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My very warm thanks as well to my family and friends for their unremitting support. There was a moment when serious problems with my computer put me on the verge of a nervous breakdown. Jim Roberts, computers' supervisor at our Department, spent many hours to set it up and I am immensely indebted to him for that help. English is not my first language, not even the second, and it was thanks to the kind corrections made by my British friends and fellow-students at Leicester that I
could managed to write this doctoral dissertation. I am also very grateful to the other postgraduate students undertaking research at the Department in the area of communication because this essay has benefited a lot from my regular discussions with them. Finally, last but not least, I wish to place on the record my most especial acknowledgement to Armelle, to whom I would like to dedicate this thesis in gratitude for her tremendous help in all stages of my research, from the preliminary researchs in archives and libraries to the daily exchange of views during the arduous process of writing.
0.2 JUSTIFICATION AND OBJECTIVES.

The history of taste is a discipline said to have many subdirectories: the annals of collecting, the historiography of art-criticism, the evolution of aesthetics, the changes in the art market, etc. One day historians of taste should also study the topics of academic dissertations, for they too are affected by the pendulum moves of taste. It is no accident that the art of the nineteenth century has become a popular subject for doctoral dissertations only in recent years. Up until the late 1970s such a choice would have seemed outmoded, or could even have been accused of being reactionary, as though the culture of the previous century did not deserve the same attention as other cultures. Prior to this time, art historians dispatched the manifold artistic production of the nineteenth century with a distorted image. They used to write about just a few movements - the Romantics, the Pre-Raphaelites, the Impressionists, the Post-Impressionists - and the rest seemed taboo, for it was systematically ignored with the radicalism of a cruel damnatio memoriae. In art museums, mainstream art-works of the 19th and early 20th century were banned from display and exiled to the store rooms. During this period of general indifference nobody seemed to care, except perhaps some senior citizens who were hurt by the hostility shown towards their own cultural standards.

It is often forgotten that our contemporary identity is indeed based upon 19th century innovations. Democratic parliamentarism, the abolition of slavery, the industrial revolution, great technical progress and scientific inventions, labour and social regulations, generalized medical care... are some of the inputs of the historic period comprising the time between the French Revolution and the Great War. It was also a decisive period for the history of art. Since the Greeks, Western art had been driven by the imitation of nature, but this imitation peaked and reached its non-return point in the landscape painters of the nineteenth century. The 'scientific' decomposition of colours and drawing by means of impressionist strokes was the swan song of realism, which opened the doors to the non realist avant-gardes of the 20th century. Finally, from the point of view of the social history of art, that period had an undeniable importance. On the one hand, the guilds were abolished everywhere, and their hierarchical system for the artistic career gave way to a profession practised by free individuals in a free market. On the other hand, the
number of art-customers increased throughout the 19th century thanks to illustrated editions, public exhibitions, museums of art, and other communication media.

Thus, the *en bloc* damnation suffered by the common legacy of a century should come to an end. The much required defence of the heritage and culture of the nineteenth century gradually started. The destruction of iron-built train stations, commercial galleries, market-halls, towering factories, and other typical monuments of that time, ceased. The paintings, sculptures, and decorative arts of the 19th century turned gradually to be seen and appreciated in the art market, in art exhibitions and in art-museums. If a banner was needed as a major symbol of that recuperation, this came in 1986 when in Paris a museum for the arts of 1848-1914 was opened at the former train-station of Orsay. On the other hand, many art historians began to confront taboo subjects: art-works which had passed from the greatest success to the greatest disdain were reconsidered once again. In short, an increasing number of museum professionals and art-historians presented a non-distorted study of nineteenth century art, and it is within this context that I would like my work to be considered.

Since 1987, when I graduated from the University of Saragossa (Spain) with a dissertation on 'History painting in Saragossa (1849-1919)', my research has centred around issues concerning the official taste of the 19th and early 20th century, specialising in the history of a few academies of art and their members. However, not only art-academies embodied that taste; art-museums did also. Therefore, this PhD thesis is in a sense a continuation, not an interruption, of my previous work. Seen from that point of view, my first essay in the field of museum studies is just the pursuit of the same campaign from another front. It is no accident if this dissertation on 'museums specialising in 19th century art', is mainly an historical study, since I had never been trained as lawyer, sociologist, or semiologist, but as an art-historian. That my subject should be about 19th century art in museums seemed to me obvious, because we always give our best when we deal with familiar knowledge.

Since the Musée d'Orsay opened, numerous studies have emerged about its conversion from a railway station to museum, its impressive architecture and design, its management peculiarities, its famous collections, its popularity. This begs the question: 'Why not study its Parisian or foreign precedents and peers?' It is surprising how scarce the new bibliography is on that subject, either in France or elsewhere. It seems as if a taboo already removed from the history of art is still surviving in the history of museums: every week a new publication appears somewhere about some museums of modern art, but their references to the past ignore the 19th century, as though the first museums of contemporary art had been the Guggenheim Museum or the M.O.M.A. On the other hand, general histories of museums do not ignore the 19th century, which was in fact the boom of the museum age; but in contrast with the
many pages they all devote to the development of the national museums of antiquities or the national galleries of old masters, they usually write just a few sentences -if any-, to dismiss of the most popular of that time, those devoted to modern masters.

The main objective of the present essay is therefore, to fill a gap in the literature of museum studies. My way of doing this is not necessarily the same as others would do their research, had they been presented with a similar task. I do not think my nationality has played an important part. In spite of the fact that most of my research has been paid for by the Spanish Government, the space devoted here to Spanish museums is almost insignificant. This is not a virtue in itself (I would never dare to underrate the precious work of many of my best colleagues and friends, who are writing dissertations in Leicester about museums in their own countries!); but it is true that a sense of balance is always welcome in international studies (above all, I had tried to avoid the outrageous chauvinism which annoys me so much in some historians of museums). Conversely, the places where I have been living have been very influential: most of the experiences and references I have gathered preparing this dissertation are limited to museums of Western Europe, because this is the cultural space in which I have been travelling and living in the last four years. Finally, my being an art-historian has no doubt influenced my view, which is rather focused on collectors and collections, whereas other contributions to the history of museums are more centred on museum architecture or management, depending upon the task of the writer. Nevertheless, I have refrained from the anecdotal perspective of some collection-centered narratives produced by art-historians turned museum-chronologists, who merely see art-works as disputed hunting-trophies of an acquisition contest. The historic role of museums should not be reduced to that of mere strategists, gaining art-works like generals gain territories.

The consequence of the above is, that I sincerely wish future contributors to complete my point of view, signal my gaps and correct my faults. It is in fact a cardinal objective of this dissertation to stimulate further contributions. There should not be taboo subjects for historians of museums. It is an historic fact that 19th century art happened to be, or has been chosen to be, the aim of the collecting policies of some museums, and this phenomenon deserves our attention. I also wish my work to be of some use for the future of the galleries studied here, many of which are in the process of disappearance (ultra-modern museologists with a doctrine would never dare to attempt changes in historical 17th century-built quadrierie, but many unchanged 19th century-built galleries of contemporary art are now in danger!). However, it is not an objective to promote museums for 19th century art. Nowhere in the following pages will it be said or implied, that 19th century art is best appreciated
in one of those specialist museums rather than in a general art gallery. Historians do their work better when they involve themselves in creating a dialogue between the past and the present, therefore frequent references to the modern museology or comparisons with the present museums will be found interspersed with the comments on museums or museum-masters of the past. But the museums' policy of tomorrow lies beyond the limits of this PhD dissertation (besides, it is very unlikely that an academic paper may ever have any influence in politics!).
0.3 LITERATURE REVIEW. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND STRUCTURE OF THIS DISSERTATION.

Although the History of Museums is a much younger discipline than other domains of History, its practitioners already work from a multitude of approaches, from structuralism and Marxism to post-modern theory, mirroring most of the ideas which have influenced academic circles in recent decades. Perhaps one of the most developed lines of thought is that of literature attempting to re-read the past of museums according to some form of social analysis. This is by no means surprising for an area of study directly linked to socio-cultural history and specifically to the history of cultural institutions and cultural facilities: museums are close relatives of libraries, temples, monuments, schools, universities, scientific societies, academies, residences of artists, art-unions, halls of exhibitions, dealers' galleries, World Fairs, theatres, cinemas, arts-centres, sports-centres, amusement parks, and so on. Therefore, new researches in Museum Studies are, most naturally, socio-cultural researches.

Thus, my labelling a new contribution to the discipline as 'a socio-historical study' might seem gratuitously redundant rather than self-explanatory. Used by other historians this label would immediately recall the genre of interdisciplinary historical research vindicated by Fernand Braudel and the *Annales* School; but in the mind of museums historians, this expression requires further expansion to become meaningful. Hence, I would like to start a synthesis of the state of the art avowing that this dissertation has been swayed by two scholars who have authoritatively combined in their essays Sociology with the History of Museums. My supervisor, Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, is the first. A number of features of my thesis, including part of the title, are inspired in her PhD thesis, submitted five years ago to the Department of Sociology of Education of the University of London: *The Museum: The Socio-Historical Articulations of Knowledge and Things* (Hooper-Greenhill, 1988, cf. also her later book, 1992). The second is Dominique Poulot, lecturer at the Department of Modern History of the University of Grenoble (France). Many of his writings (cf. especially Poulot, 1983a & 1986a) are concerned with the finality devised for art museums in past and present societies. Indeed, the finality of museums is also a main focus in my studying *Museums for nineteenth century art*. The thrust of the argument of this thesis is to assess up to which extend were the museums discussed really meant
for the art of that period. They were meant 'for' nineteenth century fine arts to be their specialty.

Like the studies of both Hooper-Greenhill and Poulot, this essay also discusses some particular cases to illustrate a global discourse, which is aimed to be international in its considerations. The ultimate objective is a comparative international study, not an exhaustive 'global' survey of all possible examples in every country. Such a research would occupy decades and would prove too costly. It would be beyond the human resources of a single person! Some of the venerable pioneer-scholars who wrote universal histories of museums spent on those projects not just a few years but their entire lives and even then they did not entirely succeed. Inevitably, their voluminous chronicles (Curtius, 1870; Murray, 1904; Bazin, 1967) offered far more detailed information about their respective countries. Nevertheless, they remain the basic reference for any international study on museums, including this essay. They provide meagre data on museums devoted to 19th century art, yet they have been very useful for me as inexhaustible sources of museological thought and general information.

In order to complete their gaps, more specific publications surveying the history of some institutions have been lavishly used here, as the references scattered throughout the text and the final bibliography will evince. Happily, the history of cultural institutions is today a discipline in considerable expansion. More and more institutions have publications recording their past. Frequently, one finds also this kind of chronicle in the introductions of the catalogues and guides available in every museum-shop. A major source of information for my research have been in fact specific historical accounts of this kind that I have been collecting in the last years: books, leaflets, booklets, guides, introductions to catalogues, and other publications of this type. I have obtained some of them in my visits to museums and others have been kindly posted to me by the personnel of some of the museums studied in this pages.

Hitherto, this kind of literature has often indulged in eulogistic writings, but the examples emerging today are honest efforts of historical meditation. Museums are becoming increasingly interested in investigating not merely their collections but also about their own past as institutions. Proof of this are, for example, the permanent galleries reserved in the Louvre and in the Ashmolean Museum to put on display their own origins. Not to speak of the far more frequent cases of temporary exhibitions devoted to the history of museums. Several of them have been in fact, some of the most thorough sources of information for the topic studied here (Lacambre, 1974 & 1987; Trapp, 1981; Waterfield, 1991). These and other similar initiatives of museum workers self-questioning their own profession (Beard & Henderson & Phillips, 1992) show their willingness to transform art museums from mere palaces of art into...
communicators of information, ideas, and interrogations. Scholars all over the world live now in times of 'reflexivity', as a well-known book has put it (Lawson, 1985, p. 9-31); fortunately, museum professionals are not an exception.

Those contributions are enriching a field of study in continuous expansion. The increasing bibliography on the history of cultural institutions is becoming a central focus in the work of many historians. Corner-stones in this discipline were the seminal books of Nikolaus Pevsner on art academies and other cultural institutions (Pevsner, 1940; 1976). He broke new ground in a line of cross-European comparative studies from whom the framework of this dissertation derives. This kind of comparative analysis has been fostered by international symposia and/or publications reuniting contributions by specialists from different nations in order to discuss specific topics of the history of museums. Some of them have been indeed pre-eminent sources for me (Denecke & Kahnsitz, 1977; Haskell, 1981; McGregor, 1985). More specific studies on a national or local scale have also been of great help. Particular mention here deserve four doctoral dissertations analysing the progressive intervention of the public powers in museums and the arts in Britain (Minihan, 1977), France (Genet-Delacroix, 1988; Sherman, 1989) and Spain (Jiménez-Blanco, 1989). Studies of this kind offer in every page a rich base for substantial thought, because they consider the history of museums not as a mere sum of the chronicles of singular cases, but from a political point of view and in the context of art policies in general.

These decisive studies on the history of cultural institutions, can however be complemented with more specific socio-historical approaches, either focusing on a special feature or else on a particular period. The later option has been splendidly exemplified by some weighty doctoral dissertations (Fawcett, 1974; Vaisse, 1980; Marrinan, 1988) devoted to a politic moment and the synchronous arts policies in general: urban planning and new monuments, museums and palaces of arts, theatres and opera-houses, art commissioned and purchased by the public authorities, the various kinds of official exhibitions, the protagonism of artists in social gatherings, the bursaries and prizes given to painters, sculptors, writers, musicians, etc. The remaining option works the other way round: a single social feature is discussed trough a diachronic historical survey. Some of the most valuable examples for this pattern are PhD theses focused on the pedagogic capacity of the museum (Wittlin, 1949, republished in 1970) or in its social function (Taborsky, 1981). This diachronic approach has often been used by authors having in mind a holistic idea or ideology whose light they have tried to cast on an aspect of the history of museums. A well-known example is Kenneth Hudson's polemical book A Social History of Museums: What the Visitors Thought (Hudson, 1975), which stresses the universal 'progress' from the collection-minded pursuits of the early museums to the present user-minded practises.
There is nothing intrinsically wrong with writing socio-political chronicles of art institutions in form of fierce polemics à thése (for a salient instance cf. Laurent, 1982). However, the literature of this kind produced by historians of museums frequently appears deceptively schematic. Over-simplified Marxian arguments have been a permanent temptation for social historians since the Hungarian Arnold Hauser published in 1951 his Social History of Literature and Art, fashionable world-wide in the 1960s and 70s. Even earnest Marxist writers have been more brilliant when analysing the political iconography of some art galleries (Duncan & Wallach, 1978 and 1980) than in writing sociological surveys of the history of museums (Binni & Pinna, 1989).

Although these polemicists believed their contributions to be radically different from the previous literature produced by traditional chroniclers of museums, they nevertheless shared with them a common character: their fatalistic belief in History as a teleological progress. In general, the historiography of museums used to be tendentiously 'Darwinist', for all changes in museums were perceived as result of a slow unavoidable evolution. The history of museums was always presented as a long-term progress moving across time from the first collections of curiosities towards the scientific classification and educative aims of modern museums (Alexander, 1979; Bazin, 1967; Hudson, 1975; Ladendorf, 1973; Morely, 1968; Munro, 1963; Murray, 1904; Ripley, 1982 -first edited in 1969, Wittlin, 1949). According to that idea of progress, the museums of the past were necessarily worse in any sense and those of the future necessarily better.

Certain of that, convinced educationalists dreamed of a world where museums had been more and more aimed at the common people, which is a beautiful Utopia but substantially unreal: in fact many cases reveal art museums to have been more popular, more didactic and more accessible -both in terms of opening times and admission charges- during the 19th century than now! For a number of years however the dream survived, fed by reassuring quantifications of visitors -another 20th century fetish. After all, nobody had ever heard of long queues in front of the earlier royal galleries, whilst this has become a very familiar social phenomenon in all major museums since World War II thanks to the blockbuster exhibitions regularly organised in these great temples. Yet, an eminent sociologist awakened museums professionals from their day-dreaming. The raising number of visits to museums, said Pierre Bourdieu, did not necessarily mean a social widening in museum visitors, because the 'love of art' and the museum mania was in fact only affecting a restricted cultural elite (Bourdieu & Darbel, 1966).

Thus Bourdieu led museologists to consider how the different socio-cultural categories of people have addressed art galleries. A 'new museology' was born (Auer, 1989; Vergo, 1989; Rivière, 1989). Sheer quantitative surveys about the 'public' of
museums had to be complemented with qualitative surveys of 'publics' (Hooper-Greenhill, 1988b; Wright, 1991). This methodological upheaval has also affected historians of museums, in spite of their obvious constraints. Instead of questionnaires answered by samplings of people randomly taken from the whole social spectrum, historians deal with documentary sources (archive records, chronicles, novels, books of memoirs) whose authors usually belong to special socio-cultural strata. Clearly, these sources are particularly inconvenient for a qualitative sociological study of museum visitors. However, museum visitors are not the only 'public' (or 'publics') to be considered while studying the social pervading of museums. The spread of art matters in the social tissue always occurs in concentric circles; the first social audience of any human creation is in fact the author itself and his/her commissioner (Ragghianti, 1990), and the second circle of expansion is the restricted social universe of other authors, art clients and amateurs (Bourdieu, 1992). It is therefore no coincidence if a strong current in the recent literature by social historians of museums has focused on museum masters and their inter influences, since we rarely have qualitative information about museum visitors in the past.

Perhaps the most comprehensive European contribution in this line has been the book by Walter Grasskamp: Museumsgründer und Museumsstifter: Zur Sozialgeschichte des Kunstmuseum (Grasskamp, 1981). In that historical survey only the part about museums-founders was directly linked with my own research, but its general distribution seemed very attractive to me and I could not refrain from attempting a similar binomial contrast. Thus, in the 19th century fostering of galleries of modern art, I have differentiated two social kinds of patrons: monarchs or their ministers in a first part and private notables and bourgeois in a second part. It is among Americans where socio-historical distinctions of this kind had raised an earlier interest, which is by no means a coincidence considering how clearly the history of their museums has been determined by the social condition and ideas of private founders. If I have developed a special interest in classifying museums according to the nature of their strivers I own it to the inspiring pages of books like Palaces for the People. A Social History of the American Art Museum (Burt, 1977), The Art Museum. Power, Money, Ethics (Meyer, 1979) and, especially, Museum Masters: their Museums and their Influence (Alexander, 1983).

This kind of approach seems a most natural option for any social historian of museums previously trained as art historian. The study of art patrons and art collectors is one of the most developed fields of research in the social history of art, especially since Francis Haskell published in 1963 his seminal book Patrons and Painters. A Study in the Relations between Italian Art and Society in the Age of the Baroque. But, in as much as some of the most influential art patrons and art collectors of the
19th and 20th centuries were also museum masters and museum founders, is it not obvious that social history of art and social history of museums are overlapping disciplines? Thus, one can only agree with Niels von Holst in his conviction that both the evolution of art and the development of museums are mere sub-categories of the history of taste. Although his voluminous book *Künstler, Sammler, Publikum* (Holst, 1967; cf. also Alsop, 1982) is usually compared to the other big compendia of museums' history, it seems to me that his approach was completely different and much more modern — or indeed 'post-modern' avant la lettre. Instead of writing yet another universal meta-narrative of museums illustrating their continuous evolution towards a teleological perfection, he presented a chronicle dominated by discontinuity and U-turns in taste.

However, merely scanning the frequent changes in art taste is insufficient to spot the social determinants of the history of art museums. As Dominique Poulot has put it, questions of national identity, international affinities, political issues or pedagogic ideals are much more relevant than the mere history of taste to explain the social *goût du musée* and the *goût du monument* (Poulot, 1981b: p. 115; cf. also Poulot, 1992). Thus if the historians of taste have detected short-wave discontinuities in the history of museums, social historians on the other hand are much more concerned with long-wave changes related to the history of mentalities (Huizinga, 1955). Pierre Francastel, the patriarch of French social art historians, stressed that one has to connect *esthétique* and *causality*, because what really matters from a socio-historical point of view it is not a factual history, but an association between historical events and their *modèles imaginaires*, as scientists relate their observations to mathematical theorems (Francastel, 1963: p. 124-125). In his sociological and historical works, the philosopher Michel Foucault pursued this quest to discern the succession of different mentality moments which he called *épistèmes* (Foucault, 1966). There is no reason why this socio-historical approach should not be applied to the history of museums as well.

Actually, much of the historical research carried out at the Department of Museum Studies of the University of Leicester seeks to analyse the past and present of museums at the light of the history of mentalities (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992; Pearce, 1992; Kavanagh, 1990 & 1991). The first doctoral dissertation submitted here was in fact an interpretation of the past of museums in Britain as a reflection of the changing ideas of their professionals (Teather, 1983). Sadly, that impressive study of how museological thought circulated and the prototypes or established patterns of museums has never been published. My unmasked obsession about identifying 'models' of museums and their eventual influences upon the museums founded in...
related cultural areas derives partly from that (cf. also Hudson, 1987; Teather, 1991), although this fixation for the tracing of 'influences' is indeed typical of most art historians (Greenhalgh, 1978; Gombrich, 1979). The same could be said of many literature experts, philologists, philosophers and communication theorists too. After all, is it not patently true that, as the guru of Post-modernism has put it, every person is always located at nodal points of specific communication circuits? (Lyotard, 1979: p. 31).

This image of communication cloverleaves or 'nodal points' —«noeuds»— has become one of the most cherished literary references for post-modern philosophers, who seek to demonstrate that human history is not a progression in a single line. Such vision of History derives from post-structuralist writers like Foucault. However, the source acknowledged by Jean-François Lyotard for this terminology in particular is the Systems theory, which imagines every society as a system of social intercourse with 'cross-roads' —«carrefours»— at which communication converges and is redistributed (Lyotard, 1979: p. 8 of introduction and footnote 56). In their attempt to conciliate Marxist principles and the scepticism of the post-structuralists towards teleological narratives of History, Ernesto Laclau and Chantay Mouffe have also used the term 'nodal points' to designate historical fragments which, contrary to Marx's one-way progression of History by 'modes of production', are short and pluridirectional historical steps. It was from them that Eileen Hooper-Greenhill borrowed in her doctoral dissertation the term 'nodal points' that has been reused here again in a similar sense but in an essentially different discourse. Coincidentally, my own interest as historian starts precisely in the period after the last 'nodal point' discussed by her—the French Revolution and the Napoleonic era— (Hooper-Greenhill 1988 and 1992), but my doctoral thesis is not a continuation of hers!

After careful consideration, I decided not to structure my survey according to the historical breaks proposed by Foucault and the other preachers of the death of Modernity. There is not much agreement among them about the date when that proclaimed end took place: the 1930s? the 1950s?, the 1970s?. Considering their propensity to remit the death of Modernity again and again, accounting their tendency to make Post-Modernity start just a few years before the moment when the penultimate post-modernist theory appears, one can not avoid turning back with relief to the customary division by centuries. For a study on the historical development of museums specialised in nineteenth century art, nothing seems indeed more proper that a break at the beginning of the 20th century; at the moment when the art of the 19th century can not be called 'modern art' because this adjective has to be used with other meaning: not as the contrary of 'old masters' but as opposite to 19th century academicism. Nevertheless, it is obvious that changes in our conventional calendar of
centuries need some 'corrections' prior to be used as boundaries of real politic, cultural and social changes. For this reason, historians usually delimit the frontiers of the nineteenth century between the French Revolution and the First World War (for a justification of this limits cf. the introduction in Knight, 1986) and these are the chronological limits assumed here for the art and culture of the 19th century.

All in all, this essay is intended to be an historical exercise, not a philosophical cogitation, and it is therefore reasonable that the example of historians prevail here upon the philosophical theories. Post-modernism deserves however a particular homage in this literature review for many reasons. The rediscovery of nineteenth century art, as a whole, has been directly connected with the rise of post-modern scepticism in the art-world regarding the Modern tradition. Whereas the Museum of Modern Art in New York (opened in 1929) was a landmark in the enthronement of the Modern avant-gardes (Picasso and Matisse were worshipped there together with their 'historic' predecessors, Cézanne and Gauguin), it seems that the controversial pluralism of taste practised by Post-modern artists has found one of its best symbols at the Parisian museum for nineteenth century art. By recovering the Salonists from the reserves, the Musée d'Orsay (inaugurated in 1986) proposed an inclusive view of the past which accepts contrary values; moreover, instead of demolishing the old train station, Orsay's museographical space was conceived as a dialogue of past architecture mirrored by twentieth-century high technology. If the most typical monuments of the Modern period were avant-gardist contemporary-art-centres erected in suburban green areas or in razed historic spaces, the homages to the arts of the past are the quintessence of the spirit of the Post-modern era, nowhere better manifested than in the famous post-modernist extensions added to venerable art galleries or in the re-use of old buildings to house new museums.

Post-modernism is an age of recurring citations in art, in architecture, in literature, in the media and, as Charles Jencks has ironically stressed (ironically, because he asserts this quoting a statement by Umberto Eco), even in lovers' messages to their beloved (cf. Jencks, 1989: p. 16). In that case, one only needs a little of post-modernist sense of humour to conclude that this is a very post-modern PhD thesis, since it abounds in citations and parenthesis containing references (for an example of the contrary cf. Bazin, 1967). This is because this essay is much based on ideas which were born out of, and developed from my reading, although, following the usual methodology of most cultural historians, I have also combined this information with primary sources.

For obvious reasons of feasibility and time, my use of historic documentation have been limited to the archives located at practicable reach from my successive
lodgings in the last four years. Unfortunately, the year I spent in Italy did not produce any outcome from this point of view, because I could not obtain access to either the archives of the Galleria d’Arte Moderna of Palazzo Pitti in Florence, or to those of the Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Moderna and the Galleria Comunale d’Arte Moderna of Rome. The only Italian museum I found prepared to allow public access by researchers to their archives was the Galleria degli Uffizi - a museum not directly connected with my topic.

More fortunate for the tracing of documentary sources was my time as a museology student in Paris. The files of materials conserved at the documentation department of the Musée d’Orsay have been decisive for my research on its forefather-institution, the Musée du Luxembourg, specially some of the letters written to and by the curator Léonce Benédite. Much of my archive research concerning the Luxembourg has been indeed centred on the personality of this curator and the evolution of the museum under his rule, because on the one hand it seems that the oldest documentation related to that museum was burnt out in 1871 and, on the other hand, Genivieve Lacambre already provided an unmatchable list of archive references for the period around 1874 in her well-documented study about that institution (Lacambre, 1974). It is then not surprising if the new documentary contributions offered in this dissertation correspond to the crisis of the Luxembourg at the turn of the century, for this was the only period left susceptible to well-exploitable archive findings; a quest in which I was successful thanks to the generous help of Chantal Georgel and Armelle Jacquinot, who acted for me as versed navigators of enquiries at the Archives Nationales (C.A.R.A.) of Paris.

Both of the two London institutions more intensively examined in this dissertation warmly welcomed me into their archives. That of the Tate Gallery possesses rich holdings concerning its past but although they have already been profusely used by the institution’s own chroniclers (cf. Rothenstein, 1958), it seems that Tate’s *Act of Indenture*, transcribed here in some length, had never been published before. The same is the case with the archives of the V&A’s National Library of Art with the particularity that the *Deed of Gift* of John Sheepshanks, also presented here, has been deceptively summarised in a framed notice decorating the walls of the V&A’s Print Room... where any unaccomplished condition stipulated by the donor has been carefully neglected.

1 *Somehow dispiritedly, I invested part of my spare time there carrying out a quick survey on their 19th century files, documenting artists’ applications for allowance to practice copying in the Uffizi. This survey made me perceive the importance formerly conceded to the production of copies (something nearly worthless by 20th century standards) which used to be referred to as one of the most influential educational purposes justifying the creation of art galleries.*
Yet, crucial as they might be for most kinds of historians, archive documents are not to be held as the only primary source for historians of museums (Agosti, 1985; Angrand, 1984-8). If art historians have always to return to the direct analysis of art-works as their primary source of information, I believe that museologists too have to contrast their discourse with direct visits to museums. This point has been perhaps the best asset to my research because, compelled by the fact that I was always in transit anywhere I have been living, I have spent four years under a syndrome of tourist-anxiety, desperately seeking to visit as many cities and as many museums as possible.

The advantage of this is the natural way in which one comes to put museums in context. The memory of every single gallery is stored together with the image of its urban setting, the other museums and monuments visited in that city, those of the other neighbouring capitals visited immediately before... Being permanently exposed to this flow of images, the brain flows with fluxes of comparisons coming almost unconsciously. Indeed, this dissertation is nothing but an attempt to put into words an ineffable melange of mental connections: museums of modern art are continuously confronted here with adjacent galleries of old masters, art galleries in any country are paralleled with those of its close cultural areas, some instances of a museum-type are mentally inter-associated with remote examples of similar characteristics...

The feeble point of this kind of discourse is perhaps its subjectivity. Still, this risk has not prevented anyone from admitting that archeologists or art-historians with an educated eye can recognize much of the history of, respectively, a monument or an art-work simply by looking at it. Why should this connoisseurship be alien to museologists? Museums can be 'read': visiting them could become a game of inferring what principles have governed their inner articulation, trying to spot some traces of their original appearance, assessing later changes and deteriorations, guessing the date of the successive reforms and additions... (Assoc. Naz. Musei Italiani, 1980)

In order to imagine how museums of modern art used to be hundred years ago, the best primary source is not a hundred years old document, but a direct visit to the Galleria d'Arte Moderna 'Empedocle Restivo' of Palermo. No noticeable changes, save the inevitable ravages of time, have taken place within its echoing red and gilded walls. The decay of the city in our century has resulted in an inveterate absence of funds for renewals in that space, which remains enchanted as a 'mummified' testimony of that epoch when Palermo used to be a flourishing Mediterranean port. Not much different is the case of Liverpool and its surroundings, especially the Edwardian town of Port Sunlight where everything, including its 'Lady Lever Art Gallery', is kept as it was left by the soap manufacturer who created that settlement for his workers. In fact, even the institutions whose buildings and collections have
been greatly transformed in our century, like for example the Tate Gallery of London, the Neue Pinakothek of Munich, or the Galleria d'Arte Moderna of Turin, can still educe some souvenirs of their past.

A basic source of data especially suitable for research in museum studies is the information provided by museum curators through interviews and letters, although in this case one is somehow uncertain whether to call it a 'primary' source. In any case, leaving aside its categorisation as a first or second class source, the fact is that this has really been a fundamental source of information abundantly exploited here. When a personal interview was not possible, the pertinent professionals were contacted by post. The initial step in many cases was the mailing of a questionnaire (see appendix) asking for their advice: would they encourage me to include their institution in an study on museums specialising in 19th century art? Their reactions of tacit agreement or strong protest to that labelling gave me an idea of the inner perception of every institution of itself. Being in touch with the personnel of the museums studied here has certainly enlarged my vision with other perspectives.

These contacts have also been an opportunity to enrich my own collection of museum prospectuses, booklets and postcards. I had included in my letters an appeal for this kind of material and the response was usually positive when not remarkably generous. I had also asked for bibliographical references, and these came too by tens: usually in form of lists of recommended books and articles that I would immediately ask for by interlibrary loan, often as photocopies of texts edited in the past by the museum concerned, and sometimes in heavy parcels containing genuine museum catalogues! It was essentially thanks to this help, added to my voracious use of library facilities anywhere I happened to be, that I could amass a very assorted bibliography.

Above all, this dissertation relies heavily on these secondary sources and this has in fact greatly determined my prospects. For a study intended as a contribution to the social history of museums, it might seem paradoxical my centring the discourse in the foundation or re-foundation of new galleries, giving only marginal attention to the fostering of already existing museums. Yet the published information on museum benefactors has only reached an extended high level of development as far as museum-founders are concerned. Contrarily, the information about museum-donors is still scarce, especially outside the realms of the greatest institutions. As more information comes to light little by little (cf. Hamlyn, 1993 for a recent and outstanding British example) it is probable that in future years a dissertation comparing the social types of museum-donors in different countries would become a practical project (Lewis, 1992; Rohr, 1989).
There is no point of saturation for the thirst of information, either from primary or from secondary sources; but there is certainly a point when one feels that more additions mean just more of the same. I have no doubt that further archival research in other cities would have brought to light a quantity of new data; yet I made a choice to centre my perusing of archives in Paris and London, which does not seem inappropriate for a dissertation focusing in 19th century Paris and London as World museological capitals and their influence in the creation of museums of modern art. Inevitably incomplete too have been my campaigns of visits to museums (I have never visited any of the Scandinavian countries, never travelled further East than Budapest, never been out of Europe). The same could be said of my bibliography, which probably omits many relevant titles. It is therefore certain that the image drawn here is incomplete, but perhaps the addition of more examples and more references would just enlarge the picture, not change it very much.

The structure of this dissertation reflects a combination of chronological and geographical survey. In this, the line of discourse follows the archetypical layout of any kind of chronicle. The survey starts with a panoramic view of some cultural issues emerging at the beginning of the nineteenth century, then focuses in two 'nodal points', namely the precocious foundation of a Museum of Living Artists in Paris fostered by royal backing and, on the other hand, the later attempts to open equivalent institutions in London successfully achieved by private initiative. Afterwards comes a survey of other galleries created elsewhere up to 1919 following these two 'models'. Finally the dissertation concludes with an assessment of the present status of museums specialised in 19th century art, considering how they derive -or not- from the museums of modern art established in the last century.

Chapter one is broadly theoretical and based on a miscellany of cultural history readings. It is intended as a preliminary contextualisation of some cultural trends typical of the nineteenth century. Accordingly, this chapter is divided into two sections. The first points out how the post-Enlightenment age was characterised by the apotheosis of specialism in every human domain, including museums. The second reports the emergence of a new social spectrum of power after the Industrial Revolution epitomised -in cultural matters as well as in politics- by the dialectic of two social forces: on the one hand the rich bourgeois, yearning for a rapid social upgrading, and the monarchs on the other hand, striving to outlive at the apix of power inspite of the wreck of the Ancien Régime.

Chapter two analyses an historical study-case, the famous Museum of Living Artists created by Louis XVIII at the Luxembourg Palais in Paris, supported and enriched by the ensuing monarchs, and cornered into a small orangery by the Third
Republic. The study, based on a review of primary and secondary sources, combining old and recent bibliography, is divided into two sections. The first examines the creation of the Musée du Luxembourg in 1818 in the light of its political determinants. The second section is about the political hesitations under the Third Republic concerning the refoundation of the museum, which at a first stage appeared to imply its mere reopening in 1886 on a provisory site but finally turned out to be a whole questioning of the museum itself and its goals.

Chapter three consists of another case study, pointing out that London and its hinterland staged, thanks to the initiative of some private museum-founders, a remarkable proliferation of galleries more or less specialised in modern masters. Again, the study is based on a review of sources and bibliography of all kinds, and it is once more divided into two sections. The first discusses the increasing interest in modern British art among definite segments of the public and how this led to the plea for the creation of a Gallery of British Art, which was finally opened in South Kensington after a generous gift proffered by the collector John Sheepshanks in 1857. The second section deals also with questions of taste in Britain and the thesis maintained here is that it was a predilection for 19th century art (in both the private galleries of major art collectors and the public museums enshrining official taste) which formed the basis of the late multiplication of new museums featuring mainly modern British Art, like the Tate Gallery itself, opened in 1897.

Chapter four shows the spread of similar foundations in other places before 1919, putting then in relation to either the French 'model' of museums stirred by the royalty or the British 'model' of galleries prompted by private individuals. The survey, based on information recollected in previous literature, has consequently two sections. The first one is devoted to the museums of modern art impelled by kings and queens: above all come there those of the kingdoms close to France whose first museums of modern art were implemented by a spirit of direct emulation of the Luxembourg, thereafter those galleries created as a German alternative in opposition to the French, and finally those more separated, geographically as well as in their aims, from the Parisian pattern. The second section reviews examples of privately encouraged galleries of modern art: it starts surveying those closer to the British paradigm, goes ahead identifying a particular museum-type identified as 'museums d'auteur', and finishes with examples of a different kind originated in Italy.

Chapter five discusses the frequent confinement of 19th and 20th century art in separate museums in the context of the new cultural trends of the 20th century. Its first section questions whether the museum policies of our century regarding recent-contemporary art are the pursuit of last century strategies by other means. The second section logically focuses this analysis of the museological legacy of the last century.
on the galleries which have apparently been the closest inheritors: the museums specialising in 19th century art. Finally, the third section considers some of the most recent museological repercussions of the present passions for the rediscovery of both the art and the museums of the last century.

This quest closes with an appendix assessing the results of 'a questionnaire in search of galleries specialising in the arts of 1789-1919' which was mailed in 1991/92 to 165 museums in Europe and America. This ultimate survey, in spite of its being presented as an 'appendix' to the bulk of the dissertation, does not merely come as a background music of accompaniment to the historical survey. As many other historians, I believe that a glance to the present situation can be the logical completion of a scientific appraisal of the past (Boylan, 1992c; Fawcett, 1973; MacGregor, 1985; Minissi, 1983; Pearce, 1992; Poulot, 1988b). Lastly, the part entitled 'conclusions' strives to find the manifold answers to the question heading this dissertation: «Museums for 19th century art?».

Unlike most museum-studies dissertations, this thesis does not culminate with sets of recommendations for the better development of museums in the future. Writing a Ph.D. thesis on, for example, the didactic role of museums or the social use of museums, bestows on many fortunate museologists an enviable authority, since their researches are always the basis for scientific-based 'practical' proposals: they are at the same time scholars and oracles. Historians of museums, on the other hand, must resign themselves to a more modest social role; their 'science' consists, like that of the antique bards, in narrating and explaining -not in leading to action. However, bards have sometimes been indirect instigators of dramatic events: sociology handbooks teach that the assassination of Caesar was not merely caused by Cassius' plot, that the ultimate origin was the way in which hatred of tyrants was violently manifested in the old Greek-Roman culture. Thus the death of Caesar was, in a way, a legacy of the many classic narratives and monuments justifying and praising some tyrannicides who were supposed to be courageous heroes and honorable persons ('honorable men' is, not casually, the questioning key-word placed by Shakespeare at the emotional turning-point of Mark Antony's funeral speech). Perhaps, in a similar way, the historians of museums can also become fomenters of far-reaching factual issues -provided that, partly emulating the considerable attention given to history and mythology by the Greeks and Romans, the history and genealogy of museums be given substantial attention in the training of museum-curators and in the different series of publications in cultural studies!
Chapter 1.
NEW MUSEUM-TYPES IN A NEW HISTORICAL CONTEXT. A PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION.
SUMMARY:

This chapter is intended as a preliminary contextualisation of some cultural trends typical of the nineteenth century.

The first section, 'The era of specialism and the Museum Age', is structured like a play of Russian puppets in order to convey an idea of consecutive specialism. The history of museums started with encyclopaedic institutions featuring a pluridisciplinary range of materials, but in the early 19th century they were split into different kinds of museums: for example museums of art. Later, the museums of art originated art galleries specialising in particular historical periods: for instance galleries of modern art. A further way of specialisation was the creation of art galleries containing works by a single artist or group of artists; but it is a thesis maintained here that most of the 'one-man' museums were not intended as true art galleries and therefore this museum-type is only discussed here as a short digression. Therefore, the final link discussed in this chain of increasing specialism is the tendency -more marked in galleries of modern art than in those devoted to old masters- to be outstandingly selective, neglecting 'minor' works and eccentric artists: the results were galleries of modern art specialising in masterpieces.

The second section, 'New museum models for different art patrons', refutes any inherent connexion between the outburst of art galleries and the flourishing of art movements, putting the birth of museums of modern art in relation not with artists' appeals, but with the will of art patrons. The founder of a gallery of modern art was blessed with an aura of modernity, which could be sometimes a useful political instrument at the service of inner conservative monarchs and sometimes an instrument of social self-affirmation for snobbish nouveau riches. But this process was not merely fuelled by Machiavelism and social climbing, other human factors overlapped in the fostering of galleries of modern art: as any page of the history of culture, this has to be reported too as an issue of cross-cultural confrontation, emulation and inter-influence.
1.1 THE ERA OF SPECIALISM AND THE MUSEUM AGE.

The first museums specialising in art of the nineteenth century were called 'museums of living artists' or 'museums of modern art'. They constituted a new museum-type characteristic of the post-Napoleonic era. Other types of art-museums were born in the same time (Pevsner, 1976: p. 131), for example those specialising in arts and crafts (museums of industrial design, galleries of decorative arts, museums for the productions of regional popular traditions) or those conceived as an homage to a country's heroes and culture (national portrait galleries, halls of fame, national temples decorated with busts and sculptures imitating the Pantheon of Paris or the Walhalla of Regensburg). However, it could be said, as Francis Haskell has written, that 'the most important new development of the nineteenth century [regarding art galleries] was the creation of museums designed to hold contemporary art' (Haskell, 1981: p. 7).

The birth of this museum-type has to be put in its historical context: a cultural context of growing specialism. David Murray, one of the fathers of the historiography of museums, wrote that the modernity of a museum was then expressed in its specialisation, and in its careful and accurate classification (Murray, 1904: p. 231). It seems that some curators worked with this distinctive attribute of modern progress in mind. The founder of the Australian National Museum of Victoria used to say: 'a private collection can resemble a circus, a museum must not' (Goodman, 1990).

The fear of circuses had been established long before. One of the first steps in the move of museums towards specialisation happened in the seventeenth century, where living creatures were separated in botanical or zoological gardens while dead beings were put in the repositories of scientific societies, which is somehow an early development of specialised institutions for specialised scientific collections (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992, p. 140). Other early examples of a remarkable tendency to specialise could also be seen in art collections: refined amateurs developed in the courts of Europe a taste for Greek/Roman sculptures, from which in the eighteenth century originated the first museums of antiquities: the Museo Capitolino, Villa Albani and the Museo Pio-Clementino in Rome or the Museo del Palazzo degli Studi in Naples -curiously, all lost later the character of 'specialised institution' since they were soon enlarged and complemented with galleries of paintings (Bazin, 1967: p. 163-165).
However, notwithstanding the former examples of specialisation in previous centuries, it is essential to the logic of discourse chosen for this dissertation to insist here that the move towards specialisation in museums was an historical break, a new issue of the post-Napoleonic era. The museum-types created during the era of Enlightenment became archaic: as the 19th century advanced neither the British Museum nor the Louvre retained their role as models to be imitated internationally. The organisation of these two forerunners had become 'obsolete'. In the former because of the combination of museum and library, in the latter because of the conjunction of painting, sculpture, decorative art and archaeology (Seling, 1967: p. 114). New, more specialistic, museum-types developed in the post-Napoleonic era.

The fragmentation of knowledge. The specialisation of museums.

The birth of the first public museums, as museologists often like to signal, took place concurrently with the writing of encyclopaedias: 'Both [museums and encyclopaedias] were an expression of the eighteenth-century spirit of enlightenment which produced an enthusiasm for equality of opportunity in learning' (Hudson, 1975: p. 6). In the following century, when the public museums developed, the cultural situation had changed. The nineteenth century was no longer the age of encyclopaedism, neither in the scientific work, nor in the museum world.

One of the most defined features differentiating the nineteenth century from the previous period in Western civilization, was an irreversible tendency towards specialisation. The post-Napoleonic world lived a moment of cultural break comparable with the previous cultural break produced towards the middle of the seventeen century when, according to Michel Foucault, the 'classic age' had begun. The *episteme* of that previous cultural age was, in the words of Foucault (1966: p. 259-260), the inner tendency in all sciences towards *une mathesis universelle*, i.e., the building of a universal corpus of knowledge. The Encyclopédie of Diderot and d'Alembert, the works of Descartes or Leibniz are representatives of the climax of this tendency in the eighteenth century. Contrary to this, the *episteme* of the modern age, beginning with the nineteenth century is *une mathesis rompue*, i.e., the fragmentation of knowledge.

Of course, science continued to produce general syntheses in the nineteenth century (the laws of thermodynamics and the theory of evolution, for example), and it was the same for the humanities (for instance the philosophical analyses of Kant, or Marx's interpretations of History); but it was an historic move towards specialisation
that defined the new *episteme* of modern age, as though Adam Smith's principle of the division of labour was carried over into the intellectual world.

*In the eighteenth century the Renaissance ideal of the universal man was still almost possible; we think of Diderot, Franklin, Priestley and Goethe. There were still giants in later science; but John Herschel's decision not to specialise was uncommon by the 1830's, and would have been unwise thereafter. By the end of the nineteenth century, a scientist would expect to read books and journals confined to his own specialism—perhaps inorganic chemistry; and to rely upon what was essentially popularisation for all other parts of science (Knight, 1986, p. 3-4).*

In the arrangement of museums similar trends predominated everywhere. Britain may not be the best example since many of its provincial museums built in the Victorian age apparently contradicted this general tendency of specialization. However, even the British Museum, proudly encyclopedic in the age of Enlightenment, later gradually fragmented in different national museums dealing specifically with particular areas such as art, natural history, science, ethnology, militaria... Perhaps the most striking example was Italy. The dynastic collections in every city with an old *reggia* were dismembered when 19th century politicians decided to open them for the curiosity and the education of all citizens. In Rome, Naples, Florence, Turin, the various ranges of materials were divided into different museums: the Roman, Greek, Etruscan, or Egyptian materials were separated from the galleries of paintings by old masters, the scientific and technical objects could not be mingled with ethnographic items, the rarities or the creatures of nature left the company of the precious stones and jewellery... In the city of the Uffizi the fragmentation of the old ducal collections started in the period 1779-1825 and gathered momentum in 1866 (Meloni & Spalletti, 1981: p. 10; Meloni, 1982: p. 23) and in the following years they gave birth to no less than ten national museums, among them the Museum of Archaeology, the historical museums of the Ville Medicee, the Museum of Natural History, the Museum of the History of Science, the Museum of Silver and Porcelain, the Museum of Hard Stones, the Museum of Ethnography, the Museum of Sculpture, and three different galleries

---

1 Well advanced the 19th century, and even later, many cities of this country built-up a museum-encyclopaedia, rarely found in other European countries. Many U.K. museums assemble, under a single roof: 1) a repository of archeology, natural science and ethnology reflecting that of the British Museum. 2) an art gallery collection beginning with the Italian Quattrocento and having, like the National Gallery in London, other strong points in the classical Western old masters of the 16th century, the Dutch 17th century and the French 18th. 3) a section of decorative arts inspired by the Victoria and Albert Museum, combining historic Western and Eastern art-crafts with a number of potteries, glass, and metals of the industrial age. 4) a gallery of native 19th century art reflecting the typical taste for academic and commercial styles of the National Gallery of British Art in South Kensington (cf. Miers, 1928; Chapel & Gere, 1985).
with paintings (Borsi, 1982). In Italy this happened under the political pressure of the country's reunification, when most of the previous courts perished; but other examples of the 19th century preference for specialised museums can be found in other European Courts. In Dresden, the 'Florence of the Elbe', the dividing up of the Kunstkammer of the electors of Saxony into artistic, scientific, and technological collections had started in the 18th century under the reigns of August the Strong and August III but this process was abruptly accelerated from 1831, when Saxony became a constitutional monarchy and the royal collections began to be administered by the Government -although they legally remained the property of the King until the revolution of November 1918 (Seydewitz, 1960: p. 24). The Kunstkammer was dissolved in 1835, the Porcelain Collection and the Kupferstich Kabinett (Prints and Drawings Cabinet) were installed apart while the old Rüstkammer was renamed 'Historical Museum', a new Paintings Gallery building designed by Gottfried Sempere was built in 1847-54, and the royal collection of Greek marbles, complemented with new acquisitions, was installed in the old Arsenal², transformed into Museum of Sculptures in 1885-89 (Menzhausen, 1978: p. 26-28). In Copenhagen the Royal 17th century Kunstkammer was the origin, in the 1820's and 40's, of the Royal Natural History Museum, the Ethnographical Museum, the Cabinet of Antiquities, the Museum of Northern Antiquities, the Chronological Collections of the Kings of Denmark, the Museum of Sculpture and Handicraft, the Royal Picture Gallery... (Gundestrup, 1985: p. 133).

Thus, the tendency to specialise took over from the love of encyclopaedism in many new 19th century foundations. Dominique Poulot has poetically described this tendency as l'éclatement du miroir muséologique, qui n'offre plus à la société, désormais, qu'une myriade d'images fragmentées [the shattering of the museological mirror, which offers henceforth a society's reflection fragmented in a myriad of images'] (Poulot, 1981b: p. 106). The prevalence of specialisation in museums through the nineteenth century produced a substantial discontinuity in the history of these institutions. A historic step; though, as Donald Horne opines, not necessarily a step forward.

² The building of the old Arsenal, later called 'Albertinum', houses since World War II the Gemälde Galerie Neue Meister (gallery of modern masters) featuring works by 19th and 20th century artists (Neidhardt, 1965). Plans for the creation of such a gallery had been warmly discussed in Dresden since the 1890s and the emplacement usually proposed was Pillnitz castle, but finally it was at the Sekundogenitur that a gallery of 19th century art, from the Romantics to the Impressionists, was opened in 1931 (Zimmermann, 1964: p.10-11).
about five different social sciences. But then there were set firmly the rigid divisions of museums into particular subject areas - antiquities, art, natural history, ethnography, science and industry and (in one way and another, from museum houses to army museums), what you might describe as history (Horne, 1992: p. 66).

Art and archeological museums probably went further in this way towards specialisation. They were, as a matter of fact, multiplied everywhere much more than science or natural history museums (Lee, 1975). This may be because they were the only museums dealing with what Foucault (1966: p. 381-382) defines as the more intrinsic preoccupation of the nineteenth century: «l'historicité humaine». Human history is nowadays explained in museums through a wide range of testimonies of material culture, whereas at that time art and archeology items were paramount even in museums of local history.

A result of such museological identification of human history with art and archeology was that art and archeology galleries were the first whose different rooms were articulated according to chronological arrangement. One of the first instances where the division of Prehistory was illustrated was, in fact, in a museum: the predecessor of the National Museum in Copenhagen which, by 1836, had one room for the Stone Age, one for the Bronze Age, one for the Iron Age (Horne, 1992: p. 69; Pearce, 1992: p. 103).

In museums of sculptures and monuments this use of different rooms for different ages dates from the French Revolution, when Alexandre Lenoir proposed to transform the repository of sculptures gathered at the ex-monastery of the Petits-Augustins into a museum articulated in a series of rooms arranged by historic order (Duro, 1987: p. 46). From this point of view, his Musée des Monuments Français, was much more modern than the Louvre, whose Grande Galerie was first a miscellaneous assemblage of different materials arranged according to aesthetic principles and whose collections of antiquities were displayed by subject-matter, following the 18th century model of the Vatican Museo Pio Clementino (Poulot, 1986c). Lenoir’s idea of arranging sculptures by chronological order was soon backed in Munich by the Glyptothek of the Prince of Bavaria, later Ludwig I. In spite of his advisors' preference for the arrangement by typologies epitomised by the Vatican Museums (Nogara, 1948), the Prince decided for a chronological round starting with Egypt, continued with Greece and Rome, and ending with works by Canova, Thorwaldsen, Schadow, and others.

In picture galleries a first step of change from entirely aesthetic to partly historical functions dates from 1779, when Christian von Mechel re-arranged by national schools the Imperial collection of pictures at the Belvedere palace in Vienna.
But the pattern of chronological ordering originated in Germany in the first third of
the 19th century. Its godfather is usually considered to be the art-historian Freiherr
von Rumohr, for his arrangement of the museum of arts and antiquities opened in
Berlin in 1830 by King Frederich Wilhelm III.

Galleries specialising in a particular period. Museums of modern art.

As Foucault immediately points out after writing that «l'historicité humaine»
became the most characteristic mania of the nineteenth century, human history was
then split up in different categories (Foucault, 1966: p. 382). Scholars of the 19th
century began to call Prehistory the times known through only archeological remains,
and History as the times after the invention of writing. The later was divided (Best &
Kellner, 1991: p. 2) into Antiquity (economies of slavery), Medieval Age (feudalism),
Modern Age (precapitalism), and Contemporary Age (industrial capitalism). The
former was divided in ages depending upon the archeological materials found. Thus,
the past was perceived and studied, divided into different chunks. Up until this time
human history had been explained as being determined by omnicomprehensive laws
-religious, philosophical or whatever- governing the world; but in the 19th century
human history was conceived as being determined by economic rules, and
furthermore it was divided into cultural ensembles.

This cultural division was the origin, on the one hand, of different museums
for Western, Oriental or -at the beginning of the 20th century- African and American
arts. On the other hand, historians of the 19th century divided Western civilization
into different periods, and museums experienced parallel divisions (Searing, 1986). If
artistic productions were, according to Taine's philosophy of art, the reflection of
historic times, obviously the fragmentation of human history implied the partition of
art museums. Ever since the first generation of art museums, classical and pre-
classical antiquities from the Mediterranean civilizations and old masters of the
Renaissance and later times were exhibited apart (Louvre, Vatican) or even in
separate museums (Naples, Munich, Berlin, London). The great art museums of the
second generation often distributed materials in a chronological sequence by floors
(Pevsner, 1976: p. 127). Antiquities and archaeology on the ground-floor, the

3 This was the predominant division of Western History in the times of our great-granparents. This
terminology, in particular the denomination 'Modern Age' for the time of the Absolute Monarchies,
has been superseded by more recent historical thought. We have seen at the beginning of this chapter
that a contemporary philosopher of History (Foucault, 1966) distinguishes between two post-
Renaissance eras: the 'classical age' (1660-1800) and the 'modern age' (1800-1950). Other
classifications call 'Modern' the time from the 18th century to World War II (Pearce, 1992: p. 90, fig
5.1).
medieval treasury concentrated on a mezzanine or in narrow spaces close to the stairs, old European masters -divided by national schools- on the main floor and sometimes a review of contemporary/local art at the top floor (Schinkel's Altes Museum in Berlin, built in 1824-28; the new Ashmolean Museum in Oxford, built in 1839, the New Ermitage, built in 1840-49). This way of distributing different historic materials in different floors became so natural for past museologists, as had been for classic architects the distribution of columns by orders in any façade: at the bottom the Doric order, Ionic columns in the middle, then the Corinthian, and the Composite order at the very top. With time, those different distributions within the museums derived into different monographic museums. Many European capitals developed urban complexes of specialised museums: an antiquarium, a museum of the medieval age, a gallery of old masters, and a museum of contemporary art.

Of all of these, the museums of the medieval age were the less numerous, although some relevant examples were created in Paris (the Musée de Cluny, in 1844), Nuremberg (the Germanisches Nationalmuseum, in 1853), Munich (the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, in 1854), or Copenhagen (the Rosenborg, in 1859). How did it come about that in the century of neo-gothic and of Viollet-le-Duc, art museums hesitated to specialise in the medieval age? The clue to the answer lies perhaps in the type of users art museums were thought for: they were mainly opened for artists -the general public was usually admitted under tighter restrictions. As late as 1885, the law still dictated in France: Les musées sont destinés à servir de modèles pour les artistes et d'initiateurs pour le goût public [Museums are aimed to serve as models for artists and as guides for public taste] (Répertoire du droit administratif, 1885, quoted by Poulot, 1983a, p. 27). Yet, whilst artists were encouraged to learn by copying antique sculptures, paintings by old masters, or the masterpieces of contemporary art, they were prevented from using as model medieval art, which was then considered harmful for their education. In fact, medieval 'primitives' had been admitted into national art galleries in the middle of bitter public controversy because champions of classicism despised them (cf. chapter 3 'The two temptations' in Haskell, 1976); so, it was out of the question to entertain even the idea of an art museum completely devoted to them! Actually, none of the examples of museums of the medieval age cited above were indeed art museums: they rather were 'museums of medieval life', created by private antiquarians or by politicians struck by the popularity of the medieval period rooms of Alexandre Lenoir's Musée des Monuments Français (Erlande-Brandenburg, 1977: p. 49-58; Haskell, 1993: p. 249).

More numerous were the museums specialising in contemporary art. At the end of the nineteenth century rare was the capital or big city which had not established one. Such museums enjoyed the highest social success. That popularity is
difficult to imagine nowadays, because our museums of contemporary art rather intimidate popular audiences (Canadian I.C.O.M. Sub-Commitee for Museums of Modern Art, 1969; Rivière et al., 1972). Unlike many old masters or twentieth century artists, most nineteenth century practitioners created easily comprehensible art-works, which obviously played a role in attracting the popular public. On the other hand, the arrival of the big 'machines' produced by contemporary artists assured a changing spectacle, at least in the case of those museums which tried to be up-to-date, getting new works by the artists à la mode of the time. That was an advantage for their magnetism amongst popular publics, whose use of museums had many points in common with their consumption of the leisure industry: most people just visited museums on special occasions (a holiday, a day of bad weather, a trip, the arrival of some family guests), but their visits were more frequent if the 'spectacle' changed from time to time (Poulot, 1983b: p. 195).

Among the educated classes, the ideological optimism of that century supposed another footing for the exaltation of modern art. Artists and art-critics shared an almost religious belief in the Hegelian progress of art, which implied that they repeatedly proclaimed as superior the art schools of their time -and the art schools of their own countries in particular (Ruskin, 1987). The masterworks of modern artists were considered to deserve imitation as much as, or even more than, the works of old masters: about 1845 the Grande Galerie of the Louvre contained mainly works by artists recently deceased (Holst, 1967: p. 255, fig. 162). Good contemporary art had to be a repertory of 'good examples' deserving imitation, a model for the education of taste. In the early nineteenth century, the influential Berlin art historian Carl Friedrich Rumohr demanded artists to seek for Bildung (education) when they produced a Bild (picture) destined for a museum (Holst, 1967: p. 231).

Hence, the galleries of contemporary art had assured, first of all the maximum interest of art-students: they had learned from the classics through the originals or copies displayed in art schools, but modern works could not usually be apprehended in their schools4. On the other hand, a second category of target audience among the learned was an urban public of cultural consumers, with a combined interest for novelty and parochialism. Thus, art being simultaneously recent and local (or at least national) became the focus of the first museums of living artists. Not merely in museums of provincial cities could this trend be observed, but in those of the biggest

---

4 The art-dealer Durand-Ruel found a lucrative way to exploit this circumstance. He 'lent' for at least 25-50 francs masterworks of Bouguereau or other top-rated living artists, so that pupils of art schools of every corner of France could copy them. In addition to art schools, he later found another kind of client for this commerce: female artists who did not dare to paint copies in museums. Durand-Ruel used to send them together the original picture and a prepared new canvas, ready to be painted (Argencourt, 1984: p. 102).
Metropolises as well. The museum of living artists of Paris exhibited in its first decades only French art, in Munich and Berlin the Neue Pinsakothek and the National Galerie were expressly established as the answer of the German nation against the Napoleonic cultural influence, in London the equivalent institutions were always galleries of British artists. From our present point of view, this contrasts strikingly with the cosmopolitan character of today's galleries of modern art; but from the point of view of that boldly nationalistic century, this was quite natural. In a sense, such nationalistic galleries of contemporary art were as typical of their time as royal galleries of old masters mainly dominated by foreign schools -the Italian school in particular-, had been a typical creation of the Enlightenment.

**Museums devoted to a single 19th century artist or school of artists.**

Nationalism and localism stressed, in more ways than one, the omnipresent pressure of politics on the generation of museums. The move towards specialisation did not stop at the birth of art museums specialising in antiquities, medieval age, old masters, or modern art. The latter experienced a further-specialisation: museums devoted to a single school of modern art. This museum-type might seem rather typical from 20th century local-museum policies, but in fact its origins reach back in time beyond a hundred years. Remarkable examples were to be found especially in centres of famous 19th century schools of landscape (for instance Norwich in Britain or The Hague in Holland). In fact such museums were also inspired by 19th century patriotism. When those cities devoted a gallery to their landscape painters, were they not, at the same time, honouring local pride?

The extreme outcomes of this trend were the museums devoted to a single artist, another typology of art-museums with a great development in the 20th century. Early precedents could be found in some 18th century projects never achieved, but its effective origin must be searched for in the century which filled city parks and squares all over Europe with bronze or marble monuments of famous individuals (Poulot, 1985b). In some cases, such an homage was not in the form of a statue, but in a much more monumental guise, the opening of a so-called 'one-man museum' -the term is quite sexist, but actually the honoured used to be men. Most of these institutions escape the limits of this dissertation. It is rather doubtful that, even if sometimes the protagonist happened to be an artist, they were conceived as art-museums at all. Often that kind of museum was first a panegyric monument, a monument-museum to honour the classic painter Nicolas Poussin. The design of the building included a dome, inspired in the Pantheon of Rome, decorated with thirty-five octagons where the most famous paintings of the artist should be placed (Poulot, 1981: p. 3).
comemoration of a fellow-citizen; second in importance was its aesthetic finality, its presenting a good collection of major and minor examples (or, quite frequently, only minor works) of the artist's production. In some cases such museums assembled just souvenirs but no art-works at all!

This dissertation is not the place to study that typology in depth, a work already attempted by other authors (Zankl, 1972, Hoł-Słończyk, 1985, Lacambre, 1987), but at least these museums deserve a few lines here, because many of them were devoted to nineteenth century artists. In some cases the homaged was an old master (in 1859 the Museo Casa Buonarroti opened in Florence, Dürer's house in Nuremberg was opened as a museum in 1871, Rembrandt's house of Amsterdam in 1911, and Vasari's house in Arezzo opened the same year as a municipal museum); much more frequently, however, the 'one-man' museums were devoted to contemporary artists.

Some 19th century artists opened one-man museums to the public in their own lifetime, either by their private means (the Turner gallery in London, the Watts gallery in Compton, the Musée Crozatier in Le Puy -France-) or with the help of public funds (the Musée P. J. David in Angers -France- in 1836, the Sir John Soane's Museum in London in 1833). In other cases, there was a particular arrangement; a studio was offered to an artist, with the agreement that it would become a public museum after his death (the Thorvaldsen Museum in Copenhagen in 1848, the Antoine Wiertz Museum in Brussels in 1890, the Vigeland Museum in Oslo, the Rodin Museum in Paris). Finally, a number of those museums were opened to the public as post-mortem memorials, created either by bequest of the artists' themselves or by the initiative of their relatives and friends, or by the initiative of public powers; many 19th century artists have received this kind of homage only in our century, but the examples of this type of institution created in the 19th century were by no means rare (Canova's Gipsoteca in Possagno -Italy- in 1836, the Schinkel-Beuth Museum and the Rausch Museum in Berlin opened in 1844 and 1865, the Schwantaler Museum in Munich in 1848, the Musée Ingres in Montauban in 1851 -France-, the Musée Greuze in Tournus -France- in 1866, the Réattu Museum of Arles -France- in 1868, the Musée Henri Chapu in Le-Mée-sur-Seine in 1886, the Schilling Museum of Dresden in 1888, the Museum Gustave Moreau in Paris in 1902, the House-Atelier of Constantin Meunier in Brussels, etc. -the list is unexhaustable).

It was a common characteristic of 'one-man' museums in general, that they usually offered a reassemblyment of any kind of work rescued, or even the personal memorabilia of the protagonist arranged as they were left. Accumulation for accumulation's sake prevailed over the idea of selection; thus museums of a single artist were in a sense an archaic repository-like institution. Their aims were too far
from what the 19th century regarded as the vocation of the 'art-museum', the presentation of selected didactic examples of beauty (Poulot, 1985a).

Modern art galleries specialising in masterpieces.

That the didactic vocation remained always a priority for art-museums seems beyond discussion. However, it is worth finishing this section with a clarification about the changes of approach experienced throughout the nineteenth century, and the particularities of museums of contemporary art in this respect. Art museums were born as complementary instruments for the training of artists and artisans because, in the first part of the 19th century, it was understood that art-education should be addressed to the art-professionals: this is what Nicholas Pearson calls the 'hard' approach of State investments in art-education (Pearson, 1982: p. 34). But that attitude was replaced by a 'soft' approach, when art-education became a profit desirable for all citizens. As Dominique Poulot has pointed out (Poulot, 1983b), art-museums ceased then to give preference to artists in their opening hours, and they practised a broader admission of the general public, who came there in order to experience the pleasures of beauty. The didacticism of art-museums changed accordingly in the sense that they were not any more conceived as a selection of masterworks to be copied.

Curiously enought, this renunciation to the exclusivity of masterpieces took longer to arrive in museums of contemporary art than in other art museums. In the mid-nineteenth century, galleries of antiquities gave way to new museums of archaeology, where not only great sculptures and rich treasures but any modest cultural testimony of the past was welcome. Galleries of old masters® were transformed into -let us call them- 'galleries of masters and disciples' by art-historians who revised many optimistic attributions, examining with new interest the works by minor artists (Holst, 1934). Contrary to this, most museums of modern art practiced a selective memory. They were specialised in art-works declared to be, according to the taste of the nineteenth century, the masterpieces of contemporary art. The consequence of this in the history of art is well know: many artists produced 'museum-pieces' when looking for public prestige and professional legitimizing, 'commercial-art' when in need of money, and only when these things were assured, could afford themselves to concentrate in a personal artistic research -the great

® With important exceptions however. The National Gallery of London has remained very much a 19th century museum of master works, avoiding to charge its reserves with 'minor' pieces of more art-historical interest. Neil MacGregor, its present director, has declared on this issue: 'The National Gallery is about masterpieces, not about specimens' (The Guardian, 13 October 1990, p. 14).
versatility of stylistic registers played by compromising modern artists like, for instance, Giovanni Fattori, is really amazing.

What made a museum of living artists different from an exhibition or Salon, was not just that museums had permanent displays while exhibitions were temporary, but also a declared vocation of guiding the artistic production rather than reflecting it. Shows of contemporary art often contained a representative presence of the full artistic variety of the time; museums of contemporary art tended not to present anything but just the artistic productions admired by the curators. 'Salons des Refusés' existed in Paris, but there were nowhere 'Musées des Refusés'.
1.2 NEW MUSEUM MODELS FOR DIFFERENT ART-PATRONS.

In the hierarchical society of the Ancien Régime, it seemed obvious that the greatest works of art should be in the hands of the highest powers, not only because they were able to pay high prices for them, but also because it was considered bad to possess a quality piece of art and not give it to a higher authority (in Court or in Church). European history is full of examples of how dangerous it could be for a subject not to respect this unwritten rule (Richelieu and Louis XIV were no more clement with the owners of things they desired than the biblical king David with the husband of his beloved Bathsheba). As a consequence, having a work purchased by a prince, a cardinal or a rich cathedral was, for a living artist, not only a commercial success but also the opportunity of being installed in the most natural way between the best works of old masters. Young Michelangelo was very proud of himself when his Bacchus, bought by a roman aristocrat, was installed in a garden of old Roman sculptures. In every studiolo, gallery, and kunstkammer, the princes used to gather number of items selected according to their taste, regardless of whether they were old or contemporary works.

The national temples for the arts created by the Revolution put an end to this practice. The opening of the Louvre as a museum, carefully planned by the cultural administration of Louis XVI, actually originated from the Revolution's urgent need to present to the public what had become the nation's property; in other countries too, the national galleries of old masters were organized according to the ideological issues of French republicanism. Contemporary art continued then to be found in churches or private collections mixed with old masterpieces as had always been the case (Whiteley, 1983); but not on the walls of the central museums like the Louvre and the 'national galleries' of other countries which followed the example of France. Those museums were temples of a very special kind, comparable to national pantheons -another typical civil-sacred space, created by many countries in the 19th century. Some similarities of museums and pantheons in their practices of re-inventing the past are well known (Horne, 1984: p. 17-20; Bell, 1991). This has already been remarked in particular cases like the National Portrait Gallery of London which has been defined as a national 'hall of fame' (Hooper-Greenhill, 1980). Other scholars have studied the use of names or portraits of artists as allegoric pantheons of taste to decorate museum-buildings (Hetherington, 1978), or the role of tombs, decorative paintings of historical content and monumental halls in museums.
(Kahsnitz, 1977). Others have pointed out that the temple-like architectural stereotype of 19th century museums derived from pantheons and memorials to the famous dead, which were frequently built on a hill or at the top of impressive stairs, with temple-like neo-Greek façades and imposing domes (Traeger, 1981; Davis, 1990: p. 108). Such architectural relationship seems confirmed by the fact that some founders of art galleries used them as their mausoleum, an architectural problem successfully solved by John Sloane in that of Dulwich on the outskirts of London (Waterfield, 1987) and echoed at the University of North Carolina where the Ackland Memorial Art Gallery contains the tomb of Mr. Ackland (Burt, 1977: p. 369). In other cases art galleries were also used as burial places for artists: in Copenhagen an art museum actually features as a major attraction the real tomb of the sculptor Thorvaldsen (Jorgensen, 1984). The painter John Trumbull, founder of the art gallery of Yale University, specified that he and his wife had to be buried under his picture of George Washington (Burt, 1977: p. 47) and the museum has always fulfilled his wish in spite of the changes of site: the couple now lie in a cellar directly beneath Washington's portrait. But the kinship of museum/pantheon may also be stressed in a broader sense. Artists were only represented in the collections of national museums posthumously. Likewise, in national pantheons only the dead were paid homage with a tomb or a commemorative inscription (a pantheon is, according to its etymology, a temple devoted to all gods, but in the modern world, pantheons are temples devoted to the dead). It follows that everywhere a national gallery of art was opened, another museological necessity was created: to find a place apart for contemporary artists. And this was the origin of the first museums of 19th century art.

Considering that the Musée du Louvre -opened in 1793- had been the first pantheon-like 'national' gallery of art, it is not surprising that Paris subsequently produced the earliest example, and the most famous prototype, of a gallery of modern masters: the Musée du Luxembourg -created in 1818.

The French model: galleries of modern art fostered by heads of State.

After Waterloo, the monarchies consolidated or restored in most of Europe were most determined to maintain the status quo, as though nothing had happened. Yet, ironically enough, it was in that new momentum of conservatism that the first museums of modern art were invented. In theory, the cultural politics of the monarchy were supposed to be continuations of that of the Enlightenment; but in fact, at least regarding museums, the changes introduced by the Revolution endured. In France the traditional patrons of artists had disappeared and the King or the State took
the responsibility of encouraging contemporary artists. A landmark in this policy was the creation of the Luxembourg Museum.

It is undoubtedly fair to put this event into its artistic context; but the move was above all a socio-political question, a decision handled by the masters of the cultural politics in every state. This may seem a truism, nevertheless it is worth pointing out that one of the most prominent writers of museums' history, Germain Bazin, justifies the early creation of a museum for living artists by alluding to the artistic context in Paris, not to the museological context. For him, the fact that the first museum of this kind happened to be opened in France, was due to the strength of French contemporary art, put on show every two years in an important exhibition - the Salon. And he afterwards explains the creation of galleries of modern art in Munich and other German capitals as a consequence of the animated artistic life of Romanticism in Germany:

La grande activité des mouvements artistiques dans l'Allemagne romantique du XIXème siècle a pour conséquence la création de musées d'art moderne.


Bazin's assumption that the first creation of galleries for living artists came as a direct consequence of the precocity and strength of some centres of contemporary art is easily refutable. The major capital for living artists was still Rome, where the acquaintance of the general public with modern art and art-exhibitions was a living tradition, which dated back long before the first Parisian Salons (Holt, 1979). Romanticism, on the other hand, was not an artistic movement exclusive to France and Germany: Britain, for example, had in those years major figures like Turner, Blake, Fuseli, Lawrence or Wilkie. Therefore, according to Bazin's explanations, Italy and the United Kingdom should have been among the first countries to built national galleries of modern art; whilst, in fact, they were some of the last.

More relevant than the artistic context seems the political stage. Different cultural politics determined the outcome of different museums. Some governments regularly exercised large economic investment in art; others preferred to leave art patronage mainly in private hands. Britain was the most characteristic example of the

---

7 Art exhibitions were an old tradition in Rome, Venice, Florence, Bologna, Naples and other Italian cities. In the 17th century the most popular were the exhibitions of contemporary artists held every year for St. Joseph's-day at the Pantheon's portic in Rome, and the exhibitions of St. Luke's-day held in several churches of Rome and Florence. In the 18th century important public art exhibitions of works by living artists were organized by local academies of art everywhere on the occasion of Catholic festivals: those of Rome and Venice were world famous (Koch, 1967: p. 87-121 and 184-195).
latter group, which will be analysed here as a special study case. As for the former group, the prototype for State interventionism in the arts was clearly France. The case of Paris was always considered as examplar every time the claim for more expending in the arts was made by foreign artists, journalists, members of parliament, or dilettanti... (Benjamin, 1989). French cultural politics regarding museums of modern art is therefore studied in the following pages as a model.

This said, let us relieve immediately the word 'model' of the charge of positive connotations of excellency that it usually bears. If there were a world record of criticisms of museums, the Musée du Luxembourg would probably head it. This museum was soon found to be too small, quite inadequate for the effective conservation of its exhibits and criticized heavily for its taste. Above all, Parisians often complained about the lack of true museum-buildings in the city: their art museums were all installed in re-used old and labyrinthine palaces like the Louvre or the Luxembourg itself, and they envied the purpose-built museums of London. Neither are there any positive connotations intended in the word 'model' when attributed to the cultural non-interventionism epitomised by Great Britain, which -as we will see later- also received strong criticism: Londoners envied the magnificence of French national museums. The situation is not very different now, and this is perhaps another of our inheritances from the last century. As Daniel M. Fox has pointed out, nineteenth-century artists and critics were always convinced that art patronage was much better in other countries: 'English commentators cited French examples, Germans used English and French innovations to club slow-moving government officials and, after 1870, even the French were impressed by a few English arts institutions' (Fox, 1976: p. 378).

Another current implication of the term 'model' should be discarded. It is undeniable that the monarchs of the 19th century had their eyes on the French 'model' when they created the first museums of modern art in Europe; but is doubtful whether they really imitated it. The kings or emperors, or their ministers in charge of cultural politics, probably thought: «France has a famous museum of contemporary art in Paris: should we have one too?»; but they would seldom add «our museum should be like the one in Paris». In fact, the Musée du Luxembourg was rarely emulated in its more peculiar characteristic: its being a 'museum for living artists', which was therefore defined as a musée de passage whose materials should leave it some years after their authors' death. Outside of France, the contraposition to the 'galleries of old masters' was more often conceived in another way.

The name 'old masters' was more and more used to designate the stars of past Western art -from the medieval proto-Renaissance primitives to the late-Baroque or Rococo artists. The frontier between 'old masters' and 'modern art' was not too clearly
delimited, but there was a general feeling that the boundary might be somewhere around the last decade of the 18th century and the first third of the 19th. This division was initially proclaimed in Munich: in 1846 Ludwig I of Bavaria founded the Neue Pinakothek in front of the Alte Pinakothek, and defined their corresponding collecting policies as centred in the arts of, respectively, after and before circa 1780. Most national galleries of contemporary art were afterwards organized this way. Even the Musée du Luxembourg, although always maintaining its denomination as 'museum of living artists', was tempted to follow this example. What other reason had their curators to keep works by long-ago deceased masters of the 19th century? So, the Luxembourg was a museum of 19th century art, in spite of its name.

That was the mainspring of the hatred which this museum attracted in its last years. Those who visited it in the 1910's and 20's expected to find there the Parisian avant-gardes, and were disappointed. Prior to World War I not even the Impressionists and Post-Impressionists were well represented there. A side room held those of the Caillebote collection bequest, whilst in German museums a number of works by Monet, Renoir, Cézanne and others, were been acquired and put in evidence by Ugo von Tschudi, director of the Nationalgalerie of Berlin from 1896 to 1909, and later of the Neue Pinakothek of Munich from 1909 to 1911.

The British model: the temples of the masters of the industrial revolution.

Whereas in France and in the countries of its cultural area the creation of the first museums of contemporary art was a political issue fuelled, paradoxically, by the last representatives of the Ancien Régime, in other countries the promoters of galleries of this kind were private citizens challenged by a desire of social self-affirmation. Great Britain is probably the best instance, because the monarchs here played no role in the creation of any national gallery of modern art. The museological complex for industrial arts at South Kensington was partly instigated by Prince Albert, but the sovereigns did nothing similar for museums of fine art (Goodwin, 1990). Government and Parliament created the National Gallery without any Royal drive. As for the opening in London of a national museum for living artists, neither Queen Victoria nor her Government were willing to make the first step forward. In the end, it was thanks to rich individuals like John Sheepshanks and Henry Tate that modern artists obtained a museum.

If the political rulers failed to erect public museums of modern art, the 'masters of the industrial revolution' were ready to do it. These new people, the offspring of the so-called era of 'Carboniferous Capitalism' (Briggs, 1988), supplanted in many ways the social leaders of the Ancien Régime. They also inherited their
images of power: art collecting for example. However, these people had not being educated among old pictures of their ancestors -if they knew them at all. They rather were fervent enthusiasts of everything modern -as themselves- both in art and in the other human skills. Their attraction for modern art was shared by the public in general; in fact, during the age of industrialism and of the first World Fairs, a boom of interest for contemporary artists developed in all nations in the Western World. Undoubtedly, this taste was of decisive influence for the history of museums, and this is specially evident when we refer to galleries of modern art spurred on by 19th century sponsors of museums.

Private patrons would offer either a purpose-built edifice or a large collection (or both things) for the creation of a new museum, under the condition that the public powers provided the rest. Thus, even when public money was also somehow involved, the museum project as a whole was originated by these private benefactors: they could therefore be called 'museums founders'. Their role was indeed comparable to that of the sovereigns who founded museums of modern masters. The only substantial difference in this respect was that monarchs tended to retain the ownership and to control the management of these museums while 'the masters of the industrial revolution' were rarely willing to become 'museums masters' as well. On the inauguration day they usually handed the gallery over to the city, to the nation or to a public establishment. There was no gain for them on the day to day management of the new institution. Frequently, the benefactor would endow a regular fund, but only in exceptional occasions would the future of the institution be handed to a private trust.

Unlike the museums of nineteenth century art founded by monarchs, those created by private individuals were not so much fuelled by political aims (although many of these benefactors were elected city councillors or appointed Lords). It does not seem that commercial aims played any significant role either. Henry Tate sold his sugar company so as to make clear that he was not looking for publicity of the 'Tate Sugar' through the 'Tate Gallery'. But he did not renounce a knighthood by the sovereign; on the contrary, he was delighted, which shows us a suggestive aspect of the personality of museum patriarches: their inner wish of social relevance. Nouveau riches were envied and might often raise aversions, but a museum's founder has always assured the reverence of his/her fellow-citizens and a positive local remembrance for posterity!

In this respect, the social history of the fostering of museums has many points in common with the social history of art collecting: it is well known that investing in art has often worked as a subtle means to make people forget the discreditable origins of some dirty fortunes based upon slavery (Dabydeen, 1987), the dissolute morality of
some notables (Haskell, 1987a, esp. chapters 4 & 12), or the brutality of capitalist exploitation (Lake, 1992). Yet, there is an obvious distance between the mere fact of gathering art works for oneself and founding a public gallery. In trying to ascertain the personal grounds swaying these sponsors, it should be put on the record as well the sincere concern for social welfare professed by many museum promoters (Flower, 1898; McDonald, 1900; Fox, 1963; Royal Academy of Arts, 1980).

It is true that a number of these benefactors were members of the rich bourgeoisie willing to ascend to the higher spheres of power: industrialists, traders, merchants of colonial products, etc... Nevertheless, in assessing the determining social factors of the birth of museums, the struggle for the political hegemony appears less significant than the momentous cultural thrust of the landed aristocracy by an emerging urban civilisation (the etymological meaning of bourgeoisie is 'city inhabitants'). If museums are eminently urban phenomena; nowhere was this more evident than in Victorian Britain with its dense network of museums implanted in London and the populous cities of the North. In this nation, where churches were in the early 19th century quite deprived of altarpieces, the enjoyment of art had been mainly based during the Georgian era in an eminently private realm: the English country house. The opening of art galleries in the cities approached art to new masses of people and facilitated the art experience of the connoisseurs, who had hitherto endured exhausting travels to worship the old masters. Thanks to the wealth derived from coal, navigation and cloth industries, Northern Britain became between 1870 and 1919 one of the world areas most densely serviced with public art galleries, many of them featuring mainly modern masters.

However, the 'nodal point' of this cultural phenomenon was London. It is hence no accident if two London-based institutions promoted by John Sheepshanks and Henry Tate will be discussed here as study-cases. This, not on account of the importance of the collections proffered or -in the case of Mr. Tate- of the enormous amount of money expended, but because these two initiatives reached a special transcendency. In part, these cases were widely known and discussed because they took place in a big and most influential metropolis: the capital of the British Empire. Many other private founders of museums of modern art in provincial Britain and in the British colonies, as well as in Europe or America, might have visited London, Europe's biggest city, or at least knew about its museums through comments heard

---

8 One of the defining criteria considered by researches on contemporary urban history in distinguishing between 'city' and 'small town' is the existence of a museum (I owe this remark to Prof. Peter Clark, director of the Centre for Urban History of the University of Leicester).
from friends or read on newspapers. For good or for bad, the museums of London - especially the 'national' museums - acted very much as models.

Of course these were not the only models in the world for museums of modern art founded by private initiative. Important institutions of this kind have been founded elsewhere by private individuals years before any national gallery of modern masters opened in London. Furthermore, we can not assume that the museums of London were known by the founders of public galleries in cities out of the area of cultural influence of Britain. Again, we must insist that the term 'model' is not necessarily used here to mean an example widely imitated. We are studying here social phenomena, and in sociology a paradigm is not only something - or someone - whose influence set up the norms for the others, but also a most representative example of a pattern of behaviour (Pearce, 1992: p. 186).

9 Comments on London-based museums abounded in both the national and the local press, whilst the references regarding provincial museums are mostly to be looked for in local newspapers (cf. the paper by Rosemary Flanders: 'Early museums and the nineteenth-century media', in the forthcoming book edited by Eilean Hooper-Greenhill: Museum, Media, Message, London: Routledge).
CONCLUSION:

The conclusion to be drawn from this theoretical chapter is that the creation of galleries of modern art was, on the one hand, the result of a process of consecutive specialisation in the articulation of museums and, on the other hand, the effect of the involvement of some monarchs and private individuals, swayed sometimes by their own interests and sometimes by a spirit of emulation.

This is the thesis which now has to be developed, corroborated and illustrated with historical examples in the forthcoming chapters.
CHAPTER 2.
A FIRST NODAL POINT: THE MUSEUM OF LIVING ARTISTS IN PARIS 'RIVE GAUCHE'.
SUMMARY:

This chapter endeavours to ascertain with the first study-case some of the theoretical deductions about the origin of museums of modern art exposed in the previous chapter. The thesis vindicated there as a conclusion was that the creation of these galleries is to be related on the one hand to the previous evolution of museums and on the other hand to the interest -either genuine or duplicitous- of a double category of benefactors: the royalty and the bourgeoisie. Here we shall follow these two axes of study in an essay examining the origins, purposes and evolution of the Musée du Luxembourg in Paris.

This 'Museum of Living Artists', opened in 1818, would never have existed without the pre-existence of two Parisian galleries specialising in paintings by old masters -one in the Luxembourg Palace itself and the other in the Louvre-, both declining to display works by living artists. On the other hand, despite the concern for similar projects showed by the revolutionaries (they had opened in 1797 in Versailles a museum of late 18th century art and had also conceived the idea of a Musée Olympique de l'École Vivante des Beaux-Arts), the history of the Luxembourg Museum is directly linked to the political agenda of the Restoration and to the support of the successive monarchs. Such are the points discussed in the first section of this chapter.

The second section reviews the purposes and evolution of the institution at the light of the changes it experienced during the Third Republic. In 1886 the museum reopened, provisionaly, in an orangery, but its much requested and long discussed re-foundation failed to arrive despite numerous plans to install it in another place and to reorganise it with another identity. Yet, it was perhaps at that moment of crisis when the importance of the Luxembourg as influential model gathered momentum.

Nineteenth century Paris was a 'nodal point' in the history of museums: many museological innovations originated in that cultural cross-road. Not only was born there the first gallery of modern art, but also the crisis of identity and the inner contradictions peculiar to such museum-type still nowadays.
2.1 THE CREATION OF A GALLERY OF MODERN MASTERS AT THE LUXEMBOURG PALACE.

Preliminaries: the art galleries of old masters in the Luxembourg, and in the Louvre.

At the time of the Restoration of the monarchy after Waterloo, nothing seemed more effective in the justification of any political move, than to present it as a continuity from the pre-revolution era. If there were many political reasons to prevent Louis XVIII from closing down the art museum established at the Louvre by the regicides, the most convincing argument for him to keep it open, was that the idea had been already planned by Louis XVI. When he created a royal gallery of contemporary art, a project without direct precedents in the past, the choice of the Luxembourg palace to accommodate it allowed him a mental connection with the royal gallery opened there from 1750 to 1779, whose existence was still alive in the memories of the Parisians. Any essay on the origins of the first museum of contemporary art has to be introduced, therefore, by a two-step flash-back in time, a reference to those two galleries of old masters; their pre-existence determined the birth of the Musée du Luxembourg.

General histories of the development of the world’s museums frequently acknowledge the significance of the establishment of the Louvre and its impact in the subsequent growth of museums in the modern world (Boylan, 1992a). But the historians of museums writing in English often omit the fact that the premises of the palace at the Luxembourg Garden, on the Paris left bank, had been used as a museum long before the Louvre. The latter had lost, to the benefit of Versailles, its functions as royal dwelling of the Court, but still it remained a house reserved for the King of France, whilst the Luxembourg palace and gardens, built at the beginning of the 17th century for the Queen Marie de Médicis, were usually offered to close relatives of the monarch. Thus, when as early as 1747 some writers and courtisans claimed that a choice selection of the royal collections should be opened to visitors¹, the painter Coypel and the royal administration found that the Luxembourg Palace, rather than the Louvre, was the most suitable place to open to the public (Pommier, 1991).

¹ In that very year of 1747, La Font de Saint Yenne had published in The Hague a booklet entitled: Réflexions sur quelques causes de l’état présent de la peinture en France, where he had proposed the transfert of the royal collection from Versailles to the Louvre, and its opening to artists and foreigners.
So, the first Royal museum of art in France was the gallery of old masters opened in the Luxembourg palace on October 14th, 1750. There were ninety six of the best pictures from the royal collection exhibited there: Raphael, Correggio, Andrea del Sarto, Titian, Veronese, Caravaggio, Poussin... and of course, the Rubens series of paintings dedicated to the life of Marie de Médicis were shown in situ. The gallery was open to visitors twice a week, every Wednesday and Saturday, from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. in Winter (October-April), from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. in Summer (August-October). No expense was spared to present the pieces in perfect condition and well restored (McClellan, 1984: p. 438-441), for the crown was anxious to refute pamphleteer accusations of neglect in the maintenance and display of the royal picture collection (Connelly, 1972). However, thirty years later other political pressures ended this accessibility of the Royal collections to aficionados and artists when Louis XVI gave, in 1779, the Luxembourg Palace to his brother the Count of Provence, later Louis XVIII. The King's pictures were then removed from there and stored.

It was then that the 'Grande Gallerie' in the Louvre was envisaged as the best place to re-install the highlights of the royal collection so as they could continue to be admired by the public. Plans of different architects were considered by the count d'Angiviller, Directeur des Batiments Royaux, from 1776 (Pommier, 1989: p. 20). But it took the upheaval of the Revolution to turn the palace into Europe's first national art museum, the 'Musée Français', which opened late in 1793. Enriched by the rape of artistic treasures taken from the enemies of the Republic (the King, the nobles, the Church, the foreign potencies), three years later it became 'Musée Central des Arts', and later was called 'Musée Napoleon' (Gould, 1965). The Republic and the Napoleonic Empire gathered a universal pantheon of the arts in the Louvre, which became the pearl of French cultural achievements (Aulander, 1953-70). Yet, this pearl was not the only one, but the biggest in a great necklace, the centre of a network of museums created all over France and the conquered capitals: museums became a political instrument to court public opinion (Bazin, 1967: p.194-5; Nora, 1988). They were often installed in Ancien Régime monuments, epitomising the public appropriation of ex-monasteries, ex-churches or ex-palaces.

The Luxembourg palace, like the Louvre or in general any other symbol of the past royal power, could not escape being re-used and re-interpreted by the new regime. The site was nationalized in 1791, when the Count of Provence ran away from Paris. It became a prison under the Convention, it was the Government palace under the Directoire, and finally, Napoleon installed the Senate there, which became the definitive function of the house².

² The Senate was suppressed by the II Republic, and therefore the palace was abandoned between 1845 and the reestablishment of the Senate by Napoleon III in 1852. Another parenthesis was the period of the Commune (1871), and the eight following years when the Préfecture and the Conseil
In 1801 the Senate decided, in remembrance of the fact that the palace had been the first museum in Paris, that part of the building should be re-opened to the public as a museum. The Luxembourg became again a gallery of old masters: the Rubens series of paintings devoted to the life of Marie de Medicis returned there from the Louvre, a series of pictures of the *Ports of France* by Jules Vernet came from the Ministère de la Marine, canvases of Le Sueur originally painted for a nearby monastery, some works of Philippe de Champagne, Raphael, Poussin, Rembrandt, Titian... together they formed a collection of about one hundred paintings and twenty sculptures.

The Luxembourg gallery, which opened to the public in 1802, was, in a sense, an attraction complementary to the visit of the Louvre, since it offered 'more of the same'. The main difference lay not in their collecting policies, but in the superiority of the Louvre compared to any other art gallery of the Republic. The Luxembourg was just the gallery of the Senate -*Chambre des Pairs*- while the Louvre, called since 1803 'Musée Napoléon', was the national gallery in more ways than one.

Long before the Revolution, the architecture of the Louvre was seen as a national banner. Whilst the Luxembourg or Versailles had each been built by a single sovereign, and both were inevitably associated with these two places, the Louvre was the product of many centuries, which rendered that building symbolic of most of the past of France. For art amateurs, the Louvre also symbolized the triumph of French artists over the Italians, because in the 17th century Bernini's projects for the façades of the Louvre had been rejected and the plans of a French architect, Charles Perrault, had been chosen (Aulander, 1953-70; Blum, 1946).

After the Revolution, the Louvre Museum became an emblem of the French Republic (Hooper-Greenhill, 1989). Some historians (Cantarel-Besson, 1981, vol. 1, p. XIII) have emphasised the political symbolism of its opening date, underlining the fact that the Muséum des Arts was inaugurated on August 10th, 1793; a date of the strongest significance, being the first anniversary of the fall of the monarchy. On the other hand, as Hooper-Greehill has pointed-out, the transformation of the Louvre into a museum was a remarkable event, not only because the royal palace and private art collections were opened to visitors, but mainly because they became a nation's monument.

*Through the bringing together and displaying of material things which had been violently taken away from their previous religious, aristocratic, royal and enemy owners, a space was...*
constituted where new values of liberty, freedom, fraternity and equality among citizens of the State could be both produced and reproduced (Hooper-Greenhill, 1990, p. 57; cf. also Poulot, 1986b and 1988).

Vivant Denon, the director of the Louvre who transformed it into a compendium of the History of Art from any country and time, articulated his museum with a sense of progress (Hooper-Greenhill, 1990). His general idea was that the recovery of the quality of art culminated in the artistic excellence of Napoleonic France worldwide. But, curiously enough, he did not include in his museum a review of French contemporary art. This occurred in some provincial museums (Pomnier, 1986: p. 461 and 464; Sherman, 1987, p. 42) but not in the Louvre. Who could dare introduce on the walls of such a sacred space the works of somebody who had not yet been consecrated by the judgement of Time, i.e., deceased? The walls of the Louvre became, by order of the Girondin Roland, Minister of the Interior, a forbidden fortress for contemporary art (Gould, 1965: p.24). This was the origin of a long tradition of excluding works by living artists from the permanent collections3, which was sanctioned by the museum statements in 1863, where it was stipulated that nothing could be admitted at the Louvre but after at least ten years since the death of its author.

This ban of contemporary works was only partly raised during the Empire, when the Louvre admitted, albeit out of the Grande Gallerie (Poulot, 1981a), some paintings of Bonaparte and his battles, in particular Napoleon's coronation (Alexander, 1983: p. 97), one of David's less inspired works. However, such exceptional treatment was not conceived as homage to the mastery of the painter, but to the glory of the portrayed; just as art has always been introduced into churches for its iconographic contents more than for its aesthetic virtues. Out of that, even Jacques Louis David, the most celebrated living artist of the moment venerated as a master equal to the best of the past4, reached the final consecration of the Louvre only after his death. Henceforward, the only works by living artists visible in the Louvre would be ceiling paintings, which clearly were not intended as part of the museums’

3 Temporary exhibitions of contemporary art were not removed from the Louvre until 1849: the year of the last Salon to be held in the Louvre's Salon Carré.

4 David was not only a prominent artist, but also a prominent figure in politics (cf. Hemmings, 1987: p. 21-28 and 60-65). He was a backer of the Jacobins, and during Robespierre's rule of the Convention David became the dictator of taste, the controller of any political initiative concerning the arts. Of course, the experts selected for the Comité directing the Louvre Museum, where under his ascendancy. However, the many paintings by David owned by the Revolutionary Government were not hung on the walls of the Louvre, but in the Senate and other buildings symbolically related to the Republican State.
collections: when one of these, Ingres’ *Apotheosis of Homer*, gained repute, it was stripped down from the ceiling, to be put on display at the Universal Exhibition of 1855. It never returned to its first emplacement, where it was replaced by a copy, and the original continued to be exiled from the Louvre during the lifetime of Ingres (Bazin, 1967: p. 201). Hence, if the Louvre was a sacred space reserved for the dead, if the modest gallery of old masters installed at the Luxembourg would not accept contemporary art either, it became obvious that Paris was in need of another museum to encourage living artists.

This was the claim of Emeric David, who proposed at the Institut National the creation of a *Musée Olympique de l'Ecole Vivante des Beaux-Arts* intended both for artists and for artisans (Bazin, 1959, p. 52-53). But this proposal is not to be considered here as a precedent of the *Musée des Artistes Vivants* later established at the Luxembourg palace, even if that proposal was, according to Dominique Poulot (1983a: p. 22), the most representative museological project of the First Republic. The proposal of Emeric David, whether due to political indecision or lack of time, never materialised and was never public knowledge. It did not even reach the stage of a debate about the location of the proposed museum, there was no public polemic in the media, no architects competed for the design of the building; in short, its role as historic precedent for Louis XVIII’s museum of living artists was nil. Whilst the Republic had opened the Louvre Museum as a reply to the well advanced and long discussed projects of the Ancien Régime, it seems clear that the Restoration did not open a museum for living artists as a response to the failure of the Republic to carry out the project.

The Restoration itself did not implement remarkable changes for museums in Paris nor in the provinces. The latter rarely returned the materials arrived to their local museums during the triumphant Republic and the Empire (Chamberlin, 1983). The art galleries of the Louvre and the Luxembourg were not closed, most of the religious pieces taken to these two museums from churches and monasteries were not returned, and their curators were not dismissed: Vivant Denon was maintained as director of the Louvre (Alexander, 1983: p. 101-103), and Jean Naigeon continued in charge of the gallery of old masters at the Luxembourg. The only museum dismantled in the capital was the *Musée des Monuments Français* of Alexandre Lenoir, who watched helplessly as the tombs of the Kings and Queens of France were solemnly reinstated in St. Denis and many religious monuments were returned to their churches. But some other pieces of this abolished museum remained on its site (Christ, 1965), where the revived *École des Beaux Arts* was established; and Lenoir, appointed ‘Administrateur des monuments français’ on December the 10th, 1816, succeeded in his demand that these pieces, supplemented by casts and copies, should
be kept there as a museum of models for the training of artists (Erlande-Brandenburg, 1977).

The big changes in the museums were not a consequence of the return to the Ancien Régime, but of the Vienna Agreement of 1815 which enforced the return of the treasures pillaged in different countries. The most affected was the Louvre, which had been benefited most by those pillages. Its richness had been, in the heyday of French military power, a symbol of the political supremacy of post-revolutionary France; its emptiness became, as Germain Bazin has put it, 'a veritable symbol of defeat' (Bazin, 1959: p. 61). But the Louvre was for the nation too symbolic a place to let its walls be stripped, and therefore the Luxembourg's gallery of old masters, which had not been directly touched by the foreign reclamations, was struck in an indirect way. Most of its treasures, including the enormous canvases of Rubens, were transferred to the Louvre's Grande Gallerie; just seventeen paintings remained in the Musée de la Chambre des Pairs. So, the art gallery whose visit usually complemented that of the Louvre, was used to complete the Louvre. Henceforth, completing the Louvre was to be its destiny.

The new 'Musée des Artistes Vivants', Instrument of the monarchy.

For the royalists, back in power, the defeat of Waterloo had not been their shame nor that of France, but merely the downfall of the revolutionaries. However, the nation was not in a celebratory mood, and any pretext to proclaim French superiority would have seemed a gratifying instrument to raise patriotic pride. Such cultural politics were not alien to the heads of art museums and many of them became increasingly chauvinist. Vivant Denon had been tempted, in a moment of despair, to renounce forever his lifelong ambition of a museum-encyclopaedia of art from any time and country, an ideal dangerously menaced by the delegates of the foreign potencies reclaiming the Louvre's booty:

Denon realizing the inevitable, cried out in the manner of a Minister of Culture today, "Let them take them! But they lack eyes to see and France will always show her superiority in the arts; for her masterpieces were always better than those of others!" (Ripley, 1982: p. 42) (another version in Gould, 1965: p.123).

It is doubtful that Denon's patriotism could blind him to the point of really thinking that French old masters were better than those of all other countries; but he, like many of his contemporaries, did actually consider the best living artists to be

---

5 These seventeen paintings by old masters remained there for some years, even after the gallery was transformed in a museum of living artists, and were only transferred to the Louvre in 1821.
French. He believed that, despite the country's overturned military hegemony, French cultural and artistic superiority would, however, outlast the crisis of post-revolutionary politics. It will come as no surprise if future historians researching on Dominique Vivant Denon discover that he first considered the possibility to refill the Louvre using French contemporary art-works!

But, as we know, the final solution for the emptiness of the Louvre was different. The Louvre became again a rich compendium of art history by sacrificing the Musée de la Chambre des Pairs, which lost its most reputed old masters. The problem of emptiness and symbolic defeat affected then the Luxembourg palace, and it was its gallery which was refilled using French contemporary art. By means of some loans from individuals and institutions and thanks to the richness of the art collection of Louis XVIII, who had always been a conspicuous buyer in the 'Salons', a gallery of seventy four pictures was ready in a couple of years. The new Musée du Luxembourg was opened on a symbolic date, April 24th, 1818, the day of the second anniversary of the Bourbons' Restoration in the throne of France. Well had the King and his supporters learned from what the republicans had done in the Louvre!

The circumstances of this birth are not completely clear. The new paintings came to an already existing museum and the management of that old museum of the Senate experienced no changes, therefore it seems that no law was produced for this purpose. No contemporary information about this event is recorded in the Archives Nationales, apart from the documents accompanying a report of 1816 quoted by Genevieve Lacambre (1974: p. 7), and it seems that the entries dating from that time in the archives of the Luxembourg were burnt in 1871. Thus, it is hard to calibrate the actual involvement of Louis XVIII himself in the creation of that museum.

The atmosphere of adulation around him attributed the initiative exclusively to the King. The anonymous chronicler who signed his three long articles at the Moniteur Universel in May-June 1818 with just a 'T', insisted that the new institution was the consequence of a change in taste headed years ago by Louis XVIII,

6 Former researchers have been rather centered in his life during the pre-Waterloo era (Lelièvre, 1942; Chatelain, 1973).

7 Paris, Archives Nationales (C.A.R.A.N.), O-3-1393. There is another report, whose existence I have learnt of thank to the help of Armelle Jacquinot, written by one of the first historians of the Musée du Luxembourg, Léonce Benedite, who worked there as assistant-curator since 1886 and as chief-curator from 1896 to his death in 1925. In 1913 Benedite wrote in that administrative report: Les archives du Luxembourg ont été totalement brûlées pendant la Commune. Les vicissitudes qu'a subies ce Musée à travers les diverses administrations, dont les archives ont été, en partie dispersées, ou égarées, n'ont pas permis de retrouver le texte de l'ordonnance de Louis XVIII. Le statut du Luxembourg reste, dans tous les cas, fixé par une tradition constante de presque un siècle et la jurisprudence continue du Comité consultatif des Musées.

when he was only a Prince. Similarly, a booklet published in the same year of 1818, signed by a Monsieur G. de la V., attributes the birth of the museum to the «gout éclairé d'un Monarque, ami des sciences et des arts» [the enlightened taste of a Monarch friend of sciences and arts] (G. de la V., 1918: p. 63). In almost the same words, the 'enlighted taste' of the King was extolled two years later, in the first catalogue of the new gallery, entitled Explication des ouvrages de peinture et de sculpture de l'école moderne de France exposée le 24 avril 1818 dans la galerie royale du Luxembourg destinée aux artistes vivants.

How much can these contemporary sources be trusted? In his mémoires, the marquis Philippe de Chennevières (1979: p. 35) attributes the idea for the museum not only to the King but also to Jean Naigeon, the curator. Naigeon was already well experienced in the fascinating work of building-up a museum collection starting from scratch; in fact, most of the old paintings of the previous art gallery of the Senate had been found by him in ex-covents and secularised churches. Now, again, it was he who made the selection of most of the pieces for the collection of the new museum, who contacted the donors and lenders, who directed their transport and installation. But we do not really know if the idea of a museum for living artists was suggested to the king by Naigeon himself. Another 19th century writer, Frédéric Villot, curator of the Musée du Louvre, maintained (according to Bénédite, 1923: p. 10) that the project was put forth by the count Louis de Forbin, Directeur des Musées Royaux (Alexander, 1983: p. 101), whose interest in contemporary art was more evident, since he was himself a painter, one of the many admirers and imitators of David. In any case, it seems beyond doubt that the creation of the new museum encountered the highest levels of enthusiasm among the politicians of the Restoration. Was that museum an instrument at the service of politics?

At a first glance such expectations are denied. It is very remarkable how liberal the acquisition policy was in those first years, especially if we compare it with the conservatism of the choices in the second part of the century. The purchases for the museum of living artists included above all the regicide David, exiled in Brussels: the King forgave him for having voted in favour of the capital punishment in the trial of Louis XVI and invited him, in vain, to come back to Paris. Even more, he paid considerable sums for two of David's ideologically tendentious paintings: Leonidas at Thermopylae and Rape of the Sabinas (Angrand, 1972: p. 119-125). A similarly
courteous treatment was received by Prud'hon, one of the official painters of Napoleon (Angrand, 1972: p. 29-32). Was Louis XVIII trying to overstep the memory of the favours of Napoleon towards modern artists? (cf. Kirstein, 1969). This could be an explanation for his reign; but even the next Bourbon, Charles X, maintained the count Louis de Forbin in his charge, and continued this liberal policy. Delacroix's *Dante and Virgil in Hell*, a painting cruelly scorned by the members of the Académie des Beaux Arts, was immediately bought by Auguste de Forbin for the Luxembourg, and for years the supporters of Romanticism used to congregate there to worship their leader and gossip against Ingres.

Not only the museum's policy, but the arts policy in general, seems quite progressive in those years. Mentions and medals of the Salons were awarded to the boldest of the innovators. When the ship *Méduse* sunk and common sailors were not allowed in the life-boats, a public scandal broke out in the media, denouncing the lack of humanity of the Restoration's navy officers, recruited exclusively among the aristocracy. Théodore Géricault, a 28 year old painter, produced a picture representing the sailors abandoned in their precarious raft (Hemmings, 1987: p. 149-155). Despite its political message, Forbin appreciated its merits, and thanks to him Géricault's *Raft of the Méduse* ended up by being acquired for the King!. It seems as though during the Restoration of the Bourbon, official taste was more separated from academic art than ever in the nineteenth century (Boime, 1971; Genet-Delacroix, 1986). Considering how both Louis XVIII and Charles X lacked liberalism in politics, and how the taste of the later was traditionalist and catholic (Hemmings, 1987: p. 173-231), one is tempted to think that this liberal policy in the arts was not sincere, but a planned strategy of image.

Obviously, the Bourbons and their supporters were very interested in denying the widespread accusations that the Monarchy were opposed to modernity and that the monarchs lacked patriotism. Most of the hundred and eleven paintings Louis XVIII bought were modern and French (Bazin, 1959: p. 62). So, modern and French too, the Musée du Luxembourg had to be: for the best glory of the Monarchy. Thus, the vocation of the Musée du Luxembourg commenced as twofold: it appeared as a symbol of modernity (the first museum in the world devoted only to living artists), and it was radically patriotic, (only French art was represented).

No doubt it was conceived as the reverse of the 'Musée Spécial de l'École Française', opened in the palace of Versailles by the Republic in 1797 (Bazin, 1967: p. 172), which was in fact very special: very much a precedent of the exhibition *Entartete Kunst* organized by the Nazis in 1937-8. Modern works of the French school had been gathered there out of the eyes of the great public. In the words of Lenoir himself (cf. Poulot, 1983a: p. 20) Versailles was «un muséum séquestré» [a
confined museum] whose rare visitors were expected to laugh and mock the taste of the monarchs or to show just scholarly interest in the exhibits: paintings of fêtes galantes, Rococo furnitures, and other examples of art considered degenerate.

Moreover, the Luxembourg became also an instrument of pacific revenge over both the Napoleonic pillages for the Louvre, and the violent repraisal of the foreign potencies which had reinstated the Monarchy in France:

En décidant de pourvoir à nouveau en tableaux la galerie de l'ancien Sénat conservateur -deviendra galerie de la Chambre des pairs- et de la pourvoir en tableaux français contemporains, Louis XVIII ne répare pas seulement une injustice, il fait un acte de revanche nationale: il s'agit de prouver au monde que la France est capable d'assurer elle-même l'enrichissement de ses musées. La France d'aujourd'hui et de demain, celle des 'artistes vivants' auxquels est expressément consacrée la nouvelle galerie royale.

Louis XVIII's decision to supply the gallery of the Senate with new pictures and specifically to supply French contemporary paintings, was not only a reparation, but also an act of national revenge: the aim was to give proof to the world, that France herself was capable of enriching her museums. The new royal gallery is specifically dedicated to the France of today and tomorrow, represented by 'living artists' (Schlumberger, 1974, p. 70).

Let us not forget, on the other hand, that the Luxembourg palace had been the private house of Louis XVIII before the Revolution. Thus, the installation of his paintings in that palace was also a symbolic reclamation of the home of his happy youth, now owned by the French Senate. That was however merely a symbolic reconquest of just a part of the building: he never pushed the transformation of the gallery into a political instrument to the point of using it as a sumptuous setting for social parties, as Napoleon had done at the Louvre in 1810, when the Salon Carré and Grande Galerie staged the Emperor's marriage to Marie-Louise (Poulot, 1981a: p. 130). Louis XVIII had learned, by the experience of his guillotined brother, the dangers of confrontation with Parliament. Surely, as Camille Mauclair ventured (1928: p. II), by creating a gallery of modern art in the Luxembourg palace, the King wanted to please the Senate -Chambre des Pairs de France-; but it must be stressed here that the newly arrived pieces did not come in exchange for the masterworks.

9 Every time the Louvre reclaims a masterwork previously deposited by the State in another museum, the government is pressured to send something in exchange. This is a 19th century tradition (Sherman, 1989) still alive (for example in the 1960s, for the reassembling of the Italian paintings of the Campana collection in the Petit Palais of Avignon), whose antecedents go as far back as 1815, when many provincial museums reclaimed replacements if they were to send back the plunder which had been doled out to them (Gould, 1965: p. 125).
transferred from the Senate's gallery to the Louvre. In fact, they were never given to the Senate.

The Bourbons could themselves feel at home anywhere in the Luxembourg palace and gardens, their old domicile, but nowhere more rightfully so than in the gallery occupied by the museum of living artists. For a few years they let the Senate administer it (the curator Jean Naigeon and the guards were Senate functionaries), but soon they made the museum directly depend upon the royal administration, on the pretext that most of its collections were the private property of the King. The scarce art-works that were the property of the Senate were segregated in 1835 by Louis-Philippe, in order to avoid confusion (the separation of state and royal patrimonies was a novelty of his reign).

Most of the time, the Luxembourg's exhibits were considered King's property and the gallery was called 'Musée Royal' (Royal Museum) on the cover of the official catalogues. In theory, this changed when the Luxembourg Museum was nationalized after the 1848 revolution (Lacambre, 1974; Lawless, 1986). In practice, as soon as Louis-Napoleon became President of the Second Republic and later Emperor, the walls of the Luxembourg gallery overflowed with pictures from his liste civile -the list of personal belongings of the monarch. It was rarely well defined whether these were temporary loans or gifts, and this often produced confusion in the inventories (Bénédite, 1923: p. 12-14). Thus, as long as France had a sovereign at the head of State the public of the Luxembourg gallery was always indebted to the the monarch, regardless of whether the museum was called 'national' or not. In that indirect way, not by means of direct politic propaganda in the exhibits, but through subtle cross-references to the patronising role played by the pater-patriae, the museum of living artists worked as a political instrument.

The Louvre itself, which had already been declared national property by the First Republic and was again returned to the nation after the revolution of 1830, remained nevertheless of central propaganda value in the politics of French 19th century monarchs. Not merely because it was named 'Musée Royal' (and under Napoleon III 'Musée Impérial') but mainly because of the extensions made by the

---

10 The official catalogues of the Musée du Luxembourg have been for me an irreplaceable instrument of work, although they will not be found in the final bibliography of this dissertation, where this kind of publications have been spared in order not to make an endless list of all the official catalogues of every museum mentioned here. Only from 1852 onwards did the catalogues of the Luxembourg present an historic introduction and until 1893 they always were very simple and small. For their simplicity and brevity, they recall both the catalogues of the previous gallery of old masters in the same palace, and those produced for the Salons: not surprisingly, since the curator of the Luxembourg was, at the same time, the head of the Government's Service of Art Exhibitions (Bénédite, n.d., p. VII).
I - King Louis-Philippe visiting the Musée du Luxembourg, on October 2nd, 1838. Oil painting by Auguste Roux (Musée National de Versailles).

III - Plan of the Musée du Luxembourg, Paris.
(from the 1894 edition of the museum's catalogue).
kings to the museum's installation within the palace -originally restricted to the Grande Gallerie and the Salon Carré (Bazin, 1959). Louis XVIII created the Galerie d'Apollon, Charles X opened a new section for antiquities called after him, Louis-Philippe d'Orléans renovated the palace and established in the museum the Galerie Espagnole, Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte, the greatest reformer of the Louvre, extended both the collections and the palace embellishing the Louvre with sumptuous staircases, colonnades, and decorative façades. »Nul monarque sans doute conclu -concludes Germain Bazin- autant que Napoléon III n'a fait servir les musées à sa propagande« (Doubtlessly no monarch more than Napoleon III exploited museums for their propaganda value) (Bazin, 1967: p. 228).

The Luxembourg Museum too, was similarly backed by these kings for its propaganda value. In fact, here this propaganda value seems even more evident in some cases. Most of the historic art-treasures exhibited in the Louvre had been collected by the old Bourbons; thus, neither an Orléans nor a Bonaparte could adduce, as did the last Bourbons Louis XVIII and Charles X, that the Louvre was their private inheritance. The Luxembourg Museum however worked exactly the other way round: since everything kept there was relatively recent, its exhibits bore no historic associations with previous regimes. Therefore, any royal visit to the Luxembourg, regardless of whether the visitor was a Bourbon, an Orléans, or a Bonaparte, was very much a visit of a proprietor to his possessions because, as had been said above, most of the acquisitions for the museum of living artists were usually made with funds from the liste civile of the King.

It is hence not surprising that the literature about the Luxembourg has focused so much on an image of this museum as an apotheosis of official taste. However, if one considers how the choices of the sovereigns, or of their advisers, were sometimes separated from official taste, we realize that their gifts were often correcting, not mirroring, the purchases bought through the national funds for art-acquisitions. Thus, it was not until the 1870s', under the Third Republic, that the Luxembourg museum became a pure reflection of the art purchases practised by the State taste; before then, this was combined with a clear glorification of the taste of the Head of State.

Art treasures had always been useful in legitimating power (Millon & Nochlin, 1978). Our modern politicians have not been the first to discover that opening a museum assures its political father public recognition! The restored Bourbons had learned that from the Revolution, and also the next monarchs, Louis-Philippe and Napoleon III, both devoted great personal interest in raising their respective museum-monuments.
The banner of Louis-Philippe's cultural policy was the creation of the Musée Historique at the palace of Versailles, which was a consequence of his own interest in History but also a political move, because that museum used history at the service of the legitimization of a king brought to the throne by a revolutionary movement (Francastel, 1930). The historical characters and events represented there by paintings and sculptures were all political evocations of the kingdom of Louis-Philippe. The king-citizen was keen on historical préfigurations of himself: one of his favourites was the medieval king-chevalier Philippe-Auguste, another Philippe, who united the nation after the battle of Bouvines in 1214 (Gaehtgens, 1981: p. 58-59). Francis Haskell has called this attitude, so typical of the Romanticism, 'the manufacture of the past in nineteenth-century painting' (Haskell, 1987: p. 75-89).

History, and its political manipulation, was also a major interest for Napoleon III. He created within the Louvre the Musée des Souverains (Bazin, 1959), a glorification of providential men -i.e. dictators- who became great sovereigns although some were not legitimate monarchs (of course, this gallery did not last beyond his reign: one of the first decrees of the III Republic in 1872 involved its dissolution). However, the new focus of attention during the II Empire was the creation in 1862 of the Luxembourg Museum, which was a place of political propaganda for Napoleon III. He was also a great patron of contemporary artists, and this profile was manifested in his purchases and commissions, paid with his personal fortune (in spite of that these works were never reclaimed back by him from his exile in England), for two of his museums: the gallery of living artists in the Luxembourg palace and the Musée Historique in Versailles (Gaehtgens, 1984). Nevertheless, his role towards the Luxembourg Museum was not only that of a contributor, since he deprived it of history paintings to the benefit of Versailles.

11 His importance as art collector and great patron of the arts is well known (Mairinan, 1988); but the role of Louis-Philippe as a museum master is more controversial. He was one of the most important collectors of old paintings in his time, and this is one of his profiles in relation to museums. In the same way that Bonaparte had brought to France the art treasures of Italy, the king-citizen took to the Louvre a rich gallery of paintings from Spain, emulating his hero in a more peaceful way, since he did not send soldiers there but money... However, if Napoleon's plunder had not remained there after Waterloo, the Gallerie Espagnole left the Louvre as well, after Louis-Philippe was deposed.

On the other hand he was a great patron of contemporary artists, and also this profile was manifested in his purchases and commissions, paid with his personal fortune (in spite of that these works were never reclaimed back by him from his exile in England), for two of his museums: the gallery of living artists in the Luxembourg palace and the Musée Historique in Versailles (Gaehtgens, 1984). Nevertheless, his role towards the Luxembourg Museum was not only that of a contributor, since he deprived it of history paintings to the benefit of Versailles.

12 Napoleon III showed great interest in old masters. Proof of this is, for example, that he requested in 1858 to put on show in the palace of the Tuileries, his official residence, a picture attributed to Raffael property of a collector from London, Morris More, who was exhibiting it around Europe (Haskell, 1987: p. 164). Another proof is that he bought for 4.8 million francs most of the enormous amassment of Greek vases, classical sculptures, Italian primitive and Renaissance paintings, jewellery, etc. from the collection of the marquis Campana di Cavedi, sold in Rome in 1864. Unlike the plunder of Napoleon I or the Gallerie Espagnole de Louis-Philippe, this collection remained in France when the Emperor was removed from power, because the Parliament payed the purchase-price. It was partly distributed to provincial museums and partly given to the Louvre (Bazin, 1959).

He also was an inducer of shows of works of contemporary painters and sculptors, which was the main novelty of the International Exhibitions held in Paris in 1852 compared with the London First International Exhibition of 1851 (Holt, 1981: p. XXIV). Even before becoming Emperor he was a prominent buyer in the Salons, which brought him social prestige and political propaganda. Finally, he was a great benefactor of the Luxembourg Museum; however, his most personal museological project in relation to contemporary art was the creation of the Musée de l'Art Industriel (Sherman, 1989: p.27), and he did not show a personal concern about the problems of space of the Luxembourg Museum.
of the Musée des Antiquités Nationales at the royal castle of St. Germain-en-Laye, on the outskirts of Paris. The Emperor, who saw himself as a new Caesar, was an enthusiastic reader of Julius Caesar's *De Bello Gallico* ([Commentaries on the Gallic Wars]) and therefore his most cherished museological project was a museum for French Roman and pre-Roman antiquities (Bazin, 1969: p. 228).

It is no surprise that all the monarchs named above encouraged rich investments in the Louvre, occasionally financed by their personal fortunes. The Louvre was, and still is, one of the most conspicuous symbols of the nation, which makes it politically titillating for any government; but it seems evident that other pre-existing museums do not excite any comparable appeal to politicians. In fact, one of the best examples of dereliction by the state rulers was the Luxembourg gallery, unanimously denounced in the contemporary press for lacking *grandeur*. No doubt that it being a *musée de passage*, the fact that its collections were not really permanent but just in the gallery for a few years, was a decisive factor. On the one hand this made it a perfect show-window for those in power: they had no fear of being overshadowed by the previous contributions of their predecessors, since the natural passage of time cleared those old gifts from the gallery. On the other hand, it would always act as a pedestal for anyone who happened to be holding power at a particular time, therefore the political interest was never superlative to the point of making monumental long-term investments in the building. The Luxembourg was useful at the service of monarchy, but not an instrument of the 'monument-to-posterity' type.
2.2 CRISIS OF THE LUXEMBOURG MUSEUM DURING THE THIRD REPUBLIC.

The decay of the gallery, its removal to the orangery of the Luxembourg gardens.

In spite of his being a regular purchaser of contemporary art in the Salons, Napoleon III did not feel at the same time compelled to renovate the modest gallery of the Luxembourg palace devoted to living artists. This contrasts with his personal commitment to the refurbishing of the Louvre in particular and to the renovation of the whole city of Paris in general. His prefect, baron Haussmann, transformed the city constructing 85 miles of new large avenues and boulevards, innumerable new buildings, a modern water supply and sewer system, two big green areas (bois), many new parks, squares and cemeteries and a standard system of street furniture (pissoitères, benches, shelters, kiosks, clocks, lamp-post, etc). Napoleon III and Haussmann however, failed to create an urban complex of new museum-buildings like the Museumsinsel of Berlin or the Ringstrasse in Vienna. The architectural enrichment of the Louvre during the Second Empire was not followed by similar investments at the gallery of living artists. Whilst the Louvre consolidated its image as palace of the arts -although one of its wings was occupied by the Ministry of Finances- the Luxembourg remained in everybody’s mind as the palace of the Senate.

The revolutionarists of 1871 showed a greater interest for the gallery of living artists. In fact, one of their first concerns seems to have been to rearticulate this museum and making of it an instrument of propaganda at the service of their political discourse (cf. series of articles by Darcel in Gazette des Beaux Arts of 1871-2).

Hence, the short-lived revolutionary régime of the Commune wanted the whole Luxembourg palace for the museum's exhibits. But time and finances were scarce, the war against Prussia absorbed every effort, and in the anarchy of those days the orders given in respect of the Luxembourg museum were contradictory and, usually, not accomplished. Therefore, when the Third Republic was proclaimed the problem of the Luxembourg was still unsolved. It remained so for years, because the ministers of the new régime turned the matter over and over in their minds and were unable to make a decision.

Gone for ever were the days of direct interventionism of the highest political levels at the national gallery of living artists. Contrasting with previous management, when decisions would always emanate from the upper levels, the Third Republic
abdicated responsibilities and everything was decided upon the advice of one or several committees. This increased the influence of the Academy of Art (Laurent, 1982, p: 74-83), since in any committee asked to give advice on art matters its members, or people wanting to become its members, were usually in influential number -if not a decisive majority. Museum curators were also typical representatives on these committees. Thus, museums benefited from a change in the management structures: initiatives started at the lowest levels, were approved by committees, and ultimately confirmed by the Minister. Henceforward the direct rulers of the Luxembourg Museum were its curators, which probably was the reason why although idealist projects of reform abounded real changes diminished. No eyes could see better than those of the museum's own professionals the problems of the institution, but their hands were far from the resorts of power. Money and statutory changes were out of their reach.

The most obvious consequence of this, was the lack of political resolve to choose and carry out any of the successive projects proposed to reinstatethe gallery in a more convenient way. The best evidence of this comes in the form of the personal testimony of marquis Philippe de Chennevières, curator of the Musée du Luxembourg under the Second Empire and the first years of the Third Republic. He denounced, in a booklet of restricted circulation (Chennevières, 1878), the weakness of the policies for art under the new régime: not only was the whole administration running too slow, as a result of the abandonmen of responsibilities in favour of committees, but there was also a lack of political continuity due to the frequent changes of ministers -seven Ministers of Public Instruction in the first four years. In his memoirs, a more widely circulated book reprinted a few years ago (Chennevières, 1979), he tells how he was able, through his own initiative, to extend the museum within the Luxembourg palace. Even before the repair of the damages to the building caused by Prussian bombs had started, Chennevières 'invaded' with heavy sculptures some of the rooms and galleries available. He had started these guerrilla activities in 1870, when the Senate was dissolved, but his advances room by room to gain as much of the palace as possible were increased in the first years of the Third Republic, as a result of the

---

1 Philippe de Chennevières-Pointel (1820-1899), an art historian mainly known as the first instigator of the «Inventaire général des riches d'art de la France», was in charge of the gallery of living artists from 1861 to 1879. He was the third curator in the history of the institution. The first, Naigeon the father, had been succeeded by his son Elzidor Naigeon in 1829. Chennevières had been previously in charge of the annual exhibitions of art -the Salons- where he had startled by his liberalism (not only had he encouraged Napoleon III to create the Salon des Refusés, but he also avoided the usual favouritism in the hanging of pictures, arranging them by alphabetic order). In 1873 he was promoted Directeur des Beaux Arts, the highest responsibility, after the Minister of Public Instruction, of the State's initiatives regarding the arts. He kept that position, together with the curatorship of the Luxembourg Museum until his resignation in 1879.
irresolution of the Government and the many influence groups who were lobbying to obtain the Luxembourg palace for their own purposes.

In addition he pressed too, for a political decision. In his memoirs he tells how he tried to persuade the Minister of Public Instruction that the museum needed the whole of the Luxembourg palace. First of all, Chennevières reasoned that the exhibits were so numerous that they could and should occupy all the building. On the other hand, he suggested, a political decision of this kind would assure its instigator everlasting glory for posterity, for no other investment seemed more perennial than a museum. Had not the Louvre remained a museum in spite of the Restoration of the monarchy after the First Republic? Had not Versailles itself, since Louis-Philippe had transformed it in a museum of national history, survived all the subsequent political changes of France?

[...] autant je défie aucun pouvoir au monde de déposséder le Louvre de son attribution actuelle de temple des chefs-d'œuvre éprouvés par le temps, et Versailles de son attribution de musée historique, autant, je vous l'affirme, je défiérais tout pouvoir futur de déposséder le Luxembourg du caractère que vous lui aurez imposé de Palais de l'art vivant. Rien n'est tenace comme un musée, surtout s'il a son unité, son but bien clair dans l'esprit du public. [...] no political authority in the world would ever dare to expel from the Louvre the museum of old masterpieces, or to deprive Versailles of its being an historic museum; similarly, if you could secure the peculiarity of the Luxembourg as its being the palace of living art, I am positive that no power in the future would ever dare to annul that. Nothing is more solid than a museum, especially if it has its own unity, and its aims can be clearly seen by the public) (Chennevières, 1979: p.37-42).

In fact, the opposite happened. The minister never granted the whole of the palace for the museum. For a few years the public gallery shared the Luxembourg palace with the Préfecture and the Conseil municipal -the City Hall had been burned down by the revolutionarists of 1871- and since the Senate was reinstated by the Third Republic in 1876, its members lobbied their colleagues at the Government to give back to that institution its traditional site. The senators succeeded over Chennevières, who was pressed into retirement in 1879. In that year the Senate returned to the Luxembourg palace. Seven years later the national museum of living artists was expelled by the Senate from the Luxembourg palace.

So anxious was the Senate to banish artists and amateurs from the Luxembourg palace that, on hearing the claims of the Ministers of Public Instruction²

² Although the leftist Minister of Public Instruction Jules Ferry swore in the Senate (séance du 27 juin 1882) the imminence of plans for the construction of a new museum of living artists, the project lost priority for both left and right-wing politicians (Vamedoe, 1981: p.65-66).
that they had no funds to transfer the museum somewhere else, the Senate offered an adjacent orangery and paid all the necessary repairs and alterations to transform it into a museum. The move was presented as a generous sacrifice of the Senate in favour of the arts. Nobody seemed to realize that, as a result, one of the historic treasures of the nation's heritage would be closed for ever to visitors (the ex-palace of Marie de Medicis is still now the house of the Senate and the home of its president; no visitors are allowed in except on arranged group-visits organised once a year on a paying basis).

The old orangery of the Luxembourg gardens was enlarged to include a squared salon and a gallery for sculptures set at right angles to it. This modest building, designed to keep the orange-trees of the Luxembourg gardens warm in winter, with its great south-facing glass-windows, was too humid and hot for the conservation of paintings. Nobody seemed concerned about this in the inauguration year. Such new site was intended to be temporary, until the Ministry of Public Instruction invested in another building. However, the museum remained there from 1886, when it was re-opened by the President of the Republic Jules Grévy, to the year after the 1937 International Exhibition, one of whose pavilions -the Palais de Tokyo- was to be re-used as Museum of Modern Art.

More public concern raised the problem of dignity. The humble ex-orangery building was too small. So small that, on suggestion of yet another advisory committee, the government dictated that henceforth no more than three works per artist should be admitted for the museum. It is a common mistake in the literature devoted to the Musée du Luxembourg to assume that this limit of three works per artist was one of the museum's historic traditions, but in fact the Third Republic is solely responsible for this quota (cf. Ladoué, 1936: p. 185). Yet in spite of this allotment, the new gallery was always overcrowded. Two hundred and sixty two pictures, many of them of great dimensions, were accumulated in the 2,177 sq.m. available in the eleven rooms destined for paintings, and almost one hundred statues were shown in the 432 sq.m. of the great gallery of sculptures (Ladoué, 1948: p. 198). In the beginning the sculptures were ordered in two rows on each side, but later on more and more rows of sculptures were added within this large gallery which, at the turn of the century, looked like a forest of sculptures presented 'elbow to elbow', while the rooms for paintings were similarly arranged in a display 'frame to frame'. A text on the front-page of the newspaper l'Événement of December 12th, 1901 called it a «bric-à-brac de chefs-d'oeuvre» a «capharnaüm» were the space was so scarce that everything seemed accumulated rather than exhibited (quoted in Lawless, 1986: p. 20).
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This lack of space was made worse by the fact that the collections grew more rapidly than in any other kind of museum. Artistic production at this time in Paris—a mecca for late 19th century artists (Millner, 1988)—was prolific and every artist wished to have works exhibited there, in order to gain both prestige and customers. In only thirty years, from 1892 to 1922, the catalogues of the Luxembourg registered 1,175 new acquisitions of paintings. As a result, it seems that the museum sought not just quality but also small size:

Le voeu secret, et aisé à deviner, des conservateurs, est qu'au moins ces œuvres survenues soient de dimensions restreintes, pour pouvoir satisfaire à toutes les requêtes. Ainsi voit-on les signatures nouvelles s'accumuler au bas de tableaux de plus en plus petits, qui sont parfois de simples études et des «cartes de visite».

[The curator's secret desire, easy to guess, is that in order to satisfy most requests for acquisition, the works selected should be of small dimensions. Thus, one sees that the pictures signed by the newest artists are smaller and smaller, often just studies in the size of visiting cards] (Mauclair, 1928: p. VI).

It became obvious that the museum needed another site. The printed testimonies of protest against the lack of space and dignity of the ex-orangery of the Luxembourg palace were numerous. Their leitmotiv was always the comparison between such a modest building and the big museums of modern art in other European capitals... If the English press has once ridiculed the primitive site of the National Gallery in London by superimposing an image of Montagu House with one of the Louvre, similarly we find about a century later in French magazines photographs of the modest doorway of the Luxembourg orangery compared with the imposing façades of equivalent institutions for contemporary art in London and Munich (cfr. illustrations in the article of Hamel, 1920).

Some went further in their protests, criticising not just the building of the national museum of living artists but those of all national museums in the capital. During the Third Republic many cities in the provinces erected purpose-built museums, in some cases particularly sumptuous—Marseilles might be the most striking example. Could Parisians themselves be resigned not to have any? Perhaps

3 For parliamentary criticism, between 1877 and 1903, of the exigency of the ex-orangery cf. references provided by Daniel J. Sherman (1989: p. 271, note 21). Regarding the repairs in the Luxembourg palace cf. also Archives Nationales F 21/585 and F 21/817-818.

4 More other examples can be found in the existent bibliography (Angrand, 1984-8; Vaisse, 1980; Sherman, 1989); however, perhaps the capital contribution about the buildings of provincial museums in 19th century France will be an exhibition and catalogue envisaged for 1994 by Chantal Goergel, curator of the Musée d'Orsay. I own her the reference to some files in the Archives Nationales of Paris, containing documentation relative to this subject: F/21/4505-4513.
the medieval hotel de Cluny had an old charm for a national museum of medieval art, thanks to its similarity to a house of antiques, but it seemed that old palaces like the Louvre were too ill-suited for the exhibition of paintings (L'Evenement, December 12, 1901). Thus, apart from the fact that the re-use of an old orangery as a museum of living artists seemed particularly inappropriate, it was the Revolution's policy of re-using historic buildings as museums which was then, for the first time, questioned as a whole. The new international railway networks allowed many Parisians to travel abroad and they then realized that their city was almost the only European capital lacking purpose-built art-museums! As a consequence more and more people requested a modern museum-building for the gallery of modern art. This plea rose stronger in our century (leading articles in the Cronique des Arts et de la Curiosité, December 1921), and although it was partly answered by the building of the Palais Tokyo for the International Exhibition of 1937, its complete fulfillment came only when the Pompidou Centre was built in the 1970s.

For the hypothetical new location of the national gallery of living artists two contrasting areas of Paris were in dispute. Some - perhaps impressed by the concentration of museums in particular districts of Berlin, Munich or Vienna - argued, that the best new site for the gallery of living artists should be in the vicinity of the Louvre, because the visit of these two museums was complementary. Others considered the museum of living artists inextricably linked to the life of the «rive gauches», and that the gallery should remain near the Luxembourg gardens in order not to lose its already famous name, Musée du Luxembourg.

The former group first suggested the Palais Royal, a site previously proposed by Auguste Jeanron in January 1845, when the palace had been abandoned by Louis-

---

5 This kind of discourse was still in force in 1931, when Louis Haueteour, conservateur of the Musée du Luxembourg, wrote:

_Tous les pays tiennent à honneur d'exposer les œuvres de leurs artistes contemporains. Plusieurs d'entre eux ont construit de très beaux musées: l'Italie possède à la Vallée Giulia un très vaste édifice moderne, la Galleria Nazionale; l'Angleterre a aménagé à nouveau la Tate Gallery, l'Allemagne a développé à Berlin dans son île des Musées la section moderne, la Belgique a ouvert toute une série de salles pour son art contemporain. Peut-on dire que le Musée du Luxembourg soit digne de l'art français? Il nous semble qu'il y a une contradiction entre la richesse de notre art et la pauvreté de ce musée. [...] Les Musées étrangers, souvent moins riches que les musées français, peuvent mettre leur collection en valeur, parce qu'ils disposent de la place nécessaire (Paris, Archives Nationales, F21/4905, dossier 1d, doc. 3).

6 The surroundings of the univeristy 'Quartier Latin' in the _rive gauche_ were the artistic heart of Paris during most of the 19th century, or at least until its last quart, when the wealthier artists moved their studios to the 'Nouvelle Athènes', an elegant suburb in the Nord, similar to Kensington in London. The _rive gauche_, where cultural bustle still survives, has many souvenirs of its past artistic life: the Académie des Beaux-Arts, the École des Beaux-Arts, and a few artists' studios, sometimes transformed in museums, like the Musée Delacroix, or the Musée Hebert... all are situated in the left-bank district.
Philippe. Later came the idea of rebuilding the Tuileries Palace, deserted by Napoleon III and burn out during the revolution of 1871, as a museum of modern art (Varnedoe, 1981). Afterwards proposals for a Grand Louvre, where the whole space available in the palace would be given to the arts, gained much backing. The supporters of this idea wanted the Musée des Artistes Vivants to be installed between the Musée du Louvre and the Musée des Arts Décoratifs. On the other hand, the supporters of the rive gauche proposed to erect a purpose-built museum in the rue Michelet or in the Champ de Mars, to reform the house of the École de Sourds-Muets, to move to the old seminary of St. Sulpice, or to the Hotel Biron, etc. Even an extension, using land from the Luxembourg gardens was considered (Gonse, 1892, p. 299).

Out of all these projects, the only one which seemed ever to come close to implementation was the renovation of the ex-seminary of St. Sulpice, in rue Vaugirard, just opposite the Luxembourg (Bénédite, 1910). The building was granted to the museum in 1913. An American benefactor, Hugo Reisinger, offered to pay for the work of refurbishment in the building, but his money was rejected by Parliament. With typically French concern about the State's self-importance, the members of the Assemblée Nationale decided that the museum could accept donations for its collection but not for the building, because -as J. Symian, the spokesman from the Commission du Budget put it- 'such investment corresponded only to the State' (Simyan, 1913: p. 13). However, when the Parliament was about to vote a budget for these works, the decision was delayed due to further discussions prompted by the backers of the transfer to the Louvre palace. Another parliamentary committee, the Commission de l'Enseignement et des Beaux-Arts, whose spokesman was M. Fournol, wanted the Ministry of Finances to quit the wing of the Louvre palace it occupied and move to the ex-seminary of St. Sulpice. (Fournol, 1913: p. 1-6). World War I paralysed the debates, and in the end not only did the Ministry of Finances not leave the Louvre palace, but it got the building of St. Sulpice as well, while the bewildered curator of the Musée du Luxembourg, kept on looking for other alternatives.

The curator, Léonce Bénédite, had indeed been the most active supporter of the proposed transfer to the ex-seminary of St. Sulpice, if not also the originator of that proposal: the reports presented to Parliament by the Directeur des Musées Nationaux in the Autumn of 1913 seem drafted by Bénédite himself (Archives Nationales, F/21/4905, first dossier7). Imitating the guerilla tactics of faits accomplis

7 This file contains eleven dossiers of documents related to the Musée du Luxembourg, the Musée de la Marine, the Musée Gustave Moreau, the Musée de l'Orangerie, and the Musée Rodin, all of them in Paris. The information concerning the Luxembourg mostly refers to the above named initiatives of Bénédite.
used before by Chenevières, he had even begun installing certain equipment of the museum in St. Sulpice, and for months he worked there with his assistants clearing away materials left by the seminarists. He could not bring himself to throw away those materials and brought them to the already over-filled store-rooms of his museum (a point which speaks for itself about the characteristic curator's mind of Bénédicté). Twenty-three years later, his successors were perplexed to find at the Luxembourg ex-orangery so many religious books and they wrote several reports (Idem dossier 1.) asking to get them transferred to the National Library or rendered to the Catholic Church.

When the battle for the ex-Seminary of St. Sulpice was lost, Bénédicté turned his attention to another building not too far away from the Luxembourg gardens, the 'hotel Biron' -an enormous villa with romantic gardens, where Auguste Rodin had spent his last years. Bénédicté, who was a friend and admirer of the famous sculptor⁸, and the author of many publications about him, was in love with that place. The site was in fact a national property since 1911, but Rodin was allowed to live and work there because, being childless, he had agreed in 1916 to bequeath to the State all his collection and the copyright of his bronzes in exchange for the use of the hotel Biron until his death. The artist died in 1917 and, although plans to transform his residence into a museum commemorating him had always been in the air, no action was taken by the Government for years. Bénédicté was exasperated; he felt there was a danger that the villa would never become a public museum. On August the 13th, 1918, the year the Musée du Luxembourg was commemorating its centenary, he wrote a flattering report to the Minister of Public Instruction (Idem, dossier 1d, 1st doc.) proposing to celebrate the event with a birthday present: the transfer of the museum of living artists from its current inadequate emplacement in an ex-orangery to the 'hotel Biron'. He received no reply. Still he repeated this plea two years later, on occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Third Republic, in a new letter to the Minister dated September 4th, 1920 (Ibidem, 3rd doc.). Eventually the 'hotel Biron' was opened as a museum, not for living artists, but as Musée Rodin. Bénédicté was appointed as its first curator.

In the meantime, the national gallery of living artists never moved from the ex-orangery of the Luxembourg gardens until its final closure, when a new museum of modern art from the Post-Impressionists onwards (Cassou, 1947: p. V) was constituted in 1938. A year later the ex-orangery was empty; but, unlike the Third Republic, this building survived the World War II, and its façades, decorated with

⁸ A rich collection of letters from and to Bénédicté was bought by the archives of the Louvre in April 1992. I am very greatful to the Documentation Service of the Musée d'Orsay to have let me read those letters, which are contained in a dossier called «Iconographie: Léonce BENEDITE». 
Photos: Santiago Morán.
busts honouring nineteenth century artists, are nowadays a favourite place of meditation for strollers in the Luxembourg Gardens. No information is given to indicate that this orangery, whose walls evoke Delacroix, Carpeaux, etc., is the last reminder of a significant institution, the oldest museum of modern art in the world.

The aims of the museum questioned: 'art-encouragement' or 'art-history'?

The Luxembourg was intended not to have permanent collections, since the works of deceased artists should leave the museum within a reasonable time. One of the Louvre's statements ruled that no art-work could be admitted there until ten years after the death of its maker, therefore that period of ten years was usually reported to be the limit for works by dead artists to be removed from the Luxembourg. Only major works would be sent to the sacred space of the Louvre, while the rest would be condemned to decorate the walls of a ministry, or to be transferred to a provincial museum (Pommier, 1986). In theory at least, nothing was kept permanently in the Luxembourg. Thus, the museum was perceived as a waiting-room for meritorious works (œuvres de mérite) awaiting the 'last judgement' of time for their final 'consecration' or 'damnation': a purgatory-museum (musée purgatoire), as it was popularly called.

«Oeuvre de mérite» was in 19th century France 'the most common accolade bestowed on the state's purchases of contemporary art', writes Daniel Sherman in his study on the politics of culture in nineteenth-century France (1989: p. 53). He immediately adds:

> Although some of its representatives may have had such pretensions, the state in its plenitude was not in the business either of certifying genius or of sniffing out masterpieces; its refusal to make such claims, indeed, explains why it scrupulously distinguished between the Louvre and the Luxembourg (Sherman, 1989: p. 53).

He is partly right. Hardly one over two paintings registered in the catalogues of the Luxembourg appears later in the catalogues of the Louvre (the proportion is more favourable for sculptures). That seems to confirm Sherman's disbelief about the exclusivity of masterworks as target-pieces for the state search of 'works of merit' or 'museum pieces' (Genet-Delacroix, 1985). But Sherman goes much further than that. He emphasises: 'The Luxembourg made no claim to house masterpieces; that was the Louvre's department' (Sherman, 1990: p. 58). Thus, he stresses as much as possible the differences between the aims of the Louvre and the Luxembourg whereas, on the other hand, he tends to identify the Luxembourg with the sections of contemporary art in French provincial museums and with the temporary exhibitions of modern art.
The Luxembourg however was not simply a show of contemporary art, but a 'museum' and, to be exact, a 'national' museum -since 1848- with all the usual inferences of excellence attached to these words. It was not as sacred a place as the Louvre, but nevertheless its aim was to be a 'national temple of art', a visit to which would be perceived as a semi-religious experience which would raise the spirit of the public -therefore the preference for 'works of high aspiration' at the Luxembourg. In the press it was often called 'passing-place' (lieu de passage), and 'ante-chamber of the Louvre' (antichambre du Louvre), which shows us the popular assumption that gaining a place at the museum of living artists was a first step leading to the final 'consecration' of an artist (cf. Lacambre, 1974: p. 7).

If the traditional aristocratic or religious patrons of artists in France had disappeared because of the Revolution, both the King and the State took over the role of encouraging the artistic production; yet their highest action of encouragement towards an artist was not merely to purchase his or her work, but to assign it to the museum of living artists. The Luxembourg Museum represented the highest level of recognition possible for contemporary arts, because only the best of the best was intended to get there. The 'minor' arts were banned from that gallery (drawings, medals, prints, and water-colours entered only in the second half of the century and were not always exhibited). Paintings and sculptures had to be well-finished: sketches or non finished works would not be admitted even if they were the work of a reputed artist. Furthermore, the museum preferred 'works of high aspiration', i.e. History paintings\(^9\) and similar genres, instead of anecdotal subjects or portraits (even if these were the more characteristic works of the artist!).

Like the Louvre, the Musée du Luxembourg started as a review of good examples by consecrated masters, offered for imitation by other artists. The didactic value of any art-work exhibited was paramount, because art-works venerated there became exemplary for other artists -the classrooms of the École des Beaux-Arts are also in the 'rive gauche', fifteen minutes walking from the Luxembourg. So as to ensure the necessary artistic excellence, most of the pictures acquired by the State and given to the Musée du Luxembourg were bought from among those awarded with a medal in the Salons or in International Exhibitions. There was therefore a triple filter: the jury of admission to the Salon, the jury of Salons awards, and the jury in charge of selecting art-works for the national collections\(^10\). This system of consecutive

---

\(^9\) Counting the entries of the catalogues results in an apparent denial of this preference: sometimes History painting were barely a third of the total. But, as some painted or photographic views of the Musée du Luxembourg record, those pictures occupied most of and the best space, because they were enormous, and they were given central place on the walls.

\(^10\) The Salons were managed by the Directeur des Beaux Arts, of the Ministry of Public Instruction, which was as well the person in charge for acquisitions of contemporary art. The curators of the
selection was intended as a guarantee that the rooms of the museum of living artists were preserved from any mediocrity.

At the beginning the general public were admitted only on Sundays and holidays, whilst artists -and foreign visitors- could enter during the rest of the week. This was another direction for the use of art museums the légitimistes learned from the Revolution. The Republic had suppressed the Academy and had proclaimed the Louvre as the new art-training place, where the young artists could learn for themselves by copying the old masters of their own choice (McClellan, 1984: p. 454-455). The reason for this had been the revolutionaries' opinion that French art had experienced a 'degeneration' during the eighteenth century as a consequence of the 'corrupt' hierarchical art-training system which forced a stylistic dependence from master to pupils. Although the restored monarchy defended that dependence and the École des Beaux-Arts became the main training centre for artists, the new State did not expel copyists out of the museums. In the 19th century nobody seemed against the practice of copying in museums -an activity strictly forbidden at the former royal gallery of old masters opened at the Luxembourg in 1750. In spite of its revolutionary origins, that practice turned out to be a reinforcement of academic values. Nowhere was this more evident than at the museum of living artists (Valabrègue, 1881), since the pieces young copyists would find there were mostly works by teachers of the École des Beaux Arts and members of the Academy.

However, this didactic role for art-professionals lost pre-eminence in the second part of the century, when the new learning-place for many artists became Musée du Luxembourg had no responsibility for these purchases and only from 1873 had they the authority to select or refuse works offered by the Directeur des Beaux-Arts (Bazin, 1959: p. 63, Lacambre, 1974: p.8). From 1905 a select committee was in charge for the purchases in the Salons, and another special committee was in charge for acquisitions in individual exhibitions. The curators and the Conseil des Musées Nationaux had complete liberty to receive gifts or bequests, and acquire works by recently deceased artists. By decree of February 7, 1929, a special committee decided which works went to the Luxembourg (Hautecoeur & Ladoûé, 1931, p. 14).

Musée du Luxembourg had no responsibility for these purchases and only from 1873 had they the authority to select or refuse works offered by the Directeur des Beaux-Arts (Bazin, 1959: p. 63, Lacambre, 1974: p.8). From 1905 a select committee was in charge for the purchases in the Salons, and another special committee was in charge for acquisitions in individual exhibitions. The curators and the Conseil des Musées Nationaux had complete liberty to receive gifts or bequests, and acquire works by recently deceased artists. By decree of February 7, 1929, a special committee decided which works went to the Luxembourg (Hautecoeur & Ladoûé, 1931, p. 14).

11 When Emeric David had proposed at the Institut National the creation of a «Musée Olympique de l'Ecole Vivante des Beaux-Arts» his declared purpose was mainly to honour the country, to promote living artists, and -last but not least- to show exemplary art-works as models:

La nation placerait dans cet honorable Musée toutes les productions utiles et remarquables des beaux-arts et une collection de chefs-d'œuvre des habiles ouvriers vivants dans tous les arts. Là le charpentier déposerait le modèle d'une machine, le serrurier montrerait comment il assouplissait un métal revêche. Un établissement de cette nature honorerait autant la France qu'il lui serait utile. Égale facilité donnée à tous les artistes de se faire connaître, et au public de les juger, publicité des inventions ingénieuses, émulation, perfection de l'art et du goût (E. David, quoted in Poulot, 1983a: p. 22).

12 Napoleon Bonaparte established a new Academy which attempted to rule over art education and the Salons for the rest of the century (Fox, 1976: p.377; Laurent, 1982: p. 14-33).
Nature itself (Blanche, 1931). Nevertheless, the artists in general did not call into question the definition of the Luxembourg museum as the most prestigious instrument of art-encouragement. Even avant-garde painters saw the gallery of living artists with venerating eyes (Cézanne himself is reported to have showed great delight when some of his works were admitted there). The cry 'fire to the museums' uttered by early 20th century artists like Marinetti or Pisarro, was still far away. A famous comment on the Luxembourg by an art-critic is often quoted as a precedent, however it is worth pointing out that its author was not an artist, but an art-critic who wanted modern art-tendencies to be represented at the national gallery of living artists:

Les maîtres de la peinture actuelle sont absents. Et nous applaudirions à un incendie assainissant le hangar luxembourgeois, si ne s'accumulaient là des documents indispensables aux monographies futurs de la bêtise au XIX siècle.

(The masters of today painting are absent there. And we may applaud that a fire would purify the Luxembourg hangar, should not its contents become one day indispensable documents for the future monographs on silliness in 19th century) (Fénéon, 1886: p. 63).

What the artists often questioned was not the definition of the Luxembourg or its aims as the national museum of living artists. For most of them there was no problem seeing it as a respectable place -not a hangar-, a bit less sacred than the Louvre. What many of them complained about was just its failure to accomplish its definition: that art-works by long ago deceased artists should give way to other works by living artists. The 'last judgement' was delayed every time there was no space available at the Louvre, thereby punishing paintings and sculptures of long dead artists with a long dwelling in that 'purgatory museum' (Lutece, 1912). In fact, numerous pieces which failed to interest the Louvre stayed there for years, although it seems that, on the other hand, other works were sometimes reclaimed too soon by the temple of sacred art: in 1863 the Louvre was admonished by the Supervisor of Fine Arts, not to ask again for art-works from the Luxembourg before a minimum delay of ten years after their authors' death (Dumas, 1884: p. XV).

As the space available at the ex-orangery was really scarce, difficulties were experienced in finding display-space for the new acquisitions and many were stored in the reserves after a short time on show: frequently they were on show for just a year or two (Bénédite, 1892: p. 411). The Archives Nationales record plenty of testimonies written by some of the victims of such procedures. One of them for example was the painter Montessuy in 1871. Remarking that his only painting in the Luxembourg -a small one, he carefully details- had been retired to the reserves on

---

13 But cf. the ferocious comments on the Luxembourg Museum written by Gauguin, in 1902 (Lacambre, 1974: p. 11).
pretext of the lack of space, he wrote to Charles Blanc, head of the Direction des Beaux-Arts:

*Mon plus grand désir et mon intérêt seraient, qu'il soit remplacé au Musée des Peintres modernes, d'autant plus que des ouvrages d'artistes morts déjà depuis 1855, 1856, etc, y tiennent ainsi la place d'artistes encore vivants; je vous rappellerai d'ailleurs, que mon tableau est de petite dimension.*

[My greatest desire and interest would be, that it be replaced in the Gallery of modern painters; even more so on the account of the fact that some pictures by artists deceased in 1855, 1856 and thereafter, are taking the place belonging to living artists; on the other hand, I would like to remind you that my picture is of small size].

As this letter shows, the artists' criticism on the museum policy happened to be a confrontation of generations as much as a conflict of taste. The Luxembourg was supposed to be a museum of living artists, but for decades, the masters of the first third of the century occupied most of the space, while the works of the younger artists could hardly enter the gallery. Until the revolution of 1848 the members of the jury in charge of selecting art-works for the Luxembourg were exclusively members of the Academy of Arts. They were old people, whose taste had been formed in the first third of the century, and, as Th. Pelloquet stated (1856: p. 185), this resulted in their ignoring the young artists, overwhelmed on the walls of the museum by a clear predominance of the artists who had flourished in the days of the Empire and the Restoration. Things were not very different later: of course the series of revolutions experienced in France during the nineteenth century, assured a regular generational change for both political leaders and administrators of the arts, but even the curator Etienne Arago, a revolutionarists' hero in politics, was conservative in taste and he tended to keep in the gallery old paintings from the bygone years of his youth

14 The request succeeded, perhaps thanks of the small size of the picture, or, rather, because Montessuy was an old acquaintance of Blanc. Not all were so lucky. One year later, on November 27th, 1872, Charles Blanc answered to a similar request of the painter Ségé:

_Monsieur, Le Luxembourg est encombré, archi-encombré. Tant qu'on n'aura pas la place au Louvre pour y recevoir les tableaux des peintres modernes recemment morts tels que Delacroix et Ingres, il est impossible de songer à un remaniement quelconque._


Three more refusais to similar requests, this time from the curator Etienne Arago, have been published by Marie-Thérese Laurcille (1984: p. 267-269).

15 Étienne Arago, curator of the Musée du Luxembourg from 1879 to 1896, had had an intense political life since the revolution of 1830 (Delacroix portrayed him in *Liberty leading the people to the barricades* with a top hat and a rifle in hand); but his taste was not so progressive as his ideals. When he commenced the task of reorganising the museum in the orangery he was aged with eighty four, and his taste had not advanced beyond the Realists. When he reopened the gallery in 1886
although he often paid lip-service to the traditional rule compelling the museum to have only recent works, which he reported to be 'the most fascinating quality' of the national gallery of living masters (interview with Arago quoted in Ladoué, 1936).

Thus, there was certainly a problem of space but on the other hand a crisis of definition was also developing. Little by little, the Luxembourg tended not to be just a museum for the encouragement of living artists, but also a museum of art-history: it used to start with a step backwards, a review of 19th century art, so as to put contemporary artists in an historical context (cf. Lacambre, 1974: p. 10). A convinced backer of this custom was Léonce Bénédite, Arago’s successor at the head of the museum in 1896. He did not believe in the idea of a ‘musée de passage’ and ceased the transfers to other museums or institutions -apart from those reclaimed by the Louvre. He realized that the delay of ten years after the artists’ death was not practical (Bénédite, 1892: p.412). Artists similar in style, perhaps members of the same artistic movement, had to be exhibited apart because one died as a youth, and the other enjoyed great longevity! He therefore proposed to forget that old custom and wanted to transform the Luxembourg into a gallery like the Neue Pinakothek in Munich: i.e., a museum with a permanent collection commencing from a fixed date (Bénédite, 1900). In the last years of his charge, he even tried to change the museum statements. In a report he wrote to the Director of the Musés Nationaux, which is worth quoting at some length, he said:

D’après la règle qui a été instituée, il ne faut pas l’oublier, exclusivement dans l’intérêt du Louvre, comme il est expressément expliqué dans les notices anciennes, aucun ouvrage d’artiste moderne ne peut être admis par le Musée du Louvre, si ce n'est après un délai de dix ans depuis sa mort. Ce délai a été établi sagement pour éviter les instances inévitables des héritiers et des admirateurs, pressés de faire donner à tel parent ou tel maître une consécration définitive. Mais il n’y a aucun délai pour être retiré du Luxembourg. Tout ouvrage peut et doit y rester tant qu’il est nécessaire à l’enseignement de la période d’histoire contemporaine qui est dévolue à ce musée. […] C’est-à-dire que le Luxembourg au lieu d’être un établissement de passage, toujours instable et constamment dérouté, deviendra un musée définitif au même titre que les musées similaires étrangers et que, de ce fait, le Louvre sera mis à l’abri de l’engorgement que lui fera subir bientôt l’envasissement des collections modernes.

[After the rule which was instituted, let us not forget it, exclusively in the interest of the Louvre, as it is expressly explained in the old documents, no work of a modern artist can be admitted by the Musée du Louvre except after a delay of ten years after his/her death. This delay has been wisely established so as to avoid inevitable attempts of inheritors and

Degas, Monet, Guillaumín, Odilon Redon, or Renoir -aged 45 to 52- were absent, as well as Manet himself -died in 1883.
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supporters to hasten assurance of a definitive consecration for their relative or master. But there is no delay prescribed to leave the Luxembourg. Any work can and must remain here as long as necessary to instruct about the period of contemporary history presented in this museum (...) That is to say that the Luxembourg, instead of being a passing-place, an institution always instable and continuously overturned, is to become a definitive collection like the similar museums abroad, and in that way the Louvre will be spared the overflow that the present invasion of modern works is threatening to produce soon. (Paris, Archives Nationales, F/21/4905, doc. 1a).

Deceased or alive, as long as an artist was considered to be a 'modern master', his or her place was felt to be in the gallery of the Luxembourg, not in the Louvre. We now understand this philosophy perfectly well, since almost every museum of contemporary art nowadays starts with a review of 'modern classics', following the model of the Museum of Modern Art of New York (Duncan & Wallach, 1978), which opened in 1929 with one hundred paintings by Cézanne, Gauguin, Seurat and Van Gogh, all of them dead long before the M.O.M.A. was founded. At the time, this meant that the Impressionists, whose works first entered the national museums of France in the 1890s' thanks to the Caillebote bequest, were not thought to be showable at the Louvre -though Manet, for example, had died more than ten years before.

The history of «the scandal of the affair Caillebote» is in fact highly revealing of how the aims of the museum were called into question towards the end of the century, when the tendency to substitute art-encouragement and art-didacticism by art-history reached its peak. The affair started in 1894, the year of the death of the painter Gustave Caillebote, a close friend and supporter of the Impressionists group. He had bequeathed in favour of the State sixty-nine art-works under the condition that they should all be exhibited -i.e., none of them put in store rooms- at the Luxembourg Museum or in the Louvre, but not in the suburbs of Paris or in provincial museums16 (Chardeau, 1984). Many of the pictures were by Cézanne, Degas, Manet, Monet, Pisarro, Renoir, Sisley and other artists opposed to the polished finish of the academic techniques. Most of these artists -Cézanne in particular- were despised by those who measured art quality by technical skills: for those people the bequest seemed a 'dirty trick' to get third-rate painters consecrated at the holiest national temples of art (Berhaut, 1983; Vaise, 1983 a & b). The Academy of Fine Arts lobbied (Laurent, 1983). The second paragraph of his 1876 will, reads:

'Je donne à l'état les tableaux que je possède; seulement comme je veux que ce don soit accepté et le soi de telle façon que ces tableaux n'aillent ni dans un grenier ni dans un musée de province mais bien au Luxembourg et plus tard au Louvre, il est nécessaire qu'il s'écoule un certain temps avant l'exécution de cette clause jusqu'à ce que le public, je ne dis pas comprenne, mais admette cette peinture' (Varnodos & Lee, 1976: p. 220).
1982: p. 84-99), with the backing of public opinion to prevent that move. As it is well known, the affaire finished in 1896 with an agreement between the Government and the testator's trustees: at the end, the latter were convinced not to offer some pieces so that, at least in theory, it could be said that the State had entirely accepted the bequest (Vaisse, 1981, p. 149). In practice 29 art-works were refused, or at least this is basically the way the posterity remembers the scandal of the affair Caillebote, although the contemporaries' perspective of the 'scandal' was the other way round: it was reported scandalous that 40 pieces of -supposedly- bad quality, were admitted.

The national gallery of living artists was admitting works from the *Salon des Refusés*. In so doing, had the aims of the museum been violated? Many claimed so, and the question arose at the Senate (perhaps its proximity and historic ties with the Luxembourg Museum justified a closer interest on the museum's problems) on the 15th of March 1897. The historian Jeanne Laurent, in her book about the mischievous influence of the Academy of Arts in State's cultural policies (Laurent, 1982), tells how the raising of this issue in the Upper House offered an opportunity for the shine of Henry Roujon, the head of artistic affairs at the Ministry of Public Instruction, who was a specialist in verbal persuasion:

> Puis, Roujon fit une déclaration de nature à lui concilier les ennemis de l'impressionisme sans toutefois blesser les amateurs du mouvement: «Si nous sommes beaucoup à penser que l'impressionisme n'est pas le dernier mot de l'art, nous considérons cependant que c'est un mot de l'art, que ce mot a le droit d'être proféré, et que l'évolution impressioniste, qui a intéressé une partie du public, est un chapitre de l'histoire contemporaine de l'art, chapitre que nous avons le devoir d'inscrire sur les murs de nos musées»

[Then, Roujon made a declaration styled in such a way that it would bring the enemies of Impressionism on to his side, without offending the supporters of this movement: «Although many of us think that Impressionism is not the last word in art, we think however that it is a word of art, that this word has a right to be said in public, and that the Impressionism's own evolution, which has interested a part of the public, is a chapter of current art-history and this chapter must be written on the walls of our museums» (Laurent, 1982: p. 95).]

Jeanne Laurent accuses Roujon of being, together with some of the members of the Academy who lobbied the Conseil d'Etat, the person to blame for the State's refusal of part of the Caillebote bequest. In her account of the long-lasting historic contest between the academicism and the avant-gardes, she uses Roujon's speech to illustrate how cunning was this 'stooge' of the Academy within the Government. But Roujon's speech could be used here as an illustration of another historic struggle, the raising of art-history in the articulation of art-museums. And at least in this struggle Roujon was, without a doubt, on the winning side. Art-history is in fact the key-word
in his discourse. Despite the pressures from the Academy of Arts, despite the traditional rules of the museum, despite the innermost dislike of Impressionism professed by the head of artistic affairs at the Ministry of Public Instruction, some works of the Impressionists were admitted at the national gallery of living artists thanks to the logic of the «histoire contemporaine de l'art».

The emergence of art-history as the principle ruling the articulation of art-museums is an output of the 19th century which is mainly known for its implications in museum's ways of displaying their exhibits according to chronology and school (Duncan & Wallach, 1980: p. 456, 462). Less frequent is the observation that, thanks to the development of art-history, museums also changed their way of selecting exhibits (for the repercussions of the development of art history on republican arts policies and on official art taste cf. Green, 1987a: p. 76-78). In the case of 19th century France, discourses like that of Roujon were produced first in the provinces, and ultimately the principle of art-history was accepted by the national museums. In Bordeaux, when Millet's La bouillie, an example of the paintings typical of Naturalism, was proposed for acquisition in 1865, a city councillor proclaimed the merits of acquiring for the museum works of all genres and tendencies, though at the same time he hesitated and asked himself: 'Would it be prudent to admit it? This genre, which really constitutes a whole system, will be copied by our young people. Will it not warp their taste, carrying away their imagination and leading it astray?'

(Sherman, 1989: p. 149 and fig. 2). The purchase was finally turned down, but four years later the picture was bought by Marseilles' city council, which also dared to acquire in that epoch a picture by Gustave Courbet, another bold Naturalist. In that way, the development of art-history was forcing new acquisition policies, their aim being the search to make museums representative of any artistic tendency.

This was easier in the case of non-contemporary works. The city council of Bordeaux, so irresolute in their decisions when purchasing contemporary artists like Millet, bought then without great discourses a number of works of past art which were generally minor and unespectacular: in fact most of the purchases of non-contemporary works did not even have to face a vote at the city council (Sherman, 1989: p. 145). Whilst the acquisition of arts of the past were not considered but in terms of price and authenticity, contemporary works used to be publicly judged on account of their moral or didactic qualities and their technical achievement. Only in front of contemporary art did philistines dare to make loud-voice comments or criticisms on the merits of works, pointing sometimes with their walking sticks to the exhibits (Sherman, 1987; Poulot, 1983b). Nobody contested the value of any non-contemporary work as a 'museum piece', but finding a public consensus about contemporary works was always difficult. When this consensus became impossible
due to the irreversible differences in taste between the 'avant-gardes' and the 'academics' in the second part of the century, art museums renounced little by little presenting their contemporary exhibits as a selection of art deserving encouragement and imitation. Another line of thought was arising and perhaps the last fortress gained by this new philosophy was the Musée du Luxembourg:

(...) les Musées ne sont pas de simples dépôts, des promenôirs pour les militaires et les nourrices, mais des établissements d'enseignement supérieur tenus de donner un tableau synthétique et complet de l'histoire de l'art pour l'époque à laquelle ils sont consacrés,-et le Luxembourg, comme le Louvre, ne doit pas échapper à cette règle (art museums are neither mere repositories, nor spaces for the promenades of soldiers and baby-sitters, but establishments of high scholarship aimed to present a synthetic and complete panorama of the history of the arts from the time they study -and the Luxembourg, like the Louvre, should obey this rule) (Bénéédite, 1892: p. 412).

It is in this context that the defence by Roujon of the Impressionists' presence at the Luxembourg is interesting for us. The Luxembourg Museum, which had had its doors wide open to bold innovators during its first fifty years of life thanks to the liberal purchases of some monarchs, was under the Third Republic mainly dominated by pompiere art. It is therefore not surprising that most of the chroniclers and critics of this museum usually present its history as a regression, because they only see it from a 'pure' artistic point of view, that of what Haskell calls 'the hagiography of the modern movement' (Haskell, 1981: p. 6), a hagiography which consists mainly of a chronicle of victories in small battles like the Salon des Refusés in 1863, the First Impressionist Exhibition of 1874, the Salon des Indépendants of 1884, the entrance of the Impressionists at the national gallery of living artists through the Caillebote bequest of 1896 and the public subscription to buy and present Manet's Olympia for the Luxembourg Museum in 1890. But from the perspective of a 'socio-historical' approach separate victories in single battles do not count as much as the general victory of art history, i.e. of all tendencies -not only the vanguard artists. Seen from this point of view, the history of this museum becomes clearly a progress and the last years of the Luxembourg can be regarded as the culmination of the triumph of art-history over art-guidance in the definition of art-museums. An art-museum previously dominated by the personal taste of the heads of state, became then an institution where all artistic tendencies had a right to be represented, even those which the political authorities and the museum rulers disliked (the Impressionists and Post-Impressionists were not very well presented, but at least they were present). This was an advanced policy still not reached nowadays in many of our museums of modern art, which rarely contain works their curators dislike.
CONCLUSION:

This chapter was mainly intended as a study-case to test with a major example the determinist role played in the creation of the first galleries of modern art by two cultural elements: the previous museological inheritance and the involvement of specific categories of patrons. Appropriately, it has been pointed out here how the Musée du Luxembourg was always conceived as a complement to the Louvre, how much its creation and growth were associated to royal patronage.

A meaningful contrast has been established here between the time when the museum was instrumental in the self-promotion of the monarchs and the crisis of the institution during the Third Republic. Yet, this crisis has not been discussed as a mere *demostratio ab contraria* of the initial thesis (no kings, *ergo* no support), but rather as a first instance of a derived idea: the apparent stability associated to royal patronage and the more instable identity of the galleries of modern art grown out far from the hands of kings and queens. But this argument will be better elaborated in the following chapters.
CHAPTER 3.
A SECOND NODAL POINT: VICTORIAN LONDON AND ITS HINTERLAND.
SUMMARY:

If last chapter was centred on the presence/absence of royal patronage at the Musée du Luxembourg in Paris, this second study-case discuss the initiatives of private entrepreneurs for the creation of similar institutions in 19th century Britain, particularly in London -then a 'nodal point' in the history of museums. The result is a remarkably different picture, not only because the geographical setting and the kind of people portrayed are different, but also because the perspective and focus have changed. This time the vision could not be concentrated in a singular institution because, unlike France, where there was a single Museum of Living Artists, Britain put up many equivalent foundations. Furthermore, the attention here moves away from politics and switches to questions of taste, because the leading idea in the discourse is to demonstrate that, as much as political issues had been decisive in the flourishing/decline of the Luxembourg Museum, the genesis and configuration of its British peers were more conditioned by the history of private or institutional art taste.

Private collecting in Britain is a key argument in the first section of this chapter. It starts with a report of the boom of art collecting after the Industrial Revolution characterised by a double dialectic of artistic preferences -foreign or national art, old or modern masters. In this historical context is explained the prototypic personality as art patron epitomised by John Sheepshanks, the founder of a National Gallery of British Art in South Kensington in 1857. This institution was engendered and moulded by Sheepshanks and other generous donors of similar taste, who favoured Victorian well-finished pictures featuring sentimental subjects. On the other hand, this gallery was, in many ways, stirred and modelled by a spirit of rivalry: it was perceived as the antithesis of the National Gallery in Trafalgar Square.

The second section is more centred in questions of institutional taste. It is well known that art academies, art unions, and official institutions in 19th century Britain were increasingly enthusiastic about contemporary art; but here it will be shown that nowhere was this tendency so marked as in the case of public museums. Many local galleries of art, established in the 1870s or henceforth, tended to be -to a degree very unusual abroad- solely concerned with 19th century art, neglecting the arts of the past. Eventual upshot of this tendency were the museums erected at the turn of the century in London and in the industrialised North: art temples for the glory of their private founders, and shrines for Victorian art. The most important example, the Tate Gallery, opened in 1897, is studied here in some length. In relation to it are also briefly reviewed other institutions based in London and elsewhere in Britain.
3.1 JOHN SHEEPSHANKS AND THE 'MODERN' ALTERNATIVE TO THE NATIONAL GALLERY.

The first boom of collecting in Britain and its dilemmas: ancient or modern?

The days of the Industrial Revolution and of the Victorian Empire knew a
stream of classical art (works of the Italian Quattrocento and Cinquecento, Spanish
and Dutch Baroque, French Rococo, etc...) spreading out from the traditional holders
on the continent (churches pillaged by revolutionary troops, monastic properties sold
by rising liberal governments, ruined aristocrats putting family goods for auction,
etc), to the British private manor-houses and public museums (Herrmann, 1972).

Whereas Rome and Paris attracted more and more artists and could claim the
title of world capitals of the art practise, Britain became early in the 19th century the
eye of the hurricane regarding art collecting\(^1\). However, that massive arrival of
foreign art in Britain implied a hard competition in the art market wich sometimes
made life difficult for native contemporary artists. When works by Raphael and his
predecessors were available, one is tempted to ask, adopting the point of view of an
art collector of that time, why should anybody buy English 19th century Pre-
Raphaelite paintings? Why should a private connoisseur or a museum's curator with
plenty of money, worry about living artists, when famous old masters were within
range? No wonder then, that the government of Great Britain, the first world power
at that moment, invested funds for the building and collections of the National
Gallery of Art (and assembled there throughout the century one of the best collections
of old masters in Europe), but not for a National Gallery of Living Artists comparable
to the Musée du Luxembourg in Paris. After all, one could easily think, is this not
justifiable as a reflection of the British art collecting policy in that time?

In fact, this is a dangerous fallacy. The dazzling shine of the trade of old
masters eclipses too often the many British collectors who were fond of native
contemporary artists. Perhaps they failed, from our point of view, to get the most
relevant items of modern art. Today, the 19th century art-works most praised by them
find a very secondary space in the art literature (whilst some formerly \textit{maudits}, such
as William Blake are now very popular). But it is obvious that these newcomers
infiltrated in the world of art amateurs, reached a very interesting place in the artistic
stage. And they do deserve, indeed, much more attention.

\(^{1}\) Today, New York plays the artistic role earlier enjoyed by Paris, whilst major art-collectors are to
be found prevalently in the richer countries of the Far East.
Much has been written about the most typical British collectors in the 18th and 19th century (Bruntjen, 1985; Herrmann, 1972; Holst, 1967; Pears, 1988; Pye, 1845; Steegman, 1936, 1950; STRONG, 1975). They were aristocratic land-owners who, in their youth, used to conclude their education on the 'Grand Tour' to Europe accompanied by some experts (later replaced by printed guides) who guided them for two or three years in the discovery of Europe’s most famous artistic monuments, and conducted them in the paths of what had to be considered as ‘good taste’. Far more rare is the literature devoted to the new patrons of art, the rich bourgeois -offspring of the era of ‘Carboniferous Capitalism’- commonly not too interested in importing old masters from the continent. The passion of the nouveaux riches to surround themselves with ultramodern vehicles, houses, clothes and possessions is not a monopoly of our time. In 1865 Dickens represented that in *Our Mutual Friend*, portraying the Veneerings, a family of new-comers established in a new house of a new fashionable quarter of London: «Their carriage was new, their harness was new, their horses were new, *their pictures were new* [my italics], they themselves were new...» (quoted by Briggs, 1988: p.19). This social phenomenon, which reached its peak in the 1840s, when contemporary pictures were the most coveted pieces by the English and French public (Reitlinger, 1961), resulted in a market of very affordable prices for old pictures: a great opportunity for collectors of short means but able to discriminate real works by old masters from old rubbish and new forgeries (von Holst, 1967).

It must be easy for modern scholars, moved by a certain degree of self-identification with these connoisseurs, to envy nostalgically that golden age when one did not need a fortune to be a great art collector. Perhaps this fascination is the reason why, on the other hand, the 19th century patrons of contemporary artists have usually attracted little attention. Even Francis Haskell, the highest authority in the study of patrons of art, gave them merely sporadic consideration in his famous book about taste, fashion and collecting in 19th century England and France (Haskell, 1976). The most direct reference there to a collector of pictures by modern English painters comes occasionally as part of a comment on the xenophobic taste vindicated by The Art-Journal, a magazine whose editors ridiculed the buyers of Italian old masters and extolled among British collectors one name²: Robert Vernon, ‘self made-man, part profiteer, part patron’ who spent his fortune on the works of modern English painters and offered them to the nation (Haskell, 1976: p. 52). As for the Parisian public, the

² He also makes there, in passing, a reference to the existence of many ‘enterprising collectors of the north country’ who usually favoured for their new mansions works of contemporary compatriots as Etty and Landseer.
few nineteenth century investors in contemporary-art cited in that book appear generally subdivided into two types of collectors: false-hearted and venal. The first are those new-comers to the artistic stage, who would make that choice terrified by some scandals about fakes or by the uncertainty of attributions in the field of old masters. The second are very rich speculators like the Rothschilds, Demidoffs, Holford, Pourtalèes and Pereires. They would buy only those modern artists already consecrated like Ingres, Delacroix, Bouguereau and Cabanel, whose prices would always rise in the course of their official careers, and specially at the end: «The sooner they die, these fellows, the better», Isaac Pereire is reported to have said about Ary Scheffer and other painters he avidly collected (Goncourt, E. & J., Journal. Mémoires de la vie littéraire, cited by Haskell, 1976).

Although the renowned author of Patrons and Painters has later given more attention to 19th century patrons of modern artists, notably in a more recent book (Haskell, 1987a: p. 47-64 & 175-185), the studies of 19th century collectors of contemporary art remains nevertheless rare in Britain among the historians of art patronage, despite the growing interest for this discipline. One can find in the pages of the Oxford Journal of History of Collections articles about either collectors of historical objects and patrons of contemporary-art of earlier times; but, as though only the former were considered 'pure' when speaking of the last century, no article about a 19th century collector of 19th century art had ever been published there until the special issue of Autumn 1992 devoted to Lord Lever's collecting and the founding of the Lady Lever Art Gallery (Morris, 1992). In fact, this is an attitude with established precedents. Very well known is the series of four little pictures called 'Patrons and Lovers of Art' made in 1826 by Peter Christoph Wonder⁴. The protagonists of these group-portraits are always collectors of old masters: collectors of modern art had not yet been admitted to the hierarchy of connoisseurs! (Steegman, 1950: p. 57-58).

However, while the specialists in the history of collecting turn their eyes out of Victorian art patrons, their vindication has been initiated by recent contributions from the field of the history of museums. That seems perfectly fair, for -unlike the prominent Parisian examples quoted above- many of the British 19th century collectors of modern art became generous museum benefactors (cf. Clarke, 1982; Clarke, 1982; 1986).

³ This was not always like that. A recent article about Bouguereau and the art-market in France precises that many rich speculators who bought up-rated modern masters used to buy also works by promising painters. They would boast in front of their visitors about their more precious paintings, those signed by consecrated artists like Bouguereau, which they would always put on display in their living-room, but in less frequented parts of the house they would store many pictures by very young artists. (Argencourt, 1984: p. 96).

⁴ These paintings, now in the National Portrait Gallery, are frequently reproduced in the literature of art collectionism. See, for example, The English as Collectors (Herrmann, 1972), plates 28, 29, 30 and 31.
This civic generosity was far less frequent for collections of old masters which—with many valuable exceptions—usually finished as they originated: in inheritances or in public auctions. Obviously, this contradicts that ubiquitous cliché which presents Victorian collectors of old masters as morally superior and supporters of 19th century arts as philistines.

Another dangerous cliché, fortunately becoming less frequent among scholars may be that of seeing an unfailing connection between old masters and the aristocracy on the one hand, between modern artists and the bourgeoisie on the other hand. In fact, this cliché makes sense only for the period 1800-1830. And only in general terms, for there were, even in that period of time, remarkable exceptions. For example, on the one hand, the rich John Julius Angerstein who formed a collection of old masters—the only work by a living artist was Wilkie’s *Village Festival* (Boase, 1959: p. 203)—which, bought by the Government in 1824, was the original nucleus of the National Gallery of London. Whilst, on the other hand, Sir John Leicester collected almost exclusively contemporary art for his ‘Gallery of English Pictures’, sometimes also called ‘Gallery of Modern Art’ (Young, 1825, n.p. introduction). This gallery, part of his London house in Hill Street, was open free to the public from 1818, and finished by leading him to ruin. He had failed to persuade the Prime Minister to buy it as a basis for a National Gallery of British Art, and so it had to be sold immediately after his death.

Within the first three decades of the century we find, it is true, two main factions in taste: on the one side the landed gentry, enriched by the improvements in farming methods and the high prices of agricultural goods during the Napoleonic wars, benefiting from the exodus of old art treasures from the Continent; and on the other side, a class of *nouveaux riches*, moneyed by means of industry, commerce and trade, not educated in the taste of old masters and more keen on buying easily-understandable contemporary art. But later this emergent class shared with the aristocracy the apex of the social pyramid and, little by little, there were no

---

5 Other rich Victorian collectors of contemporary art are still rarely studied: the historic research carried out by museums personnel is, of course, rather focused on museums founders and donors. A more comprehensive review of the history of many Victorian collections, including those which did not finish with the ‘happy ending’, to the benefit of a museum, will be found in a forthcoming book by a lecturer from the University of California, who has already put forward some of its contents in an article (MacLeod, 1987).

6 The proportion of free gifts to paid purchases is higher for arts of the period than for old masters, as much in national galleries as, specially, in the case of British provincial museums.
remarkable distinctions in art taste. At the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, either in Britain, in the United States, or elsewhere, both the major collectors of old masters and the patrons of avant-garde artists were of the same very high-socioeconomic status. And, if we extend the relevant temporal limits back to the 18th century, it is not so evident -in spite of the well-known satires of William Hogarth-, that a mere snobbish disdain of contemporary English art motivated Georgian aristocrats (Pye, 1845: p. 2). They could afford and wanted the best for their collections. As a consequence, they just commissioned paintings from national artists when they enriched their galleries of ancestors' effigies with new portraits. Portraiture was the only genre of painting in which the English had excelled, according to Joshua Reynolds' opening speech when the Royal Academy was founded (cf. Hutchison, 1968: p. 22-23). For paintings of other genres they would turn elsewhere if the quality or (in the case of Hogarth genre-paintings) the style of English artists did not suit their tastes:

It is true that most eighteenth-century collectors spent their money either on the dead Masters or on the living artists of foreign schools; but there is another aspect of the question. The majority of those who complained of neglect were themselves artists, which possibly makes their attitude a little suspect. The portrait-painters never lacked support, and there is no doubt that portraiture was infinitely the best expression of the native talent: had the other branches of painting been of an equal excellence, probably they too would have been supported, but pure landscape of any school was not greatly in demand; religious painting cannot be produced in a Protestant country, and historical or mythological painting has seldom been well done in England. There seems to be no valid reason why anyone should support something ill-done merely because it is a native product (Steegmann, 1936: p. 99).

The first 'native products' which became best-sellers on the British 19th century artistic stage were anecdotal tableaux de genre which were praised in their days as 'the English modern translation of Dutch 17th century art' (Steegmann, 1936: p. 191). Even David Wilkie, the romantic Scottish painter, surrendered to the market-imposed standards leading to these sweet paintings contemporary -and comparable in taste- to the French troubadour painting or the German Wiedermaier style. Not many artists were, like Benjamin Haydon or James Barry, ready to die penniless rather than making any popular concession to this taste for anecdotal pictures! The new clientèle of rich men, mostly concerned to see in an art-work its argument and its technical well-finish, were great enthusiasts of this fashion. One of the most devoted collectors of this kind of pictures was John Sheepshanks, the founding father of the so-called
'National Gallery of British Art' in South Kensington and a personal friend of artists like Wilkie, Mulready, Landseer or Hardy.

In our century that taste has been scorned. Even the vindicators of Sheepshanks' memory call his taste 'tame and cozy' and think that his collection is to be considered with 'good-humoured condescension' (Davis, 1963: p. 74). However, a similar taste for sweet and commercial art specimens can be found throughout the whole century (Denvir, 1986: p. 7-8). Far more sickeningly sweet are some religious paintings by Millais, Rossetti or Holman-Hunt, whose copyrights made them -and the print publisher Ernest Gambart- so wealthy (Maas, 1975: p. 66-68). Not to speak of the very well priced Graeco-Roman genre-scenes of Alma-Tadema in the 1890s and later! For that matter, the taste of Sheepshanks was a very typical example of a mainstream Victorian collector from the time of the Industrial Revolution.

A collector such as John Sheepshanks can be regarded, indeed, as a very interesting prototype in many ways. Firstly, it has to be stressed that it was not him but his father, a Yorkshire cloth manufacturer, who was the founder of the family fortune. Here, his case illustrates the typically slow emergence of the bourgeoisie onto the artistic stage: The 'new rich' were as old as the Industrial Revolution, but only from 1830 onwards did they become patrons of art. There could be many different explanations for this. On the one hand, as Steegman has suggested, after the Reform Bill of 1832, which facilitated their entry into the House of Commons, the new rich did not need such vast investments to secure a political promotion, and this spare money was channelled into the art market (Steegman, 1950: p. 50-51). On the other hand, this delay can be justified by a theory about family-generations and expenditure, pointed out by Fawcett, in the words of a provincial newspaper of that time: «The generation which rears opulence is seldom the generation which uses it with liberal discretion, especially in the encouragement of the fine arts, that gives to wealth its title of respect» (Norwich Mercury, 26 May 1827, quoted by Fawcett, 1974: p. 85).

Secondly, the personality of John Sheepshanks as a collector refutes the cliché of a strict social division of tastes. He was mainly, but not exclusively, a collector of modern British painting: he also had a large collection of old prints, most of them Dutch, which he gave to the British Museum (Davis, 1963: p.74). This shows how his inclination towards the modern British recreation of old Dutch masters resulted

---

7 Other striking examples of that fancy for English 'neo-Dutch-art' can be seen in provincial museums, for example the Central Art Gallery of Wolverhampton, or the Art Gallery of Cheltenham.

8 The archives of the National Art Library at the Victoria & Albert Museum of London hold some of his correspondence with E. Landseer (pressmark MSE-Land), W. Mulready (pressmark MSE-Mul) and J.Pye (pressmark MSE-Py).
inevitably, in his gliding from the Victorian neo-Dutch to the original 17th century Dutch masters. We now know that the education in the love of art always works in that way. Statistics of museum visitors have demonstrated that the interest towards art-works of far cultures -far in time or in geography- usually develops from the love of the art items one finds around in everyday life (Bourdieu & Darbel, 1969); art-lovers tend to multiply their favours: new artistic preferences do not discard the previous favourites. But, apparently, many in the 19th century were convinced of the contrary. The artists looked on the love of old masters as competition: Constable was against the creation of a National Gallery! (King, 1985: p. 13; Taylor, 1987: p. 303). Art exhibitions had also their detractors for opposite reasons: some scholars like C. Dyall feared that shows of art where one would find displayed together old European masters and young native artists might induce the common people to assume mediocre local amateurs to be as excellent as Raphael (Dyall, 1888).

Happily, Dyall was quite wrong in his fears: the mind of collectors does not work like that (cf. Pearce, 1992: p. 36-67). Even in the first decades of the century, when aristocratic and bourgeois taste were more boldly separated in Britain, there were numerous examples of collectors who assembled both past and contemporary art in their collections. The architect Sir John Soane collected archeological items, works by Hogarth, Neo-Classical paintings and drawings, etc... The collection of the banker Samuel Rogers had works by Tintoretto and Reynolds mingled together. Lord Northwick, mainly known as a collector of old masters, commissioned new paintings as well. The Earl of Normanton gathered in his gallery at Somerly not only Dutch and Italian masters but also modern British paintings. The Earl of Ellesmere possessed some Rubens and recent works by native artists as well. Queen Victoria and Prince Albert bought early Italian primitives, old masters from the German countries, and many works by contemporary British artists -Albert's favourite painter was William Dyce (Boase, 1959: p., 214; Herrman, 1972: p. 244-320). Late in the century, this became more usual. Proof of this is the Ionides Gallery at the Victoria & Albert Museum, memento of one of the most outstanding collections of the 1870's and '80s, where one finds 17th century French and Dutch masters combined with 19th century British and French paintings. And another visitable testimony from the same epoque is the Wallace Collection in London, world famous for its Dutch 17th century and French 18th century sections, but also containing rich galleries of 19th century art.

Establishment of a National Gallery of British Art in South Kensington.

Whereas the Louvre had been articulated by Denon as an historical review concluding with the triumph of the French school, its younger London sister, in spite of its having been called 'National Gallery', scarcely exhibited any kind of English
This raised much controversy (Waterfield, 1991) and, following in Sir John Leicester’s footsteps, many people had tried to press the Government to collect British Art. First of all was the sculptor Sir Francis Chantrey, who died in 1842. He had bequeathed the nation a large fortune -about £ 3,000- to be employed only in purchases of Fine Arts made in Britain. The Royal Academy was in charge to select the purchases, which were exhibited at South Kensington until the Tate Gallery was built. But the Chantrey bequest only came into operation at the end of the century, after the death of his widow in 1875. So, the first real attempt to create a national collection of British modern art-works dates from 1847. In that year, during his own lifetime, the collector of British contemporary art Robert Vernon presented 157 pictures, 6 busts and a group of marble sculpture to the nation (Hall, 1851; Hamlyn, 1993). However, the Trustees of the National Gallery did not care too much about them. Even the Turner Bequest, effective in 1856 to the benefit of the National Gallery, was nomadic and lacking of an established space in that temple of Trafalgar Square, which was felt by many to be obstinately unwilling to accept British paintings (Turner Society, 1979).

Therefore, it was not to the National Gallery, but to the Department of Science and Art and its National Art Training School established in South Kensington, that John Sheepshanks presented in 1857 his collection of 233 oils and 298 watercolours and drawings. In the heading of his Deed of Gift he made clear that his gift should never benefit the National Gallery of Trafalgar Square: it should be the origin of a new National Gallery of British Art established in a quiet and green place:

[... I desire that a collection of pictures and other works of Art fully representing British Art should be formed worthy of National support and have the advantage of undivided responsibility in its management instead of being subject to the control of anybody of Trustees or Managers.] [... I conceive that such a collection should be placed in a Gallery in an open and airy situation possessing the quiet necessary to the study and enjoyment of works of Art and free from the inconveniences and dirt of the main thoroughfares of the Metropolis] [... I consider that such Gallery might be usefully erected at Kensington and be attached to the Schools of Art in connexion with the Department of Science and Art now established there] [... with the view to the establishment of such a collection, and in the hope that other proprietors of pictures and other works of Art may be induced to further the same object. I have determined to make such a conditional Gift of the original pictures and Drawings (the productions of British Artists) which I possess (London, Archives of the

---

9 'Till the Tate Gallery was built in 1897 they were kept in successive provisional locations: first in the basement, then in Marlborough House, later in South Kensington, finally in a new wing in Trafalgar Square.
John Sheepshanks had a personal abhorrence of any kind of corporate trustees and therefore wished that a sole individual should be responsible for the management of the 'National Gallery of British Art'. This individual had to be «the Member of Her Majesty's Government for the time being charged with the promotion of Art Education now undertaken by the Department of Science and Art» (at that time it was Sir Edward John Stanley, baron of Alderley). Sheepshanks' Deed of Gift follows stating nine conditions which, with the only exception of conditions 2 and 3, repeatedly insist on the responsibilities of that person regarding some management issues: the public exhibition and the accurate conservation of the paintings and drawings, new acquisitions, disposals, etc. The document ends with a warning: in the event of these conditions being not adhered to, his gift «shall wholly cease and the Ex-Officio Trustee for the time being shall thereupon hold the said pictures and drawings in trust for the University of Cambridge to be added to, and for ever thereafter form part of, the Fitzwilliam Collection in the said University». According to that, one is tempted to think that the Fitzwilliam Museum has much more legal right than the Victoria and Albert Museum to own the collection of Sheepshanks, because the most important point of his Deed of Gift has not been accomplished: the gallery is managed by the Board of Trustees of the V & A.

As for the rest, Sheepshanks yearned for a space apart in South Kensington and this wish was fulfilled. In 1857 the 'National Gallery of British Art' was installed in the newly erected 'Brompton Boilers' -now the rooms 26, 29, 83, 84, 91 and 92 of the Victoria & Albert Museum¹¹- (Physick, 1982, p. 33-39 and 39-45). This preference was not merely based on questions of urban development. Sheepshanks was the personal friend of many artists and used to entreat them over dinner once a week in his house: he was on their side, he shared their resentment against the National Gallery of Trafalgar Square.

¹⁰ Sheepshanks' Deed of Gift established that the collection must be located in South Kensington. However it allowed any kind of loan somewhere else; hence, a transfer of this collection of 19th century art-works to the Tate Gallery does not seems legally impossible, provided this transfer be called long-term 'loan'.

¹¹ This part of the V & A still operates nowadays as the 'National Collection' of British water-colours and British portrait miniatures, but most of it previous role regarding painting and sculpture has been assumed by the Tate Gallery since 1908. It has now a modest name: 'Department of Paintings, Prints and Drawings of the V & A', and is displayed in several floors of the modern Henry Cole building, although the Massey Report (published in 1946) recommended that all 19th century paintings of the V&A should be transferred to the Tate Gallery. This was not done due to some legal impediments and -mainly- to the opposition of its directors to lose 'their' pictures (cf. the text of Leigh Ashton in Blunt & Whinney, 1950, pp. 98-103).
South Kensington was then for John Sheepshanks the museological alternative to the existing National Gallery, whose trustees repudiated English artists and artisans, contrary to the Department of Science and Art of South Kensington, which was mainly concerned with contemporary British works (it was not until the 1870's that old foreign specimens -remarkably many Italian 'Virgin and Childs'- obtained noticeable preponderance there according to Alexander, 1983: p. 161). In the 1850s Henry Cole, the *alma mater* of the museum, was advocating contemporary collections of any kind of products. In 1857 there were for example within the South Kensington complex: a 'Museum of Construction' with building materials, a 'Museum of Education' with school appliances, a 'Food Museum' with realistic models of viands, and many others collections of this kind. Among other exhibits -and this is most relevant here-, there was even a gallery of modern British sculptures (Alexander, 1983: p. 160). This was the original context for the Sheepshanks' gift. The South Kensington complex was, indeed, the alternative to that 'National' Gallery where only old masters from mainland Europe were on display. The project for a new National Gallery was much more than a museum of contemporary art. It was a double-edged initiative: in Britain, since the times of Hogarth, the supporters of modern art against old masters were, in the same time, champions of nationalistic pride against foreigners.

The gallery was a great success with the public, to the point that twice a week it was also opened by night, with gas-lighting (Alexander, 1983: p. 162). Sheepshanks' example prompted other collectors to make major additions (the use of Government's money for purchases was scarce): Mrs Ellison -whose important gift of 1860 was followed by her bequest in 1873-, the Reverend C.H. Townsend -who in 1869 bequeathed 174 Victorian watercolours-, the Reverend Alexander Dyce -his bequest of a remarkable collection of late Georgian drawings and prints entered the museum in 1869-. For all those collectors of Sheepshanks' generation, as for himself, the ambition to represent British art actually involved mostly contemporary pictures; thus, their gifts to that 'National Gallery of British Art' were predominantly works dated between 1820 and 1860 (Parkinson, 1990), and it was not until towards the end of the century that the interest of benefactors moved towards earlier British art -neglecting some of the most interesting contemporary artists, like Whistler or the New English Art Club! Similarly, as if Sheepshanks gift had also determined the prevalent taste of the future collection, the acquisitions tended to be popular examples of genre-painting and landscape from the first half of the 19th century. The Pre-Raphaelite movement passed very much ignored. With regard to landscapes, in 1888 the gift of 98 oil paintings, 300 drawings and watercolours and three sketch-books by
Constable, given by the artist’s daughter Isabel, raised the quality level very greatly.

This pattern of selection, turning its back on some of the most remarkable British artists, inspired the collecting policy of most British provincial museums. No wonder that some backers of the newest tendencies complained that, in the art scene, London was not acting as a true capital: for example Roger Fry, the director of the Burlington Magazine, who, in the context of his first Post-Impressionist exhibition at the Grafton Galleries, produced a tirade against the metropolitan elite, saying that their collecting of English Victorian painting was not a spectacle for nationalistic pride but was an index of provincialism (Parkinson, 1990: p. VII). However, it must be acknowledged that there had been some extraordinary attempts at renovation of the South Kensington Museum during the second half of Victoria’s reign, led by three donors whose heterogeneous collections were by no means centred either in 19th century art, nor in works of British painters. The Rev. Chauncy Hare Townshend, who died in 1868, bequeathed a miscellaneous collection of pictures, watercolours, prints, drawings, gem stones, cameos, coins, etc... whose main interest lay, as pointed out by Dr. Waagen’s Treasures of Art in Great Britain, in its being «interspersed with admirable works by the best painters of Belgium, Holland, Germany and Switzerland» dating mainly from the 1840s and 50s (Kauffmann, 1973: p. VIII). In 1882 John Jones, a regimental tailor, bequeathed a massive collection of French rococo furniture, ceramics, objects d’art, and pictures, complemented by a number of Victorian paintings. And in 1900 arrived the bequest of Constantine Alexander Ionides, a merchant of Greek origin, patron of contemporary artists living in England -Legros in particular, but also Rossetti and Burne-Jones-, and enlightened collector of both continental old masters as well as French 19th century school (Reynolds, 1964: p. 4-7). But, exactly as now, both of these last collections occupied separate galleries. Fulfilling the wills of these three donors, modern paintings never joined the Sheepshanks gallery, which kept unaltered its nature of Gallery of British Art, mainly Victorian.

This apparent specialisation in Victorian art was also enhanced by the museological context. From 1858 to 1876 the ‘Brompton Boilers’, known since 1864 as ‘Bethnal Green’, were also the provisional site of both the Turner Bequest and the Vernon Bequest owned by the National Gallery. The National Portrait Gallery was also moved there in 1885 (it received a permanent domicile at the back of the National Gallery only in 1895). As a result, the public tended to perceive that part of South Kensington as a unique museum for 19th century art, not noticing that it was an amalgam of four unitiies: the National Gallery of British Art, the National Portrait Gallery, and the galleries of the Turner and Vernon Bequest. Proof of this is that
sometimes the management insisted that the doors connecting the galleries be kept closed, in order to make visitors aware of the separations. Thus, that complex at the heart of the South Kensington Museum became for some years a rather complicated administrative amalgam (Cocks, 1980; Physick, 1982), yet with a clear unity of contents. Indeed, though the main educative purpose of the National Portrait Gallery was not the history of art, but the exemplary nature of those portrayed (Hooper-Greenhill, 1980), secondarily it could be considered -actually, it was- an art museum as well. Its contents, from that point of view, could be seen as British paintings and sculptures, and they worked well in terms of visual unity with the Turner and the Vernon Galleries, and with that section of the South Kensington Museum founded by Sheepshanks and called the National Gallery of British Art.
3.2 TRIUMPH OF VICTORIAN ART. ITS TEMPLES: THE PARADIGMATIC INITIATIVE OF HENRY TATE

The apotheosis of modern art in art institutions throughout Britain since the 1870s.

In Georgian times, apart from some private initiatives, the stars of the artistic stage in the cities were Academies of the very same type as those which patronized the studies of arts on the Continent. As a natural complement for the education of the artists-to-be, these Academies yearned for the creation of art galleries with good examples from the past. These were developed in many provincial cities: the Northern Society of Leeds, the Liverpool Academy, the Associated Artists of Manchester, the Birmingham Academy of Arts, the Carlisle Academy of Arts, the Norwich Society of Artists, the Gloucester Institution, the Bath Institution, the Bristol Institution, the Plymouth Institution, the Devon and Exeter Institution, the Brighton Institution, the Northumberland Institution, and others (Officer, 1974). Many had a permanent collection but apparently the only cities who, furthermore, succeeded in having some kind of permanent display were Liverpool and Norwich (Fawcett, 1974: p. 112 and 168-201). Even the Royal Academy in London failed to have a permanent exhibition. In 1801 they had proposed to house a permanent collection of the finest contemporary British works. But the academicians could not persuade the Pitt Government to provide £5,000 a year for the project (Minihan, 1977, p. 19).

In Victorian times, the institutions affecting the spread of art were more interested in promoting the creations of their members, and therefore rather involved in temporary exhibitions of contemporary art. None of them were sustained by Government funds (Mellinghoff, 1977: p. 89); not even the Royal Academy, whose sole resources came from the Annual Summer Exhibitions it hosted. There was an entrance fee for the public of these shows, which were the most famed artistic event.

---

12 Some of the first private art galleries in the provinces worked as small businesses where, on payment of an entrance fee, customers could see art works of local contemporary artists mingled with old masters (Fawcett, 1974: p. 75-79).

13 In London: the Royal Academy, the British Institution, the Society of British Artists, the Water-Colour Society, the International Society of Sculptors Painters and Gravers, the Pastel Society, the New English Art Club, among many others (Redgrave, 1947: p. 451-452). But similar associations existed all around the country. In 1883 an art magazine listed thirty-three art clubs in England and Scotland in addition to the those of London (*Today's Art* quoted by King, 1985: p. 204).
in London every year. R.A. members usually had the best spaces available (Leslie, 1914: p. 77), but the Royal Academy of London was remarkably generous admitting other exhibitors... for the simple reason that every artist had to give a commission rate for any work sold. Ephraim Harcastle, editor of the Somerset House Gazette commented upon this: «our Royal Academy is thus maintained by public curiosity rather than by national taste» (quoted by Denvir, 1984: p. 201).

Temporary exhibitions, and not permanent displays, were also the objective of the 1851 Great Exhibition of London, and the Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition of 1857. Contemporary art was not the main subject on these occasions, but it nevertheless had an important role. In other more modest suburban or provincial initiatives throughout the country, 19th century British art was basically the sole content; always with astonishing success in number of visitors. The Canterbury Music Hall in Lambeth, which opened in 1858, had a picture gallery containing contemporary paintings worth £10,000 (Denvir, 1986: p. 5). The enthusiasm for art was bound together with the excitement of the popular public to see some of the works of those artists who provoked record prices14; they would never have the opportunity to possess any, and they could share a number of them for some minutes, having the feeling that modernity had visited their suburb. That ritual made of them modern people, enjoying some of the latest wonders of their time. In the case of charity exhibitions, whose chronological rise and progress was related by John Pye in a book against the lucrative-minded activities of the Royal Academy (Pye, 1845), 19th century British artists were of course the standard contributors.

In that age of 'industrialization of Taste', British 19th century art was also the main feature of the art-works lotteries and the engravings distributions made every year for the subscribers of the Art Unions. Institutions of this kind, inspired by the German Kunstvereine, were in operation all around Europe as well as in America. In Britain they were so numerous that they became a social phenomenon on the artistic stage. Among the earliest should be cited the Edinburgh Association for the Promotion of the Fine Arts in Scotland, the London Art Union, the Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, or Dublin Art Unions; but many more similar institutions proliferated in the second half of the century (King, 1985: p. 56). Apart from them, 19th century art also benefitted from -or became the victim of- the professionalisation of the art trade. The mid-nineteenth century saw a radical change from its first quarter, when only print sellers and print publishers among art-dealers had dealt in contemporary art (King, 1985). Late in the century, specially towards its last quarter, commercial art galleries became synonymous with trade in contemporary art: Ernest

14 It was frequent, from 1860 to the turn of the century, for paintings by Landseer, Millais, Frith, Leighton, Edwin Long or Alma Tadema to surpass the prices obtained by masterpieces of Van Eyck, Botticelli, Mantegna, Velazquez, Poussin, etc... (Sutton, 1962: p. 437-438; Furr, 1978: p. 353-357).
Gambart, Thomas Agnew and Sons, Ernest Brown and Sons were prime examples (Maas, 1975; Agnew, 1967; Brown, 1968; Seligman, 1961).

Until the World War I, art that was 'contemporary' and 'British' at the same time, and better if also 'local' in some way (having a local subject or made by local-born authors), played a central role, because it had the best guarantee of popular understanding among Victorians. In that time of staggering didacticism, art had to be understood in order to be appreciated (Fullerton, 1982: p. 65); the discovery of African art, abstract art, etc, was concurrent with the collapse of that esthetic conviction, after the successive attacks of the Esthetic movement, preaching the love of art for art's sake, and the European advangardes questioning the figurative conventions.

This almost exclusive attention to Victorian paintings in the origins of most British local art-galleries supposed a certain neglect for ancient art. The European arts of the Renaissance, the Baroque, and the Classicism, nowadays better represented in some local museums of Britain than in similar institutions on the Continent, have, in many cases, entered them in quite recent days.

One of the most striking examples is Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery, opened in 1867. It still has one of the richest collections of 19th century British art works, but only since 1927 do they no longer outnumber the other historic periods, as had been the case until the death of Whitworth Wallis, the keeper who had founded the Art Gallery and was at its head for sixty years (Davies, 1985, p. 34-35 and 44).

The same is true of Leicester Museum, built in 1849, whose entire collection of old masters date from recent acquisitions made since the 1950s. And this is a particularly telling example, because the art collection assembled in the 20th century is exhibited in the recently-built upper floor of the old building, while the fine arts collected during the 19th century are kept in another edifice built in 1876 to extend the museum on the East side. That extension, which was devoted to fine arts (natural history and archeology had ceded their preeminency to art as a collecting target for local museums by the 1870's), has not changed very much, even in its contents: academic and genre Victorian paintings and sculptures (mostly purchased at the Royal Academy Summer Exhibitions of the last quarter of the 19th century).

The Walker Art Gallery of Liverpool -whose life began in 1877- owes its present richness in old masters -Cranach, Rembrant, Rubens, Poussin- to a radical change in its acquisitions policy about 1932. Before that date it had been dominated by Victorian art: the Beatles' fellow-citizens rediscovered some of those favourites of their great-grand-parents at the exhibition The Taste of Yesterday, mounted with items from the reserve collection (Scrutton, 1970).
Similar is the case of Manchester City Art Gallery, created when the Royal Manchester Institution transferred its collections to the city in 1882, with the feature that it still owes the best of its repute to its Pre-Raphaelite paintings. Victorian and Edwardian paintings overfill the walls of most of its fine art galleries and decorate the monumental staircase, while the collection of old masters is rather poor (Farrington, 1984).

Leeds City Art Gallery—built in 1888—collected Victorian paintings until the young art critic Frank Rutter brought about in 1914 the prevalence of modern 20th century art; which was a notable change in the acquisitions but not in the acquisitions philosophy! Pictures by old masters continued to be rare in the collection, and they were all transferred in 1982 to Temple Newsam House (Strickland-Constable, 1982).

The same circumstances occur in Aberdeen Art Gallery, established in 1883 and built two years later (and extended in 1905 and 1925). Contemporary art, with a strong bias towards British and particularly Scottish artists, has always been the key to its collection. In 1884 Alexander MacDonald, the heir of a local businessman in the granite industry, left his collection of Victorian art to the gallery, together with an endowment for the purchase of further pictures. He imposed the condition that the paintings eligible for purchase with that fund should be no more than 25 years old. Thus, the gallery was—and still is—a basically a museum of contemporary art.

Keswick Art Gallery, Oldham Art Gallery, Rotherham Museum and Art Gallery, Warrington Municipal Art Gallery, Walsall Museum and Art Gallery, and many others, could be further examples of late 19th and early 20th century collections planned by local authorities15, monopolised by Victorian and Edwardian art.

This phenomenon is very unusual in the eyes of most Europeans. On the Continent, the regional network of art museums of every country accorded some interest to contemporary art only after that of the past had been rescued. Every provincial emulation of the Louvre or of the respective capital city's national gallery, was created first as a shelter for the heritage of the past, second as a didactic review of the best examples of the different periods in the history of art, and only ultimately as a client of contemporary art (Pommier, 1986; Sherman, 1989). Even in such nations as the United States, Canada and Australia, where the concept of cultural heritage was seen as foreign, this kind of historic review seemed inherent in art galleries in building-up their museums networks: the difficulty of getting real

15 This list does not include art galleries founded by private art-amateurs at the end of the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th. In fact, as we will later see, many of them were also exclusively devoted to contemporary native art; but because the collections were chosen by the founder, they can not be used here to illustrate the peculiarity of the country's museums policy. They merely reflect the art taste of British collectors, not the institutional policies in Britain.
examples from the Old World was surmounted via sculpture reproductions in plaster and copies of paintings (Alexander, 1979: p. 31; Alexander, 1987, p. 342; Burt, 1977: p. 41-42, 131, 166; Katz, 1965: p. 48, 33, 58, 90). Of course, this didactic practice was not unknown in the country of Henry Cole and John Ruskin, where the use of facsimile played such an important part in some art museums (as the South Kensington in London, the Ruskin Museum in Sheffield, the Ancoats Museum in Manchester, the Harris Art Gallery at Preston, etc); but, as a matter of fact, most municipal art galleries did not bother too much about the previous development of art: what really counted in the establishment of art museums was contemporary art (Waterfield, 1991: p. 22-23).

One is tempted to explain it by thinking that, because Great Britain was spared the Napoleonic pillaging of churches and noble houses and the expropriation of monasteries had already been undertaken in 1536 by Hery VIII, the bourgeois modern state here had no urgent need to safeguard the artistic heritage in local repositories. The present richness of British art galleries is the result of a slow procession of gifts, bequests, and purchases, not of a sudden transfer of dynastic, religious or aristocratic collections to the nation; in fact many of the best art treasures of the country are still visitable in situ within the walls of private palaces and manor houses. So, the local art galleries were not created for the benefit of art works in danger, but for the benefit of the local people: customer-oriented. No wonder that contemporary art, being the most popular and - unlike modern 20th century art - the best understandable, formed the bulk of so many collections. Local elites in Liverpool, Birmingham, Manchester, Glasgow and many other big capitals in nineteenth century Britain, used to imagine their cities as a New Athens comparable to the Florence of the Medicis; but, unlike those Renaissance patrons, avid collectors of antiquities, they were enthusiastically insular in their taste, convinced that never before and nowhere else had art reached a higher climax (Reising, 1977: p. 103; Waterfield, 1991: p. 25).

This last sentence introduces into our historical explanations a second term of reference: the interdependence between the history of museums and the history of taste. The history of museums in Britain experienced throughout the nineteenth century a steady prevalence of art over natural sciences in the 'taste' of local...
museums. Eighteenth century encyclopedic museums like the Ashmolean or the
British Museum, were in Britain the prototype followed by those temple-like local
museums, spread out over the country first by the initiative of Philosophical Societies,
later by municipalities encouraged by the Museum Act of 1845 (Lewis, 1986: p. 23-
38). The period of the foundation of provincial art galleries arrived in the 1870s -that
of Nottingham Castle was the first one. Some art collections were housed in pre-
existing museum-buildings, among stuffed birds, fossils and minerals; but most of
them were established in differentiated new buildings.

Thus, the fine arts -Victorian fine arts in particular- became in the 1870s the
main beneficiary of museographical investments and the main focus for museological
assured more local funds for museums, most of which benefited art museums. This
has never been directly commented upon, but such is the conclusion one draws from
an attentive consideration of the data provided by Joyce Edmunds in her study of the
museums built in Britain in that period. Among the six different building structures
identified by her, only museums of naturalia & artificialia appear cited as examples
for the two simplest types (museums installed in a single room, museums installed in
a hall with a gallery of balconies in an upper level), while art galleries predominate in
her examples for the most expensive museum-structures (Edmunds, 1951: p. 91-97).
This seems quite logical, since the creation of a regional network of art galleries in
Britain took place only in the last quarter of the century (Herrmann, 1972: p. 46-47;
Jones, 1966), a few years later than in most European countries17. And in my opinion
that chronological delay contributed, for reasons linked to the historic evolution of
taste, to their specialization in Victorian art: had they been created in the middle of
the century, they might have been more centered in the art of the past; had they been
created in the times of princely courts before the bourgeois revolution, they would
have specialized rather in classic sculpture.

Finally, and this is the central idea of this chapter, we must not forget that the
taste of British local art galleries reflects in many cases that of private businessmen
(Lewis, 1992): they were temples erected by the industrial revolution masters. And
the taste of these rich citizens favoured in most cases modern art, mainly British (in
spite of some cases of Europhilia: Henry Hill of Brighton for example, who was an
avant-garde collector and local populariser of the French Impressionists). Not
surprisingly then, since the winds of the Victorian art-world rotated so much around
the whirlwind of British contemporary art, that when main-stream collectors turned

---

17 Out of Europe the prevalence of natural history over art history in museums lasted even longer, for
obvious reasons: the most typical products of the colonies were their natural wonders, and the life of
people there was closer to Nature, far from any artistic stage.
The agitated early years of the Tate Gallery in Millbank.

Public opinion by the end of the century, was not satisfied with the circumstantial solution for a museum of modern art found in South Kensington. Modern Great Britain could not resign herself to be represented by just a modest section in a hotchpotch-museum. The fortune of that museum-complex in the eyes of the London art-world had much declined forty years after its foundation. Gone were the days when it was considered the popular, didactic and healthy alternative to the National Gallery's aristocratic reign of connoisseurs in polluted Trafalgar Square. The South Kensington Museum appeared old-fashioned and its situation seemed inaccessible to the mass of Londoners (Holroyd, 1905: introduction unpaginated).

The National Gallery had gained an international reputation, and its central situation ensured that anyone visiting London could easily approach it and pay homage to the heaven of painting in Great Britain. But most, and the best, of the space in that heaven had been reserved for Catholic Italian saints, condemning the national predilection for domestic portraits, genre paintings and landscapes to the hades: i.e. to South Kensington. Both the National Gallery of British Art and, since 1885, the National Portrait Gallery were installed there. This was an outrage for the followers of John Ruskin, the most distinguished enemy of South Kensington (Minihan, 1977: p. 134-135), who were growing rapidly in the context of a new wave of pious Anglicanism in religion and patriotic nationalism in aesthetics. One of the followers of Ruskin was the landscape painter James Orrock, the leader of a campaign of complaints against the authorities of the National Gallery for their systematic neglect of the English school.

On March 10th, 1890 Orrock found an outlet for his polemic protests in one of his lectures at the Society of Arts in London. Two days before, it had been made public that Henry Tate, a rich sugar refiner keen on modern English art, had offered in October of the previous year fifty-seven of his pictures to the National Gallery. The Times commented on the news in a leading article, giving fuel to Orrock in his reproaches to the National Gallery and praising the offer of Henry Tate; furthermore, the conservative newspaper reclaimed not just a better representation of national art in

18 His ideas were not foreign in that milieu. Orrock had been lecturing there for ten years.

19 Nothing seemed more unpleasant for Tate than a public scandal or a risk of rejection. Not only did he want his affair to be settled in secret, but also he declared in his first letter to the Trustees of the National Gallery, dated on October the 23rd, 1889, that they could eliminate works if they wished. This letter is the first in the file "Tate Gift", in the archives of the Tate Gallery in London (Box No. 321).
Trafalgar Square, but even a new museum for it:

Trafalgar-square complains with considerable reason that it has neither the space nor the funds to develop its collections so as to include the English school from the time of Hogarth to the present day. Yet there can be no doubt that such a collection of English art is imperatively demanded. A wealthy country like ours, which possesses so fine a national school as we do—a school of landscape and a school of portraiture containing so many of the elements of greatness—ought to be able to stop the mouths of foreign critics by showing them a really representative and choice collection of our art gathered together in some great central gallery. The Manchester Jubilee Exhibition showed what English painters had done during the last fifty years. Why cannot we have in London, started partly by voluntary effort and afterwards subsidized and directed by the Government, a gallery that shall do for English art what the Luxembourg does for French? We do not at the present moment attempt to answer the subordinate though difficult question as to whether the Director of such a gallery should be empowered to purchase the works of living artists. (The Times, 13th March 1890, p. 9).

This idea was the one which finally prevailed, after a long game of manoeuvering, played by four protagonists: H. Tate, the National Gallery, the Treasury, and the press. Thanks to the decisive voice of 'the fourth power', the Tate Gallery can follow, step by step, every move of its origins and first years.

Tate had offered his collection to the National Gallery on condition that it should be exhibited in a new section apart, called after him. The opinion of the press was mostly favorable, though Punch, the satirical art magazine, mocked his pretensions calling him 'the Potent Tate' (Punch 22 March 1890). The opinion of the National Gallery was unfavourable: the condition that the collection should be kept apart was, they argued, against the educational principle of displaying pictures in chronological sequence (practised there since the 1840s—cf. Waterfield, 1991: p. 52). But the frustrated benefactor then backed the project that The Times had proposed, of a gallery of modern art, independent of the National Gallery, in competition with the French prototype. In a letter to the Chancellor of the Exchequer immediately published by The Times, Tate proffered his collection to the Government if the Treasury would create a new museum

[... on lines similar to those of the Luxembourg Gallery, Paris, which is devoted exclusively to modern works of French artists. The works to consist of paintings in oil and water]

20 In another leading article of the 1st April 1890, The Times insisted on the same idea.

21 Most of the press quotations presented in this chapter come from a bound volume denominated Press Cuttings: March 1890-August 1902, in the archives of the Tate Gallery, London.
colours, engravings, works in black and white, etchings, and sculpture, including bronzes [...] representative of the history of British art, executed since 1750, or thereabout» (The Times 21 June 1890, p.12)

The Financial Secretary to the Treasury answered on June the 26th (the letter was published by The Times on the 27th of June 1890) proposing the Eastern and Western galleries at South Kensington. Tate was perplexed and a leading article by The Times then stated (1 July 1890) that South Kensington was «very far from the ideal solution»: South Kensington had many detractors23. Therefore, Sir Charles Robinson and the committee appointed to attend to the birth of the new museum, put forward the project of reforming Kensington Palace, followed by St James’s Palace as a second candidate (perhaps their preference for royal palaces was inspired again by the French precedent -the Luxembourg Palace in Paris). But they were merely an advisory committee, and the Government, fearing that the reform of an old palace would be too expensive, finally favoured the primitive idea of installing the paintings within the 1862 built galleries of South Kensington Museum24. A group of artists and art connoisseurs, Sir A. Hardinge, Sir H. Layard, Sir F. Leighton, and Sir James Linton, were asked to back this choice. They produced an statement which was presented on the 14th August 1890 in the House of Lords as proof that the site was adequate:

we, the undersigned, having, at the request of the Lord President of the Council and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, visited the east and west galleries at South Kensington in reference to their adaptability for the purpose of a National Gallery of British Art, be to state that in our opinion they are adequate in regard to space and well lighted (Hansard, 1890, p. 931).

The Government thus had ignored the two conditions established by Tate in

22 The press cheered the idea (cf. for instance a leading article by The Times 23 June 1890; Reynolds News, 29 June 1890; Land and Water, 28 June 1890; The Huddersfield Chronicle, 26 July 1890). The most enthusiastic supporter was the art critic Harry Quilter, who wrote two long letters published in The Times (16 and 28 July 1890). In the first of them he offered £ 2,000 towards the establishment and maintenance of the new gallery, and in the second he recommended that such a gallery should buy works by young artists.

23 But it had supporters as well. The dealer William Agnew offered to contribute £ 10,000 provided that the South Kensington site was selected (The Times, 22 July 1890).

24 However, as a positive countermeasure to calm the protesters, it was announced that the National Portrait Gallery would find a definitive site at the rear of the National Gallery. A move which resulted in a considerable saving of investment, since a private benefactor, William Henry Alexander, payed four-fifths of the costs: the new edifice of the National Portrait Gallery was inaugurated in 1896.
his original offer: a new institution and a central site. But, in a way, this choice of keeping Tate’s paintings close to the already existing National Gallery of British Art at South Kensington, is quite understandable. In aesthetic terms, there was no reason for separating these pictures, mostly Victorian genre paintings very much of the same kind as Sheepshanks’ (which largely exceeded Tate’s collection in number). Some art writers such as Walter R. Sickert or George Moore, questioned later if the mainstream taste standards of Henry Tate, who had bought most of his paintings at the Royal Academy, should determine those of the new gallery. Painters who had studied in Paris, among then those of the New English Art Club, which had been exposed there to a contagious hatred of academism, regarded as a threat the birth of yet another national gallery of British Art where “pictures popular in subject as in treatment might set the tone” (Rothenstein, 1958, p. 12). And when these prophetic misgivings were confirmed, another critic wrote in Art Journal that the gallery had been filled with “the more insular section of the British school” and lamented the exclusion of examples of the new artistic tendencies in France (quoted in Armstrong, 1894: p. 193; cf. also Brighton, 1977).

There were also financial reasons. The Government had opted for the cheapest choice: it was estimated that building a new gallery would have cost the nation £ 100,000, while the costs to install the Tate collection in South Kensington were minimal. To this, James Orrock replied, on the occasion of the 1890 meeting in Birmingham of the National Association for the Advancement of Art, that installing British art in the National Gallery would be equally inexpensive, and other delegates backed him in his protest against South Kensington, a location “so far away from the centre of human life in London” (Orrock, 1891: p. 191, 193, 195). However, Tate was ready to make further proposals. His friend Humphry Ward wrote to the Chancellor of the Exchequer a letter announcing that Henry Tate would pay up to £ 80,000 for the building of a new gallery if the Government should give the land (the letter was published in The Times, 21 March 1891, but the name of the donor was kept anonymous, and the location suggested was not revealed). And Tate made another concession: the site he had chosen was at South Kensington.

The Government agreed, but it happened that the area had already been promised to the Royal College of Science to accommodate its scientific collections. After lobbying pressure, the scientists reconquered their promised land, and Tate lost his nerve. A subsequent attempt to buy a City of London property on the Embankment failed too, because the price was too high for the Government (the City

25 Similar criticisms were also expressed in an anonymous article in The National Observer of the 13 February 1892 entitled ‘The sad case of Mr. Tate’.
Corporation valued the site at £200,000, which was followed by the withdrawal of Tate's offer, concerning both the paintings and the money.

After a change of Government in the summer of 1892, Tate found the new Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir William Harcourt, more sympathetic to his project, and in November the newspapers announced with delight that the negotiations had restarted. Some months before, an anonymous writer —Sir Edward du Cane— had suggested the 24 acres of the Millbank prison in a letter to *The Times* (17 March 1892). The penitentiary, a national property, was intended to be transformed into cottages for workmen and a new military barracks, but the land was offered to Tate, who accepted the site in November that year, in spite of its being 'a notorious centre of chronic rheumatism, ague and neuralgia' (*The Daily News*, 3 November 1892).

Henry Tate would erect there, at his cost, the new building for a 'National Gallery of British Art' and, unlike John Sheepshanks, he declared himself happy to submit it to the Trustees of the National Gallery of Trafalgar Square. On November the 6th, 1894, he and the Trustees and Director of the National Gallery signed a document of 'indenture', whose last paragraph reads:

> THIS INDENTURE WITNESSETH that the said Henry Tate in considerations doth hereby freely and voluntarily GIVE GRANT ASSIGN AND CONFIRM unto the said Trustees and Director ALL AND SINGULAR the pictures and statuette specified and enumerated in the schedule hereunder written TO HOLD the same unto the said Trustees and Director as a part of the National Collection and under the care and ordering of the said Trustees and Director and upon and for the like trusts intents and purposes upon and for which they hold or are possessed of the several pictures and other articles composing the residue of the National Collection PROVIDED NEVERTHELESS that the said pictures and statuette shall be placed and thereafter kept for the purposes of exhibition in the said gallery or building now in course of erection when completed [...] (London, Archives of the Tate Gallery, Box No. 123).

Tate's architect was Sidney R. J. Smith, who had been designing plans for the gallery even before a site was found. His designs for Millbank were radically different from his previous plans, but they were also too grandiose, and this created new problems and successive revisions (Robin Hamlyn writes about the five or six revisions he made, in response to different proposals prompted by the Royal Academicians, in *Waterfield*, 1991: p. 113-116). In September 1893 the foundation stone was laid, and in July 1897 the building was formally opened (to the general public it was opened on the 16th August): it had cost Tate over £100,000, much

---

26 The correspondence was published in *The Times*, 5 March 1892.
more than what he had first offered, yet the gallery contained not only his collection (63 oil-paintings, 2 watercolours, and 2 sculptures, to whom he had lately added 2 oil-paintings and a marble statue, supplemented by his widow in 1900 with another painting), but also those purchased with the Chantrey Bequest (85 works), together with the recent Watts Gift (18 pictures), a part of the Vernon collection (44 pieces), and other modern British paintings from the National Gallery. Only those artists born after 1790 were eligible for inclusion (Farr, 1978: p. 342) with three declared exceptions: Constable, Wilkie and Turner.

As a result of these transfers from South Kensington and Trafalgar Square, the gallery was completely overfilled. An extension was envisaged by Mr. Tate, and two years later, in 1899, he completed his scheme by the addition of eight more galleries and a large sculpture hall. Since then, the history of the gallery has been one of increased additions by gift, bequest and purchase, and, in consequence, of continuous extensions. The Turner Bequest was transferred in 1906, and two years later the magnate Joseph Duveen offered to sponsor for it an additional extension. As a result, the Turner Wing opened in 1910: five rooms on the main floor and four on the ground floor (nowadays, the Turner Bequest is installed in a new wing, the Clore Building, erected in 1980-86).

Until 1917 the Tate Gallery was managed by the Trustees of the National Gallery, who were not interested in avant-garde art. In 1913 they had accepted -reluctantly- only fifteen pictures of the magnificent collection offered on loan by Hugh Lane on different occasions since 1907. The £ 3,000 of the Chantrey Bequest, administered by the Royal Academy and the National Gallery, were the only official funds available for purchases at the Tate Gallery right up to 1946 (Reid, 1969, p. 5). The Tate had no say in the selection of works -usually chosen from the Royal Academy exhibitions- and no right of refusal. This was a subject of much controversy (D.S. MacColl, keeper of the Tate in 1906-1911 regularly opposed this academic taste in the acquisitions), and public polemics (Rothenstein, 1958, p. 16-19).

27 The official separation of the two institutions was effected by the Act of 1954 which gave the Tate trustees sole responsibility for the gallery.

28 Discouraged by the tactless response of the National Gallery of London, Hugh Lane turned to his home-land and offered his collection to the city of Dublin on condition that they would provide for it a new purpose-built museum; but they did not. Subsequently, in making his will in 1915 he bequeathed it to the London National Gallery. He died that year at the sinking of the Lusitania. Before embarking he had added a codicil stating that, if the City Council of Dublin would build a suitable gallery within five years after his death, the paintings were theirs. But the codicil was legally invalid because he had made it without witness. The controversy between London and Dublin finished only in 1959 with a compromise agreement: the collection was divided in three parts, which should exchange in rotation every seven years (Rothenstein, 1962: p. 30-33).

29 McColl had written two acid articles on the subject in the Saturday Review: "The
However, this lack of interest also had its good points; the Tate benefitted since 1900 from a steady dumping of modern foreign pictures from the stocks of Trafalgar Square (Farr, 1978: p. 346). Such pictures had already gained many backers in London, which then became backers of the Tate Gallery. In general, Edwardians were far more keen than Victorians on European avant-garde artists (Becket & Cherry, 1987). All through the first decades of the 20th century some London dealers like Alex Reix, Hugh Lane or the Leicester Galleries of Leicester Square, introduced in London the Impressionists and Post-Impressionists, Cézanne, Van Gogh, Matisse, Picasso, etc (Herrmann, 1972: p. 391-404; Brown, 1968: p. 34-45). Years later the National Art-Collections Fund carried out important campaigns of purchases in this market (Aitken, 1928: p. 109) and many more French Impressionists arrived at the Tate Gallery through the generosity of private benefactors. This new opening of taste to include modern European trends was clear in the Tate Gallery from 1915, when Duveen’s son, also called Joseph (most usually referred to in the literature as Lord Duveen of Millbank), made a new offer of an extension (Alley, 1959: p. 278) in order to build a Gallery for Modern Foreign Art.

Thus, as all these extensions show, we once again find at work the dialectic dichotomy of ‘modern art’ (as opposed to old masters) and ‘British art’ (as opposed to other European schools). This institution, in spite of being emphatically called ‘National Gallery of British Art (Tate Gallery)’, was also functioning as a Gallery of Modern Art without limits of nationalities. It appears almost as a predestined movement of counter-balance, that in the same year -1915- that the gallery of Modern Foreign Art was approved, the Trustees of the National Gallery proposed to transform the rest of the Tate Gallery into a complete historical representation of the British School, not only of modern British Art. They had their own reasons: they wanted

---

30 In 1923 Samuel Courtauld created a fund to purchase French Impressionist paintings for the Tate Gallery. The Frank Stoop Bequest of 1933 also greatly enriched the Gallery’s modern French collections.

31 The new addition, four rooms on the main floor and five on the ground floor (a modest predecessor of the 1973-79 extension devoted to modern international art), was delayed by the obvious difficulties raised by the Great War, and only opened on the 26th June 1926 (in Paris, the Musée des Écoles Étrangères Contemporaines was established at the Jeu de Paume in 1922, but opened to the public only in 1932). Years later, in 1935-37, Duveen also added a new Sculpture Gallery.

32 Which sometimes was seen as natural, and sometimes was criticized with questions like: «What have Horace Vernet and Ary Sheffer to do in a National Gallery of British Art? [...] What right have Bonvin, Costa, Fantin-Latour, Salame, Clays, Rosa Bonheur, Charles Pousin...» (The Graphic, 5 September 1903).
some of Millbank's most valuable pieces at Trafalgar Square and, above all, they wanted to get rid of many secondary pieces, in order to solve the problems of space of the National Gallery 'of old masterpieces'. In accordance with this, during 1919, more than 200 paintings of the older British School were transferred from Trafalgar Square, (only a small collection of selected pieces sufficient to make a proper representation remained there), whereas they took from Millbank 22 outstanding works by British nineteenth century painters, such as Stevens, Millais, Madox Brown and Rossetti.

The dual nature of the Tate Gallery was then established, and since 1919 its displays are divided into two different areas: one of them devoted to the history of British art from the 16th century till 1880, the other to 20th century national and Western art in general. In this way the duality of preferences for 'contemporary' and 'British' art, blended in the previous examples, was here intensified and separated. Modern art in general (not necessarily British), and British art in general (not exclusively modern) became the twofold collecting targets of the Tate Gallery.

In the authoritative view of Nicholas Serota, the gallery's present director, who is campaigning to move the 20th century section to a new site apart, this is a 'struggle on two fronts', a 'peculiar combination, which coexists at the Tate as in no other museum in the world' which resulted from the National Gallery's historical prejudice against modern art (Serota, 1992: p. 393). He is completely right: up until 1990 the terminal date of the collection at Trafalgar Square was situated around 1910 (this limit has been now exceeded mainly by means of temporary loans of Post-Impressionists and Cubists pictures -Berggruen collection, etc.).
since the first major gift to the gallery, the paintings of John Gilbert received in 1893), with special emphasis on contemporary local artists. Alfred Temple was appointed secretary, later director, and from 1896 was also curator of the whole City's collections dispersed in several buildings. He was even offered the post of first keeper of the Tate Gallery in 1897 (Knight, 1986: p. 1 and 15), but he refused to go over to the 'enemy'.

The Guildhall Art Gallery, under the rule of Alfred Temple, was indeed a fearful competitor of the Tate Gallery. This competition had started already when the Tate Gallery was being conceived. Alfred Temple had tried to persuade Tate to make his offer of a new gallery not to the Government but to the City of London, the owner of the too expensive site at the Embankment yearned for by Tate in 1891 (Temple, 1918: p. 110). By then the Guildhall Gallery was already too small for the City's growing collections, and Temple had even secured from other sponsors £ 34,000 for more purchases of contemporary art in case he would succeed in convincing Tate to provide for the new building.

He failed with Tate, but prevailed in many other cases, notably in attracting the Gassiot bequest of 127 Victorian paintings. Mr. Charles Gassiot had originally meant to leave his collection to the Tate Gallery, but when he died in 1902 only four paintings went to Millbank, and the rest, valued at £ 84,000, were left to the Guildhall thanks to the persuasion of Alfred Temple who had argued: «were your pictures at the Guildhall your name, for all time, would have far greater prominence than if it were identified with probably a selection of them at the Tate Gallery» (Knight, 1986: p. 15).

The institution only began to have its own Purchase Fund in 1902, which no doubt stimulated Alfred Temple's eagerness for attracting donations in competition with other museums. And he was one of the most active museums professionals of his time in many other ways: he organized between 1890 and 1907 a series of loan exhibitions of old masters which were extremely popular, and he was a pioneer of Sunday openings (most of the gallery's public were clerks). He died in 1928. The gallery never again achieved the popularity it had in Alfred Temple's heyday 34.

The City of London was not the only competitor to the Tate Gallery in getting donations from collectors of Victorian art. Some social idealists concerned with the education of people, used art as the necessary complement of schools. And the

34 It was badly damaged by bombs during World War II and is closed since then; although organising periodic temporary exhibitions of part of its collections (the items datable between 1789 and 1919 are still the bulk of them). The old building was finally demolished in 1987, and it is now believed that the new building will be open in 1995.
districts of London saw at the end of the 19th century a blossoming of private initiatives (later they lost this character, being managed by a range of different London-based authorities), where art galleries were included in educational institutions. Once again, the dominant taste in these galleries was for British nineteenth century art.

First to deserve mention here is the art gallery of the Royal Holloway College in Egham, an independent college for women founded by Thomas Holloway (it joined the University of London in 1900). The college was inaugurated in 1886, and its gallery opened the next year. Holloway had made a fortune with the world famous 'Holloway Pills and Ointment'. He owned a number of old masters paintings, which were sold after his death: but for the gallery of his college he bought contemporary paintings. In a very short time, from May 1881 to his death in 1883, he amassed his collection of paintings by modern masters for Holloway College, bidding record prices in auctions. Apart from a Gainsborough, a Constable, and a Turner (polemically deaccessioned in 1993) most of them were contemporary paintings chosen from the 'picture of the year' of the Royal Academy Summer Exhibitions. Only one has a non-British signature, a landscape by the Norwegian L. Münthe (Derryan, 1973; Chapel, 1982, p. 9-15).

Another example of undeniable interest is the South London Art Gallery, which opened in 1891. The local tradesman William Rossiter -who began to exhibit paintings at his shop in Camberwell Road in 1868- was one of the founding fathers of the South London Working Men's College, an institution which established, thanks to Rossiter patronage, a free library in 1878 and in the next year an art gallery, formed by loans from private collectors. They held exhibitions annually with loans from wealthy benefactors and artists: Sir Henry Irving, G.F. Watts and Lord Leighton. Both institutions moved to various locations during the 1880s. In 1889 a site in Peckham Road was purchased to erect there a purpose-built Art Gallery.

The building, finished in 1891, was financed mainly by donations, and one year later the Newspaper Magnate John Passmore Edwards gave £ 3,000 to build the library plus 1,000 volumes for it. On May 4th, 1891, the South London Gallery opened to the public, oriented to the lower social classes (even if it also had a 'social' opening in October 1893, presided by the Prince of Wales). The gallery exhibited, free of charge, works of British contemporary artists.

In 1896, South London Art Gallery was transferred to the local authority, the Vestry of Camberwell, whose plans were to erect a school of applied-art as a complement to this art gallery for workers. The project was financed by £ 5,000 offered by John Passmore Edwards to build it in an adjacent site (MacDonald, 1900). Then, little by little its collection diversified, adding some ceramics, coins, medals
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and models during the years between 1898 and 1904, during which the gallery was
managed by this local authority school. Later, it became directly dependent on the
Borough of Camberwell, and maintained a kind of specialisation in local
contemporary art, devoting much of its activities to temporary exhibitions\(^{35}\)

Another philanthropic art gallery intended to cultivate the popular crowds of
the suburbs of London was the Whitechapel Art Gallery, opened in 1902 in the East
End. This time the founder was not a capitalist, but a man of religion, Canon Samuel
A. Barnett, and his wife Henrietta; but, as in the case of South London Art Gallery,
contemporary art -Watts, Leighton, Burne-Jones, Rossetti- was again the protagonist.
In fact, the life of the gallery (whose innovative building was designed by the
architect Charles Harrison Townsend in 1897), was preceded by previous exhibitions
of borrowed paintings. The Barnetts had started those initiatives in 1881, on the
premises of St. Jude's National Schools in Whitechapel, and temporary exhibitions of
works on loan was going to be the main activity of the gallery until the present day

More examples of art galleries deserving to be mentioned here come from
another borough of London, in a rather different context. In Kensington, the
fashionable artistic quarter of London in late Victorian times, the houses of some
artists were transformed into museums. Of particular interest here is Leighton House.
In 1914, eight years after the death of the artist, his family founded there a private
trust museum\(^{36}\). The house was denuded of Leighton's own collections, sold in
public auction, and the trust tried to furnish the empty rooms with acquisitions or
loans of works, either by Leighton or his contemporaries and friends: a mixture
between a one-artist 'souvenir museum', and an a gallery devoted to a particular
period: the art of Leighton's time (Jones, n.d. -1981?-, n.p.).

\(^{35}\) The building was severely damaged by bombs in 1941, but although the gallery was restored and
reopened in 1949, the permanent collection has been in store ever since (though a temporary
exhibition in the Spring of 1993 has put many of them on show for a limited time). Some events in its
programme of exhibitions regularly feature a part of its possessions, but the arts of 1789-1919 do not
play a central role. The gallery depends, after the local authority re-organisation effected in 1965, on
the London Borough of Southwark and its activities are centered in local interest, which is more
concerned with 20th century art.

\(^{36}\) Since 1926 it is run by the Royal Borough of Kensington which proceeds with the same policy: the
institution is not a personality's souvenir-house like the nearby Linley Sambourne House or a one-
artist art gallery as the Watts Gallery in Comton. Not all the paintings exhibited were done or
possessed by Leighton, but of course there are more works by him than by any other artist (the house
itself, because of its very personal arrangements might be called a work of Leighton). If other artists
should gain more presence there, they would be those of the colony established at that time in the
borough. Then the house will be a museum of the local artistic sybaritism fin-de-siècle!
Both the 'one-artist museums' and the 'philanthropic galleries' were widely emulated all over the country; but the former fall out of the limits of this study (they belong rather to the history of one-person museums than to the history of museums devoted to 19th century art). As for the philanthropic galleries, some examples of galleries associated with institutions for the education of artisans had been operating in the provinces long before any of them were established in the suburbs of London (Williams, 1963: p. 152). In 1871 John Ruskin had created in Sheffield the Guild of St. George, located in a small cottage from 1875 to 1890, when it was transferred to the city administration (Barnet, 1985: p. 12-27). However, neither this collection nor that of the Whitworth Art Institute -as it was then called- established in Manchester in 1889, were intended as galleries devoted to contemporary art. It is even questionable whether they could be called art galleries, because a central role in their collecting policy was given to items of non-artistic nature, for instance minerals, or scientific materials.

More fruitful is the search for initiatives of patronage, of the very same kind as that of Henry Tate. It comes to no surprise that those generous patrons of the arts proliferated in the North, then the industrial heart of the country. And most of them favoured Victorian and Edwardian art in their patronage of art galleries, though no one expressly yearned, as Tate did, for institutions with any kind of specialisation in British or/and modern art. The subsequent tendency in these galleries has often been to collect art of every time. However, many of them are still galleries of modern masters (of the 19th and 20th century) and in some cases 19th century items are still in the majority because the acquisitions after the First World War have been scarce or non existant. The other remarkable difference in comparison with the case of Tate, is that rarely do we find in those patrons of the provinces both the art collector and the gallery builder. The Cooper Art Gallery in Barnsley, opened in 1914, is one of the few comparable to the Tate Gallery, because its founder gave both the collection and the building. More well known is the Lady Lever Art Gallery in Port-Sunlight which is also one of the best examples in the field of private philanthropic galleries, since indeed no other gallery of this kind managed to survive so long as an independent trust museum (until 1978!). It was founded in 1913 by William Hesketh Lever, the owner of a soap factory, but the history of this gallery belongs to the aftermaths of World War I, its building being concluded in 1922. However, it is important to notice that as early as 1911 a Hulme Hall Art Gallery with its own curator had been opened in Port Sunlight Village. The former dining-room for female
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37 In April 1890 the city relocated the Guild's collections in Moorsbrook Park, with a new name: the Ruskin Museum. In 1982 it changed again both its denomination and its location: it is now called the Ruskin Gallery, and it occupies an old wine shop in the city centre.
factory staff was transformed in a lavishly designed art gallery, at a cost of £18,000, displaying mostly late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century pictures and furniture (Shippobottom, 1992: p. 177-178).

Of all the rest, the first to be mentioned, in chronological order, must be those benefactors who gave collections of Victorian art to local authorities on condition that a new purpose-built gallery should be provided for them. Perhaps one of the most famous is John Newton Mappin, a successful brewer, whose collection—supplemented by Mappin's nephew, Sir Frederick Mappin, by a sum of money and further gifts—was the backbone of the Mappin Art Gallery in Sheffield, founded in 1887 (Tooby, 1987). Similarly, Edwin Richards, a business man of Wednesbury, offered the town his extensive collection of English 19th Century oil paintings and watercolours, if they provided a purpose-built edifice to create Wednesbury Art Gallery, which was accomplished in 1891. Another family of gallery-founders were the three heirs of an inveterate collector of art from the first half of the 19th century: Thomas Wrigley, the owner of a Bury paper manufactury founded by his father. In 1897 they presented the collection to the Corporation of Bury, and subsequently Bury Art Gallery was built between 1899 and 1901 and opened immediately with great public success: it received 142,873 visitors in 1901-02 (Sparke, 1904: p. 1-2 and 4; Towrend, 1905).

None of these galleries have maintained in the following years any kind of specialisation in their collecting policies—except their usual interest for local subjects.

As for the other group of gallery-founders, those who did not collect art of any kind, but financed the construction of galleries for English modern art, the best examples come again from the North. Southport, the Victorian fashionable health resort in Merseyside, opened its Art Gallery in 1878. The building was a gift of W. Atkinson, who named the gallery after him; but the rich collection of English 19th century paintings of Atkinson Art Gallery came afterwards through different donations and purchases.

In Bradford the first local gallery had opened in May, 1879 in one room in a multipurpose building, and for twelve years it had no permanent collection, only loans from collectors and artists. In the early 1890s the municipal Corporation created a budget for the purchase of a collection; but there was no money for a new building. This need was met by Samuel Cunliffe Lister (later Lord Masham of Winton). Some twenty years earlier he had sold to the city for half its price his childhood home, Manningham Hall, which was then in a dilapidated state and he proposed the demolition of the house and the erection of a new art gallery as a monument to Dr. Edmund Cartwright, (the originator in Britain of the combing machine) for which he offered £40,000 (he finally paid more than £47,500). Cartwright Hall opened in 1904, and its founder continued to give money for new purchases, but he was not
himself an art collector: the superb ensemble of 19th century art gathered there comes from the collection of the industrialist Abraham Mitchel, who had collected in the 1860s and 1870s Victorian paintings of genre and oriental scenes, landscapes and seascapes, etc, and further, through the influence of the painter Henry La Thangue, went on buying modern French and English pictures. La Thangue immortalised him as the prototype of an art-lover in his most famous painting: *The Connoisseur* (Hopper & Jenkings, 1989).

An even better example is Alexander Laing, a wine and spirit merchant. In 1900 he proposed to the City Council of Newcastle-upon-Tyne to build, at his own expense, an art gallery which would bear his name, in a site provided by the City Council. On October 13th, 1904, the *Laing Art Gallery* was opened: it had cost him £ 30,000. But there was no permanent collection to put in the building (they exhibited items on loan, until a collection of local interest was built). And, as the most easily obtainable items were modern British paintings, they put on display a large loan exhibition of British paintings, works by local contemporary artists and a variety of collections of applied arts from the Victoria and Albert Museum and private sources. This areas defined the collecting policy of the next years.

Further similar cases fall out of the chronological boundaries of this study. However, it is worth saying that the change of century coincided with the start of a smooth change in the ‘taste’ of new-born museums. In 1927 the Rt. Thomas R. Ferens offered £ 45,000 for the building of an art gallery in Hull and £ 20,000 to start the purchases; but British 19th and 20th century art was not chosen as the main collecting-target. Such a choice was becoming rather a rarity. The leaders of industry and commerce went on building temples for the arts, but other divinities from other times and other countries were worshipped as well. Gone were the days when the masters of the Industrial Revolution founded art galleries exclusively devoted to British art of recent times.
This chapter has proposed a second study-case offering further corroboration of the initial thesis that the creation of galleries of modern art in the nineteenth century was stimulated by two determinants: the previous evolution of museums and the involvement of contemporary patronage, either royal or private. In London, as in Paris, the campaigning for the creation of a national gallery of modern art was first of all a consequence of the exclusive interest of the National Gallery for the arts of the past. In this case, however, the leading sponsors were not the monarchs but two private businessmen: John Sheepshanks and Henry Tate.

As a result, Victorian art obtained in London two national museums instead of one since Tate insisted on creating a new national gallery, different of that founded by Sheepshanks. This would have been unthinkable under royal patronage, because the supposed legitimacy of monarchy actually lies in the historical continuity from sovereign to sovereign. As we saw in chapter two, monarchs are always keen on presenting themselves following in the footsteps of their predecessors; but the examples surveyed here show that private founders and their families tended to relinquish the 'parental custody' of the galleries they engendered, handing the newborn museums over to the State or the municipalities. Besides, in the final conclusion to the previous chapter we even raised the hypothesis that the galleries of modern art grown out apart from royal patronage risked having an unstable personality. Such a Freudian-like postulate has been confirmed in this chapter with our analysis of the changing identities of South Kensington and Millbank: both galleries were somehow defined as temples celebrating British artistic virtues (of any time) but worked initially as museums featuring nineteenth century arts (of any nationality). Eventually, both failed to become in their adulthood genuine museums of modern art.

Finally, another conclusion that can be drawn at this point is that the disparity of sponsors does not seem to have led to substantial differences in the selection of contents. All galleries, either of royal or of bourgeois lineage, favoured their respective national school and preferred mainstream tendencies -prized works by salonists painters above all. In this Paris and London were alike. In the next chapter this will be proved with further examples.
CHAPTER 4.
THE EXPANSIVE WAVE: PARALLEL ENDEAVOURS IN OTHER COUNTRIES UP TO 1919.
This chapter is, above all, an exercise in taxonomy. Sociologists, following the example of biologists, base their science on classification, not on experiments. They construct theories about social phenomena analysing diverse case studies and then verify the 'scientificity' of such theories not with repeatable experiments but with a battery of examples found in a general scanning of the existing literature. Basically, this is the task envisaged in this chapter: to move from the specific to the general.

What follows here is a survey of other examples connected with the two case studies previously examined: a panoramic review of comparable galleries that flourished around Europe and in the U.S.A. up to the end of World War I. Inevitably, the historical inspection looses depth as the vision broadens: we know less and less about more and more. However, the target of this research is not to write a complete narration; the chronicle of each museum is sketched with the attention centred on a single argument: the historic causes and original purposes of the creation of galleries specialising, sometimes deliberately and sometimes haphazardly, in 19th century art. Thus the key point here is to establish a relation of cause and effect between some circumstances intervening in the creation of museums and the identity developed by each institution. Accordingly, the text is divided into two sections: section 4.1 focusing on museums linked with the Parisian model, and section 4.2 discussing those associated here with the British pattern. Each section cross-classifies museums in different subheadings according to some variables intervening in their establishment: namely the interplay of cultural inter-influences, the preconditions set by the museological context, and the role of royal or private sponsors as catalysts.

SUMMARY:

This chapter is, above all, an exercise in taxonomy. Sociologists, following the example of biologists, base their science on classification, not on experiments. They construct theories about social phenomena analysing diverse case studies and then verify the 'scientificity' of such theories not with repeatable experiments but with a battery of examples found in a general scanning of the existing literature. Basically, this is the task envisaged in this chapter: to move from the specific to the general.

What follows here is a survey of other examples connected with the two case studies previously examined: a panoramic review of comparable galleries that flourished around Europe and in the U.S.A. up to the end of World War I. Inevitably, the historical inspection looses depth as the vision broadens: we know less and less about more and more. However, the target of this research is not to write a complete narration; the chronicle of each museum is sketched with the attention centred on a single argument: the historic causes and original purposes of the creation of galleries specialising, sometimes deliberately and sometimes haphazardly, in 19th century art. Thus the key point here is to establish a relation of cause and effect between some circumstances intervening in the creation of museums and the identity developed by each institution. Accordingly, the text is divided into two sections: section 4.1 focusing on museums linked with the Parisian model, and section 4.2 discussing those associated here with the British pattern. Each section cross-classifies museums in different subheadings according to some variables intervening in their establishment: namely the interplay of cultural inter-influences, the preconditions set by the museological context, and the role of royal or private sponsors as catalysts.
4.1 THE HISTORICAL INFLUENCE OF THE LUXEMBOURG MUSEUM IN DIFFERENT REALMS.

Emulation of the French precedent in the neighbouring kingdoms.

Like the construction of Gothic cathedrals in medieval times, which spread from the Île de France to the rest of Europe, the creation of museums of modern art in the 19th century originated in France and gradually spread elsewhere. Cathedrals were built where there were bishops and, likewise, the proliferation of new Luxembourgs was linked to monarchs. No equivalent of the Luxembourg Museum emerged in Switzerland, a Republic, in spite of its proximity to France. The expansive wave ran from Paris to other Royal Courts so by-passing the rest of the capitals in the map of Europe, as the flames would also contour wet spots in a burning paper for example. Hence, geography was interrelated with politics in determining the timing of the first expansion: the further from Paris and the more remote from a monarch, the more unlikely for a 19th century capital to open an early museum of modern art. And a third point can be added referring to the museological context: the earlier a country had a gallery similar to the Louvre, the earlier it would produce a museum like the Luxembourg.

Thus, the earlier and/or closer followers of France appeared in the orbit of her bordering kingdoms: the first circle in the expansive wave. It was felt as almost a question of national pride for her neighbours¹ to have a gallery of the same kind or, indeed, to produce a better one, which is the etymological meaning of the term 'emulation', from the Latin aemulare (to compete with). It is true that the museum policies implemented by the royal courts of the Low Countries, Italy and Spain were mirroring the French model, but it is also true that none of these realms erected a facsimile of the Musée du Luxembourg: its peculiar personality as a musée de passage supposedly reserved for living artists was never reproduced anywhere else. In fact, as we have seen, this system was even questioned in the Parisian museum itself. It was no accident that its original name, Museum of Living Artists, was usually replaced by the popular denomination: Musée du Luxembourg.

¹ England was not immune to this feeling, even though keeping her distances from the French orbit: There is no reason why in this matter at least we should not do as others do. Not only is there a Luxembourg in Paris, but almost every other European capital has a gallery of the same kind (The Times 23 June 1890, p. 9).
Actually, the question of naming is not an irrelevant one in discovering what influences might have moulded the identity of a gallery. Just as many parents call their children after their beloved or their heroes, museum founders too show us through the names chosen for their institutions what models they had in mind. Most revealing in this sense is the name Rijks Verzameling van Levende Meesters which is a mere Dutch translation from the French Musée des Artistes Vivants, although the art works gathered in that museum of Haarlem were not removed after the death of their authors. A counter-example appeared in Brussels, where the arguable duplicates of the Louvre and the Luxembourg were called Musée Ancien and Musée Moderne, a choice recalling the names of the Alte- and Neue-Pinakothek of Munich. These Munich connexions in Belgium seem nonsense at a first glance, but one has second thoughts considering that Brussels, unlike Paris but the same as Munich, only discriminated in different museums past and contemporary paintings: sculptures, old and new, were on the other hand displayed together. The same happened in Florence, where the respective institution was sometimes called Galleria dei Quadri Moderni and sometimes Galleria Moderna; however, Rome soon put forth a fortunate alternative, Galleria d’Arte Moderna, which was immediately assumed in the rest of Italy and elsewhere with slight variations. One of these variations was the designation Museo de Arte Moderno, eventually adopted in Madrid after a short-lived preference for the denomination Museo de Arte Contemporáneo. Both names had a great success in all languages: nowadays ‘Museum of Modern Art’ and ‘Museum of Contemporary Art’ are the most frequent names for galleries exhibiting works by present-day artists.

All this seems like musical variations on a common model; but if we compare museum names with inauguration dates we deduce a simple rule: the later a museum of modern art was created, the greater was its dissimilarity, even in its name, with the Luxembourg. However, the degree of self-determination defining the character of every institution is also closely related to the actual intervention of the monarchs and to the museological context: the more direct was the involvement of the sovereign and the more the existing gallery of old masters matched the Louvre, the more likely was the result to be a solid institution of strong personality. With all these points in mind, let us now review the examples starting from those closer in time and nature and finishing with the furthest to the Parisian model.

The closest follower of the Luxembourg Museum was the Dutch Rijks Verzameling van Levende Meesters (National Collection of Living Masters) opened in 1838 at the Paviljoen Welgelegen in Haarlem, a city between Amsterdam and The Hague. Political dependence on France was over when Willem I had become King of the Netherlands and Belgium in 1814, but still, hardly surprising in a land which had
been so directly linked to France, his arts policy was moulded around the example of the restored French monarchy. Like Louis XVIII in France, Willem I did not close the national museum of art created under the rule of the French revolutionaires and the Napoleonides. However he took good care to delimit his property: his own collection of paintings was kept in the Mauritshuis of The Hague (where the royal collections are still housed today), and the National Museum of Art -Rijksmuseum- left the Royal Palace to be installed in the Trippenhuis on Kloveniersburgwal.

Willen I was a regular client of living artists for his own private collection, and in only fifteen years his Government bought about 300 works by contemporary Dutch and Belgian painters for the national collections (Loos, 1991, p. 9). The Rijksmuseum lacked the space to keep these works by living artists -frequently history paintings of vast dimensions. It was therefore most natural that the equivalent of Louis XVIII's Musée du Luxembourg was created during Willem's reign (Luttervelt, 1960: p. 48). However, it is difficult to know the actual degree of involvement of the King in the project, because, like the Musée des Artistes Vivants in Paris, the enterprise started without any formally stated legal edict. The pavilion of Haarlem was just a storage and exhibition space for contemporary works which supposedly had to be transferred in the future to the Rijksmuseum's headquarters. Contrary to its French paragon, which developed with time both its collections and its administrative personality, the growth of the Rijks Verzameling van Levende Meesters dimmed in the following years. It never reached administrative independence, remaining merely a 'section' of the Rijksmuseum. It did not continue to acquire great numbers of new works.

In part this was because Willem II was not as keen on enriching its collections as his father had been. On the other hand the State purchases of art-works at the national exhibitions, so numerous in previous times, almost ceased in the middle of the 19th century. The Netherlands entered an era of economic decline after the Belgian revolt in 1830, which led to the formation of an independent Belgium nine years later. Finally, the Paviljoen Welgelegen of Haarlem was closed in 1885, and the National Collection of Works of Living Artists was integrated into the purpose-built new edifice of the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam. Since 1909 it has been housed at the Stadhouderskade's Drucker Extension, enlarged in 1916. It became a section of the

2 When the French Republic had invaded the Netherlands, the collection of Prince Willem V (filled with pictures from the times of Holland's Golden Age) was transformed into a National Gallery, which opened near The Hague in 1800. Eight years later one of Napoleon's brothers, Louis Bonaparte, was proclaimed King of Holland. He transferred that gallery, then called Koninklijk -i.e. 'Royal'-Museum, to his palace, the former Town Hall of Amsterdam. Between 1810 and 1813, Holland became a province of the Napoleonic Empire, and that museum in Amsterdam a subsidiary Louvre.
national gallery, yet set apart from the paintings in the main building.

The case of Belgium presents also great links with the Parisian model, but in spite of the geographical and cultural closeness to France, the expansive wave came here quite late: not surprisingly, because the monarchy also arrived later and the museological context was more undeveloped in Brussels—besides, the actual involvement of the Belgian kings as art patrons was usually rather small. When Brussels became the capital of the newly-born kingdom of Belgium after the revolt of 1830, the city had already a municipal gallery of art established by Napoleon. It was not a national pantheon for the arts, but just a modest local museum, very similar to its peers, the first municipal galleries created in France. So, contemporary art was admitted there in the most natural way: the first modern pieces to arrive here had been fourteen works by contemporary artists offered in 1817 by Willem I, and in 1834 the Belgian State started to deposit there works purchased in exhibitions or committed from living artists.

However, the transformation of Brussels into a State capital required a national gallery; on January the 7th, 1835, Léopold I decreed the creation in the city of a national museum devoted to Belgian arts, and in view of the difficulties in establishing a collection for it, the Parliament bought the municipal museum for 1,644,000 francs (Baly et al., 1988). It is no coincidence if the next museological issue was the creation of a separate section for works by modern Belgian artists, decreed by an arrêté royal of November 26, 1845.

The obvious model for the Belgian national gallery of art had been the Louvre. In 1844 the writer William Thackeray noted in his book *Little Travels and Road-side Sketches*:

> It is an absurd little gallery, absurdly imitating the Louvre, with just such compartments and pillars as you see in the noble Paris gallery; only here the pillars and capitals are stucco and white in place of marble and gold, and plaster-of-paris busts of great Belgians are placed between the pillars (Thackeray, 1869: p. 186).

But the parallels with the Parisian museums policies did not stop in matters of gallery design. In the beginning, the modern section and that devoted to the old masters shared a single building, the Ancienne Cour (old residence of the Austrian stadtholders of the Netherlands). However the collections of the modern section were

---

3 The Drucker Extension of the Rijkmuseum (containing the collections of 19th century paintings, many of them donated by Jean Charles Joseph Drucker and his wife), is undergoing, since July 1991 a complete renovation. The aim is to transform it into a modern separate museum of nineteenth-century painting.

XIV - Plan of the Musée Moderne, Brussels. (from Baedeker, 1905)
soon retired from display and exhibited elsewhere, mainly at the Palais Ducal from 1862 to 1877 (Mertens, 1988). They returned to the Ancienne Cour in April 1877, installed in a new extension inaugurated as Musée Moderne by Léopold II and the Queen Marie-Henriette. Ten years later the paintings of the other section, the Musée Ancien, and all the sculptures without distinction of chronology, were transferred to the newly erected Palais des Beaux-Arts. The Musée Moderne was consequently reopened, on February 27, 1887, occupying all the rooms available in the Ancienne Cour, except the 'Grande Galerie', which was reserved for temporary exhibitions.

The analogies between the 'Modern Museum' installed at the Ancienne Cour of Brussels and the Luxembourg Museum of Paris could be manifold. On the one hand regarding the official taste enhanced there: the museum never acquired any single work from the exhibitions of the Groupe des Vingt -the Belgian followers of the French Impressionists. On the other hand, public polemic abounded also here in respect of the lack of grandeur of the building. A campaign of articles in the press, especially in L'Art Moderne, praised the importance of the modern Belgian school whose museum was found too defective and mean an installation. King Léopold II, whose personal involvement in the urban reform of the capital makes his role in Brussels comparable with that of Napoleon III in Paris, favoured a change of site, and many architects proposed projects for a new building which unfortunately never materialised4 (cf. Roberts-Jones-Popelier, 1987: p. 79).

As in the Low Countries, so in Italy the successive foundation of museums of modern art is linked to the arrival of the monarchy and the subsequent creation of royal capitals. In 19th century Italy the process of unification gathered momentum when the coalition armies of the King of Sardinia Vittorio Emanuele II and the Emperor of France Napoleon III drove the Austrians from Lombardy. By 1860 most of the nation, except the Veneto and the Papal State, had been annexed to the kingdom of Sardinia, and on March 17, 1861, Vittorio Emanuele was proclaimed king of Italy. The event was celebrated in that same year with a 'National Exposition of the Kingdom of Italy' held in Florence: a great show of developed agriculture, modern industry and contemporary art (Holt, 1981: p. 2-96-326). Three years later, in 1864, Florence became the capital of the kingdom of Italy. A period of about fifty years of general welfare followed, second only to the golden years of the Renaissance. Characteristically, this modern reflowering in the city of the Uffizi,

4 The Musée d'Art Moderne was closed in 1959 and its edifice, the Ancienne Cour, demolished in 1960. Five years later, the Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts were restructured: the Musée Ancien became Musée d'Art Ancien et du XIXe siècle and a new Musée d'Art Moderne was constituted for 20th century art, provisionally installed at the ex-Hôtel de l'Europe in the place Royale until 1978 (its present underground installation was built in 1979-84).
found its cultural symbol in the opening of a Galleria dei Quadri Moderni (Gallery of Modern Pictures) in 1867.

This was a project with immediate antecedents at the time of the Lorraine: in the 1850s the Great Duke of Tuscany Leopoldo II had gathered his collections of nineteenth century art at the Palazzo della Crocetta intending to open it later as a museum of modern art. But it was Vittorio Emanuele II who accomplished that project, transferring those paintings -together with other pictures, bought by his Government and by himself- to a section of modern works opened in the art gallery of the Florentine Academy. The new section, redesigned and refurbished in 1913, had a remarkable bias towards Tuscan art (regular purchases were made at the Società Promotrice -the local art union), but this was combined with an intention of national representation (purchases by the Government at the national and various local exhibitions) (Spalletti & Morand, 1982).

This gallery became an independent institution when Vittorio Emanuele III offered both his collection of modern art of Palazzo Pitti and a site in the palace itself, so that the Gallery of Modern Pictures could develop out of the meagre Academy headquarters. Stimulated by the royal example, many other local collectors offered further donations, and even the city council intervened, offering not only its collections of 19th century art, but also to share the responsibilities of the day by day running of the future museum. Hence, in 1914 the Italian State and the City of Florence signed an agreement to create a museum of remarkable administrative autonomy, the Galleria d’Arte Moderna di Palazzo Pitti, controlled and financed half by the State and half by the City Council. After the lapse of World War I, the gallery began its life5, being opened to the public in 1922. The Royal Family patronised it with numerous other gifts (Condem Lazzeri, 1986).

In the meanwhile, Rome, which had been chosen by a plebiscite in 1871 as new capital of the kingdom of Italy, had also become the new capital of national exhibitions of contemporary art. The Italian equivalent of the 'Salons' found a definitive house at the Palazzo delle Esposizioni (built in 1880-82) on Via Nazionale and, provisionally, on the first floor of this palace was opened in 1883 a Galleria d’Arte Moderna (created by Royal Decree in 1881). Only in 1915 was the museum given its definitive house, the central pavilion of the international exhibition held in 1911 at the Roman district of Valle Giulia.

5 The museum was organised in two sections: one for 19th art, the other for works of the 20th century art. The first one has always been the most developed, either in terms of acquisitions (until World War II 55% of the acquisitions registered were of 19th century items), and of display (only the 19th century section has been arranged in permanent galleries, while 20th century works are exhibited in temporary exhibitions) (Spalletti & Sisi, 1989).
The collection here, like that in the Luxembourg Museum, basically consisted of the purchases of Italian official art made at the national exhibitions by the King and his Government. No nationalistic bias was ever declared in the purposes stated for the gallery; not even when Mussolini instigated its transformation in a Soprintendenza speciale: Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Moderna (1939, Legge 1089). However, foreign avant-garde artists, like the Impressionists for example, were totally excluded. This tendency continued in the first decades of the 20th century, when either foreign or Italian avant-gardes (Cubism, Futurism, Metaphysical painting) passed ignored. Thus, the gallery remained for years, much more than the Luxembourg, attached to the art tendencies of the Ottocento.

But in this case this was the result of a determined choice, which shows a vigorous self-determination in defining a path out of the French model. Obviously, the existence of many galleries of old masters in Rome helped a lot to set clearly the chronological boundaries post-quem for the collecting policy of this institution. This was even reinforced by a Royal Decree of 1915 whose text made clear that the gallery was not merely to be a museum of living artists, that its purpose should be: «raccogliere opere di pittura, scultura, disegno e incisione senza distinzione di genere e di maniera degli artisti fioriti dal principio del secolo XIX in avanti e quelli viventi» [to gather paintings, sculptures, drawings, and prints without distinction of genre or style made by artists active from the beginning of the 19th century onwards and by living artists] (Regio Decreto n. 392, 1915, quoted by Trombadori, 1977: p. 224). The Decree aimed to broaden the institution's collecting policy towards both the different art techniques since 1900 and the manifold tendencies of contemporary art. Yet, whilst the gallery did immediately start to systematically collect early 19th century art, it nevertheless continued to ignore most 20th century art tendencies!

In the kingdom of Spain the interplay of circumstances was just the opposite, even though the final result was similar to that which materialised in Italy. The creation of museums of modern art also came about very late, but not because of a late political disposition: the crucial barrier here was the peculiar museological context in Madrid. The first attempt to open the royal collections as a museum had been made in 1809 by the ephemeral king Joseph Bonaparte, who reigned during the

---

6 The art of the avant-gardes only entered by gifts or bequest, and the funds for purchases were always scarce. The first extraordinary spending -500 millions lire- was the acquisition in 1962 of four works signed Degas, Monet, Cezanne and Van Gogh. This was presented by the Ministry of Public Instruction as a success in the renovation of the gallery, making it more modern and international; which was answered by some critics with the remark that those acquisitions had further stressed the richness of the museum in 19th century art and its poverty in 20th century art (Trombadori, 1982/83: p. 226).
Napoleonic invasion and the restored Bourbons maintained this project opening the Museo del Prado in 1819. However, neither Fernando VII nor Isabel II declared it a national possession: the collection was the private property of the monarch and thus it had by no means assured its future existence as a museum. The central government on the other hand, did not possess notable art collections. The reevaluated Zurbarán, Murillo, el Greco, and other figures of the Spanish Golden Age could be seen at the Louvre and some museums in Britain, but in Spain most of their works were kept in monasteries and not exhibited in a national gallery of art.

This situation was transformed by the *desamortizaciones* (nationalizations of the properties of religious orders), and by the organization of national art exhibitions. Both events were decreed during the relatively long reign of Isabel II, which started in 1833 when she was still a child, and finished with the revolution of 1868. Historians often compare her with Queen Victoria, the only other woman occupying a European throne at the time, but the parallels should be directed to their French coeval, Louis-Philippe; not only because Isabel's personal attachments were more related to France (the country to which she fled when she was dethroned), but also because she shared with the Citizen King a serious need for legitimacy. They both had to confront other 'legitimate' royal candidates, who were backed by ultra-traditionalism and Catholic extremism, and they both aimed to gain the goodwill of the common people with liberal Constitutions and with the use of art as propaganda. If Louis-Philippe gathered in Versailles a *Musée Historique* of pictures representing the past and present of France, seeking national concord and personal propaganda, Isabel II committed, or bought at the national exhibitions, patriotic and adulatory 'Isabéline' history paintings which would be kept in an art gallery at the Royal Palace of Madrid or given to art museums7 (Reyero, 1991).

Like Louis-Philippe, Isabel II and her ministers were very interested in clearly differentiating between royal properties and national possessions. Obviously, the best way to clarify in everyone's mind that the Prado was not a national property would be by setting up a national museum of art. Thus a Real Orden of 31st December 1837 commanded the creation of a new museum in the nationalized convent of The Trinity in Madrid, which became the *Museo Nacional de la Trinidad* -it was inaugurated in 1838, but it opened regularly to the public in 1840 (Gaya Nuño, 1947: p. 20). Old masterpieces, taken from the expropriated monastic orders, were displayed; plus works by living artists purchased by the Government at the national exhibitions -an historic precedent of the present 'struggle on two fronts' at the Tate Gallery, London.

---

7 A modest section at the Prado was called 'Escuelas Contemporáneas de España' (cf. the presentation written by Alfonso E. Pérez Sánchez in De la Puente, 1985: p. 9).
This characteristic amalgam however, retained some general unity due to the fact that most of the works were by Spanish artists (Alcolea, 1991: p. 59-64), a feature which was most remarkable in comparison to the Prado, which was then a shrine consecrated to Italian, Flemish and French old masters, sanctioning just a few Spanish names of Kings' painters -like Velasquez and Goya.

Since 1846 this museum shared the ex-convent of the Trinity with the headquarters of the *Ministerio de Fomento* (the ministry in charge of Commerce, Public Instruction and Public Works). This caused a permanent lack of space, and apparently the exhibits most affected by the problem were those by living artists, for some well-known painters asked the Queen to create a national museum of contemporary artists. This proposal did not bear fruit, but the plea for a museum of contemporary art remained strong, aiming at a specific target: a gallery in the *Palacio de Bibliotecas y Museos*, the Spanish equivalent to the British Museum and Library. Its first stone was laid by Isabel II in 1866.

The disturbed years following the revolution of 1868 produced many changes in museums policy. First of all the nationalization of the Royal Gallery; then the closure of the young and underdeveloped National Museum in 1870, which was followed by the transfer of its collections to the Prado in 1872, in spite of the objections raised by the director, the painter Cosme Algarra (cf. Reyero, 1984). The Prado was then named *Museo Nacional de Pintura* (National Museum of Paintings) and became in theory the owner of all the national collections. In practice however, most of the paintings from 19th century artists found no space in its galleries: some were kept in the store-rooms and the rest dispersed in provincial museums or other official institutions.

In 1875 the Bourbon dynasty was once again restored and the following years of relative calm allowed the continuation of the works to erect the *Palacio de Bibliotecas y Museos*. So magnificent was its architecture, and so poor the Treasury -harmed by continuous overseas wars- that the building process took decades: it was finished as late as 1892, and the museographical arrangements inside took a further two years (Gaya Nuño, 1968, p. 361). Part of the palace became the house of the *Museo de Arte Contemporáneo* (museum of contemporary art), created by a Royal Decree of August the 4th, 1894.

---

8 Álvaro Martínez Novillo has transcribed in an unpublished dissertation, a memorial submitted to the Queen entitled *Exposición que elevan a S.M. varios artistas, para la fundación de un Museo Histórico Nacional de Autores Contemporáneos*, dated December the 15th, 1847, and signed by six painters: Vicente López, Antonio María Esquivel, Genaro Pérez Villanúa, Rafael Tejeo, Vicente Jimeno and Alejandro Ferrant (quoted in Jiménez-Blanco, 1989: p. 16-17 footnote 10).
As in many other periods in the history of Spanish museums, the organization of this gallery was made with an attentive eye on Paris; they even appointed for the occasion a consulting committee, like those so typical of the French Third Republic! However, by 1894 the Luxembourg Museum retained very few of its most peculiar characteristics: its complicated conception as musée de passage was then in crisis and in fact it was not really working any more as a museum of living artists, since plenty of works by long deceased artists were regularly displayed on its walls. These features of the Luxembourg, not its unobserved rules, were the model for the new Spanish gallery, which consequently sought a permanent collection with a fixed chronological starting point. It was thus from Paris and not directly from Germany or Italy that this pattern came to Spain.

In fact, not one of the non French 'museums of modern art' was mentioned as an example when the official name of the institution was changed into Museo de Arte Moderno by a Royal Decree of October 25th, 1895, whose leading paragraphs justified the change alluding specifically to the Luxembourg as a term of comparison9. Furthermore, the members of the consulting committee also ignored the German and Italian models when they set up the chronological limits for the gallery's collecting policy. Instead of making the start in the last decades of the 18th century, they held as the starting point of modern international art in Spain the painter José Madrazo and the sculptor Álvarez Cubero, disciples of David and Canova (on the other hand, they considered Goya the culmination of the Spanish Baroque painters, and advised his works should conclude the Prado10). As in the Luxembourg Museum, paintings and sculptures awarded with Salon prizes were to form the core of the exhibits, with a declared predilection for 'major' works -i.e. great historic subjects and narrative paintings.

---

9 'Ni sería en rigor posible establecer en Madrid un verdadero Museo de Arte Contemporáneo, como el de Luxemburgo, porque faltaría en el Museo del Prado local suficiente para ir colocando en él todas las obras procedentes del de Recoletos, a medida que fueran muriendo sus autores' (quoted from Jiménez-Blanco, 1989: p. 238). In a new Royal Decree of February 19th, 1915, creating a Board of Trustees to manage the gallery, a reference is made to the beneficial examples set by foreign museums, but this time no name of any particular museum is specifically given (for this and other new regulations cf. the documental appendix of Jiménez-Blanco, 1989).

10 In 1916 a new reglament stated that the collecting target of the gallery were works by authors posteriores al siglo XVIII. This allowed the subsequent display of some Pre-Romantic works by Goya. In 1931, on the creation of the II Republic, this museum was deprived of many of its 19th century paintings. In 1951 the Government of Franco stipulated its division into two museums: the Gallery of Nineteenth Century Art (later named -since 1962- Museo de Arte Moderno), and the Gallery of Twentieth Century Art (immediately called Museo de Arte Contemporáneo). In 1971 the Gallery of 19th century art was installed at the Casón del Buen Retiro and has lost since then its character of autonomous museum, becoming an administrative section of the Prado.
A German alternative model in controversy.

If we were to consider the museum policies of the German courts as direct satellites of France, they would have found a place in this chronicle between the first impact of the Luxembourg's expansive wave of influence on the Low Countries and its late and softened waves exerted further away in Italy and Spain. But the museological context in the Mitteleuropean area was not exactly a calm water ready to accept a steady expansion of the Parisian model advancing in concentric circles. If the French had invented the museum of modern art, the Germans replied producing two opposing museum-types: the Kunsthalle, and the National-Museum, whose spread crisscrossed the expansion of the French model in Central Europe and nearly overshadowed it in the Eastern and Northern countries.

The former is not yet the 'Heimat Museum': the museum devised to grasp the national Geist of a people. Properly speaking, the Heimat Museum and its evolution towards open-air museums of anthropology and ethology is a very 20th century phenomenon; but the Heimat Museum is nevertheless a modern derivation from the German 19th century monumental temples erected to the antiquities, arts and culture of the nation usually called 'National Museums' (the adjective national does not refer here to the possessors but to the purposes of the museum).

The origins and development of this museum-type are not to be discussed here because they trespass the natural boundaries of this essay (cf. relevant papers and pertinent bibliography in Deneke & Kahsnitz, 1977), but it is clear that the waves of its expansion in the Middle, North and East of Europe interfered with the spread of the French-born museum-type of a galleries of modern art: the only place where both models materialized without any conflict was Munich, where Ludwig I built an example of each type: the Neue Pinakothek and the National Museum.

Therefore, we have to add here another deviant variable affecting the creation and shaping of museums of modern art in Europe: the influence of the expansive wave of this German museological pattern. A high degree of nationalism had never been alien to the museums modelled after the French prototype, but when the adjective national became the moulding principle it entered in contradiction with the notion of modern art (there were no stylistically differentiated 'national' schools any more in the 19th century). The more we advance to the North or to the East of Europe, the more frantic becomes this dialectic of two ideals in conflict: the desire for a gallery of modern art competed with the exigency of a nationalistic museum. The result was sometimes an amalgam. The difference between the German area and the Northern and Eastern parts of Europe, which will be considered in the next subheading, was the active role of some German kings and kaisers in favour of the idea of a museum of modern art.
Politics and museums of modern art were, once again, hand in hand. Until 1866 the German area remained a confederation of states with little central government. Each state had its own political as well as cultural institutions. There were many political capitals and artistic centres. In terms of living artists, Düsseldorf was world-reputed for its landscape painters, whereas for the other genres the school of Munich was for decades recognized as the most important. Yet we have to stress here again that the creation of galleries of modern art was not necessarily connected with the remarkable artistic life of some capitals, but rather with political decision. Therefore, it is no coincidence that the three main museums of modern art in the German area were erected in the most politically influential 19th century capitals.

If Paris had been, thanks to Louis XVIII, the first city to have a museum of contemporary art, Munich was the first capital to erect a purpose-built edifice for a similar museum. In contrast to the militarist Prussian Court, Ludwig I of Bavaria did not root his grandeur in the politics and the arms. He viewed his own glory as a patron of the arts, in spite of the popular saying -usually attributed to Louis XIV of France- that 'a king who commissions works from an artist makes twenty enemies and one ungrateful friend'. Ludwig thought the opposite:

> My great artists are my pride and my joy. The statesman's work will have long since passed away, while the creations of great artists continue to delight and to inspire. (quotation, and translation from the original German, taken from Lenz, 1989, p. 25).

His arts policy was indeed multifaceted: it was he who erected the Munich Glyptothek for classic sculptures, and later he created the Alte Pinakothek for the paintings by old European masters; but he was also a regular patron of living artists. Ludwig began acquiring contemporary pictures in 1808, when he was 22 years old, and from then onwards, he became a patriotic crusader on behalf of German art: nationalism flourished all around Germany in those years after the Napoleonic campaigns. His taste as collector and patron was comprehensive to the point of contradiction. He could simultaneously appreciate the sentimentalism of the Nazarens, the realism of the Deutsch-Römer, or the classicism of Klenze -whose collection of more than a hundred contemporary paintings was bought by Ludwig in 1841 (Heilmann, 1977: p. 124).

Ludwig always had his public buildings decorated with expensive commissions of sculptures or frescos (Plageman, 1970). Peter von Cornelius and his team decorated the Glyptothek, the Alte Pinakothek and the Ludwigskirche; Schnorr von Carolsfeld worked in the Residenz; Heinrich Hess and the Schraudolph brothers in the Allerheiligen-Hofkirche. But at the end of the 1830s, he wanted to combine his
vocation of town-planner and of patron of living artists in a more direct way. Firstly, he promoted, in 1838, the construction of the *Kunst- und Industrie-Ausstellungsgäbude* (Halls for the Display of Arts, Crafts and Machines), for the exhibitions organized by the *Kunstakademie* (Academy of Fine Arts) and the *Kunstverein* (Art Union). Later, in 1842, he conceived a museum *für Gemälde aus diesen und aus künftigen Jahrhunderten* (for paintings of this and following centuries), the *Neue Pinakothek*, financed with his private money. He laid the foundation stone in 1846 and the museum was opened in 1853 (Plagemann, 1967, p. 127-130). Among the gallery's 300 exhibits the first paintings presented to the view of the public were the frescoes of its façade, commissioned by Ludwig from Wilhelm von Kaulbach (Plagemann, 1970: p. 24-27). When Ludwig I died, in 1868, the Neue Pinakothek had about 400 pictures, mostly purchased by the King himself with his own means. The institution later benefited from many private donations, but it remained a royal property until 1915, when it was transferred to the State.

The new museum was situated just in front of the Alte Pinakothek, where the paintings by old masters were on display. It was, however, an autonomous institution, not a *musée de passage*: its paintings were not intended to be transferred to the building in front after the death of their creators. Prince Ludwig sensed that an old artistic era had finished in the last decades of the 18th century and a different historic period had then started. It was his decision that the collections of the Neue Pinakothek would be devoted to paintings from circa 1780 onwards (Mittlenmeier, 1977; Heilmann, 1984).

As an instrument of German cultural self-affirmation against French artistic influence, Ludwig's Neue Pinakothek was not a complete success, because it never became so universally known and commented upon as the Parisian Musée du Luxembourg. However, in the history of museums of modern art it represented a new step of enormous transcendence in many ways. Not only was it the first of these institutions to have its own purpose-built edifice, but it was also, unlike the Luxembourg, the first to have a permanent collection. Furthermore, this Munich gallery marked the end of a museum-type: the 'Museum of Living Artists'. From now on the museums of contemporary art were not aiming to hold just works by contemporary artists *strictu sensu*, and even that of Paris ended up by following this trend, retaining works by artists long deceased. Thus, the Neue Pinakothek can be seen as a new prototype. In fact, most of the museums of contemporary art created

---

11 In the first catalogue, published in 1855, up to 97 German painters appear represented —often with several works— against 44 foreigners. In the second catalogue, edited in 1868, there are 113 Germans and 55 painters from various foreign schools, including Britain -David Wilkie-, but only two of them -Cogniet and Lepoittevins- from France (cf. Heilmann, 1977: p. 132).
XV - View of the *Neue Pinakothek*, Munich, circa 1865. Reproduction of an anonymous lithography kindly sent by Christoph Heilmann, (Head-curator of the Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen).

XVI - The *Nationalgalerie*, Berlin circa 1905. Coloured postcard (from Demps, 1992)
during the nineteenth century, collected art from a chronological range approximately similar to that fixed by Ludwig I for his new gallery\(^2\) (Steingraber, 1981).

A different example, almost a mixed solution to the French/German museological dialectic of modern/national art developed in Prussia - the boldest rival to Bavaria as an emergent German power in the museums' field, as well as in politics. During the second part of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth, the Hohenzollerns erected in Berlin one of the world's greatest museum centres: the *Museumsinsel* (Museums Island) on a peninsula formed by the Spree and Kupfergraben rivers. Friedrich Wilhelm III had admired the Louvre and so prompted the creation there of a similar Royal Museum for classic sculptures and paintings by old masters (built in 1824-28, opened in 1830). His successor, Friedrich Wilhelm IV, decreed in March 1841 that the whole island around should be 'a shelter for arts and science', and asked his architect Friedrich August Stüler to plan two complementary museums: one for Egyptian and European antiquities, the *Neues Museum* (built in 1843-1855, opened in 1859), and one for German contemporary art, the *Nationalgalerie* (built in 1866-76, opened in 1876) (Weber et al., 1983).

Thus, the building of the *Nationalgalerie* was erected on the initiative of Friedrich Wilhelm IV, who liked the prestige and grandeur of Greek architecture and backed Stüler's plans for a neo-Corinthian temple. The collection, on the other hand, was provided by his brother, King Wilhelm I, albeit not in a direct way, because he himself was not a great patron of artists. However, he was an active militarist who managed, thanks to his chancellor Bismarck, to become the political head of pan-germanism: he was proclaimed Kaiser of Germany in 1871. The patriotic artists and art lovers striving for the creation of a new museum of German art saw him as the emerging German leader. It was in view of this, that they donated him numerous works. Of special relevance was the case of the Swedish-Norwegian consul in Berlin J. Heinrich Wilhelm Wagener, because his bequest was going to be, with some additional works from the collections of the Kaiser, the cornerstone of the future Nationalgalerie (Waetzoldt, 1992: p. 5-6).

Wagener, a rich banker and merchant, was one of the most prominent collectors of 19th century German art. When he died in 1861 Wilhelm I inherited

\(^2\) About 1939 modern 20th century art became a central focus in the collection (cf. Lenz, 1989). As the old 19th century building did not any longer accord with the modern style, it was demolished in 1949, despite vigorous protests from Munich citizens (Gordon, 1982, p. 282). A modern designed building, considered more appropriate for 20th century art, was planned in 1966. But in 1969, when the development of the design was well-advanced, the political decision was taken to accommodate the 20th century collection on the Hofgarten site. As a consequence, when the building opened in 1981, Munich had a collection of 19th century paintings in an ultra-modern 20th century building! (Knopp, 1982).
from him a collection of 264 paintings representative of the different German art-
schools from Neo-classicism to Realism. Because of that, Wagener has sometimes
been celebrated by the present Nationalgalerie as its Stifter (founder), but the terms of
his bequest did not necessarily lead to the founding of a new museum of modern art.

In his will, dated 16 March 1859, he stated two conditions: firstly that his
collection should be kept undivided in Berlin for the illustration of artists and art
lovers, secondly that his collection should be expanded to create in the future a
National Gallery

welche die neuere Malerei auch in ihrer weiteren Entwicklung darstellt und den Zweck, der
mir bei Begründung der Sammlung vorgesehen hat, vollständig erfüllt, als dies während
der kurzen Lebensdauer eines Einzelnen möglich ist

[to show also the further development of modern painting and to realise completely the goal
which, as long as this be possible during the short time of one's individual life, has impelled
my setting up the collection] (quotation from text published by Rave, nd.: p. 13).

Today the professionals of the Nationalgalerie justify with this text both the
name of the institution and its commitment to contemporary art. But on doing that,
they interpret it in the light of the gallery's factual history, not in the context of
Wagener's hypothetical Zweck (goal). For the historian Gudrun Calov, one of the
highest authorities in this field, Wagener's project has to be viewed in relation to the
other initiatives to create museums of national character, so frequent then in the
German area and in the neighbouring countries (cf. also Bahns, 1977). Let us also
emphasise that in his conclusive essay on art collecting in 19th century Germany,
Calov discussed this case under the title «Die nationalen Bestrebungen in
Deutschland» (the national endeavours in Germany), and not in the section he
devoted to «Die Sammlungen Zeitgenössischer Malerei» (the collections of
contemporary paintings). He presented Wagener's project as a modern-biased
aftermath of, and complement to, museums like the Germanisches Nationalmuseum
of Nuremberg (planned in 1833, founded in 1852), which were focused on German

To sum up, the institution that Wagener yearned for, was a museum devoted
to the German national Geist—hence the name: Nationalgalerie. It was to some extent
marginal to his plans that in this case contemporary art was given special attention as
the strong point of the collection. But, as a matter of fact, it was the reverse that
occurred. The gallery was born as a museum of contemporary art, with a special
interest in German works. This stems from Wilhelm I and the group of contemporary
artists who lobbied his government on that matter (Hontignam-Zinserling, 1975: p.
100); thus, the consul Wagener should be recognised as the baptiser and grandfather
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of the institution, but not as its founder-father.

The collecting target decided for the Nationalgalerie was art of any country -mainly, but not only, those of the German area-, dating from the time of Goethe onwards. Indeed, it was impossible for Wilhelm I to use Wagener's bequest to create a museum solely devoted to German art. The collection inherited from Wagener had a considerable number of pictures by foreign contemporary artists, mainly from the Belgian school, and a few from French painters. If the new museum was to be a gallery of solely German art, these pictures had to be expurgated. Yet, the first condition of the will stipulated that the bequest should be kept undivided!

The history of the gallery in the subsequent years is particularly indebted to the Kronprinz, and later Kaiser, Friedrich III: the proclaimed 'protector of the museums', who assured for the museums of Berlin an active policy of acquisitions paid for either with funds voted by Parliament or with the royal fortune. However, contemporary art was not the area of collecting that benefitted most from such purchases: the lion's share was for antiquities and Renaissance art. Perhaps this was because the most active force behind the acquisitions was the general-director Wilhelm von Bode, who was not very keen on modern art (Alexander, 1983: p. 218-219; Waetzoldt, 1932). Nevertheless, in those heyday years for the museums of Berlin, many new acquisitions were made for the Nationalgalerie by its first manager: Max Jordan, director between 1876 and 1896. When the German Parliament -the Reichstag- was built in Berlin on the site of the Raczynski Palace, the important collection of 19th century German art gathered there by the ex-diplomat Athanasius von Raczynski was transferred in toto to the Nationalgalerie in 1903, where it was installed as a separate section.

Hugo von Tschudi, director between 1896 and 1909, was a committed supporter of the French Impressionists and intensified the gallery's initially timid choice to be a museum of modern art. That provoked bitter controversies in the Court, and Wilhelm II acted as arbiter in 1898: he ordered the removal of most Impressionist pictures from display. The personal way in which this autocratic Kaiser frequently controlled the policies of Berlin museums later provoked the resignation of von Tschudi. He moved to Munich and took charge of the Neue Pinakothek, transforming it into a museum of modern international art. His successor in Berlin, Ludwig Justi, director from 1909 to 1933, was also a convinced supporter of the international avant-gardes, but he centred his acquisitions on German movements, the

---

13 In 1903, with the consent of the heirs, Raczynski's gallery was taken to Poznan, to be the core of a new museum of German art: the Kaiser Friedrich Museum. The Prussians were then expelling the Polish citizens of Poznan and replacing them with German colonists. The new museum was founded to reinforce the 'German identity' of the city.
Expressionists in particular\textsuperscript{14}. He himself was dismissed by Hitler, who removed and in some cases destroyed, 'degenerate' modern art. Indeed a historic echo, in more tragic terms, of the attitude of Wilhelm II towards von Tschudi and the Impressionists!

Yet Kaiser Wilhem II, unlike Hitler, was a generous founder of art galleries, and Munich owes to him its second museum of 19th century art: the Schackgalerie. This initiative was obviously a political move, intended to gain sympathies in a capital which was a serious competitor to Berlin as a German leader. With Prussian thriftiness, he opened that museum with minimal spending. As in the founding of the Nationalgalerie of Berlin, the source of the collection was an ensemble created by a diplomat. Wilhelm II inherited from the consul Adolf Friedrich von Schack, who died in 1894, an important private collection of German 19th century paintings. Schack, a writer born in the province of Mecklenburg had been a casual purchaser of paintings in the art market and a conspicuous commissioner of works from Böcklin, Feuerbach, Lenbach, Marées, Schwind, Preller, Franz-Dreber and many other German 19th century painters (Calov, 1969: p. 163-168). Wilhelm II decided that instead of taking that collection to Prussia, it would be better left in Munich as a museum. Temporarily, Schack’s town-house on Briennerstrasse was opened without great changes, but in 1908 the collection was housed in the building of the Prussian Embassy in Munich, which has been its home ever since (Lenz, n.d.; Ruhmer et al., 1969).

The third capital in the dispute for the 19th century rebirth of the old Holy Roman Empire was Vienna, an Imperial Court whose political ambition ended up in gradual retirement and decline at the turn of the century. It was during the decadence of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, however, that its cultural life gathered momentum; and the creation of 'Imperial museums' (\textit{Kaiserlich Museen}) was one of its main accomplishments.

Concerning museums specialising in 19th century art, the first project which has been traced dates from as early as 1851, when the idea of creating a Galerie of

\textsuperscript{14} In 1919 Justi separated from the Nationalgalerie headquarters a department of 20th century art (including some 19th century artists like Van Gogh or Cézanne,) which was opened to the public in Kronprinzenspalais. This has been celebrated (HafUnann, 1967: p.61) as the first museum of 20th century art in the world. After World War II another division was practised in the museum's collection, this time not in function of chronology but according to the political situation: the Nationalgalerie of East Berlin remained in the old site, and the Nationalgalerie of West Berlin was installed in 1968 in a new building designed by Mies van der Rohe (Waetzoldt, 1980). A year after the opening of Orsay Museum, the latter detached a section from its 19th century collection to create the Galerie der Romantik in Charlottenburg Palace (Birch-Supan, 1987). In the present re-unified Berlin, the old Nationalgalerie is going to be used for 19th century art only, while the Mies van der Rohe building will house the art collections of the 20th century (Waetzoldt, 1992).
Modern Art was launched. The Empire was then practising, through the Ministry of Education created in 1848, a systematic policy of grants, purchases and commissions, to the benefit of contemporary artists. This policy was further reinforced in view of the projected gallery of modern art, but for a long time the works purchased were merely deposited at the Academy of Art, while the portraits of famous people commissioned for that museum were dispersed among several institutions\(^{15}\).

It was only on April 16th, 1901, that the Ministry of Culture finally set up a Committee for the Creation of a Gallery of Modern Art; although many Austrian artists -among them those of the Secession movement- had long before reclaimed a national gallery devoted to contemporary art. The committee withdrew the original idea of installing the gallery in the studio of the painter Makart, because there it would lack sufficient space. Instead, they pleaded with Emperor Franz Joseph for one of his palaces on the Belvedere estate on the outskirts of Vienna: the Unteres Belvedere Palace. Several historical precedents underpinned their plea, for another palace in front, the Oberes Belvedere, housed, since 1778, the Royal collection of old masters, and the Unteres Belvedere itself had previously housed the Imperial collections of antiquities. The Emperor favoured the project, endorsing the definitive transformation of the Belvedere site in a museum-complex for fine arts. Thus, the Moderne Gallerie was opened at the Upper Belvedere on the 2nd. May, 1903 (Aurenhammer, 1971; Hammel-Haider, 1992).

Later, all the paintings of the Imperial collection dating from 1780 or after, joined the institution, as well as many watercolours and drawings from the Albertina (the new museum benefited in 1916 from the arrival of thirty paintings from the Department of Modern Paintings of the Imperial Galleries). Though some French painters and sculptors were represented there, the collection was mainly composed of works by Austrian and German artists of the second half of the 19th century: Amerling, Böcklin, Feuerbach, Klimt, Klinger, Stuck, von Uhde... This nationalistic trend was reinforced by the first director of the museum, Friedrich Dörnhöffer, appointed in 1909. He was an historian, and his interest for History led him to determine a two-fold collecting policy for the gallery: on the one hand international modern art, and on the other hand Austrian art of any time from the past (again an historic precedent for the similar binary partition practised in 1915 at the Tate Gallery of London!). In 1911 he even changed the museum's name calling it 'The Austrian State Gallery': Österreichischer Staatsgalerie\(^{16}\) (Hilimbauer, 1992, p. 8-10).

\(^{15}\) All those purchases are inventoried in a 1851 document, Inventar der staatlichen Kunstkäufe, in the archives of the Österreichischen Galerie, Vienna.

\(^{16}\) In 1921 his successor, Franz Martin Haberditzl, named it simply Österreichische Galerie (Austrian Gallery). In 1923-1929 he also separated the collection into three departments: the
Nationalism and royal nonchalance in the North and East of Europe.

Unlike Italy, where the dominant patriotic feelings during the period of reunification did not interfere in the development of galleries of modern art, the 19th century political movements of independence or reunification in the East of Europe, from Norway to Greece, developed a taste for non-specialised nationalistic museums. Their ideal museological pattern were galleries testifying a nation's identity. We have seen how this ideal had jeopardised the birth and growth of the museum of modern art in Berlin. Perhaps the final changes in the collecting policy of the Viennese gallery, emphasized by a change of name, should be put down to the success of nationalistic museums in the peripheral territories of the Austro-Hungarian Empire: the Hungarian National Museum of Budapest (Korek, 1977), the Bohemian National Museum of Prague, the Rumanian National Museum of Bucharest, etc (cf. Wittlin, 1970: p.122). Similar museums proliferated in the territories controlled by the Russians, where nationalist movements stirred the creation of the National Museum of Warsaw, the Museum of Ukrainian Art in Kiev, etc (cf. Calov, 1977: p. 43) and in the Baltic nations (cf. Rasmussen, 1977).

Nationalism also encouraged new tendencies in taste; with special consequences for the development of museums in the North and East of Europe. Usually, the 'old masters' enshrined in the first museums of art were always Italians, French, Dutch, Flemish, Spaniards, Germans... It seemed as though the countries of the North and East of Europe had never produced anything worthy in art. Of course, the contemporary artists of these countries were not happy with that taste. The success of foreign old masters in Britain provoked passionate and almost xenophobic reactions in native painters, who wanted to gain a place in the art market and in art history. For them, it was more urgent to found museums of 'national art' than to separate 'old masters', and 'modern art' in different museums. These reactions were even stronger in the Slav countries, where the nationalistic movements of the 19th century brought along the rediscovery and revaluation of their national 'non Western' past. As for the Scandinavian nations, it is well known that the most typical museums developed there in this time were none other than the Museums of Northern Antiquities, Art and Ethnology: the so-called Nordiska Museet (Alexander, 1983).

In Denmark and Sweden, the monarchs led the creation of museums of this kind (Boesen, 1966: p. 10), whilst the development of museums of modern art only

Museum of Baroque Austrian Art at the Lower Belvedere, the Gallery of Modern Art at the Orangerie of the Belvedere gardens, and at the Upper Belvedere the Galerie des 19. Jahrhunderts (the Gallery of 19th century art), which opened in 1924 (Fliedel & Mutenthaler & Posch, 1992).
materialised due to private individuals seconded by supporting municipalities. In Britain, as we have seen in the previous chapter, the monarchy was inactive in respect of the creation of both a Gallery of British Art or a Museum of Modern Art: these projects, mingled together, had to be raised by private initiative. In Russia too these two projects were joined together, and private benefactors were, there as well, the first to create such museums. However, the Czar finally created in Saint Petersburg a Russkij Muzej (Russian Museum), which deserves special comment here because, as in the case of Britain, for years the exhibits consisted of art-works dating mainly from the 19th century.

During the 18th century Saint Petersburg had always been a bridgehead for the influence of Western culture in Russia, since Peter the Great installed his Court there. Catherine II had gathered rich collections of antiquities and masterpieces of painting there, in a purpose-built palace: the Hermitage. Born out of that cultural and artistic Westernization was, at the beginning of the 19th century, the first generation of Russian non-traditional artists, whose training have been made in many cases in art-academies of West-European capitals.

While the majority of the population, with the powerful Russian-Orthodox Church at its head, continued to commission traditional icons, the professional career of these modern artists was difficult. Many often emigrated back to the Western countries were they had studied, because in Russia their clients were rather scarce. Besides, that minority of the public who admired West-European culture, tended to be keener on West-European masters -the old and the modern- than on Russian Westernized artists. The Czars who led the Westernization of Russia in the 19th century were great patrons of art, but they rather favoured foreign artists: both the Gallery of War Heroes of Alexander I at the Winter Palace and the New Hermitage Museum of Nicholas I were built and decorated by Western architects and painters.

It is true that some works by modern Russian artists had entered the royal collections in 1802, and in 1824 they even constituted a small section at the last rooms of the Hermitage. However, in the mid and indeed most of the second part of the century, this section remained unchanged with barely no new entries of paintings or sculptures by Russian living artists (Novouspensky, 1974: p.3). The reaction of the Russian artists and art critics to this omission in the Royal Museum, was a general demand for the creation of a Museum of National Art. The critic Vladimir Vasilievic Stasov and the journalist Ivan Alexandrovisch Gontscharow started a campaign in the press in 1874 and this culminated in the creation of 'Museums of Russian Art' founded by private initiative (Calov, 1977: p. 45).

This situation changed radically under Alexander III, who reigned from 1881
to 1894. Unlike his predecessors on the throne, he was rather suspicious about a hurried Westernization of Russia, which might involve political risks, and he found himself a natural leader for both ultranationalists and pan-slavonists. He realised the political benefits of a wise blend of modernization and nationalism, and this combination was in fact the main character of the new gallery he created. Alexander reunited in Anitschkov Palace a mass of Russian paintings and sculptures taken from the Hermitage, from the different palaces of the Imperial family and from the collection of the Imperial Academy of Fine Arts of Saint Petersburg. This royal gallery, was the core of the Russkij Muzey Imperatora Aleksandra III, founded in 1895 by Nicholas II in Mikhailovsky Palace, which opened to the public in 1898 with great success: more than 100,000 visitors in the first year (Novouspensky, 1974: p. 4).

Like the Nationalgalerie of Berlin at that time, this new gallery of Saint Petersburg originated with a dilemma between modern and national art. At the start the collection of this supposed museum of national art was in fact dominated by academic 19th century paintings. However, in this case the political choice of a nationalistic museum prevailed in the future years. Under the reign of Nicholas II the presence of old Russian art was little by little increased. In 1902 a new section of ethnography was opened. In 1913 a section of Russian antiquities was created. Thus, the institution was transformed into an encyclopaedic museum of Russian things, very much like the Nordiska Museet. When the monarchy was abolished it was renamed, accordingly, Russkij Musej. When the monarchy was abolished it was renamed, accordingly, Russkij Musej. When the monarchy was abolished it was renamed, accordingly, Russkij Musej. When the monarchy was abolished it was renamed, accordingly, Russkij Musej.

17 After the 1917 revolution, other specialised museums for antiquities and ethnology were created from it, therefore, since the reorganisation of 1934 it became again an art gallery. Since World War II the collections of Soviet art are housed in a close building, refurbished in 1948-53, whilst the art previous to Communist times is kept in Mikhailovsky Palace. Here there is a Department of Early Russian Art, a Department of 18th Century Art, and several Departments for the next artistic periods (Karpovich, 1975: p. 79-85).
4.2 FURTHER SPREAD OF PRIVATELY ENCOURAGED GALLERIES OF MODERN MASTERS.

Museums with a fortuitous preponderance of 19th century art. The U.S.A.

Returning back to the analogy used at the beginning of this chapter we can look again to the development of the Gothic style of architecture in medieval Europe for more clues to understand the World development of museums of modern art in the nineteenth century. It is true that bishops' cathedrals were the main bridgeheads in the expansion of Gothic architecture, but not all Gothic temples were cathedrals. Other early Gothic churches of major influence were spurred by simple abbots, like Suger of Saint-Denis, and by rich lay notables who were instrumental in expanding the new style out of the cathedral-cities. The nineteenth century counterpart of these church-builders of the Medieval Age were the private museum-founders of the 'Museum Age'. It was mainly thanks to such private individuals who acted as decisive catalysts for the creation of local and national galleries that, as long as the century advanced, art museums of any kind multiplied in cities, both big and small, spreading over the Western World like a rich coat of art treasures.

This development of art museums gathered momentum from 1870 onwards, an epoch when the attention of the art public was more centred than ever in works by living artists. In conformity with this taste, many of the galleries created at the end of the century paid special attention to contemporary art. That could be rephrased in form of a general statement: the later a country would establish its network of art museums, the higher tended to be the proportion of 19th century art-works filling the newborn museums on the inauguration day. But this fact did not imply a deliberate choice of specialisation: such preponderance used to be fortuitous and temporary. The natural vocation of most pioneering art galleries was to expand their collections as soon as possible taking on art works representative from a variety of times and places.

This is a crucial point to be keep in the back of our minds. Britain was not the only place where many art galleries came into existence when a collection or/and the building were proffered by private citizens. What makes Britain a special case in this story is perhaps the fact that until well into the 20th century, her provincial network of art galleries continued focusing on contemporary or relatively recent art. This was not the general tune elsewhere; the art museums policy in most Western countries immediately strove decidedly for a complete survey of the history of art: the more
complete the better. In Europe the idea of a museum was naturally identified with a shelter for historic 'treasures'. Rare was the temple of the Muses erected in any big city whose visitors would not find themselves, like modern pilgrims, worshipping antique relics and works -often spurious- by most venerable old painters. Although contemporary art gained towards the last quarter of the century a remarkable central role in the local museums of France, the exhibits which were more often quoted and more vehemently praised either in the reports written by visitors or in the museum guides themselves used to be historic pieces (Sherman, 1989: p. 57-65).

The European nations where a comparison with the British pattern seems more grounded are the Scandinavian countries. Their alternatives to the galleries of old masters combined, as in the U.K., the praise of the old national school and the promotion of contemporary artists. Denmark is perhaps the example which most resembles Britain. First of all because the creation of its network of art museums was driven by enterprising individuals. Secondly, because like in Britain, the thirteen provincial fine-art galleries established there before the First World War, did not commonly show paintings by old masters: their initial core consisted of works by contemporary artists, mainly national and preferably local (Boesen, 1966 p. 13). However, the museum policies in the countries of the North and East of the Continent were mainly under the influence of German-born museum-types which we will study in the next sub-heading.

To find the most obvious parallels with the evolution of museums in Great Britain we have to turn towards the other side of the Atlantic: to the United States of America (in Canada the museums created by art academies and private amateurs before 1919 used to blend past and contemporary art cf. Key, 1973). The declaration of Independence was only a political split, not a cultural break: the museological context at the advent of the first galleries featuring modern art was quite the same in the U.S.A and in the U.K.

The earlier museums, like in the metropolis, were encyclopaedic and preponderantly scientific (Alexander, 1987). Another significant similarity was the fact that neither in the U.K. nor in the U.S.A. did any nationalised royal collection of old masters ever act as a first step in the creation of art museums. In fact, if Britain had been one of the last European powers to erect a parallel of the Louvre, the National Gallery of Washington was built more than a century later than its namesake of London! Despite the fact that a national gallery of art was part of the original plans for the Smithsonian Institution, opened in 1858, the only art-works on display there were some pictures decorating the hall and the staircase. Science, not art, was the collecting target of this American equivalent of the British Museum, which had been
established in 1846 with the money left by a liberal Briton, James Smithson, «for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men» (Levine, 1988: p. 156). Not until 1910 was there created within the Smithsonian a, rather modest, 'National Gallery' (European old masters and pre-Civil War American painters). Like in Britain, the birth of the first museums of fine arts was not bound up with the head of State, but driven by private individuals.

As for the degree of attention to contemporary art paid in American museums, perhaps the choice was not so decidedly biased towards national/recent art as it was in Britain, but in any case the proportion of ancient works was lower than in mainland Europe. Many major American museums have dramatically changed their collecting policies in the 20th century, when the old agreed art conventions have been sacked and a new unforeseen burden was imposed on art judgements. Even the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, where contemporary art used to play a central role did «decline not simply to buy, but, what is far more reprehensible, even to display the work of contemporary artists and artisans in any field» (from a letter written in 1902 by the museologist John Cotton Dana, quoted in Meyer, 1979: p. 38). Echoing the regulations of its European equivalents, the trustees of the National Gallery of Washington have ruled until recent years that work by living artists, or dead for less than twenty years, may not be admitted as permanent acquisitions (important gifts of Abstract and Pop paintings were accepted as 'temporary loan', intended to become 'permanent acquisition' twenty years after the artists' death). However, this reluctant attitude of museums towards works by living artists was not a common feature in 19th century America. Just the opposite!

As in Georgian Britain, the pioneering years for art museums in America were related to business-minded artists who became bazaar show-men, organizers of temporary art-exhibitions, founders of local art-academies or members of art-unions (Levine, 1988). The painter Charles Wilson Peale (1741-1827), the main instigator of the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, is held up as one of the first museum masters in the United States; he and his sons exhibited in Philadelphia and Baltimore permanent collections of natural wonders complemented by his pictures of Independence War heroes (Alexander, 1983; Ellis, 1966; Miller & Ward, 1991). Another painter and American patriot, Colonel John Trumbull (1756-1843), first president of the short-lived American Academy of Fine Arts of New York, is considered the indirect originator of two museological institutions of our days.  

18 It was renamed 'National Collection' when the new National Gallery was opened in 1941 thanks to the generosity of the collector of old masters Andrew W. Mellon. In the 1960's the 'National Collection' moved to its present site, the old Patent Office building, its strong point now is pre-Civil War American Paintings.
Firstly, his burial place: Yale University Museum of Art, opened in 1832 with historical paintings by Trumbull, after an arrangement mediated by his nephew-in-law Professor Benjamin Silliman. Secondly, the civic Athenaeum of Hartford opened in 1844, endowed by Daniel Wadsworth, also a nephew-in-law of Trumbull and collector of his works (Burt, 1977, p. 36-47). These pioneer museums cannot however be counted as art galleries specialising in contemporary art. Not even can they be considered as 100% 'true' art galleries: in these early collections of American landscapes and pictures of American heroes, pure moral/patriotic aims outweighed any aesthetic consideration.

Further private attempts to create public art galleries before the middle of the century usually only knew a short life as well. American 19th century art used to be the focus of these museums, especially in the case of the gallery created by the merchant Luman Reed in New York, which was bought at his death in 1836 by his associates and friends, for the city. It opened at the city-owned Rotunda as The New York Gallery of Fine Arts, but in 1858 the collection was handed over to the New York Historical Society - where it is still exhibited today (Lynes, 1954, p. 40-41).

Luckier however was the attempt, some years later, for a municipal museum of art in Buffalo (New York), which was called the Buffalo Academy. It survived, and it is one of the oldest municipal art galleries in America after the Hartford Athenaeum. It opened in 1864 with eleven contemporary works bought by a subscription raised among citizens of influence and taste headed by the ex-President Millard Fillmore, the local artist Thomas Le Clear and the local art-dealer Josiah Humphrey. They probably wanted that ensemble of 19th century pictures to be the embryo of a much expanded all-embracing collection, but in fact the gallery's growth in the following years was almost nil. The museum was nearly defunct by 1871 and at the end of the century it still numbered fewer than fifty objects (Burt, 1977: p. 152). However, new energy burst forth in 1905, when it was installed in a new and purpose built edifice financed by John Joseph Albright, a former director and president. The museum, which was then renamed Albright Art Gallery became a gallery of modern art, a junior brother of the Luxembourg Museum of Paris (which sent here an exhibition of some of its holdings), albeit decidedly more youthful in its taste: the Albright Art Gallery housed successful exhibitions of contemporary German art, French Impressionists, Pictorial photography, designs for the Ballet Russe, etc19 (Katz, 1965: p. 105).

19 In 1962 a new wing opened, financed by a gift of Seymour H. Knox and the museum became the Albright-Knox Art Gallery. Nowadays it features mainly 20th century art, but 19th century art is still an important part of its exhibits.
The true development of art museums in the U.S.A. started as late as 1870 (Burt, 1977: p. 75). Groups of individuals assembled in clubs or academies, backed by the municipal powers and sustained by private donors and benefactors, erected in the last quarter of the century the first art museums in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Washington, Detroit, Chicago, Saint Louis, Indianapolis, and the other main cities. As happened in the provincial art galleries of the U.K., also founded in these same years, nineteenth century art was usually the core of their initial collections, but the American public came to be far less nationalist and more Europhile than the British. In the second half of the century, the importation of works by contemporary artists from Germany, Russia, and France (specially by Bouguereau and the other best-sellers of the Parisian Salons), competed successfully in their preferences-sometimes above the patriotic fervour serving local artists.

This American Europhilia also resulted in defining -perhaps unintentionally- a certain ideal of the art museum. Although most city art galleries began without purchase funds or a determined collecting policy (they took what patrons gave them), there was a tacit social agreement about a desirable ideal. The public galleries founded in the United States in the last quarter of the 19th century mirrored the paradigm of general survey art museum dominant in mainland Europe (Zolberg, 1992: p. 115-116). So psychologically inculcated was that model of the art museum that, when no old European art-works were available, cast and copies were used instead.

This was an old recourse regularly used in galleries of pedagogic aim: rare was the academy in any country where the works by the contemporary members would not be complemented with originals or copies of famed old masterpieces! A fire in 1845 made the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Art a singular exception to this universal rule, because its amassment of cast and copies and its collection of works by old masters burned down. This event generated there an imbalance in favour of contemporary art, which afterwards was even reinforced, when Joshep Harrison and Henry Gilson left the academy their collections of 19th century paintings (cf. Goodyear, 1976).

Even the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York and the Museum of Fine Art in Boston displayed plaster casts of famed masterpieces in their beginnings (Alexander, 1979: p. 31; Levine, 1988: p. 151-154). This practise was also usual in more modest city museums up to the late 1890's. The majority of exhibits in every new-born art museum used to be contemporary works, but dutifully supplemented with the inevitable copies20 or casts of old art-works, which would as soon as possible

---

20 Perhaps the most striking example was the Western Gallery of Art in Kansas City: in its first years
be replaced by originals (Katz, 1965: p. 58, 90).

Nevertheless, the accentuated central role of individual initiative in the setting of the American network of museums did allow some prospects for specialisation. Of course, museums benefiting from various private gifts grew irremediably assorted, but those with a single founder and benefactor might result naturally in some kind of specialisation, provided that this mentor be a specialised collector. This was notably the case of the art museum at Vassar College in Poughkeepsie (New York), a female academy founded by the brewer Matthew Vassar, who provided its grandiose building with an art gallery in 1864. In many points, this initiative foreshadowed its British equivalent, the gallery of Victorian art in Holloway College. But, unlike Thomas Holloway, Vassar had no patience to build a collection by himself: he wanted to buy one already assembled. He sought advice from Samuel Morse, who led him to purchase Elias Magoon's collection of pictures by members of the Hudson River school and American 19th century landscapists. The gallery conserved this unity of character until well into the 20th century21 (Burt, 1977: p. 165).

A similar art museum with a different history is that of Smith College in Northampton (Massachusetts). This woman's school was founded in 1871 and started immediately to build up a collection of 19th century American paintings. Ten years later a local man of means named Winthrop Hillyer gave money for a museum building and for purchases. The college's director happened to be Dwight Tryon, one of the landscapists of the American Impressionist School, who left more money for a second building. American art was, not surprisingly, the speciality of the museum up to the 1920s, when French pictures by the Romantics, the Impressionists and the Paris School began to bolster Tryon's acquisitions (Burt, 1977: p.166).

The American counterpart of John Sheepshanks was the businessman William P. Wiltch. He was a patron of Pennsylvanian artists and, at the end of his life, one of the most prominent buyers in the Paris Salons. Wiltch spent a fortune in contemporary art with the idea of a new museum in mind. If the city of Philadelphia would provide a site in the middle of Fairmount Park, he would be ready to finance the building as well. There was no need of this, however, since the Commissioners of Fairmont Park offered Memorial Hall, the huge glass-domed pavilion for European

many of the pictures on display were copies of famous Italian and Dutch paintings, most of them offered by the newspapersman William Rockhill Nelson, who had bought them in a visit to Florence in the 1890's (Katz, 1965: p. 48).

21 The gallery has now Italian Primitives, Baroque masterpieces, Chinese jade, and some 20th century paintings.
modern art of the 1876 Centennial Exhibition. Wilstach died in the meanwhile, and it was his widow who finally bestowed the collection and a bequest for maintenance and future purchases. But this was as late as 1893, and the Pennsylvania School of Industrial Arts had in the meantime occupied most of Memorial Hall with a Museum of Applied Arts directly modelled on London's South Kensington. In theory, the paintings were not part of this museum, but in the early 20th century both entities were mingled to found the present Philadelphia Museum (Roberts, 1959). The collection and funds provided by the Wilstachs were the cornerstone of its section of fine arts, as Sheepshank's bequest was the origin of the fine arts collections of the present Victoria and Albert Museum of London.

Henry Tate has also an American predecessor: the founder of the Corcoran Art Gallery in Washington. William Wilson Corcoran (1798-1888) was a banker of Georgetown whose principal interest was the collecting of paintings by his American contemporaries. Like Henry Tate some years later, Corcoran was not a posthumous museum founder. He wanted to give his pictures to the nation and finished by offering a new museum building in the capital and an endowment fund as well.

The Corcoran Gallery of Art was chartered by the Congress in 1870 and opened in 1874. The Smithsonian foundation deposited there its paintings and sculptures, which reinforced the American character of the contents. In 1897 the institution was transferred to a new larger building due to the growing number of acquisitions. Most of them were pictures and sculptures by French Salon artists, although Corcoran had expressly wished that the trustees should give particular attention to American art (Constable, 1964: p. 141-142). In fact, when the Government retired its deposits in the 1890's, the Corcoran Gallery seemed more a museum of modern art than a gallery of American art. However, a junction between these two vocations was reached from 1900 onwards, when the gallery started to organize the 'Biennial Exhibitions of Contemporary American Oil Painting', and make there most of its acquisitions (Katz, 1965: p. 73).

---

22 In 1928 the Philadelphia Museum of Art opened in a new building, but neither the decorative arts nor the Wilstach Collection were moved there. In 1954 the political powers decided Memorial Hall should cease to be used as art museum, and the director of the Philadelphia Museum, Fiske Kimball, decided to dispose at auction of most of its contents, specially the 19th century American and French paintings (some of them have been reacquired afterwards).

23 This unity of character finished in 1926, when the Senator William A. Clark, from Montana, bequeathed more money and his collections which included some Daumiers, Corots, Millet, Rousseau and Degas, but also many Dutch old masters and heterogenous range of ceramics, tapestry and other decorative arts.
The reputation of the Corcoran Gallery prompted other typical collectors of the American school and the Paris Salonistes to create similar museums in their cities; but even in museums directly bound to a single 'father', subsequent gifts would divert any eventual predominance of 19th century art observed at the start. Yet, in particular cases, mainly when a museum was established as a private-trust foundation, gifts by further benefactors could be deterred. Some of these private foundations were created by eccentric collectors voluntarily isolated from their fellow citizens, and therefore their museums grew up in complete independence of the local artistic milieu and rivalling the local art gallery.

One of the most relevant examples of this was the Walker Gallery in Minneapolis (Minnesota). Thomas B. Walker, a wealthy lumber merchant, opened to the public his collection of *objets d'art* and of American and French *pompier* paintings in a gallery installed in his own house in 1879. This acted as the only art museum of Minneapolis until the local public gallery opened in 1915; but Walker was not on good terms with the rulers of this new institution and they never obtained any gift or loan from him. Instead, when he moved house a year later, he stored his collection in the Minneapolis Library, which he himself had founded. Finally, when he was eighty-seven years old, he had a new edifice built and established a private foundation which was to run his museum in the future with radical changes24 (Katz, 1965: p. 19-20).

Another example was Layton Art Gallery in Milwaukee (Wisconsin). Its founder, the businessman Frederick Layton, was the son of an English butcher and a collector of American and English-Victorian paintings. He had an art museum built in appropriate English-Victorian style, which opened to the public in 1888. Its neighbour and competitor, the public gallery of the Milwaukee Art Society, was established in 1911 and experienced a rapid growth which proved to be fatal for the future development of the Layton25 (Burt, 1977: p. 190-191).

---

24 The new gallery and the foundation started their life in 1927. In the late 1930s Walker's heirs and the successive directors of the gallery transformed it into a museum of modern 20th century art. The original collection of the founder seemed to interfere in this choice and was gradually sold -almost entirely! As for the gallery itself, in 1970-71 a new greater building was erected instead of the old one. Thus, the inheritance from Walker is basically vanished and his taste, either as a collector of paintings and as museum builder, has been violently denied by the Walker Art Centre (Burt, 1977: p.189-190).

25 The Layton collection is, since 1957, a semi-autonomous part of the Milwaukee Art Institute. The original Layton Gallery building was razed for a parking lot.
Criss-cross with rival models in continental Europe.

It was rare to find in the heart of the European continent uncontaminated parallels to the British way of creating museums for nineteenth century art. The influence of the German fascination for nationalistic galleries overran the British ambiguity in confronting the dilemma: 'national' versus 'contemporary' art. In the newest museums of the Slavonic nations nationalism was a resolute choice. Many East-European museum founders clearly specified that their ideal was a national gallery embracing arts of any time, and the fact that initially the collections consisted mainly of works from the 19th century seemed to them irrelevant. The name 'National Museum' was sometimes deliberately chosen even for municipal galleries!

One of the most clear examples was the National Museum created in 1880 in Cracow. The former Polish state was then divided into three parts controlled by Prussia, Russia and Austria; only the latter -the region of Galicia- enjoyed in the second half of the 19th century a certain amount of autonomy. Cracow, the wealthy capital of this region, was a lively centre for arts and politics where Władysław Czartoryski, a former exile, had opened in 1876 a museum containing antiquities, medieval relics and paintings by old masters (including Leonardo, Raphael and Rembrandt). In answer to that, only three years later, the painter Henryk Siemiradzki and many other nationalistic artists presented to the city a number of their works for a new gallery to be created in the Cloth Hall, a Renaissance building which had been restored in the 1870's as a monument to the past of the nation. The municipality accepted their initiative immediately, and only one day later, on the 7 October 1880, the National Museum of Cracow was born, the only great institution collecting Polish art up to World War I (Lorentz, 1974: p. 20).

The term 'national' is expressive of the ambitious political goals of this municipal gallery. When it opened to the public in 1883, its exhibits -most of them donations- were heterogeneous: mementoes from the past coexisted with works by Polish living artists, the latter expanding rapidly (Porebski, 1991: p. 5). This, and the growth of the collection in the following years, impelled the authorities of Cracow to split up the collections according to more scientific criteria: it was decided that only the national art from the nineteenth century should remain in the Cloth Hall. However, the First World War delayed these projects for a long time26 (Banach, 1977: p. 22-23, 25, 27 and 31).

26 In 1934-39 was built a new edifice in another site, which could not be used but after the end of World War II. The whole of the collection was transferred to the new building by decision of the state authorities, who took control of the institution in 1950 (Lorentz, 1956: p. 56-60, 76); but subsequently the Galerie-Sukiennice has been created to hold Polish 19th century art.
Another municipal gallery called 'National Museum' was the Tretyakov Art Gallery in Moscow. Pavel Tretyakov, the son of a rich textile businessman, was the most important patron of the Russian realist painters, the Peredvishniki (Wanderers), in the 1860s and 70s. He was only 28 when he first expressed his wish for a gallery of Russian art:

> Being a true and ardent lover of painting, I could not think of anything better than to lay the foundations of a public repository of works of art, accessible to all, benefiting many and pleasing everyone... I would like to leave behind a truly national gallery, i.e. one comprising pictures by Russian painters (quoted and translated in Iovleva, 1983: p. 7).

With this project in mind he collected systematically, turning his interest also to the Russian painters of the Romanticism and the Enlightenment. He would even buy works he did not like: «I take whatever is needed in my opinion, for a comprehensive picture of Russian painting» (quotation and translation from Volodarsky, 1977: p. 10). By 1872 he had amassed more than five hundred paintings, which packed the rooms of his extensive mansion of the wealthy Moscow district of Tomachi. He then commissioned a gallery building next to the house, which was completed in 1874. The painter Viktor Vasnetsov decorated the building with Russian themes and Tretyakov personally supervised the placement of his collection there: on the ground floor were hung canvases of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, whilst the plein-air paintings of the Wanderers were placed on the first floor (Kean, 1983: p. 67).

For Moscow citizens and foreigners, the Tretyakov Gallery became the natural complement to another pre-existing private foundation, the Rumyantsev Museum created by Nikolai P. Rumyantsev in 1861, which housed antiquities, icons, and old paintings (Calov, 1977: p. 45-46). Both were mainly museums of Russian art, but Rumyantsev had a notable collection of Italian and Dutch old masters, and the Tretyakov Gallery acted as its modern counterpart, especially when Tretyakov's

---

27 Perhaps he was inspired by similar initiatives by collectors of contemporary art who also tried to create a national gallery of Russian art, notably in the capital, St. Petersburg. From 1819 to 1839 the publisher Pavel Swyany had gathered in his house in St. Petersburg a collection of 18th and early 19th century paintings and sculptures which he called the 'Russian Museum'. Guerassime Ivanovich Khudov established a museum at the beginning of the 1850s which displayed Romantic paintings. Vasily Aleksandrovich Kokorev also constructed in 1860 a special building to house his paintings and opened a public gallery which lasted for ten years (Calov, 1966: p.130-134; Kean, 1983: p. 66).

28 The Rumyantsev Museum was closed in 1924 and its paintings transferred to the Tretyakov Gallery by the Soviet State.
brother Sergey, who died in 1892, bequeathed his collection of eighty-four 19th century paintings, many of them by Achenbach, Corot, Courbet, Menzel, Messonier, and the Barbizon school. The public was regularly admitted to the Tretyakov gallery at first by payment of an entrance fee, and from 1881 onwards without charge: 8,000 people visited the gallery in that year (Rostovtseva, 1975: non-paginated introduction).

The Czar Alexander III was eager to acquire the collection for the National Museum of Russian art of St. Petersburg, but Tretyakov offered it instead, together with the building, to the Duma -local council- of Moscow in 1892. The museum was called after him and his deceased brother: the Pavel and Sergei Tretyakov Art Gallery of Moscow City. Pavel was also made its trustee and curator for life. When he died in 1898, a committee of trustees ran the institution under the leadership of the painter Ilya Ostrovkov, a connoisseur of icon painting. It was by his initiative that in 1903 the gallery started displaying old icons, and later he was also influential in convincing the City Council to acquire works by 20th century artists for the gallery29 (Volodarsky, 1977: p. 11)

Paradoxically, it seems that the German area itself did not produce similar examples of privately-encouraged museums blending an overruling nationalistic ideal in their purposes with a marked leaning for 19th century art in their taste. The most likely justification for this refers, once again, to the preconditions settled by the museological context. If the German museum founders did not feel the necessity for new museums featuring modern art, it was perhaps because the public appetite for contemporary art was already well nourished by another museum-like institution: the Kunsthalle (palace of art). Monumental civic palaces of fine arts had been established on quite early dates in most of the bigger cities of the German area: the Kunsthalle of Basel (founded in 1839), the Kunstgebäude of Stuttgart (built in 1843), the Kunsthalle of Karlsruhe (1846), Bremen (1849), Kiel (1857), Hamburg (1869), etc... (cf. Plagemann, 1967; and Lapaire, 1980).

The originators of these institutions were the provincial Kunstvereine (Art Unions) of local artists and amateurs. They were particularly interested in promoting

29 On June 3, 1918, Lenin decreed the nationalisation of the Tretyakov Gallery, but he decided the museum should continue to bear the founder's name and be called 'Tretyakov State Art Gallery' (it was the only museum from the pre-revolutionary era which conserved a private founder's name). In Soviet times the gallery came to possess an impressive collections of Russian icons and old paintings, mainly from nationalised private collections: the Tsvetkov Gallery, the Picture Gallery of the Rumiantsov Museum, the Ostrovkov Museum of Icons and Paintings, etc. In 1932 an independent section of Soviet art -not only from Russia, but from the U.S.S.R. in general- was inaugurated. In the 1970s a new building and a separate branch of the museum were created for icons and old paintings. The original building was reserved for 19th century art and for the section of Soviet art.
local contemporary art, although this was by no means due to a declared desire of specialisation. Actually, any so-called *Kunsthalle* would house exhibits of any kind, including archaeology items, scientific and technological materials, etc. This German institution was therefore not essentially different from the British museum-type in its diversity. The point of disparity lay in the fact that the museological role was just a secondary aspect in the *Kunsthalle*, since it was mainly intended for exhibitions, not for permanent displays. They could hardly be called museums.

But in as much as they influenced 'genuine' museums of art, these institutions deserve as well the attention of the historians of museums. Sometimes their influence was so strong that the result was a blend of 'art museum' and 'Kunsthalle'. The most outstanding example is perhaps the *Palais de Beaux-Arts de la Ville de Paris*: its name 'Palais de Beaux-Arts' is nothing but a direct translation of *Kunsthalle* and in fact temporary exhibitions are a main asset in its activities - but, unlike the Grand Palais across the road, this is a genuine museum because it also has rooms reserved for its permanent collection.

The gallery was founded in 1900 by the municipal Corporation of the capital, pushed by the bequest of the painter and art-collector Auguste Dutuit made in 1888 - verified after his death in 1902. Although the Dutuit bequest had an important content of non-contemporary works, most items in the new museum consisted of late 19th century and early 20th century art. The subsequent gifts or bequests and the purchases made in the immediate years (Dutuit had bequeathed a large fortune as well, and the city council was a regular buyer in art-exhibitions) were overwhelmingly dominated by modern art: works by Delacroix, Corot, Daumier, Millet, Courbet, Henner, Moreau, Bonnard, Gauguin, Sisley, Vuillard, etc (Laffon, 1981). In its beginnings this municipal gallery at the Petit Palais, the first purpose-built museum in Paris, was regarded as a 'modern' alternative to the 'conservative' Musée des Artistes Vivants (Alexandre, 1919). Proof of this were the gifts of Ambroise Vollard, an art-dealer who specialised in modern art (works of Cézanne, Renoir, Denis, Pisarro, Maillol, etc). Like him, those who denigrated the academic taste of the Luxembourg Museum, boasted the Petit Palais.  

30 Still nowadays, more than four over five pictures of its collection are works of painters of the second half of the 19th century (cf. the 'avant-propos' to the most recent catalogue of paintings: Laffon, 1981). Only after World War II were the purchases directed to the market of old masters, because the corporation had opened in the meanwhile a municipal museum of modern art. The Petit Palais became then a universal survey art-museum, where the art of the 19th century was solely represented by some paintings by Courbet and the Impressionists. In the middle 1980's, however, the curator Théodése Burollet gave back to 19th century art a prominent place in the display-room available.
A special sub-category: the galleries d'auteur.

Some museum-founders impressed so strongly their personality upon their institutions, that the new-born museum worked, and still works in many cases, primarily as a monument to their tastes. Even if among the exhibits we find masterpieces by the greatest artists, the name which really stands out in a visit to these institutions, is the name of the collector-founder. These museums could be called galleries d'auteur, paraphrasing the expression cinema d'auteur, used by Nouvelle Vague French critics for films whose 'stars' are not the actors we see, but the mind of the director behind them.

Obviously, when the auteur was a nineteenth century collector of contemporary art, the result was a museum 'specialised' in nineteenth century works. From a sociological point of view, these museums are not essentially different from those discussed above: they are just a sub-category of the museums founded by private individuals. The difference lies not in the way they were created, but in their life afterwards. On the inauguration day, institutions like the Tate Gallery of London, the Corcoran Gallery of Washington or the Tretyakov Gallery of Moscow, were also museums d'auteur, whose building and collections referred to someone as their main originator. However, we have seen how those galleries experienced immediately a rapid growth, thanks to gifts, bequests, and new acquisitions; whereas the institutions studied in this sub-heading can be considered as a particular sub-category because they did not receive considerable additions of works.

The fact that this 'specialisation' was usually unpremeditated is another point in common with the previous examples. It was rather fortuitous if the galleries discussed in this sub-heading continued (in most cases until now) to exhibit the works gathered by a single collector with few or no additions at all. Only in exceptional cases such as the Mesdag Gallery in The Hague did the founder want specifically to keep the gallery unchanged. Other authors who bestowed purchase funds as well, would have been shocked if they knew that their museums have been maintained practically 'frozen'!

The multiplication of museums of this kind is a fascinating subject of research which can only in part be attempted here. Evidently, a complete study of this phenomenon should also include museums whose auteurs were collectors interested in works by old masters. On the other hand, this museum-type as a whole should be discussed in relation to the contemporary success of museum-monuments paying homage to a single person and of art galleries containing the works of a single artist. However, even though the examples discussed below will illustrate this pattern only
in part, they sufficiently demonstrate that their development occurred simultaneously in many places. No country or cultural area could be presented as leader or role-model. Britain just contributed with a very late, albeit highly monumental, example: the Lady Lever Art Gallery in Port Sunlight, whose construction was delayed by the First World War. Other important examples on the Continent had preceded it; especially in Northern Europe, where galleries of this kind abounded and many of then presented 19th century art as their only feature.

One of the most attractive is the Cygnaeus Gallery in Helsinki. Fredrik Cygnaeus (1807-1881), professor of history, aesthetics and modern literature in the University of Helsinki, was one of the leaders of the nationalist movement in Finland, then an autonomous grand duchy of Russia. He also was one of the most influential cultural figures of his time in Helsinki: for many years he presided the Finnish Art Association. He began collecting during his long journeys around Europe, and since the 1860s developed into a systematic supporter of Finnish artists, determined to have at least one work by every Finnish artist: he had the project of a public museum in mind already then (Lähteenmäki, 1991).

Cygnaeus pleaded strongly for the founding of an Academy of Art in Finland, and was planning to give his collection for the opening of a national gallery. But in 1872 he changed his mind and decided to found his own museum, named after him, and bequeathed his collection of about 200 paintings to the Finnish people, as the state of 'Finland' did not yet exist.

He also bequeathed the museum building: his summer villa on top of the rocks in Kaivopuisto, a park bordering the sea in a well-known holiday resort in southern Helsinki. The furniture and other belongings were sold immediately after Cygnaeus' death so as to make public circulation easier, and the Cygnaeus Gallery opened to all visitors a year afterwards, in 1882. Cygnaeus' collection reflected the aesthetic ideas typical of his nationalism. It was a quite representative review of Finnish art from the beginning of the 19th century to the 1880s, especially historical painting, landscape painting, portraits, and academic sculpture (cf. Niinivaara, 1975).

In the case of the Dutch Mesdag Museum the opening to masses of visitors took place without many alterations, because the founder had already admitted them for years. Hendrik Mesdag, the son of a banker from Groningen, was one of the leaders of the famous group of landscape painters of The Hague. He had built in 1887 a gallery for his art collection next door to his house. It was a magnificent art gallery

---

31 The collection has been enlarged by numerous gifts and it is nowadays over double the original number, but most of the works of art added later are contemporary with Cygnaeus' own lifetime.
in the style of the private art galleries built in Britain in the houses of the richer capitalists; but, unlike those private galleries, Mesdag had designed it as a museum. When Johan Gram, a local journalist of the *Haagsche Stemmen* visited this gallery of modern art he wrote:

A wide passageway joins the house to the new building, which the Mesdag have designed to be exclusively a Museum of Modern Art [my italics]. The design, determined by the founder in consultation with an architect, leaves little to be desired in terms of light and interior decoration. On the upper floor top-light pours down liberally on the works of art on the wall. On the first floor high and wide side-light matches that of the upper rooms. There are no overwhelmingly large rooms, which are so seldom conductive to tranquil viewing and enjoyment. At most the pleasant rooms contain twenty paintings, tastefully arranged by an experienced host, to ensure that every guest derives the utmost enjoyment from them [...] Above all else, it is a collection which gives an excellent impression of the art of our times (quoted -and translated from Dutch- in Leeman, 1991, p. 3).

Mesdag owned almost 300 paintings and 90 prints and drawings. It was a collection of international reputation. Its main strength was in Dutch painting of the 19th century, mainly the masters of the Hague School: Johannes Bosboom, Jozef Israelis, Jacob and Matthijs Maris, Anton Mauve, Willem Roelofs. However, it also contained an important ensemble of works by Camille Corot (twelve paintings), Charles François Daubigny (twenty paintings and five drawings) and other French contemporaries: Gustave Courbet, Eugène Delacroix, Honoré Daumier, Jean-François Millet. Curiously the English schools were not represented, in spite of the fact that Mesdag was a cousin of Laurens Alma-Tadema.

In his gallery the walls were not overfilled although most of the pictures were small, because the rooms were small as well. Mesdag was not merely a refined collector, he also showed himself a careful museum-maker. In order to assure the survival of both his collection and the gallery he had made for it, in 1903 he donated both the collection and the museum building to the State. The painter kept only his private house and atelier. A separate entrance was made to allow direct access from the street and the gallery was immediately opened as Rijksmuseum Mesdag. The Mesdag Museum was the first museum of modern art in The Netherlands and it was to remain the only one until the Kröller-Museum opened in Otterlo. Mesdag stipulated that the original character of the building and the collection should be retained: nothing could be changed. The founder himself controlled the accomplishment of this condition until he died in 1915.

32 And after him his family. In 1926 they constrained the director of the day, who had changed the hanging and exhibited works of modern 20th century artists, to return the gallery to its original state. However, another director also introduced changes in the gallery some years later: in 1958 he
Denmark, again a northerly country, has also kept two examples of museums d’auteur. One of them is Faaborg Museum, created in 1910 by Mads Rasmussen, a wealthy businessman of Faaborg, who wished to establish a major gallery of paintings by contemporary artists of the region. In 1912-15 the architect Carl Petersen built for him one of the finest examples of Nordic Classicism in a long, narrow site, part of which had to be released from Rasmussen’s adjacent canning factory. He also left money and important decisions regarding future purchases, and although the collection kept growing, the historical unity of ensemble has been preserved until now33. A huge statue of its founder still presides alone over a domed hall situated after the entrance and the cloakroom.

On the other hand, there is the Hirschsprung Collection in Copenhagen. This outstanding museum-memorial was founded by Heinrich Hirschsprung, a tobacco manufacturer who was a passionate art patron mainly interested on Danish 19th century artists. At first he supported his contemporaries, especially the younger and more controversial: the Danish Symbolists, the Funen painters, the Skagen painters Anna and Michael Ancher, some radicals as Philipsen, Zahrtmann and Hammersoei. In particular, he reunited a large collection of works by P. S. Kroeyer. Later, at the turn of the century, he began to make systematic purchases from the so-called Danish ‘golden-age’: painters from the first half of the 19th century like Eckersberg, Koebke, Bendz, Lundbye (Finsen, n.d).

Some suggested to him that he should donate his collection to the State Museum of Fine Art, whose collections of 19th century art were poor and rather academic in taste, but instead, Hirschsprung wanted a new museum. In 1902 he and his wife bequeathed the whole collection to the Danish nation and the city of Copenhagen with three conditions. Firstly, that the city should provide a site in front of the State Museum of Fine Art; secondly, that the State and city jointly should erect there a museum building for his collection; and finally, that the museum should remain as an independent institution. The last was the only condition refused; for the Government it was unacceptable that a museum erected with public funds might remain independent, and Hirschsprung conceded34. In 1907 the construction began

33 After a careful restoration work realized in 1982-83, even the original colours of the walls have been researched and recovered! (Træelsen & Andersen, 1984).

34 However, the personality of the collection has been maintained. The collection has been supplemented by new acquisitions, but always of art of the period.
under Heinrich Hirschsprung's supervision, but he died in 1908, and so he could not witness the opening three years later, in 1911 (Zibrandtsen, 1961).

One of the most attentive visitors and devoted admirers of the Hirschsprung Collection was the founder of the Rasmus Meyer Gallery in Bergen, Norway: Rasmus Wold Meyer (1858-1916), a rich businessman from a merchant family dealing with corn and milling. From 1905 to his death Meyer strived to emulate Heinrich Hirschsprung gathering in Bergen, his native town, the most considerable Norwegian collection of nineteenth and early twentieth century paintings outside the National Gallery of Oslo:

> It is my intention to try to create in the course of time a Gallery, which -like Hirschsprung's in Copenhagen, even though on a smaller scale- will show the development of Norwegian art in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (letter from Rasmus Meyer to Dr. Thommessen dated September 1905, quoted in Johannesen, 1956: p. 9)

This reference to the Hirschsprung Collection as a model is very significative. Meyer remembered Hirschsprung's house as a shrine of national Danish art and it was this the idea he favoured for his own project. In fact, his collection has a very small selection of foreign art (mostly works by Swedish and Danish artists, and a single picture by the German painter Christian Morgenstern), while he avidly assembled Norwegian furniture, silver and glass from the past periods as a complement to his collection of paintings. But for all his thinking and exchanging letters about creating a gallery, Meyer never wrote a bequest and when he died it was thanks to his inheritors, Gerda and Finn Meyer, that the City Council of Bergen received in 1916 the collection and the house, which were immediately opened to the public (Skedsmo, 1976).

It is most meaningful the fact that it was not Meyer himself but his successors who took the decision of opening the Meyer Collection as a museum. As further examples to come will prove (cf. below chapter five, section two), the prevailing examples among the museums d'auteur established after the First World War have been museums-memorials created by a collector's widow and descendants as a tribute to his souvenir. Moreover, Rasmus Meyer Art Gallery and the other museums d'auteur discussed hitherto are also foreshadowing the forthcoming 20th century

---

35 But Meyer's collection was kept in his original setting only for a short time. For the sake of safety, the city council renounced to keep it unchanged and although the collection remained 'frozen' with no acquisitions, it ceased to be a genuine gallery d'auteur in 1924, when it was reopened in a new building erected in a site beside Lille Lungegaards lake.
examples in another common feature: their being generally located in northerly Europe. However, even if this is an interesting point to take note of, it does not seem to be a question deserving much emphasis. In fact, the creation of museums of this kind was a very universal phenomenon and the special attention given here to the North-European examples derives from the fact that, coincidentally, the best samples of museums d'auteur focusing in 19th-century art seem to be some galleries located in Britain, Holland and above all in the Scandinavian countries. Had been within the limits of this study to discuss the creation of museums d'auteur independently of the chronology of their contents, Italy would likely have prevailed over any other country in number of examples. No other country could dispute to Italy the invention of this sub-category of museums or indeed another even more interesting sub-type which flourished in her very peculiar museological context.

A differentiated case: the Italian network of galleries of modern art.

The illustrious history of art-patronage and art-collecting in the Italian states brought out a rich museological tradition which culminated in the transformation of many collections and palaces of princes into public museums (Emiliani, 1978). Some of them had been open to the public since the 18th century: viz. in Florence (the Uffizi, 1771), Rome (the Museo Capitolino, 1734; the Musei Vaticani, 1771), and Naples (the Real Museo Borbonico, 1777). In the early years of the 19th century many others were opened as public museums: in Milan (Pinacoteca Brera, 1806), Turin (Galleria Sabauda, 1832), Pavia (Pinacoteca Malaspina, 1838), Venice (Galleria dell'Accademia, 1809, Pinacoteca Manfrediana, 1838), Ferrara (Pinacoteca Nazionale di Palazzo dei Diamanti, 1836), Bologna (Pinacoteca Nazionale, 1808), Parma (Galleria Nazionale, 1816), Florence (Galleria Palatina, 1823), Perugia (Galleria Nazionale dell'Umbria, 1810), etc.

This constellation of 'small Louvres' made the museological context of Italy a special case. No other geography in the Western World had inherited such a decentralised system of historic temple-like rich galleries of old masters. While the cities of Britain, France and all other countries were with enormous effort erecting encyclopaedic museums, the main cities of Italy were already leading a second museological step: to split out venerable pluridisciplinary collections into specialised museums (Meloni & Spaletti, 1981; Meloni, 1982), or to complement the already existing art museums with new galleries to held the arts not represented there, i.e. galleries for contemporary art, and museums for applied arts, (Buzzoni, 1980; Bairati & Finocchi, 1988: t. III, p. 352, 561-564).

The pre-existence in every historic city of a local temple of art devoted to the old masters helped to bring into being municipal galleries like those of Britain,
mainly focusing on nineteenth century art. This seems particularly clear in the case of the rich capitals of the triangle Milan-Turin-Genoa, but sooner or later every important Italian city opened its municipal gallery with substantial collections of modern art: works acquired in the exhibitions organized by the local Società Promotrice (Art Union), deposits of pieces purchased by the State in the National Exhibitions, and private donations (of modern works in most cases, since those by old masters were always welcomed in the local ex-dynastic gallery).

Apparently, this development of a network of art museums in Italy after the re-unification presents many parallels with the British pattern, either from the point of view of the contents favoured for them, and from a sociological point of view -they were fostered by prominent citizens and supported by the municipalities. However, in a few cases a capital innovation emerged at the turn of the century: the municipal galleria d'arte moderna (gallery of modern art). As the name itself makes clear, this was a kind of municipal museum whose purpose excluded for ever the acquisition of works of old masters. The specialisation in modern art was not haphazard, like in Britain or in the museum d'auteur.

Another peculiarity of the Italian case, was the political arrangement overlaying this double network of galleries of modern art and of old masters. Whilst the State took charge of most of the historic Gallerie d'Arte Antica all around the country, it was thanks to the backing of the local corporations that the Italian network of Gallerie d'Arte Moderna was established. In part, this was possible due to the general awakening of the historic cities during the Risorgimento, comparable only to the levels of power enjoyed by the municipalities in medieval times. The role of the municipalities in this matter is not to be underestimated since there was no political enforcement for local governments to erect museums. However, the pressure and influence exerted upon them by private amateur-patrons always played a decisive role, because in fact no municipal gallery of modern art was created by direct initiative of the local council. The role of these amateurs was not comparable to that of the rich museum-builders from the non-Latin countries, but they acted as decisive catalysts in the creation of the municipal galleries of modern art.

---

36 A comparable case can be traced in the capital of Ireland, where the Hugh Lane Municipal Gallery of Modern Art was established in 1908 as a result of Sir Hugh Lane's campaign for a Modern Art Gallery in Dublin. In 1933 the collection moved from its temporary home in Clonmel House, Harcourt Street to its present location in Charlemont House, Parnell Square North. It has been completely refurbished between 1990 and 1992.

37 In the countries where the socio-politic customs derive from the Ius Romanus the core funding spent on behalf of public welfare come from public funds.
The first municipal Galleria d'Arte Moderna was that of Turin, created in 1891 by initiative of the painter Vittorio Avondo. Since 1860-63, when the historic capital of Piémont was also the capital of the kingdom of Italy, the city had a museum of art whose collection of nineteenth century works had been continuously growing, in a great part thanks to donations by city amateurs (notably the marquis Emanuele d'Azeglio, who offered in 1877 two hundred and fifty works by his uncle Massimo). This ensemble was split from the old gallery in 1895 and installed apart, as Galleria d'Arte Moderna di Torino, in a modern building (a pavilion which had been built in occasion of the 1880 Fourth National Exhibition of Art). During its' first fifty years of life it was devoted to local or regional artists, although its' future88 commitment to international art was foreshadowed in a few acquisitions of pictures by foreign artists, including one by the Swedish Adelstein Normann (Mallé, 1968: p. 8-11).

The beginnings of the Gallery of Modern Art of Milan, opened in 1903, are very similar. It originated from the segregation of 19th century art works from the Museo Artistico Municipale. This institution, opened in 1878 by initiative of the local sculptor Marchesi, had originally been an alternative to the Pinacoteca Brera and therefore concentrated its collecting policy more on contemporary art than on old masters. Marchesi bequeathed to the city his collection of works by himself and other neoclassical artists in 1858. This was the origin of the municipal collection of art, and soon Marchesi's example was followed by many other private collectors. As a consequence of this, in 1878 opened the Museo Artistico Municipale, whose entire collections had arrived through donations (until 1903 practically no money was available for purchases). On the whole these donations were of contemporary art.

In fact, it seems that this bias of the museum towards contemporary art was well perceived at the time not only by private individuals, since the Brera Academy itself decided in 1902 to deposit there on permanent loan 110 sculptures and 93 paintings dating from the end of the 18th century onwards. Next year the city council bought sixty paintings, mostly by realist landscape painters, from the collection of E. Pagliano. All these new acquisitions added to the 19th century works already at the municipal museum generated the long reclaimed Civica Galleria d'Arte Moderna, opened in 1903, whose later enrichment continued to be, as were its origins, due to private benefactors: sometimes by gifts like those of E. Borgomanero (1907) and V. Grubicy de Dragon (1920), sometimes through bequests like those of Francesco Ponti (1895) and Amilcare Briani (1912). Installed in a lavish setting, the baroque palace of

38 Since about 1930, under the guidance of director Vittorio Viale, it developed into a gallery of national and international modern 20th century art. The building suffered from heavy bombing in 1942, and a new modern building was erected instead in 1959 (Maggio Serra, 1989).
Villa Reale, the subsequent life of the gallery after World War I has never denied its character as museum for the art of the 19th century (Cai'amel & Pirovano, 1975, p. 9-13).

Venice, lost by Austria as late as 1866, had long remained on the margin of the cultural and economic stimuli of the united Italy. In 1893, in celebration of the twenty-fifth wedding-anniversary of King Umberto I to Margherita di Savoia, the city organized an international art exhibition: the Biennale di Venezia (the first of a series of prestigious biennial exhibitions of modern art still celebrated today). Since then, every two years the cultural life in the Serenissima recovered great vitality thanks to modern art. This periodical awakening was, however, too ephemeral, and wishing to make it permanent, a local patron of contemporary painters, prince Alberto Giovannelli made a substantial gift to the city in 1897 with the result that a permanent gallery of modern art was opened. Consequently, in 1902 the Galleria Internazionale d'Arte Moderna di Venezia was inaugurated in Ca' Pesaro, the palace which already housed since 1898 a foundation for the promotion of modern art created by another art-lover, the duchess Félicita Bevilacqua La Masa. A personal friend of the duchess, Nino Barbantini was the secretary of the fondazione La Masa and became also the first director of the gallery. Under his rule, Ca' Pesaro became, between 1902 and 1915, the leading art-centre in Italy for the promotion of the French Impressionist or Post-Impressionists and of their Italian emulators, the Divisionists; while the Biennali were usually dominated by Italian Salonists, the English Pre-Raphaelite, and the Austro-German symbolists (Bairati/Finocchi, 1988: p. 544-547 and 557).

In the capital of Sicily, Palermo, a flourishing bourgeois city during the 19th century, the city council had started a collection of contemporary art, mainly Sicilian, to mark the Esposizione Nazionale di 1888 and later they maintained this acquisitions' policy during several Italian exhibitions of art. The creation of a gallery of modern art was long intended, and was in fact approved by the city council on the 28th March 1906. But it was thanks to the contribution of a local intellectual, the jurist and university lecturer Empedocle Restivo (1876-1938), that the idea finally materialized. The Galleria d'Arte Moderna was installed in several spare rooms of the Politeama

---

39 The Civiche Raccolte d'Arte of Milan are now separated into five sections: the Gabinetto dei Disegni (drawings and prints) and the Museo d'Arte Antica (old masters) are installed in the Sforza Castle, while the Galleria d'Arte Moderna (19th century art), the Padiglione d'Arte Contemporanea and the Museo d'Arte Contemporanea (20th century art) are located in the Palazzo Reale and in via Palestron.
Similar to this was the process for the creation of the Galleria d'Arte Moderna di Genova, founded in 1914. The separation of 19th and 20th century art from the rest of the municipal collections was due to the painter and art-historian Orlando Grosso (Giubilei, 1991: p. 120). The first significant entry of art works in the possessions of the city council dated back to the arrival of the collection of the Prince Oddone Savoia in 1866. He was a collector of archaeological and scientific items, coins, work of old masters... but especially a devoted patron of painters of his time, whose work he avidly gathered: artists like Angelo Beccaria, Pasquale Domenico Cambiaso, Tammar Luxoro, Alfredo d'Andrade, Ernesto Rayper, Vincenzo Cavianna, Luigi Bechi, etc (Giubilei, 1990: p. 16-24). So rich was Oddone’s collection of contemporary art that it constituted itself the whole section of modern paintings and sculptures at the Ligurian art exhibition of 1868.

When the city of Genova received Oddone’s collection, it was intended to create as soon as possible a ‘Museo Oddone’ in the city, but only in 1892, on the occasion of the fourth centenary of Colombus’ first trip to America, did the Corporation provide a museum both for its previous collections and those at one time amassed by the Prince. Thus, the Galleria Comunale opened in Palazzo Bianco, the pavilion used for the art show of 1892. The collections of modern art continued there, sharing the building with the works by old masters, even after the creation in 1914 of the Galleria d’Arte Moderna di Genova, sometimes also called Galleria d’Arte Moderna ‘Principe Oddone’ (Ghio, 1980). In the beginning this new museum of modern art occupied merely the ground-floor of Palazzo Bianco, but soon it obtained an independent site (Giubilei, 1990 & 1991).

Being 1919 the pre-established chronological limit for the chronicle of this chapter, this Italian story must to be interrupted here. It is true that in this case the end of World War I seems more than ever a very artificial limit, because Italy continued for decades moulding number of her new museums of modern art after the examples

---

40 The site has not changed and it is still a very 19th century atmosphere. Acquisitions have been very few since World War II. In 1963 the city council renamed the gallery calling it, in homage to its instigator, Galleria d'Arte Moderna Empedocle Restivo.

41 In 1920 it was installed independently, in Palazzo Rosso. Another change of site followed in 1928, when the museum was transferred to Villa Serra of Nervi Park. Curiously, however, the gallery always remained specialised in works by local artists of the second half of the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th century, probably because this was the taste favoured by the painter Orlando Rosso, who ruled it until 1949. Obviously this was not the taste of the following generations, and the gallery has been closed since 1989.
discussed above. Many *Gallerie d'Arte Moderna* created before and after 1919 looked very much alike - even in their contents, chiefly featuring 19th century works! It is interesting to evoke here this reluctance towards modern 20th century art, which will be analyzed in the next chapter, because it evidences that these post-World War I reverberations only apparently resembled the earliest *Gallerie d'Arte Moderna*. Their purpose was already different, since they no longer were created for contemporary art.
CONCLUSION:

The main conclusion to this long walk through Europe and the U.S.A. is the general confirmation of the validity of the individual answers advanced in the preceding chapters for the questions 'who' and 'why' in relation to the creation of museums of modern art before 1919. As previously, we have again emphasized here the influence of the museological inheritance as major determinant for the invention of new museum-types and we have called attention to the key-role as catalysts played by some monarchs and private sponsors. But we have also discussed here the questions 'where' and 'when', deducing some general statements which relate the above noted variables with a third determining factor: the interplay of cultural influences. Questions of international cultural relations have therefore been lumped together with political issues, with arguments of taste, and with the peculiar circumstances of each museological context in order to explain the geography and timing of the pioneering of museums specialising in modern art.

Furthermore, we also have looked for answers to the question 'how', classifying museums in different subheadings according to their identity and alleged tasks. This taxonomic exercise has confirmed that the personality of museums, like that of humans, is connected to the identity of their procreators, to the interrelations with fellow entities and to the cultural influences experienced in their formative years. Different combinations of these three circumstances produced museums with different character. There is clearly no common identity for museums of modern art. The usual tendency to define institutions with an idea of continuity in mind has also been denied here: the examples have demonstrated that the identity of museums was frequently subject to change. The degree to which museums remained more purposely committed to modern art was higher in the case of national galleries of royal foundation, in the private museums d'auteur blocked to the influence of further interventions, and in the city galleries born as complements to pre-existing art museums already featuring domestic old masters.
Chapter 5.
MODERN/POST-MODERN TRANSFORMATION OF A LEGACY: MUSEUMS FOR 19TH CENTURY ART.
This chapter can be described as a culmination of chapter 4; a culmination, not a continuation, because this is not a post-World War I chronicle of the institutions studied above (such a chronicle has been sketched in the footnotes of the previous pages). In part, this final chapter is mainly intended as a counterpart of the preliminary discussion attempted in chapter 1 — where it was pointed out, amongst other cultural innovations of the 19th century, the propensity to segregate pieces by old masters from modern art works, which were often isolated in special galleries. Conversely, this chapter works as an epilogue analysing, in the context of the new cultural trends of the 20th century, the frequent confinement of 19th and 20th century art in separate museums.

Such is at least the core-argument of the section 5.1, entitled 'The creation of museums featuring twentieth-century art', aimed to show how the museum policies of our century regarding recent-contemporary art are to a great extent the pursuit of last century strategies by other means. Yet the museums specialising in recent 20th century art are so innovative, both in their contents and in terms of operation, that it would be absurd to interpret them as mere followers of any 19th century pattern. Therefore, this analysis of the museological legacy of the last century focuses on museums specialising in 19th century art, whose resemblance to 19th century institutions give then un air de famille, as if they were their closest inheritors. Aren't they? With this question in mind, section 5.2 examines the persistence of pre-World War I patterns of museums of modern art and their transformation after World War II under the influence of the Modern Movement.

Finally, section 5.3, 'Surmounting the flaws of the past?: the post-modern panacea', considers the very recent vogue of the 1980s and 90s to honour the arts of the 19th century with special temples, to create museums for 19th century art.

SUMMARY:

This chapter can be described as a culmination of chapter 4; a culmination, not a continuation, because this is not a post-World War I chronicle of the institutions studied above (such a chronicle has been sketched in the footnotes of the previous pages). In part, this final chapter is mainly intended as a counterpart of the preliminary discussion attempted in chapter 1 — where it was pointed out, amongst other cultural innovations of the 19th century, the propensity to segregate pieces by old masters from modern art works, which were often isolated in special galleries. Conversely, this chapter works as an epilogue analysing, in the context of the new cultural trends of the 20th century, the frequent confinement of 19th and 20th century art in separate museums.

Such is at least the core-argument of the section 5.1, entitled 'The creation of museums featuring twentieth-century art', aimed to show how the museum policies of our century regarding recent-contemporary art are to a great extent the pursuit of last century strategies by other means. Yet the museums specialising in recent 20th century art are so innovative, both in their contents and in terms of operation, that it would be absurd to interpret them as mere followers of any 19th century pattern. Therefore, this analysis of the museological legacy of the last century focuses on museums specialising in 19th century art, whose resemblance to 19th century institutions give then un air de famille, as if they were their closest inheritors. Aren't they? With this question in mind, section 5.2 examines the persistence of pre-World War I patterns of museums of modern art and their transformation after World War II under the influence of the Modern Movement.

Finally, section 5.3, 'Surmounting the flaws of the past?: the post-modern panacea', considers the very recent vogue of the 1980s and 90s to honour the arts of the 19th century with special temples, to create museums for 19th century art.
5.1 THE CREATION OF MUSEUMS FEATURING TWENTIETH-CENTURY ART.

Rupture, abandonment and recycling of nineteenth century patterns.

Because 19th century culture is indeed in many ways 'modern' and speaks to us across the years in accents that we can understand and appreciate, it is sometimes hard for us to grasp how really different it was from our culture. One could easily be tempted to liken our newest galleries to those created in the 19th century. After all, have we ever devised new museum-types different of the patterns created in the last century? The national or local gallery, the industrial-arts museum, the museum of modern art, the Kunsthalle boasting art exhibitions cum lumber-roomed permanent collection, the gallery d'au
teur, the museums specially devoted to the cultural achievements of one person or one nation... everything seems to have been invented one hundred years ago!

Adding a touch of provocative wit, the comparison can even be turned to bring shame on our own self-esteem as modern people of action and technology-masters. Twenty years ago, in a blustering tirade against university deconstructionism which is worth quoting in some length, the director of the Uffizi hailed the 19th century as the age of 'museogi' aphy' (the art of setting-up museums) asking himself whether our century should be merely considered a time of 'museology' (the science studying museums).
technical - pardon technological - availability [...] should result in exhausting delays, in rather Byzantine criticism [...]. It would be disheartening if our century has passed from museography to museology (-logy, suffix in vogue), intended in a rather negative etymological sense: logos, theory, discussions, words) (Berti, 1974: p. 41).

Nevertheless, the temptation to view our arts policies as meagre followers of a Golden Age is to be avoided with as much care as the opposing extreme: the oblivion of the consequential influence which 19th century patterns still have in present-day. An appropriate way of keeping this necessary balance is perhaps to define the influence of the past as a "legacy". After all, speaking of somebody's legacy implies that the subject of the study is dead. By using this term instead of 'survival' we assume that the foundation of museums of modern art after World War I has happened in radically different circumstances, even in the cases when the new results are apparently similar to the previous patterns.

'Legacy' was in fact a favourite term in the 19th century. Our ancestors of the last century liked the idea of historical continuity. The present furore in the defence of the legacies of past times is itself an intellectual 'legacy' that we have inherited from them. But they did not make of this affection for things past a mere issue of preservation of the cultural heritage; on the contrary, it was intrinsic to every sphere of their everyday culture. For Turner it was the highest of compliments to be compared with Claude, for Manet the best tribute was being paralleled to Velasquez, and so on. Sometimes it seems as though Victorians had been essentially inheritors, imitators, revivalists. Ironically, this view is again another legacy from the 19th century: this was the way they liked to be seen themselves, not exactly the way they were. In fact, the classical quotations in their architecture masked great engineering innovations and the ubiquitous references to the old masters in the fine arts concealed a strongly original creativity.

Such historicism has been overcome by the futuristic devotion and the worship of innovations proclaimed in the early 20th century and widespread ever since through the tide of insurgences that followed: first Surrealism, Dadaism, and Futurism, later Pop Art, Minimalism, and so on. Moreover, the exaltation of novelty is an obsession by no means peculiar to art-creators; on the contrary, it is one of the most generalised features defining the Zeitgeist of the 20th century. The spirit of our time is typically afflicted with a quasi-pathological cult of modernity -which has been diagnosed with the neologism 'modernolatry' [modernolatria] (Bergman, 1962). Of course, this era of 'modernolatry' had had some precedents in the 19th century; cultural periods slide gradually from one into another, though occasionally there are upheavals like the First World War that seem to set apart a vanishing cultural era
from a new one. At the end of the Great War it seemed that the previous world was definitively over, the sense of separation from the 19th century world grew stronger... (Kavanagh, 1985: p. 122). What remained from the past was an inheritance, a 'legacy'.

With this connotation of break/persistence the term has remained a favourite for the 20th century modern and post-modern culture, which tends to mark boundaries with the past at every moment. Rupture and abandonment of the old practices are thus, paradoxically, the initial clues which explain the use the term 'legacy' in building associations between the creation of museums before and after circa 1919. This breakthrough had indeed to be emphasised and explained prior to any further comment on common affinities between some of our museums and those of the past. When the new museologists study the history of museums it is not in order to stress ideas of continuity, nor to demonstrate how the past prefigured or over-brightened the present, but with a dissecting eye:

"Focusing in when and how 'museums' in the past changed and in which way and why long-standing practices were ruptured and abandoned, may provide a context for today's apparently all too sudden cultural shifts" (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992: p. 11).

The rupture and abandonment in our century of the 19th century patterns of galleries featuring modern art can perfectly be compared in importance with the split-up of Ancien Régime collections into different kind of museums one hundred years ago. The denominations 'Museum of Living Artists', 'Museum of Contemporary Art', 'Museum of Modern Art', and 'Museum of 19th Century Art' have been alternatively employed hitherto in this essay as synonyms, opposing them to the 'Gallery of Old Masters'. In the 20th century they all became differentiated subtypes.

Framing a new concept of modernity: the M.O.M.A. and its sequels.

We have already described the crisis and abandonment of the Parisian model of Museum of Living Artists. In theory, the Musée du Luxembourg never changed its official name, but at the turn of the century it had become a survey featuring art works from the 1870s onwards. The question that this de facto turnabout was never made official by a change and clarification in the museum statements generated some protests in the press:

"Est-il un Musée des Artistes Vivants, selon le vœu de l'ordonnance de 1818? Dès lors, qu'y font Van Gogh, Puvis, Sisley, Fantin, Pissarro, Cézanne, etc... morts depuis vingt, trente, trente-cinq ans et plus [...] Est-il, au contraire un Musée d'art contemporain? [...] Si oui pourquoi le Louvre le concurrence-t-il, en réunissant les œuvres contemporaines les plus significatives?"
Is it a Museum of Living Artists, according to the purpose of the decree of 1818? Then, what are Van Gogh, Puvis, Sisley, Fantin, Pissarro, Cézanne, etc... doing there when they dead twenty, thirty, thirty-five years ago or more [...] Is it on the contrary a Museum of contemporary art? [...] If so, why then is the Louvre acting as its competitor, gathering the most significant contemporary works? (Tabarant, 1926: p. 134-135; cf. also Salmon, 1925).

In the aftermath of the First World War the art of the 19th century had ceased to be, strictu sensu, 'contemporary'. Nevertheless, the Luxembourg orangery was retaining 19th century works looking too modern for the Louvre. Thus the Luxembourg was, rather unconsciously, on the verge of turning to be a Musée d'Art Moderne: this was actually its new name when it was refounded in 1938. Its personality and purposes changed then and it was transformed into an art temple enshrining the 20th century modernists (Cassou, 1947 & 1948; Dorival, 1947).

However, the nodal point where this special kind of museum originated was not Paris, but New York, and the earliest landmarks were the Museum of Modern Art (1929), the Whitney Museum (1930) and the Guggenheim Museum (1937). These New York institutions supposed a consequential outburst in the history of museums. Although the name 'Museum of Modern Art' had precedents in the 19th century, it would be absurd to merely interpret the M.O.M.A. of New York City and its sequels as modern reverberations of 19th-century museum-types. It is true that their creation -as with any novelty in history- came in response to previous events; yet the really important issue about them that must be singled out here is not their past lineage, but their subsequent influence. These galleries acted as one new focus whereupon a new kind of museum was developed and spread elsewhere. For mid-twentieth-century museums the M.O.M.A. was the earliest and most influential point of reference, the new 'Chartres', of modern art museums (Duncan & Wallach, 1978: p. 30).

In our century the adjective 'modern' has been charged with new meanings through the replacement of the dilemma ancient vs modern, which used to operate in the 19th century art world, by the new discrimination conservative vs modern. The whole history of art has been reviewed with this new dilemma in mind in search of 'progressive styles'. This quest, which has become commonplace in art books and museums, was pioneered by the New York 'Armory Show' of 1913, usually cited as the turning point which originated the public recognition and commercial success of Picasso, Matisse, Kandinsky, Léger, Dufy and the other early 20th century leaders of the Modern Movement.

The upshot of that event was the boom of the Modern Movement all around the world in the years immediately before and after World War II. For its mentors the
most praised merit in every sphere of life—especially in the arts—is innovation; thus modernist art treatises and galleries enhance the forerunners, the great innovators of every moment. Returning to the most frequent analogy in this dissertation, which depicts the history of cultural spreads as a succession of waves, we could say that the 20th century modern avant-garde admires the most advanced part of the wave—no matter whether it is also the highest part. In breaking with the long-established Western art-tradition which had conceived the visual arts as signifying naturalistic representations, the Modern Movement has broken down a tyrannical hierarchy of the arts, so firmly maintained in the 19th century, when elevated ideas shaped in well-finished murals, canvases, marbles and bronzes—considered top quality materials—were declared superior to the low subjects and the minor arts. Thus the apostles of the modern avant-garde have invented non figurative art and used in their creations materials of any kind or new means of art expression like installations and happenings; but in so doing they have also substituted one hierarchy for another. Arguably, positioning works of art as ‘advanced’ or ‘retarded’ is after all like drawing a new line of front/back works, instead of the previous line of up/down terms.

The museological issue of this new hierarchy has been the creation of galleries specialising in advanced art, i.e. the 20th century Museums of Modern Art—‘modern’ in the double sense of recent and innovative. In many ways, their founding process recalls that of their 19th century predecessors. The story and its protagonists could be again summed up in three scenes. In a first gloomy stage we have avant-garde artists finding no way to enter the sacred spaces of the existing museums. In a second stage a few spot-lights direct everybody’s eyes towards some nodal points where enthusiastic Maecenas to new talents create for them ex-novo Museums of Modern Art. In a final third stage a multitude of characters act as catalysts in moving the heavy bureaucratic machinery of the public powers for the multiplication of similar museums everywhere.

These new Museums of Modern Art have also inherited a contradiction congenial to their 19th century ancestors: namely the controversy whether there should or should not be a frontier-date defining the starting-point of modern art. How ‘modern’ are modern pioneers when the passing of time and the string of successive art trends have made of them ‘classics’ of our time? How can a museum devoted to what is modern justify an ageing permanent collection? Can a museum be called museum rather than Kunsthalle when it regularly has in store the bulk of its collection and devotes its rooms to launch temporary shows of the penultimate art trends? (Levin, 1983). As Gertrude Stein once suggested, a museum can either be a museum or modern but not both (cf. Burt, 1977: p. 339). This museological turmoil is a modern recasting of the 19th century confrontation between the Parisian model of a
musée de passage for living artists, and Munich's eventually triumphant bid, the delimitation of a frontier-date as starting-point for the collection.

The newer 'Museums of Contemporary Art'. A virtual return to 19th-century patterns?

The M.O.M.A. of New York City, originally a simple Kunsthalle for temporary exhibitions when it was founded in 1929, was made a permanent Neue-Pinakothek in 1931 by Miss Lizzie Bliss' great bequest of pictures by Cézanne, Gauguin, Redon, Seurat and others. But for how long could these 19th century modern masters be seen in point of fact as either 'modern' or 'contemporary' in 20th century New York? The M.O.M.A. has become with the passing of years like an elderly person who tries to act and dress as in his/her twenties (Lynes, 1954: p. 265).

In this sense the M.O.M.A. and its New York sister-institutions of the 1930s have acted not only as models but also as anti-models for the penultimate temples of the Modern Movement. In a city which has come to be the capital of the art world since the triumph of the 'New York School' of Abstract Expressionists, the Pop/Op Artists, the Minimalists and so on, the persistence of the Guggenheim in boasting ageing Mitteleuropean Abstract paintings, the Whitney's fidelity to the early 20th century American heroes of the Ash Can School, and M.O.M.A.'s perennial veneration for the historic masters of the School of Paris smell too much like 'museum stuff'.

A new crisis of personality has developed in the very bosom of the model of 20th century museums of modern art. The parallel institutions erected after World War II rather see themselves as showcases for the promotion of new talents, therefore they frequently avoided the adjective 'modern', too narrowly associated with early 20th century avant-garde movements, and usually preferred the term 'contemporary art'. Notorious examples of this substitution have been the Institute of Modern Art in Boston, a quasi-official stepchild of the M.O.M.A., defiantly re-christened 'Institute of Contemporary Art' and, most notably the Los Angeles Museum of Modern Art, deemed to be the new omphalos for modern American art of the 1980s, eventually renamed Museum of Contemporary Art - and hence nicknamed M.O.C.A (Berelowitz, 1993, p. 154). Even the word museum itself is often turned down; the tendency is to use instead the term 'art centre' since these institutions usually spend most of their time and means in exhibitions, not in purchasing works for their permanent display areas - the most celebrated European instance is perhaps the Centre Georges-Pompidou, opened in Paris in 1976 (Monnier, 1991: p. 286-287).

This is a differentiation backed by growing number of aduts. Art works dating from the Post-Impressionists to the Second World War tend to be called 'modern art' and those dating from 1945 onwards are denominated 'contemporary art' (cf. for example the sales catalogues of Sotheby's and the opinions of art-historians quoted in Moulin, 1992: p. 10).
Yet, how far can the word 'contemporary' be stretched? How effective are these post-Second World War art centres as show-cases of the latest tendencies? The art of the 1950s, 60s and 70s towering in their permanent collections is already too distant from the present and their curators' revolutionary zeal in producing exhibitions is turning doctrinaire as they grow older. They are becoming arbiters of taste (Tuchman, 1977). They have promoted a generation of artists or a determined artistic movement but younger artists and other tendencies have a difficult struggle in reclaiming attention from under the feet of these 'institutionalised' contemporary artists.

The most recent answer to this cyclical question has been 'The New Museum of Contemporary Art'. Such is the name which has been given to an experimentalism-oriented institution created by Marcia Tucker in 1977 at the heart of SoHo, New York's most cosmopolitan artistic district (Storr, 1984). This new museum is doubly unconventional for the fact that its exhibitions are open to any kind of challenging works, even those produced by amateur artists or people out of the art circuits, and on the other hand for the fact that it does acquire many works from its exhibitions for its permanent collection. But in fact the museum does not have any properly speaking 'permanent' collection, because it actually is 'semipermanent':

After ten years virtually everything is reviewed and offered for sale to other public institutions or individuals. The funds raised by the sales are used to acquire new works, in order to emphasise innovation and freshness rather than what the museum considers enslavement to a permanent collection (Zolberg, 1992: p. 126).

Sociologist Vera Zolberg acclaims it as a 'radically different' concept of what a modern-art museum should be. But perhaps it is not so radically different for it seems very much like the ultimate modern recycling of the Parisian model of the musée de passage -that had apparently come to its downfall at the turn of the century under the curatorship of Léonce Bénédite 2. What really looks innovative from a

---

2 Contrary to Bénédite radical ideas of reform, it seems that Louis Hautecoeur, his successor in charge, believed that the Musée du Luxembourg should remain truthful to its original aims: to be a musée de passage at the service of living artists, for their encouragement and education. In 1931 he wrote:

Le rôle du Luxembourg devrait être de faire connaître aux amateurs étrangers les peintres, les sculpteurs, les décorateurs français contemporains. Aujourd'hui ces amateurs visitent les galeries des marchands, mais beaucoup d'entre eux se méfient. Le Luxembourg pourrait être un instrument précieux de propagande artistique. Il devrait réunir de larges collections qui seraient un réserve où puiserait le Louvre futur; il devrait être enfin un lieu d'éducation pour les artistes et les artisans, si nombreux à Paris. Remplit-il aujourd'hui ces fonctions? On n'oserait pas l'affirmer. (Archives Nationales, (C.A.R.A.N.), F/21/4905, doc 1d.)
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sociological point of view is the fact that about one-half of the museum's members in
New York's 'New Museum of Contemporary Art' are artists. Furthermore, its twenty
trustees are all well-known artists; they are invited to serve for terms of three years in
an advisory panel (Zolberg, 1992: p. 127). This is by no means common by 20th
century standards. Individual artists, academies of art and art unions had always been
instrumental in the pioneering of art museums, but artists rarely like to be involved in
bureaucratic tasks (Genet-Delacroix, 1987); therefore the post of curator of fine arts
or even the directorship of some art galleries, which had usually been conferred to
artists and amateur artists, passed little by little to art connoisseurs, art critics and art
historians (Warnke, 1979). In our century artists have been replaced by scholars and
accountant-managers in the governing bodies of most galleries -those devoted to
modern art are perhaps the last redoubts where artist still have a say (e.g. the Tate
Gallery, governed by ten trustees of whom at least four must be practising artists).
This had been the tendency until now, but maybe a new historical switch, a partial
return to past uses, will give artists a greater say in art museums since modern artists
and museums are no longer contentious enemies (Grasskamp, 1979).

At the turn of last century museums played no relevant role in the promotion
of avant-garde artists, whose only backers were some gambling art-dealers serving
eccentric collectors. Since the 1960s we are witnessing an immediate assessment of
the artistic innovations in an internationalised and glamorous market of modern art
with two intertwined tissues: the international network of commercial galleries on the
one hand, and the intricate web of public galleries on the other hand (Moulin, 1992).
Modern artists now produce for museums as much or even more than they used to in
the nineteenth century! (Haskell, 1987b). Moreover, the increasing intervention of the
public sector as active artistic agent has radically changed the market for modern art.
The definitive result is the redressing of an initial gap but also, inevitably, the
'institutionalising' of the Modern Movement: challenging artists benefit now from an
out-pouring of public funds in the form of new museums, exhibitions, art prizes,
bursaries, purchases... (Monnier, 1991). Paraphrasing a famous line by Quatremère
de Quincy3 we could say that there are no more unofficial artists since unofficial
artists have been honoured with museums (cf. Bourdieu, 1987).

Subsequently, by initiative of Hautecoeur himself, the procedures of transfer from the Luxembourg
were altered. Henceforth there was no necessary delay after the artist's death; but after her or his
birth: the new rule stated that no work could leave the museum before the eightieth anniversary of its
creator -no matter if he or she was alive or not (Hautecoeur & Lefoué, 1931: p. 14).

3 The original phrase pronounced by Antoine C. Quatremère de Quincy was: «Depuis qu'on a fait des
musées pour créer des chef-d'œuvre, il n'y a plus de chefs-d'œuvre pour remplir les musées» (quoted
in Berti, 1974: p. 41; cf. also Haskell, 1983 about the aversion of Quatremère for museums).
Most modern art museums today believe in showing all kinds of things. This cautious attitude is a backlash effect provoked by the memory of fatal errors. As the mentors of 20th century Museums of Modern Art or Contemporary-Art Centres have tended to be fanatical leaders following a vision, there has been much vanity and presumption, and eventually much erring, in their selections of pieces. It is well known the case of Hilla Rebay, the alma mater of the Salomon R. Guggenheim Museum, who hailed in a 1939 catalogue the now almost forgotten painter Rudolf Bauer -a German disciple of Kandinsky- in these vehement terms: «In this collection is represented a genius, the greatest of all painters whose every work is an accomplished masterpiece» (Burt, 1977: p.343). From the vantage point of the end of the 20th century the long history of museums as arbiters of taste appears so abundant in such errors that any bold attitude is now carefully avoided: ne privilégier aucune tendance de manière à ne pas nous tromper -not to favour any tendency in order not to make mistakes- was the catchword preached by the French magazine Art Press in a special issue on contemporary art collecting (n° 72, juillet-août 1983, p. 9).

This new relativity-inclined attitude is underpinning a great open-mindedness in matters of taste. Such refusal to make bold judgement values comes along with the spirit of our time: 'anything goes' reads the most repeated slogan of Post-Modernism. Is thus the late 20th century returning to the Solomon-like decisions implemented by the arts administration of the French Third Republic? Are we living another museological transition from 'art-encouragement' to 'art-history'? In 19th century France that transition was prompted, as we have seen in chapter 2, by the fact that the Musée du Luxembourg passed from being patronised by the kings to being fully controlled by the State. Similarly, perhaps the clue explaining this marked disposition of our newest museums to diversify their choices is to be related to the fact that, since the 1960s at least, some of the most determined promoters of museums for modern art have been the public powers: obviously, present-day ministers or city councillors -like hundred years ago the mandarins of the French Third Republic's arts administration- find hardly justifiable in political terms the promotion of any particular art tendency in detriment of others.

Nevertheless, while the position of artists vis-à-vis modern art museums and vice versa seem to be returning to the state of things of hundred years ago, irreversible changes have occurred concerning their former founders. In the 20th century the patronage of new artists is mainly in the hands of art-dealers, a professional category of amateurs who are often exerting enormous influence in the art-world but who, unlike other categories of art lovers, rarely if ever bestow their collections to create museums (Burt, 1977: p. 365). Kings and queens, the first
founders of museums of modern art in the past, are now a political species in process of extinction, whose main strategy of survival seems to depend on their ability to keep politically neutral, to go socially unnoticed. In any case, with the socio-economic upheavals of the 20th century they have lost most of their former relevance as art patrons. Madrid's brand-new Museo Nacional Centro de Arte 'Reina Sofia', inaugurated in 1992, has been pompously called after the present Queen-consort but nobody really knows why. For better or for worse those totally responsible nowadays for the cultural policies implemented by any modern democracy are the national, regional and local governments. Few heads of State dare to bypass their ministers of culture proposing some personal initiatives for the arts. The case of the Presidents of the French Fifth Republic is perhaps the most notable exception for this common rule (Boylan, 1992b). However, tempting as it might be to draw 19th/20th century correspondences between the Bourbon's restoration after the French Revolution and the Gaullist return to power after the students' revolution of May 1968, there are decisive differences between Louis XVIII's creation of the Musée du Luxembourg and Georges Pompidou's initiative for a centre of contemporary art in the Parisian district of Beaubourg. It is true that both enterprises responded to quite similar political strategies, using progressive art as a modern face-lift for an undermined conservative power; but Pompidou, unlike Louis XVIII, never proffered his own collection of contemporary art in order to materialise his 'personal' project.

Similar abdication of personalized initiative in favour of collective powers can be traced in the private sector as well. Rich tycoons are still important museum founders, but they too are nowadays, like the monarchs, a species of museum-founders in process of extinction: their formerly 'individual' drives are now becoming the initiatives of enterprises boards -looking for tax revenues or for a refined way of indirect publicity for their company.

It has long been the practice of men who have made great individual fortunes to use their private wealth to set up foundations for the support of culture, to establish libraries, and to endow universities. But now it is the corporations who are taking over the functions that once belonged to the old tycoons. It is the corporation that has become the most promising patron of the fine arts and supporter of cultural institutions. Corporations have picture collections; they buy paintings to hang in executive offices; they commission fine artists to paint their advertisements, they hold conferences about ways to raise the level of the public taste, they contribute funds to universities for pure research and even for support of the humanities (Lynes, 1954: p. 309).
The 20th century foundations of museums specialising in ever-more-modern art are thus concurrently innovative and, to some extent, parallel to their 19th century predecessors. The processes and elements determining their creation are in part similar and in part different to those studied in previous chapters.
Anti-modernism and Victorian nostalgia in the age of the avant-garde.

It is somehow embarrassing to discuss post-World War I artistic initiatives propagated in the shadow of modernism because, according to the view of art history conveyed in most treatises, museums and exhibitions, the art-tendencies which are really interesting and positively worthy of study are those which emanated from the most avant-garde ranks. Such teleologic narratives seek to enhance the modernist stardom by completely neglecting the rest, as though no artistic life had survived out of the light of avant-gardism. Yet many artists and a weighty share of the art-public did not quite forsake the past artistic tradition. The first social triumph of the Modern Movement at the Armory Show of New York in 1913 was merely a victory in a battle, not a war won altogether: the subsequent prevalence of modernism was neither all-sudden nor all-embracing. Actually, even many modernist art-amateurs and, likewise, many new museums supposedly created for modern art, have found themselves superseded by the incessant succession of innovative challenges. Museums are, like people, ageing organisms with a limited adaptability to new changes: their original ideals can be incessantly reshaped according to new historical circumstances... only to a certain limit.

The analogy is not gratuitous: old age has indeed played a significant role in this issue. Typically, many of the museum-founders which will be singled out in this section were 19th-century people. However, this nostalgia for the 19th century was not always an isolated social phenomenon peculiar just to elderly survivors of that era. The birth and growth of a gallery specialising in 19th century art also depends on the existence of widespread local affections for the art and culture of that time! Thus it was also in accordance with the local context that so many galleries were born in the immediate decades after World War I with a marked lean towards pre-modernism.

A telling example is the American myth of the conquest of the West, popularised not only in American cinema, but also in many U.S. museums created in the shake-up of a general revaluation of American art. An example is the Butler Institute of American Art in Youngstown, Ohio, which claims to be the first purpose-built museum of American art, founded in 1919 by the industrialist Joseph G. Butler Jr. According to the catholic taste of the founder, the museum offered originally a survey of mainstream American art: from the earliest Limner painters of
the colonial period, to a remarkable collection of narrative pictures featuring Western subjects and numerous marine 19th century paintings, on into works by artists of the Ash Can School. One of the most valuable historic treasures of the institution is the building itself, whose history epitomises that of the museum. It was originally a classic McMinn, Meade and White edifice which experienced new additions in the 1930s and in the 1960s recently culminated in the erection of a post-modern West wing which opened in 1987. The museum's displays, in a similar process, have added modern art-works to the initial collection in recent years. Thus, the original predominance in works by 19th-century artists like Benjamin West or Frederick Remington has been tapering off little by little.

That fate seems common to most of the other pioneering museums of early American art like the Murdock collection of American Art in Wichita, Kansas, the Thomas Gilcrease Institute of American History and Art in Tulsa, Oklahoma, the Amon Carter Museum in Forth Worth, Texas, the Santa Fe Museum of Fine Arts, New Mexico, the Museum of the Arizona State University in Tempe, Arizona, the Whitney Gallery of Western Art in Cody, Wyoming, and so on (for a more complete comment cf. Burt, 1977). Thus, while many galleries featuring 19th-century art in Europe were kept more or less as at the moment of their birth, the boom of the American economy in the aftermaths of the First and Second World Wars fuelled a frantic growth of museums' collections in all directions: modern art, old masters, arts of the American natives...

Many contemporary examples could be cited as European equivalents of this retrospective lean towards the cultural glories of a nation's recent past. One of the most obvious was the nostalgia for Romanticism. Curiously, the culture of the Romantic epoch has always been admired with a shared enthusiasm by both progressive and conservative people. It is therefore difficult to tell whether the creation of museums highlighting Romantic art was driven by sheer nostalgia of 'bygone golden times' or rather fuelled by the 'revolutionary aura' usually associated to that movement.

A blend of both influences was probably the origin of the Museo Romántico in Madrid, possibly the oldest example of a museum exclusively devoted to the arts and culture of the Romanticism. It was founded in 1921 when the Marquis Benigno de la Vega-Inclán y Flaquer (1858-1942) donated to the Spanish State eighty-six paintings and various objects and furniture so that a specific museum could be devoted to the cultural and artistic movements flourishing in Spain between 1820 and 1868. In 1924 the collection was opened to the public in its definitive installation ever since, a house also offered by the founder. Eventually, the museum was conceived of
not as a mere gallery of art, but rather as a set of period rooms supposed to convey the idea of an historical setting. The result was nearly a gallery d'auteur: the memory of the founder and his taste comes to mind in front of every exhibit, especially in some of the rooms reserved for his personal memorabilia and some pictures created by the marquis, who was a painter himself. Nevertheless, the trustees -the museum is run by the Spanish Ministry of Culture through an autonomous institution: the Patronato de las Fundaciones Vega-Inclán- do not aim to conserve his house exactly as it used to be: the collections have been extensively refurbished in 1945 and 1968 (Rodríguez de Rivas, 1955; Gomez Moreno, 1986).

Numerous other museums were also established by simply opening to the public some 19th century private galleries, and in many cases the display was kept more or less unchanged. But, unlike the foregoing example, mostly those galleries specialised in very recent art. Whereas the Marquis de la Vega-Inclán collected arts of the time of his parents, most late-19th century art collectors who became museum-founders after 1919 had been gathering works of art dating from about the turn of the century.

An attractive case, because it is a museum d'auteur still conserved intact, is the Thielska Galleriet in Stockholm, named after the local banker Ernest Thiel. He had assembled in a gallery-building, which had been erected under his control in 1905 and extended the following year, a collection highlighting Swedish art of circa 1890-1905, with some important works by Norwegian, Danish and French artists. This gallery was an annexe to his mansion, thus it was meant to remain private. However, during the nineteenth twenties, under the pressure of financial difficulties, Ernest Thiel had to sell it. Both the collection and the building became ultimately a national property. The gallery was then opened as public museum, keeping the furniture and exhibits practically unchanged (Serner, 1960, p. 25).

We have seen in chapter 4 that the Scandinavian countries had created a strong tradition of pan-Scandinavian nationalistic museums. It was in that taste that Thiel's gallery was put together. In other latitudes, on the other hand, nationalism and nostalgia came blended with a sense of better times lost. It is therefore no coincidence that some post-World War I museums featuring 19th century works are often situated in declining neighbourhoods daily surrounded by memories of a brighter recent past.

This has probably been the reason why Liverpool and its hinterland has been the most relevant focus in 20th century Britain for the opening of museums specialising in Victorian art. Not that the arts of that era have become better represented there than in the rich galleries of other provincial capitals like...
Manchester, Birmingham, Glasgow or even London, but the Merseyside urban conurbation is unique in the number of museums focusing on Victorian art. Perhaps the decay of the area in modern times has been instrumental in the retrospective attachment of the Merseyside conurbation to the culture of the Victorian era.

Nothing but a memorial, in the strict meaning of the word, was the Lady Lever Art Gallery of Port-Sunlight when it opened on the 16th December, 1922, after a delayed process of building which had lasted almost ten years. The founder, William Hesketh, the industrialist of 'Lever-soap' ennobled as Viscount Leverhulme, named the institution in memory of his wife, Elizabeth Ellen, Lady Lever, who had died on the 24th July, 1913. Indirectly, we may also add, that the institution became also a memorial to fading values: the art and taste of a disappearing age, that of Lord Leverhulme's heydays.

Another nearby example of enduring Victorian nostalgia is the Williamson Art Gallery, opened on March 4th, 1928. The Corporation of Birkenhead erected this museum thanks to the help of John Williamson, the first director of the Company 'Cunard Steamship Ltd', and his son Patrick Williamson, who had bequeathed in 1917 a sum for that purpose. But its contents are mostly due to the enthusiasm of many citizens who supported the initiative with a number of other gifts and bequests endowed in the 1920s. In fact, so copious was this flow of art-works accessioned before 1935, that these early acquisitions still constitute the major part of the art collection owned now by the gallery. Yet, it is not the art of the 1920s and '30s which takes the lion's share in that collection; its strong points are Victorian paintings of the Liverpool-Birkenhead school, together with British water-colours of the 18th and 19th century, and a large collection of pottery and glass of different periods but mainly Victorian.

This is also the case in the Sudley Gallery, the best Liverpool example of a museum-memorial recalling the art values of Victorian times. The house and pictures were bequeathed to the City of Liverpool by Miss Emma Holt in 1944. They had belonged to her father George Holt (1825-1896), a founder of the shipping line of Lamport & Holt and a pioneer of trade with Brazil. Like other merchants at that time his taste was chiefly for subject pictures by contemporary or near contemporary British artists of the academic school; but he also bought some foreign paintings. The collection was thus fairly representative of early 19th century landscape, of youthful and later works by the Pre-Raphaelites, of the academic classicist and of the late 18th century portraitists, with a background made up of genre paintings (Bennet, 1971: p. 1-7).
Completely different circumstances, and an also entirely different kind of 'nostalgia', was in the origin of the institutions founded in Italy in the 1920s and afterwards. In this country the clue explaining their retrospective pose lies perhaps in the fact that after the Great War everybody was fully conscious of the languishing of Italy as art-centre. Rome had managed to retain part of her artistic preeminence in the 19th century, but to the contemporary art-scene of the 1920s all the artistic capitals of Italy were peripheral (Bairati & Finocchi, 1988). Hence the obsessive search for continuity with the glorious artistic past, preached by the museums and the art-institutions of Italy -defiantly confronted then by Marinetti and the Futurists.

There was on the other hand, once again, the peculiarity of the museological context. Nowhere else had the separation between galleries purposely collecting either old or modern masters been so generalised; it seems therefore natural that Italy came very early to assume the alternative choice between creating 'retrospective' and 'properly-speaking-modern' museums of modern art.

Thus to a certain extent, the blossoming of more galleries of modern art, which reached a momentum in many Italian cities between the First and the Second World War, stemmed from the 19th century and resumed the pre-1919 founding of Gallerie d'Arte Moderna in the main capitals. Nothing, neither regarding their social basis nor even in questions of taste, seemed fundamentally different in the creation of museums during the years of Fascism. Yet it is precisely that so 'apparent' resemblance of most of these museums to 19th century patterns which makes them intrinsically dissimilar: whilst their 19th century predecessors used to be very updated in their contents, many of these new galleries would feature a great deal of 19th century-works and a rather poor selection of contemporary art.

Unwilling or unable to secure a minimum number of new pieces representative of the most recent art-productions, at a definite moment some museums opted out of their initial commitment to contemporary culture and their subsequent acquisitions were not directed any more towards new art. They turned into 'retrospective' collections. This metamorphosis added a new dimension to the specialising of museums in respect of modern art: choosing a starting chronological/stylistic limit was the point of controversy for the museums discussed in the foregoing section and in previous chapters. Now we will discuss institutions which would definitively not go beyond a certain point following the innovations of modern art.

The highest-ranking instance of this museological tendency came across, of course, in Rome. The city was an urban emblem for the fascist régime which boldly transformed the capital combining Mussolini's enthusiasm for modernity with his
fervour for past glories. In tune with such a conjunction of modernolatry and historicism the municipal corporation of Rome opened in 1925 a Galleria Comunale d'Arte Moderna, installed in six rooms of the Palazzo Caffarelli in the Campidoglio, which was destined to endure a quite troubled life. Its first closure arrived as soon as 1929, but after an important income of works purchased by the city at the Prima Quadriennale exhibition, it was reopened in 1931 with the name 'Galleria Mussolini'. As this meaningful change of name suggest, the museum was replacing modernity by fascism. The gallery conveyed an idea of modernity, which, needless to say, excluded the leftists avant-gardes and extolled the kind of art favoured by the party's taste: the realism of the 19th century, the northern landscapists of the Scapigliatura and the Italian Novecento. When this taste became outmoded the museum entered a mortal lethargy. For a second time the gallery was closed in 1938. It never recovered completely from that deadly stroke. Although it was refunded in 1952-53 recovering its original name, Galleria Comunale d'Arte Moderna, and installed on the third and fourth floors of the Palazzo Braschi, it has never been opened to the public in a regular way (Trombadori, 1982/83). In spite of some controversial political initiatives in the 1960s, when a left-wing City Council separated part of the collection to open a small municipal gallery of 20th-century art (ephemerally opened at the second floor of the Palazzo delle Esposizioni), the whole of this municipal collection of more than six thousand works dating chiefly from the late 19th century and the early 20th century is still inaccessible to the many visitors and inhabitants of Rome.

Other eloquent examples can be tracked in the North of the country, which was then thriving on a feverish process of industrialisation. Northern Italy experienced in the first decades of the 20th century an economic boom which resulted in a boom of art collecting comparable to that of the 1830s in the North of Britain. Many of those North-Italian collections had a common mentor, the Milanese patron and merchant of moderately modern artists Ferruccio Stefani, who was the furnisher of the main art-collectors of the area. But due to Stefani’s limited range of favourites, his influence occasioned much reiteration: every private gallery would be articulated echoing a very similar 'menu', as Maria Chiara Giubilei has put it:

Era solo una questione di quantità: gli “ingredienti”, soprattutto quelli legati alla produzione artistica moderna, erano sempre gli stessi -Boldini, De Nittis, Mancini, Michetti, Bianchi, Segantini, Fattori, Pasini, Delleani, Fontanesi, Palizzi e cost via- con qualche concessione al simbolismo, poche alla ricerca divisionista e per niente al Futurismo

[All was about just a matter of quantity: the 'ingredients', specially regarding contemporary art, used to be the same -Boldini, De Nittis, Mancini, Michetti, Bianchi, Segantini, Fattori,
Pasini, Delfauni, Fontanesi, Palizzi, etc— with some indulgences to the Symbolists, or even to
the Divisionists, but not at all in favour of the Futurism) (Giubilei, 1991, p. 134).

In a few years, many of these private collections became the basis of public
museums. For instance, in 1924 the art collector N. H. Giuseppe Ricci Oddi made an
offer to the Mayor of Piacenza very much in the line of pre-1919 museum-founders:
if the local authorities would provide the site for a museum of modern art, he would
pay for the building and donate to it his paintings of Italian masters of the 19th
century and the Novecento movement. The municipality offered the ex-convent of
San Siro; and so Mr. Ricci Oddi built the edifice. Thus Piacenza got its Galleria
d’Arte Moderna Ricci Oddi which opened in 1931. Until his death in 1937 Mr.
Ricci Oddi continuously enriched the collection with new purchases (the museum
owned about 200 items on the opening day, and more than 400 at the time its private
mentor deceased). He also provided in his will generous funds for future acquisitions,
but they soon were wracked by the subsequent monetary inflation in Italy. The
purchases became rare and the museum, originally supposed to be a gallery of
modern art, soon failed to follow the artistic developments of the 20th century. Only
the economic boom of the late 1960’s resumed the flow of new funds from the
Corporation of Piacenza and the local industrialists. But to built up a representative
collection of modern 20th century art would have been too costly; so it was rather
decided to assume the old taste of the museum. Since then the gallery, whose building
was lavishly restored in 1968, presents itself as ‘an example of the taste of a typical
collector of contemporary art in the 1890s and early 1900s’ (Aristi, non dated).

Very similar was the case of Alfredo Giannoni, a jeweller of Novara who
became one of the cultural activists of the city in the 1920s. It was the time of the
fascist exaltation of the Italian Novecento art-movement and he himself did not escape
completely that taste; but Giannoni was an old man by then, and he rather favoured as
art collector paintings by 19th century Romantics and Realists. Interestingly, he
justified this passion for such art arguing that he had in mind a museum for the city
—implying that museums were the place where old-fashioned art-collections belonged
to! In 1930 the City Council backed that project: Giannoni offered 420 art works and
the Galleria Giannoni opened at the first floor of the Palazzo del Podestà. Later, the
donor made further gifts: 304 paintings, sculptures, and drawings in 1935, and 148
more works in 1938. But after his death all purchases ceased. As a matter of fact,
after World War II the gallery, whose strong point remained always 19th century-
pictures and Italian Novecento art-works, was closed for many years. In 1986 it has
been partially reopened with a scrupulous care not to alter its historical atmosphere⁴ (Bove, 1986; Mongiat, 1990: p. 33).

Those municipal galleries of modern art born with a retrospective stand spread out of Italy as well. Perhaps the non-Italian example which got closer to the Italian model came about in Barcelona: the Museu d'Art Modern. The city had an old Museum of Art and Archaeology which was enriched in 1920 with an outstanding number of medieval fresco-paintings following a regional campaign of preventive stripping practised in many churches in the Pyrenees. In order to leave enough space for them, the whole collection of 19th and 20th century art was then transferred to the Palau des Belles Arts, one of the pavilions built for the Barcelona Universal Exhibition of 1888, by then a derelict empty structure. This was named Sectiò d'Art Modern, but it worked merely as a store-room until the trustees of the Junta de Museus de Barcelona (a body of distinguished persons administering museums financed by either the municipal and the provincial councils) invested a relevant part of their 1924 budget in a massive architectural refitting. The palace was thus opened to the public only in 1925. As for the collection, it combined the works purchased by the municipality in the art exhibitions held in the city since 1891, the selection of 19th century-art proffered by the local academy of fine arts, and other works acquired by public subscriptions or offered by private citizens - a remarkable example was the donation of 21 works by the widow of Joaquin Vayreda in 1921. Hence, as in the Italian municipal galleries, pre-World War I works flowed here in great quantity, outnumbering the entries of properly speaking 'contemporary art' (Sanz-Pastor, 1972: p. 102-103).

Four years later the Barcelona International Exhibition of 1929 provided the Junta de Museus de Barcelona with a new magnificent building crowning the hill of Montjuïc: the Palau Nacional, one of the most popular visual symbols of the city ever since. It was immediately decided to house there a unified Museum of Art and Archaeology merging in one site the pre-existing two sections of 'historic' and 'modern' art. These plans were fostered by the political autonomy gained by Catalonia during the Spanish Second Republic. Then the Palau de la Ciutadella, the historic palace housing the museum of medieval and classic arts, became in 1932 the home of the Catalan Parliament, which pressured for the complete eviction of the art collections from that house. Thus, from 1934 to the end of the Spanish Civil War, there was no museum of modern art in Barcelona, but a single general survey museum of art towering over the city from the prominence of Montjuïc. Since 1931 it

---

⁴ A programme of refurbishment is being carried forward in the 1990's, aiming to restore the gallery to its old splendour.
was called Museu d'Art de Catalunya (though it featured mainly Catalan art, that name alluded not to its contents but to its administrative status -a joint venture of the city council of Barcelona and the regional Government of Catalonia).

Ironically enough, it was under Franco's dictatorship that the idea of a special museum of modern art eventually materialised in 1940. The city council brought back its collections of 19th and early 20th century art to the Palau de la Ciutadella, opening the Museu d'Art Modern on June 5th, 1945. In spite of its name, the collections were still centred on 19th and early 20th century art -and its later development has maintained this focus. The gallery underwent repeated refurbishments and expansions... until the re-establishment in 1976 of the Catalan Parliament, which was reinstated in its historic house (Mendoza Garriga, 1987: p. 10-33). The ensuing suggestions that the gallery should be moved elsewhere resulted in the merge of the Museum of Modern Art with the other public art collections of Barcelona (Llei de Museus de Catalunya, October 17th, 1990) in a single administrative establishment jointly financed by the City Corporation and the regional government of Catalonia: the Museu Nacional d'Art de Catalunya, to be installed in Montjuic's Palau Nacional 5.

The example of Barcelona did not prompt similar initiatives in the other big cities of Spain, a country where municipal museums of any kind have been rare until recent years (the public administrations funding the Spanish network of museums were traditionally the provinces and nowadays the regions). Unusual was the case of Olot, another Catalan city, where the creation of Barcelona's Museum of Modern Art in 1940 was immediately matched by the inauguration in 1943 (two years before that of Barcelona was actually opened to the public) of their own Museo de Arte Moderno.

As on so many occasions before, here again the founding of a gallery specialising in modern art came as a second museological step once a general-survey museum had reached complete expansion. Indeed, Olot had already been, in 1893, one of the first cities in Spain to found a municipal museum. Although its heterogeneous collections assembled important specimens of natural history, archaeology, material culture, etc, the most coveted treasure of the museum was its collection of art, specially paintings and sculptures dating from the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th -a time when Olot had attained great repute as a flourishing art centre for landscape painting and for the artists of the Catalan Noucentisme movement. It was then as an homage to that era, whose memory cheered

5 Since September 1991 the site is being transformed by an ambitious project of renovation works at the end of which the collections of modern art will be transferred and installed there at the first floor, just as the culmination of the ground floor display of medieval art and works by old masters.
up local pride in Olot, that the city councillors had their museum of modern art installed in a 19th century country house (Danés i Llongarriu, 1962). There it survived until recent years: the gallery has been closed and the collections of modern art have been returned back to the old local museum, re-founded in 1982 as Museu Comarcal de la Garrotxa (community museum of art & history of the Garrotxa district) which opened in 1987 after an intensive campaign of refurbishment. Community-museums of this kind are a developing museological invention of our times whose spread, as this example illustrates, often brings to a dramatic end the 19th century evolution towards specialised museums for art, natural history, local antiquities, and so on (Pearce, 1992: p. 112; cf. also Gilman, 1978). In this particular case however, and in general whenever a museum of art is paying tribute to local schools of art, the switch over to a museum featuring the 'global archeology of a community' comes without great losses.

All in all, the museums analysed here were born with a strong bias towards the 'global archeology' of the community they were deemed to serve. Or, let us put it in plain words: they were created by staunch supporters of cultural nationalism, regionalism, or localism.

The examples cited hitherto dated from up to the 1940s. Let us finish with two more recent examples of museum of 19th century art which became so in accordance with the local spirit of their communities. The first is a regional museum from the Italian-speaking part of Switzerland: the Pinacoteca Cantonale Giovanni Züst in Rancate, Canton Ticino. Mr. Züst offered to the Swiss State in 1966 -he was then 79 years old- his collection of pictures by painters from the Canton Ticino. Apart from a couple of paintings by the Baroque artists Giovanni Seridone and Giuseppe Antonio Petrini, the bulk of the collection are 19th century paintings, and further donations have emphasized this bias: the nostalgia for the last century has been most influential in shaping the museum.

Finally, we can conclude this survey back in Italy, where we find one of the most recent examples of yet another museological success of 19th-century nostalgia over modern 20th century art. Pinerolo, a North-Italian city, in the province of Turin, has opened in the 1970s the Collezione Civica d'Arte di Palazzo Vittone. The aim of the local authorities was to create a gallery of contemporary art with the help of donations of artists or art collectors; but some of the most generous donors gave 19th century art. The first of them was a local painter and art collector, Giuseppe Gavuzzi, born in 1887 and deceased in 1975, and others of the same kind followed. Thus, when the gallery opened in 1977, its temporary exhibitions were of contemporary art, but its permanent collections were dominated by 19th century and early 20th century
pieces, mainly works of local and Italian painters collected by the local bourgeoisie during the years of the economic boom of the 1920s. Since 1986 some contemporary tendencies are well represented in the permanent collections, but still more than two thirds of the space is filled with work from the collections of Giuseppe Gavuzzi and Pietro Santini, and the gallery presents itself nowadays as mostly specialising in 19th century art (Taverna/Marchiando-Pacchiola, 1982).

In conclusion, the museums which have been discussed here can be defined as late survivals of 19th century museum-types. What differentiated them from those of the past is merely the fact that their focusing in 19th century art was already regressive when they were created -in some cases well into the middle of our century. Thus, they have demarcated a limit which did not exist before. But their specialisation in 19th century art was nevertheless haphazard, like in the case of most of the museums studied in previous chapters. In these collections the art-works dating from the period 1789-1919 can predominate overwhelmingly but were never meant to be 100% of it. They happen to be museums virtually specialising in 19th century art, but they were originally not intended exclusively for 19th-century art.

**The modern charm of the museums highlighting French Impressionists and Post-Impressionists.**

The profusion after World War II of so many surviving and/or new museums devoted to 19th-century artists in almost every big city seems something like a miracle. Nevertheless, such profusion should not always be put down either to contingent miracles or to the initiative of elderly nostalgics for a by-gone era. Many new museums specialising in 19th-century art actually appear quite attractive even for radical modernists because, in fact, their collections have been shaped by the influence of modernist taste. These are museums honouring the masters who paved the way for the Modern Movement. Usually, such are museums bursting with French works, since for most 'modern' minds speaking of 'progressive' 19th century art is especially linked to the French school. In fact, some names of artists would reappear from one gallery into another in different parts of the world. This is a characteristic differentiating these museums from the nationalistic bias of the galleries studied above in the previous subheading. It is, on the other hand, a characteristic linking them with the new galleries of modern art and with modernism in general.

Modern 20th-century art is radically cosmopolitan and so has to be any attempt to discuss it, be it with a didactic combination of art-works and labels in a museum or by means of combining text and images in a book. Nowadays any discourse on modern artists lacking of international references is likely to be despised.
and to be accused of parochialism. This cosmopolitanism of our contemporary art-scene is often producing galleries of modern art which tend to resemble each other (cf. Millet, 1988: p.13). This is a phenomenon typical of our age, where a handful of great modern masters generally extolled constitute a familiar litany of some consecrated names to be found everywhere.

Not that major galleries of old masters established in the nineteenth century were averse to that situation6. Actually, it would be easy to draw correspondences between our pantheons of old and modern masters. Picasso is the most venerated of the moderns: like Raphael in the other team, his presence seems indispensable in any important temple of modern-art and Cézanne, like Giotto for Raphael, stands as his 'primitive' predecessor (Duncan & Wallach, 1978: p. 35-36). Matisse's and Miró's colourful works are almost as ubiquitous in modern museums as those of Titian and Veronese in the galleries of old masters, and the installations of Calder are as omnipresent around the world as the large paintings of Rubens used to be in Ancien Régime royal palaces.

Certainly, nothing like that happened in the galleries of modern art created before the First World War -neither, as we have just seen, in many of those opened afterwards; they were all rather focused in their respective national school, and this is true even for the Musée du Luxembourg, which was probably the most open of all to works by foreign artists 7 -in part, due to the fact that many of them frequented Paris or spent part of their lives there. It is therefore no wonder if those 19th century galleries soon seemed outmoded in the eyes of 20th century museum-goers. Not only were those museums too conservative in their taste for advanced 20th century standards, but also disheartening nationalistic in their selections.

This new way of valuing art appreciating its degree of innovation could not but retroactively transform those institutions. They have been faced to the alternative of a complete change or a complete disdain. Those 'antiquated' museums have frequently experienced in recent decades U-turns in their collecting policies, crises of personality, or closures (cf. footnotes to the previous chapters). Many of our 20th

---

6 Quatremère de Quincy accused the museums of spreading the 'idolism of the masters', notably Raphael: «Toutes les collections veulent avoir de lui un morceau vrai ou faux, à peu près comme jadis toutes les églises voulaient avoir un morceau de la vraie croix» (quoted in Poulot, 1986a: p. 1077, footnote 195).

7 When the Marquis Philippe de Chennevières created the first room for foreigners the museum counted hardly fifteen foreign paintings. From 1890 to 1928 foreign paintings were 420 of the new acquisitions arrived, and there were many drawings and medals as well (Janneau, G., 1922, p. 342). In 1922 a section of the Musée du Luxembourg was opened at the Jeu de Paume of the Tuileries park, as 'Museum of the Foreign Modern Schools' (with a small room upstairs for the most recent acquisitions of the French school).
century galleries of modern art were born from dying 19th century galleries of contemporary art: they were laid upon a cadaver.

Frequently the change has simply taken place through a drastic modern-biased re-hanging (Hautecoeur, 1931; von Holst, 1967: p. 286) which has condemned the Salonists to the store rooms keeping on display only a few forerunners of the Modern Movement, to be served as tasty hors d'oeuvres before the main course: the newest avant-garde productions. Conspicuous instances of this are most of the municipal Gallerie d'Arte Moderna of Italy, notably those of Turin, Venice and Verona. But some venerable national museums of modern art have been purged free of any annoying 19th century ballast so as to found true museums of 'modern' art, a most manifest example thereof being the creation of the Museum of Modern Art in Paris in 1947. Other capitals like Madrid (1951), St. Petersburg (1953), or Munich (1966) followed suit splitting out national galleries of modern art founded in the last century into specialised museums: one for 'modern' international 20th century art, the other for the rest. This will soon happen in London (Serota, 1992: p. 393) and Berlin as well (Sperlich, 1992: p. 140). Thus, as a roundabout effect of the ascendancy eventually enjoyed by the Modern Movement the result is that 19th century art, which had been banished hundred years ago out of the inner sanctums consecrated to old masters, is now also being torn out from the temples erected for the modern masters.

However, the champions of the modern avant-garde never saw themselves as a total break with the art of the past. Significantly, the exhibits of the Armory Show were preceded by a sixteenth-century drawing of geometrical human figures to show the respectable origins of Cubism, by a collection of old-progressive pictures by Ingres, Delacroix, Daumier, Corot, Puvis de Chavannes, Renoir and Monet, and then by separate rooms specially devoted to the most 'modernist' 19th century masters: Cézanne, Van Gogh, Odilon Redon and Gauguin (Lynes, 1949: p. 204). Thus, a respectful treatment was accorded to certain 19th century-art. The most praised 'pre-modern' artistic movements in the view of modernism are Impressionism and Post-Impressionism: the late-19th/early-20th century thresholds leading to modern avant-gardism. Actually, many amateurs or business-corporations who want to give an image of being modern but feel intimately uneasy in front of art-installations of mixed media or experimental non-melodic music, have developed a special taste for the discreet charm of Impressionism and Post-Impressionism. For a part of the art public, the more challenging have contemporary artists become, the more old modern-masters like Van Gogh, Cézanne, Monet, or Renoir have turned into popular cult-figures.
The supreme museological banner of that modern cult was the Musée de l'Impressionnisme opened in 1947 at the Jeu de Paume in Paris, which was closed sometime before the inauguration of the Musée d'Orsay in 1986.

Officially sanctioned art, long displayed in the Musée du Luxembourg, was falling into increasing disfavour between the two World Wars, but it was only in 1947 that the French State was willing to endorse the 'modernist' view of late nineteenth-century art unequivocally, by the conversion of the Jeu de Paume into a museum of Impressionism, and by presenting this as the true mainstream of French art of the period (House, 1987: p. 69).

Basically, its exhibits were an expurgated redisplay of the Caillebotte bequest and other Impressionist works inherited from the perished Musée du Luxembourg. This rather small gallery was managed as a section of the Louvre, exclusively devoted to late 19th century painters who were 'modern' avant la lettre. Notwithstanding its lack of grandeur that had seemed so inexcusable at the Luxembourg Museum, this setting seemed very charming to most critics (Cooper, 1947; Drucker, 1947; Bazin, 1948; Perruchot, 1958) and acted indeed as one of the towering sacred places of pilgrimage for modern museum-goers in Paris. A visit to its collection of Impressionists, possibly supplemented by calling to see the nymphéas by Monet at the closeby Orangerie des Tuileries and to the Musée Marmottan or the Monet House & Studio in Giverny, was an absolute imperative for crowds heading from the Louvre to the museums of modern art installed at the Palais de Tokyo. Long queues and overcrowded rooms were a permanent problem at the Jeu de Paume.

However, the existence of other new galleries elsewhere devoted to 19th-century art would pass nonchalantly unnoticed by the general public. The modern fortune of the Impressionists and Post-Impressionists eclipsed completely other local 19th century artists and their respective museums: discreet numbers of modern devotees would venture to visit in Paris the Musée-Atelier Delacroix, but not the houses and studios of Gustave Moreau, Jean-Jacques Henner, Ernest Hébert, or Renan Scheffer, all transformed into museums in the decades of the triumph of radical avant-gardism. As for other museological capitals, a few exceptionally popular examples of new galleries of 19th century artists could of course be cited, like the Van Gogh Museum in Amsterdam and the Munch Museum in Oslo. But we shall leave apart these cases, since their foundation is not to be chronicled in this essay. It is rather through modest examples of museums d'auteur, often marginal to the great

---

8 Before this gallery was established at the Jeu de Paume, a section of the Luxembourg Museum exclusively devoted to the nymphéas of Claude Monet and the Caillebotte bequest had already been opened in 1926 just in front, at the orangery of the Tuileries park, with the name 'Museum of the Impressionists'.
flows of visitors, where we should discuss the influence of modernist taste in the new creation of museums of 19th century art.

There is one of them for example on the outskirts of Stockholm specialising in works by progressive 19th century artists, which somehow creates the missing bridge between the old masters of the Nationalmuseum and the contemporaries of the Moderna Museet: the suburban complex known as Prins Eugens Waldemarsudde, a national property run by the city of Stockholm. This estate towering over Ryssvik Bay consists of an early 20th century house which used to be the private mansion of the founder, an adjoining gallery he had built in 1913 for his large collection of contemporary art, and an extensive area of gardens and secondary buildings. Prince Eugen, the youngest son of King Oscar II and brother of Gustav V, was a notable landscape painter himself as well as a keen purchaser and benefactor of artists. When he died in 1947 at the age of 82, he bequeathed to the nation all his Waldemarsudde state, and his art collections numbering, excluding the prints, up to 1,500 works (mostly by Northern turn-of-the-century painters like Josephson, Zorn, Nordström, Munch... but also a few by French artists) which are kept very much as he left them: most filling the art gallery itself and a few works decorating the palace and the gardens (Söderlund, 1992).

The northern Expressionists highlighted in this Swedish gallery were selected with a modernist taste, but it is with the Impressionists and Post-Impressionists that the modernists feel greater affinity. The examples of galleries chiefly devoted to them are therefore quite numerous, although not necessarily in the countries where one would expect them to abound. Surprisingly, there are not many in North-America, home of a great number of rich collectors who bought lots of pictures from Monet, Renoir, Degas, Pissarro and other members of the group. The pictures are still in private hands or have ended in general-survey museums.

In the U.S.A. the most famous gallery d'auteur featuring French Impressionists and Post-Impressionists is probably that of the Barnes Foundation, in Merion, Pennsylvania, preserved exactly as left by Dr. Albert C. Barnes after his death in 1951. But for all its fame among the lovers of Impressionism, the Barnes is by no means -neither was it ever meant to be- a regular museum: visits to the gallery are kept in very limited numbers and only permitted by long prior arrangement. Besides, the Barnes collection cannot be included in here as a proper example, because it is not only focussing on 19th century works; in fact the arts from other

---

"As a tax-free institution it has suffered great pressures to open the collection for a wider public and in 1993/94 some of the gallery's highlights will be on show in a touring exhibition in Europe and America."
centuries are also well represented there. That is the case too in many other modern galleries d'auteur reputed for their collection of European 19th-century art, like the H. Dixon Museum of French Impressionism in Memphis, Tennessee or the Phillips Collection in Washington D.C.:  

Although Phillips' main preoccupation was with the art of his time and of the recent past, his interest in the evolution of artistic expression led him to look further back in time for the sources of modern art. For this reason the collection soon embraced works as varied in their origins as Egyptian eighteenth-dynasty sculpture, Coptic textiles, and paintings by Giorgione, Goya, Chardin, Delacroix, Constable, and El Greco. In his arrangements of the collection, he deliberately juxtaposed these works with more recent ones in the hope that the visitor would intu as the relationships between them (Rathbone, 1986: p.6).  

In order to find an American example which comes completely within the framework intended for this essay, we have to turn to a less famous, but not less charming, instance: Hill-Stead Museum in Farmington, Connecticut, opened to the public in 1947. It used to be the country-house of Alfred Atmore Pope, a 19th century industrialist from Cleveland, Ohio, who gathered there works by contemporary painters like Manet, Monet, Degas, Cassatt and Whistler. When his daughter, Theodate Riddle, died childless in 1946, she left Hill-Stead as a museum in her will, with a modest endowment in memory of her parents. It is, to the fullest extent of the term, a 'frozen' museum d'auteur: pictures and furnishings are all arranged as they were during the lifetimes of the owners (Warwick, 1988).  

Curiously, it was also an American, the painter William Henry Singer, who was the progenitor of one of the first equivalent museums in Europe: the Singer Museum in Laren, Netherlands. This seaside Dutch village had been from the 1870s to the First World War, a renamed artistic colony where many national and foreign painters used to stay, painting popular characters or seascapes (Raassen-Kruimel, 1990, p. 81-84). Singer, the son of a well known industrialist in the steel world, left Pittsburgh for Europe, and after some time in Paris established his home in Laren, at a villa called 'The Wild Swans'. There he amassed an important collection of French pictures (the Barbizon school, the Impressionists, and others) and Dutch contemporary works (the Hague School, the Amsterdam School, the Laren school), complemented with a few sculptures of French and Dutch artists from the same period and a print-room with many drawings, watercolours and etchings. He died in 1943, but in 1954-56 his widow, Mrs. Anna Brugh-Singer, made of the villa a memorial to him. She had a theatre built on one side of the house and on the other side an art gallery, devoted to the collection of Impressionists and Impressionist-like
local landscapists, including Singer's own paintings. Great public success made the initiative profitable -or at least self-supporting- and the 'Singer Museum and Theatre' is still an independent institution, administered by the Singer Memorial Foundation.

A Danish similar example, which is also a museum-memorial founded by the widow of an early lover of French Impressionism, is the famous Ordrupgaard Gallery in Copenhagen, opened to the public in 1953. It used to be the country house and private art gallery of Wilhelm Hansen, a rich businessman of the insurance world and the founder of the Scandinavian Association for French Art -Foreningen Fransk Kunst-, who had wanted to keep his collection of French Impressionists wide-open to the public during his lifetime. Hansen was a collector of Danish 19th century art as well, but these pictures hung in his house, not in the gallery. For four years, from September the 14th, 1918, visitors had free access to his gallery each Monday from 12.00 to 3.00 p.m. -and also some Sundays at a charge of one crown -for the benefit of French prisoners of war and other charities (Rostrup, 1981, p. 74). But in 1922 Hansen, who had by now got into financial difficulties, had offered the entire collection to the Danish State, which did not buy a single picture from him. He felt a deep bitterness over this and as a result his collection was closed to the public. About half of Hansen's French paintings went for sale -the Carlsberg Foundation, bought then around twenty of his paintings for the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen; yet Hansen soon recovered his wealth, and by the time of his death in 1936 he had made his collection again as large and good as it had been. His widow, Mrs. Henny Hansen, who died in 1951, bequeathed to the State both the rich art collection and the house with all its surrounding estate, upon condition that it should be kept unchanged in memory of her husband (Finsen, 1982 & 1989).

One of Ordrupgaard visitors in early years and also one of the purchasers of Hansen's pictures when the Danish insurance man went into financial difficulties in 1922, was the Swiss Oskar Reinhardt, another great lover of French Impressionist pictures. He too had an art gallery built in 1924, directly inspired by the architecture of Ordrupgaard, adjacent to a country house of his called 'Am Römerholz' in his city of Winterthur. Mr. Reinhardt was a merchant who had retired from the family enterprise at the age of 39 in order to devote himself entirely to expanding his art collection. Winterthur has two museums founded by him. In 1951, at the age of 66, he set up the Oskar Reinhart Foundation, handing over to the City Council a select part of his collection: five hundred Swiss, German and Austrian pictures dating from the late 18th to middle 20th century, which were to be housed at the Old Gymnasium. Until his death, he kept his gallery of French 19th century-art and a choice collection
of paintings and drawings by old masters, all of which he bequeathed to the Swiss Confederation, together with the gallery-building and his house itself. This was opened to the public in 1970, five years after Mr. Reinhart death, with the name Oskar Reinhart Collection Am Römerholz (Koella, n.d.; Stähelin, n.d., p. 5-12).

Further examples could be added, probably as popular as those cited above. In any case, the fame of the galleries discussed in this section contrast with the minor fortune of the ‘nostalgic’ museums featuring local 19th-century art reviewed in the preceding one. Some justification for this might be sought in the already mentioned counterpoint cosmopolitan vs parochial taste, so consequential for the likes and dislikes of the modern art-scene; however, it is also true that the Jeu de Paume could hardly be qualified as ‘cosmopolitan’, since it mostly featured works by French or France-based artists. Was 19th-century French art more modern and thus more attractive on the eyes of the campaigners of Modernism? In part, the answer is that the French school was at least perceived as closer to them -let us remember that the first masters of the Modern Movement were Paris-based. On the other hand, it has to be recalled that the French were the first to exploit the business of modern art-editions on a World scale. The dealer Goupil had been in the 19th century the leader for the international commercialisation of prints and art-books with reproductions of artworks (Pink, 1978). The first bank of art-images producing artistic reproductions for postcards and art-books all around the World was that of the photographers Giraudon. Therefore, until recent decades French editions and French reproduction were majority in the private libraries of modern-art-aficionados of any country -Kettles Yard in Cambridge provides a characteristic example.

Hence, it was not only an hypothetical superiority of the 19th century French school what made it more attractive; but also the fact that it was more world-wide publicized (on art mystification and commerce cf. Bourdieu, 1979). Whilst non-polished art-collectors would invest in works by pre-modern artists of their local school, well-read and well-travelled amateurs would found galleries of French Impressionists and Post-Impressionists (Cooper, 1954). Similarly, the general public would feel more enthusiastic about galleries featuring famous fetishes of mass-consumption: Monet’s views of the cathedral of Rouen or Van Gogh’s landscape with the church of Auvers-sur-Oise at the Jeu de Paume of Paris, or Renoir’s Déjeuner des canottiers [Launcheon of the Boating Party] at the Phillips Collection of Washington, and so on. In spite of Walter Benjamin’s assertion that excessive exposure to reproduction has destroyed the ‘aura’ of art-works, mass-favoured museums are successful temples of a mercantile system exploiting mechanical reproduction (Heinich, 1983; Tilling, 1983).
5.2 POST-MODERNISM AND THE REDISCOVERY OF 19TH CENTURY AESTHETICS.

Towards a more inclusive museum for 19th-century art. The Musée d'Orsay.

Although the term 'Post-Modernism' has made great progress, it may be utterly misleading. Post-modern art and post-modern theory are not merely a forward movement succeeding Modernism: the very idea of progress is refuted by Post-Modernism, which is deemed to be a U-turn, not yet again another contribution in the saga of superseding avant-gardes which have succeeded each other within the Modern Movement. 'Supra-Modernism' would be perhaps a more appropriate denomination.

Another problem when trying to grasp the nature of this recent movement is perhaps its Nietzschean complacency in destructiveness, criticism and irony. Its novelty lies not in the possible newness of the fruits it bears, but in a new posture: 'Post-Modernism is essentially an attitude [my emphasis] of incredulity' (Lyotard, 1979: p. XXIV). This attitude is the only common feature in the post-modern menagerie; there is no such thing as a post-modern philosophical Summa or artistic manifesto, because its practitioners are decided agnostics, unwilling to replace a creed by another set of convictions. Post-modern philosophers have undermined the foundations and beliefs of Marxism and Structuralism, the most sacred modern theoretical buildings, without replacing them with a well-defined new system (Best & Kellner, 1991). Post-modern artists and architects, on the other hand, have abolished the long reign of Abstract painting and the International Style of architecture, but they have not replaced them with one unified new style; their aesthetics seem irreconcilable beyond their common taste for inserting ironical cites and 'misquotations' of classic/modern paintings and architectures (Jencks, 1989).

Thus at the heart of Post-Modernism lies a sceptical perspective blending humorous revisionism and ironic self-referentialism. This is very obvious in the fields of architecture and the visual arts, but also in post-modernist theory. The High Priests of the 'New French Thought' often remind literary characters of Franz Kafka magnetised by the appeal of abysses and those of Jorge Luis Borges enchanted by the lure of the labyrinths. Foucault recalls a paradoxical passage of Borges's *Chinese Encyclopedia* in the preface of his most influential book, *Les mots et les choses* [*The Order of Things*, is the title in English] whose first chapter on the other hand presents a very subjective vision of *Las Meninas*, showing Foucault's enthusiasm for the self-
referring hints scattered by Velasquez in this picture (Foucault, 1966). Baudrillard's Kafkaesque obsession for the spiral, has been connected to the impressive story of 'The Prague Student' (Gane, 1991: p. 207) -the story of a student who sold his reflected image to the devil. Lyotard's essay: *La condition postmoderne*, claims that studying institutions is not unlike studying certain language games (Lyotard, 1979).

The corrosive effect of this questioning perspective has spread out from the field of art and philosophy provoking turbulences in other traditionally calmer scientific domains. Scholars in many disciplines have been attracted by the vortices of deconstructionism, especially in the areas lying at the epicentre of the post-modern movement: sociology and semiotics -but also mathematics: the voluminous book by Douglas R. Hofstadter: *Gödel, Escher, Bach: an Eternal Golden Braid* has been a great best seller in university departments of science ever since its publication in 1979. However, the professionals of the museum world have been more un receptive to this revisionism (cf. Walsh, 1992), probably because, as has been noted in a ground-breaking contribution -bearing the Borgesian title «In the lair of the monkey: notes towards a post-modernist museography»- museums 'constitute the essential mechanisms of a ministry of truth' (Shelton, 1990: p. 96). Significantly, Anthony A. Shelton focuses his essay on the art of setting-up museums (museography), since he believes that the main influence of Post-Modernism in museums is to be found primarily in the installation of interactive displays, whereby the visitors are given a say and the curators release part of their control of the selection/interpretation process, and secondly in some challenging temporary exhibitions organised with a revisionist eye. To the examples he quotes, there could be added the case of a recent show entitled «?Exhibition?» (the profusion of question-marks is itself very post-modern): this temporary display was a timely attempt to present classical antiquity 'reflexively' at the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford (Beard & Henderson & Phillips, 1992; but cf. also the objections raised by Nail, 1993).

The idea inferred from the above is that the influence of Post-Modernism applied to the art of setting-up museums consists, above all, in a whole-hearted questioning and re-writing of previous conceptions (Kaufmann, 1989: p. 151). It is therefore not surprising if the museographical initiative which has emerged as the towering emblem of Post-Modernism is the conversion of an old train-terminal into an art-gallery where the history of 19th-century art has been re-written. While the

10 I hasten to add that, in identifying post-modernity with metaphorical ambivalence and detached revisionism, I am assuming here a definition of what is Post-Modernism which is not universally shared. It would not be, I should think, totally acceptable to the very militant mood prevailing among the writers and artists associated with or singled out by *October* (cf. for example the radical views of Crimp, 1980 and 1987) -I will soon comment this other vision, reviewing an article on Orsay's post-modernism published in that magazine (Mainardi, 1987).
museum-symbols of Modernism were modern-Gesamtkunstwerken like the M.O.M.A., the Guggenheim Museum, or the many later examples housing avant-gardist modern masterpieces in challenging modern-style buildings, no parallel landmark has emerged now combining collections of post-modern art with a post-modern edifice -despite the fact that additions and new building for museums have become some of the most celebrated works in the professional curriculum of the architects of the 'Post-Pompidou Age' (Davis, 1990). Without any doubt, the museum embodying the spirit of the new age is the Musée d’Orsay in Paris, opened in 1986:

An inclusive architecture and view [my emphasis] of the past and present which accepts contrary values and makes a varied comment on them. Nineteenth-century tastes in art, both academic and Modern, are mirrored by twentieth-century ironies and technology, as well as beautiful lighting and a very rich development of layered space (Jencks, 1989: p. 56).

If there were ever an architecture designed to reconcile contradictions and to substitute spectacle for history, that architecture is postmodernism. Its central stylistic attributes, the appropriation of a historicizing architectural vocabulary and the combination of mutually contradictory styles, create a spectacle of historical references while at the same time dissembling whatever historical meanings those references might possess. This, as we shall see, is an apt description of the 'history' put forth by Orsay, where postmodernist architecture and a species of revisionism work hand in glove to reconcile opposites and suppress dissent (Mainardi, 1987: p. 35).

It is highly interesting to emphasize and develop the comprehensive interpretation of Orsay’s post-modernism pointed out only intuitively -his subsequent comments focus on the architecture- by Charles Jencks and in a hypercritical way by Patricia Mainardi. Curiously, what most of the criticism published11 on Orsay’s museography has described as post-modernist -for better or worse- is only the interior architecture designed by Gae Aulenti (Foucart, 1985). Although the curatorial team revealed that Aulenti’s style was not accidental and that they had chosen her because her design served well their ideas (Laclotte, 1987: p. 16), few asked themselves how post-modern ideas had -or had not- impregnated the final blueprint for Orsay. Doubly exceptional in this context are thus Patricia Mainardi’s words: 'Implicit in the Orsay installations is an ambivalence about context that reveals its position on history to be postmodernist' (Mainardi, 1987: p. 49; cf. also Mainardi, 1985). But what is Orsay’s position on history? As many others (Dagen, 1986; Le Pichon, 1986), she tries to

---

11 Regrettably enough, unlike the Tate Gallery, the documentation services of the Musée d’Orsay did not gather press-cuttings of the generous media-covering of its foundation, in the years immediately before and after the inauguration. The references used here are thus not the most significant but only those I could trace.
interpret - in socio-political terms - the 'left' and 'right' distribution, the 'upstairs' and 'downstairs' within the museum, and brings herself into a cul-de-sac. Mainardi gets angry when her penetrating eyesight fails to detect any clear-cut theoretical articulation hidden behind the mannerist jumble of materials, forms, colours and details of distribution: 'Art historical revisionism may be necessary and welcome, but the least one might expect from its adherents is an articulation of the theory that informs their version of history' (Mainardi, 1987: p. 46). Yet, is not the renunciation of any parti-pris, the wish not to become involved in one ideological/aesthetical viewpoint that Post-Modernism is all about?

It is thus as a result of the self-effacing personality of art-theory in Orsay that the boldness of Aulenti's visual effects stands out even more. Not surprisingly then, the main bone of contention for its critics has not been Orsay's eclecticism and egalitarian neutrality, which has found many enthusiasts (Chastel, 1987; Faunce, 1988; Pingeot, 1987; Reff, 1988; Rosemblum, 1987 & 1988; Roux, 1986) and only a few enemies (Alechinsky, 1989; Kirili, 1988; Lewis, 1987); but the self-assertiveness of its design and display, which has raised passionate criticism (Alechinsky, 1989; Arikha, 1988; Beetham, 1989; Buchanan, 1986; Bury, 1987; Gandee, 1987; Lévi-Strauss, 1987; Matthews, 1987; Soulages, 1987), rare defenders (Filler, 1988; Trachtenberg, 1988), and even rarer impartial thorough analysis (Rosen & Zerner, 1987a & b; House, 1987). Similarly, the chronicle of the ideas which came into play in the long process of the conception of the museum often appears overshadowed by narrative history and - yet again - architectural details in the otherwise fascinating and very well-written book by Jean Jenger: Orsay, de la Gare au Musée. Histoire d'un grand projet [also published in English: Orsay, the Metamorphosis of a Monument. From Paris Terminus to National Museum] (Jenger, 1987; cf. also Jenger, 1986 & 1987b and his later booklet: Jenger, 1989). Now that the clamour of the controversies has subsided, it is time for a calm reflection over the scope of the Musée d'Orsay and to give it a place in the history of museums.

The Gare d'Orsay was condemned for demolition in 1971, but after the destruction of Les Halles many campaigned to conserve some example of this kind of 19th-century iron architecture in central Paris. Eventually, the campaigners succeeded and the old railway station was classed as a historical monument in 1973, although nobody had a clear idea of what new use could be made for this enormous vaulted nave once would had it been restored to its former splendour (Crosnier, 1986). As usually happens with buildings of troublesome adaptability to daily life, the project of transforming it into a museum then emerged most naturally (Cabanne, 1978; Belves, 1980). It was also natural, considering the date of the station itself and the growing
problems of overcrowding and long queues at the nearby Musée de l'Impressionnisme, that the art of the late 19th century was chosen as its speciality by that crusader of Modernism, president Georges Pompidou (Jenger, 1986: p. 69).

However, it soon became obvious that Orsay should not merely be an aggrandised version of the Jeu de Paume, whose expurgated vision of art history was, if not contested, at least proved to be incomplete by a historic exhibition at the Grand Palais (Lacambre, 1974). Hence when the Cabinet of president Valéry Giscard D'Estaing launched on October 20th, 1977, the first decisions concerning the creation of the new museum, it showed a resolute interest in bringing back to light academic works as well. Moreover, in a further step towards a more inclusive museum of 19th-century art, it was also decided that the projected institution was to include all the arts of the period: painting, sculpture, prints, drawings, architecture, decorative arts, photography, and cinema (Darblay, 1980; Vaisse, 1985).

At the beginning, the Government referred to the project naming it sometimes as 'Musée d'Orsay' and sometimes 'Musée du XIXe siècle' (Duault, 1981), although always expressing an intention to focus it on the art of the second half of the century—an arguable legacy of the Jeu de Paume. Nevertheless, everybody agreed that the span of the museum had to end a few years after 1900 (Daix, 1983); regarding its starting point, on the other hand, Giscard had his personal ideas. His mind was to push the date as early as possible:

_Dans mon esprit, je pensais depuis l'origine qu'il était souhaitable de rechercher l'unité de la création française du XIX siècle, comportant à la fois l'influence des grands pionniers tels que David et Ingres, et le déploiement des admirables talents de Courbet, de Corot et de Delacroix._

[It had seemed to me from the outset that it would be desirable to seek to portray the overall unity of 19th century French creative work, including both the influence of great pioneers such as David and Ingres and the unfurling of such admirable talents as Courbet, Corot and Delacroix] (introduction by Giscard d'Estaing in Jenger, 1986: p.9)

Whichever choice was made in this respect concerned the Louvre (Laclotte, 1986): fixing an earlier starting date for Orsay was, indirectly, deciding to culminate the Louvre's displays with the works of Delacroix, with those of David, or at the French Revolution. Had the question been faced purely in terms of history or art-history, perhaps the argument for a return of the Louvre to its origins would have been successfully brandished, letting David, Géricault, Corot, Delacroix, Courbet and all the others go for good. But these artists seemed an irrenounceable asset from a sentimental, French, point of view of the Louvre: the galleries featuring their works were virtually the only glamorous shrine to French art in its displays by 1980, as none
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of its luxurious brand-new galleries of French paintings were existing then. The curatorial advice was therefore that the frontier-date between the Louvre and Orsay should be 1863 (the date of Manet’s *Olympia*, the year of the *Salon des Refusés*, and of the death of Delacroix). It took Giscard’s most direct intervention to gain the great masterpieces of Courbet for Orsay, and still the first half of the century as a whole was deemed to remain under-represented.

When François Mitterrand took over in 1981, the Marxist historian Madeleine Reberioux was appointed as vice-president of the *Établissement public du musée d'Orsay*. She demanded that the museum’s chronological limitations be politically rather than aesthetically determined: dismissing the proposed date of 1863 as important only for the history of modern painting, she imposed instead historically-minded limits for the span of the collections: 1848 (date of the revolution instituting the II Republic) and 1914 (start of World War I). This was very revealing of her new ideas for the museum: it had to be not simply an art-museum but a *musée de l'art et de la civilisation*. Some hints like the installation of a locomotive in the middle of the nave (Rosen & Zerner, 1987b) were conveniently filtered to the media like soundbites... and officially denied once that a very deep opposition had been expressed by public opinion.

Certain cardinal curatorial decisions have been taken at the outset. The different art-materials should not, in general, be mixed; there would be no attempt to create period interiors. Nor would there be texts of art-history interpretation and historical contextualisation interfering with the display; they would be kept strictly separate -historical/art-historical explanations are offered both in the *carnet-parcours* available in the library and in the didactic material scattered in information stations or *points-clés* (Kucerova, 1990). Thus, following Malraux’s ideals, the works of art would be left to speak for themselves to their present-day viewers (Cachin, 1986, 1987a & b; Laclotte, 1987; Rigaud, 1987).

It is actually this isolation of the art works and the formalist approach to art-history deprived of social-historical clues that some American social-art-historians find most disappointing (Brenson, 1988; Nochlin, 1988; Sherman, 1990). In the European tradition, the museums of social history and the museums of art belong in completely separated realms whilst in the U.S.A., on the other hand, many art-collections are displayed in period-rooms. Not surprisingly then, Reberioux’s attempt seemed a turning-point in the conception of Orsay which produced anxiety in Paris and raised great expectations across the Atlantic (Augulhon, 1987). As it is well known, most of her initiatives were ultimately neutralized by the art-curators. Social history turned out to be like a foot-note in the museum: not only are historical displays scarce and peripheral as she herself acknowledged (Reberioux, 1987a & b),
but also repeatedly linked to the toilets -in terms of both physical proximity and design-psychology! (Sherman, 1990: p. 63-64).

Thus the symbolic battle of the dates was Rebérioux's first and only triumph. In fact, one is tempted to say, it was just a Pyrrhic victory. Choosing the date of 1848 merely offered a socio-historical disguise, but the issue of why the museum should focus on the second half of the century remained unquestioned. Would it not have made more sense, from the point of view of a historian, to establish the chronological limits of the museum between the French Revolution and World War I? After all, the insurrection of 1848 was only a minor event in comparison to the revolution of 1789, which set in motion in France a period of successive upheavals, namely those of 1830, 1848 and 1871. Ironically enough, the cultural thrust of the French Revolution was also, as Maria Teresa Almeida has pointed out (Almeida, 1987: p. 113), the origin of Orsay's museographical approach, which tends to present a chronological arrangement of works and schools, separating paintings from sculptures and from decorative arts.

This leads us to the question of whether the Orsay Museum is really revisionist or rather, reminiscent of previous galleries (Rosen & Zerner, 1976). To believe the most authoritative voice in this respect, Daniel J. Sherman, author of a PhD thesis on art-galleries in 19th century France (Sherman, 1989), almost everything in Orsay came as a legacy of the Luxembourg and other museums of the last century: the collection itself -excluding photographs and cinema- (cf. also Normand-Roman, 1986), the liberal-minded eclecticism of taste, and the crowded installation (Sherman, 1990). But what strikes him most is actually the spirit of continuity with a conventional approach to art-history as formalist connoisseurship underlining the lack of interpretation on the labels, and especially the texts of the museum guide-book (Mathieu, 1986). Hence he concludes that Orsay is a very traditional kind of museum, not an alternative one (cf. also Vaisse, 1987). But perhaps his terms of comparison are misplaced: Orsay was not deemed to be different from the 'traditional' art-museum as conceived since the French Revolution; but simply a departure from the religious fanaticism of Modernism.

Orsay rightly rejects the twofold ideals reclaimed for art-museums in the age of Modernism: 1- the prudist ideal of an austere clinically-white museum-architecture which should be undemanding, permissive and, above all, self-obliterating... 2- the puritan ideal of pious lecturing which 'modern' museum-curators used to profess:

---

12 I can not avoid adding, adopting Sherman's point of view, that even this approach is yet another legacy of the 19th century. Art-curators in France are specially well-trained in the skills of 'formalist' connoisseurship because this is the strong-point of the education they receive at the Louvre-School (cf. Lorente, 1993), which was created in 1882 (on the founding and development of the École du Louvre see Archives Nationales F21-4483).
"[...] separating esthetic sheep from goats with an even and unprejudiced hand, leading the uninitiated on a fixed and purposeful path whose meanings are preordained by the tablets of the esthetic law: Thou shalt take Cézanne to thy bosom! Thou shalt not eat of the fruit of the tree of Academicism! You shall not ask too many unsettling questions and think for thyself because all that is worth thinking has already been thought for thee! [...] This transcendence of stereotype seems to me to be precisely the museum's [Orsay] most positive quality, allowing it to challenge the visitor as if it were a kind of text -visual, material and spatial- producing multiple, sometimes unintended, meanings and often generating contradictory readings (Nochlin, 1988: p.86).

Orsay could be saluted as an influential step towards the end of the museum perceived by its public as a church (Clair, 1987; Schaer, 1987), despite the parallels of the imposing perspective of its vast nave with the architecture of 19th century pavilions for World Fairs and with the monumental museum-temples of the last century.

Museums musealised: 19th-century museums rediscovered.

In as much as the 20th century boom of art-books and art-editions had approached the art of the last century with a limited regard until the 1970s, the 'post-Orsay era' presents a quasi-archaeological urge to reconstitute in its integrity the memory of that time. The foundation of the Musée d'Orsay in 1977 and its opening in 1986 were landmarks in the rediscovery of 19th-century art in its entirety: both progressive and academic works, both French and non-French schools. The 'Orsay effect' has awakened hibernating relatives of this museum in France and abroad, profiting the general recuperation of 19th-century art (Levi-Strauss & Vaisse & Foucart, 1981).

The Galerie des Batailles in Versailles -the backbone of the Musée Historique created there by King Louis Philippe in 1837- which was rarely visitable before, has opened daily since then. The 1900 building of the Musée du Petit Palais recovered part of its original architectural decorations and many 19th century art-works have emerged from the stores. The house-museum of Renan-Scheffer, managed by the City Council of Paris since 1982, was completely refurbished and reopened in 1990 as Musée de la Vie Romantique. A similar museum, called Galerie der Romantik, was installed in the Charlottenburg Palace in Berlin and opened in 1987. During those years the Austrian Ministry of Education undertook a complete reorganization of the national museums in Vienna as a result of which the Neue-Gallerie der Stallburg, created in 1967 to display works by foreign artists, was...
suppressed in 1986: henceforth the distribution of the national art-collections in the
museums of Vienna should not be made according to questions of nationality but to
chronology. Thus the Oberes Belvedere became since 1989 a gallery of Austrian and
foreign 19th century art. In 1989 the Tate Gallery of London was completely
renovated, with a new rehang which brought back on display many 19th century
works, and the interior architecture of the building was rendered to its original state.
In Italy, contemporarily, similar investments were made for the renovation of the
partially closed section of 19th century art at the Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Moderne
of Rome and also in those of Milan and Novara. In 1991 a tycoon of American fast
food industry -Mr. Morton A. Fleischer- opened the Fleischer Museum of California
Impressionism at the Perimeter Center, Scottsdale, Arizona. In 1992 the City Council
of Genoa opened Villa Grimaldi as a museum devoted to the Frugone Collections of
19th century art. In 1992 the main floor of Bury Art Gallery, in the North of Great
Manchester, was restored to its original state for the better showing-off of its 19th-
century collections.

Other projects are still in the making. In 1991 the Rijkmuseum of Amsterdam
started a complete refit of the Drucker extension for 19th-century paintings.
Simultaneously, a redistribution is taking place between the collections of the old
Nationalgalerie in what used to be East Berlin and the namesake institution in the
West: all 20th-century art will be regrouped in the modern Mies van der Rohe
building of the latter and the art of the 19th century transferred to the former. Since
1992 plans are being considered in Madrid to transform the building of the Ministry
of Agriculture into a section of the Prado devoted to Goya and 19th-century art. In
1993 an American millionaire has offered in the pages of The Times -and
subsequently withdrawn- to make a donation for the creation of a national gallery of
19th-century art in London... It seems as though that what seemed outmoded a few
years ago might now have re-entered the news with force provoking great excitement.

In fact it is not merely the art of the 19th-century which attracts new visitors
and investments. Significantly enough, the project of Orsay consisted first of all, in
the preservation of a 19th century monument (Lachenaud & Laclotte, 1979). A group
of three architects -R. Bardon, P. Colboc and J.-P. Philippson- refitted the station's
nave and hotel, with its restaurant, foyer and ball-room. Similarly, many of the other
museums and projects cited above are not only a vindication of the art of the last
century, but also a recovery of 19th-century settings and taste. To a certain extent,
what many of these new museum initiatives are about is not only the history of art,
but also the history of taste. Take for example the gallery of Villa Grimaldi in Genoa
recently opened on the occasion of the 1992 commemorations of Columbus'
discovery of America. The local council has created this museum in homage to the brothers Lazzaro G. and Luigi Frugone, two 19th century art-patrons who bequeathed their collections to the city in, respectively, 1935 and 1953. But, ironically, this same municipality still keeps closed the Galleria Comunale d’Arte Moderna itself, where the 19th-century works of the Frugone collections were only a part of a vast ensemble of works from the same period (Frabetti, 1984, p. 5-8; Giubilei, 1991, p. 134-136). More than a special period in the history of art is thus a particular case in the history of 19th-century collecting that is reivindicated there!

On the other hand, numerous art-galleries founded in the last century seem to be now proudly rediscovering their origins and thus destroying modern false ceilings and partitions in order to restore their 19th-century original architecture. This is not only happening in the examples cited above, where one could justify the move as a socio-historical craze for 'period rooms' installations. It is also happening in galleries of old masters like the Dulwich Picture Gallery, redecorated in 1981, and the National Gallery of London, which has restored its foyer in 1993.

Since the 1970s a new traditionalism has emerged in the display of public collections. This new traditionalism is linked to increasing interest in the restoration of historic interiors, and to the growing body of information about paint colours of the past: it is significant that enthusiasm for redisplaying galleries in a nineteenth century manner -or what is considered to be nineteenth century- should be especially strong in a country where an unusually large number of furnished historic houses survives in the hands of the National Trust and of private owners (Waterfield, 1991: p. 64).

Actually, 'what is considered to be nineteenth century' is often a re-creation made with great imagination -a 'restoration' à la Viollet-le-Duc. This is not the place to analyze such re-creations, which also have their very passionate defenders (House, 1987: p. 72; and specially Clifford, 1982). It also happens, however, that the interest in 19th century collecting practises derives in some cases from what could be called the 'archaeology of museums'. Museographical installations like that of the Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford, created according to a specific aim which has subsequently completely faded (Pearce, 1992: p. 85-86), are now surviving as 'archaeological' testimonies of themselves. Ironically, such museums musealised\(^\text{13}\) do not, as most museums do, 'legitimate themselves by the supposed qualities of the objects which they possess' (Shelton, 1990: p. 99); in those cases the museum itself constitutes its best treasure. As many of the examples already discussed in this dissertation show, something similar is happening very frequently with the museums of modern art.

\(^{13}\) I borrow the term 'museum musealised' from an article of Renato Tella entitled 'Il museo museificato' (Tella, 1972) -in Italian, the verb 'musealise' (musealizzare) is of current use in museum studies literature (cf. for instance Minissi, 1988).
founded in the last century, especially in the case of the museums d'auteur. Very often, what seems more interesting in this galleries is not the particular examples of 19th-century art they hold, but the general setting where they come at the encounter of the imagination of visitors with their 19th century 'period flavour' -something like the 'sense of history experienced by Michelet while visiting the Musée des Monuments Français.

As John Murdoch, then assistant-director at the Victoria & Albert Museum, put it in nice words, some Victorian paintings are better appreciated when seen 'in concert' than as 'solo parts':

_The strength of the V&A collections [of 19th-century paintings] must be seen to lie not, as John Sheepshanks intended, in their former status as a National Gallery of British Art, but as a commentary on the way in which the art of painting was constructed into our culture, both on the domestic level and in the great public spaces which have come down to us from the last century. Many of the paintings were designed to be seen en masse, to achieve their effect and claim the attention of the spectator from high up on a crowded exhibition wall. The narrative strategies of the paintings, their deployment of unresolved and open-ended situations, were aimed at forcing the spectator to pause and the reviewer to attempt exegesis [...] and it is a relatively flat experience to see these paintings in their rich gold frames with only yards of empty pallid wall around them (Murdoch, Preface to Parkinson, 1990)._

Continuing with the musical metaphor, we can add that there is a crucial point here: the 'concert' must be played with original instruments. This is a most peculiar aspiration in a time like ours, touched with a craze for 'archaeological' musical-performances played with historical instruments and philological re-publications of literary text in the original version (Ragghianti, 1990: p. 90). Very much unlike the displays of Lenoir's _Musée des Monuments Français_ who 'completed' his displays with copies, falsely combined original fragments and totally imagined fakes (Haskell, 1993: p. 247). One of the effects of what Walter Benjamin called 'the age of mechanical reproduction' was the end of the didactic use of copies in art museums (Levine, 1988) -casts and copies much favoured in museums in the middle of the 19th century then fall into disgrace because in what Walter Benjamin called 'the age of mechanical reproduction' people go to museums to see 'non-reproductions', to confront themselves with 'original' art pieces (Heinich, 1983: p. 107). Malraux's famous dream of a museum without walls was the replacement of original by photographs, so that a huge bank of images would replace and excel the art museum in its didactic quest to show a complete survey of the history of art. But in the 'post-

---

14 Curiously enough Malraux's didactic idea of a 'museum without walls' (i.e. the popularising of art works through photographs) originated from his personal way of studying art, covering with photographs of details of art-works the floor of his studio.
Benjamin age' even that primordial didactic role of art museums is disappearing: post-modern art-museums reject one of the former raisons d'être of galleries as encyclopædias supposed to convey a vision of the history of art in general or in a particular period or time.

With a typical post-modern love for self-referentialism, some museologists are already advocating 'critical editions of museums': that is, presenting some old-fashioned displays with no change, merely adding marginal explanations -like footnotes in a critical edition- to justify themselves as professionals in front of their public. Such displays are Borgesian monuments of erudition, museums-mirrors whose authors do not claim any merit as auteurs, but as reviewers-anthologists (Borinsky, 1977: p. 94-101). This quest for preserving 'past views' is not necessarily confined to very old museums: when Gae Aulenti was asked to do a refit of the interior architecture of the Museum of Modern Art at the Pompidou Centre (Gibson, 1986) some critics wondered themselves whether such intervention would change the original structures of the 'historical monument' which was the Pompidou Centre (Scognamiglio, 1985: p. 68). Obviously, this philosophy is not a legacy of the 19th century: Victorians kept changing and radically 'modernising' museums as well as they radically 'restored-modernised' art-works (Mensch, 1990). Arguably, this museographical tendency derives from the present interest for studying the past of museums.
Even some of the most innovative 20th century initiatives look very much like modern recasts of pre-World War I strategies. Paradoxically, the longing for continuous innovations in questions of art has not produced remarkably original museum types: the policies piloting the creation of museums specialising in 20th century art seem a recycling of those of the 19th century with slight variations. By a curious irony, the Modern Movement also resulted, sometimes indirectly, sometimes in a direct way, in the creation of museums specialising in 19th century art. More recently, one of the most innovative museological issues of Post-Modernism has been the museographical re-establishment of the art of the 19th century in its integrity and the philological recovery of 19th century museum-structures.

CONCLUSION:
CONCLUSIONS.
Following Foucault's studies on 'human archaeology' analysing the history of prisons, asylums, hospitals, and other social institutions, many social historians had pursued, with a similar dissecting eye, an 'archaeology' of cultural institutions -schools, universities, academies- and some museologists had also examined the genealogy of museums (Poulot, 1986a; Hooper-Greenhill, 1988). Prompted by their example, I have strived here to write a non-teleologic history of the origins and changing strategies of one of the most mystified cultural institutions of the Western world: the museum of modern art.

It is difficult to generalise in a few words about the origin of the creation of such museums before World War I and about their impact and consequences in the institutions which seem to be their closest inheritors in our time -the museums specialising in 19th century art. The research findings have revealed an equivocal picture. In fact, the most recent museums policies concerning 20th century art could be considered to a certain extent as a continuation of the strategies of one hundred years ago. On the other hand, the recent foundation of museums endeavouring to present the aesthetic of the 19th century in its wholeness, do not appear to be a legacy of the liberalism preached in the French Third Republic by those who believed that art galleries should display «all the flowers of the field» (Green, 1987b). Instead, the present eclecticism rather derives from the brand-new relativity-inclined attitude of Post-Modernism. Not surprisingly, because above all the history of museums is, and has always been, a reflection of the history of mentalities (Pearce, 1992).

In this dissertation I have tried to present a broad insight into some revealing hints of the mentality and culture of our recent past. Like Foucault in his historical essays, I have chiefly relied on informations gathered in secondary sources; however, in my case the dominant approach has not been philosophic-linguistic, but socio-historical. Throughout the whole of this essay I have tried, as most cultural historians do, to encompass questions of politics, economy, civilisation and taste. I can not claim any originality in this. In particular, my insistence in linking cultural flourishing with the role of 'art patrons' is an idea whose inceptions date from at least as early as Plutarch (Haskell, 1993: p. 220). None the less, it is an original contribution of this thesis the refutation of an assumed socio-historical fallacy: namely, the belief in a linkage between the artistic vitality of a capital and the early creation there of a museum of modern art (Bazin, 1967: p. 216 and 218).
I have also followed in the footsteps of historians of collecting, but trying to avoid the assumption they frequently convey in their studies, that every art gallery derives from an art collection. In the 19th century this was not always true any more: some museums were established, built, equipped and endowed with funds prior to the existence of any collection at all to be put on display! (and in the 20th century this phenomenon is even more frequent). Thus I have not used Krysztof Pomian's division of four different museological patterns for the transformation of art collections in public galleries during the 18th century: 'traditional' museums, 'revolutionary' museums, 'evergetic' museums and 'commercial' museums (Pomian, 1987). Instead, my classification of 19th century museums of modern art (partly inspired in Grasskamp, 1981) reunites all those categories in a simpler division: those pioneered by monarchs or their ministers and those spurred by private individuals.

However, there are several precise points I wish to make. The first is that this simple dichotomy does not apply any more to the creation of museums of any kind after 1919, because the main museum founders after World War I tend to be collective boards: i.e. the public powers and some business corporations. The second, that I would not extend this taxonomy for a study of general-survey art museums, whose creation was often due to external drives coming from legislators, academic bodies, and a range of other levels. But in the particular case of 19th century museums specialising in modern masters, I believe to have demonstrated the accuracy of this easy and eloquent two-term classification.

Finally, I insist in a precision that I have tried to emphasize in the text: other factors of various nature were woven throughout the two origins of museums singled out here. On the one hand, I have evinced that the creation of museums of modern art was often underpinned by an array of vested political interests, sheer ambition of social promotion, whitewashing of easy money, etc. On the other hand, I have demonstrated that many museums were born out of a spirit of emulation. Here again, we enter in the domain of the history of mentalities. As Francis Haskell has pointed out (1993: p. 211), some 18th century writers had launched a new kind of chronicle of the exploits of past and contemporary social leaders: such a chronicle would disregard their military or political deeds - only their achievements as art patrons were recorded. This resulted in a new conception of history, rooted in Voltaire, which attained its peak in the 19th century, when many intellectuals claimed that the most outlasting episodes of a people's past were its monuments and arts (cf. Bann, 1984; Haskell, 1993). Hence if ancient kings, popes and notables had taken a personal pride in erecting monumental churches, those of the 'museum age' would compete in founding monumental art galleries when looking for future outlast of their fame.
The kind of museum most favoured varied according to some 'fashions' in private and institutional taste (Holst, 1967). In the second part of the 18th century the large classical statues -or their plaster casts- won general favour, eclipsing the smaller objects, medals and coins which had formerly sent connoisseurs into raptures. Picture galleries highlighting works by Italian, Flemish, Dutch, French, Spanish and German old masters became in the early 19th century the art museum par excellence. Then, in the last quarter of the century, the creation of galleries specialising in modern masters gathered momentum experiencing an international boom.

The direct conclusion to this is that the history of museums reflects the changes in taste and in scientific and historical interests (on this point cf. also Murray, 1904; Hoffmann, 1959). Consequently, an objective, non-partisan, social historian of 19th century museums should not be completely absorbed by his or her task of 'unmasker' of wolves in sheep's clothing. It is undeniable that a gallery of modern art always bestowed an aura of modernity which could be sometimes a useful political instrument at the service of inner conservative monarchs and sometimes an instrument of social self-affirmation for snobbish nouveau riches. Nevertheless, it is also true that this process was not merely fuelled by Machiavellism and social climbing. Other human factors overlapped in the fostering of galleries of modern art: as any page of the history of culture, this has to be reported too as an issue of cross-cultural confrontation, emulation and inter-influence.

To sum up: the creation of galleries of modern art before World War I was the effect of the involvement of some monarchs and private individuals who were swayed sometimes by their own interests and sometimes by their spirit of emulation.

Indeed the notion of human emulation is a central issue in this thesis. I have endeavoured to apply to the history of museums some of the 'ways of seeing' typical of art-historians (cf. Ragghianti, 1990 for a different case). All humans draw on past examples, sometimes imitating them, sometimes reacting against them. Museum founders are not an exception to this rule; therefore the history of the creation of museums -like the history of the creation of art works- can be represented as a wave current: different patterns are originated in some turbulent 'nodal points' and spread like waves to different countries, at times affecting remote geographies, at times being immediately crisscrossed or interfered by other waves. Contrary to some museologists who insist in presenting museums as outermost incarnation of a nation's culture, I think that the interplay of cultural inter-influences did also impinge on the creation of museums as well as in all cultural matters -ironically enough, the 'Englishness' of the music of Elgar owed a great deal to the influence of Wagner! Thus I have explained the spread of museums of modern art in terms of cross-national
and international emulation. Questions of world cultural interrelations have therefore been lumped together with socio-political issues in order to explain the geography and timing of the pioneering of museums specialising in modern art.

There is yet another innovative point which separates this dissertation from the purely socio-historical literature and approximates it to the works of art-historians. A premise I whole-heartedly advocate is that, apart from the 'external' social factors determining the creation of museums, a range of other circumstances 'internal' to the object of study should be analysed as well. After all, the birth of the galleries discussed here was also the result of purely museological factors. This has been demonstrated in the previous pages with many examples. The Parisian Musée des Artistes Vivants would never have existed without the pre-existence of two galleries specialising in paintings by old masters - one in the Luxembourg Palace itself and the other in the Louvre -, both declining to show works by living artists. Anywhere else, in the same way, the precedent of galleries specialising in old masters and avoiding the display of works by 19th century artists originated the first galleries of modern art. Likewise, the pre-existence of galleries of modern art highlighting 20th century artists and bypassing older works has spurred in recent decades the creation of galleries for 19th century art.

Attempting to open up a more interdisciplinary perspective was thus an integral part of this project. This procedure had the added advantage of allowing mutually reinforcing discourses to come to the fore. The combination of different viewpoints and the consideration of both external and internal variables could only be beneficial for the enterprise of mapping and explaining the origin of museums of modern art. Even so, I can by no means pretend to have reached an all-embracing account of the historic causes and original purposes of the creation of galleries specialising, sometimes premeditatedly and sometimes haphazardly, in 19th century art. In the social sciences, the precise causes of events are never unequivocally established.

Nevertheless, although producing an overall theory about the origins of these museums was important, the main issue was to establish a relation of cause/effect between some circumstances intervening in the creation of museums and the identity developed by each institution. The research findings have confirmed that the personality of museums, like that of humans, is connected to the identity of their procurators, to the interrelations with fellow entities and to the cultural influences experienced in their formative years. Different combinations of these three circumstances produced museums with different character.
In order to call attention to that idea of variety, several museum types and subtypes have been identified. The main concern was not to propose divisions and subdivisions for the mere sake of taxonomy: although these museum patterns have been discussed as separate and isolate, in fact they are not, one blends into the next. I have often hesitated whether to include some examples in the category of 'museums d'auteur', or in the 'English pattern' and so on. Cultural productions can not neatly been 'chopped up' in clear-cut compartments. The goal was to deny the existence of one common identity for museums of modern art, an idea which is often hinted at in the existing literature. The conclusion to this study of museum types and subtypes is that they were diverse in terms of their task, even though many of them extolled a similar taste -a point to which we shall shortly return.

The examples have also proved wrong the usual tendency to think of museums with an image of continuity in mind. Museums are changing establishments. As we have seen, the identity of the museums discussed here has frequently been subject to change: many museum founders would be shocked if they could come back to life and see what the institution they founded has become! We could say for museums what a famous Marxist sentence enunciated for human beings, that «everyone is conditioned by its class, no-one is entirely determined by it». Thus the fate of museums has been 'conditioned', not completely 'determined', by their genealogy. In general, the degree to which museums remained more purposefully committed to their original collecting policies was higher in the case of, in this order: a) royal foundations of national galleries of modern masters, b) private museums d'auteur, c) the 'Italian type' of city galleries born as complements to pre-existing art museums of old masters.

A derived conclusion from the above is that, in average terms, the galleries of modern art which have more often presented an unstable identity have been those grown out far from the hands of kings and queens, whilst museums originated by royal patronage have presented a remarkable continuity in their evolution. In part, this is due to the simple fact that private founders and their families tended to relinquish the 'parental custody' of the galleries they engendered, handing the newborn museums over to the State or the municipalities. Conversely, the galleries of royal foundation abandoned immediately to their fate have been very rare: most of them were nurtured for years by the constant intervention of the founders and their successors. Monarchs, it is well known, are always keen on presenting themselves following in the footsteps of their predecessors, among other reasons because the supposed legitimacy of monarchy actually lays in the casting of a view of historical continuity from sovereign to sovereign.
Another conclusion that can be drawn at this point is that the disparity of sponsors does not seem to have lead to substantial differences in the selection of contents. All pre-World War I galleries of modern art, either of royal or of bourgeois lineage, favoured their respective national school and preferred mainstream tendencies -prized works by Salon painters above all.

Analysing this taste from the standpoint of the new cultural trends of the 20th century, it seems as though our museums of modern and contemporary art were several light-years far away from their forerunners. Rather than trying to built seemingly unsustainable bridges between then, one would be tempted to construct analogies with the 19th century galleries of old masters, substituting the 'essentials' of one pantheon for those of the other: Raffael for Picasso, Giotto for Cézanne, and so on. However, after second thought, one realizes that the changes are beyond mere issues of taste, that the definitions of 'art' and of 'art museum' have completely changed under the overturning influence of the 'Modern Movement' -the string of successive artistic avant-gardes from the Post-Impressionists onwards.

The popularization of photography helped to put an end to the function of art as representation of the reality through perspective illusionism. Then the Modern Movement tried non-representation: abstract art, collages, Dadaist happenings, art 'installations', *arte povera*... Almost nobody is scandalised to find in 20th century museums and galleries of modern art defiant exhibits à-la-Duchamp: urinals, piles of bricks, and other *objets trouvés*. What have in common these museums with their 19th century equivalents? Those sacred preserves of 'major' works -when the Caillebote bequest was offered to the French State, even some of the artists represented in the collection expressed embarrassment about the fact that some of their paintings which were only sketches and 'minor' works were proposed for the Luxembourg Museum (Vaise, 1980: p. 438). The point is that not only museums of modern art have changed; what has changed is also the very idea of 'art museum' altogether. One of the effects of the popularization of mechanical reproductions of art is that people simply go to museums to see 'non-reproductions' (Ladendorf, 1973: p. 23), to confront themselves with 'original' art pieces.

Beneath a major shift in artistic style, in taste and in museums we gauge here, once again, a break in the history of mentalities. The idea of calling attention to ruptures in the past of museums had already been enhanced by those museologists who have strived to apply Foucault's cosmology of history to the study of museums (Poulot, 1992, p. 137; Hooper-Greenhill, 1992: p. 11). Accordingly, the thrust of the argument of this dissertation is built upon the conviction that there has been a decisive rupture: after World War I the museums of modern art entered a process of
metamorphosis. The dialectic of 'progressive' versus 'retrograde' set up by the Modern Movement, has produced different kinds of museums of 20th century art, and different varieties of museums highlighting 19th-century art. Nevertheless, it is also fundamental to this thesis that, in spite of the rupture, there has been a legacy: namely, the resilient tendency to create ever-more-specialised art museums (Fayard, 1992). Proof of this is the creation of museums devoted to the arts of the 19th century -or a period within. On the other hand, some museums of 20th-century art display mostly works dating from the Post-Impressionism to the Second World War, others highlight chiefly post-1945 works, and of course newest chronological specialisations are already in the making...

Apparently, we are experiencing now another historical upheaval -although not everybody agrees whether to date the shift immediately after World War II, or in the 1970s. Most artists now feel that the values of the Modern Movement are already superseded: the old confrontation of two opposed factions -avant-garde vs. official art, or abstract art vs. realism- has vanished and with it has also disappeared the assuring feeling to belong to 'the' avant-garde front -there are a plurality of 'avant-gardes' now. Likewise, some philosophers and sociologists believe that we have entered a new age that they call Post-Modernism.

Number of recent essays have tried to assess how museums are now coming to terms with the spirit of Post-Modernism (cf. for example Walsh, 1992 and the extensive bibliography he provides). As a particular contribution to this line of literature, I have pointed out a couple of significant trends developing in the museums discussed here. Firstly the present reinstatement of the art of the 19th century in its many-sided integrity. Secondly the current philological recovery of 19th century museum-structures and displays. These two phenomena have been exposed here as another example of the changes Post-Modernism is impinging on the museum world. Whether a 'right answer' has been arrived at is a matter for debate: some of their adversaries are probably right in many of their critics; but they are wrong in scornfully defining them as museographical setbacks. If the very idea of progress has been called in question nowadays, in the history of art as well as in the history of museums, what is the sense of talking about setbacks? The waves of the creation of museums move confusedly. We barely can perceive whence they come, and we do not know whither they go.
APPENDICES.
A QUESTIONNAIRE IN SEARCH OF MUSEUMS
DEVOTED TO THE ARTS OF 1789-1919.
APPENDIX A: THE MAIL SURVEY
Dear Sir/Madam,

As a Ph D. student at the University of Leicester preparing my thesis on the above topic, I need your help in deciding whether to include your institution in my study; i.e.: Is your art gallery mostly specialised in art of about 1789-1919? (or a period within these chronological limits).

It is for me quite difficult to answer that question thoroughly only with the help of general guide books and museum directories. Therefore, I wonder whether you could help me: please, find enclosed a very short questionnaire. The three points in it, refer to your collections, your operation objectives, and your professionals, in the more recent times; but you can also use the back, to add comments about the past and/or the future of your institution. I shall be writing to more than a hundred of your colleagues, in a number of countries, from those museums that I presume are, on the whole, specialised in art of 1798-1919.

If you are interested in my subject, I would be very grateful for any kind of collaboration, either more information about your institution (history, catalogues, other studies, activities, purposes, bibliography, etc...) or even your suggestions of other institutions' names.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Yours sincerely:

J. P. Lorente
It is not difficult to make direct enquiries about the origins of a gallery and its initial aims, but it is much harder to have a simple answer for a straightforward interrogation like: 'Is your art gallery mostly specialised in art of about 1789-1919? (or a period within these chronological limits)'. Such a question leads itself to many kind of subjective answers always difficult to check. Hence the idea of mailing a questionnaire asking things that could only be answered by a yes or no, and grounded not on the personal feeling of the eventual answerer but on numerical data.

This research experience was two-fold in its aims. The main objective was to gauge in which measure are 19th century art works still -or again- the core speciality of some of our present museums of fine arts (excluding one artist museums) at any level: contents of their collections, choices on display, programmed activities, declared policies, and current field-work of their personnel. Secondarily, it was also hoped to obtain some identikit pictures imaging them: how big, how active, how modern they are. This survey of the situation in the 1990s was held as a most appropriate appendage and closure for a dissertation about 'museums for 19th century art' in the past.

The practice of posting questionnaires is by no means an innovation (Scott, 1961): it is indeed a very popular research method in the field of museums studies. This was in principle a good point, since this experiment could then benefit from other people's experiences; but, on the other hand, the multiplication of this kind of research in recent years has attained a point close to saturation: many museums staff are already completely fed up with answering questionnaires for M.A. or PhD. museology students! This meant a risk of negative reactions or no repliss. A percentage of replies of about 40% in this kind of surveys is usually deemed good enough. It seems then that there was a fair proportion of response from the institutions contacted: 91 out of 165 (about a 55.5%). Especially considering that, unlike the usual procedure in these cases, no stamped envelopes were sent (British stamps would have not been valid to be used overseas!).

In order to assure a better rate of response, every questionnaire was accompanied by a letter asking for information about publications related to the history of the museum (this is the reason why many of the answerers are librarians or

1 I am very grateful to Yiao-Hwei Chuang a fellow-researcher at the Department of Museum Studies preparing a PhD thesis on Budist arts and artefacts in British museums, for giving me a copy of his questionnaire from where I took my inspiration. My hearty thanks also to Mr. John Beckott, from the Computer Centre of the University of Leicester, who improved it introducing many appropriate changes, and, of course, to my supervisor, Dr. Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, for her reviewing the whole thing.

RESPONSE RATE TO THE MAIL SURVEY
archivists). The questionnaires were tested first (November 1991 and January 1992) with a list of museums within Britain, afterwards (December 1991 and March 1992) other European institutions were sent similar questionnaires, and finally the experience was closed with a transatlantic mailing-list (November 1992 and February 1993) of museums presumed to be concentrated on 19th century art. There was also a follow-up mailing: three months after the first mailing more questionnaires were sent to the institutions that had not answered.

The mailing lists were made picking-up museum names and address from world directories of museums. The description provided there is normally a very condensed synthesis, which is usually enough to discern fine art galleries from the rest but often insufficient to discriminate universal survey art museums from specialised institutions. Thus, due to an insufficient or partial information, many museums who have little to do with 19th century art were included in the mailing. This explains the important number of 'errors'.

Some experts (Hendon, 1979) assume that in a survey carried by post, a non answerer is more likely to be someone not very motivated by the subject studied. This seems logical and it would be a consolation thinking that most of the museums who did not answer have no special commitment towards the arts of the 19th century; but paradoxically two of them are the Oberes Belvedere of Wien and Lady Lever Art Gallery of Port Sunlight—perhaps the most outstanding example in Britain of a museum still featuring nowadays mainly Georgian, Victorian and Edwardian art, which shows that, alas!, some of the non answerers were institutions of great significance for the objectives of this experiment.

So, one wonders if the lack of motivation has to be attributed to the subject or, rather, to the questionnaire. Actually, the fact of having sent a questionnaire instead of asking for a non-framed reply does seem to have had a negative influence. It is difficult to know if some of the institutions who did not answer would have done so if not confronted with 'yet another boring questionnaire'; but as a matter of fact fifteen of the institutions who did answer, did not fill the questionnaire: one of them was the only rude answerer encountered—the director of the Museum für Kunst und Kulturgeschichte of Lübeck (Germany) is someone definitely against questionnaires—whilst the other fourteen kindly sent printed prospectus or catalogues instead.

2 The Guildhall Art Gallery of London, the South London Art Gallery, the Beaverbrook Art Gallery of Fredericton (Canada), the Art Gallery of Hamilton (Canada), the Nordjyllands Kunstmuseum of Aalborg (Denmark), the Williamses Museum of Frederikssund (Denmark), the Taidemuuseum of Pori (Finland), the Musée d'Orsay of Paris (France), the Moderne Galerie of Rosenheim, the Sächsische Museum of Velbert (both in Germany), the Galleria d'Arte Moderna of Milan (Italy), the Prince Eugen Waldemarsudde of Stockholm (Sweden), the Kunsthalle of Basel (Switzerland) and the Hill-Stead Museum in Cincinnati (Ohio, U.S.A).
However, this formality can not have been the most decisive point about the level of cooperation experienced. Probably, the variability of expectations of reply for any letter, with or without questionnaire, depends much more upon the readiness of the destinataires to keep their post regularly answered. It seems that in the U.S.A. and Italy impersonal queries carried out by post are not very likely to find any motivated staff member ready to answer, while, according to the results obtained here, one is always 100% sure to have an answer for any letter sent to Switzerland. All Swiss museums contacted answered and all of them in less than one month!

Likewise, the language may have been sometimes a serious barrier. The questionnaire and the letter presenting it, were first produced in English and then translated into French, German, Italian, Polish, Portuguese and Spanish, which assured that most of the institutions were contacted in their own language. Otherwise questionnaires were sent in at least two different languages, but in spite of that it is very possible that many interlocutors, specially in some East-countries, did not understand the questions.

Finally, one has to assume that some politico-cultural and financial matters did play a role: the farther a letter is sent, the less probable it becomes that it finds sympathetic receivers ready to answer it (the postage is more expensive and the psychological distance greater).
APPENDIX B: THE QUESTIONNAIRE
INSTITUTION NAME: ........................................................................................................

RESPONDANT NAME & ROLE: ..........................................................................................

IS YOUR ART GALLERY MOSTLY SPECIALISED IN ART OF ABOUT 1789-1919? (or a period within these chronological limits). You could help me to answer considering three different points:

1) your collection:

Would you say that at least 75% of all items in your art collection date from the period specified?

Yes No (please underline)

If you can, please give numbers, even if only approximately: How many items are there in your art collection as a whole and from that period? [It would be perfect if you could even specify: a) drawings, b) paintings, c) sculptures, d) others]

-arts as a whole: a) .......... + b) .......... + c) .......... + d) .......... =

-1789-1919 arts: a) .......... + b) .......... + c) .......... + d) .......... =

Are those items of 1789-1919 the most important in quality terms, of your art collection?

Yes No (please underline)

2) your operation objectives:

-In the last ten years (1981-1991), were about 75%, or more, of your acquisitions, devoted to arts of 1789-1919?

Yes No No acquisitions (please underline)

-In the last ten years (1981-1991), were visitors able to find about 75%, or more, of the space in your permanent displays, devoted to art of 1789-1919?

Yes No Section in refurbishment* Museum closed* (please underline)

*Date of the closure: Date of the re-opening: ........................................

-In the last ten years (1981-1991), were about 75%, or more, of your temporary exhibitions, devoted to the arts of 1789-1919 or mostly dominated by them?

Yes No No exhibitions (please underline)

-Have you got a mention of this speciality in your museum statements?

Yes No No written statements (please underline)

3) your experts' field of work:

-Are more than 75% of your professional staff (curators, conservators, educators, researchers..) working in the arts and artifacts of the period specified?

Yes No (please underline)

If you can, please give numbers for your professionals:

-your professionals as a whole: ........................................

-those more concerned with 1789-1919 arts: ..............

Thank you very much for your help!
ASSESSMENT OF THE REPLIES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The total number of replies to the questionnaire was 76. There were 35 completely negative answers—when all questions were answered no. Many respondents let a number of question unanswered. Therefore, rather than a global assessment of the replies, the results have to be examined section by section.

The first thing which would define a museum as specialised in 19th century art should obviously be its collection. When at least 3/4 of a museum's items are datable between the French Revolution and the First World War, and/or the most precious art-works all date from that period, this is clearly a museum of 19th century art. This assumption is the basis for SECTION NUMBER 1 in the questionnaire.

It was first asked: Would you say that at least 75% of all items in your art collection date from the period specified?: yes or no—and afterwards, trying to avoid any subjective answer to this, I wanted numbers for the whole of the collection and for the arts of 1789-1919. There were 42 yes, and 26 no. Most times the following information confirms those choices; with the exception of the numbers given by the Hugh Lane Municipal Gallery of Dublin (Ireland) and the Musée du Petit Palais of Paris (France), who answered 'no' but showed figures for the arts of 1789-1919 clearly mounting up to over 75% of their collection... A case of a previous disposition of the respondents against that historical period? However, very often it is not possible to contrast this data with the previous answer, because many respondents did not face the boring work of doing arithmetics (this had already been foreseen and, in order to avoid too many abandonments, the questionnaire made clear that even approximate numbers would be O.K. for its purpose). Apart from the contrast between the figures and the 'yes' or 'no' answer, the numbers also provided information about the size of the collections and the kind of art-works collected. Apparently, most of them are rather small, for twenty museums declared numbers below 1,000 items in total, while sixteen of them are medium size, that is, add up to a total of items between 1,000 and 5,000, and only two may be considered big, with more than 5,000 items. Most museums have at least twice as many paintings than sculptures, and, when they do have a section of drawings in their collections, their number greatly exceeds that of the paintings. This shows the taste (painting better than sculpture) and the limited means (drawings better than nothing) of the average art-amateurs who were the 'fathers' of the collections. In many cases there is also a big quantity of other items; this said, I will however refrain from pointing out here some very revealing examples of questionnaires where this option raised higher numbers...
than the other three options together, because I am conscious that in part this choice is so numerous just because the range of things covered is numerous as well (it would have been really too much asking for separate numbers!): from prints to tapestry, from furniture to ceramics, from metal works to jewels.

The following question about the collections was: *Are those items of 1789-1919 the most important in quality terms, of your art collection? yes or no* This was a dangerous point in the questionnaire, a hole in the fortress built against subjectivism: is there anything more subjective than speaking about quality? But this was a risk one had to take in order to know if the brighter stars of the collections were 19th century art-works. It was also a difficult question in some cases, because in weighing quality it is not always easy to point out one side of the balance: this was the answer of the curator of the *Musée José Malhoa of Caldas da Rainha* (Portugal), who did not give a simple *yes* or *no* choice. The rest of the respondents managed to overcome this difficulty, and as many as 38 of those 42 who had underlined the *yes* choice at the previous question put *yes* again here. The other 4 (namely the *Aberdeen Art Gallery*, the *Laing Art Gallery of Newcastle upon Tyne*, the *Walsall Museum and Art Gallery*, and the *Civica Galleria d'Arte Moderna of Genoa*) made known that in spite of the fact that about three quarters of their collections are datable between 1789 and 1919, those items are not the most important in quality terms. A case apart is the *Pinacoteca Cantonale Zuest* of Rancate (Switzerland), whose curator did answer *yes* here, but also added a note saying that their most precious items are some 17th century paintings by artists of international reputation (and in fact, two of those paintings take the cover pages of the advertising this gallery kindly sent me). By themselves these five answers corroborate that, in spite of the objections mentioned above, it was a good idea to introduce this reference to quality in the questionnaire, because the quantities alone may lead to wrong conclusions about the degree of specialisation of museums. But there is more: among the 35 museums who answered *no* to the first question, 6 marked the *yes* answer here. The *Muzej na Rasbarskoto i zografsko Ikustvo* of Tryavna (Bulgaria), the *Hugh Lane Municipal Gallery* of Dublin (Ireland), the *Lillehammer By's Malerisamling* (Norway), the *Brugg Städtlistubli* (Switzerland), the *Barnes Foundation* of Merion and the *Columbus Museum of Art* (both in the U.S.A.) consider that their highest quality items are art-works dated between 1789-1919. This shows how things can get complicated in the task of finding out what museums could claim to be specialised in 19th century art.

The SECTION NUMBER 2, dealing with operation objectives, is based upon my firm conviction that museums should not only be catalogued for what they own but also for what they do. I knew from my personal experience as a visitor, that
many museums of 19th century art are institutions created at the end of the last century which managed to survive but really have failed to keep full of vitality: they may be partially or completely closed to visitors for long periods of time, they do not make new acquisitions, they rarely organize temporary exhibitions, they live without stated aims...they are 'fossils museums'. In other cases, and this is a situation particularly frequent in Britain, some art galleries that, for different reasons, have inherited a collection of mostly 19th century art-works are now more keen on 20th century art as a target for their exhibitions, purchases, educational activities, etc ... they are 'museums in a crisis of change'.

Let us forget now those museums we already know are not specialised in 19th century art: we count only the answers of those galleries who declared in the previous questions a predominance, either in terms of quantity or in terms of quality, of the importance of 1789-1919 arts.

We found a very balanced distribution of answers to the question: In the last ten years (1981-1991), were about 75%, or more, of your acquisitions, devoted to arts of 1789-1919? 15 of them said yes, 15 said no, and 16 said they made no acquisitions.

A clear majority, 30 votes, for active institutions; but shared half and half between galleries mostly committed to 19th century art and galleries trying to complete their collection with arts of other periods. The number of galleries who actually survive without increasing their collections with new material is more important than any of the other two active categories.

Following question: In the last ten years (1981-1991), were visitors able to find about 75%, or more, of the space in your permanent displays, devoted to the art of 1789-1919? 32 said yes and 11 answered no, 2 museums underlined the special option preview for displays in refurbishment, and 3 marked museum closed. Thus, most times the declared predominance of 19th century art in the collections implies a parallel predominance in the permanent display. Only a small minority reserves at least a third of the space for a selection of items ranging from other historical periods.

The museums closed are all in Italy: the Civica Galleria d'Arte Moderna 'Villa Serra' and the Raccolte Frugone, both in Genoa closed respectively in 1989 and 1985 (the second may reopen in 1993, the first will not reopen before 1996), and the Galleria d'Arte Moderna Paolo e Adele Giannoni of Novara was closed in 1984 (the reopening is not envisaged). I suppose, based on my frustrated attempts to visit similar galleries in Italy, that this is sadly a very usual situation there: a number of city councils have inherited from the last century some art galleries devoted to local artists of the Italian Risorgimento and the times immediately previous to the Fascist régime. Nowadays those galleries do not attract enough public, and many are closed (therefore the many non-returned questionnaires from there). A case apart is the Picture Gallery of the...
Royal Holloway and Bedford College in Egham: they underlined the choice **closed** because it is visitable only by appointment, but their answer has been counted among the positives, because it is run by the Victorian Art & Architecture Department of the University of London and is currently visited by their staff and students.

Next it was asked: **In the last ten years (1981-1991), were about 75%, or more, of your temporary exhibitions, devoted to the arts of 1789-1919 or mostly dominated by them?** Here again the answers are very wide: 17 yes, 17 no, 12 no exhibitions, 2 did not make any choice at all. Again a clear majority of museums are active institutions, even if the number of 'fossil-museums' is far from small. But among those who did have exhibitions, half take the choice to open them to the arts of other historic periods and can not therefore be considered as specialised only in 19th century art.

The question **Have you got a mention of this speciality in your museum statements?** obtained 26 yes replays, 10 no, 8 no written statements, and 4 no choices. Apparently there is in most cases an official commitment towards the arts of 1789-1919 (or a period within these chronological limits).

The **SECTION NUMBER 3** of the questionnaire deals with people. A museum ruled by a staff not interested on 19th century art, will hardly project any interest for it in the display of those contents or in the museum activities; whilst the contrary would happen if they are people with a special education and training regarding 19th century art in their different jobs: conservation, education, research... That is why the questionnaire finished with a small 3rd section inquiring museums about their **experts field of work**. No mention was made here of the public. First because the museums which can offer a portrait of their customers based on visitors surveys are very rare. But also because there are many other more influential factors in defining the publics of an art gallery than the chronology of its art-works: its possessing world-famous pieces or works by very popular artist (Van Gogh, the Impressionists, the Pre-Raphaelites, etc), its charging policy, its exhibitions and activities programs, its location in an attractive building (a historic monument, or purpose-built modern architecture), its situation (in a tourist centre, or in an area with good transport links), etc... Perhaps a very specific part of the public is specially committed to 19th century art, but it would be an exaggeration to claim that only when those people are the overwhelming majority of the visitors can we define an institution as a museum of 19th century art (most of the visitors to Orsay are tourist 'doing' sightseeing in Paris).

Here again were counted only the answers given by the forty eight museums who in the first section of the questionnaire had declared for their collections a
supremacy of 1789-1919 arts in quantity or in quality. It was asked: *Are more than 75% of your professional staff (curators, conservators, educators, researchers...) working in the arts and artifacts of the period specified?*. And 27 said yes, 16 put no, 5 did not make any choice. Here again, the respondents were asked to check with numbers the accuracy of their answers in order to avoid subjectivism in the estimation. For example, both the Rasmus Meyer Samlinger of Bergen (Norway) and the Galeria-Sukiennice of Warsaw (Poland) had underlined the yes choice, but they declared to have, respectively, only one and two 19th century art specialists among their five professionals. But many did not give any numbers (some explained that they were not allowed to give this kind of information). However, most of those who had answered yes in this last section of the questionnaire about their staff-members, did reveal their figures. This was useful information for, apart from controlling the accuracy of the previous answer, the numbers confirmed again -as in the section about the collections- that the target museums of this experiment are usually small: 17 declared a professional staff of less than two persons, and 2 give numbers between five and ten professionals.

General outcome of the questionnaire: 42 galleries (those underlined in the list of museums contacted) were identified as specialising in 19th-century art.
REFERENCES.
MUSEUMS CONTACTED:

The sign * identifies those who did answer. The museums underlined are those that I consider -within the limits of the information I have- specialised in 19th century art (one-artist museums excluded).
AUSTRIA
Bad Ischl: Kaiservilla*
Wien: Obers Belvedere
Wien: Sammlung Sobek im Geymüller-Schlossel*

BELGIUM
Bruxelles: Musée Charlier*
Nivelles: Musée Charles Gheude
Tienen: Tienen Museum

BRASIL
Petrópolis: Museu Imperial

BRITAIN
Aberdeen: Art Gallery*
Barnsley: The Cooper Gallery*
Bembridge: The Ruskin Galleries
Birkenhead: Williamson Art Gallery and Museum*
Bradford: Cartwright Hall Art Gallery
Bury: Art Gallery and Museum*
Egham: The Picture Gallery*
Liverpool: Sudley Art Gallery*
Liverpool: Walker Art Gallery*
London: Guildhall Art Gallery*
London: Leighton House Museum*
London: South London Art Gallery*
Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Laing Art Gallery*
Oldham: Art Gallery
Port Sunlight: Lady Lever Art Gallery
Rotherham: Art Gallery*
Royston: Wimpole Hall
Southport: Atkinson Art Gallery*
Tintern: Tintern Abbey
Torquay: Torre Abbey*
Walsall: Museum and Art Gallery*
Warrington: Museum and Art Gallery
Wednesbury: Art Gallery and Museum*
Wolverhampton: Wightwick Manor
BULGARIA
Silven: Okræzna Chudoéstvena Galeriya
Trjavna: Muzej na Resbarskoto i Zografsko Izkustvo*
Varna: Muzej na Várazdaneto

CANADA
Fredericton (Nw.Br.): Beaverbrook Art Gallery*
Hamilton (Ont.): Art Gallery of Hamilton*
Kleinburg (Ont.): Mc. Michael Canadian Collection*

CZECH REPUBLIC
Prague: Galerie Hlavniho Mesta
Prague: Narodni Galerie V. Praze

DENMARK
Aalborg: Nordjyllands Kunstmuseum*
Charlottenlund: Ordrupgaard Samling*
Copenhagen: Hirschsprungske Samling*
Faaborg: Faaborg Museum for Fynsk Malerkunst
Frederikssund: Willumsen Museum*
Odense: Fyns Stiftsmuseum*
Skagen: Skagen Museum

FINLAND
Helsinki: Cygnaeusen Galleria*
Helsinki: Sininbraghojfin Taidekokoelmat*
Kokkola: Taidemuseo
Oimattila: Taidekokoelmat
Pori: Taidemuseo*
Tampere: Tempeereen Taidemuseo*
Turku: Taidemuseo

FRANCE
Paris: Musée d’Orsay*
Paris: Musée du Petit Palais*
Paris: Musée de la Vie Romantique
GERMANY
Berlin: Nationalgalerie
Dortmund: Museum für Kunst und Kulturgeschichte*
Essen: Museum Folkwang
Gelsenkirchen: Städtisches Museum*
Giessen: Oberhessisches Museum
Karl-Marx-Stadt: Städtische Kunstsammlungen
Lübeck: Museum Behnhaus*
Lünen: Kunstmuseum
Magdeburg: Kulturhistorisches Museum*
München: Neue Pinakothek*
München: Schack-Galerie*
Oldenburg: Städtische Kunstsammlungen*
Rosenheim: Saarland Museum Moderne Galerie*
Saarbrücken: Stiftung Saarländischer Kulturbesitz*
Stuttgart: Galerie der Stadt*
Sulzbach-Rosenberg: Bayerisches Schulmuseum*
Velbert: Städtische Museen*

GREECE
Mesolongi: Municipal Art Gallery

HUNGARY
Szőkesfehérvár: Budenz-Ház

IRELAND
Dublin: Hugh Lane Municipal Gallery of Modern Art*

ITALY
Anticoli Corrado: Galleria Comunale d'Arte Moderna
Civitá d'Antino: Raccolta Cerroni
Feltre: Galleria d'Arte Moderna 'Rizzarda'
Firenze: Galleria d'Arte Moderna di Palazzo Pitti*
Genova: Civica Galleria d'Arte Moderna*
Genova: Raccolte Frugone*
Giulianova: Pinacoteca Civica Vincenzo Bindi*
Livorno: Pinacoteca Civica 'G. Fattori'*
Lugo di Vicenza: Collezione Malinverni
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Milano: Civica Galleria d'Arte Moderna*
Milano: Collezione G. e I. Jucker
Modena: Galleria Luigi Poletti
Napoli: Galleria d'Arte Moderna dell'Accademia di Belle Arti
Novara: Galleria d'Arte Moderna Giannoni*
Palermo: Civica Galleria d'Arte Moderna 'Empedocle Restivo' *
Piacenza: Galleria d'Arte Moderna 'Ricci Oddi' *
Pinerolo: Collezione Civica d'Arte di Palazzo Vitone *
Prato: Galleria d'Arte Moderna
Roma: Museo 'Canonica
Roma: Gall. Com. d'Arte Moderna
Roma: Gall. Naz. d'Arte Moderna
Sciacca: Pinacoteca
Torino: Galleria Civica d'Arte Moderna

JAPAN
Tokio: National Museum of Western Art*

NETHERLANDS
Almen: A. Bonger Collectie*
Amsterdam: Fodor Museum*
Dordrecht: Dordrecht Museum
Eindhoven: Stedelijk van Abbe Museum*
Then Haag: Rijksmuseum Hendrik Willem Mesdag*
Then Haag: Haags Gemeentemuseum
Laren: Singer Museum*
Otterloo: Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller
Utrech: Van Baaren Museum

NORWAY
Bergen: Rasmus Meyer Samlinger *
Lillehammer: Malerisamling*
Trondheim: Kunstgalleri*

POLAND
Kraków: Muzeum Narodowe Galerie-Sukiennice*

PORTUGAL
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Caldas da Rainha: Museu José Malhoa*
Lisboa: Museu Dr. Anastácio Gonçalves
Sintra: Palácio Nacional da Pena

ROMANIA
Bucuresti: Anastase Simu Muzeul de Arta
Bucuresti: Muzeul Toma Stelian*
Bucuresti: Muzeul Zambacciam

RUSSIA
Puskin: Muzej-Dvorec

SLOVENIA
Osijek: Zodiak Galerija

SPAIN
Barcelona: Museo de Arte Moderno
Madrid: Casón del Buen Retiro*
Madrid: Museo Romántico*
Olot: Museu Comarcal de la Garrotxa*
Pamanes: Colección de Arte Palacio de Elsedo
Santa Cruz de la Palma: Museo de Bellas Artes

SWEDEN
Boras: Konstmuseum*
Stockholm: Prins Eugens Waldemarsudde*
Stockholm: Thielska Galleriet

SWITZERLAND
Basel: Kunsthalle*
Brugg: Stäblistübl*
Chur: Bundner Kunstmuseum*
Genève: Musée de l’Athénée*
Genève: Musée du Petit Palais*
Rancate: Pinacoteca cantonale Giovanni Züst*
Sankt Gallen: Kunstmuseum*
Vevey: Musée Jenisch*
Winterthur: Sammlung Oskar Reinhart*
UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Andover (Mass.): Addison Gallery of American Art
Baltimore (Maryl.): Baltimore Museum of Art*
Buffalo (Nw. York): Albright-Knox Art Gallery
Cincinnati (Ohio): Cincinnati Art Museum*
Columbus (Ohio): Columbus Museum of Art*
Farmington (Conn.): Hill-Stead Museum*
Los Angeles (Cal.): Norton Simon Museum of Art
Los Angeles (Cal.): Frederick S. Wight Art Gallery
Milwaukee (Wisc.): Milwaukee Art Museum
Merion (Pen.): Barnes Museum*
New Britain (Conn.): New Britain Museum of American Art
New York (Nw. York): National Academy of Design*
Northampton (Mass.): Smith College Museum of Art*
Oshkosh (Wis.): Paine Art Center and Arboretum
Philadelphia (Penn.): Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts*
Pittsburgh (Penn.): Carnegie Museum of Art
St. Petersburg (Flor.): Museum of Fine Arts of St. Petersburg-Florida
Syracuse (Nw. York): Everson Museum of Art
Waltham (Mass.): The Rose Art Museum
Washington (Was.D.C.): Phillips Collection*
Washington (Was. D.C.): Corcoran Art Gallery
Youngstown (Ohio): Butler Institute of American Art*

YUGOSLAVIA

Novi Sad: Galerija Matice Srpske
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