

Markian Prokopovych

The City and the Museum:

Cracow's Collections and their Publics in the Long Nineteenth Century¹

It is generally acknowledged that museums were an essential part of the national project in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Europe – and some retain this function even today. Classic works in nationalism studies such as Eric Hobsbawm's have clearly highlighted the role they played in the birth of modern nations.² Subsequent studies that focused on specific national contexts help us understand better the mechanisms through which museums contributed to the invention of national traditions as well as to the formation of historical consciousness, historical memory and the functioning of modern states.³ As these and other scholars of museum history also demonstrate, the museum founders, directors, curators and the broader public around them were also driven by agendas and aspirations other than nation-building within these larger processes. It is precisely by looking at how in the making of museums these agendas mixed with the aims of the national project in a specific locality that new insights into the formation of modern subjectivities in this period can be gleaned.

With the exception of Viennese museums, the institutional history of which has been analysed as part of the study of Habsburg imperial self-representation, much of scholarship on the emergence of museums in Central Europe has been researched from the perspective of how their creation contributed to the making of nations.⁴ For Cracow, the city whose history was so much weighted by its symbolic status as a former capital of Poland in this period, the only study that aimed at revising and going beyond the national narrative in the creation of museums is that by Maud Guichard-Marneur.⁵ This scholarly lacuna is significant given that,

in nineteenth-century Habsburg Central Europe in particular, the imperial state and the empire's diverse nations were not necessarily mutually-exclusive. The multi-ethnic Habsburg Empire was home to a number of nascent nationalisms that had their own view on art and culture that often contrasted with the official Viennese vision.⁶ A fairly coherent Habsburg state ideology through which the population was to be made governable certainly existed, but to speak about it without taking these nationalisms into account would be misleading. At the same time, it was possible and politically profitable, in Cracow for example, to be a patriotic Pole and a loyal Habsburg subject, and combine these two allegiances with a number of other identities related to one's locality, status, profession and gender. And in fact a number of people in the middle of the century did not feel the need to decide ultimately which "national" camp they belonged to and simply remained loyal subjects and local patriots at the same time.⁷ Furthermore, as Pieter Judson has argued, in their urge to construct a coherent narrative, historians disregarded an essential element of "national indifference" that prevailed among the people of Central Europe and beyond.⁸

The fact that both the "state" and the "nation" existed and functioned on several distinct levels, from abstract, broader geographical to a very concrete local, was certainly not limited to Austria-Hungary. For example, historical scholarship on "Heimat," that particularly troublesome concept for every translator the closest equivalent to which in English is probably "homeland," demonstrated many different local dimensions and workings of German nationalism, regional sentiment and local patriotism, as well as those of the empire.⁹ Many nineteenth-century "national" museums across Europe emerged out of earlier, aristocratic collecting initiatives of regional and local character and continued to tread a fine line between all these different allegiances at the century's close. Cities were not just mere locations for the emergence of museums but had their own complex agency, as well. They displayed the multiplicity of local interests ranging from the official position of the

municipality to the agendas of private collectors (aristocratic and not), the increasingly professionalised art, academy, university and heritage protection circles and the attitudes of diverse urban publics. As Maud Guichard-Marneur has shown, the active support of Cracow City Council was essential for the institutionalisation of several local initiatives as museums, and the belief in the central role of the museum as a nation-building institution consolidated divergent views on the nation among the local elite.¹⁰ However, to trace the developments of museums to some abstractly defined nation is particularly difficult in smaller cities such as Cracow, whose cultural importance within the region went far beyond their administrative function but whose elite's aspirations also firmly remained within the cultural orbit of the imperial centre. Relying and critically re-evaluating the work of Guichard-Marneur, Nathaniel D. Wood and others,¹¹ this article traces such divergent agendas on the local level and aims to identify the role of the city and the broader urban public in the creation of museums in late nineteenth-century Cracow. In so doing, it aims to revisit the understanding of the national project at this time and the extent to which it may have been more of a local Cracovian or Galician affair than most historians have hitherto assumed.

Cracovian histories and communities

A number of events in Cracow's nineteenth-century history contributed to a peculiar perception of the role of the city in the region of Central and Eastern Europe and the comparably consensual nature of the museum initiatives there. Traditionally a royal seat where the Polish kings were crowned since the Middle Ages until the mid-eighteenth century, Cracow became part of the Austrian province of Galicia following the Partitions of Poland in 1772-1795, was given a free city status at the Congress of Vienna in 1815 and was finally incorporated fully into Austria after the unsuccessful uprising in 1846.¹² Cracow's situation was also peculiar in that it not only had to adhere formally (and often wholeheartedly) to its

loyalty to Vienna, but also had to accept that many decisions concerning its present and future would be decided in the Galician administrative capital in the province's East, Lemberg (Lwów/Lviv). Significantly smaller in size, Cracow was often in an explicit competition with Lemberg as an attractive location for institutions of science and culture.¹³ The presence of a large Austrian military garrison in the city and the construction of numerous new fortifications including those on the Wawel Hill, the site of the Royal Castle, was perceived as oppressive. While for the local elite who saw it as one of the most sacred places in the history of Poland Austrian rule was sometimes the cause of much frustration and resentment, that rule was also more liberal than the one the Poles endured in the Prussian and Russian partitions.¹⁴

Parallel with the events that led to the signing of the Austrian-Hungarian Compromise of 1867, Galicia's autonomy within the Monarchy increased, as well. This gave the Polish elites a much freer hand in ruling the province and provided a chance for the *Stańczyks*, Cracow's ruling conservative political party loyal to Austria, to transform Cracow, which was granted self-government in 1866, into their vision of a modern "Polish Mecca," i.e. the historic capital of all Poles.¹⁵ Institutions of science and art were founded and monuments erected to achieve this goal, and the Great Fire of 1850 that destroyed a large section of the historic city centre provided a further impetus and sanction for municipal intervention. In parallel with these activities, a number of illustrious, mostly aristocratic Poles also relocated there or returned from emigration, brought their rich collections along and founded a number of museums, as well. The municipality actively engaged the local elite and the former *émigrés* in the organisation of celebrations that, like elsewhere in the monarchy, collected large crowds and fostered diverse loyalties among Cracovians.¹⁶ To paraphrase Nathaniel D. Wood, Cracow was not only turning into the "Polish Mecca" but also into the "little Vienna on the Vistula," and the role of the municipality was central in this transformation.¹⁷

At the same time, in just a few decades Cracow would become a modern metropolis with a ring road, broad boulevards, modern apartment houses and newly incorporated suburbs. The creation of “Greater Cracow” in 1910-1915 would serve as a culmination of this process. As Wood has shown, in their attempt to integrate their recent experiences in the city the increasingly heterogeneous migrant population would find identities other than national more compelling and attractive. Through the reading of the illustrated and boulevard press he demonstrates that these new Cracovians would see themselves as metropolitan and European first and only secondly as Polish, and the vision of the new urban community thereby created by this press would be much more inclusive than that created by the historicizing initiatives of the conservative city fathers.¹⁸ Until the time when, late in the first decade of the twentieth century this press would start reporting in detail on, for example, the events in the National Museum,¹⁹ large segments of the local public were excluded from the making of the official image of Cracow. This, of course, had administrative reasons, too: until the incorporation of working-class suburbs such as Podgórze, completed in 1915, their inhabitants could not expect to be treated as a sizeable urban constituency to be reckoned with in terms of their everyday and symbolic needs. Hence, for the largest part of the time discussed in this study, the growing suburbs largely lived a parallel life unconcerned with a group of enthusiasts in the municipality, the university and the aristocratic circles who initiated the creation of public art museums to display their vision of Polish history and the place of Cracow in it.

The contribution of others was much less evident, visible or acknowledged. Cracow Jewry was certainly a visible and sizeable constituency in the city; however, the attitude of the official “exhibitionary” discourse towards Jewish legacy of Cracow was ambivalent. The degree to which it was often unprepared to embrace this legacy can be illustrated with the

following example: When, in 1887, a decision was due about the content of the antiquarian section at the Provincial Agrarian Exposition in Cracow, the exposition board decided to dedicate the entire section to Catholic church art (*sztuka kościelna*). To this end the Bishopric of Cracow printed an appeal to all Roman Catholic clergy requesting them to assist the organisers with the artefacts in their possession.²⁰ This together with the fact that the exposition was accompanied by the exhibition of *Polish* art organised by the Society of the Friends of Fine Arts (*Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Sztuk Pięknych*)²¹ ensured that a regular visitor would leave with an impression of a Christian, and Polish Galicia. Some attempts to exhibit material artefacts of Jewish culture were made, for example, at the Provincial Exposition in Lemberg in 1894, but the work of a historian Feivel Hirsch Wettstein (1858-1924) and the Ezra Judaic Library, founded in Cracow in 1899, on the preservation of specifically Cracovian Jewish legacy, was even much more representative.²² It can be argued that, in the mind of the exhibition organisers and the ruling *Stańczyks* elite, Jewish historic legacy and its material culture had no place in the Polish national narrative and rather belonged to the sphere of parallel initiatives of the Jewish community. In this worldview, a “Polish” museum was not expected to appeal to a local Jewish audience or to actively seek out their participation. It is ironic that at the time when the eminent Jewish historian Majer Bałaban and others lamented on how the best ancient books, artefacts, even entire private libraries and archives were being sold to foreign entrepreneurs or irreparably lost, the Cracow Gentile community employed the identical argumentation when they attempted to preserve Polish artefacts from the same fate.

At the same time, however, the fact remains that many powerful individuals within Cracow’s Jewish community contributed to the city’s major planning and renovation projects, such as for example, the Cloth Hall (*Sukiennice*).²³ While their presence was much less placated during the inaugurations, an increased number of Jewish municipal officials also cooperated

with the Polish elite in many areas of municipal concern.²⁴ There is evidence to suggest that many Cracow Jews not only eagerly embraced Polish history – especially in its local, urban version – but also contributed to the making of local museums in many different ways. Perhaps one of the most telling examples is Adolf Sternschuss (1873-1915), board member of the Society of Lovers of History and Monuments of Cracow (*Towarzystwo Miłośników Historii i Zabytków Krakowa*) and several others, who initiated tours of the historic city centre and the Wawell Hill to visiting students and gymnasium pupils.²⁵ A lawyer by profession and a passionate collector and art patron, Sternschuss donated to several Cracow museums and was involved in the turning of the home of the leading historical painter Jan Matejko into a museum. The author of an important book on Cracow's historic houses, Sternschuss, an Austrian army officer, would join the Polish legions in 1914 and die from the Russian bullet a year later – which in retrospect made him not only a true Cracovian but also a Polish national hero.²⁶ If as the “Heimat” scholarship argues the nation could be conceived as *both* local and universal, the number of those in Cracow Jewish community and possibly other groups who, like Sternschuss, ascribed to its more fluid and flexible definition would likely be much larger than national history would let us believe.

Early initiatives

The changing dynamic between the activities of the municipal government, philanthropists, the intelligentsia and the emerging broader public in the making of Cracow museums is already apparent in the early initiatives. Especially early on, the municipal representatives seemed to have favoured, on the one hand, a close collaboration with a select circle of individuals in leading positions in the city's institutions of science and culture over broad public participation, and on the other hand, the spirit of the antiquarian movement over more forward-looking and popular middle-class initiatives. As would become even more evident

later on, the city was particularly hesitant to embrace precisely these latter initiatives because of their much broader and more diverse public base.

While the first attempts at the institutionalisation of art and science collections date back to the creation of Cracow Scientific Society (*Towarzystwo Naukowe Krakowskie*) in 1815 and its activities during the following three decades, these attempts fell much more into the framework of earlier initiatives at collecting art that had regional and local significance. The society, established on the initiative of Walenty Litwiński (1778-1823), the rector of the Jagiellonian University, was originally conceived as an internal university institution and although this changed later, the strong link between its activities and those of the Jagiellonian University remained characteristic in the later decades.²⁷

The Museum of Antiquities, the idea for which first emerged in 1850, and the first Antiquarian Exhibition (*Wystawa starożytności*), which took place in the Lubomirski Palace in 1858, demonstrated a tendency that would be characteristic of many subsequent initiatives in the realm of art collecting and art museums. A significant overlap between the representatives of the municipality, the university, the private aristocratic and middle-class collectors and the initiatives of public art institutions was partly due to the fact that in a city as small as Cracow many initiatives were undertaken by a group of intricately connected public enthusiasts. However, they also shared some of the life-forming experiences. Though of different status and social position (some aristocratic and some what we would call the middle class), many of them shared the experience of the revolutionary events of 1848 (and, if often indirectly, of the Polish January uprising in Russia in 1863) and the subsequent exile. Many also were prominent *Stańczyks*. Dignitaries from the City Council, the municipal administration as well as professionals employed by the municipality – who were often the

same people active in the university networks or other public initiatives – played a fundamental role in the establishment of art museums in Cracow. Due to the shortage of buildings that could provide space for such initiatives, several locations in the city would repeatedly re-emerge, as well. The overlap of different institutional representatives and locations further accentuated just how small the cohort of enthusiasts actually was within the city's population. As urbanisation proceeded, this cohort which ultimately decided on how the new museums should look became proportionately even smaller.

The project for the establishment of the museum of antiquities, allegedly modelled on the Royal Museum of Northern Antiquities in Copenhagen, was drawn in 1850 by the Municipal Building Director and the member of the Scientific Society Karol Kremer (1812-1860). A prominent architect and conservator of architecture, Kremer directed the renovation works on most of the precious historic monuments in the city in the middle of the nineteenth century.²⁸ He was an active member of the local community and partook in a number of other preservationist and charitable organisations. When it came to the establishment of the committee for the selection of worthy artefacts for the museum, Kremer was an obvious choice.²⁹ Apart from Kremer, who was also involved in the organisation of the Exhibition of Antiquities in 1858, another important personality who would re-emerge later was university rector Józef Łepkowski (1826-1894).³⁰ Similarly, current or former university professors active politically would continue to be engaged: for example, prominent conservative politician Paweł Popiel (1807-1892), a co-founder of the academic magazine *Kwartalnik Naukowy* (Scientific Quarterly) and in 1848-53 sat at the City Council, and Wincenty Pol (1807-1872), a respected writer and geography professor.³¹ The host, Count Jerzy Henryk Lubomirski (1817-1872), was himself a conservative politician and a curator of the Ossolineum Library in Lemberg. One of the four rooms of the exhibition was dedicated to the

collection of the Lubomirski family, where family portraits were displayed along with other family regalia and historic weapons. Illustrative of early antiquarian exhibitions across Europe at the time, this arrangement nevertheless highlighted how important the representation of local aristocracy (*szlachta*) would be in the subsequent antiquarian exhibitions.³² Stored in Popiel's residence for two years, the exposition was moved to the newly constructed headquarters of the Scientific Society on Sławkowska 17 in 1864 along with the collection of antiquities from the Jagiellonian University Library, to become effectively the first public museum in Cracow. The second exhibition of antiquities took place in 1872 in a different location, the Bishop's Palace on Franciszkańska, a venue that would host a few more art-related institutions and exhibitions in the future.³³

Practically at the same time when the Scientific Society was established and the first exhibitions of antiquities took place, a different initiative was born largely outside the scope of municipal authority. The Society of the Friends of Fine Arts was founded in Cracow in 1854 by Walery Wielogłowski (1805-1865), also a former émigré and the descendant of a wealthy landowning family.³⁴ Like other such societies abroad, however, the Friends of Fine Arts primarily strove to popularise art and to support Cracow artists financially though organising large commercial art exhibitions.³⁵ Antiquarian pathos and aristocratic sentiment were essentially absent. The Society of the Friends of Fine Arts was responsible for the growth of some of the leading Cracow painters' reputation: Matejko, Artur Grottger and Henryk Rodakowski, and later the modernist movement "Young Poland" (*Młoda Polska*). It was through its exhibitions that their paintings were bought by wealthy families across the borders of partitioned Poland. The Society of the Friends of Fine Arts was also an increasingly professional organisation. Dominated in its early years by aristocratic landowning families, such as the Sanguszkos, the Czartoryskis and the Potockis, few of whom

had professional interest in the arts, and directed by a nobleman, Edward Aleksander Raczyński (1847–1926),³⁶ the society soon changed nature and its second, long-term directory board (1858-1926) included practically all notable artists and experts of local significance. In contrast to the antiquarian exhibitions that, though well attended, catered primarily for the aristocracy and the local elite comprised of artists, writers and academics, the Friends of Fine Arts' exhibitions attracted a much broader public including the wealthy middle class from Cracow and far beyond. It seems, however, that precisely because of the society's increasingly professional nature, its broader public appeal and initial commercial success the municipality concerned itself little with the activities of the organisation. It would be more adequate to speak of only minor, indirect involvement, such as the membership in it of Popiel, who sat on the City Council in 1848-1853 and was appointed the conservator of historic monuments in 1854. Originally housed in the Larisch Palace on Bracka, renovated in 1854 after the destruction by the Great Fire and donated to the city, the society amassed a collection of over 200 paintings by the early 1870s, moved to the Bishop's Palace in 1871, and finally to its own purpose-built Palace of Art (Pałac Sztuki) in 1901.

While the difference in the ways the city treated the Antiquarian Museum and the activities of the Friends of Fine Arts is striking, it only highlights how much more value and prestige the antiquarian movement, dominated by the leading aristocratic collectors, had in the eyes of the educated public in contrast to exhibitions of larger popular appeal. It also shows that another reason for the municipal involvement in and support of the antiquarian movement was its aristocratic flair, with which many in the City Council wished to associate. This attitude would gradually change as the leading academic painters that the Friends of Fine Arts brought to fame became centrepieces for new museums in the following decades. And yet its residues can also be seen in the involvement of the municipality with the three major public art

collections in the city that were initiated in 1860s: the Museum of Technology and Industry, the Czartoryski Museum and the National Museum.

Adrian Baraniecki, the Industrial Museum and municipal ambivalence

On 25 August 1868, a year after the signing of the Austrian-Hungarian Compromise and the establishment of Galician autonomy in the reformed monarchy, Adrian Baraniecki (1828-1891), a medical doctor by education and a passionate collector, returned from a three year-long travel in France and Britain, where in particular he was impressed with the works of John Ruskin and Henry Cole.³⁷ A model of Polish Positivism, Baraniecki believed in modernity, progress and dedicated work rather than historicising initiatives like that of the antiquarian movement or the Cracow municipality. Informed by Western experiences, he initiated the first industrial exhibition in the Cracow Town Hall, which was to display his collection of industrial artefacts. Baraniecki's choice of Cracow was deliberate, but it was not motivated by the existence of a local tradition of industrial design in any way, as the latter certainly lagged behind that of more industrially advanced regions of Austria-Hungary. Rather, Baraniecki saw the exhibition as one of the means to foster the awareness in the Western industrial design and the development of local crafts. The exhibition thus became an occasion to attract those within the Cracow community who, unlike the *Stańczyks* and the conservative intelligentsia, supported the development of Cracow into a modern metropolis rather than an antiquated historic capital and who saw modernity— in art, design and elsewhere – as a point of local pride. Baraniecki's spiritual affinity with the current city mayor Józef Dietl (1804-1878), with whom he shared not only professional allegiance, as Dietl was likewise a medical doctor by training, but also general goals on the development of the city, was one of the decisive factors.³⁸ But as the attendance of the exhibition testified, a larger new public in support of such initiatives was also emerging. At the same time, the

industrial exhibition highlighted not only how one individual's enthusiasm could eventually result in the establishment of a new cultural institution in the city and point it towards a development in a new direction, but also how the publicly declared commitment of the municipality to foster local industries and industrial design contrasted with what they were willing to contribute with in reality.

Baraniecki's collection consisted mostly of artefacts which he acquired a year earlier at the *Exposition Universelle*, and donated to the city of Cracow on the condition that it would make the foundation of the industrial museum, be maintained by the city and remain in Cracow permanently.³⁹ The exhibition in the Town Hall laid the foundations for the establishment of the Museum of Technology and Industry (*Muzeum Techniczno-Przemysłowe*, further in the text the Industrial Museum). Modelled on London's South Kensington Museum founded a decade earlier, it aimed to function also as a centre of learning: it strove to foster the development of local crafts through the improvement of technological skills among the craftsmen.⁴⁰ Entrance tickets to the museum collection were kept deliberately low to allow entry for the local middle and lower middle class. Furthermore, aiming at a much broader public, it was also designed to serve as a place of study – initially for the students of the fine arts and later for local craftsmen. The museum initiated public lectures for a wide urban audience where local luminaries such as Pol and Matejko, art historians Marian Sokołowski (1839-1911) and Karol Estreicher (1827-1907), and even future mayor Ferdynand Weigel (1826-1901) presented.⁴¹ Józef Ignacy Kraszewski (1812-1887), one of the most prolific writers in his generation, the 50th anniversary of whose creative career became a major celebration in Cracow in 1879 was also among the lecturers.⁴² As reported in 1872 by a popular Warsaw weekly *Tygodnik ilustrowany* (Illustrated Weekly) that was widely read in Cracow and was particularly popular with the conservative educated middle class:

The audience that gathers for those lectures is variable in number, from 80 to 200 persons ... belonging to the most diverse social layers and ages: serious people and academics sit side by side with the retinue of craftsmen and boys ... barely ten years of age. The number of the youngest attendees is usually dominant. Sometimes one finds a stray priest, or a soldier, a clerk, and one even saw a Jew from the Kazimierz District once.⁴³

This was clearly a very different public from that that collected for the events of the antiquarian movement. The museum was particularly welcoming to a much broader Cracovian community, including the poorer groups and the local Jewry. Apart from the anonymous Jew from the Kazimierz District and others like him who attended the lectures as reported by the journalist of *Tygodnik ilustrowany*, personalities of Jewish origin were prominent in the museum's committees and other initiatives. For example, architect Józef Sare (1850-1929)⁴⁴ who would later serve as a long-term vice-mayor and elected delegate to the Galician Parliament, features repeatedly in the Industrial Museum's committees.⁴⁵ In the early twentieth century, Sternschuss would teach art history at Baraniecki's Higher School for Women (*Wyższe Kursy dla Kobiet*), founded the same year as the museum, and would also be involved in the institutional reorganisation of the museum.⁴⁶ Baraniecki's museum was neither on the map of an average Habsburg dignitary, nor of a typical patriotic tourist; however, it attracted sizeable groups of visitors from Cracow and beyond who were particularly interested in sciences, applied arts and industrial design, including larger student groups from Cracow schools or those who stayed in the city for a longer period of time.⁴⁷ The museum also had a broader international outreach and reputation within the scientific community, as testified by visits by the delegation of Austrian Society of Engineers and Architects in 1885 and Rudolf Virchow in 1902.⁴⁸

Despite its popularity both at home and abroad, however, the City Council found only sparse funds to support its existence. The position of the museum's director remained unpaid, voluntary, and for life, and the peculiarity of the early years was that Baraniecki also functioned as a custodian and a gate keeper. While the museum was supported by a small yearly municipal subvention and later by the Galician Parliament, many items of the daily expenditure were covered from Baraniecki's own funds due to the inefficiency and often the lack of understanding on behalf of the municipality. The location in the Franciscan Cloister where the museum, a number of service rooms and the residence of the director were accommodated until finally moved to the elegant new building on Smoleńsk 9 in 1913, was small and hugely inadequate. By the early 1900s the collection amassed during the first decade of the museum's existence was kept in piles of boxes so enormous and disorganised that not even the director or the curator could keep proper records any longer. Visitors were reportedly repulsed by the miserable look of the dilapidated entrance gate and the odour of mould from the exhibition premises, and the director's own cramped office, far from being suitably representational, offered a humiliating view on a smeared wall in the backyard.⁴⁹ The shortage of municipal acknowledgement and material support thus ensured that the museum remained a civic, non-aristocratic initiative, set quite apart from the newly instituted historicising rituals of the municipality. For example, during emperor Francis Joseph's tour to Galicia in 1880, the visit to the Industrial Museum was crossed out from the final itinerary drafted by the municipality. By contrast, the full programme included a route from the train station to the Market Square with numerous locations of symbolic significance that gave an impression of the emperor meeting different representatives of the Galician society but was in fact entirely written down and controlled by the Stańczyks. Additionally, a series of paintings such as Juliusz Kossak's "Entrance of His Majesty the Emperor to Cracow" (1881) were

commissioned specifically for the event and celebrated exactly these elites and the event as their exceptional achievement.⁵⁰ In view of the local tour organisers in the municipal government, personalities like Baraniecki – or the artefacts from his museum – did not belong to this political narrative.

A few years later, the City Council was more willing to reframe the museum as an imperial institution though it was still unprepared to incorporate it into its larger museological initiatives. In 1888, Cracow municipality requested the permission to construct the new building for what it now wanted to call the Museum of Technology and Industry in the Name of Francis Joseph (*Muzeum Techniczno-Przemysłowe imienia cesarza Franciszka Józefa*), to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the Emperor's rule. However, Vienna rejected it as tactless on the grounds that the actual founder of the museum, Baraniecki, was still among the living.⁵¹ It is ironic that Vienna's rejection would highlight the lack of tact on behalf of the municipality in dealing with Baraniecki and his initiative.⁵²

One of the museum's most interesting and progressive initiatives, the Higher School for Women was funded entirely by Baraniecki himself.⁵³ It is particularly striking that at the time when the municipal government supported numerous symbolic historicizing initiatives it found no funds to assign to the management of such an important institution. Located in the House of Female Teachers (*Dom Nauczycielek*) on Karmelicka 36, the school was often referred to jokingly by its pejorative name "Baraneum" (a derivative from the founder's surname in effect implying that the school was producing "rams" i.e. idiots). Nevertheless, it was virtually the only institution in Cracow to offer professional education to women at the time. Until 1894, when the Jagiellonian University allowed women to enrol as students, its role and status in Cracow was unprecedented. Shortly before his death in 1891, the news of

Baraniecki planning to close the school due to bad health and the lack of funds were reported in the press. On that occasion, Cracow correspondent of *Dziennik Poznański* (Poznań Daily) appealed to the wider publicity, rather than to the city of Cracow, to support “the institution sustained though so many years by the power of will and energy, and even, in significant part, Dr. Baraniecki’s own funds, which turned out to be so extremely useful.”⁵⁴

It is also ironic that the museum’s founder and benefactor needed to die for the City Council to stop seeing it as a civic institution and to finally incorporate it into its funding programmes. In 1891, funding from the Ministry of Culture and Education was secured and the museum staff increased considerably under the directorship of the former custodian Jan Wdowiszewski (1853-1904). However, only after Wdowiszewski’s death in 1904 and a short interregnum when the museum was subordinated to the National Museum, by then the leading Cracow institution with an ambition to absorb other collections, and the appointment of architect Tadeusz Stryjeński (1849-1943) as director could the plans for the design and construction of the new building finally proceed.⁵⁵ The date is significant as it marked the beginning of the energetic and progressive mayoralty of Juliusz Leo (1861-1918), who would be remembered as a creator of “Greater Cracow” as well as for the removal of the Austrian military from the Wawel Hill. Under Leo, Cracow municipal government expanded its scope of activities to include more cultural initiatives.⁵⁶ In 1906, Cracow finally chose to implement its own 1888 decree to construct the new building and to take the Industrial Museum under its wing administratively. It prompted the municipal Savings Bank to contribute to the purchase of the plot on Smoleńsk and to the actual construction. Stryjeński and a fellow architect Franciszek Mączyński (1874-1947) designed the splendid Art Nouveau edifice, following the façade drawing by painter Józef Czajkowski (1872-1947), and the works were carried out in 1910–1914.⁵⁷ The bitter aftertaste of the earlier history of ignorance and neglect left an imprint on

this municipal success and further accentuated the limits to which the municipality wished to recognise the Industrial Museum and incorporate it into its official narratives and programmes. Extraordinarily successful with the new public, Baraniecki's institution fundamentally lacked that essential element that mobilised and engaged the local elites: aristocratic and antiquarian ethos, which fitted their vision of Cracow and its public institutions so much better than international industrial design and the the idea of modern Cracow.

Władysław Czartoryski, the aristocratic lobby and the Emperor

In the historiography on Cracow, the signing of an ownership agreement on several properties in the city centre on 13 November 1874 between Cracow municipality and Count Władysław Czartoryski (1828-1894) marks a symbolic union between the Stańczyk elites in the Town Hall and the émigré community, of which Czartoryski was one of the most prominent figures.⁵⁸ After some deliberation, the Count decided to move his library and art collection from his property that functioned as the Polish émigré headquarters in Paris, the Hotel Lambert, to Cracow, rather than to Lemberg or Vienna, which he apparently also considered. Returning them to his former home residence in Puławy, which fell into the Russian Partition, was obviously not an option.⁵⁹ The municipal sanction in 1874 to what would become Cracow's largest and most prominent aristocratic art collection was predated by lengthy negotiations. In these negotiations, both parties attempted to secure measures of control over the new institution to the mutual benefit.

The central property provided by the municipality was the building of the city's former armoury, Arsenal Miejski. It would build the core of the future museum, clustering around it other neighbouring buildings and structures such as the Florian Gate, a section of the

fortification walls, an adjacent building and a section of Planty, Cracow's green belt surrounding inner Medieval core and replacing the fortification walls except in the area in question, where two towers and a fraction of the walls were preserved in the nineteenth century.

Following scrupulous restoration work under the supervision of Viollet-le-Duc's student architect Maurice Ouradou (1822-1884) which were still to continue, the museum opened its doors in 1876. Despite the public status on paper, catering for the broader public was not among the museum administration's priorities. As Guichard-Marneur has argued, the museum rather used "its objects as mnemonic tools to remind those individuals privileged enough to see them of the glory of Poland."⁶⁰ The collection was often unavailable for viewing even for the representatives of the most educated and respected Cracow personalities. In May 1878 Estreicher, a leading art historian and a member of a respected local family, intended to show the collection to Czech composer František Ladislav Hovorka (1881-1929). To his astonishment he found it closed. Only after much subsequent tension between Czartoryski and Estreicher was Łepkowski, formerly the rector of the Jagiellonian University involved in the Antiquarian Exhibition previously and now the museum's director advised to establish a book of visitors and to regularly inform the public about the opening hours of the museum.⁶¹

Given the pronounced aristocratic nature of the collection as expressed by Czartoryski himself in his lecture at the Historical and Literary Society in 1882,⁶² its public, which from the outset included Cracow's aristocratic philanthropists, the academic elite, other local luminaries and municipal employees, was very different from that of the Industrial Museum even after the opening of the collection to the public. Czartoryski's affiliates in Cracow such as Dionizy Skarżyński (1820-1903), also formerly an émigré aristocrat, were instrumental in the

successful establishment of the museum and formed a powerful aristocratic lobby themselves. Dietl's successor mayor Mikołaj Zyplikiewicz (1823-1887), in office in 1874–1881 and Speaker of the Galician Parliament in 1881-1886, was also more supportive of the initiative, and there was a powerful lobby at the Academy of Learning, too.⁶³ A graduate of Lemberg University, Zyplikiewicz is remembered as one of the most resourceful Cracow mayors in reshaping the city into an historic artefact imbued with national symbolism.⁶⁴ The construction of the new building of the Academy of Fine Arts on the Planty (1879-1880) under Zyplikiewicz's mayoralty across from the Barbican and the Florian Gate created an important cultural cluster by bringing several institutions in the vicinity to each other. Czartoryski himself had a lot of leverage simply based on his status of a born and bred aristocrat and someone who corresponded with the Emperor directly.

In dealing with the question of turning Czartoryski's private aristocratic initiative into a public museum, the city exhibited both restraint and calculation. On the one hand, while publicly demonstrating good will, relieving Czartoryski from property tax or lowering it significantly on another occasion, and eventually offering him the honorary citizenship of the City of Cracow, it also insisted on a measure of control over the future museum. The Article 4 of the act of donation of the properties explicitly stated the right of the municipality to buy them back in case of sequestration or when the Count would decide to move his collection out of Cracow. Article 4 was a matter of some bitterness and frustration for Czartoryski, who was involved in a legal battle over it with the city during the next twenty years.

On the other hand, precisely those members of the university faculty who sat on the City Council and themselves frequented the museum for research purposes attempted to integrate the benefactor into larger urban schemes. For example, Czartoryski was included into

municipal organisation committees and other academic and public initiatives. In return, he was expected to contribute to them financially or in kind, including the funding of studentships. Every such gesture was immediately applauded publicly and in the press. The city also used the count's status and authority to impress the central government and legitimise itself in front of Vienna whenever possible. For example, Czartoryski was invited to the organisation committee of the Emperor Francis Joseph's visit to Cracow in 1880. The visit to the museum was given a prominent place in the programme and the fact that the emperor signed the book of visitors with his name written in Polish as "Franciszek Józef" was widely trumpeted in the press.⁶⁵ As a consequence, the museum was firmly put on the route of a visit by an important Austrian functionary, such as Minister President of Cisleithania Eduard Taaffe, or a distinguished foreign aristocrat, such as Italian ambassador to Vienna Count Constantino Nigra.⁶⁶ As far as municipal interest in and support of the Czartoryski Museum is concerned, forging the link between the conservative local elites and the émigré aristocracy and the prospects of turning it into a showcase to display for Vienna's appreciation played a much larger role than the concern for the significance of its collection to the broader local public or to all Poles.

The City, the National Museum and public engagement

The idea of a national museum in Cracow was voiced for the first time in 1868 – and although the discussions were often coloured with patriotic pathos and spoken from a broader national horizon encompassing all territories of partitioned Poland, the emphasis was, at the same time, often on the local, the regional and the urban significance of such a museum. At the same time, the project involved a great number of people at its various stages and was thus a matter of negotiation within and without the very urban elite that created it.

Incidentally, the initial idea was not far removed from the collection of antiquities that featured in the local discussions a decade or so earlier. This is evident from Pol's suggestion at his lecture on the preservation of monuments of the past during the meeting of the Scientific Society on 18 March 1868. Pol argued for the creation of a province-wide public collection (*zbiory krajowe publiczne*) that would encompass both excavated artefacts and other historic memorabilia.⁶⁷ The role of the official city representatives in shaping the future museum was crucial early on. At the meeting of the City Council two years later, on 5 January 1871, Dietl argued for the establishment of the national museum in the project for the "improvement of the city of Cracow" (*uporządkowanie miasta Krakowa*). This was one of the last initiatives of the frail mayor who spent his extensive time in office on much more mundane issues of infrastructure, road improvement, restoration after the Great Fire of 1850 and the encouragement of local trades and industries. That Dietl would think it timely to establish a national museum in the city is significant as it marks a threshold for many other prominent public figures of his generation. The improvement project concerned itself with the city's most urgent needs, and as the last item on its agenda, which followed the expected issues of canalisation, road management, water provision, school education, hospitals, slaughterhouses and the council headquarters, Dietl suggested the restoration of one of Cracow's landmark buildings, the Cloth Hall. There, he envisioned the "gallery of Polish Kings, Heroes, Scholars and Artists" (*galleria Królów, Bohaterów, Uczonych i Artystów polskich* – capitalisation in the original) where "historical paintings memorialising the great deeds of the nation, ... ethnographic collections [and] figures of past Polish armies" would create a "true National Museum."⁶⁸ It is easy to mistake the national pathos for a comprehensive programme encompassing the representation of all Polish lands within the museum. In reality, Cracow's specific historical and artistic heritage found its way as a prominent narrative in the national discourse.

Although the location of the new art museum in such a prominent building in the historic Medieval and Renaissance centre might appear obvious, it was far from being so to its contemporaries. A number of other important “contenders” i.e. historic buildings in a state of disrepair due to what the local intellectuals often perceived as deliberate neglect by the Austrian administration during the earlier periods were actively discussed in the municipal government meetings and in the press. Prominent architects such as Tomasz Pryliński (1847-1895) were involved in the renovation of many of them⁶⁹ and the fact that they were restored in the first place was due to Zyplikiewicz’s efforts. The restoration of the Cloth Hall, and a decade later the Wawel Castle complex, the medieval seat of Polish kings but in the possession of the Austrian army since 1846 fundamentally transformed the visual appeal of the city in the eyes of its inhabitants as well as visitors.⁷⁰

In 1875, Pryliński, who would become one of the most influential architects and conservators in Cracow in the subsequent decades, submitted his project proposal on the restoration of the Cloth Hall to the City Council. Zyplikiewicz, who was much more willing to engage with symbolic politics and was in general a very different kind of politician from his predecessor, was supportive. Pryliński finished the works within four years with a spectacular inauguration of the renovated building on 3 October 1879. In the same year, the Society of the Friends of Fine Arts moved from its previous residence in the Bishop’s Palace to the beautifully renovated Cloth Hall to share office with a few other institutions there, including the museum’s art collection.

The Kraszewski jubilee of 1879, which marked the symbolic beginning of the museum’s public collection, has been analysed in detail by Patrice Dabrowski.⁷¹ Following the

ceremony, during which Zyblikiewicz led the revered writer to the Cloth Hall, hours-long speeches and odes in Kraszewski's honour and a literary-artistic feast and ball, painter Henryk Siemiradzki surprised nearly everyone by donating his enormous "Nero's Torches" (1876) to the city of Cracow. Further donations followed. The City Council's resolution from 7 October 1879 to establish the National Museum "as a property of the Cracow community for the benefit of the whole nation"⁷² is illustrative of both the crucial role of the municipality in the foundation and the functioning of art museums in a specific urban setting and to the special vision that its ruling political and cultural elite desired to shape cities as showcases for their imagined nations. Guichard-Marneur reminds us, however, that far from a straightforward and consensual act as it is presented in national historiography, the National Museum was created "in an atmosphere of dissent, debate and strong opposition."⁷³ Furthermore, the early years of the museum were clouded by the degree of ambivalence about its purpose and directions. The restraint with which Cracovian conservative elites on the occasion embraced Kraszewski, whose views were far too radically national to Stańczyks' liking, and the caution with which Siemiradzki's donation was presented in the press as dedicated to "kraj" rather than the nation are testimonies of this ambivalence. "Kraj" was another peculiar term that conveniently blended definitions of home locality, region, province, and homeland that rendered it at least as difficult to translate as the German "Heimat." Employing the term might have been a useful tool for the city fathers to avoid angering the imperial centre while still being able to claim some allegiance to the national project. But such terminology was not unproblematic or without limits, and in this situation the city of Cracow was framed as the main denominator of this important museum initiative.

On 13 November 1879, the full session of the City Council approved the Committee of the National Museum (originally *Komisja dla utworzenia Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie*,

later called *Komitet Muzeum Narodowego*), whose aim was to work out the structures and functioning mechanisms of the future institution. The committee consisted of twelve members – six of whom came from the City Council, and six others were independent. As a reflection of the established *Stańczyk* arrangement that favoured working closely with the select academic elite in order to avoid including those who disagreed with their vision of Cracow's development, the municipality was represented by professors of the Jagiellonian University, among them one of the leading *Stańczyk*s historian Stanisław Tarnowski (1837-1917), the president of the Academy of Learning Józef Majer (1808-1899) and the president of the Notary Chamber of Cracow District Court and the city's future vice-mayor Stefan Muczkowski (1832-1895).⁷⁴ Independent members included Sokołowski, the long-term president of the Society of the Friends of Fine Arts Marcei Czartoryski (1841-1909) as well as Łuszczkiewicz and Popiel, the latter at that point a conservative MP to the Galician Parliament.

After a similarly intense discussion within the City Council in 1883, especially its sections on law and education, the revised version of the statute was finally published. This effectively meant that despite the fanfare of the spectacular inauguration during the Kraszewski Jubilee, the museum's doors remained closed for the next four years. This was largely due to the conflicting ideas within the city elite about what and how should be exhibited there as well as the inadequacy of the existing collection. For example, in September 1883, an exhibition dedicated to the 1683 Relief of Vienna and celebrating the legacy of King Jan Sobieski III, was organised in another wing of the Cloth Hall.⁷⁵ This exhibition, according to Dabrowski, was an occasion to distract the public attention from a rather mediocre state of the museum's art collection, an opinion shared among the local elite, including Zyblikiewicz himself.⁷⁶

Apart from large events such as the Relief of Vienna Exhibition, which incorporated artefacts

from other collections and celebrated the empire as much as the Polish nation, the struggle to bring order and logic or any unifying rationale to the large and fast growing collection through permanent display in the first years was only partially successful.

Although a number of “outstanding and serious personalities” (*wybitne i poważne osobistości*)⁷⁷ from the province of Galicia and from abroad were invited to express their views during the public discussion of the statute in 1881-1883, the sheer number of local actors, from the members of the Committee of the National Museum to all delegates of the City Council ensured that, in its statute, collecting practices and institutional arrangement, the museum also had an important local dimension that suited the Stańczyk elites. According to the approved statute the museum became the property of the city community (*Gmina*), which was obligated to finance it and to foster the growth of its collections through purchase as well as through gifts and bequests. It was financially supported by an annual donation from the city, a smaller donation from the Galician Parliament and further contributions from the local institutions, such as an insurance fund (*fundusz asekuracyjny*), which increased as time went by.⁷⁸ It was governed by a committee consisting of eight experts from Cracow and ten remaining members selected from the tested members of City Council and artists. The first committee, appointed in 1883, included many familiar names representing the university, the arts academy, the Friends of Fine Arts as well as municipal employees, who belonged to the small cohort of the involved personalities in previous museum initiatives. Both Cracow mayor and vice-mayor were also involved. Prominent art historian Władysław Łuszczkiewicz, who was appointed director also belonged to this small circle.⁷⁹

The resonance of the museum’s foundation quickly extended beyond Galicia to other partitions and even further afield and several important art patrons and collectors outside of

Cracow donated works to the museum. Konstanty Schmidt-Ciążyński (1818-1889), a well-travelled collector and a member of cosmopolitan Polish circles who at that point resided in London and had a reputation of a respected antiquarian, was the owner of a large corpus of paintings, sculptures, etchings, books, applied arts, gems and cameos. Originally intended for the Polish Museum in Rapperswil, it was donated to Cracow's National Museum, which for Schmidt-Ciążyński and others served as the depository of national traditions. Others followed suit, and their actions were praised in the local press.⁸⁰ The symbolic importance of the National Museum for émigré intellectuals is further emphasized by the fact that Schmidt-Ciążyński did not think of splitting his collection and donating the items of applied arts to Baraniecki's Museum of Industry. At the same time, it is equally evident that the many more donations that arrived between 1879 and 1883 were either from Cracow or were on Cracow-related subjects (such as, for example, Marcin Jabłoński's "Krakowianka").⁸¹

This tendency persisted later on, as well. For example, in 1901, Adolf Schernschuss and others from the Society of Lovers of History and Monuments of Cracow organised the exhibition of an important painter of the Romantic period, Michał Stachowicz (1768-1825). The exhibition catalogue presented him above all as a *Cracovian* painter and praised his contribution to the city's churches as well as to the commemoration of important historical events.⁸² Stachowicz's many versions of Tadeusz Kościuszko's 1794 oath at the Market Square in Cracow, some of them now in the archives of the National Museum, as well as his many other paintings firmly linked Cracow to Polish history in a particular way and celebrated the city's historic pre-eminence in the former Commonwealth. The City Council donated their 1821 copy of Stachowicz's gouache depicting Kościuszko's oath to the National Museum already in 1884. On the occasion of the exhibition, Sternschuss, among others, also contributed with some of the artist's etchings from his own collection, a large part of which

would be donated to the National Museum after his death.⁸³ His contribution shows that the museum engaged more local benefactors than is generally recognised as tried to appeal to both local patriotism and the greater Polish nation across the partitioned territories. At the same time, as so much of the exposition was either based on local artefacts or celebrated the place of Cracow in larger events pertinent to national history, and in a specific situation when free expression was so much more limited in Congress Kingdom, Cracow was becoming one of the primary indicators for the nation.

At the same time, the degree to which the museum wished to engage with the broader public was changing, too. One extreme example from 1879, reported by Dabrowski, might illustrate the elitist nature of the future museum and its initial averseness to reach out to the countryside in particular. During the Kraszewski Jubilee, one particular peasant whom the venerated writer knew personally and who greatly contributed to the popularisation of the anniversary in the countryside, Maciej Szarek, was promised but eventually refused an entry ticket to the celebration by the municipality. To Kraszewski's great displeasure, the city authorities in a typical Stańczyk attitude argued that they would not allow entry to a peasant "when so many dignitaries had to be refused."⁸⁴ By contrast, during the Relief of Vienna exhibition, it was decided to make the museum permanently open to the public. Furthermore, village school groups were allowed free entry from 1892, and as part of the centennial of the Kościuszko Insurrection in 1894, free admission was granted to all visitors. A significant increase in the number of peasants and school groups visiting the museum was reported. However, it would be an overstatement to suggest that, by the early twentieth century, the museum became, as Guichard-Marneur put it, "a point of contact between the ruling class and the people"⁸⁵ for the simple reason that the culture of exhibitions at the time did not involve active engagement with the broader public unless in very abstract future terms. For instance, commenting on the

state of the collection of the National Museum in 1904, Galician illustrated paper *Ilustracya polska* (Polish illustration) simply argued that much more time and a more adequate location “where objects could be adequately exposed” was needed until “the broader layers of our society would know that ... they can and should turn to the National Museum.”⁸⁶

This certainly set limits to the effectiveness of the museum’s activities locally. Even in the early twentieth century, the Jews, the mass of the newly migrant suburban populations and others who did not belong to the nation as imagined by Cracow’s conservative elites were largely absent in the reports. At the same time, these groups were becoming increasingly aware of the activities of the museum and its prominence in the city as well as the imagined nation. In this, they were assisted by their press. For example, in the early twentieth century Cracow popular illustrated weekly *Nowości Ilustrowane* (Illustrated news) that catered predominantly for suburban readership started to inform on the activities of the National Museum, and in 1909 dedicated a long article about it on the occasion of its twenty-fifth anniversary.⁸⁷ Such news reports, along with the activities of those within the Jewish community who, like Sternschuss, understood the Polish nation in much broader, more inclusive terms and contributed to the functioning of the museum in so many different ways testified that the museum’s popular outreach was becoming much broader than the gentlemen at the City Council, the academic circles and the museum’s curatorium would be prepared to admit.

Conclusions

Focusing our attention on museums as urban institutions challenges us to revisit their role and function that has often been narrowed indiscriminately to the familiar story of nation building. Furthermore, it encourages us to rethink the nature of the national project itself. At the time

when groups of enthusiasts at the municipality, the university and the aristocratic, educated and émigré circles initiated the creation of public museums to display their vision of Polish history with Cracow as its centrepiece, the story of their foundation and the first several decades of their functioning is a much more complex one. As institutions, they – and the individuals involved in their creation – needed to reconcile regional and local identities, aristocratic and antiquarian values with the interests of the municipality, the educated elite, and the broader public. They needed to respond to the challenges of modernity and the imagined needs of the nation rather loosely defined. Originally created by and *for* a small elite, museums ended up serving a number of different purposes in the life of the nation and the Cracovian community in the subsequent decades.

That nation was understood by some as exclusive, elitist and imbued with aristocratic grandeur and the memories of former glory, and by others in much more inclusive terms of heterogeneity and modernity was the characteristic of the time. However, in every instance beyond the nation imagined in broad abstract terms there was also its local, specifically urban, Cracovian characteristic. Clear preference given to Czartoryski's aristocratic collection as opposed to the Industrial Museum shows not only that it was much more instrumental for the municipality as it pursued its own agendas vis-à-vis the local population, the national project, and Vienna, but also the survival, until the early twentieth century, of conservative antiquarian values among the local elite and their peculiar understanding of Cracow as a historic city. For Stańczyks, the small cohort of academic elite who worked with them on the making of Cracow museums as well as for the aristocratic émigré community, Cracow meant antiquity and not modernity. At the same time, the number of those within the municipal government and the larger public who similarly to Dietl and Baraniecki understood Cracow not only as a reliquary of Polish national traditions but also a modern metropolis was not

negligible. The lack of municipal support for Baraniecki's initiative until after his death is unfortunate, but together with the museum's popularity with the new public it also highlights tensions between those among in the municipal government who, along with the aristocratic donors and the political elite favored the historicizing project, and the public who imagined Cracow differently.

In the history of the National Museum in the first decades of its existence one finds moments of ambivalence. Involving a much larger number of actors that shaped its collection and display, the National Museum attempted to speak with several voices to its diverse imagined publics – the national, the local, the aristocratic, and the peasant one – and the resulting message was often lost behind the cacophony of those voices and reached out only to the fraction of the local public. The museum struggled to define itself and to bring forward a comprehensive permanent collection with a clear concept and agenda. And yet here, too, there emerges an important local, urban dimension. It seems that, even though the city had not been the capital of the Polish Commonwealth since the sixteenth century and most of the national uprisings had played out primarily in the Congress Kingdom, Cracovian art and culture at the National Museum was actually *becoming* the culture of the national project as a whole. This was due to several factors, from a particular constellation of the Habsburg Monarchy that allowed free expression in contrast to the other partitions to the nature of the museum donations and the predominance of the historicizing vision of Cracow among its curatorial board. It demonstrates an interesting and until now insufficiently researched dynamic within the Polish national project that might have further parallels in Central Europe and beyond.

Furthermore, the museum's public was clearly evolving from the elitist and exclusive one in the 1870s that was typical for the earlier antiquarian movement to include, by the early

twentieth century, peasantry, high school students as well as individuals of Jewish origin. This is an indication that looking at the national project from an urban standpoint might actually prompt us to include more Cracovian communities than those typically included in standard national histories. Of course, segments of the city's suburban population and others within the local public for whom the national project remained less important than living the modern city were still excluded at the time. However, even those new Cracovians who preferred indulging in riding modern trams, going to the cinema and reading the cheap boulevard press rather than going to a museum were made aware of its activities, sometimes through the publication in the press that catered specifically to them. This suggests a deepening of national culture to include urban classes and the rural population that might well have made Cracovian museum culture paradigmatic of a new trend in Polish self-identification.

¹ The author would like to express his thanks to Nathaniel D. Wood and the anonymous reviewers of the *Austrian History Yearbook* for their useful comments on the earlier draft of this article.

² Eric Hobsbawm, “Mass-Producing Traditions: Europe 1870–1914,” in Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge, 1983), 263–308.

³ See in particular Simon Knell, *National Galleries: the Making of Nations* (London: Routledge, 2016); Carol Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums* (London: Routledge, 2005); Peter Aronsson, Gabriella Elgenius, eds., *National Museums and Nation-building in Europe 1750-2010: Mobilization and Legitimacy, Continuity and Change* (London: Routledge, 2014); Donald Preziosi, *Brain of the Earth’s Body: Art, Museums and the Phantasms of Modernity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003); Susan A. Crane, *Collecting and Historical Consciousness in Early Nineteenth-century Germany* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000); *ibid.*, ed., *Museums and Memory* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000); James J. Sheehan, *Museums in the German Art World from the End of the Old Regime to the Rise of Modernism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Tony Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics* (London: Routledge, 1995); Daniel Sherman, *Worthy Monuments: Art Museums and the Politics of Culture in Nineteenth Century France* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989).

⁴ On Vienna, see Herbert Haupt, *Das Kunsthistorische Museum: Die Geschichte des Hauses am Ring* (Vienna: Christian Brandstätter, 1991); Cäcilia Bischoff, *Kunsthistorisches Museum: History, Architecture, Decoration* (Vienna: Christian Brandstätter, 2010); Gudrun Swoboda, *Die kaiserliche Gemäldegalerie in Wien und die Anfänge des öffentlichen Kunstmuseums* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2013). For a good overview of the approaches to other museums in Central Europe, see Ernő Marosi and Gábor Klaniczay, eds., *The Nineteenth-*

century Process of “Musealization” in Hungary and Europe (Budapest: Collegium Budapest, 2006).

⁵ Maud Guichard-Marneur, “Drafting Futures: The Birth of the Museum Institution in Cracow, 1868-1939,” *Centropa* 12, no. 2 (2012): 113-130. For institutional history of museums as part of the national project, see Franciszek Stolat, ed., et al, *Narodziny Muzeum. Ważniejsze daty w stuletnich dziejach Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie* [The Birth of the museum. Important dates in the centenary history of the National Museum in Cracow] (Cracow: Muzeum Narodowe, 1979); Beata Krzaczyńska, ed., *Zapomniane muzeum. Adrian Baraniecki i Muzeum Techniczno-Przemysłowe 1868-1950* [Forgotten museum. Adrian Baraniecki and the Technical-Industrial Museum 1868-1950], Exhibition catalogue (Cracow: Muzeum Inżynierii Miejskiej, 2013); Zdzisław Żygulski, ed, *Muzeum Czartoryskich: Historia i Zbiory* [Czartoryski Museum: History and Collections] (Cracow: Muzeum Narodowe, 1998); Janusz Pezda (ed.), *Władysław Czartoryski, wystawa w stulecie śmierci* [Władysław Czartoryski, exhibition of the centenary of death] (Cracow: Muzeum Czartoryskich, 1994).

⁶ Pieter M. Judson, *The Habsburg Empire: A New History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2016).

⁷ See Jeremy King, “The Nationalization of East Central Europe: Ethnicism, Ethnicity, and Beyond,” in Maria Bucur and Nancy M. Wingfield, eds., *Staging the Past: The Politics of Commemoration in Habsburg Central Europe, 1848 to the Present* (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 2001), 112-52.

⁸ For an overarching new narrative that incorporates this scholarship, see Judson, *The Habsburg Empire*. Also see idem, *Guardians of the Nation: Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006); James E. Bjork, *Neither German nor Pole: Catholicism and National Indifference in a Central European Borderland* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2008); Tara Zahra, *Kidnapped Souls:*

National Indifference and the Battle for Children in the Bohemian Lands, 1900-1948 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008).

⁹ Celia Applegate, *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990); Alon Confino, *The Nation as a Local Metaphor: Württemberg, Imperial Germany, and National Memory, 1871-1918* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).

¹⁰ Guichard-Marneur, "Drafting Futures."

¹¹ Nathaniel D. Wood, *Becoming Metropolitan: Urban Selfhood and the Making of Modern Cracow* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2010); Patrice M. Dabrowski, *Commemorations and the Shaping of Modern Poland* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004); Keely Stauter-Halsted, *The Nation in the Village: The Genesis of Peasant National Identity in Austrian Poland, 1848-1914* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2001).

¹² For a good historical summary, see Nathaniel D. Wood, "The 'Polish Mecca,' the 'Little Vienna on the Vistula' or 'Big-City Cracow'?: Imagining Cracow before the Great War," *Urban History*, 40, no. 2 (2013): 229-31.

¹³ Further on Lemberg, see Markian Prokopovych, *Habsburg Lemberg: Architecture, Public Space and Politics in the Galician Capital, 1772-1914* (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 2008).

¹⁴ See Jacek Purchla, *Krakau unter österreichischer Herrschaft 1846-1918. Faktoren seiner Entwicklung* (Vienna, Cologne and Weimar: Böhlau, 1993); idem, *Jak powstał nowoczesny Kraków* [How modern Cracow emerged] (Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1990); Wojciech Balus, *Krakau zwischen Traditionen und Wegen in die Moderne: Zur Geschichte der Architektur und der öffentlichen Grünanlagen im 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2003).

¹⁵ On how Cracow was routinely compared by nation builders to Mecca, Athens and Rome to stress the importance of its literary, artistic, cultural and ecclesiastic circles and institutions, see Wood, “The ‘Polish Mecca.’”

¹⁶ Daniel L. Unowsky, *The Pomp and Politics of Patriotism: Imperial Celebrations in Habsburg Austria, 1848-1916* (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 2000).

¹⁷ Wood, “The ‘Polish Mecca.’”

¹⁸ Wood, “The ‘Polish Mecca’”; idem, *Becoming Metropolitan*.

¹⁹ “Jubileusz Muzeum Narodowego [National Museum Jubilee]” *Nowości Illustrowane*, 23 October 1909, 15-16

²⁰ “W sprawie wystawy starożytności [On the issue of the antiquarian exhibition],” *Kurjer lwowski*, 12 August 1887, 3.

²¹ *Katalog pierwszej wielkiej wystawy sztuki polskiej w Krakowie, we wrześniu 1887: Wystawa Krajowa Rolniczo-Przemysłowa w Krakowie 1887. Oddział Sztuki Polskiej* [Catalog of the First General Exhibition of Polish art in Cracow, September 1887: Provincial Agricultural and Industrial Exhibition 1887: Section of Polish Art] (Cracow: Czas, 1887).

²² Dr. Majer Balaban. “O zabytkach historycznych żydów w Polsce (Wstęp do dziejów sztuki żydowskiej w Polsce. Ciąg dalszy) [On historic artefacts of Jews in Poland. An introduction to the history of Jewish art in Poland. Continued]”, *Kurjer lwowski* 15 June 1908, 3.

²³ Andrzej Żbikowski, *Żydzi krakowscy i ich gmina w latach 1869-1919* [Cracow Jews and their district in 1869-1919] (Warsaw: DiG, 1994), 13, quoted in Wood, *Becoming Metropolitan*, 30.

²⁴ Wood, *Becoming Metropolitan*, 31. Further on such taboos, which were characteristic for Habsburg Central Europe, see Mary Gluck, *The Invisible Jewish Budapest: Metropolitan Culture at the Fin de Siècle* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2016).

²⁵ See, for example, “Wycieczka młodzieży gimnazjalnej do Krakowa [A tour of the gymnasium youth to Cracow],” *Kurjer stanisławowski*, 1 June 1902, 2.

²⁶ Adolf Sternschuss, *Godła domów krakowskich* [Cracow Houses’ Emblems] (Cracow: Czas, 1899). On Sternschuss see Rafał Róg, “Adolf Sternschuss. Miłośnik sztuki, co na stos rzucił swój życia los [Adolf Sternschuss: Art lover who threw his life on a pyre],” *Mówią Wieki* (2013) 5, 28-30.

²⁷ Stolot, *Narodziny Muzeum*, 3-57, 5. On the establishment of the Scientific Society and the Society of the Friends of Fine Arts, see Matthew Rampley, *The Vienna School of Art History: Empire and the Politics of Scholarship, 1847–1918* (University Park: Penn State University Press, 2013), 66-7.

²⁸ Antoni Henryk Stachowski, ed., et al., *Encyklopedia Krakowa* [Cracow Encyclopaedia] (Warsaw and Cracow: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 2000), 507.

²⁹ Other committee members included another municipal employee, water inspector Teofil Żebrawski (1800-1887), who was a prominent cartographer, architect and mathematician and was also involved in some of the same restoration works with Kremer.

³⁰ Further see Barbara Łepkowska, *Ludwik Łepkowski (1829-1905) i jego działalność na polu sztuki* [Ludwik Łepkowski (1829-1905) and his activity in the field of art], Vol. 1 (Cracow: Collegium Columbinum, 2006).

³¹ Further on on Popiel, see, for example, Unowsky, *The Pomp and Politics*, 42-43. Wincenty Pol is also incidentally believed to have introduced the important term “kresy” (borderlands) to Polish historiography to define the eastern territories of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

³² See Karol Beyer, *Album fotograficzne wystawy starożytności i zabytków sztuki urządzonej przez c.k. Towarzystwo Naukowe w Krakowie 1858 i 1859 r.* [Photo album of the exhibition of antiquities and historic artefacts organised by the k. k. Scientific Society in Cracow]

(Warsaw: K. Beyer, 1859); Lucjan Siemieński, *Przegląd wystawy starożytności i zabytków sztuki urządzonej w Krakowie przez Komisję delegowaną z oddziału archeologii i sztuk pięknych w c. k. Tow. Nauk. krakowskiem* [Overview of the exhibition of antiquities and historic artefacts organised in Cracow by the committee of the archaeological and fine arts department of the k. k. Cracow Scientific Society] (Cracow: Czas, 1858).

³³ In 1872, the Scientific Society was also transformed into the Academy of Arts and Letters (*Akademia Umiejętności*) but remained in the same venue on Sławkowska until today (Stolot, *Narodziny Muzeum*, 6).

³⁴ Jerzy Kuzicki, *Orężem i pracą. Życie i działalność Walerego Wielogłowskiego (1805-1865)* (Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej w Rzeszowie, 2005).

³⁵ Stolot, *Narodziny Muzeum*, 7.

³⁶ Andrzej Wojtkowski, *Edward Raczyński i jego dzieło* [Edward Raczyński and his work] (Poznań: Nakł. Biblioteki Raczyńskich, 1929).

³⁷ See Krzaczyńska, *Zapomniane muzeum. Adrian Baraniecki i Muzeum Techniczno-Przemysłowe 1868-1950*; Piotr Hapanowicz, “Adrian Baraniecki – prekursor polskiego muzealnictwa przemysłowego [Adrian Baraniecki – a precursor of Polish industrial museology],” *Muzealnictwo* 57 (2016), 16-25; idem, “Działalność Muzeum Techniczno-Przemysłowego w Krakowie i jego likwidacja w latach 1949–1950 [The Activity of the Technical-Industrial Museum in Cracow and its liquidation in 1949-1950],” *Zarządzanie w Kulturze* 8 (2007), 43-62; Purchla, *Krakau unter österreichischer Herrschaft*, 69, 80, 88, 98.

³⁸ Further on Dietl, see, for example, Purchla, *Krakau*, 39-40; Guichard-Marneur, “Drafting Futures,” 115.

³⁹ See “Krótki zarys historii budowy Muzeum techniczno przemysłowego w Krakowie [A brief outline of the history of the Technical Industrial Museum in Cracow],” *Archiwum*

państwowe w Krakowie MPA 16, sp. 352; also see Krzaczyńska, *Zapomniane muzeum*, 16-17.

⁴⁰ Stolot, *Narodziny Muzeum*, 8; Guichard-Marneur, “Drafting Futures,” 116; David Crowley, *National Style and Nation-state: Design in Poland from the Vernacular Revival to the International Style* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992), 9-10, 12-15, 48-50 and 61-65.

⁴¹ “Krótki zarys historii budowy.” Further see Lech Kalinowski, “Marian Sokołowski,” in Lech Kalinowski, ed., *Stulecie Katedry Historii Sztuki Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego (1882-1892)* [Centenary of the Art History Department of the Jagiellonian University (1882-1892)] (Warsaw, 1990), 11-35; also see Stanisław Zarewicz, ‘Marjan Sokołowski’, *Kurjer Lwowski*, 4 April 1911, 7-8; Krystyna Grzybowska, *Estreicherowie. Kronika rodzinna* [The Estreichers. Family Chronicle] (Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1999); *Encyklopedia Krakowa*, 193. Ferdinand Weigel, a Lemberger, served as Cracow mayor in 1881-1884. On the course lectures for 1897, see, for example, ‘Dr Wiktor Czermak’, *Dziennik krakowski*, 1 May 1897, 4.

⁴² Dabrowski, *Commemorations*, 25-48.

⁴³ Krzaczyńska, *Zapomniane museum*, 16-7.

⁴⁴ Henryk Markiewicz, ed., et al, *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, Vol. XXXV (Warsaw and Cracow: Polska Akademia Nauk, 1994), 189-193.

⁴⁵ “Program konkursu dla rękodzielników w Galicji [Program of the competition for Galician craftsmen]”, *Kurjer lwowski*, 28 November 1888, 3-4; “Posiedzenie rady miejskiej z d. 20 lipca b.r. [City Council Session on 20 July]”, *Kurjer krakowski*, 22 July 1897, 4-5.

⁴⁶ Róg, “Adolf Sternschuss.” On the Higher School for Women, see Janina Kras, *Wyższe Kursy dla Kobiet im. A. Baranieckiego w Krakowie, 1868-1924* [Higher School for Women in the name of A. Baraciecki in Cracow, 1868-1924] (Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1972).

⁴⁷ See, for example, “Galicyjski przemysł [Galician industry],” *Kurjer lwowski*, 30 August 1885, 4; “Gimnazjum żeńskie w Krakowie [Gymnasium for women in Cracow],” *Kurjer lwowski*, 15 July 1897, 1-2; “Wyciecka młodzieży gimnazjalnej do Krakowa [Visit of gymnasium students to Cracow],” *Kurjer stanisławowski*, 1 June 1902, 2.

⁴⁸ “Austriacy inżynierowie i architekci w Krakowie [Austrian engineers and architects in Cracow],” *Kurjer Lwowski*, 9 September 1885, 1; “Virchow w Krakowie [Virchow in Cracow],” *Kurjer lwowski*, 7 October 1902, 2. On the appreciation of Baraniecki’s museum among ethnographers, see see Bronisław Piłsudski, “Czeskie etnograficzne muzeum w Pradze [Czech ethnography museum in Prague],” *Kurjer lwowski*, 22 September 1913, 1.

⁴⁹ Krzaczyńska, *Zapomniane muzeum*, 29-33.

⁵⁰ Unowski, *The Pomp and Politics*, 61-4.

⁵¹ Hapanowicz, “Adrian Baraniecki,” 21.

⁵² Krzaczyńska, *Zapomniane muzeum*, 21-2.

⁵³ Kras, *Wyższe Kursy dla Kobiet*.

⁵⁴ ‘Potrzeba poparcia [The need to support]’, *Kurjer lwowski*, 31 March 1891, 1.

⁵⁵ Lechosław Lameński, “Tadeusz Stryjeński (1849–1943) – architekt, konserwator i przemysłowiec krakowski. Biografia [Tadeusz Stryjeński (1849–1943) – Cracow architect, conservator and industrialist. A biography],” *Prace Humanistyczne* 1, no. 30 (1991), 59-101.

⁵⁶ Celina Bąk-Koczarska, *Juliusz Leo - Twórca Wielkiego Krakowa [Juliusz Leo the Creator of Greater Cracow]* (Wrocław, Warsaw and Cracow: Ossolineum, 1986). Also see Wood, “The ‘Polish Mecca,’” 228, 234.

⁵⁷ The partial collapse of the new construction prompted Stryjeński’s eventual resignation in 1910. See “Krótki zarys historii budowy”; Jan Adamczewski, ed., *Mała encyklopedia Krakowa [Small encyclopaedia of Cracow]* (Cracow: Wanda, 1999), 504; *Encyklopedia Krakowa*, 599.

⁵⁸ Purchla, *Krakau*, 57. Further see Pezda, *Władysław Czartoryski*.

⁵⁹ Janusz Nowak, “Władze gminy miasta Krakowa wobec Muzeum Książąt Czartoryskich 1874-1939 [Cracow municipal government to the Princes Czartoryski Museum, 1874-1939],” *Krakowski rocznik archiwalny* 7 (2001), 96.

⁶⁰ Guichard-Marneur, “Drafting Futures,” 117-18.

⁶¹ Nowak, “Władze gminy,” 98.

⁶² “Odczyt Władysława Czartoryskiego, wygłoszony na posiedzeniu Towarzystwa Historyczno-Literackiego, 8 stycznia 1882 roku w Paryżu [Władysław Czartoryski's lecture, delivered at a meeting of the Historical-Literary Society, 8 January 1882 in Paris]” in Pezda, *Władysław Czartoryski*.

⁶³ See Nowak, “Władze gminy miasta Krakowa,” 95-6. Further see Irena Homola, *Kraków za prezydentury Mikołaja Zybkiewicza* [Cracow under the presidency of Mikołaj Zybkiewicz] (Cracow, 1976).

⁶⁴ Further see Purchla, *Krakau*, 56-7.

⁶⁵ Nowak, “Władze gminy,” 96-9.

⁶⁶ “Prezydent ministrów [Minister President],” *Kurjer lwowski*, 9 June 1889, 4; “Z Krakowa donoszą [Report from Cracow],” *Kurjer lwowski*, 24 June 1898, 3

⁶⁷ Quoted in Stolot, *Narodziny Muzeum*, 9.

⁶⁸ Stolot, *Narodziny Muzeum*, 10.

⁶⁹ Apart from the photo-documentation of the Wawel Castle complex and Sukiennice, Pryliński also renovated the Bishop's Palace, in 1881-84.

⁷⁰ More on Wawel restoration, see Rampley, *The Vienna School*, 196-8; Bałus, *Krakau*, 2002. For a suggestion to establish the National Museum in the Wawel Hill, see Teodor Nieczuja Ziemięcki, *Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie* [National Museum in Cracow] (Cracow, 1878);

idem, *Zamek na Wawelu i Muzeum Narodowe* [The Castle on the Wawel Hill and the National Museum] (Cracow, 1879).

⁷¹ Dabrowski, *Commemorations*, 25-48; also see Guichard-Marneur, “Drafting Futures,” 119-20.

⁷² *Uchwała Rady miasta Krakowa o utworzeniu Muzeum Narodowego w Sukiennicach jako własności Gminy m. Krakowa na pożytek całego narodu* [Resolution of the City Council of Cracow on the creation of the National Museum in Cloth Hall as the property of the municipality of Cracow for the benefit of the whole nation] (Stolot, *Narodziny Muzeum*, 12).

⁷³ Guichard-Marneur, “Drafting Futures,” 120-1.

⁷⁴ Stefan Muczkowski was the son of Józef Muczkowski, also a professor at the Jagiellonian University, who was involved in the museum of antiquities.

⁷⁵ On how King Sobieski became a compromise figure to celebrate both Habsburg loyalty and the Polish nation, see, for example, Prokopowych, *Habsburg Lemberg*, 170-2.

⁷⁶ Maryan Sokołowski, *Wystawa zabytków z czasów Jana III w Sukiennicach krakowskich* [Exhibition of monuments from the times of John III in the Cloth Hall of Cracow] (Cracow: Czas, 1884); Guichard-Marneur, “Drafting Futures,” 122-3; Dabrowski, *Commemorations*, 48-74, 51-53.

⁷⁷ Stolot, *Narodziny Muzeum*, 15.

⁷⁸ *Sprawozdania Muzeum Narodowego 1887-1898* [Reports of the National Museum, 1887-1898] (Cracow: Czas, 1888-99).

⁷⁹ Marcei Czartoryski, Majer, Muszkowski, Kossak, Siemiradzki, Łepkowski (at that point archaeology professor at the Jagiellonian University), Sokołowski (now professor of art history at the same university). Additionally, the president of the Academy of Learning (Majer) and another representative of the Friends of Fine Arts (Otto Hausner) also participated (Stolot, *Narodziny Muzeum*, 15-16).

⁸⁰ Further on Schmidt-Ciążyński see Joachim Śliwa, “Konstanty Schmidt-Ciążyński (1817–1889): Zapomniany kolekcjoner i znawca starożytnej gliktyki [Konstanty Schmidt-Ciążyński (1817-1889): Forgotten collector and expert of ancient cameos],” *Meander* XLIII (1988) 9–10, 437–51.

⁸¹ Stolot, *Narodziny Muzeum*, 18-21.

⁸² Emmanuel Świeykowski, *Katalog malowideł, rysunków, sztychów i litografii Michała Stachowicza wystawionych w salach Sukiennic staraniem Towarzystwa Miłośników Historii i Zabytków Krakowa* [Catalog of paintings, drawings, sketches and lithographs by Michał Stachowicz exhibited in the Cloth Hall due to the efforts of the Society of Lovers of History and Monuments of Cracow] (Cracow: Towarzystwo Miłośników Historii i Zabytków Krakowa, 1901).

⁸³ Róg, “Adolf Sternschuss.”

⁸⁴ Dabrowski, *Commemorations*, 35-6. On further divisions within Galician peasantry and the privileged status of the so-called “Cracowian” peasants, see Stauter-Halstead, *The Nation in the Village*, 9.

⁸⁵ Guichard-Marneur, “Drafting Futures,” 123-4.

⁸⁶ Dr. K. S., “Muzeum Narodowe,” *Ilustracya polska* 20 (9 June 1904), 320.

⁸⁷ “Jubileusz Muzeum Narodowego,” *Nowości Illustrowane*, 23 October 1909, 15-16.