

STERN PRIZE

“ICH KAUFE MIR DEN KAISER!” ROYAL RELICS AND THE CULTURE OF DISPLAY IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY PRUSSIA

Fritz Stern Dissertation Prize Presentation, November 9, 2001

Eva Giloi Bremner
Princeton University

Start of a Journey

When I first started down the path of researching my thesis, I had a notion that I would write about the way in which the Prussian monarchy manufactured its image during the nineteenth century, and specifically how it sought to retain its predominance and regal aura in an age of growing nationalism and democracy. I decided that I would first look at royal iconography, possibly monuments, and such spectacles as processions, parades, coronations, weddings and so forth—all very much in the tradition of David Cannadine’s work on the “invention of tradition.”¹

Once ensconced in the archives in Berlin, I happened upon a very promising set of records from the 1870s and 1880s cataloging the bestowal of royal photographs and autographs.² Here, I thought, was the jackpot: here I was sure to find evidence of a direct, concerted attempt on the part of the monarchy to control and manipulate its image for public consumption, to present a public face resplendent in its imperial glory and authority.

As so often happens, I found precisely the opposite. Sifting through these documents, I discovered that neither Wilhelm I nor Wilhelm II had an overt policy concerning the content and distribution of photographs of themselves or their dynasty. While they were actively involved in determining the content and iconography of their painted state portraits,³ their attitude towards their photographic image was, in contrast, largely disorganized and diffuse. Indeed, rather than developing an official court policy towards photography, the Prussian monarchs relied largely upon the entrepreneurial initiative of individual photographers to take, to construct—through photomontage—and to distribute their image as the pho-

tographers saw fit. It was at the suggestion of such private individuals as Louis Schneider, Ernst Litfaß, and the proprietors of photographic companies such as A. Braun and Co., for instance, that specific photographs were produced for public consumption.⁴ As a result, these private individuals had a determining influence on the style and content of the photographs—an influence that tended towards creating images that they felt would not only be agreeable to the monarchs, but would also appeal to popular tastes and fashions: in short, be marketable.

This process was further reinforced by the 1876 copyright law concerning photography, which all but encouraged third parties to pirate official royal portraits by making it virtually impossible for the authorized photographers to sue those doing the pirating.⁵ As a result, many of the royal portraits in circulation were pirated and were furthermore either retouched or reconstructed as outright photomontages. Such pirated photographs thus often represented altogether new and unauthorized images—images that were geared more towards what the pirates thought the public wanted to see (and buy), than what the monarchy sought to project.

Occasionally this led to awkward results: Wilhelm I, who was no great fan of historical costumes, once complained about a particularly popular (albeit reverent) photomontage depicting him in the imperial robes of Charlemagne, a photo that he felt made him look like “an Indian chief at a rain dance!”⁶ But despite his chagrin at what he considered absurdly anachronistic images, Wilhelm did not regard this as a sufficient reason to try to lay down a policy concerning the photography of his person.

The one area over which Wilhelm I did keep a tight control was that of his autograph—or more usually his autographed portrait. But even in this case, I found the unexpected: patriotic young men who wrote to the emperor, swearing their loyalty and martial devotion, were usually not given the desired autographed photos. Instead, Wilhelm sent his regal souvenir to people with whom he felt he had an affective bond—young women who proclaimed their adoration of him; the patriarch of a family of four generations of fishermen; an eccentric pastor born at the very moment when Wilhelm’s father had died, and so forth. It was these people, who touched Wilhelm’s fancy, not patriotic, military-minded young men, who had the honor of receiving an autographed portrait of the emperor.⁷

Naturally, I found all of this rather surprising, not least since Wilhelm I is predominantly associated with Prussian conservatism and militarism rather than with affection, whimsy, and sentimental fancy. Intrigued by this unexpected turn of events, I turned to another set of archival files,

concerning the Hohenzollern Museum—a museum dedicated to the Hohenzollern monarchy and filled with a variety of objects relating to the Prussian dynasty.⁸

As the archival files revealed, some of the items in the Hohenzollern Museum were straightforward ceremonial objects and symbols of royal power: regalia, seals, uniforms, etc. But these were far outnumbered by objects of a more personal nature, such as those that exemplified the various monarchs' personal hobbies and obsessions: for example, Frederick the Great's snuff boxes, or the walking canes with which Friedrich Wilhelm I was wont to thrash any idlers whom he encountered on his strolls down Unter den Linden. There were also objects of a rather more eclectic and eccentric nature (at least to modern eyes): an iron nail turned half to gold by the court alchemist; a "hat made from the hair of a blackamoor," hand-crafted by the Margrave Albrecht; Luther's inordinately large beer mug; and a statue of Priapus to which Peter the Great, while visiting Berlin, took such a liking that he ordered his consort, Catherine I, to "embrace the indelicate piece of sculpture"—under threat of cutting off her head if she refused.⁹

The museum also contained some intriguing corporal relics: locks of Königin Luise's hair; Wilhelm I's left sideburn; Frederick the Great's umbilical cord and two teeth that he knocked out while playing the flute; and—perhaps most bizarre of all—a silver belt buckle that Friedrich Wilhelm I swallowed as a five year old child and shat out three days later.

Along with such relics, the museum also contained a profusion of royal souvenirs—from the individual monarchs' childhood toys and baby clothes to taxidermic displays of their favorite pets—and popular memorabilia, the latter produced largely by private entrepreneurs, often in great masses for public consumption. Memorabilia commemorating Frederick the Great seem to have been particularly in demand; his image graced a wide variety of collectible items: tea sets and lamp shades; snuff boxes and tobacco scissors; rings and bracelets; fans and handkerchiefs. This memorabilia was part of the general fascination with Frederick that had arisen throughout much of Europe as a result of his successes in the Seven Years War.¹⁰ In fact, there were so many Frederick the Great souvenirs on the market by the late eighteenth century that, when Goethe himself complained that he was being trivialized by his popularity, he drew the analogy that he could "be had on tobacco pipes and tea cups like Old Fritz."¹¹ So in Goethe's eyes, at the very least, Frederick the Great represented the epitome of the commercialization of fame.

Spurred on by my discovery of these surprisingly intimate and often less than regal items, I shifted the direction of my research to the Hohenzollern Museum.

The Hohenzollern Museum

The origins of the Hohenzollern Museum lay in the royal *Kunstkammer* (essentially a curiosity cabinet) founded in the seventeenth century and housed in the Berliner Schloß up to the early nineteenth century. The royal *Kunstkammer* was organized as a sort of 'living encyclopedia,' containing anything and everything that was noteworthy and unusual—natural history specimens, art works, Roman antiquities and coins, ivory chalices and other curiosities—and it also contained royal relics.¹² The royal relics did not, however, receive any special attention. Up to the early nineteenth century, all of the objects in the *Kunstkammer* were organized according to the principle of the "affinity" of the materials out of which they were crafted. In other words, all wooden objects were collected together in one set of cabinets, all ivory works in another, all works in silver in yet another cabinet, and so forth. The wooden statue of the Great Elector was therefore grouped together with such disparate wooden items as lacquered Chinese boxes, a runic staff, a Dürer carving, and cherry pits with hundreds of miniscule faces carved onto them.¹³

During the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the museum world, and the *Kunstkammer* with it, underwent a revolution in terms of organization and classification. The function of the museum became closely tied to the humanistic ideal of *Bildung* in every sense of its meaning—character formation, edification of the soul, aesthetic education, and intellectual training and scholarship. As a result, the formerly "universalist" collections of the curiosity cabinets were sorted according to pedagogical or more specialized, scientific (*wissenschaftlich*) criteria. Best known of these new collections was the one in the Altes Museum, designed and built by Schinkel, in which masterpieces of art and sculpture were collected together in a "temple of art" to edify and instruct the viewer. But other collections were winnowed from the *Kunstkammer* as well: the collections of natural history specimens and minerals were set up as an anatomical and a geological museum, respectively, in the newly founded University; the Egyptian and the Nordic artifacts were moved to other locations and exhibited as discrete collections, etc.¹⁴

And in order to stay in step with this revolution in museology, the royal relics likewise had to take on a more pedagogical import. Mere curiosity was no longer a sufficient organizing principle. Under the direction of the amateur historian and antiquarian Leopold von Ledebur, and influenced by the spirit and scholarship of the growing number of historical associations and journals of the 1830s, the royal relics were reorganized into a patriotic (*vaterländisch*) display.¹⁵ Interestingly, it was a patriotic display that honored not only the Hohenzollern, but also great artists and other middle class heroes, so that for a time the Hohenzollern

had to compete with such 'great men' as Napoleon, Luther, Beethoven, Schiller and Liszt.

As the Berlin museums' collections grew exponentially during the second half of the century, and as the need for ever more exhibition space became acute, the collection of royal relics, by now set up in the Neues Museum, was regarded as superfluous and simply in the way.¹⁶ The relics were therefore moved out of the Neues Museum and into a new, permanent home in Schloß Monbijou, which officially opened as the Hohenzollern Museum in 1877 under the direction of Robert Dohme, a privy councilor in the court chamberlain's office.¹⁷

What was the nature of this Hohenzollern Museum? Now that the museum's directors had the opportunity to expand and reorganize the collection, what kind of image of the monarchy did they promote?

Given the military tradition of the Prussian monarchy, one might assume that the museum provided a prime opportunity for the Hohenzollern to portray themselves in their full soldierly glory, and Wilhelm I in particular as the hero of the Franco-Prussian war—the hero of Sedan. And yet, once again, I found the unexpected: the Hohenzollern Museum did not principally contain symbols of martial prowess or even regal authority. The Hohenzollern military regalia and arms were sent instead to the new Zeughaus military museum on Unter den Linden.¹⁸ So the Hohenzollern Museum itself did not portray the monarchy in a martial light.

Nor did it follow the other typical pattern for royal museums—that of the cultural-historical museum (*kulturgeschichtliches Museum*). Most royal museums of the nineteenth century—and of the present as well, if one thinks of Sanssouci, Schloß Charlottenburg, or Schönbrunn—were designed to display the finest examples of luxury arts and crafts—furniture, wall fixtures, paintings, murals, porcelain, and so on—in their original settings. The Hohenzollern Museum, on the other hand, did not seek to be an arts-and-crafts or a cultural-historical museum; this function was already being fulfilled by the Museum of Applied Arts (*Gewerbemuseum*), located in the Gropiusbau.¹⁹

Instead, as Robert Dohme emphasized in his inaugural speech, the real purpose of the museum was to encourage "tender-hearted historical commemoration" of the Hohenzollern; as such, "unlike the Hall of Fame in the Zeughaus," it showed the royals in the intimacy of their "domestic circle and family life" and illustrated "how the individual members of the royal family lived and acted in their private rooms."²⁰ The museum was, correspondingly, replete with intimate, homely objects—Easter eggs given to Friedrich Wilhelm III by his children; the gloves that protected Friedrich Wilhelm IV's trembling hands after 1848; Wilhelm I's favorite childhood toys (described as "amusing cats and dogs with large wooden

heads"²¹); Friedrich III's baby clothes and tiny, purple shoes; a cracked tea cup that Frederick the Great had dropped because its contents were too hot—all of this bric-a-brac suggesting the mildness, vulnerability, frailty, and, ultimately, accessibility of the royal family.²²

Nowhere was this more apparent than in the rooms dedicated to Königin Luise. These rooms—exact replicas of her bedroom and boudoir—put some of her most intimate possessions on display: a selection of her toiletries were set out on her dressing table; her bedclothes and nightcap were laid out on top of her bed; and next to the bed stood the cradle in which she had rocked the future Wilhelm I. Not only were these objects intimate, but they also evoked strong, often bitter-sweet emotions in the visitors to the museum—or so, at least, claimed those visitors who wrote about their experiences in the museum. Articles in *Die Gartenlaube*, *Daheim* and other popular newspapers of the time typically waxed lyrical over these objects, imagining Luise as she stood above the cradle, “pensive and troubled” as she “rocked the little, exceedingly frail Prince Wilhelm to sleep,” or describing the tears that welled up in the visitors’ eyes when they saw the precious locks of Luise’s hair that a heart-broken Friedrich Wilhelm III had preserved after her death.²³

The more I found such descriptions of the museum’s displays, the more I was reminded of Dolf Sternberger’s magnificent study of German middle class culture, *The Panorama of the Nineteenth Century*.²⁴ In that work, Sternberger identified a mode of experience and emotion that he called *genre*. Borrowing the term *genre* from the “genre paintings” that were so popular in the nineteenth century, Sternberger described this way of viewing the world as one that focused on moments frozen in time, just before something emotionally potent was about to occur. These highly-charged, frozen moments compelled the viewer to complete the arrested action in his or her mind, and thereby indulge, vicariously, in all of the heady emotions that infused the scene. As Sternberger wrote about this bourgeois culture of *genre*: “goodness and nastiness, beauty and inner suffering, innocence and cruelty can be found in abundance just about anywhere, wept for, sighed over, and cursed at.”²⁵

Such was, for example (according to Sternberger), the impulse and meaning behind the locks of hair that were so carefully—and so universally—preserved in the nineteenth century. These locks of hair and other “precious mementos”—yellowed letters, dried roses, preserved childhood clothing—enabled the beholder to “painfully relive the sweet sensations and once again shed the long-dried tears” of love and loss.²⁶ The displays in the Hohenzollern Museum functioned in the same manner; the Königin Luise rooms specifically allowed the public to experience vicariously the *genre-esque* themes of bitter-sweet sorrow and loss, innocent and endangered childhood, and beauty in death.²⁷

And since, as Sternberger demonstrates, *genre* was a mode of experience typical of the nineteenth-century German middle class, the Hohenzollern Museum must also be seen as an instance of middle-class culture. Rather than being a martial museum, rather than emphasizing the regal aura of the monarchy, rather than promoting feudalistic ideals for the middle class to imitate, the Hohenzollern Museum catered to the middle-brow, sentimental tastes of its bourgeois audience.

Furthermore, individual Hohenzollern, and Wilhelm I foremost among them, encouraged this tendency towards sentiment. As in the case of the autographed photos mentioned above, Wilhelm I seems to have seen in the Hohenzollern Museum an opportunity to foster affective bonds with his subjects. Wilhelm was well-known in his own day for cherishing the many gifts and tchotchkes that his subjects sent to him on his birthday and other festive occasions. For weeks after these events, he would leaf fondly through the endless letters of congratulation that he had received, and set the gifts—no matter how humble or mundane—out on display in his palace. When he would finally give in to the entreaties of his chamberlains to take the displays down and make some room again, Wilhelm would then send many of the gifts—these tokens of his subjects' affection—over to the Hohenzollern Museum to be set up on display there.²⁸ And in this manner, through the aegis of Wilhelm himself, the Hohenzollern Museum became a site of mutual and sympathetic exchange between the monarchy and the public.

Conclusions

This leads me back to the question of how the finished thesis ultimately differed from my original plan to study royal pageantry and spectacle. Royal spectacles can reveal a great deal about the ideal vision that a monarchy holds of itself and wants—again ideally—to project onto the public. As highly choreographed, normative ceremonies, however, they do not reveal very much about the public's response, about whether the public accepts and endorses that vision or not. On the other hand, permanent, stationary exhibits that seek to draw and to keep an audience—like the Hohenzollern Museum—do illuminate much more clearly the dynamic interaction between official and popular views of the monarchy. They say as much about what museum directors think will appeal to the public and draw an audience over the longer term, as they say about how the monarchy preferred to present itself.

In the case of the Hohenzollern Museum, the emphasis was on the softer side of the monarchy. And in this, the Hohenzollern Museum was not alone; other instances of royal display—the Prinz Wilhelm Palais, palace tours, royal photographs, the production of memorabilia—equally

point to a sentimentalization of the monarchy, a sentimentalization that acted as a potent counterweight to the more soldierly image that prevailed in the Zeughaus military museum or during the annual military parades and reviews.

This sentimentalized image found a direct echo in other privately-run, popular entertainments, such as in Castan's Panopticum, a wax museum that featured a tableau of Königin Luise rocking baby Wilhelm almost identical to the descriptions of the display in the Hohenzollern Museum;²⁹ or in a panorama in Dresden that showed Wilhelm I in his study amidst a profusion of affectionate gifts from his subjects.³⁰

Moreover, as my dissertation demonstrates, the Hohenzollern Museum indirectly mirrored what I call the "culture of display" of nineteenth-century middle-brow entertainments—panoramas, wax museums, zoos, natural history tableaux, and so forth. The collection of royal relics followed popular trends in entertainment throughout the course of the nineteenth century, from a focus on the news-worthy and exotic in the early years of the century, through the romanticism and emphasis on the cult of the hero in the middle years, and finally to the "dream worlds" of the Wilhelmine Empire. Indeed, in its last incarnation, the collection of royal relics in the Hohenzollern Museum had in common with privately-run, middle-brow entertainments that spirit of *genre*, historicism and fantasy that was so fundamental to bourgeois popular culture. This similarity between the Hohenzollern Museum and other popular entertainments points to the fact that the museum—and by extension the monarchy itself—was, at least in part, a form of popular entertainment for the middle class.

Which brings me, finally, to the title of my dissertation. The quote comes from one of the better-known anecdotes about Wilhelm I at the time. Out on a stroll in Bad Ems, he passed a group of children looking at a shop-window display of photos of the Emperor himself, the Crown Prince, Bismarck and Moltke. The children were discussing which photos they were going to buy, and one small boy piped up: "*Ich kaufe mir den Kaiser!*"—"I'm going to buy the Emperor!" The others cheered and said "yes, yes, we want to buy the Emperor!" Wilhelm, tickled, walked up to the children and said, "Come along, I'll buy the Emperor for you" and bought each of them a photo of himself.³¹

The point about this anecdote—and about the Hohenzollern Museum and the other royal institutions that I examined in my thesis—is that much of the middle class public in Berlin did "buy into" the monarchy, as it were, but it bought into an image of the monarchy that was a reflection of the bourgeoisie's own tastes and values. And the monarchy, equally, was willing to sell an image of itself that appealed to the middle class.

It is in this way that the fact that the Hohenzollern remained popular—even in an age of mass democracy—becomes more readily intelligible. The monarchy did not retain public support by inducing the middle class to forfeit its cultural hegemony, or by “feudalizing” it. Rather, in the Hohenzollern Museum and the other institutions that I discuss in my thesis, the monarchy reflected middle-class taste. Guided by middle-class entrepreneurs, advisors and museum directors, the monarchy allowed itself to be both commodified and displayed in ways that did not emphasize its pomp or circumstance—its regal aura—, but rather highlighted its domesticity, sentimentality, and emotional accessibility. To support the monarchy was therefore not necessarily to support a feudalistic institution at the cost of denying bourgeois culture; instead, the monarchy was, in fact, part and parcel of that modern middle-class culture.

Notes

¹ David Cannadine, “The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the ‘Invention of Tradition,’ c. 1820–1977,” in Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge, 1983).

² The relevant archival files are: “Acta des Königlichen Geheimen Civil-Cabinetts betr: die Verleihung des Bildnisses Sr. Majestät des Königs Wilhelm an die Landesbehörden,” 1868–1878, Geheimesstaatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz (hereafter GStA-PK), HA1, Rep.89, Nr. 2318; “Acta betr: die Verleihung des Bildnisses Sr. Majestät des Königs Wilhelm I an die Landesbehörden,” 1879–, GStA-PK, HA1, Rep. 89, Nr. 2319; “Acta betr: die Verleihung des Bildnisses Sr. Majestät des Kaisers und Königs Wilhelm II an Behörden,” 1888–1894, GStA-PK, HA1, Rep.89, Nr. 2321; and “Verleihung oder Verwendung des Namenszuges, sonstiger Niederschriften von Äusserungen Seiner Majestät und anderer Mitglieder des Königlichen Hauses, und Bildnissen, darstellend Seine Majestät und andere Mitglieder des Königlichen Hauses,” 1876–1914, GStA-PK, HA1, Rep. 89, Nr. 2792.

³ For a comprehensive study of Hohenzollern portraiture, see: Rainer Schoch, *Das Herrscherbild in der Malerei des 19. Jahrhunderts* (München, 1975).

⁴ When it came to publishing his portrait in the press, Wilhelm I relied heavily on Louis Schneider. Editor of *Der Soldatenfreund*, “reader at court,” and librarian of Wilhelm’s private library, Schneider was what might today be considered an unofficial (and largely self-styled) press secretary. For his own account of his press activities, see: Louis Schneider, *Aus dem Leben Kaiser Wilhelms, 1849–1873*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1888). For Ernst Litfaß’s activities, see: Stadtmuseum Berlin, *Ernst Litfaß (1816–1874): Bestandskatalog des Nachlasses* (Berlin, 1996), 31. For A. Braun and Co.’s successful efforts to produce a photograph of Wilhelm I, see: *Neue Preußische Zeitung (Kreuzzeitung)*, no. 68, 22 March 1877.

⁵ The copyright law and pirated photographs are discussed in a letter from the chairman of the *Photographische Sachverständigen-Verein*, Dambach, to Wilhelm II, 4 May 1889, GStA-PK, HA1, Rep. 89, Nr. 2792.

⁶ Hans Erman, *Berliner Geschichten, Geschichte Berlins: Historien, Episoden, Anekdoten* (Berlin, 1966), 333.

⁷ See footnote # 2 for references to the archival files containing letters to this effect.

⁸ The files concerning the Hohenzollern Museum are contained in the following series: “Hohenzollernmuseum und die an diese abgegebenen Einsendungen,” Bd.1-5 (1850–1918),

GStA-PK, HA1, Rep. 89, Nrs. 2776, 2777, 2778, 2779, 2780. For the museum's precursor, the Kunstammer, see the series of archival files: "Kunst-, Antiken-, und Münzkammer in Berlin und deren Personal," (1810–1832, 1833–1879), GStA-PK, HA1, Rep. 89, Nrs. 20435, 20436.

⁹ For the reference to the hat, see: Leopold von Ledebur, "Wanderung durch die Königliche Kunstammer in Berlin mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Erinnerungen an das hohe Herrscherhaus," in Leopold von Ledebur, *Allgemeines Archiv für die Geschichtskunde des Preussischen Staates* (Berlin, 1833), 22. For the reference to the statue of Priapus, see: Oleg Neverov, "'His Majesty's Cabinet' and Peter I's Kunstammer," in Oliver Impey and Arthur MacGregor, eds., *The Origins of Museums: The Cabinet of Curiosities in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe* (Oxford, 1985), 57.

¹⁰ For instances of the various memorabilia commemorating Frederick the Great (and other members of the Hohenzollern family), see: Konrad Vanja, *Vivat-Vivat-Vivat! Widmungs- und Gedenkbänder aus drei Jahrhunderten* (Berlin, 1985); Heinz Battke, *Die Ringsammlung des Berliner Schlossmuseums: zugleich eine Kunst- und Kulturgeschichte des Ringes* (Berlin, 1938); Kustos R. Buchholz, *Die Sammlung der Schmutftabak-Dosen im Märkischen Provinzial-Museum* (Berlin, 1907); Erich Köllmann, *Berliner Porzellan 1763–1963*, 2 vols., (Braunschweig, 1966); Henry Sandon, *Coffee Pots and Teapots for the Collector* (New York, 1973); Marie-Luise Plessen and Daniel Spoerri, eds., *Le Musée Sentimental de Prusse* (Berlin, 1981).

¹¹ "Zu haben bin ich wie der Alte Fritz auf Pfeifenköpfen und Tassen." Quoted in: Konrad Breitenborn, *Bismarck: Kult und Kitsch um den Reichsgründer* (Frankfurt a/M, 1990), 7.

¹² For a history of the Berlin Kunstammer, see: Josephine Hildebrand and Christian Theuerkauff, eds., *Die Brandenburgisch-Preussische Kunstammer* (Berlin, 1981); Berlin, *Zur Geschichte der Königlichen Museen in Berlin: Festschrift zur Feier ihres Fünfzigjährigen Bestehens, am 3. August 1880* (Berlin, 1880); and Leopold von Ledebur, *Geschichte der Königlichen Kunstammer in Berlin* (Berlin, 1831). For a more general history of the development of curiosity cabinets throughout Europe, see: Impey and MacGregor, eds., *Origins*; Paula Findlen, *Possessing Nature: Museums, Collecting, and Scientific Culture in Early Modern Italy* (Berkeley, CA, 1994); Krzysztof Pomian, *Der Ursprung des Museums: Vom Sammeln* (Berlin, 1986); and the classic Julius von Schlosser, *Die Kunst- und Wunderkammern der Spätrenaissance: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Sammelwesens* (Braunschweig, 1978).

¹³ For descriptions of the Kunstammer in the late eighteenth century, see: Friedrich Nicolai, *Beschreibung der Königlichen Residenzstädte Berlin und Potsdam*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1786), 791–799; and J.D.F. Rumpf, *Beschreibung der aeußern und innern Merkwürdigkeiten der Königlichen Schlösser in Berlin, Charlottenburg, Schönhausen in und bey Potsdam* (Berlin, 1794), 271–286.

¹⁴ For the most recent and definitive examination of the development of German museums, see: James J. Sheehan, *Museums in the German Art World: from the End of the Old Regime to the Rise of Modernism* (Oxford, 2000). For the wrangling that led to the division of the Kunstammer into individual collections, see: Friedrich Stock, ed., "Zur Vorgeschichte der Berliner Museen, Urkunden von 1786 bis 1807," *Jahrbuch der Preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, beiheft II, vol. 49 (1925).

¹⁵ For a recent and comprehensive examination of patriotic, or *vaterländische*, museums and associations in Germany, see: Susan A. Crane, *Collecting and Historical Consciousness in Early Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Ithaca, NY, 2000).

¹⁶ See, for instance, Guido von Usedom's plea for more space: "Denkschrift über die nötigsten Erweiterungsbauten zur Raumbewinnung in den Königlichen Museen," 19 February 1873, GStA-PK, HA1, Rep. 89 Nr. 20447; see also: Berlin, *Königlichen Museen*.

¹⁷ The story of the founding of the Hohenzollern Museum is told in detail in: Robert Dohme, *Unter fünf preussischen Königen: Lebenserinnerungen* (Berlin, 1901).

¹⁸ For histories of the Zeughaus, see: Regina Müller, *Das Berliner Zeughaus: Die Baugeschichte* (Berlin, 1994); Monika Arndt, *Die "Ruhmeshalle" im Berliner Zeughaus: eine Selbstdarstellung Preussens nach der Reichsgründung* (Berlin, 1985); and David Joseph, *Zur Baugeschichte des Königlichen Zeughauses in Berlin* (Berlin, 1910).

¹⁹ In fact, Robert Dohme, who had long desired to establish a royal museum, traveled to Copenhagen in the late 1860s to get inspiration from Rosenborg Castle, a royal museum already then evocative of present-day museums such as Schloß Charlottenburg or Schönbrunn. In the end, however, Dohme's Hohenzollern Museum was very different in style and content from Rosenborg Castle, as a perusal of their respective catalogues demonstrates. Compare, for instance: *Führer durch das Hohenzollern-Museum im Schlosse Monbijou* (Berlin, 1883); and Dr. Phil. P. Brock, *Die Chronologische Sammlung der Dänischen Könige im Schlosse Rosenburg: Eine Kurzgefaßte Übersicht* (Kopenhagen, 1888). For the history of museums of applied arts, see: Barbara Mundt, *Die deutschen Kunstgewerbemuseen im 19. Jahrhundert* (München, 1974). For the history of cultural-historical museums in general, see the various essays in: Bernward Deneke and Rainer Kahsnitz, eds., *Das kunst- und kulturgeschichtliche Museum im 19. Jahrhundert* (München, 1977).

²⁰ *Staatsbürger-Zeitung*, vol.13, no.82a, 23 March 1877.

²¹ Paul Lindenberg, *Das Hohenzollern-Museum in Berlin* (Berlin, 1888), 9.

²² Descriptions of all such items can be found in the various guides to the Hohenzollern Museum, from: *Das Hohenzollern-Museum im Königlichen Schlosse Monbijou* (Berlin, 1878); to *Führer durch die Sammlung des Hohenzollern-Museums im Schlosse Monbijou* (Berlin: 1895); etc.

²³ Such sentiments were voiced in: Georg Hiltl, "Das Hohenzollern Museum im Schlosse Monbijou zu Berlin," *Daheim*, vol.13, no.41, 7 July 1877; Walter Schwarz, "Das Luisenzimmer im Schlosse Monbijou zu Berlin," *Die Gartenlaube*, vol.10, 1877; *Berliner Tageblatt*, no.69, Erstes Beiblatt, 23 March 1877; *Königliche privilegierte Berlinische Zeitung (Vossische Zeitung)*, no. 69, 23 March 1877; *Staatsbürger-Zeitung*, vol.13, no. 82a, 23 March 1877; Paul Bellardi, *Königin Luise, ihr Leben und ihre Andenken in Berlin* (Berlin, 1893); Lindenberg, *Hohenzollern-Museum*.

²⁴ Dolf Sternberger, *Panorama of the Nineteenth Century*, Joachim Neugroschel, trans. (Oxford, 1977).

²⁵ *Ibid*, 53–55.

²⁶ *Ibid*, 62.

²⁷ Along with Dolf Sternberger's examples of *genre*, see also the images of childhood and motherhood in: Wolfgang Brückner, *Elfenreigen—Hochzeitstraum: Die Öldruckfabrikation 1880-1940* (Köln, 1974).

²⁸ On Wilhelm I's love of sentimental gifts, see a variety of contemporary sources: Henry Vizetelly, *Berlin under the New Empire: its Institutions, Inhabitants, Industry, Monuments, Museums, Social Life, Manners*, vol. 1 (1879; New York, 1968); F. Bornhak, *Das Palais Kaiser Wilhelms I.: Unter den Linden zu Berlin* (Berlin, ~1910); Dohme, *Königen*; Georg Horn, "Ein Tag des Kaisers," *Die Gartenlaube*, 1872, 487–488; Jules Laforgue, *Berlin—the City and the Court* (New York, 1996), among others.

²⁹ Both Castan's Panopticum and Berlin's other wax museum, the Passage Panopticum, were filled with exhibits high in *genre-esque* content and style. Such displays as the one of Luise rocking baby Wilhelm's cradle, or "A Morning Pint at Chancellor Prince Bismarck's," in which parliamentarians had gathered in Bismarck's home for an early morning glass of beer and were engaged in "free and easy, good-natured small talk," fit in quite naturally with other sentimental displays. See: *Castan's Panopticum: Catalog* (Berlin, 1910); and *Catalog des Passage Panopticum* (Berlin, 1897).

³⁰ Max Osborn, *Eugen Bracht* (Bielefeld, 1909), 66–68.

³¹ The anecdote is repeated in numerous sources; for one example, see: L. Hoernemann, *Hohenzollern-Album enthaltend charakteristische Züge aus dem Leben der Regenten und Regentinnen aus dem Hause Hohenzollern* (Düsseldorf, 1882), 11–12.