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“Raphael, or Ingres, or Picasso are meant to be meditated upon. [...] In order to meditate on a painting, it is essential to present it in a favorable location and within a calm atmosphere.”

Le Corbusier[1]

In this essay I will discuss the exhibition policies that were developed for a few altarpieces by Raphael in German and Italian museums during the nineteenth century and up to the first half of the twentieth century.[2] This study was inspired by Claudia Brink and Andreas Henning’s careful reconstruction of the various hangings of the Sistine Madonna from 1754, when the altarpiece arrived in Saxony after its removal from the church of San Sisto in Piacenza, to the present day in its current location in the Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister Dresden.

Fig. 1: View of the current installation of the Sistine Madonna in the Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister Dresden (Herbert Boswank, Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden).
Alte Meister in Dresden, where it is exhibited as the climax of the western wing’s stunning enfilade of Italian galleries (fig. 1). Furthermore, my investigation has been inspired by the current discourse on transnational museum history: extending beyond the theory, by now universally accepted, that museums have been the perfect place for the construction of national identity (at least since the nineteenth century), the new transnational perspective suggests that the history of museums, especially in Europe, is also a history of “cross-fertilization”, that is, a history of intense relationships among different institutions from different nations. After all, “the museum is open” by definition.

Raphael in Dresden

“Make space for the great Raphael!”: a famous gouache by Adolph Menzel bearing this title (1855/1859) (fig. 2) illustrates an anecdote which may have circulated at the court of Saxony from the middle of the eighteenth century, and which became well-known not only in Germany but to an international audience as well, after it was included in Johann David Passavant’s 1839 monograph on Raphael. The subject of Menzel’s painting, where the quick brushwork contributes to the strong cinematographic quality of the scene, is the enthusiastic welcoming of the Sistine Madonna (1512/13) to the court of August the Third, Elector of Saxony and King of Poland, on March 1, 1754. The king, dressed in an ermine mantel and a red turban, two obvious indications of his enormous wealth, is portrayed in the act of pushing away his own throne in order to make space for Raphael’s altarpiece, which has just been carried into the throne...
Fig. 3: Noël Lemire (after Charles Eisen), Allegory of the Installation of the Royal Picture Gallery in Dresden, vignette-frontispiece from Carl Heinrich von Heineken, Recueil d’Estampes d’après les plus célèbres Tableaux de la Galerie Royale de Dresden [...], 2 vols, 1753-1757, Vol. II, Dresden 1757, Etching 20.5 x 27.2 cm, Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett (Herbert Boswank, Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden).

Fig. 4: Michael Keyl, Plan of Dresden picture gallery in the former royal stable building known as "Stallhof", from Carl Heinrich von Heineken, Recueil d’Estampes d’après les plus célèbres Tableaux de la Galerie Royale de Dresden [...], 2 vols, 1753-1757, Vol. I, Dresden 1753, Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett (from Brink 2005, Der Name des Künstlers, p. 69). The different locations of Raphael’s Sistine Madonna are marked in blue: the painting hung first on the longest wall, to the right of the entrance, and later on the shorter wall, just opposite to the entrance.

room. The painting by Raphael, as is well known, had been eagerly awaited in Dresden: the negotiations for its purchase from the Benedictine monks of San Sisto in Piacenza had taken no less than two years, and the sum of 25,000 scudi romani that was finally agreed upon was the highest price which had ever been paid for a work of art. [6] As for the gouache by Menzel, the fact that the Sistine Madonna is hardly visible in the scene, and that it is not even mentioned in the title, the latter referring only to Raphael, expresses the actual significance of this famous purchase very well. Indeed, August the Third had not been interested in getting this particular altarpiece by the artist, a painting which he had never seen before its arrival in Dresden. What he really had wanted, was to own a work by Raphael — any work by Raphael! —, a wish which was perfectly in keeping with the opinion, widely held since the seventeenth century, that the name of Raphael on its own could sanction the excellence of any art collection. [7]

As a matter of fact, the court of Saxony did not immediately appreciate the solid perfection of Raphael’s style. Initially, local taste, with its passion for lavishly Rococo decoration, leaned towards the softer and vibrant quality of Correggio’s artistic style. Correggio’s Holy Night was given the place of honor not only in the second volume (1757) of the Gemäldegalerie’s precious Galeriewerk, where it appeared both as the vignette-frontispiece (fig. 3) and as the very first of the fifty etchings representing the royal collection (significantly enough, the Sistine Madonna was not included among them). [8] Furthermore, Holy Night also occupied the most prominent position in the physical space of the Gemäldegalerie, which had been housed in a
Renaissance building close to the Frauenkirche since 1745: the painting was exhibited on the first floor, at the center of the main wall of the so-called “inner gallery”, namely the horseshoe-shaped gallery dedicated to the Italian school.[9] As for the Sistine Madonna, it hung on the same long wall as Holy Night, but in a rather peripheral position (fig. 4). This very first placement of the altarpiece by Raphael corresponds, more or less, to the area which is occupied by Holy Night in a view of the “inner gallery” dated 1830, where a couple and their child stand at the foot of the painting by Correggio (fig. 5). This view is quite interesting because it documents the gallery’s drastic re-hanging of 1817: the Sistine Madonna is now exhibited on the wall opposite the entrance, that is, it is aligned with the direction of the visitor’s promenade, of which it constitutes the climax.[10] The altarpiece’s high ranking is further suggested by the symmetrical disposition of the paintings surrounding it. In a way, Dosso Dossi, Titian, and Carracci constitute a sort of meta-frame for the work by Raphael (fig. 6).[11]

The new placement of the Sistine Madonna visualizes how dramatically the perception of this altarpiece had changed since the last decades of the eighteenth century, when a number of key figures of the Romantic movement had started to celebrate this painting as the most perfect expression of the new Mariological component of their philosophy. According to the Schlegel brothers, and to Fichte, Wackenroder, and Novalis, the Virgin Mary represented the ultimate ideal of human reason, and the figure of the Virgin painted by Raphael embodied a kind of universal humanity.[12] While the writings of these philosophers and men of letters certainly did help draw attention to the Sistine Madonna, it was probably the sheer power and novelty of the image – a vision which is both incredibly celestial and real – that found its way into the hearts of a much larger public.[13] In fact, the increasing popularity enjoyed by the Sistine Madonna at the turn of the eighteenth century is indicated by the exceptional number of prints and copies made thereafter; soon, these prints would contribute to an even more widely extended fortuna of the image thanks to their reproducibility in almanacs and journals.[14] By the time of the painting’s re-hanging in 1817, the Sistine Madonna was on its way to become one of the first fetish-images of pop-culture.[15] On the one hand, this explains the museum’s decision to present it as the high point of the Italian gallery; on the other hand, such an exhibition strategy was destined to increase the picture’s popularity.

Another factor which may have contributed to the painting’s relocation in the Gemäldegalerie in 1817 is the renewed attention which Raphael’s entire production had been enjoying internationally since 1803, when the display of his works had been presented as the most prestigious section of the Musée Napoléon in Paris. Thanks to the systematic confiscation of art in the countries conquered by Napoleon, the director of the Louvre, Dominique Vivant Denon, had been able to collect the largest number of works by Raphael that a museum would ever possess.[16] Furthermore, he had arranged them along the walls of the Grand Gallery according
to the most modern criteria, concentrating on this single artist in what we could call a “proto-monographic way”, and presenting the paintings in a broad chronological order. For instance, Raphael’s last and most celebrated work, the *Transfiguration*, was presented as the climax of the installation, as Denon himself explained in a famous letter to Napoleon, dated January 1, 1803. Above, hung two works by Perugino, Raphael’s teacher; on the sides and below, other works by Raphael had been distributed in order to reconstruct the later evolution of his style (fig. 7).[17]

The importance of the presentation of Raphael’s œuvre at the Louvre cannot be overestimated. First of all, it is documented that this presentation was quite influential in the work of both Quatremère de Quincy and Passavant, the authors of the two studies on Raphael that are unanimously acknowledged as the first modern monographs in art history.[18] As a matter of fact, it could be argued that the strict chronological arrangement of their catalogues hinted at not only Winckelmann’s “revolutionary conception of art history as history”,[19] but also Denon’s new exhibition criteria. Furthermore, in the introduction to his book on Raphael, published in 1824, Quatremère proudly stated that he had had the advantage of actually, and repeatedly, seeing almost all of the paintings for which he was providing information.[20] In spite of the author’s well-known acquaintance with Italy and its monuments, it is difficult to imagine that he would have been able to make the observation he did if he had not been quite familiar with the exceptionally rich presentation of the works of Raphael in the Grand Gallery.[21] As for Johann David Passavant, whose monograph came out
in 1839, his enthusiasm for the “immortal Raphael” was definitely fueled by the frequent visits he paid to the Louvre from 1809 to 1813, a highly formative experience that he described explicitly, as well as movingly, in a few letters to his mother.

Another factor indicating that Denon’s installation at the Louvre was quite influential for the modern understanding of art or Kunstinn (as Passavant liked to call it) can be detected in the new way of organizing the collections that characterized many European institutions after Napoleon’s fall in 1815. When most of the works exhibited at the Louvre were restituted to their countries of origin, the new public museums which soon opened in these countries ended up adopting Denon’s modern exhibiting criteria. This meant that their collections were organized according to schools and chronology, and, in the cases involving paintings attributed to Raphael, that one or more rooms would be dedicated to these. This is true, for instance, of Berlin’s Altes Museum, inaugurated in 1830: on the first floor, the five works attributed to Raphael (mostly small-format Madonna and Child paintings) were divided up between two rooms, where they hung together with works by artists who were considered to have been influential for Raphael, or to have been influenced by him (fig. 8). The first room carried the title Pinturicchio – Raphael als Lehrling (Raphael as Pupil), and the second room was called Fra Bartolomeo – Raphael als Meister (Raphael as Teacher). Similar exhibition criteria were adopted for the Alte Pinakothek in Munich, the founding stone of which had been laid on April 7, 1826, namely on the day which was believed to be Raphael’s birthday. Inaugurated in 1836, the museum’s first floor contained three large rooms dedicated to the Italian school (room VII to IX) (fig. 9). Room IX, the last and most important of these spaces, was called Raphael Saal: here a small group of works by the artist (or attributed to him), culminating in the famous Madonna
Canigiani, were shown together with Verrocchio, Perugino, Correggio, and a few other High Renaissance and Baroque artists.\[26\]

The situation at the Gemäldegalerie in Dresden, however, was unique. The royal collection had been spared Napoleon’s confiscation because France needed Saxony’s political support.\[27\] Having thus missed the kind of rethinking that resulted from a direct confrontation with the Louvre of Dominique Vivant Denon, the Dresden re-hanging of 1817 looked quite old-fashioned. Certainly, it did follow the division between Italian and Northern schools, this being a criterion which had by that time become canonical in museums all over Europe; yet the collection was still organized mainly according to symmetry, not chronology. This is quite visible in the wall-section where the Sistine Madonna is displayed, where the crowded accrochage, albeit decorative, has a strong Baroque flavor (fig. 6). Indeed, this museum’s installation was perceived as obsolete and confusing by the public itself, which increasingly criticized it.\[28\] After undergoing a short-term re-hanging in 1833, the Gemäldegalerie was finally reorganized in a more modern style when it moved to the new building by Gottfried Semper in 1855.\[29\]

On the first floor, the rooms of the western wing (namely those to the left of the octagonal tribuna for the visitors coming from the main staircase) (fig. 10, G), displayed the Italian school, those to the right the other schools, i.e. German, Flemish, and Spanish painting. All works were arranged according to chronology and size: the large altarpieces in the main galleries, the smaller ones in the cabinets.

As for the Sistine Madonna, the time had finally come in which the museum was seriously willing to “make space for the great Raphael”: in fact, one wonders whether it can be a mere coincidence that the gouache by Menzel carrying this title was painted precisely in the same year, 1855, or shortly after (fig. 2). The altarpiece by Raphael hung all by itself in Room A (fig. 10, A), i.e. the last room visitors would reach whether they had walked through the main galleries or through the cabinets. Extrapolated from the chronological disposition followed by the rest of the collection, and finally isolated, the painting had definitely become the climax of the museum’s experience, its sancta sanctorum.\[30\] In the following year, the sacred aura of Raphael’s masterpiece was further emphasized by framing it within a beautiful Neo-Renaissance structure in the shape of an altar (fig. 11). The painting’s importance, as well as the myth surrounding the name of its author, were further accentuated by means of two inscriptions: the one in the upper part of the frame read RAPHAEL SANZIO, while the one in the area corresponding to the altar’s paliotto recorded the description of the painting as provided by Vasari in the 1568 edition of his Lives.\[31\] Later on, in 1898-1899, Room A was
redecorated with the clear intent of suggesting the lavish atmosphere of a Renaissance palace: its ceiling and walls were heavily ornamented, elegant wood-work and precious material (a document speaks of “soft red silk damask”), a large curtain – also red – was hung behind the painting, a sofa was placed in front of it[32] (fig. 12). Interestingly enough, this installation seems to have anticipated the famous historicizing trend that characterized Wilhelm von Bode’s evocative rooms at the Kaiser-Friedrich Museum in Berlin, inaugurated in 1904.[33] As for the Sistine Madonna, it was kept in its splendid isolation until 1939, when the museum had to be evacuated. In fact, it was only in 1956 that the painting, after a ten-year stay in Moscow, was exhibited again in the west wing of the Dresden Gemäldegalerie, where it was finally integrated in the rest of the collection and exhibited as it still is today.[34]

Raphael in Bologna and Milan

I am convinced that the nineteenth-century presentation of the Sistine Madonna in Dresden, where philological accuracy was sacrificed in favor of a spectacular hanging, was quite influential in the exhibition strategies adopted by at least two Italian museums, each of which possessed a major altarpiece by Raphael. These altarpieces were (and still are) perceived to be the undisputed highlights of the respective collections. I am referring to the Pinacoteca Nazionale in Bologna, which has owned the Ecstasy of Santa Cecilia (ca. 1518) since 1816, and to the Pinacoteca di Brera in Milan, which acquired the

Fig. 10: Plan of the first floor of the Royal Picture Gallery in Dresden, from Julius Hübner, Verzeichniss der Königlichen Gemälde-Galerie zu Dresden [...], Dresden 1856 (Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kunstbibliothek). The Raphael Room (Room A) is marked in blue.
Marriage of the Virgin (1504) in 1806. In different ways, both institutions were the result of the cultural politics of Napoleon, and were shaped by the restitution of the works that had been confiscated during the Napoleonic campaigns of 1796-1798. However, in a typically Italian way, there was a noticeable delay in these museums' adoption of the modern criteria of the Musée Napoléon, at least in comparison to analogous institutions in Germany. Their collections underwent an initial, thorough reorganization at the turn of the nineteenth century, and subsequent reinstallations during the following decades. In general, the directors in charge made a visible effort to hang the works of art in a more strictly chronological order, and to be more consistent in dividing them up according to different schools, whether Italian or of foreign origin. However, when confronted with the art of Raphael, they all seem to have shared the urge to isolate his masterpieces within a specially decorated space, thus revealing the intention to transform it into their museum’s sancta sanctorum.

BOLOGNA. The Pinacoteca Nazionale di Bologna originates to a large degree in the Napoleonic suppression of churches and convents in Italy, including the Papal States, from 1796 to 1810. The Accademia Clementina, the Bolognese academy for artistic education, which had been officially approved by Pope Clement XI in 1711, and which had received a few important donations of paintings in the course of the century, was immediately put in charge of collecting and securing the most significant works of art from suppressed institutions in Bologna and surroundings. The importance of this mission became evident after July 1796, when a large group of major altarpieces was transferred to Paris: this group included Raphael’s Ecstasy of Santa Cecilia, which had been removed from the suppressed church of San Giovanni in Monte on July 2, 1796.

In 1802, as a consequence of the new Napoleonic laws on public education, the Accademia Clementina ceased its existence, being
transformed into Accademia di Belle Arti, a national institution which had its Milanese counterpart in the Accademia di Belle Arti di Brera, founded at the very same time. In 1803, the new Bolognese Accademia, together with its collection of paintings, settled in the former Jesuit convent of Sant’Ignazio, namely the building facing Via Belle Arti where both the Accademia Clementina and the Pinacoteca Nazionale are still located.[38] In 1816, the academy’s picture gallery, which at that time did not occupy more than three large rooms in the complex of Sant’Ignazio, boasted no less than eighteen altarpieces from the group that had left Bologna for the Louvre twenty years before, and which had been restituted in 1815 thanks to the efforts of Antonio Canova. Before being moved to the Pinacoteca, the restituted altarpieces, including Raphael’s Santa Cecilia, were shown in a public exhibition held in the former church of Santo Spirito, like Sant’Ignazio ecclesiastical property seized by the French. Interestingly, here the work by Raphael had been placed at the end of the stunning sequence of paintings by the Carracci, Domenichino, Guercino, and Reni, a choice which deliberately ignored chronology in order to make clear the collection’s priorities.[39] Since then, the painting by Raphael has always been considered the Pinacoteca’s “principal ornament”, as the archbishop of Bologna Cardinal Oppizzoni significantly called it (1831).[40] Just like the Sistine Madonna, the Santa Cecilia enjoyed an exceptional, and constantly increasing...
popularity thanks to the large number of reproductions published in Bologna throughout the nineteenth century and relying – in the case of the Santa Cecilia – on a quite prestigious tradition of etchings going back to Marcantonio Raimondi.[41]

As for its location within the museum’s spaces, the Santa Cecilia does not seem ever to have been separated from the rest of the collection. An overview of the museum’s catalogues from the nineteenth and twentieth century suggests that the painting must almost always have been exhibited together with the Madonna in Glory and Saints by Perugino (1497-1499), an altarpiece also coming from the church of San Giovanni in Monte (and subsequently from the Louvre). Besides Perugino, i.e. Raphael’s teacher, other artists – mostly not belonging to the Bolognese school – were represented in the same room with Raphael. It was precisely in order to give Raphael and his companions a more appropriate space that, at the end of the 1850s, one of the first additions to the picture gallery was constructed (fig. 13, nr. 10). In fact, this new room continued to serve as the exhibition space for the Santa Cecilia until the museum’s major renovation in 1957-1973, when the entire Renaissance section was moved to its present location, i.e. the new north-west wing of the complex of Sant’Ignazio, facing Via Irnerio (fig. 13, nr. 11). From the 1890s to 1957, this work by Raphael was constantly presented together with works by Parmigianino, Bugiardini, Cima da Conegliano, and others, in the category “non-Bolognese schools”, a designation to which the current installation has remained faithful.[42]
Fig. 15: Plan of the first floor of the Pinacoteca di Brera according to the project submitted in 1899 in view of the riordi-namento by Corrado Ricci, Milan, Sovrintendenza ai Monumenti della Lombardia, Archivio Storico (from Balestri 2006, Il colore di Milano, p. 125). The sequence of four large rooms to the right corresponds to the Saloni Napoleonici, while the Raphael Room is marked in blue.

Most likely, two main factors contributed to the fact that the Santa Cecilia was never separated from the rest of the collection: first, the Bolognese Pinacoteca has always suffered from a lack of space; secondly, this museum has concentrated on its local school from the very beginning, a perspective that implies that every other work was (and still is) mainly to be understood from the point of view of its contribution to, or relationship with, Bolognese painting. However, the idea of isolating Raphael’s Santa Cecilia in a special space was under discussion on the occasion of the important refurbishment undertaken between 1882 and 1890, right after the Pinacoteca had become independent from the Accademia di Belle Arti.[43] Cesare Masini, the director of the new Pinacoteca, was deeply aware of the fact that the museum needed, besides more space, a general riordinamento of the collection. According to the project he submitted to the Ministry of Public Education in
1887, the reorganized picture gallery was to have exhibited Bolognese painting backwards, starting with Guido Reni in Room I and ending with Francesco Francia in Room V. Room VI, the last one, was supposed to present all the works belonging to the other Italian schools including the Santa Cecilia, but only temporarily: in fact, the latter was meant to be moved into a temple-like aedicule which had been especially designed for this purpose.[44] This part of the project, most likely to be understood as a niche-like structure to be built in Room VI, appears to have been particularly close to Masini’s heart. In a letter to Minister Carlo Fiorilli of 1884, the Pinacoteca director had already explained that this special presentation, which he described “as a royal palace for the prince of painters”, was necessary because the art of Raphael fell outside of, and was above, any category of “school”. [45] Nevertheless, Masini did not exclude the possibility that the planned aedicule might be surrounded by the works by Perugino, Timoteo Viti, and Francia, all of whom were Raphael’s teachers and friends, at least according to a well-known, albeit highly disputed tradition that goes back to Vasari’s Lives.[46]

It is no wonder that the riordinamento proposed by Masini did not receive the approval of the Ministry of Public Education: its inconsistency, together with a number of disputable attributions, was harshly criticized by Adolfo Venturi, and in the end it was the latter’s recommendations that were approved by the Roman authorities in 1890 and were destined to shape the rehanging of the Bolognese Pinacoteca in the following years.[47] As a consequence, the aedicule destined to contain the Santa Cecilia was never executed. And yet, the idea of physically singling out Raphael’s altarpiece as the museum’s sancta sanctorum seems to have left its echo in the following decades: first, at the turn of the century, when the painting was given a new frame reproducing its original ancona,[48] and secondly under the directorship of Francesco Malaguzzi Valeri (1914-1928), when the entire picture gallery was reinstalled according to the current “historicizing” trend.[49] On that occasion, the Santa Cecilia was placed upon a pedestal vaguely reminiscent of an altar (a solution certainly due also to the exceptional weight of its ancona), and the section of the wall surrounding it was decorated with an elegant Renaissance pattern (fig. 14).

As for Masini’s original project of enclosing the painting within an aedicule, it is quite possible that this idea was somehow inspired by the exceptional presentation which the Dresden Gemäldegalerie had reserved for the Sistine Madonna since 1855, when the royal collection had been moved to the new building by Gottfried Semper facing the Zwinger (1847-1854). As mentioned above, the altarpiece had been located in a room of its own, and its sacral aura had been enhanced by framing the panel with a Neorenaissance structure in the shape of an altar. In fact, this sumptuous installation must have been well known to at least one leading figure in Bologna’s cultural and political life, namely Marco Minghetti (1818-1886), and it is him whom I suspect to have worked as trait d’union of ideas between the Gemäldegalerie and the Pinacoteca. Minghetti, a cosmopolitan intellectual with an exceptionally broad range of interests – from natural sciences to philosophy, from economics to art history –, held a number of prestigious political appointments, working first for the Papal State, later on for the Regno d’Italia.[50] Germany appears to have been a frequent destination in his numerous trips abroad, and he definitely had first-hand knowledge of the museums in Dresden, Berlin, and Munich, as can be gathered from the speech he gave in 1854 at the Accademia di Belle Arti in Bologna. On that occasion, while implicitly encouraging the Bolognese accademici to develop a more progressive view of artistic production, Minghetti also mentioned the new building by Gottfried Semper for the Gemäldegalerie in Dresden as one of the best foreign examples of modern creativity in art and architecture.[51] In the early 1880s, after having retired from political life, Minghetti devoted himself to studying, among
other things, the œuvre of Raphael. It was an intense activity, which culminated in an ambitious monograph published in Bologna in 1885. Needless to say, in this book the author demonstrates first-hand knowledge of most of Raphael’s paintings, including the *Sistine Madonna*, whose chromatic nuances he also carefully describes. In my opinion, it can hardly be a coincidence that Masini was planning to enclose the *Santa Cecilia* within an aedicule – a solution vaguely reminiscent of the *Sistine Madonna*’s isolated setting in Dresden – in the same years in which Minghetti was intensively writing about Raphael. Although quite different in their personalities, the progressive statesman and the conservative director must have known each other well, as confirmed by the fact that Masini himself wrote the eulogy that the Accademia di Belle Arti published in memory of its honorary member Minghetti in 1886. In light of this, the hypothesis that the two *accademici* had the opportunity of exchanging information and ideas about Raphael and the exhibition strategies adopted abroad for the famous master from Urbino does not seem particularly farfetched.

**MILAN.** The Pinacoteca di Brera was inaugurated on the 15th of August, 1809, namely on Napoleon’s fortieth birthday, a date which was chosen in order to stress the very special role played by the Milanese museum within the Emperor’s cultural politics. Since the beginning of the French domination, Milan had been acknowledged as the capital city first of the Repubblica Cisalpina (1797), then of the Regno d’Italia, of which Napoleon had proclaimed himself king on May 26, 1805. In light if this, the collection of the Accademia di Belle Arti di Brera, an academy originally founded under the Austrian government in 1776, had been conceived as a grand national project: this “Royal Gallery” would confront students “with the progression of art history from its very beginning to the present, and with examples of the various styles of one same artist”, while contributing to “the general improvement of good taste” among citizens. To make this ambitious project possible, during the first decade of the nineteenth century Brera became the official repository of the exceptional number of “homeless” paintings resulting from the suppression of religious institutions which took place not only in Lombardy, but also in Veneto, as well as in those regions that the French troops had taken away from the Papal States, namely Emilia, Romagna, the Marches, and Umbria.

A further sign of the Emperor’s support of the Milanese Pinacoteca, which was explicitly meant to become the Louvre’s counterpart in Italy, was the acquisition of an exceptional group of paintings that vicere Eugenio de Beauharnais (Napoleon’s adoptive son) made possible in March 1806: Raphael’s *Marriage of the Virgin* (1504), originally located in the church of San Francesco in the Umbrian town of Città di Castello, was the undisputed highlight of this purchase. Two months later, the very first exhibition of the academy’s picture gallery was organized within the spaces of the Brera complex, a former Jesuit convent which had been housing a number of educational institutions since the times of Maria Theresa of Austria. On that occasion, the paintings – representing a wide range of ages and schools from various parts of Italy – were distributed among three rooms bearing the name of the most illustrious artist each of them hosted: “Bramante Room”, “Raphael Room”, “Luini Room”. Because of an obvious lack of space, these rooms presented a rather crowded and chaotic *accrochage*, as can be gathered from the fact that the altarpiece by Raphael was exhibited together with works by Orazio Gentileschi, Daniele Crespi, Camillo Procaccini, and Marco d’Oggiono (to mention just a few of the artists whose works were included in the *Sala Raffaello*). This situation, evidently quite far from the exhibition principles which Dominique Vivant Denon had applied at the *Musée Napoléon*, does not seem to have changed much throughout the entire nineteenth century, that is from 1809 onwards – when the most prestigious pieces of the collection were moved to the four
monumental galleries, still known as Saloni Napoletanici, which were added to the museum on occasion of its official inauguration (fig. 15) – until 1882, when the Milanese Pinacoteca was separated from the Accademia di Belle Arti, thus obtaining its administrative independence, a process we have already encountered in the discussion of the Pinacoteca di Bologna.\[59\]

Whereas Giuseppe Bertini, the first director of Brera as a state museum (of which he was in charge from 1882 to 1898), shaped the collection mainly by promoting new acquisitions and exchanges with other institutions, credit must be given to his successor, Corrado Ricci, for having given the Pinacoteca its much-needed riordinamento. Originally from Ravenna, with one university degree in law and another in the humanities, Corrado Ricci (1858-1934) was an exceptionally open-minded scholar with a solid background both in art history and archeology. He came to Brera in 1898 after having reorganized the Royal Gallery in Parma, and left it to become director of the Uffizi in Florence in 1903.\[60\] In fact, he was the first person in charge of the Milanese Pinacoteca who had not been selected from among the painters belonging to the Brera Academy,\[61\] which explains why his approach in reorganizing the collection was more scholarly than aesthetically oriented.

To use Ricci’s own words, he followed “the criterion, which today is generally considered to be the best one, of separating the paintings according to schools, and the schools according to centuries”.\[62\] As Ricci himself willingly admitted, this major transformation had been made possible first and foremost by annexing fifteen new rooms, mostly as a consequence of the fact that a large number of sculptures and modern paintings had been moved to the Castello Sforzesco. The new Pinacoteca di Brera, inaugurated on June 1, 1903, presented itself as a truly modern museum characterized by the most rational distribution not only of its paintings, but also of its spaces: indeed, the rooms’ sequence suggested an ideal tour which allowed visitors to move along the Italian peninsula from north to south, from east to west. Labels with information about both the works on exhibit and the respective artists contributed to the clarity of this promenade, and clarity appears to have been the main criterion of the installation itself. Great care was taken in hanging the paintings with the best lighting possible, as well as on the most appropriate background. Ricci had decided to paint the galleries’ walls in a peculiar shade of green described as “dry” (verde secco), a light color that had been chosen in order to avoid the “oppressive” effect of the dark background characterizing more traditional collections.\[63\]

In short, the 1903 installation of Brera appears to have been as rationally organized as soberly decorated, and this makes the spectacular presentation that Corrado Ricci reserved for Raphael’s Marriage of the Virgin even more remarkable. In the previous decades the altarpiece, the popularity of which had steadily increased thanks to frequent reproductions, had been exhibited in a relatively narrow room together with works by a number of other Renaissance masters from Northern Italy such as Bellini and Mantegna, Bergognone and Luini, Carpaccio and Titian.\[64\] Following his geographical criterion, Ricci placed the Marriage within the schools of Central Italy, which he located in two large rooms in the southern area of the Brera complex, namely the corner room – itself divided into three sections corresponding to Rooms XXII-XXIV, plus one small storage area – and the room to the left, corresponding to Room XXV (fig. 15). The largest section of the corner room, i.e. Room XXII, was entirely devoted to the altarpiece by Raphael, an honor which the artist from Urbino did not share with any other painter whose œuvre was represented in the Milanese collection. The Marriage of the Virgin was now placed upon a large wooden pedestal; the walls behind it had been given a niche-like form, so that the room was vaguely reminiscent of the octagonal shape of the Uffizi’s Tribuna, i.e. the sancta sanctorum in the history of museums by definition (indeed, the word “tribuna” seems to have been used to define this space).\[65\]
Furthermore, these walls were completely covered by a curtain made of dark green velvet, which was arranged in elegant drapes, conferring the altarpiece’s background a solemn rhythm. This meditative atmosphere was completed by two rows of Neorenaissance chairs, of the type known as "Savonarola", which had been placed at the sides of the painting (fig. 16).

Definitely, Ricci’s sumptuous presentation of the Marriage had much in common with the installation that the Gemäldegalerie in Dresden had conceived for the Sistine Madonna in 1898-1899 (figs. 10-12). Can this be just a coincidence? Is it possible that the exceptional – and exceptionally similar – mises en scène conceived for the altarpieces by Raphael in the museums of Dresden and Milan during the very first years of the twentieth century were nothing more than two totally independent examples of the historicizing trend which would soon dominate the presentation of art collections not only in Europe, but also in the United States? I do not think so. Corrado Ricci had travelled through Germany in 1894, when he visited Munich, Dresden, and Berlin. By that time the Sistine Madonna was already displayed all by itself and enclosed within its monumental frame, as it had been since 1855/56, although its room (Room A) had not yet been redecorated to evoke the aura of a Renaissance palace, a project documented by the sketches of 1898. However, Ricci must have been impressed by the fact that his German colleagues had placed the painting by Raphael in a room of its own; furthermore, it may very well be that he heard about their project of increasing the sancta sanctorum-effect for Room A. At the moment, this hypothesis is mere speculation: on the other hand, we know for sure that Ricci did stay in touch with the director of the Gemäldegalerie in Dresden, Karl Woermann, since he contacted him on the occasion of a petition – better known as Concordato artistico – that he promoted in 1900 in order to have the Baroque frescoes removed from the dome-area in the church of San Vitale, in his native town Ravenna. Woermann, who had been directing the Gemäldegalerie since 1882 (he would retire in 1910), signed the Concordato to-
gether with many other professionals in the field of monument preservation from all over Europe. German art historians are particularly well represented in this document, and those from Dresden number as many as four, which suggests that Ricci had made numerous fruitful acquaintances during his stay in that city.\[67\]

In fact, if Germany had been influential in Ricci’s work for Brera, this project of his must have been followed with some interest in Germany, as indicated by the excellent review that Wilhelm von Bode, the famous director of Berlin’s royal collections, published in the pages of the journal Kunstchronik only a few months after the new Milanese Pinacoteca had been inaugurated. In his article, Bode praised Corrado Ricci as “one of Italy’s most active art historians”, adding that “[in Brera] he has completed within a few years what in other Italian collections has been discussed for decades, and in the end has not been executed.”\[68\]

Although Bode did not mention Ricci’s installation of the Marriage of the Virgin, it is quite likely that the solemn aura of that room did appeal to his historicizing taste. On the other hand, this presentation was criticized as “a decoration worthy of a wall-paper shop” by at least one Milanese contemporary.\[69\] This judgment may later have been silently shared by Ettore Modigliani and Piero Portaluppi, respectively the director and the architect who reorganized the Milanese Pinacoteca in 1920-1925, on occasion of the museum’s reopening after World War I. The altarpiece by Raphael was not removed from Room XXII (as a matter of fact, the Marriage has never left this area of the picture gallery), yet an effort was made to better contextualize it within the Umbro-Marchigiana school by placing it together with works by Piero della Francesca, Giovanni Santi (Raphael’s father), Timoteo Viti, Luca Signorelli, and a few others.\[70\] The painting by Raphael, however, was still presented as the room’s undisputed highlight: the wall behind it was covered by the most elegant boiserie in dark walnut, and the panel, together with its Neoclassical frame, was further enclosed within an altar-like structure bearing the golden inscription “RAPHAEL” in the area corresponding to the paliotto, a solution recalling (again!) the monumental frame that had been carved for the Sistine Madonna seventy years before (fig. 17).

Fig. 18: Installation of the Raphael Room by architect Piero Portaluppi according to the riordinamento by Ettore Modigliani and Fernanda Wittgens, 1950 (from Milan 1984, Raffaelo e Brera, p. 22).

And yet, when architect Portaluppi undertook his second riordinamento of the Pinacoteca in 1946-1950 (first under the directorship of Modigliani, then Fernanda Wittgens), the altarpiece by Raphael was given its “splendid isolation” back: Portaluppi placed it in a chapel-like space constituting the climax of an almost mystical promenade which started in two other rooms dedicated to Bramante and Piero della Francesca (fig. 18). In a way, one gets the impression that the lesson of Corrado Ricci, as well as the one of his colleagues in Dresden, had never been entirely forgotten.\[71\]
A Final Note for Further Investigations

In this essay, I have argued that the similarities between the presentation of the altarpieces by Raphael in Bologna and Milan, and of the Sistine Madonna in Dresden were the result of specific interchanges among people in the field, be they museum directors, art historians, or intellectuals in general. Further investigation involving other institutions might very well provide analogous results. The Pinacoteca Vaticana, which was also deeply affected by Napoleon’s cultural politics, could constitute an interesting starting point since this museum owns an exceptional number of works by Raphael, including as many as three great altarpieces: the Oddi Altarpiece (1503-1504), the Madonna di Foligno (1511-1512), and the Transfiguration (1519-1520). As is well known, the latter has always been considered Raphael’s absolute masterpiece, and this judgment appears to have inspired the Pinacoteca Vaticana’s exhibition policy throughout the entire nineteenth century in spite of the fact that, from 1817 to 1857, the collection changed its location within the Vatican Palace a number of times. In 1817, when the Pinacoteca was located in the Apartment Bor-

gia, and in 1822, when it was moved to the Apartment of Pius V, the Transfiguration was indeed exhibited as the very first painting visitors would come upon in the very first room: nevertheless, it was presented together with a number of works by Raphael or by other artists. On the other hand, in 1857, when the collection was moved to the Apartment of Gregory XIII, an attempt was clearly made to “isolate” the Transfiguration by moving it into a separate room together with the Madonna di Foligno and Domenichino’s Last Communion of St. Jerome (fig. 19). While Raphael’s earlier work was placed rather inconspicuously at the back of the room, the Transfiguration stood on a monumental easel in front of the altarpiece by Domenichino, which was considered to be the only painting worthy of entertaining an ideal conversation with Raphael’s final and greatest work.

In light of the process of “cross-fertilization” between the Gemäldegalerie in Dresden and the Italian museums I have discussed above, it seems legitimate to wonder whether the spectacular presentation which the altarpiece by Raphael was given in the Pinacoteca Vaticana in 1857, and which was done at the expenses of the rest of the collection, ignoring the museum’s lack of space, may have been influenced by the fact that the Sistine Madonna had been placed in a room of its own in Dresden only two years before (1855). Of course, similarities of this kind may very well result from a general “museum Zeitgeist” involving both space distribution and installation trends all over Europe. This could also be the case for the monumental frames that were carved for the three altarpieces by Raphael around 1932, when the Pinacoteca Vaticana was moved to its first autonomous building (still its current location), a late work by the Milanese architect Luca Beltrami. On that occasion, all the works by Raphael (including his tapestries) were finally presented together, namely according to a strict monographic criterion, in the museum’s largest room (Room VIII) (fig. 20). The three altarpieces

Fig. 19: Installation of the Raphael Room at the time when the Pinacoteca Vaticana was located in the Apartment of Gregory XIII, 1857-1909 (from Pietrangeli 1985, I Musei Vaticani, p. 174).
The Raphael Room were framed within three Neorenaissance structures which, albeit different from each other, all looked noticeably similar not only to the structure which had been enclosing the *Sistine Madonna* since 1856, but also to the one which used to frame the *Marriage of the Virgin* in the Brera installation of circa 1925-1940 (fig. 21). In this case, architect Beltrami, who had been a key figure in Milanese cultural life since the turn of the century, and had followed the development of Brera with great interest on occasion of the *riordinamento* of Corrado Ricci,[76] is likely to have worked as *trait d’union* between the Pinacoteca Vaticana and its Milanese counterpart concerning the presentation of the altarpieces by Raphael. This is one of the issues that could be the object of further investigation.

By leading the reader of this essay along a virtual journey through some of Europe’s most prestigious museums, I have tried to demonstrate two main concepts. First, the Louvre of Domini-que Vivant Denon shaped the picture galleries not only in Germany, but also in Italy in the deepest way possible, namely in respect to both collecting criteria and exhibition strategies. Secondly, the intense (albeit not always immediate) relationships which developed in the course of the nineteenth century between the collections in Paris, Berlin, Munich, and Dresden, but also between those in Dresden, Bologna, Milan, and Rom, demonstrate once again that museums are indeed an ideal place for transnational discourse and cultural exchange.
Fig. 21: Installation of the Raphael Room in the new Pinacoteca Vaticana by architect Luca Beltrami under director Biagio Biagetti, 1932 (from La nuova Pinacoteca Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1932, Pl. XIV).

Notes

1. “Raphaël ou Ingres ou Picasso sont faits pour être médités. […] Pour méditer devant un tableau, il faut qu’il soit présenté en bonne place et dans une atmosphère calme.” Le Corbusier, Vers une architecture, Paris 1924, p. 94.

2. A first draft of this essay was presented at the session “Exhibiting Renaissance Art”, which I had organized for the Renaissance Society of America’s annual conference in Berlin (March 25-28, 2015). The other participants in this session, which was chaired by Julien Chapuis of the Bode Museum, were Neville Rowley and Federica Manoli, whose papers are also published in this issue of kunsttexte.de. I would like to thank Catherine Framm for having edited my English text with her usual thoroughness and scholarly involvement.


8. Recueil d’estampes d’après les plus célèbres tableaux de la Galerie royale de Dresde, Dresden, Royal Gallery, ed. Carl Heinrich von Heineken, 2 vols., Dresden 1753-1757. Galeriewerke can be considered a form of proto-catalogues of the XVII- and XVIII century: they were luxury in-folio publications of etchings from selected works of art which were thought to best represent a given collection. The Dresden original Galeriewerk consisted of two volumes (the third one was published only in 1870), each containing fifty etchings: the first volume was published in 1753, the second one in 1757, i.e. three years after the Sistine Madonna had entered the royal collection. In this volume, the frontispiece-vignette by Noël Lemire (after Charles Eisen) represents the Genius of painting in the act of indicating the prominent place where Correggio’s Holy Night should be hung, that is in the lower row at the center of the wall which is visible in the background. In the very same volume, Correggio’s Holy Night inaugurates...

9. The building in question is today’s Johanneum, now housing the Dresden Museum of Transportation: originally known as Stallhof because it used to host the royal mews, it was refurbished in 1745-1746 by Johann Christoph Knöffel in order to exhibit the Elector’s collection of paintings. On its space organization see Brink 2005, Der Name des Künstlers, pp. 68-69; Andreas Henning, Bernardo Bellotto, ’Der Neumarkt zu Dresden vom Judenhof aus (Neumarkt mit altem Galeriegebäude)’, 1749, in: Henning (ed.) 2012, Die Sixtinische Madonna, p. 226.


11. Professor Tristan Weddigen of the University of Zurich is the author of the excellent reconstruction of this fascinating accrochage. Brink 2005, Der Name des Künstlers, pp. 84-85.


16. A Louvre catalogue of 1803, dedicated uniquely to Raphael, records as many as 35 works; half of them at the very least had been confiscated in Italy from 1796 to 1798. See Manuel du Muséum Français. École italienne – Œuvre de Raphaël, Paris, Musée du Louvre, ed. François Emmanuel Toulonogeon, Paris 1803. According to Andrew McClellan, the paintings by Raphael (or attributed to him) which were confiscated in Italy were 15, while Martin Rosenberg lists 16 of them (and yet writes that they were 17). See Andrew McClellan, Inventing the Louvre. Art, Politics, and the Origins of the Modern Museum in Eighteenth-Century Paris, Cambridge 1994, pp. 140-148, especially p. 137; Martin Rosenberg, Raphael and France. The Artist as Paradigm and Symbol, University Park, 1995, pp. 147-164, especially pp. 149, 188.


16. A Louvre catalogue of 1803, dedicated uniquely to Raphael, records as many as 35 works; half of them at the very least had been confiscated in Italy from 1796 to 1798. See Manuel du Muséum Français. École italienne – Œuvre de Raphaël, Paris, Musée du Louvre, ed. François Emmanuel Toulonogeon, Paris 1803. According to Andrew McClellan, the paintings by Raphael (or attributed to him) which were confiscated in Italy were 15, while Martin Rosenberg lists 16 of them (and yet writes that they were 17). See Andrew McClellan, Inventing the Louvre. Art, Politics, and the Origins of the Modern Museum in Eighteenth-Century Paris, Cambridge 1994, pp. 140-148, especially p. 137; Martin Rosenberg, Raphael and France. The Artist as Paradigm and Symbol, University Park, 1995, pp. 147-164, especially pp. 149, 188.


able to 1802-1803. See Maria e Richard Cosway, ed. Tino Gipponi, Turin 1998.


20. "J’ai eu l’avantage de voir et de revoir la presque totalité des ouvrages dont je rends compte". Quatremère de Quincy 1824, Histoire de la vie, p. XVI.

21. As it has been recently demonstrated, “Quatremère’s position on the museum [as institution] was more complex than the outright condemnation that his attitude towards Lenoir’s project [of the Museum of French Monuments] implied, and which has survived widely associated with Quatremère’s name". Alexandra Stara, The Museum of French Monuments 1795-1816. “Killing art to make history”, Farnham 2013, p. 140.

22. “Ich kann dir nicht verbergen, daß mich jeher die Kunst sehr angezogen hat, und so sehr ich auch besonders seit vorigem Jahr dagegen gestritten habe, jetzt mehr als je, da mein Sinn, durch das öftere Betrachten der herrlichen Kunstwerke welche von allen Ländern hier zusammen gebracht worden sind, immer mehr angefacht und gebildet wurde” (letter of Passavant to his mother, dated July 10, 1812); "Ich wünschte ich könnte nur auf ein paar Tage mit dir diese göttlichen Werke auf ein paar Tage mit dir diese göttlichen Werke bewundern, es würde auch ein unbeschreiblicher Genuss für deinen Kunstsinn seyn" (letter of Passavant to his mother, dated March 5, 1812): both documents are quoted in Schröter 1990, Raffael-Kult, p. 325.


24. The first room exhibited the paintings corresponding to the catalogue numbers 208-239, which included works by Giovanni Santi, Perugino and Pinturicchio; the second room exhibited the catalogue numbers 240-268, including copies from (or school of) Raphael, Francesco Francia, Fra Bartolomeo, Andrea del Sarto. Gustav Friedrich Waagen, Verzeichnis der Gemälde-Sammlung des Königlichen Museums zu Berlin, Berlin 1830 (an static reprint Berlin 2000), pp. 61-73. The importance of the Louvre as an inspiring example for the foundation of the Altes Museum, i. e. Berlin’s very first public museum, is discussed in Savoy 2011, Kunstraub, pp. 393 ff.


30. The isolation of the Sistine Madonna had been strongly desired by director Julius Schnorr von Carolsfeld. For a more thorough discussion of his installation of the painting, and of those which followed, see the bibliography indicated in the note above.


38. Until 1803, the paintings collected by the Accademia had been stored in the suppressed convent of San Vitale: moving the entire collection to Sant’ Ignazio took until 1808. Bentini 2004, La Pinacoteca, p. 11.


40. From a note found in a letter by Antonio Bolognini Amorini to Cardinal Oppizzoni, dated April 10, 1831, quoted in Mazza 1983, Le vicende storiche, p. 100.


42. Reconstructing how the paintings were distributed throughout the rooms of the Pinacoteca during the nineteenth century is made difficult by the fact that the earlier catalogues (starting from Gaetano Giordani, Catalogo dei quadri che si conservano nella Pinacoteca della Pontificia Accademia di Belle Arti in Bologna, Bologna 1826) present the works under the artists’ names, which are listed alphabetically. However, in his catalogue of 1846 Gaetano Giordani made the distinction between “Scuole diverse” and “Scuola bolognese”, a criterion which might have reflected the physical distribution of the paintings (Gaetano Giordani, Guida per la Pontificia Accademia di Belle Arti in Bologna, Bologna 1826). In 1851 Giordani himself proposed to create a new room for Raphael and three others of the most prestigious paintings of the collection, yet he did not say which works he had in mind. A similar request was made in 1860 by Carlo Arienti, who specified that the new room should be dedicated to Raphael, Perugino, and Francia (for these documents see Cammarota 2006, Le origini della Pinacoteca, respectively pp. 404, 113). By the 1890s, the separation of the Bolognese school from the other Italian schools was definitely established (see the discussion below), and this is clearly shown in the new catalogues of the Pinacoteca, starting with the first one to include a map, i.e. Anacleto Guadagnini, Regia Pinacoteca di Bologna. Catalogo dei quadri, Bologna 1906. For the different building phases of the Pinacoteca see Emiliani (ed.) 1967, La Pinacoteca, pp. 75-86; Bentini 2004, La Pinacoteca.

43. A detailed reconstruction of this process is given in Cammarota 2006, Le origini della Pinacoteca, pp. 533-565.

44. “Sala Vla – Scuole diverse italiane. Quando sia costruita, vi si raccoglieranno le opere più grandi delle altre scuole, compreso Raffaello fino a che non possa collocarsi nella progettata per lui apposita edicola, o provvedere altrimenti in modo degno del divino autore.” Cesare Masini, Piano ordinatore della R.a Pinacoteca di Bologna, dated September 6, 1887 (ACS, I versamento, busta 180, n. 882, trascribed in Cammarota 2006, Le origini della Pinacoteca, pp. 544-547).

45. “Ora nelle gallerie destinate alle scuole diverse d’Italia, com poderá trovarvi degno posto la S.
Cecilia di Raffaello, la gemma più preziosa della Pinacoteca, la cui fama atrave di per se sola il visitatore forestiero? Oltre il non sapersi ben definire la scuola cui il Sanzio appartenga, se all’umbra, alla fiorentina, o alla romana? A sottrarsi a tale difficoltà ebbi già a proporre all’E.V. la costruzione di un’apposita Edicola, come a reggia del principe dei pittori, dove potrebbe fargli corona un Viti ed un Perugino che furono suoi maestri ed aggiungere un Francia, che gli fu amicissimo [...]


47. In a report to Minister Fiorilli dated October 27, 1890, Adolfo Venturi harshly criticized the project for the Pinacoteca’s rehanging. On November 7, 1890, the Commissione Permanente di Belle Arti approved the project by Venturi, defining it “più razionale, e più conforme agli studi critici e alle norme cominciate ad adottare nelle principali gallerie d’Europa.” Both documents are transcribed in Cammarota 2006, Le origini della Pinacoteca, pp. 555-559.

48. The original ancona by Formigine never left the church of San Giovanni in Monte. The Santa Cecilia had received a new frame already in 1818. Mazza 1883, Le vicende storiche, p. 99.


52. Marco Minghetti, Raffaello, Bologna 1885, pp. 154-155.


55. In 1803 the renowned painter Andrea Appiani, who had been appointed “commissionario generale delle Belle Arti”, was instructed by Luigi Vaccari, “consigliere di Stato”, to form a collection which would offer “agli studenti la storia progressiva dell’arte da’ suoi primordi sino al presente e gli esempi delle diverse maniere d’uno stesso artista” (quoted in Lauber 2012, Pinacoteche, p. 14).

56. “[…] incremento generale del buon gusto”: these are words by the painter and man of letters Giuseppe Bossi, a seminal figure for the formation of the picture gallery of Brera’s Accademia di Belle Arti, which he directed as “secretary” from 1801 to 1807. Giuseppe Bossi, Notizia delle opere di disegno pubblicamente esposte nella Reale Accademia di Milano nel maggio dell’anno 1806, Milan 1806, p. 3 (quoted in Simonetta Bedoni, Giuseppe Bossi e Raffaello, in: Raffaello e Brera, Milan, Pinacoteca di Brera, Milan 1984, p. 85).

57. Mariolina Olivari, Appunti d’archivio sullo “Sposolizio” a Brera, in: Milan 1984, Raffaello e Brera, pp. 30-34.

58. The exhibition of 1806 is carefully described in Bossi 1806, Notizia delle opere.


62. “[…] il criterio, oggi generalmente ritenuto il migliore, di dividere i dipinti per iscuole e le scuole per secoli”: Corrado Ricci, La Pinacoteca di Brera, Milan 1907, p. 242.

63. “È impossibile immaginare color peggiore [Ricci is speaking of a deep red color which had been used for the picture gallery in Parma] per la oppressione e, sarest per dire, la soppressione delle tinte lievi dei dipinti […]” Corrado Ricci, La Regia Galleria di Parma, Parma 1896 (quoted in Balestri 2006, Il colore di Milano, pp. 122-123). Francesco Malaguzzi Valeri described the color chosen by Ricci for the walls in Brera as “un color verde secco che contribuisce a raccogliere la luce sui

64. Catalogo della R. Pinacoteca di Milano (Palazzo Brera), Milan, Pinacoteca di Brera, Milan 1892. Raphael’s Marriage of the Virgin (nr. 270) is located in Room V.

65. Balestri 2006, Il colore di Milano, p. 122. Interestingly, also Cesare Masini had described the anecdote he was planning for the Santa Cecilia as “una edicola a tribuna”. Cesare Masini, Storia della Pinacoteca di Bologna, Bologna 1888, quoted in Bentini 2006, La Pinacoteca, p. 16.


68. “[... ] hat die Brera in Corrado Ricci einen der rührigsten Kunsthistoriker zu ihrem Direktor bekommen. Er hat in Jahresfrist zur Ausführung gebracht, was in anderen Sammlungen Italiens durch Jahrzehnte ventilirt und schließlich doch nicht ausgeführt wird”. Wilhelm von Bode, Italienische Kunstpflege, in: Kunstchronik, N.S., XV (1903/1904), Nr. 6, November 26, p. 103.

69. “E poi il Raffaello con una decorazione da tappezziere!” With these words Marino Viganò, a supporter of Ricci, was quoting – with great irritation – the criticism which had been expressed by architect Alfredo Melani. Balestri 2006, Il colore di Milano, p. 123.

70. Tardito 1986, Brera, pp. 64-65.

71. As for today’s installation, it was planned by architects Vittorio Gregotti and Antonio Citterio, under director Carlo Bertelli, on occasion of the five-hundredth anniversary of Raphael’s birth (1983). Initially, the altarpiece was exhibited together with the Sacra Conversazione by Piero della Francesca and a Madonna and Child by Luca Signorelli; later on, Signorelli’s Flagellation and Donato Bramante’s Christ at the column have been added to the group. Tardito 1986, Brera, pp. 80-106; www.brera.beniculturali.it/Page/t02/view.html?idp=336 (accessed on August 20, 2015).


73. A useful reconstruction of the Pinacoteca’s “movements” from 1802 to 1932, and of the changing distribution of its paintings (room after room), is offered in Ennio Francia, Pinacoteca Vaticana, Milan 1960, pp. 57-67.

74. “È il solo quadro, lo si è ripetuto mille volte, paragonabile alla Trasfigurazione.” Francesco Wey, I Musei del Vaticano, Milan 1878, pp. 38-39. The same author witnesses the “sfortuna” of the Madonna di Foligno in the same room: “Ci resta a discorrere del San Girolamo e della Trasfigurazione che si osservano a’ due lati d’un gran finestre, lasciando al secondo piano in fondo alla sala un quadro molto meno avvertito, la Madonna di Foligno […] questo monumento […] non riesce a cattivarsi la folia, la quale, ammiratrice per impulso altrui, getta, senza fermarsi, uno sguardo distratto sulla Madonna di Foligno come sopra un oggetto stimabile si, ma secondario.” Wey 1878, I Musei del Vaticano, p. 35.
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Fig. 11: Installation of the Sistine Madonna in Room A of the building by Gottfried Semper (1855), photograph ca. 1920-30 (Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden).

Fig. 12: Otto Gussmann, Sketch for Room A, 1898, pencil and watercolor on paper, 30.5 x 45.8 cm, Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett (Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden).

Fig. 13: Plan of the Pinacoteca Nazionale di Bologna after its last refurbishment of 1957-1973 (from Emiliani (ed.), 1967, La Pinacoteca, p. 87).

Fig. 14: Installation of the Raphael Room according to the riordinamento by Francesco Malaguzzi Valeri in the 1920s (Bologna, Soprintendenza BAEP e Polo Museale Emilia-Romagna, Archivio Fotografico).

Fig. 15: Plan of the first floor of the Pinacoteca di Brera according to the project submitted in 1899 in view of the riordinamento by Corrado Ricci, Milan, Sovrintendenza ai Monumenti della Lombardia, Archivio Storico (from Balestri 2006, Il colore di Milano, p. 125).

Fig. 16: Installation of the Raphael Room according to the riordinamento by Corrado Ricci, 1903, from the Illustrazione Italiana, June 7, 1903 (from Balestri 2006, Il colore di Milano, p. 131).

Fig. 17: Installation of the Raphael Room by architect Piero Portaluppi according to the riordinamento by Ettere Modigliani, 1925 (from Milan 1984, Raffaello e Brera, p. 21).

Fig. 18: Installation of the Raphael Room by architect Piero Portaluppi according to the riordinamento by Ettere Modigliani and Fernanda Wittgens, 1950 (from Milan 1984, Raffaello e Brera, p. 22).

Fig. 19: Installation of the Raphael Room at the time when the Pinacoteca Vaticana was located in the Apartment of Gregory XIII, 1857-1909 (from Pietrangeli 1985, I Musei Vaticani, p. 174).

Fig. 20: Plan of the new building of the Pinacoteca Vaticana by architect Luca Beltrami, 1932 (from La nuova Pinacoteca Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1932, Pl. III).

Fig. 21: Installation of the Raphael Room in the new Pinacoteca Vaticana by architect Luca Beltrami under director Biagio Biagetti, 1932 (from La nuova Pinacoteca Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1932, Pl. XIV).

Abstract

The essay discusses the exhibition policies that were developed for a few altarpieces by Raphael in German and Italian museums during the nineteenth century and up to the first half of the twentieth century. In particular, it is argued that the spectacular presentation reserved for the Sistine Madonna in the Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister in Dresden after 1855 was deeply influential for the presentation of the Ecstasy of Santa Cecilia in the Pinacoteca Nazionale di Bologna, and for the Marriage of the Virgin in the Pinacoteca di Brera in Milan. Evidence supports...
the idea that these similarities were the result of specific interchanges among people in the field, whether museum directors, art historians, or intellectuals in general, thus confirming that museums are an ideal place for transnational discourse and cultural exchange.
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