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EINFÜHRUNG / INTRODUCTION

SPECIALIZATION AND CONSOLIDATION OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM AFTER 1830
THE NEUE MUSEUM IN BERLIN IN AN INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

Debora J. Meijers

This is the second volume in the research programme, National Museums and National Identity Seen from an International and Comparative Perspective (c. 1760–1918), a joint project of the Huizinga Instituut in Amsterdam and the Institut für Museumsforschung in Berlin. Briefly speaking, the aim of the project is to elucidate how in the ‘long’ nineteenth century various European states made use of their museums to fashion and disseminate the image of a ‘national culture’. With regard to period and subject-matter, this volume links up with the first one, published in 2009, Napoleon’s Legacy, which discusses the rise of national museums in Europe (1794–1830) under the influence of the confiscations during the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars and the restitutions that followed those upheavals. The current book that arose out of a conference to celebrate the reopening of the Neue Museum in Berlin focuses on the period from around 1830, when a new phase in museum policy began to emerge, parallel to the development by which the various European nation states each attempted to acquire an ‘identity’ of its own. Initially we wanted to examine this phase right across the board, and with reference to developments at four levels: Firstly the new or restored governments began work on the founding of large-scale, more or less autonomous museum buildings or extensions of existing buildings on strategic locations, mainly in capital cities. The museum as a type of civic building emerged alongside other similar structures such as law court buildings, city halls, university buildings, libraries, municipal hospitals and banks. In the same period museums were built in London, Munich, Berlin, Budapest and Stockholm, to mention a few instances, while in St Petersburg the Hermitage was given a huge extension for use as a museum. Paris occupied a special place in this development, because the Louvre had already emerged in the Napoleonic age as the prototype of the national, public, civilian museum, only to decline into a shadow of itself in 1815 as a result of the restitutions. During the Restoration however this museum too was once again able to vie with the museums of other nations due to new acquisitions and a dramatic expansion of space in the existing Louvre building under King Charles X. Secondly the public expanded to include various layers of the population, under the impact of broader social developments such as educational advances for the middle classes and a corresponding consumption of culture, the expansion of means of transport and commu-

1 Bergvelt/Meijers/Tibble/Van Wezel 2007.
2 Also published in the series Berliner Schriften zur Museumsforschung (vol. 27). See Bergvelt/Meijers/Tibble/Van Wezel 2009.
3 Pevsner 1976 is the classic study in this field.
4 See Eva Börsch-Supan in this volume. In the period up till around 1860 new buildings were built in London: British Museum (Robert Smirke, 1823-1847), National Gallery (William Wilkins, 1832-1838); Munich: Glyptothek and Alte Pinakothek (Leo von Klenze, resp. 1816-1830 and 1826-1836); Neue Pinakothek (August von Voit, 1846-1853); Berlin: Altes Museum (Karl Friedrich Schinkel, 1822-1830) and Neues Museum (Friedrich August Stüler, 1841-1855/59); Budapest: Hungarian National Museum (Mihály Pollack, 1837-1846); Stockholm: National Museum (Friedrich August Stüler, 1848-1866), to mention a few. Instances of extensions are the Musée Charles X in the Louvre (1827-1834: newly decorated galleries, such as the Musée d’Egypte); St. Petersburg: the New Hermitage (Leo von Klenze, 1842-1855; built onto an earlier museum wing of the still functioning palace).
nizations, travel facilities and tourism. The museums contributed to this process by extending opening times and admitting wider groups of the population, and by adopting educational elements in the presentation such as captions and supportive interior decoration.5

At the same time a process of specialization took place. The various departments of collections were given separate identities and provided with specialized supervision, parallel to the emerging academic disciplines in the universities. While these departments were still sometimes combined under a single roof in keeping with the tradition of the eighteenth-century encyclopaedic museum, from the 1870s onward they often started leading a life of their own as separate, specialized institutions. In St Petersburg, where the Kunstkammer had already been housed since the early eighteenth century in an autonomous building, the exodus of natural objects and hand-made artefacts to the zoological and botanical museums, for instance, and to the Hermitage had occurred during the 1830s and later.6 Another instance was the removal of the Natural History department from the British Museum to a building of its own between 1881 and 1886. During the course of the century collections of paintings were divided into separate sections, with special galleries for instance being set up for contemporary art.7

Finally in the course of the nineteenth century the national museum acquired an extra function with the recording, or rather designing of the history of the nation concerned and especially its heroic achievements, and hence with the image of the nation that its government wished to propagate. It was granted a role in the education of middle-class society through the public presentation of the collections, which now started being viewed from the standpoint of one’s ‘heritage’. In this respect the period from about 1780 to 1880 witnessed a shift from the concept of humanity as a whole to that of one’s ‘own nation’.8 This was expressed both in the design of the building, its interior and decorations, and in the layout, organization and presentation of the collections. In Madrid for instance the Prado was transformed into the Royal Museum of Painting and Sculpture in 1819, with a strong focus on the Spanish school already. In Berlin the Nationalgalerie was founded in 1876 to specialize in German art while in St Petersburg the Hermitage was given a department of Russian art (1824) that was later succeeded by the Russian Museum, 8 Since the end of the eighteenth century different sort of patriotic or nationalist pride found expression in princely or else state museums (see also Meijers 1995 and Bergvelt/Meijers/Tibbe/VanWezel 2009). They can tentatively be divided into three stages. Firstly, from 1780 onwards, the artistic or natural products of one’s own territory, as a variation within the total, international spectrum, were put on display for reasons of patriotism. The aim here was to stimulate domestic production and to highlight the economic and artistic character of one’s own state in response to competition from abroad, and from France and Italy in particular. Secondly, there came the need to develop a notion of one’s own heritage as a source of national pride. This stage began with the campaigns of the French revolutionary armies from 1794 onwards and especially the Napoleonic wars of 1804-1815 and culminated in the return of the confiscated collections from Paris after the allied victories and the museums that were founded afterwards. Thirdly, from about 1870 onwards, the possessions and achievements of one’s own state were put on display in a nationalist and even imperialist framework. While these three stages strictly speaking form a continuum, their distinct characteristics should not be overlooked. As far as we know, no studies have yet been published revealing or interpreting the gradual shifts between these stages, either in individual cases or by way of international comparisons. This provisional division into periods will be explored further in the sequel to the present research project.

5 The international trends and differences in attitudes towards the public have not yet been adequately researched, but some patterns have already been discerned due to the work of Bergvelt/Hörster 2010 in the special number of De negentiende eeuw, in which there are also other contributions about different sorts of museums and their public. In 1853 the British Parliament conducted an international enquiry by which various national museums were asked about matters such as their accessibility; see Bergvelt 2005, 330-332 (in Dutch) and Bergvelt 2007, 44-46 (in English). Penzel 2007 by contrast discerned a ‘Vermittlungsdefizite’ (lack of mediation) in the nineteenth century, at least as far as museums of paintings were concerned, until around 1880 when a thorough-going educational approach was propagated, by Alfred Lichtwark in particular. See for Great Britain (Victoria and Albert Museum): Burton 1999; for Belgium: Nys 2009.

6 Kistemaker/Kopaneva/Meijers/Vilinbakhov 2005, 106.

7 Examples can be found in Paris (Musée du Luxembourg, 1818) and Haarlem (Paviljoen Welgelegen, 1838). Bergvelt 1985; Lorente 1998.
founded in 1898. The *Nederlandsch Museum voor Geschiedenis en Kunst* (The Hague, 1876; in the *Rijksmuseum* in Amsterdam after 1886) can with some reservations also be included here.\(^9\)

**The case of the Neue Museum**

It soon became apparent that it would be impossible to deal with all these aspects in a single conference, let alone if one were to include examples from various countries. Similar to *Napoleon’s Legacy*, we have aimed for an international and comparative approach, by which the discussions would focus on the detection of international patterns, but also differences in these trends. We thus intend to test the accuracy of the above-mentioned more general and abstract narrative of museum history by means of concrete instances, adjusting it where necessary.

We therefore decided to concentrate on the two latter aspects of our subject. The main theme that is discussed in this book is that of academic specialization in the evolution of the museum in the nineteenth century. At issue here is how scholarship and learning influenced the composition and presentation of museum collections and also the kind of knowledge those responsible wanted to spread by means of the museum. Our particular focus is on the role played by specialized scholarly knowledge in the process of nation-building – a question about which little concrete and detailed study has been carried out until now.

When the opportunity occurred, we took advantage of it to link up with the reopening of the *Neue Museum* in Berlin in 2009 and consequently to define the limits of our study more precisely and make it more concrete. At its opening and even when it was under construction, the *Neue Museum*, designed and built by Friedrich August Stüler in the period from 1841 to 1855/59, was already a sensation. This building, which was also technologically extremely modern, was designed as an extension of Karl Friedrich Schinkel’s museum of painting and the sculpture of antiquity, opened in 1830 on the Lustgarten and later known as the ‘Alte’ museum (Börsch-Supan fig. 4). The *Neue Museum* (Introduction fig. 5–11) was designed to house the remaining royal collections. Non-classical antiquity, whether that of Egypt or of the German nation, and ethnographic material, plaster casts, former objects from the *Kunstkammer*, and prints and drawings were all now deemed worthy of a public museum. In other words, all these objects were considered important enough, in keeping with the older notion of universality, to be displayed together in a single public institution, and to a wider public than had previously been the case in the *Kunstkammer* of the royal palace, in the neighbouring *Schloss Monbijou*, in the Academy of Fine Arts and elsewhere. In 1855 when the first visitors entered this building – gigantic for its time – they were astonished by the variety of sorts of collection, each with its own interior architecture and colourful murals. In the case of Egypt there was even a free reconstruction of a temple (see the contribution of Bénédicte Savoy and Dietrich Wildung). They were also struck however by the chronological sequence of the different departments and the evolution-based layout of the museum as a whole – from Nordic prehistory and ethnography (in both cases consisting of objects from ‘the infancy of humanity’, according to Elsa van Wezel’s and Peter Bolz’s articles) alongside the Egyptian artefacts on the ground floor, by way of an extensive plaster cast series of the development of European sculpture from the Greeks to early modern times\(^1\) that took up the whole first floor (‘the real focus of all the collections’, according to the essay by Gertrud Platz-Horster), up to and including the highly sophisticated western prints and drawings.

9 Neverov/Piotrovsky 1997, 70-71.
10 Ellinoor Bergvelt’s contribution to this volume shows that allusions to the Dutch nation remained subordinate to those to the city of Amsterdam in the decorations of the *Rijksmuseum* produced in around 1885.
11 See also the contribution of Nikolaus Bernau in this volume.
section and the department of Kunstkammer objects that was still known as the Kunstkammer, each occupying its own wing on the third storey (see Heinrich Schulze Altcappenberg and Barbara Segelken).

In fact however this superior complex hardly lasted twenty-five years in its originally intended form, before all the internal and external moves began. These took place not only due to collections expanding but also because of academic specialization, leading to a disruption in the carefully elaborated mutual harmony of collections and decorations. In this development, the Neue Museum was no exception, as we have seen already. First of all in 1876 the Kunstkammer was moved to the recently founded Kunstmuseum. Then the collections of ethnographic and prehistoric objects acquired new premises in the Museum für Völkerkunde, built in 1886. The constantly expanding collection of Assyrian antiquities took over the galleries on the ground floor that consequently came vacant. How this relatively new field of collecting and scholarship expanded under the influence of the competition between France, Great Britain and the German Empire is described in the contribution of Nicola Crüsemann. The Kupferstichkabinett was expanded in 1905 to include the former galleries of the Kunstkammer, so that it now occupied the entire top floor. It thus developed into one of the largest in Europe.

Once murals had been painted over, double walls installed and ceilings lowered – as happened internationally in so many museums – in a series of stages from about 1890 onwards, little remained of the original concept. On the other hand we should not forget that adaptations like this have also kept museums ‘alive’ under continually changing social circumstances. This was particularly true of the next stage. Badly damaged by bombardments during the Second World War, the Neue Museum led a long existence as a ruin, until it was restored in recent years after a design by David Chipperfield and was once more given a goal in life. The entire museum is now devoted to prehistory and antiquity, without any limits of culture or geography. From the mid-1980s to 2009, the year when the conversion was completed and the museum reopened, lengthy debates about the proper course that the restoration and reallocation should take have been accompanied by a number of important publications about this museum.

Despite all this, it was our view that some aspects deserved more attention, and perhaps even a different approach. This was especially so for the genesis of this museum in turbulent times when groups of progressive citizens in various German states were striving to achieve democratic reforms (such as a constitution and freedom of the press) and when, after they realized that they stood little chance of progress on that front, romantic nationalism grew into a more political nationalism, leading to the Revolution of 1848. The particular composition of this royal museum, somewhere between the Encyclopaedist idea of universalism and that of greater specialization, called for a closer locating in the context of the revolutionary period around 1850.

This is why it isn’t just due to the present situation of its reopening that the Berlin museum has been chosen as our departure point. It forms a provocative case for our theme. At the time of its origins the Neue Museum was the prototype of the specialized and scholarly-based museum of cultural history and as such it set a standard for many museums to come. Historical studies will certainly benefit from a closer look at this

13 The volumes Museumsinszenierungen. Zur Geschichte der Institution des Kunstmuseums. Die Berliner Museumshandbuch (Joachimides/Kühnau/Vahrson/Berndau 1995) and Berliner Museen. Geschichte und Zukunft (Berlins Museen 1994) give interesting interpretations of these debates. Both of them deal with the Neue Museum in the framework of the reallocation of the museums of Berlin after the reunification of Germany in 1989, and of the city of Berlin in particular. For recent publications, see the two volumes that appeared on the occasion of the reopening: Blauert 2009a and Hamm 2009. In the present volume Wolfgang Henze and Anne van Grevenstein-Kruse explore aspects of the issue of restoration in the Neue Museum and the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam respectively.
particular case: Gustav Friedrich Waagen and later representatives of the museums in Berlin, also in their capacity as professor at the University or the Akademie der Wissenschaften, encouraged with their work the process of specialization and institutionalization in art history, archaeology (for instance, Konrad Levezow, Ernst Toelken, Eduard Gerhard, Theodor Panofka), Egyptology (Richard Lepsius), prehistory (Leopold von Ledebur), and ethnology (Adolf Bastian). In turn this specialization contributed to the modern scholarly approach to the museum presentations, resulting in a largely chronological arrangement of the objects per department, and in the evolution-based sequence of the separate sections in the building as a whole. The fact that these developments occurred on an international scale can be seen in the articles in this volume dealing with Holland, Denmark and France.\textsuperscript{14}

At the same time, in Prussia as elsewhere in Europe, the presentation of these specialized collections was meant to generate appreciation for the discoveries in, and by, the respective nation states. It was a way of stressing the importance of those scholarly results and giving the national museum an international character. Though the designation ‘national’ was not used in connection with the Neue Museum, this was what also happened here with the very ambitious Egyptian department (including its temple and decorative murals), with the collection-in-progress of near-Eastern archaeology, and, last but not least, the excavations and finds on the ‘national soil’. Leopold von Ledebur, director of the Kunstkammer and the Museum for Vaterländische Alterthümer, had already reminded his readers in his catalogue of 1838 that in former times ‘what was discovered at home used to be despised as barbaric’, and for an object to be considered worthwhile and appreciated, it must never be Germanic or Slavic, but had to be proclaimed as a Roman artefact.\textsuperscript{15} But this was past history: by around 1830/40, finds from the Nordic soil were thought to deserve at least as much attention as Greek and Roman antiquity. The creation of a specialized collection in the museum was obviously also meant to foster patriotic pride.\textsuperscript{16} One of the aims of this volume is to pay greater attention to historical evidence of this function, not only in Prussia but also in other European states.

\textbf{Academic specialization and patriotic pride}

Various attempts have been made here to fill this lacuna. Peter Pentz shows that in the years of the planning and construction of the Neue Museum a number of decisive developments took place in the fields of science and politics. Excavations by Jacques Boucher du Perthes in the valley of the Somme in northern France and by Jens Jacob Worsaae in Denmark caused ‘the bottom to fall out of time’, that is, the existence of human life on earth proved to go much further back than had been hitherto assumed. In this field too a path was cleared for the theory of evolution. This find also led to searches in other countries about the earliest traces of human life – and hence of one’s own people – in one’s own territory, actual or claimed as such. Prussia was no exception and, similar to elsewhere, the museum collections and their pres-

\textsuperscript{14} See the articles by Annie Caubet, Dominique de Font-Réaulx, Rudolf Effert, Peter Pentz, Lieske Tibbe and Ingrid Vermeulen.

\textsuperscript{15} Ledebur 1838, iv: ‘Aber freilich hatte man zu jener Zeit [=17th/18th century] nur die Absicht, Gegenstände des klassischen Alterthums auf vaterländischem Boden zu gewinnen, das eigentlich Heimathliche, als Barbarisches vernachlässigt, hatte gar keinen Aufmerksamkeit sich zu erfreuen; und brachte ja einmal das Zufall der Betrachtung Werthes und Ausgezeichneteres zu Tage, so war man weit entfernt, es für germanisch oder slavisch zu halten, sondern man trug gar kein Bedenken, es sofort für römisch zu erklären’. See also Elsa van Wezel in this volume. At the time Ledebur published these words this department of the future Neue Museum was still located in Schloss Monbijou; before 1834 it formed part of the Kunstkammer in the Stadtschloss (the Royal Palace).

\textsuperscript{16} It seems likely that in around 1838 what was involved was still only a limited form of patriotic pride in the territory of Brandenburg-Prussia, rather than a fully fledged German nationalism. German unity only began to become an aim of the government after 1850 (see Menke in this volume). See note 8 for a provisional division into periods of patriotism and nationalism with regard to national museums.
presentation, coupled with the excavations, played a crucial role. That this could even lead to territorial conflicts with Denmark is shown in Pentz's article and it is also a theme in that by Marion Bertram.

It is an intriguing question whether one can trace a connection here with the second development – that of the popular struggle for a greater voice in public life and for German unification that culminated in the Revolution of 1848. A connection with the Neue Museum cannot be explicitly proven, as long, that is, as we are looking for direct evidence. One of the few signs of one is the rapid sketch, discovered beneath the plaster in one of the Egyptian galleries; with the words ‘Es lebe die Republik’ (see the contribution of Wolfgang Henze fig. 8). It is precisely the secretive character of this sketch that gives one a clue to the attitude of the Neue Museum to the nationalist movement. It would be absurd to expect a direct connection in this royal institute with the efforts to achieve democracy and German unity that had aroused the civilian population in the 1840s (see Elsa van Wezel's article). In its most radical form this struggle was, after all, addressed to the abolition of the hereditary rule of the House of Hohenzollern, and even in its more moderate form it always aimed to reduce the political might of that family. On the other hand Friedrich Wilhelm IV (1840-1861) and his advisers responded to these developments with a number of moderately liberal measures, such as the instituting in 1847 of a Vereinigte Landtag (state parliament), which provided a very limited form of popular representation. Nonetheless the king deliberately stopped short of setting up a constitution. For this reason he also refused to accept the imperial crown of Germany offered him by the Frankfurt Parliament of 1849. In as far as he had German unification in mind, it was only in the form of a revival of the old Holy Roman Empire of the German states that went back to the Middle Ages and which had been dissolved by Napoleon. That system allowed for an election and coronation by the German electors, but not by a Parliament of ordinary citizens. Even so, one would expect to see traces of government policy at the level of the administration of the sciences and the museums. It is therefore curious that to date there has hardly been any research carried out on this issue and that this museum is also generally seen as the Freistätte (sanctuary; Introduction fig. 3–4), the notion that pleased the fancy of its founder in 1841. Despite the fact that this museum was a creation of the authorities, in a period when the nationalist movement was flourishing in that part of the nation that was active in its opposition to the authorities, it is possible to discern elements in museum policy that recall the spirit that prevailed among both the romantic and the revolutionary nationalists. The inclusion of a section of medieval German sculpture in the series the remainder of which consisted of plaster casts of works from classical antiquity on the first floor may perhaps not directly be associated with influence from these circles, any more than was the case with the above-mentioned department of Germanic antiquities on the ground floor, decorated with scenes from the Edda. Even so the inclusion of a German section in the plaster cast collection calls to mind another cast museum, the Musée de Sculpture comparée which Viollet-le-Duc planned in Paris.

17 In this respect one gets another picture from the Czech state and Bohemia during this period than one does from Prussia. Unlike Berlin, the national museums in Prague and Budapest already played an explicitly political role in the first half of the century. The Czech national museum (founded 1818, new building 1891) and the Hungarian National Museum (founded 1802, new building 1837-1847) took on a nationalist character in the struggle for liberation from Habsburg rule and the founding of their own states. See Marosi/Klaniczay 2006; Fodor 1992 and Stloukal 1992. We encounter another, equally politically charged version in Edinburgh, where a Scottish National Museum emerged between about 1847 and 1866 in the tension between loyalty to the British state and Scottish self-awareness. See Burnett/Newby 2007.

18 See Nipperdey 1993.
19 Friedrich August Stüler called his plan of 1841, drafted on the basis of a sketch by Friedrich Wilhelm IV himself, the Freistätte für Kunst und Wissenschaft – a sanctuary for art and science.
20 See Nicolaus Bernau in this volume.
in the same period to foreground French sculpture and also to compare it with that of antiquity (see the article of Dominique de Font-Réaulx). In this case, the attempt to rehabilitate the ‘national culture’ was more explicit than it was in the Neue Museum. We have already seen however in Ledebur’s statement with regard to national antiquities that this mode of thinking in terms of the culture of one’s own nation definitely prevailed in museum circles in Berlin as well. Something of this sort must have played a role in the department of national antiquities. The patrons and designers of the Edda murals made their intentions plain with present-day interpretations of northern European myths, such as those of Jacob Grimm, the intellectual leading light of the struggle for German unity who explicitly gave a political twist to his philological studies. In Berlin too it seems the political and academic authorities attached importance to the supposed roots of the national culture and they felt it essential to remind museum visitors of these, for example in the shape of large-scale murals. Also the character of and vicissitudes around Wilhelm von Kaulbach’s paintings in the stairwell are signs that at the end of the period from 1841 to 1865, the year when the cycle was completed, what was at issue was no longer an ‘evolution of mankind’ presented as politically neutral, but rather the victorious role of German culture in this process. In this volume these aspects are discussed by Annemarie Menke and Nikolaus Bernau.

A similar shift after the mid-century can also be detected in the treatment of objects of non-European cultures. These acquired a place in the museum on the one hand as objects of ethnographic interest, dating from roughly the seventeenth century to the present day, and on the other in the form of archaeological remains from the Near East (Assyria) and Egypt. Similar to state museums elsewhere in Europe, these fields for scholars and scientists acquired a colonial dimension during the last quarter of the century – a development that ran parallel to the increasing professionalization of these areas of study. The rehousing of the ethnology collection in a separate Museum für Völkerkunde in 1886 was also part of this process. Especially with the extensive collection of ethnographic material (Adolf Bastian) and archaeological digs in the Near East (Richard Schöne and Carl Humann), Germany since the Reichsgründung of 1871 had joined in the fierce competition already embarked on some decades earlier between France and England, as is shown in the articles of Peter Bolz, Nicola Crüsemann and Annie Caubet.

In spite of all the modernization that has taken place, however, the Neue Museum also remains linked to the past. In the opening essay Horst Bredekamp examines the issue of the continuance of the tradition of the Kunstkammer, firstly with regard to the Neue Museum as a whole, and secondly with regard to the department of minor arts on the third floor that also still kept the name of Kunstkammer after its rehousing from the Stadtschloss (the Palace) in 1855. In contrast with the prevailing viewpoint that this nineteenth-century museum definitively sealed the disintegration of the older form of collecting, Bredekamp treats it as testifying to ‘the powers of endurance of the Kunstkammer’. According to him, it rose again like a phoenix from the ashes in this new universal museum. This view also casts a new light on the issue of academic specialization. Seen in this way, it was also initially (that is, until the separations after 1876) more a continuation of the eighteenth century than a prelude to the modern form of division into separate professional disciplines. The second aspect, the vicissitudes and semantic shifts that the Kunstkammer objects experienced are also described by Barbara Segelken and Lieske Tibbe, especially on the occasion


22 See also Pentz in this volume.

23 This is partly attributable to the death of Friedrich Wilhelm IV in 1861 and the accession of his brother, who later became Kaiser Wilhelm I, and partly to the increased vehemence of nationalist politics – something that was also the case with the other western powers.
of their next rehousing in 1876 in the new Kunstgewerbemuseum. The latter contribution shows how a very similar process of shift and rehousing took place in the Netherlands with the contents of the Koninklijk Kabinet van Zeldzaamheden (Royal Cabinet of Rarities) in The Hague. The Kunstkammer objects seem thus to have been given a new lease of life in the context of the burgeoning applied arts movement of the second half of the nineteenth century.

The aims and arrangement of this book
The key question this volume poses is that of how specialized academic research was applied in the museum after 1830 and of identifying the aims of individual institutions with regard to the building of the nation and the education of its citizens. This issue will be discussed with the Neue Museum as departure point and where possible in an international, comparative perspective.

Nine papers cover the special fields of the Neue Museum and the respective presentation of its departments. These departments consist of Archaeology/classical, medieval and early modern sculpture (the collection of plaster casts), Art History (the print room), Egyptology, Assyriology, Slavic-Germanic (Nordic) Prehistory and Early History, Ethnology, and Arts and Crafts (the Kunstkammer). Another six papers introduce the presentations of these disciplines in national, royal or similar museums abroad in the nineteenth century: The Galleries of Eastern and American Antiquities, and the Chalcographie (print collection), both in the Louvre; the Musée de Sculpture comparée, also in Paris; the National Museum in Copenhagen (collection of Danish antiquities); the Dutch Royal Cabinet of Curiosities in The Hague, the Department of History, Fine and Applied Arts in the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, and the National Museum of Ethnography in Leiden.

These contributions which are related to specific collections are preceded by two articles dealing respectively with the origins of the Neue Museum in the concept of the Royal Kunstkammer and the Neue Museum as an architectural design. Finally a group of four articles focuses on the interior decoration of this type of museum, in particular concerning its relation to the collections and the problems that arose with recent restoration projects in Berlin and Amsterdam.
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