UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

The Kaiserlich Königliche Gemäldegalerie in Vienna seen from an International Perspective: 1780 - 1855 - 1891: It's architectural setting and museological embedding

Meijers, D.J.

Publication date

2013

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Die kaiserliche Gemäldegalerie in Wien und die Anfänge des öffentlichen Kunstmuseums. - Bd 2: Europäische Museumkulturen um 1800

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Meijers, D. J. (2013). The Kaiserlich Königliche Gemäldegalerie in Vienna seen from an International Perspective: 1780 - 1855 - 1891: It's architectural setting and museological embedding. In G. Swoboda, K. Patz, & N. Fischer (Eds.), *Die kaiserliche Gemäldegalerie in Wien und die Anfänge des öffentlichen Kunstmuseums. - Bd 2: Europäische Museumkulturen um 1800* (pp. 385-405). Böhlau Verlag. <http://www.oapen.org/record/465871>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

The Kaiserlich Königliche Gemäldegalerie in Vienna seen from an International Perspective

1780 – 1855 – 1891: ITS ARCHITECTURAL SETTING AND
MUSEOLOGICAL EMBEDDING*

Fig. 1

Julius Victor Berger, Habsburg
emperors as patrons of the arts,
Detail: Maximilian I with Dürer.
Vienna, KHM, ceiling painting
of room XIX, 1891

When viewed from an international perspective, the history of the *Gemäldegalerie* of the Habsburg dynasty since the late eighteenth century displays a number of exceptional characteristics. (Fig. 2) From being extremely progressive in 1780, the gallery gradually lost its exemplary status after 1815 – at least in terms of its location and its museological situation – as compared with galleries in places like Berlin, Dresden, Munich, and London. A turn in the gallery's fortune took place after 1858 with the planning and construction of the *Ringstrasse*.¹ It is true that it made up for lost ground in terms of modernization, but the result – the new museum building designed by Gottfried Semper and Carl von Hasenauer – ensured that it reverted once more to being something of an anomaly in the European museum landscape of the second half of the nineteenth century. (Fig. 3)

This was the case in at least two respects. In the first place, while elsewhere the general trend was towards greater specialization, the Viennese painting gallery was made part of a complex of two museums, which together continued to embrace the entire spectrum of art history and natural history departments. Secondly, whereas in the rest of Europe the newly built museums had gained independence from the traditional seat of power, namely the palace, the Viennese museums had their constituent parts moulded by the urban planners into a single unit with the *Hofburg*, known as the '*Kaiserforum*'.

In this paper I should like to examine from an international perspective² the extent to which the *K. K. Gemäldegalerie* remained an exception to the rule, and what factors could have played a role in this. In doing so I don't intend to enter the gallery, but rather to make a tour around it to investigate its siting. Let us take as our reference point the year 1855 and see if the characteristics of the gallery in that period already tell us something about the new *Hofmuseum* designed and built between 1867 and 1891 in terms of the encyclopedic character of the collection in which the painting gallery was embedded,³ and of the dynastic character of its location, the *Kaiserforum*.

A British traveller in 1855

A hypothetical art expert – an Englishman, for the sake of argument (Fig. 4) – undertaking a tour of Europe in 1855 would have visited Berlin, Dresden and Munich, towns where, since 1825, five new royal museums had sprung up. He would deliberately have chosen to travel by train,⁴ and to go in September of that year, because two of the museums would just have opened their doors to the public: in Berlin, Friedrich August Stüler's *Neues Museum* (built, 1841–55/59, as a complement to Karl Friedrich Schinkel's *Königliches Museum* of 1822–30, henceforth referred to as the *Altes Museum*); and in Dresden, Gottfried Semper's *Neues Königliches Museum* (1847–55).

**Aus urheberrechtlichen Gründen darf die Abbildung
an dieser Stelle nicht gezeigt werden.**

Fig. 2

Panorama of the Oberes and Unteres Belvedere from the south, with the fortified city in the background. Lithograph, before 1850. Vienna, ÖNB, 11.532C

Fig. 3

Gottfried Semper/Karl von Hasenauer, Grundzüge einer Anlage bezweckend die Verbindung der Hofburg mit den k.k. Museen in Wien (Design for connection between the Hofburg and the Imperial and Royal Museums in Vienna), pencil drawing, 1869

Fig. 4

English travellers consulting Baedeker or Murray. Coloured lithograph, 1852

Aus urheberrechtlichen Gründen darf die Abbildung an dieser Stelle nicht gezeigt werden.

Fig. 5
Karl Friedrich Schinkel, View of the Lustgarten in Berlin with Royal Palace (right), Cathedral, Museum (left) and Arsenal (front left). Drawing, 1823. Berlin/Kupferstichkabinett

From Dresden our British tourist would then have travelled to Munich to view Leo von Klenze's pioneering work, the *Glyptothek* (1816–30) and the *Pinakothek* (1826–36). He would also have heard of Klenze's *New Hermitage* in St Petersburg (1839–52), but viewing it would have been too ambitious for a single tour – the more so because his final destination would have been Vienna.

In the case of these German projects, all pre-1855, he would be confronted with modern urban development projects, which reflected the new demands of bourgeois society. Within these projects the new museum buildings were all allocated important sites, more or less separate from the palace as the traditional seat of power.⁵ (*Fig. 5*) Of course, the situation varied according to the state involved: whereas in Berlin, Dresden⁶ and Munich clusters of museums arose relatively independently of the palaces, entering the public domain instead, in St Petersburg (to Klenze's rage) the museum had to be built on to the Hermitage. This imperial museum thus displayed a certain resemblance to that of Vienna. London, by contrast, was a very different story, due to the parliamentary form of government already in place in Great Britain. The National Gallery (William Wilkins, 1833–38) was built entirely on a citizen initiative and was situated in the city centre, on Trafalgar Square, to make it easily accessible to the public.⁷

His own experience in London and his museum tour through Germany would mean that our British traveller would now be familiar with recently built and usually centrally located galleries and museums. However, when he arrived in Vienna in 1855 to visit the *Kaiserlich Königliche Gemäldegalerie*, he would have had to go out of the town centre to reach it, at a location which ought, as he understood it, to have become unusual for the housing of a national or imperial collection. (*Fig. 6*) And what he encountered there would have been equally striking: an early eighteenth-century baroque country estate in the form of a long, sloping park, closed off on its two short sides by, respectively, an encyclopedic museum and a picture gallery. Even so, a great number of visitors did manage to find their way to it despite its decentralized location – a development that was facilitated

Fig. 6
Map of Vienna, 1850, from:
*A Handbook for Travellers in
Southern Germany [...]*, 6th edition.
London: John Murray 1851

Fig. 7
Rudolf von Alt, *The Gloggnitzer
(right) and Brucker (left) railway
stations near the Belvedere, on either
side of an office building with a
restaurant*. Baedeker and Murray
recommended this place to museum
visitors for lunch. Watercolour,
c. 1860. Vienna, ÖNB,
Inv.no. D 16.735-B

by the two railway lines, which by c. 1850 brought travellers from especially the southern part of the empire almost to the main entrance to the park and the gallery in the *Oberes Belvedere*.⁸ (Fig. 7) The encyclopedic museum in the *Unteres Belvedere*, which was situated on the *Rennweg*, was a particular attraction however. There the visitors would have seen Egyptian sculpture and other antiquities, suits of armour, ethnographic objects and curiosities of all sorts, which had been gradually assembled – as the printed guide explained – since the former Schloss Ambras *Kunstammer* had been installed there in 1814–16.⁹ They were interesting exhibits in themselves, but probably not what our British visitor had come to see, accustomed as he was to the collections of the British Museum. His destination would have been the gallery of paintings, which he would already have spotted at the top of the park, and whose opulence would not have disappointed him: the National Gallery in London (set up at great effort only a few decades before) bore no comparison with this collection.¹⁰

Changes in the perception of the gallery and the park since c. 1780

In a number of respects, it was still possible for visitors in 1855 to imagine how at the time of its reorganization in 1780 the Vienna gallery had been one of the most progressive galleries in Europe: quite apart from its overwhelming riches, clear, instructive classification and easy access it would still have been appealing, particularly in view of a number of modern features that had been introduced by 1855.¹¹ Its location was a different story altogether, as was the museological context in which the gallery had ended up. In the 1770s, when the paintings were moved from the gloomy *Hofburg* development to the *Belvedere* country estate, they were also seen as having been ‘liberated’ from the curiosities which had previously formed part of the gallery. Their setting in the natural environment of the park and its surrounding countryside was thought ideal in that enlightened epoch: its praises were sung by Christian von Mechel who deemed it to be an ideal union between art and nature: ‘Every window of this exquisite building reveals a delightful landscape, a new nature painting to our gaze.’¹²

A royal or imperial gallery on a country estate – in the German-speaking territories this was a tradition which could be traced back to the beginning of the eighteenth century, when German sovereigns would, by preference, set up a gallery in or adjoining their summer palaces. It belonged to the tradition of *Schloss Salzdahlum* between Wolfenbüttel and Braunschweig (1687–1715) or *Schloss Schleißheim* near Munich (c. 1715–26) and also to the first freestanding gallery in Potsdam near Berlin (1755–64).¹³ A stroll through the garden combined with the delights of art gave respite from the demands of court life in the city. Moving the *Bildergalerie* to the *Belvedere* towards 1780 to some extent fitted in with this trend, with the important difference that park and mansion had already lost their original residential function and were now opened to a wider public, comprising artists, art-lovers and any interested citizens.

By around 1855, however, the rustic setting had become unusual: in the eyes of our Englishman such a location among verdant greenery was an appropriate setting for a private nobleman, but not for the collection of a monarch. By that time, the rightful place for a public gallery was in, or near, the town centre. The vicinity of the encyclopedic complex of cabinets in the *Unteres Belvedere* would probably have come across as even more singular.¹⁴ With its suits of armour, antiquities, ethnographic objects and other curiosities, these exhibits acted as a sort of introduction to the gallery of paintings from one end, or if you entered from the other end, they functioned as an unusual added bonus. The gradual relocation of these collections to this site after 1814 had inevitably placed the picture gallery in a different context, which begs the question as to whether the visitors of 1855 saw the paintings in a different light than those of 1780. In more

than one regard we get the impression that the Belvedere complex had become historized – a process by which the collections on display were given the function of a dynastic museum.

Whereas it was lauded as long ago as the Mechel epoch for the links it evoked with its builder Prince Eugene of Savoy, for instance with a presentation of battles in the *Unteres Belvedere*,¹⁵ in this new era the whole development was being in a certain sense 'museumified'. This can be witnessed in around 1850 when the gallery's director Peter Krafft had the fountains, gates and buildings restored to their original Baroque style dating back to the time of its heroic patron.¹⁶ And whereas in 1780 the two galleries in the *Oberes* and *Unteres Belvedere* already recalled the patronage of many generations of Hapsburgs, after 1815 this was intensified by the transfer of the former Ambras *Kunstkammer* with its many suits of armour, portraits and genealogical trees of ancestors testifying to the greater glory of the Hapsburg dynasty. These tangible objects may have appealed more to people's imaginations than mere paintings of battles, the more so because the Ambras collection had been evacuated in 1805 after the loss of Tyrol to Bavaria, and saved three times from confiscation by the French. Due to its history this *Kunstkammer* had inevitably become a memorial in the form of a museum, and this probably explained in part its great appeal to a wide public.¹⁷ (Fig. 8)

Fig. 8
Carl Goebel, 'Second Armoury Room',
watercolour 1875. On the right: the armour of
Emperor Ferdinand I (Augsburg 1526).
Vienna, Belvedere, Inv.no. 2802

But in addition to this, the different exhibits that had been added to the collection in the following years also referred to the achievements of the Hapsburg dynasty. For instance, there was the *Sammlung Kraushaar*, a collection of portraits, maps and atlases illustrating Austria's history from 1454–1705, set up under the name 'Maximilian library', because it also contained a charter and a portrait of Maximilian I in his youth.¹⁸ What would, after all, have still been called a *Kunstkammer* a few decades earlier had, by 1855, become more of a historical museum displaying the achievements of the dynasty, intended for and actually visited by a broad public, including children.¹⁹

Temporary solution or precursor?

This was how the Belvedere development, unlike museums in the German states of around 1815, had gradually been given a dynastic and encyclopedic boost – begging the question: should we see this as a precursor of the same two qualities which would later be the hallmarks of the new *Hofmuseum* on the *Kaiserforum*? Or to put it another way, did this development stem from merely practical considerations, amounting in fact to a "Notlösung", as some authors suggest?²⁰ Or was something more structural taking place – a deliberate choice to combine these differing sorts of collections, including the picture gallery, specifically on this site? The latter explanation seems more likely, for there were even plans for a further extension. In my view the concept of the dynastic total museum of the *Ringstrasse* was already in statu nascendi at the Belvedere, although practical factors probably played a role here too.

Seen from the perspective of the court authorities, transporting the Ambras collection to this country estate was a logical step. Where else could these suits of armour and valuable curiosities be shown to an ever-increasing public? There was no convenient place in the *Hofburg* and it would have been difficult to find space for the construction of new buildings inside the town walls. The Belvedere was already in use as a museum, with its painting gallery which drew visitors from home and abroad. So opting for this location for the Ambras collection must have been a foregone conclusion.

Even though pragmatism may have played a role in the choice of location, however, it does not mean that we are dealing with a "Notlösung" here. That is attested to by several plans that were launched by the Cabinet of coins and antiquities, situated in the *Augustinergang* of the *Hofburg* – the department which the Ambras collection fell under. There is an unimplemented proposal dating from 1816 to move this cabinet in its entirety from its cramped quarters to the *Unteres Belvedere*.²¹ Another plan, launched by the curator Josef Ritter von Arneth in 1833, was more selective and betrays a more specific motive. Arneth proposed to leave the coins, cameos and "Preziosen" in the *Burg* as these were important for specialists, but to accommodate all the other more popular art collections in the *Unteres Belvedere*. As Lhotsky put it, Arneth's aim in relocating the art collections to the Belvedere was to make them more accessible, prompted as he was by a belief that works of art were a '*Mittel des Unterrichtes und der Bildung*'.²² The proposal moreover affected not only the art, but also the natural history collections. This was incidentally not the first such attempt: there is even a design drawing for a museum of natural history, dating presumably from around 1820, and intended to be sited in the *Kammergarten*, next to the *Unteres Belvedere*. Because it was common practice everywhere to include ethnology under natural history,²³ it would seem not improbable that this museum design was also intended for the ethnographic objects, which were the spoils of the expedition to the Portuguese colony of Brazil ordered by Emperor Franz II (I) in 1817 on the occasion of his daughter Maria Leopoldine's marriage to the Portuguese heir to the throne, Dom Pedro. It was during these years after all that a search was being conducted for suitable premises to display this rapidly growing collection.²⁴

Fig. 9
The museum in the Botanical Garden of the University, next to the Belvedere, built 1843–44. Photograph from: Fritsch 1894, Teylers Museum Haarlem

However this may be, none of these plans do suggest that we are dealing with a *Notlösung* or temporary solution due to lack of space, but with a deliberate choice for this particular location where, according to its director Anton Steinbüchel, the Ambras collection had already proved the “public’s favourite”, attracting five or six hundred visitors a week.²⁵ That the proposed move to the Belvedere was in part carried out, can be concluded from the fact that in 1821 a start was made on moving ethnographic objects,²⁶ and in around 1840 parts of the collection of antiquities to the *Unteres Belvedere*, including the sculptures of the ‘Theseus’ temple in the *Volksgarten*.²⁷ The same occurred with the Egyptian antiquities, which till 1836 had shared premises in the *Johannessgasse* with the *Brasilianisches Museum*.²⁸

Unfortunately the natural history collections mentioned in Arneth’s plan were ignored by the historians who were only interested in the art collections. In this connection however they should be looked at, because there was a great deal of activity going on at that time next door in the university botanical gardens that bordered on the Belvedere. (*Fig. 9*) Building had begun here in 1843 on a museum to house the botanical collection of the *K. K. Hof-Naturalienkabinett*, including the many plants from the *Brasilianisches Museum*, which means that these too, like the archaeological and ethnological collections just mentioned, were moved to the *Rennweg*.²⁹

Although the Belvedere complex developed in this way partly due to practical circumstances, we can perhaps discern here the features that would later define the new *Kunsthistorisches Hofmuseum* – the emphasis on the dynastic, and the combining of all the art-historical collections with the painting gallery embedded in it as one department among several.

Where did this unusual syndrome – as one might almost call it – come from, and what factors played a role in this phenomenon for which there had been increasing evidence from the early nineteenth century onwards? Did the founding since roughly 1805 of numerous *Nationalmuseen* and *Landesmuseen* have an influence on the policy regarding mu-

seums as pursued in Vienna?³⁰ These questions should be viewed in the context of the peculiar constitutional history of Austria, which displays ever more conflict between the centre of power and the 'periphery' during this period. Due to its complexity this question is beyond the scope of this article and deserves separate study. I will therefore only touch tentatively on some aspects.

Enquiry into a syndrome 1: the Hapsburg Länder

As I have shown above, Vienna was slow off the mark in developing museums compared with the German states. From today's point of view we would expect that the new building works in Vienna would have been fostered by this realization. Especially in the earlier writings about the history of the *Kunsthistorisches Museum* however reference is made not to activities abroad but to the situation in the Austrian-Hungarian monarchy itself. According to Alphons Lhotsky, the museums which had already been founded in the first decades of the nineteenth century in most of the parts of the empire formed one of the most important stimuli for the court and the city of Vienna to undertake new internal museum developments.³¹ One might deduce from this that internal competition weighed more heavily than that from outside. This sounds not improbable, because with these new internal museum developments patriotism played a considerable role, finding its expression for instance in the claims some of the *Länder* had begun to make on archaeological finds in their own regions, and in the growing tendency among the aristocracy to donate their art or other collections to their native land. This was the *Länder's* response to the automatism by which since at least the mid-eighteenth century the most valuable collection items were transferred to Vienna.³² Moreover in some instances, these museums, which were built up in an encyclopedic fashion, aspired not only to provide a distinct local accent but also to collect work of international significance. The aim was to compare one's own flora, fauna and archaeological finds with those from elsewhere, and the same applied to the arts and objects of antiquity.³³ With the arts the national criterion could also lie in the origins of the collector instead of that of the art collected. This for instance was the case with the Viennese Esterházy collection, where Italian, Spanish and Netherlands masterpieces were sold to Hungary, the collector's native land.³⁴ Correspondingly in the case of the Tyrolean *Stände* a dominant factor was the wish to get back the *Ambraser Sammlung* that had been moved to Vienna, even though this collection did not actually contain any 'Tirolensia'.³⁵

In brief then, the founding of these museums could have formed a threat to 'Vienna', and yet we get the impression that Franz I initially embraced the founding of museums in the *Länder*, as did the heir to the throne, Ferdinand (Innsbruck) and the archdukes Joseph (Pest) and Johann (Graz).³⁶ Whether that was still the case after 1848 is not certain. It is a known fact that the relations between the central authorities and the *Länder* were subject to major changes in this period. The museum policies implemented by both parties should not therefore be studied in isolation but in relation to each other and in the context of nineteenth century constitutional developments – something that has regrettably occurred all too little up till now.

It is doubtful whether the wide scope of these local museums bore any relation to the equally generous composition of the imperial collections in Vienna – for instance, through having roots in a similar tradition. The *Nationalmuseen* and the *Landesmuseen* were generally encyclopedic in contents, but their backgrounds were different. They did not originate as the imperial collections did in an older, royal *Kunstammer* tradition, but in the eighteenth-century optimism of the Enlightenment and they were often related to societies of the aristocracy or the bourgeoisie, who documented, studied and encouraged the countryside, crafts, agriculture, arts and literature of their region.³⁷

Aus urheberrechtlichen Gründen darf die Abbildung an dieser Stelle
nicht gezeigt werden.

Nonetheless this sort of faith in progress and patriotism was also present in imperial circles. One can see it in Joseph II for instance, and in the man appointed by him in 1779 to rearrange the *Gemäldegalerie*, Christian von Mechel from Switzerland.³⁸ In this light Mechel's German section on the second floor, which has so often been a subject of debate, suddenly takes on the traits of a *Nationalmuseum* before the term existed. Possibly this may explain why this aspect of his German nationalist redesign enjoyed little appreciation in Viennese court circles. As Kugler put it: "[...] the great, public imperial collections didn't amount to a *Nationalmuseum*. They established an identity with the dynasty and not with the people or the nation."³⁹ In the Hapsburg state with its variety of peoples, which was dominated by the German-speaking sector of the population, a German *Nationalmuseum* would have been inappropriate.

Enquiry into a syndrome 2: from Berlin to Vienna

It must be admitted however that there are cases elsewhere in the Europe of around 1855 of painting galleries being incorporated into a museum with a broader composition. But these were situations that dated from the eighteenth century and which still prevailed, like for instance the *Hermitage* in St Petersburg, the *Uffizi* in Florence, or the *Museo Borbonico* in Naples where antiquities of all sorts belonged to their stocks.⁴⁰ The typical feature of Vienna on the other hand was that what was involved here was not the survival of, but rather a reversion to an embedding of the painting gallery. Something similar was also true of the architectural location. There definitely were some museums elsewhere in the second half of the nineteenth century that were directly linked to power centres; there too however it was a matter of a relation that had originated at an earlier stage and which was still maintained, as in the case of the Vatican.⁴¹ The situation in Vienna was quite different because there it was deliberately planned and repeated over again.

Fig. 10

View of Friedrich August Stüler's (New) Museum, connected to Karl Friedrich Schinkel's (Old) Museum. Coloured engraving after Albert Henry Payne, c. 1855

Fig. 11
Neues Museum in Berlin, department of
plaster casts: Roman Room. Steel engraving
from: *Die Königlichen Museen in Berlin*,
Leipzig/Berlin: Verlag der Englischen
Kunst-Anstalt [1855]

Apart from Emperor Franz Joseph, no European ruler in the course of the nineteenth century commissioned an encyclopedic art museum – with one exception. It is true that King Frederick William IV of Prussia did so, but the dynasty did not play such a crucial role there. (Fig. 10) Once again a comparison with this Berlin museum serves to cast light on the very particular character of the situation in Vienna.

Arriving in Berlin in the summer of 1855, our British art-lover would have been able to visit Friedrich August Stüler's newly opened *Neues Museum* (built 1841–1855/59), where a range of collections representing various cultural fields was on display. The new building was connected by an overhead bridge to Schinkel's *Altes Museum* opened shortly before, in 1830, which was deliberately dedicated exclusively to painting and original sculptures, cameos, coins, vases and other precious objects from classical antiquity. However, when the *Neues Museum* was added, the two museums with their different specializations – art and history – formed a new entity, with the two parts complementing each other.⁴² After first admiring the originals from classical antiquity, the 1855 visitor could walk from the painting gallery of the *Altes Museum* by way of the overhead bridge, enter the chronological survey of plaster casts in the *Neues Museum*, (Fig. 11) and then decide to go down to the departments of Egyptian antiquities, *Vaterländische Altertümer* and ethnological objects. Or alternately he could go up to the former Brandenburg *Kunstammer* and the cabinet of drawings and prints.

In Vienna however, on arrival in the Belvedere, the traveller would have recognized few similarities. Even though the court cabinets would have been the starting point in both cities, in Berlin there were scarcely any references to the patron Frederick William IV and his dynasty, let alone any exaltation of it as was the case in Vienna.⁴³ The Berlin museum development was originally intended to be a *Freistätte*, or sanctuary, totally devoted to the arts and sciences. Moreover, if the combination of the *Altes* and the *Neues Museum* could already have been called encyclopedic, then this was not so much in the traditional *Kunstkammer* sense of the word, but should rather be seen as meaning that it included the whole gamut of modern cultural and historical disciplines, from art history and archaeology by way of Egyptology to national archaeology and ethnology.⁴⁴ It could in fact be called a scientific museum and this stage was soon to be realized in Vienna too with the new *Hofmuseum*, but there, as already mentioned, it was permeated with references to the Hapsburg dynasty in both its location and in the building's decoration.⁴⁵

Furthermore in Berlin the different departments had already moved to their own, specialized museums by the time that a single all-embracing museum opened its doors in Vienna in 1890/91. For instance, in Berlin the *Kunstkammer* had already been moved to the *Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe* in 1875.⁴⁶ What was definitely exceptional in Vienna was that a new museum of such an all-embracing nature should actually be built so late in the century, as twin sister to an almost identical natural history museum opposite, and that the departments should have stayed together to the present day.

Conclusion: The embedded gallery and the specific history of the Hapsburg museum

To sum up briefly then, when the plans for the museum's new building in Vienna were developed after 1867, not only were they late, but they also took on a form of their own. This was the case in more than one regard. It is of course true that the painting gallery returned to the town centre, as was the trend, and was housed in a new building as a part of the urban renewal plan like everywhere in the German states. Nonetheless there were two crucial differences between Vienna and anywhere else in Europe.

Firstly, by moving the collections from the *Unteres Belvedere* and the *Hofburg* with it,⁴⁷ the gallery was made part of a cultural and historical complex with, among other artefacts, Greek, Roman and Egyptian antiquities, applied art from the Middle Ages to more recent times, and historical weapons. That was at odds with the pattern of specialization, which had taken place elsewhere in Europe in the same period, since around 1870.

Secondly, the collections, including the painting gallery, once again became part of the Hof development, with the construction of a *Kaiserforum* linking the art history and natural history *Hofmuseen* with the *Hofburg* and converting them into the physical and symbolic centre of the new *Ringstrasse*. This deviated from the pattern of self-determination seen in museums elsewhere, which – physically, administratively and symbolically – were engaged in a process of freeing themselves from their ruler's sphere of authority.

This meant that the *Kunsthistorisches Museum* didn't become a museum in the modern sense, but rather a monument to the Hapsburg dynasty or, as Beatrix Kriller puts it, "an imperial palace of the arts, housing the private property of the emperor with its origins in the Hapsburg dynasty and making it public for 'His peoples'". It reflects a unity of collection, building, decorations and the sovereignty of its builder, so that it can in fact be denoted as a monument."⁴⁸ (Figs. 12 and 13)

Both characteristics, I would suggest, had already taken shape in the Belvedere as it was before 1855, and were founded on age-old Hapsburg traditions. Two key quotations confirm this, one by Lhotsky, the other again by Kriller. Even though the picture they give here is of the museum in the form it acquired in the period from 1867 to 1891, their words refer implicitly to a Hapsburg tradition that dates back a long way, even further than 1855 or 1780, which are my self-imposed marker dates.

Fig. 13

Benvenuto Cellini, Salt cellar. Gold with enamel, 1539–43. Vienna, KHM, Kunstkammer, Inv.no. KK 881. Since 1891 this precious object from the Kunstkammer of Archduke Ferdinand of Tyrol was displayed in room XIX of the new museum and given a specific context by the ceiling painting of J. V. Berger. Cellini is represented seated to the left holding the salt cellar on his lap.

Fig. 12

Julius Victor Berger, Habsburg emperors as patrons of the arts: Charles V with Titian and Cellini holding his salt cellar (left), Maximilian I with Dürer (centre), and Charles VI (right). Vienna, KHM, ceiling painting of room XIX, 1891

Fig. 14
Panorama of Vienna, with the (Unteres)
Belvedere highlighted on the lower right and
the two new museums projected on the
Ringstrasse to the left. Engraving after Gustav
Veith, c. 1873. Wien, ÖNB, Inv.no. 128.917B

Lhotsky indicates that, in view of the tradition of the artistic policies of the Hapsburgs, the *Kunsthistorisches Museum* could not become a systematic museum with universal pretensions; instead he defines it as one of the last private *Kunstammern*. He endorses the declared aim of 1875 of “bearing witness to the generosity and artistic sensitivity with which the rulers of Austria had dedicated themselves from times immemorial to protecting and patronizing the arts and sciences.”⁴⁹

Beatrix Kriller subscribes to this by describing the museum as “a watertight statement of intent, exclusively determined by the aim of proclaiming the sovereignty of the Hapsburg dynasty. [...] Art is attributed the power here of maintaining the state and architecture, painting and the decorative arts are treated as means for conveying a self-image of sovereignty.”⁵⁰

In this sense this museum differed fundamentally from the trend in Europe, and if our British visitor had lived that long, he would have been surprised once again in 1891. He would then have been confronted with an enlarged version of the thing that had already impressed him in 1855 when the gallery was still housed in the Belvedere.

However, he would no longer have seen anything of the country-estate setting of its former location. (Figs. 14 and 15) The rustic character had vanished long ago due to the demolition of the town ramparts and the rapid growth of the suburbs.

Fig. 15

August Stauda, View of the south front of the Oberes Belvedere, with the railway in the foreground. Photo, 1873. Vienna, ÖNB, Inv. no. ST 2260F

- * This article was translated from the Dutch by Donald Gardner and Kate Williams.
- 1 Alphons Lhotsky, *Die Geschichte der Sammlungen. Festschrift des Kunsthistorischen Museums zur Feier des fünfzigjährigen Bestandes*, Vienna 1941–1945, Vol. I; Beatrix Kriller/Georg Kugler, *Das Kunsthistorische Museum, die Architektur und Ausstattung: Idee und Wirklichkeit des Gesamtkunstwerkes*, Vienna 1991.
- 2 In the brief scope of this article, any discussion of international issues is bound to remain limited. For a more exhaustive treatment of international patterns in the world of nineteenth-century museums, see: Ellinoor Bergvelt, Debora J. Meijers, Lieske Tibbe and Elsa van Wezel (eds.), *Napoleon's Legacy. The Rise of National Museums in Europe, 1794–1830* (Berliner Schriftenreihe zur Museumsforschung, 27), Berlin 2009; Ellinoor Bergvelt, Debora J. Meijers, Lieske Tibbe and Elsa van Wezel (eds.), *Museale Spezialisierung und Nationalisierung ab 1830. Das Neue Museum in Berlin im internationalen Kontext/ Specialization and Consolidation of the National Museum after 1830. The Neue Museum in Berlin in an International Context* (Berliner Schriftenreihe zur Museumsforschung, 29), Berlin 2011, and Debora Meijers/Ellinoor Bergvelt/Lieske Tibbe/Elsa van Wezel, *National Museums and National Identity, seen from an International and Comparative Perspective, c. 1760–1918: an Assessment*, Huizinga Institute Amsterdam, 23 January 2012: <http://www.huizingainstituut.nl/beheer/wp-content/uploads/National-Museums-and-National-Identity.pdf>.
- 3 The term 'encyclopedic' is used to mean 'covering all fields of knowledge', namely naturalia, scientifica and artificialia. In this article I use the term in a more limited sense, to refer to a wide range of only artistic artefacts, including various sorts of antiquity; coins and medals; cut stones and precious stones, shells and bone objects; wood and metal carving; ceramics; sculptures, paintings, drawings and prints.
- 4 As early as 1841 one can trace a relation in Vienna between museum attendance and the emergence of modern means of transport, as can be seen in the statement of Josef Ritter von Arneth, keeper of the cabinet of coins and antiquities in the Hofburg. Von Arneth argued successfully that the cabinet should stay open in August, by pointing out that with the introduction of steamboats and trains it was in this month that great numbers of foreign visitors came to Vienna. See Lhotsky 1941–45 (note 1), vol. II, p. 542. By 1856 Vienna could be reached by train from Berlin via Krakau, Olmütz (1841), Brünn (1839) and Wagram (1838) in the north; and by 1857 from Trieste in the south via Laibach (1849), Graz (1844), Gloggnitz (1842) and Wiener Neustadt (1841). The eastern line, though planned on Austrian initiative via Raab on the southern banks of the Donau, was instead built by the *Ungarische Centralbahn*, connecting Vienna with Pest via Pressburg on the northern side of the river by 1852/54. Although the railways were built for military and economic reasons rather than for tourism, it was an incidental stroke of fortune that the eastern and southern terminuses were located not far from the main entrance of the Belvedere complex. Our British visitor in 1855, coming from Munich in the west, would however have had to rely on other means of transport for the final leg of his journey, as this route was only completely developed in August 1860. See Wolfgang Kos/Günter Dinhold (eds.), *Großer Bahnhof. Wien und die weite Welt*, Ausst.-Kat. Wien-Museum, Vienna 2006, 215, 220; Ludwig Neunlinger, *150 Jahre Eisenbahn in Österreich*, hg. von Franz Patzer, 210. Wechselausstellung der Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, Wien 1987, 9–11.
- 5 See Adrian von Buttlar, *The museum and the city: Schinkel's und Klenze's contribution to the autonomy of civic culture*, in: Ellinoor Bergvelt, Deborah J. Meijers, Lieske Tibbe and Elsa van Wezel (eds.), *Napoleon's Legacy. The Rise of National Museums in Europe, 1794–1830* (Berliner Schriftenreihe zur Museumsforschung, 27), Berlin 2009, p. 173–189.
- 6 Semper had in fact designed a forum for Dresden comparable to that of Vienna, but it wasn't implemented. Wfried Nerdinger/Werner Oechslin (eds.), *Gottfried Semper 1803–1879. Architektur und Wissenschaft*, Munich/Zurich 2003, p. 149–157.
- 7 See Jonathan Conlin, *The Nation's Mantelpiece. A History of the National Gallery*, London 2006.
- 8 In Prince Eugene's day (c. 1725) the ceremonial (but little used?) main entrance to the entire gardens was at the top end on the south side of the *Oberes Belvedere*. In the 1780s visitors to the painting gallery still entered the building from this side, although "auch ein anderer Eingang von unten durch den Garten angebracht [ist], welcher der Nähe und grösseren Bequemlichkeit wegen allgemein gebraucht wird" (Pezzl 1786–90, vol. I, p. 436 in Bénédicte Savoy (ed.), *Tempel der Kunst. Die Geburt des öffentlichen Museums in Deutschland 1701–1815*, Mainz 2006, p. 489). Since then the numbers of people going to and through the park increased considerably, especially after the two stations at the Linienwall were built (see note 4). For this reason the director of the gallery, Peter Krafft, created two entrances in around 1850 – above from the Heugasse (today's Prinz Eugen-Straße) and below on the Rennweg, Katrin Harter, *Der Garten im 19. Jahrhundert. Vom Garten des Prinzen Eugen von Savoyen zum „Belvedere“*, in: Agnes Husslein-Arco/Katharina Schoeller (eds.), *Das Belvedere. Genese eines Museums*, Weitra 2011, p. 194. Gertrude Aurenhammer, *Geschichte des Belvedere seit dem Tode des Prinzen Eugen*, in: Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Galerie, Vienna, 13, no. 57, 1969, p. 83, and Hans and Gertrude Aurenhammer, *Das Belvedere in Wien. Bauwerk, Menschen, Geschichte*, Vienna/Munich 1971, p. 28 point out that the entrance from the Rennweg was at the time already very much in use as it was the shortest route to the stations and the industrial developments in the Favoriten district. Karl Baedeker, *Handbuch für Reisende in Deutschland und dem Oesterreichischen Kaiserstaat, I: Oesterreich, Süd- und West-Deutschland*, 6th ed., Coblenz 1855, p. 6 and John Murray (ed.), *A handbook for travellers in Southern Germany: being a guide to Würtemberg, Bavaria, Austria, Tyrol, Salzburg, Styria, [...]*, 8th ed., London 1858, p. 212 advise museum visitors to take "one of the Süd-Bahn omnibuses, which set you down at the upper Belvedere". Further research may well reveal more detail about any relations between the siting of these stations and the increased numbers visiting the collections, as well as the change in the composition of this public.
- 9 See Joseph von Bergmann, *Übersicht der kaiserlich-königlichen Ambraser-Sammlung (im unteren k.k. Belvedere) nach ihrer dermaligen Aufstellung*, 4th ed., Vienna 1858 (1st ed. 1846), p. 5.
- 10 The National Gallery was founded in 1824, with the purchase by the British Parliament of the Angerstein collection. Conlin 2006 (note 7); Ellinoor Bergvelt, *De Britse Parlementaire Enquête uit 1853. De "modernisering" van de National Gallery in Londen*, in: Ellinoor Bergvelt/Debora J. Meijers/Mieke Rijnders (eds.), *Kabinetten, galerijen en musea. Het verzamelen en presenteren van naturalia en kunst van 1500 tot heden*, Heerlen et al. 2005, p. 319–42. In this regard the question also arises of whether the Hapsburg collections were even regarded abroad as a 'museum' prior to the new development of 1867–91. Vienna for instance isn't mentioned in the findings of the British Parliamentary Enquiry which was forwarded to all the 'national' museums of Europe in 1853. This can indicate two equally interesting possibilities – either Vienna was ignored when the enquiry was sent out, or else the enquiry was not responded to. See also note 42.

- 11 The layout of the collection was altered for instance in the 1830s by director Johann Peter Krafft who, among other things, introduced a separate department for modern and contemporary Austrian painting. His predecessor Josef Rebell still hung the paintings in question between works by artists of other schools, including older paintings. See Grabner in this volume and Sabine Grabner, *Die kaiserliche Gemäldegalerie von den Napoleonischen Kriegen bis zum Revolutionsjahr 1848*, in: Agnes Husslein-Arco/Katharina Schoeller (eds.), *Das Belvedere. Genese eines Museums*, Weitra 2011, p. 106. Furthermore the initially fairly free admission policy was revoked. In 1813 the director at the time, Friedrich Heinrich Füger, had complained about an undesirable public: while in the department of Antiquities and in the *Naturalienkabinet*, "Anstand und Ordnung" prevailed, the unconditional free access, which had been introduced in 1780 with the best and most humane intentions had for a long time led to exactly the opposite in the painting gallery, according to Füger. He then launches into a diatribe about the plebs who with their rowdiness and lack of cleanliness prevented the "gebildeten Stände" from enjoying the pleasures of the gallery, which required silent contemplation. To restore order, Füger had asked the *Oberstkämmerer* for permission to introduce a system of tickets and to reduce admission from three to two days a week. His request was granted in the same year, 1813, and the new ruling was announced in the *Wiener Zeitung*. Lhotsky 1941–45 (note 1), vol. II 2, p. 488.
- 12 Christian von Mechel, *Verzeichniss der Gemälde der Kaiserlich Königl. Bilder Gallerie in Wien*, Basel 1783, *Vorbericht* VIII: "Jedes Fenster dieses prächtigen Gebäudes entdeckt dem Auge eine herrliche Gegend, ein neues Naturgemälde."
- 13 Resp. by Duke Anton Ulrich of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, Elector Max Emanuel of Bavaria and King Frederik II of Prussia.
- 14 This public presentation in the *Unteres Belvedere* replaced the Hapsburg family portraits and paintings of the heroic deeds of Archduke Leopold Wilhelm and Prince Eugene of Savoy that had hung there since 1766 and c. 1780 respectively and to which access was limited. Aurenhammer 1969 (note 8), p. 50–51 and 61; Mechel 1783 (note 12), p. X and 315.
- 15 At that time there were seven paintings by Ignace Parocel in the *Unteres Belvedere* depicting Prince Eugene's battles. Aurenhammer 1969 (note 8), p. 61. He was renowned especially for his victory over the Ottomans at the battle of Zenta in 1697.
- 16 Aurenhammer 1969 (note 8), p. 85–86 and 1971, p. 28. Grabner 2011 (note 11), p. 107.
- 17 In 1815, during the Congress of Vienna that was held in the Belvedere, the participating rulers and statesmen eagerly visited the former Ambras *Kunstammer*, thus spreading the fame of this collection internationally (Lhotsky 1941–45 (note 1), II 2, p. 490–91, 511–14). What the negotiators would have seen there had the character of a "Ruhmestempel des Hauses Habsburg", according to Aurenhammer 1971 (note 8), p. 25. Lhotsky, II 2, p. 492 also mentions that after its removal to Vienna the Ambras collection was viewed through romantically-tinted spectacles, especially by Aloys Prümmer, who was keeper of the cabinet from 1816 to 1827. According to Lhotsky he and his spouse Julie Mihes formed the hub of an eccentric circle who waxed lyrical about the German past.
- 18 Lhotsky 1941–45 (note 1), vol. II 2, p. 555.
- 19 The 1858 edition of Bergmann's guide (see note 9) mentions the opening times of the collection as being 'the summer months up to November, Tuesday and Friday from 9 to 12 and 3 to 6'. In the winter the museum remained closed as there was no heating. Carl Goebel the Younger's watercolours give a good idea of the composition of the public in the years from 1875 to 1889; it is striking how often children are depicted. The process of 'museumification' was not unique to Vienna. The *Kunstammer* in Dresden was also converted in the 1820s into a sort of historical museum, under the influence of Johann Kranz (oral account by Tristan Weddigen, 26 November 2011).
- 20 Recently by Georg Lechner, *Die Anfänge der kaiserlichen Galerie im Belvedere 1776–1805*, in: Agnes Husslein-Arco/Katharina Schoeller (eds.), *Das Belvedere. Genese eines Museums*, Weitra 2011, p. 125.
- 21 Aurenhammer 1969 (note 8), p. 71 and note 179, refers to a floor plan by the court architect Johann Aman (HBA, Nr. 1033 ex 1816), indicating where an area was reserved for the classical sculptures, coins and bronzes, the library and the Etruscan collection in the building, which was already largely occupied by the Ambras collection.
- 22 Lhotsky 1941–45 (note 1), vol. I, p. 36–37 does not mention the source of this plan of 1833. In 1842 Arneth again came up with a design, providing a sort of museum quarter abutting on the library of the Hof. His combination of collections was even more encyclopedic; he linked the proposed museum centre (minus the painting gallery) to a proposal for founding an Academy of Sciences (implemented in 1847). Lhotsky 1941–45, vol. II 2, p. 547 and I, p. 36–37, again without naming the source. Lhotsky 1941–45, vol. I, moreover refers in note 4 to a plan for a museum building by Joseph Ziegler of 1827 (at that time: *Städtische Sammlungen*, Inv.no. 54309, Mappe Großformate), the background to which he has not succeeded in explaining.
- 23 In Vienna the ethnological collections were only removed from the *Naturhistorische Museum* in 1927, in order to continue their existence as the *Museum für Völkerkunde* in the Neue Hofburg. Max Fischer/Irmgard Moschner/Rudolf Schönmann, *Das Naturhistorische Museum in Wien und seine Geschichte*, in: *Annalen des Naturhistorischen Museums in Wien*, 80, November 1976, p. 1–24: http://www.landesmuseum.at/pdf_frei_remote/ANNA_80_0001-0024.pdf, 15.
- 24 Aurenhammer 1969 (note 8), p. 72, note 184 and p. 78, note 234, refers to a floor plan by Johann Aman (PI A, C IV 1, Nr. 8). See also Lhotsky 1941–45 (note 1), vol. II 2, 496–7; Christa Riedl-Dorn, *Die grüne Welt der Habsburger. Zur Ausstellung auf Schloss Artstetten, 1. April bis 2. November 1989* (Veröffentlichungen aus dem Naturhistorischen Museum Wien, Neue Folge 23), Vienna 1989, p. 44; Robert Stangl, *Eine mysteriöse Sammlung brasilianischer Hölzer in der Fachbereichsbibliothek Botanik*: http://bibliothek.univie.ac.at/sammlungen/objekt_des_monats/files/XylothekeText.pdf, consulted on 13 Nov. 2011: In 1822 the Emperor Franz I founded the *Brasilianische Museum*, with its premises in the Johannesgasse, presently no. 7, for the consignments from his daughter Maria Leopoldine and the scholars and scientists who travelled with her to Brazil. This museum was closed down however in 1836 after which the collection was split over various court cabinets according to the kind of object. Those of ethnographic interest for instance went to the so called *Kaiserhaus* in the *Ungargasse* while botanic items were rehoused in the *Naturalienkabinett* and later on in 1844 in a newly built museum in the university botanic gardens. See also note 26.
- 25 Lhotsky 1941–45 (note 1), vol. II 2, p. 493, note 151. Steinbüchel says this in 1828.
- 26 Lhotsky 1941–45 (note 1), vol. II 2, p. 496–7. What was involved here was not the Brazilian ethnographic objects, but

- those purchased in London in 1806 on the instructions of the Emperor Franz I from the museums of Ashton Lever and James Parkinson, and the James Cook collection. According to Fischer/Moschner/Schönmann 1976 (note 23), p. 6–7 these objects were in fact removed from the *Unteres Belvedere* in 1836, to be housed together with the ethnographic part of the *Brasilianische Museum* in the *Kaiserhaus* in the *Ungargasse*.
- 27 This free version of the ancient *Theseion* in Athens was built in 1820–22/23 by Peter von Nobile to accommodate Antonio Canova's sculpture group of *Theseus slaying the Centaur*, originally ordered by Napoleon for the Corso in Milan but bought by Franz I after his defeat (since 1890 the sculpture adorns the stairwell of the *Kunsthistorisches Museum*). According to Lhotsky, the installing of a goodly number of Roman finds on Austrian soil in this temple in 1822 meant the creation of the first *römische Provinzialmuseum* in Austria. In 1840/41 the sculptures were moved to the *Unteres Belvedere*. Lhotsky 1941–45 (note 1), vol. II 2, p. 499 and 543. Lhotsky 1941, vol. I, p. 23–24.
- 28 Aurenhammer 1969 (note 8), p. 78, notes 232–234; and 1971 (note 8), p. 28; Lhotsky 1941–45 (note 1), vol. II 2, p. 556.
- 29 Stangl s.d. (note 24). According to Leopold J. Fitzinger, *Geschichte des k. k. Hof-Naturalienkabinetts zu Wien. V. Abtlg.: Periode unter Kaiser Ferdinand I. von Österreich von 1842 bis zum Rücktritt des Kaisers von der Regierung Anfangs December 1848*, in: *Sitzungsberichte der math.-naturwissenschaftl. Klasse der kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, LXXXII. Band, I. Abtlg., Jahrgang 1880, p. 298–299 the immediate reason was the appointment in 1840 of Stephan Endlicher as professor and director of the botanic gardens. Endlicher, who had up till then been the keeper of the Hof Naturalien Cabinet, also wanted to be certain of the future availability of his familiar research material and had thus persuaded the Emperor to agree to the transfer of the botanic collection and the relevant part of the library.
- 30 Lhotsky 1941–45 (note 1), vol. I, 37. Walter Wagner, *Die frühen Museumsgründungen in der Donaumonarchie*, in: Bernward Deneke/Rainer Kahsnitz (eds.), *Das Kunst- und kulturgeschichtliche Museum im 19. Jahrhundert. Vorträge des Symposiums im Germanischen Nationalmuseum, Nürnberg*, München 1977, p. 19 names as examples Budapest 1802, Graz 1811, Prague 1818/20, Innsbruck 1823, Laibach (Ljubljana) 1821/31, Linz 1833, Salzburg 1834, Klagenfurt 1846.
- 31 Unlike Lhotsky 1941 (note 1) and Wagner 1977 (note 30), Georg J. Kugler, *Das Nationalmuseum im österreichischen Vielvölkerstaat*, in: Hadwig Kräutler/Gerbert Frodl (eds.), *Das Museum – Spiegel und Motor kulturpolitischer Visionen: 1903–2003; 100 Jahre Österreichische Galerie Belvedere*, Konferenzband zum gleichnamigen Symposium, anlässlich des 100-jährigen Bestandes des Museums, Wien, 16. bis 19. Oktober 2003: *The museum – mirror and motivator of cultural-political visions, Österreichische Galerie Belvedere*, Vienna 2004, p. 89–92 draws a distinction between *Nationalmuseen* and *Landesmuseen* and elucidates the discussion about their aims and character: “War ein Nationalmuseum jene Institution, die das historische Interesse eines Teiles der Bevölkerung eines Kronlandes wecken und fördern wollte, so stellten sich die Landesmuseen die Aufgabe, das gesamte Kronland zu repräsentieren, alle Volks- und Sprachgruppen eines Landes einzubeziehen.” The latter was the case for instance with the Tyrolean *Landesmuseum Ferdinandeum* (1823; new building, Innsbruck 1843–45), the *Johanneum* in Styria (Graz 1811) and the *Landesmuseum* of Moravia (Brünn 1817). In Bohemia on the other hand the purpose was to encourage the national (Czech) feelings of a particular people in the midst of a bilingual monarchy dominated by German-speaking Bohemians; the *Böhmisches Nationalmuseum* was thus founded in Prague in 1818. The *Ungarisches Nationalmuseum* (Budapest 1802) was also the product of patriotism and a sense of the identity of one's own people. Kugler 2004 (note 31), p. 90–91.
- 32 For instance the considerable finds of coins and gold objects in Szilagy-Somlyó (1779) and Nagy-Szent-Miklos (1799). The impoverished discoverer of the latter hoard appears to have travelled on foot from the Banat region to Vienna, where she was given a reward of a thousand guilders by the keeper of the antiquities cabinet. The bronze helmets which were discovered in 1812 in Negau (Untersteiermark), were divided between the *Landesmuseum Johanneum* in Graz (five pieces) and the imperial cabinet in Vienna (twelve pieces). Lhotsky 1941–45 (note 1), vol. II 2, p. 477, 502–504; and 547 about the increasing claims made on such finds by the provincial museums. See also Lhotsky p. 500 (minerals) and p. 510 (paintings).
- 33 On the *Böhmisches Nationalmuseum* in Prague, see Wagner 1977 (note 30), p. 24 and Jan Bažant, *Czech myths in the National Museum in Prag*, in: Ernő Marosi /Gábor Klaniczay (eds.), *The Nineteenth-Century Process of “Musealization” in Hungary and Europe* (Collegium Budapest Workshop Series, 17), Budapest 2006.
- 34 Gábor Ébli, *What made a museum ‘national’ in the nineteenth century? The evolution of public collections in Hungary*, in: Ernő Marosi/Gábor Klaniczay (eds.), *The Nineteenth-Century Process of “Musealization” in Hungary and Europe* (Collegium Budapest Workshop Series, 17), Budapest 2006, 86; József Korek, *Der Museumsgedanke und die Sammlungsmethoden in Ungarn. Die ersten fünfzig Jahre des Ungarischen Nationalmuseums (1802–1852)*, in: Bernward Deneke/Rainer Kahsnitz (eds.), *Das Kunst- und kulturgeschichtliche Museum im 19. Jahrhundert. Vorträge des Symposiums im Germanischen Nationalmuseum, Nürnberg*, Munich 1977, p. 32.
- 35 Lhotsky 1941–45 (note 1), vol. II 2, p. 551–52. Lhotsky, vol. II 2, p. 526 describes Aloys Primmer's idea for a *Nationalmuseum* in *Schloss Ambras* (1818) as a first step *en route* to the Tyrolean *Landesmuseum Ferdinandeum*, founded in Innsbruck in 1823. Primmer's proposal included the return of a selection of the paintings from the Ambras collection that had been moved to Vienna, preferably to be followed by other parts. This romantic idea of restoring the old unity in a *Schloss* to be restored in the ‘sixteenth-century manner’ popped up again for a short while in 1855 but was never realized.
- 36 See Wagner 1977 (note 30), p. 20, 23–25.
- 37 Wagner 1977 (note 30), p. 19–22.
- 38 Debora J. Meijers, *Kunst als Natur. Die Habsburger Gemäldegalerie in Wien um 1780* (Schriften des Kunsthistorischen Museums 2), Vienna 1995, p. 33.
- 39 Kugler 2004 (note 31), p. 90: “die großen, öffentlich zugänglichen, kaiserlichen Sammlungen waren kein National-

- museum. Sie stifteten Identität mit der Dynastie, nicht mit Volk und Vaterland." And he goes on: "Dazu kam, dass in den kaiserlichen Sammlungen nur die internationale Kunst vorzüglich vertreten war, die Kunstproduktion der österreichischen Kronländer beziehungsweise bestimmte Regionen aber nur sporadisch oder zufällig. Lediglich die römischen Bodenfunde und die mannigfaltigen Grab- und Schatzfunde der Völkerwanderungszeit, die in vielen Teilen der Monarchie gehoben wurden, waren seit der Regierungszeit des Kaisers Franz II. als Sammlungsgebiet des k. und k. Münz- und Antikenkabinetts anerkannt, aber ohne einen Bezug zum Fundort. Weder gotische Tafelbilder noch barocke Skulpturen aus den aufgehobenen Klöstern fanden ihren Weg in die kaiserlichen Sammlungen, noch die Zeugnisse der Alltagskultur."
- 40 A separate instance was Dresden, where Gottfried Semper's gallery building of 1847–55, with an additional fourth block, supplemented the existing natural history and physical science cabinets of the Zwinger.
 - 41 Or else one could speak of an absence of historical synchronicity as with the museum in the Louvre, which was founded in the former royal palace as an anti-traditional statement. See Kriller/Kugler 1991 (note 1), p. 38.
 - 42 Elsa van Wezel, *Die Konzeptionen des Alten und des Neuen Museums zu Berlin und das sich wandelnde historische Bewußtsein*, in: Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen N.F. 43, Beiheft (2001), Berlin 2003, p. 7–244. It can also be seen in the way the Berlin museum directors described the structure of the museum as a single entity in response to the question on this subject by the Parliamentary Enquiry of 1853. See *Report from the Select Committee on the National Gallery; together with the proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed, 4 August 1853*, London 1853, Appendix No VII: Answers [1 and 3 by 'Berlin'] to Queries on the Galleries and Museums of Fine Arts in different Countries, 753–758; for this enquiry in general, see: Bergvelt 2005 (note 10). Max Schasler, *Die Königlichen Museen von Berlin. Ein praktisches Handbuch zum Besuch der Galerien, Sammlungen und Kunstschatze derselben*, Berlin 1864 (unnumbered page preceding p. 1), also shows that in practice the two museums were treated as a single entity; he describes their joint opening times and conditions for admission.
 - 43 What role ownership relations played in this should be the subject of further study. See Meijers/Bergvelt/Tibbe/Van Wezel 2012 (note 2), p. 13–14; Robert W. Scheller, *Art of the state: forms of government and their effect on the collecting of art 1550–1800*, in: Simiolus, 24, 1996, p. 284. The fact that the art collections always remained the emperor's private property can possibly be understood in the light of this exaltation. In 1812 Franz I sold part of the natural history collection to the nation, mainly because he was short of cash. For the same reason in 1815 he decided to do the same with the Ambras collection, although the sale never went through. Lhotsky 1941–45 (note 1), vol. II 2, p. 472 and 524–6.
 - 44 Bergvelt/Meijers/Tibbe/Van Wezel 2011 (note 2).
 - 45 See Beatrix Kriller, *Die Grenzen der Freiheit: Künstler, Kustos und Ausstattungsmalerei am Beispiel der Antikensammlung des Kunsthistorischen Museums*, in: Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien, vol. 88, 1992, p. 157–187.
 - 46 Schasler 1864 (note 42), p. 180 denotes the *Kunstammer* in the *Neues Museum* as "Museum der Kleinkünste, der Kunstindustrie und historischen Kuriositäten", which points to the change in meaning that the former *Kunstammer* objects had undergone in this new context. The next step in Berlin was that part of this collection was moved in 1875 to the recently founded *Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe*, or museum of applied arts. See Lieske Tibbe, *Kunstammer objects in museums of industrial arts: banishment or useful destination?*, in: Ellinoor Bergvelt/Deborah J. Meijers/Lieske Tibbe/ Elsa van Wezel (eds.), *Museale Spezialisierung und Nationalisierung ab 1830. Das Neue Museum in Berlin im internationalen Kontext/ Specialization and Consolidation of the National Museum after 1830. The Neue Museum in Berlin in an International Context* (Berliner Schriftenreihe zur Museumsforschung, 29), Berlin 2011, p. 177–89. Although in Vienna the term '*Kunstindustrie*' was also employed for a significant part of the former *Kunstammer* objects (see the floorplan of the *Kunsthistorisches Museum* of 1891), these continued to be kept there, despite the fact that the *K. K. Museum für Kunst und Industrie* had already been founded in 1863. Its originator and first director Rudolph von Eitelberger had in vain attempted to integrate this museum with the *Kunsthistorisches Museum*, when it was still under construction. See Kriller/Kugler 1991 (note 1), p. 23.
 - 47 This occurred on the basis of the criterion that all art objects that were the personal property of the imperial family, and not that of the state, should be housed in the museum, under the same roof. The decision to earmark the new art museum for the private property of the emperor with its origins in the Hapsburg dynasty gave its compilation the character of an encyclopedic *Kunstammer*. In contrast with the art collections of the Hapsburgs the natural history collections had ended up in state ownership. Lhotsky 1941–45 (note 1), vol. II, p. 524–26, 533, 562–69.
 - 48 Kriller 1992 (note 45), p. 157: "Es ist der imperiale Kunstpalast, der den dynastisch gewachsenen Privatbesitz des Kaiserhauses beherbergt und diesen 'Seinen Völkern' öffnet. In ihm spiegelt sich die Einheit von Sammlung, Bau, Ausstattung und Souveränität des Bauherrn wider, so dass ihm, de facto, denkmalhafter Charakter zukommt."
 - 49 Lhotsky 1941–45 (note 1), vol. II 2, p. 569 quotes Quirin von Leitner's *Generalprogram* of 1876: "[...] Zeugnis von dem Kunstsinne und der Munificenz abzulegen, mit welchen die Herrscher Österreichs von jeher bestrebt waren, Kunst und Wissenschaft zu pflegen und zu unterstützen."
 - 50 Kriller 1992 (note 45), p. 157–8: "[...] eine festgemauerte Absichtserklärung, bestimmt von dem alleinigen Gedanken, die Souveränität der Dynastie Habsburg zum Ausdruck zu bringen. [...] Hier wird Kunst zur staaterhaltenden Macht, werden Architektur und [Decorations-] Malerei zu Mittlern souveränen Selbstverständnisses." Prior to this quotation she writes that: "Das Kunsthistorische Hofmuseum ist nicht als Ort musealer Zurschaustellung gedacht, nicht – im Sinne Schinkels – als Heiligtum der Kunst, wie das Alte Museum in Berlin, oder als vaterländisches, national glorifiziertes Denkmal, wie etwa das Germanische Nationalmuseum in Nürnberg. Es ist kein Provinzialmuseum oder Reichsmuseum, welches die Kunst der territorialen Ausdehnung der Monarchie zum Inhalt hat. Es ist vielmehr eine festgemauerte Absichtserklärung [...]."