

2006

Y.S.S. Chung and R. Boast "Controversies in the Fitzwilliam Museum (1815-1857): The Power of the Will Displayed."
ICOFOM Study Series 35.

**Controversies in the Fitzwilliam Museum (1815-1857):
The Power of the Will Displayed**

First presented, but not published, at the International Society for Intellectual History, Conference: "Quarrels, Polemics, and Controversies", Trinity College, Cambridge, UK, 2001.

Dr. Yun Shun Susie Chung
Assistant Professor
Center for Advanced Study of Museum Science and Heritage Management
Museum of Texas Tech University
Box 43191
Lubbock, Texas 79409-3191
USA
Tel: +1-806-742-2442 Ext. 254
Fax: +1-806-742-1136
Email: yun-shun.chung@ttu.edu
Webpage: <http://www.webpages.ttu.edu/yuchung>

Dr. Robin Boast
Curator for World Archaeology
Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology
Downing Street
Cambridge, UK
CB2 3DZ
PHONE: 44-(0)1223-333516
FAX: 44-(0)1223-333517
Email: rbb10@cus.cam.ac.uk

Abstract

The bequest of a collection to establish a museum has been common throughout the foundational history of museums. In many cases collections were donated to an institution under the direction of the donor's will. The interpretation of a donor's will concerning the bequest of a collection and the subsequent foundation of a museum is the subject of this paper. Such a perspective has not been dealt with in previous literature on the history of collections and museums. This research will show the *controversies* that resulted from the interpretation of Lord Viscount William Fitzwilliam's will by the University of Cambridge Syndicate of the Fitzwilliam Museum, especially concerning the "public nature" of the Fitzwilliam Museum in the nineteenth century. It reveals the mentality of the museum's personages in regard to collecting, visitors, and exhibits during the nineteenth century. In consequence, it shows that museum wills are prone to different interpretations according to the various periods of history.

Introduction

The history of museums and collecting (Alexander 1979; Alexander 1983; Bazin 1967; Bennett 1995; Bennett 2004; Chung 2003; Conn 1998; Elsner & Cardinal eds 1994; Findlen 1994; Hooper-Greenhill 1992; Impey & MacGregor 1985; Murray 2000; Pomian 1990; Thompson ed 1992) is a subject that is more extensive than the history of the interpretation of donor's wills to an institution. The beginnings of museums are noted to reach back to the proto encyclopedic museum, the Mouseion, in 3rd century Alexandria, Egypt. The Mouseion was a place of scholarly congregation and had various collections for the purposes of learning. It had a botanical garden, zoological parks, lectures halls, and laboratories. The history of museums and collecting extends to the collections inside Greek and Roman temples of votive offerings. According to Pomian, collections "play[ed] a role of intermediaries between their onlookers, whomever they might be, and the inhabitants of the world to which the former did not belong: the visible world, if the onlookers were invisible and vice versa" (Pomian 1990:25). At the Treasury of Athenians at Delphi (5th century B.C.), there were statues and statuettes made of gold as well as paintings called *pinokotheke* (Bazin 1967). These collections were offerings to Apollo, the Sun god, and god of intellect, the arts, prophecy, healing, and light, the son of Zeus, and sacrificed animals. These sanctuaries or temples were visited by pilgrims for worship, which demonstrates the phenomena of how collections played a role between the visible and the invisible. The collections in the temples of votive offerings continue their existence into the Middle Ages in many other parts of the world. For example, in Japan, there is the Todaiji Monastery at Nara. It was made for votive offering to Buddha and after the death of Emperor Shomu (who reigned from 724-756), his widow Komyo bequeathed collections to the Monastery. It was opened as a museum in 1873 to the public (Bazin 1967:29). From the Middle Ages to the Renaissance, there is the development of secular collections and museums. The terminology for these collections and museums include *studiolos* and *studios*, small private rooms in which aristocrats placed their collections inside. There is also the development of the cabinets of curiosities and cabinets of natural history in the 2nd half of the sixteenth century. These collections were literally cabinets that showcased unusual artifacts (human-made objects) and *ecofacts* (nature) (Bazin 1967; Findlen 1990). In Northern Europe, the *Kunstkammer* (art gallery), *Schatzkammer* (treasury of objects in precious metals), *Wunderkammer* (room devoted to curiosities), and the *Rustkammer* (wardrobe for parade armor) were the division of different types of collections belonging to the wealthy collectors. By the seventeenth century studios were being replaced by galleries and private collections and were opening up to the public. The history of the public nature is also depicted as part and parcel of the literature in the history of collecting and museums. One body of literature by Kenneth Hudson (1975), *A Social History of Museums* demonstrates the changing idea of the museum through different periods. Up to the seventeenth century, they show the history of private collections and audiences that are select. One of the earliest museums to open up to the public is the Ashmolean Museum. The Ashmolean was founded by bequest from Elias Ashmole with the collections of the Tradescant Collection and his own collection, charging the university to construct an appropriate building (Hunter 1983), before his death. The museum charged admission fees and visitors were guided by *cimelarchus* or the guardian of the museum. By the eighteenth century,

national museums such as the British Museum and the Louvre were being opened to the public. Both institutions were founded by the State. The precursor to university museums were literary and philosophical society museums that gradually opened up to the public in the latter half of the nineteenth century (Chung 2001). Within this research, we wish to explore the beginnings of a university museum, the Fitzwilliam Museum, and the development of its public nature during the nineteenth century.

The subject of museums and donor's wills are included within the history of collecting and museums, but there is no account of the different kinds of interpretations that each can have within the scope of the period and individual preferences. *Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge* by Eilean Hooper-Greenhill (1992) adopted Michel Foucault's (1970) theory of "effective history" to focus on the changes that took place in the history of the museum:

Effective history thus focuses on those very long-term movements that span the centuries, which are often ignored by normal history which prefers to look at more immediate and shorter-term activities. Effective history also prioritises the breaks and ruptures which signal abrupt endings and painful new beginnings, violent change, and disruption (1992: 11).

She focuses on the *epistemes* of knowledge in the museum based on Foucault's theory of the sixteenth century, Classical, nineteenth century, and modern *epistemes*. Like Hooper-Greenhill's work (1992), Tony Bennett's book (1995) is also directly relevant to this research in that 1) they both write about nineteenth-century museum history in a broad perspective 2) the works include the intellectual social history of museums 3) and they both use Foucauldian theories of change in knowledge for the former, and the power of knowledge for the latter. This research, too, will examine nineteenth-century museum history, specifically the history of an institution that was founded upon a will. However, we will write an intellectual *micro* history of museums, and this study will also look at the *micro* changes through controversies in collective knowledge within the museum context.

In this research, the theory of the interpretation of wills is based on an anthropological study of law by Clifford Geertz (1983). His perspective of the curious nature of how law works in societies, he states, "And of these curiosities, surely the most curious is the endless discussion as to whether law consists in institutions or in rules, in procedures or in concepts, in decisions or in codes, in processes or in forms, and whether it is therefore a category like work, which exists just about anywhere one find human society, or one like counterpoint, which does not" (Geertz 1983:168). Geertz emphasizes the importance of law being "interpretive" in societies and as a part of local knowledge. Law is not, he argues, a thing that is general or placeless or an institutional taxonomy, but cultural translation (Geertz 1983:218). In his research, we wish to emphasize the point that cultural translation or interpretation of law or of wills apply to different societies in history and within the history of museums. Our argument in this research is that a museum will does not act on its own objectively to formulate what the donor has requested, but that it is the particular society or particular person in a particular place and particular time that activates the will according to his, her, or their interpretation.

The case study for this phenomena is Lord Viscount Richard Fitzwilliam's will to the University of Cambridge. Lord Viscount Fitzwilliam was known as Richard, 7th viscount (1745-1816). He is amongst the English family of the Fitzwilliam descent of William the Conqueror. Richard Viscount Fitzwilliam is best known to have left the university library and the collection and fund to build Cambridge University Museum. He was an avid collector of music manuscripts, early printed music, and art. Lord Viscount Fitzwilliam's will and testament came into effect in 1815 when the collection of "Pictures, Portraits, Prints, Drawings, and Engravings," and "Books," "Music," "Busts, Statues, Medals, Gems, Precious Stones, and Bronzes" in addition to the proceeds of the New South Sea Annuities to be spent on building a "Museum or Repository" were to be delegated into the powers of "the Chancellor, Masters and Scholars of the University of Cambridge" (UA CUR 30.1/1). The problems to be discussed in this paper start with an extract of Fitzwilliam's will:

...the Dividends and Annual Proceeds of my said New South Sea [Sea] Annuities so directed to be transferred to them as aforesaid, cause to be erected and built a good, substantial, and convenient Museum, Repository, or other building within the Precincts of the said University, for the reception and preservation of the said Pictures, Books and other Articles, or to purchase one or more erections or buildings for that purpose... (UA CUR 30.1/1)

Nowhere is there a phrase for whom the Museum or Repository would be established. Previously written histories do on the following statement from the Fitzwilliam will “for the purpose of promoting the increase of learning and the other great objects of that noble foundation” (Robinson 1998; The Fitzwilliam Trust 1989). “That noble foundation” was referring to the University of Cambridge, and the management would be in the hands of this institution according to its “Laws and Usages” stated in the will (UA CUR 30.1/1). This paper will specifically look at five controversies that took place during the implementation of the Fitzwilliam’s will. What did it actually mean for a university to be opening up art collections in a public museum in 1812, the year that the will became active? Did it mean that everyone was permitted to enter at free of charge? Did the museum have the same meaning as it does today according to the International Council of Museum’s definition? By ending at 1857, we will see how the fifth controversy on the management of the Museum for the method of hanging paintings was settled. These elements are important to the history of the museum as a public institution.

The Fitzwilliam Syndicate- The formation of the interpreters

On 9th April 1816 the University of Cambridge appointed a Fitzwilliam Syndicate of trustees to interpret the will and bring it into effect:

A Grace was offered by Mr. Cresswell proposing that a Syndicate be appointed consisting of all the Heads of Houses & 17 other Members of the Senate to be elected by ballot on a future day, to provide a place for the temporary reception of the paintings &c left by will to the Univ by Visct Fitzwilliam, to consult also upon the best mode of carrying into effect that part of the will which relates to the erection of a Museum, & to report thereon to the Senate. Thrown out in the [Caput] (Grace Book M. 181).

The Vice Chancellor, Dr. Davy of Divinity, Dr. Thackery of Divinity, Dr. Clarke of Law, Sir J. Pennington of Physic, Professor Hailstone and Professor Jackson (Non-Regents), Mr. Sedgwick of Trinity and Mr. French of Pembroke (both Regents) were appointed as the first Fitzwilliam Syndicate (UA Min VI. 1/III.44). Thus there were to be many interpreters of the Fitzwilliam will. The Syndicate immediately went into operation in respect to the erection of the building for the Fitzwilliam Museum (UA Min VI. 1/III.34) and the search for a “temporary receptacle” (UA CUR 30.1/10).

The First Interpretation: The Temporary Receptacle

While the Syndicate was searching for a site to build the Museum, the first action to take in accord with the will was to find temporary accommodation for the collections. There were no controversies in finding a temporary receptacle. Three buildings were examined for this purpose by three members of the Syndicate (Hailstone, French, and Sedgwick). The building that was situated on Free School, occupied by a grammar school called the Perse School, was the favorable option (UA CUR 30.1/8). In the end, the Vice Chancellor was to request the Trustees and Master of the Free School to receive the Collections (UA Min VI. 1/III.35). For the Syndicate, the arrangements were agreeable and the “ ‘1st stage of the Fitz. Business’ had ended “very well and expeditiously” (UA CUR 30.1/7). Thus, the Free School was to be fitted up for the reception of the paintings (UA Min VI. 1/III.45) and the curator (UA Min VI. 1/III.45). William Wilkins was the architect to make the plans for the alterations to the building (UA CUR 30.1/13). Wilkins wrote to the Vice Chancellor on 21 August 1816, expressing his hope that the room in the Free School would be opened to visitors by the time term began at the (UA CUR 30.1/22). The arrangements in the room turned out to be museum and library in one, looking like a “depository” rather than a “repository”. The question, then, to be posed is, what would it matter that the “Room” be opened at the

beginning of the term? To the Syndicate's interpretation, was this "Room" to be opened for solely the members of the University or to include the general public?

The First Controversy: The First Regulations for the Fitzwilliam Museum

Unlike, the Woodwardian will, the Fitzwilliam will did not include regulations of opening hours to the Museum. It was up to the Syndicate to decide who was permitted to enter the Museum. Before regulations for the Fitzwilliam Museum could be determined, the Syndicate made out a report entitled, "Queries Respecting Regulations for the Fitzwilliam Museum" which mainly concerned who the Museum would admit (UA CUR 30.1/29a). These queries revealed how unfamiliar the Syndicate was in dealing with a museum of fine arts that they were responsible to uphold. The first question was in regard to the opening hours, considering whether or not the Museum should be opened daily and "for the use of Members of the Senate" only. Those that followed dealt with whether or not these members could invite one or more guests "*in statu pupillari*, Strangers on a visit to the University, or Residents belonging to the Town, during this interval".

Rather than the idea of preservation and generating knowledge, it seems that there was a sense of much ado about museum security for the Syndicate. For example, there were more queries concerning book-cases to be or not to be installed with "wire-net doors", books to be taken out only by the Keeper; or valuable books and engravings only to be viewed by permission from the Vice Chancellor and through the Keeper. Even the Keeper was not to be trusted since the Syndicate inquired into getting him bondsmen or insurers if there were "any clandestine loss that may happen to the MUSEUM", and if they happened to find out that the Keeper was dealing in the same kind of objects as the Museum, terminating his employment was considered. The protection of the Museum was primary importance. The Syndicate considered having the members come to the Museum in "proper habits" so that the Keeper could distinguish them from "Strangers". There was even a query concerning the admittance of "the Public" or "Strangers":

Whether it is not expedient to have one day in the week for exhibiting the Pictures to the Public, and to prevent too great a crowd on this occasion, to issue only a limited number of tickets of admission, to be had upon application to the Keeper (UA CUR 30.1/29a)?

"Refutations for admission" by the Senate was passed on 28 March 1817 and the "Regulations respecting the Fitzwilliam Museum" were as follows:

The Museum shall be open for inspection every day on which the public Library is opened from ten o'clock in the morning till two in the afternoon and from four o'clock till six in the Evening, during the months of April May, June, July, August, and September and from ten o'clock in the morning till two in the afternoon during the remainder of the year (Grace Book M.216).

Although there was to be no "pecuniary gratification" or admission fee, members of the Senate were required to dress in "Academical habit" when visiting the Museum with "the oath of admission to degrees" (Grace Book M.216). The question of the public being admitted once a week was never realized, but two "Strangers" or friends of the members of the Senate could be invited "*in statu pupillari*" with the requirement that the members had to walk around with them throughout the entire visit to the museum. The target group was settled to be the members of the Senate (UA Min VI. 1/III. 49). On 24 October 1817 a minor alteration to the regulations concerning the time of the opening was made, changing the time from " 'ten o'clock in the morning till two in the Afternoon during the remainder of the Year'" to " '11 o'clock in the morning till three in the afternoon during the remainder of the year'" (Grace Book M. 237). Therefore, this is a glimpse of how the Museum was run in the "temporary receptacle" on Free School Lane till 1824 when Grace was offered:

That Visitors be admitted, during the appointed hours, to the Fitzwilliam Museum by tickets bearing the names of the party admitted with the signature of a Master of Arts; the restriction of the former Grace, requiring for the inspection of the books or prints the

presence of a Member of the Senate, still remaining in force (UA CUR 30.1/58c).

However, there were complaints on the opening times of the Museum. Vincent Novello, Organist for the Royal Portuguese Chapel in London, wrote to Vice Chancellor LeBlanc on 27 July 1825 proposing to publish a Catalogue of MS or Manuscript Music. Novello complained that the opening hours were limited during the Christmas vacation, depriving him from consulting the MS or Manuscript Music with much scrutiny (UA CUR 30.1/60).

There were other complaints about the admission regulations concerning “Strangers”. The controversy was that members of the Senate did not like the idea that “Strangers” had to be chaperoned throughout the entire visit. This controversy was settled when the regulation was finally altered on 24 October 1825 allowing the “Strangers” to roam around free in the Museum without a chaperon (UA CUR 30.1/60(4)).

Entrance to the Daniel Mesman (1762-1834) Museum which consisted of collections of Dutch and Flemish paintings (which eventually was donated to the Fitzwilliam Museum) and the Fitzwilliam Museum in the beginnings were “So from the beginning it appears that both museums could be visited by suitable members of the public but, unlike the National Gallery, this was a privilege and not an inherent right.” (Herbertson 1993, 220). “So Daniel Mesman’s hope, expressed in his will, that his pictures should find a suitable home in the University’s new Fitzwilliam Museum, was fully honoured some fourteen years after his death.” (Herbertson 1993, 221).

The Second Controversy: Powers of the Syndicate vs. the Colleges

The Syndicate was busy with matters in fulfilling the second requisite in Fitzwilliam’s will, the construction of the building for the Museum. For the future museum building site, they were applying to many Colleges for the purchase of university property, especially grounds that were near the Senate House. The controversy and dichotomy that existed in the property issue was one between College and University. The Fitzwilliam Syndicate, requesting the sale or exchange of the property, used diplomatic terms such as “to accommodate the [Syndicates crossed out] University” (UA Min VI. 1/III.55-56). Thus, it was the Syndicate’s interests that would represent those of the University (Bourdieu 1987, 25).

The first piece of land that they were seeking as a potential site was the one extending from the east end of King’s Chapel to King’s Lane belonging to King’s College (UA Min VI. 1/III.35). Yet, George Thackery, Provost of King’s College, replied that “all the members present seem’d decidedly adverse to the alienation of that part of the College property” (UA CUR 30.1/23 ; UA Min VI. 1/III.45) . It certainly did not seem as if the Colleges felt it was their duty to help the University “accommodate” a Museum (UA Min VI. 1/III.35). The Vice-Chancellor was to ask the Society of Catherine Hall to sell the Black Bull and the property surrounding it to the University (UA Min VI. 1/III. 48). However, this application was rejected (UA CUR 30.1/37). The grounds for Catherine Hall’s rejection, thus, showed no sign of so-called respect or duty to the University, but their reasons were that “as by so doing they [Catherine Hall] might deprive their successors of the power of enlarging at any future period the site of the College” (UA Min VI. 1/III.50). The Syndicate also considered erecting the Museum building on the grounds of the old Botanic Garden (UA CUR 30.1/41a ; UA Min VI. 1/III.52; UA Min VI. 1/III. 54). Other possible sites also were to be looked into (UA Min VI. 1/III.56). But in the end, Peterhouse accepted selling the ground between Trumpington Street lying between Peterhouse, and Pemberton’s Premises to the University (UA Min VI. 1/III.62). A valuation of the property of Peterhouse was to be presented (UA CUR 30.1/41a). Nonetheless, financial demands by the twelve lessees of this property had to be dealt with first and the Report of the Fitzwilliam Syndicate on 15 May 1823 stated that the Syndicate dissuaded the University from accepting the lessees’ proposal (UA CUR 30.1/58a). The Syndicate was clearly the driving force behind what the University would stand for.

The offer for St Peter’s College Grove by Peterhouse stood at 8,500 pounds (UA CUR 30.1/50). The offer was accepted on 28 May 1821 (UA CUR 30.1/51) and permission was requested on 1 June 1821 in the Senate (UA Min VI. 1/IV.5). Peterhouse also agreed to demolish the buildings standing between the

College and the future Museum, and a garden was to be established in place of those buildings (UA Min VI. 1/IV.5). In the meantime, the Trustees of the Perse School was no longer willing to accommodate the Fitzwilliam Collections on Free School Lane (UA CUR 30.1/60). The Syndicate purchased the Peterhouse site by Act of Parliament in April 1823 for 8,500 pounds (UA CUR 30.1/62), and they immediately proposed constructing the building since the collections would be deprived of their “temporary receptacle” (UA CUR 30.1/62). Between 1823 and 1835, more collections were purchased for the museum. These included Sir M.M. Skyes’s collection of prints and Dodwell’s collection of drawings were to be included (UA Min VI. 1/IV.44 and 45). The Trustees of the Perse School finally required the moving out of the museum on 3 March 1835 perhaps due to the increase of the collections inside the room (UA CUR 30.1/61). Plans to start construction were settled to be after Michaelmas term or fall term in 1835 (UA Min VI. 1/IV.116). Architects were requested to submit plans for the competition of the new Museum building (UA Min VI. 1/IV.128). A notice concerning the competition was to be published in the Cambridge newspapers, the *Times*, *Morning Herald*, *Globe*, and *Standard*, and a Circular also was to be printed (UA Min VI. 1/IV.129).

The plans and models for the Museum were placed in the Pitt Press with the same opening hours and regulations as the Museum on Free School Lane (UA CUR 30.1/62a). Members of the Senate were to vote for the design (UA CUR 30.1/66), and on 29 October 1835, George Basevi’s neo-classical design was chosen out of the thirty-four (UA CUR 30.1/69). However, controversy arose between Peterhouse and the Syndicate concerning Basevi’s design and structure. Peterhouse felt that it was not ideal architecture for a gallery. The ideal architecture for an art gallery at this time was neo-classical. An example is the National Gallery on Trafalgar Square. Throughout the nineteenth century there were controversies concerning the type of architecture between the gothic and neo-classical (Lubbock 1995). Furthermore, Basevi’s design did not appeal to the Syndicate and they would require more space than the original agreement:

The Society be leave to remind the V. Chancellor & Syndicate that the land was originally sold by the College on the understanding of a Gallery & not such a building, as Mr. Basevi’s will be, being erected upon it (UA CUR 30.1/73).

In the end, the additional space was offered to the University “at the rate of half a guinea per square foot” (UA CUR 30.1/75).¹ Negotiations for the completion of Basevi’s plans were resolved under the condition that additional space was provided at 1000 pounds (UA CUR 30.1/79). There was an enormous amount of administrative procedures for the actual construction of the building. In the midst of all this, Basevi fell off a scaffold in the North Tower of the Ely Cathedral and died an unfortunate death (UA CUR 30.1/139a.). Cockerell, architect for the Cockerell building that would house the Woodwardian Museum and the University Library in 1840 (UA CUR 39.17.2/39), was appointed to continue his work (UA CUR 30.1/139c.).

For the Syndicate, the Fitzwilliam Museum would be “an higher object of pride to the University and a more splendid monument to the liberality of its noble and munificent Founder” (UA CUR 30.1/ 86). The first stone was laid on 2 November 1837 with a procession in order and the members of Senate in academical costume (UA CUR 30.1/114 and 115). During the ceremony, the Vice-Chancellor’s (Ainslie) address showed another interpretation of Fitzwilliam’s will, emphasizing the connection between the works of art and God:

For things, when reightly viewd, whether they be the works of nature or of human genius, afford ample cause to admire and adore that Great Being, who is alike the Author of all material objects and of the intellect which is exercised upon them. Such reflections we should be always anxious to cherish; and thus, having the honour of the Supreme Being as the aim of all our efforts, we may the more freely indulge in the hope, that His benevolence and favour will guide them to a happy termination (UA CUR 30.1/117a).

Now, this was pomp and circumstance! The interpretation of the will by the Vice Chancellor showed that the Museum bestowed not only objects and powers upon the University but pride and honor as heir to

God's works.

The Third Controversy: The Type of Collections

Regarding the type of collections to be housed, the Museum was not to include any natural history collections since this was not embodied in Fitzwilliam's will (UA CUR 30.1/42c). In 1816 the Fitzwilliam Collections were divided into four sections: books; pictures [paintings]ⁱⁱ and drawings and other objects; prints and engravings; and music. Another major bequest, similar to that of Fitzwilliam's, was made by Daniel Mesman (1762-1834) (Herbertson 1993; UA CUR 30.1/63). Mesman's will distinctly requested that John Seguier, advisor of paintings for Mesman and brother of William Seguier, the first Keeper of the National Gallery, arrange the 200 paintings (Herbertson 1993; UA CUR 30.1/63; UA Min VI. 1/IV.124).

The Fitzwilliam Syndicate also had power to purchase other additions to the Museum under the directions of the will (UA CUR 30.1/1). They purchased 1000 pounds worth of the late Sir M.M. Sykes' Prints Collection (UA Min VI. 1/IV.44). They appointed Samuel Woodburn "whose acknowledged taste and experience in this department of art, and whose thorough knowledge of the late Lord Fitzwilliam's Collection rendered him in their opinion, the fittest person to be employed as the Agent of the University at the Sale of Sir M.M. Sykes's Collection" (UA Min VI. 1/IV.44). Other collections such as Dodwell's Collection of 61 drawings representing Classic History was purchased by the Senate at 500 pounds (UA Min VI. 1/IV.48-49). In addition, numerous casts were being purchased by the Vice Chancellor and there were even dealings with the British Museum (UA CUR 30.1/ 156b).ⁱⁱⁱ

In the meantime, the Cambridge Antiquarian Society applied for the use of the room next to the Library of the Fitzwilliam Museum in order to display the Society's collections of British antiquities. In 1844, the Vice Chancellor allowed this collection to be placed in the room of the Pitt Press which also was the Cambridge Philosophical Society's building on agreement that it be temporary; that the University and the Vice Chancellor would not be responsible for them; that the admission regulations to the Fitzwilliam Museum would not apply to the Society's collections; and that the cabinets containing the British antiquities would need to be placed in a certain way that it would not injure the bases of the pilasters (UA CUR 30.1/148a). In 1857, Charles Babington, Treasurer and John Rigg, Secretary of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society, requested for the third time that the Society's to be placed inside the Fitzwilliam Museum, which was "in a place more easily acceptable to the public than they are at present"(UA CUR 30.1/192aa). The collections, he added, were much more valuable and extensive than when they had first deposited them in the Pitt Press (UA CUR 30.1/192aa). The Syndicate never replied to the Society's request (UA CUR 30.1/192aa). Since 1844, the collections of "Roman and British antiquities" were housed in the Philosophical Society's building (UA CUR 30.1/192aa). These collections would later be the foundations of the Cambridge University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology in 1884. The Syndicate made no room for any archaeological collections, especially British prehistoric. Until the mid-nineteenth century, British prehistoric archaeological collections were considered less valuable over Greek, Roman, and Egyptian collections.

In 1850, John Disney founded and endowed a Professorship of Classical Antiquities and the "Collection of Ancient Marbles" (the collection that was a part of the *Museum Disenianum* or Disney Museum) to the University. The Professor was required to give at least six lectures on "Antiquarian research and the Fine Arts" during the academic year on (UA CUR 30.1/159). The Disney Collection was placed in the basement of the West Room in the Fitzwilliam Museum, which required another assistant to look after its security on Public Days. Thus the Disney will established the teaching of Classical Archaeology at Cambridge University, and the distinction between Classical Archaeology and Prehistoric Archaeology was clearly marked.

The Fourth Controversy: The Public Nature of the Museum

A circular was printed respecting the regulations that the Fitzwilliam Syndicate would adopt "for the future management of the Fitzwilliam Museum" with an appointment of a new Syndicate on 6 December

1848 (UA Min VI. 1/IV.179). Part I. A. of the circular dealt with the Managing Syndicate. The general management of the Syndicate would consist of the Vice-Chancellor and eight other members of the Senate. The duties of the Syndicate were defined. Everything from conservation, collections management, management to visitor admissions was to be dealt with under the powers of the Syndicate. Each year, they were to print an annual report of the state of the Museum. But what they did not include as a part of their powers were exhibition design and the art historical theory of hanging art into periods or into style, later to become hot grounds for controversy.

Part I. B. of the circular specified the regulations for admission which they said were “adopted in similar Institutions” (UA Min VI. 1/IV.181). The first section of Part B applied to those “Picture and Sculpture Galleries and Entrance Hall”. The Museum would be opened every day from ten in the morning till four in the afternoon. It would be closed on Saturdays with the exception of May first to September first when the Museum would also be opened from five to six-thirty in the evenings. The Museum would be closed on Sundays, Christmas-Day, Epiphany, Purification, Ash-Wednesday, Good-Friday, Easter-Monday and Tuesday, Ascension-Day, Whit-Monday and Tuesday, and November 5; the first Thursday of every month for cleaning and inspection of the Collections; and Annual Inspection day (UA Min VI. 1/IV.180).

Undergraduates were to be received only after twelve in the afternoon (UA Min VI. 1/IV.181). Graduates could bring “any strangers or friends” but they had to stay with them during the entire visit, especially if they were inviting “strangers”. Undergraduates had strict regulations concerning the invitations. They had to obtain a ticket signed by the Tutor or Head of the College he belonged to and write the name and address of one of his guests. Those students or artists who wished to copy paintings needed the permission of the Vice-Chancellor and the recommendation of a member of the Senate. The student or artist was instructed to place a ticket in a book “and if a stranger, [he or she] must be accompanied upon the first visit to the Building by some Resident Member of the Senate” (UA Min VI. 1/IV.180).

The public were admitted on “Public Days” usually Wednesday and Saturday from twelve till four in the afternoon, but they had to be “respectably dressed”. The public also could be requested to give their names and addresses. Children under ten years old were not to be admitted (UA Min VI. 1/IV.181).

Part II dealt with the Library (UA Min VI. 1/IV.181). A dichotomy would now exist between Museum and Library with the new building and regulations. The opening hours and dates that applied to the Museum would be the same for the Library. Some rules such as the admittance of the public on “Public Days” and undergraduates’ permission to invite “strangers” to the Library would not apply.

The next section dealt with the curators. There would be three curators to take care of the “Pictures, Sculptures and Antiquities”, the Library, and the Building, respectively. The curator of “Pictures, Sculptures and Antiquities” was instructed to stay in the galleries during exhibition hours with his two assistants: one who would be positioned in the south gallery, and the other in the north gallery and entrance hall. Positioned in these areas, the curator and his assistants’ roles were clearly defined “not to explain the collection or conduct parties round the galleries, but to watch their respective departments” (UA Min VI. 1/IV.182).

The curator of Library also would be instructed to remain in the Library during the opening hours and assist visitors. The curator of the Building was to manage the admission of visitors and apply the rules at all times. Moreover, he would take care of the maintenance of the Building (UA Min VI. 1/IV.182). The regulations were proposed and passed in the Senate on 25 April 1849.

Thus, although the public were now admitted to the Museum, there were considerable restrictions that were still in place since the first regulations passed in 1817. The paranoia about security of the objects was retained amongst the Syndicate. Furthermore, the curators’ duties were “not to explain the collection or conduct parties round the galleries, but to watch their respective departments” (UA Min VI. 1/IV.182).

Although it could be viewed that the Syndicate was doing a good deed of admitting the public, whether or not the Museum was a “public institution” would be confessed in a letter marked “Private and Confidential” from the Vice Chancellor to the Master of Trinity. The battle arose between the Committee of the Parishioners of St. Mary the Less and the Syndicate on 25 May 1849. The controversy was concerning the payment of parochial rates or church taxes for the land where the Fitzwilliam Museum was situated. The Committee of the Parishioners of St. Mary the Less asserted that the University should pay the parochial rates (UA Min VI.1/IV. 183). The following day the Syndicate voiced that they should not be obligated to pay the rates under the defense that “the objects of the Museum were public objects & that there was no beneficial occupation”. The “Contest with the Vestry of the Parish of Little St Mary’s” was passed by the Senate on the 30th of May 1849, and it granted the University to be free from paying parochial rates (UA Min VI.1/IV. 184).

However, in November 1849, Turner, Clarkson, and Peacock, the Committee of the Parishioners of St. Mary the Less, battled again with the University by opening a new case to Cowling, the University Counsel. Cowling, “who, after a conference with the VC [Vice Chancellor], the Master of Pembroke, and the Master of Catherine Hall, was requested to advise as to the prudence of the University continuing the contest with the Parish” (UA Min VI.1/IV. 184). In the meantime, the Vice Chancellor, James Cartwell, wrote to the Master of Trinity, a letter that was “Private and Confidential” explaining the arguments for the Syndicate that “Lord Fitzwilliam’s Benefaction was for public purposes, and consequently wholly exempt from Rates” (UA CUR 30.1/155(2)). However, according to the Vice Chancellor’s letter addressed to the Master of Trinity marked “Private and Confidential”, Cowling admonished the University’s defense and objected to the University’s decision to jointly submit the case to the Superior Court:

“The University Counsel offers three cogent reasons for not carrying the case before a superior Court; being of opinion

1. That the Court would not determine the Museum to be of that public description which would render it exempt from Rates.
2. That, if the Superior Court were to determine it to be rateable, and were to lay down Rules for the guidance of the Court of Quarter Sessions, (to which latter Court the question of the reasonableness of the Assessment must ultimately revert, and from which there is no appeal,) the latter Court might interpret these Rules as it pleased, so that it is very questionable whether any distinction of the Rate could be obtained.
3. That, to argue the Case in the Superior Court on the ground that the purposes of Lord Fitzwilliam’s bequest were public (and there is no other ground upon which to rest the claim of exemption) would be opening questions touching the [public crossed out] character of the Museum, which would let in arguments highly prejudicial to the interest of the University not only in that property, but also in other property of a similar nature” (UA CUR 30.1/155(2)).

The Vice Chancellor was authorized to advise the University to stop battling with the parish and pay the rates (UA Min VI. 1/IV.184-185). The parochial rates were paid including the arrears from July 1848 (UA Min VI. 1/IV.185). Thus, the “public nature” of the Fitzwilliam Museum was defined to be not so public after all.

The Fifth Controversy: Power to the Vice Chancellor or the Syndicate

The fifth controversy arose when members of the Fitzwilliam Syndicate, H. Philpott, E. Guest, T. Worsley, A. Long, and W. Geo. Searle submitted their resignation in January 1856 (UA CUR 30.1/185). The reason for their resignation was due to their disapproval of the Vice Chancellor’s rearrangement of the paintings without first consulting the Syndicate. William Whewell, Vice Chancellor and Master of Downing at the time, wrote out his defense arguing that there were not enough members of the Syndicate to consult before Christmas vacation (UA CUR 30.1/186(1)). He was thus driven to rearrange the paintings according to his own discretion before term began in order to prevent any changes to regular

opening hours after vacation (UA CUR 30.1/186(1)). His reason for re-hanging the paintings was to incorporate the recent acquisitions into the remainder of the collections in the gallery (UA CUR 30.1/186(1)). In addition, there were paintings depicting nude figures inappropriately in what he called a “public gallery” “since, in recent times, we have opened the Fitzwilliam Gallery to the public indiscriminately, and to very young persons of both sexes, it appears to be quite necessary, for the credit of the University, that it should be possible to pass through the Gallery without looking at such pictures; and therefore, that they should not be in prominent places in the Large Room by which the spectator enters”. He also wished to hang the paintings by Schools following the example of the “Picture Gallery in Berlin”. Three years previously, Whewell visited this gallery in which its director, Gustav Friedrich Waagen, arranged its paintings according to this method. Whewell stated that “Every one who has seen the Museum must have been favorably impressed by the instructive and agreeable effect of the arrangement there adopted; the leading principle being that the Italian school, and the German and Flemish schools, diverge in opposite directions from a common center; and also, that the works of the same artist, and the same school, are placed near each other”. Concluding, he voiced his opinion “that the pictures should be arranged upon known and evident principles; not placed according to the unexplained feeling of an individual, or the casual relations of contiguous pictures” with the mode of hanging to be with “bars and hooks”. According to Carmen Stonge, Waagen was the first museum director to arrange the paintings by Schools, and one who felt that art and museums should be accessible to everyone (Stonge 1998, 61). He influenced British art and museums through his publications and as a part of the Select Committee of the House of Common’s decisions in 1836 on setting up the Government Schools of Design to educate and hold exhibitions on the virtues of design (Stonge 1998, 68). This was the same year that his advice was taken by the National Gallery on the historical survey of hanging paintings (Stonge 1998, 68). Therefore, Waagen’s method of hanging paintings would affect the controversy concerning the interpretation of Fitzwilliam’s will.

This was not the first time the Vice Chancellor had tampered with the paintings without consulting the Syndicate. A reply to his defense was made by Rev. Thomas Worsely of Downing College on 7 February 1856 that the hanging of paintings by Schools had been rejected in March 1848, and they were governed to hang the paintings according to “Harmony and Contrast in Subject, Style, and Colour; or of each picture being so placed as most effectually to bring out its own beauty, and enhance that of the group to which it was assigned” (UA CUR 30.1/186 (2)). Most of all, Worsely was vexed at the fact that the Vice-Chancellor took a hold of the power to do things his own way without the consultation of the Syndicate and a quorum:

Was the Management Syndicate- I had almost said are Syndicates in general- appointed by the Senate for the sole purpose of registering the Vice-Chancellor’s decrees? or was it appointed to manage the Museum, and to be responsible for that Management to the Senate? Or does the Arrangement of the Works of Art in the Museum really constitute no portion of that Management (UA CUR 30.1/186 (2))?

In consequence, a new Syndicate (eventually consisting of the same members) and new proposals were to be formed in the same year (UA CUR 30.1/188). In the new proposals, the duties of the Syndicate were to include collection arrangement and exhibition design, and four members, as opposed to five stated in the regulations made out in 1848, would be required to form a quorum (UA CUR 30.1/188). By 1857, the paintings were to be divided into Schools and the Syndicate was finding new ways to the mode of hanging (UA CUR 30.2/196). This controversy proved that one man did not represent the powers of the University but the Syndicate as a group of men. It demonstrated the tendency towards a more comprehensive method of finding ways to arrange and hang paintings towards generating knowledge rather than displaying intrinsic beauty. In consequence, it established a material basis to the study of art in the mid-nineteenth century at the University of Cambridge. Finally, if the Syndicate was aware of the Waagen’s philosophy in hanging the paintings the way Whewell did, the Fitzwilliam Museum was on its way to becoming public-oriented, since Waagen method of hanging paintings in Schools was to help the public understand the historical theory rather than a subjective inherent taste theory.

Conclusion

Thus, there was more to the Fitzwilliam will than the mere phrase to promote “the increase of learning” that previous literature emphasized concerning the foundation of the Fitzwilliam Museum. As demonstrated in this paper, the text lies in the interpreter, not only in rhetoric but in action (Geertz 1983, 215). Therefore, the text in action was found in the Fitzwilliam Syndicate acting upon Fitzwilliam’s will. In this case, the public nature of the Fitzwilliam Museum was relinquished to the Syndicate for definition. We also wished to demonstrate how knowledge is found in “cultural shapes” and “social sizes”^{iv} (Geertz 1983, 154). That is, the Syndicate’s “thoughts” in the form of the Museum differed during the early-nineteenth century from the mid-nineteenth century. This difference was found in how they dealt with the Museum’s policies in their interpretation of the will (Geertz 1983, 173). During the process of interpretation, we saw many controversies that were born. It is precisely these controversies that revealed the Syndicate’s definition of the public nature of the Museum.

Into the early-nineteenth-century English museums must be mentioned to view what was deemed natural about museums to the Fitzwilliam Syndicate during this period (Geertz 1983, 85). In other words, we show their frame of thought concerning the Fitzwilliam Collections that came into Cambridge University’s possession during the early-nineteenth century. Krzysztof Pomian calls public museums established by a will the “evergetic” type (1990, 264). The nucleus of these museums is the collections left by private donors to an educational or religious institution of the town or state for public access (Pomian 1990, 264). In England, collecting art was for the wealthy and the aristocracy who collected them from the Continent or commissioned foreign artists to furnish their stately homes with portraits and paintings. There were only a few public art museums, especially ones established by the will of a wealthy gentleman, during this time in England. In the seventeenth century, the Ashmolean Museum was founded by Elias Ashmole with the Tradescant Collection. The Foundling Hospital, established by Captain Thomas Coram by royal charter in 1739 with a fine arts collection, was open to the public during this period (Hutchison 1968, 16). Since 1768 the Royal Academy of Art held public exhibitions of contemporary art at Pall Mall and the Old Somerset House.

The Dulwich Picture Gallery opened to the public in 1811 with the collections of Noel Desenfans (1745-1807). This gallery is the closest that we can find with a will specifically telling what to do with the collection. After his death in 1807, Desenfans’ friend, Sir Peter Francis Bourgeois (1756-1811) and Mrs Desenfans decided to make a gallery, according to his will, in a small charitable institution called Dulwich College (Pevsner 1976, 123).

About the same time as the Fitzwilliam will came into effect, the idea of founding a National Gallery came up when Parliament started to question whether the British Museum should preserve collections of fine art or that a separate institution should be established for this sole purpose (Martin 1974). It was in 1824 that the National Gallery actually opened, which is 7 years later than the Fitzwilliam Museum. Colin Trodd mentions that Robert Peel spoke of the National Gallery as a “symbolic space of union” between connoisseurship and the lay public, and the wealthy and the poor (Trodd 1994, 34). The National Gallery was open to the public 4 days in the week and to students of art 2 days in the week, discarding ticket admission, whereas the Fitzwilliam Museum continued to remain closed to the lay public and catered to only the graduates of Cambridge University.

In Cambridge, there were other museums formed during the late eighteenth century, which were used for lecture purposes in separate departments. One example is the Woodwardian Museum. A Professor of Physic (Medicine) at Gresham College in London, Dr. John Woodward (1665-1728)^v, wrote his will making a bequest to the University of Cambridge for the founding and endowing of a Lectureship and donating two cabinets containing his geological and miscellaneous collections^{vi} to be housed “in such proper Room or Apartment.” The will was effective in 1790 (UA CUR 39.17.1/ 1). From the evidence of his will, it is further acknowledged that he endeavored to promote the higher learning of Geology by securing the preservation and experimentation of his collections as material source of that learning. In addition, explicit instructions and powers were conferred to the University to give access to the public at

specific times, as opposed to the Fitzwilliam will which did not state specific times of opening. The Fitzwilliam Collections were art collections that the University had no precedent over in forming an art gallery and dealing with the public.

The first controversy was as a result of the Syndicate's first regulations of the Museum. Members of the University were unsatisfied with the fact that they were obligated to chaperon their guests (or what the Syndicate called "strangers") during the entire visit. Those outsiders who wished to consult manuscripts in the Museum were unhappy about the limited visitation hours. The focus of the Syndicate was on museum security and the state of the collections, than the welfare of the visitors who were apparently the Members of the Senate. The second controversy erupted when the Syndicate wished to purchase property from the Colleges for the construction of the museum building. This controversy revealed that what was natural in their own world at this time was a gallery of neo-classical design and no other, and that the University and Colleges were disparate institutions with differing interests. It also defined the Syndicate as the representative of the University. The third controversy arose when the Syndicate defined what type of collections the Museum was to preserve and collect. It excluded all natural history and British archaeological collections. With its silence, the Syndicate rejected the Cambridge Philosophical Society's request to place the British archaeological collections in the Fitzwilliam Museum. The Syndicate also created an amalgamation of other wills such as the Mesman and the Disney wills, bringing the collections in one space. This also brought about the institutionalization of art history and classical archaeology, even a lectureship on classical archaeology in the University was established. The fourth controversy issued when the Syndicate tried to evade parish rates. The "Contest with the Vestry of the Parish of Little St Mary's" resulted in the Vice Chancellor's definition of the public nature of the Museum.

Although the Syndicate now opened the Museum to the general public two days out of the week, the Vice Chancellor clearly stated in a letter marked "Private and Confidential" that the Museum was not public after all. The fifth controversy that ended in 1857, a span of 45 years since the will became active, exploded with the issue of rearranging the paintings. It ended with the reinstatement of decisions on the exhibition of paintings to be made by the Syndicate, and not the Vice Chancellor alone. Therefore, through these controversies resulting from the interpretation of Fitzwilliam's will, we could see that the Fitzwilliam Syndicate targeted the University members for the promotion of the increase of learning of the Museum, then gradually following the Picture Gallery in Berlin to direct itself towards a more public nature.

Today, the museum is one of the most important in Europe with the accumulation of the first collections to be bequeathed through the interpretation of Fitzwilliam's will. The museum is now open to the public with the exception of Friday when it is for the members of the University and their friends. Thus within the history of museums and collecting, this research has shown a glimpse into the development of the public nature of an institution and the changing nature of a will by particular events and controversies through individual and group interpretation in a particular time period.

Acknowledgments

Thanks are due to Katherine Reagan Bussells and Frances Rivera for their kind suggestions and support for this article.

Literature Cited

A. Primary Sources

1. UA CUR 30.1/

1. Extract from the will of Viscount Fitzwilliam (18 Aug. 1815). He died 15 Feb. 1816.
3. List of the 142 pictures, and valuation of each - the whole amount ,9570 (n.d.).
5. Letter of Messr. Sheldon and Roberts respecting persons to superintend the benefaction (26 Feb 1816).
8. Report of the Syndicate appointed for this purpose (27 Apr. 1816).
10. Letter of Mr. Custance respecting houses for the purpose (22 Apr. 1816).
13. Letter of W. Wilkins, respecting the arrangements in the Perse School (27 May 1816).
22. Letter of Mr. Wilkins (21 Aug. 1816).
23. Letter of Dr Thackeray, Provost of King's, intimating that the college will not part with the land North E. End of K.C. chapel to King's lane (27 Nov. 1816).
26. Report and valuation of the North wing of the Perse School Property for the temporary accomdn. of the collection by Mr. Wentworth (10 Jan. 1817).
- 29a. Queries respecting Regulations for the Fitzwilliam Museum. n.d.
- 37a. Report of the Syndicate, informing the Senate that Masters & Fellows of Catherine Hall objects to a building projecting southward beyond the line of the North wall of this Chapel; & not therefore the plan submitted to the Senate must be abandoned (Oct. 13, 1819)
- 41a. Report of the Syndicate recommending the erection of the Museum on part of the old Botanic Garden (4 May 1820).
- 41b. Report of the Syndicate offering two graces, in lieu of the single Grace suggested in the above Report, 3 May 1820.
42. (b) Report Residence of Curator not in the central part of Museum but in the Wings or rear (12 August 1834).
42. (c) Report of no Natural History (19 August 1834).
46. Valuation of the Estate belonging to Peterhouse, proposed of the Museum (18 April 1821).
50. Offer from the Bursar of Peterhouse on behalf of the college of the property for ,8,500 (18 May 1821).
- 58a. Report of the Syndicate, stating the Terms proposed by the lessees are such that the Syndicate cannot advise the University to accept them (15 May 1823).
- 58c. Grace (24 May 1824).
60. Letter from Vincent Novello (Organist of the Royal Portuguese Chapel, in London) to the Vice Chancellor, LeBlanc and Catalogue of M.S. Music proposed by him to be published (27 July 1825)
60. (4) Grace to allow strangers to be admitted to the Museum without the continued attendance of the person who introduces them (24 October 1825).
61. Letter from the Trustees of the Perse School requiring the surrender of the School room now uses as a Museum for the Collection bequested by Viscount Fitzwilliam (3 March 1835).
62. Report of the Syndicate recommending that the building be begun with a plan of the site, (27 May 1834).
- 62a. Information to architects. Signed G. King (V.C.) And 5 Syndics, 22 July 1834; Report of the Syndicate (15 April 1835).
63. Extract from the will of Mr Mesman bequeathing a collection of pictures (28 May 1834).
64. Letter of Mr Seguier respecting the 281 pictures left by Mr Mesman (3 July 1834).
66. Report of the Syndicate as to the manner of choosing a design for those offered (4 June 1835).
69. Number of votes for the 4 highest and election of Mr Basevi (29 Oct. 1835).
73. Letter of the Bursar of Peterhouse respecting buildings to be erected on the vacant place (16 Feb. 1836).
75. Letter of the Bursar of Peterhouse (5 March 1836).
- 75a. Extract from Peterhouse Order Book on which this letter is founded (5 March 1836).
79. Report of the Syndicate recommending certain changes in the title, and ,1000 to be paid to PeterHouse (28 Oct. 1836).
86. Report of the Syndicate recommending certain alterations in the design (13 Feb. 1837).
114. Notice by the V.C. (19 Oct. 1837) that the first stone would be laid on 2 Nov. 1837.

115. Notice of the order of procession on the occasion (27 Oct. 1837).
 117a. Newspaper Cutting on the Fitzwilliam Museum. n.d.
 139c. C.R. Cockerell to V.C. accepting to be Basevi's successor (10 Dec.).
 139a. Letter to V.C. in addition to above. Same date [Report, by N. Basevi, on the state of the plans for the Museum, after his broker's death, 8 Nov. 1845. Mr. Basevi was killed by a fall in the W. Tower of the Ely Cathedral (14 Oct. 1845).
 148a. Dr. Phelp to Camb. Antiq. Soc. On placing of their collections in Fitzwilliam Museum (1 Nov. 1848).
 155(2) Letter from V.C., James Cartwell, to the Master of Trinity (8 Dec. 1849).
 156b. Letter for P.B. Duncan, offering casts of Apollo Belevedere, Diana a Faun, & Townley Venus (13 Oct. 1849). Accepted 22 Dec.
 157. First Annual Report of the Syndicate (20 May 1850).
 159. Notice given by the V.C. of the gift of Mr. Disney (31 March 1851 [,1000 to endow a Profp of Archaeoly.]
 167. Report recommending the appointment of a Graduate (at ,200 p.a.) As superintendent (18 May 1853). Thrown out 9 Nov 1853.
 185. Fly sheet of the Syndicate resigning in consequence of the V.C. (Whewell)'s proceedings as to hanging the pictures(Jan. 1856).
 186(1) Statement of V.C. Whewell in his own defence (29 Jan. 1856).
 186(2) answer of Worsley (Down) (7 Feb. 1856)
 188. Report with proposals for a new syndicate &c. (20 Feb. 1856).
 189. The first syndicate under this forum appointed (7 March 1856).
 192aa. Letter from Camb. Antiquarian Society, asking for leave to deposit their collections in the Fitzwilliam Museum (14 Jan. 1857).

2. UA CUR 30.2/

196. Report (21 Feb. 1857).

3. UA CUR 39.17.1

1. (1) Copy of Mr Woodward's will 1 Oct. 1727

4. UA CUR 39.17.2

- 36/ Report of the Inspectors, Cockshutt and Versey (1 May 1790); Letter from Ansted (3 June 1840).
 37/ Report of the Inspectors, Davies and Bayley (30 April 1791).
 39/ Report of the Inspectors, Lambert and Cooper (1 May 1793).
 39/ Letter from Ansted (27 July 1840).

5. UA Min VI. 1/ (Minutes of the Syndicate 1757-1834)

III. Resolutions, Reports &c. of Syndicates (Oct. 28 1803 - March 4 1822)

- 34/ 25 April 1816
 35/ 4 May 1816
 37-38/ 7 May 1816
 44/ 17 April 1816
 45/ 27 Nov. 1816
 45/ 9 Dec. 1816
 45/ 7 Jan. 1817
 47/ 21 Jan. 1817
 48/ 12 May 1817
 48/ 19 May 1817
 49/ 21 June 1817
 50/ 21 Oct. 1817
 51/ 3 Dec. 1817
 52/ 25 Feb. 1818
 53/ 26 Nov. 1818
 54/ 13 Oct. 1819
 55-56/ 14 Dec. 1819

56/ 22 Feb. 1820
58-59/ 17 April 1820
62/ 17 March 1821

IV.

5/ 1 June 1821
44-45 / 5 July 1824
48-49/ 7 February 1825
116/ 27 May 1834
128/ 23 June 1835
129/ 21 July 1834
124/ 16 Oct. 1834
140/ 19 Dec. 1836
141/ 16 Jan. 1837
154/ 10 March 1842
179-182 / 27 March 1849
183-185/ 26 May 1849

5. Grace Book M/ (Michaelmas 1809 to 12 August 1823)

181. Syndicates respecting
216. Regulations: "Regulations respecting the Fitzwilliam Museum" (28 March 1817)
237. Alteration in Regulations (24 Oct. 1817)

B. Secondary Sources

- Alexander, E.P. 1979. *Museums in Motion: An Introduction to the History and Functions of Museums*. Nashville, TN: American Association for State and Local History.
- Alexander, E.P. 1983. *Museum Masters*. Nashville, TN: American Association for State and Local History.
- Bazin, G. 1967. *The Museum Age*. New York: Universe Books.
- Bennett, T. 2004. *Pasts Beyond Memory: Evolution, Museums, Colonialism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bennett, T. 1995. *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*, London & New York, Routledge.
- Chung, Y.S.S. (2003) "John Britton (1771-1857). A Source for Exploration of the Foundations of County Archaeological Society Museums". *Journal of the History of Collections*. 15 no. I, pp.111-123.
- Conn, S. 1998. *Museums and American Intellectual Life: 1876-1926*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1987. "Social Space and Symbolic Power", *Sociological Theory*, 7(1), 14-25.
- Cash, D. 1994. *Access to Museum Culture: The British Museum from 1753 to 1836*, Ph.D Dissertation, Cambridge: University of Cambridge.
- Duncan, C. 1995. *Civilising Rituals*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Elsner, J. & R. Cardinal (eds)(1994) *The Cultures of Collecting*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Findlen, P. 1994. *Possessing Nature: Museums, Collecting, and Scientific Culture in Early Modern Italy*. Berkeley: University of Berkeley Press.
- Geertz, C. 1983. *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Herbertson, B. 1993. "The Mesman Museum, Cambridge 1834-1848", *Journal of the History of Collections*, 5(2), 217-222.
- Hooper-Greenhill, E. 1992. *Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge*, London & New York, Routledge.
- Hudson, K. 1975. *A Social History of Museums: What the Visitors Thought*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Hutchison, S. 1968. *The History of the Royal Academy*. London: Robert Royce Limited.
- Impey, O. & MacGregor, A. 1985. *The Origins of Museums: The Cabinet of Curiosities in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Europe*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Martin, G. 1974. "The founding of the National Gallery", 9 Parts, *Connoisseur*, April 1974-Dec. 1974, Vols. CLXXV-CLXXVII.
- Murray, D. 2000. *Museums, Their History & Their Use. Staten Island: Pober Publishing.*

- Pevsner, N. 1976. *A History of Building Types*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Pomian, K. 1990. *Collectors & Curiosities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Price, D. 1989. "John Woodward and a surviving British geological collection from the early eighteenth century" *Journal of the History of Collections*, 1 (1), 79-95.
- Robinson, D. 1988. *The Dutch Connection: The founding of The Fitzwilliam Museum. Catalogue for the Exhibition 25 October 1988 to 8 January 1989* Cambridge: The Fitzwilliam Museum.
- Robinson, D. 1998. *The Fitzwilliam Museum 1848-1998: One hundred and fifty years of collecting*. Cambridge: The Fitzwilliam Museum.
- Stonge, C. 1998. "Making private collections public: Gustav Friedrich Waagen and the Royal Museum in Berlin" *Journal of the History of Collections*, 10 (1), 61-74.
- The Fitzwilliam Trust. 1989. *Treasures from the Fitzwilliam: "The Increase of Learning and other great Objects of that Noble Foundation."* Cambridge: The Fitzwilliam Trust.
- Thompson, J.M.A. ed. 1992. *Manual of Curatorship: A Guide to Museum Practice* (2nd edition). London: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Trodd, C. 1994. "Culture, Class, City: The National Gallery London & the Spaces of Education, 1822-57", *Art Apart: Art Institutions & Ideology Across England & North America*, Marcia Pointon (ed.) pp. 33-49. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Winter, C. 1958. *The Fitzwilliam Museum*. London: Trianon Press.

Endnotes

-
- i. The Extract from Peterhouse Order Book of 5 March 1836 shows that 10/6 per foot would be this price (UA CUR 30.1/75a).
- ii. Winter notes 144 paintings (1958:6); however UA CUR 30.1/1 shows that there were 142 paintings.
- iii. See Beard, M. (1993). 'Casts and cast-offs: The origins of the Museum of Classical Archaeology.' *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 39, 1-29. This paper shows the transfer of the Classical Antiquities Collections from the Fitzwilliam Museum to the Museum of Classical Antiquities.
- iv. J. Alsop borrows the phrase "the way of seeing" from Gertrude Stein in that "what" people see in different generations is not what differs by "how" they see it is what marks the difference (Alsop 1982: 4).

Appendix

Abstract from the Vice Chancellor's address during the laying of the first stone ceremony:
 'From the cultivation of the more refined arts we may naturally expect to derive the ordinary benefits, which they at all times confer upon civilized communities. But it is not necessary to limit our expectations within such narrow bounds since there is just reason to look forward to other advantages, allied to those which result from our severer philosophical studies. For things, when rightly viewed, whether they be the works of nature or of human genius, afford ample cause to admire and adore that Great Being, who is alike the Author of all material objects and of the intellect which is exercised upon them. Such reflections we should be always anxious to cherish; and thus, having the honour of the Supreme Being as the aim of all our efforts, we may the more freely indulge in the hope, that His benevolence and favour will guide them to a happy termination.'
 (UA CUR 30.1/117a)

v. On the history of the collector and his collections see D. Price (1989).

vi. David Price (1989) notes that the collections were not entirely geological. There were botanical and zoological specimens, and even archaeological artefacts amongst which were arrowheads and axes of flint

and stone which he distinguished as *artificialia* (Price 1989:90).