

Building up an academic discipline on material assemblages: modern Europe's museum developments and 'museology'*

Seong Eun Kim
(Leeum, Samsung Museum of Art)

■ ABSTRACT ■

At the turn of the century in which European colonialism was reaching its zenith and modernization was gathering speed, public museums were institutionalized. This paper looks into the part these European modern museums played in territorializing academic disciplines like anthropology and art history. The museums to deal with are the British Museum and the National Gallery in London, Musée du Louvre in Paris, and Museumsinsel in Berlin. Rather than in-depth detailed analysis of each museum, the aim is to explore the ways in which these museological institutions interacting with modern disciplines in the wider colonial context objectified other cultures and formulated a framework of the world through classification and comparison of material things, on the basis of the judgement of their artistic values. This exploration is also to rethink theoretical positions and perspectives on the museum in Korea. It is remarkable in Europe that such academic fields as history, art history, anthropology and cultural studies look for new possibilities of museology in conjunction with the recent proliferation of studies on the museum as a medium to construct and deconstruct knowledge.

* This paper was supported by National Research Foundation of Korea with the 2012 Government funds from Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (NRF-2012S1A5A2A03034169).

Meanwhile, the mammoth European museums which are often considered a stronghold of museology advocate the ‘universal museum’ themselves, quite the modern idea but in a revised rendering. Under these circumstances, this paper seeks to shed light on the definition of the museum as an arena in which scholarly discourses about art, culture and history can be created and contested, on the effectiveness of the museum as a communication medium in a postcolonial era, and on the need to pay trans-disciplinary attention to the museum in its broadest sense.

Key Words

modern academic disciplines, universal museum, European colonialism and otherness, anthropology, art history, museology

Doing or Undoing Museology

In 2011 there were some disputes in Korea when Youngna Kim, Professor of Art History, Seoul National University, was appointed Director of National Museum of Korea. The Museum is looked upon as being mainly about traditional Korean art and, because she is specialized in modern and contemporary Western art, a question was raised about whether she was qualified for the director of the institution. In Korean language, the term for the museum is ‘pang-mul-gwan’ whose literal meaning is a place for all kinds of material things of the world, and which is usually thought to house antiquities, historical artifacts and cultural heritage. A separate term ‘mi-sul-gwan’ is used in Korean for the art museum in English - rather than adding a qualifier for art to ‘pang-mul-gwan’ - meaning a place for fine art, which is normally linked to something modern and contemporary, something Korean and international. The National Museum is ‘pang-mul-gwan,’ and thus Director Kim’s academic subject was an issue. Interestingly enough, the Museum under her directorship has held such exhibitions as *Art Across America* and *Beyond Impressionism:*

Masterpieces from the Musée d'Orsay, which is quite unusual for the Museum's previous repertoires.

What academic discipline is a museum for? This question is a starting point to lead me, a curator-anthropologist who studied anthropology in the UK and is working in an art museum in Korea, to explore public museums in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Europe, because it was Europe that gave rise to the museum as we know today, that is, an institution collecting encyclopedic objects, compiling them into a certain order, and presenting them in the form of exhibition. In Europe running on the track into the twentieth-century modern society, the boundaries of academic disciplines were not clear-cut yet, and their territorialization was taking place in tandem with defining such core concepts as 'history,' 'progress,' 'culture' and 'society.' Among others, the category of 'art' was crucial to the discussion of museums. This is still true, since art museums take up a substantial portion among museum institutions; a decision made to select, collect, classify and display a specific object often involves the judgement of its artistic values, consciously or unconsciously; objects assembled and exhibited in the museum in itself are material things and to interpret their forms entails direct or indirect references to the field of art; and the outcome of curatorial research is communicated through the form of exhibition, the very visual mechanism.

More specifically to the historical conjuncture of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, art played a distinctive part peculiar to the European colonialism. European museums which brought art and culture from other parts of the world, had to justify why and how they did it. Weaving museological narratives, they strove to distinguish art from non-art, alluding to enlightenment vs ignorance, civilization vs primitiveness. Here 'art' was deployed as an absolute and universal notion, but the usage was highly Eurocentric as a matter of fact. The analysis of art can involve multiple lines of enquiry, be it interpretation in search of meanings and values, or explanation in search of causes and conditions, but what remains at

the core of any analysis is the ever-present question ‘what is art?’. This is actually a question as to what is taken to be art by society and what ought to be rationally considered art. Based on the tradition of German aesthetics established by Winckelmann, Kant, Hegel and Wöllflin, the discipline of art history formed within the framework of modernism in the late nineteenth-century Europe has established the long-standing view of art as what prompts aesthetic experience, with a linear history of artistic progress from ancient Greece. This was an outcome of the colonial world view of art.

Colonialism of modern Europe was closely related to ‘exhibitionary complex’ in Tony Bennett’s term - the fundamental rearrangement of things to be looked at as an object of appropriation in consistent visual systems such as exposition, department store, arcade, diorama, panorama, and museum (Bennett 1995: 59-88). Though these systems treated different things like works of art, antiquities, commodities, specimens, they shared representational modality. George Kubler argues that the “history of things is intended to reunite ideas and objects under the rubric of visual forms: the term includes both artifacts and works of art, both replicas and unique examples, both tools and expressions - in short all materials worked by human hands under the guidance of connected ideas developed in temporal sequences” (1962: 9). In that the museum deals with the history of things, it covers a wide range of human activities. The significance of museum objects consists not simply in values and meanings for which they were originally produced, but also in transactions along the path leading to the museum and afterwards. When everyday artifacts are collected by the museum, they come to have uniqueness; instrumental tools used in a work of art can become part of expressive art in the museum. The history of objects on the move where different participants get involved extends “from origin to current destination with changing meanings as objects are continually redefined along the way” (Ames 1992: 141). Thomas notes that “objects are not what they were made to be but what they have become”

(Thomas 1991: 4). Furthermore, when a certain object comes to inhabit the museum, the context of the museum can also be changed and even newly created.

Up to the nineteenth century in Europe, different collections were formed primarily by individuals, whether it be curiosities from far exotic countries, or masterpieces created by ancestors. These were basically an aggregation of objects evoking a state of mind being marvelled and mystified and a moment of time conjoining the object and the subject, causing a rift to be made in existing structures of knowledge. This elusive and ambiguous experience was brought about because the objects were displaced, or misplaced, in the museum (Spitta 2009: 5). Through the age of enlightenment, a more systematic effort began to be made to rearrange the objects, to understand them more rationally, and to make the public understand it. This coincided with the period when European museums entered into a formative phase more bound up with academic institutions (Keurs 2007: 212). While collections had been intended to show off the power and wealth of royalty and aristocracy, the collected objects were now reborn as part of public institutions for historical survey, to distribute and circulate knowledge. The museums set about subsuming collected objects into a larger narrative structure, for which some theoretical ground was required; and in so doing, history, art history, archaeology, geology, biology and anthropology emerged as a discipline (Bennett 1995: 75). These academic disciplines sought to substantiate the history of the globe, the history of humanity, the history of civilization, the history of art, and the history of a nation, through the museum space of representation. It was believed that the synthesized relations between the histories could be shaped and a comprehensive orderliness of the world could be set up in the museum.

The so-called 'comprehensive order' was slippery to obtain, though, for museums with an encyclopedic collection in their hands were in need of creating what could provide the collection with internal coherence and

congruence, i.e., what could provide each object with commensurability with everything else in the collection. Anthropologist George Marcus, borrowing the notion of ‘assemblage’ by Deleuze and Guattari, argues that the assemblage of fragmented and disparate objects apparently indicates a certain organized structure, “with the materiality and stability of the classic metaphors of structure,” but it is in fact elusive and ephemeral (Marcus and Saka 2006: 102). The spatiality and temporality embedded in the assemblage are unstable and infused with movements and changes, because the assemblage is inherently subject to aesthetic uses, which is precisely what undermines the ideas of structure ensuring certainty. The museum that embodies the idea of European modernity and assumes continuous and systematic spatiotemporality is indeed an assemblage of different times and different spaces that are in constant flux engaging different actors. In a nutshell, the museum is a heterotopia with high entropy. Sociologist Gordon Fyfe defines the museum as ‘calculated’ space where viewers are prompted to internalize the knowledge intended by heterogeneous objects gathered in one place; as ‘conflicted’ space where the aristocratic and the bourgeois, the elites and the masses, the colonizer and the colonized collide with each other; and as ‘collective’ space where people acquire a social identity of a modern citizen, through the collective ritual of museum-viewing (2011: 35-6).

In the visual regime of the museum, what constitutes authoritative power is the gaze, i.e., the eye to observe and interpret an object, to produce knowledge about it and dispense it to a viewing subject, thereby making the exhibited as an object of understanding, an object to own and control physically. At the same time, the museum is “a theater for the coordination of an I/eye confronting the world-as-object, with an I/eye confronting itself as an object among objects in that world” (Preziosi 2011: 56). In the museum which was an ‘engine of modernity’ producing the subject and the object at once (Preziosi 2003: 14), modern academic disciplines were constructed with sensorial and material stagecraft interwoven with

theoretical discourses. Investigating the history of science, anthropologist Bruno Latour notes that modern disciplines drawing on material culture were enabled by a network of colonial power bringing objects to European cities where the museological technology could be exerted (1987: 225). Such disciplines as archaeology and anthropology in their earliest days were the academic reflex of colonial expansion and a lot of material encounters (Gosden 1999: 16). Colonialism paired with nationalism composed the circumstances where countries competed for occupying a specific area, collecting artworks and artifacts there and creating more methodical disciplines mobilizing the objects (Shelton 2011: 67-71). It can be said that the museum was at the crux of the hegemonic nature of cultural imperialism through academic initiatives.

This paper will look into the museums which influenced and were influenced by institutionalization of academic disciplines, when European modernization was accelerated at the apex of colonialism, and when multifaceted discussions were most intensively activated on the museum as an exhibitionary complex. My primary interests lie in how museum activities got intertwined with scholarly activities and how they reshuffled existing boundaries in academia. What will be dealt with is the British Museum and the National Gallery in London, Musée du Louvre in Paris, and Museumsinsel in Berlin. These huge historic museums of three countries, which developed in different contexts in different directions cannot be analyzed in detail in the limited space here. Instead, this paper will be focused on the issues raised by major figures active in the fields of anthropology and art history, the two very cross-cultural disciplines, who took the museum as their intellectual soil at the turn of the century. This paper aims to portray and map the changes at that time in terms of the critical awareness of museums interconnecting with academic disciplines. This is ultimately to revisit the present-day museology, to see how the historical period of time can resonate with today for doing museology with renewed questions, or perhaps ‘undoing’ it in order to formulate

it in an entirely new dimension.

London – Social Imperialism behind Education for All

The British Museum was established in 1753, with the private collection of Sir Hans Sloane, physicist and botanist, and officially opened in 1759. After one century in the 1850s it became a museum with the most diverse collections in London. For example, 2,100 anthropological objects from Sloane's collections were first displayed in the form of cabinet of curiosities, and later the Captain James Cook collections from his third expedition to the South Seas were displayed in a separate South Seas Room, from which anthropological collections came to be classified by geographical categories. The British Museum then was divided into seven departments, i.e., manuscripts, printed books, antiquities, prints and drawings, mineralogy, zoology and botany. While the British Museum had been founded with the "principle of showing its heterogenous collections to studious and curious people," its goals were now expressed in relation to knowledge, "to be a public exhibition of the finest collections in the world in all branches of knowledge" so that "the intelligence of the country has been energising in all the different abstract departments of knowledge" (Whitehead 2009: 79).¹⁾ In this period of time, debates about the institutional identity of the British Museum became heated: is it a museum of natural history, a museum of art, or a museum of history? what does this national museum need to aim at for the general public and what does it need to carry out in academic terms? As well as museum professionals and specialists, those who joined in the debates were scholars who wanted to solidify the ground of young academic disciplines of theirs, and also

1) It can be construed in this vein that the British Museum not only exhibited book collections but also it played a role of library itself (Anderson 2012: 68).

politicians and officials who wanted to instrumentalize the museum for strengthening the colonial empire and modern nation state.

How to organize museum collections was critical in that new knowledge could be created and a new subject field could be defined by classification and convergence of material objects. For instance, historian David Mather Masson in his book *The British Museum, Historical and Descriptive*²⁾ expanding on the ethnographic collection maintained that even if advantages of cross-cultural comparison could arise when many heterogeneous articles from different nations were brought into juxtaposition in the same room, the cultures of China and India needed to be separated from other primitives cultures, “as presenting a civilization in some respects as advanced as our own, although of a singularly distinct kind” (1850: 22-3). Some of its collections had a colonial connection - there was a collection of Chinese cultural artifacts transported from the Summer Palace in Beijing sacked by British invaders (Clunas 1997: 191-2), and there was a great influx of Indian and Southwest Asian artifacts via East India Company - but the British Museum under the rubric of ‘an art and history museum’ was not really acknowledged as a colonial museum (Aldrich 2009: 139).

Regarding the category of ‘art,’ what is interesting in these developments of the British Museum is a special treatment of paintings. There were a few Chinese paintings in the room for Prints and Drawings which showed works by European masters like Rembrandt. The paintings were displayed together regardless of original meanings in a society from which they came because the genre of painting occupied a highest position in the hierarchy of Western art. Nonetheless, the overall portion of paintings

2) Masson described the collections of the British Museum in four parts: firstly, miscellaneous antiquities and curiosities, illustrating the manners and customs of ancient and foreign peoples, constituting the Ethnographical Department; secondly, minerals, fossils, plants and animals constituting the Natural History Department; thirdly, works of art, chiefly sculptures of ancient civilizations; and fourthly, the library together with prints, medals and portraits (1850: 20-1).

in the British Museum's encyclopedic collections was given less weight, not least because the collections were formed not by aesthetic judgements but by criteria of importance as a cultural and historical sample. From the earliest days, paintings existed in the collections of the British Museum, and especially in the early 1820s many aristocrats donated their collections of artworks to the British Museum. After the National Gallery was established in 1824, it became sorted out that paintings should go to the National Gallery, a national museum of art. The National Gallery was founded on the collection of John Julius Angerstein, businessman and underwriter. The government purchased thirty artworks from him, rented his house, and opened the museum there.

The art market of Britain was one of the most active ones in the eighteenth-century Europe, for the landed aristocracy and the emerging merchant class sought to collect artworks as a signature of social distinction as gentlemen. In this social atmosphere, a group of artists, particularly those who were presidents of the Royal Academy of Arts asked for opening private collections to the public and making a national museum of art. Politicians also paid attention to the relationship between art and the nation, among whom was radical John Wilkes. In a parliamentary speech, Wilkes argued for the need to add a national art museum to the British Museum, by which cultural superiority of the nation could be promoted through art (Wilkes 1777: 59-60). The development of the Louvre in Paris became a catalyst for the British people's desire to have a stand-alone art museum. This led to a construction of a purpose-built museum in central London, as part of urban regeneration projects. The National Gallery moved here, together with the Royal Academy, and implemented a more popular policy. Unlike the British Museum, the National Gallery laid emphasis on education for all, and consequently with an exponentially increasing number of visitors, the museum again needed more space by the mid-nineteenth century.

In the 1850s there were active discussions about the scope of museum collecting and exhibiting, in which epistemological dichotomy was at play,

namely, nature and culture, artworks and antiquities, the sacred and the secular, and Christianity and paganism (Whitehead 2009: 122). Among different museum professionals whose voices were added to the discussions on museum typology was architect Charles Eastlake, who was Director of the National Gallery for five years. He made a remark in the 1853 publication *Plan for a Collection of Paintings*: “All works of art may be compared together, and art may be compared with nature; and there is no end to the analogies which you might wish to see established and made accessible with the least possible difficulty; but I think that, practically, it would tend to very little purpose to have a museum which would embrace all works of art” (Whitehead 2009: 127). The ambiguous relationships between the British Museum and the National Gallery continued for a while, with some collections overlapped between them, so that the National Gallery was often considered as a kind of branch of the British Museum. In 1883, the board of trustees of the National Gallery made a request to the British Museum trustees for a transfer of drawings by art historical masters (Bradley and Ousby 1987: 467). 13 March editorial of *The Times* in 1890 advanced a proposal to have a central museum for contemporary art of the nation as a remedy to “the current dispersal of existing public collections of British art ... no Ministry and no Act of Parliament strictly limits and defines the scope of each of these bodies in the matter of acquisition, so that they work at cross purposes, and, if they do not actually compete with one another at public sales, each buys or accepts what ought to be the exclusive concern of one of the others” (Woodson-Boulton 2003: 153).

Although run by an independent board of trustees, these two museums having ‘British’ and ‘National’ in their titles were made national institutions by parliamentary acts, but the division of professional labour was still open to coordination and negotiation. The museums were hence a forum in which different intellectuals and scholars set forth their opinions about aims and missions of museums. Many of them began to associate the

role of museums with national identity, most notably those from the Royal Anthropological Institute established in 1871 and the Museum Association established in 1888, as well as the Royal Academy of Arts. Art historian John Ruskin argued that chronological arrangements in the museum were not merely concerned with the efficient usage of museum space but it could be a methodology to study the general history of the nation (1857: para 2474). Also a critic working for the Royal Academy, he had already given a lecture on art history in conjunction with museums, even before art history was not set up properly as an academic discipline. When Ruskin gave evidence before the 1857 National Gallery Site Commission, he suggested that the collections of art and archaeology of the British Museum should be merged into the new museum, and “one of the main uses of art at present is not so much as art, but as teaching us the feelings of nations. History only tells us what they did; art tells us their feelings, and why they did it ... the whole soul of a nation generally goes with its art” (Taylor 1999: 77). That museums have to be an institution symbolic of the nation, representative of its cultural identity, also resonates with Henry Balfour’s address in 1909. President of the Royal Anthropological Institute, and first curator of the Pitt Rivers Museum, an anthropological museum of University of Oxford, delivered a speech as President of the Museum Association about the relationship between the museum and anthropology, in which he argued for a new museum for Britain’s own culture: “only a comparatively insignificant proportion of the whole has any direct bearing upon the ethnology of Great Britain, ... Even the British Museum - of whose magnificent collections we are justly proud - is everything except British as far as ethnology is concerned” (1909: 218). Alongside the social discussion on the accountability of national museums, the development of new positions like curators, conservators, critics, directors and other museum professionals came to be regarded as enriching national cultural capital (Prior 2002: 87).

The museum more intertwined with national identity was worked out

in the social context in which the significance of education came to the fore. Museums now assumed a mission as a public institution, and the general public also became more interested in scholarly arguments about art and the issues raised by museum exhibitions. Changing museums this way resulted in more interventions from the nation. The 1853 parliamentary report mentions that “together with state schools and libraries, it was hoped that museums would contribute to the moral and intellectual refinement of all classes of the community and the formation of common principles of taste” (McClellan 2003: 8). Annie Coombes links this to ‘social imperialism’ which was to combine imperialism and social reformation (2004: 279). In the circumstances kindled by the Education for All Act motioned in 1902, many museums adjusted their efforts to transform themselves as one of the principal institutions for public education. In the seventh issue of *Museums Journal* in 1902, there was an article to clarify the directions of museums to play a key part in contributing to “one great national work, the building up of the empire through the elevation of the communities and the individual” (Coombes 2004: 288-90). What pervaded the museum culture of the early twentieth-century Britain was the very idea of ‘New Museum’ as a pedagogic apparatus, serving the national ideology to bring up citizens of the empire, the national integration through forming a homogeneous national identity, and the national policy to produce scientific knowledge and preserve cultural heritage.

Paris – Savage and Surrealist Intersected

The fact that it was by revolution that Musée du Louvre was turned into a public museum in 1789 led to its highlighted role as a conveyor of political ideologies of the nation. This is well manifested in a letter written by Minister of the Interior in 1792: “It should be open to everyone. This will be a national monument. ... it will be one of the most powerful

ways of proclaiming the illustriousness of the French Republic” (Duncan and Wallach 1980: 454). In the Napoleonic regime, the Louvre exhibited the plunders of the revolutionary army from different European cities so that its collections had less of France but more of others. The press scrambled everyday for the news that the precious cargo carts decorated with tricolors and trophies made its way to the Louvre, with fanfare and commanding convoys, as if designed to recall those of Alexander the Great (McClellan 1999: 122-3). Through the public rite of spectacularly triumphal processions, Parisians were able to observe the power and glory of their mother country, and to take part in the process by which cultural objects of conquered countries were transformed into museum collections of their own. The museum became a symbol of national power, and an instrument to win the people’s heart. Visitors to the museum felt that they had an equal right to constitute the nation and took up the co-ownership of national cultural heritage, and this mechanism transfigured people from the masses to individual citizens. This is articulated by Duncan and Wallach drawing on the concept of ritual defined by anthropologist Victor Turner: museum visitors are led to take part in the staging of a symbolic ritual reinforcing the national ideology at the moment of liminality in between the museum space and the mundane life (1980: 450).

Since the Louvre became a public museum with a strong political intent, it was unavoidable to meet with a difficulty in reconciling the contexts of collections coming from different areas and different ages. What was brought in as a solution to this was the art historical method, removing an object out of its specific original context, taking account of only its purely aesthetic qualities, and displaying them chronologically and by schools. This approach was what would lay the groundwork for the typical exhibition techniques of today’s museums (Duncan 1991: 95). Here art historical canons were brought into being, and that the history of art was represented physically in a museum exhibition means that art history then fulfilled the function of museology (Preziosi 2003: 37). The methodology

combining schools and chronology was also in line with the emergence of historicism in which European art historians like Winkelman narrated art historically, positioning classical art at its summit (Pommier 2003: 12). Since museology was none other than art history, in-depth research on historical works was prerequisite, which needed to be carried out in the museum. Taking office as Director of the Louvre after the February Revolution in 1848, Philippe-Auguste Jeanron took initiatives to make curators exercise their influence on rearranging collections necessary to mount an education-centered exhibition. He also proposed a transfer of the National Library to the Louvre to enhance research environment, and indeed succeeded in realizing his idea of a curatorial library and archive in the museum (Weisberg 2002: 179, 182-3). The status of the museum depended as much on the capacity of research and the style of exhibition as on collections per se (McClellan 1999: 80-1).

Called 'Palace for Art' or 'Palace for People' the Louvre was most of all a place to set up the French art history; in other words, it was a ritualistic place to glorify artistic heritage illuminated in the process of juxtaposing the past and the present of French art (McClellan 1999: 82). In eulogizing French art, what was often mobilized were material objects of cultural others as a counterpoint, which accompanied a series of museological issues. In the nineteenth century French imperialist navies and explorers collected marine objects and exotic curiosities, many of which flowed into the Louvre. As the antiquities from Peru, Mexico and other countries of Americas, began to make a mark in the 1830s and 40s, a separate room in the Louvre was allocated for these objects in the 1850s. In a little while, however, displays of these anthropological artifacts disappeared, partly because curatorial consensus was not reached regarding whether these objects were beautiful enough to be categorized as a work of art (Conklin 2013: 41). It is from here that to characterize non-European objects in relation to art and aesthetics became a critical but thorny issue in the French history of museums. In the 1870s, for example,

Prime Minister Jules Ferry maintained that superior races should be distinguished from inferior races, and staged a campaign to separate savage objects from artistic masterpieces of the Louvre (Price 2007: 30).³⁾

In judging the artistic values of objects from other cultures, there was a double standard in operation. What could be a case in point were objects from East Asia. As were artifacts from Africa and Oceania, those from China and Japan were handled for long with geographical classification rather than aesthetic evaluation. Museum curators spoke candidly of difficulties in dealing with those objects in terms of drawing a clear line between their anthropological values and art historical values, in that these countries had their own writing system, had a long tradition of art-making, and made a distinctive impact on industrial art and avant-garde art in Europe. Aesthetic analysis of them did not precede their becoming a museum collection either, unlike that of Greek classical art (Dias 1991: 127). Only in the late nineteenth century, the objects from East Asia came to be acknowledged as art having an independent aesthetic system. This coincided with the time when East Asian artifacts made frequent appearance in Parisian museums. While philological research was prioritized before, a new methodology of studying material objects was attempted by newly founded societies such as Société d'Ethnographie (Conklin 2013: 32). Linguist and Orientalist Sylvestre de Sacy explained this museological mode as follows: "a vast depot of objects of all kinds ... all offered to those who wish to give themselves to the study of the Orient; in such a way that each of these students would be able to feel himself transported as if by enchantment into the midst of, say, a Mongolian tribe or of the Chinese race, whichever he might have made the object of his studies" (Mitchell

3) After the 1878 Exposition Universelle, Musée d'Ethnographie du Trocadéro was established in 1883, to which anthropological objects were moved out of the Louvre in the end. As opportunities to look at other cultures through occasions like world expositions in Paris were growing, more systematic approaches were necessary, and material objects seen as a tool of scientific exploration facilitated division and specialization of museums.

1992: 293-4). The figures like Sacy wanted the museum to be a scholarly ground for research into other cultures through objects.

From the viewpoint that the museum could be an educational institution to teach and learn art, it was rather logical that *École du Louvre* was established inside *Musée du Louvre*. With an aim to enlarge knowledge about collections, and to educate curators, conservators and the general public, the *Grande École* had a curriculum of archaeology, art history and anthropology, and its academic authority was not challenged because this was even before professorship of these academic disciplines was not yet erected in universities (Dekoninck and Roucloux 2012: 317-9). It is noteworthy that many of the scholars who taught at the *École* made an interdisciplinary study; for instance, archaeologist and sociologist Henri Hubert, also well-known for his collaboration with anthropologist Marcel Mauss, gave a lecture on the ethnographic history of Celtic and Asian cultures. In 1927 the world's first museology course was opened in *École du Louvre*. Museologist Georges Henri Rivière took a course in museum studies here and became the first president of the International Museum Council later. In the 1920s and 30s, surrealist figures influenced by anthropological collections were active in *École du Louvre* too. Georges Salles taught about art from China, Islam and Africa, Georges Conteneau about Ellam and Sumer, Joseph Hacking about Afghanistan and India, and René Grousset about Asia. These surrealists around the magazine *Document* took the Louvre as their footing to rebel against the orthodox art education of University of Paris-Sorbonne (Therrien 1998: 488, 491-2).

Surrealism is closely connected to anthropology in the museological context in France. The interest of anthropology in museums came up in France relatively later than Britain and Germany. Very sociological in its inclination before, French anthropology began to take note of museums, when Marcel Mauss put forward the need for the museum, emphasizing material aspects of a society (Mauss 1913), and clearly counted museology as part of anthropological methodology of observation, proposing the

museum as an archive (Mauss 1926). Until then, most anthropologists in France entered the field via natural history, philology, archaeology, history and sociology (Conklin 2013: 242), and so did some surrealists who worked with anthropological collections (Clifford 1981). Marcel Griaule and Michel Leiris are among those who combined anthropology and avant-garde art movements. Mauss also expressed his interest in looking at anthropological objects from an artistic perspective. Surrealist Guillaume Apollinaire contended that, because exotic anthropological objects inspired European artists with their visual forms, thus being as great as the European works of art, anthropological collections had to be included in the Louvre (Apollinaire 1909, quoted in Price 2011: 70). The social connections between surrealist groups and the bourgeois class were at play as well. In 1928, Paul Rivet, anthropology professor in the Natural History Museum and Director of Musée d'Ethnographie du Trocadéro, appointed Rivière from École du Louvre as Deputy Director. Rivière had organized the Dakar-Djibouti Expedition and actively interacted with avant-garde art circles. With this appointment, Rivet had a strategic intention that Rivière's social links with surrealist artists could be an appealing factor to bourgeois people interested in the anthropological museum (Conklin 2013: 105-6). The intersection between the institutionalization of museum anthropology and the advocacy of modern art including surrealism lies at the root of the debates of aesthetics versus anthropology, which is often brought to the fore when dealing with other cultures in French museums today (Debaene 2004: 56).

Berlin – Sanctuary for Art and Science

Modern museums in Germany can be characterized by the social ideas of nation and ethnicity imbued with German Romanticism of Goethe and Schiller. After Aloys Hirt, who taught in Akademie der Wissenschaft und

Künste in Berlin, advocated the necessity of a museum in the academy first in the late eighteenth century, there were concentrated efforts to build a new museum to put together different collections accumulated across Berlin including royal collections, and to show them to the public in both scientific and popular manners. This gathered momentum by Wilhelm von Humboldt, the founder of University of Berlin, who began to serve by the order of the King, as Chairman of the Commission on the Foundation and Interior Design of the New Berlin Museum in 1829. Humboldt was an influential figure devoting himself to the enhancement of social education through university reform and through cultural and comprehensive education free to anyone (McIsaac 2007: 59). In this respect, he was interested in the potentiality of museums. German intellectuals at that time, who had opportunities to visit museums of other European countries, were keenly aware of the museum's social role. Compared with Britain and France, Germany was not yet a unified and consolidated political unity, with some social tension and disorder among different states. Humboldt believed that art could make people cohesive and cultivate cultural taste and sensibility, thereby strengthening the Kingdom of Prussia.⁴⁾ What he saw in the museum's role is that museum visitors undergo a series of viewing rituals and come to possess an object of cultural value collectively, whereby social ties are forged and social identities are shaped (Sheehan 2000: 57).

The notion of museum bound up with the state power implementing art education became materialized in the Altes Museum, the first public museum in Germany, which opened in 1830. Those who were involved in the founding of the Museum including Humboldt and architect Karl Friedrich Schinkel shared the aesthetics of Schiller and Hegel that art could elevate human souls through sublime art. Following the aesthetic

4) The Riga Memorandum that Prussian Minister of Culture submitted to the King in 1807 contains the following phrase: "the fine arts are the expression of the highest condition of mankind and that the state has the duty to make them accessible to everyone" (Duncan and Wallach 1980: 457).

idealism that art could offer transcendence which used to belong only to the realm of religion, they presented the museum as a profound place overlaid with aesthetic experience, and as an educational arena similar to Paideia, ancient Greek philosophy of education (Poulot 2012: 202). The museum was understood as part of the educational process, in which the aesthetic experience of art played an important role in consecrating the national culture. The museum was thus focused not only on showing a work of art as an exemplar of historical progress but on embodying aesthetic experience appealing to everyone intuitively. For example, a central rotunda like the Roman Pantheon was set as a twilight zone between the museum and the outside world, in which people could get prepared to view the exhibition, i.e., to enter a kind of sanctuary (McClellan 2008: 66). Meticulous calculations were conducted, about architectural structures, the movement of viewers, and wall color, lighting, plinth size, etc., to maximize the visual effect of art being autonomous and self-contained.

The Altes Museum in its earlier days was supposed to display authentic paintings and sculptures from Greece and Rome regarded as civilizations of highest aesthetic achievements. From the stage of its preparation, however, there had been discussions on how to rearrange encyclopedic collections and which museum to take what, and this continued after the opening of the Altes Museum (Gaethgens 2012: 286-7). A desire for an all-inclusive museum that could unroll the cultural history of humanity gave birth to the second museum, the Neues Museum. Friedrich Wilhelm IV designated the island along the Spree River “Freistätte für Kunst und Wissenschaft” which was the beginning of Museumsinsel (Stockhausen 2005: 10), and the opening of the Neues Museum here in 1859 brought Museumsinsel into shape as a museum complex (Poulot 2012: 203). Unlike the Altes Museum that was seen as an institution of public education, the Neues Museum was closer to an academic institution accommodating up-to-date art-historical research and representing it in spatial and material terms⁵⁾ - if there was a blank in the historical narrative: it was filled in by cast

replicas so that the museum as a media of historicism could be ensured (Marchand 2000: 182-3). The museum put to scholarly use was animated in some measure by anthropological collections that increased sharply in the mid-nineteenth century. In addition to anthropological objects scattered across different collections from the 1830s, a great amount of objects collected by explorers to Asia and Africa in the 1850s and 60s came into the Neues Museum. The number of anthropology specialists accordingly increased and their scholarly activities centered around museum collections became more invigorated too.⁶⁾

The Berlin museum project went on to open the Nationalgalerie for contemporary art in 1876. Unlike the other two museums based on royal collections, the Nationalgalerie began with the collection of banker Joachim Heinrich Wilhelm Wagener. His collections were originally international, consisting of works of artists from diverse European countries, while the Nationalgalerie set up a policy to have collections limited to works of German artists. On the frieze of the Nationalgalerie German cultural history was inscribed from prehistory to the nineteenth century, and on the pediment, “For German art, 1871” - 1871 is the year when German states were unified into Prussia, the German Empire. This was a response to the prevalence of nationalism in the newly emerging modern states, exemplified in national pavilions of international expositions, and partly a reaction to the fear of homogenization of cultures due to modernization. From the twentieth century onwards, however, the composition of collections underwent incessant changes with regard to whether a new art form should

-
- 5) Johann Joachim Winckelmann historicized art for the first time in his book *History of Ancient Art* in 1764 where he drew commonality and universality of artistic styles from each historical age. Historicization of art was reinforced later under the influence of Darwinian evolutionism.
- 6) There was a demand for a separate museum for anthropology, and finally the Museum of Ethnology was established outside Museumsinsel with the first director Adolf Bastian in 1873, to which 4,000 objects were transferred mainly from the Neues Museum.

be embraced, as the themes of everyday life were introduced in many works of art and avant-garde art of European modernism flourished (Keisch 2005: 9, 73).

A lot of artworks and artifacts were brought to collections in connection with the expansion of Germany in political and economic terms after the unification, in which Richard Schöne and Wilhelm von Bode, two General Directors of the royal museums in Museumsinsel, played a leading role. Taking office from 1880, classical archaeologist Schöne reinforced the museum as an academic arena, and encouraged experts and specialists to make use of museum collections as a scholarly resource. For instance, Adolf Bastian was employed to take charge of anthropological collections and to undertake research into them. Schöne believed that museums were not for enjoying beauty but for doing *Wissenschaft* (Marchand 2000: 185). Museumsinsel that began with the Altes Museum with classical antiquities and paintings came to have seventeen departments including anthropology, Islam and Near East when Schöne left office in 1905. The collections became so diversified not least because of the competition with the British Museum and the Louvre. The museum project in Germany started later than London and Paris, so those in power in Berlin invested a great deal in collecting artworks and artifacts, to catch up with other European countries.

Bode who became Director after Schöne in 1905 had already opened the Kaiser Friedrich Museum the year before - later renamed the Bode Museum - with such a powerful driving force that he was nicknamed 'Bismarck of the Museum.' On the one hand, he shared with Schöne the idea that the nation had to take responsibility for making a large-scale collection and its conservation and for developing museums into a single cultural complex; and the museum had to serve the German Empire. On the other, Bode as art historian and curator was not in agreement with Schöne, pursuing the museum as a place for aesthetics rather than cultural history. Collections for him were not an evidence of historical change

but an object of aesthetic appreciation. He took the views that aesthetic values extracted from material relics handed down from the past were what transcended historical evolution, and that beauty transcending time and space was invariable as the essence of human existence. Notwithstanding, it was not a simple matter whether to show historical evidences or artistic masterpieces, and it was unavoidable that different display techniques coexisted: to group different types of works from each period of time in order to show historical changes; and to reenact historical times in period rooms enabling the complete immersion of viewers in the past represented transparently there.

In the conjuncture in which the formulation of Museumsinsel was going on, there were lively interactions and interchanges between academia and the museum world in the light of cultural politics. This is because the museum was considered as a forum in which arguments on the authority of knowledge could be endorsed and generalized. Among others, there was a pronounced confrontation between the humanistic perspective to see the supremacy of ancient Greek culture, and the empiricist perspective to claim on the superiority of modern natural science. The formation of opposition was particularly conspicuous between text-based disciplines such as classicism and philology, and object-based ones such as anthropology, art history and archeology. This kind of contest and competition was not only to seize an initiative and to earn a reputation of theoretical interpretations. Anthropologists and archaeologists joined the social discussion to obtain funding required for their fieldwork, and art historians and museum professionals to take an advantageous position for a source of government funding. The most well-known is the war of words between Bode and art historian Herman Grimm from University of Berlin. Bode who was also a connoisseur involved in art markets placed emphasis on improving the artistic taste of the general public through the museum, while Grimm stressed the educational role of the museum to convey scholarly knowledge to the public, regarding art as a reflection

of zeitgeist in a broader context of cultural history (Joachimides 2000: 207-9).

The compromise between these two camps were made in the fifth museum of Museumsinsel, the Pergamonmuseum that opened in 1930. This museum was established to deal with architectural relics from Near and Middle East, the stronghold of German colonial archaeology. It developed from excavations in the areas of today's Bergama where the Hellenistic empires had flourished. With the increasing awareness that the possession of archaeological remains of other cultures was essential for the status of the German Empire, archaeological excavations that had begun in Egypt and Sudan were more accelerated with the support of the Prussian government to reach Pergamon in the area of the Ottoman Empire from 1878 to 1886. The significance of Pergamon was suggested in the 1886 special occasion in Berlin. Commemorating the centenary of the Royal Academy of Arts, and Kaiser Wilhelm I's 25th throne anniversary, what was called 'Pergamon Temple' was constructed. In the semi-circular architecture, the panorama of Pergamon was rolling out to evoke the effect of magic lantern, and actors in period costume staged the triumph of Attalus II against the Celtic, alluding to the victory of Bismarck against the French. There was a political intention to parade the achievements of German archaeologists under the auspices of the government in today's Turkey, Iraq, Jordan and Syria, and also to equate Berlin with ancient Greek cities (Bilsel 2012: 109-13). In the 1886 event, there was also an exhibition that showed German colonies in central Africa in five panoramas entitled 'Kaiser Diorama.' In the model temple of Dendera of ancient Egypt, Africa was described as part of the German Empire, absorbing Africa into Hellenistic ideals. The appropriation of colonial images in this way was fashionable at that time, which was to consume the world through the window of Europe by removing its depth and making it a painterly expression equivalent to surrounding scenery (Sternberger 1977: 46-7).

Architectural relics including the altar unearthed at the Pergamon site

were moved to Berlin, and consequently there needed museum space to store and display these enormous pieces, from which the Pergamonmuseum was born.⁷⁾ It contained architectural collections of ancient Greece and Rome, ancient Mesopotamia and Islamic Middle Ages, and these collections were presented as a collage of architectural monuments so that the entirety became the museum architecture itself. They looked like panorama paintings without any dimensional depth, in which racial and cultural typology was rendered devoid of anthropological meanings. The likelihood of facing others firsthand, which would be somewhat awkward and inconvenient, was simply eliminated in the first place in the museum. The presence of self-referential architectural monuments created illusion of actuality, and here to digest archaeological fragments in a single narrative of the cultural heritage of an imagined transcendental subject, that is, ‘humankind,’ was no less hegemonic than ethnographic displays of colonized natives, a showcase of human beings from colonized lands, which were also then in fashion (Bilsel 2012: 20, 87).

World Cultures, and ‘New’ Museology Again

With the topography of museums conceived and designed by modern Europe as mapped above, if roughly, it can be seen that another dimension of Europe’s modernity is overlapped. That is, cosmopolitanism. In parallel with Eurocentrism and nationalism, the value of a world citizen was promoted and universal cultures were pursued. The ideal of cosmopolitanism was intimately and inextricably bound up with colonial interventions of Europe in other cultures and with subsequent movements and migrations of people and things (van der Veer 2002: 166). The openness of

7) The transfer of the Pergamon altar to Berlin was partly driven by the fact that the Parthenon marbles were moved to the British Museum, projecting the imperialist aspiration onto archaeological achievements.

cosmopolitanism was concerned with an aesthetic and intellectual attitude to look at other cultures as ‘art’ to some extent (Hannerz 1990: 139). It was in the museum that what contradicted and conflicted with nationalism could be artificially reconciled under the rubric of art. Remarkably enough, this rings a bell if you bring to mind the tendency of the twenty-first-century European museums aspiring towards universality. In the wave of globalization, which is now an almost hackneyed expression, new museums with the title ‘world cultures’ come up one after another⁸⁾; and mammoth museums like the British Museum and the Louvre state their identity as a ‘universal museum.’⁹⁾ This standpoint is not surprisingly contested by non-European museums and academics. In this situation of a kind of the tug-of-war of cultural hegemony, the issues posed in the modern European public museums seem still relevant to think over today.

The nineteenth century museums as public property were transferred into a social and symbolic domain, and major cities in Europe comparing themselves with each other gave impetus to laying out urban museumscape.

8) It seems that the wording ‘world’ is being used more frequently than before. In the case of the UK, there are museums such as the World Cultures Gallery in Liverpool World Museum, and the World Art Gallery in Brighton Museum; and art courses such as School of World Art Studies and Museology, University of East Anglia. The word is also found in a diplomatic post ‘Chairman of World Collections’ to which Neil MacGregor, Director of the British Museum, was appointed by the UK government to promote six British national collections internationally.

9) In December 2002, nineteen museums including the British Museum unveiled an argument that they were universal institutions, issuing the ‘Declaration on the Importance and Value of Universal Museums.’ The signatories include the Louvre in Paris, the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, the State Museums in Berlin, and the State Hermitage Museum in St. Petersburg. The International Council of Museums aptly featured the Declaration and debates in the cover story of *ICOM News* 57.1 in 2004. UNESCO also held a public debate *Memory and Universality: New Challenges Facing Museums* chaired by the Deputy Director for Culture and attended by directors of the British Museum, the Louvre and the Hermitage, and directors of the National Museum of the American Indian in Washington, D.C. and École du Patrimoine Africain in Porto-Novo.

The museum became a political space as a ruling instrument, to propagate values mediated by the national ideology. The museum was also an educational and aesthetic space for the general public to study and enjoy cultural assets of humankind. Therefore, what to collect was not the only thing to take into account. The techniques of classification and exhibition became significant, whose methodologies were developed in a theoretical framework of each academic discipline. Furthermore, the process in which encyclopedic collections were rearranged and divided typologically, caused a museum to become departmentalized, and to become specialized in each subject. This was nothing but the very process in which modern knowledge was produced through classification and comparison on the basis of movability and combinability of collections. More than anything else, the important task of the museum was to take a bird's-eye view of the world and unfold it under the gaze of Europeans. The past segmented and fragmented was to be fused in the space of the museum through the design of the present, so that history was made up as a seamless patchwork, in which the dynamics of aesthetics and science was always at work.

In the museum space which is separated from everyday life, what European cities aimed to achieve is to have a grip of the world and to turn the world into a single unified frame of universal knowledge, which inevitably went with academic activities. European museums deployed in the colonial configuration in full swing erected a new building, selected a collection, and employed professional curators. This whole series of systematization of museums also wielded an influence on the institutionalization of anthropology and art history, the academic disciplines dealing with material culture, as socially recognized, independent subject fields. Whereas knowledge-making had been conducted before by the conventions of scholarly communities positioned in a fluid network, standard methods of inquiry came to take shape across different fields of intellectual pursuit, establishing normative codes and protocols. Behind this the museum was a driving force as a means to construct discourses and theories, as

a medium to visualize and communicate well-organized knowledge. All practices of the museum to bring the world, to bring other cultures to the here and now are what brings on a certain way of seeing and a certain web of signification, in the tension between representational qualities and immediate actualities, in which creativity and contestability are inherent (Lidchi 1997: 199). In association with the then newly emerging academic disciplines, the modern museums of Europe performed a sort of experiments to create the categories of knowledge by classifying borderline objects, and the experimentation was complex and indeterminate so that dispute and debate, imagination and appropriation were in-built.

The conceptualization of the museum as a medium has gained ground as museum studies took a new turn in the late twentieth century, especially by *The New Museology* written by Peter Vergo published in 1989. Museum studies had been concerned only about the practicalities of methodology and management of the museum before, while it was transformed into multilayered theoretical studies about history and philosophy, about objectives and responsibilities of museums. Anthropologists who joined this wave of changes by dissecting the relationships between the museum and colonialism, have expanded their museological interest in anything other than typically anthropological museums, such as an art museum and a science museum. Art historians who also came to question art-historical fundamentals taken for granted, in term of their being Eurocentric and colonialist, have deconstructed a museum narrative of art history, and pluralized it adopting a cross-cultural perspective. The museology literature that has exploded since the late twentieth century in European academia proves that there seems not a single discipline in humanities and social sciences that do not take an interest in museology. Why has museology or museum studies been thrust into the limelight so radically? The model of European public museums that built up the architecture of 'universal knowledge' by taking 'the whole humanity' as an object of the knowledge has intrinsic flaws due to its origin in colonialism. Nevertheless, it is

acknowledged that the museum can be a self-reflexive medium: in other words, what is taking place in the museum cannot but reveal its being mediated, and therefore the museum can reflect upon itself, and find a new possibility within. The recognition of the museum as a medium, and as a conduit of convergence and consilience of different disciplines is what stimulates the current boom of museum studies. This is also why the exploration of modern European museums is still significant for the present-day museum context. The most recent museology raises questions underlying the modernity of the museum, and strives to go beyond modern ideas by the very medium of the museum itself.

There is a strong tendency in Korea of thematic divisions of museums, in which each type of museum is considered to belong to a specific discipline's territory. The specialization of museums results in weakening their inherent museological function as a cross-disciplinary or even trans-disciplinary platform changing an existing paradigm and creating a new way of knowing, by different disciplines interacting with each other to be transformed and manifested anew. Perhaps this is why it is not easily accepted that the National Museum of Korea holds an exhibition on Western art history. It must be addressed, though, whether the changes in museum programs are made only by a new director's specialty or policy without sufficient social discussion on the identity of the national museum. It is also the case in Korea that anthropology is normally linked to a folk museum and its proper attention given to other types of museums including an art museum does not come fully into view yet. There is plenty of room for the interpenetration of universities and museums too in line with the rethinking and unsettling of our consciousness of museums. Research to throw new light on scholarly practices in, with and about the museum is growing, as in *The Two Art Histories: The Museum and the University* (Haxthausen 2002) and *Academic Anthropology and the Museum: Back to the Future* (Bouquet 2001). Looking at academic approaches to the museum from a non-European perspective in a postcolonial

era, it seems worth being reminded that the museum is always already a composite of archaeology, natural science, history, art history, aesthetics, sociology, and anthropology in particular which is all about cross-cultural understanding and communication delving into and dismantling demarcations.

❖ References

- ALDRICH, Robert, "Colonial Museums in a Postcolonial Europe," *African and Black Diaspora: An International Journal* 2.2 (2009): 137-56.
- AMES, Michael, *Cannibal Tours and Glass Boxes: The Anthropology of Museums*, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1992.
- ANDERSON, Robert G. W., "British Museum, London: Institutionalizing Enlightenment," in Carole Paul, ed., *The First Modern Museums of Art: The Birth of an Institution in 18th- and Early-19th-Century Europe*, Imprint: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2012, 47-72.
- BALFOUR, Henry, "Presidential Address to the Museums Association, Maidstone Meeting," 1909, reprinted in Bettina Messias Carbonell (ed.), *Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts*, London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2003, 218-24.
- BENNETT, Tony, *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*, London: Routledge, 1995.
- BILSEL, Can, *Antiquity on Display: Regimes of the Authentic in Berlin's Pergamon Museum*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- BOUQUET, Mary (ed.), *Academic Anthropology and the Museum: Back to the Future*, New York; Oxford: Berghahn, 2001.
- BRADLEY, John Lewis and Ian Ousby (eds.), *The Correspondence of John Ruskin and Charles Eliot Norton*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- CLIFFORD, James, "On Ethnographic Surrealism," in *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*, Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press, 1988, 117-51.
- CLUNAS, Craig, "Oriental Antiquities / Far Eastern Art," in Tani Barlow (ed.), *Formations of Colonial Modernity in East Asia*, Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1997, 413-45, reprinted in Howard Morphy and Morgan Perkins (eds.), *The Anthropology of Art: A Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006, 186-208.
- CONKLIN, Alice L., *In the Museum of Man: Race, Anthropology, and Empire in France 1850-1950*, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2013.
- COOMBES, Annie, "Museums and the Formation of National and Cultural Identities," in Donald Preziosi and Claire Farago (eds.), *Grasping the World: The Idea of the Museum*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004, 278-97.
- DEBAENE, Vincent, *Far Afield: French Anthropology between Science and Literature*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- DEKONINCK, Ralph and Joël Roucloux, "Art History in France: A Conflict of Traditions," in Matthew Rampley, et al. (eds.), *Art History and Visual*

- Studies: Transnational Discourses and National Frameworks*, Leiden: Brill, 2012, 315-33.
- DIAS, Nélia, *Le Musée d'Ethnographie du Trocadéro (1878-1908): Anthropologie et Muséologie en France*, Paris: CNRS, 1991.
- DUNCAN, Carol, "Art Museums and the Ritual of Citizenship," in Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine (eds.), *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, Washington, D.C.; London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991, 88-103.
- _____, *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*, London: Routledge, 1995.
- DUNCAN, Carol and Alan Wallach, "The Universal Survey Museum," *Art History* 3 (1980): 448-69.
- FYFE, Gordon, "Sociology and Social Aspects of Museums," in Sharon Macdonald (ed.), *A Companion to Museum Studies*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2011, 31-49.
- GAETHGENS, Thomas W., "Altes Museum, Berlin: Building Prussia's First Modern Museum," in Carole Paul (ed.), *The First Modern Museums of Art: The Birth of an Institution in 18th- and Early-19th-Century Europe*, Imprint: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2012, 285-303.
- GOSDEN, Chris, *Anthropology and Archaeology: A Changing Relationship*, London: Routledge, 1999.
- HANNERZ, Ulf, "Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture," *Theory, Culture & Society* 7.2 (1990): 237-51.
- HAXTHAUSEN, Charles W. (ed.), *The Two Art Histories: The Museum and the University*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.
- JOACHIMIDES, Alexis, "The Museum's Discourse on Art: The Formation of Curatorial Art History in Turn-of-the-Century Berlin," in Susan A. Crane, ed., *Museums and Memory*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000, 200-19.
- KEISCH, Claude (ed.), *The Alte Nationalgalerie, Berlin*, London: Scala Publishers, 2005.
- KEURS, Pieter Ter (ed.), *Colonial Collections Revisited*, Leiden: CNWS Publications, 2007.
- KUBLER, George, *The Shape of Time*, New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1962.
- LATOUR, Bruno, *Science in Action*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1987.
- LIDCHI, Henrietta, "The Poetics and the Politics of Exhibiting Other Cultures," in Stuart Hall (ed.), *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, London: Sage in association with the Open University,

- 1997, 151-221.
- MARCHAND, Suzanne, "The Quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns in the German Museums," in Susan A. Crane (ed.), *Museums and Memory*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000, 179-99.
- MARCUS, George E. and Erkan Saka, "Assemblage," *Theory, Culture & Society* 23.2-3 (2006): 101-9.
- MASSON, David Mather, *The British Museum, Historical and Descriptive*, Edinburgh: William and Roberg Chambers, 1850.
- MAUSS, Marcel, "Ethnography in France and Abroad," *Journal of Paris* 20 (1913), reprinted in Victor Karady (ed.), *Marcel Mauss, Oeuvres 3: Cohésion Sociale et Division de la Sociologie*, Paris: Minuit, 1969.
- _____, *Manuel d'Ethnographie*, Paris: Payot, 1926, translated in N. J. Allen (ed.), *Manual of Ethnography*, Oxford: Durkheim Press, 2007.
- McCLELLAN, Andrew, *Inventing the Louvre: Art, Politics, and the Origins of the Modern Museum in Eighteenth-Century Paris*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1999.
- _____, "A Brief History of the Art Museum Public," in Andrew McClellan (ed.), *Art and Its Publics*, Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003, 1-50.
- _____, *The Art Museum from Boullée to Bilbao*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2008.
- McISAAC, Peter, *Museum of the Mind: German Modernity and the Dynamics of Collecting*, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University, 2007.
- MITCHELL, Timothy, "Orientalism and the Exhibitionary Order," 1992, in Nicholas B. Dirks (ed.), *Colonialism and Culture*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1992, 289-317.
- POMMIER, Edouard, *Winckelmann, Inventeur de l'Histoire de l'Art*, Paris: Gallimard, 2003.
- POULOT, Dominique, "Museums and Museologies," in Matthew Rampley, et al. (eds.), *Art History and Visual Studies: Transnational Discourses and National Frameworks*, Leiden: Brill, 2012, 197-216.
- PREZIOSI, Donald, *Brain of the Earth's Body: Art, Museums, and the Phantasms of Modernity*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.
- _____, "Art History and Museology: Rendering the Visible Ligible," in Sharon Macdonald (ed.), *A Companion to Museum Studies*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2011, 50-63.
- PRICE, Sally, *Paris Primitive*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- _____, *Au Musée des Illusions, Le Rendez-Vous Manqué du Quai Branly*, Paris: Denoël, 2011.
- PRIOR, Nick, *Museums and Modernity: Art Galleries and the Making of Modern*

- Culture*, London: Berg, 2002.
- RUSKIN, John, *Report of the National Gallery Site Commission: Together with Minutes, Evidence, Appendix and Index*, High Wycombe: Harrison & Sons, 1857.
- SHEEHAN, James J., *Museums in the German Art World: From the End of the Old Regime to the Rise of Modernism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- SHELTON, Anthony Alan, "Museums and Anthropologies: Practices and Narratives," in Sharon Macdonald (ed.), *A Companion to Museum Studies*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2011, 64-80.
- SPITTA, Silvia, *Misplaced Objects: Migrating Collections and Recollections in Europe and Americas*, Houston: University of Texas Press, 2009.
- STERNBERGER, Dolf, *Panorama of the Nineteenth Century*, New York: Urizen Books, 1977.
- STOCKHAUSEN, Tilman von, "Markenpolitik im 19. Jahrhundert: Die Berliner Museumsinsel als Public Relation-Idee," in Thomas Biskup and Marc Schalenberg (eds.), *Selling Berlin: Imagebildung und Stadtmarketing von der preußischen Residenz bis zur Bundeshauptstadt*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2008, 107-15.
- TAYLOR, Brandon, *Art for the Nation: Exhibitions and the London Public, 1747-2001*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.
- THERRIEN, Lyne, *L'Histoire de l'Art en France: Genèse d'une Discipline Universitaire*, Paris: C.T.H.S., 1998.
- THOMAS, Nicholas, *Entangled Objects: Exchange, Material Culture, and Colonialism in the Pacific*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- TURNER, Victor, "Frame, Flow and Reflection: Ritual and Drama as Public Liminality," reprinted in *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 6.4 (1977): 465-99.
- VAN DER VEER, Peter, "Colonial Cosmopolitanism," in Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen (eds.), *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, 165-79.
- WEISBERG, Gabriel P., "Using Art History: The Louvre and Its Public Persona, 1848-52," in Elizabeth Mansfield (ed.), *Art History and Its Institutions: Foundations of a Discipline*, London: Routledge, 2002, 178-90.
- WHITEHEAD, Christopher, *Museums and the Construction of Disciplines: Art and Archaeology in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, London: Duckworth, 2009.
- WILKES, John, *The speeches of John Wilkes, one of the knights of the shire for the county of Middlesex, in the Parliament appointed to meet at*

Westminster the 29th day of November 1774, to the prorogation the 6th day of June 1777, Volume 2, London: Fielding and Walker, 1977.

WOODSON-BOULTON, Amy, "The Art of Compromise: the Founding of the National Gallery of British Art, 1890-1892," *Museum and Society* 1.3 (2003): 147-69.