

THE DESIRABLE PROJECTION OF ART
MUSEUMS AS SUGGESTED BY THE
DESIRABLE CLASSIFICATION OF ART
LIBRARIES

BY

PROF. WILLIAM H. GOODYEAR

Curator of Fine Arts in the Brooklyn Institute Museum

Reprinted from the Proceedings of the American Association of Museums
Vol. III, 1909

Bibliothèque Maison de l'Orient



135805

THE DESIRABLE PROJECTION OF ART MUSEUMS AS
SUGGESTED BY THE DESIRABLE CLASSIFICATION
OF ART LIBRARIES

INTRODUCTION

Within the last few months a bequest amounting, with accrued interest, to some six thousand dollars became available for additions to the art department library of the Brooklyn Institute Museum.¹ Purchases for the art department library to the amount of some five thousand dollars (including expenses for periodicals and their binding) had been made under my advice since 1900, and the Museum had inherited, from the older Institute library, various important works on art which might add another one thousand dollars to the total library value.

¹ The bequest of Samuel Bowne Duryea of Brooklyn was made in favor of the Brooklyn Art Association, whose trustees have placed the works purchased under the bequest in charge of the Museum of the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences.

The task which fell to me of suggesting purchases under the bequest naturally involved a survey of our previous acquisitions and the creation of such a classification as would make it possible to supplement and round out the art department library in a systematic and comprehensive manner, as far as a total sum of some twelve thousand dollars was concerned.

The question which I was led to consider was apparently this:

What selection of individual books should be made for a museum of art which is able to spend twelve thousand dollars on a library? There was evidently, however, another question underlying this one, viz: What classification of these books should be projected? If the new works were chosen without first creating a classification system, it would be impossible to balance up the new purchases, so that they might round out and supplement those which had been previously made. Former purchases had naturally been made from the standpoint of the needs of the curator for special collections and special studies at special times, and consequently could not be made from that systematic and comprehensive point of view which now became necessary. What was needed, therefore, was a classified bibliography of works on art, balanced for all topics and periods, and amounting in total value to the sum of about twelve thousand dollars.

The Museum enjoys the services of a most excellent and highly qualified librarian and this librarian had adopted and employed what is known as the Dewey system of classification. This, I believe, is the library system most widely adopted in the United States, and it is also said to be widely employed in Europe. Our library not only includes science, ethnology, and history, but it is, in other directions, a general library, as a result of inheriting the older Institute library, which was the original essence and visible beginning of the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences. The Dewey classification had been adopted for the general library, and its divisions for the art department had consequently been followed.

Thus it happened that a curator of fine arts was led to study the Dewey system, as far as it relates to art. The Dewey system is said to be an excellent system for the purpose of enabling a librarian to find rapidly the book which may be called for. Now I believe that the best system for such a practical purpose must always be the system with which a librarian is already familiar and that from this point of view no system is ever as good as the one which he has invented himself, because he naturally understands and remembers it a little better than any other.

The results of my examination of the Dewey system were as follows:

No art library should in future adopt the Dewey system.

No new art library could be projected or planned, as a systematic whole, on the Dewey system.

No one can tell from access to the shelves arranged on the Dewey system what an art library really possesses.

No one can properly supplement, or round out systematically, an art library already existing and arranged on the Dewey system, until a new classification of its present possessions has been made.

So far, the results of my research might appear to be of interest to librarians, rather than to museums, therefore I will now proceed to formulate another proposition, as follows: the natural and logical projection of an art museum should, in general terms and with obviously desirable and easily made modifications, be the same as the natural and logical projection of a classification for the books of an art museum or of an art department library. So, if we inquire what the arrangement of such a library ought to be, we are, as far as my views are concerned, stating also what the general arrangement and general plan of an ideal art museum ought to be.

We are led immediately by such a proposition to examine the following vastly important questions:

How far must the ideal museum of art history admit deficiencies which only books can supply?

How far can an existing museum supplement by illustration,—possibly casts, possibly photographs, possibly plate publications,—such deficiencies as might not exist in an ideal museum, but which are certain to occur in all real museums, however relatively ideal they may be? Therefore, while I am ostensibly speaking of a bibliography of books to cost about twelve thousand dollars, and while I am ostensibly speaking of a desirable classification for such books, I conceive myself to be actually speaking of the ideal arrangement and projection of the ideal art museum and of commendable partial arrangements for the actual museum, which can never strive to be better, unless it has a plan, and unless it realizes and announces its own deficiencies.

THE DEWEY SYSTEM

Descending for a moment from the high plane of theoretical propositions and plans to the lower but more convincing plane of actual experience, allow me to offer some illustrations of the deficiencies of the Dewey system.

I had asked our librarian for a list of books in the art department library. This list was duly furnished. Some months later, when I began to examine the list, various books occurred to me as having been purchased, which did not appear in the list. On inquiry it turned out that they had been unintentionally omitted. The reason was that such books had been classified under "archæology" or "travel" and not under "fine arts." Now a book which is classified under "archæology" or "travel" on the Dewey system cannot be classified under architecture, sculpture, painting or even under the general history of art.

Properly speaking, it is manifest that the term "archæology" includes all architecture, all sculpture, all painting and all other arts of all the ancient oriental, and classic, nations. Although, when mediæval studies are in question, we are more likely to use the term "antiquarian" than the term "archæologist," the term "Christian archæology" is also not only defensible, but it is actually the sub-title of a very excellent book on the subject of early Christian art. It is evident therefore, that the term "archæology," as properly and generally used, overlaps and includes so many subjects that it is indefensible as a general heading in classification. The term (when used in its proper sense) never ought to be admitted into the major headings of a classification. For, in the accepted sense of the term, Pompeian paintings are archæology, while Renaissance paintings are not archæology. In the accepted sense of the term, Greek sculpture is archæology, Renaissance sculpture is not archæology. But even Greek sculpture is not archæology on the Dewey system. Even Pompeian paintings are not archæology on the Dewey system. As a major heading, therefore, the term history of art should replace the term archæology.

In the Dewey system, "archæology" practically includes anything the librarian chooses to put into it which does not visibly and distinctly belong to some other art classification. It is the limbo of books that are not distinctly to be put somewhere else; but the books which distinctly ought to be put somewhere else in the Dewey system, really belong to archæology. In the Dewey system archæology is theoretically *a subdivision of biology*. We are saddened by the thought that logic does not rule the Dewey system, because sculpture and painting and architecture, although they are undoubtedly archæology for the ancient periods, and even for the early Christian, are not found under "biology." On closer study we find that the Dewey system theoretically confines archæology in the large sense to prehistorics, but the unfortunate librarian very naturally puts the *Revue Archæologique*, which rarely publishes

anything prehistoric, and the American Journal of Archæology, which is almost wholly confined to classic art, on the same shelves with Lubbock and Tyler.

However, under "geography and travel" we find a subheading for the "antiquities and archæology of individual nations." Thus things pertaining to "excavations" go under a subheading of "geography and travel." The Dewey system seems to take it for granted that excavations have nothing to do with architecture, sculpture, or painting, and that anything which is not very popular may as well go under archæology as anywhere else. Devotees of the Dewey system are not encouraged to ascertain the fact that books on excavations might possibly relate to the general history of art and go under it in their proper subdivision.

Next to the inspiration which places "archæology" under "biology," I note the insertion of "landscape gardening" between general works on the fine arts, on the one side, and special works on architecture, sculpture and painting on the other. I discovered this feature of the classification by accident. In looking over the new shelves for the works on Japanese art, I naturally supposed that they were placed together and that what I saw on the given shelves was all we had. My eyes fell on Professor Morse's "Japanese Homes and their Surroundings," and it occurred to me that we had a book by the well-known architect, Mr. Ralph Adams Cram, on "Japanese Architecture and Related Arts," which did not appear on the shelves. I asked for the book and was told that it was in the library and properly shelved, but that the Dewey system required it to be placed with general works on the fine arts. It was shown me at some distance away. I then noticed a large number of books on landscape gardening to be intervening, and I found that the Dewey system ordered things in this fashion.

As another illustration of the Dewey system, I will say that a book relating to Egypt may be catalogued and shelved under 'fine arts' in general; it may be under "architecture," "sculpture," or "painting," or it may be under "archæology" or under "travel." The latter I found to be an extremely attractive shelf division. Any one who has told us something about the archæology of Egypt, who has been so unfortunate as to travel, is very apt to find his books under that general and inspiring division of scientific knowledge.

It may be added here that I wish everything which I have said about the Dewey system to be taken in a purely Pickwickian sense as far as Mr. Dewey is concerned. I have met Mr. Dewey personally

and found him a charming companion. I have no doubt that he employed an expert to do this part of the work for him, and I think it quite likely that this expert will never reap his full reward.

Is there anything better than the Dewey system? There must be something better because nothing could be worse. Hence I offer, with great confidence, my own system as being something better, and there is this to be said in its favor: it is not at present a theoretical system. It is a system which has, in practical use, offered a convenient working classification for twelve thousand dollars' worth of books. The test of a classification is that it does not leave one in doubt where to place an object or a book, as the result of overlapping categories. The system in question has been used for a card catalogue representing every work mentioned in the bibliography, whether already owned, or not owned, and desired as a purchase. My personal experience is that after this classification was drawn up, all these cards, representing as many works, were distributed as fast as hands and eyes could work.

This system is, therefore, not a theoretical classification. It works in practice. A scholar, who looked over the classification, remarked that it seemed a good one, but that a subheading for "utensils," had been forgotten under antiquity. I pointed out that there are no extant books on ancient utensils, although there are some which embrace this subject with many others. Hence this is a matter for cross-references in a topical catalogue, but not a proper heading for a book classification. This point is mentioned as an instance of the difference between a practical and a theoretical classification of books, also as indicating the many manifest and necessary discrepancies between a classification of books and a classification of museum material.

Another instance of the difference between a theoretical and a practical classification of books is instanced by the absence of a heading for "glass" under Greek art, although such a heading is found under Roman art. This is not because there is no ancient Greek glass but because there is no special book on the subject—the finds never having been sufficiently numerous to warrant a book.

One point in passing, as to the practical use of the proposed classification in libraries which have already introduced the Dewey system, or some other system which may possibly be inferior to the one proposed. The reclassification of a library which is already well under way, is probably impossible in most cases. No librarian will assume such a burden, which involves the renumbering and redistribution of a card catalogue which has required several years for its building up.

For such cases it may be pointed out that a good topical classification by a special card catalogue is always to be desired. The classification now proposed will always be available for the making of a topical card catalogue, and will be of most use, in such cases, to the libraries which are now using the worst system and which are obliged to retain it. Such a topical catalogue becomes necessary as soon as the shelves themselves do not show together the books which belong together.

If it be suggested, on the other hand, that a good topical card catalogue makes it a matter of no concern as to what shelf arrangement be adopted, and that the Dewey system is as good as any, provided a good topical card catalogue be accessible, I can only answer that such a good topical catalogue, outside of my own, is not yet extant in proper classification for scholars' use, to my knowledge. Moreover, all scholars who use a library prefer to go directly to the shelves, and consequently prefer to have books which belong together, kept together. They can learn much more rapidly from the shelves, than they can from a card catalogue, what a library possesses in a given field, and they can test the value of a book previously unknown to them much more rapidly by taking it down, than they can by calling for it through a card catalogue.

Having thus disposed of some possible indifference to the proposed classification, which indifference will inevitably affect those persons who may suppose that they are called upon to upset and revise an already established system in an already existing library, we come to the classification itself, as presented below.

THE PROPOSED SYSTEM

COMPENDIUMS AND WORKS OF REFERENCE

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

ENCYCLOPÆDIAS AND DICTIONARIES OF ART AND ARCHITECTURE
MUSEUM HANDBOOKS CLASSIFIED BY CITIES IN ALPHABETIC
ORDER

SETS OF HANDBOOKS

Bibliothèque de l'Enseignement des Beaux-Arts; Artists' biographies in series; Sets of miscellaneous popular summaries of Industrial and Decorative Art. Handbooks of Travel for Art Students. General Works of Travel for Art Students (countries in alphabetic order, cities in alphabetic order)

GUIDES AND HANDBOOKS OF TRAVEL

GENERAL HISTORIES OF ART

General Histories of Architecture; General Histories of Sculpture; General Histories of Painting; General Histories of Industrial Art; General Histories of Ornament

HISTORY OF ART. ANTIQUITY

GENERAL HISTORIES OF ANCIENT ART

EGYPT

Popular introductory works to Egyptology; Cairo Museum; Official publications on excavations by authorities of the Cairo Museum; Folio plate publications in order of appearance; Egyptian Exploration Fund; Egyptian Research Account; Prehistoric and early Dynasties; Other Recent Excavations; Architecture; Archæology; Manners and Customs; Pottery; Textiles; Ornament; Scarabs; Religion; Mythology; Papyri; Hieroglyphs; Records and Inscriptions; Coptic period; Arabic period; Modern period; Political and Social History

ASSYRO-CHALDÆA

Chaldæa; Assyria; Persia; Hittite Mesopotamia; Asia Minor

SYRIA AND PHENICIA

ÆGEAN AND EARLY MEDITERRANEAN ART

Cyprus; Crete; Mycenæ

GREECE

Topography and Travel; Monumental plate publications; Architecture; Ornament; General Art Histories; Sculpture; Terracottas; Pottery; Coins and Gems; Antiquities and Archæology; Æsthetics and Criticism; History, political and social

ITALY AND ROME

Prehistoric and Bronze Age; Etruria; Rome (the city); Pompeii; The Empire; Architecture; Art and Archæology; Coins and Gems; Glass; History, political and social

HISTORY OF ART. MEDIÆVAL PERIOD

MEDIÆVAL HISTORY, CULTURE AND CIVILIZATION

PREHISTORIC AND BRONZE AGE. General works, as introduction to Mediæval Art

PREHISTORIC AND BRONZE AGE IN NORTHERN EUROPE

Including early Roman influence in Northern Europe, and including early Christian influence in Britain

Spain; Germany; Gaul; Britain; Scandinavia; Russia

BYZANTINE AND SARACENIC ART

Byzantine art, general histories; Saracenic art, general histories, Persia; Syria; Asia Minor; Constantinople; Cairo and Mohammedan North Africa; Mohammedan Spain

EARLY CHRISTIAN AND MEDIÆVAL ROME

General; The Catacombs; Mediæval ivories; Mediæval miniatures

MEDIÆVAL ARCHITECTURE

Plate publications, general; Books, general; Italy, plate publications; Italy, books; Germany and France, plate publications; Germany and France, books; Great Britain, plate publications; Great Britain, books; Spain; Scandinavia; Russia

Let us consider this classification not only as a plan designed for libraries but also, with some manifest limitation, as a projected plan for an art museum, with special reference to those features which an ideal museum may possibly cover, and also with special reference to those features which an ideal museum cannot possibly cover. By such a procedure we shall not only clarify our views as to the desirable projection of an ideal art museum, but we shall also rise to a conception of the vast importance of the knowledge to be obtained from libraries, as a background absolutely necessary to fill up the scheme of any good art museum. We shall learn, besides, as regards the projection of new museums, or the filling up of the deficiencies of old ones, to consider in what departments photographs or casts have mainly to be considered.

DIVISION BY PERIODS, AS OPPOSED TO A DIVISION BY
SEPARATE ARTS

Passing by the inevitable first place for books of reference in the narrow sense, such as bibliographies and dictionaries, the latter being arranged in order of period and then in the natural order of the special arts, we reach next the natural and logical preliminary divisions of an art library; the divisions for general histories of art and for general histories of architecture, sculpture, painting and ornament.

It will be observed that there are no distinct general divisions beyond this point, as there are under the Dewey system, for architecture, sculpture, and painting. These subjects are not admitted at all as the basis of main divisions in classification, which is, on the contrary, outside of the far East, first arranged by periods and then by territories under these periods. Thus the special arts are grouped together, not only by the larger periods, but also by territories. That an ideal museum should be classified by periods and not by the divisions of architecture, sculpture, and painting is to my mind so obvious as to be hardly debatable. But it will not be so immediately obvious to a layman perhaps, until our libraries are classified on the same system.

Here again the special subject of library classification has vast importance for those points of view which ought to filter insensibly into the conscience of the general cultivated public and which ought not to be fought over and battled for by scholars and experts, when they are really elementary propositions, which ought not to be debatable.

In an ideal general museum, Egyptian architecture, sculpture and painting should go together, with all other Egyptian arts and relics. This

is plain common sense, and the same point holds for classic antiquity in general. Both periods should be separated throughout from mediæval, and all should be separate from Renaissance. The contrary arrangement is against common sense, whether in books or in museums. Neither ancient nor mediæval sculpture should be separated in study from the related and contemporary architecture. Neither can Italian painting, in its most important productions, be separated from architecture. As for the minor arts like those of ceramics, glass, ivories, etc., it is absurd to destroy the atmosphere which ought to envelop and inspire them, by ignoring periods and considering only the crude material of which they fortuitously consist.

But if this be true of art museums, it should hold true also of books, which are the background and scaffolding of all our knowledge of the subject. When our libraries are properly arranged we shall better understand what art museums are for. This is, at present, occasionally a debated question. But inasmuch as the proposition that a division by periods is preferable to division by separate arts, is not so immediately obvious for books, it will now be debated for books.

The objections to arranging books under the headings of architecture, sculpture and painting, instead of arranging these arts by periods, are really crushing, when considered by an expert. These objections move first from the constant and inevitable overlapping of topics in one book. Individual art objects naturally never overlap, but books inevitably do. If you have a bad classification for museum material, you are still able to stick to it. But if you have a bad classification for books, you cannot even stick to it. The bad classification for books is the one which allows them to overlap in categories, as they inevitably overlap in fact. Take for instance "excavations." These may include, and constantly do include architecture, sculpture, painting, ceramics, and every possible variety of objects. The recent excavations in Crete are a notable example; excavations in Egypt are another; excavations at Pompeii are another; excavations at Olympia are another. Now under the Dewey system these go under "antiquities and archæology of special countries," and this is a branch of "geography and travel." Hence they are removed by all the subdivisions for literature from their legitimate position under the general history of art. As a matter of fact they have no legitimate position. The arrangement is a makeshift, unworthy even of criticism. If I wish to study the plan of a temple at Naukratis, unearthed by Petrie, I go to "geography and travel." If I wish to study Petrie's book on the pyramids, I go on the other hand to "architecture," but I do not, in either

case, go to Egypt. What monumental obscurity! The instance of separating "Japanese Homes and their Surroundings," by Morse, from "Japanese Architecture and Allied Arts," by Cram, is duplicated whenever a work on excavations is catalogued by the Dewey system.

Take another instance of the difficulties of arranging works under the divisions of architecture, sculpture, and painting. Many of the most splendid folio plate publications on Mediæval architecture include sculpture, painting, stained glass, and furniture. Why should these books be separated from the photogravures of the Mediæval casts of sculpture in the Trocadero, which are architectural without exception, but which, notwithstanding, go under sculpture and not under architecture.

The absurdity of placing special works on Renaissance sculpture under the same category with Greek sculpture is another phase of this confusion. The student of Renaissance sculpture is naturally interested in Renaissance culture, Renaissance architecture, and Renaissance painting. The related books should be associated by periods, not by divisions which obscure the knowledge of periods. This arrangement is not only theoretically better but it is practically workable, as fast as one can distribute and handle the books and the catalogue cards.

For a general museum expert the proposition that Greek pottery should be classified, on general principles, with other forms of Greek art, rather than with Italian majolica and modern china, needs no special plea, and what holds of museums holds to an even greater degree where books are concerned.

It may be said, as an aside, that I should have as little objection to a modest synoptic museum collection of ceramics as I have to a book on modern ceramics which includes a mention of Greek pottery, but it is clear that no general book on modern ceramics can do justice to Greek vases and it is equally clear that, in a general museum, no important collection of Greek vases should be associated with an important collection of Italian majolica.

A few more words may now be devoted to the question whether museum and art libraries should be projected under the divisions for the main periods of art history, viz: under Ancient, Mediæval, Renaissance and Modern; although to my mind the subject is hardly debatable.

If this arrangement be desirable, it becomes evident that the museums of the future must give much attention to the subject of casts and photographs, and I will add that they must give much attention also to the subject of books and especially of folio plate publications. For instance, miscellaneous collections of the minor classes of Egyptian antiquities

may be obtainable for some time to come, but are not the great folio plate publications for Egypt an indispensable adjunct to every museum which can afford to buy them? There could be no greater boon to the general public than to frame up for public exhibition the folio color plates of Prisse d'Avignes. A public exhibition of large photographs of Egyptian pyramids, temples, and statues, appears to be desirable in every general museum, as well as the exhibition of the easily obtainable but not very numerous casts and squeezes of Egyptian material which can be had from Cairo and the British Museum.

Just as the library of an art museum or department should be rounded out, as far as possible, in a manner wholly independent of the museum's actual exhibits of original material, so an ideal general art museum should round out its possessions and fill up its necessary gaps by casts and by photographs. I can see no hope for the future student of art history unless this be done and I have very little respect for an art criticism which does not rest on historic foundations, and which is not inspired by historic principles.

We will pass now from the matter of the large divisions by general periods, to the questions connected with the arrangement by territories within those periods, and first of all to the question as to *what territories should be excluded* from an arrangement under periods.

CLASSIFICATION FOR INDIA, CHINA, AND JAPAN

In these days of evolution theories and evolution tendencies there can be no debate as to the point that the order of evolution must be considered in formulating a classification, either for an art museum or for an art library. Hence those territories or exhibits have first to be considered which do not adapt themselves to an evolutionary arrangement, for whatever reason it may be, and that reason will generally be our own ignorance, due to gaps in the record, which may be compared to the gaps and breaks in the record presented by the strata of geology.

In an art library and in an art museum the first problem of arrangement and of classification, is that which deals with the disposition to be made of the far East, viz: India, China, and Japan. These territories are outside of the sequence of European evolution and as to their own evolution we have in the case of India and of China no material and very little reliable record. Manifestly then, these territories must come either at the end or at the beginning of a library classification, in order not to

break the sequence which can be established for all other territories of Western Asia and of Europe.

Which shall it be for India, China, and Japan; end, or beginning? For a museum it might appear to be a matter of indifference; supposing that its galleries could be arranged in physical sequence, which is not always possible. For a library it is not at all a matter of indifference. The logical arrangement of territories in a definite sequence is as important as the logical arrangement of periods. The movement of civilization is always by contiguity and the movement has generally taken place in what may be called a sequence of contiguity.

What now are the facts regarding Hindoo art as known to us? The facts are, that India's art has always been bastard, and never has been independent. Neither has Indian art or architecture any high antiquity as known to us. 300 B.C. is about as high as we can go in dates. There are absolutely no very ancient temples in India, much as the contrary has been suggested. Buddhist art starts, as we know it, under Greek influence, dating from Alexander the Great's campaign and the states near the Hindoo borders founded by his generals. There was, of course, an earlier art, but such as there was appears to have been under Assyrian or Persian influence. Later Indian art is Mohammedan Saracenic, and Mohammedan Saracenic is, in origin, Byzantine.

Now it is absurd to study the art of a nation which has always been derivative, before we have studied the art from which it was derivative. Thus, as between the beginning or the end of a classification, India goes to the end, and certainly should not go at the beginning. If introduced at any intermediate point India breaks a sequence. China and Japan should come after India, not because much of their art is not independent of India, but because much of it *is* dependent on India, whereas the reverse does not hold. Of course, there can be no debate about putting Japan after China, in a question of evolutionary sequence. Thus the far East is disposed of. It comes last in our classification.

THE ARRANGEMENT OF TERRITORIES FOR THE ANCIENT PERIOD

In the Dewey system for fine arts history in general, China comes first; Egypt, second; Judea, third; India, fourth; Chaldea, Assyria, and Persia, fifth; Rome, sixth; Greece after Rome; and then the modern countries. There is absolutely no logic in such an arrangement, no logic in the knowledge which inspired it and no logical knowledge obtainable from it. In

explaining my own arrangements of territories, the defects of this Dewey arrangement will further appear.

The classification advocated does not call for a special division for pre-historics. The prehistoric art and bronze age art is called for by territories, wherever it appears in finds and has been treated by books. In very recent years a prehistoric period of great interest is known in Egypt. For Egypt the books on prehistoric finds come last, because these excavations are most recent. No one can study Egyptian art by beginning where science and archæology have ended. Otherwise, omitting the Tigris-Euphrates valley, Syria and Greece, where no bronze age art is known, up to date,¹ we next enter the topic under Italy, where our first real knowledge of this art begins and where the insensible transition from the bronze age to the later art can first be studied. The sequence from bronze age art to Greek influence is much earlier in Italy than in the territories of Europe farther north and west.

The point of view in avoiding a special division for prehistoric and bronze age art, and in treating it by territories, is that prehistoric art in Europe merges into bronze age art insensibly and without sharp demarcation. Now the earliest bronze age art which is known by large masses of material, that of Italy, shows east Mediterranean influence, and no north European bronze age art is known which does not show barbaric adaptations of Greek art, through Etruscan or other Italic mediation. Consequently I hold it to be illogical to study bronze age art before these influences have been considered. This is my explanation for not putting prehistorics before Egypt. As for entering prehistorics under special territories, outside of Egypt, before Italy comes on the stage, my objection is that a classification should never be theoretic.

As an instance of theoretic classification I have noticed in an expansion of the Dewey system for architecture which has been published by a Western University, a classification of Syrian territories in which there is an entry for the Philistines. It can only be said of such a classification that any library which possesses a book on Philistine architecture (in the territorial sense) should immediately make the fact known, and that any archæologist who can mention a single remnant of Philistine architecture will become instantly famous.

¹We must distinguish here between the use of bronze which was well known in Greece and the so-called "bronze age" art. The Dipylon period of pottery undoubtedly represents such a period, but the finds of metal from this period, in Greece, are, so far, infinitesimal. Bronze finds are fairly numerous in Crete, but they do not show the "bronze age" art.

To return to Egypt, we have only one more point to make. Within the last few years dates are being established for the Tigris-Euphrates valley culture, which have an antiquity possibly as high as that accepted for Egypt and possibly higher. Is it not therefore a matter of indifference whether Chaldea precedes Egypt, or the contrary, or would not logic compel us to reverse the arrangement which places Egypt first, if higher dates were positively established for Chaldea? The answer to this question involves an explanation of the point of view from which the territories have been arranged under given periods, throughout this classification.

Under the general facts of history, and these are naturally the general facts for the history of art, we are dealing under the various terms of Chaldea, Assyria, and Persia with only one culture, and that is the culture of the Tigris-Euphrates valley. Different military ascendancies under different names, according to the province which assumed the leadership, are found at different times in the Tigris-Euphrates valley, but the culture sequence is uninterrupted, until ultimately the Egyptian influence spreads by way of Syria and overlays and saturates the Tigris-Euphrates culture. This overlay and saturation begin to be apparent in the Assyrian period, but are more especially evident in the Persian period, until the Greek influence takes its place.

Thus, in the sequence of art history and of culture, we should place first the Egyptian culture, because it ultimately overlaid the Assyrian. Otherwise we study Assyria with the disadvantage of not knowing Egypt; a disadvantage, because Assyrian art was largely bastard Egyptian through Phœnician transmission.

As Phœnicia was the connecting link geographically, and therefore historically, between Egypt and the Tigris-Euphrates valley, we need no argument for the location given to Phœnicia in our system. No position can be given it, excepting that of intermediary; for Phœnicia had absolutely no independent art. The intermediary must logically come after both the cultures which it joined and united.

Equally clear is it that the Ægean and early Mediterranean cultures of Cyprus, Crete, and Mycenae are here arrayed in their logical order. They connected Phœnicia with Greece and, as far as their own arrangement is concerned, the order represents their own sequence of relation, the sequence which naturally would hold geographically and which actually did hold historically; the sequence from East to West, which was also a sequence in time, as regards beginnings.

The absurdity of the Dewey arrangement in placing Rome before Greece is palpable—we have only to consider that the expansion of Roman power over Italy did not even begin until the time of the downfall of the Greek states, under Philip of Macedon, and that the later history of the culture of Italy, of Rome, and of the Empire of Rome, is the history of the diffusion of Greek art and influence over western Europe. Moreover the earlier history of Etruscan and other Italic art is the history of Greek influence. We do not know any Etruscan art, even the most archaic, which is not Greek in derivation, or, at least, in influence. To place Rome before Greece is to be absolutely out of the sequence of evolution. In an art museum it would be ridiculous to invert their relations. In a library it is not less so.

ARRANGEMENT OF TERRITORIES FOR THE MEDIAEVAL PERIOD

In the classification for the Mediæval period there are arrangements of territories which may not be immediately obvious to a layman as the logical arrangement, but which defend themselves as soon as they are briefly explained.

Historically speaking the Mediæval period represents the contact of the Germanic and Celtic races with Greco-Roman civilization, and their gradual assimilation of this civilization, with those remarkable differences of form and spirit, which partly their own independent racial traits, and partly their own originally ruder development, in the order of time, made necessary and inevitable.

That the background of Germanic and Celtic culture was that of a stone age culture, gradually modified by a bronze age culture which moved up from the south, is demonstrated by the history of art. Therefore the history of art should be so arranged as to illustrate this sequence, whether in books or in museums.

No excuse is therefore needed for beginning the classification for the Mediæval period with a preliminary section for prehistoric and bronze age art. The arrangement of individual territories is naturally that of their appearance in order of time in bronze age culture.

The bronze age culture of the Swiss lake dwellers has been until recently the earliest known in northern Europe. This would give Germany first place in the classification. Without debating questions of precedence in time, as compared with Spain, the best arrangement will place Spain first on account of her relations to the cultures of Mycenæ and Crete. If Germany is given second place in the

classification, the arrangement should then be, according to sequence of time, Gaul, Britain, Scandinavia, Russia.

Having thus established an independent Northern foundation for the Middle Ages, we turn back to the Byzantine and Saracenic cultures, which must be disposed of before the Middle Ages, in the narrower sense which applies to western Europe, can be considered. For Mediæval culture history is that of a gradual saturation by the ancient Mediterranean culture; partly by the local survivals of Roman culture in the West; partly by Byzantine East Roman influence, and in a less degree by Arab Saracenic influence, which was in origin also Byzantine, but which to some extent moved through Spain.

All Arabian and Saracenic art is an offshoot of the Byzantine Greco-Roman, and it first developed in the Byzantine territories of Syria, Egypt and North Africa, after the Arabs conquered them. In the library classification we therefore place first the general works on Byzantine art, and then those on Saracenic art.

In the arrangement of territories we observe the sequence: Persia, Syria, Asia Minor, Constantinople, Egypt, North Africa, and Spain, as being much the most convenient and logical.

We are now able to take up the direct sequence of Mediæval art as it began in the catacombs and in early Christian Rome and Italy.

IVORIES AND MINIATURES

The ivories follow immediately, because they are the most important connecting link between Pagan and Christian art. The reasons are obvious. In the late decadence of Pagan-Roman art, ivory carving was the art most practiced and the best design survived there. Therefore, in the beginning of Christian art, ivory carving shows the best design. Next, the ivory carvings, being portable, were most easily concealed from the cupidity of barbarian ravages. Moreover, their material was not tempting to these ravages. They could not be melted up like metals. Thus the ivories were not only the best art but they were also the most easily preserved. For this reason, as far as survivals go, they are the main surviving connecting link between Pagan and Christian art.

Next in order we place the miniatures, both of Byzantine and of early Irish art, since, west of Byzantium, Ireland was the only territory not overflowed by the German invasions, and therefore was the main refuge of West Roman culture in the 5th, 6th, and 7th centuries. Ire-

land was spared from barbarian degradation until the 10th century and the inroads of the Northmen.

The later arrangement of the Mediæval classification need hardly detain us, but the arrangement of territories for the history of architecture is not that of the Dewey system. In the order of time Italy is first, Germany second, France third; then come, side by side, Spain and Great Britain. Therefore we also place them in this order territorially.

PAINTING

The reasons for placing the general histories of painting at the close of the Mediæval period or at the beginning of the Renaissance, are obvious. All histories of painting unite the two periods. If placed last under the Middle Ages or first under the Renaissance, we are not obliged to duplicate mention or references.

The later subdivisions for the Renaissance and modern period need hardly detain us, as long as large and general points of view are controlling.

COINS

It will be observed that Coins have a major heading and a department of their own. They form an exception to the usual standpoint of my classification. The reasons are easily given, but space is lacking here. An exception is made, however, for Greece and Rome which will involve cross references and duplicate carding.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

We are now able to return to some general considerations. Is this scheme too ambitious? For a library classification, it certainly is not. Anything less comprehensive would be open to instant and incessant criticism.

Is this scheme too ambitious for a museum? In principle, certainly not. In practice, no museum, of course, can even attempt to cover the whole architectural field in casts. Only one museum in the world—the Trocadéro in Paris—has attempted this in a large sense, even for Mediæval architecture. But should not a museum, for that very reason, pay the more attention to photographs and to monumental plate publications? In the best sense, the art museum should be a supplement to a library as far as the history of art is concerned.

My idea is: Set the pace in your ideal of a library, and then inquire what are the absolutely unavoidable shortcomings in any museum, which only a library can fill. Next, inquire what can be done with casts and photographs to fill in the gaps which, in practice, even the best equipped museum will inevitably show. However far the actual thing may be from the ideal, the best practicable thing can only be reached by having an ideal in view.

What is needed in art museums is the historic point of view for historic objects and the disposition to balance up unavoidable deficiencies by photographs and casts. That balanced and comprehensive selection is more important than massive exhibitions in special fields, is widely admitted for museum exhibits of originals, and the observation of this same rule for photographs and casts will carry us a long way on the road to popular synoptic art museums.

That a good art library bibliography, well classified, should be a valuable assistance to a museum expert, few will deny. We will admit that many good museums cannot possibly own and ought not to own twelve thousand dollars' worth of books. But no one is confined to a single library, and if the bibliography once exists, the knowledge and consultation of books are furthered. The knowledge of their existence and of their correlation ought to be widespread.

A specially close relation between libraries and museums holds for the field of history. The value of art museums as institutions for the suggestion of the broad facts of general history cannot be overestimated.

ART HISTORY AND ART MUSEUMS

Even considered in the narrowest point of view, that of "art for art's sake," the true theory of cultivating the art sense is to place the student in contact with good examples, and with the best. These are, in the majority of cases, historic examples. Even in painting, where some modern artists occasionally, or possibly, rival some of the older ones in individual cases, the historic models offer the best standards. If we desert them we find ourselves disturbed by our own individual tastes, by the contentions of modern critics and by the contemptuous attitude of one modern artist, or of one modern school, toward another, when both may ultimately prove to be meritorious. It is not denying the greatness of modern literature to hold that the historic standard authors offer the best examples for educational training. The same point holds in a much more eminent degree for art.

Thus the problem of the museum of historic art is to select its examples in a properly balanced distribution, whether casts, photographs, or originals, and to arrange them in historic sequence and relation. The problem of the art library is not only a related problem; its solution may even be an assistance to the art museum.

The mission of the museums of the future is not to supplant or to excel, in the matter of original possession, those already formed. Such ambition is, in many directions and in many cases, puerile and unattainable.

What the public needs to know first and foremost is, what the best things are and where they are. It is as much the business of the art museums of the future to assist the public to this knowledge, as it is to collect originals of their own. But also in collecting such originals, the relations of these to other originals must be made known and the unity of these relations should be apparent. Otherwise the focus is lost and the perspective disappears.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN MODERN ART GALLERIES AND HISTORIC ART MUSEUMS

In considering the problems which confront our museums of art in America, our theorists sometimes overlook a very practical consideration. This consideration is mentioned in closing, without special reference to my own paper, unless it should occur to someone that this paper appears to neglect modern art and that it is in so far defective.

There are no important museums of historic art in Europe which include in their exhibits modern contemporary art by living artists. There are no important museums of historic art in the United States which do not include contemporary modern art by living artists. Let us consider, for a moment, the result of this difference. This result is, in my opinion, a confusion of theories and views, caused, in America, by discussing two kinds of museums or galleries which are really quite different, but which in America almost invariably exist together under one roof. There is not the slightest objection to this combination in the United States. It is certainly inevitable and it is very likely desirable. What I do object to, is the confusion of ideas which results in discussing the mission of an art museum and the point of view to be taken about it.

The point of view must be different in the case of a gallery of modern art from the point of view in a museum of historic art. If we combine the two things in one building let us not forget that a different point of view must still be taken for the two different capacities of the same mu-

seum. The point of view for the gallery of modern art must be the point of view of the modern artist, and no doubt there may be different points of view and many debatable questions, within the limits of the general point of view of the modern artist. The point of view for the museum of historic art (and this holds, even if it be combined with the modern gallery) must be the point of view of the art historian.

The good art historian is necessarily a good critic, and he must consequently be a good judge of modern things, but his attitude toward historic art must be to consider its environment and to consider its evolution, and first and foremost to consider the work of historic art from the standpoint of the time and race and period which produced it.

Many theories and much debate about historic art will drop out of sight if we ask the simple question, What was the idea of the thing in the mind of the man who made it and what did he make it for? The work of historic art is a document and a record of history. As such it should be considered and as such it should be treated. The greatest modern critics have been developed as students of historic art. Therefore we need not fear that the accent which has been placed in this paper on historic art, as distinct from modern art, may suggest or indicate an indifference to the latter.