Creating The Bowes Museum, c.1858-1917: Private Collecting and the Art Market in the Public Art Museum

Simon Spier
BA(Hons), MA

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Volume 1: Text

The University of Leeds
School of Fine Art, History of Art and Cultural Studies

February 2021.

Acknowledgements

This thesis was generously supported by the Arts and Humanities Research Council Collaborative Doctoral Partnership consortium. I also wish to express my gratitude to the Director and Trustees of The Bowes Museum, who supported the research and writing of this thesis through access to the archive, collections and documentation held at The Bowes Museum. This project has also received financial support from the White Rose College of Arts and Humanities, the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, the Furniture History Society and the Decorative Arts Society, to whom I wish to convey my sincere thanks.

My sincerest thanks go to my academic and partnership organisation supervisors, Dr Mark Westgarth at the University of Leeds, and Dr Jane Whittaker and Dr Howard Coutts at The Bowes Museum. They provided patience and genuine encouragement throughout the research process, and always made sure that I developed my skills in ways outside of the PhD project true to the nature of the Collaborative Doctoral Partnership programme. They have made this an immensely enjoyable process. I also benefited from a welcoming community of colleagues at the University of Leeds School of Fine Art, History of Art and Cultural Studies, and in particular the members of the Centre for the Study of the Art and Antiques Market, who I also wish to thank for their support.

I am also lucky to have been part of a wider community of researchers, staff and volunteers at The Bowes Museum. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Judith Phillips, the Honorary Archivist at The Bowes Museum, who shared her extensive knowledge and always provided unfailingly generous advice on negotiating the archive at the Museum, all whilst completing her own important doctoral research. Special thanks also go to Lindsay Macnaughton, my fellow CDP student at The Bowes Museum, who has provided inspiration as a colleague and collaborator and support as a friend.

The research presented in this thesis also benefitted from the help and kindness of staff at the following museums, institutions and services: the Ashmolean Museum, the British Library, Darlington Library, the Hôtel Drouot Archives, Durham County Record Office, Glamis Castle, the National Portrait Gallery, Nuffield College, the Archives de Paris, the Victoria & Albert Museum, and The Wallace Collection.

My final and most heartfelt thanks are reserved for Helen. She has experienced the rough and the smooth of this project as much as me, stood by my side and been unshakeable. I hope she knows how much I appreciate it.

Abstract

This thesis presents a historiographical reinterpretation of the history of The Bowes Museum, an institution that started life as the private collection of John Bowes (1811-1885) and Joséphine Bowes (1825-1874), whose aim was to found a public art museum for the inhabitants of Barnard Castle, County Durham. The investigation places the creation of The Bowes Museum into the context of public museum formation in Britain in the second half of the nineteenth century, and the relationship that art museums held with private collectors and the art market during this period. Through extensive use of the museum's archive, much of which has remained unexplored, this thesis recasts the history of the Museum to argue that private collections and public museums worked symbiotically, contributing to the evolving discourse of institutional art history. Through this historiographical intervention, it inserts the history of this important museum into a number of disciplines such as institutional histories, collecting histories and the emerging field of art market studies.

Beginning in c.1858, when the Bowes began a structured engagement with the art and antiques market in Paris, this thesis is presented in three sections that track the process of the Bowes' collection shifting from the private to the public sphere. The first, 'Forming the Collection', explores the methods the Bowes used to form their collection in Paris in an increasingly competitive and specialised market for fine and decorative arts. By examining the social and cultural contexts of collectors and museums' engagement with the art market, the Bowes are brought into dialogue with other contemporary private collectors, antique dealers and museum professionals highlighting their role as actors in the formation of The Bowes Museum. The second section, 'Housing the Collection', explores the physical and conceptual creation of The Bowes Museum in the context of the formation of museums in Britain throughout the nineteenth century, focusing in particular on the perceived role of the museum in society. This demonstrates for the first time the Museum's debt to the political and cultural debates around the role of the museum that took place in Britain from the 1830s onwards. The final section, 'Organising the Collection' explores how the Bowes' private collection was translated into the space of the public art museum through the mediation of a curator and museum trustees, representing its transformation into a public art institution. The investigation finishes in 1917 when the Museum's curator and trustees sold off a number of objects from the Museum collection, viewing them as too domestic, personal and unsuitable for a public museum, reinforcing the tensions inherent in the public utility of the applied arts museum and the private gallery of the collector.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations **1**

List of Illustrations **2**

Introduction **10**

Historiography of The Bowes Museum 15

Private Collecting and Public Art Museums in the Nineteenth Century 23

The Role of the Public Art Museum in Britain 29

Private Collectors and the Art Market 34

The Archive 41

Thesis Structure 43

Chapter 1: Forming the Collection **47**

Private and Institutional Forms of Collecting 54

Antique Dealers and Collecting 69

Antique Dealer Geographies 78

Antique Dealer Networks 85

The Bowes and Auctions 92

Antique Dealers and Auctions 98

Chapter 2: Housing the Collection **112**

Public Museums and Private Houses in the Nineteenth Century 119

Siting The Bowes Museum 131

The 1871 Public Parks, Schools and Museums Act 139

Building The Bowes Museum: Exterior 145

Building The Bowes Museum: Interior 156

The Entrance Hall and Stairs 164

Chapter 3: Organising the Collection **172**

Employing the Curator 180

Collection Arrangement 189

- Display Cases 193
- Museum Galleries 197
- Sculpture Galleries 202
- Picture Galleries 204

Epilogue **208**
Domestic Furnishings in the Museum Post-1885: Souvenirs of the Bowes

Conclusion **216**

Appendix I: Auction Sales that appear in The Bowes Museum Archive in relation to their art and antique dealers **222**

Appendix II: The Public Parks, Schools and Museums Act of 1871 **252**

Appendix III: Letters relating to the appointment of a Curator at The Bowes Museum held at Durham County Record Office **253**

Appendix IV: Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to John Bowes describing the final arrangement of the Museum collection **264**

Bibliography **266**

Abbreviations

TBMA	The Bowes Museum
DCRO	Durham County Record Office
V&A	The Victoria and Albert Museum

List of Illustrations

Figure 1.0
The Bowes Museum, 1892, photograph, © The Francis Frith Collection.

Figure 1.1
Jacques-Eugene Feyen, *John Bowes*, 1863, oil on canvas, B.M. 300, © The Bowes Museum.
Antoine Dury, *Joséphine Bowes, Countess of Montalbo*, 1850, oil on canvas, B.M. 297, © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 1.2
John Greenwood, *William Hutt*, c.1830, etching, 34.2 x 25 cm, 1876,1209.293, © The Trustees of the British Museum.

Figure 2.0.
French, A Rouen ware jug, 1749, earthenware, X.1670, © The Bowes Museum.
French, A Rouen ware jug (detail), 1749, earthenware, X.1670, © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.1
Joséphine Bowes, *The Chateau du Barry at Louveciennes*, nineteenth century, oil on canvas, J.45, © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.2
Dining Room in Streatlam Castle, c.1915, from *Country Life Magazine*, vol. 38, no. 938, (1915), 840.

Figure 2.3
Photograph of the Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition, 1857, GB127.m79207, © Manchester Archives and Libraries.

Figure 2.4
Salviati Workshop, wine glass, 1867, lace glass, G.74, © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.5
Mafra workshop, Oxen, 1870, earthenware, C-622&A-1921 © The Victoria and Albert Museum.

Figure 2.6
Minton, Plate, 1858, earthenware with majolica glaze, 4730-1859, © The Victoria and Albert Museum.

Figure 2.7
Master of St. Gudule, *Altarpiece*, c.1460, oil on panel and oak, W.123, © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.8
Catalogue des Objets d'Art de Curiosité & d'Ameublement composant les riches magasins de M. Monbro Aîné, Hôtel Druout, 16-17 December 1859, © Hôtel Drouot Archive.

Figure 2.9
Victor Navlet, *Salle des Emaux du musée de Cluny*, 1876, oil on panel, 100 x 162 cm, 887.5.7 ; 958, © Musée des Beaux-Arts et d'Archéologie, Chalons-en-Champagne.

Figure 2.10
Arthur Roberts, *Interior of Charles Sauvageot's Study*, 1856, oil on canvas, 48.5 x 59 cm, MI 861, © Réunion des musées nationaux.

Figure 2.11
French, cake moulds, 19th century, earthenware, © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.12
Galignani's Plan of Paris and Environs, 1867, © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.13
Maps showing the Bowes's apartment and the spread of dealers in Paris in 1850 and 1870 © Artl@s (https://artlas.huma-num.fr/fr/).

Figure 2.14
Pierre Tetar van Elven, *La Collection d'Armes du comte de Nieuwerkerke au Louvre*, 1866, oil on panel, 56 x 42 cm, C 51.004 © Réunion des musées nationaux.

Figure 2.15
Map showing the location of the dealers used by Émilien O'Hara, Comte de Nieuwerkerke.

Figure 2.16
Map showing the location of the dealers used by John and Joséphine Bowes.

Figure 2.17
Photograph of Pierre Theodat Jarry (1826-1864), Penabert & Cie, c.1860.

Figure 2.18
Map showing the dealers around the Gare St. Lazare © Artl@s (https://artlas.huma-num.fr/fr/).

Figure 2.19
Bill for Jarry, 1863, TBMA, JB/5/9/20 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.20
Bill for Adolphe-Cabaret Lamer showing two addresses, 1863, TBMA, JB/5/10/1/1 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.21
Bronze Hercules, 19th century, bronze, M.243 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.22
Map showing location of A.C. Lamer from 1859-1861 and concentration of dealers around Hôtel Drouot between 1850-1870 © Artl@s (https://artlas.huma-num.fr/fr/).

Figure 2.23
Dutch, Candlestick, 1650-1700, silver gilt, X.4595 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.24
Auction catalogue showing Lamer as assistant, 1866, TBMA, JB/5/10/4/1 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.25
Bill for Moritz Meyer, 1868, TBMA, JB/5/13/14 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.26
Bill from P. Albert to John Bowes, 29 April 1870, D/Bo/E30 © Durham County Record Office.

Figure 2.27
Italian, Casapanca, c.1600, walnut, FW. 159 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.28
Interior of the Bardini Museum, 'Bardini's at Florence' *The Art Journal*, 1893. 10.

Figure 2.29
Italian, Sedan chair, 18th century, ebony, leather, giltwood, FW. 366 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.30
French, Lock, 18th century, M.221 © The Bowes Museum.
Detail of label on Lockplate, M.221 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.31
Vasily Vereshchagin, *Room in the House of A.P. Bazilevsky in Paris*, 1870, Watercolour on paper, 57 x 78 cm, OP-45878 © The State Hermitage Museum.

Figure 2.32
Adolphe-Félix Cals, *Peasant woman and child*, 1846, oil on canvas, 46.4 x 37.8 cm, B.M. 647, © The Bowes Museum.
Adolphe-Félix Cals, *A Cook plucking a wild duck*, 1854, oil on canvas, 45.7 x 38.4 cm, B.M. 360, © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.33
De Klaauw factory, Moneybox, c.1750, earthenware, X.3684 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.34
French, Nutcracker, c.1700, boxwood, 224-1866 © The Victoria & Albert Museum.
Mexican, Triptych, boxwood, 226-1866 © The Victoria & Albert Museum.
French, Mandore, c.1640, pearwood, ebony and ivory, 219-1866 © The Victoria & Albert Museum.
French, Nutcracker, seventeenth century, boxwood, 223-1866 © The Victoria & Albert Museum.
Netherlandish, Miniature Altar, sixteenth century, boxwood and silver, 225-1866 © The Victoria & Albert Museum.
French, Mazer, c.1400, Maple burr, 221-1866 © The Victoria & Albert Museum.

Figure 2.35
Francesco Pomarano, Boxwood statuette of Hercules c.1520, S273 © The Wallace Collection.

Figure 2.36
French, Hurdy-Gurdy, c.1640, Pine, 220-1866 © The Victoria & Albert Museum.

Figure 2.37
German, Ceremonial Staff, c.1770, X.743© The Bowes Museum.
Unknown, Ewer, eighteenth century, X.114 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.38
French, Clock case, 19th century, rock crystal and gilt bronze, CW.101, FW.101 & X.133, © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.39
Vernis martin cabinet, reproduced in Merton Russell-Cotes, *Home and Abroad: An autobiography of an octogenarian*.

Figure 2.40
French, A Rouen ware jug, 1777, earthenware, X.1346, © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.41
French, Iron Coffer, eighteenth century, Iron, X.545© The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.42
Anselmus van Hulle, *Portrait of a Family*, c.1650, Oil on canvas, 207.2 x 190.3 cm, B.M. 131 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 2.43
Lot 174 from *Catalogue des Objets d'Art, Petit secrétaire de dame, époque Louis XVI; Beau meuble du XVI^{e} siècle en bois sculpté; Bureau Louis XV et commodes Louis XVI en lacque de Coromandel... De la Collection de M. le Comte L*****, showing 'trianon' annotation © Bibliothèque Nationale de France.

Figure 2.44
French, Writing Desk, c.1750, Lacquer with gilt bronze mounts, FW.355 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 3.0
Joseph Michael Gandy, Detail of *Plan, Elevation and Views of the New Picture Gallery, - the Mausoleum and Sisters' Apartments at God's Gift College Dulwich erected in the years 1812 & 1813*, Watercolour, 90 x 146 cm, P265, © The Trustees of Sir John Soane's Museum.

Figure 3.1
Frederick Mackenzie, *The National Gallery when at Mr J. J. Angerstein's House, Pall Mall*, 1824-34, Watercolour, 69 x 85.5 cm, 40-1887, © The Victoria and Albert Museum.

Figure 3.2
Unknown Artist, *Aston Hall – Exterior*, nineteenth century, watercolour, 6.5 x 10.5 cm, © The author.
Unknown Artist, *Aston Hall – Interior*, nineteenth century, watercolour, 6.5 x 10.5 cm, © The author.

Figure 3.3
C.J Richardson (?), from John Soane, *Description of the House and Museum on the North Side of Lincoln's Inn Fields, the Residence of Sir John Soane*, (London: Levey, Robson and Franklyn, 1835), Plate XXXIV.

Figure 3.4
J. S. Heaviside after B. Sly after R. Kerr, 'Engraving of Design for Proposed National Museums, South Kensington, to which the Second Premium was Awarded', *The Builder*, 25 June 1864, 475.

Figure 3.5
J. Deazely, *Parliament House, Brisbane*, c.1881, photographic print, State Library of Queensland, negative number 57387.

Figure 3.6
Postcard showing Sunderland Museum and Free Library, c.1900, © The author.

Figure 3.7
Postcard showing Tynemouth Palace, c.1900, © The author.

Figure 3.8
Jules Pellechet, *Elevation of The Bowes Museum*, 1869, TBM/5/1 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 3.9
John Edward Watson, *Elevation of The Bowes Museum*, 1869, TBM/5/1 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 3.10
Édouard Baldus, *Tuileries*, 1855, salted paper print, 31.3 x 44.8 cm, RCIN 2584461, © HM Queen Elizabeth II.

Figure 3.11
Postcard showing the Hôtel de Ville, Le Havre, twentieth century, © The author.

Figure 3.12
Engraving of 'Mrs Bowes's Mansion and Museum, Barnard Castle, Durham', *The Builder*, January 1871.

Figure 3.13
Engraving of Montagu-House, Whitehall, the Residence of the Duke of Buccleuch, *Illustrated London News*, 24 September 1864, 313.

Figure 3.14
Roger Fenton, *University Museum of Natural History in Oxford*, 1858, albumen print, 28.8 x 22.7cm, RPS 1564-2017, © The Victoria and Albert Museum.

Figure 3.15
Godfrey Sykes and Francis Fowke, *Design for the decoration of the South Kensington Museum*, c.1865, pencil, pen, ink and watercolour, 47.3 x 71.3 cm, D.930-1899, © The Victoria and Albert Museum.

Figure 3.16
John Edward Watson, *Plan of The Bowes Museum, Basement and Cellar Floor*, 1870, TBM/5/1 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 3.17
John Edward Watson, *Plan of The Bowes Museum, Ground Floor*, 1870, TBM/5/1 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 3.18
John Edward Watson, *Plan of The Bowes Museum, First Floor*, 1870, TBM/5/1 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 3.19
Details of John Edward Watson, *Plan of The Bowes Museum, First Floor*, 1870, TBM/5/1 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 3.20
Engraving of 'New Mansion, Museum and Galleries, Barnard Castle: Plan of Ground Floor', *The Builder*, January 1871, 28.

Figure 3.21
John Edward Watson, *Plan of The Bowes Museum, Basement Floor*, 1874, TBM/5/1 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 3.22
Jules Pellechet, *Plan of The Bowes Museum, West Pavillion, Second Floor*, c.1879, TBM/5/1 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 3.23
Detail of John Edward Watson, *Plan of The Bowes Museum, Ground Floor*, 1870, TBM/5/1 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 3.24
John Edward Watson, *Detail of Principle Staircase*, 1872, TBM/5/1 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 3.25
John Edward Watson, *Plan of The Bowes Museum, Staircase and Entrance Hall*, 1878, D/St/C5/551/1b © Durham County Record Office.

Figure 3.26
Floorplan of the Russell-Cotes Art Gallery © The Russell-Cotes Art Gallery.

Figure 3.27
Thomas Rowlandson and Augustus Charles Pugin, 'The Hall and Staircase, British Museum', 1808, hand coloured etching and aquatint, 28 x 22.3cm, I,8.126 © The British Museum.

Figure 3.28
The Entrance Hall, c.1914, photograph, © The Francis Frith Collection.

Figure 3.29
John Watkins, *West Staircase*, 1876, pen and ink, 40.6 x 29.2 cm, 8089F, © The Victoria and Albert Museum.

Figure 3.30
Postcard of Russell-Cotes Art Gallery and Museum Entrance Hall, c.1900 © The author.

Figure 3.31
French, Staircase balustrade, c.1720, wrought iron, cast iron, gilt brass, wood, F.68 © The Wallace Collection.

Figure 3.32
Akerlind Factory, stove, c.1867, earthenware, X.1465, © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 3.33
John Edward Watson, *Cornice for the Entrance Hall*, 1872, D/St/C5/297/77b © Durham County Record Office.

Figure 3.34
John Edward Watson, *Section of The Bowes Museum, Main Staircase*, 1872, TBM/5/1 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 3.35
Letter from A. J. Arrowsmith & Co., 1874, D/St/C5/387/1b © Durham County Record Office.

Figure 4.0
William Linnaeus Casey, *Marlborough House: Second Room*, 1857, watercolour, 31.6 x 41.8 cm, 7280, © The Victoria and Albert Museum.
William Linnaeus Casey, *Marlborough House: First Room*, 1856, watercolour, 7279, © The Victoria and Albert Museum.

Figure 4.1
Attributed to Isabel Agnes Cowper, *The National Competition Judges*, 1871, photograph, 23.8 x 29.1 cm, V&A Archive MA/32/27, neg. 9244, © The Victoria and Albert Museum.
John Watkins, *The Water Colour Galleries*, 1876, pen drawing, 26.7 x 40.6 cm, 8089C, © The Victoria and Albert Museum.

Figure 4.2
Photograph of the Jones Collection in the National Competition Gallery, c.1910, 1000BW0172 © The Victoria and Albert Museum.

Figure 4.3
Austrian, Powder Flask, c. 1600, horn and silver gilt, 234-1854, © The Victoria and Albert Museum.
French, Powder flask, nineteenth century, antler horn, X.321, © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 4.4
Jules Pellechet, *Plan of The Bowes Museum, West Pavillion, First Floor*, c.1879, TBM/5/1 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 4.5
Jules Pellechet, *Plan of The Bowes Museum, East Pavillion, First Floor*, c.1879, TBM/5/1 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 4.6
Detail of John Edward Watson, *Plan of The Bowes Museum, First Floor*, 1870, TBM/5/1 © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 4.7
Photograph of 'X' shaped display case in The Bowes Museum © The author.

Figure 4.8
Photograph of the room of French porcelain, c.1900, TBMA, TBM/11/2, © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 4.9
Plate 33. From Haret, frères, *Recueil de planches: différents stands, vitrines et bâtiments aux Expositions universelles de 1867 à Paris, de 1873 à Vienne et de 1878 à Paris*, c. 1867-1878, CNAM-BIB Gd Fol Xae 3 Res © Conservatoire Numérique des Arts et Métiers.

Figure 4.10
Henry Cole's vertical display stand, photograph, V&A Archive, MA/32/26, neg 8939. © The Victoria and Albert Museum.

Figure 4.11
Detail Photograph of the Picture Gallery, c.1900, TBMA, TBM/11/2, © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 4.12
Plan of the South Kensington Museum, 1869, from *A Guide to the Art Collections of the South Kensington Museum*, (London: Spottiswoode & Co., 1869).

Figure 4.13
Plan of the first floor arrangement of The Bowes Museum, 1885.

Figure 4.14
Plan of the second floor arrangement.

Figure 4.15
Photograph of the display case of Sèvres Porcelain, from Owen Stanley Scott, 'The Bowes Museum – Barnard Castle', *Art Journal*, (1897), 122-125.

Figure 4.16
Photograph showing displays of Chinese ceramics in Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery, c.1900, © Birmingham Museums Trust.

Figure 4.17
'Index' to Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, (Barnard Castle: W.R. Atkinson, 1893), iii.

Figure 4.18
Wood engraving of Drawing Room and Ground Plan of no. 95 Piccadilly from *Handbook of the Jones Collection in the South Kensington Museum*, (London: Chapman and Hall, 1883), 9 & 29.

Figure 4.19
Photograph of the plaster cast gallery, c.1915, TBMA, TBM/11/2, © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 4.20
Photograph of the Victoria & Albert Museum Antique Cast Court, c.1900 © The Victoria and Albert Museum.

Figure 4.21
Postcard showing the Plaster Cast Gallery in Leeds City Art Gallery, 1904 © Leeds Museums and Galleries.

Figure 4.22
John Watkins, *Sheepshanks Collection*, c.1860, pen and ink, 32.9 x 47.5 cm, 8089D © The Victoria and Albert Museum.

Figure 4.23
Photograph of the Picture Gallery, c.1900, TBMA, TBM/11/2, © The Bowes Museum.

Figure 4.24
Sketch of The Bowes Museum Picture Gallery from 'Mr Long's visit to and report on Provincial Galleries', 1910, V&A Archive © The Victoria and Albert Museum.

Introduction

This thesis takes as its subject the creation of The Bowes Museum, a large collection of fine and decorative art that opened to the public in the market town of Barnard Castle, County Durham, in 1892 (**figure 1.0**). Housed in a building that was constructed explicitly to house a museum collection, and set in eight hectares of parkland, The Bowes Museum was from its very inception envisaged as an institution that had an overt benefit to the local residents of Barnard Castle. The former museum curator Elizabeth Conran in a 1992 guidebook described the Museum's formation as 'largely educational', and that the founders 'wished to introduce the wider world to the people of Teesdale and the North of England.'[1] Nevertheless The Bowes Museum is characterised by the two individuals to which it owes its existence, John Bowes (1811-1885) and Joséphine Bowes (1825-1874), who built the museum collection through a sustained campaign of collecting in Paris in the middle decades of the nineteenth century, using private wealth (**figure 1.1**).[2] They then funded the large French Renaissance style building in which the collection is now housed and arranged for the presentation, care and future preservation of the collection with instructions that were activated through their respective Wills and Codicils.[3] Neither founder lived to see the realisation of the museum project, as Joséphine Bowes died in 1874, whilst the museum building was still under construction, and John Bowes died in 1885, before the finished building could be completely arranged with their collection. Therefore, the history of The Bowes Museum is an exemplar that institutional histories are marked by constant flux, instability and renewal, which warrants close historical study.

This thesis' main aim is to offer a contextual reinterpretation of the creation of The Bowes Museum that contributes to a number of established and emerging disciplines. The first of these is the broad

[1] Elizabeth Conran, *The Bowes Museum*, (London: Scala, 1992), 11.
[2] Caroline Chapman, *John & Joséphine: The Creation of The Bowes Museum*, (Barnard Castle: The Bowes Museum, 2010); Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, (Barnard Castle: The Friends of The Bowes Museum, 1982, first printed 1970)
[3] Copies of these are held in the museum archive, see TBMA, TBM/2/1/1, The Will and Codicil of Benoîte Joséphine Bowes, 12 & 19 July 1871 and TBMA, TBM/2/1/2, Will and Codicils of John Bowes, 1 June 1878, Six Codicils dated 17 July 1880, 20 May 1881, 27 May 1881, 22 January 1884, 27 June 1885 and 25 September 1885.

corpus of institutional histories, with a special focus on those which highlight the pivotal role of the private collector and their various networks.[4] Operating as a form of institutional critique, studies which emphasise this role have become mainstream in scholarly literature in recent times, and now contribute significantly to the understanding of important art museums founded in the nineteenth century such as the National Gallery, the Victoria and Albert Museum and myriad regional galleries and museums that emerged contemporaneously and subsequently.[5] For example, the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool, established as a publicly governed institution in 1873 and formed around the collection of the banker and M.P. William Roscoe (1753-1831) has been the subject of a recent study by Suzanne Macleod.[6] Focusing on a combination of 'people, politics, identity and use' as subjects within the formation of the Walker, Macleod offers a wealth of new directions in which institutional histories can take, and effective ways in which to discuss broader concerns of museum making in the nineteenth century through the close study of a single institution.[7] For Macleod, institutional histories need to provide a link between the institution and the 'lived reality of museum making.'[8] This

[4] Marjorie L. Caygill and John F. Cherry, eds., *A. W. Franks: Nineteenth-Century Collecting and the British Museum*, (London: British Museum, 1997); James Delbourgo, *Collecting the World: The Life and Curiosity of Hans Sloane*, (London: Allen Lane, 2017); Suzanne Higgott, *'The Most Fortunate Man of his Day' Sir Richard Wallace: Connoisseur, Collector & Philanthropist*, (London: The Wallace Collection, 2018); Lawrence Keppie, *William Hunter and the Hunterian Museum in Glasgow, 1807-2007*, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007); Frances Larson, *An Infinity of Things: How Sir Henry Wellcome Collected the World*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Robert O'Byrne, *Hugh Lane, 1875-1915*, (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 2000); Stacey J. Pierson, *Private Collecting, Exhibitions and the Shaping of Art History in London: The Burlington Fine Arts Club*, (London: Routledge, 2007); Dora Thornton, 'From Waddesdon to the British Museum: Baron Ferdinand Rothschild and his Cabinet Collection', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 13, no. 2, (2001), 191-213. For the American context see Anne Higonnet, *A Museum of One's Own: Private Collection, Public Gift* (Pittsburgh: Periscope Publishing, 2009).

[5] For the National Gallery see Jonathan Conlin, *The Nation's Mantlepiece: A History of the National Gallery*, (London: Pallas Athene, 2006); Carol Duncan, 'Putting the "Nation" in London's National Gallery', *Studies in the History of Art*, vol. 47, (1996), 100-111; Colin Trodd, 'The Paths to the National Gallery', in Paul Barlow and Colin Trodd, eds., *Governing Cultures: Art Institutions in Victorian London*, (London: Routledge, 2000), 29-43. For the Victoria and Albert Museum see Anthony Burton, *Vision & Accident: The Story of the Victoria & Albert Museum*, (London: V&A Publications, 1999); Julius Bryant, *Creating the V&A: Victoria and Albert's Museum (1851-1861)*, (London: Lund Humphries, 2019); For a survey of regional galleries see the chapter 'Patrons, Donors, Councillors, Curators, Visitors' in Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries: Art Museums and Exhibitions in Britain 1800-1914*, (London: Yale University Press, 2015), 247-273. For Birmingham see Stephen Wildman, 'Opportunity and Philanthropy: The Pre-Raphaelites as Seen and Collected in Birmingham', in Stephen Wildman, *Visions of Love and Life: Pre-Raphaelite Art from the Birmingham Collection*, (Alexandria: Art Services International, 1995), 57-69. For Glasgow see John Morrison, 'Victorian Municipal Patronage: The foundation and management of Glasgow Corporation Galleries 1854-1888', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 8, no. 1 (1996) 93-102.

[6] Suzanne Macleod, *Museum Architecture: A New Biography*, (London: Routledge, 2013).

[7] Suzanne Macleod, *Museum Architecture*.

[8] Suzanne Macleod, *Museum Architecture*, 7.

suggests neither a focus on the larger objectives of institutional formation – such as their educational remit – nor on the trivial details of individual character – such as an idiosyncratic aesthetic or prevalence of a certain type of collection – but instead a focus on the interplay between the macro and the micro history of the museum.

By following this example, and writing The Bowes Museum into such institutional histories, this thesis resists seeing its formation as an anomaly in the rise of public museums in the nineteenth century. Institutions such as The Bowes Museum that act as public museums, but which also stand as memorials to their founders have been theorised in a critical work by Carol Duncan entitled *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museum*, in the chapter 'Something Eternal: The Donor Memorial.'[9] Duncan proposes the idea that 'donor memorials' are defined as private collections left as singular, discrete bequests to be opened for public access, and that they 'cannot be readily defined as a group by their look as collections. Their collections may be encyclopaedic or specialized, and their architecture anything from historicist…to modern.'[10] Duncan finds these institutions still bear residual traces of their function as stately private residences, and therefore instil in the visitor a sense of elitism that prevents them from being truly beneficial as public institutions.[11] Paying tribute to Duncan's ideas, writers such as Anne Higonnet and Giles Waterfield have typologised The Bowes Museum as a 'collection museum.'[12] For them the Museum sits beside institutions such as the Wallace Collection, the private collection of Sir Richard Wallace (1818-1890) bequeathed to the nation by his wife Lady Wallace (1819-1897) in 1897; the Holburne Museum in Bath bequeathed to the city by the sister of Sir Thomas William Holburne (1793-1874); and the Russell-Cotes Art Gallery and Museum, a museum created by Merton Russell-Cotes (1835-1921) for his wife Annie Russell-Cotes (d.1920) who left it to the city of Bournemouth in 1907.[13] Waterfield has described these institutions as

[9] Carol Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums* (London: Routledge, 1995), 72-100.
[10] Carol Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals*, 72.
[11] Carol Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals*, 72-100.
[12] Anne Higonnet, *A Museum of One's Own*, 20; Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 248.
[13] Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 248. For the Russell-Cotes see Merton Russell-Cotes, *Home and Abroad: An autobiography of an octogenarian*, (Bournemouth, 1921). For the Holburne Museum see Barbara Milner, 'The Holburne of Menstrie Museum, Bath: Its Foundation and Development', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 5, no. 1, (1993), 79-87. For the Wallace Collection see Suzanne Higgott, *'The Most Fortunate*

characterised by their 'otherness' due to an overarching sense of memorial, rather than celebrations of communal and collective effort, as typifies the majority of the regional museums he includes in his study *The People's Galleries*.[14] This sets museums such as The Bowes Museum apart from the conditions in which institutions which fit Waterfield's survey are created, not responding to societal needs but instead commemorating the Bowes as elite collectors. Therefore, in reassessing the purported exceptionalism of the creation of The Bowes Museum, another aim of this thesis is to recontextualise it with the political and cultural conditions which gave rise to a new landscape of cultural institutions in Britain from the 1830s onwards.[15] This era saw a new relationship between individuals and the state, with the philanthropy of the upper and middle classes acting as a key catalyst for the formation of art museums.[16] It is one of this thesis' contentions that the Bowes' social network, public roles and collecting project brought them into dialogue with the community that debated, theorised and governed British art museums, a relationship that has until now been previously understated. It is for this reason that the creation of the Museum cannot be viewed as separate from the educative mission of British cultural and political officials. Such an approach requires nuanced views of concepts of public duty and private motives. Writers such as Kate Hill, Brandon Taylor and Paul Barlow and Colin Trodd have questioned the supposedly egalitarian missions of the upper-middle class, or the bourgeoisie, to educate and 'civilise' the working classes through access to art.[17] Hill focuses in particular on the role of the regional museum, and identifies

Man of his Day'; Peter Hughes, *The Founders of the Wallace Collection*, (London: Trustees of the Wallace Collection, 1981); John Ingamells, *The 3rd Marquess of Hertford as a Collector*, (London: Trustees of the Wallace Collection, 1983); Barbara Lasic, 'Splendid Patriotism: Richard Wallace and the Construction of the Wallace Collection', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 21, no. 2, (2009), 173-182.

[14] Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 250 & 4.

[15] Paul Barlow and Colin Trodd, eds., *Governing Cultures: Art Institutions in Victorian London*; Tony Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum: History, theory, politics* (London: Routledge, 1995); Janet Minihan, *The Nationalization of Culture: The Development of State Subsidies to the Arts in Great Britain*, (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1977); Marcia Pointon, ed., *Art Apart: Art Institutions and Ideology Across England and North America* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994).

[16] Frances Borzello, *Civilizing Caliban: The Misuse of Art 1875-1980*, (London: Routledge, 1987); Michael Harrison, 'Art and Philanthropy: T. C. Horsfall and the Manchester Art Museum', in Alan J. Kidd and K. W. Roberts, eds., *City, Class and Culture: Studies of Social Policy and Cultural Production in Victorian Manchester*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985), 120-147.

[17] Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums 1850-1914*, (London: Routledge, 2005); Brandon Taylor, *Art for the Nation: Exhibitions and the London Public, 1747-2001*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999); Paul Barlow and Colin Trodd, 'Introduction' in Paul Barlow and Colin Trodd, eds., *Governing Cultures: Art Institutions in Victorian London*, (London: Routledge, 2000), 1-25.

many such institutions as a locale for displaying and defining the identities of the middle classes as much as improving the lives of the lower classes.[18] As such The Bowes Museum is an exemplar of the kind of museum that blends the taste and aspirations of wealthy and socially mobile members of the upper middle class with the philanthropy and munificence that characterises such civic projects at this time, and must be seen through both lenses.

Another historiographical intervention this thesis makes is within the field of collecting histories, using the emerging discipline of art market studies to reveal previously obscured links between the Bowes and the wider practices of collecting in the second half of the nineteenth century. Like the preeminent view of their museum, the Bowes' collecting has been seen as an individualistic practice, operating outside of the general trends or tastes of aristocratic and bourgeois collectors in the nineteenth-century.[19] Indeed the Bowes' collecting has been characterised by its focus on smaller, inexpensive objects, a lack of concern for aesthetic properties and the abundance of purchases made from a small cast of dealers based in Paris in the 1860s and 70s.[20] These views fail to adequately take into account the notion that the Bowes were participating in a social form of consumption that indicated their standing in a wider matrix of art collectors. Taking this more preeminent view of collectors opens up new possibilities for understanding the Bowes' collecting, using such models as Arthur Macgregor's chapter 'Collectors, Connoisseurs and Curators in the Victorian Age', which provides one of the best overviews of how from the 1850s the democratisation of collecting was driven by, and in turn, driving, the formation of museum collections, stressing the interconnectedness of such activity.[21] This thesis argues that the studies on the rapidly expanding market for artworks in the mid-nineteenth century offer a new methodological framework in which to place the Bowes' collecting, by stressing the role, agency and influence of outside actors and events such as

[18] Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums*, 48.
[19] The Bowes do not appear in surveys which attempt to find a nationalistic character in collecting such as James Stourton and Charles Sebag-Montefiore, *The British as Art Collectors: From the Tudors to the Present*, (London: Scala, 2012).
[20] Caroline Chapman, *John & Joséphine*, 81.
[21] Arthur MacGregor, 'Collectors, Connoisseurs and Curators in the Victorian Age' in Marjorie L. Caygill and John F. Cherry, eds., *A. W. Franks*,

contemporaneous collectors, antique dealers, auction sales and institutional formation.[22] In this way, the Bowes and the formation of their museum collection can be brought into dialogue with collectors and institutions that it has historically remained separate from. Thus, the Museum is provided a new context of the art market in Britain and France in the 1860s and 70s.

Historiography of The Bowes Museum

Previous studies of The Bowes Museum have been limited to a narrow scope of themes, outlined here, and which this thesis builds upon. The main lens for interpreting the collection and museum of John and Joséphine Bowes is their biographies and social standing. The conceptualisation of the Bowes' collecting activities owes much to psychoanalytic readings of their biographies and as such are often framed by personality traits or social or moral circumstances to which the collection is thought to relate. In his important essay 'The System of Collecting', the French social theorist Jean Baudrillard proclaimed: 'it is invariably *oneself* that one collects.'[23] This quote encapsulates the view that collectors cannot be viewed as separate from their collections, and as such collections act as surrogate selves and take on the personality or identity of their collectors. This complex idea has been explored by a number of writers on the history and psychology of collecting in the second half of the twentieth century.[24] For example, Mario Praz's *The House of Life* (1958) which operated as an autobiography told through his collection, as the reader is taken around his house room by room and objects act as

[22] See recent studies such as Susanna Avery-Quash and Christian Huemer, eds., *London and the Emergence of a European Art Market, 1780-1820*, (London: Yale University Press, 2019); Jan Dirk Baetans, and Dries Lyna, eds., *Art Crossing Borders: The Internationalisation of the Art Market in the Age of Nation States, 1750-1914*, (Leiden: Brill, 2019); Lynn Catterson, ed., *Florence, Berlin and Beyond: Late Nineteenth-Century Art Markets and their Social Networks*, (Leiden: Brill, 2020); Anne Helmreich and Pamela Fletcher, eds, *The Rise of the Modern Art Market in London, 1850-1939*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011); Mark Westgarth, *The Emergence of the Antique and Curiosity Dealer 1815-1850: The Commodification of Historical Objects*, (London: Routledge, 2020).

[23] Jean Baudrillard, 'The System of Collecting', in John Elsner and Roger Cardinal, eds., *The Cultures of Collecting*, (London: Reaktion, 1994). 12.

[24] See works from the 1950s such as Walter Benjamin, 'Unpacking my Library – A Talk about Book Collecting' in Hannah Arendt, ed. Trans. Harry Zohn, *Illuminations*, (New York: Schocken Books, 1968, first published 1955) and Mario Praz, trans. Angus Davidson, *The House of Life*, (London: Methuen & Co., 1964, first published 1958), revived and reconsidered in the 1990s in John Elsner and Roger Cardinal, eds., *The Cultures of Collecting*, (London: Reaktion, 1994); Werner Muensterberger, *Collecting: An Unruly Passion, Psychological Perspectives*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994); Susan Stewart, *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection*, (London: Duke University Press, 1993).

portals to different memories, events and ideas.[25] Here collecting is an egotistical activity whereby Praz places part of himself within each object and they are inseparable from his identity. Werner Muensterberger's *Collecting: An Unruly Passion*, published in 1994, is a leading exploration into the psychological impulses behind collecting, focusing separate studies on compulsive collectors, and in particular, on the 'generative conditions leading up to the cause of the collector's obsessional infatuation with the objects.'[26] For Muensterberger, using biographical data to explain the origin of collectors' motives and actions is a core component of his thesis, termed 'psychobiographies'.[27]

Recent collecting histories have most often been biographically driven. In the last few decades there has been a proliferation of monographic explorations of single collectors and art museum professionals in Britain and abroad, such as Sir John Charles Robinson (1824-1913), Sir Richard Wallace (1818-1890), William Hesketh Lever (1851-1925), Augustus Wollaston Franks (1826-18967) and Gustav Friedrich Waagen (1794-1868).[28] Consequently there is a far greater emphasis on the role of collectors like these in shaping institutional collecting practices, and these works provide an extremely useful context for a revised study of The Bowes Museum. However, as suggested by their single subject, collecting histories are in danger of remaining disconnected from one another and biographies become a substitute for exploring larger social or cultural themes. Thus it is this work's aim to expose commonalities and contrasts between collectors and collecting histories, using new contexts and moving away from the individualistic focus of previous literature.

There have been two previous full-length studies which take The Bowes Museum as their subject, and both are overtly biographical. The first project with any ambition to engage with the museum

[25] Mario Praz, trans. Angus Davidson, *The House of Life*.
[26] Werner Muensterberger, *Collecting*, 7.
[27] Werner Muensterberger, *Collecting*, 71-162.
[28] Marjorie L. Caygill and John F. Cherry, eds., *A. W. Franks*; Jonathan Conlin, 'Collecting and Connoisseurship in England, 1840-1900: The Case of J. C. Robinson' in Inge Reist, ed., *British Models of Art Collecting and the American Response*, (Farnham: The Frick Collection/Ashgate, 2014), 133-143; Helen Davies, 'Sir John Charles Robinson: his role as a connoisseur and creator of public and private collections', Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Oxford, (1992); Suzanne Higgott '*The Most Fortunate Man of his Day'*; Carmen Stonge, 'Making Private Collections Public: Gustav Friedrich Waagen and the Royal Museum in Berlin', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 10, no. 1, (1998), 61-74; Lucy Wood, 'Lever's Objectives in Collecting Old Furniture', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 4, no. 2, (1992), 211-226.

collection and its founders took place throughout the middle decades of the twentieth century by Charles Hardy. His work culminated in a substantial book on the history of the Museum called *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum* in 1970.[29] The biography is remarkable in its scope and Hardy is prolific in providing the essential and minute details of the Museum's creation, but the pressing issue with Hardy's work is its lack of context for the collecting and formation of the Museum, preferring instead to focus on uncited primary sources and anecdotal events.[30] Moreover, there is a distinct focus on the biography of John Bowes: Hardy's first 10 chapters are dedicated to John Bowes' birth, upbringing, education, political career and business and leisure pursuits.[31]

Since the publication of Hardy's biography work has been ongoing to redress the premise of his history of the creation of the Museum to make it more expansive and provide it with a suitable context. In the 2008 the Museum was awarded funding in order to sort, catalogue and make accessible the huge amount of papers that formed the basis of Hardy's book yet were not formally referenced. Concurrent to this work was the research and writing of a revised book on the history of the Museum by the historian Caroline Chapman entitled *John & Joséphine: The Creation of The Bowes Museum*.[32] However, Chapman also focuses heavily on the biographies of both John and Joséphine Bowes, devoting the first three chapters of her book to the Bowes and their origins.[33] Moreover, Chapman also ascribes some of the psychoanalytical motives of collecting to the formation of the museum collection, such as the fact that John and Joséphine Bowes did not have children may have led them to view their museum as a surrogate child.[34]

[29] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, xiii. Charles Hardy, a retired teacher from the local school, was a research assistant employed under the directorship of Frank Atkinson. Atkinson was a pioneer in the industrial museum movement, eventually leaving The Bowes Museum to create the Beamish open-air museum. Whilst at The Bowes Museum he increasingly sought to preserve and display the social history of the local area, adding greatly to the collection in this spirit. It would seem fair to say that Hardy's resultant book is a product of Atkinson's desire to improve the Bowes Museum's presence as an institution focused on local history, and therefore it is limited in its reach within the broader discipline of the history of collecting.
[30] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, passim.
[31] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, Chapters 1-10, 1-106.
[32] Caroline Chapman, *John & Joséphine*.
[33] Caroline Chapman, *John & Joséphine*, Chapters 1-3, 5-56.
[34] Caroline Chapman, *John & Joséphine*, 71.

Taking their cue from Chapman and Hardy many subsequent studies have taken these biographical details and used them to incorporate the museum project into wider contextual studies.[35] Such studies focus on the Bowes and their ambiguous class origins, following the proposition that they collected in order to attain a certain level of social status. Because of John Bowes illegitimacy, born to John Bowes the 10th Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorne (1769-1820) and his mistress Mary Milner, it is most ordinarily seen that John Bowes is not of the aristocratic class.[36] Indeed, Mark Girouard has described John Bowes as 'far from being a self-made man, but his career and social position were somewhat ambivalent.'[37] A legal dispute surrounding his birth allowed John Bowes to inherit the English estates belonging to the Bowes family, Streatlam Castle and Gibside, but he had to relinquish the Scottish estate Glamis to his uncle Thomas Lyon-Bowes (1773-1846), who also took the Earldom and became the 11th Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorne. The title then passed down through the 11th Earl's male issue. Though John Bowes received the conventional aristocratic upbringing, attending Eton College and then Trinity College, Cambridge, in a society where legitimate claims to the upper classes were important, Bowes inherited only wealth without its accompanying property, and this may have resulted in a sense of dual identity.[38] One on hand John Bowes' francophilia has been seen as a rejection of the English patrician class. For example, Waterfield sees the large French chateau-inspired building as 'being close to the centre of the (legitimate) family estates while proudly stating

[35] Clarissa Campbell Orr, ed., *Women in the Victorian Art World*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995); Jeannie Chapel and Charlotte Gere, eds., *The Fine and Decorative Art Collections of Britain and Ireland* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1985); Frank Davis, *Victorian Patrons of the Arts: Twelve Famous Collections and Their Owners*, (London: Country Life, 1963); Mark Girouard, *The Victorian Country House*, (London: Yale University Press, 1979); Anne Higonnet, *A Museum of One's Own*; Kate Hill, *Women and Museums 1850-1914: Modernity and the Gendering of Knowledge*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016); Barbara Lasic, 'The Collecting of Eighteenth Century French Decorative Arts in Britain, 1789-1914', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Manchester, (2005); Edward Morris, *French Art in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, (London: Yale University Press, 2005); James Stourton, *Great Smaller Museums of Europe*, (London: Scala, 1999); Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*.

[36] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, Chapters 2-3, 6-26; For the history of the Bowes family see J. Gill, *Streatlam and Gibside: The Bowes and Strathmore Families in County Durham*, (Durham: Durham County Council, 1980); Margaret Wills, *Gibside and the Bowes Family*, (Chichester: Phillimore for Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle upon Tyne, 1995). For the family's generational tastes and collecting practices see Margaret Wills and Howard Coutts, 'The Bowes Family of Streatlam Castle and Gibside and its Collections', *Metropolitan Museum Journal*, vol. 33, (1998), 231-243

[37] Mark Girouard, *The Victorian Country House*, 296.

[38] Charles Hardy *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, Chapter 4, 27-37; For Gentlemanly pursuits such as John Bowes' success as a racehorse owner see Elizabeth Conran, *John Bowes: Mystery Man of the Turf*, (Barnard Castle: The Bowes Museum, 1985).

its distinctiveness as a stately pile,' as if John Bowes had crafted himself a new identity aligned to but separate from his long aristocratic ancestry.[39] On the other hand, John Bowes followed the path of the typical English gentleman, entering into public politics following university, and though this political career was short lived – he retired from any sort of public office in 1847 – he still maintained a level of public duty that was a central ethos of the governing classes.[40]

Joséphine Bowes' biography has also been characterised by her humble origins. Born in Paris as Benoîte-Joséphine Coffin Chevallier in 1825 to a clockmaker, little is known about her life before her career as a vaudeville performer at the Théâtre des Variétés from the late 1840s and subsequent relationship with John Bowes.[41] There is no doubt Joséphine Bowes enjoyed success whilst on the stage as evinced by many favourable reviews that have recently been discovered.[42] However the social standing of Joséphine Coffin Chevallier has been characterised by the disreputable nature of the Parisian theatre profession and its close alignment with the cultural identities of courtesans and prostitutes in mid-nineteenth century Paris.[43] According to some writers Joséphine Bowes may also have felt the need to validate her position in society after marrying John Bowes. Indeed Girouard also claims that John Bowes purchased a title for her in order to 'conceal her ambivalent origins.'[44] This view is also articulated by Clarissa Campbell Orr who describes John Bowes' illegitimacy and Joséphine Bowes' post-marital status as a 'kept woman' something to 'live down', and the creation of a museum an effort 'to give a respectable impression.'[45] The historian Sarah Kane has also paid close attention to Joséphine Bowes' modest upbringing and career as an actress in a theatre notorious for

[39] Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 250.
[40] For Bowes' political career see Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, Chapters 5-8, 37-77; John Bowes was a regular supporter of local munificent institutions, such as the Barnard Castle Mechanics' Institute, for which he served as President in the 1860s.
[41] Joséphine Bowes' birth certificate is held in the Archives de Paris, V3E/N 513.
[42] Judith Phillips, 'National Identity, Gender, Social Status and Cultural Aspirations in mid-Nineteenth Century England and France: Joséphine Bowes (1825-1874), Collector and Museum Creator', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Teesside, (2020), 109 fn. 95. Phillips credits James Illingworth for these discoveries. See also Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 84-85.
[43] Sarah Kane, 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces: Joséphine Coffin-Chevalier and the Creation of the Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle', *Journal of Design History*, vol. 9, no. 1, (1996), 2-6.
[44] Mark Girouard, *The Victorian Country House*, 297.
[45] Clarissa Campbell Orr, 'Introduction', in Clarissa Campbell Orr, ed., *Women in the Victorian Art World*, 22.

being ‘vulgar’ in order to emphasise her need to claim respectability.[46] Again these details operate as motivation for attaining a level of social status through forming a museum.

Another lens through which the idiosyncratic nature of these collections is viewed owes much to the work of studies of gender within museums, collecting and philanthropy. Any serious attempt at writing about women collectors has been curbed until recent times by the overriding vision of women as unthinking consumers or confined to the so-called ‘minor arts' such as ceramics or textiles, or as operating within the shadow of a more well-known spouse.[47] This was a persistent trope in early writings on The Bowes Museum, from at least Hardy’s work and the male-dominated narrative approach it took. This led to the foregrounding of John Bowes as the main protagonist in the creation of the Museum in a number of studies following Hardy’s work such as Frank Davis’ *Victorian Patrons of the Arts* of 1963 that included John Bowes alone as one of its twelve case studies of nineteenth century British collectors, whilst omitting the influence of Joséphine Bowes.[48] More recently Edward Morris has described the Museum as the ‘house and private art gallery’ of John Bowes, crediting Joséphine Bowes only with a slight influence on his taste.[49] The view has been balanced due to the efforts of Caroline Chapman who has emphasised the driving role that Joséphine Bowes had in the Museum’s history in her revisionist project.[50] This is clearly evident in various moments in archival correspondence but even though there are numerous references from John Bowes crediting the museum project to his wife, the lack of archival material that relates solely to Joséphine Bowes has made a completely revisionist project difficult, and this probably accounts in some part to histories such as Hardy’s paying greater attention to John Bowes.[51]

[46] Sarah Kane, ‘Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces’, 1-3.
[47] Dianne Sachko Macleod, *Art and the Victorian Middle Class*, 6; Rémy Saisselin, *Bricabracomania: The Bourgeois and the Bibelot*, (London: Thames and Hudson, 1984).
[48] Frank Davis, *Victorian Patrons of the Arts*, 69-73
[49] Edward Morris, *French Art in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, 85 & 203.
[50] Caroline Chapman, *John & Joséphine*.
[51] For example, John Bowes wrote in a letter ‘…it must be recollected that thanks only are due to my late Wife, as the idea, and prospect of the Museum and Park originated entirely with her...’, TBMA, JB/2/1/42/21, Letter from John Bowes to R. J. Dent, 5 October 1874, quoted in Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 192. Also quoted in see Caroline Chapman, *John & Joséphine*, 71.

The renewed focus on Joséphine Bowes as a significant force in the Museum's creation has not dispensed with gendered prejudices. Sarah Kane in her analyses of the methods in which the Bowes museum collection was formed, sees Joséphine Bowes as the sole author of the collection, rather than seeing the collecting as a joint project and argues that the random sequence in which the objects were purchased indicated the behaviour of a 'mere collector of bibelots.'[52] Even Chapman's revisionist biography describes her as a 'compulsive shopper and bargain hunter.'[53] Focussing exclusively on Joséphine Bowes, Chapman and Kane view her collecting through a gendered lens which ties middle and upper class bourgeois women to a form of mindless consumerism in aid of establishing their position within society, and succumbing to new fashions. Their perspective owes a large debt the work of Rémy Saisselin who argues that in the second half of the nineteenth century, a wave of bourgeois collectors – mainly women – accumulated objects in high numbers with no regard to their historic significance.[54] Leora Auslander also subscribes to this point of view in her discussion of the 'bourgeois stylistic regime' in the mid-nineteenth century France, distinguishing between the gendered role of the woman collector creating an interior for domestic inhabitation, and a man finding social elevation and individuation in forming a collection.[55] Here the domestic and social collecting distinction between men and women takes on a proxy for public and private spheres, where the men collect for the museum and the women collect for the home.

The major role of women collectors has now been recognised within the history of museum creation with writers such as Charlotte Gere and Marina Vaizey, and Kate Hill contributing huge amounts of empirical information and a new theoretical approach to this revisionist project.[56] Even though Gere and Vaizey describe John and Joséphine Bowes as indicative of collecting 'partners whose roles are

[52] Sarah Kane, 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces', 10.
[53] Caroline Chapman, *John & Joséphine*, 55.
[54] Rémy Saisselin, *Bricabracomania*, xv.
[55] Leora Auslander, *Taste and Power: Furnishing Modern France*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 290-97.
[56] Charlotte Gere and Marina Vaizey, *Great Women Collectors*, (London: Philip Wilson, 1999); Kate Hill, *Women and Museums 1850-1914*. See also the recent special issue of *Visual Resources*, 'Women's Expertise and the Culture of Connoisseurship', vol. 33, no. 1-2, (2017) and 'Old Masters, Modern Women' *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*, vol 28, (2018).

difficult to differentiate from those of their spouses,' their work does much to convey agency on women collectors. For example, in her study of the ceramics collector Lady Charlotte Schreiber, Anne Eatwell has referred specifically to both Schreiber and Joséphine Bowes as exceptional cases within a landscape of public munificence dominated by men.[57] This vein of scholarship is starting to become visible in the way the Museum understands its own history: In much more recent years the Museum hosted an exhibition entitled 'Joséphine Bowes: A Woman of Taste and Influence'.[58] This innovative display made a conscious use of archival material and recent research to counterbalance the male-dominated, biography-driven history written by Hardy as well as to show a more nuanced biographical overview of the Museum's founder. Led by the Curator of Textiles Joanna Hashagen and Archivist Judith Phillips, who has written a doctoral thesis on Joséphine Bowes' life in the context of gender, social class and cultural aspiration in the mid-nineteenth century, this exhibition prescribed a far greater degree of agency to Joséphine Bowes in the field of collecting.[59] Using thematic categories such as 'patron of the arts and collector', 'artist', 'woman of fashion', 'socialite', 'wife', 'mistress' and 'actress', the exhibition attributed an intelligent, creative and ambitious personality to Joséphine Bowes. Much more recently James Illingworth has used his extensive research into the library of books in French of John and Joséphine Bowes to argue that her position within the intellectual and artistic circles of nineteenth century Paris is much more involved than previously recognised, and that consequently she should be considered as a credible contributor to artistic institutions at the time.[60] Now that such work has been produced that addresses the gendered imbalance in the collecting of John and Joséphine Bowes, this study proposes to build upon this to view their relationship as a symbiotic collecting partnership, whereby their tastes, backgrounds and motives together shaped the Museum in conscious and unconscious ways. Indeed Kate Hill, seeing the museum collection as a joint initiative, has offered John and Joséphine Bowes as an example of a couple that complicate the

[57] Ann Eatwell, 'Private Pleasure Public Beneficence: Lady Charlotte Schreiber and Ceramic Collecting', in Clarissa Campbell Orr, ed., *Women in the Victorian Art World*, 135.
[58] This exhibition took place between May and July 2017.
[59] Judith Phillips, 'National Identity, Gender, Social Status and Cultural Aspirations in mid-Nineteenth Century England and France'.
[60] James Illingworth, 'Joséphine Bowes (1825-1874), Shopaholic or Patroness of the Arts?', in Maggie Allison, Elliot Evans and Carrie Tarr, eds., *Plaisirs de femmes: Women, Pleasure and Transgression in French Literature and Culture*, (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2019), 73-87.

gendered aspects of collecting more generally.[61] This work subscribes to this view to assess John and Joséphine Bowes as equal actors whose motivations and decisions were shaped as much by contextual factors as they were by individual motives, in essence moving away from the biographical narratives that have for so long constrained the writing of The Bowes Museum.

Private Collecting and Public Art Museums in the Nineteenth Century

The Bowes Museum provides a new perspective on a period of history where concepts of private collecting and public museums are in constant redefinition as they became increasingly intertwined.[62] Sarah Kane has written critically about the British and French museological contexts in which The Bowes Museum emerged, encapsulating the contradictory private and public motives which the founders adopted.[63] Placing the creation of the Bowes' museum in the context of the rapid growth and establishment of French national and regional museums, Kane concludes that it is difficult to determine whether there was any particular model the Bowes were following for their museum.[64] She writes 'they are certainly not known to have sought the advice of museum curators in France and England or to have studied other museums' collections.'[65] This thesis complicates this claim, arguing that collectors in the nineteenth century constantly drew from museological practices, whether explicitly or implicitly. As such this thesis relies heavily on writing on the intersection of collecting and museum histories, and it is initially worth delineating the recent trajectories of these disciplines, and how the role of the private collector in the formation of museums is now central to their

[61] Kate Hill, *Women and Museums 1850-1914*, 141.
[62] As illustrated in David Murray's 1904 three-volume work *Museums: Their History and their Use*, there were over 120 museums established in Britain between 1850 and 1900. David Murray, *Museums: Their History and their Use* (Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1904), 292-312.
[63] Sarah Kane, 'When Paris Meets Teesdale: The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle', in T. E. Faulkner, ed., *Northumbrian Panorama: Studies in the History and Culture of North-East England*, (London: Octavian, 1996); Sarah Kane, 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces', 1-21.
[64] Sarah Kane, 'When Paris Meets Teesdale', 178.
[65] Sarah Kane, 'When Paris Meets Teesdale', 178.

understanding in order to place the methodological framework of this thesis in what is now a long-established discipline.

In following the historiographical trajectory of the study of the rise of museums and private collecting from the sixteenth to the twentieth century, there comes a point in the middle of the nineteenth century where writers viewed collectors and institutions as separate entities. The eminent historian of collecting Krzysztof Pomian describes private collections as sources of curiosity and innovation throughout Early Modern Europe and the Enlightenment, however his narrative of progress leads to the age of the public institution and the inevitability of such private collections transferring into the realm of public utility.[66] This view has been articulated by a number of scholars since the 1980s as a shift in the perceived role of museums, summarised by the sociologist Tony Bennett as: 'the mid-nineteenth-century reconceptualization of museums as cultural resources that might be deployed as governmental instruments.'[67] Bennett and other writers such as Hooper-Greenhill and Sherman & Rogoff have taken as a model the work of the French theorist Michel Foucault (1926-1984), who wrote extensively on the relationship between institutional knowledge and power.[68] This Foucauldian strand of museum studies views institutions as exercising a degree of social and cultural control and maintaining a power structure that was cloaked by the mission of 'civilising' the working classes. Within this view there is no convincing explanation for the idiosyncratic nature of national or regional museums and galleries, nor the rise of individuals establishing private museums. Consequently, an alternative narrative of museum creation has emerged outside of the national and regional institutions that concentrates on the myriad uniquely formed institutions that are termed variously by the historian

[66] Krzysztof Pomian, trans. Elisabeth Wiles-Porter, *Collectors and Curiosities: Paris and Venice 1500-1800*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990). See also Ken Arnold, *Cabinets for the Curious: Looking Back at Early English Museums*, (London: Routledge, 2005); Arthur MacGregor, *Curiosity and Enlightenment: Collectors and Collections from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century*, (London: Yale University Press, 2007); Susan Pearce, *On Collecting: An Investigation into Collecting in the European Tradition*, (London: Routledge, 1995).
[67] Tony Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum: History, theory, politics* (London: Routledge, 1995), 28. See also Carol Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals*; Carol Duncan & Alan Wallach, 'The Universal Survey Museum' *Art History*, vol. 3, no. 4 (1980), 448-469; Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, *Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge*, (London: Routledge, 1992); Daniel J. Sherman & Irit Rogoff, eds., *Museum Culture: Histories, Discourses, Spectacles*, (London: Routledge, 1994).
[68] Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, (New York: DoubleDay, 1977).

Anne Higonnet as 'collection museums' or 'house museums'.[69] Higonnet positions these as an antidote to the 'encyclopedic' collections of national institutions, reminding us that as debates around the public role of the art museum progressed throughout the nineteenth century, 'great princely collections survived or continued to be formed, resisting political trends calling for the nationalization of great art.'[70] The shift from privately displayed artworks to public institution that writers have observed was not a simple transformation, or even an uncontested one. Indeed, one of Higonnet's main arguments in her book is that the 'action' to establish large, educational, public museums incited a specific 'reaction', in the form of 'collection museums.'[71] Through her close analysis of American 'collection museums' Higonnet is responding to a change in the historiography of collecting history that also occurred around the late 1980s, prompted by the work of scholars such as Pomian that revealed the centrality of the collector in museum formation. Indeed, Stephen Bann in reviewing Pomian's classic work *Collectors and Curiosities: Paris and Venice 1500-1800* is dissatisfied in the conclusion that the 1850s heralded the 'age of the institution,' and believes in not considering other idiosyncratic collections of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries Pomain's work only serves to highlight 'the continual evolution of the relationship between "public" and "private", and the need to specify the historical conditions of each particular transaction.'[72] In 1989, the founding issue of the *Journal of the History of Collections* was published with an editorial that described the journal's genesis at a symposium dedicated to sixteenth and seventeenth century cabinets of curiosity entitled 'The Origins of the Museum'.[73] This effectively consolidated the view that the study of the origins of public museums required a more nuanced examination of the myriad types of collections which they were representative of, and has proved it through continuous publishing of original research on collectors for over three decades.[74] Subsequent studies have responded to this, exemplified by John Elsner and Roger Cardinal's edited volume *The Cultures of Collecting* published in 1994, that sought

[69] Anne Higonnet, *A Museum of One's Own*, 7-23.
[70] Anne Higonnet, *A Museum of One's Own*, 7-9.
[71] Anne Higonnet, *A Museum of One's Own*, 8.
[72] Stephen Bann, 'Review of Krzysztof Pomian, "Collectors and Curiosities: Paris and Venice 1500-1800"', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 73, no. 4, (1991), 690.
[73] *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 1, no. 1, (1989), 1-2.
[74] The journal is currently on its 31st volume and changed from producing two issues per year to three in 2012 indicating the growth in the discipline.

to present research on collectors and collections that did not contribute to typical formations of taste or the canon, those in their words which '…parody orthodox connoisseurship…challenge the expectations of social behaviour, even…construct a maverick anti-system.'[75] This explicitly acknowledges that questions of taste and knowledge posed by collections existed outside as well as alongside and within the institutional framework.

Rather than viewing the rise of the institution as a narrative of either the adherence or divergence of private collectors, both museums and collectors can also be seen as developing simultaneously and in dialogue with one another, and this provides a key lens for this thesis. A number of writers have recently reframed the emergence of museums in Victorian society not as hegemonic cultural controllers, but in a much more nuanced way, focussing instead on the myriad differences and idiosyncrasies and their relation to overall projects of public munificence, scientific exploration, colonial power, civic pride or social aspiration.[76] One way in which this is achieved is through acknowledging the difficult interplay between concepts of public and private in nineteenth century collecting and museums. Even though Tony Bennett subscribes to the Foucauldian view of museums, he also takes ideas from the German sociologist Jürgen Habermas (b.1929), and in particular Habermas' ideas on the 'public sphere' that appeared in his 1962 work *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*.[77] According to Habermas, the emergence of a bourgeois public sphere took place in the eighteenth century in liberal western European cities, whereby the structures of authority upheld by the monarch gave way to the middle classes through the formation of spaces in which they could assemble and enact reasonable discussion.[78]

> The bourgeois public sphere arose historically in conjunction with a society separated from the state. The social could be constituted as its own sphere to the degree that, on the one hand,

[75] John Elsner and Roger Cardinal, 'Introduction' in John Elsner and Roger Cardinal, eds., *The Cultures of Collecting*, 3.
[76] Colin Trodd, 'The Discipline of Pleasure; or, How Art History Looks at the Art Museum', *Museum & Society*, vol. 1, no. 1, (2003), 17-29; Amy Woodson-Boulton, 'Victorian Museums and Victorian Society', *History Compass*, vol. 6, no. 1, (2008), 109-146.
[77] Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into the category of Bourgeois society* (Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1989).
[78] Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*.

> the reproduction of life took on private form while, on the other hand, the private realm took on public significance.[79]

However, Bennett recognises the reordering of cultural values, and the diminishing of the bourgeois public sphere alongside the prevalence of the state sponsored museum. More recently writers have reassessed the museum's complicated role in the relationship between society and the state. For example, Jennifer Barrett defines the differing and slippery definition of 'public' in relation to museums, and the reductive way that 'private' operates as a binary to this elusive term.[80]

Other writers have recognised the residue of the so-called 'private realm' within the public institution. The cultural theorist Frazer Ward critiques the accessibility to institutions of art and culture in modern Europe prescribing them with what he terms 'representative publicness'.[81] Ward described that for Jürgen Habermas 'the museum was one of the institutions embodying a form of publicity that functioned to challenge the "representative" publicity of royal collections (in order to realise a conception of publicness opposed to the secret politics of absolutism)'.[82] Ward describes this "representative" publicity as the access which royal and aristocratic collectors provided their subjects to their collections in order to showcase their wealth and stately magnificence.[83] He goes on comment that in reality, 'in its development out of the royal collections, the public art museum took form as an institution of the bourgeois state, but one that defined a hybrid form of publicity, haunted, as it were, by representative publicity'.[84] Ward uses the example of the establishment of the Louvre, which arose from the conversion of the French royal palace into a public museum during the French Revolution in the late eighteenth century, to describe a ceremonial display of democratic public property that

[79] Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, 129.
[80] Jennifer Barrett, *Museums and the Public Sphere*, (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 7.
[81] Frazer Ward, 'The Haunted Museum: Institutional Critique and Publicity', *October*, vol. 3, (1995), 76.
[82] Frazer Ward, 'The Haunted Museum: Institutional Critique and Publicity', 76.
[83] Frazer Ward, 'The Haunted Museum: Institutional Critique and Publicity', 76.
[84] Frazer Ward, 'The Haunted Museum: Institutional Critique and Publicity', 76.

institutionally still adhered to its foundation within a royal administration, as paradigmatic of this hybrid form of publicity.[85]

Another key idea is drawn from Tom Stammers' work on the activity of private collectors in Paris after the French Revolution.[86] Stammers argues that the political unrest that turned the Louvre into a public institution, rather than decimating all notions of the private ownership of art – as is the dominant narrative within museum history – opened up new perspectives and methods for the formation of private collections.[87] As such, a significant deal of art historical knowledge was produced outside of the national collections, through collecting networks and accessibility to collections in private homes.[88] According to Stammers, in nineteenth century France the concept of heritage evolved as a partnership between private collectors and the state, taking tangible form in the many art institutions and houses of the bourgeoisie.[89] Thus the private collector is now a valuable barometer of the way in which knowledge is formed and disseminated in the public sphere, and the private home becomes a legitimate site for that dissemination. As an institution that blurs the boundaries between private and public, and the house and the museum, The Bowes Museum represents an apposite case study through which to further explore these notions. In effect, contributing to the work of Stammers, Ward and the general disciplinary shift that entailed the 'new museology', this thesis will use The Bowes Museum's distinctiveness within the institutional landscape in the second half of the nineteenth century to show that most museums formed during this period exhibit individualistic appearances, acquisition rationales and aims, but are grouped together under the umbrella of the 'institution'. By bringing the private collector to the foreground in the

[85] Frazer Ward, 'The Haunted Museum: Institutional Critique and Publicity', 78. For the history of the Louvre see Andrew McClellan, *Inventing the Louvre: Art, Politics and the Origins of the Modern Museum in Eighteenth Century Paris*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
[86] Tom Stammers, *The Purchase of the Past: Collecting Culture in Post-Revolutionary Paris c.1790-1890*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020); see also Tom Stammers, 'The Bric-a-Brac of the Old Regime: Collecting and Cultural History in Post-Revolutionary France', *French History*, vol. 22, no. 3, (2008), 295-315 and Tom Stammers, 'Collectors, Catholics, and the Commune: Heritage and Counterrevolution, 1860-1890', *French Historical Studies*, vol. 37, no. 1, (2014), 53-87
[87] Tom Stammers, 'The Bric-a-Brac of the Old Regime', 296-97.
[88] Tom Stammers, 'The Bric-a-Brac of the Old Regime', 295-315; Tom Stammers, 'Collectors, Catholics, and the Commune: Heritage and Counterrevolution, 1860-1890',
[89] Tom Stammers, *The Purchase of the Past*, 17-22.

narrative of the history of public museums, this thesis strengthens the case for further studies on local or regional art museums, as well as increased attention on the complexity that defines museum formation in this period.

The Role of the Public Art Museum in Britain

Another way in which this thesis makes a historiographic contribution to the history of The Bowes Museum is viewing the institution through the lens which its founders and their contemporaries perceived its role and function in British society. The Museum officially opened its doors to the public on 10 June 1892, on a celebratory day filled with festivities, a procession through the market town of Barnard Castle, and tour through the recently constructed galleries. Before the visitors were admitted, a speech was given by the Liberal MP for Barnard Castle Sir Joseph Whitwell Pease (1828-1903), which he closed by declaring:

> I consider that to-day we have opened to the public a priceless boon, because it is not only the Museum that we open, but it ought to be a great centre of education for this district, a centre always and constantly improving in its character and tone, adding another step to those many steps which this country has lately taken in the cause of higher and popular education, leading people's minds from those things that are gross and grovelling to those which are higher and which raise men's minds; which give them employment when other employment's cease, and enable them to fully enjoy that leisure which the working classes so constantly and vigorously claim.[90]

Pease's comments encapsulate the perceived role of the public art museum in the second half of the nineteenth century: the political and cultural developments of the previous 40 years had established that the regional museum was a place that was enmeshed with its surrounding area and provided educational and moral improvement to local inhabitants through interaction with art. Essentially art could improve society. Writing in the 1880s the publisher and advocate for public libraries and museums Thomas Greenwood (1851-1908) outlined five objectives of the regional museum that

[90] Anon., 'Bowes Museum', *The Northern Echo*, 11 June 1892, 4.

included providing 'rational amusement of an elevating character' and a 'home for local objects of interest', as well as being an educational institution, contributing to local trades and industries and forming one part of a constellation of services that 'further the education of the many, and the special studies of the few.'[91] The Bowes Museum as described by Pease, then, fits much of Greenwood's criteria, and is portrayed as the embodiment of the regional art museum, serving the working classes of Barnard Castle and providing the wider Teesdale region with entertainment and education. Yet despite this view, The Bowes Museum has not been written sufficiently into the political and cultural ideas that the museum represented the embodiment of in nineteenth century British society.

As outlined in the previous section, the development of the art museum is seen as the emergence of a truly democratic and educational institution that acted as the opposite to the closed-off, elitist realm of the private art collection. This occurred in Britain as a consequence of a slow transference of broader political and cultural power from the aristocratic to the middle classes at the opening of the nineteenth century.[92] More generally, the years around 1830 represented a key moment in the political and cultural relevance of the arts to the state.[93] Notions that the state held some form of responsibility for the welfare of the people emerged at this time, epitomised by the Reform Act of 1832, which cast voting rights over a much wider spread of the population and consequently, parliamentary representation began to include the middle-classes. Central to the programme of many of these newly elected 'radicals' who challenged the elitism of the ruling classes, such as the MP William Ewart (1798-1869), was the provision of education for the entire population and the institutional infrastructure that would introduce this through both work and leisure.[94] These decades are important to the formation of The Bowes Museum as the context in which John Bowes and his contemporaries were active in political life. One aspect which is worthy of closer study in relation to its influence on

[91] Thomas Greenwood, *Museums and Art Galleries*, (London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1888), 4-5.
[92] Peter Mandler, *Aristocratic Government in the Age of Reform: Whigs and Liberals, 1830-1852*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).
[93] See Tony Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum*, 22; Janet Minihan, *The Nationalization of Culture: The Development of State Subsidies to the Arts in Great Britain*, (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1977), 29-63.
[94] Peter Bailey, *Leisure and Class in Victorian England: Rational Recreation and the Contest for Control,1830-1885*, (London: Routledge, 1978).

The Bowes Museum project is the attitudes to art and education which were held by individuals such as the Liberal MP, colonial administrator and close intimate of John Bowes, William Hutt (1801-1882) (**figure 1.2**). According to the writer Augustus Hare (1834-1903) Hutt first met John Bowes when tutoring him at Cambridge University in the 1830s, and it was through this association that he subsequently married John Bowes's mother, Mary Bowes, Countess of Strathmore (1787-1860) and became John Bowes' step-father.[95] Though these relationships appear as formalities, Hardy describes them as closely tied by 'friendship and mutual interest', and this is evinced by the vast number of letters between them preserved in the Museum archive and Durham County Record Office.[96] William Hutt and John Bowes were also closely aligned politically, both being members of the Liberal Party, with Hutt helping Bowes throughout his time as Member of Parliament for Durham between 1832-47.[97] Hutt was dedicated to his career in politics, unlike John Bowes whose political career was short-lived, taking on leading roles in Britain's colonial expansion in Australia and New Zealand, before becoming the Vice-President of the Board of Trade between the years 1860-65, directly contemporaneous to when The Bowes Museum was being formed. However, no literature on The Bowes Museum has drawn parallels between the ambitions of the Board of Trade in respect to museums and that of the Museum's founders.

Tom Gretton has outlined how the British liberal bourgeoisie at this time adopted an ambivalent position in establishing museums, on the one hand they strove to 'educate, moralize and improve the public realm', and on the other they desired to maximise 'freedom of competition.'[98] This epitomises the contested relationship between private individuals and the collective effort of politicians and reformers attempting to introduce cultural reforms. The individuals in government and those that sat on the trustee boards of museums held private interests within their policy making, and as articulated

[95] Augustus Hare, *The Story of My Life*, (London: George Allen, 1896), vol. 2, 180.
[96] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 32. Most of Bowes and Hutt's correspondence is preserved in the records DCRO, D/St/C5 and TBMA, JB/2/5.
[97] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 55-64.
[98] Tom Gretton, ''Art is Cheaper and goes lower in France' The language of the Parliamentary Select Committee on the Arts and Principles of Design 1835-1836', in Andrew Hemingway and William Vaughan ed., *Art in Bourgeois Society, 1790-1850*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 95.

by Gretton, their definition of what was valuable about 'the arts' was vague and often contradictory.[99] Most significantly William Hutt was appointed by William Ewart to sit on a Select Committee formed to investigate the supposed lag in the British market of applied and industrial arts, framed by the relationship between art and manufacture.[100] Hutt is described by Gretton as having adopted a radicalism that centred on 'free trade and the ballot.'[101] The report formed and published by the Select Committee includes testimony from a number of esteemed cultural and governmental figures, many of whom Hutt personally interviewed, and based on its findings it was proposed that the answer was to form a nation-wide system of design schools in order to centrally educate craftspeople, and by extension elevate the taste of the consumer class.[102] However, it was conceded that these schools and their pupils also needed exemplary models of art and manufactures from which to learn.[103] This gave rise to the view that museums and galleries could be established or co-opted within this project – broadly termed 'design reform' – in order to improve the market for practical and artistic objects wholesale.[104]

The exemplary moment of this movement is perhaps the foundation of the South Kensington Museum.[105] After the enormous success in 1851 of *The Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of*

[99] Thomas Gretton, ''Art is cheaper and goes lower in France'', 95-99.
[100] This committee was formed to 'enquire into the best means of extending a knowledge of the Arts and Principles of Design among the people (especially the manufacturing population) of the country…' as described in its subsequent report: *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures*, (London: House of Commons, 1836).
[101] Thomas Gretton, ''Art is cheaper and goes lower in France'', 85.
[102] The two standard works on this are Quentin Bell, *The Schools of Design*, (London: Routledge, 1963) and Stuart Macdonald, *The History and Philosophy of Art Education*, (London: University of London Press, 1970). See also more recent work such as Rebecca Wade, 'Pedagogic Objects: The formation, circulation and exhibition of teaching collections for art and design education in Leeds, 1837-1857', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Leeds, (2012).
[103] See Raphael Cardoso Denis, 'Teaching by Example: Education and the Formation of South Kensington's Museums', in Malcolm Baker and Brenda Richardson, eds., *A Grand Design: The Art of the Victoria and Albert Museum*, (New York: Abrams with the Baltimore Museum of Art, 1997), 107-116.
[104] Paul A. C. Sproll, 'Matters of Taste and Matters of Commerce: British Government Intervention in Art Education in 1835', *Studies in Art Education*, vol. 35, no. 2, (1994), 109. See also contemporary publications such as Edward Edwards, *The Administrative Economy of the Fine Arts*, (London: Saunders and Otley, 1840).
[105] See Lara Kriegel, *Grand Designs: Labor, Empire and the Museum*, (London: Duke University Press, 2007), 1-18. For an ambitious post-colonial work exploring the global impact of this project, see Arindam Dutta, *The Bureaucracy of Beauty: Design in the Age of its Global Reproducibility*, (New York: Routledge, 2006). For the history of the South Kensington Museum see Malcolm Baker and Brenda Richardson, eds., *A Grand Design*; Anthony Burton, *Vision & Accident*; Louise Purbrick, 'The South Kensington Museum: The Building of the House of Henry Cole', in Marcia Pointon, ed., *Art Apart*, 69-88.

All Nations, a large-scale temporary exhibition showcasing the advances made in manufacturing since the government intervened in the 1830s, the state was well-placed, culturally and financially, to start buying up works to form a national collection.[106] This is how the nucleus of the South Kensington Museum was formed, with a selection of modern manufactures purchased from the Great Exhibition. These went on display the following year under the rubric of The Museum of Ornamental Art, housed in Marlborough House in St. James's Palace. Here the collection was supplemented with collections of historic decorative arts, perhaps most notably they displayed objects from the Royal Collection generously loaned by Queen Victoria. However, the museum was also active in acquiring historic art in the view that it was equally valuable in teaching the principles of good taste and design. Thus from its outset the formation of the South Kensington Museum was an educative programme, but its links to the commerce and consumption of art are also explicit. For example, the museum had an effective policy from the 1850s onwards to attempt to acquire entire collections that entered the market.[107] Two significant wholesale acquisitions were made from existing private collections in these early years of the Museum of Ornamental Art, that of the politician Ralph Bernal (1784-1854) in 1855 and the Jules Soulages (1812-1856) collection of French and Italian Renaissance works between 1859-1865.[108] These collections of an antiquarian and connoisseurial nature, which had been formed on aesthetic grounds rather than to educate, were incorporated into the existing collection of modern applied arts in the eighteenth-century domestic interiors of Marlborough House according to the instruction of the museum's first curator Sir John Charles Robinson (1824-1913). Robinson himself noted as early as the 1850s that the mission of the museum was to render 'the taste for collecting almost universal amongst educated persons.'[109] So it is evident that from the 1850s the museum had as much potential influence on collectors as it did on artisans and the working classes.

[106] See Jeffrey Auerbach, *The Great Exhibition of 1851: A Nation on Display*, (London: Yale University Press, 1999).
[107] For example, in relation to furniture see the section entitled 'Collecting collections' in Christopher Wilk, ed., *Western Furniture 1350 to the Present Day*, (London: Philip Wilson, 1996), 12-13.
[108] The Soulages collection was on display at Marlborough House in 1858 but was purchased item by item over the next 7 years, Julius Bryant, *Creating the V&A*, 66. For the Bernal collection see Julius Bryant, *Creating the V&A*, 67-74.
[109] John Charles Robinson, *Catalogue of the Soulages Collection*, (London: Chapman & Hall, 1856), iv-v.

In a large way, the Bowes' predilection for modern and historic fine and decorative art, assembled to show variety of style and technique, is paralleled by the rise of large institutions dedicated to the applied arts such as the South Kensington Museum. Their collecting has been described as 'encyclopedic', which has overt references to the all-encompassing education that one could draw from a museum.[110] Kane, Coutts and Medlam have all made passing references to the influence of the South Kensington Museum on the formation of The Bowes Museum.[111] Each has acknowledged The Bowes Museum's debt to the unprecedented level of collecting modern and historic decorative arts and the impulse to classify them according to materials and techniques that followed the formation of the South Kensington Museum and other associated museums of applied arts. Yet The Bowes Museum remains contextually untethered from the wider reform movement in which they materialised. This thesis shows that through William Hutt and his involvement with the Board of Trade the Bowes enjoyed closer links to the museum world centred in London and South Kensington than have been previously shown. Therefore, the presence of role of the perception of the art museum and its practicable form in the South Kensington Museum is perennial throughout this study, as a network which encapsulates the tensions and symbiosis of private collectors and public institutions. In this way, as well as exposing the debt the creation of The Bowes Museum owes to its far-reaching and nebulous form, it operates as the vehicle for studying the broader themes of private collecting and museum making in the nineteenth century.

Private Collectors and the Art Market

Another historiographic intervention this thesis makes is to place the Museum within the growing discipline of art market studies, which is beginning to receive increased interest.[112] Scholarly attention

[110] Sarah Kane, 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces', 12.
[111] Howard Coutts and Sarah Medlam, 'John and Joséphine Bowes' Purchases from the International Exhibitions of 1862, 1867 and 1871', *Journal of the Decorative Arts Society*, vol. 16, (1992), Sarah Kane, 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces', 16.
[112] Mark Westgarth, ed. *SOLD! The Great British Antiques Story*, (Leeds: Archipelago, 2019).

focused solely on the subject of the Bowes' engagement with the art market has appeared only a handful of times since the publication of Hardy's *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*.[113] Hardy provides mostly anecdotal accounts of the Bowes' collecting methods, highlighting particularly significant or expensive purchases but does not attempt to fit the Bowes' purchasing into any broader social or cultural patterns of the time.[114] Furthermore, due to his writings being the first systematic exploration of the archive, the papers preserved at the Museum have been largely arranged according to Hardy's research agenda, and subsequently a narrative that privileges certain purchases, dealers or events and marginalises others is imposed on to the primary material. As a study that hopes to redress this imbalance, this investigation is building upon a small body of literature that has already begun the process of introducing alternative and nuanced perspectives that appear in the archive.

Caroline Chapman's book on the creation of the Museum dedicates a chapter to the Bowes' collecting entitled 'Assembling the Collection'.[115] Chapman is much more attentive to the Bowes' social networks and the various methods used to form their collection. However, the choice to use the term 'assembling' again betrays a notion that the collection was put together piecemeal without an overarching framework to guide it. It is this study's conscious choice to use the term 'forming the collection' as a more active verb, implying a bigger conception of the collection existed and ascribing more agency to those involved in its creation. Since Chapman, one of the most significant attempts to place the Bowes' collecting into a specific commercial context is by Sarah Kane, whose publications use the growth of national and regional museums in Britain and France alongside the expanding phenomenon of shopping and consumerism in the second half of the nineteenth century as the backdrop to attempting to understand the Bowes and their collecting.[116] Kane generally sees the

[113] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*.
[114] Hardy does recognise the Bowes' collecting in the context of, for example, the contemporary lack of taste for the Impressionists in the 1860s and 70s. Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 157. See Amy Barker, Howard Coutts and Adrian Jenkins, *The Road to Impressionism: Joséphine Bowes and Painting in Nineteenth Century France*, (Barnard Castle: The Bowes Museum, 2002).
[115] Caroline Chapman, *John & Joséphine*, 69-90.
[116] See Sarah Kane 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces', 1-21; Sarah Kane, 'When Paris Meets Teesdale', 163-187.

collecting as driven by Joséphine Bowes' desire for social acceptance and the increasing availability of bibelots allowing her to craft and identity as a collector with relative ease.[117]

This study consciously moves away from viewing the Bowes as the sole authors of their collection, and is strictly evasive of the biographical model, as according to Tom Stammers, this approach 'prioritises the intentions of the creator[s] of a collection at the expense of subsidiary actors (such as dealers, critics, advisors and competitors).'[118] Many publications are now being produced which carry a marked emphasis on the role of a sophisticated art and antiques market in collectors shaping and responding to emerging institutional collections.[119] John and Joséphine Bowes relied substantially on a network of art dealers, curators and associates which is indicative of, practically, how collections were formed in the nineteenth century.

The importance of the art market to the formation of institutional and private collections seems obvious, yet only in relatively recent times have focused scholarly studies appeared on this subject. Now that so much work has been done to excavate the important role of the art market in the formation of museums and private collections The Bowes Museum must be analysed through the same lens in order to demonstrate how an evolved and sophisticated art market could allow the upper and middle classes to collect in a structured and discerning way.[120] One of the reasons for the reticence to emphasise the role of the market is likely due to the challenging nature of the relationship between the art market – and by extension, money and commerce – and the museum. Traditionally in scholarship, museums are a space devoid of money and the commercial: a place where, according to

[117] Sarah Kane 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces', 1.
[118] Tom Stammers, *The Purchase of the Past: Collecting Culture in Post Revolutionary France, c.1790-1890*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 9.
[119] Anne Higonnet, *A Museum of One's Own: Private Collection, Public Gift* (Pittsburgh: Periscope Publishing, 2009); Morna O'Neill, *Hugh Lane: The Art Market and the Museum, 1893-1915*, (London: Yale University Press, 2018).
[120] Morna O'Neill, *Hugh Lane: The Art Market and the Museum*; Tom Stammers, *The Purchase of the Past*; Clive Wainwright, prepared for publication by Charlotte Gere, 'The Making of the South Kensington Museum III: Collecting Abroad'; Clive Wainwright, prepared for publication by Charlotte Gere, 'The Making of the South Kensington Museum IV: Relationships with the Trade: Webb and Bardini'; Mark Westgarth, *The Emergence of the Antique and Curiosity Dealer in Britain 1815-1850*.

Joseph Leo Koerner and Lisbet Rausing, 'the "priceless twin" of the object is displayed.'[121] Koerner and Rausing acknowledge that museum objects have a market value, but that it exists outside of the institutional framework, yet the two are inextricably linked. More recently, Mark Westgarth has identified the occurrence of an 'art market turn' within literature on the history of art.[122] Indeed, as early as the 1970s scholars such as Francis Haskell and Arnold Hauser were making claims for the importance of the art market and its influence on public museums in the formation of canonical taste.[123] As observed by Haskell, the development of the public museum in the nineteenth century is directly affected by the expanding of the art market, which was caused by huge social and political events such as the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars.[124] As a collection and institution that grew out of and contributed to this context, The Bowes Museum is a new lens through which to consider the nature of this relationship.

Writers who have turned their attention to the art market and its contribution to the structure of art history as a discipline have done so in a number of ways, however the archive at The Bowes Museum is particularly well suited to a methodology that is influenced by studies that have incorporated a level of statistical analysis. As rigorous record-keepers, the Bowes have left behind a huge amount of primary material that details thousands of transactions for artworks and objects that provide a window into the art market in Paris in the middle of the nineteenth century. A significant study that helps layer these complex issues into a traditional art historical framework is Guido Guerzoni's *Apollo and Vulcan: The Art Market in Italy 1400-1700*.[125] Guerzoni as an economist by training provides a socio-economic account of the market for art across all media in his period of study that acts as a bridge between earlier econometric studies, such as those undertaken in the 1980s by John Michael Montias

[121] Joseph Leo Koerner and Lisbet Rausing, 'Value', in Robert S. Nelson and Richard Schiff, eds., *Critical Terms for Art History*, (London: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 426.
[122] Mark Westgarth, *The Emergence of the Antique and Curiosity Dealer in Britain 1815-1850: The Commodification of Historical Objects*, (London: Routledge, 2020), 5.
[123] Francis Haskell, *Rediscoveries in Art: Some Aspects of Taste, Fashion and Collecting in England and France*, (London: Phaidon, 1976); Arnold Hauser, *The Sociology of Art*, (London: Routledge, 1982). Hauser's work was first published in German in 1974. See also Mark Westgarth, *The Emergence of the Antique and Curiosity Dealer in Britain 1815-1850*, 6 & 20-21.
[124] Francis Haskell, *Rediscoveries in Art*, 26.
[125] Guido Guerzoni, *Apollo and Vulcan: The Art Market in Italy 1400-1700*, (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2011).

into seventeenth century Dutch art, and the many investigations that are taking advantage of newly digitised resources or the potential for data visualisation.[126] In a large way Guerzoni unlocked the potential for large macro-studies across entire epochs, that use archival material relating to the trade and transfer of artworks that has been taken up by numerous scholars since.[127] Though the scope of this study is only decades, rather than centuries, its methods and results provide a valuable contribution to the new ways in which scholars of the art market are beginning to reshape the history of collecting.

The Bowes' regular interaction with art and antique dealers also provides a rich source of information for widening the Bowes' collecting networks. No prior studies on the Bowes' collecting have attempted to investigate the network provided by, or the level of influence of, the dealers that were so central to the formation of the museum collection. This untapped source of knowledge was first anticipated by the prolific Victoria & Albert Museum curator and scholar Clive Wainwright, who throughout the 1980s and 90s was involved in researching the impact of the art trade on the formation of the Victoria & Albert Museum in the second half of the nineteenth century. His research was edited and published posthumously by Charlotte Gere in 2002 in a special edition of the *Journal of the History of Collections*.[128] Since then, Mark Westgarth has opened up new possibilities in investigating the role of the antique and curiosity dealer in the formation of private and institutional collections in Britain in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries through sustained and systemic study.[129] Westgarth has accumulated a large amount of primary material for the University of Leeds' special collections held in the Brotherton Library, and established a dedicated research centre entitled the Centre for the Study of Art and Antiques Market (CSAAM). Much of this work was led by his original investigation

[126] John Michael Montias, *Artists and Artisans in Delft: A Socio-Economic Study of the Seventeenth Century*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982).
[127] See for example the empirical breadth of Susanna Avery-Quash and Christian Huemer, eds., *London and the Emergence of a European Art Market, 1780-1820*, (London: Yale University Press, 2019).
[128] *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 14, no. 1, (2002). See also the chapter dedicated to the trade in Clive Wainwright, *The Romantic Interior: The British Collector at Home, 1750-1850*, (London: Yale University Press, 1989), 26-53.
[129] Mark Westgarth, 'A Biographical Dictionary of Nineteenth Century Antique and Curiosity Dealers', *Regional Furniture*, vol. 23, (2009); see also Westgarth's AHRC-funded project 'Antique Dealers: The British Antiques Trade in the 20th Century, a Cultural Geography' (2013-2016) which resulted in the interactive map of antique dealers trading in Britain accessible at https://antiquetrade.leeds.ac.uk/

into the antiques trade in the early nineteenth century, published recently as *The Emergence of the Antique and Curiosity Dealer in Britain 1815-1850*, which argues that in the first half of the nineteenth century the curiosity dealer was central to the evolving interest in historical objects.[130] Though the Bowes were collectors of paintings, this investigation finds a singular opportunity to foreground the unique insights that are provided into the market for decorative arts in the second half of the nineteenth century. This present study also takes much from the approach of other historians of the art market that focus on how art and antique dealers contribute to knowledge structures in art history throughout the nineteenth century. The role of the antique dealer has historically been marginalised in accounts of collecting and institutional histories, but now there is a speedily growing corpus of works that work to address this historical lacuna. This includes a range of explorations encompassing a vast geography such as Fletcher and Helmreich's studies of the London and Paris art markets, Jan Dirk Baetans, Bruno Blondé and Dries Lyna who uncovered the significance and scope of dealers' networks in the Low Countries and their impact across Europe, and Charlotte Vignon's study of the impact of the dealers Duveen Brothers on the formation of important museum collections in the USA.[131]

Building on this conceptual leap and the advance in the validation of primary sources from the art market and dealers, there are more specific studies emerging which focus on the links between art dealers and galleries and the museum in Britain. The Bowes' own network of dealers has hitherto remained isolated from this burgeoning area of scholarship, instead the small group of dealers and agents who represent such a significant portion of the archive are seen as lone operators who traded and negotiated with the Bowes divorced from the wider social and cultural networks of Paris. Now this study feeds into and form a significant contribution to an established field of scholarship. This

[130] Mark Westgarth, *The Emergence of the Antique and Curiosity Dealer in Britain 1815-1850*.
[131] Pamela Fletcher and Anne Helmreich, 'Local/Global: Mapping Nineteenth-Century London's Art Market', *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide*', vol. 3, no. 11, (2011); Anne Helmreich and Pamela Fletcher, eds, *The Rise of the Modern Art Market in London, 1850-1939*; Jan Dirk Baetans and Dries Lyna, eds., *Art Crossing Borders: The Internationalisation of the Art Market in the Age of Nation States, 1750-1914*, (Leiden: Brill, 2019); Bruno Blondé and Dries Lyna, 'Neophilia and Old Master paintings: Changes in consumer choice and the evolution of art auctions in the eighteenth century', *Continuity and Change*, vol. 31, no. 3, (2016), 361-389; Charlotte Vignon, *Duveen Brothers and the Market for Decorative Arts, 1880-1940*, (London: D. Giles Ltd, 2019).

owes much to scholarship originating in the USA with the Getty Research Institute's acquisition of records pertaining to high profiles art dealers such as Knoedler & Co, Goupil et Cie and Duveen Brothers, and the subsequent sustained and forensic research that followed. The importance placed on this material by such a respected museum and research institute has had tangible effects around the globe. Now the UK is making significant steps in this fruitful area of research: only very recently have two doctoral theses been completed on the symbiotic relationship between the internationally known Old Masters and print dealers Thomas Agnew and Sons and the National Gallery at the end of the nineteenth century, supported by the National Gallery's research department.[132] In relation to decorative arts, or 'antiques', The CSAAM at the University of Leeds has staged a temporary exhibition on this subject in 2019 entitled 'SOLD! The Great British Antiques Story' at The Bowes Museum, and included an accompanying publication which explored the very active role that British antique and curiosity dealers have had in contributing to museum collections over the past 200 years.[133] A follow on project entitled 'The Year of the Dealer 'also re-centres the marginalised narrative of the role of the antique dealer in building museum collections in national and large regional institutions such as the Victoria & Albert Museum, National Museums Scotland, the Ashmolean Museum, Temple Newsam in Leeds and the Lady Lever Art Gallery in Liverpool.[134] A PhD project has also been completed in relation to the Scottish merchant William Burrell's collecting practices and his vast and eclectic collection art objects' subsequent transformation into a public museum.[135]

Taking their cue from the interest in the art trade by scholars such as Wainwright and Westgarth, more recently historians interested in French culture such as Tom Stammers and Diana Davis have

[132] Alison Clarke, 'The Spatial Aspects of Connoisseurship: Agnew's and the National Gallery, 1874-1916', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Liverpool, (2017); Barbara Pezzini, 'Making a Market for Art: Agnew's and the National Gallery, 1855-1928', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Manchester, (2017).
[133] Mark Westgarth, ed. *SOLD! The Great British Antiques Story*. The exhibition of the same name ran at The Bowes Museum January-May 2019.
[134] 'The Year of the Dealer' project website can be accessed at: https://antiquedealers.leeds.ac.uk/research/yotd/
[135] Isobel C. MacDonald, 'Sir William Burrell (1861-1958): The man and the collector', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Glasgow, (2018).

made clear the role of antique dealers in the formation of a taste for collectors that span the British and French decorative arts markets, and Suzanne Higgott has provided a remarkable study of Richard Wallace's interactions with the trade in Paris.[136] These works provide a very specific context for this present study in their focus on the market for art in Paris during the middle decades of the nineteenth century as well as the relationship between the French and British markets at this time. The freshness of the publication of these works – all within the last two years – reveals the strength of interest in these formative decades and furthermore many of the primary actors in these studies, such as collectors, agents and dealers, overlap with the Bowes' network marking this study as timely, and one that can also profit from the sudden injection of interest this discrete period of study has received.

The Archive

This thesis is underpinned by extensive archival material held across a number of locations. At The Bowes Museum, the papers held in the archive are generally divisible into three sections: the papers of John and Joséphine Bowes covering their personal correspondence and collecting activities (JB); papers relating to museum business from the 1880s when it was preparing to establish itself and open as a public institution (TBM); and miscellaneous records relating to the Museum and its founders.

Held in the sub-fond 'Dealers and Collecting' (JB/5) are papers relating to the antique dealers Charles and Amelié Basset (JB/5/5), Benjamin Gogué (JB/5/7), Pierre Theodat Jarry (JB/5/9), Adolphe-Cabaret Lamer (JB/5/10), Madame Lepautre (JB/5/11), Edouard Rogier (JB/5/12) and Tito Gagliardi (JB/5/14). Further to this, there are approximately 100 bills in the archive at the Museum which are 'Bordereau d'Adjudication', or receipts from purchases at auctions at the Hôtel Drouot.[137] These documents allow for matching objects in the Museum's collection to specific auction sales, and in

[136] Diana Davis, *The Tastemakers: British Dealers and the Anglo-Gallic Interior, 1785-1865*, (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2020); Suzanne Higgott '*The Most Fortunate Man of his Day'*; Tom Stammers, *The Purchase of the Past*.

[137] The Hôtel Drouot was, and still is, the main auction house in Paris that operated as a state-run complex of rooms which private auctioneers could book for sales, as opposed to the private auction houses in London such as Christie's and Sotheby's. It will receive close study in Section 1.

some cases they can be traced back to certain collectors and significant moments in time, revealing trends in collecting practices. These have been published in a supplementary appendix (see Appendix I), in order to provide support to the arguments of this thesis as well as contribute knowledge to the Museum's collection that is outside of this thesis' scope. There is also a comprehensive collection of catalogues relating to auctions – mainly at the Hôtel Drouot – generally from the 1850s, 60s and 70s, with a few exceptions (JB/5/2). These tend to match up with many of the bills and provide another key insight as to the types of objects the Bowes were purchasing at any one time. This important documentation has for the first time been cross referenced with other archival material held in Paris, namely the minutes of sales that took place at the Hôtel Drouot held in the Archives de Paris, referenced according the *commissaire-priseur* (auctioneer) who held the sale (e.g. for all sales held by the auctioneer Charles Pillet, the reference is D.48E^{3} 53 and they are divided by year). Also within the collecting sub-fond are papers relating to the purchase of artworks at the Paris Exposition Universelle in 1867 and the London International Exhibition of 1871 (JB/5/3 and JB/5/4). There are also mixed in with the papers from the London International Exhibition of 1871 a number of bills relating to British antique dealers (JB/5/4/5).

The papers relating to the building, furnishing and organising of the museum project are also abundant in the archive. These are generally dispersed through the correspondence files of John Bowes, but there are particular caches of letters between John Bowes and the Museum's architects Jules Pellechet (1829-1903) and his Newcastle-based collaborator John Edward Watson (1821-1885) (spread variously through JB/2). There is also a wealth of early visual documentation such as a range of plans and elevations from the 1860s to the mid-twentieth century (TMB/5/1), photographs of the interior of the Museum (TBM/11/2), as well as early object catalogues (TBM/8/1), inventories of objects that were used to record their shipping from Paris to England in the 1870s and 80s (JB/6/6/2) and early museum guides (TBM/8/2). Another group of interesting papers relate to the activities of the museum trustees around the turn of the century when they are discussing the thinning out and redisplaying of the collection in order to bring the Museum's narrative away from the domestic collections of the founders (TBM/7/2/1).

Outside of The Bowes Museum archive there are a number of other valuable archival sources which this thesis draws upon. One significant holding of material relating to John Bowes is the cache of correspondence held at Durham County Record Office (D/St/C5/1-D/St/C5/600). These appear under the Strathmore Papers, which are mainly associated with the family of John Bowes and their estates. However, happily reinforcing the contention of this thesis that the private affair of collecting and the public duty of the museum are inseparable, there is much in the record office that is of interest to this thesis' topic. For example amongst the letters about the coal mining business and stud farming are more bills and correspondence with dealers, letters from the Museum's architect John Edward Watson (1821-1885) with regular updates on the construction of the building, letters to friends concerning museum matters and discussion of cultural affairs more generally. These letters are crucial in building up a picture of John and Joséphine Bowes' private network and how it influenced their public remit.

Also at Durham County Record Office are a cache of documents relating to the Museum's integration into the Durham County Council administration (CC/X/94). In these are a number of original letters from the curator Robert Harley (d.1884) outlining the arrangement of the Museum's collection in the years 1879-1882. It is the author's belief that these letters have remained unexamined since deposited in the record office and therefore have not been referenced in any prior publication relating to the Museum. They provide a vivid picture of how John Bowes wished to decorate and display objects in the Museum after Joséphine Bowes' death and thus an important insight into the development of the Museum.

Thesis Structure

The form this thesis takes tracks the continual change of motivations, perspectives and perceived functions of the Bowes' collection which make this such an important institution to the fields of collecting and museum history. There are three stages that direct the changing narrative of the

Museum, which can be summarised as follows: In its initial years the museum project is assessed through the collecting of John and Joséphine Bowes in the context of private collectors and museums navigating a crowded realm of consumerism and an art market that is becoming increasingly specialised. This also set against the way that museums collected artworks in relation to their perceived role in society. From the 1870s onwards, spurred by the death of Joséphine Bowes in 1874 the Museum struggled to reconcile itself as a fully public institution after being conceived as a hybrid private residence and museum, and it also takes on the aura of a memorial through John Bowes attempt to cement his late wife's legacy. Finally, in the 1880s, after John Bowes' death in 1885, the Museum's rationale changes yet again, and any sense of the founders' identities is gradually erased as a professional curator and board of trustees debate and reconfigure the collection and its practical and intellectual use in wider society.

Loosely grouped around these three stages, the main narrative of the thesis is divided into three sections that appear to track the creation of The Bowes Museum as it transfers from private collection to public museum. By following the processes that constitute the creation of a museum collection, namely, the 'forming' of the collection, the 'housing' of the collection and the 'organising' of the collection, and using these to structure the investigation, it is possible to effectively highlight the points of difference, tension and intersection of public and private interests.

Forming the Collection

The first section spans the decades of the 1850s until the 1870s and considers the formation of the collection and the complicated way in which scholars have considered John and Joséphine Bowes as private collectors. One central point of understanding here is that the Bowes' were forming a 'public' collection. It is generally accepted that from around the year 1858 the collecting of John and Joséphine Bowes was carried out with the museum project in mind. Thus, it is argued that the acquisition of objects – and their method – were part of an existing knowledge structure which is in direct dialogue with that of the large public art institutions formed contemporaneously. This

knowledge structure is explicit and implicit in the reams of primary source material and documentation that is held in the Museum's archive and beyond. Utilising this material the section takes the perspective of external pressures on the Bowes' collecting, shifting the focus away from the biographical narrative. Instead, the study examines a number of perspectives external to the Bowes: that of contemporary collectors, institutions and antique dealers. The contention is that the Bowes used antique dealers and auctions in order to legitimise their collecting, and therefore transform the perception of their collecting from the consumerism associated with the bourgeoisie to the status of the institutional remit. This section will also for the first time place the emphasis on the Bowes' many art and antique dealers and offers a significant amount of new information about their lives, trades and networks in Paris in the 1860s and 70s, focussing particularly on the auction sales that were used to gather hundreds of objects for the Bowes' collection.

Housing the Collection

The second section concentrates on the housing of the founding collection. The period of study is the late 1860s until the 1880s, from the laying of the foundation stone of the Museum until the opening of the completion of the general fabric of the building. However, as this section incorporates both a study of the creation of the physical museum building as well as the study of the conditions in which the Museum was conceptualised and legitimised, there contains discussion of the context of museum establishment from the 1830s onwards. Thematically this follows on from the first section in emphasising the public art museum as a place with unique relationships to domesticity. In the case of the Bowes and their museum the notion of the domestic is complicated in the way the physical museum straddles the lines between a large civic institution and a private house in both form and function, due in part to the death of Joséphine Bowes while the building was under construction. This discussion is underpinned by examination of the complex relationship between public and private space in the nineteenth century museum.

Organising the Collection

The third section in effect, ties the first two sections together through a discussion of how the collection – the physical objects purchased by the Bowes – was rationalised and organised through the mechanisms of museum display. The chronology and context here are contained to the years from around the 1880s and 90s, significant for The Bowes Museum in being the decades in which John Bowes passed away and the Museum was left in the hands of a professional curator and board of trustees, consequently and fundamentally changing the nature of how the museum collection was presented to the public. But here the context is also important, as these decades also mark a rise in the re-presentation of a number of private collections as public institutions, beginning with the South Kensington Museum's acquisition of the John Jones collection in 1882, through to the opening of the Wallace Collection in 1900. The section is followed by an epilogue that takes the study into the opening decades of the twentieth century. With the proliferation of 'private museums' that were publicly accessible but explicitly linked to the taste of their creators, the trustees of The Bowes Museum began to change the way the collection was presented in order to present the Museum less as a memorial to John and Joséphine Bowes and more as an institution of utility that served a local population.

Chapter 1: Forming the Collection

Introduction

This section begins to redress the historiography of the creation of The Bowes Museum through reassessing the formation of the core collection on the art market from the 1850s to the 1870s. The Bowes bought an eclectic mix of art and objects, from fine art to decorative arts beginning in the late 1850s. This period corresponds directly with a huge expansion in the formation of institutional collections of decorative arts, but is also in tandem with a drastic rise in private collecting which occurred in the second half of the nineteenth century and saw increasing levels of specialisation of knowledge within the decorative arts.[138] This boom in collecting also filtered down to the masses and the collecting of 'bibelots', 'curiosities', 'bric-a-brac' and 'objet d'art' became a leisure pursuit for many middle- to upper-class men and women.[139] The cultural historian Janell Watson has described the bibelot as the 'quintessential object of modern material culture', signalling that luxury goods were not just the reserve of the elite but became available to the middle classes.[140] Yet the Bowes' own practice of collecting cannot be defined by simply defining them as collectors emulating a ruling or aristocratic class, or driven by the motivations often ascribed to public art institutions such as forming a classificatory collection in order to educate visitors.

[138] For example, the Burlington Fine Arts Club – established in 1856 as the Fine Arts Club – who met informally to discuss decorative arts in a connoisseurial way. See Ann Eatwell, 'The Collector's or Fine Arts Club 1857-1874. The First Society for Collectors of the Decorative Arts', *Journal of the Decorative Arts Society*, vol. 18, (1994), 25-30; Stacy J. Pierson, *Private Collecting, Exhibitions and the Shaping of Art History in London*.
[139] Such as Herbert Byng-Hall, *The Adventures of a Bric-a-Brac Hunter*, (London: Tinsley Brothers, 1868); Frederick Litchfield, *Pottery and Porcelain: A guide to collectors*, (London: Bickers and Son, 1879). See also Mark Westgarth, 'A Biographical Dictionary of Nineteenth Century Antique and Curiosity Dealers', 11.
[140] Janell Watson, *Literature and Material Culture from Balzav to Proust: The Collection and Consumption of Curiosities*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 2.

By revisiting the sites of consumption that Sarah Kane assesses in her study of the Bowes' collecting, such as the antique shop and the international exhibitions that they attended in the 1860s and 70s, the subsection 'Private and Institutional Forms of Collecting' instead views their collecting as drawing from both the practices of the middle- to upper-class 'private' consumer as well as 'institutional' frameworks of collecting.[141] 'Institutional' collecting represents the public face of art consumption, and carries with it differing perceptions of motives and means for buying art. However, in attempting to pinpoint a definition for 'institutional' collecting, using the writings of historian of consumer culture Russell Belk who sees individual and institutional forms of collecting as containing differing properties, it is suggested that the two are in fact interrelated and, at times, indistinct.[142] This is best exemplified through the collecting campaigns of the South Kensington Museum which began at the Great Exhibition of 1851, and the trajectories of which offer a constant point of comparison to the creation of The Bowes Museum. Through comparison with the South Kensington Museum's active engagement with large international exhibitions, antique dealers and agents, it is evident that the Bowes' collecting is emblematic of the blurred boundaries between the private collector and the public museum throughout the second half of the nineteenth century.

The subsections relating to the Bowes and antique buying focus on the methods the Bowes used in forming their collection through the mechanisms of a growing market for art and antiques. This type of exploration is becoming more valued within scholarship as a signifier of status, knowledge and the motives of collectors, as well as the roles of art and antique dealers in this process.[143] Works such as the new biography of Richard Wallace are building on such scholarship to showcase the pivotal role of dealers and agents in the formation of the collection, offering an unprecedented level of detail of

[141] Sarah Kane, 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces'.
[142] Russell W. Belk, *Collecting in a Consumer Society*, (London: Routledge, 1995).
[143] See for example the emphasis on the role of dealers and the art market in various publications such as Jan Dirk Baetans and Dries Lyna, *Art Crossing Borders*; Rufus Bird, 'George IV and the Art Market' in Kate Heard and Kathryn Jones, eds., *George IV: Art and Spectacle*, (London: Royal Collection Trust, 2019), 89-104; Diana Davis, *The Tastemakers: British Dealers and the Anglo-Gallic Interior*; Anne Helmreich and Pamela Fletcher, eds, *The Rise of the Modern Art Market in London*; Suzanne Higgott '*The Most Fortunate Man of his Day'*; Tom Stammers, *The Purchase of the Past*; Charlotte Vignon, *Duveen Brothers and the Market for Decorative Arts*; Clive Wainwright, *The Romantic Interior*, 26-53. Mark Westgarth, *The Emergence of the Antique and Curiosity Dealer in Britain 1815-1850*.

the intricacy of the art market in Paris in the middle decades of the nineteenth century.[144] In order to ascertain how the art market catered for collectors of distinct social classes or institutional affiliations, it is highly profitable to explore the networks of procurement the Bowes used to form, rationalise and legitimise their collection as both a comparator and a counterpoint to the methods used by elite collectors such as Wallace. Further to this, the archive at the Museum provides unparalleled potential to investigate larger methodological questions about how private collectors and museums operated as collectors and consumers, with decades of correspondence with and invoices and receipts from art and antique dealers, interior designers and furnishers, department stores and second-hand shops, shippers and insurance brokers and many of the other stakeholders involved in the physical process of buying art.[145]

Throughout the 1860s the Bowes purchased most of their art and antiques from a select network of dealers that hinged on a number of factors related to their social status and domestic situation. Because of Hardy's work on the history of the museum privileging certain dealers and marginalising others, the following section of this thesis also highlights previously unrecognised forms of interaction with the art market and show the Bowes as diverse collectors and clients. Hardy's observations on dealers focus on those closest to the Bowes as well as individuals who occupied prominent positions in scholarship at the time such as Edward Solly (1776-1844) or Émile Gallé (1846-1904).[146] Howard Coutts has since explored some of the different dealers and sales from which the Bowes acquired ceramics and thereby directed more attention on to the important role of the art market, but there is still much more empirical information to interpret.[147] For example, there are

[144] Suzanne Higgott, *'The Most Fortunate Man of his Day'*.
[145] The papers relating to the Bowes' antique dealers are held under TBMA, JB/5 along with papers relating to European trips (JB/5/13 & 14), purchases at the International Exhibitions (JB/5/3 &4) and auction and exhibition sale catalogues (JB/5/1& 2).
[146] For Edward Solly see Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 139. Solly appeared in Frank Herrmann's 1972 work *The English as Collectors*, but Hermann had published articles on Solly in *The Connoisseur* from 1967. See Frank Herrmann, *The English as Collectors: A Documentary Chrestomathy*, (London: Chatto & Windus, 1972), 202-208; Frank Herrmann, 'Who was Solly?', *Connoisseur*, vol. 164, (1967), 229-235. For Émile Gallé see Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 179. Gallé has his own separate folder amongst the dealers in the archive, despite selling relatively little to the Bowes, TBMA, JB/5/6.
[147] Howard Coutts, 'Joséphine Bowes and the Craze for Collecting Ceramics in the 19th Century', *International Ceramics Fair Handbook*, (London, 1992), 16-23.

regular mentions of dealers who appear in period and secondary literature on antique dealing and collecting in the second half of the nineteenth century that have not previously been highlighted, one being the dealer Mme. Oppenheim, who was an established dealer in Paris and regularly supplied antiques to the ceramics expert and collector Lady Charlotte Schreiber later in the 1860s and 1870s.[148] Bills at The Bowes Museum show Joséphine Bowes buying from Oppenheim in 1858, during their early phase of collecting and before substantial dealer-agent relationships had developed with the small group of regular dealers throughout the 1860s.[149] Interactions such as this serve to highlight that the Bowes' collecting can be mapped on to a range of other collectors and the essential nature of this deep archival exploration. A close analysis of these interactions with art and antique dealers and their wider networks occupies a comprehensive part of this section, integrating the primary material held at The Bowes Museum into the growing discipline of art market studies.

The subsection on 'Antique Dealer Networks' investigates the Bowes trip through Europe in 1868 during which they bought many artworks, and John Bowes' later trips to Italy in 1874 and 1875, after Joséphine's death and when he was trying to complete the museum project without her.[150] This subsection acknowledges that the Bowes were collectors on an international scale, and their museum was not formed solely on the Paris art market or through the advice of only a handful of dealers as suggested by Sarah Kane who views the Bowes collecting only in the context of Parisian consumer society.[151] This subsection recognises the attention now paid to the increased network of goods in to and out from commercial centres such as Paris and London, and how this was one catalyst for the formation of the Bowes' collection. Another was the increased mobility in the form of leisure travel that also contributed to expanding art market.[152] In an age of increased travel and interconnectedness

[148] Montague J. Guest, ed. *Lady Charlotte Schreiber's Journals: Confidences of a collector of ceramics & antiques throughout Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Turkey, Austria & Germany from the year 1869 to 1885*, (London: John Lane, 1911), 56.
[149] TBMA, JB/3/3/6/95, Bill from Oppenheim to Mme Bowes, 28 December 1858; For details on Oppenheim see Mark Westgarth, 'A Biographical Dictionary of Nineteenth Century Antique and Curiosity Dealers', 145
[150] The records for the 1868 journey through Europe are held under the reference TBMA, JB/5/13. The records for John Bowes' trips to Italy are held under TBMA, JB/5/14.
[151] Sarah Kane, 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces'.
[152] Jan Dirk Baetans and Dries Lyna, 'Towards an International History of the Nineteenth-Century Art Trade', in Jan Dirk Baetans and Dries Lyna, *Art Crossing Borders*, 1-14.

of markets, shopping for antiques in other continental European destinations became a leisure activity of the middle-classes when previously it had been the reserve of the aristocratic 'Grand Tours' originating in the eighteenth century.[153] Christopher Wood has stressed the importance of the diversification of these trips, led by widely available guides that 'channelled the esoteric knowledge collected by scholars back into the exoteric sphere, in effect restoring knowledge about art to oral circulation patterns.' [154] For Wood, the creation and publication of guidebooks by Karl Baedeker (1801-1859) and John Murray (1808-1892) from the 1850s aided in the rapid democratisation of art historical knowledge, and this is shown through the way in which the Bowes utilised a network of antique collecting that was propounded by such guides.[155]

The final subsection 'The Bowes and their Dealers at Auction' explores the way in which the Bowes used their dealers as agents at auction sales in Paris and the regions of France. This is an aspect of their collecting that plays a significant role but has had received little attention. Charles Hardy only discusses auctions in relation to some of John Bowes' early Old Master purchases from the sale of the Duke of Lucca in 1840, and the Spanish paintings bought from the collection of the Conde de Quinto in 1862.[156] Caroline Chapman dedicates more space to discussing the activities of the dealers and names some auction sales, such as the sale of the collector Aristide le Carpentier of 1866 and the sale of the Vicomte de l'Espine in 1865, but these sales are not discussed in relation to their importance for contemporaneous collectors, nor are auctions discussed as an important method of acquisition.[157] For example, the le Carpentier sale was an important auction for the South Kensington Museum, which they

[153] The standard work on the Grand Tour is Jeremy Black, *The British Abroad: The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century*, (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1992). For the widening participation in the Grand Tour see Lynne Withey, *Grand Tours and Cook's Tours: A History of Leisure Travel, 1750-1915*, (London: Aurum Press, 1998).
[154] Christopher Wood, *A History of Art History*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019), 234.
[155] Christopher Wood, *A History of Art History*, 234. For John Murray's guides see Gráinne Goodwin and Gordon Johnston, 'Guidebook Publishing in the Nineteenth Century: John Murray's *Handbooks for Travellers*', *Studies in Travel Writing*, vol. 17, no. 1, (2013), 43-61.
[156] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 183. Silver Swan Automaton is object X.4653.
[157] Caroline Chapman, *John & Joséphine*, 82-3

targeted for its mixture of objects of high quality and with good provenance, and it follows that the Bowes' dealers would have targeted this sale for the same reasons.[158]

This subsection offers the first systematic study of the many auctions that the Bowes purchased from. Aided by the many invoices issued from the *commissaires-priseurs,* or auctioneers, of the Hôtel Drouot – Paris's centralised auction house – and matching these up with their corresponding auction sales allows a picture to be built up of a previously uninvestigated social aspect of the Bowes' collecting.[159] Following the work of the sociologist Charles W. Smith in *Auctions: The social construction of value*, this subsection views the Bowes' participation in auctions as them having acted 'consciously or unconsciously, as part of a community'.[160] Through investigating the sales of collectors or institutions that the Bowes chose or were advised to buy objects from, a raft of previously unknown social or cultural groupings become visible and this, in the words of Smith, allows room for such questions as 'what groups exist [in these structures]?' and 'who is linked to whom?'[161] Other writers such as Jean Baudrillard have also written on the auction as a site of ritual and exchange between communities who consider themselves peers.[162] More recently Westgarth has synthesised these views, describing the auction as a place 'where social prestige and economic power can be reinforced and where the relationships between economic value, cultural value, and social status are formulated and made concrete.'[163]

A corresponding dataset is published as an appendix (Appendix I) that details all the significant sales appearing in the primary source material related to the Bowes and their art and antique dealers. This achieves a level of knowledge of the provenance of the founding collection at the Museum which

[158] V&A Archive, MA/3/20, Report on the Lecarpentier collection and list of lots recommended for purchase, Copy of minute 27 June 1866.
[159] These auction house invoices appear throughout the files relating to dealers, but are mainly concentrated in the bills from Jarry, Lepautre and Lamer, see TBMA, JB/5/9-11.
[160] Charles W. Smith, *Auctions: The social construction of value*, (Brighton: Wheatsheaf 1989), 51.
[161] Charles W. Smith, *Auctions: The social construction of value*, 51.
[162] Jean Baudrillard, trans. Charles Levin, *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, (London: Verso, 2019), 106.
[163] Mark Westgarth, *The Emergence of the Antique and Curiosity Dealer in Britain 1815-1850*, 136.

until now has been obscured, and for the purposes of this study, offers the opportunity of a deeper level of understanding of potential motives and rationales in the Bowes' collecting practices. Such a study is considered important as any researcher that explores The Bowes Museum's collection realises that most objects' provenances begin when they entered the collection of John and Joséphine Bowes. This, of course, obscures a critical aspect of the object; namely, why it initially appealed to the Bowes. To build on this, volumes which critically discuss the importance of provenance of art objects are utilised to suggest some further motives the Bowes had for acquiring certain objects, such as their association with a particular collector or collection.[164] Using claims that objects attached to a name of repute is often a measure of authenticity or status for the object itself, such as by Elizabeth Pergam who suggests American Gilded Age collectors were enticed by dealers who 'reinforced the idea that the quality of a painting could be judged by the prestige of the family who had owned it,' this subsection argues that many objects were purchased because of their previous ownership.[165] This level of provenance was mediated in particular by auction sales, as observed by Sophie Raux who has identified the importance of provenance in eighteenth century French auction catalogues, noting that 'mentioning previous owners…indicated the painting had already gone through several selection and ratification processes, thereby building a consensus on the painting's value and enhancing its prestige.'[166] The archive at the Museum is proof that the Bowes were consistently authenticating and valorising their objects through their provenance, with notes in catalogues listing previous owners and the sales from which they originated.[167] Even the objects themselves often reinforce this idea, with some still having auction catalogue descriptions or labels pasted on the bottom, as if to tangibly link them to their previous collections and owners (**figure 2.0**). Therefore, the Bowes' unexplored use of

[164] See Gail Feigenbaum and Inge Reist, eds., *Provenance: An Alternate History of Art*, (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2012); Jane Milosch and Nick Pearce, eds., *Collecting and Provenance: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2019).
[165] Elizabeth Pergam, 'Provenance as Pedigree: The Marketing of British Portraits in Gilded Age America', in Gail Feigenbaum and Inge Reist, eds., *Provenance*, 104.
[166] Sophie Raux, 'From Mariette to Joullain: Provenance and Value in Eighteenth-Century French Auction Catalogues', in Gail Feigenbaum and Inge Reist, eds., *Provenance*, 100.
[167] See, for example, the catalogue of paintings in John Bowes' hand which lists many of the sales and former collections from which they were acquired. TBMA, JB/6/6/1/1, Picture Catalogue, 1878.

auctions has the potential to reveal a new social stratum of collecting, through analysis of the sales they targeted, the objects they bought and the prices they paid.

Private and Institutional Forms of Collecting

The fields of collectors and museums might be drawn even more closely together through an analysis of how they both relied on the market for historic objects, which became a sophisticated area of consumption throughout the nineteenth century. Patterns of collecting in the nineteenth century took on various new forms, which have been codified by different writers as emulative, allowing the middle classes to conform to a higher social group.[168] This growth in collecting was in tandem with a general growth of consumption and expansion of a leisure time, a phenomenon that historian Rosalind Williams has seen as an 'unprecedented expansion of goods and time' available for people to consume.[169] Writers such as Thorstein Veblen have been critical of this general rise of consumption, naming its participants the 'leisure class', speculating that it represented a process of the middle classes attempting to emulate those with a higher social status.[170] This is partly because historically solely the aristocratic class had enjoyed greater access to goods and leisure time and they thus provided the model for this form of consumption.[171] According to Tom Stammers the decades in which the Bowes amassed their collection, from the 1850s to the 1870s, collecting became 'a fashionable and luxurious activity…thanks to the patronage of the court, learned societies and the mobilisation of resources behind landmark exhibitions.'[172] With the mass visibility of collecting, and the prestige associated to it thanks to its courtly sanction, the middle and upper classes in Paris

[168] See Rémy Saisselin, *Bricabracomania: The Bourgeois and the Bibelot*, (London: Thames and Hudson, 1984).
[169] Rosalind H. Williams, *Dream Worlds: Mass Consumption in Late Nineteenth-Century France*, (London: University of California Press, 1982), 4.
[170] Thorstein Veblen, *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions*, (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1924).
[171] Thorstein Veblen, *The Theory of the Leisure Class*.
[172] Tom Stammers, *The Purchase of the Past*, 24.

contemporaneous to the Bowes participated in this exact form of activity. However, Dianne Sachko Macleod suggests that for the middle classes in the middle of the nineteenth century, the trading of money for artworks stabilised their cultural identity and marked them as independent cultural generators as well.[173] This present section views the collecting of John and Joséphine Bowes as adhering to no discrete category of consumption, but instead mirroring aspects of wealthy private collectors and upper-middle class amateurs, but also adopting the purchasing remit of a class who were anxious to present themselves as contributors to a cultural landscape, rather than mere imitators. In the case of the Bowes, this is achieved by comparing their collecting to that of the museum, in order to see how such patterns of consumption also fit to the supposedly scientific form of accumulation.

In 1852, after their marriage, John Bowes bought the Château du Barry at Louveciennes on the outskirts of Paris, formerly the residence of Louis XV's premier mistress, Madame du Barry (**figure 2.1**). This residence is emblematic of many strains of the collecting of John and Joséphine Bowes and their collecting, no doubt of interest to them due to its historical association with Madame du Barry, who was one of the most notorious and intriguing figures of the ancien regime due to her status as mistress to the King, as well as the obvious links with court life and society. Records show that from the early 1850s the Bowes were purchasing expensive luxury goods, such as furnishings and decorative objects, that contributed to its interior scheme in the fashionable eighteenth-century revival style. Most of this work in Paris was carried out by the firm of Monbro fils aîné. Monbro were established as furniture makers and antique dealers in the 1830s and had been trading as such for two decades already, but by the 1850s had become one of the leading furnishers in Paris, providing furniture and services for high profile residences such as the Garde Meuble for Louis-Philippe and Napoleon III, and the chateau at Chantilly for the Duc d'Aumale.[174] For John and Joséphine Bowes

[173] Dianne Sachko Macleod, *Art and the Victorian Middle Class*, 44-45. See also Leora Auslander, *Taste and Power*, 261-305.
[174] See the exhibition catalogue for *The Second Empire 1852-1870: Art in France under Napoleon III*, (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1978), 110; Mark Westgarth, 'A Biographical Dictionary of Nineteenth Century Antique and Curiosity Dealers', 138. The Bowes' patronage of Monbro has also been covered in a more recent study of the firm by Anne-Sophie Brisset: Anne-Sophie Brisset, 'Le Maison Monbro et

Monbro primarily supplied modern furniture in imitation of earlier styles, rented furnishings for large parties, or restored and adapted existing furniture in their repairs workshop.[175]

This early stage of purchasing is distinct and prior to a perceptible shift in how and what the Bowes bought from the end of the 1850s onwards, when they moved away from buying furniture and furnishings, and instead purchased smaller decorative art objects and curiosities, many with a historic character. The antiquarian tradition of collecting can be partly ascribed to this form of purchasing by the Bowes, through their strong interest in material remnants of the past, and the desire to document and preserve them. There are even certain peculiarities in the type of commissions the Bowes made from their interior furnishers that suggest a precursor to this later collecting campaign. For example, Joséphine Bowes commissioned from Monbro a number of pieces of furniture upholstered with antique tapestry fragments, which has been described as Sarah Medlam as unusual within the fashions of the time, and 'may show a rather specialised taste.'[176] John Bowes also pursued antiquarian interests, buying curiosities and early Italian and Netherlandish pictures from early on in his life, and correspondence shows that he often discussed purchasing pictures or artefacts relating to his ancestors when they appeared on the market throughout the 1850s, 60s and 70s whilst the Bowes formed their museum collection.[177] Indeed, in correspondence relating to Streatlam Castle throughout the nineteenth century there is evidence of a 'museum room' from the 1830s, and John Bowes had a heraldic ceiling created especially to illustrate his family's ancestral history to visitors in 1879, suggesting he held a strong and sustained interest in material objects related to his family alongside the collecting for the Museum (**figure 2.2**).[178] However, in Clive Wainwright's important study on

---

les Modèles et Dessins d'André-Charles Boulle', in Dion-Tenenbaum, Anne and Gay-Mazuel, Audrey, *Revivals: l'Historicisme dans les Arts Décoratifs Français au XIX^e Siècle*, (Paris: MAD & Louvre, 2020), 166-171; Anne-Sophie Brisset, 'Les Monbro, de marchands de curiosité à décorateurs. Illustration des mutations de la profession dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle,' Unpublished Dissertation, Ecole du Louvre, (2013).

[175] An extensive range of invoices from Monbro to the Bowes survive, covering the years 1851-1860 and are held in the archive under reference JB/4/6/1-4. Cursory examination of these reveals the huge variety of activity the firm were carrying out for their clients.

[176] Sarah Medlam, 'Two French Furnishing Schemes of the 1850s', Unpublished article in The Bowes Museum.

[177] See, for example, the letter from William Hutt to John Bowes that discusses 'a portrait of the Archduke Albert by Rubens' that appears at auction, which appears to be a copy of a picture in the collection at Gibside: DCRO, D/St/C5/137/62, Letter from William Hutt to John Bowes, 14 July 1860.

[178] The most recent study to discuss this is Jonathan Peacock, *Streatlam Castle: Rediscover the Home of John and Joséphine Bowes*, (Barnard Castle: The Bowes Museum, 2017), 15-17. The ceiling was made by Heaton,

antiquarian collecting *The Romantic Interior* the focus of his study ends at the middle of the nineteenth century precisely due to the huge rise in popularity of the incorporation of historic objects into the domestic interior. Wainwright states: 'By the 1880s everyone was being encouraged to incorporate a few curiosities into their houses.'[179] This trend is certainly indebted to the development of the public art museum, as Mark Westgarth has made explicit, stating: 'after the 1850s the knowledge of and interest in historical objects shifts…as the museum itself…becomes a significant platform through which the historical object is articulated into later nineteenth century consumer culture.'[180] The suggestion here is that as more and more private collections became public, the sanction of the museum rareified an object, and became a large factor in its desire for possession by collectors.

The relationship between museums and consumption was met with some resistance, in what was viewed as a facile imitation of museums in the home. By the late 1870s, writers such as the clergyman and historian William John Loftie (1839-1911) began to criticise this fashion and the obvious ease with which middle and upper-middle class people were able to accumulate objects. Adopting the view that by this point, collectors needed to be encouraged not to mindlessly consume, Loftie stated: 'Collecting, indeed is only one name for the thing. I do not want to see everybody collecting. I do not admire private museums. I think houses which are ugly and badly furnished and uncomfortable, are none the better for being filled with curiosities.'[181] For Loftie, the furnishing of a home was a reflection of the religious and moralistic views of the occupier, and should be done with restraint, which implicitly affirmed the degradation of the boundary between the museum and the market that had taken place over the last few decades. Thus, the Bowes, perhaps the type of consumer that Loftie

Butler & Bayne and is now in the collection of The Bowes Museum, FW.162. For the 'museum room' see TBMA, JB/2/1/7/16, Letter from John Bowes to Ralph Dent, 11 March 1838.

[179] Clive Wainwright, *The Romantic Interior*, 287. For the French context of this see Anca I. Lasc, *Interior Decorating in Nineteenth Century France: The Visual Culture of a New Profession*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018).

[180] Mark Westgarth, *The Emergence of the Antique and Curiosity Dealer in Britain 1815-1850*, 13.

[181] William John Loftie, *A Plea for Art in the House: With special reference to the economy for collecting works of art, and the importance of taste in education and morals*, (London: Macmillian, 1878), 22.

had in mind, do not appear comfortably in either narrative as bourgeois consumers or learned collectors.

Former studies of the Bowes' collecting also focus on a perceived difference in pracices between both of them, for instance Joséphine Bowes' collecting of ceramics has been viewed through a particularly gendered lens, seen as epitomising the aesthetic and domestic collecting of women.[182] The Bowes Museum's collection of ceramics could be interpreted as domestic in nature, consisting of many smaller objects such as porcelain teacups and saucers. However Joséphine Bowes' collecting of ceramics has been put into the context of the increasing level of knowledge of the history and subsequent fields of specialisation in ceramics collecting.[183] Ann Eatwell has drawn a parallel between Joséphine Bowes collecting to that of Lady Charlotte Schreiber (1812-1895).[184] Schreiber formed an enormous collection of decorative arts, with a particular emphasis on European ceramics, throughout the middle decades of the nineteenth century before she gifted it to the South Kensington Museum in 1884. She was known for fastidiousness and discernment in her methods of procuring objects, as chronicled by her diaries which were edited by her son Montague Guest and published in 1911 (1839-1909).[185] Her collecting was successful, according to Eatwell, due to having both the time and personal finances to cultivate a deep knowledge of ceramics and their associated value, and employ dealers and agents to aid in finding examples of rare or desirable pieces.[186] Like Lady Charlotte Schreiber, Joséphine Bowes had both the time and money to increase her expertise and pay her various dealer-agents to find good pieces. A vast number of the bills from her antique dealers include information about various makers marks and techniques of manufacture or decoration.[187] This

[182] Caroline Chapman, *John & Joséphine*, 81. For gendered notions of ceramic collecting see Beth Kowaleski-Wallace, 'Women, China and Consumer Culture in Eighteenth-Century England', *Eighteenth Century Studies*, vol.29, no. 2, (1995-96), 153-167; Stacey Sloboda, 'Porcelain Bodies: Gender, Acquisitiveness and Taste in Eighteenth-Century England', in John Potvin and Alla Myzelev, eds., *Collecting Subjects: The Visual Pleasures and Meanings of Material Culture in Britain*, (Burlington: Ashgate, 2009), 19-36; Moira Vincentelli, *Women and Ceramics: Gendered Vessels*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000).
[183] Howard Coutts, 'Joséphine Bowes and the Craze for Collecting Ceramics in the 19th Century,' 16-23.
[184] Ann Eatwell, 'Private Pleasure Public Beneficence: Lady Charlotte Schreiber and Ceramic Collecting', 135.
[185] Montague J. Guest, ed. *Lady Charlotte Schreiber's Journals*.
[186] Ann Eatwell, 'Private Pleasure Public Beneficence: Lady Charlotte Schreiber and Ceramic Collecting', 126.
[187] For example Lamer sells Joséphine Bowes a soft-paste porcelain cup with the mark of 'Old Vincennes', TBMA, JB/5/10/5/26, Bill from Lamer to Joséphine Bowes, 31 March 1867.

type of information was becoming increasing more accessible through French and English publications such as William Chaffers' *Marks and Monograms on Pottery and Porcelain* (1863) and Albert Jacquemart's *Histoire artistique, industrielle et commerciale de la porcelain* (1862).[188] John and Joséphine Bowes' extensive library of works in French has been suggested by James Illingworth as a measure of their intellectual aspirations and the prevalence of such of specialist texts in the libraries of the upper and middle class amateur suggests that a level of connoisseurship suitable for amateur collecting could be gained through reading.[189] There is a copy of Chaffers' *Marks and Monograms* (1866, 2nd edition) in the Museum's library which came from Susan Davidson (d.1877), John Bowes' cousin who amassed a significant collection of ceramics.[190] She and Joséphine Bowes corresponded, and it is entirely conceivable that this was a shared interest through which they shared knowledge and expertise.[191]

If John and Joséphine Bowes were influenced by fashionable taste and possessed more of a sense of the educational or historically significant qualities of objects, it is fruitful to see how they might fit a pattern of what is perceived as 'institutional collecting'. Russell W. Belk's *Collecting in a Consumer Society* applies a sociological review of the collecting from classical antiquity to the present day to show a correlation between 'private' and 'institutional' forms of collecting.[192] Belk attempts to define institutional collecting as something that is immune from the pressures of tastes and fashions and instead maintains a dispassionate scientific orderliness.[193] He states: 'the individual feelings of

[188] William Chaffers, *Marks and monograms on pottery and porcelain, with short historical notices of each manufactory, and an introductory essay on the vasa fictilia of England. Illustrated, etc.*, (London: J. Davy, 1863); Albert Jacquemart, *Histoire artistique, industrielle et commerciale de la porcelain*, (Paris, 1862).
[189] James Illingworth, 'Joséphine Bowes (1825-1874), 73-87.
[190] William Chaffers, *Marks and monograms on pottery and porcelain with historical notices of each manufactory, preceded by an introductory essay on the Vasa Fictilia of England and followed by a copious index*, (London: J. Davy, 1866). The copy in the library bears the inscription 'Davidson', signifying it came from her collection, and Davidson also appears as a subscriber. For Susan Davidson's collection see Howard Coutts and Patricia Ferguson, 'Setting the Table at Gibside: The Bowes Family of County Durham and their ceramic acquisitions in the 18th century', *Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle*, vol. 27, (2016), 161-191.
[191] Correspondence from Susan Davidson to John Bowes is filled with mentions of notes and gifts passing between her and 'Mrs Bowes' see TBMA, JB/2/4/1-6 and DCRO, D/St, where correspondence from Susan Davidson is present throughout.
[192] Russell W. Belk, *Collecting in a Consumer Society*.
[193] Russell W. Belk, *Collecting in a Consumer Society*, 102.

possession and acquisition of objects may be lacking in institutional collections.'[194] However, the museum also played a significant role in the process of changing tastes and fashions and institutions shaped, and in turn were shaped by, the changing landscape of collecting. Indeed, institutional collecting was necessarily shaped by changes in fashion and the financial constraints that came with this. For example, the South Kensington Museum curator John Charles Robinson expressed the view that it was fruitless for regional museums to attempt to buy Old Masters, describing them as 'practically unattainable', suggesting private collectors were much better placed to secure master works due to having more funds.[195] Even though museums had the veneer of collecting and preserving exemplary specimens, sometimes the competition with a fierce market meant that they were unable to.

Sarah Kane views Joséphine Bowes' collecting in a similar vein to the institutional definition offered by Belk, and in particular her efforts to transform the status of her 'bibelots' to 'museum pieces.'[196] To show this Kane utilises the definition of 'systematic collecting' offered by Susan Pearce, which emphasises the removal of objects from their context in order to create new relationships through seriality.[197] This is, of course, a key trait of museums in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in their desire to classify and universalise, and would align the Bowes' collecting with such projects. However, Kane uses as a comparison with the South Kensington Museum, whose development as an institution continually disrupts the boundaries between public and private collecting.[198] The influence of its formation and collection on the market for art has not escaped writers on its history and context, for example Deborah Cohen offers the claim that 'the boundaries between art, home and commerce [were] breached first by Henry Cole's South Kensington Museum.'[199] This is an acknowledgement of the institution's role in driving the manufacture and consumption of domestic applied arts through

[194] Russell W. Belk, *Collecting in a Consumer Society*, 102.
[195] John Charles Robinson, 'Our National Art Collections and Provincial Art Museum', *The Nineteenth Century*, vol. 8, (1880), 262. Quoted in Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 198.
[196] Sarah Kane, 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces', 13
[197] Kane is using the classificatory system for objects outlined in Susan Pearce, *Museums, Objects, Collections*, (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992).
[198] Sarah Kane, 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces', 16.
[199] Deborah Cohen, *Household Gods: The British and Their Possessions*, (London: Yale University Press, 2006), 64.

their own displays. David Phillips has also noted the South Kensington Museum provided a sanction for this very practice within the museum by displaying the prices paid for contemporary objects.[200] Often these objects that displayed their prices were the modern manufactures the museum purchased at the many large-scale international exhibitions that took place from 1851 onwards.[201] Throughout these decades the South Kensington Museum was committed to being an arena of instruction, therefore they purchased the best examples of new craft techniques, designs and manufacturing process in order that they could be shown to the industrial classes to improve the quality of the nation's applied arts.[202] Many of these purchases were made in the public arenas of the large internal exhibitions, where nations would display their most accomplished craft techniques and best manufactures. Official reports were also occupied with the prices that the museum paid for such new manufactures at the large European international exhibitions in the 1850 and 60s.[203] Effectively, the museum endorsed the purchase of art and manufactures which were on display to a huge audience at the international exhibitions, and integrated them into a museum collection.

Like the South Kensington Museum, the Bowes also had a developing engagement with the large international exhibitions that took place in the 1850s, 60s and 70s that generally followed the trajectory of collecting for their museum project.[204] It is also in these sites that the Bowes' more ordered, institutional form of collecting, has been located by previous writers.[205] Howard Coutts and Sarah Medlam show that the Bowes attended a number of these exhibitions: the Great Exhibition of 1851 (though John Bowes was only interested in agricultural machinery), the International Exhibition

[200] David Phillips, *Exhibiting Authenticity*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 8.
[201] David Phillips, *Exhibiting Authenticity*, 8; Clive Wainwright, prepared for publication by Gere, Charlotte, 'The Making of the South Kensington Museum II: Collecting Modern Manufactures: 1851 and the Great Exhibition', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 14, no. 1, (2002), 25-43.
[202] Peter Trippi, 'Industrial Arts and the Exhibition Ideal', in Malcolm Baker and Brenda Richardson, eds., *A Grand Design*, 79-88.
[203] For example, see the *Catalogue of the Articles of Ornamental Art, selected from the Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations in 1851, and purchased by the Government*, (London: Chapman and Hall, 1852), which includes the prices paid for each object.
[204] Howard Coutts and Sarah Medlam 'John and Joséphine Bowes Purchases from the International Exhibitions of 1862, 1867 and 1871', *Journal of the Decorative Arts Society*, no. 16, (1992), 50-61. The receipts and lists that Coutts and Medlam derived their article from are held under TBMA, JB/5/3-4
[205] Caroline Chapman, *John & Joséphine*, 87-88; Howard Coutts and Sarah Medlam 'John and Joséphine Bowes Purchases from the International Exhibitions of 1862, 1867 and 1871', 50-61; Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 154.

of 1862, the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1867 and the London Exhibition of 1871.[206] They also provide an inventory of objects purchased at the 1862, 1867 and 1871 exhibitions which shows the Bowes buying a kaleidoscopic range of objects including porcelain and earthenware from most western European nations, woodcarvings and glass from eastern Europe, porphyry objects from Sweden, textiles from Persia, Russian pietra dura and mosaics from the Papal States.[207] This variety in material, manufacturing technique and geographic location suggests that the Bowes were approaching these exhibitions as opportunities to acquire an international array of artworks and objects.

The reception of these large scale exhibitions has been described by Giles Waterfield, who states that 'they combined the desire to instruct and amuse with a commercial impetus that challenged the accepted distinction between an "exhibition" and a "bazaar".'[208] This relationship has been recognised in relation to specific institutions by Charlotte Klonk, who has drawn together the models of exhibition and display in London's 'bazaars' – a predecessor to the department store in the form of one space where a multiplicity of goods could be viewed and purchased – and the National Gallery in the 1830s and 40s.[209] For Klonk, the similarity lay in the dense presentation of artworks that resembled 'glittering luxury articles, commodities whose value lay solely in the gratification of sensual desires.'[210] In the sense of overabundance, there was no room for scientific rationalisation or comparison between different types of artwork and instead the viewer could only admire them aesthetically. However after the Great Exhibition of 1851, the large exhibitions that took place all over the UK and continental Europe began to adapt the classificatory system of displaying art, applied arts and manufactures alongside one another.[211] In France, from the International Exhibition of 1855, the system of display for the pictures was borrowed from the Paris Salons – the annual exhibition of

[206] Howard Coutts and Sarah Medlam 'John and Joséphine Bowes Purchases from the International Exhibitions of 1862, 1867 and 1871', 50.
[207] Howard Coutts and Sarah Medlam 'John and Joséphine Bowes Purchases from the International Exhibitions of 1862, 1867 and 1871', 52-61.
[208] Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 94.
[209] Charlotte Klonk, 'Mounting Vision: Charles Eastlake and the National Gallery of London', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 82, no. 2, (2000), 335.
[210] Charlotte Klonk, 'Mounting Vision', 335.
[211] Paul Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas: The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World's Fairs, 1851-1939*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), 198-226.

the Académie des Beaux-Arts that has occurred since the seventeenth century – reinforcing a connection between the public art institution and the commercial remit of these exhibitions.[212] Visitors such as the Bowes would have had impressed upon them both the visual element as well as the didactic, as evinced by John Bowes' friend and step-father William Hutt who wrote to John Bowes about the 1862 International Exhibition: 'The collection of pictures along will be a grand spectacle. Several of the English school are already on the walls & Reynolds & Gainsborough are very distinguished.'[213] By remarking on the specific scholastic display methods used to arrange the English paintings, Hutt here demonstrates the extent to which by 1862 these exhibitions were classificatory exercises in display, intended to instruct as well as provoke an aesthetic response.

The continued presence of the private collector at these exhibitions also reinforced the interdependence of public displays and elite consumption of fine and art applied art. This was perhaps most overt in the Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition which took place in 1857.[214] In contrast to the Great Exhibition of 1851, which displayed works associated with industrial production and manufacture, this large public exhibition project emphasised the rich collections of fine art possessed by the country. Housed in a purpose-built pavilion and attracting over one million visitors during its six month run, the mission of the organising team, led by Albert, Prince Consort (1819-1861) who was instrumental in the organisation of the Great Exhibition of 1851, was to impress upon the public the importance of taste in contemporary and historic fine and decorative art, as well as the modern manufactures that had been showcased in 1851.[215] One innovative aspect of this exhibition was the chronological hang of the pictures, which also invited comparison between different schools of painting.[216] As shown in a contemporary photograph, the walls were densely packed with pictures,

[212] Elizabeth Gilmore Holt, ed., *The Expanding World of Art, 1874-1902, vol. I: Universal Expositions and State-Sponsored Fine Arts Exhibitions*, (London: Yale University Press, 1988), 10-11.
[213] DCRO, D/St/C5/149/13(i-ii), Letter from William Hutt to John Bowes, 17 March 1862.
[214] Ulrike Finke, 'The Art Treasures Exhibition', in John Archer, ed., *Art and Architecture in Victorian Manchester*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985), 102-126; Elizabeth A. Pergam, *The Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition of 1857: Entrepreneurs, Connoisseurs and the Public*, (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011); Helen Rees-Leahy, ''Walking for Pleasure'?: Bodies of Display at the Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition', *Art History*, vol. 30, no. 4, (2007), 545-565; Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 89-94.
[215] See Francis Haskell, *The Ephemeral Museum: Old Master Paintings and the Rise of the Art Exhibition*, (Yale: Yale University Press, 2000), 82-88.
[216] Francis Haskell, *The Ephemeral Museum*, 86-87.

and this coupled with the relatively small scale of the rooms allowed viewers to cross-examine the various geographical and temporal arrangements (**figure 2.3**). As such this huge display brought to the fore the contribution of private collections to large and intellectually rigorous public exhibitions, and the organisers even used many objects borrowed from art and antique dealers, implying the role of the art market in such classificatory structures.[217] It is also no coincidence that when John Ruskin was asked by the Manchester Athenaeum to visit the exhibition and give public lectures on the themes he considered relevant, he chose to speak about economics, seeing the exhibition as an iconoclastic monument to the private enterprises within art making.[218] According to Elizabeth Pergam, this conflation of private and public collections within a museological classification was designed to showcase the potential holdings for British art institutions, and would have foregrounded the potential role of private collectors in building up significant repositories of national cultural heritage.[219]

Though there is no evidence of the Bowes visiting and purchasing works at the Manchester Art Treasures exhibition of 1857, a letter from William Hutt to John Bowes indicates that they had intended to visit:

> …I passed thro' Manchester & got a cursory view of the pictures, tho a good deal too hurried. It is a noble collection & very well exhibited. I suppose it may be said that there is no first class picture in the collection. I mean a gran sacred(?) or historical by a first rate hand, but everything else there is I should imagine in great number & execution than was ever before seen. The historical gallery too is very interesting. I hope you will con? to carry out your plan of bringing Madame over in the course of the Autumn & coming here. I would meet you at Manchester for I only ran through the Gallery & should like to see it again & with you.[220]

This section of the letter demonstrates the extent to which Bowes and Hutt were interested in the content and arrangement of the historical gallery, Hutt's impression being that it was not the aesthetic quality or inclusion of masterpieces which makes the display remarkable, but the range of artworks of

[217] Mark Westgarth, 'A Biographical Dictionary of Nineteenth Century Antique and Curiosity Dealers', 21
[218] Ruskin gave two lectures which were published under the title *The Political Economy of Art* in the same year, and then republished in 1880 under the title *A Joy Forever: And its price on the market*. For an account of these lectures and their reception see David Throsby, '*The Political Economy of Art*: Ruskin and Contemporary Cultural Economics', *History of Political Economy*, vol. 43, no. 2, (2011), 275-294.
[219] Elizabeth A. Pergam, *The Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition of 1857*, 5.
[220] DCRO, D/St/C5/125/44, Letter from William Hutt to John Bowes, 18 August 1857

display. This suggests that for Hutt the remarkable element of the display was the arrangement of pictures based on the narrative that connects the various artworks to one another, and expands the boundaries of art historical knowledge, rather than a collection of singular masterworks that are merited for their individual qualities.

After the Art Treasures Exhibition 1857 there was a much clearer purpose for the Bowes' attendance at the various international exhibitions. Charles Hardy acknowledges that the object of the Bowes' visit to the exhibitions in the 1860s and 70 was to purchase 'an endless variety of articles representative of the way of life and the arts and crafts of a dozen countries European and Asiatic.[221] Coutts and Medlam also describe the Bowes' purchases from these exhibitions as an attempt at imposing a sense of classificatory order on their 'random collection of objects on the Paris art market.'[222] This would be a fair assessment given the scholastic display which originated at Manchester in 1857, and the way private collections were institutionalised and displayed with scientific rigour, and objects were grouped in a museological classificatory structure. It was also the South Kensington Museum's remit to grow their own collection in its utility at these exhibitions, and they often produced catalogues of the works they had purchased, as well as integrating them into stylistic surveys.[223] For the Bowes, the exhibitions offered a rationale of acquisition and display for what could be interpreted as a random accumulation of objects. From the 1862 International Exhibition in London, which was relatively early in their collecting campaign, they bought a small selection of modern European wares from Britain, Hungary, Austria and Turkey showing a fledgling interest in international art manufactures.[224] The Bowes were also encouraged by William Hutt to visit the accompanying temporary loan exhibition of Medieval and Renaissance works of art that took

[221] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 154.
[222] Howard Coutts and Sarah Medlam 'John and Joséphine Bowes' Purchases from the International Exhibitions of 1862, 1867 and 1871', 50.
[223] The prototype for this was Ralph Nicholson Wornum's essay on the Great Exhibition of 1851 entitled 'The Exhibition as a Lesson in Taste', see Ralph Nicholson Wornum, 'The Exhibition as a Lesson in Taste: an essay on ornamental art as displayed in the industrial exhibition in Hyde Park, in which the different styles are compared with a view to the improvement of taste in home manufactures', *The Art Journal Illustrated Catalogue: The Industry of All Nations, 1851*, (London: George Virtue, 1851).
[224] Howard Coutts and Sarah Medlam 'John and Joséphine Bowes' Purchases from the International Exhibitions of 1862, 1867 and 1871', 50.

place at the South Kensington Museum, organised by John Charles Robinson as a historic appendage to the International Exhibition.[225] Here the Bowes would again have been struck by the vast number of private lenders that could create such a comprehensive overview of the history of decorative arts in the public museum, which surely would have catalysed their own collecting. Indeed, the French critic Clément de Ris proclaimed that the loan exhibition gave 'a higher idea of the wealth of the English people than the Universal Exhibition,' and as such would have provided an aspirational display for the Bowes as contributors to the collecting landscape.[226]

It was the exhibitions of 1867 in Paris and 1871 in London where the Bowes purchased the majority of their 'modern art manufactures', an aspect of their collection consisting of hundreds of objects and spanning almost 20 different nations.[227] The late 1860s were an active time for the Bowes' collecting generally, but the 1867 Paris Exhibition is also important to their museum project in that it enjoyed a much closer association to the South Kensington system through William Hutt, who was appointed as the Associate President of Jurors, for the section of the exhibition dedicated to 'Clothing (including fabrics) and other objects worn on the person.'[228] This position indicated his standing in the Board of Trade at this time, and involved close interaction with the foremost members of the cultural world of the United Kingdom at that time, and therefore Hutt would have been seen as close to the centre of 1860s institutional practice.[229] Thus, it seems more than coincidence that the Bowes would have carried out their most institutional form of collecting from these years, as Sarah Kane concedes, in 1867, 'there are parallels between Joséphine's acquisition policy and that pursued by the South

[225] DCRO, D/St/C5/149/76, Letter from William Hutt to John Bowes, 28 August 1862; See the introduction of J. C. Robinson, ed., *Catalogue of the Special Exhibition of Works of Art of the Mediaeval, Renaissance and more recent periods, on loan at the South Kensington Museum, June 1862*, (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1862).
[226] Quoted in Anthony Burton, *Vision and Accident*, 66.
[227] Howard Coutts and Sarah Medlam 'John and Joséphine Bowes' Purchases from the International Exhibitions of 1862, 1867 and 1871', 52-61.
[228] *Reports on the Paris Universal Exhibition, 1867…Presented to Both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty*, vol. I, (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode for HMSO, 1868-69), 52.
[229] Henry Cole's diaries reveal a number of business and personal appointments with Hutt in the 1860s suggesting a professional relationship, such as: '22 August 1860: Office. Mr & Mrs Hutt in the Museum,' and '30 October 1867: Paris: bkfasted with Mr Arles Dufour. Met there Ld Stanhope, Sir Wm Hutt. Editor of Opinion National, M Guerrault. Le Pasteur Martin, Mr Laurent, Trelat &c.' The Diaries of Henry Cole are held in the National Art Library and I am grateful to Natalya Kusel at the V&A Archive for providing me with transcripts.

Kensington Museum, both general similarities in the range and type of purchases made and specific identical purchases being made from the same source.'[230] Kane cites these identical purchases from the *List of the Objects Obtained During the Paris Exhibition of 1867 by Gift, Loan or Purchase, and now Exhibited in the South Kensington Museum* (1868), and they include objects such as a 'marble paper weight and a pair of leather boots from Russia, faience dishes from Portugal, wooden spoons and earthenware bottles from Romania, and a mosaic box from Persia.'[231] As outlined in the preface to the *List of the Objects Obtained* by the South Kensington Museum, the principal aim was to procure objects in order to make the exhibition 'useful to the manufacturing industry of Great Britain and Ireland.'[232] Caroline Chapman describes the Bowes' purchases in Paris as 'of documentary rather than artistic worth,' echoing the South Kensington Museum's remit as set out in their catalogue of purchases.[233] This is also reinforced by objects in the Museum collection bought at the 1867 International Exhibition which bear a label listing their place of manufacture, such as a wine glass from the Salviati factory in Venice that is labelled as such, this obviously being an important factor in its acquisition and later interpretation in the Museum (**figure 2.4**).

By the 1871 International Exhibition in London, Chapman claims that Joséphine Bowes' taste had 'matured', and 'she bought objects which lack the "curiosity" approach of many of the purchases she had made at the 1867 Exhibition.'[234] This view is primarily due to the items purchased from luxury factories and makers such as Salviati glass and a young Emile Gallé (1846-1904), who at this time was working for his father and still early in his career as a ceramicist and glassmaker.[235] However, as already noted the Bowes bought objects from these manufactories for documentary as much as aesthetic purposes. The 1871 International Exhibition was also significant for the South Kensington Museum which acquired their most diverse range of objects since the beginning of their presence at

[230] Sarah Kane, 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces', 16.
[231] Sarah Kane, 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces', 20-21, fn.89.
[232] *List of the Objects Obtained During the Paris Exhibition of 1867 by Gift, Loan or Purchase of an now Exhibited in the South Kensington Museum*, (London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1868), iii.
[233] Caroline Chapman, *John & Joséphine*, 87.
[234] Caroline Chapman, *John & Joséphine*, 87.
[235] For the relationship between Joséphine Bowes and Emile Gallé see Howard Coutts, *Emile Gallé and the Origins of Art Nouveau*, (Barnard Castle: The Bowes Museum, 2007).

the large international exhibitions.[236] Even though Chapman believes the Bowes had moved away from collecting curiosities and documentary artefacts, there are still direct comparisons between their purchases and those of the South Kensington Museum to the extent that were attempting to buy the very same objects. This is attested to in a letter from William Hutt to John Bowes shortly after their exhibition visit which details that the Bowes had attempted to purchase ceramic fish and oxen that was promised to the South Kensington Museum, and had appealed to Hutt in order to find out which factory it had originated from and the price the museum had paid:

> The Fish and the Oxen belong to the Kensington Museum, having been purchased for the Institution by Mr Doria Secretary to the Legation in Portugal, under direction from the Foreign Office. They ought not to have been offered to sale to you or the Queen or anybody.[237]

The pieces in question are examples of the faience produced by the Mafra workshop in Portugal, who specialised in Palissy-ware (**figure 2.5**), which is zoomorphic, heavily sculptural and colourfully glazed earthenware inspired by that first produced in sixteenth century France by ceramicist Bernard Palissy (1510-1589).[238] Palissy ceramics were coveted by collectors from the 1830s, and had featured at the South Kensington Museum loan exhibition of Medieval and Renaissance works of art of 1862 organised by J. C. Robinson, loaned by a huge range of collectors and dealers.[239] However the South Kensington Museum also had a strong desire to collect this type of work throughout the 1850s and 60s as it was seen as a sophisticated way in which artisans and designers adapted nature to their own means (**figure 2.6**).[240] The letter from Hutt also suggests these modern Portuguese pieces had wide appeal, being offered to Queen Victoria as well as desired by the Bowes and the South Kensington

[236] Peter Trippi, 'Industrial Arts and the Exhibition Ideal', in Malcolm Baker and Brenda Richardson, ed., *A Grand Design*, 86
[237] TBMA, JB/2/5/4/39, Letter from William Hutt to John Bowes, 15 June 1871; Mr Doria is William Doria (1820-1889), a successful British diplomat.
[238] See Cristina Ramos e Horta, 'Portugese Ceramicist Manuel Mafra: Nature, Exoticism and Luxury', *The Journal of the Decorative Arts Society*, vol. 37, (2013), 52-71.
[239] See the section for 'Bernard Palissy ware' J. C. Robinson, ed., *Catalogue of the Special Exhibition of Works of Art*, 110-114. The list of private lenders includes the collector Lionel de Rothschild (1808-1879) as well as the antique dealers Henry Farrer (1798-1866) and Isaac Falke (1819-1909).
[240] See the recent three volume catalogue accompanying the exhibition 'Majolica Mania': Susan Weber, ed., *Majolica Mania: Transatlantic Pottery in England and the United States, 1850-1915*, 3 vols., (London: Yale University Press, 2021).

Museum. Seemingly the modern adaptation of traditional craft practice appealed to Prince Albert for the Royal Collection as well, who was known to acquire objects at the international exhibitions as an endorsement for their utility.[241]

The Bowes ended up buying many hundreds of objects from the exhibitions of 1867 and 1871.[242] Though these exhibitions were used as a way to impose a classificatory sense on the Bowes' seemingly disparate method of purchasing on the art market, as stressed by Coutts and Medlam, and as shown through the adoption of scientific organisational principles by the exhibitions, they also show how the museum is predicated on such unstable classificatory techniques. By investigating how the Bowes compared to the purchasing patterns of the South Kensington Museum at the international exhibitions, it was shown that both used their supposed institutional remit as a framework to classify works on an open market. As such they blended the market and the museum. The Bowes have also been investigated as operating as between the realms of leisurely consumption and institutional collecting to see how far they collected as private consumers or as an institution. The next section will show how the Bowes' use of antique dealers – supposedly operating outside of the institutional realms of the exhibition or the museum – also enforced a sense of order on the objects the Bowes collected, thereby drawing the museum into closer dialogue with the art market.

Antique Dealers and Collecting

It is posited by Charles Hardy that the Bowes' sustained use of picture and antique and curiosity dealers coincided with the latent desire to collect for a 'museum' collection, and that the dealers were employed directly for this task.[243] This has been suggested by Sarah Kane and Elizabeth Conran as occurring in 1862, the date when the Bowes sold their chateau at Louveciennes and raised the

[241] See the exhibition catalogue *Victoria & Albert: Art & Love*, (London: Royal Collection Trust, 2010).
[242] Howard Coutts and Sarah Medlam 'John and Joséphine Bowes' Purchases from the International Exhibitions of 1862, 1867 and 1871', 52-61.
[243] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 153.

necessary funds for such an undertaking.[244] However, it is evident that the Bowes' use of art and antique dealers was a structured progression from their engagement with the firm of interior decorators, restorers and antique purveyors Monbro fils âiné, who reflect the type of hybrid firms that emerged in the second half of the nineteenth century to satisfy the demand in antique collecting.[245] There are, however, examples of the Bowes using Monbro to buy objects that were intended for their museum collection, such as the purchase of a large altarpiece, now identified as by the Master of St. Gudule, but then attributed as the school of Albrecht Durer (1471-1528), bought from Monbro in 1859 (**figure 2.7**).[246] The large screen was originally offered for sale in an auction of the stock of the firm in December 1859 and previous museum scholarship has assumed that the Bowes must have purchased it from the sale, however an annotated version of the sale catalogue in the archives of the Hotel Drouot indicates that the lot passed without a buyer (**figure 2.8**).[247] It is perhaps more likely that the Bowes saw an opportunity after such a striking piece went unsold and picked it up after the sale. This purchase is significant, as Monbro until now had only supplied the Bowes with modern and antique furniture for specific decorative schemes, and the purchase of a large-scale historic object such as an altarpiece suggests a departure from the interior furnishing projects that had previously occupied the Bowes.

The earliest references to the Bowes buying from antique dealers – rather than hybrid furnishers and decorators – to form their collection is actually 1858.[248] Amateur collectors such as John and Joséphine Bowes were indebted to the antique dealer for the networks and knowledge they provided. This was a widespread phenomenon and in the case of the collector's dependence on the dealer, the shift in the power dynamic was noted in 1877 by the French art critic Edmond de Goncourt:

[244] Elizabeth Conran, *The Bowes Museum*, 11; Sarah Kane, 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Objects', 6.
[245] Mark Westgarth, *The Emergence of the Antique and Curiosity Dealer in Britain 1815-1850*, 95-96.
[246] TBMA, JB/4/6/4/2, Monbro bill, March 1860.
[247] See the *Catalogue des Objets d'Art de Curiosité & d'Ameublement composant les riches magasins de M. Monbro Aîné*, 12-17 December 1859, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 25151), lot 253. See Caroline Chapman, *John & Joséphine*, 73.
[248] TBMA, JB/3/3/6/6, Bill from T. Jarry to Joséphine Bowes, January 1858; TBMA, JB/3/3/6/95, Bill from Oppenheim to Mme Bowes, 28 December 1858

> I am very surprised to see the revolution suddenly taking place in the habits of the new generation of bric-a-brac dealers…Yesterday, they were scrap merchants…Today, they are Gentleman dressed by our tailors, buying and reading books…in business – this business – the seller is no longer in a state of inferiority to the buyer, who seems, on the contrary, obliged to the seller.[249]

The subtle fact that Goncourt mentions dealers 'reading books' is suggestive of the self-education that allowed these merchants to become gentlemen, and the knowledge they possessed that they could then monetise. In 1897, reflecting on a life of collecting over the previous fifty years, Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild made the exact same observation: 'The Old Curiosity Shop with its dingy recesses and its picturesque assemblage of motley articles is now transformed into a garish 'Fine Art Gallery', the dealer into a gentleman who makes it a favour to show one his goods'[250] Rothschild, though suspicious of the new class of gentleman-dealer, couldn't overlook the role of the dealer in the formation of his collection, writing later in the same memoir: 'it is true I am indebted to the dealers for most of the works of art on the possession of which I pride myself.'[251] These collectors' assessments, rather than driven by a sense of bitterness over the rising costs of antiques, corroborate the significant rise of the art dealer as told by the historical record: that of wealthy and powerful individuals – gentlemen – who acted as dealers or agents for collectors and museums. Many writers have noted that this was a phenomenon that emerged particularly in the second half of the nineteenth century with figures such as the dealer-collectors such as Alexander Barker (1797-1873), Frédéric Spitzer (1815-1890) and Stefano Bardini (1836-1922) advising and selling to clients across Europe in the 1850 to 90s.[252] As Westgarth has noted, the antiques trade was responding to changes in collecting practices: 'in the decades after 1850 collectors also began to specialise to a much greater extent than earlier collectors and single type or class of object became a much more common collecting

---

[249] Shelley M. Bennett and Carolyn Sargentson, eds., *French Art of the Eighteenth Century at The Huntington*, (London: Yale University Press, 2008),
[250] Ferdinand de Rothschild, 'Bric-à-Brac: a Rothschild Memoir of Collecting' in Michael Hall, ed., *Apollo*, vol. 166, (2007), 50-77.
[251] Ferdinand de Rothschild, 'Bric-à-Brac'.
[252] Lynn Catterson, 'Duped or Duplicitous? Bode, Bardini and the many Madonnas of the South Kensington Museum', *Journal of the History of Collections*, published online June 2020; Stefan Muthesius, 'Why do we Buy Old Furniture?: Aspects of the Antique in Britain 1870-1910', *Art History*, vol. 11, no. 2, (1998), 231-254; Tom Stammers, *The Purchase of the Past*, 243-285. Clive Wainwright, prepared for publication by Charlotte Gere, 'The Making of the South Kensington Museum IV: Relationships with the Trade: Webb and Bardini', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 14, no. 1, (2002), 63-78; Mark Westgarth, 'A Biographical Dictionary of Nineteenth Century Antique and Curiosity Dealers', 10-12.

practice.'[253] Thereby it is clear that as collectors became more demanding in the types of objects they desired, the trade adapted to fit this demand through an increased knowledge base, and therefore implies a significant change in perception of the status of the antique dealer over the exact same years the Bowes were collecting.

To further explore the Bowes Museum's debt to the development of the South Kensington Museum, the reliance on many knowledgeable antique dealers was particularly prevalent at the museum in the 1850s and 60s, when it was under the influence of one particularly powerful curator, Sir John Charles Robinson. According to Jacqueline Yallop, the institutional and personal collecting of Robinson in his capacity as a museum employee was an extremely disrupted boundary:

> the spheres of private and public collecting were intimately entangled during the Victorian period, more so than ever before or since: the collection being developed at South Kensington was so much a part of Robinson's character and had his identity so clearly written into it that it was difficult to see any distinction between his personal choices and those he was making on behalf of the nation.[254]

Though the museum had been created with the mission to educate the manufacturing and artisanal classes on the principles of good design, Robinson's view was that there was another caste of visitors to who the public museum communicated. This view is present in his introduction to the catalogue for the Soulages collection, where he wrote: 'The establishment of public museums has rendered the taste for collecting almost universal amongst educated persons.'[255] Suggestive of a change in perception of who museums were for, now the museum was also obligated to provide more specialist knowledge for collectors, as well as encourage the consumption of historic artworks and objects. Robinson also drew inspiration for his curatorial decisions from his time in Paris, discovering and examining the great private collections that had been made public such as those of Alexandre du Sommerard housed at the Musée de Cluny – the Medieval structure that du Sommerard repurposed and opened as a museum in

[253] Mark Westgarth, 'A Biographical Dictionary of Nineteenth Century Antique and Curiosity Dealers', 10
[254] Jacqueline Yallop, *Magpies, Squirrels and Thieves*: *How the Victorians Collected the World*, (London: Atlantic Books, 2011), 81.
[255] John Charles Robinson, *Catalogue of the Soulages Collection*, (London: Chapman & Hall, 1856), iv-v.

1843 – and Charles Sauvageot (1781-1860) who opened his collection of Renaissance and Medieval works of art in his house at 56 rue de Faubourg-Poissonière (**figure 2.9**, **figure 2.10**).[256] Thus, according to Anthony Burton, through an intimate knowledge of contemporary private collections, Robinson himself 'had the psychology of a collector' and is thus considered the exemplary figure who blurs the boundaries between the collector, the museum and the market.[257]

As well as private collectors, crucially, Robinson was seen to have a symbiotic relationship with the art trade and particularly with dealers, a quality that was seen as essential to building a good museum collection. Major Herbert Byng-Hall (1805-1883), in his manual for aspiring collectors of the 1860s included a coded reference to Robinson as a hero of the museum in the way he successfully negotiated with dealers – who by now were establishing themselves as experts and connoisseurs – and avoided the embarrassment of either buying genuine artworks at inflated prices, or confusing genuine artworks with imitations, forgeries or low quality objects:

> Beautiful as are many of our specimens in the Kensington Museum, there is only one person connected with that institution – and I say so with no intentional discourtesy – in whom I should have great faith as a purchaser. Much that is good has been refused at moderate prices, and much that is mediocre obtained at heavy ones. Indeed the taste and knowledge of many of the leading dealers of London render them better judges than the best of amateurs.[258]

However, Robinson was also looked upon unfavourably for acting loosely with public funds when an agent for the South Kensington Museum and the image of the museum as his personal repository was in the public imagination. As the art educator Walter Smith (1836-1886) wrote in the 1860s:

> Venetian glass and majolica plates are purchased at fancy prices, whilst Provincial Schools of Art, in important centres of manufactures, are crippled and curtailed; the Schools of Art and

[256] Charlotte Drew, 'The Colourful Career of Sir John Charles Robinson: Collecting and Curating at the Early South Kensington Museum', *Journal of Art Historiography*, vol. 18, (2018), 2-3. See also Jonathan Conlin, 'Collecting and Connoisseurship in England, 1840-1900: The Case of J. C. Robinson', 133-144.
[257] Anthony Burton, 'The Uses of the South Kensington Art Collections', 79.
[258] Herbert Byng-Hall, *The Adventures of a Bric-a-Brac Hunter*, (London: Tinsley Brothers, 1868), 30.

> Schools of Design, throughout England, are to be made mere elementary drawing classes, in order that South Kensington may have a public curiosity shop.[259]

Here Smith laments the fact that the museum was not representative of the nucleus of the design education system, but instead draws resources away from the educative aims of the museum and channels them into the commercial aspect of the art trade. For Smith, the museum's perceived aim of cultivating collectors was detrimental to the museum's founding principles of encouraging and improving the manufacturing across the country.

Robinson drew a vague distinction between public resources and private collecting, often using his own money to acquire objects and then reimbursing himself with government funds, therefore bypassing the bureaucracy of the museum's acquisition process.[260] This eventually led to his demotion within the museum.[261] Nevertheless, the South Kensington Museum built up an unparalleled collection of objects due to Robinson. A series of articles researched by Clive Wainwright and edited by Charlotte Gere highlight how crucial a strong relationship with the antiques trade was to developing the museum's collection in the earliest decades of its operation.[262] Furthermore, it is now established that Robinson was not an isolated case at this period, and his activities should be viewed in the wider context of how early museum employees were unstable as a categorical profession, and most keepers or curators engaged in private activity to build a reputation or supplement a modest income.[263] Helen Davies is one scholar to come to the defence of Robinson's ambiguous relationship as a buyer and seller of artworks, citing another well-known South Kensington Museum curator John Hungerford Pollen (1820-1902):

---

[259] Walter Smith, *Report on the Works of Pupils in the French Schools of Design, Recently Exhibited in the Palais de l'Industrie, Champs Elysees, Paris, With a Comparison of the French and English Systems of Art Education*, (Leeds: Edward Baines and Son, 1864), v.
[260] Charlotte Drew, 'The Colourful Career of Sir John Charles Robinson', 14.
[261] Charlotte Drew, 'The Colourful Career of Sir John Charles Robinson', 14.
[262] Clive Wainwright, prepared for publication by Charlotte Gere, 'The Making of the South Kensington Museum III: Collecting Abroad', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 14, no. 1, (2002), 45-61; Clive Wainwright, prepared for publication by Charlotte Gere, 'The Making of the South Kensington Museum IV', 63-78.
[263] Giles Waterfield discusses the 'lowly' status of curators in the nineteenth century: Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 17.

> in view of comments made in recent years regarding Robinson's purchases for himself and others while travelling abroad on public funds, Pollen's activities in this respect must be mentioned: he always went abroad with one or two private commissions to furnish houses or rooms, or purchase china, ironwork, tapestries and other works of art.[264]

This statement serves not to cleanse Robinson's reputation earned through his conflicting interests during his employment at the South Kensington Museum, but to illustrate that the professional and private life of a curator were not cleanly cut divisions.[265] Pollen's biography written by his daughter Anne Pollen made numerous mentions of her father's interactions with the market through his work at the South Kensington Museum, exemplifying his discernment: 'For John Pollen possessed the very eye required for treasures then to be rescued from heterogeneous piles in dark and dusty corners of the shops in Wardour Street – or like places in every great and little town of the continent – and purchased for a song by the discerning few.'[266] Thus it is evident how curators at this date were in constant dialogue and transaction – intellectual or fiscal –with dealers, agents and brokers and even acting as agents themselves.

Like the symbiotic relationship between the collector, the trade and the museum that is illustrated by the South Kensington Museum example, the Bowes also use the knowledge, service and networks of their dealers to legitimise their collection through access to art institutions. In her analysis of the Bowes' participation in the art trade, Sarah Kane fails to see the points in the archive where the Bowes are benefitting from interactions with large public institutions through their antique dealers.[267] One example is the 'rare cake moulds from the time of Bernard Palissy' that were purchased from their dealer Pierre Theodat Jarry (1826-1864) in 1862, that Kane highlights as emblematic of the Bowes' domestic type of collecting (**figure 2.11**).[268] Closer examination of the bill supplied from Jarry shows that he qualified the status of the objects by writing 'three or four items from this batch

[264] Helen Davies, 'John Charles Robinson's Work at the South Kensington Museum, Part II: From 1863-1867: consolidation and conflict', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 11, no. 1 (1999), 95.
[265] See Ivan Gaskell, 'Tradesmen as scholars: Interdependencies in the study and exchange of art', in Elizabeth Mansfield, ed., *Art History and its Institutions: Foundations of a Discipline*, (London: Routledge, 2002), 146-162.
[266] Anne Pollen, *John Hungerford Pollen, 1820-1902*, (London: John Murray, 1912), 296; See also Simon Spier 'Between the Museum and the Market: John Hungerford Pollen and Antique Furniture with special reference to his work at the South Kensington Museum', *Furniture History*, vol. 57, (2021), forthcoming.
[267] Sarah Kane, 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces', 9-10.
[268] Sarah Kane, 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces', 10.

were bought by Monsieur Riocreux for the Imperial factory at Sèvres, who had no examples of this type in his museum.'[269] These objects were clearly of heightened interest as similar in a classificatory sense to those which were chosen for a museum collection, in this case they were validated by Denis Désiré Riocreux (1791-1872), the Keeper of the Musée de Ceramique housed at the Sévres Porcelain factory. The museum at Sévres was intended to show the historical and technical development of ceramic art in its entirety, with its educational benefit and system of classification allowing 'any one able to derive definite knowledge of the subject of pottery.'[270] As a project designed to be encyclopedic, Jarry is using the ceramic museum as a paradigm for the Bowes' own collecting remit, drawing parallels between the institution's and the collectors' desires to possess representative collections. Furthermore, this shows that dealers were also able to contribute to the classification of a collection as much as a museum professional or an exhibition structure. Kane marginalises this aspect of Jarry's contribution because it does not fit with her view of Joséphine Bowes as a 'mere collector of bibelots', but instead it suggests an underlying strategy to their purchases.[271] Furthermore, it is shown how such purchases were mediated by the Bowes' dealers, and how they contributed to such strategies.

The Bowes and their dealers did not simply copy the remit of institutional collections, however. They also utilised the knowledge and connoisseurship of museum professionals to validate their own collection. For example, in 1865, one of the Bowes' principal antique dealers, A. C. Lamer, wrote to Joséphine Bowes regarding a number of pieces of Sévres porcelain:

> Yesterday I went to the Sévres factory to see Monsieur de Riocreux, the Director, to verify what he told me about those plates which I sold you… but to give a written description of them he would have to see the objects and he offered to look at your collection and to tell you about all the marks I will bring him to you if you wish…[272]

[269] TBMA, JB/5/9/6, Bill from Jarry to Joséphine Bowes, 1862.
[270] Alfred Darcel, 'The Ceramic Museum of Sévres', *The Decorator and Furnisher*, vol. 17, no. 4, (1891), 129. See this article for a complete overview of the museum's presentation and layout.
[271] Sarah Kane, 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces', 10.
[272] TBMA, JB/5/10/3/71, Letter from A.C. Lamer to Joséphine Bowes, 1865,

Here Lamer drew on the expertise of Riocreux, as Jarry drew on his collecting practices a few years earlier, in order to add a level of authenticity to the objects he sold to Joséphine Bowes. What is also important, however, is the suggestion that Riocreux was also willing to visit and assess the Bowes' collection and, by extension, reinforce its value and authenticity. Leora Auslander, writing about the bourgeois fashion for collecting in the nineteenth century claims of the relationship between collectors and so-called 'experts': 'An expert could not say that a collection of Chinese porcelain was inappropriate for a collector occupying a particular social location; he could only state that a vase that claimed to be from seventeenth-century China really was one.'[273] However, acknowledging the relationship between dealers, collectors and museum experts is to dispute this claim, as art dealers used museum experts for verifying the authenticity of objects and therefore bolstered social ambitions. In a period where collecting was becoming increasingly specialised, and certain areas of specialisation carried more social currency to authenticate Joséphine Bowes' Sèvres porcelain, was to reinforce her 'social location.'[274] Therefore using Riocreux to evaluate Joséphine Bowes' Sèvres porcelain would have marked her as a collector in possession of elevated taste, rather than just an ordinary consumer, and therefore the expertise became part of the transaction.

Through comparing the Bowes' relationship with their antique dealers to how museums such as the South Kensington interacted with the trade, it has been shown that the Bowes' regular dealers have significant agency within the context of emerging literature on the role of the art trade in the formation of museums, highlighting instances where transactions offer examples of a distinct collecting practice, rather than simply the random acquisition of objects. Through further investigation of the relationship the Bowes shared with their antique dealers, and what type of networks they provided, it is the object of the next section to further shift the focus on to the agency of the dealers, highlighting and exploring their social and cultural positions within the nineteenth century art trade in Paris.

[273] Leora Auslander, *Taste and Power*, 299.
[274] Leora Auslander, *Taste and Power*, 299.

Antique Dealer Geographies

There are a number of reasons that the Bowes chose to work with specific antique dealers, and the first consideration would be a logistical one – that of convenience or proximity. The physical location of the antique shop is singled out as of particular import by Didier Maleuvre, noting the significance of the prevalence of antique shops on the Quai Voltaire which stand in the '*reflection* of the Louvre Museum.'[275] Noting here the cross fertilisation of knowledge structures between the antique shop and the museum, proximity is of prime concern. Using the geography of antique dealers to dissect the social and economic contexts of selling and collecting antiques is of growing interest to a number of scholars. For example, Pamela Fletcher and Anne Helmreich have mapped and explored the London art market between 1850-1914 to show the rapid expansion in the commerce of historical objects at this time.[276] Also, Mark Westgarth has explored the cultural geography of the antique dealer in Britain in the 20th century to visualise the proliferation of the trade in centres and peripheries across the British Isles, and highlight the evolving business practices of dealers over the last 100 years.[277] More relevant to this thesis is the valuable work done by Félicie de Maupeou, Julien Cavero and Léa Saint Raymond in mapping the locations of dealers and galleries in Paris between 1815-1955.[278] These studies show a steady and complex expansion of the art and antiques trade in Britain and France in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and serve to highlight the pluralistic nature of such markets, whereby they cannot be defined by the adherence to a singular model or explained by the rise of singular institutions.

[275] Didier Maleuvre, *Museum Memories*, 204.
[276] The project, titled 'The London Gallery Project' is accessible at https://learn.bowdoin.edu/fletcher/london-gallery/. For an in-depth discussion and evaluation of the project, its methodologies and results see also Pamela Fletcher and Anne Helmreich, 'Local/Global: Mapping Nineteenth-Century London's Art Market'.
[277] This is accessible at https://antiquetrade.leeds.ac.uk/
[278] Entitled 'Géographie du marché de l'art parisien' (GeoMAP) hosted on the website of the research group Artl@s: https://paris-art-market.huma-num.fr/. See also Félicie de Maupeou, Julien Cavero and Léa Saint-Raymond, 'Les rue des tableaux: The Geography of the Parisian Art Market 1815-1955', *Artl@s Bulletin*, vol. 5, no. 1, (2016), 119-159.

This is evident through tracking the Bowes' use of antique dealers in Paris in the 1860s and 70s. The Bowes' apartments on the rue de Berlin were at the meeting point of the 8th and 9th *arrondisements* in Paris. An annotated map taken from *Galignani's New Paris Guide* of 1867 shows the Bowes' social life concentrated around this area, including John Bowes' clubs, Joséphine Bowes' couturier, as well as theatres and their antique dealers (**figure 2.12**).[279] Using de Maupeou, Cavero and Saint Raymond's digital map it is possible to show the expansion in art dealers and galleries appearing in this area between 1850 and 1870 (**figure 2.13**). In 1850 the galleries are clustered in the area around the 1st and 2nd *arrondisements*, close to the cultural institution of Paris such as the Louvre and the theatre district. Then by 1870, evident is the significant number of antique shops and galleries which are appearing around the Gare St. Lazare in the 9th *arrondisement* to cater for the increasing number of upper- to middle-class residents. This is also due to a shifting of the cultural centre of Paris towards the north-west when a new site of the Opera opens in 1860, and crucially the opening of the auction house the Hôtel Drouot in 1852.[280]

It useful to compare the Bowes' interaction with the art trade to the networks of other collectors who bought in Paris contemporaneously, such as Sir Richard Wallace, whose purchase receipts preserved in the archive at the Wallace Collection show him visiting a number of dealers based around the 1st *arrondisement* such as Mannheim and Alfred Beurdeley (1847-1919) at the Pavillion de Hanovre.[281] Similarly the papers of the collector and dealer Charles Drury Edward Fortnum (1820-1899) held at the Ashmolean Museum contain mentions of visiting a number of dealers in Paris in the 1870s, including Beurdeley and the major importer of Chinese and Japanese works of art Siegfried Bing (1838-1905) on the rue Chauchat.[282] The most comprehensive cache of bills which allow a vivid picture of the locales of antique dealing in the 1860s are those addressed to the Comte de

[279] *Galignani's New Paris Guide for 1867*, (Paris: A. & W. Galignani & Co., 1867)
[280] Félicie de Maupeou, Julien Cavero and Léa Saint-Raymond, 'Les rue des tableaux', 125-128.
[281] These are held in the Wallace Collection Archive, HWF/RW/2.
[282] Ashmolean Museum Archive, Fortnum Archive, Supplementary Box, pocketbooks dating from c.1859-1894. These detail Fortnum's travels on the continent visiting collections and dealers. See also Ben Thomas, 'The Fortnum Archive in the Ashmolean Museum', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 11, no. 2, (1999), 253-268.

Nieuwerkerke (1811-1892) also preserved in the Wallace Collection archive.[283] Count Alfred Émilien O'Hara van Nieuwerkerke was known for his collection which featured heavily in Medieval and Renaissance works of art, as well as arms and armour (**figure 2.14**). Richard Wallace acquired Nieuwerkerke's collection in 1871, and along with it over 300 receipts from over 70 dealers documenting his collection between 1865-70.[284] Placing a selection of these dealers onto a map show the concentration of Nieuwerkerke's buying around the 1st *arrondisement*, including purchases from Mannheim, Beurdeley, Laurent, Chapuis and Joyeau, as well as several dealers in the popular area on the Quai Voltaire (**figure 2.15**). As the illustration of Nieuwerkerke's collection shows, he possessed a strong interest in arms and armour, and a number of the dealers Nieuwerkerke used were known for dealing in this area, such as Felix Petitprêtre, also located on the Quai Voltaire, whose bill describes him as dealing in 'arms, armours and curiosities.'[285] Due to Nieuwerkerke's specialist interest and his relative wealth, it stands that he would have frequented the dealers in the 1st *arrondisement*, at the very heart of the Paris trade in order to cater for his specialised collecting practices.

The Bowes operated similarly in a network of dealers, however comparison to Nieuwerkerke's network shows a very different geography to their acquisitions. In the late 1850s and early 1860s, the Bowes visited a number of different antique dealers: in 1863-1865 alone they purchased antiques from dealers named Angibout, Benoit, Cheylus, and Dubessy in Paris, Delauné Vernet and Gotte in Boulogne-sur-Mer and Bengst, Ganachaud and Mendes in Nantes.[286] However, mapping these onto the commercial geography of Paris shows that many of the dealers they visited were concentrated around their Paris apartments on the rue de Berlin and the Cite d'Antin, and indeed situated outside of the main centre of the trade and instead positioned on the peripheries (**figure 2.16**). It has been noted

[283] Wallace Collection Archive, HWF/RW/2/2 (1-73). These include some of the most high-profile dealers in Paris at the time.
[284] Wallace Collection Archive, HWF/RW/2/2 (1-73). See also Suzanne Higgott, *The Most Fortunate Man of his Day*, 166.
[285] Wallace Collection Archive, HWF/RW/2/2/53, Receipt to the Comte de Nieuwerkerke from Felix Petitprêtre, 1 May 1867.
[286] A number of these are mentioned in Howard Coutts, 'Joséphine Bowes and the Craze for Collecting Ceramics in the 19th Century', 20; and Sarah Kane, 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces', 18 fn.43.

that the Bowes purchased a greater number of objects at lower prices than their contemporaries, and this would be a justified assertion based on the locales in which they looked for acquisitions.[287]

Despite this wide geographic range of purchasing, it is undeniable that the Bowes bought mainly from a select group of art and antique dealers who deserve further consideration, if only to reinsert their activities into the wider networks of art dealing in Paris in the mid nineteenth century. It is also telling that the dealers the Bowes use appear in very few primary sources, therefore an examination of the types of dealers that less elite collectors may have frequented is a useful contribution to the history of collecting.[288] Pierre Theodat Jarry appears to be the first dealer from who the Bowes were buying exclusively antique objects and curiosities for the purpose of forming a museum collection (**figure 2.17**). Until now no biographical information was available for Jarry, being referred to simply as 'T. Jarry' or 'Theodat Jarry' as the letters and invoices in the archive are signed. However, a marriage certificate between Pierre Jarry and an English woman named Eliza Weston dated 1849, held in East Sussex Record Office has provided his full name and some other details such as his profession which at that time was given as 'Artist'.[289]A few existing bills in the archive indicate purchases from Jarry as early as 1857-58, but the bulk of his service to the Bowes was carried out in the years 1861-63, presumably cut short by his death in 1864.[290]

[287] Sarah Kane, 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces', 10.
[288] Most of the dealers appear in the trade directories for Paris that were published annually under the title *Almanach-Bottin du commerce de Paris, des départemens de la France et des principales villes du monde...* between 1839 and 1856, and from 1857 until 1909 it was known as the *Annuaire-almanach du commerce, de l'industrie, de la magistrature et de l'administration. Almanach-Bottin du commerce de Paris, des départemens de la France et des principales villes du monde...*, (Paris, Bureau de l'Almanach du Commerce, 1839-1856); *Annuaire-almanach du commerce, de l'industrie, de la magistrature et de l'administration*, (Paris: Firmin Didot Fréres, fils et cie, 1857-1909). The dealers also appear in art related directories such as *Annuaire Public par la Gazette des Beaux-Arts…Année 1870*, (Paris: Bureau de la Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1870). Benjamin Gogué, the Bowes' dealer and restorer of paintings, is possibly mentioned in the catalogue of the collection of Edmond de Goncourt, though his name is spelt 'Goguet', in Edmond de Goncourt, *La Maison d'un Artiste*, (Paris: G. Charpentier, 1881), 27. Amélie Basset appears in the catalogue raisonne of Pierre-Paul Prud'hon (1758-1823) by Edmond de Goncourt as the owner of a sketch of the Count Giovanni Battista Sommariva (1762-1826), the finished portrait of which is now in the Pinacoteca di Brera, Milan, after Charles Basset purchased it at the Laperlier sale. Edmond de Goncourt, *Catalogue Raisonné de l'Oeuvre Peint, Dessine et Grave de P. P. Prud'hon*, (Paris: Rapilly, 1876), 43.
[289] East Sussex Record Office, PAR 255/1/3/20, Marriage Certificate for Pierre Jarry and Eliza Weston, 2 June 1849. I am indebted to Andrée Rathemacher and Hélène Personnaz, descendants of Jarry for providing me with this information.
[290] All letters and bills relating to Jarry in the archive are held under reference JB/5/9 and run from 1861-63.

It is useful to trace Jarry's presence through the French trade directories, and doing so shows a consistent proximity to the Bowes' residence on the rue de Berlin. In 1855 Jarry is recorded as a dealer of curiosities at 30 rue d'Amsterdam and remains at that address until 1864.[291] He does not appear in the database and map of Maupeou, Cavero and Saint Raymond, but his presence is certainly part of the trend of art dealers appearing around the Gare St. Lazare (**figure 2.18**). Crucially this is only a very short walk from the Bowes' house on the rue de Berlin and they would have been attracted by a relatively established dealer in close proximity to them in an area slightly peripheral to the Paris art market. It is evident that Jarry is an established dealer, as a professional printed billhead describes him as a dealer in curiosities and pictures, and a number of bills detail premises at another address other than the one on rue d'Amsterdam (**figure 2.19**).[292]

It is possible that Jarry's death in 1864 also opened up an opportunity for the next significant dealer who helped the Bowes form their collection, Adolphe-Cabaret Lamer.[293] Lamer is described as a 'dealer of curiosities' as well as of paintings and a huge number of other objects including old furniture, wood carvings, snuff boxes, porcelain and tapestries (**figure 2.20**).[294] This type of variety would have appealed to the Bowes who were not seeking a single type of object but maintained variety in their collecting and thus would have preferred more generalist dealers. The earliest transactions between Lamer and the Bowes are recorded as taking place at the very end of 1863, and the first purchases they make are for a range of higher price items such as a piece of Louis XIII marquetry furniture and 'old bronze' copies of the Farnese Hercules (**figure 2.21**), suggesting the Bowes are beginning to accelerate their collecting around this point, and needed access to higher tier objects.[295] Furthermore, by this time they would be slightly more familiar with the landscape of the art

[291] *Almanach-Bottin du commerce de Paris*, (1855), 826; *Annuaire-almanach du commerce*, (1864), 776.
[292] TBMA, JB/5/9/8, Bill from Jarry to Joséphine Bowes, 1862. The other address is Rue Capron, 35.
[293] All letters and bills relating to Lamer in the archive are held under reference JB/5/10 and run from 1863-73. The first bill is dated December 1863: JB/5/10/1/1, Bill from Lamer to Joséphine Bowes, 27 December 1863.
[294] This information is taken from the bill heading of Lamer. See TBMA, JB/5/10/1/1, Bill from Lamer to Joséphine Bowes, 27 December 1863.
[295] TBMA, JB/5/10/1/1&2, Bills from Lamer to Joséphine Bowes, 27 & 31 December 1863. I am indebted to Judith Phillips' research on the amount the Bowes are spending with each antique dealer. See Judith Phillips

and antiques market after 4 to 5 years of collecting, and wished for a dealer who operated more closely to the centre of the Parisian art market, which in the 1860s centred on the auction house the Hôtel Drouot.[296] Maupeou, Cavero and Saint Raymond's digital map shows the location of Lamer between 1859-1861 on the Passage des Panoramas, and also the spread of other dealers in that area between 1850-1870, all within a short walk of the auction house (**figure 2.22**). In fact, one of Lamer's printed billheads indicates he had owned shops on the rue Grange-Batelière and the rue Drouot by 1863, as well as those listed on GeoMAP, and thus was already operating as an established curiosity dealer at this point (**figure 2.20**).[297] It is uncertain when exactly Lamer began trading, but a letter written by him to the Bowes in 1866 describes him of 20 years of good reputation, so a date in the 1840s is quite probable.[298] The *Almanach-Bottin du Commerce de Paris* of 1854, almost a decade before he begins selling to the Bowes, lists Lamer as a dealer of curiosities at Rue Rougemont, 4, and from then on shows a consistent proximity to the streets surrounding the Hôtel Drouot.[299] In 1856 Lamer is listed as proprietor of an address in the Passage des Panoramas, Galerie des Variétés, 21.[300] Significantly this is located at the back of the Théâtre des Variétés, where John Bowes and Joséphine Coffin-Chevallier would have entered the premises daily through the rear entrance. It is likely that it was here that a relationship developed between the curiosity dealer and client as John Bowes did not sell the theatre until 1858, giving at least a couple of years of sustained proximity to one another. However there survives no proof to confirm that the Bowes were purchasing objects from Lamer in the late 1850s. At the end of that decade and the beginning of the 1860s Lamer is listed in the *Almanach* at various numbers in the Galerie des Variétés until 1862 where he does not appear at all.[301] However, bills issued to the Bowes from Lamer dated from 1863 display the rue Grange-Batelière

'National Identity, Gender, Social Status and Cultural Aspirations in Mid-Nineteenth Century England and France', Appendix 6 'Analysis of Dealers' Bills', 316-356.

[296] See Nicholas Green, 'Circuits of Production, Circuits of Consumption: The Case of Mid-Nineteenth Century French Art Dealing', *Art Journal*, vol. 48, no. 1, (1989), 32.

[297] Maupeou, Cavero and Saint Raymond list Lamer at 21-23 Passage des Panoramas from 1857-1861. https://paris-art-market.huma-num.fr/. Accessed 24 March 2020.

[298] TBMA, JB/5/10/4/17, Letter from Lamer to Joséphine Bowes, May 1866.

[299] *Almanach-Bottin du Commerce de Paris*, (1854), 292.

[300] *Almanach-Bottin du Commerce de Paris*, (1856), 939.

[301] *Annuaire-almanach du commerce*, (1860), 683; *Annuaire-almanach du commerce*, (1861), 724

address, only a short walk from the Théâtre des Variétés through the Passage Jouffroy, and by the 1864 and 1865 editions of the *Almanach* he is listed at the premises on the rue Drouot.[302]

Bills addressed to the Bowes indicate that Lamer was selling to them throughout the 1860s and indeed had a burgeoning profile with significant local and international contacts.[303] Throughout the letters from Lamer to the Bowes there are mentions of objects associated with well-known people, or from collections well known in Paris, such as Antoine-Louis Clapisson (1808-1866) the composer and collector of historic instruments.[304] In 1865 Lamer offered the Bowes a pair of silver and silver gilt candlesticks said to be from the service of Louis XIII and with a makers mark from the time of Henri III, with a note stating they had the 'provenance of the collection of Mr Barker of London (**figure 2.23**).'[305] This certainly refers to the dealer-collector Alexander Barker and shows that Lamer had a growing network that includes some connections to significant collections such as Barker's. Further evidence of Lamer's standing in the French art trade is in 1866 when Lamer acted as an assistant to the popular auctioneer Charles Oudart (**figure 2.24**) for a sale of paintings at the Hôtel Drouot.[306] Auction sales in Paris at this time always included an expert as well as the auctioneer as a way of regulating them so this sale suggests Lamer was a dealer with an established network and contacts with a presence in Paris when the Bowes begin their relationship with him.[307] As such this section has shown that the Bowes' use of antique dealer operated slightly outside of the traditional centre of the art trade in Paris, and epitomised the growing presence of antique collecting within the middle-classes, yet they were using dealers that had established practices afforded by the expansion of the art and antiques market outside of the traditional cultural centres of Paris. The next section will develop this to investigate how the Bowes used this method when collecting across the European continent.

[302] *Annuaire-almanach du commerce*, (1864), 776; *Annuaire-almanach du commerce*, (1865), 791-792.
[303] Lamer sells to the Bowes without interruption from 1863 to 1869: TBMA, JB/5/10/1-7.
[304] TBMA, JB/5/10/4/66, Letter from Lamer to Joséphine Bowes, 1866.
[305] TBMA, JB/5/10/3/57, Letter from Lamer to the Bowes, 20 September 1865. Based on the dimensions of the candlesticks disclosed in another letter from Lamer in Durham County Record Office these could be X.4595.1 & 2. DCRO, D/St/C5/160/64, Letter from Lamer to the Bowes, September 1865.
[306] TBMA, JB/5/10/4/1, Bill written on Auction catalogue cover, 12 January 1866. *Notice d'une Collection de Tableaux Ancien…provenant du Cabinet de M. d'E****, 12-13 January 1866, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 28787).
[307] Nicholas Green, 'Circuits of Production, Circuits of Consumption', 32.

Antique Dealer Networks

The Bowes did much of their collecting outside of France, often taking tours specifically for that purpose, which until now has been a little recognised aspect in the formation of the Museum.[308] This kind of pan-European expedition was not uncommon for fastidious collectors, for example John Charles Robinson recounted that the collection of Jules Soulages was the result of repeated tours through Italy during the 1830s and 40s, for 'the express purpose of acquiring specimens of Art.'[309] The fruitfulness of such journeys is exemplified by Lady Charlotte Schreiber, whose journals record her seemingly endless excursions and missions to European towns and cities in order to buy ceramic objects.[310] Her voraciousness is best detailed by her son in the opening pages of the published edition of her diary: 'She hunted high and low, through England and abroad; France, Holland, Germany, Spain, Italy, Turkey, all were ransacked.'[311] The process of acquiring objects across the European market was also essential for developing museum collections. The National Gallery's first director Charles Eastlake, whilst travelling abroad in the 1850s and 60s bought well over 100 paintings to take back to Trafalgar Square.[312] Clive Wainwright has also documented the various trips abroad by officials from the South Kensington Museum in order to buy from various antique dealers, private collections and auction houses.[313]

The fact that high status collectors and museum officials were visiting the same art and antique dealers during the 1850s, 60s and 70s is compelling evidence for a kind of pilgrimage undertaken by

[308] Charles Hardy devotes only two paragraphs to the Bowes' 1868 excursion across Europe: Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 156.
[309] John Charles Robinson, *Catalogue of the Soulages Collection*, iii.
[310] Montague J. Guest, ed. *Lady Charlotte Schreiber's Journals*.
[311] Montague J. Guest, ed. *Lady Charlotte Schreiber's Journals*, xxvi.
[312] Susanna Avery-Quash, 'The Travel Notebooks of Charles Eastlake', *The Volume of the Walpole Society*, vol. 73, (2011), 2 vols. See also Jaynie Anderson and Carol Togneri Dowd, 'The Travel Diaires of Otto Mündler 1855-1858 at the National Gallery, London', *The Volume of the Walpole Society*, vol. 51, (1985).
[313] Clive Wainwright, 'Shopping for South Kensington: Fortnum and Henry Cole in Florence 1858-1859', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 11, no. 2, (1999), 171-185; Clive Wainwright, prepared for publication by Charlotte Gere, 'The Making of the South Kensington Museum III', 45-61.

the collecting classes. The ways in which that information passed between those who were equipped with the knowledge or social network took various forms. For example, the Dresden-based dealer in antiquities and works of art, Moritz Meyer, who was established enough to supply antiques to the Emperor Napoleon III, the king-consort of Portugal, Ferdinand II of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha (1816-1885) and the German Prince August of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha (1818-1881) (**figure 2.25**) was a popular destination for collectors.[314] Meyer is also recorded as being visited by Charlotte Schreiber in her diaries, and seemingly had a reputation for pricing objects far beyond their value, suggesting his exclusive clientele.[315] These types of trips were aided by publications such as the series of guides produced by the firm John Murray. These guides had dedicated sections to the reputable antique dealers in each city, and advertised the premises of dealers such as Moritz Meyer in Dresden and Tito Gagliardi in Florence.[316] Henry Cole is known to have used these guides to augment his European collecting trips for the South Kensington Museum.[317] A copy of *Murray's Handbook for Travellers in Northern Italy* from 1858 now in the National Art Library displays annotations from Cole, filling in extra details of dealers or collections that merited being recorded, suggesting these guides operated as just a starting-point for the serious collector.[318] Wainwright even notes that most significant museum officials and collectors knew Murray personally and would provide updates and additions for future editions of the guide, showing how this type of guide was predicated on a circular form of knowledge which was filtered down to less elite travellers.[319]

In 1868, the Bowes took such a trip around Europe, visiting the large cities, cultural attractions and antique shops across Belgium and German and Austro-Hungarian territories.[320] Their route for buying

[314] Alexander Rodrigues and Bruno A. Martinho, 'The Assemblage of a Distinct Glass Collection: The Creation and Display of the Stained-Glass Collection of Ferdinand II of Portugal', *Revista de História da Arte – Serie W*, vol. 3, (2015), 21-27. See the illustrated billhead for Meyer for his other royal appointments.
[315] Montague J. Guest, ed. *Lady Charlotte Schreiber's Journals*, 31-32,
[316] These were included under a list of 'agents' at the front of the guide, see *A Handbook for travellers in Portugal: A complete guide for Lisbon, Cintra, Mafra, the British battle-fields, Alcobaça, Batalha, Oporto, &c.*, (London: John Murray, 1864), 3
[317] Clive Wainwright, 'Shopping for South Kensington', 171-185.
[318] Clive Wainwright, 'Shopping for South Kensington', 175-177.
[319] Clive Wainwright, 'Shopping for South Kensington', 173. *A Handbook for travellers in central Italy. Part I, Southern Tuscany and Papal States*, (London: John Murray, 1853), the National Art Library accession number is RC.F.11.
[320] The many bills from this trip are in TBMA, JB/5/13, Purchases during travels in 1868.

took them to Mayence, Stuttgart, Ulm, Munich, Ratisbon, Vienna, Pest, Breslau, Dresden, Brunswick, Cologne, Ghent and Bruges, spending over 8000 francs on paintings, antiquities and curiosities that were then shipped back to Paris.[321] It is quite likely the Bowes followed a route that would have been suggested by a guidebook resembling *Murray's Handbook* – a popular form of antique hunting – as they paid a visit to dealers such as Moritz Meyer in Dresden.[322] However, in Ratisbon they visited a dealer named Koch which suggests the Bowes also followed an established trail of collecting that was perhaps not elucidated through the guidebooks. Koch's, according to Charlotte Schreiber, was the only destination for the discerning collector: 'There is only one Antiquary's shop at Ratisbon, a little place in the Dom Platz kept by a man called Koch.'[323] Here the Bowes bought a number of objects including a majolica salt cellar, a selection of engraved glass and a parquetry box.[324]

Though the Bowes travelled to collect, similar relationships to those they cultivated with their dealers in Paris are also evident with dealers they met on their excursions. Upon visiting Ghent, the Bowes purchased from two dealers: De Buyser and Edmond Rogiers (d.1892).[325] The latter, Rogiers, became a regular supplier of antiques for the Bowes and occasionally acted as an agent for them at auction sales in Belgium and northern France through into the early 1870s.[326] Information about him is fairly scarce, but through a number of documents a picture of Rogiers and his activity can begin to be built up. He was referred to variously as E. Rogiers or Ed. Rogiers, 'antiquaire,' in a number of Belgian auction catalogues, trading always at Rue Neuve-St. Jacques in Ghent up until the 1890s.[327] It is likely that his full name is Edmond Rogiers, who was listed as a contributor of various decorative art objects to the *Exposition Nationale de 1880* in Brussels.[328] An auction sale of his stock – well over 1000

[321] TBMA, JB/5/13/20, Note in John Bowes' hand of paintings and antiquities bought while travelling, 6 September to 18 November 1868.
[322] TBMA, JB/5/13/14, Bill from Moritz Meyer to Joséphine Bowes, 28 October 1868.
[323] Montague J. Guest, ed. *Lady Charlotte Schreiber's Journals*, 28.
[324] TBMA, JB/5/13/6, Receipted bill from Ratisbon & Regensburg, 24 September 1868.
[325] TBMA, JB/5/13/17, Bill from De Buyser, November 1868. For Rogiers' bills see TBMA, JB/5/12/1-55.
[326] See for correspondence regarding the auction of M. Leconte Baillon: TBMA, JB/5/12/36-69, Letters from Rogiers to the Bowes, March-June 1870.
[327] This information derives from a number of Belgian auction catalogues which list Rogiers as a vendor of the catalogue at this address. See for example the sale catalogue of the studio of the French painter Alexandre Thomas Francia (1820-1884) that took place in Brussels after his death, 2 March 1885, Lugt 44632.
[328] *1880 Exposition Nationale, IV^e Section Industries d'Art en Belgique Antérieures au XIX^e Siècle. Catalogue Officiel*, (Bruxelles, 1880). See cat. nos. 543, 2369, 2500, 2560 in the section 'Orfèvrerie, etc.'

articles of paintings, furniture, sculpture, ceramics and arms and armour – organised by his widowed wife, took place in June 1892 indicating a probable date of death around then.[329] Auction catalogues preserved in various collections that show Rogiers as the expert or organiser give the impression that he was active around the whole of the south of Belgium and northern France in the 1870s and 80s, with sales taking place in Ghent, Brussels, Kortrijk, Turnhout and Roubaix.[330] The established reputation of Rogiers and his far-reaching network must have appealed to the Bowes as he was the only dealer from their European trip who they maintain contact with and receive objects from on an almost monthly basis.[331] This reinforces the rationale behind the Bowes' activities in Paris suggesting that their preferred method of acquisition was to create a robust relationship with a dealer who could have then acted on behalf of them at various sales and focused on supplying them with a large quantity of objects at relative speed.

There was a similar instance when the Bowes cultivated a relationship with one particular dealer named 'P. Albert' whilst they sought refuge in England due to the political turbulence in France during 1870-71.[332] This enforced stay in John Bowes' home country allowed them an opportunity to patronise some of the antique dealers of London.[333] It appears that the Bowes did not seek the services of the major dealers who may have appealed to French or francophile collectors, such as Ernest Gambart and his successful 'French Gallery', who had been trading in London since the 1850s but instead utilised an influx of dealers caused by the troubles in France.[334] With the political and social instability brought on by the fall of the Second Empire many French antique dealers were compelled to relocate to London. This included market leaders such as the successful picture dealer Paul Durand-Ruel (1814-1902), but it follows that a number of smaller dealers would have also relocated to the

[329] The auction took place on 1 June 1892 in Ghent, see Lugt 50906
[330] For example, see sale of W. F. J. van Genechten, 7 November 1881, Turnhout, Lugt 41342.
[331] TBMA, JB/5/12/1-55.
[332] Bills from Albert are included in TBMA, JB/5/4/5 and date from April and May 1870.
[333] TBMA, JB/5/4/5 is dedicated to the Bowes' purchases at the London International Exhibition of 1870 but includes a number of bills from antique dealers in London dating to 1870.
[334] Pamela Fletcher, 'Creating the French Gallery: Ernest Gambart and the Rise of the Commercial Art Gallery in Mid-Victorian London', *Nineteenth Century Art Worldwide*, vol. 6, no. 1, (2007) accessed online on 13 November 2020; Jeremy Maas, *Gambart: Prince of the Victorian Art World*, (London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1975).

major trading cities of Britain.[335] One dealer the Bowes frequented during 1870 was a Frenchman named P. Albert on Oxford Street, who is described as an 'Importer of & Dealer in Works of Art of Every Description', which would have appealed to their wide-ranging collecting brief (**figure 2.26**).[336] The Bowes visited Albert at least six times over April and May 1870, spending hundreds of francs and most of the bills are written out meticulously in French, indicating that there was probably some level of shared cultural experience between the dealer and Joséphine Bowes, prevented from returning to her native country.

It is also possible that, like when travelling across Europe, the Bowes took instruction from publications and guides for collectors in London, as they visited dealers who would have been widely known and provided objects for a wide range of customers. Twice they paid a visit to the dealer William Wareham near to Leicester Square, who had been mentioned in Herbert Byng Hall's *The Bric-à-Brac Hunter, or Chapters on Chinamania* (1875) as a dealer of 'the highest respectability and honour', and sold a vast array of objects to the British Museum in the 1860s and 70s, from cuneiform tablets to Japanese netsuke.[337] They also used established British dealers to acquire objects of French interest such as S. J. Phillips, the popular silver and jewellery dealers, from whom they purchased a Napoleon-themed snuff-box.[338]

Despite Caroline Chapman's suggestion that collecting for the museum project ceased in early 1874, after Joséphine Bowes' death, John Bowes continued to travel and acquire objects accompanied by his second wife Alphonsine de Saint-Amand.[339] In 1874 they travelled to Italy together. Hardy claims that the purpose of the trip was to seek solace from the exhausting mission of the museum project, but

[335] Petra ten-Doesschate Chu, 'The Lu(c)re of London: French Artists and Art Dealers in the British Capital, 1859-1914' in Jennifer Hardin, ed., *Monet's London: Artists' Reflections on the Thames, 1859-1914*, (St. Petersburg, Florida: Museum of Fine Arts, 2005), 39-54.
[336] DCRO, D/Bo/E30, Bills from P. Albert to Joséphine Bowes, April/May 1870.
[337] DCRO, D/Bo/E30, Bills from W. Wareham to Bowes, 7 & 9 June 1870. For information on Wareham see Herbert Byng-Hall, *The Bric-à-Brac Hunter, or Chapters on Chinamania*, (London: Chatto & Windus, 1875), 286. Wareham is also mentioned in Mark Westgarth, 'A Biographical Dictionary of Nineteenth Century Antique and Curiosity Dealers', 180; See also Wareham's page on the British Museum Website: https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/term/BIOG129401?page=6
[338] DCRO, D/Bo/E30, Bill from S. J. Phillips to Joséphine Bowes, 15 May 1870.
[339] Caroline Chapman, *John & Joséphine*, 90.

that 'he could not resist two bargains that came his way.'[340] This suggests an informality in the way that the collection advanced in these years following Joséphine's death, and it is true that Bowes' second wife Alphonsine de Saint-Amand was also buying up furniture and decorative objects to furnish her new apartments in Paris. However, this also gave Bowes the opportunity to buy a number of things that accorded with his own taste for the curious and the antiquarian, such as Old Italian pictures and furniture attached to prominent ducal families. In 1874 in Venice Bowes bought a large walnut 'casapanca' – a bench with a hinged lid which opens to reveal a chest – from the dealer Consiglio Ricchetti, who also supplied objects to Wilhelm von Bode and the American collector Isabella Stewart Gardner (**figure 2.27**).[341] In 1875 Bowes travelled to Italy again, and it was during this trip that he first visited Florence and purchased from the dealer Tito Gagliardi. Gagliardi, as mentioned above, was a feature in Murray's *Handbooks* so certainly on the travellers' trail through Europe, and is mentioned in contemporary literature as the best curiosity dealer to be found in Florence.[342] He also is a dealer who supplied most of the top museums and collectors on the continents and counted amongst his clients John Charles Robinson on behalf of the South Kensington Museum, Wilhelm von Bode, the Comte de Nieuwerkerke, as well as the English poet Herbert Horne (1864-1916) and the scholar of Italian art Bernard Berenson (1865-1959).

Florence was already a well-established centre for the trading in early Italian works of art.[343] The dealer Stefano Bardini (1836-1922) perhaps best epitomises this, with his prolific (and irreputable) activity being the focus of numerous studies in recent times.[344] His legacy as a munificent art world figure was also established by the gift of a collection to the city of Florence: the Bardini Museum

[340] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 192.
[341] TBMA, JB/3/3/22, Bill from Consiglio Ricchetti to John Bowes, October 1874. The casapanca is possibly FW.159 in The Bowes Museum collection. For information on Consiglio Ricchetti see Anna Tüskés, 'Mercanti veneziani e Wilhelm von Bode', in Anna Tüskés, Áron Tóth, Miklós Székely, *Hungary in Context: Studies on Art and Architecture*, (Budapest: CentrArt, 2013), 145-163.
[342] Herbert Byng Hall, *Adventures of a Bric-a-Brac Hunter*, 175.
[343] Lynn Catterson, ed., *Florence, Berlin and Beyond: Late Nineteenth-Century Art Markets and their Social Networks*, (Leiden: Brill, 2020); Mark Westgarth, 'A Biographical Dictionary of Nineteenth Century Antique and Curiosity Dealers', 12.
[344] Lynn Catterson, 'Duped or Duplicitous?'; Annalea Tunesi, 'Stefano Bardini's Photographic Archive: A Visual Historical Document', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Leeds, (2014); Clive Wainwright, prepared for publication by Charlotte Gere, 'The Making of the South Kensington Museum IV', 63-78.

(**figure 2.28**). Bardini profited from the work done by Tito Gagliardi in bringing the market to the city, who by the early 1860s is already supplying objects to the South Kensington Museum through frequent trips to London and providing them privileged access to his stock.[345]

John Bowes appears to have informed Gagliardi about the museum project currently underway in England, and as such is afforded the treatment of an institutional client. In a long letter outlining the provenances of a number of Italian Renaissance pictures by Bronzino and Ghirlandaio, including endorsements from Italian experts such as Gaetano Milanesi (1813-1895), Gagliardi offered a special arrangement for John Bowes' purchases based on the fact he is buying for a museum:

> As for payment, as you have asked me to buy on behalf of a museum's account, I would have no difficulty in accepting a payment which would not have to be settled at once. I have made this arrangement several times with the Kensington Museum.[346]

The pieces that John Bowes bought, alongside the Italian pictures, were a departure from the small but voluminous objects that he and his late wife had spent a decade purchasing together. A bill from Gagliardi for 8130 francs includes an enormous walnut armoire from the ducal palace of Parma, a casapanca from the Casa Martelli in Florence, a quantity of maiolica and a sedan chair which bears the arms of Duke Ferdinand of Parma (1765-1802) (**figure 2.29**).[347] It seems appropriate that after over a decade of collecting together through semi-formal networks of dealers and associates, once on his own with the museum project John Bowes would turn to a more established dealer with standing in the museum world, as well as buy several large pieces which are more suited to the museum setting than the domestic setting. However, analysis of the entirety of the Bowes' activities collecting outside of France shows that they both adhered to established antique buying networks, emphasised through

[345] See the 16th century Cassone supplied to the South Kensington Museum in 1867 (58-1867); A note in the V&A archive reads 'Mr Gagliardi of Florence is here [London] on his usual annual visit, and has brought over a miscellaneous collection of works of Italian art for sale. As on previous occasions, Mr Gagliardi sent to me to make the first inspection and choice on behalf of the Museum.' see the online collection entry: http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O123708/cassone-unknown/. Catterson suggests Bardini learned his trade from Gagliardi in Lynn Catterson, 'Duped or Duplicitous?', 2.
[346] TBMA, JB/2/1/43/51, 'Description of large paintings by Bronzino at Mr Gagliardi's in Florence', 9 October 1875.
[347] TBMA, JB/5/14/7, Bill from Tito Gagliardi to John Bowes, 1875;

the popularisation of dealers' shop in travel guidebooks, as well as forged their own relationships with dealers who were particularly sympathetic to their own collecting practices.

The Bowes and Auctions

The direct relationship between the auction and the building of museum collections, particularly the South Kensington Museum and its associated regional outlets, has been explored by scholars such as Clive Wainwright, and the importance of auctions as the process of dispersal of collections is beginning to be recognised more generally.[348] As shown more recently by art historians such as Christopher Maxwell and Elizabeth Pergam, using auction sales as a starting point for the transaction of objects between collections is a fruitful avenue for research and one that is often overlooked.[349] Pergam shows through the study of John Charles Robinson's collection at auction that these events became the 'new model of museum-building,' and museum professionals needed to possess a knowledge of the contents of private collections and the monetary value of objects.[350] Maxwell has confirmed this, focussing exclusively on the dispersal of the Hamilton Palace collection through auctions at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, relaying how significant these events were for increasing the holdings of Britain's national museums.[351]

In mid-nineteenth century Paris, the role of the auction is arguably more central than in any other time and place.[352] This is because a centralised system was put in place, where most auctions took place

[348] Susan Pearce, *On Collecting*, 379-381; Clive Wainwright, prepared for publication by Charlotte Gere, 'The Making of the South Kensington Museum IV', 63-78; Mark Westgarth, *The Emergence of the Antique and Curiosity Dealer in Britain 1815-1850*, 134-141. There has been a PhD-length study on the dispersal of the Hamilton Palace collection at auction sales from the end of the nineteenth century, see Christopher Maxwell, 'The Dispersal of the Hamilton Palace Collection, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Glasgow, (2014).
[349] Christopher Maxwell, 'The Dispersal of the Hamilton Palace Collection'; Elizabeth Pergam, 'John Charles Robinson in 1868: A Victorian Curator's Collection on the Block', *Journal of Art Historiography*, vol. 18, (2018), 1-31.
[350] Elizabeth Pergam, 'John Charles Robinson in 1868', 19.
[351] Christopher Maxwell, '"Spurious Articles": The Purchases of the Department of Science and Art from the Hamilton Palace Sale of 1882', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 28, no. 1, (2016), 109-124.
[352] Nicholas Green, 'Circuits of Production, Circuits of Consumption', 32. See also Nicholas Green, 'Dealing in Temperaments: Economic Transformation of the Artistic Field in France During the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century, *Art History*, vol. 10, no. 1, (1987), 59-78.

under one roof in a display of spectacle and theatricality, and became a social destination, as well as a commercial one. This conforms to the view of writers such as Jean Baudrillard, Charles Smith and Mark Westgarth that the auction house acted as a space where collectors could make visible their status amongst their peers through their public purchases.[353] As such the Bowes as collectors would have had a close relationship with the auction houses of Paris. The main auction house, the Hôtel des Ventes opened in 1852 after a syndicate of auctioneers, called *commissaires-priseurs* in France, decided to combine the many small sales rooms across the city and concentrate them inside one building on the rue Drouot.[354] This meant that in Paris from the mid-nineteenth century the auction house acted as a microcosm for the entire artworld. Manuel Charpy describes the way the large building was divided up and organised, with the various levels reflecting social strata in the quality of objects bought and sold and the legitimacy and integrity of the dealers and vendors and the business transactions they conducted.[355] That meant that the 'Hôtel Drouot', as it is called, had a space for every form of social type, from elite or amateur collectors to scrap merchants.

In response to the recognised importance of the Hôtel Drouot as a centre of commercial, cultural and intellectual exchange, critical inquiry into auctions taking place there in the middle decades of the nineteenth century is now a burgeoning subject matter. Large macro studies of the economic structures of the Parisian art market using the auction house as a fulcrum have been published in recent years.[356] The auction house has also been explored as the centre of a pan-European circulation of art objects.[357] The wealth of primary source material that remains due to its centralised and systematised governance at this point, namely, the sale minutes (*Dossiers de Ventes*), are also

[353] Jean Baudrillard, trans. Charles Levin, *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, 106; Charles W. Smith, *Auctions: The social construction of value*, 51; Mark Westgarth, *The Emergence of the Antique and Curiosity Dealer in Britain 1815-1850*, 136.
[354] Lucy Hooper, 'The Hôtel Des Ventes, Paris', *The Art Journal*, vol. 3, (1877), 313-314; Lukas Fuchsgruber, 'The Hôtel Drouot as the Stock Exchange for Art', *Journal for Art Market Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, (2017), 35.
[355] Manuel Charpy, 'The Auction House and its Surroundings: The Trade in Antique and Second-Hand Items in Paris during the Nineteenth Century' in Bruno Blondé, Natacha Coquey, Jon Stobart and Ilja van Damme, eds., *Fashioning Old and New: Changing Consumer Patterns in Western Europe*, (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), 217-233.
[356] Léa Saint-Raymond, 'Revisiting Harrison and Cynthia White's Academic vs. Dealer-Critic System', *Arts*, vol. 8, no. 3, (2019), 1-17.
[357] Lukas Fuchsgruber, 'Berlin – Paris: Transnational Aspects of French Art Auctions in the Middle of the Nineteenth Century', in Jan Dirk Baetans and Dries Lyna, *Art Crossing Borders*, 193-219.

beginning to be analysed by scholars of anglophone collecting histories, revealing the networked aspect the art market that gave rise to such auctions, and how these were so significant to the collecting activities of collectors such as Richard Wallace, John Charles Robinson and the founder of a museum of Asian art, Clémence d'Ennery (1823-1898).[358] As such, examination of the sale minutes puts the Bowes into a form of dialogue with such collectors, and is a new aspect of their collecting.

It is not likely that the Bowes ever attended specific auction sales in order to bid, but they did attend the Hôtel Drouot for various reasons such as viewing art works, and as such would have shared this space with other collectors.[359] For Manuel Charpy, the auction house was a public site where collectors and amateurs could gather and perform the viewing and judging of artworks in a relatively safe way, without fear of being defrauded or expressing the wrong opinion, given that experts and auctioneers were on hand to offer advice.[360] Moreover, the auction house was also seen as a place in which bourgeois collectors could learn more about their particular area of interest, much like a museum.[361] This practice dovetails with the Bowes' own aspirations to build an authoritative and encyclopedic museum collection without themselves necessarily being experts, but by having access to spaces where knowledge and expertise could be drawn from. This assertion is strengthened by correspondence between John Bowes and William Hutt who, in 1872, asked Bowes to visit the Hôtel Drouot on his behalf to look at a series of paintings by Francois Boucher in order to ascertain: '1st whether you think them genuine Bouchets [sic] & good pictures 2nd whether they are, in the subjects, inoffensive to English fastidiousness…& 3rd whether in your opinion they are likely to be sold under £200'[362] It is notable that Hutt asks Bowes to go personally and offer an opinion on the taste, authenticity and value of an eighteenth century French painting. It is impossible to know if Bowes went alone or in the company of one of their dealers, but according to Charpy's description of the

[358] The minutes of sales provide significant archival support to Elizabeth Emery, *Reframing Japonisme: Women and the Asian Art Market in Nineteenth Century France, 1853-1914*, (London: Bloomsbury, 2020); Suzanne Higgott, *'The Most Fortunate Man of his Day'*; Elizabeth Pergam, 'John Charles Robinson in 1868'.
[359] DCRO, D/St/C5/294/10b, Letter from William Hutt to John Bowes, 25 January 1872.
[360] Manuel Charpy, 'The Auction House and its Surroundings', 223.
[361] Manuel Charpy, 'The Auction House and its Surroundings', 223.
[362] DCRO, D/St/C5/294/10b, Letter from William Hutt to John Bowes, 25 January 1872.

auction house at this time it is safe to assume that Bowes could have, and indeed may have wished to visit the Hôtel Drouot and display a form of public art knowledge and appreciation.

Besides being seen at the auction house, having taken part in specific auction sales acted as a marker of status within the Bowes' collecting. As noted by Susan Pearce whilst writing on auctions: 'it is clear that financial value is created as much by the importance of the collector… – with their attributes of depth, history and accumulated taste – as it is by the aesthetic qualities of the piece itself.'[363] For the Bowes the status of a piece within their collection is often reinforced through its provenance, often being described as purchased from a particular sale of a noted collector or collection.[364] For example a catalogue of paintings written by John Bowes frequently mentions important people or collections from which the pictures derived, along with biographical details about that person, including them as part of the objects' history.[365] Two early significant auction sales that appear in the documentation in The Bowes Museum as a provenance for objects are the sales of the interior of the Chateau du Bercy in 1860 and of the collection of the Russian Prince Peter Soltykoff (1804-1889) that took place in 1861.[366] Both provenances are referred to in later catalogues, and there is no extant bills that firmly link objects to either sale, but nonetheless the notes act as a form of valorisation of objects.

The reference to the sale at the Chateau du Bercy is in a manuscript catalogue which constituted a record of all museum objects being shipped from Paris to England in the mid-1870s.[367] A number of entries make references to objects supposedly from the chateau du Bercy, particularly two in John

[363] Susan Pearce, *On Collecting*, 379-380.
[364] TBMA, JB/6/6/1/1, Picture Catalogue, 1878.
[365] In one entry in the catalogue of paintings from 1878, no. 317, John Bowes described a portrait of the Duchesse de Berry and her children from the collection of the politician Pierre-Antoine Berryer (1790-1868) as belonging to 'Monsieur Berryer, the celebrated legitimist Statesman, & advocate, & was bought from his collection after his death'. TBMA, JB/6/6/1/1, Picture Catalogue, 1878.
[366] For the importance of the sale of the Chateau de Bercy interiors see John Harris, *Moving Rooms: The Trade in Architectural Salvages*, (London: Yale University Press, 2007), 65; Bruno Pons, *Grands Décors Français 1650-1800: Reconstitués en Angleterre, aux Etats-Unis, en Amérique du Sud et en France*, (Dijon, Editions Faton, 1995) 28-52.
[366] John Harris, *Moving Rooms*, 65.
[367] TBMA, JB/6/6/2, Volume of objects shipped to the museum, 1871-1880.

Bowes' own hand which describes in crate number 27: 'Louis XV locks with H and Fleurs de Lys…from the Chateau de Bercy, bought at the Nicolaï sale.'[368] Also listed in crate number 30, packet S is an 'Old lock bought at the sale of Mons[r] Nicolaï – beautiful engraving' (**figure 2.30**).[369] The sale at the Chateau du Bercy after the death of the Marquis of Nicolay has been described by architectural historian John Harris as a 'watershed', being 'the last surviving fully furnished château in the environs of Paris' before its contents were torn down and sold off and the building demolished.[370] The sale was a huge draw for the most prominent British and French collectors of the age: the *salon de compagnie* (the large drawing room used as an entertaining space) was purchased by Lord Hertford who then shipped it to Britain, Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild bought the library, the fountain was bought by the bibliophile Baron Jérôme Pichon, and many pieces of furniture were purchased on behalf of Napoleon III.[371] The annotated sale catalogue reveals the high prices paid by the oligarchy of collectors who could afford to buy the interior panelling and furniture *en masse*.[372] The catalogue does not reveal, however, the plethora of auxiliary objects that would have been bought up by lower tier dealers and collectors over the four-day sale. The Bowes would not have contested the elite collectors such as Hertford or Rothschild, or the Emperor of France, for the complete interiors of the chateau due to the relatively small amount which they typically spent at auction, but it follows that the Bowes would have desired to own a small remnant of this significant monument to French taste in order to signal their presence as collectors of import.

The object with the Soltykoff sale association in The Bowes Museum is a Byzantine brass crucifix that cannot currently be traced, but its inclusion in the archive is worthy of analysis due to the

[368] TBMA, JB/6/6/2, Volume of objects shipped to the museum, 1871-1880, no. 27.
[369] TBMA, JB/6/6/2, Volume of objects shipped to the museum, 1871-1880, no. 30. The description reads: 'ancienne serrure acheté à la vente de Mons[r] Nicolaï – belle gravure.' One of these is possibly M.221 in the museum's collection, which displays a very degraded label on which the word 'Bercy' is faintly discernible
[370] John Harris, *Moving Rooms*, 65.
[371] *Catalogue des Boiseries Sculptées, marbes, meubles anciens, tapisseries, tableaux, ornements, etc. du Chateau de Bercy*, 15-18 March 1860; See Tom Stammers, 'Collectors, Catholics and the Commune: Heritage and Counterrevolution 1860-1890', 81, fn.150.
[372] *Catalogue des Boiseries Sculptées, marbes, meubles anciens, tapisseries, tableaux, ornements, etc. du Chateau de Bercy*, 15-18 March 1860.

importance of the sale.[373] The sale of the collection of Prince Peter Soltykoff that took place in April of 1861 was a significant source of objects for many public museums at the time.[374] It was targeted by the South Kensington Museum particularly for its Medieval enamelled objects like the one in the Bowes'collection, of which J. C. Robinson remarked 'no *public* museum in Europe ever can compete,' and acquired together would fill a gap in the museum's collections.[375] The South Kensington Museum ended up spending over £7,000 on 26 objects, suggesting the high prices that objects reached as well as the lengths the museum went to secure them.[376] The reference to the Soltykoff sale appears next to an object contained in a list entitled 'Contents of cases transferred from Streatlam Castle to the Bowes Museum and unpacked subsequent to Nov. 4th 1884.'[377] This list is in the hand of The Bowes Museum's second curator Owen Stanley Scott, employed between 1884 and 1922, and under object numbered 631 is written:

> Cross, brass, the limbs terminating in cherub heads. (This has probably been enamelled, but no trace of enamel now remains; the figure also is wanting. Described "Magnifique croix Byzantine garnie de ses emaux d'épargne. Elle provient de la Vente Soltykoff) [*sic*].[378]

It is possible that the Bowes' dealers attended this sale to purchase objects for them – a bill dated 1861 from Jarry contains a 'Byzantine cross set with enamel' sold for 18 francs – however, the minutes of the sale held in the Archives de Paris do not reveal Jarry as a purchaser, indicating the cross came in as a later purchase.[379] The curator Christine E. Brennan has analysed the dispersal of

[373] TBMA, JB/6/5/2, List of 'Contents of cases transferred from Streatlam Castle to the Bowes Museum, and unpacked subsequent to Novr. 4th 1884'.
[374] For the South Kensington Museum and the Soltykoff sale see Julius Bryant, *Creating the V&A*, 94-101; Clive Wainwright and Charlotte Gere, 'The Making of the South Kensington Museum IV: Relationships with the trade: Webb and Bardini', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 14, no. 1, (2002), 64-68. For the British Museum and the Soltykoff sale see Eloise Donnelly, ''A Desire for the National Good': Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks and the Curatorship of Renaissance Decorative Art in Britain, 1840-1900', *Journal of Art Historiography*, vol. 18, (2018), 5-6.
[375] 'J. C. Robinson's report on the Soltikoff Collection, 25 March 1861'. Quoted in Clive Wainwright and Charlotte Gere, 'The Making of the South Kensington Museum IV', 66.
[376] Julius Bryant, *Creating the V&A*, 95
[377] TBMA, JB/6/5/2, List of 'Contents of cases transferred from Streatlam Castle to the Bowes Museum, and unpacked subsequent to Novr. 4th 1884'.
[378] TBMA, JB/6/5/2, List of 'Contents of cases transferred from Streatlam Castle to the Bowes Museum, and unpacked subsequent to Novr. 4th 1884'. The description translates as 'Magnificent Byzantine cross, adorned with enamels. Provenance of the Soltykoff sale.'
[379] Archives de Paris, D.48E3 53, Dossiers de Vente, Charles Pillet, 1862.

this collection and its enduring presence within museum collections to the present day.[380] Brennan has described how 'the continuous growth in the significance of a Soltykoff provenance would influence how collectors, dealers, and museum officials viewed works from the moment they were identified with the prince into the twenty-first century'.[381] This indicates that objects associated with Soltykoff were desirable from the moment of the sale, and as such they reappeared at sales very rapidly prior to the sale in 1861, and often with a note describing their provenance, demonstrating the level of prestige around the collection.[382] This is possibly how the Bowes acquired the cross, but further to that it is clear why the provenance of such objects collected by the Bowes is a key component of its interest.

Antique Dealers and Auctions

The conduit between the Bowes and auction sales was their antique dealers, and without these intermediaries and their knowledge and understanding of the networks of French auctions, the Bowes' collection could not take the form it did. This is broadly indicative of the increasing recognition of the agency of antique dealers in the nineteenth century in forming private and public collections.[383] Dealers' activity at auction was central to this process, as evinced through so many primary source materials such as annotated sales catalogues, minutes of sales, museum documentation and press reports, yet their importance is yet to be recognised through sustained secondary study.[384] In the case of the Bowes, the actual bidding and purchasing of objects at auction sales was carried out by their dealers, as testified by the receipts held in the Museum archive which are addressed to the antique dealers. [385] The dealers then collected payment from the Bowes and took a commission of 5%.[386]

---

[380] Christine E. Brennan, 'Provenance in Nineteenth Century Paris and Beyond', 141-160
[381] Christine E. Brennan, 'Provenance in Nineteenth Century Paris and Beyond', 143.
[382] See for example the sale of M. Jacob which contains a number of lots described as from the Solykoff sale: *Catalogue d'une belle et nombreuse réunion d'objet d'art... par suite du décès de M. Jacob*, 12-13 March 1862, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 26629).
[383] Tom Stammers, *The Purchase of the Past*; Mark Westgarth, 'A Biographical Dictionary of Nineteenth Century Antique and Curiosity Dealers'.
[384] Mark Westgarth, *The Emergence of the Antique and Curiosity Dealer in Britain 1815-1850*, 136-137.
[385] See for example, TBMA, JB/5/11/3/79, Bordereau d'Adjudication addressed to Lepautre, 7 December 1867.
[386] Each bill usually has a note on the back in John Bowes' hand with the amount paid and the date it was settled, as appears on the verso of TBMA, JB/5/11/3/79, Bordereau d'Adjudication addressed to Lepautre, 7 December 1867.

Furthermore, as established tradespeople the Bowes' dealers were in the best position to recognise which sales were going to provide them with the type and quality of object they wanted for the best price. This is in opposition to Charles Hardy, who suggests that the Bowes' dealers were often directed by the Bowes to attend specific sales, as he notes the Bowes were subscribers to the *Moniteur des Ventes*, the regularly published source of information about French auction sales.[387] However, the level of the Bowes' authority in this matter is questioned through closer examination of the archive, suggesting the dealers had more agency than previously ascribed. A significant collection of sales catalogues is preserved in the Museum, which reveals a potentially more bilateral relationship evinced by the many catalogues that have obviously been sent by the dealers as prospective sales that match with the Bowes' taste and budget.[388] For example, Lamer regularly visited regional sales from which he sourced an array of furniture, old masters and other antiques and beforehand would send a catalogue to the Bowes for consideration. In 1865 he wrote to the Bowes about the sale of the Marquis de Villette at the Chateau de Villete in Condécourt: 'I will send you the catalogue and the description of a variety of paintings and you could tell me which ones you'd like.'[389] This suggests that Lamer had targeted this specific sale and selected certain pictures that he believed would satisfy the Bowes' taste and be obtainable for them. Many of his letters to the Bowes discuss his trawls through the regions and the vast number of objects he has been able to procure, as well as the many dealers and transporters he employed to get objects back to Paris for consideration, demonstrating his established trade networks and practices from which the Bowes benefit.[390]

Archival material can concretely link the dealers A.C. Lamer and Mme. Lepautre to specific sales, also presented in Appendix I, and build up a picture of the more routine and strategic methods they used to acquire objects for the Bowes. The auction house receipts which exist in the archive number

[387] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 154.
[388] These are held under reference JB 5/2/1-118. There are two catalogues dating from 1837 which are likely from John Bowes' earlier period of collecting and thus outside the scope of this thesis.
[389] TBMA, JB/5/10/10/3, Letter from Lamer to the Bowes, 1865. The catalogues for the sale are still in the museum archive TBMA, JB/5/2/18-19.
[390] In 1866 Lamer goes to Dreux to the sale of the town's former Mayor Louis Lamésange and he sends objects back through a dealer named Falet based in Choisy-le-Roi, TBMA, JB/5/10/4/45, Bill from Falet to the Bowes, November 1866.

to around 100, and for the most part they are from the sales of unknown or relatively minor collectors, contemporary artists or cultural figures.[391] When more significant collections or collectors appear, it is often the case that the Lamer and Lepautre purchased the lower value items. For example, Lamer and Lepautre attended the sales of known collectors Alexander Petrovitch Basilewski (1829-1899) and Laurent Laperlier (1805-1878), and focussed on buying the objects which would be less desirable to prospective collectors, for not having the association of being the 'speciality' objects in their respective collections.[392] In March 1868 Lepautre bought a number of modern French paintings from the sale of the Russian diplomat Basilewski who was famed for his collection of Medieval decorative arts, as shown in a watercolour by Vasily Vereshchagin (1842-1904) where Basilewski sits surrounded by Medieval enamelled caskets, Italian maiolica and painted panels of religious subjects (**figure 2.31**).[393] In a small sale of Basilewski's paintings, featuring no works that he might be typically associated with, Lepautre purchased two canvases by Adolphe-Félix Cals (1810-1880) 'Peasant woman and child' (1846) and 'A cook plucking a wild duck' (1854), and a work by Philibert Léon Couturier (1823-1901) of a poultry yard scene for 298 francs (**figure 2.32**).[394] It is not untypical that the dealers would attend the sale of a prolific collector of such as Basilewski, known for his objects from the Renaissance and Middle Ages, and buy modern French pictures. According to the French art historian Louis Courajod (1841-1896), collections such as Basilewski's were 'better conceived, better presented and better catalogued than those of public museums, and their contents were indispensable for the pursuit of art history.' [395] Even though the Bowes were not purchasing objects from the collectors' field of speciality, there is no doubt the collector's reputation for taste and expertise would have been associated across the spectrum of objects owned by them, and therefore made them desirable.

[391] Most auction receipts are held in the files relating to Lamer and Lepautre, TBMA, JB/5/10-11.
[392] TBMA, JB/5/10/5/34, Letter and bill from Lamer to Joséphine Bowes, 16 April 1867; TBMA, JB/5/11/4/26, Bordereau d'Adjudication addressed to Lepautre, 4 March 1868.
[393] TBMA, JB/5/11/4/26, Bordereau d'Adjudication addressed to Lepautre, 4 March 1868.
[394] TBMA, JB/5/11/4/26, Bordereau d'Adjudication addressed to Lepautre, 4 March 1868. *Collection de M. de B***, Catalogue des Tableaux Anciens & Moderne*, 4 March 1868, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 30286); Archives de Paris, D.48E^{3} 53, Dossiers de Vente, Charles Pillet, 1868. The minutes of the sale confirm these lots were purchased at the sale by Lepautre.
[395] Louis Courajod, 'Bibliographie – Collection Basilwesky', *Revue archéologique*, 31 (1876), 373; the quotation derives from Tom Stammers who is paraphrasing Coujaroud, in Tom Stammers, *The Purchase of the Past*, 219.

In 1867 Lamer attended the sale of the collector Laurent Laperlier (1805-1878), who was well-known for his collection of eighteenth century French paintings – particularly that of Jean Siméon Chardin (1699-1779) and on this strength the sale attracted buyers such as Richard Wallace, Edouard André and officials representing the Louvre, all bolstering their own collections.[396] However, Lamer was not seeking French masters, but instead wrote to Joséphine Bowes indicating that he had gone specifically to target the porcelain.[397] Indeed the minutes of the sale and the sale catalogue show that Lamer purchased a Lorraine faïence Jardinière and a quantity of other faïence and porcelain pieces, some of which did not appear in the sale catalogue but are confirmed by the minutes of the sale and are deducible though the invoice from Lamer (**figure 2.33**).[398]

There are exceptional instances in the 1860s and 1870s where Lamer and Lepautre attended the sales of high-profile collectors and acquired objects, due to the opportunities presented by a particular collection appearing on the market, or, as in the 1870s, the opportunities provided by huge social factors such as the Franco-Prussian War. These sales also show how the Bowes' dealers acted as autonomous agents outside of the patronage of the Bowes, which has defined their activities so far. One of the significant sales that Lamer attends for the Bowes in the 1860s is that of the collector of

[396] See Marie-Martine Debreuil, 'The Taste for Eighteenth-century Painting and the Art Market Between 1830 and 1860 as Regards the La Caze Collection', in Guillaume Faroult, Monica Preti and Christopher Vogtherr, eds., *Delicious Decadence – The Rediscovery of French Eighteenth Century Painting in the Nineteenth Century*, (London: Routledge, 2016), 26-27. For Sir Richard Wallace's purchases here see John Ingamells, *The Wallace Collection Catalogue of Pictures III, French before 1815*, (London: The Westerham Press, 1989), 314-15: Pierre-Paul Prud'hon, *Puppies*, (1790s, P264). See also Appendix III 'French pictures before 1815 formerly in the Hertford-Wallace collections' which lists 2 paintings bought by Wallace at this sale, no. 43 Chardin, P.-J. *Attributs des arts avec une tête de Mercure en plâtre* (lot 28) and no. 29 Boucher. *La cible des amours* (lot 5), 385.

[397] TBMA, JB/5/10/5/34, Letter and bill from Lamer to Joséphine Bowes, 16 April 1867.

[398] *Collection de M. Laperlier: Tableaux & Dessins de l'école française du XVIIIe siècle et de l'école moderne, miniatures, terres cuites par Clodion et Marin, objets divers*, 11 April 1867, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 29701): lot 303: 'Jardinière de forme cintrée en faïence de Lorraine, décorée d'oiseaux en couleurs et rehauts d'or', part of lot 305: 'Quantité de figurines en porcelaine, en biscuit et en faïence, qui seront vendues par lots'; part of lot 306: 'Quantité de tasses, théières, bols, assiettes, etc., en porcelaines diverses, qui seront vendus par lots' Archives de Paris, D.48E^3 53, Dossiers de Vente, Charles Pillet, 1867. The minutes also show the Bowes' dealer Charles Basset is present at this sale buying modern French paintings, pastels, drawings and miniatures (see Appendix I).

Renaissance works of art Aristide le Carpentier in 1866.[399] Carpentier was described in the *Journal of the Society of Arts* as a collector whose 'antiquarian wealth approaches that of M. Sauvegeot, whose collection is now in the museum of the Louvre.'[400] A press report from 1865 shows that this significant collection was kept at 248 Rue de Faubourg, St. Honoré, and was open to visitors by application and was obviously known and visited by many serious collectors.[401] One anecdote recounts: 'You enter by a sculptured door, the bronze knocker of which is wrought with such rare skill that Baron Rothschild offered M. le Carpentier eighty pounds for it, which the latter refused,' giving a sense of the distinguished visitors and collectors that made the journey to his collection.[402] The twenty-day-long sale took place at the Hôtel Drouot between 14 May and 2 June 1866 and was attended by the most important collectors and institutions of the time, as the minutes of the sale show dealers such as Charles Mannheim and Joyeau, as well as collectors such as Basilewski, William Chaffers and Jean-Marie Allègre (1793-1869) purchasing lots.[403] The sale was viewed particularly significant by the South Kensington Museum who sent John Charles Robinson out to Paris to view the collection:

> I have to report that I have inspected the collection of objects of art forming the le Carpentier collection about to be sold in Paris on the 14 May & following days and that I have noted a certain number of objects which I think it would be very desirable to acquire: they consist chiefly of wood carvings on a small scale, a series of Russian crosses in carved wood mounted in enamelled metal (from the Soltikoff collection), a carved rétable overalter [sic] piece (fr the Soltikoff collection), a carved walnut wood chest or Cabinet (period Louis 14) & two richly decorated mandolines of the 16th century. I have estimated the value of these objects altogether at about £500 but probably £400 would purchase as many of them as would be sold within the limits of price I place on each specimen. I have made a provisional arrangement with Mr Rutter to attend the sale and buy for us, and I recommend that he be authorised to expend £400 to the best of his judgement in purchasing the lots hereafter noted at or about the indicated prices.
> This is likely to be the last important sale of this season in Paris, and considering the war panic which prevails at present in France, it is not improbable that the objects we require may

[399] TBMA, JB/5/10/4/17-18, Letters from Lamer to the Bowes, May-June 1866. The sale catalogue is also in the archive, TBMA, JB/5/2/28, *Catalogue des Objets d'Art et de Curiosite, Tableaux Anciens, composant la collection de feu M. le Carpentier,* 14 May-2 June 1866, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 29135)
[400] Anon., 'Fine Arts', *Journal of the Society of Art*, November 25, 1864, 33.
[401] Anon., 'France (From the Correspondent of the Star)', *Cork Examiner*, June 13, 1865, 2.
[402] Anon., 'France (From the Correspondent of the Star)', *Cork Examiner*, June 13, 1865, 2.
[403] Archives de Paris, D.48E^{3} 53, Dossiers de Vente, Charles Pillet, 1866.

> be obtained at considerably lower rates than I have assumed, and they are all desirable as being in sections in which the museum is deficient.[404]

From this lengthy description it is understood that the museum wanted the small-scale wood carvings and works with a strong provenance, such as those from the Soltykoff collection. Similarly to the way in which the Bowes had Lamer acting for them at the sale, Robinson had arranged for the Paris-based dealer Edward Rutter to bid on behalf of the museum.[405] Rutter was a regular bidding agent for the South Kensington Museum throughout the 1860s, and also helped other private collectors purchase French decorative arts such as William Ward the 1st Earl of Dudley (1817-1885) the noted collector of Old Master paintings and Sèvres porcelain, reinforcing the museum's dependence on experienced and knowledgeable dealers, and how the dealer serviced both the public and the private collector.[406] However, the purchases for the South Kensington Museum did not go entirely to plan (**figure 2.34**). According to Robinson, writing to the museum after the sale: 'the objects in general have realised considerably higher prices than I anticipated.'[407] As Robinson predicted, the sale proved to be important and attracted some of the most high-profile collectors of the age. The museum was unsuccessful in acquiring lot 37, the boxwood statuette of Hercules that was bought by the Comte de Nieuwerkerke and ended up in the collection of Sir Richard Wallace (**figure 2.35**) demonstrating the incompatible motives of the collector and the museum, and how the private collector often has more wealth than the institution and in this way can diminish its holdings.[408] It is also possible to see where the institution's presence at such sales influenced future purchases for the Bowes and their dealers. For instance, lot 688, the Hurdy-gurdy with arms of Henri II and Catherine de Medici, which they secured for £123, may have prompted the later purchase by Lamer of a clock case with the arms of Henri II and Catherine de Medici that he offered to the Bowes in November of the same year (**figure 2.36**). Significantly Lamer offered this object as a 'museum piece', perhaps qualified by observing the

[404] V&A Archive, MA/3/20, Report on the Lecarpentier collection and list of lots recommended for purchase, Copy of minute 27 June 1866.
[405] V&A Archive, MA/3/20, Report on the Lecarpentier collection and list of lots recommended for purchase, Copy of minute 27 June 1866.
[406] See Rutter's entry in Mark Westgarth, 'A Biographical Dictionary of Nineteenth Century Antique and Curiosity Dealers', 160-161.
[407] V&A Archive, MA/3/19, List of objects purchased at le Carpentier sale, 7 June 1866.
[408] S273 in the Wallace Collection

hurdy gurdy enter a significant national museum collection a few months previously.[409] This suggests these sales also had broader implications on the Bowes' collecting beyond what they could obtain at a particular sale: in setting values and imbuing museum status on objects, the Bowes' dealers actively shaped the Bowes collection through their attendance at auctions.[410]

It is possible that Lamer as a dealer also felt this sale was a significant one amid the 'war panic' that Robinson described, as he appears to have invested his own money in this sale as well as acting as an agent for the Bowes, afterwards presenting to them a list of thirty-one lots for which he had paid 753 francs.[411] Not all of these met the Bowes' approval as they ended up purchasing a selection of much less than half for 270 francs on 2 June 1866.[412] Lamer had also passed on a list of sixteen lots purchased by his partner Marie Constance Roposte, offered to the Bowes at a price of 720 francs, but here they only purchased three for a sum of 90 francs.[413] The selection of pieces bought ended up including a gilt wood ceremonial staff dated 1770, a small jasper and silver ewer incrusted with coral, an agate chest, a box made of aventurine, four powder horns, an amber flask, a curious gothic abbesses buckle and a German earthenware pot (**figure 2.37**).[414] However the high prices reached here was a symptom of the high calibre buyers in the auction room, evident by the collections in which many of the objects remain in today, and therefore represented a valuable investment for Lamer beyond his work for the Bowes.

Lamer and Lepautre's purchases for the Bowes at auction took a hiatus in 1870 as the Franco-Prussian war upended the country and the Bowes took refuge in Britain. There is little correspondence from the

[409] TBMA, JB/5/10/4/33, Invoice from Lamer to the Bowes, 12 November 1866.
[410] For a later case study that helps evidence the relationship between museums and dealers, collectors, auctions and provenance see Abigail Harrison Moore, *Fraud, Fakery and False Business: Rethinking the Shrager Versus Dighton 'Old Furniture Case'*, (London: Continuum, 2011).
[411] TBMA, JB/5/10/4/18, Invoice from Lamer to the Bowes, June 1866; V&A Archive, MA/3/20, Report on the Lecarpentier collection and list of lots recommended for purchase, Copy of minute 27 June 1866.
[412] TBMA, JB/5/10/4/18, Invoice from Lamer to the Bowes, June 1866. Each object selected is marked with an 'x'.
[413] TBMA, JB/5/10/4/17, Letter from Lamer to Joséphine Bowes, May 1866. Each object selected is marked with an 'x'.
[414] See TBMA, JB/5/10/4/17-18 for the complete list of objects bought by Lamer and Constance Roposte and offered to the Bowes.

dealers in Paris throughout the conflict due to severed lines of communication, but the number of auctions taking place in 1871, reduced to about a quarter of that in 1869, illustrates the decimation of the art market in Paris at this point.[415] However as noted by a number of writers on the art market, war and conflict provides a catalyst for the circulation of objects across borders and nations, and therefore many more collections became available as a consequence.[416] The ramifications of the Franco-Prussian War and the Paris Commune on the art market has most recently been explored by Tom Stammers, who presents a comprehensive landscape of the numerous auctions taking place in London in 1870-71 due to the catastrophic effects of warfare on French dealers and collectors.[417] The aftermath of the Franco-Prussian War was also a prosperous time for the art dealers in France, as Durand-Ruel wrote in his memoirs in 1872 he 'feverishly began to seek out new wonders that war-time losses suffered by various collectors would make it relatively easy to find.'[418] Things soon picked up for Lamer and Lepautre as well, as the Bowes arrived back in Paris in October 1871 and settled into a steady routine of museum acquisition once again. Contrary to Hardy's claim that only 'a few things were bought during 1872 from both Lamer and Mme Lepautre,' the appendix shows 1872 as a key year for auction purchases, with the dealers buying objects for the Bowes from at least 15 separate sales and, in contrast to their usual collecting practices, acquiring numerous objects for high prices, suggesting that they fully capitalised on the influx of objects on to the market.[419] This period of expensive purchases was aided by the high prices for coal caused by the 'coal-famine', which itself was partly caused by the conflict in Europe, but meant that John Bowes was receiving significant revenue from his collieries in the early 1870s.[420] In January 1872, Lepautre purchased a rock crystal

[415] Sourced from a search on Art Sales Catalogues Online which shows the number of auctions in Paris for 1869, 1870 and 1871 as 417, 304 and 96 respectively. https://primarysources-brillonline-com.ezproxy.inha.fr:2443/browse/art-sales-catalogues-online accessed 25 March 2020.
[416] Guido Guerzoni, 'The British Painting Market, 1789-1914' in Michael North, ed., *Economic History and the Arts*, (Cologne: Bohlau 1996), 115-16; Francis Haskell, *Rediscoveries in Art*, 26.
[417] Tom Stammers, 'Salvage and Speculation: Collecting on the London Art Market After the Franco-Prussian War (1870-71)', in Kate Hill, ed., *Museums, Modernity and Conflict: Museums and Collections in and of War since the Nineteenth Century*, (London: Routledge, 2020), 15-38.
[418] Paul Durand-Ruel, Paul-Louis Durand-Ruel, Flavie Durand-Ruel, eds., Deke Dusinberre, trans., *Memoirs of the First Impressionist Art Dealer (1831-1922)*, (Paris: Flammarion, 2014), 83.
[419] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 183.
[420] Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, (Barnard Castle: W.R. Atkinson, 1893), 3. See also C. E. Mountford, 'The History of John Bowes & Partners up to 1914', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Durham University, (1967).

and gilt bronze clock for 1300 francs, sold at the sale of the radical journalist Henri de Rochefort (1830-1913), which took place in anticipation of his deportation due to vigorous support for the commune (**figure 2.38**).[421] In December 1871 she also purchased on behalf of the Bowes some marble urns for 620 francs from the sale of the Teresa, Marquise de Boissy, formerly Countess of Guiccioli (1800-1873), who fled France due to the conflict and whose estate at Louveciennes was occupied by the Prussians whilst they sieged Paris.[422] The minutes of the sale show many of Paris' foremost dealers, such as Charles Mannheim and Alfred Beurdeley, paying high prices for her objects and furniture suggesting it was an important sale for the revival of the trade after the war.[423] Lepautre also takes advantage of this sale to buy objects which she did not offer to the Bowes, suggesting she also used this sale to augment her business.[424] Both of these sales display how the Bowes' collection profited from the upset caused by the Franco-Prussian War in its immediate aftermath, and how Lamer and Lepautre were integral to this process through facilitating the purchase of objects. However, this time was also key for the dealers themselves, who needed to revive a war-torn trade.

The aftermath of the war also marked the end of the Second Empire, and perhaps the most well-known sales that took place after the Paris Commune were that of the Emperor Napoleon III and Empress Eugenie's possessions, which were held periodically over the subsequent years, and offered an unprecedented opportunity for collectors to acquire objects of significant value and quality.[425] The museum-founder Merton Russell-Cotes (1835-1921) was one collector who profited from these sales. Russell-Cotes' 1921 autobiography *Home and Abroad: An autobiography of an octogenarian* recounts buying a vernis-martin cabinet belonging to Empress Eugenie from a John Anderson (1817-

[421] This was acquired by Lepautre from the dealer Laurent in the Palais-Royale. Rochefort's sale catalogue was anonymised but identified by Fritz Lugt; *Catalogue d'objets d'art, miniatures, fixés, gouaches*, 11 January 1872, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 32829), lot 57.
[422] See the letter written in February 1871 by Teresa Guiccioli from the safety of the Villa Boissy in Italy published in Willis W. Pratt, 'Twenty Letters of the Countess Guiccioli Chiefly Relative to Lord Byron', *The University of Texas Studies in English*, vol. 30, (1951), 151-152. See also *Catalogue d'objets d'art et de curiosité... le tout appartenant à Mme de X****, 11 December 1871, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 32762), the marble urns are possibly part of lot 55. Archives de Paris, D.48E^3 53, Dossiers de Vente, Charles Pillet, 1870.
[423] Archives de Paris, D.48E^3 53, Dossiers de Vente, Charles Pillet, 1870.
[424] Archives de Paris, D.48E^3 53, Dossiers de Vente, Charles Pillet, 1870.
[425] For the consequences of the war on the Imperial regime's possessions see Catherine Granger, *L'Empereur et les arts. La Liste Civile de Napoléon III* (Paris: École des Chartes, 2005), 369-392.

1892) of Glasgow (**figure 2.39**).[426] Anderson – probably the same John Anderson who owned The Royal Polytechnic Warehouse, one of Glasgow's first department stores – purportedly bought 'about £30,000 worth of art property, furniture, and effects at the sale in the Palais Royale after the Commune.'[427] Though there is no evidence that the Bowes purchased anything directly from the sales of the Emperor and Empress, the Bowes and their dealers again worked together to gain from the displacement of collectors who had been close to them. In April 1872, Lepautre and Lamer attended the sale of the *aide-de-camp* of Napoleon III, Louis-Joseph Napoléon Lepic (1810-1875).[428] Lepic was the comptroller of the Imperial palaces and responsible for the furnishing of many of the Emperor and Empresses' interiors, and has been described by Harvey Buchanan as a collector and a man 'of taste as well as tact'.[429] As a collector and an individual so closely involved in the decoration of the Imperial palaces, it follows that the Bowes would desire to own pieces from his own personal collection as a key component of ruling class taste.[430] At the sale Lamer purchased a number of lots totalling over 1000 francs, of which only one was sold to the Bowes – a Rouen ware jug dated 1777, suggesting he was acting on his own interests rather than as an agent for the Bowes (**figure 2.40**).[431] Lepautre purchased a few lots for herself, as well as a variety of decorative arts and paintings on behalf of the Bowes.[432] The objects bought for the Bowes show they were more interested in the prestige that came with these objects once being close to the French Imperial collection, rather than focussing on enhancing a particular area of their collection.[433] To reinforce this there are written reminders by John Bowes against most of the objects purchased at the Lepic sale, such as a large iron

[426] Merton Russell-Cotes, *Home and Abroad: An autobiography of an octogenarian*, (Bournemouth, 1921), 41
[427] Merton Russell-Cotes, *Home and Abroad*, 41.
[428] TBMA, JB/5/11/8/36-37, Bordereau d'Adjudication addressed to Lepautre, 23-24 April 1872.
[429] Harvey Buchanan, 'Edgar Degas and Ludovic Lepic: An Impressionist Friendship', *Cleveland Studies in the History of Art*, vol. 2, (1997), 35.
[430] For the relationship between taste and class see Pierre Bourdieu, trans. Richard Nice, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984).
[431] The annotated sale catalogue held in the Hôtel Drouot Archive shows Lamer bought lots 25, 51, 139, 146, 147, 148, 158, 176 and 192. Lot 176 corresponds to X.1346 in The Bowes Museum collection, though no bill has yet been found that matches it. *Catalogue des Objets d'Art, Petit secrétaire de dame, époque Louis XVI; Beau meuble du XVI^e^ siècle en bois sculpté; Bureau Louis XV et commodes Louis XVI en lacque de Coromandel… De la Collection de M. le Comte L*****, 23-24 April 1872, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 33129).
[432] The annotated sale catalogue held in the Hôtel Drouot Archive shows Lamer bought lots 188, 189 & 190. *Catalogue des Objets d'Art, Petit secrétaire de dame, époque Louis XVI; Beau meuble du XVI^e^ siècle en bois sculpté; Bureau Louis XV et commodes Louis XVI en lacque de Coromandel… De la Collection de M. le Comte L*****, 23-24 April 1872, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 33129).
[433] TBMA, JB/5/11/8/36-37, Bordereau d'Adjudication addressed to Lepautre, 23-24 April 1872.

coffer, which in the volume of objects shipped from France, reads: 'The coffer comes from the sale of Comte Lepic, Governor of all the Palaces at the time of the Emperor Napoleon III. And who resided in the Louvre where this coffer was' (**figure 2.41**).[434] Bowes here seems keen to situate this particular object inside the royal palace whose symbolic power had just been dismantled. Similarly, a large family portrait by the Flemish painter Anselm van Hulle (1601-1674/94) was entered by John Bowes' into the paintings catalogue with the remark: 'This picture was bought at the Sale of the Comte Lepic after the German War, & French Revolution in 1871,' stressing the circumstances which brought the picture onto the market (**figure 2.42**).[435] The impulse to mark out objects as coming from this particular sale, as well as the location in which the objects were once kept, must single it out as particularly important in the Bowes' collecting. Even the smaller objects purchased reflect this interest: a Bohemian glass hunting flask ornamented with fleur-de-lis, and a Sèvres biscuit figure of Marie-Thérèse of France as an infant, sitting on a fleur-de-lis cushion, and which is annotated in one surviving auction catalogue with the word 'Trianon', after the royal palace on the Versailles estate from which it was suggested to come (**figure 2.43**).[436]

Most notably for the Bowes, they purchased through Lepautre the second lot of the sale, a Louis XV bureau in old Coromandel lacquer, decorated with equestrian and hunting scenes, for a costly 3550 francs (**figure 2.44**).[437] Given the prior analysis of auction purchases by the Bowes' dealers up to now it is apparent they do not normally contest the premium lots at sale and instead go for lower priced

[434] TBMA, JB/6/6/2, Volume of objects shipped to the museum, 1871-1880, no. 24. 'Ce coffre provient de la vente du Comte Lepic Gouverneur de tous le Palais du temps de l'Empereur Napoléon 3. Et qui résidait au Louvre où était ce coffret.' This was lot no. 123: 'Grand coffre en fer orné de fleur de lis; XV siècle' (Large iron chest ornamented with fleur-de-lis, 15th century) and is possibly X.545 extant in the museum collection.
[435] Catalogue no. 320, TBMA, JB/6/6/1/1, Picture Catalogue, 1878
[436] Lot no. 174: 'Biscuit de Sèvres. - Marie-Thérèse-Charlotte de France, enfant (duchesse d'Angoulême). Elle est assise sur des coussins fleurdelisés, tenant son pied d'une main et ayant une tige de lis dans l'autre main.' (Marie-Thérèse-Charlotte of France, child (Duchess of Angoulême). She sits on fleur-de-lis cushions, holding her foot with one hand and having a stem of lily in the other hand). The annotated catalogue is in the Bibliotheque National de France and has been digitised, available on Gallica.bnf.fr.
[437] Described in *Catalogue des Objets d'Art, Petit secrétaire de dame, époque Louis XVI; Beau meuble du XVIe siècle en bois sculpté; Bureau Louis XV et commodes Louis XVI en lacque de Coromandel… De la Collection de M. le Comte L*****, 23-24 April 1872, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 33129). The full description of lot no. 2 'Très-beau bureau Louis XV, à quatre faces en vieux laque de Coromandel décoré de cavaliers et d'épisodes de chasse. Il est richement garni de chutes et d'ornements rocaille en bronze doré et cuivre repoussé. Intérieur à tiroirs laqués rouge avec cavaliers et animaux.'

objects, but this purchase reinforces the 1870s as a crucial moment in which the Bowes are consolidating their collection around significant objects. In the notebook of objects transported from Paris to the Museum in John Bowes' hand, the bureau is described as: 'Very fine bureau in Chinese lacquer formerly in the apartments of Madame de Maintenon, and in Trianon. Purchased at the sale of Comte Lepic in April 1872. The former Empress intended to place it in the Chinese Museum at Fontainbleau'.[438] As such, the archive reveals a purported provenance for this piece which may have made it particularly important and desirable for the Bowes and their museum project. The Bowes were clearly drawn to objects with have an association with the Empress Eugénie's *Musée Chinois* (Chinese Museum) at Fontainebleau, which was a project initiated after the Franco-British expedition to sack the Summer Palace in Beijing during the second Opium War of 1860.[439] These objects have a dual aspect to their desirability to the Bowes, as objects owned by the Imperial powers of France they have associations with aristocratic distinction, yet as part of a semi-formal public display they have broader cultural meanings as artefacts of French history. In 1860, after the palace was relentlessly plundered, the objects were sent back to France and Britain to be distributed, displayed or sold, with the French army offering their share to the Empress for first refusal.[440] The Empress Eugénie's' acquisitions went on view to the public at the Tuileries before being permanently rehoused at the Imperial palace at Fontainebleau, in what Alison McQueen describes as a 'private and semi-public space in which economic, military and political power were exhibited, codified and reinforced through cultural objects.'[441] After the Prussian army sacked many of Napoleon III's palaces during the conflict the Chinese Museum was closed down, and many of the objects re-entered the market

[438] TBMA, JB/6/6/2, Volume of objects shipped to the museum, 1871-1880, no. 28: 'Bureau très beau en laque de Chine autrefois dans les appartements de Mme de Maintenon, et à Trianon. Acheté à la vente du Comte Lepic en avril 1872. L'ex Impériatrice avait l'intention de le placer dans le Musée Chinois à Fontainebleau.'
[439] Greg M. Thomas, 'The Looting of the Yuanming and the Translation of Chinese Art in Europe', *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide*, vol. 7, no. 2, (2008), 23-55; Louise Tythacott, ed., *Collecting and Displaying China's "Summer Palace" in the West: The Yuanmingyuan in Britain and France*, (London: Routledge, 2018). For the wider taste for Asian art in Paris see Ting Chang, *Travel, Collecting, and Museums of Asian Art in Nineteenth-Century Paris*, (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013).
[440] Greg M. Thomas, 'The Looting of the Yuanming and the Translation of Chinese Art in Europe', 35-35.
[441] Alison McQueen, *Empress Eugénie and the Arts: Politics and Visual Culture in the Nineteenth Century*, (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 235.

through the auction sales described above, and ended up in some of the most significant collections and institutions across Europe.[442]

Taking this macro approach of the sales the Bowes attended shows a number of underlying rationales to their collecting that until now have been obscured. Firstly, this type of exploration puts agency back on to the Bowes' antique dealers, inserting them into a network and viewing them as more than simply names recorded in archival material. The Bowes' dealers directed them to suitable auction sales based on their tastes and budget, as well as acted on behalf of them to make important acquisitions, thereby giving them a presence in the auction house along with other major dealers. Secondly this subsection has shown that through their dealers, auction sales offered the Bowes a number of ways to form a collection outside of the established practices used by the collecting and dealing elite, and still acquire objects with a certain level of status. This was also shown more generally by examining the geography of the Bowes' antique buying and how they took advantage of the expansion of the antique trade in Paris into the more fashionable areas of the *9th arrondisement*, and utilised dealers who had less of an elite presence, as contrasted with wealthy collectors such as the Comte de Nieuwerkerke and Richard Wallace. As such the Bowes' collecting operated on the fringes of the market in its broadest sense, but the Bowes' antique dealers were still a key method of aligning their collecting with experts, museums and connoisseurs, and legitimising their collection through a formal network. This was also demonstrated by showing how the Bowes made use of an established network of antique dealers across the entirety of Europe, inserting their collecting into a wider network of acquisition practices shared by private collectors and institutions alike.

Through placing the international exhibitions, dealers, auction sales and provenances that appear in the collections and archive at The Bowes Museum into the growing discipline of art market studies for the first time, a picture is established of how the Bowes operated at a much more professional level than as has been previously suggested by Sarah Kane.[443] Set in the broader context of collecting

[442] Greg M. Thomas, 'The Looting of the Yuanming and the Translation of Chinese Art in Europe', 47.
[443] Sarah Kane, 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces'.

histories this section has demonstrated that the art market was as a key site in which the Bowes could forge a strategy and a status for their collection, as well as connections between living collectors, historical figures and significant events and their nascent museum. Indeed, ultimately this section has bought the Bowes into dialogue with the larger, more well researched system of museum officials, experts, scholars and amateurs who dominated the collecting markets of the nineteenth century, such as the South Kensington Museum, Sir Richard Wallace and the 4th Marquess of Hertford, the Comte de Nieuwerkerke and Charlotte Schreiber, and highlighted the multifaceted and nuanced form collecting histories can take. This has also shown how the exploration of the agency of the art market within museum formation can be applied across the institutional spectrum, from national museums to regional and private galleries. Exploring how the Bowes used an established method of building their collection also highlights that these methods are potentially present in archives of smaller and less well-understood institutions, and opens up new possibilities in understanding the selection rationale of museum collections beyond that adopted and dictated by the South Kensington Museum. As in The Bowes Museum, many museums' collections embody a mixture of both the private enterprise of individuals and the institutional trends that were led by the larger national museums.

Chapter 2: Housing the Collection

Introduction

The release of Peter Vergo's edited volume *The New Museology* in 1989 signalled a shift away from the narrow confines of studies of specific collectors or collections within institutions and towards the larger discourse on the social or political role of museums.[444] However, subsequently scholarship largely lacked focus on the presence of private ownership in the public museum.[445] As outlined in the introduction to the thesis, the field was largely dominated by studies which utilise the lens of 'power' and 'state-control', and most often the theoretical writings of Michel Foucault (1926-1984).[446] However, more recently this idea is being challenged and works produced which call for more nuanced, varied and complicated accounts of the wider cultural, social and political contexts of public museums.[447] Colin Trodd, for example, provides a critical overview of the impact of the 'New Museology' and rejects the static way in which museums are associated with instruments of control, instead preferring to see the art museum as a 'fluid' and 'disordered environment.'[448] This section of the thesis constitutes a study of The Bowes Museum as it is known to visitors today: a large, French-Renaissance style building that stands on the outskirts of the market town of Barnard Castle, and the conditions of its creation. The extraordinary edifice is often described as a 'purpose-built' museum, and this discussion will interrogate what the purpose of building a museum in the second half of the nineteenth century was.[449]

---

[444] Peter Vergo, ed., *The New Museology*.
[445] See Vicki McCall and Clive Gray, 'Museums and the 'new museology': theory, practice and organisational change', *Museum Management and Curatorship*, vol. 29, no. 1, (2014), 19-35.
[446] In particular Tony Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*; Carol Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals*; Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, *Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge*, (London: Routledge, 1992).
[447] See Colin Trodd, 'The Discipline of Pleasure', 17-29; Amy Woodson-Boulton, 'Victorian Museums and Victorian Society', 109-146.
[448] Colin Trodd, 'The Discipline of Pleasure', 27.
[449] For the description of the museum as 'purpose-built' the 'History' section on The Bowes Museum's website: https://www.thebowesmuseum.org.uk/About/Our-History; For works on the purpose of museums in the nineteenth century see Barbara J. Black, *On Exhibit: Victorians and their Museums*, (London: University of

As well as continuing the chronological arc of the creation of the Museum in to the 1870s, this section will also build upon the themes of the previous section of the relationship between museums and private collecting. According to Charles Saumarez Smith: 'the original intention behind the establishment of museums was that they should remove artefacts from their current context of ownership and use, from their circulation in the world of private property, and insert them into a new environment which would provide them with a different meaning.' [450] This section looks at how the Bowes created such an environment for their private collection, using the context of public museum formation in the nineteenth century. Through dissecting the emergence of the 'public museum' from around the 1830s, during what Jonah Siegl describes as 'the development of the kind of social consensus that would make the acquisition, protection, and display of… [private] collections a matter of national interest', the first point of analysis will be the instances in which the 'private' nature of the collections presents resistance to this agenda.[451] The first subsection, 'Public Museums and Private Houses in the Nineteenth Century' explores how, as Peter Mandler has described, the space of the private house became more and more public in its perceived role and function throughout the nineteenth-century.[452] The effect this had on the viewing of art is evident in the wealth of literature that was produced in order to open up private collections to an increased audience, such as Anna Jameson's (1794-1860) *Companion to the Most Celebrated Private Galleries of Art* of 1844, Gustav Friedrich Waagen's (1794-1868) *Treasures of Art in Great Britain* produced between 1854 and 1857, and Frederic George Stephens' (1828-1907) series 'The Private Collections of England' printed in *The Athenaeum* between 1873-1887.[453] These documents reveal the ambiguity of the nature of public

Virginia Press, 2000); Janet Minihan, *The Nationalization of Culture*; Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*; Christopher Whitehead, *The Public Art Museum in Nineteenth Century Britain*; Amy Woodson-Boulton, *Transformative Beauty: Art Museums in Industrial Britain* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012).

[450] Charles Saumarez Smith, 'Museums, Artefacts, Meanings', in Peter Vergo, ed., *The New Museology*, (London: Reaktion Books, 1989), 6.

[451] Jonah Siegl, *The Emergence of the Modern Museum: An anthology of nineteenth century sources*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 13.

[452] Peter Mandler, *The Fall and Rise of the Stately Home*, (London: Yale University Press, 1987), 71-108.

[453] William Hazlitt, *Sketches of the Principal Picture-Galleries in England, with a criticism on "Marriage a-la-mode"* (London: Taylor and Hessey, 1824; Anna Jameson, *Handbook to the public galleries of art in and near London*, (London: John Murray, 1842); Anna Jameson, *Companion to the Most Celebrated Private Galleries of Art* (London: Saunders and Otley, 1844); Frederic George Stephens, 'The Private Collections of England, nos. I-

museums throughout the second half of the nineteenth century in relation to their genesis in and dependence on private enterprise. As noted by the art historian Émilie Oléron Evans, in an in-depth discussion of how private houses overlapped with public cultural institutions in the mid-nineteenth century through publications such as Waagen's *Treasures of Art in Great Britain*: 'By applying the same methods of observation and assessment developed for public museums and galleries onto the realm of English domesticity, Waagen portrays collectors who cultivated a private interest for art as patrons and as curators in the public eye.'[454] However, though private collections became more accessible due to more democratic means of disseminations, such as the periodical press, the fact that private space was inherently inaccessible added to its prestige.[455] This is highlighted by an article by F. G. Stephens that recounted a visit to Streatlam Castle to view the Bowes family private collection.[456] Through analysis of Stephens' observations on the private collection, as well as on the Bowes' public museum that was undergoing construction, it is shown that Stephens places value on the scholarly attributes of the Bowes family's Old Master pictures over the philanthropic motives of forming a public museum for instruction and education. This shows how far the notion of private collections becoming more publicly accessible can be questioned.

The subsection 'Siting The Bowes Museum' investigates the context of placing a public art museum in a semi-rural location such as Barnard Castle in the second half of the nineteenth century, focusing on particular on debates around the proximity of museums to manufacturing locations.[457] The idea

LXXXIX, *The Athenaeum*, (1873-1887); Gustav Friedrich Waagen, *Treasures of Art in Great Britain*, 2 vols., (London: John Murray, 1854-57).

[454] Émilie Oléron Evans, 'Housing the Art of the Nation: The Home as Museum in Gustav F. Waagen's *Treasures of Art in Great Britain*', *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide*, vol. 17, no. 1, (2018), 44.

[455] On the increased accessibility of art through periodical publications see Duncan Forbes, ''The advantages of combination': The Art Union of London and State Regulation in the 1840s', in Paul Barlow and Colin Trodd, eds., *Governing Cultures*, 128-142; Katherine Haskins, *The Art-Journal and Fine Art Publishing in Victorian England, 1850-1880*, (London: Routledge, 2017).

[456] Frederic George Stephens, 'The Private Collections of England, No. XXIV – The Library of York Minster. The Minster. St. Mary's Abbey. Streatlam Castle', *The Athenaeum*, September 9 1876, 344-346

[457] Studies on this subject in Britain and further afield include Quentin Bell, *The Schools of Design*; Raphael Cardoso Denis, 'Teaching by Example: Education and the Formation of South Kensington's Museums', in Malcolm Baker, ed., *A Grand Design*, 107-116; Caroline Jordan, 'The South Kensington Empire and the Idea of the Regional Art Gallery in Nineteenth-Century Victoria,' *Fabrications*, vol. 20, no. 2, 2011, 34-59; Lara Kriegel, *Grand Designs*; Stuart Macdonald, *The History and Philosophy of Art Education*; Clive Wainwright, 'Principles True and False: Pugin and the Foundation of the Museum of Manufactures', *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 136, (1994), 357-364.

that a museum needed to serve a particular location's manufacturing population is evident from the 1830s, particularly due to the publication *Report of the Select Committee on Arts and Their Connexion with Manufactures* of 1835-6, which encouraged extending a knowledge of principles of art and design to artisans.[458] As Barnard Castle was not a centre of industry, nor did it possess a manufacturing population at the time the Bowes chose to locate their museum there, many commentators questioned its use within society, seeing it instead as a private residence akin to the Bowes country house. This is emphasised in early reports of the Museum, where it was described interchangeably as a 'mansion' and a 'museum', complicating the widespread view that the Museum was purpose-built as a fully public institution.[459] However, the establishment of art museums outside of urban centres was also seen a benefit. As articulated by writers such as Raymond Williams and the historian Asa Briggs, the Victorians saw themselves as within 'an age of great cities', and this divided opinion between pride and alarm at the expansion of population and industry and the subsequent effect this had on society.[460] Williams charts this complex relationship between the countryside and the city in the nineteenth century cultural imagination in his book *The Country and the City*.[461] Williams recognises in the second half of the nineteenth century the huge swathes of industrialisation and population increase that led to 'the struggle for new amenities – the libraries and the institutes – in the new needs of the town,' reflecting the true dichotomy of urban infrastructure and a booming population, and the art museum's troubled location within it.[462] Christopher Whitehead has pinpointed to the 1850s tensions between creating museums in urban locations and the emerging ideas that art galleries should be located away from dense urban areas in order to provide a clean environment for artworks and visitors.[463] Primary sources in which this suggestion first emerges include the government-endorsed reports into the form and function of museums, such as those concerning the

[458] *Report of the Select Committee on Arts and Their Connexion with Manufactures*, (London: House of Commons, 1836).
[459] For example the titles of early articles include references to 'Mrs. Bowes Mansion and Galleries': Anon., 'Mrs Bowes New Mansion, Museum and Picture Galleries, at Barnard Castle', *The Teesdale Mercury*, 10 August 1870, 5; Anon., 'Mrs. Bowes Mansion and Galleries at Barnard Castle, Durham', *The Builder*, 14 January 1871, 27-29.
[460] Asa Briggs, *Victorian Cities*, (London: Odhams Press Limited, 1963), 57; Raymond William, *The Country and the City* (St. Albans: Paladin, 1975).
[461] Raymond William, *The Country and the City*.
[462] Raymond William, *The Country and the City*, 278.
[463] Christopher Whitehead, *The Public Art Museum in Nineteenth Century Britain*, 59-68.

National Gallery from 1850-1853.[464] Using these, this subsection questions how far The Bowes Museum can be considered a useful institution in the second half of the nineteenth century, providing amenities such as entertainment and education for visitors, unrestricted access to its collection as well as a place of refuge for works of art.

The Bowes attempted to combat such confused views around the perceived purpose of their museum by endorsing its legitimacy through political means. The subsection 'The 1871 Public Parks, Schools and Museums Act' is an investigation into the Private Act of Parliament, introduced to parliament by the Bowes through William Hutt, which allowed the Bowes to leave the Museum for the benefit of the public during the founders' lifetimes, so that they could reside there simultaneously.[465] According to UK Parliament, Private Acts:

> were so named as they passed powers or benefits to individuals or bodies rather than the general public. Parliament's role was to arbitrate between the promoters of these Private Acts and those affected by their projects, as well as to take account of the public interest.[466]

For the Bowes this Private Act of Parliament had significant public interest as it would allow buildings and land to be left by individuals for the use of schools, museums and parks.[467] However, as noted by Hardy, there were overt private interests for the Bowes passing this Act as they wished the Museum to be a residence for Joséphine Bowes as well as a publicly accessible institution.[468] This subsection also shows that the Bowes drew on the example of the Sir John Soane Museum.[469] This is the museum born from the private collection the architect Sir John Soane (1753-1837), and left to the public by a Private Act of Parliament in 1833.[470] The relationship between the creation of The Bowes

[464] *Report from the Select Committee on the National Gallery: Together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index*, (London: HMSO, 1853).
[465] 'Public Parks, Schools and Museums Act, 1871', 34 & 35 Vict, c. 13.
[466] https://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/transformingsociety/transportcomms/roadsrail/overview/privateacts/
[467] 'Public Parks, Schools and Museums Act, 1871', 34 & 35 Vict, c. 13.
[468] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 177.
[469] See the correspondence DCRO, D/St/C5/233/11 & 13; DCRO, D/St/C5/248/3-4 & 6-7.
[470] The title of the Act is 'An Act for settling and preserving Sir John Soane's Museum, Library and Works of Art, in Lincoln's Inn Fields in the County of Middlesex, for the Benefit of the Public, and for establishing a sufficient Endowment for the due Maintenance of the same.' Reproduced in John Soane, *Description of the*

Museum and the Sir John Soane Museum has not been recognised or analysed in any former literature on the history of The Bowes Museum. This is significant because, firstly, it provides the Museum with the context of private collections becoming public in Britain in the 1830s, and strengthens the assertion that the social role of the public museum at this time is key to understanding its formation. Secondly, there are broader conceptual links between the translation of Soane's and the Bowes' collections into public institutions. As stated by John Elsner, discussing Sir John Soane's Private Act of Parliament: 'the exercise of translating the private into the public, the personal collection into the museum, is…to be seen as a peculiarly textual act.'[471] For Elsner, the process of writing legislature for Soane's museum crystallised its purpose and helped the collection becoming publicly significant.[472] This subsection shows how the Bowes' Private Act text (also included in Appendix II), drafted carefully by the Bowes with legal and political counsel from William Hutt and John Bowes' solicitor Edward Young Western (1837-1924), framed the museum project as an endeavour in the public interest.[473] However, set into dialogue with the private correspondence between John Bowes and his political and social contacts, the process of passing the Act shows how the Bowes used this language to their advantage to highlight the public benefits whilst simultaneously concealing the private motives.

The following subsections of the chapter, 'Building the Bowes Museum: Exterior' and 'Building the Bowes Museum: Interior', deal with the 'housing' of the Museum much more literally through a discussion of the design and construction of the museum building. As much a re-evaluation of the many archival and primary sources which provide an insight into how the Museum was built, this is also a study of the evolution of the concept of the Museum through the documentation such as designs

House and Museum on the North Side of Lincoln's Inn Fields, the Residence of Sir John Soane, (London: Levey, Robson and Franklyn, 1835), 101-109. For more on Soane, the Private Act and the museum see: Barbara J. Black, *On Exhibit*, 67-71; John Elsner, 'A Collector's Model of Desire: The House and Museum of Sir John Soane' in John Elsner and Roger Cardinal, eds., *The Cultures of Collecting* 155-176; Gillian Darley, *John Soane: An Accidental Romantic*, (London: Yale University Press, 1999), 300-304; Sophie Thomas 'A "strange and mixed assemblage": Sir John Soane, Archivist of the Self', *Studies in Romanticism*, vol. 57, no. 1, (2018), 121-142.

[471] John Elsner, 'A Collector's Model of Desire', 158.

[472] John Elsner, 'A Collector's Model of Desire', 158.

[473] The relevant correspondence is held mostly in Durham County Record Office in bundles for the years 1870-71. DCRO, D/St/C5/233-289. It includes letters from William Hutt, Edward Western and G. A. Western.

and plans, letters between the Bowes and their architects and contemporary accounts in the architectural press and local newspapers.[474] Further to this, having established the social requirements demanded of a museum, it is possible to assess how far The Bowes Museum invested in these through a discussion of the interior layout of the Museum. Interior space of institutions has preoccupied numerous writers, and in terms of museum space many have chosen to analyse it through the lens of the writing of the French thinker Michel Foucault.[475] This approach sees the inside of the museum as a disciplinary apparatus. However, in line with the 'New Museology', this view is complicated through a more nuanced reading. As Kate Hill has noted, the weakness in the Foucauldian approach is that it does not take into account moments of change or adaptation to their use.[476] This investigation, instead, investigates The Bowes Museum's interior through the 'social logic of space', to borrow the title of the book on the syntax of space by Bill Hillier and Juliette Hanson.[477] Viewing the museum as both a 'social object' and 'system of spatial relations' as Hillier and Hanson do, this study adopts their ideas on the segregation of 'public' and 'private' space as a useful framework for providing a more destabilised account of museum making.[478] This is an approach that is appearing in the discipline of Museum Studies more recently and writers have begun to explore the possibilities of using architecture and museum layout as a way of revealing the complexities behind museum making, running counter to readings of simply 'the stories of architects and their buildings.'[479] For example, Suzanne Macleod's recent book *Museum Architecture: A New Biography* makes an assessment of the current discrepancy between museum histories and architectural histories as reductive, insisting:

[474] Original drawings and plans for the museum are held in TBMA under reference TBM/5/1, Correspondence relating to the museum building proliferates through the Strathmore Papers at Durham County Record Office, DCRO, D/St and John and Joséphine Bowes' Papers at The Bowes Museum, TBMA, JB.
[475] Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison,* (New York: DoubleDay, 1977).
[476] Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums*, 92.
[477] Bill Hillier and Juliette Hanson, *The Social Logic of Space*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 3.
[478] Bill Hiller and Juliette Hanson, *The Social Logic of Space*, chapters 4 & 5.
[479] Suzanne Macleod, *Museum Architecture: A New Biography* (London: Routledge, 2013), 7. For more works on the spatial analysis of museums see Sophie Forgan, 'The Architecture of Display: Museums, Universities and Objects in Nineteenth-Century Britain', *History of Science*, 32 (1994), 139-162; Sophie Forgan, 'Building the Museum: Knowledge, Conflict, and Power of Place', *Isis*, vol. 96, no. 4, (2005), 572-585; Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums*, 90-124; Carla Yanni, *Nature's Museums: Victorian Science and the Architecture of Display*, (London, Athlone Press, 1999).

> …one has to question what such 'smoothed-out' histories – always disconnected from place, devoid of users and dislocated from the museum itself – have to tell us about the realities of museum making or, more importantly, the complex relationships between the physical stuff of museums and galleries, their histories of change and the experiences of those who inhabit them.[480]

Macleod argues for a 'biographic approach to the histories of museum buildings that prioritises the lives lived in and through museums as a route towards the telling of the new stories of museum making.'[481] There is much value to be drawn from Macleod's micro-historical reading of museum history for the purposes of this investigation. Proceeding with a historiography of the architecture of The Bowes Museum within existing scholarship to highlight the disparity between the Museum and the larger field of British civic museum architecture, this section uses the Museum's archive to explore the relationship of its founders, their collection and the exterior and interior logic of the building to the public.

Public Museums and Private Houses in the Nineteenth Century

In 1876 the Liberal MP William Ewart Gladstone (1809-1898) gave a speech in Berwick-upon-Tweed to mark the opening of a new public art museum. During this congratulatory eulogy to the town and its people for the formation of such an institution, he offered an example of the type of institution from which it set itself apart:

> I went the other day to see an enormous building which is now being erected for the people of Barnard Castle, which is to be called a museum and picture and statue gallery. It is a building which I should think the outlay for the erection, judging from the fineness of the material as well as the scale, will be about 40,000*l*. That is an enormous sum, and the building is a considerable distance out of town, and as the town is very small I don't know whence the pictures and statues are to come from which to fill it. (Laughter.) I have not one-half faith in the future of that institution as I have in an institution like this.[482]

[480] Suzanne Macleod, *Museum Architecture*, 7.
[481] Suzanne Macleod, *Museum Architecture*, 8.
[482] Anon., 'Mr. Gladstone at Berwick', *The Daily News*, October 4, 1876, 2.

His unfavourable description of what would later become The Bowes Museum illustrates a number of interesting criteria for the effectiveness of a museum that served the public in his liberal mind: the distance between the museum and its audience must be short; the emphasis on the lavish appearance and cost of the building implies that a more modest project was appropriate for a civic institution; and the assumption that 'pictures and statues' were provided through the local population implies a desire for the presence of collective effort to be embedded in an institution. It appears the museum in Barnard Castle was an outlier to the political and social conditions in which museums were formulated in the 1860s and 70s, however the institution now has a narrative which recognises the munificence and philanthropic intentions of the founders. How and why did these two narratives exist side by side?

The tension between the safeguarding of art and culture and allowing unbridled access to it; making it public or keeping it private and isolated for the privileged few to see, infiltrated much political rhetoric of the time that is most observable in the many government-led explorations into the form, function and value of public art museums from the 1830s onwards. Kate Hill has explored why the 1830s and 40s are key decades for the development of museums: 'the impetus given by the political reforms of the 30s; the growing awareness of superior practice in other countries, especially France; and the acute social tension of the period.[483] These issues grew into such a pressing concern that it caused the formation of a Parliamentary Select Committee in 1835 to enquire into the state of the arts, their presentation in museums, and their connection with industrial manufacture.[484] Producing an influential report that would underpin the foundation of a nationwide system of educational facilities dedicated to teaching the principles of design and manufacture, this investigation is a watershed moment in the history of public art museums in Britain. It was also desired for each school to have its own teaching collection from which students could learn through close study, and many witnesses interviewed by the Select Committee expressed the need for more museums and libraries or increased

[483] Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums*, 40.
[484] *Report of the Select Committee on Arts and Their Connexion with Manufactures*.

access to those that had already been established.[485] As such, this report laid the groundwork for a significant period of institutional reconfiguration in the middle of the century.

Thomas Gretton has provided an examination of the political ingredients of this moment in which he closely considers the agenda of the enquiry, describing it as a liberal bourgeois critique of the landed elite's cultural dominance, and more specifically, as a questioning of the usefulness and relevance of the Britain's foremost art institution, the Royal Academy, to a modernising industrial society.[486] To liberal and progressive politicians the Royal Academy represented the cultural form of the aristocratic classes in its conservative and elitist view of art. However, Gretton's conclusions highlight problems within this new public discourse on art museums in that the final report produced by the committee is full of contradictions and ambiguities about what exactly the aspirations of the Liberal bourgeois institution was in terms of its 'publicness' and accessibility.[487] Not least this is shown in their attitude to the functions of public art museums as sites that would have a beneficial effect on society – in civilising the working classes – but also as places which would produce a tangible effect on the market for art and manufactures. The unclear trajectory of proposed reforms in art and design led to the opening up of a landscape of institutions that proposed to serve the working classes and contribute to Industrial Capitalism but yet were still haunted by the presence of the Academy and its cultural elitism.[488]

These debates, though occurring decades before the formation of The Bowes Museum began, are highly significant to its genesis, as the political climate into which John Bowes and many of his associates entered as active proponents of Liberal politics. John Bowes became a Member of Parliament for South Durham in 1832 aligned with the Liberal party, representing them for 15 years

[485] Janet Minihan, *The Nationalization of Culture*, 51-52; Rebecca Wade, 'Pedagogic Objects'.
[486] Thomas Gretton, ''Art is cheaper and goes lower in France.' The language of the Parliamentary Select Committee on the Arts and Principles of Design 1835-1836', in Andrew Hemingway and William Vaughan ed., *Art in Bourgeois Society, 1790-1850*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 84-100
[487] Thomas Gretton, ''Art is cheaper and goes lower in France.', 94.
[488] Thomas Gretton, ''Art is cheaper and goes lower in France.', 98. Gretton is more explicit in his assessment of the Royal Academy's influence, describing it as a 'successful conservative hi-jack of a radical project'.

until retiring from political life in 1847. During this time he showed a strong support for liberal attitudes to public betterment through educational infrastructure, donating £50 to the building of a dedicated building for the Barnard Castle Mechanics Institute in 1844 in memory of its founder Henry Witham.[489] Like every other Mechanics' Institute in the country, this organisation was set up to provide a technical education to the working classes.[490] Bowes later served as president of the Barnard Castle Mechanics' Institute between 1864-67, concurrent to forming the museum collection with Joséphine Bowes, subtly aligning his private collecting through an act of public duty.[491] Furthermore, as discussed in the introduction to this thesis, John Bowes' close friend and step-father William Hutt was an active member of the Select Committee formed to investigate the relationship between arts and manufactures in 1835. Hutt was appointed to the committee by William Ewart and has been described by the historian of art education Mervyn Romans as having a vested interest in the commercial questions that were raised by the enquiry, which would later pave a way for him to become Vice President of the Board of Trade.[492] Like Bowes, Hutt also had a commitment to the development of public institutions for the betterment of the industrial class. The Board of Trade's close relationship to design and manufacture meant that the design school network fell within its remit. In 1852 the Board of Trade established the Department of Practical Art to give direction to this endeavour, with the South Kensington Museum's future director Henry Cole as its Secretary. Often the liberal views held by reformers such as Hutt were predicated on the idea that the working classes needed to be civilised and enculturated through adoption of the social practices of the upper classes. This was propounded by people such as William Hutt in the arenas of working-class instruction. For example, during an address to the Working Men's Club of Gateshead, Hutt had stated his view on

[489] TBMA, JB/2/1/13/101, Letter from John Bowes to Wheldon, 24 December 1844.
[490] Thomas Kelly, *A History of Adult Education in Great Britain*, (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1970); Martyn Walker, '"Encouragement of Sound Education Amongst the Industrial Classes": Mechanics' Institutes and Working Class Membership 1838-1881', *Education Studies*, vol. 39, no. 2, (2013), 142-155; Martyn Walker, *The Development of the Mechanics' Institute Movement in Britain and Beyond: Supporting further education for the adult working classes*, (London: Routledge, 2016).
[491] For press reports on John Bowes' election and re-election to the office of President see Anon., 'Local and General News – Barnard Castle', *The Teesdale Mercury*, 3 August 1864, 4; Anon., 'District News – Barnard Castle', *York Herald*, 12 August 1865, 5; Anon., 'Local and District – Barnard Castle', *Richmond and Ripon Chronicle*, 10 August 1867, 4.
[492] Mervyn Romans, 'An Analysis of the Political Complexion of the 1835/6 Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures', *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, vol. 26, no. 2, (2007), 215-244.

temperance and its benefit to society, and that 'he wished the working classes would imitate…the conduct of the upper classes, and not only abstain from habits of drunkenness but refuse to tolerate drunkenness on the part of any of their surrounding or belongings.'[493] The idea that the leisure time of the working classes constituted degenerative behaviour, most often associated with consuming alcohol, was a key problem to which museums were seen as the antidote.[494] In this case, the working classes could imitate the upper classes through the civilising act of museum-going.

Opening spaces up for enculturation of the masses was not a straightforward process, however. Initially, contemporary cultural commentators were entirely conscious of the fact that the nineteenth century public art museum had arisen from the private residences of the royal or aristocratic classes of the preceding centuries, where the contemplation of art was an intellectual but leisurely pursuit.[495] As set out in this thesis' introduction the overriding narrative of the development of the public museum from the eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth century is from the royal palace or private mansion to the democratic institution. But this is not to say that the idea of the public benefit of museums did not exist before this. Writers reporting on the opening of a gallery in the London suburb of Dulwich as early as 1810 noted that its establishment was a product of the 'laudable anxiety for the cultivation and improvement of the Fine Arts.'[496] Also, Britain's earliest museums and art galleries were those attached to universities, such as the Hunterian Museum opened at the University of Glasgow in 1807 and the Fitzwilliam Museum at the University of Cambridge, founded in 1816.[497] As such a grasp of the wider benefits of picture galleries and museums on society existed, adopting terms such as 'cultivation' and 'improvement' which would resonate through the whole nineteenth century. But these institutions that were well-intentionally established for public advancement were met with a

[493] Anon., 'The Gatehead Working Men's Club – Speech of Sir William Hutt M.P.', *The Newcastle Daily Journal*, 21 May 1869, 3.
[494] See Amy Woodson Boulton, *Transformative Beauty*, 54-82.
[495] See Peter Vergo, 'Introduction', in Peter Vergo, *The New Museology* (London: Reaktion Books, 1989), 2. Vergo describes the 'dual function of collections as places of study and places of display' inherited by public museums as 'both…a justification and…a dilemma.'
[496] Charles Taylor, 'Dulwich College', *The Literary Panorama*, vol. 4, (1816), 159.
[497] Lucilla Burn, *The Fitzwilliam Museum: A history*, (London: Philip Wilson, 2016); Lawrence Keppie, *William Hunter and the Hunterian Museum in Glasgow*. The Ashmolean Museum in Oxford was one of the earliest university museums to open in 1683, but is less representative of the desire to promote the arts that existed in the nineteenth century.

certain amount of critical confusion as well. For example, the art critic and social commentator William Hazlitt (1778-1830), writing in his volume *Sketches of the Principal Picture-Galleries in England* in 1824, lamented of the large collection of Old Masters at Dulwich that 'they certainly looked better in their old places, at the house of Mr. Desenfans where they were distributed in a number of small rooms, and seen separately and close to the eye.'[498] Dulwich Picture Gallery – as it is now known – was the private enterprise of the collectors Noel Desenfans (1744-1807) and Peter Francis Bourgeois (1753-1811), originating as a collection of paintings assembled by Desenfans and Bourgeois for the Polish King Stanislaus II Augustus (1732-1798), but due to the King's exile were left in the house of the Desenfans and eventually bequeathed to Dulwich College.[499] For Hazlitt, the result of taking the paintings out of the private domestic setting that they previously occupied, and placing them in a large, cavernous top-lit space in which the general public can be accommodated was to 'lessen the effect,' and 'deaden the attention' that the pictures demanded (**figure 3.0**).[500]

Such was the atmospheric importance of viewing artworks in the domestic setting in the early nineteenth century, it was seen as a space as equally as valuable to the museum. One response to this was a flourishing of literature which began to record and describe private collections around the same time as the cultural and political leaders of the nation debated what it meant to create national and regional institutions. The idea of private collections becoming a matter of public interest starts to appear in publications such as the art historian Anna Jameson's *Companion to the Most Celebrated Private Galleries of Art* of 1844, and her *Handbook to the public galleries of art in and near London* of 1842.[501] Crucially these were written before major public art institutions such as the British Museum and the National Gallery had settled in the monumental buildings they are recognisable as today, but their locations were definitely a pressing concern: the enormous classical building of the British Museum on Great Russell Street was being constructed in place of the original mansion

[498] William Hazlitt, *Sketches of the Principal Picture-Galleries in England*, 29.
[499] in Jeannie Chapel and Charlotte Gere, eds., *The Fine and Decorative Arts Collections of Great Britain and Ireland*, 41-42.
[500] William Hazlitt, *Sketches of the Principal Picture-Galleries in England*, 29.
[501] Anna Jameson, *Handbook to the public galleries of art in and near London*; Anna Jameson, *Companion to the Most Celebrated Private Galleries of Art*.

Montagu House and did not open officially until 1857 and the National Gallery's William Wilkins building, though publicly accessible by the 1830s was criticised for being an inadequate, cramped and poorly designed space to view pictures.[502]

The differing tone of each of Jameson's texts betrays a fissure in attitudes towards the public and the private spaces of art display. The former work dedicated to the 'Private Galleries' styles itself as a 'companion,' suggestive of a more informal work; 'not a guide,' but a conversation piece combining 'a reference book with a certain degree of amusement and interest.'[503] The introduction sets out the history of collecting and great collectors, making pains to exaggerate their characters. Jameson then recounts an instance of standing with a contemporary collector and observing his interaction with his pictures:

> And while he spoke, in the slow, quiet tone of a weary man, he turned his eyes on the forest scene of a Ruysdael, and gazed on it for a minute of two in silence – a silence I was careful not to break – as if its cool dewy verdure, its deep seclusion, its transparent waters stealing through the glade, had sent refreshment to his very soul.[504]

Jameson also discusses the taste judgements made within the arena of the private collector, how one particular piece may be 'preferred, not so much for its intrinsic merit, but because it has been obtained with difficulty, – has been competed for, conquered from some rival amateur, – or it is a recent acquisition, and "the honeymoon is not yet over"…' she concludes these examples by adding: 'Now one cannot well put these delightful *dilettante* fancies in a catalogue *raisonné*, but how truly, deeply, cordially, one can understand and sympathize with them!'[505] Any type of abstract knowledge and authority that this text claims to convey is now flavoured with undertones of the personal and private life of the collector and their relationship to their possessions. Dianne Sachko Macleod has also identified Jameson's writings on private collections as highlighting the layers of public and private

[502] For the British Museum see J. Mordaunt Crook, *The British Museum: A Case Study in Architectural Politics*, (London: Allen Lane, 1972). For the National Gallery see Jonathan Conlin, *The Nation's Mantlepiece*, 372-387.
[503] Anna Jameson, *Companion to the Most Celebrated Private Galleries of Art*, xvii.
[504] Anna Jameson, *Companion to the Most Celebrated Private Galleries of Art*, xx.
[505] Anna Jameson, *Companion to the Most Celebrated Private Galleries of Art*, xx.

motivations of their owners, suggesting some of the remarks and opinions of the collectors on art are so personal and subliminal that it is difficult to ascribe any meaning at all to their collections.[506] Furthermore, in Jameson's anecdote, the type of connection the collector had with his painting is not an objective, teachable reaction. The latter text, a *Handbook* focussing on 'Public Galleries', promotes much more its 'utility' to the reader and sets out in practical terms what the author's 'purpose' was in writing it.[507] In a stark contrast to the *Companion*, the introduction to the *Handbook* is quite literally a list of definitions of key terms that are essential knowledge for any student of art history, such as 'Painting', 'Composition', 'Colouring' and 'Chiaroscuro'.[508] Jameson then proceeds to give a selection of quotations from eminent voices in the history of art and culture, such as the painter and President of the Royal Academy Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723-1792), the poet Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792-1822), and Hazlitt.[509] This anthologising of the history of art is much more rigidly structured and authoritative. It is clear, then, that Jameson felt that public and private galleries constituted different modes of behaviour adhering much more to the eighteenth-century traditions of 'gentlemanly' leisure in the private realm, with formal education taking place in the public spaces of art display.

There are many well documented cases of private residences being adapted to suit public means in the history of British art institutions. One of the most well-known is that of forming a national gallery for England in the early nineteenth century, which originated from a gift of 38 paintings by the financier John Julius Angerstein (1735-1823), which were originally housed in his mansion at 100 Pall Mall (**figure 3.1**).[510] Colin Trodd compares the critical reception of the National Gallery's physical and conceptual transformation from private collection to public museum as when the collection 'leaves

[506] Dianne Sachko Macleod, *Art and the Victorian Middle Class*, 46.
[507] Anna Jameson, *Handbook to the public galleries of art in and near London*, v.
[508] Anna Jameson, *Handbook to the public galleries of art in and near London*, xiii-xxxii.
[509] Anna Jameson, *Handbook to the public galleries of art in and near London*, xxxii-lii.
[510] Colin Trodd, 'The Paths to the National Gallery', 29-43.

the "private space" of Angerstein's residence in Pall Mall…it is defined as an arena of popular instruction.'[511]

The increasing attention placed on private collections in Britain began to spread from urban centres to more inaccessible country house collections, prompting conversations of their use to the mission of enculturation. Jameson had chosen to focus only on collections in London in her survey of private collections, such as the Royal Collection and the Bridgewater Collection in Bridgewater House in St. James's.[512] Two decades earlier in *Sketches of the Principal Picture-Galleries in England* Hazlitt had chosen a much broader range of collections spanning the breadth of the country, but in so doing also questioned the lack of access to a number country houses with rich collections, being faced with a number of locked doors.[513] The debate of access to important private collections caused a change in the way country houses were viewed as museum, as described by Kate Smith: 'In the nineteenth century, as country house owners encouraged greater numbers of people to cross their thresholds as tourists, country houses increasingly became public spaces.'[514] A key publication exemplifying this is the German art historian Gustav Friedrich Waagen's *Treasures of Art in Great Britain* (1854-57).[515] Waagen toured round the country in the 1830s, recording significant private collections, which were then translated by Lady Eastlake and published in two detailed volumes. Waagen in his activities crystallised the sense of the time that 'ownership and public display of art should be regarded as civic duty, whereby both owner and visitor benefit by taking part in the general enhancement of the nation's cultural well-being.'[516] However, the high price of Waagen's luxurious volume, as well as the privileged status of the author that allowed him entry to the various collections, raises the question of

[511] Colin Trodd, 'Culture, Class, City: The National Gallery and the Spaces of Education, 1822-1857' in Marcia Pointon, ed., *Art Apart*, 44-45.
[512] Anna Jameson, *Companion to the Most Celebrated Private Galleries of Art*, 4-166.
[513] William Hazlitt, *Sketches of the Principal Picture-Galleries in England*, 128-129.
[514] Kate Smith, 'Empire and the Country House in Early Nineteenth Century Britain: The Amhersts of Montreal Park, Kent', *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*, vol. 16, no. 3, (2015). Published online https://muse.jhu.edu/article/602384.
[515] Gustav Friedrich Waagen, *Treasures of Art in Great Britain*.
[516] Inge Reist, 'The Fate of the Palais Royale Collection 1791-1800', in Roberta Panzanelli and Monica Preti-Hamard, eds., *La Circulation des Oeuvres d'Art: Circulation of Works of Art in the Revolutionary Era, 1789-1848*, (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2007), 37. Quoted in Émilie Oléron Evans, 'Housing the Art of the Nation, 45.

whether it really provided a more egalitarian method of viewing private collections of art. This is summarised by Émilie Oléron Evans, who suggests that the exclusive access Waagen gained to elite spaces was part of the framework which kept the art distinct from the public sphere: 'Although *Treasures of Art* permitted the reader to enter an otherwise prohibited space, thus enabling access to these well-kept treasures, at least on paper, the seclusion of the artworks was paradoxically presented as a necessary condition for their enjoyment.'[517]

This was in part remedied by a number of vital publications that were produced in the middle of the nineteenth century that explored the phenomenon of the public accessibility to art by opening up and making public previously private – or at least fairly exclusive – spaces in a much more accessible format. One such regular column appeared in *The Art-Union* (renamed *The Art Journal* in 1849) under the title 'Visits to Private Galleries'. *The Art-Union* had been established by reformers such as George Godwin (1813-1888) and Edward Edwards, compelled by the evidence of the Select Committee report published in 1836.[518] Their primary aim was to make art accessible through a subscription service aimed at the middle and upper classes, whilst simultaneously channelling funds into contemporary art.[519] Edwards would also go on to write a manifesto entitled *The Administrative Economy of Fine Arts* (1840), which argued for government-led financial intervention into the arts, in order to improve the economy.[520] In the magazine that was circulated to subscribers throughout the late 1830s and 1840s appeared a series of articles from called "Visits to Private Galleries", which elucidated various collections in private hands for the benefit of the reader.[521]

[517] Émilie Oléron Evans, 'Housing the Art of the Nation', 52.
[518] Joy Sperling, '"Art, Cheap and Good": The Art-Union in England and the United States 1840-60', *Nineteenth Century Art Worldwide*, vol. 1, no. 1, (2002), 91-114.
[519] Joy Sperling, '"Art, Cheap and Good"', 91-114.
[520] Edward Edwards, *The Administrative Economy of the Fine Arts*, (London: Saunders and Otley, 1840).
[521] Anon., 'Visits to Private Galleries', *The Art-Union* (Later *The Art Journal*), 1839-1872. Dianne Sachko Macleod states this series appeared between 1839-1859, however it appears to have reappeared in some form between 1869-1872. See for example, Anon., 'Visits to Private Galleries: The Collection of George Schlotel, Esq., Essex Lodge, Brixton', *The Art Journal*, vol. 8, (1869), 341-343. Dianne Sachko Macleod, *Art and the Victorian Middle Class*, 23.

The art critic Frederic George Stephens (1828-1907) also sought out the less accessible private collections to bring them to life in the pages of the popular publication *The Athenaeum*. Stephens wrote a regular column entitled 'The Private Collections of England' from 1873-1887, visiting the homes of numerous Victorian collectors.[522] Dianne Sachko Macleod has assigned Stephens' activities to a number of motives; largely as an effort to out-do Waagen in his familiarity with the world of modern and historic art collecting in Britain, but also Stephens wished to decentre this world from the aristocratic classes to include the middle-class collectors 'in combining visits to stately homes with merchants' mansions'.[523] This effort took Stephens to a far broader range of places within Britain, recognising the changing fortunes of many industrialists and merchants in the northern towns of England. Indeed, possibly one of the strangest editions of the 'The Private Collections of England' is F. G. Stephens visit in 1876 to County Durham, where he visits the Bowes' collection at Streatlam Castle.[524] In the opening paragraphs of the description of the collection held there Stephens made reference to the museum then under construction, as the intended destination for the 'accumulation of all sorts', which he described as 'already prodigious in number and bulk, and such as will, on many grounds, astonish students.'[525] Despite the series' preference for self-made industrialists and their collections of modern pictures Stephens appears, however, to be more interested in the collection held privately by the Bowes family at Streatlam Castle. Unfortunately for Stephens, Streatlam Castle at the time of visiting was representative of the Bowes' own private collection rather than the Bowes family pictures.: 'A large number of pictures were, at the time of our visit to Streatlam, disposed on the walls of the chambers in the castle, which is, in fact, chiefly appropriated to the collections of Mr. Bowes, who lives principally in Paris.'[526] Further to Stephen's disappointed reaction, the frequent references

[522] Frederic George Stephens, 'The Private Collections of England, nos. I-LXXXIX, *The Athenaeum*, (1873-1887), passim.
[523] Dianne Sachko Macleod, 'Mid-Victorian patronage of the arts: F. G. Stephens's "The private collections of England"', *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 128, (1986), 598.
[524] Frederic George Stephens, 'The Private Collections of England, No. XXIV', 344-346.
[525] Frederic George Stephens, 'The Private Collections of England, No. XXIV', 346.
[526] Frederic George Stephens, 'The Private Collections of England, No. XXIV', 346. The visit to Streatlam does not appear in any of the analyses done on Stephens by Dianne Sachko Macleod whose narrative suggests he was primarily interested in the collections of 'avant-garde' art. See Dianne Sachko Macleod, 'Private and Public Patronage in Victorian Newcastle', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol. 52, (1989), 188-208.

to the mixed quality of the museum collection that resided in the mansion suggest that Stephens saw the aristocratic hereditary collection as of much more import to the readers of *The Athenaeum*.[527]

There were also obvious problems with the way that Stephens was forced to examine the family collection, in unsuitable conditions: 'We were most courteously welcomed to examine the paintings which were then unpacked, from a comparatively small proportion of a wilderness of cases and boxes, which occupy numerous chambers in the mansion at Streatlam.'[528] However for Stephens, the consequence of this was to limit his critical judgement and assign any value to the collection, as 'classification was out of the question', and his powers of connoisseurship were thwarted by the chaos of the display.[529] Nevertheless the paintings Stephens goes on to describe include many Italian Renaissance, Early Netherlandish and northern European pictures, including the large scene of a fruit market by the Flemish artist Frans Snyders (1579-1657), which remained in the collection of the Earls of Strathmore and now hangs in Glamis Castle (**figure 2.2**).[530] In fact, many of the paintings Stephens described were from the family's private collection, and never made it in to The Bowes Museum, such as works attributed to the school of the Caracci brothers, Agostino (1557-1602), Annibale (1560-1609) and Ludovico (1555-1619), the foremost painters of the Bolognese school.[531] John Bowes had purchased these pictures in the 1840s, long before the museum project was begun and obviously intended for them to bolster the collections of, and stay within, the ancestral homes.[532] For Stephens the country house was just as important an environment – if not more so – as the museum for students of art to judge pictures, however, the importance of correct conditions for judgements was also required. Furthermore, Stephens is much more interested in the arcane business of attribution and quality, as well as exposing the taste of aristocratic and middle-class collectors, than in the

[527] Frederic George Stephens, 'The Private Collections of England, No. XXIV', 346.
[528] Frederic George Stephens, 'The Private Collections of England, No. XXIV', 346.
[529] Frederic George Stephens, 'The Private Collections of England, No. XXIV', 346.
[530] Peacock includes an appendix listing the paintings in the collection at Streatlam Castle sourced from inventories, see Jonathon Peacock, *Streatlam Castle*, 63-71. See also Margaret Wills and Howard Coutts, 'The Bowes Family of Streatlam Castle and Gibside and its Collections', *Metropolitan Museum Journal*, vol. 33, (1998), 231-243.
[531] Frederic George Stephens, 'The Private Collections of England, No. XXIV', 346.
[532] See Jonathan Peacock, *Streatlam Castle*, 64.

institutional frameworks which make these works of art genuinely accessible. In many ways Stephens exemplified the contradictory and performative nature that writings on country house collections adopted throughout the nineteenth century. Though there was a general attitude towards increased accessibility to significant private collections, the sense that these collections were exclusive, and not easily accessible like a museum, is inherent to their interest, and in some ways drives the interest in the literature which purported to open them. The next section builds upon this perception to investigate to what extent the Bowes' physical museum, in terms of its location and purpose, was seen as accessible in contemporary responses, questioning whether it was, in fact, just seen as an extension of Streatlam Castle's stately chambers.

Siting The Bowes Museum

In the early 1860s the Bowes arranged for the purchase of a plot of land in close proximity to the market town of Barnard Castle.[533] The question of The Bowes Museum's location is pertinent to its establishment as a public institution, and also reveals many of the tensions that it poses to the liberal idea of the art gallery providing improvement to an industrial or manufacturing location. The Victorian art museum was generally founded to improve the industrial pursuits of a population and therefore needed to be easily accessible to workers.[534]As William Gladstone described the Museum in his Berwick address in 1876: '…the building is a considerable distance out of town, and as the town is very small I don't know whence the pictures and statues are to come from which to fill it.'[535] Sarah Kane raises this perceived issue with The Bowes Museum, questioning whether the institutions was committed to the public domain from the outset or if it was merely a private house with a veneer of accessibility.[536] She cites the confused language in the many press reports that were written about the proposed museum as evidence that there was no clearly defined rationale for it, but also notes the

[533] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 143.
[534] Raphael Cardoso Denis, 'Teaching by Example: Education and the Formation of South Kensington's Museums', in Malcolm Baker, ed., *A Grand Design*, 107-116.
[535] Anon., 'Mr. Gladstone at Berwick', 2.
[536] Sarah Kane, 'When Paris Meets Teesdale, 163-4.

difficulties in siting a supposedly 'educational' institution in an area of the country that was still in the process of defining itself.[537] In the middle of the nineteenth Barnard Castle was not a real industrial centre like Manchester or Nottingham, where craftsmen and factory workers were seen to benefit from the presence of a museum of applied arts. There existed in Barnard Castle a carpet weaving industry until the 1840s, but by the time of the Museum's construction this was dwindling.[538] As such there was a general confusion about the 'utility' of the Museum to the surrounding area.[539] Furthermore as Gladstone implies, a prosperous manufacturing town would benefit from a museum in close proximity, but also provide munificent donors in order that a collection could be increased and maintained properly. The art historian Amy Woodson-Boulton has explained: 'municipal art museums embodied a new version of the Liberal ideal, in which individuals could – through self-education, hard work and discipline – participate in ever increasing numbers in the democratic process.[540] For Woodson-Boulton, effectively these institutions 'harnessed together private and public wealth' [541] A museum could be a symbol of success as well as a route to prosperity. Therefore, one of the most unique factors of The Bowes Museum is its dislocation both literally and figuratively from the rise of art museums in industrial locations: it was placed in a semi-rural environment and was not perceived to concretely contribute to a local industry.

Barnard Castle is a significant location for The Bowes Museum due to the relative closeness of John Bowes' stately home Streatlam Caste, which was only three miles away.[542] Because of this Giles Waterfield is sceptical of the philanthropic motivations in the creation of The Bowes Museum, seeing the building as 'being close to the centre of the…family estates…'[543] So for Waterfield its proximity to Streatlam Castle makes it more of an annexe of the country house that hovers in the grey area between public and private. When the Bowes began construction, Barnard Castle was also without a

[537] Sarah Kane, 'When Paris Meets Teesdale, 163-4.
[538] See Dennis Coggins, ed., *People and Patterns: The carpet weaving industry in 19th Century Barnard Castle* (Barnard Castle: The Friends of the Bowes Museum, 1996).
[539] Sarah Kane, 'When Paris Meets Teesdale, 163-4.
[540] Amy Woodson-Boulton, *Transformative Beauty*, 13.
[541] Amy Woodson-Boulton, *Transformative Beauty*, 13.
[542] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 3-4.
[543] Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 250.

conventional museum or art gallery and the closest thing to a public institution was the private museum of natural history specimens created at Lartington Hall by the amateur palaeontologist Henry Witham (1779-1849).[544] This small museum was much more in the vein of the literary and philosophical society, run by local amateurs and focussed on local and natural history. Societies such as this were the precursors to the municipal museum; places for friends and society to congregate usually found in industrial cities such as Manchester and Newcastle but their model also influenced a number of smaller regional posts such as in Whitby.[545] Like Witham's museum the Bowes' new venture may have been viewed contemporaneously as a semi-public appendage to his country estate, for a select cast of visitors and with a less formal educational remit.

Creating museums in decentralised and non-urban locations was the cause and symptom of a lively set of debates all throughout the mid-nineteenth century, and these offer a counter narrative to the observations of Kane and Waterfield that the Bowes Museum had little commitment to its surrounding area.[546] In the 1850s, when the state of the urban atmosphere prompted real concern for the safety of paintings and other art works, many of Britain's foremost artists, scientists and museum professionals appeared in the numerous parliamentary inquiries giving opinions on how best to save artworks from harsh urban conditions.[547] One of the aims of the Select Committee formed to investigate the function of the National Gallery in 1850 was 'to consider the present accommodation afforded by the National Gallery, and the best mode of preserving and exhibiting to the public, the works of art given to the nation,' suggesting that preservation of artworks was becoming a prime concern.[548] In response to this, a few years later in 1853, another Select Committee formed to investigate the management of the National Gallery asked many of its interviewees what they thought

[544] See Anon., 'Geology: The Lartington Hall Museum of Natural History', *The Edinburgh New Philosophical Journal*, vol. 24, (1837-38), 223.
[545] Simon Gunn, *The Public Culture of the Victorian Middle Class: Ritual and Authority and the English Industrial City*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000); Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 47-50.
[546] Sarah Kane, 'When Paris Meets Teesdale, 163-4; Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 250.
[547] *Report from the Select Committee on the National Gallery: Together with Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index*, (London: House of Commons, 1850)**;** *Report from the Select Committee on the National Gallery* (1853)
[548] *Report from the Select Committee on the National Gallery* (1850), iii. See Christopher Whitehead, *The Public Art Museum in the Nineteenth Century*, 60.

was the most appropriate location for a large public institution.[549] The committee found that many of the responses were variations on a theme that proposed moving municipal institutions into open spaces such as suburbs and parkland.[550] The architect behind many of the foremost German museum buildings, Leo von Klenze (1784-1864), in giving his evidence to the committee, made a strong case in favour of museums and galleries being positioned in suburban locations, surrounded by open spaces and trees to provide a purer environment for the paintings.[551] In the German cities of Berlin and Munich, complexes of museum were constructed around the middle of the nineteenth century in what is described by museum historian Michaela Giebelhausen as an 'Arcadian moment', occupying islands adrift from the modern metropolis.[552] Barnard Castle may have been a conscious choice as a place of refuge for the Bowes' collection in this vein, seen as a place of refuge and tranquility for the contemplation of art.

Christopher Whitehead has drawn out the similarities between the debates for providing clean environments for artworks and providing clean environments for leisure in the 1840s and 50s.[553] Whitehead states: 'the popularization on the part of the state of parkland as an open-to-all leisure resource indeed had much in common with the institutional development of the public museum,' recognising that museums set in parkland were particularly desirable because the presiding view was that open-air attractions were also essential to a healthy and happy populace.[554] One of the earliest examples of a suburban location being adopted for a museum site was the acquisition and opening to the public of the country house Aston Hall in the suburbs of Birmingham in 1858 (**figure 3.2**). Aston

[549] *Report from the Select Committee on the National Gallery* (1853). See Christopher Whitehead, *The Public Art Museum in the Nineteenth Century*, 63-64.
[550] *Report from the Select Committee on the National Gallery* (1853); Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 169.
[551] *Report from the Select Committee on the National Gallery* (1853), Appendix no. VIII 'Response to Questions Adopted by the Chairman of the Committee of the House of Commons, for the Establishment of a National Gallery of Fine Arts, to M. de Klenze, Intendant of the Buildings of the Crown and Current Privy Councilor of His Majesty the King of Bavaria', Questions 32-35.
[552] Michaela Giebelhausen, 'Museum Architecture: A Brief History', in Sharon Macdonald, ed., *A Companion to Museum Studies*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 2011), 229.
[553] Christopher Whitehead, *The Public Art Museum in Nineteenth Century Britain*, 59-68.
[554] Christopher Whitehead, *The Public Art Museum in Nineteenth Century Britain*, 62. For the increase in public parkland see Hazel Conway, *People's Parks: The Design and Development of Victorian Parks in Britain*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Hall is a seventeenth century mansion that belonged to the Holte family, and after a series of successful fetes held in the grounds in the 1850s, a group of individuals decided to form a private company called the 'Aston Hall and Park Company' and secure the building and its grounds for the use of public recreation permanently.[555] A report in the *Illustrated London News* coloured this event as a significant act of local community coming together in an act of 'self-help'.[556] The way in which such institutions were formed was of equal importance to the facilities they provided. As an institution formed for the public, by the public, Aston Hall represented a significant local asset and symbol of collective effort, even though it needed to be taken over by Birmingham Corporation in 1864, making it the first country house to be owned publicly.[557] However, the Bowes' museum could not be viewed as a locally formed leisure resource due to its reliance on single patrons who controlled everything, from access to the parklands to the type of recreation on offer. This is reflected in William Gladstone's 1876 speech in Berwick in which he questioned The Bowes Museum's democratic nature, describing it as 'a considerable distance out of town' and therefore of little use to the town's inhabitants.[558] This was met with outcry from the residents of Barnard Castle and its surrounding area, and a response was published in *The Times* on 7 October in which the author wrote of the Museum being a great advancement to the town of Barnard Castle 'entirely due to the spontaneous liberality of Mr Bowes and his late lamented wife the Countess de Montalbo.'[559] Gladstone saw this response as meriting an apology and clarification, which was addressed to the editor of *The Northern Echo* and published in various regional press outlets one month later. In it he stated:

> When I made that reference, it was before a party of some twenty or five-and-twenty gentlemen, and I considered myself as addressing them in private. My sole object was to lay stress upon the value of institutions obtained by spontaneous effort, as compared with any establishment, however splendid, which is the result of a boon from without.
> Although I entertain this opinion, yet, had I been aware that the expression of it was to go forth to the world at large, I should not have given utterance to it without adding a respectful and cordial acknowledgment of the remarkable bounty which has prompted this foundation;

[555] Anon., 'How a People Bought a Hall and Park', *Illustrated London News*, 12 June 1858, 591.
[556] Anon., 'How a People Bought a Hall and Park', 591. The author is referencing a philosophy of self-improvement that was exemplified by publications such as Samuel Smiles, *Self-Help: With Illustrations of Character and Conduct*, (London: John Murray, 1859).
[557] Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 292.
[558] Anon., 'Mr. Gladstone at Berwick', 2.
[559] Anon., 'The Bowes Museum – Barnard Castle', *The Times*, 7 October 1876, 8.

> and which compares so advantageously with the less costly merit so often lauded in our obituary notices, of a posthumous liberality.[560]

For Gladstone, though he was pleased for the people of Barnard Castle, the real value of a public institution came from the act of collaboration and prosperity generated within a community, rather than relying on wealth or generosity whose origins lay elsewhere. Because the museum project was entirely the effort of one member of the community, it carried less social currency.

The danger of an individualistic munificent project, located away from any real centre of population, was one of exclusion and accessibility. An institution created by the people for the people was far more democratic and egalitarian. In the case of the Bowes' institution, Sarah Kane writes that John Bowes, in 1872, 'in a far from democratic move, instructed Dent [his land agent] to admit only the "principal Gentlemen in the Town" and their families into the Museum Park.'[561] However, reading in full the archival material that Kane quotes from gives a slightly different perspective:

> When you return you had better see Mr Kyle, & tell him that tho' Mrs Bowes & I don't wish to exclude altogether anyone from seeing the Works at the museum, we wish the number to be as limited as possible, & that therefore I shall be glad if he will not give any Orders, but if he wishes any of his Friends, or Acquaintances to see the place to show it them while he is there. Also with the exception of any of the Gentle men in the neighbourhood of our acquaintance such as Mr Witham, Mr Hutchinson, Mr Milbank, etc, & any of the principal Gentlemen in the Town such as Mr Holmes (of course), Mr Watson, Mr Richardson, Dr Munro, Mr Longstaffe, etc, & there [sic] Families, Roe must not admit any Strangers without an order from you. Mrs Bowes also quite approves of your idea to give a book…in which all visitors should write their names. If too great latitude is given now it will be difficult, & seem disobliging when the place is finished, & closed in to other matters.[562]

Besides the fact that in 1872 the Museum is far from complete, and the term 'Works' refers to the building works of the Museum, denoting a construction site, this quote gives an example of the Museum operating as the representative type of 'publicness' delineated by Frazer Ward and Carol

[560] Anon., 'The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle: Mr Gladstone's Apology', *The Teesdale Mercury*, 15 November 1876, 5.
[561] Sarah Kane, 'When Paris Meets Teesdale: the Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle, in T. E. Faulkner, ed., *Northumbrian Panorama: Studies in the History and Culture of North East England* (London: Octavian Press, 1996), 181.
[562] TBMA, JB/2/1/40/84, Letter from John Bowes to R. J. Dent, 14 July 1872.

Duncan.[563] For Ward and Duncan museums were sites in which the elite displayed their wealth and status alongside their 'sentiments of civic concern.'[564] John Bowes appears careful to avoid the accusation of 'exclud[ing] altogether anyone' by assuring Dent that the Museum is a place of open assembly, but at this stage there is still measures of social control taking place in permitting only certain people on to the site.[565] By making exception for his social equals, 'the principal gentlemen' in the town, Bowes was making use of the Museum and its collection as an indicator of status, providing access to those that are of the appropriate social level.[566] This is further reinforced by Joséphine Bowes' desire to keep a visitors book at this early point, as a way to record the distinguished visitors to the Museum at this early stage.[567]

Whether the true intentions of John and Joséphine Bowes were in the philanthropic spirit or not, there is no doubt that the Museum had a positive impact on its environs. A newspaper report from 1870 recognised the Museum as being surrounded by a 'extensive, well laid-out, pleasure ground,' recognising its function as a place for leisure and recreation for the local townspeople.[568] The improving nature of the institution on its surroundings was also highlighted: as early as 1874, the local press were reporting that the general architecture of Barnard Castle was improving 'contemporaneously with the erection the Bowes Museum.'[569] Even though the Museum was in the very early stages of construction at this point there were signs of the institution's presence already educating local craftsmen and trades in elevated design principles. Furthermore, the Bowes Museum was often envisioned as the focal point of a network of public serving institutions. For instance, only five years after the museum building began to be erected, in 1874, the press reported of intended plans to build a Hydropathic Institution near to the museum site in order to create a hub of tourism, but this

[563] Frazer Ward, 'The Haunted Museum', 76-77; Carol Duncan, 'Art Museums and the Ritual of Citizenship' in Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, (London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991), 88-103.
[564] Carol Duncan, 'Art Museums and the Ritual of Citizenship', 93.
[565] TBMA, JB/2/1/40/84, Letter from John Bowes to R. J. Dent, 14 July 1872.
[566] TBMA, JB/2/1/40/84, Letter from John Bowes to R. J. Dent, 14 July 1872.
[567] TBMA, JB/2/1/40/84, Letter from John Bowes to R. J. Dent, 14 July 1872. A visitor book beginning from November 1872 is preserved at the museum: TBMA, TBM/3/2/1, Visitor book, 1872-1960.
[568] Anon., 'The New Mansion and Grounds at the end of Newgate Street, Barnard Castle, *The Teesdale Mercury*, July 27, 1870, 4.
[569] Anon., 'The Architecture of Barnard Castle', *The York Herald*, September 1874, 6.

was never followed through.[570] Then, around 1879 it was decided to place the North-Eastern County School on land adjacent to the Museum, with one of the attractions being a cross-fertilisation of knowledge between the school and the Museum.[571]

Despite the debates about museums necessarily being close to industrial or manufacturing centres, it appears that The Bowes Museum was welcomed and integrated into its local area before it had even opened, thereby generating its own purpose by virtue of being established. By 1876 a report in the *Newcastle Daily Chronicle* reported: 'in spite, however, of its antiquity, of its rare beauties, and of its proximity to great mineral resources, Barnard Castle has hitherto failed to achieve any notable meed of distinction in commerce, nor would it in all probability have before it at the present time a prospect of better things, but for the magnificent museum with which it has been dowered by the late Countess of Montalbo.'[572] Here the writer views the Museum as a substitute or catalyst for industry, in its power to draw people to the local area either as visitors to the Museum or to take inspiration from its collection. This demonstrates that the role of the public museum in the nineteenth century was not a clearly defined one, but politicians and cultural commentators held an image of the correct type of institution in their minds. The Bowes Museum was met with a certain amount of confusion and hostility due to its perceived lack of use to society because it did not have a visible connection to manufacture or industry, and it did not represent a product of communal effort through its private origins. However, it has been shown that The Bowes Museum did have a perceived benefit on the local area of Barnard Castle, particularly through acting as a component of a network of facilities that could instruct and amuse the residents. The next subsection explores how the Bowes themselves sought to frame this benefit to their advantage in attempting to pass a Private Act of Parliament that would allow them to gift the Museum for the public benefit, whilst it simultaneously acted as a residence, further complicating the private and public perceptions of the Museum set out in this subsection.

[570] Anon., *The Northern Echo*, 30 October 1874, 3.
[571] Anon., 'St. John's Hospital, Barnard Castle', *The Teesdale Mercury*, 28 July 1879, 5.
[572] Anon., 'Barnard Castle, from the Newcastle Daily Chronicle', *The Teesdale Mercury*, 19 April 1876, 5.

The 1871 Public Parks, Schools and Museums Act

Shortly after construction commenced on the Museum John and Joséphine Bowes began to think of the mechanism through which the museum building, gardens and collection would be immortalised as a public institution.[573] This meant putting practical measures in place regarding the process of bequeathing the land in Barnard Castle, the proposed building and its contents. The result of this was the passing of the Public Parks, Schools and Museums Act of 1871, a Private Act of Parliament which allowed gifts of land for the use of schools, parks and museums to be left for public use.[574] As it stood in 1870, the current law regarding the transference of private property into public hands derived from a thirteenth century law restricting land passing to longstanding institutions thereby making it inalienable.[575] This was given the name the 'Statute of Mortmain', referring to the 'dead hand' in which the land was held. By the nineteenth century, with the passing of 'the Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act' in 1736, the legislation was more specifically intended to prevent the coercion of dying people into the changing of their will to the 'ruin of their heirs'.[576] As far as the Bowes were concerned this meant that Joséphine Bowes was obliged to transfer the Museum and park into the hands of trustees during her lifetime in order for it to become a charitable bequest. Hardy prescribes to Joséphine the motivation of envisaging herself 'passing the years of her widowhood in the palatial suite on the upper floors of the Museum, superintending the arrangement of her collection,' and thus wished to defer the entrusting of a board until it was necessary.[577] As such the passing of the Act is indicative of a gesture of public munificence serving private means.

[573] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 177.
[574] 'Public Parks, Schools and Museums Act, 1871', 34 & 35 Vict, c. 13.
[575] John Cannon, *The Oxford Companion to British History*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), accessed online 2 April 2020.
[576] Gareth Jones, *History of the Law of Charity, 1532-1827,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 109-119; Matthew Mills, *The Development of the Public Benefit Requirement for Charitable Trusts in the Nineteenth Century*, The Journal of Legal History, vol. 37, no. 3, (2016), 297. Otherwise known as 9 Geo 2, c. 36.
[577] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 177.

The Bowes' enlisted their friends and associates to help to find a way to enact Joséphine Bowes wishes.[578] After discussing the matter with John Bowes' solicitor Edward Western and friend William Hutt, they settled on attempting to pass a Private Act of Parliament and began looking for prior models on which to base it. An obvious model for the Bowes' to follow was that of the private collection left intact and accessible to the public by the architect and collector Sir John Soane in 1833, and residing in the house in which he lived in Lincoln's Inn Fields (**figure 3.3**). In February 1870 Hutt wrote to John Bowes recommending this course of action, and asked that he recollect John Soane's endeavours from earlier in their parliamentary careers:

> …could not all your objects be obtained by a private act such as was passed in our first Parliament for the foundation & regulation of Sir John Soane's Institution in Lincoln's Inn? I think we could insure such an act even now & win a modification of it in regard to some provisions such as you might require which did not create a serious departure from the principle then sanctioned by Parliament.[579]

Soane had arranged to have a private Act of Parliament introduced in 1833 in order to transfer ownership of his large collection of books, paintings, sculptures, prints and architectural models and fragments to a board of trustees in order for it to seen by the public and utilised as teaching aids by students of art and architecture.[580] The full title of Soane's Act is 'An Act for settling and preserving Sir John Soane's Museum, Library and Works of Art, in Lincoln's Inn Fields in the County of Middlesex, for the Benefit of the Public, and for establishing a sufficient Endowment for the due Maintenance of the same.'[581] Both the Bowes and John Soane relied on the act of their collections becoming public assets in order to imbue them with meaning, with the Act of Parliament operating as an official manifesto, as beforehand the objects represented only a vague assemblage of objects contained in a private house. However, such Private Acts were questioned as truly beneficial to the public, and a truly democratic means of creating a public institution. According to Gillian Darley's account of the John Soane Act's journey through Parliamentary readings, opposition and eventual

[578] DCRO, D/St/C5/233-289, Correspondence relating to the Private Act, 1870-1871.
[579] DCRO, D/St/C5/233/11, Letter from William Hutt to John Bowes, 15 February 1870
[580] Barbara J. Black, *On Exhibit*, 67-71; Gillian Darley, *John Soane*, 300-304.
[581] John Soane, *Description of the House and Museum on the North Side of Lincoln's Inn Fields, the Residence of Sir John Soane*, (London: Levey, Robson and Franklyn, 1835), 101-109.

acceptance, a by-product was a 'wide ranging and thoughtful debate of the accessibility of museums to the public.'[582] When Conservative politician Sir Robert Peel (1788-1850) suggested Soane's collection should be placed in the British Museum, rather than simply opening up his house in Lincoln's Inn Fields, the radical MP William Cobbett (1763-1835) attacked the idea of whether true accessibility of the general public to the galleries and reading rooms of The British Museum existed.[583] Cobbett also presented a petition against the John Soane Act on behalf of John Soane's son, George Soane, who felt that he was being disinherited by the gift of the house and the collection to the nation.[584] Darley states that William Cobbett found the bequest inherently wrong on moral grounds in that it would be depriving John Soane's family of the sustenance 'to which they were entitled.'[585] However Peel saw Soane's devotion to collecting as form of self-sacrifice, where he had denied 'himself indulgence which other persons in an equal station of life generally enjoyed' and his gift consisted of a 'most liberal act.'[586] Cobbett is perhaps here pointing out the irony of creating civilising and moralising institutions out of the disenfranchisement of members of Soane's family. For Cobbett, his dedication to the 'common man' meant he more generally held a hostility towards the exclusive nature of the bequest, being generated by private means.[587]

This furious interchange between Cobbett and Peel also exposed the belief of many politicians that simply placing objects in a museum, as opposed to a house, meant that they became available to a wider audience. John Bowes and William Hutt would have witnessed first-hand some of these debates, and in particular the contentious issues around John Soane's collection, as is evident in the discussions around their own proposed Act of Parliament:

[582] Gillian Darley, *John Soane*, 302.
[583] Sir John Soane's Museum', House of Commons Debate 1 April 1833, vol. 16, cc 1333-34, Historic Hansard; Anne Goldgar, 'The British Museum and the Virtual Representation of Culture in the Eighteenth Century', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, vol. 32, no. 2, (2000), 195-231.
[584] Gillian Darley, *John Soane*, 302.
[585] Gillian Darley, *John Soane*, 303.
[586] 'Sir John Soane's Museum', House of Commons Debate 1 April 1833, vol. 16, cc 1333-34, Historic Hansard
[587] Martin J Wiener, 'The Changing Image of William Cobbett', *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 13, no.2, (1974), 135.

> Sir Wm Hutt said he remembered Sir John Soanes Act being passed when he was first in Parliament, that it was opposed by his son whom Sir J Soane had disinherited but that the government of the day stated that they saw no reason why the bill should not pass, & it did so, after attracting considerable attention.[588]

According to Western, Hutt felt that in John and Joséphine Bowes' case, the rationale for their museum 'might be framed even more to your advantage, than in Sir J Soanes case', due to the lack of opposition due to family feuds, but also because Soane's collection at the time lacked a driving function:[589]

> Sir Wm Hutt seemed to think that Sir J Soanes Act was not quite clear on the subject of whether he was bound to leave the collection at his death at all. My impression certainly is otherwise, viz that the act means, that all his then collection and also any further articles which he might acquire & leave in the house at his death, were settled by the Act.[590]

With Soane's objects contingent on being left in the house in order to be preserved, as described by Sophie Thomas, during his lifetime: 'the border between residence, museum and even documentary archive supporting all of Soane's activities was far from fixed.'[591] Therefore, Soane's collection was in a state of constant flux until petrified at the point of his death in 1837, and as John Elsner has remarked, even at that point it wasn't clear what the house and collection that had been left for the nation actually meant, highlighting the ambiguity behind the motivations for the Act.[592] Nevertheless, Soane's museum was endorsed by his standing in the architecture profession, and his reputation as a collector managed to signify its importance to the public sphere without too much justification. However, for John and Joséphine Bowes, whose collection was less well known, the institution they proposed to create needed to resonate with the politics of museum making at that particular moment. Therefore the Act needed to be much more precise about its value to society, and they attempted to draft a much broader and more inclusive Private Act that would make its benefit unquestionable. Thus, the Bowes stopped pursuing the idea of recasting the John Soane Act, and in 1870, a year later,

[588] DCRO, D/St/C5/248/3, Letter from E. Y. Western to John Bowes, 15 February 1870
[589] DCRO, D/St/C5/248/3, Letter from E. Y. Western to John Bowes, 15 February 1870
[590] DCRO, D/St/C5/248/4, Letter from E. Y. Western to John Bowes, 18 February 1870
[591] Sophie Thomas 'A "strange and mixed assemblage": Sir John Soane, Archivist of the Self', *Studies in Romanticism*, vol. 57, no. 1, (2018), 125.
[592] John Elsner, 'A Collector's Model of Desire', 158.

the Bowes were writing their own Act that was based on the provision of gifting educational institutions in a much wider sense. This is evident through further discussions in which the focus turns to aligning the Museum with other educational institutions such as schools. In February 1871 Edward Western to John Bowes: 'Sir William Hutt … thinks that by including sites for Schools the measure will be of more Public Utility & more likely to pass – I have taken the definition of School & Schoolhouse from the Education Act of last session.'[593] By emphasising the public utility, the Bowes and Hutt obviously harboured a concern that the Museum would be perceived as a collectors' whim, and made sure to frame it a valuable educational resource, and as such Bowes and his collaborators included schools in the Private Act to make it more likely to appeal to a broader swathe of parliamentarians.

The specific choice of language used in the Act is also discussed in detail by Western, Hutt and Bowes and their exchanges illustrate how the proposed museum was further framed in order to make it subscribe precisely to their notion of 'public utility'.[594] Western wrote to John Bowes after a discussion with Hutt:

> Sir William Hutt was averse to introducing into his Bill the words 'Antiquity or Curiosity' deeming them superfluous. It seems to me that the expressions "works of art" and "objects of natural history" interpreted in a wide sense would include most if not all such objects as you have in view.[595]

The aversion to such terms such as 'antiquity' and 'curiosity' evidences the general notion of what constituted the appropriate collection of a regional Victorian museum. An Antiquity may have given the idea of an antiquarian-type collection and thus made the Museum seem more arcane in its function. Likewise curiosity, as shown in the previous section of this thesis, may have promoted the Museum's connection with the trade and emphasised its private origins. Instead the language used in the Act of Parliament was far more inclusive and technical, and the final definition of a public

[593] DCRO, D/St/C5/289/8, Letter from E. Y. Western to John Bowes, 11 February 1871.
[594] DCRO, D/St/C5/289/8, Letter from E. Y. Western to John Bowes, 11 February 1871.
[595] Letter Edward Young Western to John Bowes, February 15 1871, DCRO, D/St/C5/289/9

museum was: ‘any buildings used or to be used for the preservation of any collection of paintings or other works of art, or of any object of natural history, or of any mechanical or philosophical inventions, instruments, models, or designs, and dedicated or to be dedicated to the recreation of the public, together with all libraries, reading rooms, laboratories and other offices and premises used or to be used in connection therewith.’[596] Here the Bowes decided to define their museum collection, which consists of paintings and ‘other works of art,’ in as inclusive terms as possible, and embedded within a cast of other types of collections in order to emphasise its place within the wide educational and recreational remit of such institutions.[597]

The bill received its third reading in the House of Lords on the 25 April 1871 and passed through, eventually coming into force on the 25 May.[598] The effect of this bill on the museum project was that Joséphine Bowes could write her Will & Codicil to include provisions for how the institution was to be arranged and governed after her death, safe in the knowledge it would be already be a public institution.[599] Beyond The Bowes Museum, the Act also had further consequences for the establishment of public amenities and educational resources, described by Hazel Conway as a key step in the development of public parks in the second half of the nineteenth century by extending the provisions of the 1859 Recreations Ground Act.[600] Thus it is seen that the publicly observable acts of philanthropy that the Bowes, though they also contained private motives, had far-reaching repercussions for the advancement of public amenities in society. The next subsection moves forward to when the Bowes began to build their museum building and investigates much more literally how the building presented public and private motives through its design influences and its internal layout

[596] ‘Public Parks, Schools and Museums Act, 1871’, 34 & 35 Vict, c. 13.
[597] ‘Public Parks, Schools and Museums Act, 1871’, 34 & 35 Vict, c. 13.
[598] ‘Minutes’, House of Lords Debate 25 May 1871, vol. 206, c1250, Historic Hansard
[599] TBMA, TBM/2/1/1, The Will and Codicil of Benoîte Joséphine Bowes, 12 & 19 July 1871
[600] Hazel Conway, *People’s Parks*, 226.

Building The Bowes Museum: Exterior

There are a number of original drawings, plans, correspondence and press reports relating to the design and construction of the museum building in Barnard Castle that show how it consistently refuted categorisation as either a public institution or private domestic residence in the earliest years of its construction, suggesting the reception it received is ingrained into the building's construction, as well as the stylistics associated with it.[601] This primary material has featured in a short unpublished article by Howard Coutts, who states that 'frustratingly little survives to indicate the nature of the design process [of the museum].'[602] However, with a contextual examination of the conditions of its construction, as well as close examination of primary material that survives it is possible to piece together a good picture of some of the design sources and processes for the museum building.[603]

From the moment it was constructed in the 1870s and 80s, the reception of the Bowes Museum's exterior as it was completed was a mixed one (**figure 1.0**). Writing about the picturesqueness of the landscape around Yorkshire in 1882 in *The Portfolio*, the art critic and clerk of the National Portrait Gallery William Chambers Lefroy (d. 1915) complained about The Bowes Museum building's discordant aesthetic: 'As we turn towards Barnard Castle, though the new and well intentioned Bowes Museum haunts and torments our sight, the views that inspired Sir Walter Scott, and Cresswick, and Turner still follow one another in delightful succession.'[604] The Museum's presence in the arcadian Teesdale landscape that, for Chambers Lefroy, evokes true English countryside, is redolent of the encroachment of the *noveaux-riches* and their ostentation on the realm of the upper-class. For

[601] Original drawings and plans for the museum are held in TBMA under reference TBM/5/1, Correspondence relating to the museum building proliferates through the Strathmore Papers at Durham County Record Office (D/St) and John and Joséphine Bowes' Papers at TBMA (JB).
[602] Howard Coutts, 'The Bowes Museum: An Architectural History', Unpublished article in The Bowes Museum.
[603] These letters can be found throughout The Bowes Museum Archive, TBMA, JB/2, and Durham County Record Office, DCRO, D/St & D/Bo.
[604] William Chambers Lefroy, 'The Ruined Abbeys of Yorkshire', *The Portfolio: An artistic periodical*, January 1882, 171. Lefroy was employed as clerk to the National Portrait Gallery's director Sir George Scharf (1820-1895) and carried out a wide range of duties such as the inspection of the collections, working on catalogue and general administration. I am grateful to the NPG's archivist Carys Lewis for retrieving this information from the archive file NPG66/2/1/4.

Chambers Lefroy this edifice was a squat house that was incongruous to its surroundings aesthetically and the next section takes further steps to investigate the prejudice behind this view.

The mixed reception of The Bowes Museum is largely due to its perceived nonconformist approach to the architecture of regional public museums in the nineteenth century. Charles Saumarez Smith heralded the British Museum as the paragon of what he calls the 'classic museum type.'[605] He subdivided this 'type' into separate tenets that set the general tone for most subsequent museum building in the first half of the nineteenth century, which included the following four observations: Firstly, a building using 'a single, consistent architectural order' was key for symbolising the social and cultural integrity, as 'the façade effectively conveyed the message of an organization of knowledge and its subordination to a universal system of classification.[606] Secondly, the use of 'the language of classical antiquity' was to evoke feelings of 'subordination to the authority of scholarship and admiration for a canonical tradition.'[607] Lastly, is 'the extent to which the architect has subsumed his personality in the general concept of the museum.'[608] For Saumarez Smith this checklist constitutes the 'characteristics of the traditional museum' and is only consciously subverted by architects in the post-war period.[609] Thus, The Bowes Museum and its distinctly eclectic architectural style of the French Renaissance has been viewed in polarity to the type of buildings that represent the classic regional museum.

A view of the classical style as representative of traditional museum architecture is evident in the work of the architectural historian John Summerson, stressed in his work 'The Architecture of British Museums and Art Galleries,' which describes exactly how large national art institutions exemplify this museum type.[610] Summerson also completely writes regional museum architecture out of this

[605] Charles Saumarez Smith, 'Architecture and the Museum: The Seventh Reyner Banham Memorial Lecture', *Journal of Design History*, vol. 8, no. 4 (1995), 243. See also Helen Searing 'Museum Typology'
[606] Charles Saumarez Smith, 'Architecture and the Museum', 243-244.
[607] Charles Saumarez Smith, 'Architecture and the Museum', 244.
[608] Charles Saumarez Smith, 'Architecture and the Museum', 244.
[609] Charles Saumarez Smith, 'Architecture and the Museum', 245.
[610] John Summerson, 'The Architecture of British Museums and Art Galleries', in Jeannie Chapel and Charlotte Gere, eds., *The Fine and Decorative Art Collections of Britain and Ireland*, 9-19.

type, believing it mostly to be executed poorly by architects with no imagination.[611] However, in assessing The Bowes Museum, Summerson describes the museum building simply as 'the most gloriously independent freak of the 1870s.'[612] His judgement of The Bowes Museum implies that not only is the physical fabric of the building not in keeping with the general stylistic traits of Victorian museum building, but also that it was somehow created separately from the wider political and social contexts of the time. Giles Waterfield describes it as a 'startlingly incongruous building,' that 'proudly stat[es] its distinctiveness as a stately pile that is the epitome of otherness.'[613] Waterfield, like Summerson, is reluctant to see The Bowes Museum within the stylistics that define Victorian regional museums, but instead sees the building as a product of the social position of John and Joséphine Bowes as not belonging to the aristocratic classes. This style of building that is characterised by its eccentricity was actually a widely adopted trope of many private houses in the middle of the nineteenth century and is visible in residences such as Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild's Waddesdon Manor.[614] Joseph Mordaunt Crook, in his book on the architectural styles favoured by the *noveaux riche* of the Victorian and Edwardian periods, observes a rise in the taste for the French chateau style in their country and town houses. He states: 'by the late 1860s the vague eclecticism of Old French had clearly become a recognised symbol for ostentation.'[615] Though this architectural style was primarily seen in private residences, there was also an urban and more civic type of building associated with its use such as for luxury hotels and town halls which acted as the precursor for the domestic projects.[616] As Mark Girouard has described: 'the more self-confident of the new commercial and industrial rich, when they invested in country estates, began to build houses that reflected the luxury, opulence and stylistic peculiarities of the new hotels.[617] In this way The Bowes

[611] John Summerson, 'Museums as Architecture', *Museums Journal*, vol. 3, (1955), 31-38. See also Nikolaus Pevsner, *A History of Building Types* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1976)
[612] John Summerson, 'The Architecture of British Museums and Art Galleries', 15.
[613] Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 250.
[614] Mark Girouard, *The Victorian Country House*, 291-302; J. Mordaunt Crook, *The Rise of the Nouveaux-Riches: Style and Status in Victorian and Edwardian Architecture*, (London: John Murray, 1999); Tom Stammers, 'Old French and New Money: Jews and the Aesthetics of the Old Regime in Transnational Perspective, c.1860-1910', *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies*, vol. 18, no. 4, (2019), 489-512. For Waddesdon see Bruno Pons, *The James A. de Rothschild Bequest at Waddesdon Manor, Architecture and Panelling*, vol. 11, (London: Philip Wilson, 1996).
[615] J. Mordaunt Crook, *The Rise of the Nouveaux-Riches*, 60.
[616] Mark Girouard, *The Victorian Country House*, 293-94
[617] Mark Girouard, *The Victorian Country House*, 294.

Museum is seen as a private edifice and embodies the same uniqueness in design as the country house architecture of the newly monied classes, but actually has roots in a much more public and civic type of structure. Sarah Kane has attempted to see The Bowes Museum building as falling prey to this stylistic confusion, and describes it as a building lost in translation, being interpreted in France as representing an important civic building, but in Britain the style would have been recognised as that used for metropolitan hotels and the country house of the *nouveux riches*.[618]

The eclecticism of The Bowes Museum building is also reflected in its collaborative design and construction which occurred across both Britain and France through different architects. The architects of the museum building, a Frenchman Jules Pellechet (1829-1903) and an Englishman John Edward Watson (1821-1885) are little known in architectural history scholarship, but their role in the co-creation of the museum building is significant. As such each requires a short introduction here, as they both show prior engagement with public museum architecture and as proponents of the Second Empire style in Britain in the mid-nineteenth century. Whilst residing in France during the 1850s, the Bowes had first commissioned the French architect Auguste Pellechet (1789-1874) to carry out a number of commissions for them. These included overseeing renovations and decorations of their various homes of the chateau at Louveciennes and the apartment at rue de Berlin, Paris; and also constructing the building the Bowes used as a storehouse for works of art on rue Blomet in Paris.[619] However, during this latter project Pellechet's son Jules Pellechet took over as the Bowes' primary architect in France.[620] Jules Pellechet is known for a number of public and private buildings in Paris such as the Hôtel d'Essling on rue Jean Goujon (1866), and the Villa Huffer in Rome (1880-83). Pellechet, like most nineteenth century architects, undertook a tour of Italy as part of his training. Letters he wrote to his father Auguste Pellechet during this trip have been published, and these record him studying principle architectural and monumental sites in Northern Italy and Sicily, and meeting

[618] Sarah Kane, 'When Paris Meets Teesdale: The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle', 179.
[619] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 108-109 & 141. Auguste Pellechet sub-contracted a lot of the interior work in the Bowes' apartments to Monbro fils âiné, and many of the bills in the archive are under his name: TBMA, JB/4/6, Pellechet accounts, 1851-1880.
[620] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 141

other English junior architects such as Frederick Pepys Cockerell (1833-1878).[621] Cockerell was the son of the architect Charles Robert Cockerell (1788-1863) who worked on buildings such as the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford and the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge in the 1830s and 1840s, and Cockerell the younger himself went on to submit designs for an extension to the National Gallery in 1866, suggesting that Pellechet's education and training was carried out in the company of some of Britain's most prominent public architects.[622]

As the museum building project required a full-time architect to oversee it, rather than ask Pellechet to relocate from Paris, the Bowes employed John Edward Watson, a Newcastle-based architect to supervise and sub-contract all the necessary work. Little is written about Watson before his work for the Bowes. Born in Scotland, he began his architectural career apprenticed to the firm of John and Benjamin Green in Newcastle and there are a number of indications that Watson was an architect of some standing before being employed by the Bowes.[623] According to the *Dictionary of Scottish Architects* he submitted a design for the Great Exhibition building competition in 1850 which received a commendation from Prince Albert.[624] Like Pellechet, Watson took a tour across Europe in 1847-48 and 1855-56 so would have had an advanced education in architectural styles.[625] He crafted a comfortable career for himself throughout the 1850s and 60s, and he was made President of the Northern Architectural Association in 1869.[626] His first employ with the Bowes was in 1866, when he was engaged in renovation work at Streatlam Castle, and at this point he was described by John Bowes as 'a very expensive architect.'[627] From this point on he carried out regular work for the Bowes

[621] Catherine Pellechet and Marie Pellechet, eds., *Jules Pellechet, Lettres d'Italie, 1856-1857*, (Paris, 1894). References to excursions with Frederick Pepys Cockerell appear throughout.
[622] For Frederick Pepys Cockerell see Christopher Whitehead, *The Public Art Museum in Nineteenth Century Britain*, 206. For Charles Robert Cockerell see 'Charles Robert Cockerell', *Dictionary of Scottish Architects 1660-1980*, (accessed at http://www.scottisharchitects.org.uk/architect_full.php?id=207752, 10 April 2020.)
[623] 'John Edward Watson', *Dictionary of Scottish Architects 1660-1980*, (accessed at http://www.scottisharchitects.org.uk/architect_full.php?id=207752, 10 April 2020.)
[624] 'John Edward Watson', *Dictionary of Scottish Architects 1660-1980*, (accessed at http://www.scottisharchitects.org.uk/architect_full.php?id=207752, 10 April 2020.)
[625] Watson's journals from these tours are included in The Bowes Museum papers at Durham County Record Office, DCRO, D/Bo/F/88-89.
[626] See the list of 'Past Presidents' at https://northernarchitecturalassociation.org.uk/ (accessed 10 April 2020)
[627] TBMA, JB/2/1/35/13, Letter from John Bowes to R. J. Dent, 23 February 1866.

on their estate buildings before being tasked with the central role of overseeing the building of their new museum building.

Charles Hardy describes John Edward Watson and Jules Pellechet as the 'joint architects' of The Bowes Museum building, however he also claims the basic design was done by Pellechet, with Watson employed for overseeing the construction due to being based locally.[628] It is also logical to assume that due to the museum building's distinctively French aesthetic, that John Edward Watson was simply working to the designs of Jules Pellechet, as Caroline Chapman does, claiming that Watson was 'interpreting' the design by the 'French architect Jules Pellechet.'[629] However, examination of the proliferation of French Second Empire architecture for both civic buildings and private residences outside of France in the mid-nineteenth century opens up the possibility that Watson had more agency in the design process than has been previously acknowledged. Indeed, Hardy claims that Watson had the authority to make 'alterations in the design,' something that is also corroborated by the archive.[630] Watson's input to this design process can also be contextually reinforced by the presence of French influences in the architectural projects for British museums such as the architect Robert Kerr's (1823-1904) 1864 design in the Second Empire style for the Natural History Museum building in South Kensington (**figure 3.4**), which may have influenced Watson. A more direct relationship between Watson and Second Empire architecture is the use of the French Renaissance style by the architect Charles Tiffin (1833-1873) who was Watson's pupil in the 1850s.[631] Perhaps positively shifting the extent to which Watson was included in the design process of The Bowes Museum is the parliament building designed in Brisbane, Australia by Charles Tiffin in the mid-1860s.[632] Tiffin had emigrated to Australia in 1854, after training under Watson, and became the first to take the post of Queensland Colonial Architect with responsibility for designing

[628] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 141 & 161.
[629] Caroline Chapman, *John & Joséphine*, 111.
[630] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 161. See, for example, Watson's involvement in the design of the Picture Gallery, DCRO, D/St/C5/297, John Bowes' correspondence for 1872.
[631] Don Watson, 'Charles Tiffin: Public Service *Con Amore*', *Queensland History Journal*, vol. 23, no. 11 (2018), 752-769; Don Watson, 'Parliament House: design and construction apart from Charles Tiffin and John Petrie, who else was involved?' *Queensland History Journal*, vol. 23, no. 11 (2018), 770-797.
[632] Don Watson, 'Parliament House', 770-797.

government buildings.[633] The design for the central parliament house in Brisbane is again very similar to the typical Second Empire civic style of The Bowes Museum comprising of a central domed pavilion and two wings with projecting pavilions at either end (**figure 3.5**). Though the proportions here are not as refined as in The Bowes Museum, the general character of the building is remarkably similar. Tiffin and Watson are known to have corresponded after Tiffin's emigration, but there is no evidence that they discussed designs for the Museum so this may be evidence of a wider recognition of the Second Empire style with civic buildings.[634] The architectural historians Don Watson and Stuart King have both claimed Tiffin based his design for the parliament building on the published drawing of Robert Kerr's design for the Natural History Museum building in South Kensington (**figure 3.4**).[635] This design was published in *The Builder* in 1864, and in such a popular architectural publication would have been a widely circulated image.[636] The elevation of Kerr's east facing façade bears a striking resemblance to French buildings such as the Tuileries Palace and the town hall at Le Havre which had provided the inspiration for The Bowes Museum.[637] Don Watson has also suggested that Tiffin's design may also have been influenced by the Musée de Picardie, in Amiens, as a photograph of the façade was found in a scrap book belonging to Tiffin.[638] The Musée de Picardie was constructed between 1855-1867 by the architects Henri Parent (1819-1895) and Arthur-Stanislas Diet (1827-1890) and represents a typical Second Empire regional museum building. Elizabeth Conran has similarly pointed out the influence of regional French museums on the design of The Bowes Museum, alluding to Jules Pellechet's authority.[639] However, with design sources such as the Musée de Picardie reaching as far as the British colonies, the architecture of The Bowes Museum may have been a more general interpretation of French architecture.

---

[633] Don Watson, 'Charles Tiffin', 754-754.
[634] Don Watson, 'Charles Tiffin', 764.
[635] 'Engraving of Design for Proposed National Museums, South Kensington, to which the Second Premium was Awarded', *The Builder*, 25 June 1864, 475. See Stuart King, 'Colony and Climate: Positioning Public Architecture in Queensland, 1859-1909', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Melbourne, (2010); Don Watson, 'Parliament House', 774.
[636] See King's Dissertation abstract: Stuart King, 'Colony and Climate: Positioning Public Architecture in Queensland, 1859-1909', *ABE Journal*, vol. 2, (2012), published online https://journals.openedition.org/abe/402.
[637] DCRO, D/St/C5/227/66, Notes about Mr Watson's Sketch of the Museum, &c, 14 October 1869; Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, (Barnard Castle: W.R. Atkinson, 1893), 8
[638] Don Watson, 'Charles Tiffin', 764.
[639] Elizabeth Conran, *The Bowes Museum*, 10.

There was also a brief surge in the popularity in the Second Empire style in Newcastle, possibly due to influence of The Bowes Museum, such as Sunderland's Museum and Library, designed by John and Thomas Tillman in 1877-79 (**figure 3.6**).[640] A contemporary newspaper report also commented on the similarity between Tynemouth's Aquarium and Winter Garden and The Bowes Museum building in 1879 (**figure 3.7**).[641] This suggests that the appearance of a French Renaissance *chateau* in rural Teesdale was not as anomalous as has previously been suggested, given the prevalence of the style in the surrounding area in the 1870s.

The construction process of the building demonstrates more instances where its design evoked comments on both its civic and private nature. The foundation stone of the Museum was laid on the 27 November 1869 by Joséphine Bowes with an event of modest ceremony.[642] However, plans for the Museum had been drawn up prior to this by Pellechet and Watson, and the Bowes were already well aware of the aesthetic impact of the large French Renaissance style building which they had commissioned. There are two designs of the exterior elevation extant in the museum collection from c.1869 (**figure 3.8**, **figure 3.9**). One is signed and dated by Watson, and the other, though missing its bottom right corner where it would normally be signed, is likely from Pellechet's office. This is supported by the presence of a French flag flying above the museum building; replaced in the design by Watson with the union flag in a case of friendly cross-channel rivalry that reinforces the pluralistic genesis of the building. Because the plans are the only to survive in the museum archive, they are likely the final designs for the museum façade and a sense of the prior drafting process is shown in correspondence in the archive.[643] It is clear the design was nearing completion by October 1869, as evinced by a letter in John Bowes' hand with annotations by Watson, which comprises a list of 'Notes about Mr Watson's Sketch of the Museum, &c.'[644] One of the most significant points the Bowes

[640] See Graham Potts and Michael Johnson, *The Architecture of Sunderland, 1700-1914*, (Stroud: The History Press, 2013).
[641] Anon., 'North-Eastern Railway Tours', *The Newcastle Courant*, 5 September 1879, 7.
[642] Caroline Chapman, *John & Joséphine*, 111; Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 160-163.
[643] The correspondence is mainly held in DCRO, D/St/C5.
[644] DCRO, D/St/C5/227/66, Notes about Mr Watson's Sketch of the Museum, &c, 14 October 1869.

wished to convey was the use of the Tuileries Palace as a model for the central portion of the building, writing: 'Entrance 1 large Arch in centre of Entrance see photograph of the Tuileries.'[645] This suggests the central pavilion of the museum building is directly modelled on the royal palace of Paris (**figure 3.10**).

During the Second Empire, Napoleon III had set out to 'complete' the Louvre palace complex by constructing a new façade that linked the royal palace to the Tuileries – a project completed between 1852 and 1870 and by two consecutive architects: Louis Visconti (1791-1853) and Hector Lefuel (1810-1880). The Tuileries had served as a royal residence for the previous three centuries, and during the Second Empire it had been extensively remodelled and furnished by Napoleon III and acted as a centre of the Imperial couples' social world, hosting lavish balls.[646] This is perhaps indicative of the palatial domestic residence that The Bowes Museum was proposed to be, but the Tuileries and its associated buildings also had a strong influence on domestic and civic architectural projects in Europe. This project provided the paradigm for much of the French Renaissance revival architecture that would make its way to Britain in the 1860s and 1870s.[647] Indeed, the elevation of this new wing of the Louvre closely matches the stylistics and proportions of the museum façade so surely must have provided a reference point for Pellechet and Watson. However, it appears that the architects were also looking at French civic architecture too. According to an 1870 newspaper report the building also took elements from the town hall at Le Havre built by Charles Fortuné Louis Brunet Debaines (1801-1862) in 1857 (**figure 3.11**).[648]

[645] DCRO, D/St/C5/227/66, Notes about Mr Watson's Sketch of the Museum, &c, 14 October 1869.
[646] Louis J. Iandoli, 'The Palace of the Tuileries and its Demolition: 1871-1883', *The French Review*, vol. 79, no. 5, (2006), 988.
[647] Mark Girouard, *The Victorian Country House*, 291-292.
[648] Anon., 'Mrs Bowes New Mansion, Museum and Picture Galleries, at Barnard Castle', 5. This is also repeated in Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, (Barnard Castle: W.R. Atkinson, 1893), 8. Charles Hardy cites a letter from John Bowes to Richard Bowes, his agent in Le Havre, asking him to send measurements and illustrations of town hall there, Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 161. See also Mark Girouard, *The Victorian Country House*, 296.

The 1869 design by Watson and Pellechet provided the basis for a perspective elevation that was published in the popular architectural periodical *The Builder* in 1871 (**figure 3.12**).[649] For the museum building to feature in such a prominent architectural periodical was testament to the ambition of the project, and John and Joséphine Bowes were evidently pleased with the coverage for they sent out a number of copies to friends to admire.[650] Reactions to this, preserved within the museum archive's correspondence files, are worth noting, as they again reinforce the oscillation between the private residence and public utility the building was destined for, as well as its category defying appearance.[651] One recipient was the ceramicist and glassmaker Emile Gallé (1846-1904), who Joséphine had first met at the London International Exhibition of 1871.[652] Gallé recognised its derivation from the palace of the Tuileries: 'I hasten to thank you for your very gracious dispatch: is it really your wish to re-erect our poor Tuileries in England? It is a veritable "pavilion of Marsan". What a princely and royal setting for our humble faience! What encouragement for the faience makers of Saint Clément!'[653] Gallé was writing after the Paris Commune which resulted in the destruction of the Tuileries, so for him the Bowes' museum could represent nothing other than their desire to recreate the renowned French palace in England as a signifier of their trans-national and elite status. However, the building's appearance prompted a more ambivalent response in respect to its public function when translated and interpreted by the Bowes' British friends. One of John Bowes' regular correspondents was the travel writer and historian Alexander William Kinglake (1809-1891), who saw the design as representative of a country house rather a civic building. In the letter Kinglake exclaimed: 'My taste in architecture is not so well cultivated as to warrant me in claiming to be at all a judge, but the design strikes me very favourably as shown on paper, & what a majestic palace it will be!'[654] He then compared the design favourably to that of the second iteration of Montagu House, Whitehall (**figure 3.13**):

[649] Anon., 'Mrs. Bowes Mansion and Galleries at Barnard Castle, Durham', 28.
[650] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 178.
[651] TBMA, JB/2/5/4/7, Letter from William Hutt to John Bowes, 21 February 1871; TBMA, JB/2/6/6, Letter from Alexander William Kinglake to John Bowes, 21 February 1871; TBMA, JB/5/6/3, Letter Emile Galle to Joséphine Bowes, 18 September 1871.
[652] TBMA, JB/5/6/3, Letter Emile Galle to Joséphine Bowes, 18 September 1871.
[653] TBMA, JB/5/6/3, Letter Emile Galle to Joséphine Bowes, 18 September 1871.
[654] TBMA, JB/2/6/6, Letter from Alexander William Kinglake to John Bowes, 21 February 1871

> I have an idea that for that kind of architecture great loftiness is essential, & that a want in that direction is the cause of the failure of the architect – I don't know who he was – that designed the Duke of Buccleuch's house at Whitehall; so if the museum has not yet got so far as to preclude all change in points of height, it might be worth while for M[rs] Bowes when passing through London to drive down Parliament Street, & take a look at the building of which I speak.[655]

The residence of the 5[th] Duke of Buccleuch whose original Georgian mansion on Whitehall was replaced with a French Renaissance style palace in the 1850s, designed by the Scottish architect William Burn (1790-1870), was described by the *Illustrated London News* as 'befitting the residence of a peer of the highest rank.' [656] This edifice was well known for its sumptuous interior and private art collection, as much as its exclusiveness in terms of who was allowed inside to see it. Mark Girouard describes it as 'an invasion of the town by the country,' drawing it in to the cast of eccentric country houses owned by the *nouveaux-riches*.[657] Thus, Kinglake equating the museum building with such an exclusive private residence epitomises the perception it had of functioning domestically.

William Hutt's response to John Bowes recognised the Museum's exterior appearance as representing a civic purpose when he expressed his admiration for the design, confessing that he 'was fearful that it might be in the Tudor or Gothic style which are so much the rage just now in England for every description of public or private Building.'[658] With the Tudor Gothic being the prevailing style in British museum architecture in the middle decades of the nineteenth century, Hutt here was perhaps recalling such buildings as the Oxford University Museum of Natural History, which had been designed according the principles of John Ruskin, to who Gothic architecture represented the pinnacle of human creativity (**figure 3.14**). However, the museum design obviously pleased Hutt, who saw the most apposite form of architecture in the 'noble palaces of Florence…the grand elevations that raise up the mind and feelings of those who look at them.'[659] Perhaps because of Hutt's association to the

[655] TBMA, JB/2/6/6, Letter from Alexander William Kinglake to John Bowes, 21 February 1871
[656] Anon., 'Montagu House, Whitehall, the Mansion of the Duke of Buccleuch', *The Illustrated London News*, 24 September 1864, 311.
[657] Mark Girouard, *The Victorian Country House*, 292.
[658] TBMA, JB/2/5/4/7, Letter from William Hutt to John Bowes, 21 February 1871
[659] TBMA, JB/2/5/4/7, Letter from William Hutt to John Bowes, 21 February 1871

educative programmes of the Board of Trade and the South Kensington Museum, this museum, with its neo-Renaissance building with its sculptural façade, was the image that had been brought to mind (**figure 3.15**). One of the key principles of the South Kensington Museum's exterior, by including experimental materials and techniques, was that the viewer could look up at it and receive and object lesson in design which would certainly 'raise up the mind.'[660] Through contextualising the three responses to the Bowes' building design from Gallé, Kinglake and Hutt it is demonstrated just how varied the responses it solicited were, and thus reinforces the design's ambiguity that oscillates between palace, house and museum.

Building the Bowes Museum: Interior

Tracing the development of the interior space of The Bowes Museum throughout the 1870s highlights both implicit and explicit ways in which a private collection became a public museum. Kate Hill has asserted that the way the Victorian museum organised its space was the 'most significant method of creating meaning,' as the way the museum allowed visitors to circulate and experience a collection determined its validity to public life.[661] Following this, this subsection investigates the changing formation and function of spaces within The Bowes Museum from 1869 onwards. Hill has analysed the layouts of a number of municipal museums such as those in Liverpool, Sheffield, Preston and Leicester, and their development over the second half of the nineteenth century.[662] In so doing, Hill is testing the thesis of museum historian Tony Bennett, that museums' layouts are visible formations of the way they deploy methods of controlling their visitors movements and experience in the Foucauldian sense of exercising power over subjects.[663] By applying this method practically, and

[660] See Julius Bryant, *Designing the V&A: The Museum as a Work of Art*, (London: Lund Humphries, 2017), 24-33.
[661] Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums*, 90.
[662] Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums*, 90-124
[663] Tony Bennett applied the Foucauldian approach to museum layout in Tony Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum*, 48-58.

physically tracing the routes that visitors would take from entering the museum, and the sequence of the rooms that the visitor would encounter in Liverpool, Sheffield, Preston and Leicester, Hill highlights that far from adopting the Foucauldian model of rigorous control of visitors, Victorian municipal museums instead differed from museum to museum, acted in a much more conditional and fragmented way, and 'were relatively unplanned, undetermined spaces which responded to local conditions.'[664] This is also supported by historian of scientific museums Sophie Forgan, who states that buildings:

> are constantly subject to reuse, adaptation, and reinterpretation, both during their lifetime and by historians today. A Foucauldian analysis may be appropriate at the moment of planning or initial construction. But buildings are rarely constructed exactly as planned, and there is a multitude of intangible ways in which perceptions about particular places are modified, not only through use, but by the fabric of the building itself, its texture and durability, its decoration…[665]

Museums' interior space cannot be interpreted in simple terms due to its social nature and varied use throughout history. In the case of The Bowes Museum this is certainly applicable due to its genesis as a building that was part-museum and part-residence, which then had to adapt to a more public set of parameters as the domestic aspects of the building became redundant after the death of Joséphine Bowes in 1874. Therefore, the changing configuration of the layout of The Bowes Museum is much more revealing about how the Museum transitioned from the private to the public sphere, through the changing purpose and function of different rooms and spaces within the building. Applying Hill's method of analysing museum floor plans to plans of The Bowes Museum, alongside written accounts in the press and correspondence between the Bowes and their architects, it is evident how at first only the two large spaces to the rear of the Museum are officially designated as 'museum' space, and the purpose of the rest of the building's rooms remained vague and unfixed.[666] However post-1874, much

[664] Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums*, 104.
[665] Sophie Forgan, '"But Indifferently Lodged…": Perception and Place in Building for Science in Victorian London', in Crosbie Smith and Jon Agar, ed., *Making Space for Science: Territorial Themes in the Shaping of Knowledge*, (London: Macmillan, 1998), 198. Quoted in Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums*, 92.
[666] The main reports under consideration here are: Anon., 'Mrs. Bowes Mansion and Galleries at Barnard Castle, Durham', 27; Anon., 'The Bowes' Museum at Barnard Castle', *Richmond and Ripon Chronicle*, 14 March 1874, 7; Anon., 'The Bowes Museum', *The Newcastle Daily Chronicle*, 23 January 1878, 3.

more of the building, including the majority of the rooms housed in the Museum's wings and the domestic areas in the basement and attic, are given public functions such as an observatory and a library.[667] The shift in focus of the Museum as a house to a purely public institution is also foregrounded in the mind of John Bowes after Joséphine Bowes' death in 1874, as shown in private correspondence to the Museum's architect Watson.[668] John Bowes was obviously at pains to correct a false perception of the building as a house in any press or publicity, as Watson wrote to him in December 1874: 'I…will do what I can to get the public to call it the "museum" instead of mansion.'[669] Therefore this subsection will highlight how the change from mansion to museum was physically implemented.

The earliest initial insights gained about the interior layout of The Bowes Museum are from 1869, and show a building still very much in the planning stages.[670] John Edward Watson supplied the Bowes with a plan for their consideration, which, unlike the façade, they were not satisfied with and replied to Watson with a list of remarks and comments on how it should be altered.[671] The notes written in John Bowes' hand mentioned the formation of the "Sous-Sol" – a typically French feature of domestic architecture that consists of a part-underground level beneath a slightly raised ground floor – containing domestic quarters.[672] Bowes described this appropriate to its common use, as 'comfortably habitable for Rooms, Kitchens, &c about 8 feet high under the whole of the Front of the Building.'[673] The descriptions contained in the Bowes' 'Notes', and three subsequent plans of the Museum dated from February 1870, show that from the early stages the make-up of the museum building was divided into the following: the basement storey with the slightly higher 'Sous-Sol' at the front of the building containing domestic and private areas and cellars across the entire footprint of the building

[667] Anon., 'The Bowes Museum', 3.
[668] DCRO, D/St/C5/385/19a, Letter from J. E. Watson to John Bowes, 28 December 1874.
[669] DCRO, D/St/C5/385/19a, Letter from J. E. Watson to John Bowes, 28 December 1874.
[670] DCRO, D/St/C5/227/66, Notes about Mr Watson's Sketch of the Museum, &c, 14 October 1869.
[671] DCRO, D/St/C5/227/66, Notes about Mr Watson's Sketch of the Museum, &c, 14 October 1869.
[672] DCRO, D/St/C5/227/66, Notes about Mr Watson's Sketch of the Museum, &c, 14 October 1869. For the domestic nature of this see Mark Girouard, *Life in the French Country House*, (London: Cassell, 2000), 309-311.
[673] DCRO, D/St/C5/227/66, Notes about Mr Watson's Sketch of the Museum, &c, 14 October 1869.

(**figure 3.16**, **figure 3.17**, **figure 3.18**).[674] Above this, the ground floor comprised of the entrance hall containing the principal staircase which flanked either side of the hall and ascended to a balustraded walkway.[675] From here was gained access to a large single room spanning the rear of the gallery, which John Bowes described as 'the back part of the Building under the Picture Gallery', and recommended that it 'be divided in the first instance into the same number of compartments…as the Picture Gallery,' suggesting the form and purpose of this room was not yet fixed.[676] Eight other rooms were accessible by the balustraded corridor running along the front of the sculpture gallery: one in each pavilion at either end of the building, and six more spanning the building's front, three either side of the stairs.[677] The first floor was the same as the ground floor except for an extra room at the front of the building above the entrance hall, though according to the Bowes' notations at this stage this area of the Museum required 'considerable alteration.'[678] The 1870 plan describes the room in front of the Picture Gallery simply as a 'room', again reinforcing its unfixed purpose.[679] Another small but significant difference between the first floor and the ground floor is that the smaller rooms either side of the stairs on the first floor contain doors which on the plan suggests they were closed off spaces, as opposed to the enfilade effect of rooms on the ground floor.[680] This is an indicator that these rooms had more of a private function and could have been allocated for domestic use at this point. The 1870 plans also contain many annotations in pencil, which may well be later, and which suggest the process of thinking about the proportioning and organisation of space.[681] For example, a small section showing the top-lighting of the Picture Gallery, an architectural flourish and the placement of display cases (**figure 3.19**).[682] However, this early description and subsequent plans demonstrate that the intended function of the entire building was in flux, underscored perhaps by the

[674] TBMA, TBM/5/1, Plan of The Bowes Museum, Basement and Cellar Floor, 1870.
[675] TBMA, TBM/5/1, Plan of The Bowes Museum, Ground Floor, 1870.
[676] DCRO, D/St/C5/227/66, Notes about Mr Watson's Sketch of the Museum, &c, 14 October 1869; TBMA, TBM/5/1, Plan of The Bowes Museum, Ground Floor, 1870.
[677] TBM/5/1, Plan of The Bowes Museum, Ground Floor, 1870.
[678] DCRO, D/St/C5/227/66, Notes about Mr Watson's Sketch of the Museum, &c, 14 October 1869; it states: 'The second floor or Attic[?] Floor requires considerable alteration; TBMA, TBM/5/1, Plan of The Bowes Museum, First Floor, 1870.
[679] TBMA, TBM/5/1, Plan of The Bowes Museum, First Floor, 1870.
[680] TBMA, TBM/5/1, Plan of The Bowes Museum, First Floor, 1870.
[681] TBMA, TBM/5/1, Plan of The Bowes Museum, Ground Floor, 1870; TBMA, TBM/5/1, Plan of The Bowes Museum, First Floor, 1870.
[682] TBMA, TBM/5/1, Plan of The Bowes Museum, First Floor, 1870.

architect office's title of the plan, simply the 'Barnard Castle Building', not yet having a fully defined role as either a house or a museum.[683]

In 1871, the ambiguous nature of the interior space, both domestic and public, is present in a much fuller description of The Bowes Museum layout included in an article published in *The Builder*.[684] The article supplied a drawing of an elevation of the museum building, a floor plan of the ground floor, as well as a description entitled 'Mrs. Bowes's Mansion and Galleries in Barnard Castle, Durham' (**figure 3.20**).[685] The caption to the elevation reinforces the conflation between public and privates space: 'Mrs. Bowes's Mansion and Museum', indicating the building served both as a residence and a public museum.[686] The written description highlights the embryonic and confused status of the mansion-museum, stating: 'The plan of the arrangement, with the exception of that portion for the sculpture, museum and picture galleries, is not yet definitely fixed, further than the main walls, as it is not yet decided which portion may be set apart for the … art and curiosities.'[687] As the plan shows, the sculpture and museum galleries occupy the three large rooms to the rear of the building, with the picture galleries in the same space but on the upper floor, benefitting from top lighting. The galleries are self-contained, accessible only through a single doorway on the axis of the main entrance. This doorway into the museum and sculpture galleries, accessible from the balustraded walkway make the central column of the Museum a self-contained unit, which allowed the wings to remain closed off spaces.[688] This is reinforced by the fact that only the three rooms to the rear of the building are labelled, being the 'sculpture and museum' and 'picture galleries above', raising the contention that the collection was, at this point, only intended to occupy these rooms.[689] Using Hill's method of tracing visitor routes also suggests that the Museum offers little room for visitor circulation around the whole building, and instead, the Museum's adoption of the enfilade arrangement for the

[683] TBMA, TBM/5/1, Plan of The Bowes Museum, Ground Floor, 1870; TBMA, TBM/5/1, Plan of The Bowes Museum, First Floor, 1870.
[684] Anon., 'Mrs. Bowes Mansion and Galleries at Barnard Castle, Durham', 27.
[685] Anon., 'Mrs. Bowes Mansion and Galleries at Barnard Castle, Durham', 27.
[686] Anon., 'Mrs. Bowes Mansion and Galleries at Barnard Castle, Durham', 27.
[687] Anon., 'Mrs. Bowes Mansion and Galleries at Barnard Castle, Durham', 27.
[688] Anon., 'Mrs. Bowes Mansion and Galleries at Barnard Castle, Durham', 27.
[689] Anon., 'Mrs. Bowes Mansion and Galleries at Barnard Castle, Durham', 27.

rooms at the rear offers the most basic and straightforward plan used for museum layouts.[690] The visitor route around the Museum's rooms resembles branches from a central point – the entrance hall and staircase – which the visitor would follow before returning to the central point. This was counter to most other nineteenth century museums, which by the second half of the century were 'creating circular or even more complex routes for visitors,' which would assist the visitor in their interpretation of the objects on display.[691] Furthermore, like Hill's analysis of Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery's early arrangement that 'created deep and isolated spaces,' that 'emulated a private, aristocratic art collection' the Sculpture and Picture Gallery at The Bowes Museum complicated the enfilade arrangement by having the entrance placed in the middle, which, in Hill's view of Birmingham is reminiscent of a long gallery, a feature of a stately home, and therefore more emulative of a private art collection.[692]

The Builder article of 1871 also notes the building was always intended to contain private, domestic spaces: 'it is designed as much for a museum and picture galleries as for a mansion.'[693] Thus, it is never clear which parts of the building would have been utilised for the private and domestic aspects of Joséphine Bowes' life, such as entertaining guests, and those which are for the use of the general public. Indeed, the purpose the wings of the Museum actually serve is never made explicit, and as they contain rooms of a much smaller scale it is possible they had a hybrid public-domestic use.[694] *The Builder* article describes the basement as 'intended for the servants' apartments, kitchens, &c,' the 'attics in the roof include the servants' bedrooms' and the rooms above the picture gallery floor containing the 'bed and dressing rooms', which leaves the entirety of the two wings as unfixed spaces within the mansion-museum.[695]

[690] Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums*, 90-124.
[691] Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums*, 100.
[692] Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums*, 97-100.
[693] Anon., 'Mrs. Bowes Mansion and Galleries at Barnard Castle, Durham', 27.
[694] Anon., 'Mrs. Bowes Mansion and Galleries at Barnard Castle, Durham', 27.
[695] Anon., 'Mrs. Bowes Mansion and Galleries at Barnard Castle, Durham', 27.

In March 1874 an article published in the *Richmond and Ripon Chronicle* provided a more complete description of the building.[696] There is much more emphasis on the public munificence of the building as it was produced just after the death of Joséphine Bowes who had passed away the preceding month.[697] Consequently, the museum project was described as follows: 'the death of Mrs Bowes has entirely altered the intended disposition of events, and on its completion the Bowes Museum will at once become the property of the town in which it was situated.'[698] This statement suggests that the only purpose for the Museum was now one of public philanthropy on the part of the Bowes, and compared to the description in *The Builder* in 1871, the description of the interior of the building appeared to make much more of a concession towards public space:

> On the ground floor there are eight rooms intended for the purposes of the museum, and three rooms for the reception of sculpture. Above the sculpture galleries there will be a fine picture gallery 200ft by 45ft. In the upper storey there are about 50 servants rooms. On each floor there are private reception rooms and apartments for the use of attendants.[699]

According to this description it was clear that the eight rooms on each floor were allocated as space for the collection, and their purpose was no longer vague as in *The Builder* article of 1871 where they were described as 'unfixed spaces'.[700] The description now contains no mention of the Museum as a residence beyond that for its staff, and those many rooms that were intended for domestic service. An 1874 plan also reflects this change showing the many domestic amenities that were allocated in the basement storey such as apartments, lodging rooms and kitchens for the museum attendants, and a 'cloaking room' positioned to the side of the entrance hall which was presumably for the use of visitors (**figure 3.21**).[701]

By 1878, as more of the building was constructed and finished, a greater sense of the function of the interior space emerged. This is evident when, in January another comprehensive description of the

[696] Anon., 'The Bowes' Museum at Barnard Castle', 7.
[697] Anon., 'The Bowes' Museum at Barnard Castle', 7.
[698] Anon., 'The Bowes' Museum at Barnard Castle', 7.
[699] Anon., 'The Bowes' Museum at Barnard Castle', 7.
[700] Anon., Mrs. Bowes Mansion and Galleries at Barnard Castle, Durham', 27.
[701] TBMA, TBM/5/1, Plan of The Bowes Museum, Basement Floor, 1874.

Museum was published in *The Newcastle Daily Chronicle*, in which the author narrated walking around the building and recounting its many features from the point of view of a visitor.[702] After '[e]ntering the museum through a bold, circular headed doorway,' he described mounds of cases filled with curiosities 'which only need unpacking and placing in position to be ready for exhibition.'[703] The Museum was still in utter chaos and nowhere near ready for visitors, however the sense of its interior arrangement was much more advanced, as, described by the reporter, 'it has…been carried on by Mr Bowes with a tender solicitude that nothing should be wanting to make the Museum what it was originally intended to be, and the several principal rooms already completed show that his wishes will be more than realised.'[704] As such, the reporter emphasised the philanthropic motives of The Bowes and how these were evident from the point of view of a visitor to the Museum.[705] The 46 rooms in the attic were designated for attendants, and there is no mention of servants as previously.[706] The author also mentioned a 'cloak and dining room', 'library' and an 'observatory' – presumably a viewing point – located above the reception room in front of the Picture Gallery, marking out more public amenities in the formerly private spaces of the Museum.[707] The presence of a library is verifiable within the archive: a plan from c.1879 from Pellechet's office is labelled 'Plan no. 3: Bibliotheque', indicating that the west wing on the Picture Gallery floor was allocated for a library (**figure 3.22**).[708] These rooms were formerly shown as closed off on the 1870 plan, suggesting that the rooms with a more private or domestic function before 1874 were repurposed for overt public use after 1874.[709]

[702] Anon., 'The Bowes Museum', 3.
[703] Anon., 'The Bowes Museum', 3.
[704] Anon., 'The Bowes Museum', 3.
[705] Anon., 'The Bowes Museum', 3.
[706] Anon., 'The Bowes Museum', 3.
[707] Anon., 'The Bowes Museum', 3.
[708] This is confirmed in by John Bowes in 1879: TBMA, JB/2/1/47/71, Letter from John Bowes to R. J. Dent, 13 May 1879.
[709] TBMA, TBM/5/1, Plan of The Bowes Museum, First Floor, 1870.

The Entrance Hall and Stairs

A consideration of the evolution of arguably one of the most non-domestic spaces in the Museum, the Entrance Hall, illustrates how the Museum changed to a more publicly accessible space throughout the 1870s. An early floorplan from 1870 show the Entrance Hall with a centralised staircase which flanked the sides and dominated the space as the visitor walked into the Museum, however the Bowes soon after decided to alter the arrangement of the entrance hall and provided a large open space with a staircase to the left hand side as the visitor entered (**figure 3.23**, **figure 3.24**).[710] Mark Girouard contrasts the French country house tradition of entering by a staircase to the English tradition of having a great hall into which you entered the house.[711] The change of staircase position could indicate a translation of the building from a French to an English residence, however, with the evolution of the Museum from a space of domestic inhabitation to public institution, it follows that domestic accents associated with an entrance hall would have been changed to create a more formal space for visitors, as well as providing space to hang artworks and situate public amenities such as a cloak room. By 1878 a small plan displayed the inclusion of a 'waiting room' attached to the entrance hall suggesting the space's new public function (**figure 3.25**).[712]

The movement of the staircase also suggests adherence to established museum layout. Sophie Forgan has highlighted the significance of the staircase in museum circulatory systems, which in 'domestic' museums centre around the stair from which separate rooms radiate.[713] Other private collectors who formed museums in the late nineteenth century appear to have been defined by this, for example, Giles Waterfield recognises Forgan's 'domestic' circulatory system in the Russell-Cotes museum in Bournemouth.[714] Like the Bowes, the Russell-Cotes formed their collection with the intention of opening it up to the public, which they did in a purpose-adapted house called East Cliff Hall in

[710] TBMA, TBM/5/1, Plan of The Bowes Museum, Ground Floor, 1870; TBMA, TBM/5/1. Detail of Principle Staircase, 1872.
[711] Mark Girouard, *Life in the French Country House*, 79-84.
[712] DCRO, D/St/C5/551/1b, Plan of The Bowes Museum, Staircase and Entrance Hall, 1878,
[713] Sophie Forgan, 'The Architecture of Display, 143
[714] Sophie Forgan, 'The Architecture of Display, 143; Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 161.

1919.[715] However, the Russell-Cotes Entrance Hall includes a large open space with a staircase off to the side as in The Bowes Museum, and therefore it is arguable that the hall is the focal point of the Museum rather than the staircase (**figure 3.26**). As Waterfield suggests, the museum planning system of rooms 'set around a central hall…or staircase was a classic type,' for Victorian museums and therefore The Bowes Museum and the Russell-Cotes museum are drawing much more from nineteenth century museum convention than any domestic traditions.[716] A better example for the domestic circulatory system would the Sir John Soane Museum or the Wallace Collection in which the staircase is a much more dominant feature of the museum's interior form.

The opening up of space in order to display a collection in the Entrance Hall is another reason the staircase may have moved to a new location, further aligning The Bowes Museum with other public museums. In early museums traditionally the staircase was a place void of display, simply allowing the visitor to move from one suite of rooms to the next. For example, an 1808 engraving of the staircase at The British Museum, then based in Montague House, shows a set of rather plain stairs moving from the hall downstairs to the threshold of a closed room upstairs (**figure 3.27**).[717] There is often a flourish such as a fresco, painted ceiling or mosaic but the spaces do not generally correspond to the museum displays held within, and are separate from the museum space. However, the staircase became a more prominent and integrated feature within museums, and less of a transitional space, arguably with the architectural projects conducted at the National Gallery and the South Kensington Museum in the 1860s.[718] In 1867 it was stated in relation to the extension of the National Gallery building: 'although a noble entrance and staircase is indispensable to any National Gallery, it must be remembered that large spaces devoted to Halls, Staircases, Ante-Rooms and saloons not available for hanging pictures deduct very largely and often very unprofitably from the hanging space available for

[715] Merton Russell-Cotes, *Home and Abroad*. Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 128
[716] Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 161.
[717] Thomas Rowlandson and Augustus Charles Pugin, 'The Hall and Staircase, British Museum', 1808, British Museum Collection, I,8.126.
[718] John Physick, *The Victoria and Albert Museum: The history of its building*, (Oxford: Phaidon, 1982); Christopher Whitehead, *The Public Art Museum in Nineteenth Century Britain*, 205-237.

pictures.'[719] This suggests that museum officials were considering how the entrance and transitional spaces of the Museum could be integrated more completely into the context of the Museum's displays. The change in configuration of the staircase at The Bowes Museum opened up the entrance into a large, cavernous hall which offered greater potential for display methods. As an early photograph of the Entrance Hall shows the walls on the ground and first floor hung with large tapestries, sculpture perched on the mezzanine balustrade and large ceramic vessels holding plants (**figure 3.28**). [720]

When The Bowes Museum was under construction, museums were even beginning to demonstrate how interior decoration could unify or become a physical application of the collection housed within it. 'The West Staircase' or 'Ceramic' staircase, constructed at the South Kensington Museum between 1865-1869 best exemplifies this, with the museum's advocacy of contemporary design and manufacturing processes being physically present in the interior decoration (**figure 3.29**). This construction used Britain's best potteries and ceramic factories to decorate a key thoroughfare of the museum to show just how a well-earned education in design history could be applied in the present day.[721] As Christopher Whitehead notes, 'as a result of the intimate connection between collecting and architectural planning at the South Kensington Museum, its interiors, at the end of the 1860s, present a very complex model of art display, in that the collections themselves often inspired their surroundings'[722] Thus, here the museum architecture became a vehicle for the collection itself. After this it became more common for private collectors to integrate objects into their museums later in the century. Parts of the Russell-Cotes' collection was in-built to the space of their Entrance Hall, such as an ornamental mosaic fountain (**figure 3.30**). Richard Wallace famously incorporated an eighteenth-century iron balustrade from the Bibliothèque du Roi into the principal staircase at Hertford House as an indicator of his collection's richness of French decorative arts of the eighteenth century (**figure**

[719] *Published Correspondence on the New National Gallery*, 28 February 1867, 67. Quoted in Christopher Whitehead, *The Public Art Museum in Nineteenth Century Britain*, 211.
[720] Charles Hardy remarks on the 'number and variety' of tapestries on display in the Entrance Hall from the museum's opening, Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 271.
[721] Julius Bryant, *Designing the V&A*, 64-69.
[722] Christopher Whitehead, *The Public Art Museum in Nineteenth Century Britain*, 48.

3.31).[723] This was also a method used by the collector and museum founder Isabella Stewart Gardner (1840-1924), who designed her own house museum in the 1880s-90s in the style of a Venetian palace. Here Gardner fused genuine historic architectural fragments into the fabric of the late nineteenth century building in a scheme in which Aline Saarinen has claimed: 'it is impossible to see where the objects leave off and the building begins for they are all one and the same.'[724]

Like other private and public museums, the Bowes wished for aspects of their collection to be integrated into the fabric of the building. In 1869 they had negotiated with their Belgian art dealer Edmond Rogiers for the purchase and shipping of a large carved oak staircase.[725] Though the staircase was never fitted into the Museum, there were extensive discussions about how it might be adapted for use.[726] Furthermore, it was a practice that the Bowes had implemented in other parts of the Museum. At the 1867 International Exhibition in Paris, the Bowes had purchased a large earthenware stove from the Swedish section of the exhibition, which was then fitted into the Museum's heating system utilising the services of a Swiss workman named Baptiste Dollors (**figure 3.32**).[727] A few years later, when designing the picture gallery, the Bowes also bought a pair of mirrored and marquetry doors with gilt bronze mounts that were placed in the entrance to the Picture Gallery.[728] It is clear, then, that the Bowes saw their museum building as not just a house for their collection, but also as a vehicle for display, integrating their collection into the fabric of the main rooms and, in the case of the stove, providing a function. Nevertheless, the Entrance Hall remained relatively neutral, despite being a space for display. The finished space indicates the Bowes wished to retain the more subtle aspects of a public entrance, which in this case was even less opulent than some public art museum such as Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery. As Kate Hill has described, the Entrance Hall at Birmingham

[723] Peter Hughes, *The Wallace Collection Catalogue of Furniture*, vol. III, (London: The Wallace Collection, 1996), 1179-1192.
[724] Aline B. Saarinen, *The Proud Possessors* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1959), 51.
[725] TBMA, JB/5/12/15-18, Letters from E. Rogiers to John and Joséphine Bowes, September 1869
[726] TBMA, JB/5/12/28-31, Letters and sketches from E. Rogiers to John and Joséphine Bowes, September 1869. The staircase can be identified in the museum collection as a number of sections of 18th century French balcony balustrade (FW.332.A-D), possibly the twelve 17th century oak balusters (FW.313.A-O), and an oak staircase balustrade (FW.312)
[727] TBMA, JB/2/1/47/76, Letter from John Bowes, 19 May 1876.
[728] Picture gallery doors bought from Lamer in February 1872. See TBMA, JB/5/10/8/3, Bill from Lamer to Joséphine Bowes, 24 February 1872.

was ‘large and almost entirely marble’, accentuating an ‘extremely ornate and impressive structure.’[729] The Bowes and their architects instead decided upon a unified decorative scheme using various Scottish stones and granites which were quarried and installed by 1874. A newspaper account in 1878 gives a vivid description of the entrance:

> Entering the Museum through a bold circular-beaded doorway…the principal hall and grand staircase are reached. These are lined with polished ashlar stonework…The cold and severe effect of the freestone employed in its construction, in the lower part of the hall, relieved by polished supports of Peterhead granite which carry the landings communicating to the museum or first floor.[730]

And then:

> the visitor leaving the entrance hall behind him ascends a broad flight of polished granite steps to reach the first landing above, which is constructed of huge slabs of Cragleith stone. From this, and near the stairway, spring circular shafts of polished Aberdeen granite.[731]

The use of Peterhead, Aberdeen and Cragleith granites, all Scottish stones, may have been a subtle inference of John Bowes Scottish ancestry, and therefore in some ways indicated a certain level of status and wealth behind the Museum. Nonetheless, the impression of the newspaper reporter is that the ‘cold and severe’ stonework placed in ‘huge slabs’ is balanced with the red hue of the polished Peterhead granite in a scheme which is not remarked upon for its opulence.[732] There is even evidence the ornamentation of the Museum was restrained further than its initial designs: a drawing by John Edward Watson in 1872 shows the Entrance Hall cornice incorporating brackets ornamented with grotesques, and another large section shows highly ornamental capitals of the Corinthian order surmounted by cartouches designed to sit atop the large square section columns that line the entrance hall (**figure 3.33**, **figure 3.34**).[733] Photographs of the Entrance Hall show these details did not survive further than the design process, and the brackets and columns currently residing in the Museum the hall remained relatively plain and simple (**figure 3.28**).

[729] Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums*, 97.
[730] Anon., ‘The Bowes Museum’, *The Newcastle Daily Chronicle*, 23 January 1878, 3.
[731] Anon., ‘The Bowes Museum’, *The Newcastle Daily Chronicle*, 23 January 1878, 3.
[732] Anon., ‘The Bowes Museum’, *The Newcastle Daily Chronicle*, 23 January 1878, 3.
[733] TBMA, TBM/5/1, Section of The Bowes Museum, Main Staircase, 1872; DCRO, D/St/C5/297/77b Cornice for the Entrance Hall, 1872.

As a further support for the more pragmatic and functional interior decisions that proliferated through The Bowes Museum, many of the workmen used were regular suppliers of interior features of national and regional museums. The floors for the Entrance Hall and sculpture gallery were installed by a firm of Italian mosaic makers led by Pietro Mazzioli who also laid mosaic work in the public spaces of other institutions such as the National Portrait Gallery, the Victoria and Albert Museum and the Science Museum.[734] Also in 1874 the Bowes used Watson to find a supplier of a parquet floor for the galleries. Watson identified the firm of Arrowsmith & Co through a pupil of his who had worked on the extension of The Royal Academy, and to whom they had provided the floor (**figure 3.35**).[735] Letters to John Bowes from A J Arrowsmith, on headed paper describing his firm as 'Decorators and Upholsterers/Patentees of Arrowsmith Solid Parquet Floors/80 New Bond Street, London', reveal some of the illustrious clients they have supplied flooring to such as the Royal Academy and the British Embassy in Constantinople.[736] Also in order to convey the firms' suitability to the project a letter from Arrowsmith reported: 'we are now putting down our parquet all over Sir Richard Wallace's Picture Galleries at Hertford House, covering an area of nearly 20,000 ft.'[737] The use of such firms, who were employed by the biggest public institutions of the time, show to what extent the Bowes were drawing from established museum convention in the fixtures and fittings for their building.

More generally, it has been shown that over the decades from the Museum's earliest incarnations in the 1860s, the interior space of the Entrance Hall and Staircase gave way to a more open and flexible

[734] For a recent overview of this see the blogpost by John Findlay, 'Monsieur Mazzioli's Floors', published on https://thebowesmuseum.wordpress.com/2019/11/18/monsieur-mazziolis-floors/, 18 November 2019. The information on Mazzioli comes from the research of Javier P. Grossutti, '"In the Hands of the Italians": Friulian Mosaic and Terrazzo Workers in London', in Rosa Mucignat, ed., *The Friulian Language: Identity, Migration, Culture*, (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014), 103-121.The Entrance Hall mosaic was replaced with white and black stone in the early twentieth century, see Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 269.
[735] DCRO, D/St/C5/385/9, Letter from J. E. Watson to John Bowes, 6 April 1874,
[736] DCRO, D/St/C5/387/1a Letter from A J Arrowsmith to John Bowes, 17 March 1874. Pera House in Istanbul, formerly the British Embassy of Constantinople, underwent reconstruction and remodelling in the early 1870s after a fire caused significant damage.
[737] DCRO, D/St/C5/387/1a, Letter from A J Arrowsmith to John Bowes, 17 March 1874.

space which favoured the public utility of the Museum. Moreover, its design was less opulent, and though it displayed some of the Bowes' objects to the public, such as ceramics and statuary, it did not aspire to be a space which reinforced the Bowes' wealth and status through incorporation of large and impressive objects into the fabric of the building. Nor did it use an overtly opulent decorative scheme, instead it scaled back the architectural flourishes such as column capitals and lavish materials and favoured a more subtle use of polished granites and mosaic work flooring. These, along with other standard interior features, have been shown to be typical to the interior of the public museum in Britain in the second half of the nineteenth century.

This section has demonstrated that through the process of 'housing' their collection, the Bowes attempted to remove any connotations of private ownership from their collection and instead state its full 'commitment' to the public realm.[738] This, it was shown, was enacted in a number of ways. Firstly, the move towards the opening of private collections in democratic ways, such as a periodical press, was complicated by analysis of a study of the Bowes family's private collection in Streatlam Castle that appeared in *The Athenaeum*. This demonstrated that private collections, even when in the public realm, still held on to residual qualities that demarcated their status as private and domestic, such as scholarly and connoisseurial attitudes towards the artworks on display. Secondly, the status of The Bowes Museum as a public museum serving a local population was discussed, displaying the confused reaction it incited due to it being perceived as a remote institution, strategically close to the Bowes ancestral home, and established through solely private interests rather than a communal collective effort. However, through discussion of the Private Act that the Bowes passed in order that the Museum could be left for the public benefit, it was shown that private motives and public munificence work in tandem, as the Private Act contributed a number of tangible benefits to society as much as fulfilled the Bowes' wish to allow them to live in their museum. Finally, through sustained investigation into the interior layout of the Museum it was shown that the building defied categorisation as either a public or private space. Instead, it slowly adapted over time responding to

[738] Sarah Kane, 'When Paris Meets Teesdale, 163-4.

changing social factors. The largest of these was the death of Joséphine Bowes, which meant that the Museum lost any links to the domestic it once might have had, and this was reinforced by John Bowes, who urged his architect to encourage the public to refer to it as a 'museum', and not a 'mansion.'[739] This has broader implications when viewed through the lens of Kate Hill and Suzanne Macleod's path-breaking work into the layered meanings of museum space, as a case study which supports the view that the development of Victorian museum was not a smooth transition from the private palace to the public institution.[740] The building of The Bowes Museum has demonstrated that museum space is engineered out of a combination of social factors such as wishing to provide a logic for visitors to experience the collection, but also relies on the adaptation of pre-existing spaces, or pre-existing functions for spaces. As such, The Bowes Museum epitomises how many nineteenth century museums resist the narratives of institutionalisation that was proposed to occur from the middle of the century, and are instead a combination of the utilitarian organisation of the institution and the more personal and, in some cases, domestic representation of the collector.

[739] DCRO, D/St/C5/385/19a, Letter from J. E. Watson to John Bowes, 28 December 1874.
[740] Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums*; Suzanne Macleod, *Museum Architecture*.

Chapter 3: Organising the Collection

Introduction

The third part of this thesis moves forward chronologically to explore the role of John Bowes in the creation of The Bowes Museum in the late 1870s and 80s before his death in 1885, as well the years just after 1885. This period encompasses many significant developments in the museum project, including the transfer of an enormous number of objects from Paris to Barnard Castle, the employment of two separate curators for the Museum and the eventual transferral of the institution into the hands of trustees. Whereas section two explored the creation of the museum building through the 1870s to show how the private space of the house and public space of the museum were implicitly intertwined, this section also moves forward conceptually to explore John Bowes' motives and activity in the organising of the Museum, including the creation of a strategy for displaying the collection and effecting its transformation more literally into a public institution. As such, the term 'organising' in the heading of this section refers to the rationalisation and classification of the Bowes' collections which took place over the later decades of the nineteenth century. The organisation of museum collections took on a particularly scientific methodology in the middle of the nineteenth century.[741] Christopher Whitehead has pinpointed the 1850s as a moment where the debates around museum classification were prominent.[742] Whitehead's study focusses on what he considers the three major national collections based in London: the National Gallery, the British Museum and the South

[741] Anthony Burton, *Vision & Accident*; Anne Eatwell, 'Borrowing from Collectors: The Role of the Loan in the Formation of the Victoria and Albert Museum and its Collection (1852-1932)', *Journal of the Decorative Arts Society*, vol. 24, (2000), 20-29; Sophie Forgan, 'The Architecture of Display', 139-162; Charlotte Klonk, *Spaces of Experience: Art Gallery Interiors from 1800-2000*, (London: Yale University Press, 2009); Giles Waterfield, 'Picture Hanging and Gallery Decoration', in *Palaces of Art: Art Galleries in Britain, 1790-1990*, (London: Lund Humphries, 1991), 49-65; Christopher Whitehead, *The Public Art Museum in Nineteenth Century Britain*; Christopher Whitehead, *Museums and the Construction of Disciplines: Art and Archaeology in Nineteenth Century Britain*, (London: Bloomsbury, 2009); Carla Yanni, *Nature's Museums: Victorian Science and the Architecture of Display*, (London, Athlone Press, 1999).
[742] Christopher Whitehead, *The Public Art Museum in Nineteenth Century Britain*, 69-87.

Kensington Museum, seeing their vying attempts to rationalise and divide up the nation's collection as a lesson in museum organisational structures.[743] For Whitehead, the South Kensington Museum collection's composition was predicated on the fact that the National Gallery and the British Museum had not been able to develop a didactic display that was effective in educating the working classes.[744] In response a new form of classification emerged whereby art objects were divided by material or technique in order to make them applicable to various strands of industry, and thereby adhered to the perceived role of the public museum and simultaneously moved away from any notions of elitism.[745] By attempting to understand what The Bowes Museum and its curators and trustees thought of as their purpose and the way they displayed objects to reinforce this purpose, this section shows that the Museum drew on particular influences of museum organisation that reinforced its place in the public sphere. The main sources for this section include early photographs of the museum interior, plans of the displays, correspondence between John Bowes and the museum curators and early museum guidebooks.[746] As posited by Ludmilla Jordanova, 'all museums are exercises in classification,' thus it is the aim of this section to determine the classification that governed The Bowes Museum.[747]

The Bowes Museum's position as a public museum of the industrial paradigm is contested, however, as the last decades of the nineteenth century and the opening of the twentieth century saw a proliferation of 'collection museums.'[748] As Anne Higonnet has observed these museums were formed as an antithesis to 'enyclopedic museums', and their rationale rejected the 'classification and

[743] Christopher Whitehead, *The Public Art Museum in Nineteenth Century Britain*, 69. See also Christopher Whitehead, 'Enjoyment for the Thousands: Sculpture display at South Kensington, 1851-1861', in Cinzia Sicca and Alison Yarrington, *The Lustrous Trade: Material culture and the history of sculpture in England and Italy, c.1700-c.1860*, (London: Leicester University Press, 2000), 222-239.
[744] Christopher Whitehead, *The Public Art Museum in Nineteenth Century Britain*, 77-81. See also Bruce Robertson, 'The South Kensington Museum in Context: an alternative history', *Museum and Society*, vol. 2, no. 1, (2004), 1-14.
[745] Steven Blake Shubert, 'The Decorative Arts: A Problem in Classification', *Art Documentation: Journal of the Art Libraries Society of North America*, vol. 12, no. 2, (1993), 77-81; Ian Wolfenden, 'The Applied Arts in the Museum Context', in Susan Pearce, ed., *Museum Studies in Material Culture*, (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1989), 27-33.
[746] The majority of this material is within the following: DCRO, CC/X/94, Correspondence relating to The Bowes Museum, 1869-1885; TBMA, TBM/11/2, Photographs of the interior of the museum; TBMA, TBM/5/1, Museum floorplans; Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum*.
[747] Ludmilla Jordanova, 'Objects of Knowledge: A Historical Perspective on Museums' in Peter Vergo ed., *The New Museology*, 23.
[748] Anne Higonnet, *A Museum of One's Own*, 2-24.

scale' of the 'impersonal' national and municipal museum.[749] The transformation of the Bowes' collection from private space to public institution in the later decades of the nineteenth century is comparable to other contemporary examples that Higonnet cites as indicative of such institutions. The most prominent of the period is Sir Richard Wallace's collection, displayed at Bethnal Green between 1872-75, and subsequently transformed into a private museum in Hertford House on Manchester Square before being fully gifted to the nation in 1901.[750] However, there were some collections that occupied the middle ground between the 'collection museum' and the 'encyclopedic' museum, such as those collections that were integrated into large national museums and thus contributed to the structures of encyclopedic museums. The large collection left to the South Kensington Museum by the tailor John Jones (1798/9-1882) is one such example.[751] The Jones Collection consists of 1034 pieces of fine and decorative art, with a particular emphasis on French decorative arts of the eighteenth century. The collection had originally been on display in John Jones' house at no. 95, Piccadilly, arranged across a small number of domestic rooms which were recorded in a guidebook produced by the South Kensington Museum in 1883.[752] The Jones Collection, it is argued here, is more significant to the creation of The Bowes Museum than previously recognised. As is discussed, the Museum's second curator Owen Stanley Scott (1852-1922) was directly involved with the arrangement of the Jones Collection whilst he was employed at the South Kensington Museum.[753] Not only does this offer a compelling retrospective comparison to The Bowes Museum collections, but also the first guidebook for The Bowes Museum, produced in 1893 by Scott, cites the handbook to the Jones Collection as one of a total of six works used as a reference, indicating that a comparison was also drawn in the content and arrangement of the collection at this point.[754] It is natural that being employed as a curator to transform a private collection into a public museum, Scott would be looking

[749] Anne Higonnet, *A Museum of One's Own*, 9.
[750] Suzanne Higgott, '*The Most Fortunate Man of his Day'*, 319-346; Peter Hughes, *The Founders of the Wallace Collection* Barbara Lasic, 'Splendid Patriotism: Richard Wallace and the Construction of the Wallace Collection', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 21, no. 2, (2009), 173-182; Barbara Lasic, 'Going East: The Wallace Collection at Bethnal Green 1872-1875', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 26, no. 2, (2014), 249-261.
[751] For the Jones Collection see *Handbook of the Jones Collection in the South Kensington Museum*, (London: Chapman and Hall, 1883).
[752] *Handbook of the Jones Collection in the South Kensington Museum*, (London: Chapman and Hall, 1883).
[753] DCRO D/St/C5/595/21, Letter of application from Owen Stanley Scott to John Bowes, 15 August 1884
[754] Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum*, 30.

at precedents, and the Jones collection is an obvious choice, therefore it has direct relevance to the formation of The Bowes Museum.

A systematic collection required a level of curatorial mediation and the first subsection of this section, 'Employing the Curator' investigates the process John Bowes undertook to appoint someone to arrange and interpret the Bowes' collection. The developing notion of a 'museum professional' reaches a critical juncture in the middle decades of the nineteenth century, and through the employment of the Museum's first curators it is shown how this impacted The Bowes Museum in the employment of both an 'amateur' and a 'professional'.[755] John Bowes employed two curators in the 1870s and 80s, Robert Harley (d.1884) and Owen Stanley Scott.[756] The first, Robert Harley, was an art master employed from Sandhurst Military College who had trained at the Royal Academy, and is indicative of the vague notion of a curator being an artist proficient in the technical aspects of fine art that were prominent through the first half of the nineteenth century.[757] In this period, it was generally artists who were considered to possess the credentials to govern the art historical institutions: Many well-known museum curators and directors had initially trained as artists such as the first Keeper of the National Gallery William Seguier (1772-1843), the first Director of the National Gallery Sir Charles Lock Eastlake (1793-1865), the Director of the National Portrait Gallery Sir George Scharf (1820-1895) and even the South Kensington Museum John Charles Robinson started his career as a painter and art master.[758] However with the employment of the second curator, Owen Stanley Scott, who was recruited after working at the South Kensington Museum, John Bowes displayed recognition of an emerging idea of professional practice within museums. By seeking out a curator for the Museum through an established network of museum workers in the 1880s, Bowes was implicitly drawing from a convention that was establishing itself from the previous decades that a museum

[755] Elizabeth Heath, ed., Special edition 'The Emergence of the Museum Professional in Nineteenth-Century Britain', *Journal of Art Historiography*, no. 18, (2018); Harold Perkin, *The Rise of Professional Society: England since 1880*, (London: Routledge, 1989).
[756] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 212 & 235.
[757] James Hamilton, *A Strange Business: Making Art & Money in Nineteenth Century Britain*, (London: Atlantic Books, 2014), 255-285
[758] James Hamilton, *A Strange Business*, 255-285.

professional needed to have certain qualifications and skills in order to effectively carry out their duty as a public servant.[759] In the case of a museum of fine and applied arts, these were gained in an institution such as the South Kensington Museum. However, the search for the curator also highlighted a tension in the perception of the museum collection as reflective of the taste and status of the founders, and its broader value to a public audience. This is evident in the way John Bowes' network includes the more informal circles of antiquarians and amateurs that were present in museums and learned societies from much earlier on in the century, including figures such as Augustus Wollaston Franks (1826-1897) and George Scharf (1820-1895).[760] However, ultimately this section shows how John Bowes overrode his own private preferences with the decision to employ Scott from the South Kensington system, showing that by the 1880s Bowes valued a less elitist form of practice for the display and interpretation of The Bowes Museum collection.

With the employment of a professional curator this of course had significant ramifications for how the collection was organised, and the second subsection 'Collection Arrangement' explores how the museum objects were classified and arranged within The Bowes Museum from the late 1870s onwards, in relation to the contemporary strategies of museum display. Under Owen Scott's curatorship, this is viewed in the context of the museum being seen as an educational tool that worked symbiotically with other institutions such as design schools, universities and the laboratory, and represented decorative arts in a framework that illustrated that emphasised their utilitarianism.[761] This is best exemplified by comparison between the display strategies of The Bowes Museum and other museums of applied arts which adopted the South Kensington model in the second half of the nineteenth century, and analysing to what extent these museums deployed a 'system' to underpin their

[759] The Correspondence relating to this is in DCRO, D/St/C5/595/15-40 and published in Appendix III.
[760] For George Scharf see Elizabeth Heath, 'A man of "unflagging zeal and industry": Sir George Scharf as an emerging professional in the nineteenth-century museum world', Elizabeth Heath, ed., Special edition 'The Emergence of the Museum Professional in Nineteenth-Century Britain', *Journal of Art Historiography*, no. 18, (2018), 1-38. For A. W. Franks see Marjorie L. Caygill, and John F. Cherry, eds., *A. W. Franks*; Eloise Donnelly, ''A Desire for the National Good': Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks and the Curatorship of Renaissance Decorative Art in Britain, 1840-1900', *Journal of Art Historiography*, vol. 18, (2018), 1-26.
[761] This view is particularly relevant to scientific collections. See Samuel J. M. M. Alberti, 'Objects and the Museum', *Isis*, vol. 96, no. 4, (2005), 559-571; Sophie Forgan, 'The Architecture of Display'; Carla Yanni, *Nature's Museums*.

arrangement.[762] Christopher Whitehead has placed the term 'system' in its historical context, stating: 'in nineteenth century museology the term "system" came to be synonymous with the practice of collecting and displaying works of art in chronological sequence and/or in geographical groups.'[763] For the applied arts museum such as the South Kensington Museum the classification of objects by material was based on its origin as serving the industrial and manufacturing classes, which according to Anthony Burton was due to the feeling that 'the collections must primarily be useful to artisans and manufacturers, and only secondarily attractive to the public.'[764] This is evident in 1863, when the director of the South Kensington Museum Henry Cole stated:

> The Art Collections have been entirely rearranged during the last year with the view of rendering them useful and instructive to the Art student, manufacturer, and the public, and affording every facility of reference. They have been arranged in classes as far as possible, either chronologically or according to country, material, or trades. [765]

For Cole the Art student and the manufacturer were the priority for the museum, and though Cole gestures to the wider public, the use of material and trades as object categories emphasises their utilitarian nature. Anthony Burton's study of the use of the South Kensington Museum's historic decorative arts shows that this view endured and dictated the museum's arrangement for almost a century, and thus would have considerable influence across the nation-wide network of applied arts museums.[766]

However Whitehead also recognises the use of 'systematic' display strategies, in the form of chronological and scholastic arrangements in private interiors from the seventeenth century onwards.[767] The notion of the domestic and its relationship to the display in museums is also a key

[762] Anthony Burton, 'The uses of the South Kensington Art Collection', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 14, no. 1, (2002), 79-95. Donata Levi, 'Between Fine Art and Manufacture: The Beginnings of Italian Medieval and Renaissance Sculpture at the South Kensington Museum,' in Cinzia Sicca and Alison Yarrington, *The Lustrous Trade*, 211-221; Whitworth Wallis, 'The Museum and Art Gallery', in John H. Muirhead, ed., *Birmingham Institutions: Lectures Given at the University*, (Birmingham: Cornish Bros, 1911), 477-521.
[763] Christopher Whitehead, *The Public Art Museum in Nineteenth Century Britain*, 4.
[764] Anthony Burton, 'The uses of the South Kensington Art Collection', 87.
[765] Quoted in Anthony Burton, *Vision & Accident*, 85.
[766] Anthony Burton, 'The uses of the South Kensington Art Collection', 87.
[767] Christopher Whitehead, *The Public Art Museum in Nineteenth Century Britain*, 4.

theme that characterises the displays of The Bowes Museum from the 1870s. In domestic arrangements of historical objects in France during the nineteenth century, the influence of emerging museums was significant in the final three decades, as shown by Elizabeth Emery and Laura Morowitz in the case of the Musée de Cluny and by Andrew McClellan in his analysis of the house museum of the collector Edmond de Goncourt.[768] For McClellan the Goncourt house in its arrangement evoked an atmosphere that was oppositional to the museum, in 'the unexpected and playful juxtapositions of different media.'[769] According to McClellean, Goncourt's objects were arranged with the 'desire to conjure in the viewer the historical milieu whence objects came,' and thus rejected any notions of displaying stylistic progressions.[770] Similarly Emery and Morowitz see the boundaries between the home and museum as porous by the end of the nineteenth century as the desire to acquire and display complete sets of objects eradicates the rarefied qualities of the individual object.[771]

Indeed, histories of museum display show that the museum space is not devoid of the influence of the domestic and vice versa. One example is the arrangement for the Museum of Ornamental Art whilst it was displayed at Marlborough House.[772] The Museum of Ornamental Art at Marlborough House acted as the precursor to the South Kensington Museum between 1852-1857, before it found its permanent home.[773] Here visitors could see some of the earliest collections the museum had acquired wholesale such as that of Ralph Bernal (1783/84-1854) and Jules Soulages (1803-1857), in a series of domestic apartments that lacked the requisite space for the quantity of objects.[774] According to Charlotte Drew, early displays at Marlborough House mixed the domestic eclecticism of the French collector

[768] Elizabeth Emery and Laura Morowitz, 'From the Living Room to the Museum and Back Again: The collection and display of medieval art in the *fin de siècle*', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 16, no. 2, (2004), 285-309; Andrew McClellan, '*Vive l'amatuer!* The Goncourt house revisited', in Melissa Lee Hyde and Katie Scott, eds., *Rococo Echo: Art, history and historiography, from Cochin to Coppola*, (Oxford: SVEC, 2014), 87-107.
[769] Andrew McClellan, '*Vive l'amatuer!*, 101.
[770] Andrew McClellan, '*Vive l'amatuer!*, 103.
[771] Elizabeth Emery and Laura Morowitz, 'From the Living Room to the Museum and Back Again', 300-303.
[772] Charlotte Drew, 'The Colourful Career of Sir John Charles Robinson', 4-10; John Charles Robinson, *Catalogue of the Soulages Collection*; John Charles Robinson, *The Treasury of Ornamental Art* (London: Day & Son, 1856)
[773] Julius Bryant, *Creating the V&A*, 35-43.
[774] Julius Bryant, *Creating the V&A*, 35-43.

Alexandre-Charles Sauvageot (1781-1860), who had a museum in his private home on the rue de Faubourg-Poissonière, and the romantic historicism of du Sommerard at the Musée de Cluny; both of which Robinson had visited earlier in life and taken inspiration from.[775] This display went against Henry Cole's philosophy of grouping objects by material in order to instruct the artisan.[776] However, interior watercolours reproducing the display spaces of Marlborough House in the mid-1850s show some adherence to museum display practice, with objects grouped loosely together underneath large glass display cases (**figure 4.0**). Similarities between the displays in Marlborough House and the interior of Sauvageot's house, shown in the oil painting by Arthur Roberts is evident in the densely packed but carefully arranged centre table, and walls, only without the glass coverings (**figure 2.10**). Indeed, Robinson's own introductory lecture to the Museum of Ornamental Art in 1854 stated: 'the judicious arrangement and juxtaposition of specimens for comparison [will] facilitate the deduction of those abstract laws and principles, a proper acquaintance with which is the foundation of all true knowledge.'[777] Robinson, though focussed on the education of the collector and connoisseur, still framed his displays with their value as holistic arrangements, allowing the visitor to find commonalities and differences across art objects. In opposition to Goncourt, Robinson found a sense of order in the juxtapositions, as a form of comparison. As such, it is shown how The Bowes Museum drew from established museum practices which imbued a public function to a private collection, in order to ascribe an underlying system to its own displays.

[775] Charlotte Drew, 'The Colourful Career of Sir John Charles Robinson', 6.
[776] Anthony Burton, *Vision & Accident*, 85.
[777] John Charles Robinson, *An Introductory Lecture on the Museum of Ornamental Art*, (London: Chapman & Hall, 1854), 11.

Employing the Curator

The nineteenth century witnessed a rapid development in the idea of professional practice.[778] As pointed out by Giles Waterfield the period around the middle of the nineteenth century was a formative one for the emergence of museum professionals specifically, and as such the differences in the role of the curator between art galleries and museums, the metropolitan centres and the regions, and collections of fine arts, applied arts, natural history and scientific collections is vast and ever shifting.[779] However there was an emerging recognition of a shared mission and practice amongst museum professionals of the time, that was positioned against the more exclusive and elitist practice of antiquarian and learned groups and societies. There are parallels to be drawn between the professionalisation of curators and that of art critics, which occurred around a similar time. As noted by Prettejohn, in the early Victorian period there were no qualifications for the art critic and the job usually fell to artists or literary types such as novelists or journalists.[780] Similarly for curators, as a job with no formal qualifications the position was often taken up by artists or art teachers. This is reinforced by Joséphine Bowes' Will, which specified that she wished to appoint a curator for her museum and art gallery, and '…every Curator shall be a male person and (if possible) a single man or a widower without children and shall be chosen from the class of Artists or Professors and shall be of the age of thirty-five years at least and a person of the strictest private integrity and well acquainted with the duties required…'[781] From the Will there are evident a number of practical considerations that Joséphine Bowes was taking for the recruitment of a curator who was intended to live within the Museum, such as their status as without a family. But also, the decision to recruit someone from the 'Artist or Professor' class is indicative of the vagueness perceived around the role of a curator at this

[778] For professionalism as it applies mor generally to historical practice see Philippa Levine, *The Amateur and the Professional: Antiquarians, Historians and Archaeologists in Victorian England, 1838-1886*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986)
[779] See the section titled 'The Uncertain Rise of the Curator' in Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 266-271. See also Elizabeth Heath 'Introduction', in Elizabeth Heath, ed., Special edition 'The Emergence of the Museum Professional in Nineteenth-Century Britain', *Journal of Art Historiography*, no. 18, (2018), 1-7.
[780] Elizabeth Prettejohn, 'Aesthetic Value and the Professionalization of Victorian Art Criticism 1837-78', *Jounal of Victorian Culture*, vol. 2, no. 1, (1997), 74.
[781] TBMA, TBM/2/1/1, The Will and Codicil of Benoîte Joséphine Bowes, 12 & 19 July 1871.

time. For Joséphine Bowes, training in art practice, or teaching art practice, was adequate for the role of a curator.

It was not until 1879 that the first curator, the artist and art master Robert Harley took up post.[782] True to Joséphine Bowes wishes, Harley had trained as an artist in the South Kensington schools under the Department of Science and Art before attending the Royal Academy in London and the Royal Academy of Fine Arts in Antwerp, reflecting a traditional art background.[783] Subsequent to this training he was reported to be the Head Master at Cambridge School of Art, and then he joined the Royal Military Academy, Sandhurst as a Master in 1862, before leaving his post there in 1871.[784] Harley first wrote to John Bowes at the end of 1874 to apply for the post of curator, perhaps prompted by the significant publicity the Museum was enjoying in the press.[785] However, John Bowes responded that it was too early 'as the building is not sufficiently advanced for the Curator to be appointed or go there – and for the present there could really be nothing to do.'[786] Harley's persistence caused him to write again to Bowes in May 1878 to repeat his application.[787] In this second letter he reiterated his 'administrative knowledge' due to his 'connexion with public institutions' as well as his 'superior Art education.'[788] The public institutions Harley refers to here are art schools and technical colleges, and not public museums. However, being part of the government-endorsed design school system would have provided Harley with the requisite skills for gaining a technical education from artistic objects, but he may have been less equipped to facilitate the wider recreational facets of the institution.

[782] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 212.
[783] Anon., 'Fine Arts', *Illustrated London News*, 19 July 1879, 54; Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 212
[784] 'Anon., Fine Arts', *Illustrated London News*, 19 July 1879, 54; Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 212; The digitised staff registers from the Sandhurst archive show these dates as Harley's tenure. They can be accessed at: http://archive.sandhurstcollection.co.uk/view/8566/126219/
[785] TBMA, JB/2/1/43/4, Letter from John Bowes to R. J. Dent, 16 January 1875. John Bowes mentions receiving Harley's application.
[786] TBMA, JB/2/1/43/4, Letter from John Bowes to R. J. Dent, 16 January 1875.
[787] TBMA, JB/2/1/46/5, Letter from Robert Harley to John Bowes, 24 May 1878.
[788] TBMA, JB/2/1/46/5, Letter from Robert Harley to John Bowes, 24 May 1878.

The duties which Harley carried out in between his appointment and premature death in 1884 – caused by his persistent health problems – are preserved in archival correspondence.[789] The bulk of the work included receiving crates of objects sent from France, unpacking them and checking for any damage and beginning to arrange them, focusing mainly on the paintings.[790] Harley certainly showed preference towards the arrangement of the Old Master oil paintings, and though it was usual for curators to repair and conserve artworks, Harley prioritised making copies of significant pictures in the Bowes' public and private collections, as well as other well-known oils.[791] As such Harley's attitude towards the collection was evidently not how Bowes wished it to be interpreted. Correspondence from John Bowes to his estate manager Ralph Dent shows an increasing frustration with Harley, partly due to a debilitating illness which prohibited Harley from carrying out many duties, but also as he did not possess the right character for a museum curator: 'I do not think M^{r} Harley exactly understands the exact amount of authority, & responsibility which a Curator has.'[792] Even though Harley fulfilled the criteria as set out in Joséphine Bowes' Will as being of the class of artists or professors, Harley's Bowes began to reimagine what the duties of a curator of a public museum were.[793] The terms for a museum curator that Joséphine Bowes had preserved in her will were obviously a personal preference which John Bowes was reluctant to compromise on, even though he could see the Museum required someone with different skills and experience. In 1880 Bowes wrote to Dent to express his frustration at this predicament: 'He [Harley] always seemed to me a very excitable Person. Because [he] was an appointment of my late Wife to the Museum & as long as he conducts himself properly, I shall never think of removing him.'[794] However, soon after, doubt began to creep in which saw John Bowes reassess his duty to his late wife and the museum project:

[789] See the file in DCRO, CC/X/94, Correspondence relating to The Bowes Museum, 1869-1885. John Bowes had received Harley in early 1879 and assessed him personally, upon which he remarked that he 'seems very intelligent, but looks of delicate health: TBMA, JB/2/1/47/17, Letter from John Bowes to R. J. Dent, 1 February 1879.
[790] DCRO, CC/X/94, Most letters from 1879 onwards discuss receiving and unpacking pictures.
[791] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 212. One of Harley's first duties was to make a copy of a Holbein picture in London, TBMA, JB/2/1/47/17, Letter from John Bowes to R. J. Dent, 1 February 1879.
[792] TBMA, JB/2/1/48/39, Letter from John Bowes to R. J. Dent, 2 May 1880.
[793] TBMA, TBM/2/1/1, The Will and Codicil of Benoîte Joséphine Bowes, 12 & 19 July 1871
[794] TBMA, JB/2/1/48/78, Letter from John Bowes to R. J. Dent, 18 September 1880.

I may mention to you in confidence that when my present Wife saw Mr Harley, she expressed a strong opinion that he was not a person capable of being Curator at a Museum, but as she does not speak English, & could not converse much with him, I did not rely much on her opinion, but I believe she was right.[795]

Harley's excitability and sickly disposition meant that his presence became quite demanding for John Bowes.[796] It was clear Bowes required someone more dependable, and capable of meeting the physical demands of the job, and Harley's previous work as an art master may have not prepared him for the much more active role of arranging and interpreting a museum collection. After Harley's death in 1884, John Bowes once again had to search for a curator for his museum.[797] In a comprehensive exchange of letters in which Bowes and his friends and colleagues collectively searched for a suitable curator, it is also revealed how John Bowes thought the Museum should be administered by his eventual appointment of a curator from the South Kensington Museum, Owen Stanley Scott.[798] This time, without Joséphine Bowes' guidance, John Bowes drew on established and more conventional museum networks and found a curator that had a more appropriate profile for his vision of the Museum. This meant someone with qualifications and the endorsement of an esteemed museum director, instead of what Hardy describes as a 'man with local connections,' as his foremost qualification.[799]

Around these years in the late 1870s and early 1880s there was a public and informed discussion occurring that called for a national body of museum workers to exchange ideas and best practice in a public way, something before only carried out by the more private and learned societies of an antiquarian nature.[800] In 1877 *The Athenaeum* published a commentary from a 'distinguished painter'

[795] TBMA, JB/2/1/48/100, Letter from John Bowes to R. J. Dent, 5 December 1880.
[796] For example, in 1879 John Bowes wrote that Harley had asked him to change the configuration of the curator's apartments as Harley had difficulty going up stairs. TBMA, JB/2/1/47/89, Letter from John Bowes to unnamed addressee, 28 June 1879.
[797] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 234-235.
[798] The letters are under reference DCRO, D/St/C5/595/15-44, and reproduced in Appendix III
[799] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 200
[800] Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 45-53.

which implored for a 'conference of curators', an idea that had first been suggested in 1860 by the French art critic Théophile Thoré-Bürger (1807-1869).[801] The author's suggestion was for a regular collaborative meeting that would allow discussion on practical and technical as well as more connoisseurial subjects, such as how best to conserve and display artworks, and how to ensure a universally accepted form of attribution in gallery catalogues.[802] It was in these decades too that a number of curators in regional museums were beginning to become influential in their ideas and methods of how decorative and applied arts should be arranged and displayed. It was increasingly common for these curators to receive a level of 'training' at one of London's top museums, alongside people such as Henry Cole and J. C. Robinson. A particularly influential group were the members of the Wallis family: Whitworth Wallis (1855-1927) and George Harry Wallis (1847-1936). Both were sons of the South Kensington Museum's first Keeper of Fine Art, George Wallis (1811-1891), and trained by him in South Kensington and at the Bethnal Green Museum. Subsequently they took up positions in large regional art museums effectively transporting their museum practice from the metropolis to the provinces. Whitworth Wallis became the first Keeper of Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery in 1885 after being in charge at the Bethnal Green Museum since 1879.[803] Kate Hill has claimed that Wallis adopted an approach to museum arrangement, whereby he 'created very little in the way of didactic display,' an approach that is associated with the views of the art critic John Ruskin (1819-1900).[804] This is positioned in opposition to Cole, in that the displays bore little real relation to Birmingham's industries.[805] However, less than three years after the museum's opening, Thomas Greenwood was moved to remark on the success of the museum in capturing the interest and imagination of the local manufacturing classes, as well as Wallis' innovative interpretative techniques in presenting descriptive labels not only for single objects but to describe common materials, production processes or artistic periods.[806] George Harry Wallis was the first curator of the Midlands

[801] Anon., 'A Conference of Curators', *The Athenaeum*, no. 2613, (1877), 669-670. In the article Thoré is referred to by his pseudonym Willem Bürger.
[802] Anon., 'A Conference of Curators', 669-670.
[803] Amy Woodson Boulton, *Transformative Beauty*, 94; Whitworth Wallis, 'The Museum and Art Gallery', 477-521.
[804] Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums*, 117.
[805] Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums*, 117.
[806] Thomas Greenwood, *Museums and Art Galleries*, 48-50.

Counties Art Museum which had opened in 1878 in the restored Nottingham Castle with newly built galleries and exhibition rooms appended, giving Wallis an entirely blank canvas on which to display the extensive collections.[807] As such the 1870s and 80s began to cement the influence of the South Kensington Museum around the country's regional institutions more than before, and it was this that brought people such as Owen Stanley Scott to the forefront of the profession and made them desirable candidates.

Nevertheless, John Bowes' search shows that more informal networks still influenced museum recruitment practices. Charles Hardy claims that Bowes took advice through his friend Henry Morgan Vane (1808-1886), and in this way gained access to people such as George Scharf.[808] Bowes obviously recognised that some level of professional endorsement was required, apparently stating of the search: 'It is too serious a matter to be guided by People who know nothing of Museums, and think every goose they know of is a Swan.'[809] Yet, the actual search was still mediated through acquaintances, and Bowes sought counsel from a number of established museum administrators, and considered a number of different candidates in order to encompass a rapidly changing professional field. The letters show that Vane is the conduit through which John Bowes is reaching not only Sir George Scharf but other established museum professionals such as Augustus Wollaston Franks (1826-1897) of the British Museum, suggesting a much more wide-ranging search.[810] In August of 1884 Bowes wrote to Vane with a description of the Museum in aid of helping find a suitable curator.[811] Vane replied with an update showing that some of the candidates were learned individuals that fit with some of John Bowes' more antiquarian tendencies:

> Your description of the museum at Barnard Castle will be of great utility to me in making inquiry for a person to fill the office of Curator, & in "interviewing" any applicant. Mr Scharf having recommended a Mr Everard Green, with whom I acquainted, to see me. I have done so, & on his showing testimonials from Mr Scharf & Mr Franks, MA, Vice President of the

[807] George Harry Wallis, *Illustrated Catalogue of the Permanent Collection of Pictures, Drawings and Sculpture*, (Nottingham: J & J Vice, 1900).
[808] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 234. Hardy refers to George Scharf as 'Mr Schaff'.
[809] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 234.
[810] DCRO, D/St/C5/595/19, Letter of recommendation from A. W. Franks for Everard Green, 14 August 1884.
[811] DCRO, D/St/C5/595/16, Letter from Henry Morgan Vane to John Bowes, 12 August 1884.

> Society of Antiquaries, I will then tell him whether it will do to make his application to you.[812]

The first recommendation, Everard Green (1844-1926) is known chiefly for his expertise in heraldry and genealogy, which after being rejected for the position of Curator at The Bowes Museum began professionally as the Rouge Dragon Pursuivant in the College of Arms from 1893.[813] It seems however that at this point he is establishing himself as a scholar in this particular field, with recommendations from both Sir George Scharf and Augustus Wollaston Franks that emphasised his level of knowledge and involvement in archaeological and historical projects.[814] Indeed, Scharf, in his recommendation wrote: 'I know of scarcely any one with such sound and ready knowledge upon genealogical portraits, heraldry, pottery and medieval antiquities as my friend Mr Everard Green F.S.A. His zeal and his patient research are on an equal footing, and I should sincerely rejoice if these rare qualifications could be made available for the public benefit.'[815] Green's own application letter to John Bowes outlined that he was at this point acting as private secretary to Henry Salusbury Milman (1821-1893) the Director of the Society of Antiquaries as well as pursuing his own studies.[816] He also professed to an in-depth knowledge of Italian picture galleries, but possessed little knowledge of French and Dutch painting.[817] Everard Green's interest in heraldry and genealogy is very much in line with the antiquarian projects of John Bowes, for example the heraldic ceiling commissioned for Streatlam Castle (**figure 2.2**). Bowes seeking advice from Sir George Scharf during his directorship of the National Portrait Gallery and Augustus Wollaston Franks at the British Museum, who have both been characterised as antiquarian and moving in antiquarian circles, also reinforces this notion. The network reached through Henry Vane is closely tied to semi-public institutions such as the Society of Antiquaries and the Reform Club, as well. This is significant as exclusive spaces such as these

[812] DCRO, D/St/C5/595/16, Letter from Henry Morgan Vane to John Bowes, 12 August 1884.
[813] Anon., 'Mr. Everard Green', *The Times*, 23 July 1926, 18.
[814] DCRO, D/St/C5/595/17, Letter of recommendation for Everard Green by Sir George Scharf, 13 August 1884; DCRO, D/St/C5/595/19, Letter of recommendation for Everard Green by Augustus Wollaston Franks, 14 August 1884.
[815] DCRO, D/St/C5/595/17, Letter of recommendation for Everard Green by Sir George Scharf, 13 August 1884.
[816] DCRO, D/St/C5/595/20, Letter of application for the post of Curator from Everard Green, 14 August 1884.
[817] DCRO, D/St/C5/595/20, Letter of application for the post of Curator from Everard Green, 14 August 1884.

operated as a place of a more academic, informal and casual knowledge exchange for museum professionals in public office.[818] The attitude of elitism had by this point also become a point of contention in relation to staff at the British Museum: in 1873 *The Builder* reported it '…is a grand institution, with noblemen, gentlemen, and scholars connected with it, but the principle which has ruled, and does rule, there, is entirely opposite to that which has made South Kensington the most useful, delightful and popular institution in the kingdom.'[819] Thus, from the 1870s there was a sense of the elite circles which radiated from the British Museum that were antithetical to the perceived role of museums.

John Bowes decided not to appoint Everard Green as Henry Vane considered he 'would probably become bored, & as soon as he had arranged the pictures & objects would retire.'[820] It is clear Bowes aligned the Museum less with an antiquarian project and more with the large-scale public institution like the South Kensington Museum, and thus sought a curator with the appropriate qualifications for such an institution. Simultaneously to seeking interviews and references for Everard Green, Vane reported progress of enquiries made to the British Museum and the South Kensington Museum.[821] In August, Vane reported to Bowes an interview with Charles Thomas Newton (1816-1894), Keeper of Antiquities at the British Museum.[822] Newton had visited the Museum in October 1880 so arguably knew more than most what kind of collection it was and the type of curatorship it required.[823] Newton suggested the scholar, artist and former curator of the South Kensington Museum John Hungerford Pollen (1820-1902), which marked a departure from the previously mentioned candidates in that Pollen represented a professional class of curators who embodied the ethos of the new industrial

[818] Susan Pearce, ed., *Visions of Antiquity: The Society of Antiquaries 1707-2007*, (London: Society of Antiquaries London, 2007)
[819] Anon., 'The Future of the South Kensington Museum, *The Builder*, 26 July 1873, 579.
[820] DCRO, D/St/C5/595/28, Letter from Henry Morgan Vane to John Bowes, 26 August 1884
[821] DCRO D/St/C5/595/16, Letter from Henry Morgan Vane to John Bowes, 12 August 1884.
[822] DCRO D/St/C5/595/18(i), Letter from Henry Morgan Vane to John Bowes, 14 August 1884; B. F. Cook, 'Newton, Sir Charles Thomas (bap. 1816, d. 1894), archaeologist', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 23 September 2004; Accessed 12 Jan. 2021 https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-20051..
[823] DCRO D/St/C5/595/18(i), Letter from Henry Morgan Vane to John Bowes, 14 August 1884; See also DCRO CCX/94, Letter from Robert Harley to John Bowes, 12 October 1880. This records C .T. Newton's visit along with the historian Wilhelmina Powlett, Duchess of Cleveland (1819-1901) and her daughter Lady Mary Primrose (1844-1935).

museums. Pollen was a museum professional trained under the philosophy of Henry Cole in recognising the value of objects to educate artisans and the manufacturing classes.[824] For many people Pollen's democratic views on museums and their collections represents the antithesis of the curator John Charles Robinson, who sought to attract the elite and upper-middle class collector to the South Kensington Museum.[825] Pollen was closely aligned with the contemporary artists and decorators of the middle of the nineteenth century such as Dante Gabriel Rossetti (1828-1882), Edward Burne-Jones (1833-1898) and William Morris (1834-1896), having trained as an artist and worked with them, among others, on the painting of interior murals for the Oxford Union in 1857.[826] However, his career path diverged from the artists and artisans associated with the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, and he joined the South Kensington Museum in 1863, initially appointed to arrange and produce basic catalogues of the various decorative art collections and it was this dedication to the practical attributes of museum work that acted as the precedent for the final choice for Bowes.[827] Though Pollen rejected the post, Bowes and Vane had meanwhile been recommended – or were approached by – another employee of the South Kensington Museum in a more junior position, Owen Stanley Scott (1852-1922). Scott's letter of application which was written on 15th August outlines his 12 years of working at the South Kensington Museum.[828] Archival records at the Victoria and Albert Museum show Scott rising steadily through clerical positions from the beginning of his employment in 1872, receiving promotions in 1873, 1875, 1876, 1878 and 1883.[829] For Bowes Scott would have represented a museum professional who was equipped with the capabilities to manage the institution in an orderly way. In the letter of recommendation from Cunliffe-Owen, it is Scott's 'honest work' and 'zeal,

[824] Anthony Burton, 'Cultivating the First Generation of Scholars at the Victoria and Albert Museum', *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide*, vol. 14, no. 2, (2015), 145.
[825] Anthony Burton describes Pollen as taking over the intellectual side of Robinson's activity under Cole's direction. See Anthony Burton, 'Cultivating the First Generation of Scholars at the Victoria and Albert Museum', 145.
[826] Fiona MacCarthy, *William Morris*, (London: Faber & Faber, 1994), 130-131; Anne Pollen, *John Hungerford Pollen, 1820-1902*, (London: John Murray, 1912), 268-273.
[827] See the V&A Archive, ED/84/36, vol. II, Precis of the Minutes of the Science and Art Department, 1863-69. One of his most well known works was the first catalogue of the museum's furniture collections: John Hungerford Pollen, *Ancient and Modern Furniture and Woodwork*, (London: Chapman & Hall, 1874).
[828] DCRO D/St/C5/595/21, Letter of application from Owen Stanley Scott to John Bowes, 15 August 1884
[829] See the V&A Archive, ED/84/36, vol. III, Precis of the Minutes of the Science and Art Department, 1869-77; ED/84/37 vol. IV, Precis of the Minutes of the Science and Art Department, 1878-80; ED/84/38 vol. V, Precis of the Minutes of the Science and Art Department, 1881-83.

conduct and ability' that was stressed, as opposed to the level of arcane knowledge that Everard Green was said to have possessed by Franks and Scharf.[830] Similarly, Henry Vane advised Bowes that Scott offered the safer option over Green, who for Vane represented a bachelor devoted to 'literary pursuits',[831] Because Scott was a family man, too, he possessed qualities such as loyalty and resilience and would not feel isolated in a large remote institution. Thus, Bowes wished above all for someone reliable, hardworking, physically able to do the labour required of a serious public institution, and valued this over the more scholarly and cerebral aspects of the world of museums.

Collection arrangement

With the building project reaching completion towards the end of the 1870s, John Bowes and the appointed curators began to dwell on how the Museum should be arranged, practically and theoretically. This meant that many objects in the collection of the Bowes began to be classified or reclassified according to the developing practices of museums which applied a more scientific approach to how objects were grouped or arranged in relation to each other. This subsection uses a close reading of how specific objects and groups of objects were arranged and displayed in The Bowes Museum, analysing guidebooks, floorplans and early photographs, in order to recreate the early displays and show how the scientific rationale was implemented to objects over time.[832] To this end it is possible to see what type of systems were put in place in order that the Bowes' private collection became of public utility. The idea of the Bowes collecting in a systematic way was explored in section one of this thesis, but with the advent of the representation of their collection to a public, mediated through a curatorial strategy, the collection was most certainly retrospectively applied with a system. Indeed, in the Museum's first guidebook, Owen Stanley Scott claims that the

[830] DCRO, D/St/C5/595/29b, Letter from Philip Cunliffe-Owen to Owen Stanley Scott, 25 August 1884.
[831] DCRO, D/St/C5/595/28, Letter from Henry Morgan Vane to John Bowes, 26 August 1884
[832] Owen Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*. The Floorplans are held under TBMA, TBM/5/1. Photographs of the interior of the museum are held under TBMA, TBM/11/2

Bowes 'systematically' acquired objects to represent the various classes and styles of art.[833] This was shown to be true to some extent through their campaign of collecting, yet the objects within the Bowes' collection are tied to a number of other social and cultural meanings that are associated with their own personalities.

In Scott's letter of application for the post of curator, he claimed to have overseen the Bethnal Green Museum, and 'entirely arranged' the Jones Collection, the latter being a significant private collection that was left to the nation, comprising large numbers of French decorative arts.[834] Scott was also working at the Bethnal Green Museum in 1880 when the South Kensington Museum decided to transfer 'all modern examples of art manufacture acquired since 1851' to that site.[835] According to Anthony Burton this was due to the museum's evolving view that the 'new art…did not seem to fit well with the old art.'[836] Thus Scott was employed at the South Kensington Museum at a particularly crucial time concerning the museum's own development in its attitude to modern art manufactures, as well as during a time when the status of French decorative arts was undergoing a shift. This means that Scott may have been seen as particularly well suited to for the collections at The Bowes Museum which featured heavily both French decorative arts and modern manufactures. The process of arranging the Jones Collection, which involved taking a private collection of hitherto domestically displayed objects, and imposing on them a new classificatory structure, was an apt model for the work that would occupy the curator at The Bowes Museum. Like John and Joséphine Bowes, John Jones wished for his works of art to 'be kept separate as one collection and not distributed over various parts of the said museum or lent for exhibition,' therefore the system of arrangement was tightly constrained by what was included in the collection, and any benefit gained by comparison or

[833] Owen Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, 1.
[834] DCRO D/St/C5/595/21, Letter of application from Owen Stanley Scott to John Bowes, 15 August 1884. Though it is not possible to clarify the dates that Scott was working at the Bethnal Green Museum, he may have also overlapped with when Richard Wallace's collection was displayed there between 1872-75, whilst Hertford House in Manchester Square was being adapted to accommodate it.
[835] Anthony Burton, 'The Revival of Interest in Victorian Decorative Art and the Victoria and Albert Museum', Miles Taylor and Michael Wolf, eds., *The Victorians Since 1901: Histories, Representations and Revision*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 124.
[836] Anthony Burton, 'The Revival of Interest in Victorian Decorative Art and the Victoria and Albert Museum', 124.

juxtaposition with the existing collection was impossible.[837] Thus in this respect, working with a single collection and attempting to rationalise it, Scott represented a suitable appointment.

The relevance of the South Kensington Museum buildings as a setting for domestic furniture was questioned. In 1897, a writer for *The Magazine of Art*, in comparing the Wallace Collection to the Jones Collection, concluded:

> The public does not sufficiently realise that, except in a purely industrial museum, the surroundings of works of art are of the first importance. Anyone can prove this for himself by walking along the gallery at [the] South Kensington Museum filled with the objects of the Jones Collection. There we have a collection of a kindred nature to that of Sir Richard Wallace. Cabinets, tables, escritoires, chairs, in glass cases or railed off…but they lack much of the charm that would belong to them if they were placed in still more appropriate surroundings.[838]

John Physick and Julius Bryant have described how the Jones Collection was first displayed in the National Competition Galleries at the museum, which were generally used to display and judge the works produced in the government-run schools of art in an annual exhibition, as shown in two illustrations from the 1870s (**figure 4.1**).[839] Due to the technical nature of the room's design, which needed good lighting and open space for the best display conditions for the works, the overall effect is cavernous and aesthetically sparse. This led the author in *The Magazine of Art* to deem the setting inappropriate for the display of domestic furniture.[840] The photograph of the Jones Collection arranged in the National Competition Gallery in 1910 shows many of the objects sequestered under glass cases, and in neatly placed rows of cases along the walls and the centre of the room (**figure 4.2**).[841]

[837] *Handbook of the Jones Collection in the South Kensington Museum*, 2.
[838] Anon., 'The Wallace Collection', *The Magazine of Art*, January 1897, 298.
[839] Julius Bryant, *Designing the V&A*, 127; John Physick, *The Victoria and Albert Museum*, 87.
[840] Anon., 'The Wallace Collection', 298.
[841] Photograph of the Jones Collection in the National Competition Gallery, c.1910, 1000BW0172, Victoria and Albert Museum image database.

Even within inherently domestic collection, the urge to compare, classify and juxtapose became a mainstream principle in museum arrangement. The domestic nature of the Bowes' collection is reinforced by the fact that much of the rationalisation of the collection came from household inventories that were compiled through the incidental and routine stages of their lives, and not necessarily through museum-related business. For example, the inventory that was taken in preparation for the wedding contract of John Bowes and Alphonsine de Saint-Amand in 1877 includes a number of catalogues of objects that were set aside for the Museum, which were differentiated from the personal property which would have been .[842] Moreover, these catalogues are divided by the type and manufacturing location of the objects, having separate catalogues for works in ivory and bone, gold and silverwork, enamels, and porcelain from different factories such as Sèvres, Chantilly and Saxe.[843] So for John Bowes, this moment offered a chance to legitimise the collection as a consciously systematised one. As well as being consciously divided into a classificatory system recognisable within fine and applied art museums, these catalogues then formed the basis for English versions which were used by John Bowes and the various museum curators for further scientific categorisation and analysis of the collection.[844] These included annotations of various points of interest such as inscriptions, provenances and comparative examples in other collections.[845] For example in the catalogue of 'Objects in Bone, Rock Crystal, Porcelains à la Reine and Ludwigsberg' a horn powder flask is marked 'S.K.M' indicating a similar object in the collection at the South Kensington Museum (**figure 4.3**).[846] Thus, The order the that was initially imposed on the Bowes' domestic objects, within

[842] TBMA, JB/6/5/1/1-9, Catalogues of museum objects, c.1877
[843] TBMA, JB/6/5/1/1-9, Catalogues of museum objects, c.1877; DCRO, CC/X/94, Catalogues of paintings at 7 Rue de Berlin and artists living in 1866, c.1877. These inventories are included in a list held in the notarial records associated with John Bowes death in 1885 in the Archives Nationales, Paris, MC/ET/XI/1405, Etude Jousselin successeur de Bournet-Verron, Inventaire après décès de M. John Bowes, recorded from 30 October 1885. I owe thanks to Lindsay Macnaughton for making these connections. See also Macnaughton's work on reconstructing the interior schemes of Joséphine Bowes and Alphonsine de Saint-Amand through household inventories: Lindsay Macnaughton, 'Beyond the Bowes Museum" The Social and Material Worlds of Alphonsine Bowes de Saint-Amand, *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*, vol. 31, (2021).
[844] TBMA, JB/6/5/2, Bowes Museum Object Catalogues, 1883-84.
[845] TBMA, JB/6/5/2, Bowes Museum Object Catalogues, 1883-84.
[846] TBMA, JB/6/5/2, Objects in Bone, Rock Crystal, Porcelains à la Reine and Ludwigsberg Catalogue, 1884, no. 1.

the confines of their own private apartments, expanded to encourage the comparison and cross-referencing that was one of the central tenets of museum display.

Display Cases

As in Marlborough House or the Jones Collection galleries at the South Kensington Museum, the impulse to systematise a private collection was mediated through the use of the display case. It wasn't until 1879 that the interior plan of the Museum had been confirmed between John Bowes and his architect, a full ten years after the foundation stone had been placed. At this moment Bowes recorded in a letter: 'The whole arrangement of the Building required a great deal of consideration, & cannot now be altered.'[847] Though section two of this thesis stressed that in the early 1870s the building, its rooms and their function had been in a state of changeability, by the end of this decade the purpose of the many rooms had been given over to public museum space.[848] From this moment the Museum took over the rooms in the wings of the first floor and the western wing of the second floor and Bowes had instructed his architect Pellechet to draw up a schema for the display cases that would have concretely demarcated the spaces of display: 'I have just received from Mr Pellechet, and send you for Mr Kyle, the plans of the 1st and West End of the second Floor of the Museum & the plans of the glass cases are indicated on it – The west end of the 2nd floor will be the Library and the cases for books are marked on it. The East side of that storey as Mr Kyle will know, will be differently arranged.[849] These plans show the intended placement of showcases lined against walls and smaller desk cases in the room centres (**figure 4.4**, **figure 4.5**). The development of the displays in The Bowes Museum is certainly one of movement from a more domestic feel to a structured arrangement which emphasises comparisons and universality. The original 1879 plans show an arrangement of cases similar to the domestic spaces in Marlborough House, with a single case placed centrally in the room and the walls lined with larger cases.

[847] TBMA, JB/2/1/47/89, Letter from John Bowes to unnamed correspondent, 28 June 1879.
[848] See the description of the museum published in the Newcastle Daily Chronicle: Anon., 'The Bowes Museum', *The Newcastle Daily Chronicle*, 23 January 1878, 3.
[849] TBMA, JB/2/1/47/71, Letter from John Bowes to R. J. Dent, 13 May 1879.

The notion of the display case as integral to the systematic display of objects has been noted by Susan Pearce, who outlines how the development in technologies and design of the showcase in the museum allowed for increased visibility of objects, and therefore closer scrutiny.[850] This also led to a homogenised appearance to museums in the second half of the nineteenth century, with most metropolitan and regional institutions purchasing the same type of case, and many arranging them in similar ways.[851] As Pearce notes, 'the ability of cases to stand in regimented rows contributed considerably to the solidity of the classificatory regimes.'[852] Thus the showcase, its type, placement and proliferation throughout a room becomes as integral to an arrangement as the objects within it. The presence of a large 'X' shaped case lightly annotated in pencil on one of the Museum's early plans dating from 1870 is indicative that large display cases which divided up the collection into discrete units were considered from an early moment in the design of the interior (**figure 4.6**, **figure 4.7**).[853] In this case, each 'wing' of the 'X' was dedicated to a different material.[854] In the 1893 handbook to the Museum two 'wings' of the case are dedicated to gold and silversmiths work, one to rock crystal and precious and semi-precious stones, and the final 'wing' is dedicated to work in ivory and bone.[855] Furthermore, later photographs of the Museum show a much larger quantity of showcases in each room than was delineated on the 1879 plans, which are far more redolent of the regimented rows that Pearce describes as a defining characteristic of the nineteenth century museum (**figure 4.8**).[856]

The practicalities of displaying so many objects was also compounded in 1879, when by a lucky set of circumstances John Bowes was able to acquire a large batch of showcases second-hand from a

[850] Susan Pearce, *Museums, Objects and Collections*, 105-109.
[851] Susan Pearce, *Museums, Objects and Collections*, 105.
[852] Susan Pearce, *Museums*, Objects and Collections, 105.
[853] The annotation appears on TBM/5/1, Plan of The Bowes Museum, First Floor, 1870. This case, like many from the original arrangement, is still in use in the museum today.
[854] Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, 22-23.
[855] Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, 22-23.
[856] TBMA, TBM/11/2, Photograph of the room of French porcelain, c.1900.

supplier to the Paris International Exhibition of 1878.[857] The setback of buying such a large quantity of cases all at once, however, made finances tight for Bowes:

> Altho' you have been so good as to make the payments of August & September in advance for me, I find myself very much embarrassed for money for payments which cannot well be deferred… A good deal of this embarrassment has been owing to my having made purchases here [in Paris] of show cases & other things which I was enabled to get on highly favourable terms at the moment from the person who supplied the Exhibition last year with them.[858]

Bowes purchased these cases from the firm of Haret, the joiners and cabinetmakers that supplied a significant number of showcases to the Paris International Exhibitions of 1867 and 1878. Haret made an impact in 1878 with their prefabricated chalets that could be shipped and assembled anywhere in the country, however the carpentry firm were also quietly omnipresent at the exhibition, providing a range of showcases for the different national sections in a range of apposite styles.[859] Bowes was offered the more restrained versions of cases that furnished the section dedicated to art and manufactures from Lyon (**figure 4.9**).[860] The relative utility of these cases meant that they were designed for quick, easy and temporary assembly for the large-scale exhibitions that proliferated through the second half of the nineteenth century.[861] This is underscored by the fact that the cases came with no reverse panels and these had to be repurposed from packing crates and other remnants of timber.[862] Educative reformers such as Henry Cole were continually inventing and revising display case design in order to find practical solutions to the lack of space or finances in museums, as well as allowing the visitors to study works of art in the optimal condition. In 1866 Henry Cole designed a stand from which pictures could be hung in a way that they radiated from the centre and could be looked through like turning pages in a book (**figure 4.10**).[863] Then in 1876 the South Kensington

[857] TBMA, JB/2/2/1, Letter from John Bowes to E. Y. Western, 30 August 1879.
[858] TBMA, JB/2/2/1, Letter from John Bowes to E. Y. Western, 30 August 1879.
[859] There is a volume of plates of case designs held in the Conservatoire Numérique des Arts et Métiers: Haret, frères, *Recueil de planches: différents stands, vitrines et bâtiments aux Expositions universelles de 1867 à Paris, de 1873 à Vienne et de 1878 à Paris*, c. 1867-1878, CNAM-BIB Gd Fol Xae 3 Res.
[860] Haret, frères, *Recueil de planches: différents stands, vitrines et bâtiments aux Expositions universelles de 1867 à Paris, de 1873 à Vienne et de 1878 à Paris*, c. 1867-1878, CNAM-BIB Gd Fol Xae 3 Res. Plate 33.
[861] For the temporary architecture of the International Exhibitions see Paul Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas*, 149-150.
[862] The reverse of a case was examined at The Bowes Museum at the conference 'Making a Case for Case: The Furniture of Display', held 10-11 January 2020.
[863] Anthony Burton, *Vision & Accident*, 84.

Museum produced a publication advising what type of case would best suit specific objects, and also suggested how the objects might be arranged, suggesting an increasing level of interest in this practice.[864] The preface to this advised that 'small cases are much more convenient than large ones. They enable the Student to study the Specimens closely…The Specimens are seen more effectively.'[865] Amongst this list of positives, the clarity of the specimens on display is paramount. Robert Harley very quickly identified the problems that would arise in terms of clarity when he unpacked the glass for the cheap, utilitarian cases that John Bowes had purchased, which he found to be of a deeply inferior quality.[866] His disappointment expressed to Bowes was framed through the way the visitor would experience the objects on display, writing: 'Every object that has more or less colour decoration must be influenced by the bulk of the Glass forwarded.'[867] Harley as an art master was acutely aware of the power of the applied arts museum as an educative tool, and as such he would have been concerned to present objects to their best ability, even if he was not suited to other aspects of the job as curator. This is best expressed through Harley's endeavours to borrow from the developments in display of large public museums, in order to make the museum collection reach its potential through the display of its paintings. In this case Harley sought examples from the Louvre, where he had been whilst in Paris visiting John Bowes. Harley urged Bowes to visit the Louvre to witness a technique of displaying a painting horizontally, upon a table: 'If you kindly refer to my last letter you will find that I said that the two pictures in the Louvre I would like you to see, <u>are on the floor</u> on a kind of stand (I will say here like a table) they are a little over three feet from the floor, and the spectator looks down upon them <u>and not up</u> at them, as at a ceiling.'[868] Here Harley was showing concern for the display techniques of smaller pictures, realising that they could be lost in the cavernous halls of the picture galleries. A view of the picture gallery shows this technique implemented into the displays, as a small table with chairs surrounded by a vast display of pictures, suggesting its appropriateness (**figure 4.11**).

[864] *Drawings of Glass Cases in the South Kensington Museum, with Suggestions for the Arrangement of Specimens*, (London: Vincent Brooks, Day & Son, 1876).
[865] *Drawings of Glass Cases in the South Kensington Museum*, 'preface'.
[866] DCRO, CC/X/94, Letters from Robert Harley to John Bowes, December 1879 & January 1880
[867] DCRO, CC/X/94, Letter from Robert Harley to John Bowes, December 1879
[868] DCRO, CC/X/94, Letter from Robert Harley to John Bowes, 14 December 1881.

Museum Galleries

When Owen Stanley Scott took over the arrangement of the Museum in 1884, its parallels with the South Kensington Museum become much more apparent. The South Kensington Museum had moved to its current location on Cromwell Road in 1857 from Marlborough House, which meant that the layout of the collections took on a more practical arrangement and was more obviously divided up in a didactic fashion. A guidebook from 1869 included a floorplan of the museum, showing separate galleries devoted to objects in different materials such as Ivory and Plaster and regions such as the 'Oriental Court' and Italian sculpture; as well as a gallery assigned to objects made since 1840 showcasing the modern manufactures, and an art library (**figure 4.12**).[869]

In February and March 1885, Owen Stanley Scott wrote to John Bowes with what he considered the final arrangement of the museum collection, quite clearly of the South Kensington Museum type.[870] Reproduced here as Appendix IV, and visualised as two plans (**figure 4.13**, **figure 4.14**), this arrangement is probably the last point at which John Bowes had involvement in the layout – or at the very least was given the final say in the process – and thus signifies the product of his vision for the Museum.[871] As is evident from the letter the Museum is broadly divided up by material, with the west suite of rooms on the first floor devoted to ceramics, and separate rooms in the sculpture galleries and east suite dedicated works in other materials.[872] Within these, where the range of objects is sufficient, there are subdivisions into national schools.[873] The most comprehensive objects on display – paintings and ceramics – have separate rooms or spaces in which each national school is shown grouped together.[874] In the museum rooms on the first floor the western pavilion held examples of German and English Pottery and Porcelain, and the following two rooms showing the French and Italian ceramics

[869] *A Guide to the Art Collections of the South Kensington Museum*, (London: Spottiswoode & Co., 1869).
[870] DCRO, D/St/C5/596/88(i-iv), Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to John Bowes, 9 March 1885.
[871] DCRO, D/St/C5/596/88(i-iv), Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to John Bowes, 9 March 1885.
[872] DCRO, D/St/C5/596/88(i-iv), Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to John Bowes, 9 March 1885.
[873] DCRO, D/St/C5/596/88(i-iv), Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to John Bowes, 9 March 1885.
[874] DCRO, D/St/C5/596/88(i-iv), Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to John Bowes, 9 March 1885.

in each.[875] There are obvious similarities to the South Kensington Museum's early arrangement: The eastern wing of the Museum, begins with the room off of the entrance hall showing the 'Oriental' objects in the collection.[876] A large part of this display was the collection of English and Chinese ceramics from Ridley Hall that John Bowes received from his cousin Susan Davidson after her death in 1878.[877] The next room was designated by Scott to show the modern manufactures purchased by John and Joséphine Bowes at the various International Exhibitions in Paris and London which is comparable to the room in the South Kensington Museum showing the 'works of art made since 1840'.[878] The next few rooms followed the convention of separation by material, including all works of art in glass and in the eastern pavilion, objects in ivory and other miscellaneous materials that included rock crystal, gold and silver, jade and enamels.[879]

The Museum's layout generally stayed fixed after John Bowes' death in 1885, except for a few changes which indicate a further adherence to the scientifically based classificatory system of the applied arts museum. Taking the information from the first guidebook to the Museum, written by Scott and published in 1893, it is evident that the ceramics galleries in the west wing had altered the most by showing only objects in porcelain, rather than all ceramics mixed together, suggesting an increasing specialisation of the displays.[880] The date range had also changed so these rooms now included a display of the 'modern' porcelain wares that the Bowes had bought at the International Exhibitions from factories in Russia, Portugal, Sweden, Denmark, France, Hungary and Germany, which had previously occupied their own room.[881] The room that Scott had previously reserved for 'modern manufactures' now held works in earthenware, including the French factories of Nevers and Moustiers, Italian Maiolica and German Stoneware, or 'Grès-de-Flandres' cementing the fact that the

[875] DCRO, D/St/C5/596/88(i-iv), Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to John Bowes, 9 March 1885.
[876] DCRO, D/St/C5/596/88(i-iv), Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to John Bowes, 9 March 1885; *A Guide to the Art Collections of the South Kensington Museum*, (London: Spottiswoode & Co., 1869).
[877] Howard Coutts and Patricia Ferguson, 'Setting the Table at Gibside', 177-178.
[878] DCRO, D/St/C5/596/88(i-iv), Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to John Bowes, 9 March 1885; *A Guide to the Art Collections of the South Kensington Museum*, (London: Spottiswoode & Co., 1869).
[879] DCRO, D/St/C5/596/88(i-iv), Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to John Bowes, 9 March 1885
[880] Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, 8-15.
[881] Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, 9.

ceramics rooms were very much demarcated by material.[882] Thus, a comprehensive understanding of the different types of ceramic ware and their associated place of manufacture could be gained.

In the first of the suite of rooms dedicated to porcelain the visitor could find English and French examples from factories such as Chelsea, Worcester, Coalbrookdale, St. Cloud, Vincennes and Clignancourt.[883] The following room was devoted entirely to the Bowes' impressive collection of Sèvres porcelain which is given extensive treatment in the guidebook.[884] The final room contained the German porcelain manufactories of Berlin and 'Dresden', or Meissen, and Frankenthal amongst others.[885] Photographs from this period also show how these displays were arranged. Published to accompany a description of the Museum in the *Art Journal* in 1897, a photograph of a display case containing some of the outstanding pieces of Sèvres in the collection, including two large vases with scenes of Louis XV hunting, shows a densely packed case with objects raised upon and shown against black flock paper plinths (**figure 4.15**).[886] Each object appears with its own small card label and a few lines of text suggesting the minimal approach to interpretation.[887] Another photograph in the museum archive showing the same case but with a wider view also captures the extent of the closeness of arrangement in other cases around the room, particularly the case behind which displayed a large quantity of smaller domestic pieces of Sèvres, consisting largely of cups and saucers, and here the pieces are shown without any labels whatsoever (**figure 4.8**).[888] Comparison to Birmingham's displays under Whitworth Wallis shows a remarkable similarity to the design and arrangement of the showcases, with small cursory labels and multiple tiers of objects, suggesting The Bowes Museum was following a 'type' that had begun to proliferate through regional decorative arts museums (**figure 4.16**).

[882] Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, 16-21.
[883] Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, 8.
[884] Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, 9-12. iii-iv
[885] Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, 13-14.
[886] Owen Stanley Scott, 'The Bowes Museum – Barnard Castle', *Art Journal*, (1897), 122-125. The vases are X.1447a & b in the collection and are now attributed to be mid-19th century. Thanks to Howard Coutts for this information.
[887] Owen Stanley Scott, 'The Bowes Museum', 123.
[888] TBMA, TBM/11/2, Photograph of the room of French porcelain, c.1900.

The didactic elements of the displays are further emphasised by the unorthodox layout of the 1893 *Handbook*.[889] Rather than a contents page, the guide is preceded by an 'index', which suggests it is more for cross-referencing rather than acting as a narrative to the displays (**figure 4.17**).[890] As is shown by this page, the collection was rationalised by the materials of the objects, divided into porcelain, enamels, bronzes, earthenware, stoneware, glass, crystals, ivories, and gold and silversmiths' work, with each category subdivided into nations in alphabetical order.[891] However, the route around the Museum was not as neatly sequential, and thus the guides contents presents the collection not in the order in which the visitor would have experienced it. This suggests an element of didacticism, and Giles Waterfield has stressed that catalogues associated with regional galleries, or those of institutions connected with the South Kensington system, often emphasised technical proficiency in their focus on the artisan.[892] The Bowes' first guide would have suited the artisan, who could simply look up his desired craft technique in the guide contents and navigate straight to the relevant section of the collection. This is in contrast to the text of the guide, which reads as a first person narrative walking around the Museum.

The *Handbook of the Jones Collection in the South Kensington Museum*, however, as a work that is referenced at the back of the *Handbook to The Bowes Museum*, and therefore must have provided a model, offers an interesting comparison as a private collection being repurposed for public display through a guidebook.[893] The guide was unofficially written by the medievalist William Maskell (1814-1890), and served as an introduction to and catalogue of the collection, devoted numerous pages to describing and illustrating the rooms of Jones' house at no. 95, Piccadilly, and, similarly to The Bowes Museum *Handbook*, is presented as a narrative in which the visitor walks around Jones'

[889] Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, iii-iv.
[890] Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, iii-iv.
[891] Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, iii-iv.
[892] Giles Waterfield, 'The Origins of the Early Picture Gallery Catalogue in Europe, and its Manifestation in Victorian Britain', in Susan Pearce, ed., *Art in Museums*, (London: Athlone, 1995), 65-71.
[893] *Handbook of the Jones Collection in the South Kensington Museum*. The *Handbook of the Jones Collection* is referenced in Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum*, 30.

house (**figure 4.18**).[894] The collection had originally been on display in Jones' residence, arranged across a small number of domestic rooms that were remarked upon for their limitations due to diminutive size.[895] Even though the collection had been entirely transported to the museum, Maskell was obviously eager to draw the readers' attention to the fact that it had once existed as a domestic ensemble, and, even further, wished for the catalogue to document the original arrangement.[896] Wood engravings of the Dining Room and Entrance Hall accompany the text, and there is even a floorplan of the house, which serves no practical use to the reader at all.[897] The *Handbook* justified this inclusion by stating its decision to completely remove any of Jones' aesthetic or classificatory impositions: 'No attempt has been made' it claimed '…to put any of the things in the same position with regard to one another which existed in the house in Piccadilly.'[898] Furthermore, it argued, 'it would have been impossible, as well as useless to have retained in the South Kensington galleries any memorial of their own arrangement.'[899] The choice of the words 'useless' and 'memorial' serves to strip the objects of the personal associations they have to John Jones and renew them in the context of their museum setting as useful and pedagogic.[900] This is emphasised by the way the catalogue explains that the new arrangement placed objects in isolation in order that it may be 'best examined as far as may be consistent with its shape, if furniture, or if china, with its colour and quality,' which is then reinforced by the way the catalogue addresses each object as a singular piece. [901] The comparison between The Bowes Museum *Handbook* and the *Handbook of the Jones Collection*, thus reveals strategies of removing objects from their sense of personal ownership through seriality, however both catalogues places emphasis on the biographical details of their previous owners, and invoke an experiential view of each collection through the deployment of first person narrative.

[894] *Handbook of the Jones Collection in the South Kensington Museum*, 1-44.
[895] *Handbook of the Jones Collection in the South Kensington Museum*, 8.
[896] *Handbook of the Jones Collection in the South Kensington Museum*, 8-44.
[897] *Handbook of the Jones Collection in the South Kensington Museum*, 11 & 13.
[898] *Handbook of the Jones Collection in the South Kensington Museum*, 8.
[899] *Handbook of the Jones Collection in the South Kensington Museum*, 8.
[900] *Handbook of the Jones Collection in the South Kensington Museum*, 8.
[901] *Handbook of the Jones Collection in the South Kensington Museum*, 8.

Sculpture Galleries

The rooms which were always intended to be places of display from the earliest incarnation of The Bowes Museum were the Sculpture Galleries and the Picture Galleries.[902] Examining how these were utilised over time also reveals a complicated relationship between private and public methods of display. The lower 'museum room' had been considered as a sculpture gallery since the building's conception, as is evident on the 1871 floorplan published in *The Builder* (**figure 3.20**).[903] However, the sculpture galleries' function was still loosely interpreted by Scott in 1885, for he wrote that as well as displaying 'stone and marble carvings', they included 'the carved woodwork, wrought ironwork, and metalwork, generally.'[904] The Bowes were not avid collectors of sculpture, only buying pieces that were interesting for their depiction of a particular historical figure or pieces that had a more decorative function, and a representative and useful arrangement would have been difficult to achieve.[905] Seemingly to address this large gap in the collection, a codicil to John Bowes' Will written in May 1881 included £500 to be used to purchase plaster replicas of classical sculptures.[906] Plaster casts of antique sculptures were a staple part of national and regional collections, stemming from their use as instructional devices for artists and designers who studied in the South Kensington-led schools of design.[907] The fact that they would have been displayed in The Bowes museum amongst other forms of ornament such as carved wood and wrought metal adds emphasis to this didactic aspect of

[902] These were demarcated on the 1871 plan published in *The Builder*, Anon., 'Mrs. Bowes Mansion and Galleries at Barnard Castle, Durham', 28.
[903] Anon., 'Mrs. Bowes Mansion and Galleries at Barnard Castle, Durham', 28.
[904] DCRO, D/St/C5/596/88(i-iv), Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to John Bowes, 9 March 1885.
[905] See for example the bronze busts of Louis XVIII, Charles X and the Duc D'Angouleme acquired at the Berryer sale in 1869: S.102, S.103 & S.104
[906] TBMA, TBM/2/1/2, Codicil dated 20 May 1881, 26. I am grateful for Judith Phillips for providing this information.
[907] The most comprehensive recent overview of the history of plaster casts is Rune Frederiksen and Eckhart Marchand, eds., *Plaster Casts: Making, Collecting and Displaying from Classical Antiquity to the Present*, (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), see particularly Diane Bilbey and Marjorie Trusted, '"The Question of Casts" – Collecting and Later Reassessment of the Cast Collections at South Kensington', and Malcolm Baker 'The Reproductive Continuum: plaster casts, paper mosaics and photographs as complementary modes of reproduction in the nineteenth-century museum' in Rune Frederiksen and Eckhart Marchand, eds., *Plaster Casts*, 465-484 & 485-500. This subject and its relation to regional institutions also featured in Rebecca Wade, 'Pedagogic Objects'. See also Wade's later book on the creation and circulation of plaster casts beyond just the museum and institution in Rebecca Wade, *Domenico Brucciani and the Formatori of Nineteenth Century Britain*, (New York: Bloomsbury, 2019).

the collection, as Malcolm Baker has stressed that at the South Kensington Museum, plaster casts of figures and examples of ornament, the two-dimensional and the three-dimensional, and the reproduction and 'authentic' objects were presented side-by-side to offer a complete education for the artisan.[908] The Sculpture Galleries unfortunately remained unopened and 'unoccupied' throughout the first decade of the Museum's opening, and it wasn't until the first decade of the twentieth century that the trustees began to assemble the collection of cast statuary.[909] In John Bowes' codicil it is suggested that a collection could be formed with Jules Pellechet's assistance – as an established architect Pellechet would have had a familiarity with the tools of receiving a technical education. However by the time the trustees were deliberating Pellechet had passed away, and Pease suggests that the Victoria and Albert Museum (for it had changed its name in 1899) would be the best advisor for the selection and purchase of casts.[910] By 1913 a list of casts had been approved by the Chief Inspector of Schools of Art, as well as the well-known sculptor William Robert Colton (1867-1921).[911] A photograph after the sculpture galleries were finally installed and arranged – taken at some point after 1914 – shows the room filled with plaster casts of statues after the antique, standing on plinths, in a strikingly similar display to the Victoria & Albert Museum's 'Antique Cast Court' as well as other provincial galleries such as Leeds City Art Gallery at the turn of the twentieth century (**figure 4.19**, **figure 4.20**, **figure 4.21**). The nucleus of Leeds' cast collection had arrived after the Board of Education began granting funds to aid provincial museums from 1881, cementing these objects' status as representative of Victorian didacticism, and thus this shows The Bowes Museum's Sculpture Galleries as adhering closely to a recognised feature of the municipal museum.[912]

[908] Malcolm Baker 'The Reproductive Continuum', 485-490. For the move from the reproduction to the authentic work in American museums see Alan Wallach, *Exhibiting Contradiction: Essays on the Art Museum in the United States*, (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998), 38-56.
[909] See Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, 15
[910] TBMA, TBM/1/1/1/2, Trustees Minute Book 1907-1924, 19 October 1912, 45.
[911] TBMA, TBM/1/1/1/2, Trustees Minute Book 1907-1924, 22 March 1913, 48-49.
[912] Rebecca Wade, *Domenico Brucciani and the Formatori of 19th-Century Britain*, 124-126.

Picture Galleries

In contrast to the more systematised and didactic decorative art and sculpture rooms on the first floor, upstairs the Picture Galleries showed more of a concession towards the private picture gallery, or, at the very least the arrangement was not strictly rationalised. According to Scott's 1885 letter, the three rooms were to be divided to hold German, Flemish and English pictures in the western-most room, French pictures in the central room, and Italian and Spanish pictures in the eastern room.[913] These were to be 'arranged, as nearly as possibly, chronologically, but a certain amount of liberty in the respect to be allowed to meet the exigencies of arrangement.'[914] Allowing exigencies implies that Scott has adopted concessions in the chronology for an aesthetic effect. The 'gentlemanly' hang, which disregards classification in favour of more abstract aesthetic principles was an approach adopted by private galleries made public from the early nineteenth century, for example the National Gallery whilst displayed at John Julius Angerstein's Pall Mall residence, and it endured for the remainder of the century as Richard Wallace also displayed his pictures in this fashion in Hertford House in the 1870s-80s.[915] Though Scott was taking more of a pragmatic view to the quantity of paintings that were on display, it is still suggestive of a flexible approach to the paintings' arrangement. It is also known from at least 1881 John Bowes wished for the room which led from the staircase into the picture gallery to display Joséphine Bowes' paintings.[916] This was the room that was continually referred to as the 'reception room' throughout the construction of the building, suggesting its domestic function.[917] Furthermore, the relatively small proportions of the room lined with Joséphine Bowes' small-scale landscapes would have evoked the interiors of their own apartments in Paris or at Streatlam as well as aligning Joséphine Bowes' artistic pursuits with the canon of artists

[913] DCRO, D/St/C5/596/88(i-iv), Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to John Bowes, 9 March 1885.
[914] DCRO, D/St/C5/596/88(i-iv), Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to John Bowes, 9 March 1885.
[915] Charlotte Klonk, *Spaces of Experience*, 21-25; Barbara Lasic, 'Splendid Patriotism: Richard Wallace and the Construction of the Wallace Collection', 175.
[916] DCRO, CC/X/94, Letter from Robert Harley to John Bowes, 15 November 1881. It states: 'I understand from a former letter that you wished Mrs Bowes's Pictures to be hung in the large room from which the Picture Galleries are entered'.
[917] Anon., 'The Bowes Museum', 3.

presented on the other side of the doors. This further blurs the distinction between the educative and aesthetic remit of the picture gallery display.

Owen Scott's 1893 catalogue of the paintings in the collection includes over 700 paintings, however the list of the pictures that are actually displayed in the rooms at this point amounts to only around 130.[918] The Picture Galleries are also described as 204 feet long by 44 feet wide, and to emphasise the effect of this quantity of paintings in this space, the Sheepshanks collection at the South Kensington Museum contained around 500 works in a space that was 87 feet long by 50 feet wide (**figure 4.22**).[919] Scott advises the viewer to navigate a specific way around the three rooms, following their outer walls in a clockwise fashion, going round the whole gallery rather than taking each room separately.[920] This gives the sense – along with the rather sparse display – of a specific rationale to the hang. However, deducing from the list and comparing to his 1885 plan, the arrangement is characterised by its lack of system: in the middle room reserved for French pictures was found English works by Hogarth and Gainsborough, as well as a 15th century German crucifixion; and in the eastern room of Italian and Spanish works there was displayed French seascapes, Dutch landscapes and modern portraits of John and Joséphine Bowes.[921] To further compound the confusion, early photographs of the Picture Galleries show that in the decades following the Museum's opening the walls became densely packed (**figure 4.23**).[922] Views of the rooms show the pictures stacked vertically in columns of around 4 or 5 and arranged with little to no room around each frame, and extra screens were placed throughout the galleries on which to hang smaller works. Helpfully the inclusion of a figure – most probably Owen Scott himself – stands next to the doorway and highlights the overwhelming sense of the hang, with the highest picture suspended approximately 15 feet above his head. Indeed in 1910 an employee from the Victoria and Albert Museum visited the Museum on a tour of 'provincial galleries' and

[918] Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, 26-30 & 33-74.
[919] John Physick, *The Victoria and Albert Museum*, 35 Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, 25.
[920] Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, 25.
[921] Owen Stanley Scott, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, 27-28.
[922] TBMA, TBM/11/2, Photograph of the Picture Gallery, c.1900,

recorded his observations.[923] Chief among them was the surprise at pictures hanging 20 feet above the floor (**figure 4.24**).[924] Helpfully, Mr Long also includes the wall colour of the galleries, which is predominantly of reddish-purple, showing the Museum curators to be following Bowes' example in the colouring of the sculpture galleries below.[925]

On the day of the Museum's opening in 1892, the MP Joseph Whitwell Pease, who gave a congratulatory opening speech wrote privately in his diary about the hang: 'There are some hard pictures and some I fear not worth the wall space.'[926] The lack of a rational basis to the hanging of the paintings certainly led to visitors' belief that they had been arranged indiscriminately. In 1906 *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* wrote scathingly about the 'inferior quality of a large proportion of the pictures,' suggesting the Museum's location away from a significant population prevented it from 'having a disastrous effect upon those who visited it with the view of increasing their taste and knowledge.'[927] This also led the writer to remark more generally on some provincial galleries that 'Things good and bad are labelled and displayed side by side with an impartiality that can scarcely fail to mislead the designer who comes to the gallery in search of suggestions or models,' suggesting regional museums needed close and learned management.[928] For Pease, and the writer of *The Burlington*, The Bowes Museum the pictures were still too representative of the personal collecting tastes of the Bowes, and although Scott had tried to apply a geographical or historical narrative to the artworks, their eventual chaotic display rendered them incomprehensible.

However, as a whole this section has shown that the seemingly bureaucratic and official processes that the Museum underwent from the 1880s onwards were inevitably tightly bound to the private motives of John and Joséphine Bowes. The employment of the early museum curators Robert Harley

[923] V&A Archive, ED 84/209, 'Mr Long's visits to and report on Provincial Galleries', 30 July 1910.
[924] V&A Archive, ED 84/209, 'Mr Long's visits to and report on Provincial Galleries', 30 July 1910.
[925] V&A Archive, ED 84/209, 'Mr Long's visits to and report on Provincial Galleries', 30 July 1910.
[926] Joseph Whitwell Pease Diaries, 10 June 1892.
[927] Anon., 'English Provincial Museums', *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, vol. 10, no. 45, (1906), 142.
[928] Anon., 'English Provincial Museums', 142. See also Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*, 158-159.

and Owen Stanley Scott demonstrated that the Bowes indicated initial parameters in which they wished such employees to work, such as the moralistic requirements that Joséphine Bowes set out in her will, based on a curator living within the edifice she saw as her residence as well as a museum.[929] John Bowes also contemplated the employment of a more scholarly curator with antiquarian tendencies after the death of Robert Harley, demonstrating how the Museum might have been shaped by John Bowes' personal interests rather than the expertise and skills of a dedicated museum professional, that was more apt for a municipal or industrial museum. The Museum's earliest arrangement also reinforced this hybridity between the public utility of the applied arts museum and the private gallery of the collector, using a rigorous classificatory display system for much of the decorative arts that echoed the way the John Jones Collection was rationalised and absorbed into the displays at the South Kensington Museum. However, the paintings took on more of an aesthetic and less-scientifically rigorous hang, and their juxtaposition with Joséphine Bowes' own paintings reinforced their place within the private collection of the Bowes.

By showing how The Bowes Museum adopted a more accessible and public rationale over the decades following Joséphine Bowes' death, yet still maintained a distinct aesthetic and personal organisation also supports the wider notion that regional and municipal museums should not be 'regarded monolithically', and instead need to be understood as reflective of a variation of aims amongst a variation of actors.[930] As such, The Bowes Museum is the encapsulation of the complicated nature of the way museums presented objects – and by extension, narratives of art history – more generally. Objects presented by collectors held both personal and educational value, and even under the curatorship of a professional, a museum's agenda was never straightforward, and their function never quite clear. Instead, as in The Bowes Museum, to elucidate a particular museum's social value, its display needs to be assessed within its more localised cultural and social context.

[929] TBMA, TBM/2/1/1, The Will and Codicil of Benoîte Joséphine Bowes, 12 & 19 July 1871.
[930] Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums 1850-1914*, 120-121.

Epilogue

Domestic Furnishings in the Museum Post-1885: Souvenirs of the Bowes

The tensions between the between the public and private function of The Bowes Museum are crystallised in the choices made by governance of the Museum at the turn of the twentieth century, when the board of trustees and the curator began to look afresh at what type of museum The Bowes Museum was. In this case the many objects amassed by John and Joséphine Bowes throughout the 1860s and 1870s, mainly what were perceived by the museum staff as modern domestic wares, were questioned as to their appropriateness to a museum collection.[931] They were construed as not of value to a museum collection due to their relative ubiquity and domestic feel, as well being 'modern'. Kate Hill has further theorised objects which come with an personal associations as 'souvenirs', which proliferated alongside domestic objects in regional museums between 1880 and 1914.[932] Described as objects 'whose importance lies not in themselves but in their associations,' Hill suggests such associations carried different perceptions of value from the donor to the curator.[933] The Bowes' objects, when left to the Museum carried a number of associations, either historical or with their own personal life, and as stated by Hill, '[b]oth of these associations are key to the significance of the object to the donor, though less so…to the museum.'[934] As such, there was an anxiety that the objects used within the displays would be interpreted as representing a shrine to the Bowes themselves. Therefore the decades either side of 1900, show a re-evaluation of the collection until a pivotal moment in 1917 when the trustees sell off part of the collection,

[931] TBMA, TBM/7/2/1, Copy of Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to the Charity Commission, 30 August 1917.
[932] Kate Hill, 'Collecting Authenticity: Domestic, Familial, and Everyday "Old Things" in English Public Museums, 1850-1939', *Museum History Journal*, vol. 4, no. 2, (2011), 207.
[933] Kate Hill, 'Collecting Authenticity', 207-8.
[934] Kate Hill, 'Collecting Authenticity', 208.

At the death of John Bowes in 1885, the matter of the Bowes' furniture was passed on to the museum officials, including the curator Owen Scott and the trustees.[935] This point marks a shift in the perception of the collection, something that Kate Hill has recognised as a common feature when public museums receive private bequests, where the objects carry not only the associations they had when collected by the Bowes, but also an association to the Bowes themselves.[936] As noted by Catherine Paul the turn of the twentieth century saw a shift in the way museum directors and curators presented their collections. They moved away from 'accumulation', and preferred instead to focus on 'digestion', paying attention to being instructive as possible to visitors.[937] This is typified by the appearance of publications such as Benjamin Ives Gilman's *Museum Ideals* (1918).[938] Gilman's manifesto for museums was that the experience of the general visitor should be the key focus.[939] This was part of a more general movement away from the notion of the museum as a product of Victorian patronage, and a move towards the idea that museums were truly democratic spaces where visitors felt as though they were learning through their own efforts rather than the through the benevolence of a wealthy donor.[940] Gilman himself felt that private benefactors who gave bequests to museums should be honoured by having their name associated with certain objects, but that keeping entire collections together would be a disservice to those objects, stating: 'The effect of the individual pieces of a private collection will almost always be heightened in settings arranged for them from other exhibits of a museum.'[941] Thus, the presence of the private collector had to give way to the museum's classificatory programme.

The decades following the death of John Bowes also saw the opening of the Wallace Collection in 1900 to a wide public (not just an elite class of visitor), the large gift of Renaissance decorative arts

[935] TBMA, TBM/2/1/2, Will and Codicil of John Bowes, 1 June 1878.
[936] Kate Hill, 'Collecting Authenticity', 207-8; Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums 1850-1914*, 71.
[937] Catherine Paul, *Poetry in the Museums of Modernism: Yeats, Pound, Moore, Stein*, (Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2002), 15.
[938] Benjamin Ives Gilman, *Museum Ideals of Purpose and Method*, (Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1918).
[939] Benjamin Ives Gilman, *Museum Ideals of Purpose and Method.*
[940] Jordanna Bailkin, *The Culture of Property: The Crisis of Liberalism in Modern Britain*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).
[941] Benjamin Ives Gilman, *Museum Ideals of Purpose and Method*, 134.

from Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild to the British Museum, named the Waddesdon Bequest.[942] This meant that with two large and significant private collections opened to the public, the contribution of private collectors to institutional formation was becoming increasingly visible. The reception of such collections was often framed around the good taste and benevolence of their founders, as expressed by Carol Duncan discussing the Wallace Collection: 'The visitor can only look at, admire and envy such a display of wealth and (presumably) taste.'[943] However there was also anxiety that these new exhibition spaces challenged the educational remit of the museum.[944] The new custodians of The Bowes Museum, the trustees and curator, were keenly aware that the myriad domestic wares amassed by the Bowes may not be received in the same manner as the Wallace Collection, as they did not carry the same personal associations, and they were actually fearful it may undermine the museum's credibility as a public institution.[945] As Sarah Medlam has noted, when the trustees came to unbox the many crates of furniture from Louveciennes, they 'were horrified. Even by 1900 the furnishings of the Second Empire seemed overblown, old-fashioned, but not yet "antique", and, worst of all, in a pastiche style imitating the 18th century.'[946] The museum trustees were unable to present The Bowes Museum as a shrine to the taste of the founders due to the associations it would create to institutions such as the Wallace Collection, which was replete with many more genuine eighteenth century pieces of furniture. As is shown by Andrea Geddes Poole, trustees of museums such as the Wallace Collection at the end of the nineteenth century generally had aristocratic backgrounds, and sometimes were even collectors themselves, and often decisions were made based on their own tastes or modelled on the exclusive nature of private collections.[947] By 1890 the board of governors for The Bowes Museum included Lord Barnard, Henry de Vere Vane (1854-1918), Claude Bowes-Lyon, the 13th Earl of Strathmore (1824-1904), Monsignor Thomas Witham of Lartington Hall (1806-1897),

[942] Pippa Shirley and Dora Thornton, eds., *A Rothschild Renaissance: A New Look at the Waddesdon Bequest in the British Museum*, (London: The British Museum, 2017); Dora Thornton, 'From Waddesdon to the British Museum'; Dora Thornton, 'Baron Ferdinand Rothschild's sense of family origins and the Waddesdon Bequest in the British Museum', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 31, no. 1, (2019), 181-198;
[943] Carol Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals*, 74.
[944] Jordanna Bailkin, *The Culture of Property*, 20.
[945] TBMA, TBM/7/2/1, Copy of Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to the Charity Commission, 30 August 1917.
[946] Sarah Medlam, 'Two French Furnishing Schemes of the 1850s'.
[947] For the often strained relationship between museum employees and trustees see Andrea Geddes Poole, *Stewards of the Nation's Art: Contested Cultural Authority 1890-1939*, (London: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 77-108. See also Christopher Whitehead, *The Public Art Museum in Nineteenth Century Britain*, 3.

two members of the Pease family: Joseph Whitwell and his son Joseph Albert Pease (1860-1943), as well as R. J. Dent and E. Y. Western who had been executor of John Bowes' Will. The majority of these men owned nearby landed estates or were prominent in public life, and therefore would have invariably had their own ideas of how The Bowes Museum should contribute to the areas civic culture, but they also would have been driven by decisions of taste.

However, the problem of a public art institution displaying and interpreting so many objects of a domestic nature appeared to be a singular one in the 1890s. Kate Hill's analysis of donations of objects to regional museums suggests that 'no large or (apparently) systematic collections' were given to museums in Leicester, Warrington, Norwich or Sunderland between 1880-1914.[948] In 1893, a year after the Museum opened, Owen Scott wrote to thirteen separate regional museums, including the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge and art museums in Birmingham, Bradford, Glasgow, Leeds, Lincoln, Manchester, Nottingham, Salford, Sheffield, Wolverhampton and York asking for advice regarding their views and processes on the 'disposal of unsuitable or superfluous objects' as well as 'duplicates.'[949] Manchester Art Gallery's curator William Stanfield (fl. 1893-1912) replied; 'the only provision we have made is exercising a care not to accept any unsuitable object or picture which is not up to our standard, either by gift or bequest. Duplicates we do not accept.'[950] The consensus, present in all replies to this letter in the archive, was that few of these large metropolitan museums had made provision for this measure, generally because they had enjoyed a level of autonomy – or at the very least some choice – in what they acquired from private donors or bequests.[951] Whereas an art museum would have purchased or acquired a single example as illustrative of a particular design, technique or material, the trustees of The Bowes Museum had to preside over entire suites of furniture and dining services that had been kept from the Bowes' various houses.[952] The only institution which had taken

[948] Kate Hill, 'Collecting Authenticity', 207.
[949] TBMA, TBM/7/2/1, Copy of a letter sent to Curators of the undermentioned Museums, by order of the Trustees of The Bowes Museum, 8 December 1893.
[950] TMBA, TBM/7/2/1, Letter from William Stanfield to Owen Stanley Scott, 11 December 1893.
[951] There are replies from staff at Manchester Art Gallery, Glasgow Corporation Galleries and Nottingham Museum and Art Gallery, TBMA, TBM/7/2/1.
[952] See, for example, the inventory drawn up in 1885 which has a list of 'Articles not of common household use but fit to be placed in the museum which John Bowes retained in Paris and which since his death have been

action in disposing of works was the Corporation Galleries of Art in Glasgow, whose curator James Paton (1832-1908) wrote: 'More than once, the committee have disposed, by auction, of pictures &c which it was thought inadvisable to retain longer in the collections, but such pictures were their own purchased property, or acquired under condition that they might be so disposed of.'[953] Paton here seems to be alluding to the unique circumstances of The Bowes Museum in which the collection was bound by a set of guidelines which meant it could not be dispersed.[954]

Once the Museum had officially opened to the public in 1892, the trustees formed a managing committee by appointing representatives elected by the ratepayers of Barnard Castle to join with them in the running of the Museum.[955] By 1896 this had expanded to include nominated governors from specific institutions, such as Durham University and the County Council of Durham.[956] At some point, the trustees, or Owen Scott, felt it necessary to have someone connected to South Kensington sit on the Museum's management committee to further strengthen the ties to the metropolitan centre of applied art museums. Scott wrote to the Department of Science and Art at South Kensington in order for them to nominate a governor who would be able to represent the nationwide system of art training. The nominee was Frank Thompson (1852-1927), the artist and master of Durham School of Art who joined the board of governors around 1897. In 1905 Thompson was asked to compile a report of the collection, which was unduly scathing of many of the objects the Bowes had acquired over at the large International Exhibitions.[957] Thompson questioned whether these objects had the right to be deemed 'museum objects' in any sense

identified and placed in the museum.' This includes such items as 'An antique drawing room suite carved wood gilt covered with antique tapestry in the Aubusson style flowers and fruits on a white ground'. TBMA, TBM/2/2/1, Strathmore v Vane, 1885.

[953] TBMA, TBM/7/2/1, Letter from James Paton to Owen Stanley Scott, 12 December 1893.

[954] As per Joséphine Bowes's Will, TBMA, TBM/2/1/1, The Will and Codicil of Benoîte Joséphine Bowes, 12 & 19 July.

[955] TBMA, TBM/2/1/1, The Will and Codicil of Benoîte Joséphine Bowes, 12 & 19 July, 9-11.

[956] TBMA, TBM/2/1/1, The Will and Codicil of Benoîte Joséphine Bowes, 12 & 19 July, 9-11.

[957] TBMA, TBM/1/1/1/1, Trustees Minute Book 1886-1906.

Thompson's report was to provide the beginning of a process of re-evaluation of the collection that coincided with the Museum's reopening after a period of financial uncertainty between 1898 and 1909.[958] The Museum's reopening obviously caused a renewed focus on its purpose and the trustees minute books from 1909 onwards document the efforts made to consolidate the various aspects of the Museum with overt public benefits, such as the library and the collection of plaster statuary.[959] Through the First World War the Museum business carried on at a reduced pace, but more of the displays were allocated for collections and displays outside of the John and Joséphine Bowes' collection, and the Museum began negotiating for the purchase of a large collection of ethnographic material from the missionary Reverend George Brown (1835-1917) that he had collected in the Southern Pacific Islands.[960] To make room for such new ventures and acquisitions, in 1911 Scott was instructed by the trustees to 'compile [a] list of duplicate objects in [the] collections or [those] otherwise unsuitable for [the] Museum.[961] By 1917, this list had been finalised and Scott wrote the Charity Commission – who assisted in financing the Museum from the 1890s – to ask for permission to dispose of the unsuitable and duplicate objects by auction. However, the Charity Commission were sceptical that such activity was permitted by Joséphine Bowes' original bequest. This is evident when, in August 1917 they asked for proof that the articles they intend to dispose of are not considered as 'museum objects' within the original terms specified in Joséphine's will and codicil.[962] Scott's reply to them is uniquely taste-led and displays the present anxieties about how the collection would be perceived by the public:

> The…articles were for the most part…purchased at the Paris Exhibition, 1867, and the London Exhibition, 1871, (both very dark periods, artistically speaking!). I cannot say why these articles were bought; it may have been for the purpose of being utilised by Mrs Bowes in her residential apartments in the museum. They are just the ordinary shopkeepers' wares

[958] Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, 268-269.
[959] TBM/1/1/1/2, Trustees Minute Book 1907-1924. See the meetings on 19 March 1910, 25 March 1911, 16 October 1911, 19 October 1912 and 22 March 1913.
[960] This included a large collection of Melanesian artefacts, as well as objects from Samoa, Fiji, the Bismarck Archipelago, Tonga and the Soloman Islands. For the collection's complicated history and fraught relationship with British colonialism see Christopher McHugh, 'Recontextualising the George Brown Collection through Creative Ceramics', *Journal of Museum Ethnography*, no. 28, (2015), 85-106. For the trustees' negotiations for the collection see TBM/1/1/1/2, Trustees Minute Book 1907-1924, meetings 1916-1921.
[961] TBM/1/1/1/2, Trustees Minute Book 1907-1924, 25 March 1911
[962] TBMA, TBM/7/2/1, Letter from the Charity Commission to Owen Stanley Scott, 21 August 1917.

> that may be seen in certain sections of any industrial exhibitions; are quite unworthy of being shown in any museum, and do not even possess the questionable merit of being "curios."[963]

Finally, Scott summarised:

> They have, in short, no artistic or industrial value, and their inclusion in our exhibits would make the Bowes Museum a veritable "Musée pour rire."[964]

The objects the Bowes had purchased in the 1860s and 70s, redolent of the tastes of the Second Empire and High Victorian periods, were at this point distinctly unfashionable, which coloured Scott's judgement of vast swathes of the collection. It is undeniable now that the huge number of objects the Bowes purchased at the exhibitions of 1867 and 1871 are valid works of art and industry, however the taste judgements made by Scott concerned the Museum being perceived as a 'musée pour rire', or a museum for laughs.[965] For Scott, the objects on display needed to possess 'artistic' or 'industrial value', proving at the beginning of the twentieth century The Bowes Museum was an institution that possessed a serious artistic and academic purpose.[966] This was in contrast to an environment that promoted mere entertainment, and as the taste of the founders caused consternation that the Museum's purpose would be undermined by their 'bad taste', the collection was disconnected from the personal associations it once had. The eventual consequence of the concerned views expressed by Owen Scott and trustees such as Frank Atkinson was that approval was granted by the Charity Commission for the Museum to dispose of any objects they saw as unsuitable for the collection.[967] A sale was organised at the Newcastle based auctioneers Anderson & Garland in December 1917, described as 'a collection of duplicates from The Bowes Museum, including pottery and porcelain, costly silk curtains and gilt furniture'.[968] The catalogue grouped together many pieces of domestic furniture that, due to the difficulty of ascribing value in terms of authenticity or personal,

[963] TBMA, TBM/7/2/1, Copy of Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to the Charity Commission, 30 August 1917.
[964] TBMA, TBM/7/2/1, Copy of Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to the Charity Commission, 30 August 1917.
[965] TBMA, TBM/7/2/1, Copy of Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to the Charity Commission, 30 August 1917.
[966] TBMA, TBM/7/2/1, Copy of Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to the Charity Commission, 30 August 1917.
[967] TBMA, TBM/7/2/1, Letter from the Charity Commission to Owen Stanley Scott, 6 September 1917.
[968] TBMA, TBM/7/2/1, *Catalogue of a Collection of Duplicates from The Bowes Museum, including Pottery and Porcelain, Costly Silk Curtains and Gilt Furniture*, 4 December 1917, Messrs Anderson & Garland.

the trustees felt were not right for display. This included large selections of French earthenware from the Nancy school, along with works by Emile Gallé (1846-1904), as well as English and Italian majolica and an entire suite of Louis XV style gilt furniture.[969] Thus, the trustees disposed of nearly 300 lots of the Bowes' former personal property for the purposes of redefining their displays. As Abigail Harrison Moore has pointed out, museums are sites where the past is constantly reinvented and recycled, and for museum curators, governors and trustees: '…object choices are historical gestures. They are validated by the moment at which the choice is made, pass judgement upon the past viewed through the present, and are crucial to the process of valuation and devaluation'[970] It is demonstrated by The Bowes Museum's trustees and curators' decisions at the turn of the twentieth century that many of the objects preserved in the Museum were deemed unsuitable, and therefore invalidated. This subsection has presented the final case study which saw the Bowes' private collection become fully integrated into the public sphere, through a process of reshaping and redefinition. Finally, the analysis of the place of the Bowes' domestic furnishings within the Museum displays highlights the friction that occurs when translating a private collection into a public museum, in that so many of the Bowes' possessions that were destined for the Museum were bound up with taste and value judgements that caused anxious confusion in the minds of the elected museum officials.

[969] TBMA, TBM/7/2/1, *Catalogue of a Collection of Duplicates from The Bowes Museum, including Pottery and Porcelain, Costly Silk Curtains and Gilt Furniture*, 4 December 1917, Messrs Anderson & Garland. See, for example, lots 27, 78, 275.
[970] Abigail Harrison Moore, *Fraud, Fakery and False Business*, 137.

Conclusion

This thesis has offered a historiographical reinterpretation of the creation of The Bowes Museum from its formation as a private collection in the middle of the nineteenth century to its consolidation as a public art museum at the opening of the twentieth century. As demonstrated through this expansive case study, art museums formed in the second half of the nineteenth century held a close and symbiotic relationship with private collectors, and private collections and the market for art continued to drive the development of the art museum. This is a significant counter-argument to the accounts on the rise of the public museum such as Krzysztof Pomian's, which see the private collector and the public museum as separate entities after 1850.[971] As discussed in the introduction, much literature obscured the role of the private collector in the formation of public institutions from the 1850s onwards, instead viewing them as instruments of state-led power operating to educate the working classes. Instead, by adding to the ideas and narratives suggested by a raft of writers including Giles Waterfield, Tom Stammers, Frazer Ward and Mark Westgarth that museums and individuals were implicitly tied to one another, this thesis offers a fresh account of museum-making in the second half of the nineteenth century which allows for viewing the individual private collector and philanthropist as a key component to museum formation across national, regional and private museums in Great Britain.[972] From this it is also possible to see how, spread across Britain's institutions, the private collector was both influenced by contemporary museum policy as well as influencing it, resulting in a landscape of museums, which like The Bowes Museum, were distinctive in their appearance, collection policy and governance, and even varied in their aims.

Through investigation into a significant amount of primary and secondary material, this thesis has recontextualised The Bowes Museum's creation as a public museum in the second half of the nineteenth century using the empirical information that is preserved in the archive in tandem with

[971] Krzysztof Pomian, trans. Elisabeth Wiles-Porter, *Collectors and Curiosities*.
[972] Tom Stammers, *The Purchase of the Past*; Frazer Ward, 'The Haunted Museum: Institutional Critique and Publicity'; Giles Waterfield, *The People's Galleries*; Mark Westgarth, *The Emergence of the Antique and Curiosity Dealer in Britain 1815-1850*.

established and emerging disciplines such as institutional histories, collecting histories and art market studies. This has addressed previous book-length studies on The Bowes Museum by Charles Hardy and Caroline Chapman, that did not adequately account for the broader contextual pressures which aided in forming the Bowes' collection and creating their museum.[973] Hardy and Chapman's accounts were biographically oriented, which dislocated all subsequent scholarship that focused on the Bowes, their collecting and their museum from larger collecting and institutional histories. This thesis has worked against this impulse to insert the Bowes into the broader picture of collectors, museum professionals and institutions in Britain in the second half of the nineteenth century. Indeed, this study has effectively decentred the Bowes from the narrative of the creation of The Bowes Museum, to allow space for the external actors who shaped their collecting and museum-making practices. In doing so, it offers the creation of The Bowes Museum as a case-study which emphasises how supposedly singular Victorian institutions can be brought into dialogue with the broader cultural pressures which shaped museum policy in the second half of the nineteenth century.

This thesis has argued that the creation of The Bowes Museum drew from the conventions that surrounded the perceived role of the art museum in Britain from the 1830s. As has been highlighted, politically, socially and culturally the Bowes were positioned close to the museum officials and commentators that attempted to define and shape the landscape of art institutions through the nineteenth century, and in particular the rise of the educational museum that was epitomised by the South Kensington Museum. This is an area of The Bowes Museum's history that has been little acknowledged and explored in the literature. New aspects have been revealed on the influences of The Bowes Museum's creation, such as John Bowes' political career, which was contemporaneous with the debates surrounding the utility of public art collections in the 1830, and his close friendship with William Hutt, who was a key figure in the Board of Trade from the 1830s to the 1870s. As well as bringing the Bowes into the network of protagonists of British museum histories, this also aligns The Bowes Museum's overall aims and function with the broader notions of education, civility and

[973] Caroline Chapman, *John & Joséphine*; Charles Hardy, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*.

recreation that museums were occupied with. However, one of the significant findings of this exploration was the interplay of public duties and private interests that occurred behind the debates around museum utility. As demonstrated, the upper-middle classes notions about the educational benefits of institutions such as museums was often vague and ambiguous. It was shown that museums were often as much about the reinforcement of the upper-middle classes identities as cultural producers, than they were about munificent and educational programmes.

The thesis also represented the first examination of The Bowes Museum within the discourse of art market studies. Within this discipline writers such as Clive Wainwright, Mark Westgarth and Tom Stammers are beginning to move formerly subsidiary actors in collecting histories from the peripheries to the centre.[974] Thus, it was argued that the Bowes' sustained use of professional antique dealers is a key mode of their art collecting. Through close investigation of the Bowes' main dealers, highlighting their trade practices and networks, it was shown that the antique dealers Pierre Theodat Jarry, A. C. Lamer and Mme Lepautre allowed the Bowes access to established networks of collecting and systems of knowledge and expertise that lent legitimacy to their collecting practices. Also, as this thesis is the first study to offer an overview of the Bowes and their antique dealers' activity at auction sales in Paris in the 1860s and 1870s, it has revealed a previously obscured but significant aspect of how the collection was formed. Investigating this particular aspect of the Bowes' collecting had a number of purposes. The first was to place the Bowes in the same social spaces as other private and institutional collectors contemporary to them, such as Sir Richard Wallace and the South Kensington Museum, connecting the museum project to these similar narratives of museum formation. This has often been a barrier to understanding the creation of The Bowes Museum, as the social and cultural links to other collectors are not obvious, and therefore there has been a tendency to see John and Joséphine Bowes as divorced from the cultural field of their contemporaries. This is not, however, an attempt to elevate the Bowes' collecting to the status of the elite collectors of their time, such as

[974] Tom Stammers, *The Purchase of the Past*; Clive Wainwright, prepared for publication by Gere, Charlotte, 'The Making of the South Kensington Museum IV'; Mark Westgarth, *The Emergence of the Antique and Curiosity Dealer in Britain 1815-1850.*

Richard Wallace, the Comte de Nieuwerkerke, Lady Charlotte Schreiber, John Charles Robinson. Instead, this study inserts the Bowes into the matrix of collecting in the second half of the nineteenth century, illuminating the peripheries of the nineteenth century art market, and argues that institutional formation requires a nuanced understanding of the social role of different markets and collectors.

The secondary purpose of the study of the Bowes and their dealers' activity at auctions was to provide provenances for objects in The Bowes Museum collection. For many of the objects in the collection their point of purchase by the Bowes is the earliest reference available. By tracing objects back further it not only reveals new data that aids in an increased understanding of the collection, but as argued by this thesis, provenance also reveals new motives for John and Joséphine Bowes' collecting. By highlighting objects which were purchased for their particular historical or cultural associations a new dimension to the Bowes' collection – and its purported use – is added. It is hoped that the extensive list of auction sales provided in Appendix I offers a new and valuable dataset for future research into the study of the art market in Paris in the nineteenth century, as well as to The Bowes Museum's own understanding of its collection. This epitomises the successful research outcomes that are attained by the Collaborative Doctoral Partnership programme, and mean this project has a real and immediate impact on the Museum's interpretation and collections information.

The creation of The Bowes Museum as it is known today was realised in a number of conceptual and physical ways, and its history is marked by change. Through examination of the housing of the Bowes' collection in a specially built building it was demonstrated that the domestic space of the house and the public space of the museum were flexible concepts in the nineteenth century. As shown, there was a general trend towards opening up the space of the private collection, making it more accessible as the century progressed, however this was countered by the paramount place exclusivity had in the private collection's presentation to a public. As such, even public institutions that had developed from private collections, such as the National Gallery and the Sir John Soane Museum, bore residual traces of their private origins, and even struggled to emphasise their public role in nineteenth century society, as was the case with the latter institution. This was shown by

revealing for the first time the role the Sir John Soane Museum played as a model for the Bowes, as they discussed the terms of the Private Act of Parliament they introduced to be able to leave the Museum for the public benefit. For the Bowes, the Act passed by John Soane in order to make his private collection a public institution was not a sufficient model as the purpose it served to the public was not abundantly clear, and by the time the Bowes were contemplating their Private Act, the perceived role of museums within society had developed so that new demands, such as an overt educational remit and a clearly defined collection typology, meant that the Bowes' Private Act needed to encompass such developments.

As was discussed, The Bowes Museum's relationship to the private house was more fraught than most due to its origins as a 'mansion and museum.'[975] Its location in Barnard Castle, a place not associated with any aspects of craft and industry, as well as in close proximity to John Bowes' ancestral home of Streatlam Castle, prompted the view that the Museum functioned as a surrogate country estate for the Bowes. However, due to Joséphine Bowes death in 1874 – in the middle of the building's construction – the function of the building altered, and this was analysed through the evolution of the interior space of the Museum, and its gradual repurposing of spaces that originally had a domestic function. It was construed that The Bowes Museum's unique layout is a product of this drastic change of circumstances, however some of the spaces in the Museum drew from examples that were ubiquitous in the nineteenth century museum design, such as large and accessible Entrance Halls and appropriate public amenities. The final section of this study illustrated how private collections could be applied to the realm of public utility through a systematic and scientific arrangement. The Bowes were aware of developing museum practice in the way they formed their collection, however they consolidated this by employing a mediator to interpret their collection and shape it for public consumption. However, this section also highlights that there were private interests within the decisions that were seemingly made in the public interest of the Museum. The employment of a museum curator reflected the professionalisation that occurred within museums in the second half of

[975] Anon., 'Mrs. Bowes Mansion and Galleries at Barnard Castle, Durham', 29.

the nineteenth century, as John Bowes showed an increasing desire to have the collection interpreted in an accessible and utilitarian way.

Finally, this thesis establishes The Bowes Museum as a significant foil through which to read new histories of collecting, institutions and art markets and sets out a broad corpus of primary material which represents serious potential for future study. It is hoped that future scholars within the history of collecting, the history of the art market and the history of museums will utilise this work, draw on the rich resources which are housed in the Museum, and further integrate The Bowes Museum into networks of collecting and institutional formation in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Appendix I: Auction Sales that appear in The Bowes Museum archive in relation to their art and antique dealers

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
Pierre Theodat Jarry										
JB/5/2/7	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	December 12 1857					23869		Auction Catalogue in the archive. No bill found. Check in Archives de Paris?
	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	March 10-13 1862	Jacob Sale	31?	Enamelled Byzantine Cross		26629		Object with Soltikoff provenance listed in packing list
Mme. Lepautre										
JB/5/11/2/25	M. Charles Pillet		February 26 1866	Joseph-Désiré Court (1797-1865) Sale	194; 195	194: 'S. E. le maréchal Pélissier. Buste. Étude d'aprés nature.' 195: 'Le maréchal Soult, duc de Dalmatie. Portrait en pied, inachevé.'	35; 32	28883 28890	B.M. 479 B.M. 482	Sale cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/20
JB/5/11/2/31	M. Charles Pillet		March 5 1866	Marquis de Bailleul	21	21: Richard 'La Petit Ménagère'	62	28915		On Gallica; Copies in AAP, EBNP Sale cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/22

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/11/2/35	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	March 10 1866	Monguier Sale	23	23: Jean Louis Demarne 'Paysage', A guache, près d'une chapelle gothique ornée de statues, est une villageoise qui garde des animaux. Sur le devant, un ruisseau où un chien se désaltère; plus loin, des moissonneurs se reposent à l'ombre de grands arbres. Signé Demarne	315	28932	B.M. 290 or B.M. 661	Sale cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/24
JB/5/11/2/41	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	March 27 1866	1st day: Albert Brébant Peel (1809-1892) 2nd day: M. Meffre	144 148	144: Neer (Arthur van der) 'Canal hollandais et Entrée de village, Clair de lune' 148: Oudry (Jean-Baptiste) 'Gibier mori', A droite, entrée d'un bois; au bas d'un arbre est un chevreil étendu, un canard sauvage et d'autres oiseaux; près de lá, quleques ustensiles de chasse; au fond, rivières et montagnes. Signé au bas, à guache, en toutes lettres	100 280	28981	B.M. 210 B.M. 298	Sale cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/25
JB/5/11/2/60	M. Boussaton		May 24 1866	Vente au profit des Orphelins de Léon Bonvin, ariste peintre	87	87: Fortin Latour [sic] 'Nature morte'	82		B.M. 514	Sale cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/29
JB/5/11/2/143	M. Couturier		?November 3 1866		253 280	1 painting; 1 painting	21;140			
JB/5/11/2/166	M. Escribe		December 10 1866	Philippe Tanneur (1795-1878) Sale	14	Painting by Tanneur	52	29370	?B.M. 995	Copies in BNP

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/11/2/175	M. Charles Pillet		December 24 1866	Becquet Sale	4 6 39	4: 'Cassella (Signé) Vue du Palais des Tuileries prise du Pont-Neuf' 6: 'Dagnan (Signé) Paysage marin' 39: 'Inconnus. Paysage, vue d'un couvent.'	75 27 4.50	29417	O.32	Copies in AAP VP 1866/236
JB/5/11/2/184	M. Baudry		nd		74 78 95 106	4 paintings				
JB/5/11/2/185	M. Charles Pillet		nd		64	1 painting	61			
JB/5/11/3/2	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	January 10 1867	Symphorien-Casimir-Joseph Boittelle (1813-1897) Sale	12	12: Bachelier (I.) 'Griffon de la Havane', signé à droit, 1768	175	29435	B.M. 913	Boittelle's first sale took place on 24-25 April 1866 (Lugt 29076)
JB/5/11/3/4	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	January 11 1867	Symphorien-Casimir-Joseph Boittelle (1813-1897) Sale	208 125	208: Voirioz 'Portrait de Caillaud, chanteur de l'Opéra Comique. Il est réprésenté dans son rôle des *Deux Chasseurs et la Laitère*. Signé à droite, Voirioz, 1765 125: Lefèvre 'Portrait d'homme' Carresant son chien d'une main, de l'autre il tient une lettre sur laquelle se voit la signature Lefèvre, 1760	102 75	29435	B.M. 561 B.M. 492	

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/11/3/54	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	June 1 1867	Sale after the death of Eugène Deveria	7	7: Deveria 'Femme de la vallée d'Oussau et son enfant'	147	29856	B.M.361	Sale cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/34 Copy in AAP VP 1867/192
JB/5/11/3/78	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	December 5 1867		x 2 4	Boxes 2: Deshayes 'Village entouré d'arbres' 4: Durand Brager 'Marine. Temps gris'	7; 54; 105	30055	B.M. 749;	Sale cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/35 Copies in AAP, BAP EBP, EPNB
JB/5/11/3/79	M. Dutitre	Hotel Drouot	December 7 1867	Sale of a collection of 150 paintings old and modern	15 23	15: Kuwasseg 'Paysage avec Chute d'eau' 23: Gudin Temps 'calme; soleil couchant'	115; 34	30063	B.M. 114	Sale cat in Bowes archive JB/5/2/36
JB/5/11/3/85	M. Escribe	Hotel Drouot	December 19 1867		x x 62 65	Chest for gloves and jardiniere 2 candlesticks; 62: 'Buste de petite Fille en marbre blanc' 65: 'Buste de Bonaparte 1er Consul. Marbre blanc.'	3.50 3.50 38 57	30101		Sale cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/38 Copies in AAP, BAP EPNB; Access on Gallica through BnF cat VP 1867/262
JB/5/11/3/89	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	December 30 1867	Paintings of the modern school, provenant de l'ecole libre des Beaux-Arts	x 20 30 36	20: Dumax 'Port-en-Bessi, Normandie' 30: Jonquières (De) 'Bédouin, Trotteur russe' 36: Marsal 'Nature morte'	4; 12; 12; 24	30128	B.M. 855; O.245; B.M. 411	Sale cat in Bowes archive JB/5/2/39

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/11/4/8	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	January 20 1868	Cabinet de M. Goldsmith (de la haye) - modern paintings	12 30 50	12: Couturier 'Coq et canards' 30: Hoppenbrouwers 'Paysage avec rivière et pêcheurs: Effet de nuit' 50: Rochussen 'Pêcheurs sur le bord de la mer'	46 125 54	30166	B.M. 715; B.M. 230; B.M. 673	Sale cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/43
JB/5/11/4/11	M. Boussaton		January 25 1868		19 20 43 86 96 101	19: Colin (P.) 'Une Ferme; une Forêt' 20: Corot 'Paysage' 43: Hereau 'Chevaux à l'abreuvoir' 86: Brifaut 'Marine' 96: Dumié 'Paysage' 101: Lanfant, de Metz 'Brigands'	46 138 100 12 40 39	?		Sale cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/45
JB/5/11/4/15	M. Delbergue Cormont	Hotel Drouot	February 12 1868	Collection de M. Laluyé	7 17 35 34 16	7: Cicèri (Eugéne): Paysage 17: Grenet: Paysage; effet de printemps 35: Tabar: Vue de Venise 34: Rauch (J.): Paysage avec figures 16: Fischer: Servante de ferme donnant à manger à des porcs	40 25 40 68 60	30220	B.M. 674 B.M. 409 B.M. 747 B.M. 695 B.M. 753	Sale cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/49 [Identified by Hardy as Landscape by Ciceri; Landscape in Spring by Grenet; Scene in Venice by Tabar; Landscape with figures by Rauch; Woman feeding pigs by Fischer]

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/11/4/20	M. Delbergue Cormont	Hotel Drouot	February 21 1868	M. Eugène Gresy (1806-1867) Sale Membre de la société des antiquaires de France, correspondant du ministère de l'instruction publique pour les travaux historiques.	60; ?40; ?20-27	60: Deux petites Mosaïques italiennes: ruines de monuments; ?40:: Deux petits Flambeaux en argent, époque Louis XVI; 20-27 Ivories (one of these)	14; 142; 18	30245		Sale cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/52
JB/5/11/4/22	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	February 24 1868	Modern paintings	26 34	26: Jacque 'Paysan fauchant' 34: Troyon 'Rivage aux environs de Trouville'	130 157	30253		Sale cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/54 Charles Hardy note next to lot 26 'Not BM.735'
JB/5/11/4/23	M. Boussaton		February 26 1868		? ? ?	a Noel a Rozier a Cottin	23 16 37	?30262		Copy in BAP
JB/5/11/4/25	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	March 2 1868	Emmanuel Weyl	10 18 29	10: Couturier 'Une Basse cour' 18: Durand Brager 'Combat Naval' 29: Jacque 'Tropeau de moutons traversant une prairie. Temps couvert'	175 195 230	30278	B.M. 359; ; B.M. 372	Sale cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/58 Emmanuel Weyl was a dealer

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/11/4/26	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	March 4 1868	Alexander Petrovitch Basilewski (1829-1899) Sale	10 11 15	10: Cals, 1854 'Cuisinière tenant un canard sauvage' 11: Cals, 1846 'Villageoise et Enfant assis sur le bord d'une route' 15: Couturier, 'Poulaillier avec Poules, Coqs et Canards'	98 100 100	30286	?; B.M. 647; B.M. 360	Lepautre also bought lot 38: Palizzi 'Trois Vaches buvant à une mare' for 142 francs (Hotel Drouot Archives sale catalogue) Sale Cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/59 [Identified in pencil as Couturier; Cals Peasant Woman; Wild duck - 'See Sale Cat 4 Mars 1868'] Copy in AAP VP 1868/64
JB/5/11/4/28	M. Escribe		March 7 1868	M de M.	3	3: Brager (D.) Pendant du Précédent [Marine]	92	30297		Copy in AAP Sale Cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/62
JB/5/11/4/31	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	March 18 1868	Albert Brébant Peel (1809-1892)	43; 37	37: Hughes 'Paysage' 43: Lenfant de Metz 'Le Lever de l'Enfant'	92; 64	30336	B.M. 712; ?B.M. 659	Copy in AAP. Access on Gallica through BnF VP 1868/86 Sale Cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/65
JB/5/11/4/33	M. Charles Oudart		March 21 1868	El..	63	63: Richard (L.) 'Gardeuse d'oies'	118	?30346	B.M. 353	Sale Cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/67 Copy in AAP

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/11/3/91	M. Boussaton	Hotel Drouot	March 23 1868	Collection de M. A. F**	1 2 10 25 50	1: Anastasi 'Paysage; clair de lune' 2: Anastasi 'Le Soir' 10: Cals 'La Seine à Saint-Ouen' 25: Deshayes 'Le Brouillard' 50: Noel (J.) 'Barques sur la plage'	146 150 44 80 72	30353		Sale cat in Bowes archive JB/5/2/68
JB/5/11/4/35	M. Boussaton		March 25 1868		52; 63; 13; 34	Painting of beach at low tide; Painting of lighthouse at Honfleur; Painting; Painting of a beach	22; 17; 80; 120	?		Sale cat in BM archive? 23 March 1868
JB/5/11/4/38	M. Charles Oudart		April 1 1868		7 9 51	7: Cortès 'La Passage du gué' 9: Daubigny 'Vue prise en Dauphiné' 51: Ziem 'Le Moulin; effet de neige'	150 157 170		B.M. 349?	Sale cat in BM archive JB/5/2/70
JB/5/11/4/39	M. Escribe	Hotel Drouot	April 3 1868		29 60	29: Dorcy 'Jeune Fille rêvant' 60: Monticelli 'Preomendale à l'enclos'	62 36	30396	B.M. 700	Sale cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/71

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/11/4/41	M. Escribe		April 11 1868	Dhios (expert)	x; x; 101; 68; 6; 27; 37; 11	2 collections of engravings 6: Bourges (L.) 'Habitation de M. Ed. Frère au village d'Ecouen' 11: Chaplin 'Jeune Femme assise' 27: Dorcy (D.) 'Tête de jeune Fille blonde' 37: Lanfant (de Metz) 'Les Bâtons de vieillesse' 68: David (L.) 'L'Amateur de tableaux (mine de plomb)' 101: Kiorboe 'Étude de cheavaux. (Dessin au crayon, rehaussé d'aquarelle.)	4; 2; 2.50; 11; 35; 50; 100; 102	30415		Sale Cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/74 Copy in AAP
JB/5/11/4/45	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	April 23 1868	Pierre Joseph Dedreux-Dorcy (1789-1874) Sale	12; 13; 10; 19; 22; 31; 11; 6	Tableaux & Études par Dedreux-Dorcy 6: Dedreux-Dorcy 'Tête de Vierge' 11: Dedreux-Dorcy 'Le Repos' 19-20: Dedreux-Dorcy 'Deux têtes de jeunes femmes - Études à l'huile' 21-22: Dedreux-Dorcy 'Deux têtes de jeunes femmes - Études à l'huile' Tableaux & Dessins 10: Paul Collin 'Carrière à Palaiseau' 12: Paul Collin 'Mare dans une forêt - Ébauche' 13: Paul Collin 'Paysage avec rivière. Soleil couchant' 31: Jules Noel 'En Bretagne'	5; 3; 3; 45; 30; 92; 55; 55	30455	B.M. 443; B.M. 704; B.M. 702; B.M. 700	Sale Cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/76 Cross reference with BM database Expert Durand-Ruel

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/11/4/49	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	April 30 - May 1 1868	Mme de Montferrand	74 75 79 170 263 309	74: Étui en émail de Saxe 75: Bonbonnière en ècaille, piquèe or 79: cinq petite coupes en agate, de formes et de couleurs variées 170: Petit coffret à bijoux en malachite et bronze doré 173: Petit buste de Louis XV en bronze ciselé et doré; socle en malachite 263: Petite bibliotheque en bois rose garnie de bronze, dessus en marbre 309: Dreux-Dorcy 'Réunion galante dans un bois'	79	30485	X.5449 ?B.M. 740	Sale Cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/80 Copy in EBP with prices and names
JB/5/11/4/52	M. Escribe		May 5 1868	Dhios (expert)	2 10	2: Autre Vidrecome à anse en argent repoussé, à médaillons d'empereurs romains et guirlandes de fruits et fleurs 10: Autre Gobelet à couvercle repoussé de deux médaillons à figures de saints; encadrements à fruits et rinceaux	186 96	30496	X.4603	Copy in AAP, EPNB (names) VP 1868/162
JB/5/11/4/56	M. Couturier		May 9 1868		?34	34: 'Belle Cheminee en onyx'	85	?		AAP 1868 0509
JB/5/11/4/60	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	May 23 1868	Moïse Jacobber (1786-1864) Sale	11 x x	11: Corbeille de fleurs posée sur un banc de pierre 3 sketches 4 pieces of porcelain	102 10.50 16	30550	B.M. 646	Sale Cat in Bowes Archive JB/5/2/86 Cat includes paintings on porcelain

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/11/4/63	M. Boussaton		May ?27 1868		x; 35; 49; 83; x	Painting of a dog; Painting by Luminais of a hunt; ?Painting by Palizzi; ?; collection of studies	8; 30; 67; 31; 1	?		Check Bowes Sales Cat 16 May
JB/5/11/4/69	M. Quévremont		June 9 1868		51	A landscape	115	?		
JB/5/11/4/78	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	December 14 1868	Camille Flers (1802-1868) Sale	45 69 74 91 92	45: Camille Flers 'Meules. Prairie d'Annet' 69: Garneray 'Navire échoué' 74: Lafage 'Four à Plâtre' 91: Richard 'Entrée de bois'; 92: Richard (attribué à) 'Paysage. Crépuscule'	190 34 (69+74) 25 (91+92)	30818	B.M. 327	
JB/5/11/4/79	M. Charles Pillet		December 18 1868		x; x; x; x; 11; x; x	4 engravings; etchings	20; 9.50; 16.50; 16.50; 5.50; 6.50; 12.50	?30833		Camille Flers second sale of Prints, Porcelains and various. Copy in AAP

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/11/5/2	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	January 19 1869	Comte Klein	106 77 60 76 153 27	106: Quatre petits piédestaux en porcelaine d'Allemagne, à ornements gaufrés en relief et décor d'or. 77: Sèvres: Deux tasses, forme droite , avec soucoupe; l'une, en pâte tendre décorée de festons de fleurs en camaïeu bleu; l'autre, en pâte dure, fond rose, décorée d'animaux dans des paysages en camaïeu brun. 60: Sèvres: Deux tasses droite en vieux Sèvres, pâte tendre; l'une est décorée de fleurs en couleurs et de bords bruns rehaussés d'or; l'autre a des filets bleus avec pois d'or et des fleurettes de couleurs. 76: petit pot à pommade avec soucoupe en encienne porcelaine de Saint-Cloud, à décor en camaïeu blue. Marque du directeur Trou; 153: Groupe de cinq figures en ancienne faïence allemande, décor polychrome. Les Vendangeurs. 27: Tasse de même forme [Grande droite] avec soucoupe, en vieux Sèvres, pâte tendre, décorée de fleurs et de rubans bleus entre deux rangs de perles se détachant sur un fond doré	15 13 51 17 80 46	30903		153: faience crossed through Copy in AAP VP 1869/21
JB/5/11/5/3	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	January 20 1869	Comte Klein	38 26	38: Tasse de forme basse et arrondie avec soucoupe, en vieux Sèvres, pâte tendre, fond gros bleu, rehaussé d'arabesques d'or et médaillons, vase de fleurs et paysages en couleurs. Époque Louis XVI 26: Grande tasse droite, avec soucoupe, en vieux Sèvres pâte tendre, décorée de festons de pensées reliées par des rubans bleus, entre deux bandes vertes rehaussées de feuillages en or enlacés	55 40	30903	X.1266	
JB/5/11/5/5	M. Boussaton		January ?21 1869		12	Women dryers by Feyer Perrin	60	?30909		Copy in LP

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/11/5/6	M. Escribe	Hotel Drouot	February 1 1869	Adrien Dauzats (1804-1868) Sale	42	Dauzats 'Ruine à Montfort-l'Amaury	37	30942	B.M. 759	
JB/5/11/5/7	M. Escribe		December 17 1868		94 27	94: Petit pot à crême en porcelaine de Sèvres, pâte tendre; décor à bouquet de fleurs 27: 3 miniatures, deux portraits d'hommes et un portrait d'enfant	29 7	30831		Copy in AAP VP 1868/274
JB/5/11/5/8	M. Escribe	Hotel Drouot	February 2 1869	Adrien Dauzats (1804-1868) Sale	119 70	Study, part of 'Vues diverses' 115-137 by Dauzats study 'Vue prise à l'Intérieur de l'église Saint-Roch' by Dauzats	15 40	30942	? B.M. 743	
JB/5/11/5/9	M. Escribe	Hotel Drouot	February 3 1869	Adrien Dauzats (1804-1868) Sale	340; 341; 347; 347; 357		7; 10.50; 7.50; 7.50; 6	30942		
JB/5/11/5/10	M. Escribe	Hotel Drouot	February 4 1869	Adrien Dauzats (1804-1868) Sale	361; 362; 363; 363; 364; 365	Under Dessins, Études, Détails d'Architecture, Croquis d'après Nature. 9 drawings from 30 of 'Statues, Bas-reliefs, Armes, etc.'; Under Figures, Compositions, Études d'après nature, Costumes divers. 4 drawings from 37 'Espagne: Costumes de molnes de diverse ordres et Costumes ecclésiastique' ; 7 drawings from 29 'Espagne: Costumes du peuple, Gitanos, etc.'; 6 drawings from same; 6 drawings from 34 'Espagne: Groupes, Scènes de moeurs, Costumes, etc.'; 4 drawings from 46 'Orient: Le Caire. Costumes et types divers'	8.50; 5; 6; 14; 3.50; 10	30942		

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/11/5/14	M. Boussaton		February 15 1869		47; 90; 96; 27; 56	Painting 'the brothers'; painting by Sauvage of a doll; Painting by Feyranot of an interior; Painting by Couturier; Painting by Boulanger of geese;	78; 40; 77; 105; 88	30977		Copy in AAP
JB/5/11/5/20	M. Couturier		March ?1/2 1869		x	inkwell	23	?31026		Possibly 31026, sale on 27 February. Copy in AAP
JB/5/11/5/22	M. Charles Pillet		March 4 1869		x; 9	3.6m of Guipure lace; 2.15m of English lace	15; 50	?31038		Possibly 31038. Copy in AAP
JB/5/11/5/28	M. Quévremont		March 22 1869		x	Painting	63	?		
JB/5/11/5/34	M. Escribe	Hotel Drouot	April 19 1869	Alphonse Oudry (1819-1869) Sale	27 138	27: Eugenio Caxes 'Présentation au Temple' 138: École Espagnole 'Portrait d'une Princesse espagnole'	25 51	31200	B.M. 585	Check with BM database.
JB/5/11/5/35	M. Escribe	Hotel Drouot	April 20 1869	Alphonse Oudry (1819-1869) Sale	x	A Painting	82	31200		Proces verbal 356
JB/5/11/5/36	M. Escribe	Hotel Drouot	April 20 1869	Alphonse Oudry (1819-1869) Sale	x	1 painting; 1 painting	80; 40	31200		Proces verbal 351, 357
JB/5/11/5/37	M. Escribe	Hotel Drouot	April 22 1869	Alphonse Oudry (1819-1869) Sale	x	6 bordiere (frames)	43; 39; 21; 30; 82; 70	31210		First day of third sale 'includes 150 old carved wood frames from the ages of Louis XII, Louis XIV, Louis XV and Louis XVI.'

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/11/5/43	M. Alphonse Perrot	Hotel Drouot	May 12 1869	Colonel Bourgeois du Castelet Sale	?263	7 Frames	34; 27; 26; 23	31281		150 frames
Franco-Prussian War										
JB/5/11/7/13	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	December 11 1871	Marquise de Boissy Teresa, Countess Guiccioli (1800-1873) Sale	55?	Possibly 55: Dix vases de jardin en marbre blanc sculpté - Ils sont de forme Médicis, ornés de godrons et de palmettes. - Hauteur, 90 centimètres	620	32762		Lepautre buys 2 marble urns Procès verbal 79 Charles Mannheim purchases a tapestry for Nathaniel Rothschild Edward Rutter buys from this sale
JB/6/6/2 (French shipping book) JB/3/3/20/?	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	January 11 1872	Victor Henri Rochefort (1830-1913) Sale	57	57: Pendule et sa Console d'applique en bronze doré et cristal de roche	1300	32829	X.133	AAP VP 1872/3 See household bills JB/3/3/20: Lepautre buys from dealer Laurent in Palais Royale for 1750 francs
Hotel Drouot Sale Catalogue	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	January 23 - 24 1872	Vicomte de St. Pierre Sale	142	142: Corbeille ovale en porcelaine anglaise décorée de fleurs.	9	32855		Sale cat in Bowes Archive Edouard Andre buys from this sale.
JB/5/11/8/7	M. Charles Pillet		January 24 1872		x	Set of engravings	20	?		VP 1872/20?
JB/5/11/8/14	M. Henri Lechat		February ?4 1872		18	A Painting (?fichel)	295	?32887		Copy in AAP

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/11/8/15	M. Boussaton	Hotel Drouot	February 5 1872	Auguste Anastasi (1820-1889) Sale	92; 108	Justin Ouvrié 'Le Chateau de Pierrefonds'; Tony Robert Fleury 'Le Moineau de Lesbie'	205; 200	32890	B.M. 692; B.M. 486	
JB/5/11/8/16	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	February 6 1872	Jean Claude Bretonville Sale	76; 109; 107; 166; 93 &99; [130 or 142?]	76: 'Même fabrique [Castelli] - Trois tasse et trois soucoupes décorées de paysages et de figures.' 107:'Même fabrique [Bernard Palissy] - Petit plat ovale en hauteur: le Baptême de saint Jean, borude à godrons et ornements.' 109: 'Fabriqe de Rouen - Beau pichet à cidre, décor polychrome à fleurs et ornements, enrichi de deux rosaces repercés à jour et reliées entre elles par un tube et portant dans un médaillon la figure de sainte Anne en camaïeu blue. Au revers, le nom : Marie, Anne PAIN et la date 1749' 93: 'Même fabrique [d'Urbino] - Plat rond décoré d'une rosace en couleurs sur fond gros bleu.' 99: 'Faïence italienne - Coupe ronde à côtes et buire décorées de figures dans des paysages.	60; 165; 67; 255; 44; 47	32891	X.1670 X.1526 X.1527 X.2093 ?X.1557 ?X.4226	

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/11/8/17	M. Boussaton		February 8 1872	Achille-Gratien Gallier (1814-1871) Sale	82; 90; 96; 83; 85/84; 72; 71; 5	Terrace at St Germain; 3 watercolours; 2 watercolours (Rome); 2 watercolours (costume); 2 studies of women; a watercolour; View of Croisy	16; 12; 25; 14; 36; 12; 7; 112	32900	B.M. 687	Sale of painter Gallier. Copy in AAP
JB/5/11/8/28	M. Escribe	Hotel Drouot	April 9 1872	Eugene le Poittevin (1806-1870) Sale	24	24: Le Poittevin, 'Le Lever de la fille de ferme'	300	33082	B.M. 313	
JB/5/11/8/30	M. Boussaton		April 9 1872		135; 75	1 study of landscape; 1 landscape	25; 17	?33080		Possibly Sale of Louis-Auguste Lapito
JB/5/11/8/33	M. Charles Oudart		April ?13 1872			4 chinese engravings; 3 small pictures; 2 flower studies; large icebox; wooden panel; plinth with marquetry; pestle and mortar; 2 satsuma vases; copper dish; 2 chimeras; 2 small shells; night table; chest of drawers; 2 tapestry screens; Louis XVI bureau; portugese chest; Japanese palanquin; gothic tapestry; 5 tapestries; marble medallion; 2 marble plinths; 2 marble vases; coloured credenxa; Louis XIII furniture; 2 pieces blue silk; 2 iron firedogs; gilded wood armchair; red velvet armchair; collection of silk		?33095		Copy in AAP. INHA VP 1872/131
JB/5/11/8/34	M. Delbergue Cormont	Hotel Drouot	April 11 1872	Gancia sale		89 volumes	2297 [total]			Sale cat in Bowes archive

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/11/8/36	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	April 23 1872	Comte Louis-Joseph Napoléon Lepic (1810-1875) Sale	171; 123; 174	171: Bouteille de chasse en verre de Bohême à fleurs de lis en relief; 123: Grand coffre en fer orné de fleur de lis; XV siècle. Serrure intérieure très-remarquable; 174: Biscuit de Sèvres. - Marie-Thérèse-Charlotte de France, enfant (duchesse d'Angoulême). Elle est assise sur des coussins fleurdelisés, tenant son pied d'une main et ayant une tige de lis dans l'autre main.	16; 95; 262	33129	G.127? X.545?	Supervisor of the furnishing and decoration of the Tuileries
JB/5/11/8/37	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	April 24 1872	Comte Louis-Joseph Napoléon Lepic (1810-1875) Sale	212; 210; 68; 2; 15	212: Largillière (école de): Portrait d'un seigneur du temps de Louis XIV. Représenté debout à l'entrée d'un parc, son chapeau sous le bras et une canne à la main. Un chien saute devant lui; 210: Hulle (Anselm van): Portraits de famille, sept personnages. Grand tableau portant la signature du peintre; 68: Deux lanternes d'applique Louis XV en cuivre dore; 2: Très-beau bureau Louis XV, à quatre faces en vieux laque de Coromandel décoré de cavaliers et d'épisodes de chasse. Il est richement garni de chutes et d'ornements rocaille en bronze doré et cuivre repoussé. Intérieur à tiroirs laqués rouge avec cavaliers et animaux; 15: Petit cabinet italien en marqueterie d'ivoire sur ébène. Porte à abattant. Tiroirs à l'intérieur.	180; 860; 38; 3550; 225	33129	B.M.252. B.M. 131 FW. 355	
Hotel Drouot Sale Catalogue	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	April 24 1872	Comte Louis-Joseph Napoléon Lepic (1810-1875) Sale	188; 189; 190	188: Deux jardinières porte-bouquets, en faïence fond blanc à ornements rocaille; 190: Un porte-huilier en faïence	30; 30	33129		

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/11/8/43	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	May 13 1872	Jean Marie Allègre (1793-1869) Sale	167	Rock crystal Goblet	730	33196		Sale cat. In Wallace Collection
JB/5/11/8/44	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	May 14 1872	Jean Marie Allègre (1793-1869) Sale	236	Silver-gilt cup and saucer	185	33196	X.4614	
JB/5/11/8/45	M. Couturier	Hotel Drouot	May ?15 1872	M. French	54; ?1	un autre cadre de deux aquarelles et un dessin, par Rouargue et Wattier; poss. Anastasi 'Paysage; bords d'un étang'	12; 201	33210	B.M. 683	
JB/5/11/8/66	M. Paul Cordier		September 18 1872		x	2 cruet flasks with silver decoration	26	?33386		Copy in AAP VP 1872/209
JB/5/11/8/84	M. Charles Oudart	Hotel Drouot	November 30 1872	Collection de M. le docteur T…, d'Auxerre	60; 72 57	Moustier: plat ovale, aux armes de Mme de Pompadour; sucrier en faïence de Strasbourg avec la marque Hanongue, avec décor de fleurs et fruits; Moustier: deux assiettes, décor polychrome avec blasons aux armes de Savoie	52; 30; 36	33479	X.1261	Copy in AAP. Available on Gallica through BnF VP 1872/241
JB/5/11/8/85	M. Charles Pillet		November 29 1872		63	63: quatre marteaux de porte en fer. ce lot sera divise	11; 13; 19	33476		Copy in AAP

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/11/9/9	M. Delbergue Cormont		March 14 1873	?Cross sale	19		270			
A.C. Lamer										
JB/5/10/3/16	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	April 20 1865		57; 69	2 Sèvres cups	36; 43			
JB/5/10/3/17	M. Charles Pillet		April 20 1865		60; 67	cup and saucer; sugar bowl with lid	54; 90			Bill filled out for M. Faijan
JB/5/10/3/25	M. Charles Pillet		May 27 1865	[Febvre]	x	Painting by Jacques Stella	350			
JB/5/10/3/67 & 73	M. Warin	Chateau de Villette	November 15 & 16 1865	Marquis de Villette Sale		see bill?		28694		Sale cat in BM archive JB/5/2/18 See also Basset letter JB/5/5/3
JB/5/10/4/1	M. Charles Oudart	Hotel Drouot	January 12 & 13 1866		x					Auction catalogue cover on which bill is written; Assisted by Lamer - do the objects listed correspond to the sale?
JB/5/10/4/4 JB/5/10/4/5-6	M. Boussaton	Hotel Drouot	January 25 1866	Nadar (1820-1910) Sale	?64; 142	64: Beurrier, décor polychrome et or 142 bis.: flacon, sirène en faïence de Nevers, décor camaïeu bleu	51	28813	X.4076 X.4271	Copy in AAP VP 1866/20
JB/5/10/4/13			March 5 1866			Guercino's Suzanna and the Elders	270			Scrap removed from auction catalogue attached to bill - find sale?

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/10/4/17&18 (Sale cat JB/5/2/28)	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	May 14 - June 2 1866	Aristide Le Carpentier Sale	337 343 344 448 677 1034 1153 1154 1157	337: Ambre. – Deux pieces: petit flacon, enrichi d'ornements et d'oiseaux et relief, et oeuf reposant sur un socle en bronze 343: Jayet. – Groupe de trois figures. Deux personnages agenouillés près de saint Jacques, debout 344: Jayet. – Deux pieces: saint Jacques debout, et petit groupe sur console. Pieta 448: Pot à eau en faïence allemande, décoré de fleurs et d'ornements en camaïeu rouge; couvercle en cuivre repoussé 677: Bâton de cérémonie de corporation, en bois sculpté et doré, enrichi de figures en relief et portant la date de 1770 1034: Petit monument en ébène garnie de cuivre d'oré: au centre en bas-relief en argent représente l'Ange dictant les évangiles à saint Mathieu; joli travail 1153: 'Petite boîte triangulaire en aventurine 1154: Jaspe. – Petit vase en jaspe vert incrusté de corail, en montée en forme d'aiguière en argent 1157: Corail. – Figure fantastique d'hermaphrodite sur rocher en caillou	check letters?	29135	X.114 X.743 X.5390 (agate chest no photo)	Wallace Collection Hercules (s273) bought at this sale. SKM also purchased from this sale through Edward Rutter - see V&A online collection Sale cats in BM archive and NAL cross reference lists in BM archive with cat. Possible to match up objects Lots 335 & 354 bought by Guileani appear on Lamer's list. (e.g. 448 & 667) were bought by another dealer (Guileani/Guiliani)
JB/5/10/4/66	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	May 12 1866	Antoine-Louis Clapisson (1806-1866) Sale				29126		Pipe - not purchased

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/10/4/42-46	?	Dreux	November 1866	M. Louis Lamesange						Former Mayor of Dreux Lamer used the dealer Falet
JB/5/10/5/34	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	April 11 1867	Laurent Laperlier (1805-1878) Sale	303 305 306			29701	X.3684	Copy in AAP VP 1867/125 Prud'hon in Wallace Collection P264
JB/5/10/5/44	M. Charles Pillet		May 2 1867	Oppenheim	15; 13; 65	15: 'Partie de cabaret en ancienne porcelaine de Saxe, à sujets chinois; quatre tasses, pot à creme et plateau à sucre.' 13: 'assiette en ancienne porcelaine de Saxe à bord découpé à jour et contenant un groupe de fruits et de fleurs.' 65: 'joli vase Louis XVI, forme Medicis, en marbre blanc sculpté; le culot est orné de godrons, de feuilles d'acanthe et de fleurs; la panse offre des festons de fleurs rattachés par de rubans.'	59; 60; 145	29769	?S.134	Copies in AAP, BAP EBP, EPNB

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/10/6/7	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	January 10-11 1868		136; 154	Deux bustes de femmes, grandeur nature, en marbe blanc. Ils portent la signature de P. JURAMY		30144		Lamer bought from but apparently didn't sell to Bowes VP 1868/5
JB/5/10/6/9-10	M. Escribe	Hotel Drouot	January 27 1868					30180	?X.4301	Mentions no. 53 but Bowes don't buy VP 1868/17
JB/5/10/6	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	February 3-8 1868	Jean-Joseph Vidal Sale	383	Musical Instruments; Infant Mozart 383: Deux médaillons, en bronze doré: François 1er ey Charles-Quint.		30194; 30203; 30212	MIN.22 a young man at spinet	Musical Instruments cat in AAP VP 1868/29
DV	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	January 19 1869	Comte Klein	73	73: Deux sucrieres en porcelain de Sèvres, pâte tendre, l'un d'eux, fond gros bleu à oeils-de-perdrix d'or et médaillons, sujets champêtres; l'autre, fond bleu turquoise à médaillons d'amours. Décor moderne.	38	30903		

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/10/7/23	M. Charles Pillet		February 20 1869		111	Portrait of a magistrate	52	?30997		See letter JB/5/10/7/24 for mention of the collection
JB/5/10/7/40 - 46	M. Bèguin	Hotel Drouot	March 15 1869	Pierre Antoine Berryer (1790-1868) Sale	41 77	4: [Buste] le portrait du duc d'Angoulême 77: Statuette en porcelaine de la Chine, décor bleu, représentant un Bonze assis Poss. 132: Giordano (Luca) 'Saint Jérôme en prière'		31070	X.5465 ?O.74 S.103 B.M.303 ?S.65 S.64	snuffbox 700 f VP 1869/94
	M. Bèguin	Hotel Drouot	March 15 1869	Pierre Antoine Berryer (1790-1868) Sale		Snuff box				Acquired through Guilliani?
JB/5/10/7/76	M. Quévremont		June 11 1869		379	cup	61	?31364		Copy in AAP VP 1869/119
Franco-Prussian War										

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
Hotel Drouot Sale Catalogue	M. Charles Pillet		April 24 1872	Comte Louis-Joseph Napoléon Lepic (1810-1875) Sale	25; 51; 139; 146; 147; 148; 158; 176; 192	25: Un canapé Louis XV, en bois sculpte, couvert en damas de soie rouge 51: Deux sphères, support un acajou à pieds cannelés, epoque Louis XVI 139: Charmant coffre à angles rentrants en bois finement sculpté, à arabesques. Le couvercle est orné d'une chiffre surmonté d'un couronne, xvii siecle 146: coffret de forme octagon en bois de noyer marqueté d'ivoire, moulures guillochées; epoque Louis XIII 147: Un autre analogue au précedent 148: trois petites boîtes allongées, couvercles à coulisse de même travail 158: Petite boîte plate à angles coupés en lacque décoré, d'attributs de franc-maçonnerie 176: Cruche en faïence de Rouen, décorée d'un médaillon représentant a l'Education de la Vierge et Saint Nicolas. Ornements polychrome; date 1777 192: Ivoire. Manche de poignard en ivoire sculpté orné d'un bas-relief, Chasse au cerf, de rinceaux et d'entrelacs. Travail du XIV siècle	25	33129	Poss. X.1346	No invoices from Lamer survive to prove that they used him to purchase from this sale, but a Rouen ware jug in the collection (X.1346) closely matches the description of lot 176.

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/10/8/4-8			February 24 1872					32935?		
JB/5/10/8	M. Dhios	Hotel Drouot	October 18-19 1872	Lord D-- B-- Ancien Ambassadeur d'Angleterre, a Constantinople [Henry Bulwer]				33397		
Edmond Rogiers										
JB/5/12/7		Ghent	July 26 1849	Doure d'Alstein van Hoop	195	J. Molenaer: Intérieur avec plusieurs figures. Sujet analogue à celui du tableau précédent. Production de mérite, traitée dans la méme genre, pouvant servir de pendant au tableau précédent. Signé J. Molenaer	250	19469	B.M. 199	Bought from Rogiers in January 1869, bill lists provenance.

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
JB/5/12/36-39	E. Rogiers	Roubaix	June 6 1870	M. le Conte-Baillon		73: Droogslot 'Un garde armé d'une hallebarde. Montre un chemin à droite à une troupe de mendiants à droite et à gauet se trouvent des fermes' Probably 79: Huysmans (de Malines) 'Paysage. Plusieurs chasseurs et voyageurs à l'entrée d'un bois. Ce charmant paysage offre une vaste éntendue.' Possibly 96: Goyen (van) 'des paysans débarquent des denrées près d'un escalier qui conduit à une chaumière, tandis que des pêcheurs mettent à la voile. Quelques bâtiments sont en vue. Ciel orageux' 417: Blommaert 'Portrait d'homme. Un homme porte au bras un panier et tient suspendu un canard vivant' 418: Le Même (pendant) 'Portrait de femme portant un panier et un coq' 511: Fuchs (1750) 'Portraits de deux enfants en costumes pastoraux' 648: Stochten (1785) 'Intérieur d'eglise avec figures. Très belle perspective' 839: Byler 'Jeune bergère coiffée d'un chapeau vert à larges bords orné de fleurs' (bis) Le Même 'Jeune pâtre coiffé d'une toque grise à plume et tenant un flageolet en main' 1086: Graat (Bernaert) 'Trois personnes. S'occupent devant un hangar à placer de grands pots' 1249: Grimmer 'Paysage avec figures'		32116	B.M. 605? B.M. 203? B.M. 123 B.M. 566 B.M. 227 B.M. 228 B.M. 616 B.M. 237	

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
Charles and Amelie Basset										
JB/5/5/2	M. Dugied	House Sale, Rue Notre-Dame-des-Champs	May 24-27 1865	Auguste de Bay (1804-1865) Sale	32	32: Gros (le Baron): 'Distribution des croix aux artistes', A la suite de l'Exposition de 1808, l'Empereur fit une distribution de croix aux artistes. Ce haut encouragement excita une émulation générale. Les peintres et les sculpteurs se réunirent pour charger l'un d'eux, à l'aide d'une souscription, d'en perpéteur le souvenit. Gros fut unanimement choisi pour remplir cette intention commune. Mais cette oeuvre importante n'est restée qu'à l'état d'ébauche, assez avancée toutefois pour en reconnaitre les principaux personnages qui sont: l'Empereur, la reine Hortense donnant la main à son fils aujourd'hui l'empereur Napoléon III; l'impératrice Joséphine, David, Girodet, Gros, Prud'hon, Carle Vernet, Cartellier, Gérard, Guérin, Duroc, Denon et autres.	500 (paid to Basset)	28550		Bought by de Bay from Baron Gros studio sale 23 November - 1 December 1835, lot 1 for 420 francs (lugt 14144). Given to Napoleon III by Joséphine in 1866, now in Versailles
JB/5/5/3	M. Warin	Chateau de Villette	November 15 & 16 1865	Villette Sale				28694		Sale cat in BM archive JB/5/2/18 See Lamer bill JB/5/10/3/67 & 73

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
No ref?	M. Charles Pillet	Hotel Drouot	April 11 1867	Laurent Laperlier (1805-1878) Sale	62 70 76 81? 87 98 113 125 128 163 238	62: Greuze (J. B.) 'L'Accordée de Village quittant sa famille en larmes' Composition destinée à faire suite à l'Accordée de Village, Lavis 70: Marie-Louise (S. M. l'Impératrice) 'La Vierge et la Enfant Jesus' C'est pastel, copié d'aprés en tableau du Guide, qui est au Musée du Louvre, a eté exécuté par l'Impératrices Marie-Louise, sous la direction de Prud'hon. Provenant de la vente de Madame la duchesse de Wagram. Pastel. 76: Prud'hon (P. P.) 'Sylvie' dessin rehaussé, Gravé 81: Prud'hon (P. P.) 'Sujet allegorique' croquis rehaussé 87: Prud'hon (P. P.) 'Portrait en pied de M. de Sommariva', croquis rehaussé 98: Prud'hon (P. P.) 'Figure de jeune homme' Étude pour le tableau: «Le Réve du bonheur» peint par Mlle Mayer, et dont les études avaient étés faites par Prud'hon. dessin rehaussé 113: Prud'hon (P. P.) 'Figure d'Homme, à mi-corps, la tête levée' dessin rehaussé Tableaux de l'École Moderne 125: Cals 'Une Tête d'Homme' 128: Féron 'Arabe Blessé, emporte par son cheval' Épisode des grottes du Darah 163: Bonvin 'Tête de Jeune Femme' Croquis à la plume 238: Fragonard (Honore) Très-belle miniature carèe sur ivoire - Portrait de jeune garçon, vu à mi-corps, en costume de Crispin	251 81 130 75? 36 165 127 20 50 5 400	29701		Similar drawings of Sommariva in Morgan Library and Petit Palais

Archive Reference	Commissaire-Priseur	Auction House	Date	Sale	Lot no(s).	Catalogue entry	Price(s) (francs)	Lugt	BM object no(s).	Notes
Other noted sales/dealers										
JB/6/6/2 (French shipping book)		Chateau de Bercy	July 15-18 1860	Nicolaï						
JB/3/3/17/89	Bèguin	Hotel Drouot	March 16 1869	Pierre Antoine Berryer (1790-1868) Sale	2; 3; 135; 138	2: [Buste] le portrait de Louis XVIII 3: [Buste] le portrait de Charles X 135: Gros (le Baron) 'Portrait en buste de la duchesse d'Angoulême, par Jean-Antoine Gros. Sur le châssis on lit l'inscription suivante: Madame Augustine Dufresne, décédée le 5 janvier 1842 et veuve de Antoine baron Gros, a par un article de son testament, supplié Son Altesse Royale Monseigneur le duc de Bordeaux de vouloir agréer l'hommage de ce tableau.' 138: Inconnu 'Madame le Duchesse de Berry et ses enfants agenouillés devant le buste de leur époux et père	2200	31070	S.102 S.104 B.M. 303 B.M. 830	Bill lists a different dealer/supplier: Barrons/Barrous

Appendix II: The Public Parks, Schools and Museums Act of 1871

34 VICT., c. 13.
An Act to facilitate gifts of land for Public Parks, Schools, and Museums.
(25th May, 1871)

Whereas it is expedient to facilitate gifts of land for the purpose of forming Public Parks, Schools and Museum: Be it therefore enacted, &c.

1. This Act may be cited as the "Public Parks, Schools and Museums Act, 1871."
2. This Act shall not extend to Scotland or Ireland.
3. In the construction of this Act, the words "Public Park" shall include any park, garden, or other land dedicated or to be dedicated to the recreation of the public;
   The words "Elementary School" shall mean a school or department of a school which elementary education is the principal part of the education there given, and shall not include any school or department of a school at which the ordinary payments in respect of the instruction from each school exceed 9*d* a week;
   The word "School-house" shall include the teachers' dwelling house, and the playground (if any), and the offices and all premises belonging to or required for a school;
   And the words "Public Museum" shall include any buildings used or to be used for the preservation of any collection of paintings or other works of art, or of any objects of natural history, or of any mechanical or philosophical inventions, instruments, models or designs, and dedicated to the recreation of the public, together with all libraries, reading-rooms, laboratories, and other offices and premises used or to be used in connection therewith.
4. From and after the passing of this Act all gifts and assurances of land of any tenure, and whether made by deed or by will or codicil, for the purposes only of a public park, a school-house, for an elementary school, or a Public Museum, and all bequests of personal estate to be applied in or towards the purchase of land for all or any of the same purposes only, shall be valid notwithstanding the statute of the 9th George II., chapter 36, and other statutes commonly known as the Statutes of Mortmain.
5. Provided that every will or codicil containing any such gift or assurance and every deed, containing any such gift or assurance and made otherwise than for full and valuable consideration, shall in order to enable such gift or assurance to take effect under this Act, be made 12 calendar months at least before the death of the testator or grantor, and shall be enrolled in the books of the Charity Commissioners within 6 calendar months next after the time when the same will, codicil, or deed shall come into operation.
6. Nothing in this Act shall authorise any gift by will or codicil of more than 20 acres of land for any one public park, or of any more than 2 acres of land for any one public museum, or of more than one acre of land for any one school-house.
7. Nothing in this Act contained shall invalidate or impose any restriction or condition upon any gift or assurance which would have been valid and free from such restriction or condition if this Act had not been passed.

Appendix III: Letters relating to the appointment of a Curator at The Bowes Museum held at Durham Country Record Office

D/St/C5/438/2b

6 Thanet Place
Lewisham
Kent
Decr 20 74

Sir
A fortnight ago I wrote a letter to Mr Bowes and sent it to Streatlam Castle, not knowing the London address. I should be much obliged to you, if you would kindly inform me if it was forward to him. The letter contained a strong recommendation to Mr Bowes from Mr Witham that he had known me for a great many years and considered me fully able to fill the post of Curator at the museum now building at BC. Being an artist I ardently desire the post. I have filled very important public positions, the last being at the R M C Sandhurst, which was with several others abolished, after nearly 10 years service. I have high class testimonials as well as a high class Art education obtained in the Royal Academies of Antwerp, & London, with the addition of the highest master's art certificates, obtainable in the Kingdom, taken at the Dept of Science & Art, London. Yourself being one of the Trustees for the museum, may I ask for your support with Mr Bowes also, doing so, would confer a lasting favour on a local man.
Should I have the honour to be appointed, it will be a labour of love on my part to carry out the wishes of the noble Benefactor, and ever to the lamented Benefactress.
I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient Servant
R Harley

To R. J. Dent Esq

D/St/C5/595/15

Chevening
Sevenoaks

6th August 1884

Dear Sir Henry
I am away from London for a fortnight or so, and have only this morning received your kind note. The bank holiday seems to put us all out. I do not at the moment think of anyone both free and qualified to take the post which you mention. But our friend Everard Green F.S.A. might very likely know of some one suitable for the position. We are enjoying lovely weather here in this beautiful part of the country. Believe me ever sincerely yours
George Scharf

D/St/C5/595/16

74 Eaton Place
Belgrave Square
SW
12th Aug. 1884

My dear Bowes
Your description of the museum at Barnard Castle will be of great utility to me in making inquiry for a person to fill the office of Curator, & in "interviewing" any applicant. Mr Scharf having

recommended a Mr Everard Green, with whom I acquainted, to see me. I have done so, & on his showing testimonials from Mr Scharf & Mr Franks, MA, Vice President of the Society of Antiquaries, I will then tell him whether it will do to make his application to you. He is about 40, & an assiduous reader & writer at the Society of Antiquaries, & in the library at the Reform Club some time since, he became a Roman Catholic.
In the mean time I have written to C T Newton CB-MA & Keeper of the antiquities at the British Museum. I have met him at Raby more than once and I remember he went from there to see the museum.
Mr Dodds M.P. for Stockton was with me on business a few days ago. He had seen Mr Palmer, & asked me to invite you to accompany me to stay with him for Stockton Races – Having declined for myself, I took upon myself to decline for you also,
Yours very truly
Henry M Vane.

D/St/C5/595/17

National Portrait Gallery

I know of scarcely any one with such sound and ready knowledge upon genealogical portraits, heraldry, pottery and medieval antiquities as my friend Mr Everard Green F.S.A.
His zeal and his patient research are on an equal footing, and I should sincerely rejoice if these rare qualifications could be made available for the public benefit.

George Scharf
Director & Secretary
National Portrait Gallery
London

13th August 1884

D/St/C5/595/18(i)

74 Eaton Place
Belgrave Square
SW
14th Aug 1884

My dear Bowes
In the first place I must thank you for 3 brace which were delivered in good order this morning and are an acceptable donation & shared with my son.
I have had a long interview with Mr Newton at the British Museum by appointment. He thinks Mr John Hungerford Pollen, whose official occupation at the Science & Art Department at the South Kensington Museum is worked out, and who is on the lookout for something to augment his slender income, is the very man for you, if he will accept the appointment. He has a family some of whom are grown up, & his wife is a charming person. He has made art his study. I send you a statement of his career. You may probably remember his Brother the late Sir John Pollen in the House of Commons.
When I hear from Mr Newton, I will write to you.
Mr N. has just returned from a visit at Alnwick to meet the archaeological Society.
Yours very truly
Henry M Vane.

D/St/C5/595/18(ii)

John Hungerford Pollen – born 1820, educated at Eton and at Christ Church Oxford (M.A. 1842) formerly fellow of Merton College Oxford and in Holy Orders of Church of England, was official Editor Science and Art Department South Kensington Museum 1864-76. Married 1855 Maria Margaret daughter of the late Rev. John Charles la Primaudaye and has issue living.

Residence 11 Pembridge Crescent W.
Mr John Hungerford Pollen some time since went over to the Church of Rome.

D/St/C5/595/19

British Museum
W.C.
Aug. 14 1884

Dear Mr Green
I should think you in every way well qualified to take charge of the such a collection as the Bowes Museum of which I have long heard.
Your knowledge of history, heraldry & the numerous minor branches of archaeology would be very useful to you.
I shall harness(?) much regret your being so long a way from London, as your ready help in archaeological matters has been very useful to me & to others, especially the help you have been giving our director in the Archeologia
Yours very truly
Augustus W Franks.

D/St/C5/595/20

Reform Club
Pall Mall S.W.

To John Bowes Esqre
Streatlam Castle

Sir,
I hear from my friend Mr Scharf and from Sir Henry Vane, that you require the services of a Curator of the Bowes Museum – allow me to offer myself as a candidate for the office?
I am 39 years of age, and since 1873 have been a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London, and am now a member of the council.
At present I am private-secretary to Mr Salusbury Milman, the Director of the Society, so nearly every antiquarian matter comes under my notice.
I am much given to heraldic and Genealogical Studies, and for my application and pursuits I beg to refer you to the enclosed testimonials from Mr George Scharf, F.S.A., (the very able director of the National Portrait Gallery) and Mr Augustus Wollaston Franks, F.R.S. (the Keeper of the Medieval Antiquities at the British Museum).
I have lived a great deal in Rome, Florence, Naples and Palermo and know most the Picture-Galleries of Italy, but of French & Dutch pictures, at present I know very little.
Sir Henry Vane tells me that you will be happy to receive any gentleman whom you might deem so competent for the office before giving a final answer, and I may add that I would hold myself ready to present myself at Streatlam Castle, or Barnard Castle, on receiving from yourself an intimation that it would be convenient for you to receive me.
I have the honour to be, sir
Your obnt servant
Everard Green

14th August 1884

D/St/C5/595/21

South Kensington Museum
London
15th August 1884

Sir,
I have recently been informed of the death of the Curator of your museum near Barnard Castle, which I had the pleasure of visiting some time ago, and if no successor has yet been appointed in Mr Harley's place, I beg most respectfully to offer myself as a candidate for the post.
I have been for more than twelve years, and still am, an officer of the South Kensington Museum, and my work has consisted for the most part in carrying on the arrangement of collections here; as an example, I may refer to the "Jones Collection", which was entirely arranged by me, under the superintendence of one of the Assistant Directors of the Museum; I have also frequently taken charge of the Branch Museum, Bethnal Green.
I can obtain letters of recommendation from Sir Philip Cunliffe-Owen, the Director of this Museum; from Mr R. A. Thompson, the Assistant Director above referred to; and from Mr George Wallis, the Keeper of the Art Collections, to whose division I have been attached during the whole period of my service.
I have no connections in the North of England, with the exception of an uncle who was formerly Adjutant of the Durham Artillery Militia, and who is now living at Hartlepool. I am of Scotch descent, 32 years of age, and married.
I shall esteem it a great favour if, in the event of the Curatorship being already filled up, you will be so good as to treat this letter as a private communication.
I beg to remain, Sir,
Your most obedient servant
Owen Stanley Scott.

D/St/C5/595/24

74 Eaton Place
Belgrave Square
S.W.
20th Aug 1884

My dear Bowes
I have been to the South Kensington Museum & had a satisfactory interview with Mr Owen Stanley Scott. He has been 12 years a clerk on the establishment, & at the present time in the absence of the Assistant Director of the Branch Museum, Bethnal Green, is in charge of & resident there. His salary amounts to £210 per annum with the usual prospect of increase – a few months ago he was a candidate for the office of curator at Manchester & forwarded very good testimonials from Sir Philip C. Owen & Mr R. A. Thompson. He will ask that these may be returned to him & enclose them to you.
He has 2 children, aged about 3 & 4. Mr Thompson being temporarily absent, I could not see him. Mr Scott heard of the appointment from his friend Mr Bell, the engineer at the Middleton Lead Works.
Sir P. C. Owen is spending his holiday in Germany.
I saw Mr Green's application, after I had explained everything to him.
Thanks for your kind offer of the Venison – I will write when I know my plans,
Yours very truly.
Henry M Vane.

D/St/C5/595/26

74 Eaton Place
Belgrave Square
S.W.
25th Aug 1884

My dear Bowes
Mr Scott shewed me the testimonials which he enclosed to you on Saturday & he has written to Sir P. Cunliffe Owen, who is in Switzerland, for a letter from him as to his capability.
As Mr Scott has never had the management of a staff of employees, it would be difficult to procure a decided(?) opinion on the point. You or I could write to Mr R A Thompson at the South Kensington Museum, if you accepted his other qualifications. I presume that the staff at Manchester is considerable, & that Mr Thompson would not have given the testimonial if he did not think Scott capable to manage it.
I enclose you a letter from Mr J Hungerford Pollen – his knowledge of the utility & value of the museum seems deep & profound, but does not give me the impression of practicable. He appears to be staying with the Marchioness of Ripon who also turned Roman Catholic.
I am not quite able to agree with you as to the owner of Streatlam, Ambassador to Scotland in 1598 "Maister" Robert Bowes died in 1554. See numbers 20 & 23 in the catalogue.
I have picked up a print of Sir George Bowes.
My daughter is on a visit in Sussex for a few days, & the beginning of next week we are proposing to be joined at the seaside somewhere, by my son & Lady Catherine & her boy, for 3 or 4 weeks, this precluded me & my daughter from availing ourselves of your kind invitation to Streatlam & the pleasure of meeting Lord & Lady Strathmore which we should have liked much.
Yours very truly
Henry M Vane.

D/St/C5/595/27

Newbuildings
Horsham
Aug 25/84

My dear Sir
I have tried to see my way to accepting what would be very attractive to me – the Curatorship of the Bowes Museum. But I find it would involve the surrender of more engagements than I could afford & must with regret & with thanks – decline it.,
I hope I do not take a liberty in calling attention Mr James Weale, author of the Handbook for Belgium, formerly of the museum at Bruges & our principal authority on many art questions, French or Flemish pottery & many others. In Belgium his name is held high in the esteem of the archeological [sic] association.
He was my colleague in the (?) on Art Education this year. He is well known to the S. Kensington people by whom he has been employed to purchase, &c. this gentleman has come to live in England & has, or had lately, taken no engagement. I mention him because of his experience & high character & his pen is to any such an institution as that of Mr Bowes, a powerful engine for defence or advocacy when required. Should you have any wish to communicate with him, I would ask him to call on you, & talk the matter over. He lives at 15 The Grove, Clapham, S.W.
The proposed institution could scarcely have a better head. I have not heard of his having any permanent engagement as yet.
Believe me
With many thanks
Yrs Faithfully
J H Pollen

D/St/C5/595/28

74 Eaton Place
Belgrave Square
26th Aug. 1884

My dear Bowes
I enclose a letter from Mr J H Pollen declining the candidature of the appointment of Curator at the museum. He suggests Mr James Weale for the office. I know him by name only.
I have written to Mr Pollen & informed him that I have forwarded his letter to you.
Awaiting a testimonial from Sir P. Cunliffe Owen, I think Mr Scott is more adapted for the office than Mr Everard Green. Mr Scott having a wife and 2 children would always have society. Mr Green being a bachelor & used to literary pursuits would probably become bored, & as soon as he had arranged the pictures & objects would retire. Mr Scott would no doubt implicitly receive Mr Dent's directions
I regret that I & my daughter are compelled to decline your invitation to Streatlam.
Yours very truly
Henry M Vane.

D/St/C5/595/29a

S. Kensington Musm
August 28th '84

Sir,
I beg to enclose a letter this day received from Sir P. Cunliffe Owen.
I am, sir
Your obedient servant
Owen S Scott

John Bowes Esq.

D/St/C5/595/29b

Carlsbad
25 Aug 84

Private

My dear Owen Scott
We shall all regret your departure from the museum, you have established for yourself a reputation for good honest work and your place will not be easy to fill. But the very respect and personal regards which you inspired render it a duty to promote your interests. It is not your fault but the unfortunate regulations of the service, that prevents you from obtaining that consideration which you so thoroughly deserve.
I do not know if I am personally acquainted with Mr John Bowes, but of course I am aware of his munificence and noble encouragement he has afforded in the establishment of the museum. You may forward this private letter to him. He will be able to judge of the very high opinion I entertain of your zeal, conduct and ability. Indeed you have made good use of your experience and I am sure will do credit to any appointment you may receive,
Believe me
My dear Owen Scott
Yours most sincerely
Philip Cunliffe Owen
Director, S K Museum.

D/St/C5/595/30

74 Eaton Plcae
Belgrave Square
S.W.
28 Aug 1884.

Dear Mr Green
Having been away from home, I only found your letter last night too late for the post.
Mr Bowes explained to me that he has not himself acknowledged your letter and offer of services because the widow of the late Curator was still occupying the apartments at the museum and he had compunction at hastening her departure.
Mr Bowes will be at Streatlam this week & the beginning of next, as he has refused a visit at Raby, feeling not sufficiently well to leave home.
I by this post am writing to tell him of your proposal to go to Edinburgh & your desire to take the Museum & Streatlam on your way.
If therefore you write to him he will reply if it is convenient to him to receive you.
It so happens that I am acquainted with Sir Edward Holdich & his relatives, & have some property adjoining Dingley
Yours very faithfully
Henry M Vane

D/St/C5/595/31

74 Eaton Plcae
Belgrave Square
S.W.
28 August 1884

My dear Bowes

Thinking that it would be more satisfactory to have a personal interview with Mr R A Thompson the Assistant Director at the South Kensington Museum, I have had a long conversation with him this morning respecting his opinion of the capacity of Mr Scott to manage an establishment like the museum at Barnard Castle. He replies that as Mr Scott has already had personal supervision, in the absence of the principal, of the Bethnal Green establishment, & was recommended for the Manchester Museum, he sees no reason to doubt his ability to manage. He feels sure that Sir P. C. Owen give a favourable testimonial, and added "we shall all be sorry to lose Scott". It would probably be a good plan if Mr Dent wrote to him & offered to meet him at Barnard Castle & then for you to have an interview with him. Mr Dent offering to pay his Railway Fares. You might not care to have him as a visitor.
Mr Everard Green who is at present on a visit at Shalstone Manor, Buckingham, & going from there to Edinburgh, is very anxious to visit the museum & to see you. I explained to him that you had not answered his application on account of Mrs Harley still occupying the apartments, but that if he wrote to you, you would let him know if it is was convenient to you to see him. Altho' he stammers dreadfully, he is pleasant company in a house.
I felt quite sure that you would find your visit at Raby agreeable
Yours very truly
Henry M Vane

I expect to leave ho? For the Isle of Wight on Monday.

D/St/C5/595/34

Shalstone
Buckingham

To John Bowes
Streatlam Castle

Sir
Sir Henry Vane advises me to write & let you know that I am going to Edinburgh early in next month (September) and that if would like it, I would take Barnard Castle on the way, see the museum, and confer with you on the duties of a curator.
I am leaving Shalstone Manor tomorrow for
"Charnwood-Abbey
Whitwick
Leicestershire"
At which address please write to me, as from there I propose going to Scotland.
Trusting you will not consider this a trespass.
I have, sir, the honour to be, your ready servant
Everard Green
29 August, 1884

D/St/C5/595/36

1st September 1884

Sir
I saw Sir Henry Vane this morning, and received from him your message relative to the curatorship. I beg to offer you my most sincere thanks for the honour you have done me in selecting me for the important office, and further to assure you that I shall in all points study to prove myself worthy of your confidence and good opinion.
I also beg to express my acceptance of the terms you offer, viz., £300 per annum with apartments, and shall be ready to come to any agreement with Mr Dent which you may desire. I understood Sir Henry Vane to say that the salary would be increased so soon as the Museum is open to the public.
If you think it desirable that I should see you, I shall have no difficulty in getting away from here for a few days in order to do so.
Awaiting your further instructions.
I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant
Owen Stanley Scott.

D/St/C5/595/37

74 Eaton Place
Belgrave Square
S.W.
1st Sept 1884

My dear Bowes
Altho' I had fully explained to Mr Scott the terms you propose to give the Curator of the Museum, I thought it better that he should to you naming the terms he was willing to accept. I have accordingly seen him and suggested the letter he should write. This will I hope be satisfactory. I have written to

Mr Everard Green to the effect in your letter. I quite agree with your view as to his superior tastes & associations being likely to him think the place not sufficient for him.
Accept my thanks for the Venison - My daughter & I got to the Isle of Wight tomorrow & hope to partake of it.
Yours v
Henry M Vane

D/St/C5/595/38

3rd Sept 1884

Sir
I beg to thank you for your letter received this morning, and, in reply, to inform you that I have sent in my resignation of my appointment here, and can leave at any time, through the kindness of Mr Thompson, who has told me that I may dispense with the customary delay, if it be necessary.
I can go to Barnard Castle for the preliminary interview with you, almost at an hours notice, on whatever day you may be so good as to appoint.
I have the honour to be
Sir
Your obedient Servant
Owen S Scott

John Bowes Esq

D/St/C5/595/39

Eastfield
Ryde
4 Sept 1884

My dear Bowes
I shall be glad to hear that Mr Scott's visit to Barnard Castle gives you a favourable impression of him. He is very young looking but his manner is pleasing & gives an impressions of official & proper training
I think decidedly that it would be well to write a line to Mr E Green at Charnwood, as he very probably may wish to see the museum & also Streatlam after the description which I have given him of them.
I had a conversation yesterday with Lady Hutt, who was dining here & is very intimate with the ? ? She enquired most kindly after you, & expressed great regret that her correspondence with you had been discontinued – she added that she wished the Chancery suit was at an end & that she was willing & ready to pay the £3,000 as soon as she was told to do so. Altho' one eye is quite gone, she seems to have pretty good use of the other, & is otherwise very well.
I saw ? Milbank last Sunday and he gave an account of his visit to Barningham & of the improvements which his nephew is making, but did mention the folly & unsuitableness of covering the walls with Gobelin Tapestry. Sir F. & Lady Milbank told me that they intedned to ask Daughter & myself to Thorpe towards the end of October.
We have not yet received an invitation to Raby. My son & Lady Catherine are asked for the 29th Sept or 12th October & propose to accept the latter.
The venison arrived yesterday, & is duly appreciated, accept my best thanks for it
Yours very truly
Henry M Vane.

D/St/C5/595/40

5th Sept 1884

Sir
I am much obliged for your letter of yesterday's date, and shall hold myself at your disposal after the 17th inst.
I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant
Owen S Scott

D/St/C5/595/44

Leyburn
Wensleydale, Yorkshire

27 Sep 1884

Sir
I have this morning heard from an artist friend in London that you are in want of a Curator for your museum at Barnard Castle. I venture to think that I have many & various qualifications for the work. I am an artist, an architect, a genealogist, a herald and an antiquary. If I might have the pleasure of a personal interview with you here I think the contents of my studio would go far to convince you that the work you require would be congenial to my tastes.
Not to weary you with too long a letter, which if you have already engaged a curator may be useless, I will simply now say that I can refer you to the Duke of Westminster for whom I have for the past ten years done a large amount of genealogical, heraldic, and artistic work at Eaton Hall. About 40 armorial windows in the Library & Hall have been executed from my designs and cartoons, as also all the heraldic carving on the Chimney pieces.
I can refer you also to the Marquess of Ripon, the Duke of Norfolk, Sir Reginald Graham of Norton Conyers, for whom I am now doing some armorial windows, Lord Bolton and the Hon Wm T Orde-Powlett, Mr Hughes of Kimmel Park, Mr Wood of Gwernyfed Park, The Rev, Canon Raine of York to Mr Alfred Waterhouse, the architect, and very many other well-known artists; to my neighbour and good friend Mr Scrope of Danby, & to my fiend and Kinsman Sir Charles Theophilus Metcalfe, all of whom know me personally and know also my work & capabilities. I may also add Lady Mary Vyner of Newby and Capt Robt Vyner.
I am a cadet of the Northallerton or younger branch of the ancient family of Metcalfe of Nappa Hall in this date the elder line of which ended with Thos Metcalfe of Nappa in 1756 who was the kinsman and godfather of my grandfather the Rev. Francis Metcalfe M.A. Rector of Kirkbride in Cumberland & Vicar of Rudston in Yorkshire. My Grandfather's elder brother, on taking the estates of Little Busby in Cleveland under the will of his cousin Jane Turner (née Marwood) widow of Cholmley Turner of Kirk Leatham, grand daughter and heiress of Sir Henry Marwood of Little Busby, Bart.. assumed the name of Marwood in lieu of Metcalfe, and as his descendants, my cousins as Busby Hall, are now called Marwood I may fairly be considered to represent in Yorkshire the Metcalfes of Nappa Hall near Askeriff and of the Parish House Northallerton. As the estates in and around Northallerton, Catto, Landmoth &c which belonged to my great grandfather passed to the elder son who also succeeded to the Marwood estates in Cleveland little has come to me and as from delicacy of health as a boy I was unable to follow my father's profession of arms I chose architecture and art generally as my calling. My father was in the East India Company's military Service and died young having only attained the rank of Captain, in 1833 at Madras. I was then only three years of age.
I speak without book as I am writing in haste but I believe that a lineal ancestor of yours married a daughter of Sir James Metcalfe of Nappa. I remember when living in London some years ago marshalling some coats of arms and making cartoons (I think for glass) for you at the request of Messrs Heaton & Butler of Garrick St Covent Garden and I remember well drawing my own arms –

Arg. 3 calves passant sable impaled with the coat of Bowes. Perhaps your Metcalfe descent may incline you to show favour to one who being of the same family can claim a remote kinship to you.
I left London four years ago to settle in this dale dear to me from its family associations and attracted hither also as an artist by the beauty of the scenery. In 1880 when on a visit to Danby Hall I saw the house I now live in the picturesqueness of which took my fancy as also its nearness to Danby & to places of special interest to me, but the owner being now in difficulties the property is about to be sold by auction so I shall probably shortly have to seek a new home or buy the house myself, an alternative not altogether within my power to adopt, however much to my liking.
For this reason I am induced to apply for the post of `curator to your museum.
I am married but have no children.
I was a pupil of the late Charles James Richardson, an architect of some note in his day and the author of several works on Elizabethan architecture. While with Mr Richardson I became a student of the Royal Academy and I also studied at the Government School of Design Somerset House, and at various life schools. I was for some time with the late Sir Digby Wyatt and Mr Raphael Brandon, both men of note as architects. In 1859 I was elected as an associate of the Royal Institute of British Architects. I have drawn much on wood and on stone for various art publications and I have from time to time contributed articles to "The Academy", "Notes and Queries" &c. The pedigrees of Metcalde & Marwood in Foster's "Yorkshire County Families" and the pedigrees of Metcalfe and De Hertlyngton in last (3rd) edition of Dr Whitakers "History of Craven" were complied and contributed by me. In the accompanying Report of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings you will see my name among the local correspondents and members
I am, Sir
Your obedient Servant
John Henry Metcalfe

Appendix IV: Letter from Owen Stanley Scott to John Bowes describing the final arrangement of the museum collection

DCRO, D/St/C5/596/88(i-iv)

The Bowes Museum
Barnard Castle
9th March, 1885

Sir,
In accordance with your wish, expressed on the occasion of your last visit here, I have sketched out a plan, subject to your approval, for the final arrangement of the collections, which I now beg to submit to you

PICTURE GALLERY:-

East Room; Italian & Spanish pictures
Centre Room; French pictures
West Room; German, Flemish & English pictures

This seems to me a natural sequence of the respective schools represented in the collection, and though there is marked distinction between the works of (for example) the Italian and Spanish Masters, still the motives and feeling of their productions are in many cases very nearly allied. The paintings of the various schools should be arranged, as nearly as possibly, chronologically, but a certain amount of liberty in the respect to be allowed to meet the exigencies of arrangement, and to allow of harmonious grouping. I would further suggest that the majority of the small pictures be hung on screens (of which I have had one prepared); they will thus be not only better seen than at present, but will also be less overpowered by the larger pictures, and will, besides, leave a much greater amount of wall space available for the latter.

MUSEUM:-

Western rooms; German, French, Italian and other European Pottery and Porcelain, beginning with the German and English in the Western Pavilion and continuing with French and Italian in the following rooms, as far as the Staircase. Of the Eastern Rooms, the first from the Staircase might, as at present, be appropriated to the Ridley Hall Collection, and would hold in addition, all the Oriental objects in the Museum. In the next room may be shown the modern objects acquired at the Paris Exhibition; in the next, as now, the glass, and in the Eastern Pavilion, the Ivoried and miscellaneous objects now in the Western Pavilion. My motive for wishing to transfer the Ivoried from the Western to the Eastern Pavilion is that I may place the German ceramics in the former, and so have the rooms containing Pottery & Porcelain adjacent and consecutive.

SCULPTURE GALLERY:-

The Sculpture Gallery will contain, in addition to the stone and marble carvings, the carved woodwork, wrought ironwork, and metalwork, generally. The latter, or most of it may well be shown in "Desk Cases", of which you have two – convertible into four, being made divisible in the centre. These may be placed between the windows, at right angles with the wall, and upon them may be erected light wooden screen, upon which may be exhibited such of the metal-work as is too large for the cases, as well as the carved wood panels, of which you possess a considerable quantity. It will be necessary to also place in this room a few glass cases suitable for exhibiting the small stone and marble carvings.
There are a great many panels of painted and stained glass, which might be shown in the windows of the Eastern Pavilion, where they would be well seen, and, I think, look well.

I have made no mention of the Furniture having understood you to say that it would, for the most part, be placed in the rooms which are to be fitted up to show the progress of French Decorative Art; the pieces which are not available for this purpose may be readily bestowed in the other rooms.
I have studied the plan of the Hot Water Heating apparatus, and find that before it can be carried out in will be necessary to alter (though only temporarily) the position of nearly every case in the museum; this being the case, it would be worse than useless to attempt anything in the way of arrangement for the present as the work would all have to be undone. In addition to this, I cannot see my way to arranging the collections with only the present supply of glass cases, for they are quite inadequate to the requirements of the objects. I received from Mr Dent your message relative to the cases, in reply to my letter, so that I quite understand that I am not to expect any more at present, but I think it right to tell you my difficulties in this respect.
Will you allow me to most respectfully suggest that, if the Hot Water Heating apparatus is to be laid down this year, it may be taken in hand at an early date, so that it may be in working order at the commencement of next winter, for the present system of heating is utterly ineffective. This has not been at all a cold winter, and yet the thermometers in the Picture Gallery have for weeks at a time, registered a temperature of only 41° Fahn., although three stoves were kept constantly going. So it will take me some time to prepare for the workmen (for owing to Akers's illness I am practically without any assistance, and I learn from his doctor that he is not likely to permanently mend) it will be of great advantage to me to know in good time whether it be your intention to have the work carried out this year.
I fear lest I may have wearied you with this very long letter, but I have found it impossible to write at less length.
In conclusion, I beg to thank you for your kindness in allowing me to order a "lift",
And to remain
Sir,
Your most obedient servant
Owen S Scott.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archival Material

Papers of John and Joséphine Bowes (JB/1-10), The Bowes Museum Archive, County Durham, UK.

Papers of The Bowes Museum (TBM/1-12), The Bowes Museum Archive, County Durham, UK.

Strathmore Papers (D/St), Durham County Record Office, County Durham, UK.

Papers of The Bowes Museum (D/Bo), Durham County Record Office, County Durham, UK.

Durham County Council Clerks Departments (CC/X/94), Durham County Record Office, County Durham, UK.

Papers of the Victoria & Albert Museum, V&A Archive, Blythe House, London, UK.

Richard Wallace Papers (HWF/RW), The Wallace Collection, London, UK.

Austen Henry Layard Papers (Add MS 38931-39164), The British Library, London, UK.

Charles Drury Edward Fortnum Papers, (F/1-Supplementary Box), The Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, UK.

Joseph Whitwell Pease Papers, Nuffield College, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

Joseph Whitwell Pease Diaries, Private Collection, UK.

Parish Marriage Certificates (PAR), East Sussex Record Office, UK.

Hotel des Ventes Sale Minutes (D.48E^{3} 1-136), Archives de Paris, Paris, France.

Hotel Drouot Archives, Hotel Drouot, Paris, France.

Published Sources

1880 Exposition Nationale, IV^e^ Section Industries d'Art en Belgique Antérieures au XIX^e^ Siècle. Catalogue Officiel, (Bruxelles, 1880).

A Guide to the Art Collections of the South Kensington Museum, (London: Spottiswoode & Co., 1869).

A Handbook for travellers in central Italy. Part I, Southern Tuscany and Papal States, (London: John Murray, 1853).

A Handbook for travellers in Portugal: A complete guide for Lisbon, Cintra, Mafra, the British battle-fields, Alcobaça, Batalha, Oporto, &c., (London: John Murray, 1864).

Annuaire-almanach du commerce, de l'industrie, de la magistrature et de l'administration, (Paris: Firmin Didot Fréres, fils et cie, 1857-1909).

Almanach-Bottin du commerce de Paris, des départemens de la France et des principales villes du monde..., (Paris, Bureau de l'Almanach du Commerce, 1839-1856).

Annuaire Public par la Gazette des Beaux-Arts…Année 1870, (Paris: Bureau de la Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1870).

Catalogue of the Articles of Ornamental Art, selected from the Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations in 1851, and purchased by the Government, (London: Chapman and Hall, 1852).

Drawings of Glass Cases in the South Kensington Museum, with Suggestions for the Arrangement of Specimens, (London: Vincent Brooks, Day & Son, 1876).

Galignani's New Paris Guide for 1867, (Paris: A. & W. Galignani & Co., 1867).

Handbook of the Jones Collection in the South Kensington Museum, (London: Chapman and Hall, 1883).

List of the Objects Obtained During the Paris Exhibition of 1867 by Gift, Loan or Purchase of and now Exhibited in the South Kensington Museum, (London: HMSO, 1868).

Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures, (London: House of Commons, 1836).

Report from the Select Committee on the National Gallery: Together with Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index, (London: House of Commons, 1850).

Report from the Select Committee on the National Gallery: Together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index, (London: HMSO, 1853).

Reports on the Paris Universal Exhibition, 1867…Presented to Both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty, vol. I, (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode for HMSO, 1868-69).

Byng-Hall, Herbert, *The Adventures of a Bric-a-Brac Hunter*, (London: Tinsley Brothers, 1868).

Byng-Hall, Herbert, *The Bric-à-Brac Hunter, or Chapters on Chinamania*, (London: Chatto & Windus, 1875).

Chaffers, William, *Marks and monograms on pottery and porcelain with historical notices of each manufactory, preceded by an introductory essay on the Vasa Fictilia of England and followed by a copious index*, (London: J. Davy, 1866).

Chaffers, William, *Marks and monograms on pottery and porcelain, with short historical notices of each manufactory, and an introductory essay on the vasa fictilia of England. Illustrated, etc.*, (London: J. Davy, 1863).

Coleridge, Hartley, *Lives of Northern Worthies* (London: Edward Moxton, 1852).

Edwards, Edward, *The Administrative Economy of the Fine Arts*, (London: Saunders and Otley, 1840).

Fowke, Francis, *A description of the building at South Kensington, erected to receive the Sheepshanks collection of pictures*, (London: Chapman & Hall, 1858).

Goncourt, Edmond de, *Catalogue Raisonné de l'Oeuvre Peint, Dessine et Grave de P. P. Prud'hon*, (Paris: Rapilly, 1876).

Goncourt, Edmond de, *La Maison d'un Artiste*, (Paris: G. Charpentier, 1881).

Gilman, Benjamin Ives, *Museum Ideals of Purpose and Method*, (Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1918).

Greenwood, Thomas, *Museums and Art Galleries*, (London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1888).

Guest, Montague J., ed., *Lady Charlotte Schreiber's Journals: Confidences of a collector of ceramics & antiques throughout Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Turkey, Austria & Germany from the year 1869 to 1885*, (London: John Lane, 1911).

Hare, Augustus, *The Story of My Life*, 6 vols., (London: George Allen, 1896).

Hazlitt, William, *Sketches of the Principal Picture-Galleries in England, with a criticism on "Marriage a-la-mode"* (London: Taylor and Hessey, 1824).

Jacquemart, Albert, *Histoire artistique, industrielle et commerciale de la porcelain*, (Paris, 1862).

Jameson, Anna *Handbook to the public galleries of art in and near London*, (London: John Murray, 1842).

Jameson, Anna *Companion to the Most Celebrated Private Galleries of Art* (London: Saunders and Otley, 1844).

Litchfield, Frederick, *Pottery and Porcelain: A guide to collectors*, (London: Bickers and Son, 1879).

Loftie, William John, *A Plea for Art in the House: With special reference to the economy for collecting works of art, and the importance of taste in education and morals*, (London: Macmillian, 1878).

Murray, David, *Museums: Their History and their Use* (Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1904).

Pellechet, Catherine and Pellechet, Marie, eds., *Jules Pellechet, Lettres d'Italie, 1856-1857*, (Paris, 1894).

Pollen, Anne, *John Hungerford Pollen, 1820-1902*, (London: John Murray, 1912).

Pollen, John Hungerford, *Ancient and Modern Furniture and Woodwork*, (London: Chapman & Hall, 1874).

Robinson, John Charles, *An Introductory Lecture on the Museum of Ornamental Art*, (London: Chapman & Hall, 1854).

Robinson, John Charles, *Catalogue of the Soulages Collection*, (London: Chapman & Hall, 1856).

Robinson, John Charles, *The Treasury of Ornamental Art* (London: Day & Son, 1856).

Robinson, John Charles, ed., *Catalogue of the Special Exhibition of Works of Art of the Mediaeval, Renaissance and more recent periods, on loan at the South Kensington Museum, June 1862*, (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1862).

Rothschild, Ferdinand de, ‘Bric-à-Brac: a Rothschild Memoir of Collecting’ in Michael Hall, ed., *Apollo*, vol. 166, (2007), 50-77.

Russell-Cotes, Merton, *Home and Abroad: An autobiography of an octogenarian*, (Bournemouth, 1921).

Scott, Owen Stanley, *Handbook to The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle*, (Barnard Castle: W.R. Atkinson, 1893).

Smiles, Samuel, *Self-Help: With Illustrations of Character and Conduct*, (London: John Murray, 1859).

Soane, John, *Description of the House and Museum on the North Side of Lincoln’s Inn Fields, the Residence of Sir John Soane*, (London: Levey, Robson and Franklyn, 1835).

Waagen, Gustav Friedrich, *Treasures of Art in Great Britain*, 2 vols., (London: John Murray, 1854-57).

Wallis, George Harry, *Illustrated Catalogue of the Permanent Collection of Pictures, Drawings and Sculpture*, (Nottingham: J & J Vice, 1900).

Wallis, Whitworth, ‘The Museum and Art Gallery’, in Muirhead, John H., ed., *Birmingham Institutions: Lectures Given at the University*, (Birmingham: Cornish Bros, 1911), 477-521.

Western, Edward Young, *A History of the Bowes Museum and Park at Barnard Castle*, (Barnard Castle, 1890).

Wornum, Ralph Nicholson, ‘The Exhibition as a Lesson in Taste: an essay on ornamental art as displayed in the industrial exhibition in Hyde Park, in which the different styles are compared with a view to the improvement of taste in home manufactures’, *The Art Journal Illustrated Catalogue: The Industry of All Nations, 1851*, (London: George Virtue, 1851).

Auction Catalogues

Catalogue Vente de Manuscrits Livres Rares, Objets D’Art & de Curiosité, 12 December 1857, Hôtel Drouot, (Lugt 23869).

Catalogue des Objets d’Art de Curiosité & d’Ameublement composant les riches magasins de M. Monbro Aîné, 12-17 December 1859, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 25151).

Catalogue des Boiseries Sculptées, marbes, meubles anciens, tapisseries, tableaux, ornements, etc. du Chateau de Bercy, 15-18 March 1860.

Objets d'art et de haute curiosité composant la célèbre collection du Prince Soltykoff, 8 April-1 May 1861, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 26136a).

Catalogue d'une belle et nombreuse réunion d'objet d'art... par suite du décès de M. Jacob, 12-13 March 1862, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 26629).

Catalogue des Objets d’Art et de Curiosité provenant du Palais Vandramini, a Venise et appartenant a Mme la Duchesse du Berry, 8-13 May 1865, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 28508).

*Notice d'une Collection de Tableaux Ancien…provenant du Cabinet de M. d'E****, 12-13 January 1866, Hôtel Drouot, (Lugt 28787).

Catalogue des Objets d'Art et de Curiosite, Tableaux Anciens, composant la collection de feu M. le Carpentier, 14 May-2 June 1866, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 29135).

Collection de M. Laperlier: Tableaux & Dessins de l'école française du XVIIIe siècle et de l'école moderne, miniatures, terres cuites par Clodion et Marin, objets divers, 11 April 1867, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 29701).

*Collection de M. de B***, Catalogue des Tableaux Anciens & Moderne*, 4 March 1868, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 30286).

Catalogue d'objets d'art et de curiosité, tableaux et dessins... succession de M. Berryer, 15 March 1869, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 31070).

*Catalogue d'objets d'art et de curiosité... le tout appartenant à Mme de X****, 11 December 1871, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 32762).

Catalogue d'objets d'art, miniatures, fixés, gouaches [Henri de Rochefort], 11 January 1872, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 32829).

*Catalogue des Objets d'Art, Petit secrétaire de dame, époque Louis XVI; Beau meuble du XVI^{e} siècle en bois sculpté; Bureau Louis XV et commodes Louis XVI en lacque de Coromandel... De la Collection de M. le Comte L*****, 23-24 April 1872, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 33129).

Catalogue des tabatières, miniatures, bijoux... dépendant de la succession de feu M. Allègre, 13-14 May 1872, Hôtel Drouot (Lugt 33196).

Catalogue of a Collection of Duplicates from The Bowes Museum, including Pottery and Porcelain, Costly Silk Curtains and Gilt Furniture, 4 December 1917, Messrs Anderson & Garland.

Newspapers & Periodicals

'Letter from John Bowes to Rev. Frederick Brown', *Teesdale Mercury*, 25 February 1874, 4.

Anon., 'Geology: The Lartington Hall Museum of Natural History', *The Edinburgh New Philosophical Journal*, vol. 24, (1837-38), 223.

Anon., 'How a People Bought a Hall and Park', *Illustrated London News*, 12 June 1858, 591.

Anon., 'Montagu House, Whitehall, the Mansion of the Duke of Buccleuch', *The Illustrated London News*, 24 September 1864, 311.

Anon., 'Fine Arts', *Journal of the Society of Art*, November 25, 1864, 33.

Anon., 'France (From the Correspondent of the Star)', *Cork Examiner*, June 13, 1865, 2.

Anon., 'France (From our own correspondent)', *London Daily News*, 19 March 1869, 5.

Anon., 'Sale of M. Berryer's Effects', *Evening Citizen*, 19 March 1869, 2.

Anon., ‘Literature, Science and Art’, *Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser*, 23 March 1869, 3.

Anon., ‘The New Mansion and Grounds at the end of Newgate Street, Barnard Castle, *The Teesdale Mercury*, 27 July 1870, 4.

Anon., ‘Mrs Bowes New Mansion, Museum and Picture Galleries, at Barnard Castle’, *The Teesdale Mercury*, 10 August 1870, 5.

Anon., ‘Mrs. Bowes Mansion and Galleries at Barnard Castle, Durham’, *The Builder*, 14 January 1871, 27-29.

Anon., ‘The Future of the South Kensington Museum, *The Builder*, 26 July 1873, 579.

Anon., ‘The Bowes’ Museum at Barnard Castle’, *Richmond and Ripon Chronicle*, 14 March 1874, 4.

Anon., ‘The Architecture of Barnard Castle’, *The York Herald*, ? September 1874, 6.

Anon., ‘Barnard Castle, from the Newcastle Daily Chronicle’, *The Teesdale Mercury*, 19 April 1876, 5.

Anon., ‘Mr. Gladstone at Berwick’, *The Daily News*, 4 October 1876, 2.

Anon., ‘The Bowes Museum – Barnard Castle’, *The Times*, 7 October 1876, 8.

Anon., ‘The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle: Mr Gladstone’s Apology’, *The Teesdale Mercury*, 15 November 1876, 5.

Anon., ‘A Conference of Curators’, *The Athenaeum*, no. 2613, (1877), 669-670.

Anon., ‘The Bowes Museum’, *The Newcastle Daily Chronicle*, 23 January 1878, 3.

Anon., ‘Fine Arts’, *Illustrated London News*, 19 July 1879, 54.

Anon., ‘St. John’s Hospital, Barnard Castle’, *The Teesdale Mercury*, 28 July 1879, 5.

Anon., ‘North-Eastern Railway Tours’, *The Newcastle Courant*, 5 September 1879, 7

Anon., ‘Bowes Museum’, *The Northern Echo*, 11 June 1892, 4.

Anon., ‘The Wallace Collection’, *The Magazine of Art*, January 1897, 296-303.

Anon., ‘English Provincial Museums’, *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, vol. 10, no. 45, (1906), 141-143.

Anon., ‘Mr. Everard Green’, *The Times*, 23 July 1926, 18.

Chambers Lefroy, William, ‘The Ruined Abbeys of Yorkshire’, *The Portfolio: An artistic periodical*, January 1882, 171.

Coujaroud, Louis, ‘Bibliographie – Collection Basilwesky’, *Revue archéologique*, 31 (1876), 373-376.

Darcel, Alfred, ‘The Ceramic Museum of Sévres’, *The Decorator and Furnisher*, vol. 17, no. 4, (1891), 129-132.

Hooper, Lucy, 'The Hôtel Des Ventes, Paris', *The Art Journal*, vol. 3, (1877), 313-314.

Robinson, John Charles, 'Our National Art Collections and Provincial Art Museum', *The Nineteenth Century*, vol. 8, (1880), 249-265.

Scott, Owen Stanley, 'The Bowes Museum – Barnard Castle', *Art Journal*, (1897), 122-125.

Stephens, Frederic George, 'The Private Collections of England, nos. I-LXXXIX, *The Athenaeum*, (1873-1887).

Taylor, Charles, 'Dulwich College', *The Literary Panorama*, vol. 4, (1816), 159.

Secondary Sources

Books and Chapters

Anderson, Jaynie, and Togneri Dowd, Carol, 'The Travel Diaires of Otto Mündler 1855-1858 at the National Gallery, London', *The Volume of the Walpole Society*, vol. 51, (1985).

Arnold, Ken, *Cabinets for the Curious: Looking Back at Early English Museums*, (London: Routledge, 2005).

Auerbach, Jeffrey, *The Great Exhibition of 1851: A Nation on Display*, (London: Yale University Press, 1999).

Auslander, Leora, *Taste and Power: Furnishing Modern France*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996).

Avery-Quash, Susanna, 'The Travel Notebooks of Charles Eastlake', *The Volume of the Walpole Society*, vol. 73, (2011), 2 vols.

Avery-Quash, Susanna, and Huemer, Christian, eds., *London and the Emergence of a European Art Market, 1780-1820*, (London: Yale University Press, 2019).

Baetans, Jan Dirk, and Lyna, Dries, eds., *Art Crossing Borders: The Internationalisation of the Art Market in the Age of Nation States, 1750-1914*, (Leiden: Brill, 2019).

Bailey, Peter, *Leisure and Class in Victorian England: Rational Recreation and the Contest for Control,1830-1885*, (London: Routledge, 1978).

Bailkin, Jordanna, *The Culture of Property: The Crisis of Liberalism in Modern Britain*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

Barker, Amy, Coutts, Howard and Jenkins, Adrian, *The Road to Impressionism: Joséphine Bowes and Painting in Nineteenth Century France*, (Barnard Castle: The Bowes Museum, 2002).

Baker, Malcolm and Richardson, Brenda, eds., *A Grand Design: The Art of the Victoria and Albert Museum*, (New York: Abrams with the Baltimore Museum of Art, 1997).

Baker, Malcolm 'The Reproductive Continuum: plaster casts, paper mosaics and photographs as complementary modes of reproduction in the nineteenth-century museum' in Frederiksen, Rune and

Marchand, Eckhart, eds., *Plaster Casts: Making, Collecting and Displaying from Classical Antiquity to the Present*, (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 485-500.

Barlow, Paul and Trodd, Colin, eds., *Governing Cultures: Art Institutions in Victorian London*, (London: Routledge, 2000).

Barrett, Jennifer, *Museums and the Public Sphere*, (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011).

Baudrillard, Jean, trans. Levin, Charles, *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, (London: Verso Books, 2019).

Bayer, Thomas M., and Page, John R.,, *The Development of the Art Market in England: Money as Muse, 1730-1900*, (London: Routledge, 2011).

Belk, Russell W., *Collecting in a Consumer Society*, (London: Routledge, 1995).

Bell, Quentin, *The Schools of Design*, (London: Routledge, 1963).

Benjamin, Walter, 'Unpacking my Library – A Talk about Book Collecting' in Arendt, Hannah, ed., trans. Zohn, Harry, *Illuminations*, (New York: Schocken Books, 1968, first published 1955).

Bennett, Tony, *The Birth of the Museum: History, theory, politics* (London: Routledge, 1995).

Bilbey, Diane and Trusted, Marjorie, '"The Question of Casts" – Collecting and Later Reassessment of the Cast Collections at South Kensington' in Frederiksen, Rune and Marchand, Eckhart, eds., *Plaster Casts: Making, Collecting and Displaying from Classical Antiquity to the Present*, (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 465-484.

Black, Jeremy, *The British Abroad: The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century*, (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1992).

Borzello, Frances, *Civilizing Caliban: The Misuse of Art 1875-1980*, (London: Routledge, 1987).

Bourdieu, Pierre, trans. Nice, Richard, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984).

Brennan, Christine E., 'Provenance in Nineteenth Century Paris and Beyond: Prince Pierre Soltykoff's Famed Collection of Medieval Art' in Milosch, Jane, and Pearce, Nick, eds., *Collecting and Provenance: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2019), 141-160.

Briggs, Asa, *Victorian Cities*, (London: Odhams Press Limited, 1963).

Brisset, Anne-Sophie, 'Le Maison Monbro et les Modèles et Dessins d'André-Charles Boulle', in Dion-Tenenbaum, Anne and Gay-Mazuel, Audrey, *Revivals: l'Historicisme dans les Arts Décoratifs Français au XIX^{e} Siècle*, (Paris: MAD & Louvre, 2020), 166-171.

Bryant, Julius, *Designing the V&A: The Museum as a Work of Art*, (London: Lund Humphries, 2017).

Bryant, Julius, *Creating the V&A: Victoria and Albert's Museum (1851-1861)*, (London: Lund Humphries, 2019).

Burn, Lucilla, *The Fitzwilliam Museum: A history*, (London: Philip Wilson, 2016).

Burton, Anthony, *Vision & Accident: The Story of the Victoria & Albert Museum*, (London: V&A Publications, 1999).

Burton, Anthony, 'The Revival of Interest in Victorian Decorative Art and the Victoria and Albert Museum', in Taylor, Miles and Wolf, Michael, eds., *The Victorians Since 1901: Histories, Representations and Revision*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 121-137.

Campbell, Colin, *The Romantic Ethic and the Spirit of Modern Consumerism*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1987).

Campbell Orr, Clarissa, ed., *Women in the Victorian Art World*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995).

Cannon, John, *The Oxford Companion to British History*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Catterson, Lynn, ed., *Florence, Berlin and Beyond: Late Nineteenth-Century Art Markets and their Social Networks*, (Leiden: Brill, 2020).

Caygill, Marjorie L., and Cherry, John F., eds., *A. W. Franks: Nineteenth-Century Collecting and the British Museum*, (London: British Museum, 1997).

Chang, Ting, *Travel, Collecting, and Museums of Asian Art in Nineteenth-Century Paris*, (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013).

Chapel, Jeannie and Gere, Charlotte, eds., *The Fine and Decorative Art Collections of Britain and Ireland* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1985).

Chapman, Caroline, *John and Joséphine Bowes: Creating the Bowes Museum*, (Barnard Castle: The Bowes Museum, 2010).

Charpy, Manuel, 'The Auction House and its Surroundings: The Trade in Antique and Second-Hand Items in Paris during the Nineteenth Century' in Blondé, Bruno, Coquey, Natacha, Stobart, Jon, and van Damme, Ilja, eds., *Fashioning Old and New: Changing Consumer Patterns in Western Europe*, (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), 217-233.

Chu, Petra ten-Doesschate, 'The Lu(c)re of London: French Artists and Art Dealers in the British Capital, 1859-1914' in Hardin, Jennifer, ed., *Monet's London: Artists' Reflections on the Thames, 1859-1914*, (St. Petersburg, Florida: Museum of Fine Arts, 2005), 39-54.

Clarke, Meaghan, *Critical Voices: Women and Art Criticism in Brtiain 1880-1905*, (London: Routledge, 2005).

Coggins, Dennis, ed., *People and Patterns: The carpet weaving industry in 19th Century Barnard Castle* (Barnard Castle: The Friends of the Bowes Museum, 1996).

Cohen, Deborah, *Household Gods: The British and Their Possessions*, (London: Yale University Press, 2006).

Conlin, Jonathan, *The Nation's Mantlepiece: A History of the National Gallery*, (London: Pallas Athene, 2006).

Conlin, Jonathan, 'Collecting and Connoisseurship in England, 1840-1900: The Case of J. C. Robinson' in Reist, Inge, ed., *British Models of Art Collecting and the American Response*, (Farnham: The Frick Collection/Ashgate, 2014), 133-143.

Conran, Elizabeth, *John Bowes: Mystery Man of the Turf*, (Barnard Castle: The Bowes Museum, 1985).

Conran, Elizabeth, *The Bowes Museum*, (London: Scala, 1992).

Conway, Hazel, *People's Parks: The Design and Development of Victorian Parks in Britain*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Coutts, Howard, *Emile Gallé and the Origins of Art Nouveau*, (Barnard Castle: The Bowes Museum, 2007).

Darley, Gillian, *John Soane: An Accidental Romantic*, (London: Yale University Press, 1999).

Davis, Diana, *The Tastemakers: British Dealers and the Anglo-Gallic Interior, 1785-1865*, (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2020).

Davis, Frank, *Victorian Patrons of the Arts: Twelve Famous Collections and Their Owners*, (London: Country Life, 1963).

Debreuil, Marie-Martine, 'The Taste for Eighteenth-century Painting and the Art Market Between 1830 and 1860 as Regards the La Caze Collection', in Faroult, Guillaume, Preti, Monica and Vogtherr, Christopher, eds., *Delicious Decadence – The Rediscovery of French Eighteenth Century Painting in the Nineteenth Century*, (London: Routledge, 2016), 17-28.

Denis, Raphael Cardoso, 'Teaching by Example: Education and the Formation of South Kensington's Museums', in Malcolm Baker, ed., *A Grand Design: The Art of the Victoria and Albert Museum*, (New York: Abrams with the Baltimore Museum of Art, 1997), 107-116.

Duncan, Carol, *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums* (London: Routledge, 1995).

Durand-Ruel, Paul, Durand-Ruel, Paul-Louis, Durand-Ruel, Flavie, eds., Dusinberre, Deke, trans., *Memoirs of the First Impressionist Art Dealer (1831-1922)*, (Paris: Flammarion, 2014).

Dutta, Arindam, *The Bureaucracy of Beauty: Design in the Age of its Global Reproducibility*, (New York: Routledge, 2006).

Elsner, John, 'A Collector's Model of Desire: The House and Museum of Sir John Soane' in Elsner, John, and Cardinal, Roger, eds., *The Cultures of Collecting*, (London: Reaktion, 1994), 155-176.

Elsner, John, and Cardinal, Roger, eds., *The Cultures of Collecting*, (London: Reaktion, 1994).

Faroult, Guillaume, Preti, Monica and Vogtherr, Christopher, eds., *Delicious Decadence – The Rediscovery of French Eighteenth Century Painting in the Nineteenth Century*, (London: Routledge, 2016).

Faulkner, T. E., ed., *Northumbrian Panorama: Studies in the History and Culture of North-East England*, (London: Octavian, 1996).

Feigenbaum, Gail, and Reist, Inge, eds., *Provenance: An Alternate History of Art*, (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2012).

Finke, Ulrike, 'The Art Treasures Exhibition', in John Archer, ed., *Art and Architecture in Victorian Manchester*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985), 102-126

Forbes, Duncan, ''The advantages of combination': The Art Union of London and State Regulation in the 1840s' in Barlow, Paul and Trodd, Colin, eds., *Governing Cultures: Art Institutions in Victorian London*, (London: Routledge, 2000), 128-142.

Forgan, Sophie, '"But Indifferently Lodged…": Perception and Place in Building for Science in Victorian London', in Smith, Crosbie, and Agar, Jon, eds., *Making Space for Science: Territorial Themes in the Shaping of Knowledge*, (London: Macmillan, 1998), 195-215.

Foucault, Michel, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, (New York: DoubleDay, 1977).

Frederiksen, Rune and Marchand, Eckhart, eds., *Plaster Casts: Making, Collecting and Displaying from Classical Antiquity to the Present*, (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010).

Gaskell, Ivan 'Tradesmen as scholars: Interdependencies in the study and exchange of art', in Mansfield, Elizabeth, ed., *Art History and its Institutions: Foundations of a Discipline*, (London: Routledge, 2002), 146-162.

Geddes Poole, Andrea, *Stewards of the Nation's Art: Contested Cultural Authority 1890-1939*, (London: University of Toronto Press, 2010).

Gere, Charlotte, and Vaizey, Marina, *Great Women Collectors*, (London: Philip Wilson, 1999).

Giebelhausen, Michaela, 'Museum Architecture: A Brief History', in Macdonald, Sharon, ed., *A Companion to Museum Studies*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 2011), 223-244.

Gill, J., *Streatlam and Gibside: The Bowes and Strathmore Families in County Durham*, (Durham: Durham County Council, 1980).

Girouard, Mark, *The Victorian Country House*, (London: Yale University Press, 1979).

Girouard, Mark, *Life in the French Country House* (London: Cassell, 2000).

Granger, Catherine, *L'Empereur et les arts. La Liste Civile de Napoléon III* (Paris: École des Chartes, 2005).

Greenhalgh, Paul, *Ephemeral Vistas: The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World's Fairs, 1851-1939*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988).

Gretton, Thomas, ''Art is cheaper and goes lower in France' The language of the Parliamentary Select Committee on the Arts and Principles of Design 1835-1836', in Hemingway, Andrew, and Vaughan, William, eds., *Art in Bourgeois Society, 1790-1850*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 84-100.

Grossutti, Javier P., '"In the Hands of the Italians": Friulian Mosaic and Terrazzo Workers in London', in Mucignat, Rosa, ed., *The Friulian Language: Identity, Migration, Culture*, (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014), 103-121.

Guerzoni, Guido, *Apollo and Vulcan: The Art Market in Italy 1400-1700*, (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2011).

Gunn, Simon, *The Public Culture of the Victorian Middle Class: Ritual Authority and the English Industrial City 1840-1914*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000).

Habermas, Jürgen, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into the category of Bourgeois society* (Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1989).

Hamilton, James, *A Strange Business: Making Art and Money in Nineteenth Century Britain*, (London: Atlantic Books, 2014).

Hardy, Charles, *John Bowes and the Bowes Museum*, (Barnard Castle: The Friends of The Bowes Museum, 1982, first printed 1970).

Harris, John, *Moving Rooms: The Trade in Architectural Salvages*, (London: Yale University Press, 2007).

Harrison, Michael, 'Art and Philanthropy: T. C. Horsfall and the Manchester Art Museum', in Kidd, Alan J., and Roberts, K. W., eds., *City, Class and Culture: Studies of Social Policy and Cultural Production in Victorian Manchester*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985), 120-147.

Harrison Moore, Abigail, *Fraud, Fakery and False Business: Rethinking the Shrager Versus Dighton 'Old Furniture Case'*, (London: Continuum, 2011).

Haskell, Francis, *Rediscoveries in Art: Some Aspects of Taste, Fashion and Collecting in England and France*, (London: Phaidon, 1976).

Haskell, Francis, *The Ephemeral Museum: Old Master Paintings and the Rise of the Art Exhibition*, (Yale: Yale University Press, 2000).

Haskins, Katherine, *The Art-Journal and Fine Art Publishing in Victorian England, 1850-1880*, (London: Routledge, 2017).

Hauser, Arnold, *The Sociology of Art*, (London: Routledge, 1982).

Helmreich, Anne, and Fletcher, Pamela, eds, *The Rise of the Modern Art Market in London, 1850-1939*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011).

Herrmann, Frank, *The English as Collectors: A Documentary Chrestomathy*, (London: Chatto & Windus, 1972).

Hemingway, Andrew, and Vaughan, William, eds., *Art in Bourgeois Society, 1790-1850*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Higgott, Suzanne, '*The Most Fortunate Man of his Day' Sir Richard Wallace: Connoisseur, Collector & Philanthropist*, (London: The Wallace Collection, 2018).

Higonnet, Anne, *A Museum of One's Own: Private Collection, Public Gift* (Pittsburgh: Periscope Publishing, 2009).

Hill, Kate, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums 1850-1914*, (London: Routledge, 2005).

Hill, Kate, *Women and Museums 1850-1914: Modernity and the Gendering of Knowledge*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016).

Hillier, Bill, and Hanson, Juliette, *The Social Logic of Space*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

Holt, Elizabeth Gilmore, ed., *The Expanding World of Art, 1874-1902, vol. I: Universal Expositions and State-Sponsored Fine Arts Exhibitions*, (London: Yale University Press, 1988).

Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean, *Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge*, (London: Routledge, 1992).

Hughes, Peter, *The Founders of the Wallace Collection*, (London: Trustees of the Wallace Collection, 1981).

Hughes, Peter, *The Wallace Collection Catalogue of Furniture*, 3 vols., (London: The Wallace Collection, 1996).

Hyde, Melissa Lee and Scott, Katie, eds., *Rococo Echo: Art, history and historiography, from Cochin to Coppola*, (Oxford: SVEC, 2014).

Illingworth, James, 'Joséphine Bowes (1825-1874), Shopaholic or Patroness of the Arts?' in Allison, Maggie, Evans, Elliot and Tarr, Carrie, eds., *Plaisirs de femmes: Women, Pleasure and Transgression in French Literature and Culture*, (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2019).

Ingamells, John, *The 3rd Marquess of Hertford as a Collector*, (London: Trustees of the Wallace Collection, 1983).

Ingamells, John, *The Wallace Collection Catalogue of Pictures III, French before 1815*, (London: The Westerham Press, 1989).

Jordanova, Ludmilla, 'Objects of Knowledge: A Historical Perspective on Museums' in Vergo, Peter, ed., *The New Museology*, (London: Reaktion Books, 1989), 22-40.

Kane, Sarah, 'When Paris Meets Teesdale: The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle' in T. E. Faulkner, ed., *Northumbrian Panorama: Studies in the History and Culture of North-East England*, (London: Octavian, 1996), 163-187.

Keppie, Lawrence, *William Hunter and the Hunterian Museum in Glasgow, 1807-2007*, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007).

Klonk, Charlotte, *Spaces of Experience: Art Gallery Interiors from 1800-2000*, (London: Yale University Press, 2009).

Kriegel, Lara, *Grand Designs: Labor, Empire and the Museum*, (London: Duke University Press, 2007).

Larson, Frances, *An Infinity of Things: How Sir Henry Wellcome Collected the World*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Lasc, Anca I., *Interior Decorating in Nineteenth Century France: The Visual Culture of a New Profession*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018).

Levi, Donata, 'Between Fine Art and Manufacture: The Beginnings of Italian Medieval and Renaissance Sculpture at the South Kensington Museum,' in Sicca, Cinzia and Yarrington, Alison, *The Lustrous Trade: Material culture and the history of sculpture in England and Italy, c.1700-c.1860*, (London: Leicester University Press, 2000), 211-221.

Levine, Philippa, *The Amateur and the Professional: Antiquarians, Historians and Archaeologists in Victorian England, 1838-1886*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

Maas, Jeremy, *Gambart: Prince of the Victorian Art World*, (London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1975).

MacCarthy, Fiona, *William Morris*, (London: Faber & Faber, 1994).

Macdonald, Sharon, ed., *A Companion to Museum Studies*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 2011).

Macdonald, Stuart, *The History and Philosophy of Art Education*, (London: University of London Press, 1970).

MacGregor, Arthur, *Curiosity and Enlightenment: Collectors and Collections from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century*, (London: Yale University Press, 2007).

Macleod, Suzanne, *Museum Architecture: A New Biography*, (London: Routledge, 2013).

Mainardi, Patricia, *Art and Politics of the Second Empire: The Universal Expositions of 1855 and 1867*, (London: Yale University Press, 1987).

Mandler, Peter, *The Fall and Rise of the Stately Home*, (London: Yale University Press, 1987).

Mandler, Peter, *Aristocratic Government in the Age of Reform: Whigs and Liberals, 1830-1852*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

Mansfield, Elizabeth, ed., *Art History and its Institutions: Foundations of a Discipline*, (London: Routledge, 2002).

McClellan, Andrew, *Inventing the Louvre: Art, Politics and the Origins of the Modern Museum in Eighteenth Century Paris*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

McClellan, Andrew, 'From Boullée to Bilbao: The Museum as Utopian Space' in Mansfield, Elizabeth, ed., *Art History and its Institutions: Foundations of a Discipline*, (London: Routledge, 2002), 46-64.

McClellan, Andrew, '*Vive l'amatuer!* The Goncourt house revisited', in Hyde, Melissa Lee, and Scott, Katie, eds., *Rococo Echo: Art, history and historiography, from Cochin to Coppola*, (Oxford: SVEC, 2014), 87-107.

McQueen, Alison, *Empress Eugénie and the Arts: Politics and Visual Culture in the Nineteenth Century*, (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).

Milosch, Jane, and Pearce, Nick, eds., *Collecting and Provenance: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2019).

Minihan, Janet, *The Nationalization of Culture: The Development of State Subsidies to the Arts in Great Britain*, (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1977).

Montias, John Michael, *Artists and Artisans in Delft: A Socio-Economic Study of the Seventeenth Century*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982).

Mordaunt Crook, J., *The British Museum: A Case Study in Architectural Politics*, (London: Allen Lane, 1972).

Mordaunt Crook, J., *The Rise of the Nouveaux-Riches: Style and Status in Victorian and Edwardian Architecture*, (London: John Murray, 1999).

Morris, Barbara, *Inspiration for Design: The Influence of the Victoria and Albert Museum*, (London: V&A Publications, 1986).

Morris, Edward, *French Art in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, (London: Yale University Press, 2005).

Muensterberger, Werner, *Collecting: An Unruly Passion, Psychological Perspectives*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).

Myrone, Martin and Peltz, Lucy, *Producing the Past: Aspects of Antiquarian Culture and Practice, 1700-1850*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999).

Nelson, Robert S., and Schiff, Richard, eds., *Critical Terms for Art History*, (London: University of Chicago Press, 2003).

North, Michael, ed., *Economic History and the Arts*, (Köln: Böhlau, 1996).

O'Byrne, Robert, *Hugh Lane, 1875-1915*, (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 2000).

O'Neill, Morna, *Hugh Lane: The Art Market and the Museum, 1893-1915*, (London: Yale University Press, 2018).

Paul, Catherine, *Poetry in the Museums of Modernism: Yeats, Pound, Moore, Stein*, (Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2002).

Pearce, Susan, *Museums, Objects, Collections*, (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992).

Pearce, Susan, ed., *Interpreting Objects and Collections*, (London: Routledge, 1994).

Pearce, Susan, *On Collecting: An Investigation into Collecting in the European Tradition*, (London: Routledge, 1995).

Pearce, Susan ed., *Visions of Antiquity: The Society of Antiquaries 1707-2007*, (London: Society of Antiquaries London, 2007).

Pergam, Elizabeth A., *The Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition of 1857: Entrepreneurs, Connoisseurs and the Public*, (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).

Pergam, Elizabeth, 'Provenance as Pedigree: The Marketing of British Portraits in Gilded Age America' in Feigenbaum, Gail, and Reist, Inge, eds., *Provenance: An Alternate History of Art*, (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2012), 104-122.

Perkin, Harold, *The Rise of Professional Society: England since 1880*, (London: Routledge, 1989).

Pevsner, Nikolaus, *A History of Building Types*, (London: Thames and Hudson, 1976).

Phillips, David, *Exhibiting Authenticity*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997).

Physick, John, *The Victoria and Albert Museum: The history of its building*, (Oxford: Phaidon, 1982).

Pierson, Stacey J., *Private Collecting, Exhibitions and the Shaping of Art History in London: The Burlington Fine Arts Club*, (London: Routledge, 2007).

Pointon, Marcia, ed., *Art Apart: Art Institutions and Ideology Across England and North America* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994).

Pomian, Krzysztof, trans. Wiles-Porter, Elisabeth, *Collectors and Curiosities: Paris and Venice 1500-1800*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990).

Pons, Bruno, *Grands Décors Français 1650-1800: Reconstitués en Angleterre, aux Etats-Unis, en Amérique du Sud et en France*, (Dijon, Editions Faton, 1995).

Pons, Bruno, *The James A. de Rothschild Bequest at Waddesdon Manor, Architecture and Panelling*, vol. 11, (London: Philip Wilson, 1996).

Potts Graham, and Johnson, Michael, *The Architecture of Sunderland, 1700-1914*, (Stroud: The History Press, 2013).

Praz, Mario, trans. Davidson, Angus, *The House of Life*, (London: Methuen & Co., 1964, first published 1958).

Purbrick, Louise, 'The South Kensington Museum: The Building of the House of Henry Cole', in Pointon, Marcia, ed., *Art Apart: Art Institutions and Ideology Across England and North America* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), 69-88.

Raux, Sophie, 'From Mariette to Joullain: Provenance and Value in Eighteenth-Century French Auction Catalogues', in Feigenbaum, Gail, and Reist, Inge, eds., *Provenance: An Alternate History of Art*, (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2012), 86-103.

Reist, Inge, 'The Fate of the Palais Royale Collection 1791-1800', in Panzanelli, Roberta, and Preti-Hamard, Monica, eds., *La Circulation des Oeuvres d'Art: Circulation of Works of Art in the Revolutionary Era, 1789-1848*, (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2007), 22-44.

Reist, Inge, ed., British Models of Art Collecting and the American Response, (Farnham: The Frick Collection/Ashgate, 2014).

Reitlinger, Gerald, *The Economics of Taste vol. I, The Rise and Fall of Picture Prices*, (London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1961).

Reitlinger, Gerald, *The Economics of Taste vol. II, The Rise and Fall of Objets d'Art Prices Since 1750*, (London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1963).

Reitlinger, Gerald, *The Economics of Taste vol. III, The Art Market in the 1960s*, (London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1970).

Saarinen, Aline B., *The Proud Possessors* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1959).

Sachko Macleod, Dianne, *Art and the Victorian Middle Class: Money and the Making of Cultural Identity*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Saisselin, Rémy, *Bricabracomania: The Bourgeois and the Bibelot*, (London: Thames and Hudson, 1984).

Sherman, Daniel J., *Worthy Monuments: Art Museums and the Politics of Culture in Nineteenth Century France*, (London: Harvard University Press, 1989).

Sherman, Daniel J., & Rogoff, Irit, eds., *Museum Culture: Histories, Discourses, Spectacles*, (London: Routledge, 1994).

Shirley, Pippa and Thornton, Dora, eds., *A Rothschild Renaissance: A New Look at the Waddesdon Bequest in the British Museum*, (London: The British Museum, 2017).

Sicca, Cinzia, and Yarrington, Alison, *The Lustrous Trade: Material culture and the history of sculpture in England and Italy, c.1700-c.1860*, (London: Leicester University Press, 2000).

Siegl, Jonah, *The Emergence of the Modern Museum: An anthology of nineteenth century sources*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

Sloboda, Stacey, ‘Porcelain Bodies: Gender, Acquisitiveness and Taste in Eighteenth-Century England’, in Potvin, John, and Myzelev, Alla, eds., *Collecting Subjects: The Visual Pleasures and Meanings of Material Culture in Britain*, (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 19-36.

Smith, Charles W., *Auctions: The social construction of value*, (Brighton: Wheatsheaf 1989).

Stammers, Tom, ‘Salvage and Speculation: Collecting on the London Art Market After the Franco-Prussian War (1870-71)’, in Hill, Kate, ed., *Museums, Modernity and Conflict: Museums and Collections in and of War since the Nineteenth Century*, (London: Routledge, 2020), 15-38.

Stammers, Tom, *The Purchase of the Past: Collecting Culture in Post Revolutionary France, c.1790-1890*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020).

Stewart, Susan, *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection*, (London: Duke University Press, 1993).

Stourton, James, *Great Smaller Museums of Europe*, (London: Scala, 1999).

Summerson, John, ‘The Architecture of British Museums and Art Galleries’, in Chapel, Jeannie, and Gere, Charlotte, eds., *The Fine and Decorative Arts Collections of Great Britain and Ireland*, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1985), 9-19.

Taylor, Brandon, *Art for the Nation: Exhibitions and the London Public, 1747-2001*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999).

Taylor, Miles and Wolf, Michael, eds., *The Victorians Since 1901: Histories, Representations and Revision*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004).

Trippi, Peter, ‘Industrial Arts and the Exhibition Ideal’, in Baker, Malcolm and Richardson, Brenda, eds., *A Grand Design: The Art of the Victoria and Albert Museum*, (New York: Abrams with the Baltimore Museum of Art, 1997), 79-88.

Trodd, Colin, ‘Culture, Class, City: The National Gallery and the Spaces of Education, 1822-1857’, Pointon, Marcia, ed., *Art Apart: Art Institutions and Ideology Across England and North America* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), 33-49.

Trodd, Colin, ‘The Paths to the National Gallery’, in Barlow, Paul and Trodd, Colin, eds., *Governing Cultures: Art Institutions in Victorian London*, (London: Routledge, 2000), 29-43.

Tüskés, Anna, ‘Mercanti veneziani e Wilhelm von Bode’, in Tüskés, Anna, Tóth, Áron, and Székely, Miklós, *Hungary in Context: Studies on Art and Architecture*, (Budapest: CentrArt, 2013), 145-163.

Tythacott, Louise, ed., *Collecting and Displaying China’s “Summer Palace” in the West: The Yuanmingyuan in Britain and France*, (London: Routledge, 2018).

Veblen, Thorstein, *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions*, (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1924).

Vergo, Peter, ed., *The New Museology*, (London: Reaktion Books, 1989).

Vignon, Charlotte, *Duveen Brothers and the Market for Decorative Arts, 1880-1940*, (London: D. Giles Ltd, 2019).

Vincentelli, Moira, *Women and Ceramics: Gendered Vessels*, (Mancheser: Manchester University Press, 2000).

Wade, Rebecca, *Domenico Brucciani and the Formatori of Nineteenth Century Britain*, (London: Bloomsbury, 2019).

Wainwright, Clive, *The Romantic Interior: The British Collector at Home 1750-1850*, (London: Tale University Press, 1989).

Wallach, Alan, *Exhibiting Contradiction: Essays on the Art Museum in the United States*, (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998)

Waterfield, Giles, ed., *Palaces of Art: Art Galleries in Britain, 1790-1990*, (London: Lund Humphries, 1991).

Waterfield, Giles, 'The Origins of the Early Picture Gallery Catalogue in Europe, and its Manifestation in Victorian Britain', in Pearce, Susan, ed., *Art in Museums*, (London: Athlone, 1995), 42-73.

Waterfield, Giles, *The People's Galleries: Art Museums and Exhibitions in Britain 1800-1914*, (London: Yale University Press, 2015).

Watson, Janell, *Literature and Material Culture from Balzav to Proust: The Collection and Consumption of Curiosities*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Weber, Susan, ed., *Majolica Mania: Transatlantic Pottery in England and the United States, 1850-1915*, 3 vols., (London: Yale University Press, 2021).

Westgarth, Mark, ed., *SOLD! The Great British Antiques Story*, (Leeds: Archipelago, 2019).

Westgarth, Mark, *The Emergence of the Antique and Curiosity Dealer in Britain 1815-1850: The Commodification of Historical Objects*, (London: Routledge, 2020).

Whitehead, Christopher, 'Enjoyment for the Thousands: Sculpture display at South Kensington, 1851-1861', in Sicca, Cinzia and Yarrington, Alison, *The Lustrous Trade: Material culture and the history of sculpture in England and Italy, c.1700-c.1860*, (London: Leicester University Press, 2000), 222-239.

Whitehead, Christopher, *The Public Art Museum in Nineteenth Century Britain: The Development of the National Gallery* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).

Whitehead, Christopher, *Museums and the Construction of Disciplines: Art and Archaeology in Nineteenth Century Britain*, (London: Bloomsbury, 2009).

Wildman, Stephen 'Opportunity and Philanthropy: The Pre-Raphaelites as Seen and Collected in Birmingham', in Wildman, Stephen, *Visions of Love and Life: Pre-Raphaelite Art from the Birmingham Collection*, (Alexandria: Art Services International, 1995), 57-69.

Wilk, Christopher, ed., *Western Furniture 1350 to the Present Day*, (London: Philip Wilson, 1996).

Williams, Raymond, *The Country and the City*, (St. Albans: Paladin, 1975).

Williams, Rosalind H., *Dream Worlds: Mass Consumption in Late Nineteenth-Century France*, (London: University of California Press, 1982).

Wills, Margaret, *Gibside and the Bowes Family*, (Chichester: Phillimore for Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle upon Tyne, 1995).

Withey, Lynne, *Grand Tours and Cook's Tours: A History of Leisure Travel, 1750-1915*, (London: Aurum Press, 1998).

Wolfenden, Ian, 'The Applied Arts in the Museum Context', in Susan Pearce, ed., *Museum Studies in Material Culture*, (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1989), 27-33.

Wood, Christopher, *A History of Art History*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019).

Woodson-Boutlon, Amy, *Transformative Beauty: Art Museums in Industrial Britain* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012).

Yallop, Jacqueline, *Magpies, Squirrels & Thieves: How the Victorians Collected the World*, (London: Atlantic Books, 2011).

Yanni, Carla, *Nature's Museums: Victorian Science and the Architecture of Display*, (London, Athlone Press, 1999).

Exhibition Catalogues

George IV: Art and Spectacle, (London: Royal Collection Trust, 2019).

The Second Empire 1852-1870: Art in France under Napoleon III, (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1978).

Victoria & Albert: Art & Love, (London: Royal Collection Trust, 2010).

Journals

Alambritis, Maria, Avery-Quash, Susanna, and Fraser, Hilary, 'Introduction (Old Masters, Modern Women)', *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*, vol. 28, (2019).

Alberti, Samuel J. M. M., 'Objects and the Museum', *Isis*, vol. 96, no. 4, (2005), 559-571.

Bailkin, Jordanna, 'The Place of Liberalism', *Victorian Studies*, vol. 48, no. 1, (2005), 83-91.

Bann, Stephen, 'Historical Text and Historical Object: The Poetics of the Musée Cluny, *History and Theory*, vol. 17, no. 3, (1978), 251-266.

Bann, Stephen, 'Review of Krzysztof Pomian, "Collectors and Curiosities: Paris and Venice 1500-1800"', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 73, no. 4, (1991), 688-690.

Blondé, Bruno, and Lyna, Dries, 'Neophilia and Old Master paintings: Changes in consumer choice and the evolution of art auctions in the eighteenth century', *Continuity and Change*, vol. 31, no. 3, (2016), 361-389.

Buchanan, Harvey, 'Edgar Degas and Ludovic Lepic: An Impressionist Friendship', *Cleveland Studies in the History of Art*, vol. 2, (1997), 32-121.

Burton, Anthony 'The uses of the South Kensington Art Collection', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 14, no. 1, (2002), 79-95.

Burton, Anthony, 'Cultivating the First Generation of Scholars at the Victoria and Albert Museum', *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide*, vol. 14, no. 2, (2015), 145-161.

Catterson, Lynn, 'Duped or Duplicitous? Bode, Bardini and the many Madonnas of the South Kensington Museum', *Journal of the History of Collections*, published online June 2020, https://academic.oup.com/jhc/advance-article/doi/10.1093/jhc/fhaa011/5855091

Coutts, Howard, 'Joséphine Bowes and the Craze for Collecting Ceramics in the 19th Century', *International Ceramics Fair Handbook*, (London, 1992), 16-23.

Coutts, Howard, and Medlam, Sarah, 'John and Joséphine Bowes' Purchases from the International Exhibitions of 1862, 1867 and 1871', *Journal of the Decorative Arts Society*, vol. 16, (1992), 50-61.

Coutts, Howard, and Ferguson, Patricia, 'Setting the Table at Gibside: The Bowes Family of County Durham and their ceramic acquisitions in the 18th century', *Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle*, vol. 27, (2016), 161-191.

Donnelly, Eloise, ''A Desire for the National Good': Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks and the Curatorship of Renaissance Decorative Art in Britain, 1840-1900', *Journal of Art Historiography*, vol. 18, (2018), 1-26.

Drew, Charlotte, 'The Colourful Career of Sir John Charles Robinson: Collecting and Curating at the Early South Kensington Museum', *Journal of Art Historiography*, vol. 18, (2018), 1-16.

Duncan, Carol, 'Putting the "Nation" in London's National Gallery', *Studies in the History of Art*, vol. 47, (1996), 100-111.

Duncan, Carol, & Wallach, Alan, 'The Universal Survey Museum' *Art History*, vol. 3, no. 4 (1980), 448-469.

Eatwell, Ann, 'The Collector's or Fine Arts Club 1857-1874. The First Society for Collectors of the Decorative Arts', *Journal of the Decorative Arts Society*, vol. 18, (1994), 25-30.

Eatwell, Anne, 'Borrowing from Collectors: The Role of the Loan in the Formation of the Victoria and Albert Museum and its Collection (1852-1932)', *Journal of the Decorative Arts Society*, vol. 24, (2000), 20-29.

Emery, Elizabeth, and Morowitz, Laura, 'From the Living Room to the Museum and Back Again: The collection and display of medieval art in the *fin de siècle*', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 16, no. 2, (2004), 285-309.

Fletcher, Pamela, 'Creating the French Gallery: Ernest Gambart and the Rise of the Commercial Art Gallery in Mid-Victorian London', *Nineteenth Century Art Worldwide*, vol. 6, no. 1, (2007), 38-62.

Fletcher, Pamela, and Helmreich, Anne, 'Local/Global: Mapping Nineteenth-Century London's Art Market', *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide*', vol. 3, no. 11, (2011), 2-41.

Forgan, Sophie, 'The Architecture of Display: Museums, Universities and Objects in Nineteenth-Century Britain', *History of Science*, 32 (1994), 139-162.

Forgan, Sophie, 'Building the Museum: Knowledge, Conflict, and Power of Place', *Isis*, vol. 96, no. 4, (2005), 572-585.

Fuchsgruber, Lukas, 'The Hôtel Drouot as the Stock Exchange for Art', *Journal for Art Market Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, (2017), 34-46.

Goldgar, Anne, 'The British Museum and the Virtual Representation of Culture in the Eighteenth Century', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, vol. 32, no. 2, (2000), 195-231.

Goodwin, Gráinne and Johnston, Gordon, 'Guidebook Publishing in the Nineteenth Century: John Murray's *Handbooks for Travellers*', *Studies in Travel Writing*, vol. 17, no. 1, (2013), 43-61.

Green, Nicholas, 'Dealing in Temperaments: Economic Transformation of the Artistic Field in France During the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century, *Art History*, vol. 10, no. 1, (1987), 59-78.

Green, Nicholas, 'Circuits of Production, Circuits of Consumption: The Case of Mid-Nineteenth Century French Art Dealing', *Art Journal*, vol. 48, no. 1, (1989), 29-34.

Heath, Elizabeth, 'A man of "unflagging zeal and industry": Sir George Scharf as an emerging professional in the nineteenth-century museum world', *Journal of Art Historiography*, no. 18, (2018), 1-38.

Herrmann, Frank, 'Who was Solly?', *Connoisseur*, vol. 164, (1967), 229-235.

Hill, Kate, 'Collecting Authenticity: Domestic, Familial, and Everyday "Old Things" in English Public Museums, 1850-1939', *Museum History Journal*, vol. 4, no. 2, (2011), 203-222.

Hughes, Peter, 'Replicas of French Furniture made for the 4th Marquess of Hertford', *Antologia di Belle Arti*, no. 31-32, (1987), 50-61.

Hyde, Timothy, 'Some Evidence of Libel, Criticism, and Publicity in the Architectural Career of Sir John Soane', *Perspecta*, vol. 37, (2005), 144-163.

Iandoli, Louis J., 'The Palace of the Tuileries and its Demolition: 1871-1883', *The French Review*, vol. 79, no. 5, (2006), 986-1008.

Jones, Gareth, *History of the Law of Charity, 1532-1827*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 109-119.

Jordan, Caroline, 'The South Kensington Empire and the Idea of the Regional Art Gallery in Nineteenth-Century Victoria,' *Fabrications*, vol. 20, no. 2, (2011), 34-59.

Kane, Sarah, 'Turning Bibelots into Museum Pieces: Joséphine Coffin-Chevalier and the Creation of the Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle', *Journal of Design History*, vol. 9, no. 1, (1996), 1-21.

Klonk, Charlotte, 'Mounting Vision: Charles Eastlake and the National Gallery of London', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 82, no. 2, (2000), 331-347.

Kowaleski-Wallace, Beth, 'Women, China and Consumer Culture in Eighteenth-Century England', *Eighteenth Century Studies*, vol.29, no. 2, (1995-96), 153-167

Lasic, Barbara, 'Splendid Patriotism: Richard Wallace and the Construction of the Wallace Collection', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 21, no. 2, (2009), 173-182.

Lasic, Barbara 'Going East: The Wallace Collection at Bethnal Green 1872-1875', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 26, no. 2, (2014), 249-261.

Macnaughton, Lindsay, 'Beyond the Bowes Museum: The Social and Material Worlds of Alphonsine Bowes de Saint-Amand', *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*, vol. 31, (2021). https://19.bbk.ac.uk/article/id/3348/

Maupeou, Félicie de, Cavero, Julien, and Saint-Raymond, Léa, 'Les rue des tableaux: The Geography of the Parisian Art Market 1815-1955', *Artl@s Bulletin*, vol. 5, no. 1, (2016), 119-159.

Maxwell, Christopher, '"Spurious Articles": The Purchases of the Department of Science and Art from the Hamilton Palace Sale of 1882', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 28, no. 1, (2016), 109-124.

McCall, Vicki, and Gray, Clive, 'Museums and the 'new museology': theory, practice and organisational change', *Museum Management and Curatorship*, vol. 29, no. 1, (2014), 19-35.

McHugh, Christopher, 'Recontextualising the George Brown Collection through Creative Ceramics', *Journal of Museum Ethnography*, no. 28, (2015), 85-106.

Medlam, Sarah, 'Mrs Bowes' Furniture in 19th Century Paris', *Antique Collector*, vol. 54, no. 3, (1983), 77-81.

Mills, Matthew, *The Development of the Public Benefit Requirement for Charitable Trusts in the Nineteenth Century*, The Journal of Legal History, vol. 37, no. 3, (2016), 269-302.

Milner, Barbara, 'The Holburne of Menstrie Museum, Bath: Its Foundation and Development', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 5, no. 1, (1993), 79-87.

Momigliano, Arnaldo, 'Ancient History and the Antiquarian', *Journal of Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol. 13, no. 3-4 (1950), 285-315.

Morrison, John, 'Victorian Municipal Patronage: The foundation and management of Glasgow Corporation Galleries 1854-1888', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol.8, no.1 (1996) 93-102.

Oléron Evans, Émilie, 'Housing the Art of the Nation: The Home as Museum in Gustav F. Waagens *Treasures of Art in Great Britain*, '*Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide*, vol. 17, no. 1, (2018), 43-58.

Pergam, Elizabeth, 'John Charles Robinson in 1868: A Victorian Curator's Collection on the Block', *Journal of Art Historiography*, vol. 18, (2018), 1-31.

Pezzini, Barbara, 'William Gladstone, Collector and Collectable" Objects, Networks and Symbols of Liberalism', *Visual Culture in Britain*, vol. 20, no. 1, (2019), 64-89.

Pratt, Willis W., 'Twenty Letters of the Countess Guiccioli Chiefly Relative to Lord Byron', *The University of Texas Studies in English*, vol. 30, (1951), 132-157.

Prettejohn, Elizabeth, 'Aesthetic Value and the Professionalization of Victorian Art Criticism 1837-78', *Jounal of Victorian Culture*, vol. 2, no. 1, (1997), 71-94.

Ramos e Horta, Cristina, 'Portugese Ceramicist Manuel Mafra: Nature, Exoticism and Luxury', *Journal of the Decorative Arts Society*, vol. 37, (2013), 52-71.

Rees-Leahy, Helen, ''Walking for Pleasure'?: Bodies of Display at the Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition', *Art History*, vol. 30, no. 4, (2007), 545-565.

Robertson, Bruce, ‘The South Kensington Museum in Context: an alternative history’, *Museum and Society*, vol. 2, no. 1, (2004), 1-14.

Rodrigues, Alexander, and Martinho, Bruno A., ‘The Assemblage of a Distinct Glass Collection: The Creation and Display of the Stained-Glass Collection of Ferdinand II of Portugal’, *Revista de História da Arte – Serie W*, vol. 3, (2015), 21-27.

Romans, Mervyn, ‘An Analysis of the Political Complexion of the 1835/6 Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures’, *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, vol. 26, no. 2, (2007), 215-244.

Sachko Macleod, Dianne, ‘Mid-Victorian patronage of the arts: F. G. Stephens’s “The private collections of England”’, *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 128, (1986), 597-607.

Sachko Macleod, Dianne, ‘Private and Public Patronage in Victorian Newcastle’, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol. 52, (1989), 188-208.

Saumarez Smith, Charles, ‘Architecture and the Museum: The Seventh Reyner Banham Memorial Lecture’, *Journal of Design History*, vol. 8, no. 4 (1995), 243-256.

Shubert, Steven Blake, ‘The Decorative Arts: A Problem in Classification’, *Art Documentation: Journal of the Art Libraries Society of North America*, vol. 12, no. 2, (1993), 77-81.

Smith, Kate, ‘Empire and the Country House in Early Nineteenth Century Britain: The Amhersts of Montreal Park, Kent’, *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*, vol. 16, no. 3, (2015). Published online https://muse.jhu.edu/article/602384

Sperling, Joy, ‘“Art, Cheap and Good”: The Art-Union in England and the United States 1840-60’, *Nineteenth Century Art Worldwide*, vol. 1, no. 1, (2002), 91-114.

Spier, Simon, ‘Between the Museum and the Market: John Hungerford Pollen and Antique Furniture with special reference to his work at the South Kensington Museum’, *Furniture History*, vol. 57, (2021), forthcoming.

Sproll, Paul A. C., ‘Matters of Taste and Matters of Commerce: British Government Intervention in Art Education in 1835’, *Studies in Art Education*, vol. 35, no. 2, (1994), 105-113.

Stammers, Tom, ‘The Bric-a-Brac of the Old Regime: Collecting and Cultural History in Post-Revolutionary France’, *French History*, vol. 22, no. 3, (2008), 295-315.

Stammers, Tom, ‘Collectors, Catholics, and the Commune: Heritage and Counterrevolution, 1860-1890’, *French Historical Studies*, vol. 37, no. 1, (2014), 53-87.

Stammers, Tom, ‘Old French and New Money: Jews and the Aesthetics of the Old Regime in Transnational Perspective, c.1860-1910’, *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies*, vol. 18, no. 4, (2019), 489-512.

Stonge, Carmen, ‘Making Private Collections Public: Gustav Friedrich Waagen and the Royal Museum in Berlin’, *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 10, no. 1, (1998), 61-74.

Summerson, John, 'Museums as Architecture', *Museums Journal*, vol. 3, (1955), 31-38.

Thomas, Ben, ‘The Fortnum Archive in the Ashmolean Museum’, *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 11, no. 2, (1999), 253-268.

Thomas, Greg M., 'The Looting of the Yuanming and the Translation of Chinese Art in Europe', *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide*, vol. 7, no. 2, (2008), 23-55.

Thomas, Sophie, 'A "strange and mixed assemblage": Sir John Soane, Archivist of the Self', *Studies in Romanticism*, vol. 57, no. 1, (2018), 121-142.

Thornton, Dora, 'From Waddesdon to the British Museum: Baron Ferdinand Rothschild and his Cabinet Collection', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 13, no. 2, (2001), 191-213.

Throsby, David, '*The Political Economy of Art*: Ruskin and Contemporary Cultural Economics', *History of Political Economy*, vol. 43, no. 2, (2011), 275-294.

Trodd, Colin, 'The Discipline of Pleasure; or, How Art History Looks at the Art Museum', *Museum & Society*, vol. 1, no. 1, (2003), 17-29.

Wainwright, Clive, 'Principles True and False: Pugin and the Foundation of the Museum of Manufactures', *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 136, (1994), 357-364.

Wainwright, Clive, 'Shopping for South Kensington: Fortnum and Henry Cole in Florence 1858-1859', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 11, no. 2, (1999), 171-185.

Wainwright, Clive, prepared for publication by Gere, Charlotte, 'The Making of the South Kensington Museum I: The Government School of Design and Founding Collection, 1837-51', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 14, no. 1, (2002), 2-23.

Wainwright, Clive, prepared for publication by Gere, Charlotte, 'The Making of the South Kensington Museum II: Collecting Modern Manufactures: 1851 and the Great Exhibition', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 14, no. 1, (2002), 25-43.

Wainwright, Clive, prepared for publication by Gere, Charlotte, 'The Making of the South Kensington Museum III: Collecting Abroad', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 14, no. 1, (2002), 45-61.

Wainwright, Clive, prepared for publication by Gere, Charlotte, 'The Making of the South Kensington Museum IV: Relationships with the Trade: Webb and Bardini', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 14, no. 1, (2002), 63-78.

Ward, Frazer 'The Haunted Museum: Institutional Critique and Publicity', *October*, vol. 3, (1995), 448-469.

Watson, Don, 'Charles Tiffin: Public Service *Con Amore*', *Queensland History Journal*, vol. 23, no. 11 (2018), 752-769.

Watson, Don, 'Parliament House: design and construction apart from Charles Tiffin and John Petrie, who else was involved?' *Queensland History Journal*, vol. 23, no. 11 (2018), 770-797.

Westgarth, Mark, 'A Biographical Dictionary of Nineteenth Century Antique and Curiosity Dealers', *Regional Furniture*, vol. 23, (2009), 1-204.

Wiener, Martin J, 'The Changing Image of William Cobbett', *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 13, no.2 (1974), 135-154.

Wills, Margaret, and Coutts, Howard, 'The Bowes Family of Streatlam Castle and Gibside and its Collections', *Metropolitan Museum Journal*, vol. 33, (1998), 231-243.

Wood, Lucy, 'Lever's Objectives in Collecting Old Furniture', *Journal of the History of Collections*, vol. 4, no. 2, (1992), 211-226

Woodson-Boulton, Amy, 'Victorian Museums and Victorian Society', *History Compass*, vol. 6, no. 1, (2008), 109-146.

Online Resources

'Antique Dealers: The British Antique Trade in the Twentieth Century', University of Leeds, https://antiquetrade.leeds.ac.uk/

'Art Sales Catalogues Online', Brill, https://primarysources.brillonline.com/browse/art-sales-catalogues-online

'Artl@s: Géographie du marché de l'art parisien (GeoMAP)', https://paris-art-market.huma-num.fr/

'Dictionary of Scottish Architects 1660-1980', http://www.scottisharchitects.org.uk/

'Historic Hansard', the Commons and Lords Libraries, https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/index.html

'London Gallery Project', Bowdoin College, https://learn.bowdoin.edu/fletcher/london-gallery/

'Oxford Dictionary of National Biography', Oxford University,

'The Bowes Museum Blog', The Bowes Museum, https://thebowesmuseum.wordpress.com/

Unpublished Sources

Brisset, Anne-Sophie, 'Les Monbro, de marchands de curiosité à décorateurs. Illustration des mutations de la profession dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle,' Unpublished Dissertation, Ecole du Louvre, (2013).

Clarke, Alison, 'The Spatial Aspects of Connoisseurship: Agnew's and the National Gallery, 1874-1916', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Liverpool, (2017).

Coutts, Howard, 'The Bowes Museum: An Architectural History', Unpublished article in The Bowes Museum, (no date).

Davies, Helen, 'Sir John Charles Robinson: his role as a connoisseur and creator of public and private collections', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Oxford, (1992).

King, Stuart, 'Colony and Climate: Positioning Public Architecture in Queensland, 1859-1909', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Melbourne, (2010).

Lasic, Barbara, 'The Collecting of Eighteenth Century French Decorative Arts in Britain, 1789-1914', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Manchester, (2005).

MacDonald, Isobel C., 'Sir William Burrell (1861-1958): The man and the collector', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Glasgow, (2018).

Maxwell, Christopher L., ‘The Dispersal of the Hamilton Palace Collection’, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Glasgow, (2014).

Medlam, Sarah, ‘Two French Furnishing Schemes of the 1850s’, Unpublished article in The Bowes Museum, (no date).

Mountford, C. E., ‘The History of John Bowes & Partners up to 1914’, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Durham University, (1967).

Pezzini, Barbara, ‘Making a Market for Art: Agnew’s and the National Gallery, 1855-1928’, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Manchester, (2017).

Phillips, Judith, ‘National Identity, Gender, Social Status and Cultural Aspirations in mid-Ninteenth Century England and France: Joséphine Bowes (1825-1874), Collector and Museum Creator’, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Teesside, (2020).

Tunesi, Annalea, ‘Stefano Bardini’s Photographic Archive: A Visual Historical Document’, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Leeds, (2014).

Wade, Rebecca, ‘Pedagogic Objects: The formation, circulation and exhibition of teaching collections for art and design education in Leeds, 1837-1857’, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Leeds, (2012).