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Abstract

This thesis investigates the evolution of curatorial practice in Britain and the United States in the first four decades of the twentieth century through an analysis of the formative years of two museums, the Wallace and Frick Collections, and of two academic programmes, the Fogg Art Museum Course at Harvard University and the Courtauld Institute of Art at the University of London. Through these case studies, this study charts the emergence and development of a specialised curatorial knowledge base that was influenced by traditions of connoisseurship and criticism and shaped by discussions surrounding art history’s disciplinary parameters taking place in the museum, the press, the art market and the university.

This investigation makes visible the processes through which art museum curators, keepers and directors collaborated in the creation and standardisation of their own expertise and contends that this quest was fundamentally intertwined with struggles for authority, agency and professional recognition. The manifestation of this expertise resulted in a renegotiation of institutional power dynamics and gave rise to a new type of art museum leader: the connoisseur-scholar, who performed an important function in the art museum’s transition from a space dominated by gentlemanly amateurs to one in which academically trained art historians increasingly assumed positions of authority.

Asserting that the formation of this knowledge base cannot be separated from the academic institutionalisation of art history and curatorial training, this study demonstrates that individuals operating in the spheres of the art museum and the university were engaged in a dialogue through which the core values of these respective endeavours were realised. Detailing these processes and relationships and locating them within the context of a shift towards aesthetic idealism, this thesis provides insight into the historical origins of modern-day curatorial practice in Britain and the United States.
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Introduction

In the first decade of the twentieth century, the training of museum curators was a topic of frequent discussion at the respective annual conferences of the Museums Association and the newly formed American Association of Museums.¹ Experienced museum workers, variously employed to care for collections ranging from fine art objects to natural history specimens, pondered and debated whether it was possible to train a curator and, if so, whether such training was best acquired through general education, practical job experience or specialised training programmes (the latter only recently proposed). In his address at the Museums Association's conference in 1906, William E. Hoyle, the organisation's President, and Keeper of the Manchester Museum, spoke of the difficulties inherent in devising a cohesive approach to curatorial training: ‘At the present moment there is no trace of any system even in theory, still less in practice, in regard to the matter. There is scarcely even an idea in the public that a special training of museum curators is conceivable, let alone desirable.’² Indeed, it was not only the public who questioned the feasibility of training curators. Senior figures within the museum field also openly expressed their doubts. In 1910, Frederick A. Lucas, President of the American Association of Museums and Chief Curator at the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, concluded a roundtable seminar on the subject by asserting: ‘a curator is born and not made. I do not believe that you can train a man to be a curator. He is the result of natural ability and circumstances.’³

Underlying these discussions were tensions about the nature of curatorial expertise and how it might be defined and differentiated across disciplines. While there was general

¹ The Museums Association was founded in 1889 and the American Association of Museums in 1906.

² William Evans Hoyle, ‘Presidential Address: The Education of A Curator’, Museums Journal, 6 (July 1906), 4-24 (p.8).

consensus that the expertise required by an art curator differed from that required by a science curator, opinions varied as to what constituted these distinct types of expertise. In the face of such uncertainty, conference participants tended to speak of the qualifications and knowledge required of the curator in broad, encompassing terms. In 1902, F.A. Bather, of the British Museum, spoke of the model curator as:

\[\text{[...] a man of enthusiasm, of ideas, of strictest honour, of sincerity, with the grip and devotion of a specialist, yet with the wisdom born of wide experience, with an eye for the most meticulous detail, but with a heart and mind responsive to all things of life, art, and nature.}\]

Hoyle offered a similar assessment in his 1906 address, describing the ideal curator as a man possessing qualities of ‘general culture, tact, and courtesy’ coupled with ‘business-like and methodical habits’ and an ‘artistic sensibility and appreciation of the beautiful.’ Moreover, he should also have ‘an acquaintance, the more intimate the better’ with subjects such as science, history, geography and art, as well as ‘practical acquaintance with the use of ordinary tools for working in wood, metal and stone’, ‘experience in the management of assistants’ and ‘the power to write correct, and if possible, elegant English.’ Such declarations attest to the prevailing belief that the individual best suited for curatorial work was a well-educated generalist possessing an expansive skill set that could be adapted to numerous aspects of the museum’s organisation and administration.

In 1934, Paul J. Sachs (Figure 1), President of the American Association of Museums and Assistant Director of the Fogg Art Museum at Harvard University, used his annual conference address to offer a wholly different assessment of curatorial training and expertise. Sachs’ work in the training of a generation of mid-twentieth century art museum leaders plays a central role within this thesis and his 1934 speech encapsulates


\[\text{\textsuperscript{5} Bather, 1902, p.185.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{6} Hoyle, 1906, p.11.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{7} Hoyle, 1906, pp.12-14.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{8} Paul J. Sachs (b.1878, d.1965) See Appendix for Biographical Summary.}\]
his core understandings of museum work. Curators, Sachs contended, were professionals in the same league as doctors and lawyers and should be trained according to similarly rigorous and systematic standards.\(^9\) Specialist university training within a specific subject field was not only desirable but also absolutely essential, as a ‘comprehensive and enduring community of scholars’ must define the museum of the future.\(^10\) Universities and museums must work together to produce this ‘elite’ group of ‘museum men’ who would have the ‘power to lead the world in the coming generation in museum collecting and in museum scholarship’.\(^11\)

Less than thirty years separate Sachs’ championship of the curator-scholar from Lucas’ pronouncement that a ‘curator is born and not made’ and from Hoyle’s description of the ideal curator as a man of ‘general culture, tact, and courtesy’ possessing an ‘acquaintance’ with a wide array of subjects. Considered together, the respective viewpoints of these organisational leaders are indicative of changing conceptions of curatorial training and expertise, processes closely tied to the professionalisation of curatorial work and evolving understandings of the curator’s authority, purpose and institutional position.

This thesis is concerned with these processes as it investigates the evolution of curatorial practice in Britain and the United States in the first four decades of the twentieth century through an analysis of the formative years of two museums, the Wallace and Frick Collections, and of two academic programmes, the Fogg Art Museum Course at Harvard University and the Courtauld Institute of Art at the University of London. Through these case studies, this research charts the emergence and development of a specialised curatorial knowledge base that was influenced by traditions of connoisseurship and criticism and shaped by discussions surrounding art history’s disciplinary parameters taking place in the museum, the press, the art market and the university. This thesis makes visible the processes through which art museum curators, keepers and directors collaborated in the creation and standardisation of their own expertise, and shows how


the formation of this expertise gave rise to a new type of art museum leader: the connoisseur-scholar, who performed an important function in the art museum’s transition from a space dominated by gentlemanly amateurs to one in which academically trained art historians increasingly assumed positions of authority. Further, asserting that the manifestation of this expertise cannot be separated from the academic institutionalisation of art history and curatorial training, this study demonstrates that individuals operating in the spheres of the art museum and the university were engaged in a dialogue through which the core values of British and American art museum curatorship, academic art history and curatorial training were realised.

Key Terms and Concepts

Before outlining the parameters of this thesis a number of key terms and concepts beg examination. I will begin by defining the usage of curator and curatorial practice in this thesis and then explain how the terms art world, sphere and field are to be understood for the purposes of this research. Further, I will offer an explanation of the phrase connoisseur-scholar and illuminate the centrality of this idea within this thesis. Once these ideas are clarified, I will discuss the historical and geographical boundaries that I have imposed upon this investigation and elucidate the motivation underlying my selection of case study institutions.

The word curator stems from the Latin root curare, meaning to care take. It has traditionally been applied as a label to an officer, keeper or custodian charged with the caretaking of objects within an institution, such as a museum, gallery or library. In accordance with this definition, it follows that curatorial practice may be understood as the sum of activities in which a curator engages in relation to the caretaking of objects within an institution, endeavours in which the curator alone participates. Yet, these traditional definitions belie the manner in which these terms are commonly invoked in present museological and art historical literature. The last decade has seen a rise in publications exploring the curator’s practice. These have largely focused on present-
day curating and the development of curatorship post-1960s; many centre on the challenges posed by the incorporation of new media art into traditional art historical canons. Consequently, understandings of the concepts of curator and curatorial practice have broadened and extended to include individuals and practices operating both within and outside of the art museum. A recurring theme is the rejection of the narrow interpretation of the curator as an individual defined and legitimised through institutional association, and of curatorial practice as an endeavour in which the curator alone participates. Further, there is a refutation of the understanding of curatorial objects as limited to tangible entities, such as painting and sculpture. This traditional definition has been called into question, as it fails to account for less tangible art media such as installation, video and performance that have come to dominate the post-1960s art world.

Given the breadth of these interpretations, it is necessary to clarify that within this thesis the term curator denotes an individual operating within the institutional context of the art museum who has been explicitly charged with the caretaking of art museum objects that are tangible entities. This definition is appropriate for the purposes of a study which is confined to an examination of the pre-1960s art world, as it correlates with the way that curators would have identified themselves and their activities during that time period. However, while my interpretation of the term curator is traditional, my understanding of curatorial practice is more contemporary. Throughout this thesis curatorial practice describes the collective activities of individuals working within, or in collaboration with, the art museum and who participate in the caretaking of the institution’s objects, either


directly or indirectly. Here, caretaking encompasses both physical and intellectual custodianship; it implies not only conservation and preservation but also interpretation, that may take the form of both display and publication. The individual participants to whom I refer are varied and include curators, keepers and directors, as well as donors, dealers, critics, academics and trustees. While this thesis is chiefly focused on the collaborative efforts of curators, keepers and directors to articulate and codify their own expertise, it acknowledges that these efforts did not happen in isolation, but were influenced by the choices and actions of others operating in the broader art world. I use the phrase *art world* here, as I do elsewhere, in line with the definition offered by Howard Becker to describe a ‘network of people whose cooperative activity, organised via their joint knowledge of conventional means of doing things, produces the kind of art that art world is known for.’

In the following case studies I frequently use the term *spheres* to refer to specific centres of art world activity, such as the art museum, the university, the press and the art market. My understanding of the art world is informed by the related concept of *field*. The notion of *field* is closely linked with the pioneering sociological investigations of Pierre Bourdieu. Bourdieu’s own conceptualisation of the field was complex and evolved continually over the course of his career. However, at the most fundamental level Bourdieu understood a field to be an entity that, at any given moment, is defined and structured by ‘a state of power relations among the agents or institutions’ who participate in it. It is in this same sense that the term has been employed by Paul DiMaggio, whose investigation into the organisation of art museum practice in the United States in the period between 1920 to 1940 provides an important model for the case studies of this

---


It is with an acknowledged debt to both Bourdieu and DiMaggio that I use the idea of field. Within this thesis I frequently refer to a field of curatorial practice to describe the collective activities of individuals and institutions that, although they may exist and operate in different art world spheres, are united and identifiable by their mutual involvement in curatorial endeavours. Similarly, I use the term art museum field in reference to the network of institutions that are informally linked by shared purpose and aims and which are either art museums themselves, or directly involved in the art museum’s work. The notion of these fields, existing within the context of an art world that is itself a dynamic system comprised of spheres bound together by interconnected ideas and individuals, is integral to this investigation’s conceptual framework.

In undertaking this study, my central concern is with the quest of curators, keepers and directors to identify a unique expertise that would simultaneously serve to differentiate their knowledge from that of non-specialists and provide them with greater autonomy within their institutions. It is my aim to show that this quest was entangled with, and led to, a renegotiation of the power dynamics within the art museum field, whereby curators, keepers and directors positioned themselves as the key participants in curatorial practice. It was, I suggest, through this delineation and renegotiation that the connoisseur-scholar was born.

I use the term connoisseur-scholar within this thesis to identify a particular type of art museum leader observable in British and American institutions in the first decades of the twentieth century. An intermediary player, the connoisseur-scholar emerged in the period when art museums in the United States and Britain were professionalising, a phenomenon that I will shortly explore in greater depth. The connoisseur-scholar is identifiable by two common characteristics. The first is the possession of an expertise that may be described as transitional in that it looked back to the connoisseurial approach associated with late-nineteenth century gentleman amateurs, while anticipating the more academically oriented approach of the university-trained art historian who would gain

---

prominence in the art museum field following the Second World War. The second identifying characteristic of the connoisseur-scholar is his active engagement in discussions in the art museum, the university, the press and the art market that sought to contribute to the determination of the disciplinary boundaries of art history that were then taking shape.

An explanation as to why I have chosen the label of connoisseur-scholar is warranted as there is an inherent vagueness in the words connoisseurship and scholarship, both of which have been applied to describe a range of practices. The term connoisseur-scholar is not my own; rather, it originated with Sachs, who used it in his descriptions of the idealized art museum worker of the 1920s and 1930s. In adopting this moniker, it is not my intention to affirm Sachs’ idealisation, but rather to capture the essence of the art museum leader whom I have identified and to communicate how this figure was perceived by Sachs and a select but significant group of his art world peers.

**Research Parameters**

This thesis confines itself to a study of institutions within the United States and Britain, more specifically to art museums and universities in New York, Boston and London. It

---

19 I use the term gentleman amateurs in the same way that it has been used by Vera Zolberg to refer to non-professional, non-specialist laymen of the upper social strata whose understanding of art was grounded in connoisseurship. See: Vera Zolberg, ‘Conflicting Visions in American Art Museums’, *Theory and Society*, 10, 1 (January 1981), 103-125. I use the term academically trained art historians to describe those who were not only university educated, but trained specifically with a specialist concentration in art history.

20 Within this thesis, connoisseurship refers to the practice of assessing the perceived worth of art objects (both on an aesthetic and monetary level) through a combination of first-hand observation and personal judgement, weighted against the collective knowledge of other connoisseurs. While in theory connoisseurship may be divorced from social status, in practice it is usually cultivated through a proximity and attunement to the tastes of those in a position of dominance within the art world. Scholarship is used to describe art world participants’ activities in the press, the university, the art museum and the art market that were focused on the demonstration, communication, and affirmation of knowledge.

also narrows its scope to the first four decades of the twentieth century. The rationale for these parameters requires examination before the reasons for my selection of case studies can be adequately explained.

The analysis of institutions in Britain and the United States in tandem is justified by a number of historical commonalities that link the art museum fields in these two countries. In elaborating on these connections, it is not my intention to suggest complete homogeneity between British and American art museums. Indeed, there are several important differences between them. Significantly, public art museums did not appear in the United States until 1870, when New York City’s Metropolitan Museum of Art and Boston’s Museum of Fine Arts opened. This was nearly fifty years after the 1824 foundation of London’s National Gallery heralded the art institution’s arrival in Britain. Moreover, there are also substantial divergences in terms of typical models of institutional governance and patterns of patronage. In Britain, there is a prominent tradition of national collection art museums managed by government-appointed trustees and maintained through state funding. In the United States, art museums have usually been founded independent of the state and managed by a self-perpetuating board that is responsible for securing funds for the institution. The consequences of these differences will be considered throughout this thesis as the tensions, convergences and overlaps in the development of curatorial practice in both countries are explored.


23 By ‘public art museum’ I mean those institutions open to a broad, non-selective public. There were art museums in Britain prior to the foundation of the National Gallery, such as Dulwich Picture Gallery (1817) and the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge University (1816). However, these were initially open only to a select public.

24 The National Gallery, the Tate Gallery and the Victoria & Albert Museum all serve as representative examples of this type. There is also an observable tradition of both university and municipal art museums within the country, the latter established from the 1870s. See: Giles Waterfield, Palaces of Art: Art Galleries in Britain, 1790-1990 (London: Dulwich Picture Gallery, 1991), pp.83-98 and pp.145-158.

25 The Smithsonian Museum of Art in Washington D.C. is a notable exception to this norm.
The intellectual origins of art museums in Britain and the United States, like those in continental Europe, may be traced back to the eighteenth-century Enlightenment, when ideas about the aesthetic, ethical and historical value of art coupled with the belief that art collections should be open and accessible to the public. Yet, despite this common inheritance, British and American art museums differ from those in mainland Europe in a number of ways. Overwhelmingly, public art museums on the continent have their roots in the state’s appropriation of formerly royal collections. This is not the case in either Britain or the United States. In Britain, the nucleus of the collection of London’s National Gallery emanated not from the royal family, but from the private holdings of a single individual, John Julius Angerstein. To this day, the art collection of the British royal family has remained separate from the national collection presented in the country’s public art museums. In the United States, the absence of a monarchy meant of course that there was no royal collection to begin with.

British and American art museums also share a common tradition of foundation through the initiative of individuals which stands in contrast to practices on the continent. For instance, although London’s National Gallery was established by an Act of Parliament, the impetus for its creation lay in the efforts of a small group who agitated for its formation and worked to secure Angerstein’s art collection for that purpose. Similarly, New York City’s Metropolitan Museum of Art and Boston’s Museum of Fine Arts were

---


born as a result of the endeavours of a handful of self-selected individuals, drawn respectively from members of the Boston and New York City elite.  

Another unifying characteristic of the British and American art museum fields is a relative delay in the implementation of systematic training for art museum workers. In Germany, Gustav Waagen’s 1844 appointment as a professor of art history at the University of Berlin signified art history’s formal incorporation into the country’s university system. By the 1870s the appointment of university-trained art historians to art museum posts was becoming the norm in that country. In France, the Ecole du Louvre was founded in 1882 to provide training for art museum workers and thereafter supplied much of the country’s workforce of curators, keepers and directors. By comparison, training efforts in Britain and the United States lagged behind, as the early-twentieth century discussions of curatorial training at the Museums Association and American Association of Museums examined at the beginning of this chapter demonstrate. A concerted and organised effort to train art museum workers did not manifest itself in the United States and Britain until the 1920s and 1930s, with the respective emergence of the Fogg Art Museum Course at Harvard University in 1921 and the foundation of the Courtauld Institute of Art in 1932.

I do not mean to suggest that British and American art museums were isolated from developments in continental Europe. German art museums and art history departments in particular played a critical role in shaping the strategies and endeavours of British and American art museum curators, keepers and directors from the second half of the nineteenth century; a phenomenon that I will explore further in the next chapter. The strong influence that the ideas of European art world figures such as Gustav Waagen,

---


Wilhelm von Bode and Giovanni Morelli wielded over art museum practices in Britain and the United States is a central theme within this thesis.

Ties between the British and American art museum fields strengthened as interaction across the spheres of the art market and the university intensified in the final decades of the nineteenth century. The rapid growth of art museums in the United States after 1870 was the result of the urbanisation of American cities and the mounting wealth of small groups of citizens who were benefiting from the Industrial Revolution.\(^{35}\) This growing American wealth fuelled a transatlantic art trade, facilitated by increasingly influential art dealers such as Duveen Brothers, Jacques Seligmann & Co., and Knoedler & Co.\(^{36}\)

As the financial means of American collectors such as Isabella Stewart Gardner, John Pierpont Morgan and Henry Clay Frick expanded, so too did their acquisition of works of art from British and continental European art collections.\(^{37}\) The number of British-owned artworks on the market increased in the 1880s following the Settled Lands Act of 1882 which made possible the sale of objects once classified as indivisible heirlooms.\(^{38}\)

Initially the artworks acquired by American art collectors were primarily used to furnish the private residences of these collectors. However, after the turn of the century, these artworks were steadily transferred or transformed into major American art museum collections.\(^{39}\)

---


\(^{39}\) For instance: The Morgan Library (1903); Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum (1903); Frick Collection (1935). Following Morgan’s death in 1913 many of the artworks in his collection were acquired by the Metropolitan Museum of Art.
As the transatlantic art market expanded, a significant connection between British and American academics was also being forged. While art history was not yet recognised as an independent university discipline in either the United States or Britain, lectures on the purpose and theory of art began to be offered under the auspices of fine arts, philosophy and literature departments in both countries from the 1870s. In Britain, the first offerings of this type were John Ruskin’s Slade lectures at Oxford University which commenced in 1870 and sought to infuse the history of art with moral philosophy. Ruskin believed that art and beauty, like nature, reflected universal moral laws, and that the study of art could improve students’ ‘moral faculty’. Among those who attended Ruskin’s Oxford lectures was an American scholar named Charles Eliot Norton. Thereafter, Ruskin began to mentor Norton. In 1874 Norton was appointed as a Lecturer on the ‘History of Arts as Connected with Literature’ at Harvard University. Building upon Ruskin’s theories, Norton also adopted his mentor’s rhapsodic and impassioned lecturing style. The mentorship between Ruskin and Norton established a dialogue between academic enquiries into art in the United States and Britain and together Ruskin and Norton would prove influential in shaping British and American constructions of art history in the early twentieth century. (Figures 2 & 3)

As the activities and concerns of participants in the British and American art worlds became progressively intertwined, art museums on both sides of the Atlantic began to


41 John Ruskin (b.1819, d.1900) See Appendix for Biographical Summary.

42 Mary Ann Stankiewicz, “‘The Eye is a Nobler Organ”: Ruskin and American Art Education’ Journal of Aesthetic Education, 18, 2 (Summer 1984), 51-64.

43 Charles Eliot Norton (b.1827, d.1908) See Appendix for Biographical Summary.


undergo an important shift in relation to their aesthetic policies. As the turn of the century approached, art museums increasingly distanced themselves from the didactic, educational model that had taken hold in the decades after the mid-century establishment of the South Kensington Museum, and began instead to favour a more aesthetically oriented model. This latter model sought to provide visitors with an experience that highlighted the formal qualities of art works in a setting that encouraged their individual contemplation. A trend towards streamlined displays and simplified painting hangs, fostering the evaluation of art work as singular objects, had been growing for some time. Giles Waterfield cites arrangements at Grosvenor Gallery in the 1870s and James McNeill Whistler’s one-man exhibitions, the first of which occurred in 1874, as important precedents in the introduction of these display principles. Similar innovations came to the United States in the early 1890s and were first realised in the galleries of Boston’s Museum of Fine Arts.

While this changing attitude towards aesthetic policy has been noted by numerous scholars, it is Andrew McClellan who has given it an identifying label, describing this shift as an ideological restructuring towards aesthetic idealism. McClellan argues that, in both Britain and the United States, the move towards aesthetic idealism was the result of a mounting sentiment that art museums fashioned after the South Kensington model had failed in their objective to inspire national design and ‘alleviate the demeaning nature of mechanized labour.’ Consequently, many institutions began to re-evaluate their approach to acquisition, display and interpretation of the art objects in their collections. This reassessment resulted in the rise of what Alan Wallach terms the ‘cult

---

46 I use the term aesthetic policy as employed by Zolberg to describe the collective approach of art museum players to the display and visual interpretation of institutional objects. Zolberg, 1981.


of the original’ which championed art works on the basis of their rarity and originality. The increasing value assigned to works of this kind was closely linked to the expansion of the transatlantic art market and the fact that dealers such as Duveen Brothers were actively driving the monetary worth of these objects to unprecedented heights.

An art museum ethos grounded in aesthetic idealism became ubiquitous in British and American institutions post-1900, although the educational philosophy that had dominated previously did not disappear entirely. The widespread adoption of aesthetic idealism signalled a reconceptualisation of the art museum’s purpose and its relationship to the objects within its collection.

My decision to focus this project on the period between 1900 and 1940 should be understood in the context of these changes in the art market, the university and the art museum. Collectively these developments primed the British and American art museum fields for a shift towards professionalisation that gained momentum from the turn of the century onward. Professionalisation is a difficult term, the defining criteria of which is a matter of continuing debate within sociological studies. For the purposes of this project, professionalisation is understood as a three part process. The first part of this process is the recognition by individuals of analogous occupations employed across different institutions that they are united by shared activities and concerns and that they are engaged in a collective struggle to expand their agency and influence. The next part is the joint effort of these occupational peers to identify and define the cognitive base that constitutes their work and differentiates it from the work of others. The final part of this process occurs when members of this group seek to leverage this knowledge base for


54 DiMaggio, 1991; (Carol) Duncan, 1995, p.4.

55 Indeed, there is some disagreement about the extent to which museums workers are truly professionals. Those who argue that museum employees are still only pseudo professionals cite competing forces within the field, some of which seem to foster professionalisation and others which seem to hinder it. See: J. Lynne Teather, ‘The Museum Keepers: The Museums Association and the Growth of Museum Professionalism’, Museum Management and Curatorship, 9, (1990), 25-41, (p.26).
the purpose of increasing their collective institutional authority. It must be stressed that this last part in the process of professionalisation is ongoing. This definition is my own, but it correlates closely with the one that has been used by both Paul DiMaggio and Vera Zolberg in their respective investigations into the professionalisation of the art museum.\[56\]

DiMaggio and Zolberg both locate the professionalisation of the American art museum as occurring in the period between approximately the first and fourth decades of the twentieth century. Within this era, there is a slight variance in the exact years that they identify as the commencement of professionalisation. However, their departure on this point relates more to their individual areas of concern than any fundamental disagreement. Zolberg is specifically interested in the professionalisation of the curator, which she sees as beginning post-1910, when salaried museum workers largely ceased to replicate the approach of the ‘gentleman amateur,’ which she argues was the norm amongst trustees, collectors and patrons, and began to exploit ‘the growing respectability of university-connected disciplines such as art history.’\[57\] Simultaneously, curators began to invoke ‘support from associations which were taking on the role of creators and upholders of standards, ethics, and recruitment criteria for employees, and with respect to works of art.’\[58\] DiMaggio’s concerns are somewhat different, as he focuses on what he terms as the ‘structuration’ of the art museum field.\[59\] He describes structuration as a process that occurs immediately prior to the moment in which institutions in a given field begin to model themselves after one another, assuming an organisational form that is recognisable to those within and outside of the field.\[60\] This occurrence necessarily takes place after the professionalisation of workers has begun. Guided by this logic, DiMaggio locates the beginning of professionalisation of the American art museum closer to 1920, following a swell in the field’s ‘ideological, human and financial resources.’\[61\]


\[60\] DiMaggio, 1991, p.70 and pp.267-269.

Although both Zolberg and DiMaggio show an awareness of the professionalisation of the art museum in Britain, their studies are confined to art museums in the United States. As yet, no scholar has addressed the professionalisation of the art museum in Britain in a manner that is analogous to their studies. However, there are a number of investigations which stand to aid our understanding of the professionalisation of the art museum in Britain. Explorations into the history of British gallery display by Giles Waterfield, Charles Samaurez Smith, Christopher Whitehead and Charlotte Klonk serve as invaluable resources in this endeavour. The investigations carried out by Gordon Fyfe and Andrea Geddes Poole, which seek to anchor the power negotiations between British art museum staff and trustees in a broader socio-political context, are also of benefit. These works are referenced throughout this project as the issue of the professionalisation of the art museum in Britain is confronted. Coupling the evidence presented in these investigations with primary research, I aim to show that although art museums in Britain professionalised over the first four decades of the twentieth century, this professionalisation did not occur at the same rate or in the exact manner as it did in the United States.

**Case Studies**

A closer examination of this project’s case studies is warranted. The two art museums that I have chosen to focus on are the Wallace Collection, opened in London in 1900, and the Frick Collection, established in New York City in 1935. These institutions occupy a curious position in the British and American art museum fields. There is an element of paradox about them, as they are at once idiosyncratic and influential. Both

---

62 Patrick Boylan has offered a brief history of the professionalisation of museum work in Britain, but his investigation does not offer an in depth analysis of this process. See: Boylan, 2006.


were founded on the basis of a private collection and both were initially shaped by a close relationship with a major art museum. During its formative years, the Wallace Collection was closely bound to London’s National Gallery. This was due largely to the high proportion of trustees who sat on the boards of both museums. An analogous connection existed between the Frick Collection and the Metropolitan Museum of Art. The consequences of these ties will be discussed throughout this thesis.

The Wallace and Frick Collections are representative examples of a particular institutional typology which Anne Higonnet has usefully termed *collection museums*. Higonnet identifies collection museums as institutions that have been founded on personal art collections and donated to the public ‘on the condition that something essential about the collection and installation be preserved,’ and which seek to commemorate the ‘personal character of the art collection and its even more personal installation.’ By design, collection museums are normally contained within the former residence of the donor or else within a space that the benefactor has been directly involved in creating, such as a purpose built gallery. Although the types of artworks preserved and how they are displayed varies between institutions, all collection museums are born of the founder’s desire to create a museum focused primarily on art that was perceived to be of value during their lifetime. Further, all collection museums have been shaped by mandates from the founder placing stipulations on the content of the collection and specifying the installation of the collection in one form or another. While some collection museums, such as the Huntington Library, Art Gallery and Gardens, may only be required to loosely adhere to the collecting practices and arrangements put


68 Higonnet, 2010, p.17.

69 Higonnet, 2010, pp.2-23.
in place by the founder, others, such as the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, are barred from the deaccession or physical rearrangement of art objects.\textsuperscript{70}

Higonnet’s concept of the collection museum should be understood in the context of the work of Carol Duncan. In 1995 Duncan’s \textit{Civilizing Rituals} brought attention to a group of institutions which she identified as ‘donor memorials.’\textsuperscript{71} For Duncan the defining feature of a donor memorial museum is its facilitation of the visitor’s participation in a symbolic ritual that glorifies the collection’s absent donor. Such institutions, Duncan argues, are identifiable through a shared set of characteristics: they contain collections assembled by a single individual or family, they are displayed within a domestic space that recalls the privileged lifestyle of the donor and, almost always, they bear the donor’s family name.\textsuperscript{72} Higonnet’s notion of the collection museum builds upon Duncan’s idea of the donor memorial. However, where Duncan is interested in how museums direct the visitor’s experience by engaging them in a structured ritual of donor glorification, Higonnet is concerned with collectors’ investment of their identities in museums.\textsuperscript{73}

Collection museums may be found throughout continental Europe, Britain and the United States. Two notable examples on the continent are the Museo Poldi-Pezzoli in Milan, established in 1881 and based on the family collection of Gian Giacomo Poldi-Pezzoli, and the Musée Jacquemart-André in Paris, founded in 1913 on the collection once belonging to Edouard André Nélie Jacquemart. In Britain, the Bowes Museum in County Durham opened in 1892. Based on the collection of John Bowes and his wife Joséphine Benoîte, Countess of Montalbo, the Bowes Museum was a notable precursor to the Wallace Collection. The foundation of the Wallace Collection was laid in 1897. when Sir Richard Wallace’s widow, Lady Wallace, bequeathed the family’s art collection to the British state. The museum officially opened to the public in 1900. \textbf{(Figure 4)}

\begin{center}

\textsuperscript{71} (Carol) Duncan, 1995, pp.72-100.

\textsuperscript{72} (Carol) Duncan, 1995, pp.72-74.

\textsuperscript{73} (Carol) Duncan, 1995, p.2; Higonnet, 2010, p.xv.
\end{center}
The first collection museum in the United States was established in 1903, when Isabella Stewart Gardner opened her Boston home and its contents to the visiting public. That same year, the Morgan Library, featuring John Pierpont Morgan’s collection, was founded in New York City. Although rare books and manuscripts were the emphasis of the Morgan Library’s collection, the institution contained notable arrangements of paintings and decorative art presented in a quasi-domestic setting. This scheme of installation was most fully realised in Morgan’s study. Together, Gardner and Morgan’s institutions initiated a trend for collection museums in the United States that would reach its height in the 1920s with the opening of institutions such as the Phillips Collection in Washington D.C. in 1921, the John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art in Sarasota, Florida in 1927, and the Huntington Library, Art Gallery and Gardens in San Marino, California in 1928. The Frick Collection may also be included in this group. Although it did not open until 1935, plans for its foundation were laid in the 1919 will of benefactor Henry Clay Frick and from 1929 onward intensive preparations were underway to prepare the museum for its public opening. (Figure 5)

The Wallace Collection was an important precedent for the American collection museums that followed in its wake. As John Walker III, director of the National Gallery in Washington D.C. from 1956 to 1969, observed in his memoirs, the Wallace Collection, and its embodiment of the Style de Rothschild ‘became the model for a generation of collectors’ such as Gardner, Morgan and Frick. The taste for this style was fostered by dealers such as Joseph Duveen and his sometime collaborator, Bernard Berenson. Duveen and Berenson were also instrumental in assisting Gardner, Morgan and Frick in the creation of a style of interior decoration known as the grand goût américain, ‘formed by the weaving in of mostly Italian and French, but sometimes Spanish architectural elements and salvages with works of art and appropriate decorative elements.’ The grand goût américain style of interior became a characteristic element of collection museums founded in the United States in the first few decades of the twentieth century. (Figure 6)

---


I was drawn to a study of collection museums because of the restrictions that these institutions typically place on the acquisition of new art objects and physical rearrangement of works installed within their galleries. While these restrictions necessarily limit the scope of the activities that curators, keepers and directors engage in, they also bring a heightened awareness to the curatorial activities which are allowed. In this way, collection museums are particularly well suited to a study of the way that a relatively fixed set of objects is interpreted over time. When acquisitions and changes to display do take place, they are likely to be the result of deliberate, considered effort on the part of curators, keepers and directors. The deliberateness and relative transparency of these efforts have the potential to aid in a close and careful analysis of the interpretive aspects of curatorial work.

My decision to centre this investigation on collection museums was also determined by an interest in the circumstances that led to the proliferation of this institutional type during the period in which British and American art museums were beginning to professionalise. The rise of collection museums after 1900 coincided with the museum field’s turn towards aesthetic idealism and an increasingly organized and systematic approach to inter-institutional activity; phenomena I will explore in the forthcoming case studies. These changes were indicative of the growing sophistication and influence of an informal but complex peer network, comprised of a diverse array of dealers, donors, trustees, collectors, directors, keepers and curators. Mobilised by new publications which served to improve means of communication between art world participants, this peer network sought to identify and define the cognitive basis of art world practices, including museum work.76 Situated at the nexus of these changes, early-twentieth century collection museums acted as key sites in the determination of professional values and standards. Consequently, these institutions offer a focused yet dynamic lens through which issues surrounding professionalisation may be examined.

76 The Burlington Magazine, founded in 1903, was a publication of chief importance. See: Helen Rees Leahy, ‘For Connoisseurs, The Burlington Magazine, 1903-1911’, in Art History and Its Institutions: Foundations of a Discipline, ed. by Elizabeth Mansfield (London: Routledge, 2002), pp. 231-245. Also of note are the annual proceedings of the Museums Association and the American Association of Museums which were widely circulated in the first decades of the twentieth century.
I have chosen to focus on the Wallace and Frick Collections because of the close connections that these institutions have with one another and with the leading art museums in their respective countries. The Frick Collection has been strongly associated with the Wallace Collection since its foundation and it is generally acknowledged that Frick intended to fashion his institution after the one created by Wallace.77 The aesthetic policies and internal organisational structures of the Wallace and Frick Collections were shaped through close relationships with the National Gallery and the Metropolitan Museum of Art. I believe that a study of these smaller institutions stands to offer insight into the development of curatorial practice in the broader art museum field.

Offered in complement to the case studies of the Wallace and Frick Collections are examinations of the seminal years of the Fogg Art Museum Course at Harvard University and the initial academic programme of the Courtauld Institute of Art at the University of London. The question may be asked: why incorporate university-based case studies into an investigation concerned with curatorial practice in the art museum? My motivation for the inclusion of these case studies relates to one of the primary contentions of this thesis; that is that the factors that shape curatorial practice do not exist solely within the art museum, but are to be found across various art world spheres. It is the sum of these influencing factors, be they individuals or institutions, that constitute the field of curatorial practice. Such an assertion may seem self-evident, but it is one that I came to gradually over the course of this project. In the early stages of my research, I focused solely on an investigation of the Wallace and Frick Collections. However, I soon came to realise the inadequacy of this approach, as I uncovered primary evidence that indicated that the connections between the university and the art museum were essential to understanding the evolution of curatorial practice.

I have opted to look at the Fogg Art Museum Course and the Courtauld Institute of Art as they share a number of significant connections with the Wallace and Frick Collections, particularly in terms of an overlap of key players. For instance, Sachs, the

77 This association was first established in 1919 when a newspaper article by Royal Cortissoz, ‘A Noble Landmark in our Art History’, New York Herald Tribune, 7 December 1919, mentioned the ‘inevitable’ comparison between the two institutions. Also see George Harvey, Henry Clay Frick: The Man (New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1928), p.332. This association was also affirmed by Colin B. Bailey, Chief Curator and Associate Director, Frick Collection, in an interview that I conducted at the Frick Collection, 22 October 2009.
creator of the Fogg Art Museum Course, was intimately involved in the formation of the Frick Collection. He served as a mentor to the Frick Collection’s first director, Frederick Mortimer Clapp, and acted as an unofficial advisor to the institution throughout the 1920s and 1930s.78 Similar overlaps are to be found between the Wallace Collection and the Courtauld Institute of Art. W.G. Constable, the first director of the institute, received his early training at the Wallace Collection, where he was mentored by keeper D.S. MacColl.79 MacColl was among the initial group of art world figures that Constable selected to teach at the new institution. Working in support of Constable as Assistant Director of the Courtauld Institute was James Mann, also a keeper at the Wallace Collection.80

Beyond these connections, the Fogg Art Museum Course and the early programme at the Courtauld Institute of Art warrant attention as they represent the first endeavours to provide structured training for art museum workers in the United States and Britain. Under the leadership of Sachs, the Fogg Art Museum Course produced a generation of art museum leaders who exerted a considerable influence on American art museums in the mid-twentieth century. Among its most notable graduates were Alfred H. Barr, Jr., the first director of the New York Museum of Modern Art and John Walker III, curator and later director of the National Gallery in Washington, D.C.81 The foundation of the Courtauld Institute of Art signified the formal incorporation of art history into the British university system; several prominent mid-century museum curators and directors, including Sir Kenneth Clark and Sir Francis Watson, were involved with the institution during its formative years. 82

This thesis benefits greatly from works which have examined the institutional histories of the Wallace and Frick Collections, the Fogg Art Museum and the Courtauld Institute

78 Frederick Mortimer Clapp (b.1879, d.1969) See Appendix for Biographical Summary.
79 William George Constable (b.1887, d.1976); Dugald Sutherland MacColl (b.1859, d.1948) See Appendix for Biographical Summaries.
80 James Gow Mann (b.1897, d.1962) See Appendix for Biographical Summary.
81 John Walker III (b.1906, d.1995); Alfred Hamilton Barr, Jr. (b.1902, d.1981) See Appendix for Biographical Summaries.
82 Sir Kenneth Clark (b.1903, d.1983); Sir Francis Watson (b.1907, d.1922) See Appendix for Biographical Summaries.
of Art. Of equal value are the investigations which have examined aspects of the professional lives of key players associated with these institutions. The case studies of this thesis approach the histories of these institutions and individuals from a different angle, focusing on their participation in curatorial practice. In so doing, I endeavour to offer new insight into familiar territory.

Research Methodology

A sustained inquiry into the historical origins of art museum curatorial practice has not been attempted elsewhere. There are, I believe, two primary reasons for this. The first of these relates to what Zolberg has described as a porosity of sites of authority within the art museum. Zolberg observes that, although the general task divisions within art museums are governance, performance, and patronage, such tasks are rarely performed by mutually exclusive sets of players. Thus, the responsibilities and duties of curators, keepers, directors and trustees are frequently entangled. As a result, the motivations behind curatorial decisions remain opaque: a situation exacerbated by time and distance from the events themselves. An observation made by Charles Saumarez Smith points to the second reason that investigations of this kind have gone unauthored. All too often, Saumarez Smith explains, the motivations behind curatorial decisions go unrecorded in official museum minutes and memoranda. This is either because such decisions are not thought to be worthy of documentation or because the record of the decision process would reveal private power struggles within the institution that would be detrimental to the interests of those who documented them. In both cases, the root of the problem lies

---


in the absence of clear and plentiful primary evidence. The methodology that I employ in this thesis seeks to remedy this situation.

Unfortunately, the unearthing of primary evidence is not simply a matter of turning to art museum archives. While these may prove to be adequate sources for the official minutes and memoranda which document the history of an institution’s administrative proceedings, they rarely contain the information needed for a full and detailed portrait of curatorial practice to emerge. It is therefore necessary to look elsewhere, specifically to non-museum archives. In conducting research for this thesis I have drawn on the resources available from eleven different archives: the Special Collection Archives at the University of Glasgow, the Paul Mellon Centre Archives, the National Archives, the Warburg Institute Archives, the Smithsonian Institute Archives, the Yale Beineke Library Archives, the Frick Collection Central Archives, the Harvard University Library Archives, the Wallace Collection Archives, the Harvard Fogg Art Museum Archives and the Courtauld Institute Archives. The progression that led me from one archive to the next came about organically. I began my research in the archives of the Wallace and Frick Collections and from there followed leads which produced additional sources and led me to subsequent archives. This proved a worthwhile endeavour, for I have uncovered a wealth of material in the form of personal notes, correspondence, photographs and hand-drawn diagrams, which complements the more readily accessible museum minutes and memoranda. It is this first-hand archival research that is the cornerstone of my methodology and the reason that I have been able to draw connections between curatorial practice in the British and American art museum fields that have previously gone unexplored.

In determining how to utilize this primary evidence to examine the evolution of curatorial practice in Britain and the United States, Zolberg and DiMaggio’s investigations into the professionalisation of the American art museum serve as

87 These archives will be identified in the footnotes of this thesis by the following abbreviations: Wallace Collection Archives = WCA; MacColl Archives, Special Collections, University of Glasgow = MAUG; Harvard Fogg Art Museum Archives = HFMA; Harvard University Library Archives = HULA; Frick Collection Central Archives = FCCA; Clapp Archives, Beineke Library, Yale University = CAYU; Courtauld Institute Archives = CIA; Paul Mellon Centre Archives = PMCA; Warburg Institute Archives = WIA; Smithsonian Archives = SIA; National Archives at Kew = NAK.
important models. As I mentioned earlier, Zolberg and DiMaggio’s areas of emphasis are different. Zolberg is interested in the work of curators, while DiMaggio’s focus on the structuration of the art museum field leads him to concentrate on the connections between institutions’ organisational practices and policies. Each of these concerns are applicable to this investigation, for I am interested in the quest of curators, keepers and directors to assert their agency and authority on both an individual and collective level, within the art museum itself and across the spheres of the broader art world. The methodological approaches employed by Zolberg and DiMaggio are analogous in two key respects. Importantly, both rely heavily on primary evidence. Further, both anchor their evidence in a Bourdieusian framework which analyse the actions and motivations of art world players with an understanding that the outcomes of interactions between individuals and institutions are never predetermined. It is with this same awareness that I seek to approach the analysis of the primary evidence that I have collected, to offer insight into the historical origins of curatorial practice in both the United States and Britain.

Having explained my approach, the limitations of this study must also be conceded. This thesis does not purport to be a comprehensive examination of curatorial practice in British and American art museums in the period explored. While such an examination is greatly needed, I do not believe that it can take place until projects such as mine have laid the foundation of primary evidence and provided a preliminary model for how the history of curatorial practice might be approached and examined. Since a comprehensive survey is unfeasible I have chosen to narrow my focus to four institutions that were at the forefront of the art museum’s shift towards professionalisation and the adoption of an ethos grounded in aesthetic idealism. In so doing, I have placed a rather disproportionate emphasis on the particular curatorial expertise that was born out of these environments and which was anchored in traditions of connoisseurship and scholarship. While I have made a conscious decision to focus on the formation of this specific type of curatorial expertise, I am fully aware that this was not the only expertise available to art museum curators during this period. Indeed, a convincing argument could be made that an alternative curatorial expertise, which had its origin in the educational model of the art

---

museum that dominated in the second half of the nineteenth century, was also cultivated during this time. It is possible to see the approach of John Cotton Dana, a prominent museum leader of the early twentieth century who argued passionately for a return to the ideals of education and utilitarianism, as the embodiment of this alternative approach. Dana’s work will be discussed further in the next chapter.

A final point warrants mention. Throughout the case studies of this thesis, I group curators, directors and keepers together as a distinct set of participants, the reason for this being that, in the time during which the art museum was professionalising, the duties and responsibilities corresponding with the titles of keeper, curator and director were not rigid, but instead varied across institutions. Therefore, when I refer to curators, keepers and directors as a group, it is with the intention of both identifying and accounting for all of the art museum employees who were explicitly charged with the physical and intellectual caretaking of art museum objects, regardless of their exact institutional title. Moreover, because the recitation of these titles is cumbersome, I sometimes use the term executives to identify curators, keepers and directors. Correspondingly, I refer to institutional trustees as non-executives.

At the core of this thesis is an examination of the executive’s struggle for autonomy, a quest to identify, define and leverage expertise in order to increase authority. This was a concerted and intentional effort, which continues into the present day. The origins of this struggle extend backwards as well, to the period before the case studies of this thesis begin. It is with this in mind that the next chapter commences with a consideration of the art museum in the nineteenth century, bringing to light several developments that would shape curatorial practice in the early twentieth century.
CHAPTER ONE

Historical Contexts

This chapter looks at the period between the mid-nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, a span of time which encompassed the ‘pre-professional era’ of the art museum in Britain and the United States. My aim is to illuminate key tensions and struggles within the maturing art museum field, making visible some of the significant strategies employed by executives as they sought to assert and increase their authority and influence during the period in which the basic parameters of curatorial work were being determined. The purpose of this endeavour is to offer an insight into the formation of the intellectual and institutional frameworks that would be inherited by those engaged in curatorial practice in the first decades of the twentieth century.

My discussion centres on an examination of the National Gallery, London, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City and the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. These galleries were influential, establishing precedents of institutional practice that were adopted by subsequent art museums. As previously asserted, all three museums provided models for, and share ties with my case study institutions.

The Wallace Collection was closely bound to the National Gallery from the time of its creation. Following Lady Wallace’s 1897 bequest to the state, the Treasury fashioned the new museum’s internal organisational hierarchy after its institutional predecessor,

89 I have borrowed the term pre-professional era from Zolberg to indicate the period prior to the emergence of the three part process of professionalisation outlined in the Introduction. See: Zolberg, 1981, pp.105-107. As my case studies will show, the moment at which the shift towards professionalisation began varied slightly between countries. However, in both Britain and the United States, the professionalisation of the art museum gained momentum post-1910.

90 I do not seek to provide a full portrait of the tensions and struggles that characterised British and American art museums during the nineteenth century as this has already been achieved elsewhere. See: Conn, 1998; McClellan, 2008; Taylor, 1999; Waterfield, 1991; Whitehead, 2005.

91 Commenting on the influence of the National Gallery, Christopher Whitehead notes that the though the institution was not the first public museum in Britain it was the place where, ‘many of the issues surrounding the philosophy, design, collecting activities and management of the public museum were seriously addressed for the first time.’ See: Whitehead, 2005, p.xiii.
granting trustees control over the activities and duties of the keeper. Three of the Wallace Collection’s original trustees also held positions on the National Gallery board. For a time, brief but serious consideration was given to annexing the collection to the National Gallery’s physical building in Trafalgar Square.

A comparably close relationship existed between the Frick Collection and the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Henry Clay Frick was a Metropolitan trustee and three of the founding trustees whom he appointed to the Frick Collection’s board also held Metropolitan trusteeships. During the early 1930s, as the Frick Collection prepared for its transition from a private home to a public museum, Metropolitan employees frequently served as advisors to the staff and trustees of the younger institution. For decades after its opening, the Frick Collection relied heavily on the Metropolitan for assistance with object conservation and storage.

The Museum of Fine Arts was similarly linked to Harvard University. Among the motivations for the founding of the Museum of Fine Arts was a need for a new institution in Boston to display some of the surplus engravings and drawings in Harvard’s collection. Five of the museum’s original trustees also served on the board of

92 Power relations between the trustees and director of the National Gallery had recently been reconfigured by the Rosebery Minute of 1894. This will be discussed further in the Wallace Collection case study.

93 Trusteeships: Alfred C. de Rothschild (National Gallery, 1892 to 1918 and Wallace Collection, 1897 to 1918); Sir John Murray Scott (National Gallery, 1897 to 1912 and Wallace Collection 1897 to 1912); Lord Redesdale (National Gallery, 1908 to 1916 and Wallace Collection, 1897 to 1916). Notably, Sir Richard Wallace served as a National Gallery trustee from 1884 to 1890.

94 1897 Report of the Committee Appointed by the Treasury to Consider the Housing of the Collection of the Works of Art Bequeathed to the Nation by the Late Lady Wallace (London: Harrison and Sons, July 1897).

95 Trusteeships: George F. Baker (Metropolitan, 1909 to 1931 and Frick Collection, 1919 to 1931); Horace Havemeyer (Metropolitan, 1930 to 1947 and Frick Collection, 1919 to 1947); Lewis Cass Ledyard (Metropolitan, 1914 to 1932 and Frick Collection, 1919 to 1932). Henry Clay Frick served as a Metropolitan trustee from 1909 to 1919.

96 Joseph Breck, Interview on the Subject of Opening the Frick Collection to the Public, 13 December 1931. FCCA; Frederick Mortimer Clapp, Memorandum Regarding Metropolitan Museum of Art Expertise, 24 June 1932. FCCA.

97 Edgar Munhall, Curator Emeritus, Frick Collection. Interview conducted at the Frick Collection, 2 April 2009.
the university. The connection between the institutions was further strengthened following the foundation of Harvard’s Fogg Art Museum in 1895. During the second quarter of the twentieth century the Museum of Fine Arts and the Fogg Art Museum collaborated frequently, jointly establishing initiatives to foster the advancement of conservation training.

My examination of the National Gallery, the Metropolitan and the Museum of Fine Arts focuses on the efforts of three notable executives: Sir Charles Lock Eastlake, Benjamin Ives Gilman and Henry Watson Kent. The careers of these individuals are separated by time, geographic distance and institutional affiliation. Yet each of these men made substantial contributions to the agency of art museum workers, leaving a legacy that would prove important for future leaders in the field. In the mid-nineteenth century, Eastlake drew upon a combination of art world connections, technical art knowledge, connoisseurship and engagement with German art historical discourse to imbue his role at the National Gallery with an authority that it had formerly lacked. At the turn of the century, Gilman used the platform provided by his employment at the Museum of Fine Arts to champion aesthetic idealism and to position art museum workers as the facilitators of a gallery experience that highlighted the formal qualities of objects. Concurrently, Henry Watson Kent began to streamline the administrative activities of the Metropolitan and implement protocols for communication amongst art museum workers. These protocols were widely adopted, prompting Kent’s peers to regard him as the father of modern museum administration and management.

My interest lies in the strategies that Eastlake, Gilman and Kent employed to effect change within their institutions in connection to the influence and expertise associated with their roles as executives and in relation to the contextualisation and presentation of

98 Harris, 1962, p.550.
100 Bewer, 2010.
101 Sir Charles Lock Eastlake (b.1793, d.1865); Benjamin Ives Gilman (b.1852, d.1933); Henry Watson Kent (b.1866, d.1948) See Appendix for Biographical Summaries.
art objects. I have chosen to consider the efforts of these executives in chronological order, as this allows for reflection on the historical development of a number of themes touched upon briefly in the introductory chapter. Here, the origins underlying the divergence of patterns of governance in art museums in the United States and Britain and the intellectual exchange between German art historians and British and American art museum workers are examined in greater depth. The extent to which the strategies of executives were influenced by social and political developments shaping the broader art museum field and the art museum’s shift towards aesthetic idealism also receive further attention.

This chapter differs substantially from the case studies that follow in that it does not rely heavily on primary archival evidence. While it draws on the published writings of Gilman and Kent and makes reference to a significant gallery catalogue authored by Eastlake, it is greatly indebted to investigations that have already examined the tenures of these individuals. Additionally, studies of the historical development of the National Gallery, the Metropolitan and the Museum of Fine Arts also inform the argument presented within this chapter. The forthcoming discussion does not summarize the findings of these works, but rather revisits them with an eye towards the formation of curatorial practice. In so doing, it provides valuable context for the case studies to come.

Sir Charles Lock Eastlake

Sir Charles Lock Eastlake was the first influential art museum leader to emerge in Britain during the nineteenth century. He served as the National Gallery’s second


105 For detailed biographical accounts see: Susanna Avery-Quash and Julie Sheldon, Art For the Nation: The Eastlakes and the Victorian Art World (London: National Gallery, Yale University
keeper from 1843 to 1847 and as the institution’s first director from 1855 to 1865. In the interim period between these posts Eastlake was elected as the Royal Academy’s president, a position that conferred on him the status of National Gallery trustee, *ex officio.* (Figure 7) A half century stands between his career and the post-1900 emergence of the connoisseur-scholar. Yet, it is precisely this distance that has drawn me to a consideration of Eastlake’s tenure, as it allows us to situate the connoisseur-scholar in the framework of a long standing tradition of executives who sought to shape institutional practice and policy. Before considering Eastlake’s endeavours at the National Gallery, we must look first to the development of the institution in the years leading up to his arrival.

The National Gallery was founded amid a wave of nationalistic public art museum building that spread across Europe following the establishment of the Musée du Louvre. Part of the impetus behind the creation of these state funded institutions was a desire to make visible the symbolic power of the nation-state.106 In Britain, a mounting sense of nationalism had been building throughout the eighteenth century and the first decades of the nineteenth century, forged largely as a result of successive wars with France.107 Yet from the outset, the National Gallery’s existence was complicated by tensions surrounding its political symbolism and social role.108 Consequently, a sense of ambiguity as to the museum’s primary purpose and intended audience pervaded the institution in its early years.109

---


109 Colin Trodd has accurately described the National Gallery during this formative period as characterised by an ‘amorphous nature.’ See: Trodd, 1994, p.33.
Uncertainty as to the museum’s mission was apparent in parliamentary discussions of the 1830s, manifesting itself in debates surrounding the institution’s relocation from Pall Mall to Trafalgar Square and the proper housing and safekeeping of the collection.\textsuperscript{110} This lack of clarity was further reflected in the gallery’s approach to interpretation and display. Paintings were arranged in dense, multi-level picture hangs, corresponding with the mode of display favoured in the domestic interiors of gentleman amateurs.\textsuperscript{111} Moreover, the institution’s interpretive materials were limited to rudimentary catalogues that identified paintings by artist, subject, support, size and basic provenance.\textsuperscript{112} These served as substitutes for identifying wall labels, then absent from the gallery.\textsuperscript{113}

Co-existing with the institution’s as yet undetermined aims was a rigid internal organisational hierarchy. Modelled after the British Museum, the National Gallery’s structure of governance was laid out in two Treasury Minutes of 1824 that charged a group of government appointed trustees with the management of the institution and assigned a keeper to work in support of them.\textsuperscript{114} Initially, the board was dominated by members of the aristocracy.\textsuperscript{115} However, as Andrea Geddes Poole notes, the board soon became a ‘more eclectic mix’ of men of influence and means, as bankers, merchants and politicians were appointed alongside members of the aristocracy.\textsuperscript{116} While their backgrounds varied, trustees were typically well-educated generalists and possessed
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familiarity with the fundamental principles of connoisseurship as understood by gentlemanly amateurs.  

In relation to the trustees, the keeper occupied a subordinate position of limited power. His responsibilities were confined to safeguarding the institution’s art objects and did not extend to interpretation or display. Further, his involvement in the determination of acquisitions was limited, as he was to act in an advisory capacity to trustees only when explicitly asked to do so. William Seguier, the first person to hold the National Gallery keepership, was an artist and picture dealer by trade. This was not unusual, for by the 1820s the appointment of artists to keepership positions was an established practice. The ubiquity of this practice, which would persist at the National Gallery and other British art museums until the early twentieth century, speaks to the perceived alignment between the technical knowledge of the artist and that required of the keeper. As such, it attests to the primacy placed on the keeper’s duty to provide for the physical caretaking and conservation of art objects.

It was into this environment that Eastlake arrived in 1843, inheriting a role of circumscribed authority and agency within an institution that had not yet clarified its

117 Saumarez Smith, 2009, p.52. Indeed, many trustees possessed sizeable art collections of their own; for instance Beaumont, Lawrence and Sir Robert Peel.

118 Treasury Minute 30th March 1824; Treasury Minute 2nd July 1824. The Keeper was: ‘to have the charge of the collection; to attend to the care and preservation of Pictures; and to superintend the arrangements for admission; to be present occasionally in the Gallery; and to value and negotiate (if called upon) the purchase of any Pictures that may in future be added to the Collection; and to perform such other services as he may from time to time be called upon to do by instructions from the board.’

119 William Seguier (b.1772,d.1843) See Appendix for Biographical Summary.


121 It is further notable that all of the directors of the National Gallery in the nineteenth century were also artists: Sir Charles Lock Eastlake (1855-1865); Sir William Boxall (1866-1874); Sir Frederic William Burton (1874-1894); Sir Edward John Poynter (1894-1904); Sir Charles Holroyd (1906-1916) and Sir Charles John Holmes (1916-1928). Holmes earlier served as the director of the National Portrait Gallery (1909-1916).
overarching purpose. Yet, even in this position, Eastlake’s influence over the gallery’s interpretive practices was apparent. As Giles Waterfield notes, the collection catalogue produced by Eastlake and his assistant Ralph Wornum in 1847 represented a critical turning point in the institution’s approach to the objects in its care. 122 Inspired by Franz Kugler’s *Handbook of Painting* and Gustav Waagen’s catalogue of the paintings in the collection of the Royal Museum in Berlin, Eastlake and Wornum’s publication aimed to show how the gallery’s paintings could be seen as illustrative of the development of different schools and periods. 123

The catalogue’s arrangement reflected Eastlake’s conviction that the gallery’s paintings could be situated in a system of classification structured around a progression of stylistic advancements observable in the work of particular artists. 124 This was indicative of his strong ties to German art history and his connection to scholars such as Gustav Waagen and Johann Passavant. 125 Eastlake’s relationship with these German colleagues was of mutual benefit. 126 Their methodologies provided Eastlake with a theoretical framework through which he could support and present his ideas within the gallery. At the same time, Eastlake also proved an important ally in the promotion of their theories in Britain. 127 As Charlotte Klonk observes, common to the conceptualisation of art shared by these men was the notion that: 128


125 Gustav Waagen (b.1794, d.1868); Johann Passavant (b.1787, d. 1861) See Appendix for Biographical Summaries. Eastlake met Waagen and Passavant during his travels in Continental Europe as a young man and would collaborate with both men throughout his career. In 1850 Eastlake recruited Waagen and Passavant to contribute to the catalogue for the Royal Institute at Liverpool and in 1857 all three men were instrumental in the organisation of the Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition. Eastlake’s wife, Lady Elizabeth Eastlake, was amongst the first to translate works by Passavant and Waagen into English.


art was both synchronic as well as diachronic: on the one hand, works of art were valued because they were unique expressions of their creators or periods, yet their progression over time and between countries could be chronologically mapped.

Eastlake would apply these same principles to the installation of the collection during his directorship, thinning out the paintings in the gallery to allow for easier viewing of individual works and attempting the institution’s first historical picture hang.\textsuperscript{129}

The broader cultural significance of these innovations has been established.\textsuperscript{130} Klonk shows that Eastlake’s display practices may be seen as part of a wide spread cultural phenomenon, the emergence of a ‘new understanding of visuality,’ whereby stress was placed upon interpretation through ocular perception.\textsuperscript{131} Christopher Whitehead ties Eastlake’s interpretive strategies to the museum’s participation in a broader socio-political movement to educate and uplift the masses.\textsuperscript{132} Further, he demonstrates that Eastlake’s contextualisation of the gallery’s paintings was but one of a number of models of interpretation proposed during the mid-nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{133} The extent to which the practice of arranging paintings on the basis of historical and stylistic commonalities has persisted into the present day testifies to the lasting influence of Eastlake’s approach.\textsuperscript{134}

Eastlake also proved instrumental in a reconsideration of the institution’s administrative structure. In 1853 a Select Committee was formed to scrutinise the National Gallery’s management.\textsuperscript{135} Eastlake played a pivotal role in the committee’s investigation, providing key testimony into the museum’s operations. The gallery was subsequently reorganised in 1855 in line with many of his recommendations. Chief amongst these
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was a clarification of the specific duties and responsibilities of the keepership and the creation of the directorship. Acting as the institution’s first director, Eastlake was given the authority to make purchases on the gallery’s behalf. This was significant for two reasons. First, it represented a shift in the balance of power within the institution, establishing a precedent that would persist until the Roseberry Minute of 1894, when the board once again assumed responsibility for acquisitions. Second, it signified a recognition of the need for an executive whose expertise extended beyond the physical caretaking of art objects.

Eastlake’s capacity to effect change within the gallery was tied to his singular position within the British art world and his ability to identify, cultivate and leverage a distinctive knowledge base. Like his predecessor to the keepership, Eastlake was an artist by trade. Yet his reputation as an arts scholar was established before his tenure at the National Gallery began. Waagen’s 1838, *Works of Art and Artists in England*, describes Eastlake as follows:

> Of all the present historical painters in England, he is distinguished by solid study, correctness and refinement of taste [...] He is at the same time one of those rare instances of artists who, like Schinkel, have acquired a general knowledge of art in all branches, and commencing with enthusiastic devotion to their art, have gradually attained an intuitive idea of the essential nature and fundamental laws of the plastic arts.

Further, Eastlake was already a Royal Academician and a Fellow of the Royal Society by the time of his appointment to the keepership. Since 1841 he had also worked as Secretary to the Fine Arts Commission, which counted nine of the National Gallery trustees amongst its sixteen member board. Thus, Eastlake took up the position of keeper with an awareness of the personalities and interests of numerous board members.

137 Geddes Poole, 2010, pp.57-76.
138 This set a precedent within the gallery that would persist until the Roseberry Minute of 1894, when the power to make purchasing decisions was once again invested in the trustees. See: Geddes Poole, 2010, pp.57-76.
140 Avery-Quash and Sheldon, 2011, pp.36-38.
141 Robertson, 1978, p.79.
Eastlake’s combined involvement with these organisations helped to confer legitimacy on his position within the art world, in turn strengthening the vantage point from which he approached his dealings with others in the art museum sphere.

Key to Eastlake’s ability to influence the gallery’s practices and policy was the nature of the expertise that he possessed, which may be understood as consisting of three parts. The first of these was the technical art knowledge that was seen as the requisite qualification for art museum employment in the mid-nineteenth century and which Eastlake had acquired through his work as an artist and arts scholar.\(^{142}\) Second was his alignment with German art historical discourse and methodology, especially important given the absence of an established tradition of academic art history in Britain. The third part of Eastlake’s expertise was connoisseurship, consistently demonstrated through his endeavours at the gallery, in his involvement with various organisations within the art world, and in his collaborations with scholars such as Waagen and Passavant.

The combination of these latter two elements of Eastlake’s expertise was of particular importance in his relationship with trustees, as it meant that his distinctive knowledge base was seen at once as both familiar and progressive. Eastlake occasionally clashed with trustees over the presentation, interpretation and acquisition of works in the collection.\(^{143}\) Yet, there can be little doubt that his opinions and knowledge were regarded as valuable, as the expanded power granted to him as director attests. It was, in part, this recognition of Eastlake’s intellect that afforded him the opportunity to simultaneously redefine and reposition his role within the gallery, imbuing it with a newfound expertise and authority.

Eastlake’s achievements at the National Gallery cannot be easily separated from the political and social circumstances in which he operated. Christopher Whitehead’s 2005 study places Eastlake’s efforts in the context of a major societal shift that occurred between the enactment of the first Reform Bill of 1832 and the second of 1867. This


\(^{143}\) For instance there was friction between Eastlake and trustee Sir Robert Peel over Eastlake’s desire to incorporate early Italian art works into the collection. See: Klonk, 2002, pp.333-334; Whitehead, 2005, p.18.
period not only saw the enfranchisement of the working class, but also the rise in influence of Whig politics which ‘sought to engage with, and to improve, the “lower orders” in the name of reform.’\footnote{Whitehead, 2005, p.5.} It is in this framework that Eastlake’s involvement in the 1853 Select Committee investigation into the management of the National Gallery should be understood.\footnote{This Select Committee was one of a number formed in the mid-nineteenth century which sought to discern the appropriate function and broader purpose of the National Gallery through an examination of the institution’s activities. For a comprehensive overview of the aims of these various Select Committees see: Taylor, 1999, pp. 29-66.} As Eastlake endeavoured to shape the gallery’s vision, direction and structure, the platform granted to him through his participation in the Select Committee’s inquiry was of considerable influence and importance.\footnote{Taylor, 1999, pp.50-52.} This was because, as Whitehead explains, the mid-century affairs of the National Gallery were not peripheral to the concerns of Parliament. Rather, recognising the institution as a highly potent political symbol, the government considered the debates surrounding the administration and activities of the National Gallery to be ‘a priority in terms of home affairs.’\footnote{Whitehead, 2005, p.125. For a further discussion of the various political tensions inherent in the mid-century National Gallery debate see: Whitehead, 2005, pp.125-151.} Thus, by virtue of the socio-political climate of the time, the 1853 Select Committee investigation provided Eastlake with a parliamentary audience receptive to his argument for a move towards the professionalisation of the National Gallery. In this way, the changes that Eastlake brought to the gallery were as much a reflection of the larger social and political concerns of the day as they were a testament to the recognition of his intellect and expertise.

In the third quarter of the nineteenth century, Eastlake’s legacy was discernible in the work of Sir George Scharf at the National Portrait Gallery and J.C. Robinson at the South Kensington Museum.\footnote{Avery-Quash and Sheldon, 2011, p.120; Frank Herrmann, \textit{English as Collectors} (London: John Murray, 1972), p.34.} Scharf served as the first secretary of the National Portrait Gallery from 1852 and as director of the institution from 1882 to 1895.\footnote{\textit{Sir George Scharf} (b.1820, d.1895) See Appendix for Biographical Summary.} During this time, the institution branched out from its initial goal of collecting works solely on the
basis of their historical importance, gradually adopting an acquisitions policy that took aesthetic elements into account. Robinson, who has been described as ‘the greatest connoisseur of his day,’ worked at the South Kensington Museum as curator of Ornamental Art from 1857 to 1863 and as art referee from 1863 to 1867. 150 Outside of his museum employment, Robinson was an active collector and art dealer and was also a founding member of the Burlington Fine Arts Club. After his departure from South Kensington, Robinson wrote the first catalogue raisonné of the Ashmolean Museum’s collection of Michelangelo and Raphael drawings and later worked as Surveyor of the Queen’s Pictures from 1882 to 1901.

Like Eastlake, Scharf and Robinson initially trained as artists, yet managed to align themselves with an expertise that extended beyond technical practices. For both men, this knowledge was born out of a combination of independent study and engagement with art history within Britain and abroad. Similar to Eastlake, both Scharf and Robinson maintained close ties with leading German art historians. Scharf was connected to Waagen as a result of their mutual involvement in the Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition of 1857. He also counted Wilhelm von Bode, Waagen’s successor at the Royal Museum of Berlin, amongst his personal friends. 151 Robinson was also acquainted with Bode, and the tone of deference and respect that he adopted in his letters to the German museum leader is telling. 152

Bode was a key figure in the overhaul of the German museum system that took place under the leadership of Kaiser Frederich III during the 1880s and 1890s. 153 As part of this reorganisation, collections were rearranged according to a system of classification that divided objects into two groupings: those for display to the general public and those that were to be held in accessible store for scholars. 154 Bode’s theories of display and


151 Wilhelm von Bode (b.1845, d.1929) See Appendix for Biographical Summary.


interiors would prove key in shaping the approach of institutions in both the United States and Britain in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Indeed, his methodology made a notable influence on the reconceptualisation of display at the South Kensington Museum during the institution’s transformation into the Victoria & Albert Museum.

Similar to Eastlake, both Scharf and Robinson sought to influence institutional policy and practices from their position as executives. In these efforts, both men met with moderate success. At the National Portrait Gallery, Scharf implemented standards of identification and documentation and lobbied for the collection to be moved to a suitable permanent location, an effort that ultimately led to the museum’s move to St. Martin’s Place adjacent to the National Gallery. At the South Kensington Museum, despite an increasingly acrimonious relationship with director Henry Cole, Robinson amassed a vast collection of Italian sculpture. The cast courts that he installed at the museum are today amongst the most well known fixtures of the gallery’s collection. Robinson’s ability to secure these works is all the more noteworthy given that he was operating in the context of an institution where commitment to utilitarian value of art was then at its height.

The complex professional relations between Robinson and Henry Cole merit attention. Cole, the senior most executive of the South Kensington Museum, oversaw the administrative management of the institution and supervised Robinson’s care of the collection. Firmly committed to the institution’s stated mission of working towards the elevation of the manufacturing arts, Cole championed an approach that placed emphasis

159 Henry Cole (b.1808, d.1882).
on instruction and education. While Cole is most often remembered for his aptitude for administrative organisation, he also had a strong desire to shape the museum’s aesthetic policy, both in terms of the content of the collection and the design of the institution’s building. Yet, Cole was not a connoisseur. Although his notebooks reveal that he was deeply interested in art, he had never applied himself to a systematic study of art as Robinson had. Thus, Cole’s involvement in the institution’s aesthetic policy was a source of tension between him and Robinson. Equally problematic was Robinson’s insistence that his own connoisseurial expertise should entitle him to greater administrative power within the museum, an opinion that Cole did not share. I call attention to these tensions in order to demonstrate that the pre-professional context in which these men operated was one in which management roles, and their accompanying responsibilities, were open to contestation not only from non-executives but from executive colleagues as well.

Still, Robinson’s struggles with Cole notwithstanding, the degree of autonomy granted to Scharf and Robinson in their involvement in ongoing discussions with trustees about the aims and purpose of their respective institutions was indicative of the expanded authority and agency that Eastlake had brought to the executive’s role. I do not mean to suggest

---

160 For a detailed account of Cole’s career at South Kensington see: Burton, 1999, pp.74-90.


163 Whitehead notes: ‘Cole's attention to design and to the visual was constant: for instance, he analysed the design of clothing, and the decorative shapes cut into beef and mutton fat by the butchers in Bavaria.’ See: Whitehead, ‘Henry Cole's European Travels and the Building of the South Kensington Museum in the 1850s’, 2005, p.209.


165 Robinson appealed to Cole on several occasions to change his title from ‘Curator’ to ‘Director’ of collections, an idea that Cole rejected. See: Burton, 1999, pp.68-71.
that the endeavours of Eastlake, Scharf and Robinson were altogether analogous. Although all three were employed in service of the national collection, the museums in which they operated were markedly different from one another, shaped as they were by distinct missions. Further, there were also important divergences between the institutional roles of these men. For instance, it is not inconsequential that Robinson was employed in a curatorial position overseen by a director who exerted much greater authority within the institution than he did. Thus, my intention is not to draw a direct connection between Eastlake, Scharf and Robinson, but to highlight the common aspects of their efforts, offering an indication of the development of the executive’s strategy in the second half of the nineteenth century.

A discussion of the expansion of the executive’s role in Britain in the latter half of the nineteenth century would be remiss if it did not call attention to the work of A.W. Franks, whose efforts at the British Museum further attest to an increasingly sophisticated and codified approach to curatorial work. Cambridge-educated, Franks arrived at the British Museum in 1851 to serve as an assistant in the British and Medieval collections. His tenure spanned the remainder of the nineteenth century during which time he built up the museum’s collection and contributed greatly to its scholarship. In his final years, he would recall his contributions to the institution:

I think I may fairly say that I have created the department of which I am now Keeper […] When I was appointed to the Museum in 1851 the scanty collections out of which the department has grown occupied a length of 154 feet of wall cases, and 3 or 4 table cases. The collections now occupy 2250 feet in length of wall cases, 90 table cases and 31 upright cases, to say nothing of the numerous objects placed over the cases and walls.

These achievements have led David M. Wilson to suggest that, in many respects, Franks ‘may be regarded as the second founder of the British Museum.’

166 Augustus Wollaston Franks (b.1826, d.1897).
In considering the evolution of curatorial practice in the pre-professional era, the tenures of men such as Eastlake, Scharf, Robinson, Cole and Franks are of note. Each of these individuals strived to increase the authority of their positions and exercise greater control over the presentation and contextualisation of the objects within their collections. In so doing, they anticipated the active shift towards professionalisation that would manifest itself in the British museum field at the turn of the century. I will discuss the early indications of this turn towards professionalisation in the art museum in my case study of the Wallace Collection that follows this chapter. For the moment, let us turn to a consideration of the organisation of the Metropolitan and the Museum of Fine Arts and an exploration of the endeavours of Benjamin Ives Gilman and Henry Watson Kent.

**Benjamin Ives Gilman & Henry Watson Kent**

More than a quarter of a century after Eastlake took up the keepership of the National Gallery, the foundation of the Museum of Fine Arts and the Metropolitan heralded the arrival of the public art museum in America.¹⁷⁰ A different set of social and political factors surrounded the art museum’s emergence in the United States, shaping the structures of governance and institutional aims that became the norm within the country. These factors warrant review before the tenures of Gilman and Kent are examined.

By 1870 industrialisation had resulted in the rapid urbanisation of cities in the United States and a growing economic disparity; while much of the country’s population existed in poverty a select elite enjoyed increasing levels of unprecedented wealth.¹⁷¹ These changing circumstances were particularly apparent in New York City and Boston, the largest and most established cities on the Eastern seaboard.¹⁷² The majority of the elite who emerged during this period were self-made millionaires whose money was newly acquired.¹⁷³ Motivated by a desire to affirm their social position and foster civic pride,

---

¹⁷⁰ As previously mentioned, both the Museum of Fine Arts and the Metropolitan were founded in 1870.


¹⁷³ Only a small proportion of this elite hailed from established wealthy families, and those that did were based primarily in Boston. DiMaggio, 1986; Harris, 1962.
this elite began to invest in public municipal projects.\textsuperscript{174} In so doing, they became instrumental in the movement for entrepreneurial institution building that took place in the last third of the nineteenth century and that resulted in the founding of numerous libraries, schools, universities and museums across the United States.\textsuperscript{175}

Like other American cultural institutions founded as part of this movement, art museums adopted a non-profit model of governance.\textsuperscript{176} Operating independently of direct state control, these institutions existed as collective enterprises managed by self-governing and self-perpetuating boards. This form of governance was particularly well suited to the aims of the newly consecrated elite, allowing them to serve the community while positioning them as the definers and defenders of high culture.\textsuperscript{177}

The adoption of the non-profit model influenced the composition of art museum boards and the nature of responsibilities and expectations placed upon trustees. One of the most striking differences between the governing boards of British and American art museums was the comparatively large number of trustees who served on American boards. At the time of its creation, the Metropolitan was managed by twenty-seven trustees, while the Museum of Fine Arts board was comprised of twenty-three members.\textsuperscript{178} In contrast, the National Gallery’s board was comprised of seven appointees from the time of its establishment and throughout the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{179}

At both the Museum of Fine Arts and the Metropolitan, a token number of trustees were drawn from local government. At the Museum of Fine Arts, the Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, the Boston Superintendent of Schools and the Mayor of Boston all served on the board \textit{ex officio}. Similarly, at the Metropolitan, the Mayor of New York City, the New York Governor and the Head of the Department of Public

\textsuperscript{174} DiMaggio, 1986, pp.198-200; Tomkins, 1970, p.16.

\textsuperscript{175} Conn, 1998, pp.8-9.

\textsuperscript{176} DiMaggio, 1986, pp.198-200.

\textsuperscript{177} DiMaggio, 1986, p.199.

\textsuperscript{178} For Museum of Fine Arts trustees see: Harris, 1962, p.549. For Metropolitan trustees see: Tomkins, 1970, p.35.

\textsuperscript{179} Geddes Poole, 2010, p.18.
Parks were also trustees ex officio. The presence of such individuals is of note as it shows that while operating independent of direct state control, American art museums still relied on the informal sanction and indirect support of local government infrastructure.

However, as was to become typical of art museums throughout the United States, most of the trustees who served on the boards of the Metropolitan and the Museum of Fine Arts were men of substantial wealth and social connection. In the context of a non-profit institution, the participation of these individuals was vital. In the absence of funding from the state, the burden of raising and securing institutional funds fell directly to trustees. Consequently, trustees were often major financial contributors to the institutions they served and the expectations of their support increased when the art museum was in need of money.

By the time of the art museum’s arrival in the United States, the notion of the institution as a potential vehicle for the education and betterment of the general public was well established, having found its fullest expression at the South Kensington Museum. The Museum of Fine Arts and the Metropolitan both initially adopted the South Kensington Museum ethos, and the wording of their respective Acts of Incorporation attests to their commitment to education. The adoption of similar educational objectives was observable in museums of various typologies which were founded in the United States.

---
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183 The Metropolitan’s 1870 Act of Incorporation stated that it was founded for ‘the purpose of establishing and maintaining in said city a Museum and Library of Art, of encouraging the developing the study of fine arts, and the application of art to manufacture and practical life, of advancing the general knowledge of kindred subjects, and to that end, of furnishing popular instruction.’ Act of Incorporation, New York State Charter, April, 1870, reprinted in The Collector’s Voice. Volume 3, Imperial Voices: Critical Readings in the Practice of Collecting, ed. by Susan Pearce, Mark Hall and Fiona Morton (Burlington: Ashgate, 2002), p.42. See also: Conn, 1998, pp.192-198. The Museum of Fine Arts Act of Incorporation stated that the institution was to be, ‘for the preservation and exhibition of works of art, of making, maintaining, and exhibiting collections of such works, and of affording instruction in the Fine Arts.’ Act of Incorporation, Massachusetts State Charter, February 1870, reprinted in Harris, 1962, p.548.
during this same period. This attunement to educational objectives was indicative of the strong correlation between the movement for entrepreneurial institution building and the promotion of education.  

During its first twenty years of existence, the Museum of Fine Arts accumulated an extensive collection. Modelling its collecting practices after South Kensington, the new institution amassed a broad assemblage of prints, drawings and paintings, as well as numerous decorative arts from Europe, China and Japan. It also built up the world’s third largest plaster cast collection, surpassed only by the Royal Museum in Berlin and the University Museum at Strasbourg. These holdings were acquired almost entirely through gifts, donations and bequest. It was not until the early 1890s that the museum began to make intentional, considered acquisitions and participate directly in the art market.

The museum’s first ventures into the art market coincided with the arrival of Benjamin Ives Gilman in 1893. Born into a prosperous New York family, Gilman had worked for his family’s banking firm before completing a graduate degree in Philosophy and Logic from John Hopkins University. Gilman was initially hired at the Museum of Fine Arts as a curator. However, his title was soon changed to secretary: a label that better reflected his broad participation in the determination of the institution’s curatorial programming and educational initiatives. Gilman’s tenure at the museum would extend until 1925. Over the course of this thirty year period, the institution’s approach to collecting, display and interpretation underwent substantial changes. Gradually, the gallery came to favour an aesthetic policy that championed art objects on the basis of their rarity and originality.

---

This shifting attitude manifested itself most visibly in the reinstallation of art works within the museum’s new building in 1908.189 Adopting an approach earlier championed by Bode and other German museum leaders in the 1880s, the new museum space was arranged so that the most prized objects in the collection were displayed in the main gallery on the ground floor, while works judged to be of lesser quality were placed in accessible storage on the lower ground floor for scholarly study.190 The reorientation of the museum’s aims was also apparent in the disassembling of the cast collection between 1907 and 1910.191

Gilman played an important part in ushering in these changes, and the gallery’s post-1900 modes of art object presentation and contextualisation should be seen in the light of his ongoing advocacy of aesthetic idealism. A lecture given by Gilman at the Second Annual Meeting of the American Association of Museums encapsulates his core beliefs.192 All things, Gilman professed, may be known in two ways, either through first hand experience or through the acquisition of factual information. The art museum’s primary aim should be to facilitate knowing through direct experience, rather than through the communication of facts. To illustrate this point, Gilman offered an example: a student who reads all of the criticism written on the French novelist Honoré de Balzac without ever reading an original text will have ‘wholly missed’ the author’s aim.193 Thus, in Gilman’s conception of the art museum, the facilitation of communion between visitor and art works was fundamental to the institution’s mission.

Gilman believed that an art museum visit should be a complete sensory experience. In 1907, the year before the reinstallation of the collection in the museum’s new building, he wrote:194

The static arts - sculpture, painting, and their derivatives - are by that character heavily handicapped in competing for general favour with the dynamic arts - music, poetry, drama, and social life. People soon tire of that which never changes. Any museum which aims to maintain the permanent interest of the mass of mankind must see to it that there shall be abundant movement in its life.

To this end, Gilman incorporated concert series and public talks into the institution’s programming calendar. In an effort to improve the overall visitor experience Gilman took measures to prevent ‘museum fatigue.’ Aiming to make the gallery experience as physically unstrenuous as possible, he advocated for comfortable seating and an arrangement of paintings and art objects that maximized ease of viewing.

Gilman’s approach was not entirely at odds with the museum’s earlier emphasis on education. Rather, Gilman saw educational goals as a secondary rather than primary purpose of the institution. He explained:

The true conception of an art museum is not that of an educational institution having art as its teaching material, but that of an artistic institution with educational uses and demands.

Charles Eliot Norton was amongst the founding trustees of the Museum of Fine Arts and played an active role in driving forward the institution’s initial educationally focused agenda. A eulogy to Norton in the museum’s 1908 bulletin, unsigned but presumably authored by Gilman, praises Norton’s efforts. This is of note as it attests to Gilman’s willingness to acknowledge the gallery’s earlier educational mission at the same time that he was working to steer the museum towards aesthetic idealism.

Like Norton, Gilman believed that art possessed inherent spiritual qualities. Yet, rather than focus on art’s intrinsic moral or educational value, Gilman chose to stress its

---


philosophical and transcendent potential. It was with this notion in mind that Gilman invented and popularised the concept of the docent.\textsuperscript{200} For Gilman, the docent was not a lecturer imparting facts, but a guide who might serve to mediate the experience of art for visitors. He emphasised that docents should not give information on subject matter, history or technique.\textsuperscript{201}

Gilman’s efforts to influence the institution’s practices of display and interpretation were strengthened by his alliance with an institutional colleague who possessed a similar conception of the museum’s purpose and aims. This was Matthew Prichard, the British born aesthete who served as assistant director of the Museum of Fine Arts from 1904 to 1907.\textsuperscript{202} A scholar of Byzantine, Japanese and Chinese art, Prichard was instrumental in the decision to disassemble the museum’s cast courts which he argued were not worthy of the status of consecrated art treasures.\textsuperscript{203} Although Prichard and Gilman were not in total agreement about the ideological direction that the museum should take, both championed art works of rarity and originality and wished to distance the museum from its formerly unfocused collecting practices.\textsuperscript{204} (Figures 8 & 9)

In considering the strategy that Gilman employed to effect change within the museum, his involvement with burgeoning professional networks also warrants mention. Beginning in 1906, Gilman found a larger public platform for the expression of his ideas at the annual meetings of the American Association of Museums.\textsuperscript{205} An active participant in the new organisation, Gilman was a regular conference lecturer and amongst the strongest advocates for the publication and circulation of the association’s


\textsuperscript{201} (Sally Anne) Duncan, 2005; McClellan, 2008, p.169.

\textsuperscript{202} Matthew Prichard (b.1865, d.1936) See Appendix for Biographical Summary.


\textsuperscript{204} McClellan, 2008, pp.29-30.

\textsuperscript{205} Gilman, ‘The Triple Aim of Museums of Fine Art’, 1907; Gilman, ‘Guides and Docents in Museums’, 1913.
conference proceedings. Prior to his work with the association, Gilman contributed to the Museums Association’s *Museums Journal.*

Gilman’s engagement with these new associations, later combined with the 1918 publication of his influential treatise on museum practice, *Museum Ideals of Purpose and Method,* provided him with a platform through which he could advocate for the art museum’s adoption of the principles of aesthetic idealism. His views were widely regarded as the antithesis to the utilitarian approach advocated by his contemporary, John Cotton Dana, also an active member in the American Association of Museums. Whereas Gilman focused on the sacred aura of art works, Dana argued that museum workers should not be concerned with connoisseurship, but should instead strive to reinforce an object’s social context. Dana criticised what he perceived as an ‘undue reverence for oil painting’ and appealed for folk art and objects demonstrating industrial design to be incorporated into art museum collections and displays. Dana’s approach was informed by his work in the emerging field of library science and characterised by an astute awareness of the aesthetic museum’s adoption of the tastes of its governing elite. (Figure 10)

Gilman’s ability to situate his vision in the context of the gallery’s earlier aims, align himself with an influential colleague and find support for his ideas in the broader museum field all contributed to his success in shaping the institution’s practices. As the case studies of this thesis will demonstrate, Gilman’s approach established important precedents for the early-twentieth century art museum executives who followed in his wake. Gilman’s theories provided an ideological foundation from which these
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208 John Cotton Dana (b.1856, d.1929) See Appendix for Biographical Summary. (Carol) Duncan, 1995, p.4 and pp.16-18; McClellan, 2008, p.31; DiMaggio, 1991, pp.269-270.


individuals could promote themselves as the facilitators of an art museum experience that emphasised the rarity and originality of artworks. This foundation was valuable, as it had the potential to strengthen the case of art museum workers who sought to be entrusted with greater responsibility for the intellectual guardianship of the art objects entrusted to their care.

In 1905, twelve years after Gilman began his work at the Museum of Fine Arts, Henry Watson Kent took up his role as assistant secretary at the Metropolitan. (Figure 11) Kent’s work at the museum began at the start of a period of intense institutional change that would redefine the Metropolitan’s purpose and mission. The museum’s first director, Luigi Palma de Cèsnola, had died in 1904 and John Pierpont Morgan had taken over as president of the Metropolitan’s board of trustees. At the time of this leadership change, the Morgan Library, the new president’s own institution, was not yet two years old. A 1905 volume of the Burlington Magazine summarised the reoriented aims of the Metropolitan under Morgan’s leadership.212

For the first time the museum is in a position to build up the collection according to a comprehensive plan, and it will be the aim of the trustees to assemble beautiful objects and display them harmoniously, grouping the masterpieces of different countries and times in such relation and sequence as to illustrate the history of art in the broadest sense […]

It was with this ambition that Morgan recruited Roger Fry to the museum in 1906.213 Fry began what would prove to be his brief tenure as curator with the ambition of collecting ‘exceptional and spectacular pieces.’214 Like Gilman, Fry felt that ‘the finest examples of art embodied a universal language of human emotion’, although he also believed that works of art needed to be situated in the context of scholarly analysis and historical narrative.215 I will return to a consideration of Fry’s conceptualisation of art and museum work in the next chapter. For the moment, it is worth noting that Fry’s time at the Metropolitan testifies to the existence of a maturing transatlantic dialogue surrounding the methods and approaches of curatorial work. (Figure 12)


213 Roger Fry (b.1866, d. 1934) See Appendix for Biographical Summary.


While the Metropolitan was poised to embrace a programme of acquisition and display grounded in aesthetic idealism, it was also in dire need of an administrative overhaul. Cesnola had been a domineering figure in the museum and relations amongst staff members were poor. Further, there were no structured means to facilitate communications between salaried employees and trustees. Kent was retained to address these problems and to help organise and normalise administrative procedures to allow for the successful implementation of the museum’s ideological repositioning. He was uniquely qualified to do so. First trained as a librarian, he had benefited from an informal mentorship beneath Museum of Fine Arts curator, Edward Robinson, whom he assisted in building up a cast collection at Norwich Academy. In his memoirs Kent cited these experiences, in addition to the written work of Norton and Ruskin, as amongst his early influences.

Driven to become, in his words, ‘a student of museum administration’ Kent travelled abroad in the 1890s to acquire knowledge related to procedures, registration and display techniques utilised by museums in continental Europe. In Germany Kent met and studied with Bode. Praising the approach of Bode and his contemporaries, Kent would later recall that ‘the Germans gave very real attention to the problems of arrangement, display and management of museums of every kind.’

Kent’s conception of museum work was necessarily shaped by these experiences and influences. Arriving at the Metropolitan, Kent found an ally in his earlier mentor, Edward Robinson, now assistant director at the Metropolitan. Together Kent and

221 Kent, 1949, pp.89-91.
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Robinson implemented standardised techniques of accessioning, cataloguing and registration across the institution.224

Yet, Kent’s contributions extended far beyond the introduction of these administrative procedures. He was a pivotal voice in the museum’s decision to collect American paintings and decorative arts and to install them in period room interiors. His advocacy for this project was likely influenced by his studies with Bode.225 Additionally, Kent worked to improve the communication between art museum workers and trustees, seeking to provide a means through which both parties could work cooperatively and with an awareness of one another’s motivations. In this capacity Kent described his role as that of an ‘entrepreneur, between the initiators of all action, the Trustees, and their employees.’226 Kent also created a slide and photographic library and was active in pioneering the museum’s educational outreach efforts.227 Inspired by Gilman’s concept of the docent, Kent implemented a similar programme. However, rather than barring docents from sharing factual information, as Gilman had, Kent encouraged his docents to provide visitors with insight into scholarship related to collections.228 Sally Anne Duncan suggests that Kent’s efforts at the Metropolitan represent a ‘via media’ approach to museum work, one that embraced aspects of Gilman’s philosophy of aesthetic idealism and balanced these with the ordered administrative techniques and educational emphasis promoted by Dana.229 Indeed, Kent knew both men personally, and regarded Dana as a close friend whom he admired for what he termed his mastery ‘of public relations.’230

By synthesising the ideologies and approaches of Gilman and Dana, Kent was able to expand his influence to numerous levels of the gallery’s operation, shaping

224 Alexander, 1997, p.52; (Sally Anne) Duncan, 2005, p.308.
226 Kent, 1949, pp.141-143.
228 (Sally Anne) Duncan, 2005, p.310.
229 (Sally Anne) Duncan, 2005.
interpretation, display and administrative function. In this way the changes that he brought to the Metropolitan were reminiscent of Eastlake’s work at the National Gallery fifty years prior. However, unlike Eastlake, Kent’s efforts took shape in the context of an art museum field that was rapidly beginning to professionalise, as the foundation of the American Association of Museums in 1906 attests. One of the chief indicators of this shift towards professionalisation may be seen in the trajectory of Kent’s own career. Kent’s early endeavours within the museum field were guided by his express intention to become a gallery administrator. This was a departure from the approach of the other individuals discussed in this chapter, none of whom specifically sought out training in preparation for a museum career.

*The Pre-Professional Executive*

This chapter has succinctly covered a vast amount of territory, both in terms of geography and time. It has done so to provide context for a number of themes central to the forthcoming case studies: the executive’s struggle for authority and influence, tensions shaping the art museum’s administration and operation, and the complicated processes through which the parameters of curatorial work are determined.

As we have seen, the strategies that Eastlake, Gilman and Kent employed to increase their institutional influence were different from one another, shaped by the needs and demands of the institutions and larger art world spheres in which they operated. Despite these differences, the strategies adopted by these executives are united by three common elements. The first is a concerted effort to standardise gallery procedures and protocol. The second is a move towards the identification and cultivation of a distinctive knowledge base that could be used as a means to justify the expansion of executive authority. The third common element is a recognition of the importance of social skills and connections in furthering institutional aims. These three common elements speak to an art museum field undergoing what Paul DiMaggio has usefully defined as ‘structuration’, the processes that occur immediately prior to the period when practices within a given field establish themselves as normative. 232

---
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As noted in the introductory chapter, professionalisation is a three part process. The first step occurs when individuals of analogous occupations employed across different institutions recognise that they are united by shared activities and concerns and are engaged in a collective struggle to expand their agency and influence. Viewed in succession, the careers of Eastlake, Gilman and Kent are illustrative of the slow but steady movement towards professionalisation that began during the second half of the nineteenth century and which gained momentum with the foundation of the Museums Association (1889) and the American Association of Museums (1906).

The evidence presented within this chapter has illuminated the pre-professional executive’s initial movements towards active engagement with the formation of the disciplinary boundaries of art history and shown how that engagement manifested itself within the art museum sphere. Prime examples of this engagement may be seen in Eastlake’s adoption of Waagen and Passavant’s synchronic and diachronic display principles at the National Gallery and Kent’s adaptation of Bode’s period room interiors at the Metropolitan.

This chapter has drawn attention to the early efforts of curators, keepers and directors to utilise expertise as a means to influence institutional practice and policy. Further, it has sought to emphasise the collective nature of curatorial practice, demonstrating how the field is shaped by the interests and actions of participants both within and outside the immediate sphere of the art museum. It is with these themes in mind that this thesis turns now to the first of its four case studies. The chapter which follows centres around an examination of curatorial practice in the Wallace Collection in the first two decades of the twentieth century and the endeavours of the institution’s first two keepers, Claude Phillips and D.S. MacColl.
CHAPTER TWO

Curatorial Practice in the Wallace Collection: 1900-1920

We have here in one a National Gallery on a smaller scale and a South Kensington Museum on a smaller scale. And yet the Wallace Gallery preserves in its merits and attractions, as in its defects, the character of a private collection, with some of the intimité which a national museum, brought together under wholly different circumstances, must inevitably lack.  

The above quote is an excerpt from an article on the Wallace Collection that appeared in the January 1901 edition of the *Art Journal*, six months after the museum’s official public opening on 22 June 1900. Authored by the institution’s first keeper, Claude Phillips, the article was presented as an explanatory guide; yet it also sought to strategically situate the new museum and the artworks in its possession, in the framework of the national collection. In adopting this tactic, Phillips attempted to forestall and pre-empt criticism about the particular character of the Wallace Collection and its origins as a private assemblage of aristocratic treasures. (Figure 13)

Phillips contended that the presentation of the Wallace Collection in Hertford House, the former residence of founders Sir Richard and Lady Wallace, should not be looked upon as a negative deviation from the typical practice of housing the nation’s art collection in purpose-built galleries.  

(Figures 14 & 15) Instead it should be appreciated as an opportunity for the public to enjoy a collection and a building that would otherwise have remained inaccessible. Similarly, the gallery’s extensive holdings of French paintings and decorative art should not be seen as incongruent with other works already in the nation’s possession. Rather, they should be viewed as complementary, broadening and enriching the scope of the collective holdings of institutions such as the National Gallery and the South Kensington Museum. Further, Phillips offered a subtle defence of the collecting practices of the aristocratic founders:

---


234 By 1900 the National Gallery, the recently finished Tate Gallery and the newly renamed Victoria & Albert Museum (which Phillips still refers to as the ‘South Kensington Museum’) were all housed in purpose-built galleries.

235 Phillips, 1901, p.3.
It is evident that the succession of grands seigneurs and great connoisseurs to whom is due the formation of the Wallace Collection have regarded art as a splendid accompaniment of life, rather than a thing to which the whole devotion of life may be properly given…[this] is well illustrated in the general preference shown for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries over the fifteenth and sixteenth; by the predominance in the picture galleries of the genre, portrait, landscapes, and decorative pieces, over sacred, poetical and historical art; by the predominance, as a rule, of the splendid reality, not too far removed from earth, over the dream.

Phillips’ concerns about how the Wallace Collection would be perceived were not unfounded. The new gallery was indeed unprecedented in several respects. Prior to the museum’s 1900 opening, the general public had never seen the collection in its entirety, nor had they viewed it in situ in the Wallaces’ private residence. Moreover, the opulence of Hertford House and the period room style of display were a sharp departure from other museums in the national collection, standing as a constant reminder of the collection’s aristocratic origins. The gallery’s eclectic assemblage of artworks, especially the prevalence of eighteenth-century French art, further reinforced this association.

This chapter explores curatorial practice in the Wallace Collection during the museum’s first two decades. It focuses on the approaches and strategies employed by Phillips and his successor, D.S. MacColl, as they sought to capitalise on the expertise they had developed as art critics in order to influence how the collection’s artworks were interpreted and presented.236 (Figures 16 & 17) Of central importance in this undertaking is an analysis of the tensions and struggles that existed between keeper and trustees as both parties endeavoured to exert their authority within the institution. In examining these themes, the concerns expressed by Phillips in his 1901 Art Journal article are of note, for they speak to some of the inherent challenges that the collection museum posed, around which those engaged in curatorial practice were compelled to negotiate.

The Formation of the Wallace Collection

The Wallace Collection came into the state’s possession in 1897 when it was bequeathed to the nation upon the death of Lady Wallace, the widow of Sir Richard Wallace, the

236 Claude Phillips (b.1846, d.1924), Wallace Collection keeper (1897-1911); D.S. MacColl (b.1859, d.1948), Wallace Collection keeper (1911-1924). See Thesis Appendix for Biographical Summaries.
illegitimate son of Richard Seymour-Conway, 4th Marquess of Hertford. The assemblage of artworks that comprised the collection had been built up over successive generations, with the majority of objects emanating from the personal collections of the 4th Marquess and Sir Richard Wallace.448 The familial collection that Lady Wallace bequeathed to the nation was therefore an amalgamation of several individual collections and reflected the aristocratic taste and personal indulgences of its many contributors. In addition to French eighteenth-century paintings and objets d’art, the collection contained eighteenth-century English portraiture, seventeenth-century Dutch painting, Renaissance bronzes and Limoges enamels, as well as an extensive grouping of arms and armour. There were also works on paper and a number of Old Master paintings; Canaletto, Murillo, Teniers, Velázquez, as well as Gainsborough and Reynolds, were amongst the artists represented in the collection.

It was with Lady Wallace’s bequest that the collection passed from private to public ownership. Prior to the gallery’s establishment, however, there were two other occasions when the general public was granted access to the art objects in the collection, albeit on a limited scale and temporary basis. In 1857, while still in the possession of the 4th Marquess, forty-four paintings from the collection were exhibited as part of the Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition in the specially designated Hertford Gallery.449 In 1871 under the ownership of Sir Richard Wallace, a substantial portion of the collection, minus its arms and armour, was put on display at the Bethnal Green Museum. The collection remained there for three years while Sir Richard Wallace coordinated the remodelling of Hertford House in preparation for his relocation from Paris to London. The exhibition was noteworthy for its location in East London, for its intended audience of local lower-class workers and for the unprecedented number of items on display.450 In addition to these two occasions, after Sir Richard and Lady Wallace settled at Hertford

449 Mallet, 1979, pp.80-81.
450 Mallet, 1979, p.145. Mallet notes: ‘In all 736 pictures, 227 miniatures, 446 pieces of furniture, sculpture and decorative bronzes, 240 porcelain objects (mostly Sévres), 141 pieces of majolica and 200 items of jewellery and snuff boxes were delivered to Bethnal Green.’
House, the collection was open to a ‘polite’ public who possessed the appropriate means of introduction.451

Lady Wallace attached a number of specific conditions to her bequest in an effort to maintain the collection in accordance with the tastes and visions of those who had participated in its formation.452 First, the collection was never to be added to, sold off or allowed to travel to other destinations. Second, the collection was to permanently reside in the founders’ residence, Hertford House, if no comparable property in Central London could be found. Third, John Murray Scott, the long time personal secretary to Sir Richard and Lady Wallace, was to oversee the collection during the time between Lady Wallace’s death and the public opening of the gallery.453 Furthermore, Murray Scott was to serve as one of the members of the Wallace Collection’s board of trustees. These conditions were significant, placing restrictions on the collection’s development and interpretation and entrusting a direct representative to assure the continuity of the founders’ vision.

Soon after the public announcement of the bequest, a government-appointed committee convened to discuss the permanent housing of the Wallace Collection. As previously noted, serious consideration was given to annexing the Wallace Collection to the physical building of the National Gallery.454 However, the committee’s final report recommended that the collection should remain at Hertford House and that a selection of ‘gentleman of experience and leisure’ should be appointed to the trusteeship of the new institution.455


452 *Lady Wallace Bequest*, 23 May 1894, Articles 1-5. WCA.

453 **Sir John Murray Scott** (b.1847, d.1912) See Appendix for Biographical Summary.

454 *Report of the Committee Appointed by the Treasury to Consider the Housing of the Collection of the Works of Art Bequeathed to the Nation by the late Lady Wallace* (London: Harrison and Sons, July 1897).

Following this report, the internal hierarchy of the Wallace Collection was laid out in a Treasury Minute of 26 July 1897 that appointed the institution’s trustees and keeper. Of significance in determining the new museum’s internal organisational hierarchy was the Rosebery Minute of 1894, which had recently reconfigured the power relations between the National Gallery trustees and director. In principle, the Rosebery Minute revoked the powers granted to the director in the 1855 Treasury Minute, the same Minute that had led to the appointment of Eastlake as the institution’s first director nearly forty years prior. Beginning with Eastlake, and continuing throughout the second half of the nineteenth century, directors of the National Gallery exercised a considerable degree of authority in the determination of the museum’s acquisitions. The Rosebery Minute divested the National Gallery director of the authority to make those decisions and vested it instead in the shared authority of the gallery’s board of trustees, which was expanded to include the director as a trustee ex officio. Following the precedent established by the Rosebery Minute, the trustees of the Wallace Collection were granted a dominant position in the administration of the gallery and were given authority over the activities of the keeper who, in the absence of a director, was the de facto administrative head of the gallery.

From the outset, the Wallace Collection’s board was dominated by members of the aristocracy. There were seven original trustees: John Murray Scott, Alfred Charles de Rothschild, Lord Rosebery, Lord Redesdale, Sir Arthur Ellis, Sir Edward Malet and Sir John Sterling Maxwell. As was customary within the national collection, each of these trustees was to hold their positions on the board for life. Murray Scott, Rothschild and Redesdale were to emerge as the most outspoken members of the board during the Wallace Collection’s formative years. Notably, all three of these individuals also
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served as trustees of the National Gallery and were men of substantial wealth. Redesdale, who early in his life worked on behalf of the Foreign Office as a diplomat in China and Japan, had inherited a considerable fortune from his cousin, the first earl of Redesdale, in 1886. Rothschild, at one time a director of the Bank of England, was an heir to his family’s banking fortune. Murray Scott had received a substantial inheritance from Lady Wallace that included artworks and two properties in Paris, 2 rue Laffitte and Château de Bagatelle.

Given these circumstances, it would seem that the trustees’ power to control the activities of the institution was nearly absolute. However, this was not the case. As Geddes Poole observes, final authority over the Wallace Collection emanated not from the trustees, but from the Treasury. Ultimately the Treasury controlled all decisions related to the Wallace Collection’s financial matters and oversaw the appointment of both the keeper and the trustees. As First Lord of the Treasury, the Prime Minister was responsible for the determination of these appointments and his decisions were reported through official communications from the Treasury office. The Treasury’s authority to select, appoint, and dismiss the keeper would prove to be a point of contention for the Wallace Collection trustees, who resented that they had no official control over the selection of the keeper whose work they supervised.

The trustees’ power was further compromised by confusion as to the limitations of their authority and generally poor relations with the Treasury. The Wallace Collection was not alone in this respect as a similarly acrimonious situation existed at the National Gallery

460 Rothschild was appointed as a National Gallery trustee in 1892, Murray Scott in 1897, Redesdale in 1908.
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throughout the early twentieth century. The combative relationship between the Wallace Collection board and the Treasury may be gleaned from a 1911 letter in which Phillips warned MacColl that the trustees tend to look with ‘amusement’ upon the official guidelines set down by the Treasury. As the forthcoming discussion shows, the strained relations between the Wallace Collection trustees and the Treasury was indicative of tension at other institutional levels as well: not only between the Treasury and trustees, but also between the trustees and keeper.

*Claude Phillips, D.S. MacColl and British Art Criticism at the Turn of the Century*

The keeper of the Wallace Collection was classified as an employee of the civil service, which since 1870 had operated increasingly under a system of meritocracy. Both Phillips and MacColl gained their keepership positions on the basis of their reputations as art critics. On the surface, a number of parallels appear to unite their career trajectories. Both were well-educated and well-travelled and established themselves as writers in the popular press during the early 1890s. Further, in 1903, both Phillips and MacColl would be closely involved in the foundation of the National Art Collections Fund and the *Burlington Magazine*.

Yet underlying these similarities were important differences. To begin with, the disparities between MacColl and Phillips’ economic and social circumstances were notable. Born into a wealthy family, Phillips was educated primarily in France and Germany. After receiving an M.A. from London University he worked as a solicitor before being called to the bar in 1883. Following extensive travels in Italy and France, Phillips began to write criticism on art and music for the *Daily Telegraph*, which was owned by his mother’s family. Phillips’ familial wealth allowed him the opportunity to build up a personal art collection of his own. He amassed a substantial collection of paintings and sculpture, including works by Rodin, which he eventually bequeathed to
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467 MacColl took up his tenure at the Wallace Collection in 1911, by which time he had already been employed as a keeper at Tate Gallery for five years. However, MacColl had gained his initial appointment at the Tate Gallery through his work as an art critic.
the Victoria & Albert Museum. It is for these reasons that Frank Hermann describes Phillips as the embodiment of the gentleman connoisseur turned keeper. 468

In contrast, MacColl was born into a family of relatively modest means. Whereas Phillips had found entrance into art criticism through his familial connections, MacColl’s opportunities were the result of his academic achievements and his experience as a practising artist. 469 His early education took place in Glasgow, where his father was a minister. The family later relocated to London and it was there that MacColl completed an M.A. at University College, London. While undertaking his degree, MacColl won a prize for political economy in 1881 and afterwards studied at Lincoln College, Oxford, winning a prize for poetry in 1882. In addition to his academic studies, MacColl also took art lessons at the Westminster School of Art. Upon his father’s death, he received a modest inheritance that supplemented his income throughout the 1890s as he worked as an art critic, first for the Spectator and later for the Saturday Evening Review. It was during this same time that MacColl began to exhibit his own watercolours and from 1892 onward he was a regular participant in the shows put on by the New English Art Club.

Phillips and MacColl further differed in their approaches to art criticism. Phillips was inclined towards a verbose style that was heavily influenced by immediate emotional response. In contrast, MacColl employed a more critical and analytical style that was grounded in scholarship. Although MacColl’s writing was by no means impartial or free from personal judgments it was overall much less tied to emotional response than was Phillips.

British art criticism was in a state of flux during the period in which Phillips and MacColl began writing regularly for the popular press. The influence of art critics had strengthened over the second half of the nineteenth century, as sites of authority within the British art world diversified and increased. 470 In the mid-nineteenth century, the

468 Herrmann, 1972, p.49.
470 Fletcher and Helmreich, 2008; Dianne Sachko Macleod, Art and the Victorian Middle Class: Money and the Making of Cultural Identity (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996). This was due in part to the rapid growth of the art market post-1850, which expanded in proportion to the newly improved means of communication fostered by innovations in transportation networks.
overriding tenor of art criticism was one of education and the facilitation of appreciation for the arts; writers such as Samuel Carter Hall of the *Art Journal* and Tom Taylor of the *Times* are representative of the critics who adopted the role of educator. However, the ubiquity of this type of educationally oriented art criticism proved to be relatively short lived. In the wake of the Whistler-Ruskin trial of 1878, art critics increasingly used their writing as a platform for the promotion of particular artists and schools.

By the 1890s British art criticism was polarised around a contentious public debate surrounding the merit and integrity of both British contemporary art and French Impressionism. This debate, which would persist into the first decade of the twentieth century, pitted a group of young art critics, dubbed the ‘New Critics’ against a group of older critics known as the ‘Philistines’. In the tradition of Ruskin, the Philistines promoted an approach to art that was intensely moralistic. They were inclined to a literal style of interpretation, whereby it was possible to ‘read’ an artwork and ascertain both its meaning and worth. The Philistines maligned French Impressionism, which the New Critics were passionately committed to promoting. For their part, the New Critics wished to distance themselves from moralistic readings of art and looked instead, as Kate Flint explains, towards ‘the formalist concerns of Roger Fry and Clive Bell.

MacColl was amongst the most outspoken of the New Critics. His memoirs attest to the extent that the debate surrounding British contemporary art and French Impressionism consumed the energies of the critics active during this time. Reflecting on this period of his career, MacColl later wrote, ‘the first task for a critic in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was to champion some of the senior artists still in dispute, Manet, Degas, Whistler and Rodin, the Impressionists and others. The second was to single out the newer talents of the time.’
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The struggles between the New Critics and Philistines that occurred in the 1890s should be understood in the context of a mounting effort on the part of a number of art critics to exert a greater degree of influence over established art world institutions. This effort manifested itself most visibly in two collaborative ventures in 1903: the National Art Collections Fund and the *Burlington Magazine*. While the National Art Collections Fund was founded to increase the purchasing power of the National Gallery it also had a secondary agenda to influence the selection of the artworks that were acquired for the nation. 476 A similarly dual intent informed the creation of the *Burlington Magazine*. Helen Rees Leahy observes that the creation of the publication signified the establishment of an institutional platform from which the new generation of critics could legitimately voice their dissent and dissatisfaction with the administration and management of the national collections. 477

The critics’ push towards the creation of platforms through which they could simultaneously assert, strengthen and legitimise their authority was indicative of broader societal changes. In the aftermath of the Industrial Revolution, power hierarchies within society were increasingly organised along lines of meritocracy, a consequence of the growing recognition of individual expertise as a valuable form of capital. 478 Simultaneously, a rising class of plutocrats was reshaping the composition of the aristocracy from within while economic realities were weakening the financial position of the once dominant landed class. 479 With the convergence of these phenomena came a questioning of the old established order and the knowledge base associated with it. As a professionalising work force whose advancement within society was linked to their


479 Cannadine, 1990, pp.90-102; Geddes Poole, 2010, p.6. As Cannadine explains, a decline in grain prices in the 1870s and the resulting depreciation of land value dealt a severe economic blow to the landed aristocracy. Moreover, the Third Reform Act of 1884 stunted the political authority of this group and their economic situation was worsened by the introduction of new death duties in 1894.
individual expertise emerged, the value and supremacy of the gentleman amateur’s approach was viewed with increasing scepticism. 480

Both Phillips and MacColl were active participants in the foundation of both the National Art Collections Fund and the *Burlington Magazine*. MacColl took an especially prominent role in these ventures. This was characteristic of MacColl who, throughout his career, would position himself as an advocate for expertise grounded in scholarship, denouncing what he saw as an intertwined allegiance to amateur understandings of art and bureaucratic procedure. The most dramatic example of this may be seen in his leadership of the campaign to redress the maladministration of the Chantrey bequest in 1903. MacColl accused the trustees of the Chantrey bequest with deliberately misinterpreting its terms in order to infiltrate the Tate Gallery’s collection with artworks of dubious quality produced by the Royal Academy. 481 MacColl argued that, according to the specific wording of the bequest, the artworks acquired did not need to be by a British artist but needed only to have been created by an artist working within Britain. 482 MacColl’s accusations led to a public inquiry which resulted in a re-evaluation of the way the bequest was administered. In triumph, MacColl published an account of his crusade soon after. 483

For MacColl, the National Art Collections Fund and the *Burlington Magazine* served as vital resources in a campaign to anchor the study of art in a more formalist methodology, distanced from the connoisseurial approach of the gentlemanly amateur. This was a conviction shared by Roger Fry, with whom MacColl frequently engaged in critical debates. 484 The most famous of these played out over a period of several years and centred around the relative merits of the art work of Paul Cézanne. Fry was amongst


483 MacColl, 1904.

Cézanne’s earliest and most vocal champions in Britain. Applying his theory of aesthetics to an analysis of the artist’s works, Fry argued that Cézanne’s art represented a perfect synthesis of vision and design. MacColl adopted a contrary stance contending that Cézanne’s paintings did not succeed either as abstractions or, as Fry suggested, as representations of universal symbols. MacColl wrote that he was not convinced that Cézanne’s ‘infraction of forms’ achieved ‘new and mysterious means of conveying solidity and recession.’ Of interest in this debate is the emphasis that both critics placed on formalist concerns as this attests to Fry and MacColl’s shared desire to both legitimise and define the parameters of art history in Britain.

In contrast, Phillips’ approach represents a curious merger of the ethos of the New Critics and the gentleman amateur. He largely eschewed the formalist methodology which characterised MacColl and Fry’s art criticism. Revealingly, Phillips felt that photographs were unreliable and preferred instead to rely on his memory when making attributions. S.J. Camp, an assistant at the Wallace Collection from 1898 who would later assume the keepership upon MacColl’s departure in 1924, later recalled of Phillips: ‘I do not remember him ever using a single photograph and his notes in the catalogue were always made from memory.’ In his heavy reliance on his own connoisseurial judgements and his disengagement from formalist concerns, Phillips’ approach did not appear to differ greatly from that of the gentleman amateur whom critics like MacColl and Fry wished to distance themselves from. Yet at the same time Phillips identified with the cause of the New Critics on a number of levels, as evidenced by his alignment with the National Art Collections Fund and the Burlington Magazine. He bemoaned the steady export of British-owned artworks and, as we will see, rejected the Philistines’
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conviction that the merit of art was fundamentally tied to its moral message. Moreover, Phillips’ personal correspondence with MacColl reveals a deep shared resentment towards what he termed ‘the stonewall of official indifference.’ As we turn to an examination of the efforts of Phillips and MacColl in their tenures at the Wallace Collection, the significance of their respective positions within the field of British art criticism becomes apparent.

*A Portrait of Two Keepers: The Tenures of Phillips and MacColl*

The Treasury Minute of 26 July 1897 stated that the role of the Wallace Collection’s keeper was to encompass duties:

> [...] which will consist under the general direction of the Trustees in the control of the Staff attendants, and the arrangement and custody of the Works of Art. The Keeper will however also be entrusted with the duty of cataloguing the various Collections, a task for which high qualifications of artistic taste and knowledge shall be required.

When the board of the Wallace Collection convened for the first time on 9 August 1897 their primary concern was the degree of authority that they were allowed to exert over Phillips’ activities as keeper; seeking clarification, they resolved to write to the Treasury. Soon afterward the trustees corresponded with Phillips, informing him that if his work as a critic at the *Daily Telegraph* interfered with his ability to perform the duties of the keepership then he would have to give up the former. This initial interaction between the trustees and Phillips set the tone for the strained relations between the keeper and the board that would characterise the administration of the Wallace Collection for the next fourteen years.

In the three years leading up to the museum’s opening, the trustees established tight control over the decoration and installation of the galleries. Under the leadership of chairman Murray Scott, the board adopted an aesthetic policy that closely adhered to the
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founders’ vision. (Figures 24 & 25) The minutes of the trustee meetings that took place during this time reveal numerous board discussions about the selection of fabrics, lighting and placement of furniture. No detail in the gallery’s arrangement seems to have been regarded as too minor to warrant trustee scrutiny and input. The minutes of a meeting from the 19 June 1900, three days before the museum’s official public opening, serve as an illustrative example: ‘Sir John Stirling Maxwell drew attention to the framing of the watercolours in Gallery 21 and 22 in gold mounts and desired to have it recorded that he objected to these and preferred the use of white mounts.’

Phillips was given little opportunity to participate in these discussions. In a 1934 letter to MacColl, Stirling Maxwell, the youngest of the original trustees, recalled Phillips’ exclusion from decisions related to the initial installation of the collection:

There was a small Arrangement Committee, formal or informal, in which Murray Scott, Redesdale and Alfred Rothschild took the leading part. There was never any idea of putting me on this Committee but I attended most of the meetings at which Rosebery used to preside. Rosebery couldn’t bear Claude Phillips. I don’t think any of the others much liked him either and nature had not at all fitted him for the difficult role of a Keeper dealing with active Trustees. That job requires a strong man like yourself or a perfect worm. Phillips was neither.

Stirling Maxwell’s assessment of the trustees’ disdain for Phillips is corroborated by the recollections of S.J. Camp and Phillips himself. This dislike was mutual as Phillips lamented what he saw as a lack of sophistication and understanding of connoisseurship on the part of the trustees’. He was, for instance, particularly horrified when Rothschild suggested regilding the eighteenth-century French furniture.
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Barred from involvement in the installation and decoration of the galleries, it was necessary that Phillips’ contribution to the interpretation of the art objects in the Wallace Collection would come in the form of writing. However, in this endeavour, Phillips faced a separate set of problems related to the way in which many of the art works in the collection, particularly the eighteenth-century French paintings, were generally perceived.

By the latter half of the nineteenth century, a taste for both eighteenth-century French painting and *objets d’art* had been cultivated amongst British aristocratic collectors. Yet while this genre of art had achieved both value and legitimacy in the eyes of private collectors, it was a typology with which the Victorian public was ill at ease.

There was a long tradition in British art writing that viewed art produced by the French as inferior and morally questionable. Giles Waterfield notes that as early as 1818 William Young Ottley derided the French School in his catalogue of the collection of the 2nd Marquess of Stafford, asserting that French art had never been highly regarded outside of its country of origin. Such hostility had as much to do with national pride as it did with the artistic merit of the works in question. Tellingly, Ottley did not condemn the works of the Italians, who were not seen as a political threat to England in the way that France was. Waagen also believed that the French school of painting, as well as the Spanish school, were secondary to the Italian and ‘Flemish-German’ schools which he saw as the principal schools. In a similar fashion, Richard Redgrave’s account of his visit to the Exposition Universelle in Paris in 1855 derided the work of the French School, and the then-contemporary work of Gustave Courbet in particular. Redgrave’s
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account, which found fault in French art on both technical and moral grounds, typified the manner in which the British criticised French art.\textsuperscript{507}

By the time that Phillips assumed the keepership, the New Critics’ focus on formalist concerns was gradually steering art criticism away from discussions which centred primarily on moralistic qualities.\textsuperscript{508} Still, the Ruskinian tradition of linking the inherent worth of artwork to its moral message persisted into the early twentieth century. This concentration on morality was potentially problematic for the interpretation of eighteenth-century French art at the Wallace Collection. Many of the institution’s artworks of this genre, such as Jean-Honoré Fragonard’s\textit{The Swing} and Jean-Baptiste Greuze’s\textit{The Broken Mirror}, possessed overtly erotic overtones. (Figure 20)

These overtones are particularly notable when the eighteenth-century French paintings in the Wallace Collection are contrasted with the limited number of works of this genre held elsewhere in the national collection during this time. The National Gallery, for instance, possessed three paintings by Jean-Baptiste Greuze. (Figures 18 & 19) All three were portraits of children and their overall character was markedly different from that of the majority of the eighteen paintings by Greuze held in the Wallace Collection, most of which depicted young women in various states of undress. (Figure 21)

Phillips acknowledged the Victorian public’s difficult relationship with eighteenth-century French art in his 1901\textit{Art Journal} article: \textsuperscript{509}

\begin{quote}
The idea still sticks that the French art of this time is mainly naughty, artificial and decorative; that it may be admired but with a certain contempt and turning away of the shoulder, with a certain reservation of one’s better self for better things.
\end{quote}

Phillips would confront the challenge posed by this genre in his comprehensive catalogue of the Wallace Collection, first published in 1904.\textsuperscript{510} Yet as Phillips sought to construct an
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argument in defence of these works, his approach to art writing offered him little recourse. The catalogue that he produced is characterised by adjective-laden descriptive paragraphs, accompanied by only the most basic facts about the art works in the collection and brief biographical entries on each artist. Phillips’ entry on Greuze offers a typical example of his approach:\footnote{511}

Some of his portraits of men, as well as of women have great merit, the former showing just virility of conception which is lacking in his studies of girls and his genre pieces. The reputation of Greuze declined greatly in his old age, and he died in indigence. Like many great artists of his time, especially Fragonard and Houdon, he was unable to accommodate himself to the change of taste which set in with the Revolution. The Wallace Collection possesses one of the largest collections of Greuze’s paintings, chiefly fanciful and sentimental figure studies, with one or two portraits.

Phillips’ inclusion of qualitative personal judgements, and his lack of specificity about the exact number of the artist’s works within the collection, are representative of his writing throughout the catalogue. Phillips’ catalogue suggests that he was largely uninterested in object provenance and correspondence preserved in the Wallace Collection archives further attests to this. In response to an inquiry from a visitor seeking information on the Wallace family’s collecting practices, Phillips wrote that such information ‘can only be of minor interest to the general public.’ \footnote{513}

In 1904, the same year in which his catalogue was first published, Phillips was censured by the trustees for writing two articles concerned with the identification of works within the collection. The first of these articles, published in the \textit{Daily Telegraph}, focused on the collection’s \textit{Andromeda and Perseus} painting by Titian. Phillips detailed how he had uncovered the painting hidden behind another affixed to the wall and subsequently identified it as a Titian. \footnote{514} The second article, published in the \textit{Burlington Magazine}, similarly chronicled the uncovering and identification of another work, this one a small bronze relief, which Phillips entitled ‘A Dance with Nymphs’ and attributed to the
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Quattrocento.\textsuperscript{515} The trustees took offense to these articles, believing that they implied that they were ignorant of the extent of the museum’s holdings. Consequently, the trustees forbade Phillips from commenting on the collection in the public press without their express permission.\textsuperscript{516} \textit{(Figures 28 & 29)}

Phillips’ censure highlights the degree to which the trustees felt they possessed the greater authority in the interpretation of the collection’s art works. In his 1934 letter to MacColl, Sterling Maxwell recalled the aftermath of the incident and explained how Phillips had sought the aid of his cousin, Lord Burnham, then owner of the \textit{Daily Telegraph}: \textsuperscript{517}

\begin{quote}
I wonder if you have heard how the row between Rosebery and Phillips culminated? Not for the four hundred words. Phillips complained to his kinsman, Lord Burnham, that he was being ridden over rough-shod. Lord Burnham came to Rosebery and said that if the Trustees were not more careful Phillips would tender his resignation, to which Rosebery replied, ‘It will be accepted with alacrity.’ The threat was never repeated.
\end{quote}

Years after he had left the collection, Phillips also alluded to the incident in a letter to MacColl, ‘I never had a free hand, as you probably know, and was constantly at war with the Trustees […] I nearly got dismissed for freely expressing my views.’\textsuperscript{519}

As Phillips’ relationship with the trustees became increasingly acrimonious, his expertise was challenged from outside the institution as well. The month after his article on the Quattrocento bronze appeared in the \textit{Burlington Magazine} Phillips’ attribution was challenged by Bode, who argued that the size and style of the work suggested a Cincquento attribution.\textsuperscript{520} Phillips responded, contending that Bode, having never seen
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the work in person, was in a position of disadvantage as photographs alone were insufficient grounds on which to determine attribution.\textsuperscript{521}

If Phillips’ keepership was characterised by frustration, the same cannot be said for his successor. Assuming the position made vacant by Phillips’ retirement in 1911, MacColl arrived at the institution with the ambition of shaping the gallery’s practices of interpretation and display.\textsuperscript{522} A series of personal notes record his initial impressions of the trustees and in these MacColl identifies chairman Murray Scott, a man whom he describes as ‘gross and ungainly in figure,’ as the chief obstacle to progress within the museum.\textsuperscript{523}

For their part, the trustees were wary of the new keeper. MacColl was by this time well known for his leading role into the investigation into the maladministration of the Chantrey bequest and had served as keeper of the Tate Gallery since 1906. As with Phillips, the trustees had not been consulted about MacColl’s appointment and the news of his employment came to them through an official communication with the Treasury.\textsuperscript{524} Upon learning of the decision, the trustees were moved to include the following note in the institutional minutes: \textsuperscript{525}

\begin{quote}
That the Trustees in view of the appointment of a new Keeper, think it expedient to place on record the fact that the arrangement of the Wallace Collection was carried out solely by them. That arrangement has given the greatest satisfaction and has been approved by the highest expert authorities in Europe. The Trustees, therefore, must impress upon the Keeper that no change of any kind in the existing arrangement can be permitted without the sanction of the Board having previously been obtained.
\end{quote}

Despite this strong statement of intent the dynamics of the board were soon to change. In January 1912 Murray Scott suffered a fatal heart attack, rumoured to have taken place in the gallery in the midst of a heated confrontation with MacColl.\textsuperscript{526} With Murray Scott’s
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death the balance of power between trustees and keeper shifted and MacColl began to exercise greater influence over the interpretation of the institution’s art objects.

In 1913 MacColl produced a revised catalogue of the collection notable for its inclusion of comprehensive provenance information, conspicuously absent from Phillips’ earlier work. In crafting this catalogue, MacColl drew extensively on the recently uncovered Hertford-Mawson correspondence, that consisted of letters between the 4th Marquess and his dealer. MacColl’s utilisation of these letters was not simply opportunistic, but rather the result of a concerted effort to find out more information about the origins and purchase history of the art works in the collection. MacColl had begun working towards this aim soon after his arrival, but found little assistance from Murray Scott.

A comparison of Phillips’ and MacColl’s catalogue descriptions of a particular painting by Greuze, identified in both works as No. 388, attests to the changes that MacColl introduced to his revised edition of the catalogue. (Figures 22 & 23) Phillips’ entry on painting No. 388 notes only the painting’s title, ‘Sorrow,’ and provides its basic dimensions. In contrast, MacColl’s entry on the work provides a detailed record of its history of sale and display. Refuting the earlier title offered by Phillips, the entry contends that the painting is actually a different work entitled, ‘Psyche.’

Outside of the immediate sphere of the Wallace Collection, the significance of MacColl’s catalogue was recognised by Sir Robert Witt, later to become one of the founders of the Courtauld Institute of Art:

———
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533 Robert Witt to D.S. MacColl, 7 March 1913. MAUG.
I must send you just a line to congratulate you on your new catalogue. I wish everyone appreciated as much as I do the enormous amount of work you have put into it. Indeed the whole thing, as compared with the old edition, is transformed, and it is something of a triumph to have produced the first and only catalogue raisonné of an English public collection.

MacColl also sought to shape the museum’s display practices. Aware of the 1904 controversy caused by Phillips’ critique of Titian’s *Andromeda and Perseus*, MacColl attempted to use the trustees’ lingering frustration over the incident to his own advantage: 

The big Titian, *Andromeda and Perseus*, was badly skied. I think the Trustees had resented the action of Claude Phillips in writing about its authenticity without consulting them. I put it to them that it would reflect upon their taste if it remained in that position, and I got leave to bring it down the line. Now, as every gallery director knows, the alteration of one picture involves many more, and I took the occasion to correct a good many mistakes.

In his efforts to rearrange the paintings, MacColl benefitted from two unexpected occurrences which necessitated the removal of works on display. The first of these took place in 1913, when several paintings were taken off view amidst concerns that they were vulnerable to attacks by Suffragettes. The second removal was far more extensive, and took place in 1916 as the gallery was shut down entirely amidst fears for the collection’s safety during war time. (Figures 30 & 31)

The museum would not reopen until 1920, when the collection was once again reinstalled in its entirety. MacColl took advantage of this interim four year period to plan for a substantial reconceptualisation of the gallery’s aesthetic policy. When the gallery once again opened its doors to the visiting public several notable changes had been made. Where multi-level hangs had been the norm there was now a tendency for pictures to be hung in a line of only one or two deep. (Figures 32 & 33) Moreover, where the majority of works in the collection had formerly been displayed against a backdrop of green and red brocade, they were now exhibited in rooms that had been painted a neutral
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cream colour.\(^{539}\) (Figures 26 & 27) Describing the redecoration in a pamphlet published to coincide with the reopening, MacColl wrote: \(^{540}\)

> In London, winters light is precious, and from those clear surfaces light is reflected instead of being absorbed. There is further advantage that the colours of the pictures are not embrowned by the crimson or falsified by the green.

Although dramatic in execution, MacColl’s approach to the reinstallation was not without precedent. Rather, innovations at the National Portrait Gallery, the National Gallery and the Fitzwilliam Museum, anticipated MacColl’s adopted modes of display. Charles Holmes, Director of the National Portrait Gallery from 1909 and the National Gallery from 1916, was a close friend of MacColl’s and also brought substantial changes to the aesthetic policies of the galleries he oversaw.\(^{542}\) At the National Portrait Gallery, Holmes removed the old wallpaper and exposed the woodwork beneath. At the National Gallery, he similarly did away with the traditional green and red brocade backgrounds and covered the exposed wall surface in a neutral paint shade.\(^{543}\) At the Fitzwilliam, Sydney Cockerell transformed the university art museum, streamlining the hang and removing numerous objects that he felt cluttered the gallery and impinged upon the visitor’s experience.\(^{544}\)

MacColl corresponded regularly with Cockerell and their letters demonstrate that the two men often delved deeply into minute matters of art historical concern.\(^{545}\) Notably,
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MacColl was among those who had written a letter of support for Cockerell upon his application for the directorship of the Fitzwilliam in 1910, lauding him as an accomplished Medievalist scholar and adept administrator.\textsuperscript{546}

I draw attention to the work of Holmes and Cockerell to illustrate that MacColl’s endeavours were indicative of a larger shift towards the implementation of display practices that emphasised the rarity and originality of art works and placed them at the centre of the visitor experience. It is likely that these men were aware of the similarity between their approach and that of Gilman at the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston. Like MacColl, Holmes was deeply involved with the \textit{Burlington Magazine} during its formative years and Gilman’s work was frequently praised in the publication around this time.\textsuperscript{547}

\textit{Towards the Connoisseur-Scholar}

In their respective quests to expand their institutional authority within the Wallace Collection, both Phillips and MacColl drew upon the expertise that they had developed as art critics. This approach was a response to an art world in which professional organisations, such as the Museums Association, were still in their infancy and art history had not yet achieved recognition as an independent academic discipline in the British university system.

Ultimately, MacColl was far more successful than Phillips in shaping the Wallace Collection’s practices of interpretation and display. The reasons for this are worth considering, as they attest to changing expectations of the executive’s expertise and institutional role and are indicative of a definite and observable shift towards professionalisation within the British art museum field. To begin with, it is necessary to acknowledge that some of MacColl’s success at the Wallace Collection was due to circumstances and events beyond his direct control. Certainly, the death of Murray Scott and the upset caused by the Suffragette movement and by the First World War proved

\textsuperscript{546} Letter for MacColl displayed as part of the Fitzwilliam Museum exhibition: \textit{I Turned It into a Palace: Sydney Cockerell and the Fitzwilliam Museum} (4 November 2008 - 17 March 2009). Panaytova’s publication, cited above, was created in conjunction with this exhibition. See also: Panaytova, 2008, p.55.
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advantageous as he sought to exert his influence. Additionally, it is clear that MacColl was far more adept than Phillips at dealing with the trustees on a social level. This is noteworthy, for it reinforces an idea touched upon in the previous chapter and to be revisited in the proceeding case study: that the formation of positive social connections with non-executives was ultimately crucial to the executive’s ability to influence institutional aims and policy.

The factors mentioned above notwithstanding, MacColl’s success at the Wallace Collection was primarily due to his ability to incorporate a more formalist methodology into his endeavours in the gallery and to align himself with scholarly art historical discourses in the press. In essence, this was not a fundamentally different strategy to the one employed by Phillips, who also strived to become an active participant in the gallery’s interpretive practices and to take part in discussions in the press. However, as we have seen, Phillips was frustrated in these endeavours as he approached both his curatorial work and art criticism from the perspective of a gentlemanly amateur, a vantage point that was quickly becoming outmoded. Thus, what determined MacColl and Phillips’ ability to shape institutional change was not their basic strategy but rather the nature of the expertise upon which that strategy relied.

With the creation of new institutional platforms such as the National Art Collections Fund and the Burlington Magazine, the parameters of public conversations about art objects and their histories were becoming more structured.548 While the voices contributing to these discussions were distinct, they were also increasingly homogeneous in their emphasis upon the importance of primary source documentation and research; Phillips’ 1904 quarrel with Bode in the Burlington Magazine attests to this. For art museum workers such as MacColl, Cockerell and Holmes, the scholarly art historical discourses presented via these platforms were intimately connected to a curatorial turn towards the principles of aesthetic idealism and the further codification of a distinctive knowledge base grounded in substantive scholarship.

The tenures of men such as MacColl, Cockerell and Holmes are illustrative of the beginning of a discernible shift towards professionalisation within the British art world’s interconnected spheres of the art museum and the press. These colleagues interacted with a

demonstrated awareness that they were engaged in a common struggle and that they were not alone in their desire to expand their institutional influence and authority. Further, they were starting to collaborate in the identification and definition of a knowledge base that could serve to simultaneously articulate and differentiate their work from that of non-professionals.

Yet, this move towards professionalisation was complex, fraught with its own tensions and struggles. MacColl, for instance, was never entirely comfortable with the notion of himself as a professional. While his various official appointments indicate that he was firmly established as a privileged art world insider, throughout his life he remained fiercely committed to his identity as an institutional outsider. Roger Fry possessed similarly ambivalent feelings about his status as a professional. The letter below, written by Fry shortly after his return from the Metropolitan and congratulating MacColl on his appointment to the keepership of the Tate Gallery, attests to this:

We are welcomed back to England with the glad news of your appointment. I am delighted and you will do a huge work for English (I beg your pardon, British) art. More than you have done hitherto, I hear from an American friend who knows the R.A that they are quite ‘numb’ however all this will be buried beneath a fine official reserve. God help the New English- we are all becoming officials. Let us make a vow never to be so to one another. Well I am glad that I can say--

Yours in the bonds of red tape

Roger E. Fry

P.S. A copy of this is duly filed in the archives of the Metropolitan Museum.

Fry’s letter highlights the complexities surrounding the British art museum field’s shift towards professionalisation. While both MacColl and Fry were highly invested in their expansion of their influence and authority within the spheres of the art museum and the press, neither one had embarked on their careers with the express purpose of professionalising the role of the art museum executive. Indeed, as Fry’s letter suggests, both were wary about the potential implications of that professionalisation. This is significant as it indicates that MacColl and Fry viewed the professionalisation of curatorial work as a by-product of their struggle to expand their influence and authority within the broader art world, rather than as an end goal in and of itself.

549 Roger Fry to D.S. MacColl, 16 June 1906. MAUG.
MacColl and Fry’s ambivalence towards their professional status as art museum executives speaks to a key difference in the professionalisation of curatorial practice in Britain and the United States. Many of the changes that shaped the British art museum field during the first two decades of the twentieth century, such as the growing disregard for the knowledge base of the gentlemanly amateur and the creation of new institutional platforms through which art world standards and practices were codified, were also observable in American institutions. Yet, as the next chapter will demonstrate, the professionalisation of curatorial practice and the art museum executive’s role in the United States was shaped by an intentionality and self-directedness that was both new and unique within the Anglo-American art world and that would result in the creation of the connoisseur-scholar.

CHAPTER THREE

The Museum Course at Harvard University

As men like MacColl, Cockerell and Holmes worked to increase their institutional authority and influence, their colleagues across the Atlantic were striving towards similar aims. It was in 1919 that Henry Watson Kent, by then an established fixture in the administration of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and Paul J. Sachs, Assistant Professor in the Fine Arts Department at Harvard University, shared a train journey together.\(^{551}\) As they travelled, Kent and Sachs conversed about the changing needs of the American art museum. Noting a rise in the number of institutions being established, they found themselves united by a common concern that there was a scarcity of trained workers prepared to meet the demands of the expanding field. Both agreed that what was needed was a formal training programme devoted to the instruction of a new generation of art museum executives: individuals able to balance a commitment to the principles of aesthetic idealism with the demands of institutional management. In his memoirs, Sachs would identify this conversation as a pivotal moment in his decision to establish the Museum Course in 1921.\(^{552}\)

Officially titled ‘Fine Arts 15a: Museum Work and Museum Problems’, the Museum Course was a collaborative venture between Harvard University’s Fine Arts Department and the Fogg Art Museum. The Museum Course was the country’s first significant and sustained programme dedicated to the training of art museum leaders and it played a pivotal role in launching the careers of a generation of professionals who would assume positions of authority within the mid-twentieth century art museum field.\(^{553}\) The notable


\(^{552}\) Sachs, 1957/8, p.168. HFMA.


This chapter looks closely at the ideas and activities surrounding the Museum Course and reflects on the programme’s relationship to the professionalisation of art museum work in the United States. The discussion that follows is divided into three parts. It begins with a detailed description of the Museum Course, situating the programme’s structure and aims in the broader academic and institutional contexts of which it was a part. Next, it articulates and examines Sachs’ concept of the connoisseur-scholar ideal as it was expressed via the philosophy and curriculum of the programme. Lastly, it looks to Sachs’ part in the mentorship and guidance of the careers of two individuals whom he fashioned in the mould of the connoisseur-scholar, Alfred H. Barr, Jr. and Frederick Mortimer Clapp. Both Barr and Clapp would emerge as art museum leaders in the late 1920s, respectively assuming the directorship of the Museum of Modern Art and the Frick Collection.

As with the other case studies in this thesis, this chapter draws heavily on archival research. However, it is also indebted to examinations of the Museum Course and the Fogg Art Museum undertaken separately by Sally Anne Duncan, Sybil Gordon Kantor, Kathryn Brush and Donald Preziosi. These scholars have provided valuable insight into Sachs’ teaching methodology and the argument presented here builds upon their findings.

The Museum Course was established during a period of unprecedented growth in the American art museum field. By 1920-1930 the number of art museums in the country increased by more than a third, rising from approximately one hundred to more than one hundred and sixty. This rapid expansion was fostered and bolstered by a steep increase in financial support from philanthropic foundations that had the means to shape cultural policy. Chief amongst these organisations was the Carnegie Corporation, founded by Andrew Carnegie in 1911 and chartered to ‘promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding among people of the United States.’ Originally devoted to the professionalisation of the American library system, in 1922 the Carnegie Corporation started to orient itself towards the promotion of art education and art appreciation with an intention ‘to educate the public tastes and to train men and women who may interpret the arts to the body of the people.’ In line with these aims, the organisation began to channel its funds into the creation of art museum projects and training initiatives to ensure that these new institutions were overseen by qualified staff.

In 1923 Frederick Paul Keppel, a personal friend of Sachs, was appointed as President of the Carnegie Corporation. Soon after, the Museum Course became a direct beneficiary of the Carnegie Corporation’s philanthropy, receiving a series of substantial grants from

555 By 1920, over a hundred art museums had been founded in the fifty years since the founding of the Metropolitan and the Museum of Fine Arts. See: Lawrence Coleman, *Handbook of American Museums* (Washington D.C: American Association of Museums, 1932).

556 Significantly, a 1933 Carnegie Corporation Report notes that in the ten years between 1920 and 1930 private gifts to art institutions rose from $2.6 million to $18 million. See: DiMaggio, 1991, p.272.


560 *Frederick Paul Keppel* (b.1875, d.1943) See Appendix for Biographical Summary.
the organisation between 1924-1931, some in excess of $100,000.\textsuperscript{561} This financial support was both a testament to Sachs’ influential art world connections and an indication of the extent to which the Museum Course was seen as a potential vehicle for redressing the art museum field’s need for skilled workers.

Initiated as an experimental programme in 1921, the Museum Course became a permanent offering of Harvard University’s Fine Arts Department in 1923.\textsuperscript{562} Sachs oversaw the development of the Museum Course and served as the programme’s primary lead instructor until his retirement in 1948.\textsuperscript{563} Before examining the Museum Course’s structure and aims in greater depth, a brief consideration of the Fine Arts Department’s Fogg Art Museum and Sachs’ relationship to the institution is warranted. This is a valuable exercise, for the Museum Course’s content and approach was heavily influenced by the Fogg’s laboratory ethos and Sachs’ unique art world position, straddling the spheres of the art market, the museum and the university.

Situated on the Harvard University campus, the Fogg was central to the activities of the Fine Arts Department. Established in 1895, the museum was created in the waning years of Charles Eliot Norton’s tenure.\textsuperscript{564} Donald Preziosi has looked closely at the early development of the Fogg, viewing it as a paradigmatic example of art history’s attempt to establish itself as a systematic and ‘scientific’ practice in the late-nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{565} Preziosi contends that the museum’s establishment was significant as it represented the creation of ‘the first institution specifically designed to house the entire disciplinary apparatus of art history in one space.’\textsuperscript{566} Initially, the Fogg did not display works of art in a traditional gallery setting, but instead functioned as ‘a laboratory for study, demonstration, teaching and for training in the material circumstances of artistic

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{561} For discussion of the relationship between the Museum Course and the Carnegie Corporation see: Brush, 2004, p.73; DiMaggio, 1991, pp.274-8; Condliffe-Lagemann, 1992, pp.100-122.
\item \textsuperscript{562} Alexander, 1997, p.212.
\item \textsuperscript{563} After Sachs’ retirement the Museum Course continued to run until 1968 under the direction of John Coolidge, Sachs’ successor at the Fogg. See: Tassel, 2002, p.50.
\item \textsuperscript{564} The Museum was funded by a bequest from the widow of William Hayes Fogg; Norton retired from the Department in 1898.
\item \textsuperscript{565} Preziosi, 1992.
\item \textsuperscript{566} Preziosi, 1992, p.365.
\end{itemize}
production.\textsuperscript{567} To further this goal, the museum established a slide and photographic collection that Preziosi argues served as a ‘data bank’ from which a variety of art historical narratives, ‘aesthetic, semantic and historical,’ could be fashioned within the framework of Norton’s moralistic approach.\textsuperscript{568} It should be noted that the ‘laboratory’ model adopted by the Fogg was not an anomaly within the Harvard system, but rather was in keeping with how the university’s natural science departments were structured.\textsuperscript{569}

In 1909 Edward Waldo Forbes, a former student of Norton, was appointed to the directorship of the Fogg.\textsuperscript{570} While Forbes was committed to the institution’s founding mission, he was also intent on collecting art works valued for their rarity and originality. Soon after his arrival, he implemented a policy of strategic acquisitions and solicitation of gifts.\textsuperscript{571} Amongst the new patrons that Forbes attracted to the institution was Sachs, who began donating art works to the museum in 1911. An established collector of prints and drawings, Sachs was then working in New York for his family’s investment firm, Goldman-Sachs. In 1912, a year after his donations to the museum began, Sachs was invited by Forbes to sit on the institution’s Visiting Committee. As Kathryn Brush observes, this invitation was likely a strategic move on Forbes’ part, an effort to capitalize on Sachs’ connections with elite New York collectors who might be recruited to support the institution.\textsuperscript{572} This was the beginning of Sachs’ involvement with the Fine Arts Department and the Fogg; he was made an Assistant Professor in 1917 and became the gallery’s Associate Director in 1923. Together, Sachs and Forbes implemented modes of display within the museum’s gallery space that reflected their shared commitment to the principles of aesthetic idealism. (Figures 44 & 45) Further, they collaborated to raise the Fogg’s international profile. Brush suggests that the 1927

\textsuperscript{567} Preziosi, 1992, p.365.

\textsuperscript{568} Preziosi, 1992, p.366.

\textsuperscript{569} Brush, 2004, p.21.

\textsuperscript{570} Edward Waldo Forbes (b. 1873, d.1969) See Appendix for Biographical Summary.

\textsuperscript{571} Brush, 2004, pp.22-25.

remodel of the museum embodied the institution’s reoriented aims under the leadership of Sachs and Forbes.\(^{573}\) (Figure 35)

During his own career, Sachs assumed a variety of roles within the art museum field: patron, collector, educator, advisor and museum administrator. This breadth of experience placed him in a prime position to appreciate and comprehend the particular pressures and demands that accompanied different types of art museum work. From the outset, Sachs was explicit in his desire that the Museum Course should serve a vocational purpose and that upon completion of the programme students should be equipped to work in any number of capacities across the museum field: as curators, directors, teachers and researchers.\(^{574}\)

The Museum Course’s vocational aims were reflected in its structure. The syllabus that Sachs devised for the programme intertwined the history, theory and philosophy of museums with instruction that was directly applicable to institutional practices.\(^{575}\) Students were required to attend weekly seminars in Sachs’ residence, Shady Hill, formerly the home of Charles Eliot Norton. (Figure 41) There Sachs led lessons designed to equip students with the practical skills they would need as art museum leaders. Some of these lessons centred around the first-hand examination of art objects and were intended to impart an understanding of connoisseurship.\(^{576}\) Sachs told his students that the art objects that they selected for their future institutions would be their legacy.\(^{577}\) Therefore, it was imperative that they were able to make informed decisions about the aesthetic and monetary value of the objects they encountered. At other times, Sachs shared correspondence between himself and other art world players with his students, engaging them in discussion about the

574 Sachs, 1957/8, pp.368-369. HFMA.
575 (Sally Anne) Duncan, ‘Harvard's "Museum Course" and the Making of America's Museum Profession’, 2002, p.3. For example of a typical lesson at Shady Hill: Museum Course Record of Meeting, Shady Hill, 16 March 1931. HFMA.
appropriate strategies and protocol for dealing with museum colleagues, dealers and collectors.  

Once a week, Sachs’ students also undertook work *in situ* within the Fogg. Classes frequently took place in the gallery space and guest lectures from visiting museum workers - curators, directors, registrars and librarians - made up a significant portion of the course. Additionally, students received instruction from Forbes, who would discuss issues related to museum management, and Arthur Pope, a member of the Fine Arts Department faculty, who led lessons based around hands-on instruction in artistic practices. During Pope’s lessons, students were encouraged to experiment with materials such as egg tempera and oil paint. (Figure 36) This practical engagement with materials was not meant to imitate, in Sachs’ words, ‘traditional art school procedures’, but was instead intended to bring students to a deeper understanding of technique and formalist concerns. Sachs would later recall:

The thinking of Arthur Pope […] led to the development of a series of courses on Theory of Design and the Practice of Drawing and Painting…it was far from his purpose to train so-called ‘professional artists.’ We all shared his conviction, however, that the kind of instruction he offered—a help to better understanding through close reasoning—was of fundamental importance for future museum workers […]

As Pope’s teaching methods indicate, the laboratory ethos implemented under Norton’s leadership still lingered within the Fine Arts Department and the Fogg. This legacy proved a valuable resource for Sachs’ Museum Course students, providing them with a model and a means to bridge theory and practice. Students’ participation in the creation and mounting of an exhibition within the Fogg gallery space, to be discussed further in

---


579 Examples of visiting lectures from museum workers: *Museum Course Record of Meeting*, 1 December 1930. HFMA; *Museum Course Record of Meeting*, 21 February 1931. HFMA; *Museum Course Record of Meeting*, 27 February 1931. HFMA; *Museum Course Record of Meeting*, 16 March 1931. HFMA.
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the next section of this chapter, serves as a prime example of the manner in which the laboratory model shaped the Museum Course’s approach. So to does Sachs’ insistence that students work towards compiling original bibliographies of art objects and art historical periods that could be used to further understandings of the disciplinary parameters of the subject. Students were encouraged to view these bibliographies as real and substantial contributions to the collective knowledge of the broader art world. Enabling students to become active participants in the art museum sphere, projects such as these reinforced the vocational aims of the programme.

Outside of lessons at Shady Hill and the Fogg, visits to private collections and galleries also formed an integral part of the programme. These visits were made possible by virtue of Sachs’ extensive art world contacts and had a dual purpose: they allowed students to come into direct contact with consecrated art objects and at the same time afforded the opportunity for Sachs’ to impart knowledge about the inner workings of the art world.

Combining gallery lectures with hands-on art instruction and visits to prominent dealers and collectors, Sachs sought to promote an awareness of the many contexts through which art objects could be understood: academic, social and economic. Accordingly, he did not champion one particular method of the study and analysis of objects, but encouraged his students to master the many vantage points through which they could be evaluated: art historical, critical and connoisseurial. In structuring the programme in this way, Sachs’ intention was to offer an overview of the art museum field and how it functioned and to simultaneously provide instruction and direction as to how the field could be successfully and strategically navigated. This was indicative of Sachs’ desire to provide a blueprint for would-be entrants into

583 Sachs, 1957/8, p.181. HFMA.
585 For example, the following correspondence shows Sachs arranging private visits to the Frick Collection (before it was opened to the public) and the Morgan Library: Helen Clay Frick to Paul Sachs, 11 December 1924. HFMA; Paul Sachs to Helen Clay Frick, 3 December 1930. HFMA; Paul Sachs to Belle da Costa Green, 12 December 1930. HFMA.
the field and to equip those entrants with the knowledge base that Sachs himself had acquired through his own art world experience. (Figures 37, 38 & 39)

On average, approximately twelve to fifteen students took part in the Museum Course each year. However, the exact number of participants in the programme is difficult to know, as it was possible to audit the programme. Some Museum Course students were formally enrolled in graduate studies at Harvard, others elected to take part in the programme independent of institutional affiliation. Further complicating the matter was the fact that students were admitted to the programme at Sachs’ discretion, rather than applying directly through the university. There were no standardised entry requirements for the programme, although a B.A. degree and a demonstrated interest in art and museums was expected.

While a comprehensive list of graduates is not available, Sachs’ memoirs and personal notes contain a wealth of information about the students who took part in the Museum Course. From these sources it is clear that a high proportion of students who came to study with Sachs on the Museum Course had already completed university degrees in art history. This is significant as it attests to the extent that the Museum Course satisfied a need for practical training that was not being met by university art history programmes. The number of American university art history programmes had been rising steadily since the early twentieth century.
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590 The first two decades of the twentieth century saw the establishment of numerous American departments of art history and the conferring of graduate degrees in the subject. A formal department of art history was created at Princeton in 1905. The first PhD in Fine Arts was granted at Harvard in 1913. New York University’s Institute of Fine Arts, a graduate program in the history of art, was founded in 1922. See: Smyth and Lukehart, 1993. From this collection of essays a portrait of academic art history in the early-twentieth century emerges in which the discipline is informed by connoisseurial expertise, ‘scientific’ methodology, practical art instruction and humanistic studies.
Yet for the most part, these programmes were markedly inward looking and were disengaged from larger conversations about the job prospects of graduates.  

The Museum Course was not formally connected to other graduate programmes at Harvard or elsewhere. However, it warrants mention that after the Courtauld Institute’s establishment in 1932, Sachs helped secure Carnegie Corporation funding towards the facilitation of an informal summer course exchange programme between the new British institution and the Museum Course. Further, it is notable that Sachs frequently encouraged his students to participate in projects coordinated by other fine arts graduate programmes; for instance he urged his students to take advantage of the Princeton University’s Index of Christian Art, an extensive art historical databank and image archive.

Most Museum Course students were wealthy and a number came from prominent and socially well-connected families. However, Sachs did not discriminate on the basis of financial need and at times worked to secure special scholarships for students that he felt were particularly deserving. This is worth noting, for although Sachs unashamedly championed the notion of an ‘elite’ group of museum leaders, he valued aptitude, intelligence and potential over family connections and social status. This is illustrated not only in his efforts to secure funding for students, but also in his professional relationships with other art world players. For instance, he

591 Donald Preziosi, *Rethinking Art History: Meditations on a Coy Science*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989); See also: E. Baldwin Smith, ‘The Study of the History of Art in the Colleges and Universities of the United States, 1912’, Appendix II, in Smyth and Lukehart, 1993, pp.13-36. This 1912 survey was the first comprehensive review of art history courses and departments in the United States and is indicative of the lack of consensus as to how the subject should be theorized and taught.


595 This is evident throughout Sachs’ memoirs and personal correspondence. See also: Paul Sachs, *American Association of Museum Presidential Speech* (Transcript, 31 May 1934, Toronto).
was a great admirer of the collector and dealer Joseph Brummer, a once homeless Eastern European immigrant who had learned about the business of the art world from Parisian dealers and worked his way to the top of the New York elite. Sachs also held the collector John Ringling, head of the Ringling Brothers Circus, in high esteem. Ringling was a self-made business man, whom Sachs described as an eccentric, larger than life character. In his lectures to Museum Course students, Sachs often invoked Ringling to illustrate the importance of not prejudging a potential art world contact on the basis of appearance.

Sachs’ efforts to include women in the Museum Course also warrants mention. Harvard was a male-only university at the time and women were typically allowed to receive instruction only through its affiliate institution, Radcliffe College. Therefore, the Museum Course was somewhat unprecedented in offering classes where women and men were admitted as students of the same programme. Sachs was to guide the careers of a number of female graduates, helping them secure positions in museums and libraries across the country. Female graduates of the Museum Course were typically confined to lower-paying and less influential positions within the museum sphere. Still, Sachs’ efforts to engage women in the profession in a meaningful capacity is nevertheless remarkable and stands as an indication of a larger shift towards the inclusion of women in the workplace that would gain momentum during and after the Second World War.

Word of mouth was the driving force behind the Museum Course’s ability to attract new students. The programme became renowned as Sachs’ graduates assumed positions of authority within the art museum field. By the 1930s, a Museum Course education was seen as endorsement of competence, a signal to those already

---
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active in the field that a prospective employee had received the most thorough training for a museum career that was then available. In 1939 Lawrence Coleman, a key executive in the administration of the American Association of Museums, published a critical study of museums in the United States in which he described Sachs’ programme as, ‘the best known preparation for art museum posts of responsibility- no little part of its success being the placement of its graduates.’\textsuperscript{601}

\textit{The Connoisseur-Scholar and the Museum Course}

Sachs’ notion of the connoisseur-scholar was central to the Museum Course’s curriculum and philosophy. In his memoirs, Sachs would describe the connoisseur-scholar as follows:\textsuperscript{602}

\begin{quote}
Just as a university is no better than its teachers, so a museum is no better than its curators. But what kind of curators? Scholars trained to select the ‘best of a type;’ scholars able to publish learned articles and authoritative catalogues; scholars who appreciate the importance of the catalogue raisonné and are conversant with every type of fundamental publication in their fields; scholars who know the bibliography of their subject and calling and who keep abreast of journal literature, including museum bulletins; scholars who have sufficient knowledge of the ‘condition’ of works of art in order to understand when to ask for help from experts in the conservation field. They should also be endowed with a highly developed visual memory, as they are frequently obliged to make prompt decisions about objects in auction rooms; in the market place; or in the homes of potential benefactors—before they are in a position, by comparison with similar documented objects, to check with care first impressions.
\end{quote}

Sachs identified Waagen, Bode, Bernard Berenson and Max Friedlander as embodiments of the connoisseur-scholar ideal, praising the ability of these men to combine ‘instinct, sensibilité, with solid scholarship.’\textsuperscript{603} In Sachs’ construction, the connoisseur-scholar was an individual who possessed intellectual and social skills that were broadly applicable across the art world and which could be adapted to the needs of the interconnecting spheres of the art museum, the market, and the university. Integral to the conception of the connoisseur-scholar was an

\begin{footnotes}

\textsuperscript{602} Sachs, 1957/58. pp.369-70. HFMA.

\textsuperscript{603} Sachs, 1957/58, pp.370-373. HFMA.
\end{footnotes}
acknowledgement of the fluidity that existed between these spheres. Sachs approach to the training of Museum Course students, imparting knowledge that was applicable to art objects while simultaneously explaining the organisation and underlying power structures at play in the broader art world, was representative of his efforts to foster an understanding of this fluidity. Sachs believed that trained connoisseur-scholars, armed with social skills cultivated through mentorship, would be well prepared to meet the needs of the art museum field.

Connoisseurship and scholarship comprised the intellectual skills that a Museum Course student was expected to master. In his memoirs, Sachs defined connoisseurship as the ability ‘to know by the senses,’ adding that ‘in the true humanistic sense, a connoisseur, whether collector or curator, should remember that in addition to knowledge, the senses and instinct--sensibilité--play an important role in his activity.’ Sachs’ understanding of connoisseurship’s function in the Museum Course was shaped in part by Bernard Berenson. Although Sachs referred to Kent as ‘the real father of the Museum Course’, he also engaged with Berenson in prolonged conversations about the role that connoisseurship might play in a curatorial training programme as early as 1914. Berenson’s own understanding of connoisseurship was heavily indebted to the theories of the Italian-born Giovanni Morelli, whose ideas exerted an influence on the practices of art world participants from the 1890s. Formulated in the late nineteenth century, Morelli’s approach was essentially morphological in nature; rooted in observation, it focused on the repetition of physical characteristics and small details within a single painting. With its emphasis on individual pictures, Morelli’s methodology was well-
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607 Giovanni Morelli (b.1816, d.1891) See Appendix for Biographical Summary. Berenson’s debt to Morelli is apparent in his essay, The Rudiments of Connoisseurship, in which he asserts that the three essential materials for the study of the history of art are contemporary documents, tradition, and the work of art themselves; the latter material being the one of primary importance. See: Bernard Berenson, The Study and Criticism of Italian Art (London: George Bell and Sons, 1902), p.111.
suited to the demands of the expanding art market and the needs of dealers, collectors, and critics.

While Berenson’s ideas about connoisseurship greatly informed the philosophy underlying the Museum Course, it would not be accurate to describe Sachs’ approach as completely Morellian in nature.609 Indeed, Preziosi explains, the formalist connoisseurship traditionally associated with the Harvard’s Fine Arts department in the early twentieth century, frequently referred to as the ‘Fogg Method,’ evades easy definition or categorisation.610 While the ‘Fogg Method’ displayed elements of the ‘scientific’ approach popularised by Morelli it also contained lingering reminders of Norton’s moralistic teachings.611

In his Museum Course lectures Sachs made frequent reference to the importance of the connoisseurial ‘eye.’ Charles Rufus Morey, Professor of Art and Archaeology at Princeton University, and an occasional guest lecturer to Museum Course students, espoused a similar belief when he argued that students of art history must be guided by their eye and intuition.612 Further, Sachs stressed the importance of an individual’s visceral and emotional response to a work of art, but also urged students to evaluate artworks from as many contexts as possible. Notes recording a Museum Course meeting held in the gallery of the Fogg in February of 1931 offer insight into Sachs’ approach.613 Assembling the students around a painting identified as a Sassetta, Sachs asked, ‘Forgetting for the moment history, attribution, etc., what is its aesthetic appeal?’614 (Figure 42) Sachs then explained that he had purchased the picture on instinct, knowing nothing about the artist or subject matter, but feeling moved by the its ‘fascinating colour and arresting composition.’ Sachs then relayed the authorities on Sassetta, mentioning

609 Paul Sachs to Bernard Berenson, 17 June 17 1931. HFMA.
612 Charles Rufus Morey, Value of Art as an Academic Subject. Undated Lecture. HFMA.
613 Museum Course Record of Meeting, 27 February, 1931. HFMA.
614 The ‘Sassetta’ described in the Museum Course Notes was The Descent into Limbo, c.1440-1444. It was later attributed to the Master of the Osservanza.
Berenson, and asked the students to describe the story depicted in the painting, explain what materials were used in its creation and assess the object’s condition. Sachs also queried the students as to whether it would be useful to x-ray the work in order to gain more information. Additionally, Sachs questioned those present about the capacity in which the painting might be used to teach undergraduates. Sachs concluded by indicating that the Index of Christian Art at Princeton, a project initiated by Morey, was a useful source of scholarly and historical information.

Sachs attempt to place the Sassetta in the broadest possible framework, weighing its emotional impact and visual appeal alongside provenance, subject matter and historical significance, was representative of the manner in which he blended ideas of connoisseurship and scholarship together in the programme. Sachs encouraged Museum Course students to embrace scholarship on a broad scale. In his memoirs Sachs recalled his plans to further students’ scholarly output by facilitating:

[...] a steady stream of publication to supplement the teaching [...] not only scholarly treatises but also popular lectures and gallery talks; captions and labels under works of art-in short, all forms of publication.

The suggestion that the creation of captions, labels and gallery talks might also constitute a portion of a student’s training highlights another important aspect of the Museum Course: the student exhibition.

In the final year of the programme, students participated in the ‘cataloguing and staging of an important exhibition,’ a project that, Sachs believed, many students regarded as their favourite aspect of the course. In his memoirs, Sachs recounted that these exhibitions provided students with:
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[...] the opportunity to put into practice, unaided, all aspects of museum work including, besides connoisseurship, such important matters for a curator as the typography of catalogues, publicity through newspaper releases, the designing of pedestals and cases, the proper lighting of displays, and, under the professional guidance of one of the deans of the Harvard Business School, the production of a proper budget.

After the 1927 renovation of the Fogg, a purpose built gallery on the first floor of the new museum served to house the students’ exhibitions. Typically, students’ groups worked independently in the conception, design and installation of these exhibitions. With letters of introduction and recommendation supplied by Sachs, students were free to approach art museum directors and curators to arrange for loan requests. While the planning of these exhibitions usually occurred without incident, an episode from February 1937 proved an exception. Following a visit from a group of Museum Course students, Herbert Winlock, director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, wrote to Sachs:

I am afraid this letter is going to be a hard one to write. I understand the other day a couple of your graduate students came here to ask for some loans for an exhibition of ‘Objets d’Arte’ to be held in May […] To summarize they asked for most delicate and valuable objects from the Armor Collection- surely you understand we cannot let these things travel […]

An embarrassed Sachs replied:

Thank you for your frank communication of the 5th[…] Needless to say I had not the slightest idea that in connection with their proposed show these graduate students were going to use such bad judgment as to ask you to lend the objects that you enumerate[…] I have already expressed my opinion to them in no uncertain terms, and shall have something more to say about the whole matter this afternoon when we meet.


621 Museum Course student exhibitions included: Degas (1931); Still Life (1931); Oceanic and African Art (1934); The Tragic and the Grotesque, (1935); Style and Technique- Their Interrelation in Western European Painting (1936); The Art of the Renaissance Craftsmen (1937); The Horse, It’s Significance in Art (1938); New England Genre (1939).

622 Herbert Winlock to Paul Sachs, 5 February 1937. HFMA.

623 Paul Sachs to Herbert Winlock, 8 February 1937. HFMA.
The episode underscores the level of access and freedom which students were entrusted with as representatives of the Museum Course. It is also a prime example of the way in which the social interactions carried out as part the programme’s curriculum shaped the course’s theoretical teachings, as Sachs’ statement indicates that he was preparing to turn the students’ mistake into a discussion of inappropriate types of loan requests and museum etiquette.

Student missteps in the graduating class’s 1937 exhibition and Sachs’ subsequent incorporation of the incident into class lecture attest to the important part that developed social skills played in the training of Museum Course students. In comparison to the intellectual skills of connoisseurship and scholarship, social skills were difficult to teach. Yet, as Sachs recognised, the possession of such skills was crucial to the student’s ability to navigate the art museum field successfully.

The social skills that Sachs saw as crucial to the training of the connoisseur-scholar were multi-faceted. Some aspects of these were learned and involved adherence to what Sachs saw as appropriate manners and protocol in the art museum field. For instance, Sachs was always insistent that letters of introduction be produced at the beginning of an initial meeting with any senior art world figure.624 Other social skills were related to tact, powers of persuasion, and the adoption of the social mores of the elite.625 These were attributes that Sachs considered to be of great importance, as he once elaborated, ‘A sensitive eye and a sensitive personality, when these qualities are combined with sound scholarship, tend to produce the most successful directors.’626

It was partly in response to the dilemma of how to impart these social skills that Sachs advocated for the adoption of mentorship models in the art museum field. In his 1934 Presidential Address at the American Association of Museums, Sachs proposed that each museum in America take on one man a year as an apprentice, the

624 This was a lesson learned by the young art historian Benedict Nicolson on his visit to the Fogg in 1939. He failed to offer letters of introduction to Sachs and immediately fell into his disfavour as a result. See: Caroline Elam, ‘Benedict Nicolson: Becoming an Art Historian in the 1930s’, The Burlington Magazine, 146, 1211 (February 2004) p.84.

625 The significance of such skills had been asserted in the Museums Association and American Association of Museums curatorial training discussions. See: Hoyle, 1906; Crook, 1910.

626 Paul Sachs to Childs Frick, 15 October 1931. HFMA.
cost of which might be offset by contributions from the American Association of Museums. This system of apprenticeship Sachs argued, would benefit both mentors and mentees.627

Sachs had already put the principles underlying his speech into practice within the Museum Course. True to the programme’s vocationally oriented goals, Sachs made frequent general announcements of available jobs and opportunities in his lectures and directed students to institutions that were looking to expand in one capacity or another.628 Furthermore, students whom Sachs recognised as having potential to become leaders within the field received special attention and support. For instance, Sachs arranged for John Walker III to travel to Florence and work as Berenson’s assistant.629 Mentored by both Sachs and Berenson, Walker went on to become the director of the National Gallery in Washington D.C.630

Sachs’ Mentorship of Alfred H. Barr, Jr., and Frederick Mortimer Clapp

Sachs’ advocacy of mentorship models reflected his practices both within and outside of the Museum Course. This may be demonstrated by reviewing the parallel levels of support that Sachs’ offered to Alfred H. Barr, Jr. and Frederick Mortimer Clapp. (Figures 43 & 49) From fledgling beginnings, Sachs guided the careers of Clapp and Barr towards the attainment of respective directorships at two newly formed American art museums. Barr was appointed as director of the Museum of Modern Art in 1929, while Clapp assumed the directorship of the Frick Collection in 1931.

Sachs’ mentorship of Barr began in 1924. The two men met when Barr, a recent Princeton graduate, enrolled in the Museum Course to supplement his doctoral studies in the Fine Arts Department at Harvard. Sybil Gordon Kantor’s biography of Barr details the important role that Sachs played in helping Barr secure the

627 Sachs, 1934, pp.8-10.

628 For instance, Sachs told the Museum Course about Frederick Mortimer Clapp’s work in building up a Fine Arts Department at the University of Pittsburgh. ‘He will in time surround himself with the right kind of men. If any of you have the opportunity to join him you had better take it.’ Museum Course Record of Meeting, 1 December 1930. HFMA.

629 Paul Sachs to Bernard Berenson, 17 June 1931. HFMA.

630 John Walker III (b.1906, d.1995) See Appendix for Biographical Summary.
directorship of the Museum of Modern Art. However, a number of letters uncovered in the Fogg Art Museum Archive provide further insight into Sachs’ mentorship of Barr in the years leading up to that appointment. This correspondence demonstrates Sachs’ concerted effort to help Barr find appropriate employment in the art museum field. Soon after Barr left Harvard and had begun to work as an art history professor at Wellesley College, Sachs wrote to Samuel Lewisohn, a financier and influential trustee at the Metropolitan and the Brooklyn Museum of Art. In his letter Sachs encouraged Lewisohn to meet with Barr, and asked for his support in the purchase of a Corot painting for Wellesley. Sachs wrote:

Barr has thought more deeply on the subject of modern art, which interests you so intensely, and has the ability to express his matured thoughts with more clarity than anyone else who is at present giving time and attention to this fascinating and difficult subject.

While working to establish Barr’s reputation as an authority on modern art, Sachs also encouraged his mentee to apply for fellowships across a wide range of art historical specialties, even those in which he had no demonstrated interest or expertise. It was with this motivation that Barr applied for a fellowship in Archaeology at Princeton to work with Charles Rufus Morey. Sachs wrote to Morey privately explaining Barr’s potential and urging Morey not to be deterred by Barr’s dedication to modern art. On the same day Sachs wrote a letter of encouragement to Barr, reassuring him that if the Princeton fellowship was not successful they would find another. When Barr was not offered that fellowship, or another that he applied for in Renaissance art history, Sachs attempted to pacify him.

631 Kantor, 2002.

632 The close relationship between Sachs and Barr, and the mentor’s confidence in his mentee, was evident in a 1927 letter of introduction in which Sachs referred to Barr as ‘my friend and pupil.’ Paul Sachs to Mlle. Levallet (Letter of Introduction for Alfred Barr, Jr.,) 12 June 1927. HFMA.

633 Samuel Lewisohn would also become a founding trustee of the Museum of Modern Art.

634 Paul Sachs to Samuel Lewisohn, 8 November 1926. HFMA.

635 Paul Sachs to Charles Rufus Morey, 27 November 1928. HFMA.

636 Paul Sachs to Alfred Barr, Jr., 27 November 1928. HFMA.

637 Paul Sachs to Alfred Barr, Jr., 19 January 1929. HFMA.
You must not be discouraged by your failure to secure the Renaissance Fellowship. I have told you many times and I repeat it now that I have great faith in you, in your capacity; and in your future.

Within six months of this statement, Sachs had coordinated Barr’s appointment to the directorship of Museum of Modern Art. In response to Barr’s letter of thanks Sachs wrote:

You need not ever attempt to express your gratitude to me. I shall be more than repaid if I feel that my colleagues come to be thoroughly satisfied that my suggestion of a man who is entirely unknown to them, even by name, proves to have been an ideal choice, as they and I believe it to be at this time.

A letter written later that summer attests to Sachs’ intense level of involvement in Barr’s career even after his appointment to the directorship. Replying to a letter in which Barr had enclosed a memoranda on the anticipated organisation of the new museum, Sachs offered a range of advice. In reference to Barr’s personal office Sachs wrote that:

[…] it must afford you privacy and at the same time there must be a minimum of red tape to get to you. You will probably find that you have to leave your door open most of the time, as I have always done at the Fogg, so that people come to understand that they can get to you easily.

Sachs also explained that he had recommended to the trustees an ‘exceedingly generous salary’ for Barr that was based not on the age of the director but ‘the compensation that a director of such an institution should receive.’ Sachs then offered detailed commentary on all points of the memorandum, covering topics such as the establishment of an art library and the creation of a catalogue of modern art works. Sachs closed his letter saying, ‘Now remember, Alfred, that we cannot get all the things that we want at once. We must work towards the finest possible ideal.’

638 Kantor, 2002.
639 Paul Sachs to Alfred Barr, Jr., 16 July 1929. HFMA.
640 Paul Sachs to Alfred Barr, Jr., 1 August 1929. HFMA.
641 Paul Sachs to Alfred Barr, Jr., 1 August 1929. HFMA.
642 The salary was $12,000 a year. The director was also to be provided with an annual trip to Europe supported by an additional yearly allowance of $3,000.
643 Paul Sachs to Alfred Barr, Jr., 1 August 1929. HFMA.
As these letters reveal, Sachs’ mentorship of Barr was concerned with the young museum professional’s advancement at every level, and at every stage of his career. For his part, Barr emulated Sachs’ approach to the interpretation of art works. A lecture given by Barr during his directorship demonstrates the extent to which his own understandings of art had been shaped by Sachs’ methodology:

A work of art is an infinitely complex focus of human experience. The mystery of its creation, its history, the rise and fall of its aesthetic, documentary, sentimental, and commercial value, the endless variety of its relationship to other works of art, its physical condition, the meaning of its subject, the technique of its production, the purpose of the man who made it—all these factors lie behind a work of art, converge upon it and challenge our powers of analysis and publication. And they should be made accessible to other scholars and intelligible to the man off the street.

Like Sachs, Barr adhered to the concept of artistic genius and believed that art works possessed an inherent worth that could be discerned through careful analysis. In his early directorship, Barr was confronted with the daunting task of interpreting and presenting a canon of art that was as yet unfamiliar to the majority of American museum visitors. Drawing upon his training with Sachs, Barr installed the museum’s art works in a manner that highlighted their formal qualities and encouraged visitors to approach modern art as part of a narrative of ‘unfolding genius.’

A side by side comparison of photographs of Barr’s first exhibition at the museum, Cézanne, Gauguin, Seurat, van Gogh, and Sachs’ 1929 French exhibition at the Fogg illustrate how Barr adopted a visual language which was analogous to the one used by his mentor. (Figures 46-47) The trademarks of Sachs’ approach to installation were white walls and sparse decoration juxtaposed with a low and evenly spaced hang of pictures in ornate frames. All of these characteristics are apparent in the exhibition curated by Barr. Presenting the art works in this way, Barr created an atmosphere of reverence in the gallery, which lent weight to his argument that the art in the museum’s collection should be understood in formalist terms and seen as the latest developments in

644 Alfred Barr, Research and Publication in Art Museums (Undated Lecture, Transcript found amongst Sachs Personal Papers). HFMA.

645 Kantor, 2002.

646 (Carol) Duncan, 1995, p.102.

647 Sachs, 1957/8, p.360. HFMA.
the progression of artistic genius. Over the course of his career, Barr remained committed to the ideals visible in his Cézanne, Gauguin, Seurat, van Gogh exhibition. (Figure 48)

Let us turn to a consideration of Sachs’ mentorship of Clapp. Little is known about Clapp’s family and early life; his 1969 obituary in the New York Times stated only that he was a New York native and a descendant of a signer of the Declaration of Independence on his mother’s side. However, Clapp’s attainment of advanced degrees from Yale University and the Sorbonne suggest that he came from at least a moderately privileged background.

The first contact between Sachs and Clapp occurred in 1916 when Clapp wrote to Sachs to enquire whether he had received the copy of the Pontormo catalogue that he had sent. Sachs responded, praising the scholarship of the catalogue and a life long mentorship relationship commenced. By the early 1920s, Sachs had begun to actively support Clapp’s advancement in the art museum field. In 1922 the Harvard Fine Arts Department established a magazine, Art Studies, and soon afterward Sachs invited Clapp to contribute a scholarly article to the new publication.

That same year, Sachs wrote a letter to fellow Harvard Fine Arts Professor Arthur Kingsley Porter, expressing a desire to woo Clapp to their department. Shortly thereafter, Sachs supplied Clapp with an extensive collection of letters of introduction to art world players in both the United States and Britain. These letters provided Clapp

649 Frederick Mortimer Clapp, Resume. Approximately 1929. CAYU.
650 Frederick Mortimer Clapp to Paul Sachs, 17 March 1916. HFMA; Paul Sachs to Frederick Mortimer Clapp, 20 March 1916. HFMA.
651 Siple, 1927, p.41.
652 Paul Sachs to Professor Kingsley Porter, 25 September 1922. HFMA.
with access to important trustees, patrons, collectors and directors in much the same way that Sachs had coordinated introductions for Museum Course students such as Barr and Walker. In these letters Sachs wrote that Clapp was worthy of an introduction because of his achievements as a scholar in the field of art history. This assertion is significant as it explicitly conveys that Clapp should be allowed access to this world of the socially elite on the basis of his expertise. (Figure 50)

In the autumn of 1925 Sachs became involved in the planning of a Fine Arts Department at the University of Pittsburgh, a project in which Helen Clay Frick was the principle benefactor.654 The following September, Sachs facilitated an introduction between the heiress and Clapp, who Sachs had proposed as a potential candidate to head the new department. After the meeting Helen Clay Frick wrote to Sachs: 655

I will never be able to tell you how grateful I am for your great kindness and interest in making it possible for the University of Pittsburgh to have a Department of Fine Arts! I was deeply impressed with Professor Clapp last evening, and hope that he will accept, and I feel that every facility will be given him to create a Department worthy of all our hopes.

A month later, as Clapp was preparing to board a ship to sail to Europe, Sachs sent Clapp an urgent telegram informing him that Frick was about to offer him the position in question.656 (Figure 51) Clapp accepted the job which Helen Clay Frick endowed with an annual salary of $10,000, providing an additional $10,000 towards the acquisition of material for the department.657 During his tenure, Clapp and Helen Clay Frick further collaborated in establishing the Fine Arts Reference Library at the University of Pittsburgh; a scheme that complemented Helen Clay Frick’s work in

654 Helen Clay Frick to Paul Sachs, 4 August 1925. HFMA. Helen Clay Frick (b.1888, d.1984) See Appendix for Biographical Summary. Throughout this thesis Helen Clay Frick is referred to by her entire name. This is to avoid confusion between Helen Clay Frick and her father, Henry Clay Frick.

655 Helen Clay Frick to Paul Sachs, 22 September, 1926. HFMA; Helen Clay Frick to Paul Sachs, 23 September 1926. HFMA.

656 Telegram from Paul Sachs to Frederick Mortimer Clapp, 21 October 1926. HFMA.

the ongoing development of the Frick Art Reference Library which she had opened in 1920.\textsuperscript{658} Clapp’s employment at the University of Pittsburgh marked the beginning of an occasionally tense collaboration with Helen Clay Frick that would last for the duration of his career.

After Clapp’s appointment, Sachs’ mentorship remained constant. A letter from Clapp to Sachs in the spring of 1928 reveals details of University of Pittsburgh’s Fine Arts Department’s budget and solicits Sachs’ candid advice.\textsuperscript{659} Clapp’s relationship with Sachs will be explored further in the next chapter. For the moment, it is worth noting that, like Barr, Clapp adopted an approach to museum work that reflected the values and methodology of his mentor. In a 1929 lecture on the status of art history as an academic discipline, Clapp stated:\textsuperscript{660}

> Our tactile and visual mechanisms are so intimately related that what stimulates one often stimulates the scope and intensity of the other. All study of the fine arts should, therefore, be accompanied by patient, personal experiment in some medium or by actual contact with masterpieces. These are the highways to becoming a connoisseur.

In reviewing Sachs’ mentorship of Barr and Clapp it is apparent that the methods of advocacy and support that Sachs used to advance the careers of both men were similar. This is indicative of the extent to which the curriculum and approach of the Museum Course mirrored practices in the broader art world.

\textit{The Connoisseur-Scholar Emerges}

It was in the Museum Course that the connoisseur-scholar emerged. As previously noted, the connoisseur-scholar was an intermediary player, who possessed a transitional expertise which was a merger of connoisseurship and academic scholarship. Actively engaged in discussions across art world spheres, the connoisseur-scholar sought to


\textsuperscript{659} Frederick Mortimer Clapp to Paul Sachs, 25 March 1928. HFMA.

\textsuperscript{660} Frederick Mortimer Clapp, ‘What Can a Department of the History of Art Amount To?’ \textit{Lecture at the Thirty Third Meeting of the Educational Clinic}, 12 April 1929. FCCA.
contribute to the further codification of museum practices and the determination of the
disciplinary boundaries of art history.

Although not an academic art history programme itself, the Museum Course served as an
important ideological bridge between early and mid-twentieth century conceptualizations
of academic art history. In the early twentieth century, academic art history programmes
at Princeton, Yale and Harvard built upon the tradition of Ruskin’s Slade Lectures at
Oxford and were closely tied to the humanistic studies of philosophy and literature.\(^{661}\) In
the aftermath of the Second World War, academic art history became anchored in an
approach that championed historical contextualisation in the Warburgian tradition, a
transformation in which institutions such as the Courtauld Institute and the Fine Arts
Department at New York University played a leading role.\(^{662}\) The Museum Course
incorporated elements of these two different conceptualisations of art history into its
curriculum, making the connection between academic art history and the knowledge base
of the art museum worker explicit for the first time.

Founded during an era when the growth of the art museum field outpaced the supply of
skilled art museum workers, the Museum Course was both a product and reflection of the
unique cultural context out of which it was formed. Sachs saw clearly that the spheres of
the art market, the museum, and the university were intertwined through a complex
network of dealers, collectors, donors and emerging art museum professionals. Sachs
was keenly aware that the growth of the art museum field was being fostered by a
privileged dominant class, who wished to associate themselves with cultural institution
building in order to elevate their own status and increase their social and cultural
standing. It was for this reason that Sachs trained his students to cultivate a knowledge
base that was applicable and relevant to the broad spectrum of art world spheres in which
these wealthy players participated. This approach was designed to allow students to
integrate themselves into the art museum field at the highest level and ensure that they
were equipped with the intellectual and social skills necessary to command respect from
the powerful elites who were involved in the creation and oversight of art institutions.

(1900-1940): Five Figures*, pp.87-144.

The Museum Course played an important role in the professionalisation of the American art museum field, acting as a crucial link between the pre-professional era, where the differentiation between the knowledge of non-executives and executives was often indistinct, and the professional era, where the specialist expertise possessed by keepers, curators and directors was increasingly regarded as both distinctive and valuable. The programme provided would-be entrants into the art museum field with the broad knowledge base and practical skills necessary to embark on museum careers, attributes that were then further legitimated and consecrated by their association with the academic programme. This legitimation would prove important for keepers, curators and directors as it had the potential to act as a leveraging tool in negotiations between executives and non-executives. As Zolberg explains: 663

> When an external academic discipline develops criteria that provide validation for an institution's functioning, the professional members of the institution increase their bargaining power vis-à-vis laymen within the organizational structure.

The Museum Course’s influence upon the professionalisation of art museum work was felt first and most immediately in the United States. However, the programme shaped the professionalisation of art museum work in Britain as well, providing an important model for the Courtauld Institute. The final case study of this thesis will consider the significance of the Courtauld Institute’s initial adoption of the Museum Course model and the tensions that arose as a result of that adoption. At present, this thesis turns to an examination of the early organization of the Frick Collection and a consideration of Frederick Mortimer Clapp’s tenure as director. It is through an analysis of Clapp’s efforts as director at the Frick Collection that we can observe the connoisseur-scholar in practice.

---

In December 1935, in the midst of the Great Depression, the Frick Collection opened in New York City with grand ceremony. (Figure 52) The already sumptuous interiors of Henry Clay Frick’s former home were elaborately decorated and a formal reception was held for approximately 700 invited guests.664 The assembled group, carefully selected by the Frick Collection’s director and trustees, comprised art collectors and patrons, members of the New York City elite and influential museum professionals from across the country.665 Important foreign museum heads, including the director of the Wallace Collection, had also been sent honorary invitations to the opening of the new institution.666 Although those involved in the organisation of the Frick Collection worried about showing favouritism to particular dealers, individuals who had played a special role in the formation of the collection, such as Joseph Duveen and the associates of Knoedler and Co., were among the invited guests.667 Duveen had orchestrated Henry Clay Frick’s purchase of Jean-Honoré Fragonard’s Progress of Love panels and subsequently facilitated the acquisition of the majority of the collection’s eighteenth-century French art.668 Similarly, the associates of Knoedler and Co. had worked closely with Henry Clay Frick during his lifetime and frequently offered advice to the Frick


665 For a description of the splendour of the reception see: H.G. Dwight and A.M. Frankfurter, Art Parade: Seeing the Past Forty Years Through Art News and the Frick Collection (New York: Hastings House, 1943), pp.108-109. For a collection of letters of rejection written to those requesting permission to attend the opening see assorted letters in: Assorted Correspondence, Box 27. FCCA. For a letter inviting Sachs to a private preview before the opening reception see: Frederick Mortimer Clapp to Paul Sachs, 2 December 1935. HFMA.

666 Memorandum on Foreign Museum Heads, Box 27, FCCA.

667 For correspondence and notes between the Frick Collection director and trustees wondering whether it would be appropriate to invite some dealers and exclude others see: Assorted Correspondence, Box 27. FCCA.

668 Bailey, 2007, p.70.
Collection’s director and trustees in the years leading up to the museum’s opening.\textsuperscript{669} (Figure 56 & 57) With its rich holdings of eighteenth-century French painting and corresponding domestic interior, the Frick Collection naturally invited comparison with the Wallace Collection.\textsuperscript{670} (Figure 55) The New York City press gave the new museum a largely favourable assessment, praising the connoisseurship represented in the collection and portraying the late donor as a benevolent gentleman.\textsuperscript{671} ‘A more impressive monument,’ an article in the \textit{New York Times} proclaimed ‘to that which dominated all of Mr. Frick’s other interests, activities and inspirations could hardly be found.’\textsuperscript{672} Further, the article continued, ‘The distinction which he sought to deserve was that of giving back to the public, out of the smoke of flaming ovens whose fires he lighted for the age of steel, something as near the infinite as finite hands can fashion.’\textsuperscript{673} In Pittsburgh the name of Henry Clay Frick was inevitably tied to the tragic events of the Homestead Strike.\textsuperscript{674} However, as Colin B. Bailey, the Frick Collection’s Chief Curator and Associate Director, remarked in a recent interview, in New York City the Frick family name would

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{669} Thomas Gerrity to Frederick Mortimer Clapp, 14 February 1934. FCCA. Frederick Mortimer Clapp to Thomas Gerrity, 16 February 1934. FCCA.
\item \textsuperscript{670} Cortissoz, 1919; Harvey, 1928, p.332. Frick travelled abroad at least seventeen times between 1880 and 1914, visiting both the Britain and Continental Europe. There is no surviving evidence as to whether Frick ever visited the Wallace Collection; however, it is highly probable that he did. Contemporary research suggests that Frick’s museum ambitions owe a debt to the influence of peers in the elite circle of prominent Pittsburgh art collectors of which he was a part. See: G.P. Weisberg and D.E. McIntosh and A. McQueen, \textit{Collecting in the Gilded Age: Art Patronage in Pittsburgh 1890-1910} (Hanover, New Hampshire: University Press of New England, 1997).
\item \textsuperscript{671} For a typical example of praise see: Edward Allen Jewell, ‘Frick Art Exhibition Reveals a Rich Pageant of Paintings’, \textit{New York Times}, 12 December 1935. The few critics who did not review the new institution in glowing terms tended to focus their dissatisfaction on relatively minor points of the presentation, such as the presence of controlled pathways. For one such review see: Lewis Mumford, ‘The Art Galleries: Fifth Avenue’s Newest Museum’, \textit{The New Yorker}, 28 December 1935, p.49.
\item \textsuperscript{672} ‘Mr. Frick’s Monument’, \textit{New York Times}, 13 December 1935.
\item \textsuperscript{673} ‘Mr. Frick’s Monument’, \textit{New York Times}, 13 December 1935.
\item \textsuperscript{674} On 30 June 1892 an industrial lockout and strike occurred at the Carnegie Steel Mill in Homestead, PA; the mill was owned by Andrew Carnegie and managed by Henry Clay Frick. Negotiations broke down as union workers were attempting to secure a new contract with higher wages. Violence erupted and many workers were killed, largely as the result of the actions of private security brought in to try and halt the demonstration.
\end{itemize}
always be firmly tied to the museum and the donor would be remembered as a generous benefactor.675

The Frick Collection’s 1935 opening followed four years of concentrated activity on the part of the institution’s trustees and director. Between 1931 and 1935, amidst the chaos of the remodelling necessary to transform the residence into a public building, the institution’s internal organisational structure and aesthetic policy took shape. Clapp, having been retained as an advisor to the institution in 1931 and soon afterward promoted to the position of director, played a key part in these developments. Mobilized by the growing recognition of art historical expertise and the increasing professionalisation of the museum field, Clapp was able to assert his authority to influence the curatorial direction of the collection. In these endeavours he was bolstered by his alliance with influential individuals both within and outside of the institution. John D. Rockefeller, chairman of the Frick Collection’s board proved a useful ally, as did trustees Walter D. Hines, Horace Havemeyer and Maitland F. Griggs.676 In managing these relationships, Clapp received continual support and guidance from Sachs.677

This chapter examines Clapp’s efforts at the Frick Collection, focusing on the period between 1931-1935 when the museum’s initial curatorial arrangement was being determined. As with the Wallace Collection case study, my interest lies in the executive’s strategy to effect change within the institution, particularly in relation to interpretation and display.

The Early Organisation of the Frick Collection

When Henry Clay Frick died on 2 December 1919 he left behind a will that provided for the establishment of the Frick Collection and named the first members of the institution’s

675 Colin B. Bailey, Chief Curator and Associate Director, Frick Collection. Interview conducted at the Frick Collection, 22 October 2009.

676 Clapp’s close relationship with these individuals is apparent in his notes and correspondence. See: Frederick Mortimer Clapp, Memorandum and Notes, 24 June 1932. FCCA; Frederick Mortimer Clapp to Horace Havemeyer, 9 April 1964. CAYU; Frederick Mortimer Clapp to Horace Havemeyer, 13 October 1964. CAYU. See also: Sanger, 1998.

677 Paul Sachs to Helen Clay Frick, 27 November 1922. HFMA; Paul Sachs to Helen Clay Frick, 22 September 1926. HFMA.; See also Helen Clay Frick to Paul Sachs, 29 March 1923. HFMA.; Helen Clay Frick to Paul Sachs 23 September 1926. HFMA.
board of trustees. In addition to his wife, Adelaide, and his children, Helen and Childs, Frick selected a group of friends and associates to serve on the board of his new museum.\(^{678}\) (Figure 53) The named individuals were: George F. Baker, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Horace Havemeyer, Horace J. Harding, Walker D. Hines and Lewis Cass Ledyard.\(^{679}\) All were well-versed in the requirements of trustee work, with a number having already served on the boards of other art museums.\(^{680}\) Each of these men shared Frick’s high-ranking social status and corresponding affluent lifestyle, though the sources of their income stemmed from various different enterprises in the fields of law, industry and finance.\(^{681}\) Despite their wealth, the benefactor’s will stated that each trustee was to receive a $50,000 honorarium for their service to the institution; this would have represented a fortune to the average American, but for these men it was but a token gesture.\(^{682}\)

In considering the backgrounds of the individuals who comprised the Frick Collection’s first board of trustees it is notable that Baker, Harding and Hines were all men of humble origins whose fortunes were, like Frick’s, self-made. Moreover, although Havemeyer and Rockefeller, as well as Childs and Helen, had all been born into affluence, in each case the source of the familial wealth was only one generation removed from its entrepreneurial origins. Indeed, amongst the Frick Collection’s original board members

---

\(^{678}\) Although both of his children were named as trustees, Henry Clay Frick’s will heavily favoured Helen over Childs. As a result of her inheritance, Helen became the wealthiest single woman in the United States. The unequal division of the inheritance would remain a source of animosity between the siblings for the remainder of their lives.

\(^{679}\) By the time the Frick Collection opened in 1935, Harding, Hines and Ledyard had died and been replaced on the Frick Collection Board of Trustees by Maitland F. Griggs, Junius S. Morgan, Jr. and Andrew W. Mellon.

\(^{680}\) As noted in Chapter One, Baker, Ledyard and Frick all served together as members of the board of the Metropolitan. Frick and Baker had been elected as Metropolitan trustees in 1909, Ledyard in 1914. Havemeyer and Griggs were also later appointed as Metropolitan trustees, gaining their respective appointments in 1930 and 1935, respectively.

\(^{681}\) George F. Baker: self-made financier and philanthropist, his wealth was estimated to be twice that of J.P. Morgan’s; John D. Rockefeller, Jr.: art collector, from prominent industrialist family, son of John D. Rockefeller, Sr.; Horace Havemeyer: from prominent industrialist family, son of Henry O. Havemeyer who was the founder of American Sugar Refining Co.; Horace J. Harding: art collector, banker, financier; Walker D. Hines: lawyer, railroad magnate, personal friend of Frick’s; Lewis Cass Ledyard: Frick’s lawyer, yachtsmen, born into wealth, personal friend of Frick’s.

\(^{682}\) Bailey, 2006, p.93.
only Ledyard came from a family whose wealth and social position had been established several generations previous.

Of the six non-family members that Frick appointed to the founding board of trustees, three of them, Rockefeller, Havemeyer and Harding, possessed their own extensive personal art collections. This established a precedent as many of the trustees later appointed to the board were also active collectors. Maitland F. Griggs, Junius S. Morgan and Andrew Mellon joined the board during the institution’s formative years and all three were major art collectors.

Following the appointment of the institution’s initial board, the Frick Collection was formally created through an Act of Incorporation in 1920. However, the museum’s organisation did not begin in earnest until the death of Adelaide Frick on 4 October 1931. This delay was due to a clause in Henry Clay Frick’s will wherein the founder granted his widow the right to reside in their Upper East Side mansion for the remainder of her life. Thus, it was not until the winter of 1931 that preparations began for the transition from private collection to public institution.

It was also in 1931 that Clapp was retained as an advisor to the Frick Collection trustees. The terms of Clapp’s contract warrant examination. Clapp earned $1500 a month for his work as an advisor and he accepted the position on two conditions. First of all, that he might undertake his employment at the Frick Collection while continuing to fulfil his role at the University of Pittsburgh. Secondly, that his duties as an advisor should be primarily concerned with the intellectual oversight of the collection and the preparations necessary for its presentation to the visiting public. This second condition was attached to Clapp’s contract to help assuage the new employee’s anxiety that he might be held personally responsible for any damage that the artworks could potentially sustain while they were housed in a building that was also undergoing major expansion and refurbishment. Such a condition was necessary as the Frick Collection trustees were determined to follow a strict interpretation of the founder’s will which

\[\text{683 Frick Collection Act of Incorporation, Created Under Chapter 356 of the Laws of New York, 1920. FCCA.}\]

\[\text{684 Frederick Mortimer Clapp, Memorandum: Meeting of Committee on Organisation and Policy, 9 December 1931. FCCA.}\]
stated that the art works that comprised the collection were never to be removed from the familial home. In accordance with this instruction the members of the board opted to erect a special vault to house the artworks onsite as the building underwent remodelling, rather than remove the items to a more secure location. In light of these circumstances, all parties agreed that while the Frick home was undergoing refurbishment, Clapp’s duties would not extend to the physical custodianship of the collection. Instead, while the house was in transition the responsibility of the physical custody of the works would fall to Henry Clay Frick’s heirs, Childs and Helen.

Clapp’s participation in the negotiation of the terms of his contract with the board represents a departure from the way that such dealings had been approached in the past and is indicative of the increasing professional recognition afforded to museum executives. Equally important are the specific conditions that Clapp negotiated into the terms of his contract, which asserted his right to continue to pursue his academic career and clarified that he was being retained for his expertise. Such conditions made the changing status of curatorial practice in the art museum overt, signalling a further move away from the traditional conceptions of curatorial work as concerned with physical guardianship and oversight and towards a viewpoint that prized intellectual engagement. (Figure 54)

In October 1931, shortly before Clapp’s employment as an advisor began, Sachs, at the request of Helen Clay Frick, wrote a letter to Childs Frick in which he expressed his support for Clapp as a potential candidate for the directorship of the Frick Collection. Although Clapp would not take on the position of director until January 1933, Sachs’

685 Henry Clay Frick Will, 2 December 1919. FCCA. See: Article IV, Section 7: ‘The devise and gifts made by this article to the said corporation herein directed to be formed and to be known as ‘The Frick Collection’ are subject only to the condition that the said gallery of art shall at all times subsequent to the termination of the estate in my said dwelling house devised to my wife in and by the first section of this Article of my will, be maintained under the name which I have directed to be given to said corporation, and in and upon the premises mentioned in this Article, and it is my will that such of my paintings and other works of art as are herein bequeathed to it shall at all times be there preserved and maintained.’

686 After he became director of the Frick Collection, Clapp would cite the building of the vault and the institution’s refusal to lend paintings as evidence of the trustees desire to stick strictly to the wording of the will. See: Frederick Mortimer Clapp to Paul Sachs, 25 March 1928. HFMA. Frederick Mortimer Clapp to Paul Sachs, 1 May 1935. HFMA.

687 Paul Sachs to Childs Frick, 15 October 1931. HFMA.
letter suggests that Clapp was being considered as a possible candidate for the
directorship from the outset. This indicates that Clapp’s role was seen as one that
could develop in tandem with the growth of the institution.

Clapp’s connoisseurship, academic achievements and his ease within a elite social circle
made him the epitome of the connoisseur-scholar ideal and, in Sachs’ opinion, a natural
choice for the directorship. In his letter of support, Sachs laid out the reasons that he
believed Clapp would make an excellent director for the Frick Collection. Sachs stated
that, ‘we have in Frederick Mortimer Clapp not only one of America’s outstanding and
recognised scholars, but a man who reacts with the utmost sensitiveness of both eye and
mind to works of art of any land or epoch.’ Once Sachs had asserted the
appropriateness of Clapp’s candidacy in his letter to Childs Frick, he concluded his
assessment with the final observation:

You may well say at this point that while you are well prepared to agree to
all that has thus far been stated about Mr. Clapp’s scholarship and
sensitiveness, that there are other qualities that are needed, and that
important among these other qualities must be reckoned the ability to win
the confidence and respect of an unusual Board of trustees and yet to
maintain that independence of view that all competent men desire to find
present in the leader of an enterprise. On this count also Mr. Clapp seems to
me unusually qualified. No man who is an expert in his own field (whether it
be banking or law or anything else) can fail to recognise, even after a short
acquaintance with Mr. Clapp that he is in the presence of a master in his
field [...] Being a wise man he is a patient man and knows almost by
intuition that the authority that is inherent in his point of view about works
of art is sure to secure for him leadership in any meeting of the Board of
trustees without assuming a dictatorial or aggressive attitude.

As Sachs was well aware, the future director of the Frick Collection would have to
operate within a circle of wealth and active collecting. The position required someone
who would be able to command the respect of a group whose knowledge of art was
firmly rooted in connoisseurship, having been cultivated through personal interactions
with dealers and other affluent collectors. Thus the director who was also a connoisseur-
scholar possessed an advantage; such an individual would be able to communicate with

688 Frederick Mortimer Clapp to Walker D. Hines, 5 January 1933. HFMA.
689 Paul Sachs to Childs Frick, 15 October 1931. HFMA.
691 Paul Sachs to Childs Frick, 15 October 1931. HFMA.
the trustees from a point of view that they recognised and respected, while also possessing the academic credentials that signified him as ‘a master in his field.’

**Frederick Mortimer Clapp as Director**

Not long after Clapp began working as an advisor to the trustees, he was asked to prepare a report on the possible arrangements for the exhibition and display of the Frick Collection. At the same time he was called upon to complete a connoisseurial appraisal of the collection, identifying weaknesses and strengths as well as areas of possible expansion.

The plan and notes that Clapp produced in response to the trustees’ request record his attitudes toward the collection and offer insight into his curatorial vision. Even though notes such as these would not have been shown to the trustees, the material is significant as it reflects the intensity of Clapp’s opinions and further helps to illuminate the approach of the connoisseur-scholar. Furthermore, the notes reveal much about Clapp’s conceptions of art history and how he viewed his own construction of the discipline with relation to the professionalising field.

One of the most striking aspects of Clapp’s notes are their demonstration of his strong mistrust of what he termed, ‘Germanized pseudo-scientific’ approach to art historical classification and museum display. Though Childs Frick had asked Clapp to breakdown a description of the collection into ‘schools of art,’ Clapp rejected this notion. He wrote that:

> Schools of art are handy forms of classification and in their modern elaboration mostly a product of the German [...] they have nothing to do with art but are accretions upon this subject, substitutions for a proper understanding- for in art nothing is of moment but excellence.

---
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Clapp’s generalisations about the German approach to art history and museum practice warrant consideration. In her writing on the history of display in German art museums, Charlotte Klonk details the broad spectrum of approaches employed by German museum professionals in the late-nineteenth and twentieth century. She demonstrates that though this period was marked by a move towards interiority and intimacy in German museum display, there was wide divergence in both practice and the underlying methodology. Tellingly, even Bode did not remain a firm adherent to the concept of the period room that he had helped to popularize in the 1880s. Klonk’s research illustrates that during the period in question German approaches to museum display were remarkable not for the singularity of their vision but for their multiplicity. Clearly, Clapp was unaware of the multi-dimensionality of German approaches to museum display.

Given Clapp’s connoisseurial, object-based approach it is not surprising that his notes offer a frank assessment of the key works in the collection. His comments on the Whistler paintings in the collection offer a typical example of his remarks:

The Collection includes two excellent portraits Lady Meux and Mrs. Leyland - the latter of exquisite tonality. The Rosa Corder though dark, is a fine example of distinguished arrangement and subtle, subdued, relations. The Ocean is one of his most delicate, yet broadly felt marines. The Montesquieu, however, was never successfully achieved and belongs in another category.

Of further interest are Clapp’s statements within the notes regarding the collection’s lack of art created outside of the European and American tradition, which he mentioned as he once again condemned the notion of classification by schools. Clapp wrote that although he believed that ‘a systematic attempt at preserving specimens of artistic endeavor’ was not the purpose of the Frick Collection, it was notable that there were many ‘times and places’ not represented in the museum’s holding. Clapp named Pre-classical, Chinese, Japanese, Indian, Persian, Pre-Colombian art as noticeably lacking in the collection.

The report that Clapp prepared for the trustees, entitled ‘Alternative Suggestions for the Exhibition and Development of the Frick Collection’ presented four possible solutions to

---
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solving the problems posed by the installation of the collection within the private residence of the donor. Before presenting the solution that he personally advocated, Clapp strategically and methodically considered the other possible solutions. He explained their strengths and weaknesses, building the necessary framework to present his own argument for the arrangement of the house and the display of the collection’s objects within. In compiling the report and offering his recommendation for the presentation of the collection, Clapp faced a considerable challenge in that period rooms, while still at their height of popularity when Frick had created his bequest, had largely fallen out of favour by the 1930s.  

The first solution that Clapp considered was one in which the whole house and its contents were to be preserved in the exact manner in which they had existed as a private residence. Clapp stated that such an arrangement would serve as an ‘outstanding landmark in American culture- an advantage that will increase in significance with time, in view of the rapid change of modern life.’ However, Clapp pointed out that the disadvantages of this plan far outweighed the singular advantage of preserving a piece of American history. Clapp noted that such an installation would compromise the experience of the art, initially attract ‘merely the scrutiny of the curious,’ create technical difficulties in the circulation of visitors and curtail facilities for the independent study of the collection’s works of art. This was also a concern shared by Helen Clay Frick, who was opposed the preservation of the family’s intimate living space, specifically the notion of presenting the downstairs receptions room in this manner.

The second solution that Clapp presented for consideration examined the pros and cons of displaying the collection within the setting of a traditional public gallery, with all evidence of the private home eradicated. Clapp stated that such a solution would necessarily involve the removal of rugs, hangings, and domestic furniture. Moreover, the collection’s objets d’art would be put into specialist cases and the paintings hung

---

700 (Sally Anne) Duncan, ‘Period Rooms’, 2002.

701 Frederick Mortimer Clapp, Notebook 1: Report on Alternative Suggestions for the Exhibition and Development of the Frick Collection, 1 November 1931, p.2. FCCA.

chronologically ‘as in a museum of the standardised modern kind.’ Clapp explained the potential advantages of this approach, the greatest one being the possibility of preserving some of the character of the house, whilst laying the primary focus on the works of art in the collection. Clapp wrote:

Although masterpieces of a similar kind may be found in the Metropolitan Museum and scattered elsewhere in public buildings, some elements of the present lower floor might be preserved to a certain degree with the idea of enhancing the aesthetic appeal of the painting and sculpture. As a matter of comparison one might liken the Metropolitan Museum to magnificent, systematic mineralogical collection, while the Frick Collection might be compared to a choice collection of precious stones.

However, Clapp argued that much would be lost in such an arrangement. In presenting the collection in this manner, Clapp observed:

[...] the aesthetic impression will be sacrificed to informative values. Comparison will be invited with the variety and all-inclusiveness of systematic public galleries, which contain, not infrequently, inferior works of various periods exhibited for the sake of synoptic completeness.

Clapp also warned against what would be:

[...] the almost complete destruction, in remanding, of the unique historic import of the Collection as a whole – characteristics which cannot be acquired at any price - the Collection being merely one of the innumerable impersonal art galleries of our time.

The attributes of the collection that Clapp considered the most valuable begin to emerge through an analysis of his rejection of the first and second solutions. Clapp discarded the first solution on the grounds that it created an experience in which the works of art played a subordinate role to that of the historic home and because it would attract visitors who had come not to appreciate the art collection, but to witness the spectacle of a rich man’s home on display. Furthermore, Clapp noted, the complete preservation of the


house as a historic home would necessarily limit student and researcher access to first-hand study and examination of the art collection. From his stress upon these points it can be inferred that Clapp believed the presentation of the collection’s art objects was a matter of crucial importance and he advocated for them to be displayed to their best advantage in a way that would emphasise their formal qualities while still making them accessible for educational purposes.

However, although he believed that emphasis should be placed on the works of art, Clapp was also interested in the preservation of the formal living areas of the interior of the home, and believed that the retention of the rugs, hangings, and other thoughtfully chosen reminders of the institution’s domestic origins could form an essential part of the collection’s character. The Frick Collection, in Clapp’s opinion, had the potential to offer an experience that was more meaningful and substantial than the one offered by museums such as the Metropolitan. In his notes on the strengths and weaknesses in the collection Clapp had written that it should be understood that Frick Collection did not represent ‘a systematic attempt at preserving specimens of artistic endeavour,’ thus implying that the display techniques adopted by art museums with encyclopaedic collections should be avoided.708

The third and fourth solutions put forward by Clapp proposed that the lower portion of the house should be preserved in the spirit of its current presentation with some additional protection, such as the occasional glass case, provided for particularly delicate objects. Runners or a special walk with railings would guide the public through the house. The only significant difference between the third and fourth solutions was that the third suggested that the Main Gallery and auditorium be situated on the second floor, while the fourth plan maintained that all public spaces should be contained to the first floor. The idea of including an auditorium and gallery space on the second floor was eventually abandoned due to concerns about public safety in the event of an emergency. In both the third and fourth solutions Clapp proposed that the paintings and objets d’art should be arranged in a way that engaged both the casual visitor and the student, in a

708 Frederick Mortimer Clapp, Notes Regarding Strengths and Weaknesses of the Collection, Undated, approximately 1931-1932. CAYU.
manner that was ‘aesthetically pleasing’ and prevented ‘museum fatigue.’\(^{709}\) At the same time, although the personal aspects of the home - the bedrooms, toilets, kitchen, etc. - would be inaccessible to the visitor, the formal areas of the home would be preserved and conceived in such a way as to enhance appreciation of the works of art.\(^{710}\) Clapp argued that these solutions were the most in keeping with the donor’s wishes and would allow the art collection to be shown to its best advantage within ‘the unique environment of a beautiful home.’\(^{711}\) (Figure 62)

Clapp’s detailed and thorough investigation of the various solutions proved to be a worthwhile endeavour. The trustees adopted the fourth solution, the one that Clapp presented last and advocated for most strongly. When the institution opened to the public in 1935, four years after Clapp’s initial report on the possible solutions for exhibition and display, the arrangement of the collection was nearly identical to the solution that Clapp had suggested.

Clapp’s recommendations were not made without peer review; Belle da Costa Greene of the Morgan Library, Joseph Breck of the Metropolitan, and Sachs were all interviewed on the installation of the collection before the museum’s opening.\(^{712}\) In these interviews Greene, Breck, and Sachs expressed their views about the hang of paintings and the display of objects in terms of aesthetics and public access. The trio was also consulted in matters such as lighting and the creation of a pathway for the public to use as they walked through the collection. Additionally, the issue of ticketing and admission policies was also put before the interviewees.

---


\(^{711}\) Frederick Mortimer Clapp, *Notebook 1: Report on Alternative Suggestions for the Exhibition and Development of the Frick Collection*, 1 November 1931, p.5. FCCA.

\(^{712}\) Belle da Costa Greene, *Interview on the Subject of Opening the Frick Collection to the Public*, 13 December 1931. FCCA; Joseph Breck, *Interview on the Subject of Opening the Frick Collection to the Public*, 13 December 1931. FCCA; Paul Sachs, *Interview on the Subject of Opening the Frick Collection to the Public*. December 13, 1931. HFMA. The consultation of da Costa Greene was particularly appropriate as seventy works from Morgan’s private collection had been acquired by Frick.
As these interviews and the memorandum and notes that survive Clapp’s directorship reveal, it was common for him to seek advice from colleagues outside the Frick Collection. For example, Clapp frequently corresponded with Morris Carter, the director of the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, and William Hale, a trustee of the Huntington Art Collection. In a letter to Hale, Clapp expressed his disappointment at missing the trustee during a recent visit to the Huntington and wrote: 713

[...] there are all kinds of things that I should have liked to discuss with you, from policies to air conditioning. We have faced many problems and are making progress with what I hope is a very fine and far-reaching program.

Clapp’s letter to Hale draws attention to one of the defining aspects of Clapp’s directorship: his responsibility for the practical organisation of the collection. Clapp, working in tandem with the trustees, was responsible for the oversight of the building remodel, the determination of staff hierarchies and the creation of policies that would govern the daily operation of the institution. 715

Since Clapp’s work with these practical considerations occurred in conjunction with his curatorial efforts, these responsibilities were often intertwined. This is demonstrated in a memorandum in which Clapp recounted a discussion with Childs Frick where the various methods of lighting the gallery were considered. 716 Childs was not in favour of the skylights in the gallery as he thought they interfered with the overall look of the roof. Instead he wanted to light the gallery exclusively with artificial light. Clapp argued against this, and recalled, ‘I pointed out that harmony of light was needed.’ 717 Clapp’s views reflected similar comments that Sachs had made regarding the lighting during his interview on the installation of the collection. Recording Sachs’ response to the question

713 Frederick Mortimer Clapp to William Hale. 23 September, 1933. FCCA.

715 Frederick Mortimer Clapp, Memorandum: Regarding Discussion with John Russell Pope 15 October 1932. FCCA; Frederick Mortimer Clapp, Memorandum: Function of Organizing Director, 4 January 1933. FCCA; Frederick Mortimer Clapp, Memorandum: Function of Executive Assistant, 4 January 1933. FCCA; Frederick Mortimer Clapp, Notes on Duties of a Curator, Approximately 1931. CAYU; Frederick Mortimer Clapp, Memorandum: Frick Collection Organisation Chart. 20 July 1936. FCCA; Frederick Mortimer Clapp, Memorandum: Policies and Procedures for the Opening of the Frick Collection, 1935. FCCA.

716 Frederick Mortimer Clapp, Memorandum: Regarding Disagreement with Childs Frick about Lighting, 9 January 1933. FCCA.
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of lighting, Clapp had recorded, ‘He finds the lighting system antiquated and inadequate and thinks an arrangement could be made that would ensure daylight lighting on bright days and modern interior lighting on dark days or in the evening.’

Clapp’s argument for better lighting was indicative of his approach that focused on the overall aesthetic harmony of the museum experience. As Clapp’s obituary would recall, the director ‘daily chose the fresh flowers in the exhibition rooms on the first floor to assure that their colours would harmonize with the surrounding art.’ In a similar fashion, Clapp implemented a series of regular concerts of chamber music within the collection and made arrangement for the monumental organ on the stairwell between the first floor exhibition rooms and the upstairs administrative offices to be played at intervals throughout the day. In the year after the collection opened Clapp was also responsible for introducing a popular lecture series, where outside speakers were invited to give presentations about the art in the Frick Collection. Clapp’s efforts to create an aesthetically harmonious environment reflected similar work undertaken earlier by Benjamin Ives Gilman at the Museum of Fine Arts and Sydney Cockerell at the Fitzwilliam Museum. Correspondence in the Fogg Art Museum Archive reveals that Cockerell and Sachs were acquainted and greatly admired one another. Indeed, when Clapp visited Cambridge in the early 1920s, he carried with him a letter of introduction to Cockerell.

Clapp’s success in influencing the presentation of art objects within the collection is most clearly demonstrated in his efforts to secure a favourable position for four large scale paintings by James McNeill Whistler. Henry Clay Frick, like Isabella Stewart
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720 As discussed in Chapters One and Two. For further details of Cockerell’s work at the Fitzwilliam see: Panayotova, 2008.
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Gardner, was an avid collector of Whistler’s works. From 1931 through 1935 Clapp initiated a personal campaign to ensure that the four full-length Whistler portraits in the collection be displayed to their best advantage. In his report on the possible approaches to the installation, Clapp made a special addendum in which he commented on the display of the Whistlers:

A special effort must be made to hang these appropriately, since they require distance and a very carefully thought-out lighting. You cannot see a large Whistler from any angle that does not approach a right angle to the canvas, nor can you see it if light is concentrated on any particular area of the canvas. These facts imply a Whistler room or a room in which his works will predominate.

This was an opinion shared by Sachs who, in his interview on the collection, stated that the Whistlers must be provided with a special display as they were otherwise difficult to see. (Figure 60)

Clapp was determined that the Whistler portraits would not be lost in the general hang, but that they would be exhibited in a place of significance. At best, he hoped that the Whistler paintings would receive a room devoted to them. In this endeavour, the installation of Whistler’s Harmony in Blue and Gold: The Peacock Room at the Freer Gallery served as an important curatorial precedent. (Figure 59) Its existence allowed Clapp to make an argument for Whistler as an important American artist, whose art historical significance had already been recognised by one of the most prestigious institutions in the country. In a memorandum from November 1932 Clapp recalled a meeting with the trustees where he argued:
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Whistler is very delicate— not so easy to give the best setting to— a fact we have always realised. On the other hand, he is an American—perhaps the most famous of American artists— even though his stock may be somewhat down now.

In addition to pointing out Whistler’s art historical importance, Clapp often noted that the presence of Whistler’s works in the collection were important as ‘they record, at least in part, the tastes of the Founder.’

To further his efforts Clapp asked the trustees if they might engage John Russell Pope, the architect in charge of the remodelling of the building, to create a ‘mock-up’ of the Oval Room, a space constructed out of beaver-board, roughly half the size and scale of the proposed room. If such a room where created, Clapp reasoned, the trustees would be able to view first-hand how the Whistler portraits would look in such a setting.

Clapp’s approach to securing the ideal spot for the Whistler portraits can be understood to have three components. First of all he asserted that the display of the pictures presented a particular visual problem, one that necessitated special attention. Secondly, he argued that these portraits were worthy of such attention because they were the work of an art historically significant American artist and also because they had clearly been of importance to Henry Clay Frick. Thirdly, his collaboration with Pope in the creation of a mock-up Oval Room, ensured that the trustees where fully informed about the potential limitations of the portraits if they were shown in another room. Clapp’s approach, which showcased both his expertise as a connoisseur-scholar and his ability to successfully collaborate with those within and outside the institution, proved successful.

When the Frick Collection opened to the public in 1935 all four Whistler portraits were displayed within the Oval Room, the location that Clapp had argued for. (Figure 61)

creation of the Peacock Room was important, as it would ultimately become synonymous with the Freer Gallery.
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Upon his retirement from the Frick Collection in 1951, Clapp wrote a moving letter to Sachs. Recounting all that Sachs had done for him in the furthering of his career, Clapp acknowledged that his mentor ‘had a tremendous influence’ on his life.\textsuperscript{731} It was to Sachs that Clapp owed his employment at the Frick Collection and in many ways Clapp’s approach to directorship paralleled Sachs’ efforts at the Fogg. Within their respective institutions, Sachs and Clapp advocated for an approach to display that placed emphasis on the attributes of individual works with attention still devoted to the overall impression of the arrangement. For both men it was a combination of connoisseurship, academic qualifications, and social connections that afforded them the opportunity to play an influential role in shaping the curatorial vision of the collections with which they had been entrusted. (\textit{Figure 64})

Beyond praise for his mentor, Clapp’s letter also relayed what he felt had been his primary achievements as director of the Frick Collection. He was especially proud of the musical concerts he had organised, over which he had complete control. In an uncharacteristic tone of bravado, Clapp wrote:\textsuperscript{732}

\begin{quote}
It would perhaps be no exaggeration to say that these concerts have been superior in quality, programmes and execution to any chamber music recitals given in New York. Like the unique Library in Pittsburgh, in which I also had a free hand, the concerts have been my baby and my reward.
\end{quote}

Clapp further praised his loyal staff, noting that much of what he had accomplished at the collection was due to their support. Yet, Clapp spoke of his disappointments too. Chief amongst these was his involvement in the creation of a folio catalogue of the art in the Frick Collection, which had begun prior to his work as an advisor. An examination of the creation of the folio catalogue offers insight into the complicated power dynamics at play between various art world participants operating in the spheres of the university and the art museum in the era when the American art museum field was rapidly professionalising.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[731] Frederick Mortimer Clapp to Paul Sachs, 23 January 1951. HFMA.
\item[732] Frederick Mortimer Clapp to Paul Sachs, 23 January 1951. HFMA.
\end{footnotes}
Correspondence between Helen Clay Frick, Clapp and Sachs reveals that throughout the late 1920s and early 1930s all three were involved in a number of simultaneous projects being carried out at the Frick Collection, the Frick Art Reference Library, the Fogg Art Museum and the Department of Fine Arts at the University of Pittsburgh. The folio catalogue was one such project. Before considering the circumstances surrounding its creation, an explanation regarding the Frick Art Reference Library’s institutional history is beneficial.

Helen Clay Frick had conceived of the Frick Art Reference Library as a further expression of the provisions outlined in her father’s will; specifically, the section that charged the Frick Collection trustees’ with founding an institution ‘which shall encourage and develop the study of fine arts, and which shall promote the general knowledge of kindred subjects amongst the public at large.’ From the outset, the library’s status as an institution independent from the Frick Collection was ambiguous. Initially, Helen Clay Frick funded the library with her own money. However, when it became apparent that the library’s physical space, housed in the same building as Frick Collection, would need to be expanded, the heiress turned to the Frick Collection trustees for financial assistance. In September 1924 Helen Clay Frick, acting as a representative of the Frick Art Reference Library, signed an agreement with the Frick Collection trustees that sought to clarify how the library would be managed and funded. The agreement stated that the Frick Collection trustees would contribute $80,000 towards the $140,000 total needed to construct a new library building adjacent to the Frick Collection. Furthermore, the agreement affirmed that Helen Clay Frick, as President and Director of the Frick Art Reference Library, would for the remainder of her life pay for the library’s operating expenses, which totalled around $40,000 a year. The agreement concluded that upon Helen Clay Frick’s death the library would transfer to the Frick Collection.

734 Paul Sachs to Childs Frick, 15 October 1931. HFMA.
Helen Clay Frick’s biographer and distant relative, Martha Symington Sanger Frick, notes that while the 1924 contract pleased Helen Clay Frick it made the other Frick Collection trustees uncomfortable. This unease came to a head in 1928 when the Frick Collection trustees denied Helen Clay Frick’s request for further funding for the expansion of the library. In her failure to obtain this additional financial funding Helen Clay Frick harboured particular resentment towards her brother, Childs, and trustees Rockefeller and Ledyard. In retaliation, Helen Clay Frick removed the provision in her will that had provided for the financial security of Childs’ children after her death and instead directed that the funds should be transferred to the Frick Art Reference Library upon her passing.\textsuperscript{738}

In recounting the early relationship between the Frick Art Reference Library and the Frick Collection, it becomes apparent that both institutions were susceptible to becoming vehicles for the advancement of trustees’ own personal agendas. Helen Clay Frick’s financial retaliation against her brother’s children is a dramatic example of personal grievances interfering with institutional procedure. However, as incidents such as the trustees’ 1928 veto of Helen Clay Frick’s request for additional funding for the library suggest, resentments between trustees could manifest themselves in more subtle ways as well.

It is within this context of personal agendas and struggles that the folio catalogue project should be understood. Helen Clay Frick saw the folio catalogue as a way to simultaneously memorialize her father’s collection and celebrate the achievements of the Frick Art Reference Library. She planned to circulate the Frick Collection folio catalogue, featuring full-page colour reproductions and research by university-trained art historians, to a limited number of prestigious libraries. Retaining both Sachs and Clapp to write sections of the folio catalogue, Helen Clay Frick entrusted Clapp with the supervision of the submission of work by other contributing scholars.\textsuperscript{739}

\textsuperscript{738} Sanger, 2008, p.169.

\textsuperscript{739} Frederick Mortimer Clapp to Helen Clay Frick, 19 March 1928. HFMA; Frederick Mortimer Clapp to the Director of the Fine Arts Department, University of Pittsburgh, 11 March 1967. CAYU.
The production of the Frick Collection folio catalogue should have been a straightforward endeavour but it soon spiralled out of control. The project was continually halted and resumed at Helen Clay Frick’s discretion, with countless individuals retained and then terminated for a variety of reasons, often with little justification. As a result, although work began on the folio catalogue in the late 1920s, with the aim of being completed within a few years, the project was in fact not completed until the mid-1950s.

This state of affairs had consequences for the Frick Collection. Helen Clay Frick, using the authority granted to her as a Frick Collection trustee, refused to permit the production of a comprehensive institutional catalogue until the folio catalogue was finished. As a result, for the first thirty years of the museum’s existence, the institution was unable to offer the visiting public more than a basic summary guide of the collection.

The decades long project took its toll on Sachs and Clapp, as well as the others who had been employed to contribute to specific sections of the folio catalogue. In agreeing to be involved with the creation of the folio catalogue, these individuals had a vested interest in seeing the work reach completion.

Clapp in particular had a great deal invested in the project: initially as the individual in charge of scholarly contributions to the folio catalogue, and even more so once he took on the official directorship of the Frick Collection in 1935. Because the Frick Collection did not employ a full-time curator until the 1960s, the director acted as the most visible representative of the institution’s curatorial vision and a collection catalogue served as the primary means through which such a representative could establish their reputation. Without an institutional catalogue, Clapp was limited in the way that he could present his work at the Frick Collection within the broader art museum field.

Although Clapp suffered the most as a result of his entanglement with the folio catalogue, Sachs too came to feel that his professional integrity had been damaged through his association with the project. Indeed, by the time the folio catalogue was

740 Edgar Munhall, Curator Emeritus, Frick Collection. Interview conducted at the Frick Collection, 2 April 2009.
completed Sachs was so infuriated by the circumstances surrounding the project that it proved to be the end of his friendship with Helen Clay Frick.\footnote{Paul Sachs, \textit{Memorandum: Recalling working on the Folio Catalogue for Helen}, 17 March 1952. HFMA.}

The folio project laid bare tensions within the professionalising art museum field and revealed the complexities underlying relations between executives and non-executives. Clapp’s own feelings about his involvement in the project were mixed. While he came to regret his involvement in the folio catalogue, he was also fully aware that it was his involvement with the project that had initially set him on the path towards his employment at the Frick Collection and ultimately led to his attainment of the directorship.\footnote{Frederick Mortimer Clapp to Paul Sachs, 23 January 1951. HFMA.}

\textit{The Connoisseur-Scholar in Practice}

The connoisseur-scholar emerged out of the convergence of a particular set of needs and circumstances in the American art world: a dominant class socially and financially invested in cultural institution building, a rapid expansion in the number of art museums being founded, and a surge in the resources available to foster and bolster these institutions and supply them with qualified staff. This chapter has considered the connoisseur-scholar in practice, closely examining the tenure of Frederick Mortimer Clapp at the Frick Collection. What emerges is a portrait of an art museum executive in transition. On one hand, we see an institutional leader engaged with a community of peers and empowered by an academic expertise that was increasingly recognised as analogous with curatorial authority. On the other hand, we see a director frustrated by the limitations of his influence as he struggled against a powerful board of trustees to shape the vision, policy and aims of an art museum still in its infancy.

The dualistic nature of this portrait is indicative of the extent to which the professionalisation of the American art museum executive and the field of curatorial practice was an ongoing process. Certainly, the evidence presented within this chapter demonstrates that all three steps in the process of professionalisation had been achieved to varying degrees. Clapp was fully aware of himself as a member of a group of peers
who, having defined the parameters of the cognitive basis of their work and differentiated it from that of non-specialists, were now seeking to leverage that knowledge base for the purpose of increasing their institutional authority. Yet, as the folio project debacle illustrates, the professionisation of the American art museum executive was not without its own struggles.

The key challenges in Clapp’s quest to expand his institutional authority and influence and shape the curatorial vision of the Frick Collection stemmed from tensions between himself and the trustees. Struggles between Clapp and Helen Clay Frick were particularly difficult as the director found himself in conflict with an individual who was also the primary patron of his career. It was Helen Clay Frick who had provided the financial support that enabled Clapp to participate in projects at the University of Pittsburgh, the Frick Collection, and the Frick Art Reference Library. As Helen Clay Frick relayed in her letters to Sachs in 1926, she was initially drawn to Clapp because of his art historical expertise and his potential ability to command authority within the art museum field. Yet, the boundaries of Helen Clay Frick’s involvement in the projects that she funded were never entirely clear. While she respected Clapp’s connoisseurship and expertise, she also felt that her financial support entitled her to participation in scholarly and curatorial projects that Clapp wished to make the sole domain of the professional art museum executive. The nature of the tensions between Clapp and Helen Clay Frick are indicative of an art museum field where trustees were often the sole benefactors and overseers of the cultural institutions with which they were involved.

This thesis turns now to a consideration of the creation of the Courtauld Institute of Art. Examining the formative years of that institution and reflecting on the changing status of the British art museum field, we stand to gain further insight into the limitations and potential of the connoisseur-scholar model.

743 Helen Clay Frick to Paul Sachs, 22 September, 1926. HFMA; Helen Clay Frick to Paul Sachs, 23 September 1926. HFMA.
CHAPTER FIVE

The Courtauld Institute of Art

In October 1932, eleven years after the foundation of the Museum Course at Harvard, the Courtauld Institute of Art opened its doors to students in London.\(^746\) (Figure 65) The establishment of the institute heralded art history's formal recognition as an independent academic subject within the British university system. Earlier that summer, Lord Lee of Fareham, one of the primary founders, gave a speech before the press that outlined the aims of the institution.\(^747\) (Figures 66 & 67) Chief amongst the motivations for the creation of the new institute, he said, was a desire ‘to arouse and develop in the rising generation a love and scholarly appreciation of the Arts’ and to ‘give a limited number of students and research workers the facilities and training necessary to enable them to qualify as curators or officials of museums, or as connoisseurs, critics, writers and teachers of art history.’\(^748\)

Lord Lee’s speech pointed subtly to underlying tensions within the institution that would grow more pronounced over the coming years, eventually culminating in the 1936 resignation of the institute’s first director, W.G. Constable. These tensions revolved around a central question: for whom and for what purpose was this institution created? If the institute intended, as Lord Lee suggested, to both cultivate a general ‘love and scholarly appreciation of the Arts’ amongst the younger generation while at the same time striving to offer ‘a limited number of students and research workers’ professional training, then which one of these aims would take priority? Further, what would determine how the study of art history was defined and approached in the context of the

\(^746\) The Courtauld Institute was formally associated with the University of London.

\(^747\) Samuel Courtauld and Sir Robert Witt were the other primary founders. Courtauld was the principle benefactor, contributing £70,000 towards the foundation of the institute. Lord Martin Conway and Joseph Duveen also supported the creation of the institute.

British university system? This chapter explores the underlying causation of these tensions and considers the relationship between the development of the Courtauld Institute’s programme, the institutionalisation of art history and their relation to the professionalisation of art museum field in Britain in the period between 1927-1937.

Through an examination of the institution’s foundation, growth, and development this chapter identifies the Courtauld Institute as a site of struggle, where visions about the nature and purpose of the study of art history clashed. This clash exposed insecurities about the foundational knowledge base of art history. At the same time it raised questions about how the academic legitimisation of the discipline might redefine the traditional balance of power amongst art world participants involved in the interconnecting spheres of the university, the press, the art market and the museum.

**The British Art Museum Field Before the Courtauld Institute**

In 1928, following an extensive investigation into the management and practices of state-funded museums, the Royal Commission on National Museums and Galleries published its findings in an official report. The nation’s museums, the report suggested, lacked synchronicity in policy and procedure and were suffering from disarray and neglect, brought about by a long term deprivation of necessary state funds. Moreover, there existed no clear and structured path of entrance into the museum field. Sir Robert Witt, a member of the Royal Commission and one of the future founders of the Courtauld Institute, provided testimony as part of the investigation, voicing his concern that, ‘England was dropping behind in giving training to the curator, the students and the critics.’ (Figure 68) Seeking to remedy the lack of systematic training for museum workers, the report urged the Museums Association to implement a vocational skills programme along the lines of the one that had been adopted by the country’s Library

---


Association several years before.\textsuperscript{751} On the recommendation of the report, the Museums Association began to offer weeklong vocationally oriented courses in 1930. Two years later, in October 1932, the Museums Association initiated a diploma programme.\textsuperscript{752} To receive a diploma, students had to attend three of the week-long courses, demonstrate competency in the techniques and methods of museum administration and provide examples of their own museum work.\textsuperscript{753} Further, the report looked to models of training adopted by other countries and noted the success of Sachs’ Museum Course and the German attaché system, the latter ‘already in embryo both at the National Gallery and at the British Museum.’\textsuperscript{754}

The report’s call for a more organised, systematic approach to training echoed a sentiment that had been steadily growing within the museum field.\textsuperscript{755} In 1912, sixteen years before the Royal Commission’s investigation, D.S. MacColl wrote an article that criticised the administration of the National Gallery and emphasised the consequences of insufficient training for art museum workers.\textsuperscript{756} MacColl observed that due to a lack of proper training appointees to the posts of keeper and director were often ill prepared for the duties and responsibilities of their positions. MacColl proposed that art museums address this problem by facilitating mentorship relationships between recent university graduates and established museum staff. Although these graduates would not have been able to study art history in the British university system and would therefore arrive at the museum as generalists, MacColl stressed that they should nonetheless be, ‘chosen for

\textsuperscript{751} Royal Commission Final Report, 1928, p.80. According to the report, the Library Association’s implementation of their own examination and diploma had resulted in a ‘marked improvement in the qualifications of librarians.’


\textsuperscript{753} Lewis, 1989, pp.53-54.

\textsuperscript{754} Royal Commission Final Report (London, 1928) p.79. The attaché system was in essence an unpaid internship where university graduates shadowed senior members of staff. For a description of Benedict Nicolson’s training as an attaché at the National Gallery see: Elam, 2004.

\textsuperscript{755} The issue of systematic training for museum workers was raised at the annual meetings of the Museums Association in 1921, when it was the subject of a lecture and discussion, and in 1924, when it was brought up again in the Presidential Address. See: Lewis, 1989, pp.38-39.

their interest in, and knowledge of art, to which should be added some technical practice in painting and in the process of cleaning and varnishing pictures. MacColl argued that if these university graduates were employed as assistants to senior museum staff, and provided with time to pursue independent research and develop their own areas of expertise, they would eventually become equipped to rise through institutional ranks and develop into effective museum leaders.

Despite insistence from MacColl and others within the museum field that the adoption of a standardised approach was necessary, by the late 1920s a formal training system for British art museum workers was still yet to be realised. This situation stood in contrast to the one in the United States, where Sachs’ Museum Course had by this time been running for nearly a decade. This divergence was due to the particular conditions shaping the art museum field in each country.

The 1928 Royal Commission report noted that in the absence of state-sponsored funding, museums in Britain had come to rely on ‘the initiative and munificence of private persons’ both ‘in enriching the collections and in providing increased and improved means of exhibition.’ Yet while individuals and groups such as National Art Collections Fund offered vital support, they could not meet the deficit created by the state’s financial passivity. Additionally, there was no philanthropic organisation on scale of the Carnegie Corporation that was endeavouring to aid the growth of the art museum field in Britain. Although the Carnegie Corporation had a presence in Britain from 1913 onward it was focused upon social welfare and not the arts. Thus scarcity of organised

---

757 MacColl, 1912, p.32. MacColl’s indication that students mentees should be familiar with technical art processes testifies to the lingering notion that keepers and directors should be practising artists, discussed earlier in this thesis.

758 MacColl noted that this was how the department of Prints and Drawings at the British Museum was already being run. MacColl equated the department’s favourable reputation with its ability to train a younger generation of museum staff.

759 Royal Commission Interim Report, 1928, p.49.

760 The Carnegie United Kingdom Trust was established with the purpose of ‘improvement of the well-being of the masses of the people of Great Britain and Ireland by such means as are embraced within the meaning of the word ‘charitable’ and which the Trustees may from time to time select as best fitted from age to age for securing these purposes, remembering that new needs are constantly arising as the masses advance.’ See: Condliffe-Lagemann, 1992; Lewis, 1989, pp.42-52.
philanthropic funding, contributed to the delay of a formal training system for art museum workers in Britain.

Nevertheless, the years between MacColl’s 1912 proposal and the Royal Commission’s 1928 report did witness the gradual emergence of an informal training system for art museum workers, distinguished by hands-on training within the art museum and the acquisition of skills through mentorship and independent study. In a lecture before Sachs’ Museum Course students in 1931, W.G. Constable discussed the typical training of an art museum executive in the early twentieth century. Citing as an example the career of A.E. Popham, a future lecturer at the Courtauld Institute who began to work in the Prints and Drawings department of the British Museum in 1912, Constable explained: 761

As a boy of twenty-two, just finishing University, he entered the museum. He had no technical training, but had a good classical foundation. He was placed in a certain section for work as a sort of disciplinary training, but not taking all of his time so that he was free to develop any line of study that appealed to him. He would get a living wage, a security of position, and freedom to pursue his own subject.

Methods of training varied across institutions and amongst individuals. The early career paths of Sir Kenneth Clark and W.G. Constable warrant brief consideration as they illustrate the different ways in which this informal training system could operate. 762

Both Clark and Constable would be involved in the formation of the Courtauld Institute’s initial programme and understanding the forces that shaped their respective paths of entrance into the art museum field gives context to their individual approaches to the study of art history.

Clark, who would eventually obtain the directorship of the National Gallery in 1933, began his museum training as a student at Trinity College, Oxford in 1922, where he assisted Ashmolean keeper, Charles F. Bell. Through Bell, Clark was introduced to Bernard Berenson in 1925. Berenson mentored Clark, providing him with research opportunities in connection with the cataloguing of Florentine drawings. The working relationship that evolved between Berenson and Clark foreshadowed the one that would

761 Museum Course Record of Meeting, The New Courtauld: History, Purposes and Aims, Scope (Policies), 16 March 1931. HFMA.

soon develop between Berenson and Museum Course student John Walker III, previously mentioned in the Museum Course case study. For the remainder of the decade, Clark trained with both Bell and Berenson and his initial research interests were shaped by both of these mentors. Clark’s first art historical publication, *The Gothic Revival: An Essay in the History of Taste*, built upon Bell’s primary area of expertise, while his research into the Italian Renaissance, the area in which he would ultimately establish his scholarly reputation, was guided by Berenson.\(^{763}\) It was through his work with Berenson that Clark obtained a commission in 1929 to catalogue the Leonardo da Vinci drawings in the collection of Windsor Castle. Two years later, in 1931, Clark became keeper of the Ashmolean upon Bell’s retirement. *(Figure 70)*

Constable studied economics at Cambridge and trained as a lawyer before enlisting in the military during the First World War.\(^ {764}\) After the war, Constable abandoned the law and began to study at the Slade School of Fine Art. While there he developed a deep interest in the history of art. A mentorship relationship between Constable and Roger Fry began in 1919 when Constable wrote to Fry seeking advice about how he might further his professional interests in the history of art.\(^ {765}\) Fry offered an encouraging response, urging Constable to draft an article on an art topic that was akin to those being produced for the *Burlington Magazine* and send it to him for analysis and critique.\(^ {766}\) Fry emphasised that an approach to art criticism that was grounded in history was needed as he lamented that in Britain there was ‘no one writing who has given any sort of serious consideration to art or knows its history and development.’\(^ {767}\) Soon after this exchange with Fry, Constable began to write art criticism for the *New Statesman*.\(^ {768}\)

---


\(^{764}\) **William George Constable:** (b.1887, d.1976) See Appendix for Biographical Summary.


In 1920 the head of the sculpture department at the Slade recognised Constable’s potential and recommended him to D.S. MacColl, then keeper of the Wallace Collection. At the Wallace Collection, Constable worked first as a lecturer, guiding students around the gallery. Gradually, he began to assist MacColl in his keepership duties. Although Constable only worked with MacColl for three years, they would maintain a close correspondence until MacColl’s death in 1948. In a letter to MacColl written in December 1930 Constable would reflect on the importance of his time assisting MacColl, stating, ‘it was you who launched me on my way, and by precept and example put me on the right path.’ Constable left the Wallace in 1923 to work at the National Gallery, where he rose to assistant director and remained until he assumed the directorship of the Courtauld Institute. Constable would later recall this period as a critical juncture in his career:

I got the job at the Wallace, and that was an entirely new phase. I was now definitely in the art history and museum world […] I was used in a good many ways by MacColl […] In particular, I helped MacColl with the cataloguing of the 18th century French furniture, which is particularly fine in the Wallace Collection […] This was all very useful preparation for application to the National Gallery where a vacancy occurred about that time. Finally I transferred to the National Gallery because I was already in the English civil service, the Wallace Collection being the National Collection. So I went along to the National Gallery and there spent many years as assistant to the director, Charles Holmes.

Clark and Constable’s preliminary career paths were distinct, shaped by the specific needs of the museums in which they worked and the interests of their mentors. Yet the manner in which each man gained entrance into the art museum field is representative of the informal training system that predominated in the period leading up to the foundation of the Courtauld Institute. Considered together, certain parallels between Clark and Constable’s experiences become apparent. Both were Oxbridge educated and embarked on their art museum careers as generalists with a decided lack of focus as to area of specialization. Further, both benefitted from mentorship relationships both inside and

769 W.G. Constable, Oral History Interview, 1972 July -1973 June. SIA.

770 As evidenced by numerous letters between MacColl and Constable from 1924-1948 in the MacColl Archive at the University of Glasgow. MAUG.

771 W.G. Constable to D.S. MacColl, 19 December 1930. MAUG.

772 W.G. Constable, Oral History Interview, 1972 July -1973 June. SIA.
outside of the art museum. Clark and Constable received guidance not only from the senior museum workers they assisted but also, respectively, from Berenson and Fry, established art world players operating outside of the immediate institutional context of the art museum.

In their own careers Berenson and Fry moved with ease between the interconnecting spheres of the art museum, the market and the press, variously assuming roles as advisor, critic and scholar. Both actively contributed to understandings of the definition and structure of art history before it was fully incorporated into the British university system, imbuing the discipline with their own approach to connoisseurship and scholarship.773

That established art world players such as Berenson and Fry collaborated with senior museum workers like Bell and MacColl in the informal training of art museum workers in Britain is noteworthy. The cooperation between these parties attests to the overlap between art world spheres and speaks to the necessity of imparting new entrants into the field with a knowledge base that was fluid and adaptable to the demands of the broader art world, an idea which was also central to approach that Sachs’ employed in the Museum Course.

The Dilemma of the Museum Course Model

Plans for the Courtauld Institute of Art began to materialize in the autumn of 1927. In late November Lord Lee of Fareham signed a draft memorandum for the ‘Provision of Facilities for the Study of the History of Art’ which sketched out the initial aims for an art history programme in collaboration with the University of London.774 Although Lee’s biography portrays him as the primary force behind the project, correspondence in the Fogg Art Museum Archive calls attention to the significant contributions made by Sir Robert Witt and Samuel Courtauld even before the draft memorandum was drawn up.775 These letters illustrate the extent to which all three co-founders looked to the Museum Course to determine the goals and initial structure of the Courtauld Institute.

---


775 Clark, 1974.
A key moment in the early development of the relationship between the Courtauld Institute and the Fogg Art Museum occurred in October 1927 when Witt travelled to the United States to conduct research on behalf of the Royal Commission on National Museums and Galleries. Witt visited the Fogg with the intention of studying the Museum Course and investigating the feasibility of establishing a similar programme in Britain. Afterward he wrote a letter of thanks and praise to Sachs’ colleague, Fogg director Edward Waldo Forbes:

> What I feel about your work you know, and the Fogg is the Embodiment of it. Who could wish for better? I hope to preach your gospel to better purpose at home with the inspiration that I won from you and Sachs- par nobile fratrum!

This was not Witt’s first encounter with the Fogg. Sachs and Witt initially met in 1920 when they were introduced by Helen Clay Frick, a mutual friend, and in 1923 Witt lectured before Museum Course students at the Fogg.

In early November, less than a month after Witt’s visit to the Fogg, Samuel Courtauld and his wife Elizabeth arrived in Boston. Sachs would recall the visit in his memoirs:

> The first night at dinner it was thrilling to have them develop their ideas, and it was flattering to hear them say that they had come to see just how Forbes and I were grappling with the problems of a university museum in our newly erected building. They hoped that our philosophy about the place of a museum in education was akin to their own. We saw eye to eye.

Recognising the synchronicity of their aims, Sachs was eager to be of help. During the Courtaulds’ visit he accompanied them on a trip to the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum and provided them with letters of introduction to Mrs. J. Montgomery Sears, also a major collector of French Impressionist paintings, and Charles Livingood, the director of the Cincinnati Museum of Art. As the Courtaulds prepared to sail back to England, Sachs

---

776 Robert Witt to Edward Waldo Forbes, 19/20 October, 1927. HFMA.

777 It is interesting to note that during the October 1927 trip Helen Clay Frick accompanied Witt on an excursion to the University of Pittsburgh to meet with Frederick Mortimer Clapp, who had just begun to oversee the development of the Department of Fine Arts and its library. See: Paul Sachs to Frederick Mortimer Clapp, 8 November 1927. HFMA.

778 Sachs, 1957/8, p.309. HFMA.

779 Paul Sachs to Frederick Mortimer Clapp, 8 November 1927. HFMA. Samuel Courtauld to Paul Sachs, November 1927. HFMA. Paul Sachs to Samuel Courtauld, (Introduction to Charles Livingood Director, Cincinnati Art Museum and Mrs. J. Montgomery Sears), 4 June, 1930. HFMA.
sent Fogg catalogues and materials related to the Museum Course to their ship, expressing his hope that the resources would be of assistance to Courtauld, Witt and Lee as they formulated their plans.\textsuperscript{780} Smyth observes that Sachs’ efforts to assist in the creation of the new programme were a reflection of Harvard University’s close ties to the British art world, traceable back to the time of Ruskin and Norton.\textsuperscript{781}

In the years between the 1927 visits and the Courtauld Institute’s opening in 1932, Sachs demonstrated a continued interest in the developing institution. In a lecture in December 1930, he spoke of his desire to facilitate a future overseas exchange between Museum Course students and those at what he referred to as ‘Lord Lee’s Institute.’\textsuperscript{782} In March 1931 Sachs invited W.G. Constable, who had recently been announced as the Courtauld Institute’s first director, to come and lecture to Museum Course students about the scheme for the new institution. Constable, then the assistant director of London’s National Gallery, had by this point been involved with plans for the Courtauld Institute for some time. Later in his life he would recount that he had worked alongside Lee, Witt and Courtauld from the outset of the project as part of an informal planning committee where ‘without being specifically mentioned - it was understood that I should be the director.’\textsuperscript{783} \textbf{(Figure 69)}

Constable’s March 1931 lecture to Sachs’ Museum Course students detailed the proposed plans for the Courtauld Institute’s internal organisational structure and programme.\textsuperscript{784} The lecture offers insight into the development of the institute’s programme during a formative period and reveals how Constable conceived of the project from an idealistic viewpoint, unencumbered by daily management concerns. It had already been decided that Constable was to hold a professorship in addition to his directorial duties. Constable had selected J.G. Mann, who had taken over Constable’s

\textsuperscript{780} Paul Sachs to Samuel Courtauld, 17 November 1927. HFMA.

\textsuperscript{781} Smyth and Lukehart, 1993.

\textsuperscript{782} Museum Course Record of Meeting, 1 December 1930. HFMA.


\textsuperscript{784} Museum Course Record of Meeting, 16 March 1931. HFMA.
assistant position at the Wallace Collection in 1924, to act as the Courtauld Institute’s deputy director.\textsuperscript{785} Constable, Mann and a selection of professors already employed in different departments across the University of London, such as the expert in Chinese art and archaeology, Walter Perceval Yetts, were to teach regularly at the institute. Still Constable anticipated that much of the instruction provided to students would come from full-time museum personnel, and he mentioned his mentor D.S. MacColl as a potential lecturer. Consequently, Constable predicted that ‘a great deal of the teaching and lecturing will be after museum closing time, which will leave the day for studying in galleries and libraries.’\textsuperscript{786}

Constable relayed that students would be given the opportunity to study first-hand from the art objects in Lee and Courtauld’s collections and would also have access to an art historical library within the institute. While the decision to incorporate Witt’s extensive photographic collection into the institution had not yet been made, Constable stressed the necessity of building up a comprehensive art historical library. This was to be one of the first priorities of the institute and Constable stated his intention to assemble ‘fifty to sixty thousand volumes’ which would include ‘periodicals, important original authorities like Vasari, large volumes of reproductions, and catalogues of public and private collections.’\textsuperscript{787}

Constable further explained the Courtauld Institute was to offer four types of degrees: a one year diploma, which would mainly serve to enrich teachers’ understandings of art history, a B.A., to be awarded after three years of study, an M.A., and a Ph.D. The M.A. degree would require that students produce a written thesis, although it was not necessary that it contain original research. The Ph.D. degree, Constable believed, would be ‘far more useful’ as it would require the completion of a dissertation that demonstrated the student’s capacity for original research and allow for contribution to the knowledge base of the discipline.\textsuperscript{788}

\textsuperscript{785} James Gow Mann (b. 1897, d.1962) See Appendix for Biographical Summary.

\textsuperscript{786} Museum Course Record of Meeting, 16 March 1931. HFMA.

\textsuperscript{787} Museum Course Record of Meeting, 16 March 1931. HFMA.

\textsuperscript{788} Museum Course Record of Meeting, 16 March 1931. HFMA.
Emphasizing the importance of instruction from museum personnel and the first-hand study of art objects, Constable’s lecture made explicit the degree to which the Courtauld Institute was being fashioned after the Museum Course. At the same time however, Constable was aware that the new programme must differ from its American counterpart as it sought to respond to the needs of the British museum field, which was shaped by ‘different problems and different demands.’ While acknowledging that the 1928 Royal Commission report had made the necessity for improved training standards apparent, Constable described the museum field in his country as ‘stagnant’ and remarked that, unlike the United States, there was ‘no great demand for museum personnel.’ Further, Constable was sensitive to the lack of large scale philanthropic support available to aid the growth of the museum field in Britain. He expressed tentative hope that the Carnegie Corporation might ultimately be persuaded to fund student fellowships for graduate study at the Courtauld Institute, but stated that no such support had yet been secured.

Constable argued that these differences between the British and American museum fields made it unfeasible for the new programme to adopt the Museum Course’s vocationally oriented approach. Instead, he contended, the Courtauld Institute would necessarily ‘differ from the Fogg’ as research activities would ‘assume a larger degree of importance.’ As discussed earlier in this thesis, Sachs’ Museum Course was governed by two interconnected aims: to provide students with an overview of the museum field and how it operated and to impart the knowledge base necessary to successfully navigate that field. In contrast, Constable envisioned the Courtauld Institute’s programme as one primarily grounded in the furthering of art historical scholarship and research with only minimal attention given to providing students with an understanding of the museum field and how it functioned. Constable’s stress upon the importance of the inclusion of advanced graduate students and the foundation of a comprehensive art historical library within the institute are indicative of his research-oriented approach.

---

789 *Museum Course Record of Meeting*, 16 March 1931. HFMA.

790 *Museum Course Record of Meeting*, 16 March 1931. HFMA.

791 This support was not forthcoming although in 1934-1936 the Carnegie Corporation did fund summer course exchanges between the Museum Course and the Courtauld Institute. See: Brush, 2004, p.216.

792 *Museum Course Record of Meeting*, 16 March 1931. HFMA.
In an October 1932 article written to coincide with the official opening of the Courtauld Institute and published in the College Art Association’s journal, *Parnassus*, Constable publicly asserted his commitment to the new institution as a site for the production of original art historical scholarship and research. Perhaps in deference to the broader aims of the founders laid out by Lord Lee in his speech to the press earlier that summer, Constable’s argument within the article was subtler than in his lecture to the Museum Course students, although still readily discernible. Recounting the types of degrees offered by the institution he discussed the B.A. and the diploma courses before introducing the M.A. and Ph.D., describing the advanced degrees as ‘equally, if not more important’ because of their connection to research and potential to produce original scholarship. Constable also stated that the focus of study at the institution was to be on the ‘Christian era’ in ‘both the East and the West’ and indicated that the selection of this time period was due in part to the fact that both the ‘Classic’ and ‘Pre-Christian eras’ were already covered by other departments within the University of London. Constable had conveyed this same information to Sachs’ students during his Museum Course lecture and also expressed his eagerness for the Courtauld Institute to carry out investigation into the history of art in Britain in particular, an area he identified as particularly under researched and in need of original contributions.

The following month, in November 1932, another article about the Courtauld Institute appeared, this one authored by Sir Robert Witt and published in the *Burlington Magazine*. Witt, along with Courtauld, was to serve on the new institute’s Management Committee chaired by Lee. Repeating Constable’s assertion that the focus of the institution was to be upon art in the Christian era, Witt also agreed with Constable that an overtly vocational approach would be ill-suited to the new institution. He wrote:

---


795 Constable, 1932, pp.4-5.

796 *Museum Course Record of Meeting*, 16 March 1931. HFMA.

797 Witt, 1932, p.232.
It cannot be too widely known that the Institute is an academic or teaching institution, with no more special vocational tendency than any other Department of London University.

Yet beyond their consensus on these general points, Witt and Constable’s views on the primary purpose of the new institute diverged. Whereas Constable felt that in the absence of a vocational ethos the chief goal of the institute should be the facilitation of original art historical scholarship and research carried out by advanced graduate students, Witt took an alternate stance. Echoing the aims of the institute set forth by Lord Lee, Witt remarked that the institution’s ‘appeal to students is of the most liberal’ and further stated that all of ‘the courses will be regarded both as a means of education and as a basis of appreciation for the Arts.’

At this early stage in the Courtauld Institute’s existence, when great energy was being channelled into establishing the institution and making it fully operational, the potential conflict in the differing priorities expressed in Constable and Witt’s articles appears to have gone unrecognised. For the moment, the institution was focused upon determining how the discipline of art history should be framed and approached in the context of the British university system. While confining the scope of study to the ‘Christian era’ helped to define the chronological parameters of the discipline within the institution, questions about what should constitute the overarching philosophy and appropriate teaching methodologies of an academic art history programme persisted.

**Defining Art History at the Courtauld Institute**

One of the challenges in determining how art history should be incorporated into academia lay in the subject’s complicated relationship to other more established university disciplines. Roger Fry acknowledged these tensions in a 1933 lecture given to mark his appointment to the Slade professorship at Cambridge. Fry argued that it was in fact art history’s applicability and relevance to established disciplines, such as philosophy and history, which necessitated its recognition as an independent academic subject.
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If ever there was a study which, needing as it does the cooperation of so many sciences, would benefit by sharing the life of the University, it is surely that of Art-history.

Fry’s lecture at Cambridge represented the culmination of an argument that he had developed over several years. This argument centred around Fry’s conviction that the articulation of a systematic and ‘scientific’ approach to art history within the university system would both professionalise and invigorate the British art world. In 1930, responding to the announcement of plans for the foundation of the Courtauld Institute, Fry wrote a letter to the Burlington Magazine expressing his hopes for the institution and stressing the necessity of approaching the study of art history from an objective standpoint:

I should like to see such a faculty lean rather to the scientific than to the literary attitude. The future of what I may call applied aesthetics is rather, I believe, with the psychologist and the anthropologist than with the classical scholar. In the first place, in a study so liable to subjective distortion as that of art, the scientific discipline is of immense value. It is highly desirable that no dogmatic valuations, however respectable their traditional backing, should be allowed to pass unquestioned. It is essential that the art-historian should be able to contemplate any object which can claim in any way to be a work of art with the same alert and attentive inquisition as one which has already been, as it were, canonized.

While Fry’s emphasis on ‘applied aesthetics’ and the fair evaluation of art works outside of established canons reflected his own personal concerns, his stress upon adoption of objective methodologies and his general thoughts on the place of art history in the university system were akin to Constable’s own views. In a 1938 treatise Constable contended that art history’s close alliance with other disciplines lent it a singular quality
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802 For analysis of Fry’s concerns with aesthetics and canonisation of art works see: Green’s essay in Art Made Modern: Roger Fry’s Vision of Art, ed. by Christopher Green (London: Merrel Holborton in Association with the Courtauld Gallery of Art, 1999).
which dictated that it be approached as a serious and systematic study within the framework of other more established academic traditions. Art history may be defined as the history of man as a maker of material things into which aesthetic elements enter […] so the art historian must be prepared to study man as a producer of works of art in relation, for example, to the political, economic, literary and religious activities of the period; and in relation to such changes as those in geographical, climactic and geological conditions.

During Constable’s tenure as director of the Courtauld Institute, the articulation of art history as an independent academic subject, both in relation to established disciplines and within the context of the British university system, permeated the institution’s activities. One of the main ways in which this institutional concern manifested itself was through the importance placed upon the identification of art historical reference works which could represent the foundational knowledge of the discipline and serve as a comprehensive bibliography of the subject. (Figure 71)

Under Constable’s leadership both lecturers and library staff were actively engaged in compiling lists of art historical reference works and the institute’s 1934 publication of its inaugural *Annual Bibliography of the History of British Art* stands as tangible evidence of this engagement. Yet the *Annual Bibliography* does not represent the totality of the institution’s efforts in this endeavour. A Master Syllabus of the teaching programme from the academic year 1933-1934, uncovered in the Paul Mellon Centre Archives, contains extensive course bibliographies annotated with library identification numbers. Although a note at the beginning of the *Master Syllabus* states that the bibliographies it contains are not meant to represent a ‘complete or systematic bibliography of the history of art’ and vary according to the ‘scope and methods’ of the lecture and the intentions of the lecturer, the very existence of the document testifies to the emphasis that the institution placed upon the identification and collection of art historical reference works.
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works. Further, student work produced during this time also demonstrated a concern for the assemblage of bibliographical resources. A catalogue created to accompany a 1934 student-curated exhibition entitled, *Exhibition of Books on the Practice of Drawing and Painting from 1650 to 1850*, speaks to the pervasiveness of situating and interpreting art practices in the context of a body of scholarly literature.

This institutional focus on the identification and collection of art historical reference works that could represent the foundational knowledge of the discipline reflected Constable’s overarching ambition for the Courtauld Institute to serve as a centre for the production of original art historical research and scholarship. Constable’s intention to dedicate the institution to this purpose is also apparent in his selection of Courtauld Institute lecturers. The aforementioned Master Syllabus of 1933-1934 shows that in preparation for that academic year Constable assembled a teaching staff of forty diverse art world players drawn from the spheres of academia, the art museum, the art market and the press. A consideration of the makeup of this varied group offers insight into the disparate art world players who, employing different teaching methodologies and possessing distinctly individual approaches to the discipline, were collectively shaping conceptions of art history within the institute.

The museum personnel that Constable chose as lecturers were drawn from the National Gallery, the British Museum, the Victoria & Albert Museum and the Wallace Collection. In accordance with Constable’s desire for the programme to distance itself

806 Courtauld Institute of Art, *Master Copy of Institutional Syllabus, Vol.1 & 2*, 1933-1934. PMCA. The Master Syllabus was discovered amongst the personal papers which Frank Simpson, a former librarian and archivist at the Paul Mellon Centre, donated to the institution. The current archivist at the Paul Mellon Centre believes that Simpson was either a student or library assistant at the Courtauld Institute in the early 1930s.
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810 From the National Gallery: H.L Wellington (gallery lecturer), E.K. Waterhouse (assistant keeper) and Kenneth Clark (director). From the British Museum: A.E. Popham (keeper), Campbell Dodgson (keeper), A.M. Hind (keeper). From the Victoria and Albert: A.F. Kendricks
from a vocationally oriented approach and focus on scholarship, these museum-based lecturers did not provide practical instruction related to the museum field but instead lectured on topics relevant to their area of art historical expertise. The lectures on Italian engravings given by British museum keeper A.M. Hind, or those on Dürer given by Hind’s colleague Campbell Dodgson, were typical of the kind of instruction that the institute’s museum-based lecturers provided. It bears mention that in the institution’s first year Paul Sachs presented a short series of four lectures on American museum administration.\(^{811}\) However, the vocational emphasis of Sachs’ talks was an exception to the more scholastic approach that normally characterised the institution’s lectures.

In addition to recruited museum staff, a number of the lecturers employed by the Courtauld Institute in the 1933-1934 academic year were refugee German art historians, recently arrived in Britain as a result of the large-scale exodus of academics from Nazi Germany.\(^{812}\) Their arrival at the institute coincided with a concerted effort on the part of British academics to provide aid to German scholars from a range of disciplines. It was with this purpose that the Academic Assistance Council had been founded in the late spring of 1933.\(^{813}\) Constable was sympathetic to Council’s general aims and to the plight of displaced German art historians in particular. When Nickolaus Pevsner arrived in London after the academic year had begun and all of the Courtauld Institute’s teaching positions had been allocated, Constable went out of his way to secure a short-term lectureship for him.\(^{814}\) Letters in the Warburg Institute Archives reveal that Constable travelled to Germany in the summer of 1933 as part of his effort to coordinate the

(keeper) and R. Edwards (keeper). From the Wallace Collection: J.G. Mann (assistant keeper). See Appendix for lectures given.

\(^{811}\) Sachs’ short lecture series was entitled, ‘The Activity of Some American Museums’. See: ‘Courtauld Institute Lectures’, *Burlington Magazine*, 61, 355 (October 1932), p.160. See also: Rhoda Welsford to Paul Sachs, 8 November 1932. HFMA. Rhoda Welsford to Paul Sachs, 4 November 1932. HFMA. Rhoda Welsford was the Courtauld Institute’s Head Librarian; these letters concern arrangements for Sachs’ visit.

\(^{812}\) Professor Wilhelm Pinder, Dr. Martin Weinberger, Dr. Walter Friedlander, Dr. Nickolaus Pevsner, Dr. Oskar Fischel were amongst the German art historian refugees who lectured at the Courtauld Institute in 1933-1934 academic year.

\(^{813}\) ‘Announcement of the Academic Assistance Scheme’, *British Medical Journal*, 3 June 1933, p.974.

transfer of the Warburg Library to London with the support of Lord Lee and Witt. It is highly probable that it was on this trip that Constable recruited many of the German academics who lectured at the Courtauld Institute that coming year.  

The presence of Herbert Read, Helmut Ruhemann and James Byam Shaw amongst the 1933-1934 lecturing staff also deserves mention. In the tradition of Berenson and Fry, the careers of Read, Ruhemann and Shaw blurred the boundaries between art world spheres. Read’s professional endeavours were characterised by his involvement with academia, the art museum and the press. He worked as a keeper in the Ceramics department at the Victoria & Albert Museum and held a professorship in the Fine Arts Department at the University of Edinburgh before being appointed as editor of the Burlington Magazine in 1933. 

Ruhemann and Shaw’s careers were similarly multi-faceted as their professional activities traversed the spheres of both academia and the art market. A recent German émigré, Ruhemann had been employed as the chief picture restorer at the Kaiser Friedrich Museum in Berlin before relocating to London. The National Gallery retained Ruhemann in 1934 but he also worked on a freelance basis with London art dealers such as Duveen, Agnew’s and Colnaghi’s. Shaw also shared a close association with the partners at Colnaghi’s. After graduating from Oxford in 1925, Shaw’s extensive travels in Continental Europe were sponsored by Gustavas Meyer, one of the partners at Colnaghi’s. This was done with the understanding that Shaw would eventually work in service of the firm. Shaw would assume the directorship of Colnaghi’s in 1937 but in the years leading up to the appointment he lectured at the Courtauld Institute and acted as Constable’s assistant. It was with appreciation that Constable would later recall the

815 W.G Constable to Robert Witt, 18 October 1933. WIA. W.G Constable to Arthur Hamilton Lee, 11 May 1933. WIA. These letters show that Constable played a crucial role in securing financial support from Lee for the transfer of the Warburg Library.


contributions to the institute’s teaching programme made by those with close ties to the art market.\(^{818}\)

One or two of the best teachers were actually dealers, young dealers, who were in eminent dealers’ firms, who had wide experience and a great deal of knowledge.

In his 1990 essay, *Art History in Perspective*, Stephen Bann argues that historical positivism, art criticism, and Morellian-connoisseurship all contributed to art history’s formation as a discipline.\(^{820}\) The presence and confluence of these traditions is tangible in many of the individual syllabuses and lecture outlines produced by the diverse teaching staff that Constable assembled for the 1933-1934 academic year.\(^{821}\) Wilhelm Pinder’s ‘German Sculpture’ syllabus frames its topic in the context of the lecturer’s generational view of art history, placing importance on the interactions between successive generations of artists, and serves as an example of the way in which historical positivism manifested itself in the institute’s curriculum.\(^{822}\) While historical positivism dominated the syllabuses prepared by the institution’s German art historian lecturers such as Pinder, the tradition was also present in the syllabuses of British lecturers, although usually in a less overt fashion. Herbert Read’s ‘Aesthetic Basis of Modern Art’ syllabus bears the imprint of both historical positivism and art criticism as it anchors its topic in an assemblage of bibliographical resources that chart the chronological advancements of the philosophy of aesthetics from the publication of Hegel’s *Philosophy of Fine Art* to Fry’s *The Artist and Psychoanalysis*.\(^{823}\) Within Kenneth Clark’s ‘Leonardo da Vinci’ syllabus, the merger of art criticism and Morellian connoisseurship is readily apparent. Clark’s syllabus cites both Vasari’s historical art writing and the art criticism of Walter Pater amongst its bibliographical references, and structures its topic
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822 Wilhelm Pinder, *Syllabus for German Sculpture*, 1934. PMCA.

823 Herbert Read, *Syllabus for Aesthetic Basis of Modern Art*, 1934. PMCA.
around categories which reinforce the importance of primary documentary evidence, first-hand observation and an understanding of the artist’s methods.\(^{824}\) (Figures 72 & 73)

Although these syllabuses underscore the different individual approaches adopted by the institute’s lecturers, they also attest to a united focus on scholarship and the identification of art historical reference works. Constable, however, was eager to define the nature of this scholarship further and develop a more standardised and consistent curriculum that could steer the aims of the programme towards a concentration on the production of original research.

As the 1933-1934 academic year drew to a close, it was becoming increasingly apparent that Constable’s aims for the institute differed from those of the founders. In the spring of 1934 the Courtauld Institute received a £50,000 donation from Norman Wilkinson to be used ‘for the promotion of the objects thereof in whatever way its governing body may deem most fitting.’\(^{825}\) It was determined that the money should be used to found a laboratory for scientific research within the institute and a conference was held to define and determine the objectives of the laboratory. At the conference, and in the press coverage that followed, Constable emphasised that the new laboratory should reflect the greater aims of the institute in that it should be dedicated to what he called ‘pure research.’\(^{826}\) (Figure 74)

In the winter of 1934 Constable corresponded with Fritz Saxl, the director of the Warburg Library about the development of the Courtauld Institute’s programme thus far. A letter written by Constable on December 7\(^{th}\) not only illustrates the importance that Constable placed upon the institution’s research activities but also reveals Constable’s concerns about grounding the teaching programme in a cohesive approach to the discipline:\(^{827}\)

> The weakness at the moment of the Courtauld Institute is as a centre of research, and about this I am thinking hard. I do not reproach myself for this defect for we have only been in existence two years, but I am anxious to
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\(^{824}\) Kenneth Clark, *Syllabus for Leonardo Da Vinci*, 1934. PMCA.

\(^{825}\) ‘Founding a “Laboratory of the Arts”’, *Daily Telegraph*, 10 March 1934.

\(^{826}\) Courtauld Institute of Art, *Internal Memorandum: Manifesto for Laboratory of Art*. NAK.

\(^{827}\) W.G. Constable to Fritz Saxl, 7 December 1934. WIA.
strengthen the institute on this side. The first great difficulty is the securing of a coherent group of students who are able to devote themselves in various degrees to research. Here, economic difficulties are in the way but I am delighted to say that I see signs of such a group emerging. The second great difficulty is to find teachers capable of directing that research not merely in the case of individuals but of giving the research as a whole a definite colour and quality. This problem is less easy to solve.

Constable’s statement that he wished to give ‘the research as a whole a definite colour and quality’ testifies to his increasingly vocal assertions that the institute should altogether eschew the less scholastic pursuit of arts appreciation which the founders promoted and instead devote itself to instruction which could contribute to the knowledge base of the discipline and strengthen the position of the professional art historian.

**Conflicting Aims Over the Institution’s Purpose and Mission**

In May 1936, the differing priorities of Constable and the Courtauld Institute founders came to a head. In an institutional meeting on academic policy Constable expressed his desire that the institute eradicate its B.A. and diploma courses and concentrate its efforts on postgraduate study.\(^{828}\) Although the minutes of the meeting record that Constable’s idea was supported by a majority of those present, including deputy director J.G. Mann, the institute’s founders objected. After the meeting Samuel Courtauld wrote a letter to Lord Lee deriding Constable’s suggestion: \(^{829}\)

> [...] Although most schoolboys may not be capable of benefiting by a course at the Institute, it would be a great pity to miss the brilliant exceptions. Art appreciation is largely a matter of flair, intuition, and sensibility; it is not an exact science requiring an extreme knowledge of scientific formulae.

The following month, Witt authored the founders’ objection to Constable’s motion, writing that although he believed the institute would benefit from a more selective admissions policy the abolishment of the B.A. and diploma courses was inadvisable as it would ‘rob the institute of the greater part of it special character.’ \(^{830}\) Thus it was decided that the institute’s course structure would, for the present, remain unchanged.
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\(^{828}\) Courtauld Institute of Art, *Minutes of the Sub-Committee on Academic Policy*, 11 May 1936. CIA.

\(^{829}\) Samuel Courtauld to Arthur Hamilton Lee, May/June 1936. CIA.

\(^{830}\) Courtauld Institute of Art, *Report (Minority) on Academic Policy*, June 1936. CIA.
In the wake of the decision, both Constable and Mann submitted their resignation in the summer of 1936. The dispute, however, was not over. In September of 1937, Herbert Read used the editorial section of the *Burlington Magazine* to register his protest of the circumstances surrounding Constable’s departure.\(^{831}\) Read argued that the institute’s diploma course was ‘superficial’ and stated that though the degree might impart knowledge sufficient for a student to ‘improve his conversational powers’ it would be of no use in qualifying him for a ‘post in a museum or gallery.’\(^{832}\) Read also called into question the appointment of Constable’s successor, Thomas Boase, a historian ‘unknown to the world of art studies.’ Read alluded that Boase may have been an attractive candidate to the Management Committee as his lack of art historical expertise meant that he would not be in a position to threaten their dominant position within the institute. 

Lord Lee reacted angrily to these allegations. In a letter to the *Burlington Magazine* in October 1937 he argued that the deficiencies in the present structure of the institute’s programme were exaggerated and that, moreover, Constable had not shown objection to the B.A. and diploma courses until the May 1936 meeting.\(^{833}\) Constable himself was compelled to respond to this allegation and in his November 1937 letter to the *Burlington Magazine* he stated that his dissatisfaction with both the B.A. and diploma courses had developed during his first year at the institute and that he had expressed his misgivings both ‘to the staff and the Board of Studies in the History of Art.’\(^{834}\) In this same issue of the magazine, two Courtauld Institute lecturers, E.K. Waterhouse and D. Talbot Rice, asserted their support for Constable.\(^{835}\)

The *Burlington Magazine* debate finally came to an end in December 1937 with a letter from Witt.\(^{836}\) Witt’s letter is of interest as it speaks candidly about the underlying
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tensions at play in the debate. Witt began by acknowledging that before the foundation of the Courtauld Institute there was no institution devoted to the study of art history and no university degree offered in the subject, a situation that was ‘universally deplored.’ Yet those who deplored the situation ‘differed naturally enough in their views as to what was most needed and what they desired to achieve.’ Witt elaborated:

Museum directors and staffs, professional art teachers, professors, writers and critics were, quite reasonably, interested in the creation of an Institute which should mainly (if not exclusively) produce scholars of their own outlook and calibre and of the most exacting erudition […] But, whether unfortunately or not, no Pious Founder could be discovered to come forward to create and endow such a Foundation […] Those interested in art and art history, however, include also a very large number who are in no sense professionally concerned with its teaching or administration - collectors, amateurs, connoisseurs, men and women in every walk of life and of every profession (many, I know, readers of The Burlington Magazine) who care deeply for art in all its manifestations, love and visit Museums and Galleries, and are eager to learn all they can. If their standard of scholarship is often low they would wish it higher. If their art experience is limited, they would have it enlarged. So will their taste and powers of appreciation develop. Their enthusiasm for such an Institute as I have mentioned above for a few erudite scholars would be but secondary; their primary concern would be, also quite naturally, for one constituted on a broader basis and on more widely humanistic lines. In the interests of this great body of men and women, and as himself one of them, came forward Mr. Courtauld with his offer to London University to build and support such an Institute.

With this declaration Witt touched upon the central but theretofore unspoken issue at the heart of the conflict of interests. While Constable and his supporters wished to use the institute as a vehicle for the professionalisation of the art historian, that aim was secondary to men such as Courtauld, who, by virtue of wealth and its corresponding power, were the only individuals equipped to bring such an institute into existence. Moreover, the increased authority of the art historian that would result from the academic legitimisation of the discipline was potentially threatening as it represented a possible shift in the power dynamics between the elite who oversaw cultural arts organisation and those who were employed by them.
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In his letter to the *Burlington Magazine* in 1930, Roger Fry had been explicit in his desire for the Courtauld Institute to imbue the professional art historian with authority such that he might be able to challenge the power of institutional boards comprised of non-specialists.\(^{838}\)

The mere existence of a University degree in art history would have a marvellously sobering effect on these public-spirited, but over-inspired patrons. They would feel something of the same hesitation in overriding the opinion of such a professional authority as they may now feel about neglecting the advice of their doctor. In the long run this might lead to our provincial galleries becoming centres of artistic influence comparable to the great provincial galleries of Germany and America. The difference that this would make in the cultural life of England is incalculable.

Following the *Burlington Magazine* debate over Constable’s resignation, D.S. MacColl authored an article on the conflict in the March 1938 issue of the *Nineteenth Century*.\(^{839}\)

In preparation for the article MacColl corresponded with Witt, Lee, Courtauld and Constable to solicit their version of events.\(^{840}\) MacColl’s article, while firmly in sympathy with Constable and what he perceived as his ‘virtually enforced retirement,’ also endeavoured to understand the motivations of Witt, Lee and Courtauld.\(^{841}\) MacColl also wrote of his own feelings about the Courtauld Institute, recollecting that upon hearing about plans for the foundation of the institute he had welcomed the news, reckoning ‘here at last, with unlooked for financial backing, was the school we had desired, from which a steady stream of officials and scholars generally might be expected to proceed.’\(^{842}\)
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841 D.S. MacColl, ‘On the Policy of the Courtauld Institute’ Draft for article in Nineteenth Century, March 1938. MAUG.
842 MacColl, 1938.
Attempting to juxtapose the differing aims of the two factions invested in the institute, MacColl’s article drew attention to the complicated historic relationship between the two sides. Lord Lee, for instance, was not known to Constable only as one of the founders of the institution in question but also as a trustee of the Wallace Collection, an association that predated their mutual participation in the Courtauld Institute. In a similar fashion, Witt’s professional interactions with MacColl dated back to the foundation of the National Art Collections Fund, a project in which both men had been intensely involved. Entanglements such as these made both criticism and institutional changes particularly fraught endeavours and are no doubt part of the reason that it took four years for the conflicting aims inherent in the Courtauld Institute’s foundation to fully surface.

*The Connoisseur-Scholar’s Metamorphosis*

This chapter has examined the foundational years of the Courtauld Institute, focusing its attention on the new institution as a site of struggle where conflicting visions about the nature and purpose of the study of art history clashed. As this chapter has shown, the conflict which positioned Constable and his peers against the Courtauld Institute’s founders laid bare the tensions surrounding the traditional balance of power in the British art world.

Initially, the connoisseur-scholar ideal held great appeal for those vested in the new institute, as Sachs’ early collaborations with Constable, Courtauld, and Witt indicate. Yet, the problems inherent in applying the connoisseur-scholar model to what Constable referred to as Britain’s ‘stagnant’ art museum field became apparent almost as soon as the institute opened. The chief problem of transporting the connoisseur-scholar ideal abroad was this: the British art world had neither the means nor the resources to expand the art museum field at a rate comparable to the United States.

In light of this reality, it soon became clear that the connoisseur-scholar ideal was ill-suited to the needs of the British art museum field in the 1930s. If the British art museum executive and the field of curatorial practice were to continue to professionalise, it was evident that a strategy different to the one adopted in the American art museum field was
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needed. Such a strategy was necessary, for the British art museum field lacked both the financial capital and the philanthropic patronage necessary to replicate the conditions that had allowed the connoisseur-scholar to thrive.

But what was the knowledge base of the next generation of art museum executives to look like? As we have seen, this was a question that was in the forefront of the minds of men such as Constable, Fry and MacColl. Increasingly, the British art museum field turned towards the further codification of academic art history in answer to this puzzle. The connoisseur-scholar, however, was not lost entirely. The concluding chapter of this thesis examines the legacy and lingering reminders of Sachs’ ideal art museum worker and considers the metamorphosis of the connoisseur-scholar in greater depth.
Conclusion

It has been seventy-eight years since Sachs stood before the assembled audience of the American Association of Museums and proclaimed that the museum of the future would be an institution led by an ‘elite’ group of university-trained men, experts with the ‘power to lead the world in the coming generation in museum collecting and in museum scholarship.’\footnote{Sachs, 1934. pp.8-10.} To the contemporary observer, Sachs’ argument appears at once familiar and outmoded. His casual reference to an elite male leadership is notable.\footnote{As noted earlier, Sachs was instrumental in the museum careers of many of the female graduates of the Fogg Art Museum Course. However, for the most part, the recommendations that Sachs’ wrote strongly suggest that women in the museum field should be confined to lesser roles than those enjoyed by their male counterparts. Sachs’ mentorship of Agnes Mognan, later the Director of the Fogg Art Museum (1969-1971), was the exception, not the rule.} Further, while his emphasis on collecting is not unusual, his failure to mention the museum’s need to focus on audience engagement, development or expansion in relation to that aim, is remarkable. On both points, Sachs’ assertions seem to stand in opposition to the inclusive, educationally oriented goals of the institution that are now widely accepted by professional museum organisations.\footnote{Museums Association, \textit{Code of Ethics for Museums} (Museums Association: 2007); American Association of Museums Association, \textit{Code of Ethics for Museums} (American Association of Museums: 2000); International Council of Museums, \textit{ICOM Code of Ethics for Museums} (International Council of Museums: 2004). See also: Department for Culture, Media and Sport, \textit{Understanding the Future: Priorities for England’s Museums} (Department for Culture, Media and Sport: 2006)} At the same time, other aspects of Sachs’ argument, namely his emphasis on the importance of university training, acquisition and scholarship, correspond closely with much contemporary museum rhetoric.\footnote{Museum rhetoric is not uniform and indeed varies by institutional type and geographic region. Still, it is worth noting that the contemporary mission statements of the Fogg Art Museum, the Wallace and Frick Collections and the Metropolitan all attest to the primacy of university training, acquisition and scholarship within the present field. See: http://www.harvardartmuseums.org/about/mission.dot; http://www.wallacecollection.org/thecollection/howwework/governance/visionstatement; http://www.frick.org/information/mission.htm; http://www.metmuseum.org/about-the-museum/mission-statement (all accessed online, 15 May, 2012).}
The art museum field of today is much changed from the one in which Sachs operated. Amongst the developments that have shaped the twenty-first century art museum are a diversification of recognised occupations within the field, a retaliation to institutional elitism and intensified financial pressures. Changes such as these, and the manner in which they have restructured expectations of curatorial work, must be examined if we are to understand the complex legacy of the connoisseur-scholar.

This research has been concerned with processes of professionalisation in the art museum in the period between approximately 1900-1940. In Chapters One and Two I analysed the efforts of Benjamin Ives Gilman, Roger Fry, Henry Watson Kent, Claude Phillips and D.S. MacColl and suggested that the movement towards professionalisation of the art museum was visible in the United States and Britain from at least the first decade of the twentieth century onwards. In the previous chapter I contended that, with the onset of the Second World War, the authority and influence of the art museum leader whom I have identified as a connoisseur-scholar began to be subsumed by that of the academic art historian. It was this transition from connoisseur-scholar to academic art historian that guided my decision to draw the case studies of this thesis to a close at the end of the fourth decade of the twentieth century. The choice to end my investigation during that period should not be taken as an indication that the process of professionalisation was then complete. Indeed, as I aim to show here, the art museum field is in a constant and ongoing state of professionalisation and the executive’s quest to assert institutional authority and autonomy is a struggle which continues into the present day.

Two significant changes within the art museum field occurred as a direct result of the Second World War. The first of these I discussed earlier, noting the numerous conceptual innovations introduced to British and American university art history departments by German refugee scholars. These innovations gave shape to the iconographical concerns of academic art history, making a substantial contribution to the ideological foundation of the discipline as we recognise it today. For curators, keepers and directors, this move towards the codification of academic art history was important as it brought increased legitimacy to one of the key institutional platforms through which they would assert their authority in the post-war era. The other significant change came in the form of a reorientation of the museum’s aims towards public service. During the war, this reorientation was visible in both individual institutions and professional museum
organisations such as the American Association of Museums and the Museums Association. By the time that the International Council of Museums was established in 1945 public service aims had become part of established museum doctrine, in theory if not always in practice.

The post-war era witnessed the diversification of occupations within the art museum field. For curators, keepers and directors the emergence of two new types of professionals, the art museum educator and the conservator, was of particular significance. While both conservation and education had long been recognised as important aspects of the museum’s mission, these activities had traditionally been seen as falling within the realm of curatorial responsibilities. The correlation between conservation skills and curatorial work stretched back to the early nineteenth century, while a close association between the museum’s educational objectives and the duties of the curator had also existed since that time. The creation of the roles of the art museum educator and conservator thus signalled at least a partial renegotiation of the boundaries of curatorial endeavours.

A further indication of this diversification may be seen in the increasing distinction made between the roles of curators, keepers and directors. Gradually, the division between those employed to serve in an administrative capacity and those charged with the caretaking of objects became more defined. The formal incorporation of the Association

848 For instance, discussing the National Gallery’s history during this period, Saumarez Smith notes that the museum’s relationship with the public was transformed during the war as the gallery repositioned itself as ‘a place of mass democratic culture.’ Charles Saumarez Smith, The National Gallery: A Short History (London: Frances Lincoln, Ltd., 2009) p.131; Boylan, 2006.


850 The emergence of these professions was gradual. It was at the 1950 ICOM general conference, held in London, that conservators were recognised as a distinct category of museum professional. Educators received similar recognition at 1965 ICOM general conference, which took place in New York City. See also: Bewer, 2010.


of Art Museum Directors in 1969 made this division explicit. This separation between curatorial work and administrative authority has been significant in constructing the professional identity of twenty-first century curators, a matter I will discuss later in this chapter.

In the period immediately after the war, the art museum’s reorientation towards public service aims co-existed with a continued institutional commitment to the principles of aesthetic idealism. This co-existence remained largely uncontested until the counterculture movement of the late 1960s, when art museums found themselves at the centre of a debate about institutional elitism. The 1969 publication of The Love of Art, Pierre Bourdieu and Alain Darbel’s investigation into the audiences of French galleries, was indicative of a growing awareness that art museums were not the impartial institutions that they presented themselves to be. Rather, as Bourdieu and Darbel’s study contended, art museums served to ‘reinforce for some the feeling of belonging and for others the feeling of exclusion.’

At the core of this debate were concerns about the ownership of knowledge and the extent to which museums might serve as instruments for redressing societal inequalities. The concerns of this debate were not new. Indeed, John Cotton Dana had raised similar questions in his work, The Gloom of the Museum, in 1917. Yet the dialogue surrounding the museum’s purpose that occurred in the late 1960s was unprecedented both in scale and in its connection to a wider cultural debate. In this context, Sachs’ notion of the art museum as an elite institution administered by highly-educated men of privilege was seen as increasingly problematic.

---

853 The Association of Art Museum Directors had been founded in 1912, but it was not until 1969 that that it became an independent, professional organisation.


855 For a summary of the issues of the late 1960s debate surrounding the art museum see: McClellan, 2008, pp.42-46.


As the production of cultural knowledge was scrutinised, the authority of the art museum and the curator to make decisions about the inherent worth and value of art was viewed with mounting scepticism. This would have both immediate and long lasting consequences. A general trend towards the adoption of more inclusive, populist aims was visible across the art museum fields of Britain and the United States from the late 1960s onwards. These aims manifested themselves not only in a more sensitive display and interpretation of objects, but also in the physical architecture of newly constructed gallery spaces and art museum buildings. Over the long term, the concerns raised during this time would prove significant in ushering in a gradual shift towards increased curatorial reflexivity: an awareness of the particular values, biases and context governing curatorial decisions.

The parameters of the 1960s debate surrounding the art museum also had implications for those involved in the critique of the institution and its practices. In 1976 Brian O’Doherty challenged the presumed neutrality of the gallery space in his influential publication, *Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space*. The themes present in O’Doherty’s investigation raised questions about the nature of curatorial power and authority and laid the groundwork for a line of inquiry into the complex relationship between the art museum, the curator and society that has continued into the present day.

---


860 For instance, the 1968 opening of the Hayward Gallery on London’s Southbank, a new permanent space for temporary exhibitions, serves as evidence of this more egalitarian approach. See: Taylor, 1999, pp.203-220.


Economic realities of the latter half of the twentieth century changed the financial pressures and expectations placed on the art museum. In both Britain and the United States, the first blockbuster exhibitions took place in the late 1960s, and gained prominence in the 1970s. These exhibitions held a double appeal as they reinforced the populist ethos of the museum at the same time that they generated much needed funds. With the 1980s came the rise of Reaganism in the United States and Thatcherism in Britain, both of which served to make the economic position of the art museum more tenuous. It was in this environment that corporate sponsorship of the art museum, particularly in relation to blockbuster exhibitions, became ever more commonplace.

Strategies adopted to confront financial pressures have necessarily influenced the way in which curatorial practice is approached. Increasingly, expectations are placed on those engaged in curatorial work to locate and secure funding for exhibitions and acquisitions. This situation is commonly bemoaned by those in the field, particularly because it is seen as deviating the curator’s attention away from research activities. Moreover, justified or not, there is a pervasive unease that the museum’s alignment with exterior funding sources, be they corporate or government sponsored, might influence the type of curatorial work produced in the institution.

Changes to the relationship between the art market and the museum have also occurred. The circumstances of the twenty-first century art market are such that all but the wealthiest of museums are prohibited from the regular acquisition of consecrated works


865 Chin-tao Wu, Privatising Culture: Corporate Art Intervention since the 1980s (London: Verson, 2002).


of the canon of Western art. At the same time, the collecting of contemporary art has become both widely accepted and commonplace across the art museum field. Coinciding with these changes is a broadening view of the art museum’s aims, mission and purpose, itself an inheritance of post-war reorientation towards public service and inclusivity. In a 2004 study commissioned by the Getty Institute, Maxwell Anderson asserted that, in light of the increased focus on audience engagement, education, outreach and revenue generation, collecting can no be longer seen as the defining measure of an art museum’s worth or success. These changes are significant, as they imply a reconsideration of the position of curatorial work within the institution’s ideological framework.

The developments that I have touched upon do not represent an exhaustive list of the changes that have shaped the twenty-first century art museum field. Rather, they highlight key factors that have converged to reorient curatorial practice away from the approach of the connoisseur-scholar. Surveying these factors, a sense of the pressures and tensions which present-day art museum curators, keepers and directors are required to navigate becomes clear.

The Legacy of the Connoisseur-Scholar

This thesis has examined the rise of the connoisseur-scholar, a particular type of art museum leader observable in Britain and the United States in the first decades of the twentieth century. This leader possessed a transitional expertise, which looked back to the connoisseurial approach of the late-nineteenth century gentleman amateur at the same time that it anticipated the more academic approach of the mid to late-twentieth century

---


871 In Britain, the reorientation towards these aims was made explicit in the ‘access and inclusion’ agenda for publicly funded arts organisations introduced by New Labour in 1997. See: Department for Culture, Media and Sport, ‘New Cultural Framework’, http://culture.gov.uk/images/publications/dept_spending_review.pdf (accessed 1 May, 2012).

university-trained art historian. The connoisseur-scholar emerged during the period in which British and American art museums were beginning to professionalise and was, by definition, an intermediary figure.

Despite his temporality, the connoisseur-scholar has left an enduring and complex legacy. Central to his conceptualisation of curatorial work was the belief that objects possessed an inherent value based on their aesthetic qualities and that this value could best be ascertained by those who had undertaken specialist training in the study of art. Further, he believed that the art museum’s primary purpose was the preservation, identification and interpretation of art objects deemed to be of the highest aesthetic quality and that these should be presented to the public in an atmosphere that inspired reverence and awe. A brief review of the guiding ethos of six major post-war art museum leaders testifies to the extent to which these core beliefs have continued to shape the professional values of those in positions of authority within the field.

The early professional endeavours of Alfred H. Barr, Jr., and Sir Kenneth Clark have already received attention within this thesis. Yet the careers of both men extended into the second half of the twentieth century and in these later years both remained committed to the values instilled in them during their respective training with Sachs and Berenson. Although the types of art works they championed varied considerably, common to the approach of both Barr and Clark was an emphasis placed on knowledge gained through first-hand observation and an unerring belief that the history of art could be explained as the progression of a series of master artists. (Figure 75 & 76) Barr once described his strategy in the selection and installation of works at the Museum of Modern Art as based on the ‘conscientious, continuous, resolute distinction of quality from mediocrity.’ Further uniting Barr and Clark was a shared conviction that artworks should be presented in an environment that fostered contemplative evaluation and where the visitor’s experience was not overly mediated. Clark expounded on this belief in a lecture presented before the Museums Association in 1945:  

873 (Carol) Duncan, 1995, p.102; Kantor, 2002; Secrest, 1986.  
With pictures the important thing is our direct response to them. We do not value pictures as documents. We do not want to know about them; we want to know them, and explanations may too often interfere with our direct response.

Amongst mid-twentieth century art museum leaders, John Pope-Hennessy and John Walker III stand out as individuals whose approaches mirrored that of the connoisseur-scholar. A self-professed connoisseur, Pope-Hennessy developed an interest in art after reading the works of Crowe and Cavalcaselle at the age of twelve. In the 1930s he trained with Berenson and served as a National Gallery honorary attaché during Clark’s directorship. Years later Pope-Hennessy would recall his first meeting with Clark in 1931, stating that ‘I felt then (and for some years afterward) that he was everything that I aspired to be.’ Pope-Hennessy went on to the Victoria & Albert Museum, where he worked first as a curator of prints before heading the sculpture department. He was appointed as director of the institution in 1967, a position he held until 1974. Pope-Hennessy was committed to buying works that he regarded as being of the highest aesthetic quality. He once said that the common problem with art museums was their ‘in-built tendency to stamp collecting, to buying for small sums objects that are of interest only for the reason that nothing similar exists in the collection.’ He rejected this aim, asserting that ‘In the long term, major acquisitions are the only acquisitions that count.’

John Walker III studied with both Sachs and Berenson before being appointed as chief curator of the National Gallery in Washington D.C. in 1939. He became the institution’s director in 1956, serving in that capacity until his retirement in 1969. Like Pope-Hennessy, Walker believed that art museums should focus chiefly on significant acquisitions and avoid what he termed ‘curatorial purchases’, which he defined as ‘minor

876 John Pope-Hennessy (b.1913, d.1994); John Walker III (b.1906, d.1995). See Appendix for Biographical Summaries.


objects solely of art historical interest or useful to fill in gaps in the collection.\(^\text{881}\) Walker believed that museums should be places where objects were revered. Further, rather than focus on the engagement of uninitiated audiences, museums should appeal to individuals already interested in art.\(^\text{882}\)

While assertions such as these have become increasingly contentious in the context of the twenty-first century art museum field, the values underlying them persist. Philippe de Montebello, who served as director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art from 1977 until 2008, has been a vocal advocate for the art museum as an institution centred on art works, rather than the needs of the visitor. (Figure 77) He explained his stance in an interview in the *New York Times* in 2000: \(^\text{883}\)

   To me, audiences are second. What distinguishes an art museum from a university or a hospital or any other kind of institution is that we collect works of art. Works of art are the tangible manifestation, the highest aspirations, of man as he expresses himself in visual terms. Our primary responsibility is to the works of art. We are responsible for the guardianship, for scholarship. Then comes the matter of bringing it to the public. The public is the ultimate beneficiary of our primary purpose.

This is an outlook shared by James Cuno, director of the Getty Museum in Los Angeles since 2011. Cuno was previously the director of the Art Institute of Chicago, the Courtauld Institute of Art and the Harvard University Art Museums.\(^\text{884}\) In 2000, Cuno wrote an article in the *Boston Globe* in which he stated: ‘I know it sounds old-fashioned but I believe that an art museum’s fundamental purpose is to collect, preserve and exhibit works of art as a vital part of our nation’s cultural patrimony.’\(^\text{885}\) Cuno developed this argument further in his 2004 publication, *Whose Muse?*, in which he contended that art museums must not be afraid to position themselves as experts, as guardians of art in the


\(^{882}\) Walker, 1969, p.27.


\(^{884}\) The Harvard University Art Museums now include the Fogg Art Museum, the Arthur M. Sackler Museum, and the Busch-Reisinger Museum.

interest of the public. Indeed, Cuno reasoned that it is only by embracing this role of guardian that art museums can be worthy of the public’s trust and live up to their stated ideals of public service. (Figure 78)

While these six directors have been influential, they also represent a minority of individuals who have achieved dominant positions of authority at some of the largest art museums in Britain and the United States. Consequently, their views are not necessarily representative of those across the broader museum field. It is indeed telling that in The Discursive Museum, a 2001 volume of essays written by a diverse array of participants within the field, Cuno was the sole dissenting voice in relation to the proposal that the museum should broaden its aims.

It is therefore necessary to stress that the ethos of these post-war art museum leaders do not represent the totality of the connoisseur-scholar’s legacy, which persists in other, more subtle, ways. As we have seen, the connoisseur-scholar’s approach was governed by a marriage between connoisseurship and engagement with art historical discourse. I believe that both of these aspects continue to inform present day curatorial practice at a basic and fundamental level. This is an assertion that requires explanation, for while present day art museum curators are often described as scholars or art historians they are rarely identified as connoisseurs.

The Association of Art Museum Curators, an organisation formed in 2002 and now with a membership in excess of a thousand, defines curators foremost as ‘art historians’ and secondarily as professionals ‘engaged in scholarship with a special emphasis on physical objects.’

A close consideration of the association’s description of curatorial responsibilities serves as a useful exercise:

---


The curator’s primary responsibility is the care, presentation, interpretation and acquisition of works of art in the collection. This means that a work of art under the curator’s care, and works under consideration for acquisition, must be thoroughly researched in order to ensure their authenticity, quality, and historical importance. Uncertainties about a work’s authenticity, origins, condition, presentation, or provenance should immediately be brought to the attention of the museum administration. The proper care, presentation, and interpretation of works from the collection require that curators have broad, substantive knowledge of art history and specialised knowledge in their fields. Curators should maintain that expertise in order to fulfil their responsibility to their collections and their profession.

In its declaration that the curator is to ensure the ‘authenticity, quality’ and ‘historical importance’ of collected art works, and be responsible for understanding the ‘origins’ and ‘condition’ of those objects, this statement places importance on the curator’s ability to make qualitative judgements on the basis of first-hand observation. In so doing, it positions connoisseurship at the centre of the curator’s professional responsibilities. Yet, the word connoisseurship is conspicuously absent from this description. This is not surprising. With its connotations of commercial activity and elitism, connoisseurship is now viewed with a degree of negativity in the art museum field, as both David Carrier and Linda Young observe. Consequently, the practice of connoisseurship appears to stand in conflict with the educational and inclusive aims of the twenty-first century art museum. Accordingly, while connoisseurial activities persist within the art museum and remain central to the curator’s endeavours, they are rarely labelled as such.

There are, however, specific instances in which the connoisseurship of the art museum and the curator are not only acknowledged outright but are brought to the fore. In recent years there has been a marked increase in exhibitions that take connoisseurship itself as a central theme, examining the tensions through which art works are selected and incorporated into collections. The focus of these exhibitions varies. Some centre on an analysis of the collecting practices of a particular contributor to the art museum, such as a founder or influential curator, keeper or director. The Frick Collection has staged two exhibitions of this type, Henry Clay Frick: Collector of Drawings (December 1999 to

---

January 2000) and *From Mansion to Museum: The Frick Collection Celebrates Seventy-Five Years* (June 2010 to September 2010). Further examples can be found in the Gardner Museum’s, *Making of the Museum: Isabella Stewart Gardner as Collector, Architect, and Designer* (April 2003 to August 2003) and the National Gallery’s, *Art for the Nation: Sir Charles Eastlake at the National Gallery* (July 2011 to October 2011). At other times, emphasis is placed on a comparison of two or more similar art works side by side as in the Wallace Collection’s, *Fragonard’s Fountain of Love: Two Masterpieces Compared* (July 2007 to October 2007). The National Gallery’s *Close Examination: Fakes, Mistakes and Discoveries* (June 2010 to September 2010) took the museum’s own history of connoisseurship as its subject. The rise in exhibitions of this kind is significant, as it attests to a notable merger between a continued commitment to connoisseurship and an increased awareness of the role that curatorial reflexivity plays in the twenty-first century art museum.

There is one final aspect of the connoisseur-scholar’s legacy that I would like to draw attention to, which relates to the now commonly held belief that university training in art history is a prerequisite for curatorial work in the art museum. The extent to which the connoisseur-scholar advocated an alignment between curatorial qualifications and academic art history has become evident through the case studies of this thesis. Yet, as Sachs’ 1934 speech at the American Association of Museums attests, this idea was still in the process of gaining acceptance as the Second World War approached. By the mid-1960s, however, the correlation between curatorial workers and specialist art historical expertise acquired in the university had become accepted. An article by Colin Eisler in the journal *Curator* in 1966, entitled ‘Curatorial Training for Today’s Art Museum,’ serves as a testament to the prevalence of this notion. Eisler observes that ‘in order for a young curator to qualify for his job’ he must possess both ‘art historical training’ and ‘at least a B.A., and preferably, an M.A. degree.’

The past two decades have seen an expansion in curatorial studies and curatorial training programmes at the university level. The extent to which such programmes are likely to...


892 Notable curatorial training programmes in the United States include those offered at the California College of the Arts in Oakland, California and at the Centre for Curatorial Studies at
lead to employment as a curator is a matter of debate within the field. Yet the very existence of this kind of training is indicative of the ubiquity of university-level qualification for employment as an art museum executive which, in a broad sense, may be traced back to the connoisseur-scholar’s championship of academic qualification as a requisite for curatorial work.

Despite the important contributions that the connoisseur-scholar made to the formation of art museum curatorial practice as we recognise it today, his participation in this endeavour has been largely overlooked. This is due in part to the way in which the majority of investigations into curatorship published in the last two decades have approached their subject. The interviews and symposia with contemporary curators conducted by scholars such as Hans Ulbricht Obrist, Carolee Thea, Paula Marincola, Robert Storr and Gavin Wade have been invaluable in enriching understandings of the practice of curating in the period between the 1960s and today. However, in their focus on lived experience and the challenges of incorporating contemporary art into established canons, these studies have all taken the 1960s as a starting point in their consideration. The unintentional consequence of this emphasis has been an implication that the processes through which curatorial practice occurred in the pre-1960s art museum field were uncontentious and therefore not worthy of in-depth exploration. As we have seen, this was certainly not the case.

Contributions of Project & Future Research

The contribution of this thesis is three-fold. First, it brings to light information about the activities of art museum figures who have received scarce attention in the past. Of particular note is this project’s investigation into the tenures of Claude Phillips at the

Bard College in Annandale-on-Hudson, New York. In Britain, both the Courtauld Institute of Art and Goldsmiths, University of London, offer graduate degrees in curating.


Wallace Collection and Frederick Mortimer Clapp at the Frick Collection. As noted in Chapter Two, some aspects of Phillips’ career have received limited attention from other scholars in the context of discussions of the formation of the National Art Collections Fund and the *Burlington Magazine*. This project, however, represents the first attempt to look closely at Phillips’ curatorial work at the Wallace Collection. Such an examination has only been possible because of primary archival research undertaken at the Special Collections Archive at the University of Glasgow. Of even greater significance is the information that this project has provided in relation to the endeavours of Frederick Mortimer Clapp. With the exception of a brief mention in the Frick Collection’s official institutional history, there are virtually no published sources that mention Clapp. Yet, in compiling evidence from the archives of the Frick Art Reference Library, the Fogg Art Museum Archive and Clapp’s private archive at Yale University, I have been able to offer a detailed sketch of this prototypical connoisseur-scholar, whose participation in the creation of the Frick Collection left an indelible impression upon the institution.

Second, looking specifically at the part that figures such as Alfred H. Barr, Jr., and Paul Sachs played in the evolution of art museum curatorial practice, this investigation offers new information about individuals whose general contributions to the art museum field are well established.

The third component of this investigation’s contribution relates to the two points that I have already mentioned. This project has offered a careful and considered examination of the interaction between under-researched and well-established figures in the art museum fields in both Britain and the United States. Through this examination I have made visible several connections between British and American art world participants that have not been explored previously. A prime example may be seen in my indication of the ongoing professional dialogue between Sachs, Clapp and Sydney Cockerell at the Fitzwilliam Museum, especially notable because of their complementary approaches to the installation and interpretation of art works within their respective galleries. More broadly, it is through an examination of the interaction between greater and lesser known curatorial practice participants in both Britain and the United States that the field of curatorial practice, in its historical incarnation, begins to emerge.

As an investigation into curatorial practice in a non-contemporary context, this thesis represents a first step into seldom explored territory. I have chosen to explore an aspect
of the historical art museum field that has not been specifically studied before, but which has nevertheless been touched upon by many different kinds of investigations. Within this thesis I have often referred to institutional and individual biographies, studies of the history of the art museum and changing approaches to gallery display, and investigations into the power dynamics between art museum players and the professionalisation of the art museum. The works of these diverse genres have been crucial in laying the foundation for this thesis and it is to these same investigations that this project endeavours to contribute.

The argument of this thesis has been guided by a theoretical framework which owes a significant debt to the scholarship of Howard Becker and Pierre Bourdieu. In this regard, two ideas are of particular note. The first of these is Becker’s notion of the art world as a ‘network of people whose cooperative activity, organised via their joint knowledge of conventional means of doing things, produces the kind of art that art world is known for.’ The second of these is Bourdieu’s understanding of the field as an entity defined and structured by ‘a state of power relations among the agents or institutions’ who participate in it. Central to both conceptualisations is a recognition of the fluid nature of professional, social, and economic interactions and an acknowledgment of the complexity of power structures that exist between individuals and institutions within any given sphere.

It is with a similar awareness of this fluidity and complexity that I have strived to examine the relationships between the various academics, donors and museum workers invested in the professionalisation of art museum curatorial practice. Making use of Becker and Bourdieu’s theoretical tools, I have endeavoured to show that the field of curatorial practice is a complex web of interchanges and activities which must be understood in the context of the larger art world. Like the field of curatorial practice, this larger art world is itself a dynamic system comprised of spheres bound together by interconnected ideas and individuals. The interchanges and exchanges that take place within this web possess a dualistic quality; they are both forces that shape, and are simultaneously shaped by, the activities of others. This simple but powerful idea speaks

895 Becker, 1982, p.x.

to one of the key findings of this thesis: that the professionalisation of curatorial practitioners cannot be understood as a simple cause and effect- the influence of one party over another- but rather as a tangled, collaborative struggle to define the curator’s role within a rapidly evolving institutional structure.

My methodological approach has been grounded in the uncovering of primary archival evidence. More of this type of evidence is needed if we are to come to a comprehensive understanding of the way in which art museum curatorial practice has evolved. Considering the future directions of the research that I have begun with this thesis, I see a number of possibilities. There is potential to expand the study of the transitional art museum leader whom I have identified as a connoisseur-scholar. I believe that, with further primary research across a greater number of institutions, it would be possible to determine more precisely the extent to which the connoisseur-scholar was ubiquitous across the field. Primary research of this kind also holds the possibility to contribute to an understanding of the alternative curatorial approaches, such as the one embodied by John Cotton Dana, that emerged during this same period when British and American art museums were beginning to professionalise.

I will conclude this thesis with an acknowledgement of the need for further investigation into the historical origins of curatorial practice at this particular moment in time. The formation of the Association of Art Museum Curators in 2002 was born out of an effort to redress what was felt to be an increasing encroachment on the institutional authority of the curator and the curator’s exclusion from administrative decisions. The association has held regular annual conferences for the past ten years, which are now attended by hundreds of curators. In 2008, the organisation implemented a new initiative, the Centre for Curatorial Leadership. This programme endeavours to provide senior art museum curators with the skills and connections necessary to allow them to move into institutional positions of administrative authority with greater ease. The rationale behind this initiative is that the curator’s work has been pushed to the periphery of the art museum’s concerns and that as a result institutions are in danger of being separated from their primary purpose: the preservation, presentation and interpretation of works of art. Such concerns are not unique to the United States. A May 2012 editorial in the
Burlington Magazine expressed similar convictions in the context of a discussion of the future of Tate Britain. 897

There is no doubt that, for a considerable period, the position of the scholarly museum curator has been subject to a general attrition in institutions across Britain. While managers and administrators, departments for Human Resources, marketing, education and outreach have blossomed, curators have invariably found themselves sidelined…the broken continuity in the handing on of the curatorial baton [is now amongst the] urgent priorities to be redressed by the directorate.

Both the creation of the Centre for Curatorial Leadership and the opinion expressed in this editorial are of consequence, for they serve as further indications that the curator’s quest for institutional authority, agency and professional recognition is one that is ongoing.

Appendix

Biographical Summaries

Alfred Hamilton Barr, Jr. (b.1902, d.1981)
Place of Birth: Detroit, Michigan
Training: Received his MA in 1924 from Princeton University; began his PhD at Harvard, studying under Paul J. Sachs; left Harvard prior to completing his dissertation and in 1926 accepted a teaching position at Wellesley College, where he taught the first art history course in modern art; received an honorary doctorate from Princeton University in 1946.
Positions Held: Appointed first director of the Museum of Modern Art in 1946. He remained at this museum in a variety of positions until he retired in 1968.

Bernard Berenson (b.1865, d.1959)
Place of Birth: Lithuania; immigrated to Boston with his family at age ten.
Training: Attended Boston University and later Harvard University, where he studied under Charles Eliot Norton; known as an authoritative expert in Renaissance art.
Positions Held: Art Dealer. He amassed a sizeable fortune through his advisory partnerships with art dealers such as Joseph Duveen.

Wilhelm von Bode (b.1845, d.1929)
Place of Birth: Calvode, Germany
Training: Originally studied law, but later obtained a doctorate in art history in 1870.
Positions Held: Assistant curator of sculpture at the Royal Museum of Berlin from 1872. Promoted to head of the painting department in 1890 and became the director of the Royal Museum of Berlin and the Kaiser Frederich Museum (later renamed the Bode Museum) in 1905.
Notable information: Sceptical of what he perceived as the overly academic approach of the previous generation of German art historians. He popularised the ‘period room’ style of museum interiors during the 1880s.

Samuel James Camp (b.1876, d.1936)
Place of Birth: Bearswood End, Beaconsfield
Training: Educated at Birkbeck College; became known as an armour expert.
Positions Held: Joined the British Civil Service of the Conservative Central Office in 1890; appointed as assistant keeper of the Wallace Collection in 1908; upon the death of Sir Guy Laking in 1919 became Inspector of the Armouries; succeeded MacColl as Keeper of the Wallace Collection in 1924.
Notable information: Helped to remove the Wallace Collection to an underground facility during WWI.

Frederick Mortimer Clapp (b.1879, d.1969)
Place of Birth: New York City
Training: Received a BA (1901) and MA (1902) from Yale University. Received his doctorate from the Sorbonne in 1914. He published several volumes of poetry and a catalogue raisonne of the Italian artist, Jacopo Carucci da Pontormo.
Positions Held: Became Head of the Department of Fine Arts at the University of Pittsburgh in 1926; advisor to the Frick Collection beginning in 1929; Director of the Frick Collection from 1935 to 1951.
Notable information: Maintained a close personal and professional relationship with Paul J. Sachs throughout his life.

Sir Kenneth Clark (b.1903, d.1983)
Place of Birth: London; an only child of an affluent family.
Training: Studied art history at Trinity College, Oxford; became an expert in Italian Renaissance art.
Positions Held: In 1933 became the youngest ever Director of the National Gallery; remained as Director until 1945.
Notable information: Well known for his BBC television programme, *Civilisation*, which aired in 1969.

Sydney Cockerell (b.1867, d.1962)
Place of Birth: Brighton
Training: Mostly self-taught; limited formal education as his father died when he was ten; quit school and took up working in the family business as a coal merchant; later became a friend of John Ruskin, the art critic, and travelled extensively in Europe; considered a scholar of illuminated manuscripts.
Positions Held: worked for the Society for the Protection of Ancient Building beginning in 1891; private secretary to William Morris; served as the Director of the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge University from 1908 until 1937.

William George Constable (b.1887, d.1976)
Place of Birth: Derby
Training: Studied history, law and economics at St. John’s College, Cambridge; became known as an art administrator, critic and curator.
Positions Held: Worked at the Wallace Collection from 1920-1923 and at the National Gallery from 1923-1932; chosen to be the first director of the Courtauld Institute during the institution’s first four years; resigned in 1936 in the midst of a dispute: with the support of Sachs, secured a position as Curator of Painting at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts in 1938; remained in this position until 1957; lived in the United States for the remainder of his life.

Samuel Courtauld (b.1867, d.1947)
Place of Birth: Bocking, Baintree, Essex; born into a wealthy family that had an international textile manufacturing company.
Positions Held: Acted as the General Manager and later the Chairman of the family textile manufacturing business; his wealth allowed him to become an art collector in later life; his taste for French Impressionism was shaped in part by Roger Fry; one of the founders of the Courtauld Institute.
Notable information: Donated his home at 20 Portman Square in London to the Courtauld Institute to use as its original site; donated his personal art collection to the Courtauld Institute.

John Cotton Dana (b.1856, d.1929)
Place of Birth: Woodstock, Vermont; the son of a general store manager.
Training: B.A. from Dartmouth College; initially planned to enter law; but ill health necessitated a move to Colorado.

Positions Held: First librarian of the Denver School District; founded the public library system in Springfield, Massachusetts in 1898; Newark Free Public Library in New Jersey in 1901; created an adjunct science museum merged with an arts collection in 1909 and became the Director of the Newark Museum from 1909 to 1921.

**Sir Charles Lock Eastlake** (b.1793, d.1865)
Place of Birth: Plymouth, Devon
Training: Lived in Rome from 1816 until 1828, where he worked as a practising artist; his first exhibition at the Royal Academy was in 1827; elected to the Royal Academy in 1823; elected Fellow of the Royal Society in 1840.
Positions Held: Secretary of the Fine Arts Commission in 1841; Keeper of the National Gallery from 1843 to 1847; Director of the National Gallery from 1855 until 1865.
Notable information: Knighted in 1850; elected President of the Royal Academy in 1850, making him an *ex officio* trustee of the National Gallery.

**Edward Waldo Forbes** (b.1873, d.1969)
Place of Birth: Boston, Massachusetts
Training: Received his B.A. from Harvard University in 1895.
Positions Held: Appointed Martin A. Ryerson Professor in the Fine Arts at Harvard in 1935; Trustee of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts from 1903 until 1963; Director of the Fogg Art Museum until his retirement in 1944.

**Helen Clay Frick** (b.1888, d.1984)
Place of Birth: Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Positions Held: Dedicated to preserving the legacy of her father through philanthropy; was the founder and director of the Frick Art Reference Library; instrumental in the foundation of the Fine Arts Department at the University of Pittsburgh.
Notable information: She was the favoured child of the industrialist, Henry Clay Frick; inherited a large portion of his estate, becoming the wealthiest single woman in the United States; the unequal division of the inheritance remained a source of animosity between Helen and her brother, Childs, for the remainder of their lives.

**Roger Fry** (b.1866, d.1934)
Place of Birth: London
Training: King’s College, Cambridge; after graduation travelled to France and Italy where he studied painting; originally focused on the Old Masters; became an influential art critic.
Position Held: Founding member of the *Burlington Magazine* and the National Art Collection’s Fund; curator of European painting at the Museum of Modern Art from 1904 to 1910; Slade Professor of Fine Art at Cambridge from 1933.
Notable information: Known for his debates with MacColl about the formalist principles of works of art; strong advocate of Post-Impressionism.

**Benjamin Ives Gilman** (b.1852, d.1933)
Place of Birth: New York. Born into a prosperous family; his father, Winthrop Sargent Gilman, was head of the banking house of Gilman, Son & Co; his brother, Theodore P. Gilman was a New York State Comptroller.
Training: began his career in the family banking house, but later attended graduate school at John Hopkins University; studied philosophy and logic under Charles Sanders Pierce.

Positions Held: Instructor in psychology at Clark University; curator at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts from 1893 until 1925 (the title of the position was subsequently changed to secretary).

Notable information: wrote books on a wide range of subjects including art, museum practice, logic and philosophy.

**Sir Charles John Holmes**  (b.1868, d.1936)
Place of Birth: Preston, Lancashire
Training: attended Eton and Brasenose College, Oxford, graduating in 1887; wrote art criticism along with Roger Fry for the *Athenaeum* from 1889 to 1903.

Positions Held: Helped establish the *Burlington Magazine* in 1903; served as co-editor of the magazine; a member of the New English Art Club from 1904; Slade Professor of Fine Art at Oxford from 1904-1910; Director at the National Portrait Gallery director from 1909-1916; knighted in 1921.

**Henry Watson Kent**  (b.1866, d.1948)
Place of Birth: Boston, Massachusetts
Training: Studied Library Science at Columbia College under Melvil Dewey; in the 1890s travelled to Europe to study museum administration practices.

Positions Held: Slater Memorial Museum of the Norwich Free Academy; Library of the Grolier Club; appointed Assistant Secretary at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in 1905, subsequently promoted to Secretary in 1913, a position he held until he retired in 1940.

**Frederick Paul Keppel**  (b.1875, d.1943)
Place of Birth: New York; members of his immediate family were print dealers, patronized by Sachs.

Positions Held: Served as Assistant Secretary, Secretary and Dean of Columbia College; Elected President of the Carnegie Corporation in 1922.

**Sir Guy Francis Laking**  (b.1875, d.1919)
Place of Birth: London
Training: Attended Westminster School; showed an interest in armour from a young age; enrolled in the School of Architectural Drawing, but left to become an art advisor at Christies.

Positions Held: First Inspector of the Armoury at the Wallace Collection from its opening until his death; Keeper of the London Museum from 1911 until his death. Published inventories of armoury collection at Windsor Castle and Wallace Collection.

**Lord Lee of Fareham** (Arthur Hamilton Lee, 1st)  (b.1868, d.1947)
Place of Birth: Bridport
Training: Served in the military, often posted overseas; later held many government appointments.

Positions Held: Trustee of the Wallace Collection and the National Gallery; a member of the Royal Fine Arts Commission.

Notable information: In 1917 donated Chequers, his country estate, to the nation as a retreat for the Prime Minister; one of the founders of the Courtauld Institute of Art; bequeathed his art collection to the Courtauld Institute of Art.
**Dugald Sutherland MacColl** (b.1859, d.1948)  
Place of Birth: Glasgow, Scotland  
Training: MA from the University College, London in 1882; as a painter he was especially interested in watercolour.  
Positions Held: Keeper of the Tate Gallery (1906-1911); appointed to the board of trustees at the Tate Gallery in 1917; Keeper of the Wallace Collection (1912-1924).  
Notable information: Worked as an art critic for the Spectator and the Saturday Review; worked to advance the acceptance of Impressionist Art in England.

**James Gow Mann** (b.1897, d.1962)  
Place of Birth: London  
Training: Studied at Winchester and New College, Oxford; known as an expert in sculpture, arms and armour.  
Positions Held: 1924 to 1936 assistant to Wallace Collection keeper, S.J. Camp who had assumed the role of keeper after MacColl’s retirement; appointed keeper of the Wallace Collection in 1936; held this position until his death in 1962.

**John Stirling Maxwell**, 10th Baronet (b.1866, d.1956)  
Training: Educated at Eton and Trinity College, Cambridge.  
Positions Held: Conservative Member of Parliament; Wallace Collection Trustee, Chairman of Royal Fine Arts Commission for Scotland; in 1931 founding member of the National Trust for Scotland.  
Notable information: gifted his home, Pollok House, to Scotland and part of his estate for the housing of the Burrell Art Collection.

**Charles Eliot Norton** (b.1827, d.1908)  
Place of Birth: Boston, MA. Born into a wealthy family; his father, Andrews Norton, was a Harvard Professor of Sacred Literature.  
Training: Graduated from Harvard in 1846; his family’s wealth and social position facilitated frequent trips abroad and he became increasingly involved in art and literary circles from the 1850s; a scholar of Dante.  
Positions Held: In 1875 appointed the first professor of Art History at Harvard; remained there until his retirement in 1898; the first President of the Archaeological Institute of America; a trustee of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts.  
Notable information: A founder of Harvard University’s Fogg Art Museum (1895).

**Johann Passavant** (b.1787, d. 1861)  
Place of Birth: Frankfurt, Germany  
Training: Originally trained and worked in commerce, but later took up painting studies in Paris and travelled extensively within continental Europe.  
Positions Held: Appointed as curator of the Städelsches Kunstinstitut in Frankfurt in 1839.  
Notable information: Best known for his biography of Raphael written in 1839 and *Tour of a German Artist in England*, translated into English by Lady Eastlake in 1836. Along with Waagen, contributed to the catalogue of Liverpool Gallery in 1851; the project was overseen by Eastlake.

**Sir Claude Phillips** (b.1846, d.1924)  
Place of Birth: London
Training: MA from London University; trained as a solicitor, called to the bar 1883 but later left the legal profession to become an art critic.
Positions Held: Keeper of the Wallace Collection from 1897 to 1911; appointed three years prior to the opening of the museum to the public.
Notable information: Phillips was knighted upon his retirement from the Wallace Collection in 1911.

**John Pope-Hennessy** (b.1913, d.1994)
Place of Birth: London
Training: Attended Balliol College, Oxford; met Kenneth Clark in 1931, when Clark was preparing for the Italian Paintings exhibition at Burlington House; later apprenticed to Berenson.
Positions Held: National Gallery honourary attaché in the mid-1930s; in 1938 secured a position in the Department of Engraving, Illustration and Design at the Victoria & Albert Museum; appointed Keeper of the Department of Sculpture at the Victoria & Albert Museum in 1954; taught at Williams College 1962-63; delivered the Mellon lectures in Washington D.C. in 1963; Director of the Victoria & Albert Museum from 1967 until 1974; Director of the British Museum until 1977; at the request of Director Thomas Hoving, rehung the European paintings collection at the Metropolitan Museum of Art.
Notable information: As a child, he lived in Washington D.C. where his father was a military attaché at the British Embassy. In 1937 published his first art historical writing on the work of Giovanni di Paolo; next monograph was on Sassetta; published widely throughout his career.

**Sir Edward Poynter** (b.1836, d.1919)
Place of Birth: Paris, France
Training: Brighton College and Ipswich School; studied painting in France and the Royal Academy.
Positions Held: Slade Professor of Art at University College, London from 1871 until 1875; became a Royal Academician in 1876; Director of the National Gallery from 1894 until 1904 (and hence oversaw the opening of the Tate Gallery); Royal Academy President in 1896.
Notable information: Received a knighthood in 1896, became a baronet in 1902.

**Matthew Stewart Prichard** (b.1865, d.1936)
Place of Birth: Keynsham, Somerset
Training: Received a law degree from New College, Oxford 1887.
Positions Held: Appointed Boston MFA museum secretary in 1902 and Assistant Director in 1904; became acquainted with Isabella Stewart Gardner and Roger Fry; along with Gilman known as a strong supporter of art museum display grounded in aesthetic idealism; ultimately dismissed by the trustees at the Boston MFA in 1907 due to his demand to remove plaster casts, which he found artificial.
Notable information: In 1908 left the United States and travelled abroad; in later life became interested in Byzantine Art; published little but influenced many.

**John Charles Robinson** (b.1824, d.1913)
Place of Birth: Nottingham
Training: Originally trained as an architect and painter.
Positions Held: South Kensington Museum Curator of Ornamental Art 1857-1863; South Kensington Museum Art Referee 1863-1867; Surveyor of the Queen’s pictures from 1882 to 1901.

Notable information: Building up cast courts at South Kensington, recognised as an expert in Renaissance Italian sculpture.

Edward Robinson (b.1858, d.1931)
Place of Birth: Boston, Massachusetts
Training: Graduated Harvard in 1879; afterward studied archaeology at the University of Berlin.
Positions Held: between 1881 and 1885 assembled cast collection at the Slater Museum in Norwich, Connecticut; lectured on Classical Art at Harvard 1893-1894 and 1898-1902; appointed curator of Classical Art at the Boston MFA in 1885; Director of the Boston MFA from 1902 until 1905; succeeded Sir Caspar Purdon Clarke as Metropolitan Director in 1910; retained title as Curator of Classical Antiquities until 1925.

Notable information: Built up large study collections of plaster casts at the Slater, the Museum of Fine Arts and the Metropolitan; also believed in the importance of securing original art objects. It is notable that the Altman, Morgan and Havemeyer collections were all acquired for the Metropolitan under his leadership; fostered the career of Gisela M.A. Richter, who became the first curator of full rank at the Metropolitan when she took over the role of Curator of Classical Antiquities in 1925.

Lord Rosebery (b.1847, d.1929)
Place of Birth: London
Training: Educated at Eton and Christ Church, Oxford.
Positions Held: Member of the Liberal Party in the House of Lords; served as Foreign Secretary and briefly as the Prime Minister; Wallace Collection Trustee from 1897 until 1929.

John Ruskin (b.1819, d.1900)
Place of Birth: London
Training: travelled extensively in Europe with his parents as a child; admitted to Oxford University in 1836 as a gentleman commoner; forced to withdraw due to ill health, but finally completed his studies in 1842.
Positions Held: Appointed the first Slade Professor of Fine Art at Oxford University in 1869; founded the Ruskin School of Drawing and Fine Art in Oxford.

Notable information: Became well known as an art critic after the publication of *Modern Painters*; later in life he became a devoted social reformer.

Paul J. Sachs (b.1878, d.1965)
Place of Birth: New York; born into a wealthy family, his father being one of the founders of the investment firm Goldman Sachs.
Training: graduated Harvard in 1900; briefly worked in the banking industry; then followed his interest in collecting and art museums.
Positions Held: appointed in 1912 to the Visiting Committee of Harvard’s Fogg Art Museum; Assistant Curator of the Fogg in 1914; Assistant Professor in the Fine Arts Department in 1917; Associate Director of the Fogg in 1923; served as President of the American Association of Museums from 1932 to 1936.

Sir George Scharf  (b.1820, d.1895)
Place of Birth: London
Training: University College London; began training as an artist under his father who was an artist; entered the Royal Academy in 1838; known as an expert in the field of historical portraiture.
Positions Held: In 1857 served as Secretary of Manchester Treasures Exhibition under Eastlake; appointed Secretary of the National Portrait Gallery in 1852 ; Director of the National Portrait Gallery from 1882 until 1892.
Notable information: While at the National Portrait Gallery, he secured 982 portraits for the nation.

Giovanni Morelli  (b.1816, d.1891)
Place of Birth: Verona, Italy
Training: Studied medicine, but developed an interest in connoisseurship after meeting Otto Mündler in Paris.
Positions Held: Morelli was active in politics in his native Italy, he was instrumental in the passage of legislation restricting the export of Italian art works.
Notable information: Morelli’s approach to connoisseurship stressed the importance of observable stylistic repetitions. He sometimes published under the pseudonym ‘Ivan Lermolieff’; his methodology influenced the approach of leading art world figures such as Bernard Berenson and John Pope-Hennessy.

Sir John Murray Scott  (b.1847, d.1912)
Positions held: Secretary to Sir Richard and Lady Wallace; served as the principal advisor to Lady Wallace following her husband’s death.
Notable information: Outspoken trustee of the Wallace Collection; also a trustee of the National Gallery; made a baronet in 1899.

William Seguier  (b.1772, d.1843)
Place of Birth: London
Training: Practising artist; picture dealer.
Positions Held: Appointed Superintendent of the British Institution in 1805; became Surveyor of the King’s Pictures in 1820; Keeper of the National Gallery in 1824.

Gustav Waagen  (b.1794, d.1868)
Place of Birth: Hamburg, Germany
Training: Received a degree in history and philosophy from the University at Breslau in 1819; in 1824 he travelled to Rome with the architect Karl Friedrich Schinkel to study art museums.
Positions Held: Appointed director of the Royal Museum in Berlin in 1832 and Professor of Modern Art History at the University of Berlin.
Notable information: Waagen’s 1838 publication, *Works of Art and Artists in England*, was the first significant study of English art collections undertaken by a scholar from continental Europe.

John Walker III  (b.1906, d.1995)
Place of Birth: Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; born into a wealthy steel family.
Training: Graduated from Harvard in 1930, studied under Paul J. Sachs; worked with Berenson for three years at Villa I Tatti.
Positions Held: In 1935 appointed Professor of Fine Arts at the American Academy in Rome; began working with Andrew Mellon on the National Gallery in Washington D.C. in 1937; in January 1939 appointed Chief Curator of the National Gallery; succeeded David Finley as Director in 1956; when he retired in 1969, he was succeeded by his assistant, J. Carter Brown (Brown’s father had been Walker’s classmate in the Museum Course).
Notable information: In 1945 travelled to Europe to help identify works looted by the Nazis; secured Mona Lisa for show at the National Gallery in 1963.

**Sir Francis Watson** (b.1907, d.1992)
Place of Birth: Dudley, West Midlands
Training: Studied mathematics at Cambridge University.
Positions Held: Registrar at the Courtauld Institute from 1934 to 1938, curator of the Wallace Collection from 1938 to 1963, director of the Wallace Collection from 1963 to 1974, Slade Professor of Art at Oxford University from 1969 to 1970

**Sir Robert Witt** (b.1872, d.1952)
Place of Birth: London
Training: Received a degree in History in 1894; qualified as a lawyer in 1897; developed an interest in photography for art history.
Positions Held: Early supporter of the National Art Collections Fund; compiled a large collection of art history photographic images that he ultimately donated to the Courtauld Institute.
Notable information: Close friend of Helen Clay Frick; his own photographic library served as a model for the Frick Art Reference Library; he donated his home at 32 Portman Square to the Courtauld Institute to house his collection.
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Photographer Unknown, Paul J. Sachs, 1903, Harvard University Archives, Cambridge, MA
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Figure 5: Photograph of *View of the West Gallery* at One East 70th Street, New York, Frick Collection, 1931
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Figure 7: Portrait of Sir Charles Lock Eastlake by John Partridge, 1825

Partridge, John, *Sir Charles Lock Eastlake* (Detail), 1825, Pencil, 9 ½ in. x 7 ¼ in., NPG 3944(22), National Portrait Gallery, London
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Figure 8: Etching of Matthew Prichard, Portrait by Henri Matisse, 1914
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Figure 9: Photographic Illustrations ‘Much Bent’ by Benjamin Ives Gilman, 1918
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Figure 10: Photograph of John Cotton Dana, taken between 1910 and 1915

Bain News Service, John Cotton Dana, Digital File from Original Negative, glass negative, smaller than 5 in. x 7 in., Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division, Washington D.C.
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Figure 11: Photograph of Henry Watson Kent

Photographer Unknown, Henry Watson Kent, Date Unknown, Norwich Free Academy Archives, Norwich, Connecticut
Figure 12: Photograph of Roger Fry by Alvin Langdon Coburn, 1913

Rare book located at Davis Museum Archives, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA
Figure 13: Photograph of *Exterior of Hertford House*, The Wallace Collection, Manchester Square

Figure 14: Photograph of Sir Richard Wallace, 1857
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Figure 15: Photograph of Lady Wallace, 1890

Photographer Unknown, Lady Wallace, 1890, The Wallace Collection, London
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Figure 16: Photograph of D.S. MacColl

Photographer Unknown, D.S. MacColl, Date Unknown, The Wallace Collection, London
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Figure 17: Photograph of Sir Claude Phillips
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Figure 18: Painting. *A Child with an Apple*, Jean-Baptiste Greuze, Late 18th Century
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Figure 19: Painting, *A Girl with a Lamb*, Jean-Baptiste Greuze, Late 18th Century

Greuze, Jean-Baptiste, *A Girl with a Lamb*, Late 18th Century, Oil on canvas, 21 ½ in. x 17 ½ in., NG1154, The National Gallery, London

Copyright The National Gallery, London
Figure 20: Painting, *The Broken Mirror*, Jean-Baptiste Greuze, c. 1762-1763


Copyright The Wallace Collection, London
Figure 21: Painting, *Innocence*, Jean-Baptiste Greuze, early 1790s

Greuze, Jean-Baptiste, *Innocence*, early 1790s, Oil on canvas, 48 ¾ in. x 24 3/4 in. oval, P384, The Wallace Collection, London

Copyright The Wallace Collection, London
Some of his portraits of men, as well as of women, have great merit, the former showing just virility of conception which is lacking in his studies of girls and his genre pieces. The reputation of Greuze declined greatly in his old age, and he died in indigence. Like many great artists of his time, especially Fragonard and Houdon, he was unable to accommodate himself to the change of taste which set in with the Revolution. The Wallace Collection possesses one of the largest collection of Greuze's paintings, chiefly fanciful and sentimental single-figure studies, with one or two portraits. The varied group of his works in the Louvre has been much increased of late years by legacies and bequests. It includes the "Severus reproaching Carcalla," "L'Ascension de Village," "La Malédiction Paternelle," "Le Fils Puni," and the two famous pieces "La Cruche Cassée" and "La Laitière." Almost all the provincial museums of France have examples of Greuze, the museum of Angers being particularly fortunate in possessing the much admired "Madame de Porein." The National Gallery of Scotland has five examples, including the charming "Girl with a Dead Canary." The private collections of England are even richer in the works of this master than those of France. The most remarkable examples are to be found in those of Mr. Alfred de Rothschild, the Earl of Dudley, Mr. Pierpont Morgan, Mr. H. L. Bishedoffeheim, the Duke of Wellington, and some others.

No. 394. Innocence. Gallery XVIII.
2 ft. 4 in. A, by 1 ft. 8½ in. w.

No. 398. Sorrows.
1 ft. 3¾ in. A, by 1 ft. 2½ in. w.

No. 396. Espiègleuse.
1 ft. 8¾ in. A, by 1 ft. 4 in. w.

No. 398. Fidelity.
1 ft. 8½ in. A, by 1 ft. 4½ in. w.

No. 402. The Listening Girl.
1 ft. 6½ in. A, by 1 ft. 3 in. w.

2 ft. A, by 1 ft. 8½ in. w.

Figure 22: Wallace Collection Catalogue Entry on Greuze Painting 388, 1905

Louis, 1852 (oval); D. J. Ruyter and Hippolyte Garnier (oval in border). An advanced sketch, from the collection of Coulet d’Hanteville, fetched at the Duport sale, 1807, 800 f. 50. [Was this the version in the Normanton Collection?] A drawing, 42 x 35, was in the Didot sale, 1814; a red chalk drawing in a sale 18 March 1857; the Bibliothèque Nationale has the photograph of a drawing belonging to M. Halot. The date of the Pourtalès sale, given by

M. and M. as 1864, should be 27 March 1865; the description was:—

Une jeune et jolie fille, vue à mi-corps, et la tête dirigée de face, tient un agneau qu’elle appuie légèrement sur son sein. Ce tableau est connu sous le nom de l’Innocence. Ovale, toile, 60 x 50 (B.A.A.)

The Pourtalès version was not the Dufresnoy picture, since the latter was on panel, the former on canvas.

388  

(Psyché)  

(Formerly “Sorrow”)  

Panel, 17½ x 14½ (45·1 x 36·7). Inscribed on back of picture: 
J. B. Greuze 1786. Bethnal Green, 465, as “Sorrow.” But the inscription on the back, as well as the correspondence of this picture in all other respects with descriptions, identifies it as the 

Psyché bought by Lord Hertford at the sale of Théodore Pataureau, 
Paris, 20–1 April 1857, No. 52, bois, 45 x 37·50, 27,700 f. (B.A.A.)

A note in the sale catalogue runs: “Le revers du panneau porte la signator de J. B. Greuze, 1786.” The attitude is described, the chain of pearls, hair falling on shoulders, lilac drapery with golden embroidery, brooch on left shoulder, breast exposed. It is said to be from the collection M. B., Paris, 1827, and of Count Perregaux, 1841, and a reference is given to Smith, 72. Now Smith describes no less than three versions of Psyché, differing only in measurements; in two cases there is a companion piece of Cupid. The first is 72, panel, 16 x 13¼ inches; sale of M. B., Paris, 1827, 5,055 f. (with Cupid). The second, Supplement, 8, is the picture in the Perregaux sale, 1841, when it was “bought in at 7,600 f. and 5 per cent. (£315)” ; it was on panel and measured 18 x 15 in. This was the Patureau-Hertford picture, and is thus described:—

Psyché—The faded beauty of the poet’s imagination is here represented as a lovely girl, just merging on the age of adolescence, seen in nearly a

Figure 23: Wallace Collection Catalogue Entry on Greuze Painting 388, 1913

Figure 24: Photograph of *The French Room, The Wallace Collection*, 1905
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Figure 25: Photograph of *The Great Gallery, The Wallace Collection*, 1904
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Figure 26: Photograph of *Gallery XXI at Hertford House*, 1901
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Figure 27: Photograph of Gallery XXI at Hertford House, 1920

Photographer Unknown, Gallery XXI at Hertford House, 1920, Wallace Collection, London

Used with the kind permission of the Wallace Collection Trustees
Figure 28: Bronze Relief, *The Borghese Dancers*, Henri Perlan, 1642-1643

Perlan, Henri (Attributed), *The Borghese Dancers*, c. 1642-1643, Bronze Relief, 66.6 cm. x 200.8 cm., S155, The Wallace Collection, London

Note: Bronze relief based on model by Francois Anguier, 1642
Figure 29: Painting, *Andromeda and Perseus*, Tiziano Vecelli, 1554-1556

Vecelli, Tiziano (Titian), *Andromeda and Perseus*, c. 1545-1556, Oil on Canvas, 175 cm. x 189.5 cm., P11, The Wallace Collection, London
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Figure 30: Ink Sketch, *The Great Gallery during WWI* by Francis Sydney Ewins, 1920
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Figure 31: Ink Sketch, *The Wallace Collection during WWI (Alternative Interior)* by Francis Sydney Ewins, 1920


Copyright The Wallace Collection, London
Figure 32: Photograph of the New Room of Dutch Paintings as it appeared in an article entitled ‘Reopening of the Wallace Collection’ in Country Life, November 1920.

Photographer Unknown, ‘Reopening of the Wallace Collection’, Country Life, November 1920
Figure 33: Photograph of the Founders Room as it appeared in an article entitled ‘Reopening of the Wallace Collection’ in *Country Life*, November 1920.

Photographer Unknown, ‘Reopening of the Wallace Collection’, *Country Life*, November 1920
Figure 34: Sketch of Sir Claude Phillips by D.S. MacColl, 1924

MacColl, D. S., Sketch of Sir Claude Phillips, 1924, on the D.S. MacColl’s copy of the Table Plan of Dinner to Celebrate The Centenary of the Foundation of the National Gallery. 2 April 1824, MacColl Archives, University of Glasgow, 1924
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Figure 35: Photograph of *The New Fogg Art Museum*, 1927
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Figure 36: Photograph of *Museum Course Students Receiving Instruction in Painting Technique*

Photographer Unknown, *Museum Course Students Receiving Instruction in Painting Technique*, Date Unknown, Harvard University Archives, Cambridge, MA

Copyright President and Fellows of Harvard College
I. Philosophy of Museums
   A. Kinds of Art Museums
   B. Purposes
      1. Acquiring collections of high standard
      2. Exhibiting collections
      3. Interpreting collections through:
         (a) Research
         (b) Educational Program
         (c) Publicity
   C. Service through Cooperation with:
      1. Municipality
      2. Other Educational organizations
      3. Dealers
      4. Other Museums

II. History of Museums
   A. Humanitarian Collections
      1. The Vatican
      2. State Collections
      3. The Louvre
      4. British Museum etc.
   B. Practical Collections
      1. Victoria Albert Museum
      2. Arts Decoratif etc.
   C. American Museums
      1. Metropolitan
      2. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston
      3. Pennsylvania Museum
      4. Cleveland
      5. Art Institute, Chicago
      6. Detroit Museum
      7. Cincinnati Museum
      8. St. Louis Museum
      9. Toledo Museum
      10. Omaha Museum
      11. Rhode island School of Design
      12. Museum of Modern Art
      13. Museum of City of New York
      14. Isabella Gardner Art Gallery
      University Museums: Fogg, Yale, etc.

III. Organization of Museums
   A. State, Municipal, Private
   B. Support
      1. State or municipal aid
      2. Private bequests

Figure 37: Typescript Page, Museum Course Outline, page 1 of 3, c. 1944

Outline of Museum Course, page 1, c. 1944, Harvard Art Museums Archives, Cambridge, MA
IV. The Museum Building

A. History and development of present form.

B. Principle needs
   1. Floor and wall space
   2. Sequence and variety in size of rooms
      galleries
      cabinets
      halls
      workrooms etc.
   3. Staircases, exits, etc.

C. Types of Rooms
   1. Exhibition
   2. Administration
   3. Educational
   4. Service

D. Questions of:
   1. Lighting
   2. Ventilation
   3. Protection against:
      (dust)
      (climate)
      (damp)
      (thieves)

V. Administration of Museums

A. Departments
   1. Executive Director
      (a) secretarial
      (b) relation to public
   2. Supt. of Building
      (a) protection
      (b) care - including:
         heating
         lighting
         cleaning
         supplies
         protection
      (c) Shop - repairs - construction
   3. Registrar
      (a) Receipt and delivery of objects
      (b) Storage
      (c) Packing, unpacking
      (d) Registration

Figure 38: Typescript Page, Museum Course Outline, page 2 of 3, c. 1944

Outline of Museum Course, page 2, c. 1944, Harvard Art Museums Archives, Cambridge, MA
A. Departments (cont.)
4. Photographer
   Records - negatives
5. Curators
   Duties of, in relation to:
   Collections
   Publications
   Educational work
   Giving advice and information

VI. Collections
A. Biography & History
B. Installation
   1. Permanent
      (a) historically
      (b) aesthetically
   2. Storage
   3. Temporary or loan exhibits
   4. Labels, Catalogues in galleries etc.
C. Requisitions etc.
D. Purchases, prices, markets
E. Cataloguing

VII. Personalities in the Art World
   Collectors, Scholars, Dealers

VIII. Museum Policies in regard to:
A. Present-day art
   Decorative arts
B. Industrial art - Specialized museums
C. Rights of a Director
D. Refusal of Requests
E. Disposal of Objects
F. Decentralization
G. Scholarship

IX. Museum Ethics

Figure 39: Typescript Page, Museum Course Outline, page 3 of 3, c. 1944

Figure 40: Photograph of Museum Course Students Learning Cataloguing and Registration Methods, 1944

Photographer Unknown, Museum Course Students Learn About Registration of Museum Objects, 1944, Harvard Art Museums Archives, Cambridge, MA
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Figure 41: Photograph of *Museum Course Meeting at Sachs' Cambridge Residence, Shady Hill*

Photographer Unknown, *Museum Course Meeting at Sachs' Cambridge Residence*, Early 1940s, Harvard Art Museums Archives, Cambridge, MA
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Figure 42: Painting, *The Descent into Limbo*, Master of the Osservanza

Master of the Osservanza, *The Descent into Limbo*, c. 1440-1444, Tempera on panel, panel 14 7/8 in. x 18 9/16 in. x 1 7/16 in., The Harvard Museums / Fogg Art Museum
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Figure 43: Photograph of Alfred H. Barr, Jr., 1929-1930
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Figure 44: Photograph of Gallery Interior (Hunt Hall), Old Fogg Art Museum

Photographer Unknown, Gallery Interior (Hunt Hall), Old Fogg Art Museum, prior to 1926, Harvard Art Museum Archive

Copyright President and Fellows of Harvard College
Figure 45: Photograph of Gallery Interior, New Fogg Art Museum

Photographer Unknown, Gallery Interior, New Fogg Art Museum, after 1926, Harvard Art Museum Archive

Copyright President and Fellows of Harvard College
Figure 46: Photograph of *Gallery Interior, The French Exhibition at The Fogg Art Museum, Gallery XIV*, March 1929
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Figure 47: Photograph of Cézanne, Gauguin, Seurat, van Gogh, Exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art, 7 November to 7 December 1929


Note: This was the first exhibit by the Museum of Modern Art. Original Photograph owned by J. B. Neumann, art dealer and friend of founding Director, Alfred H. Barr, Jr.
Figure 48: Alternative Interior of the Cézanne, Gauguin, Seurat, van Gogh, Exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art Exhibition, 7 November to 7 December, 1929

Figure 49: Photograph of Frederick Mortimer Clapp

Photographer’s Initials: A.H., Photographic of Frederick Mortimer Clapp, Undated, BRN: 205548; Image ID Number: 1238166, Frederick Mortimer Clapp Papers, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University Library
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Figure 50: Photograph of Frederick Mortimer Clapp at a Picnic in Venice, Italy

Photographer Unknown, Maud, Miss Fletcher, Tim at picnic Venice, Undated, BRN: 2055469; Image ID Number: 12381771, Frederick Mortimer Clapp Papers, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University Library
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Figure 51: Telegram from Paul Sachs to Frederick Mortimer Clapp, 21 October 1926

Telegram from Paul Sachs to Fredrick Mortimer Clapp, 21 October 1926, Harvard Art Museums / Fogg Art Museum Archive

Transcription:
Frederick Mortimer Clapp
c/o New York Trust Co.
100 Broadway
New York City

When do you sail? If you still have time to come to Cambridge to see me I should be very glad as I have an important matter to discuss with you which I can only hint at in this telegram. Unfortunately it is impossible for me to come to New York now but I hope to return there soon. The University of Pittsburgh is considering starting a full-fledged Fine Arts Department under the leadership of Miss Frick. I think it is very likely that if you were to accept the position you could head a department there at a substantial salary with six months off each year for study, research and publication. If you are with Kingsley please discuss the matter with him and in my judgment if you and your wife and the ___ feel about this as I do it would be worth your while to come here if only for one evening. I should then do my best to have Miss Frick here with us and of course she is still on the North Shore. Unless I felt pretty sure that there is a real opportunity and would see this matter on most unusual terms I should not dream of disturbing you by this wire. My regards

Paul J Sachs
Figure 52: Photograph of The Frick Collection Exterior, Fifth Avenue Garden & Façade (looking toward 70th Street)

Photographer Unknown, *The Frick Collection, Fifth Avenue Garden and Facade*, Date Unknown, The Frick Museum
Figure 53: Portrait of Helen and Henry Clay Frick by Edmund Charles Tarbell, 1910

Frederick Mortimer Clapp

Head, Department of Fine Arts, University of Pittsburgh.
Born at New York, N.Y., July 26, 1879. Son of Washington V. and Mary (Carroll) Clapp. Married, Caroline Ede (painter and etcher), Florence, Italy, 1908. Educated, Yale University (A.B., 1901; Larned Fellow of Yale in English, 1902; M.A., Yale). University of Paris (Doctor in Law) de l'Universite de Paris, 1914. Also attended lectures at University of Munich and studied at Lausanne. Member of the Accademia di San Luca, Rome, Italy; College Art Association.


Head of preparatory Greek Department, C.C.N.Y., 1904-1905. Lecturer on Russian and Elizabethan Literature, University of California. Lectured on Italian Art, the same, 1927, 1928. Also lectured before various clubs and at Fogg Museum, Harvard. Organised the Department of Fine Arts, University of Pittsburgh, 1926 and collected for it a library of over 15,000 volumes, 16,000 prints, 50,000 photos. Have travelled much in Europe, 1904-1926. Visited also China, Japan, Korea.

War Record: 1st Lieutenant Signal Corps Reserve. Trained at University of Toronto, Camp Borden, Canada, Fort Worth, Texas. Adjutant 22nd Aero Squadron, December- January, 1918; Camp Hornsey, England. At front with 211th Royal Naval Air Squadron as raid officer. On northern and Central Fronts, as Adjutant, 17th Aero Squadron, which was detached to British armies, until close of War. Died, St. Algan, France.
Figure 55: Photograph of *The West Gallery, The Frick Collection*, 1935

Figure 56: Painting, *The Progress of Love: The Pursuit*, Jean-Honoré Fragonard, 1771-1772
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Figure 57: Photograph of *The Progress of Love* Panels installed in the Frick Collection’s Fragonard Room, 1935

Figure 58: Photograph of *Frederick Mortimer Clapp and Maud Clapp in Pyjamas*

Photographer Unknown, *Frederick Mortimer Clapp and Maud Clapp in Pyjamas*, Undated, BRN: 2055374; Image ID Number: 12381591, Frederick Mortimer Clapp Papers, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University Library
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Figure 59: Photograph of The Peacock Room, The Freer Gallery


Copyright 2012 Smithsonian Institution
Figure 60: The Whistler Portraits in the Frick Collection. From left: Symphony in Flesh Colour and Pink: Portrait of Mrs Frances Leyland, 1871–74; Arrangement in Black and Gold: Comte Robert de Montesquieu-Fezensac, 1891–92; Harmony in Pink and in Grey: Portrait of Lady Meux, 1881–82; Arrangement in Brown and Black: Portrait of Miss Rosa Corder, 1876–78

Whistler, James McNeill, Symphony in Flesh Colour and Pink: Portrait of Mrs Frances Leyland, 1871-1874, Oil on canvas, 77 1/8 in. x 40 1/4 in., 1916.1.133, The Frick Collection, New York


All Digital Images Copyright 1998 The Frick Collection
Figure 61: Photograph of *The Oval Room, The Frick Collection*, 1935

Figure 62: Floorplan illustrating Frederick Mortimer Clapp’s third proposed solution for the presentation and arrangement of the Frick Collection, November 4, 1931

Clapp, Frederick Mortimer, *Floorplan*, in Folder Titled: “Study: How to Make the Frick Open to The Public”, November 4, 1931, Box 34, BRN: 2055471; Image ID Number: 1238174, Frederick Mortimer Clapp Papers, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University Library
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Figure 63: Photograph of Frederick Mortimer Clapp

Photographer Unknown, *Photograph of Frederick Mortimer Clapp*, Undated, Box 15, BRN: 2055445; Image ID Number: 1238165, Frederick Mortimer Clapp Papers, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University Library

Digital Image Copyright Yale University
Figure 64: Digital image from glass negative of Frederick Mortimer Clapp

Photographer Unknown, Frederick Mortimer Clapp, Undated, Frederick Mortimer Clapp Papers, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University Library
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Figure 65: Photograph of Home House, Portman Square, London. First site of the Courtauld Institute

Figure 66: Photograph of Arthur Hamilton Lee (1868-1947), Lord Lee of Fareham


Copyright The Courtauld Institute of Art
Figure 67: Photograph of Samuel Courtauld, 1936


Copyright The Courtauld Institute of Art
Figure 68: Painting, *Sir Robert Witt in His Library at 32 Portman Square* by Thomas Cantrell Dugdale, 1931


Copyright The Samuel Courtauld Trust, The Courtauld Gallery
Figure 69: Painting, *William George Constable* by Elizabeth Polunin, 1936


Copyright National Portrait Gallery, London
Figure 70: Photograph of Kenneth Clark, Baron Clark by Howard Coster, 1934

Coster, Howard, Photograph of Kenneth Clark, Baron Clark, 1934, NPG x10519, National Portrait Gallery, London
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Figure 71: Photograph of Courtauld Institute Students Studying, early 1930s

Photographer Unknown. Photograph of Courtauld Institute Students Studying, early 1930s, Courtauld Institute Archives, London
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Figure 72: Typescript, H. Read’s Syllabus for ‘The Aesthetic Basis of Modern Art’ Class, 1934

Figure 73: Typescript, Kenneth Clark's Syllabus for 'Leonardo da Vinci' Class, 1934

Figure 74: Typescript, Minutes of the Conference on Scientific Department, 16 March 1934

The Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, Minutes of the Conference on Scientific Department (Typescript Page), 16 March 1934, The National Archives, Kew
Figure 75: Photograph of Sir Kenneth Clark inspecting a painting from the Royal Collection, 20 October 1942

Ramage, Fred, *Sir Kenneth Clark inspecting a painting from the Royal Collection*, 20 October 1942, Hulton Archive
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Figure 76: Photograph of Alfred H. Barr, Jr. with Modern Art

Photographer Unknown, Alfred H. Barr, Jr. with Modern Art, Museum of Modern Art Archive, New York

Copyright Museum of Modern Art
Figure 77: Photograph of Philippe de Montebello, Standing outside the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1978

Photographer Unknown, Phillipe de Montebello, 1978, Metropolitan Museum of Art
Figure 78: Photograph of James Cuno, during his directorship at the Art Institute of Chicago

Photographer Unknown, James Cuno, 2009, Chicago Institute of Art
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