpture, and the place of the Medieval North as opposed to the Renaissance South in this story, can be traced back some years, to his 1939 publication *Studies in Iconology*. The kernel of the lectures that became *Tomb Sculpture* is here in a digression leading up to his analysis of Michelangelo’s tomb of Julius II. This five-page overview sets out the narrative that he would expand over fifteen years later, starting with ancient Egypt and tracing the development of funerary imagery though the early Christian and medieval periods, discussing the significance of the introduction of the Virtues and Liberal Arts, and the survival and reintroduction of classical imagery and form, with the aim of determining the place of Michelangelo’s tomb within the course of this development.

The other significant project for the formulation of the ideas in *Tomb Sculpture* was surely his work on the book that was to become *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art* (1960), another lecture project that dated back to 1952, and that Panofsky had been working on with difficulty over several years. His development of his theories about the revival of antiquity in the medieval and renaissance periods that were central to this book are clearly also a determining presence in the selection of material and its interpretation in *Tomb Sculpture*. He sent the text of both books to the publishers in the same week in May 1958, though *Tomb Sculpture* was going to be another six years in the press. In a postscript to Janson in 1959 he wrote ‘I begin to be afraid that the Tombs will really appear as a posthumous memorial; but I should not mind’.

It was in *Studies in Iconology* that Panofsky first puts forward the terms ‘retrospective’ and ‘prospective’ to characterise the imagery of funerary monuments, and it is these terms (always set in inverted commas) that provide the central thread for Panofsky’s narrative in *Tomb Sculpture*. As defined by him, the imagery of the ‘prospective’ tomb looked forward to salvation and the afterlife, while that of a ‘retrospective’ monument looked backwards to the past, commemorating the life of the individual and his deeds: as he eloquently formulated it, we move ‘from the magic manipulation of the future to the imaginative commemoration of the past’. The development as Panofsky traced it, in its very broadest terms, ran from ‘prospective’ in Egypt to ‘retrospective’ in ancient Greece, back to ‘prospective’ in the medieval world and then, with the revival of antiquity and rise of humanism in the Renaissance, to the reinstatement of their ‘retrospective’ function
alongside the ‘prospective’ purpose, as tombs became a conduit for commemoration as well as salvation. With this narrative in mind, he wrote to Katzenellengbogen about the thirteenth-century tomb of Clement II in Bamberg, a monument whose extremely lively character was proving difficult for Panofsky to classify because of its contradictory qualities, but, he assures himself, these features did not disprove the general laws he was trying to establish: ‘Be that as it may’, he writes, ‘everyone seems to agree that the iconography is basically “prospective” and does not invalidate the general impression one receives from the rank and file of Gothic funerary monuments’. This comment is indicative of Panofsky’s approach to the material he amassed in *Tomb Sculpture*: he sought exceptions and marshalled them to prove his much loved rules.

Indeed, throughout *Tomb Sculpture* we can sense Panofsky attempting to codify funerary imagery by formulating its terminology. His text is liberally peppered with phrases like ‘what I would like to call’, ‘what I propose to call’ and ‘what may be called’, as he established or invented categories to structure the material and classify its forms and setting, literally, the terms of the debate while defining the origins of its language. In the process he examines, with great elegance and wit, terms such as ‘eternity’ and ‘perpetuity’ the ‘image soul’ and the ‘life soul’ (the Shâ and the Bâ), exercising liberally his favourite semantic strategy of setting up opposing binaries. One of the most influential of these categories has been the ‘Activation of the Effigy’, but we are also treated to the ‘statue accoudée’; the ‘Image in Majesty’ and the motif of the ‘Arts Bereft’. Panofsky often favours the adoption of French terms, perhaps as a way of conferring greater authority. He speaks of the ‘representacion au vif’ and the ‘representacion de la mort’; the *enfeu*, in preference to the altar tomb; ‘tombeaux de grande cérémonie’ (or the double-decker tomb) the *gisant*, of course but also of demi-*gisants’ as we may call them’ (for the figures raised up on their elbows found first, he is perturbed to admit, not in Italy but on Spanish tombs at Guadalajara and Sigüenza). Whether or not the terms he appears to be inventing are actually used by him for the first time (some certainly have longer histories, and some are drawn from contemporary documents), his definition of them and his explanation of their linguistic origins in *Tomb Sculpture* have ensured their currency.

The examples Panofsky drew on to support his taxonomy and to tell his story were naturally dependent on his intellectual formation, past academic endeavours, his own experience, and the arguments he was pursuing. His engagement with medieval German sculpture from his days in Hamburg ensured that this region was well covered: this was a field he continued to teach for some years once he had emigrated to the United States, as his course outlines at the IFA demonstrate. His deep knowledge of this field is evident in his 1924 two volume study, *Die Deutsche Plastik*, that must have been a formative work for his IFA lectures: almost all of the examples of funerary monuments that were illustrated in the 1924 study reappear in *Tomb Sculpture* (although apparently with newer stock photographs that show the objects lit slightly differently but from the same angle as in the 1924 versions). More important than German was of course Italy: Panofsky’s previous
work on Michelangelo’s tomb projects, his longstanding interest in the classical tradition and the humanistic language of tomb iconography and the basic structure of his narrative also ensured that these played a major role, particularly in Lecture IV. Panofsky’s close relationships with Leopold Ettlinger and Horst Janson during this period, respectively specialists on Pollaiuolo and Donatello, may also have contributed to the prominent presence of works by these artists. The extensive use of examples from Saint-Denis, notably in Lecture IV, reflects newer interests, and must relate in part, as noted above, to the time spent in Paris in the summer of 1957: the availability of dramatic photographs of these monuments by Pierre Jahan, theatrically lit (e.g. his figs 346-51), may also have helped to ensure they featured extensively.

The regions that receive by far the least attention in Panofsky’s text are England, the Iberian Peninsula, Belgium and the Netherlands, and eastern Europe. There are in fact only four English works illustrated, five or six from Spain, a handful more from the Netherlands, and none from Poland or Portugal, for example. The major monuments at Westminster Abbey, Canterbury, York, Burgos, Miraflores, Toledo, Las Huegas, Batalha, Bruges, Cracow and Breda, to name but a few, are absent. Some of these must be accounted for simply by his lack of first hand experience of these regions, though Panofsky bristled at this suggestion from the reviewer in the TLS: as he wrote to Janson:

I don’t know whether you have seen the review of the TOMBS in the Times Literary Supplement. The reviewer damns us with faint praise and reproaches us for insufficient attention to English monuments. He is probably quite right….. But the trouble is that all other members of the United Nations could—and probably will—raise the same objection from their point of view.\[48\]

However, Panofsky’s knowledge of English sculpture was probably not extensive; he had spent little time in that country, having last visited London in 1936. The equally scant treatment of Spain and Portugal is probably also partly explicable in a similar way: he had attempted to enter Spain in 1936, but was prevented from doing so by the Civil War, and never tried again.\[49\] However, in general terms, medieval English art did not enthral him, while the sculpture of the Iberian peninsula was mostly an unknown quantity: if he had wanted to undertake a survey of English monuments, either through travel or from photographs in the 1950s he could have done so, but Franco’s Spain was likely to have been more of a problem, and its monuments were not well published, and many were then in very poor condition. While understandable, this lack of familiarity with Iberian works of the fifteenth century is particularly unfortunate, since their iconography would have complicated his narrative, though he may have batted their evidence away as effectively as he did for the perturbing examples of rule-breaking effigies he was aware of from that region.\[50\] The relative absence of Netherlandish tombs in Panofsky’s survey is perhaps
more surprising, given the high regard in which he held the painting of this region and his considerable first hand knowledge of Belgium and the Netherlands: but Panofsky’s interest had been in its painting, not its sculpture; it is possible he just did not see its contribution in this media as of great significance. Moreover, the most significant examples, like the tombs of Mary of Burgundy and Charles the Bold in Bruges, placed emphasis on heraldry and lineage in a manner that did not fit easily into Panofsky’s narrative.

As well as his blind spots over certain regions, Panofsky also was uninterested in certain types of funerary monument, most notably perhaps medieval tomb brasses: despite the fact that one is embossed in gold on the cloth binding of the first edition of *Tomb Sculpture*, they are given only a couple of lines in his text, and these concern the absurdity of their imagery. One senses he may not have thought of these works as art worth studying, or perhaps as ‘art’ at all.

While Panofsky was himself keenly aware of the limitations of his study, and how selective his survey of such a vast terrain was by necessity, his contemporaries found much to admire in it. Colleagues writing to Panofsky perhaps predictably described his book as ‘brilliant’, and ‘exciting’, but the published reviews it received were also enthusiastic, recognising its ambition and the herculean task of bringing order into such a vast and diverse body of material. Even the somewhat less positive article in the TLS admitted that ‘the story professor Panofsky tells us is a story never told so comprehensively or so intelligently before’ and it was acclaimed as a ‘gallant effort to survey the field and name the questions that must be asked’.

Indeed, even if it was, arguably, as much a picture book as a text book—or perhaps, in part at least, because of it—*Tomb Sculpture* defined as well as surveyed the field. Its teleological narrative and persuasive terminology have remained tenacious. While in many ways, fifty years on, it shows its age, in 1964 it was at the vanguard of a new wave of studies, a work that considered not simply style but function, meaning and cultural significance, that drew a very wide disciplinary arc, and which set the terms of the debate, formulating questions as well as terminology, and looking at many of the monuments in new ways. As one reviewer eloquently put it: ‘Panofsky takes us back to the grave, and works of art, which we knew well enough in their vacuous description as sculpture and could date by their style, now stand before us as funerary monuments and speak’. This ‘activation’ of tomb sculpture, as a product and reflection of a culture and its set of beliefs, is perhaps the most important legacy of Panofsky’s book.
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