

1

Salvage and Speculation: Collecting on the London Art Market After the Franco-Prussian**War (1870-71)****Tom Stammers**

The aptly named *année terrible* 1870-71- which comprised the Franco-Prussian War, the Siege of Paris and the insurrection and civil war of the Paris Commune- had dramatic consequences for the conservation and dispersal of French works of art. The rapid disintegration of the Second Empire, the war and the Commune prompted a desperate flight of French courtiers, collectors, painters and dealers across the Channel, and their presence enriched and reconfigured the London art market. This chapter documents the impact of the events of 1870-71 on the London art scene, exploring how it reproduced dynamics visible in early revolutionary episodes. It uncovers the cosmopolitan business networks that were mobilised by the conflict, as French and Belgian dealers competed against their London peers for a share of the spoils. By working through the records of consigners and auctioneers it will sketch out some of the important French collections dispersed in London after 1870, highlighting the calculations not just of the imperial family in exile (including Empress Eugénie and Prince Jérôme-Napoléon Bonaparte) but also other French aristocrats eager to benefit from the profitability of the English market. War and insurrection played a critical role in the transfer of artworks and re-making of museums.

Introduction

According to Guido Guerzoni in his celebrated overview of the British art market: 'War was the true mother of the market, with its thefts, robberies, abuses of power and confiscations.' In a provocative analysis, Guerzoni described how the nineteenth-century artistic economy thrived on the 'decomposition' of the social structures in neighbouring states. 'From time immemorial, traumatic political turmoils (risings, rebellions, coups etc) were accompanied by the arrival of exiles and fugitives in London, a city which welcomed them with the sale of their treasures.'¹ This observation was true for the entire age of revolutions, as British collectors had been quick to profit from the periodic crises engulfing the French monarchy, and their acquisitions fed into museum and gallery development. The abolition of corporate institutions and the attack on the nobility and clergy after 1789 threw a huge quantity of artworks onto the open market, with British aristocrats in the vanguard of buying up Boulle cabinets, Sèvres porcelain and rare books (a cross-Channel trade that flourished with the connivance of French dealers and despite the imposition of a wartime blockade).² Thanks in part to the influx of émigré collections, London emerged from the French Revolution as the undisputed hegemon of the European art market. London's commanding share of art arose from its commercial dynamism, in marked contrast to coercive methods employed by Napoleonic armies who plundered continental collections for the profit of the Louvre.³

Subsequent revolutions in July 1830 (with the overthrow of the Bourbons) and February 1848 (the fall of the Orléans dynasty) drove the toppled dynasties into exile. For pretenders of all stripes, London became a site of political manoeuvring and financial restructuring. The recently elected Prince-President of the Second Republic, Louis-Napoléon, arranged a sale at Christie's in 1849 to free up capital for his imperial ambitions; in May 1853 Christie's witnessed the dispersal of the paintings of Louis-Philippe, including many Spanish masters, three years after the king's death at Claremont, Surrey.⁴ The crisis of 1870-71 was

particularly acute, since it witnessed not only the collapse of the monarchical system-embodied in the Second Empire of Napoleon III- but also military defeat at the hands of Prussia, a painful occupation and siege of the capital, and finally a metropolitan insurgency against the National Government in Versailles. With the data taken from customs receipts and the volume of imports, Guerzoni argued that in 1870-71 the number of auctions in Paris fell from 383 in 1869 to 268 in 1870 and 80 in 1871, as the political and military crisis brought business to a standstill, whereas in London over these same years the number of sales increased from 196, to 205, and from 223 to 231 by 1872. This can be backed up by considering London's market-share of European sales, which rose from 25% in 1869, to 32% in 1870, 41% in 1871- the zenith of the crisis- and remained a healthy 31% in 1872.⁵

Guerzoni's econometric approach has underlined the central dynamic by which different poles of the art market were periodically paralysed or replenished by the effects of war. Such indirect consequences of conflict on collecting have received far less attention than more overtly coercive processes of transferring and sometimes deliberately destroying works of art, some of which were also visible in 1870-71. Prussian scholars in 1870 undertook a full inquiry into works of art which had been looted from German galleries by the Napoleonic armies seven decades before, although the reclamation of lost art was not written into the final peace treaty.⁶ The French press were horrified by the destruction of historic buildings caused by Prussian shelling- such as the burning of the palace of Saint-Cloud, and the loss of the library at Strasbourg- finding in this type of cultural atrocities a barbaric assault on French civilisation.⁷ Meanwhile within Paris the revolutionary government of the Commune instigated a policy of iconoclasm against the despised symbols of the monarchical past, whether the memorial to Louis XVI, the Chapelle Expiatoire (which was not demolished due to lack of time) or the Vendôme Column topped by a statue of Napoleon I (which was). The

enduring intolerance to political signs in France has been recently diagnosed by Emmanuel Fureix via the metaphor of the 'injured eye' (*l'oeil brisé*).⁸ Confiscation, looting, expropriation, iconoclasm, vandalism: such phenomena have generated a significant literature, whereas the less volitional and more dispersive aspects of cultural politics, as expressed through the market, demand fuller investigation. Yet it was out of the market that major private and public collections were formed across the century, as individuals and institutions speculated on the opportunities afforded by war to buy and sell, vying to possess (and protect) artworks displaced or imperilled by violence. In this perspective, the Franco-Prussian War and the Paris Commune represent a fascinating chapter in how art collections became enmeshed in the political crisis, a chapter with lasting consequences for the fate of museums across Europe

Artworks were portable, and their trajectories followed the flood of refugees produced by war. As the Second Empire unravelled at astonishing speed in early September 1870, the desperate former Surintendant des Beaux-Arts, the comte de Nieuwerkerke, fled to London to dispose of his collections. Here he found a buyer for his Renaissance objets d'art and superb arms and armour in the shape of Richard Wallace.⁹ A great philanthropist to the besieged French capital (as commemorated in the city's drinking fountains), Wallace nonetheless doubted whether Paris could ever be a safe place to house the objects he had inherited from the Hertford estate. In 1872 Wallace displayed his new purchases before a mass public at Bethnal Green- and three decades later, his widow would bequeathed the exceptional collection of fine and decorative art built up by succeeding generations of the Hertford family to London.¹⁰ In this way, the decisions made by collectors in the heat of the conflict profoundly shaped the contents and creation of a major British museum, one which introduced a thoroughly French collection of art, assembled in Paris, to a new audience.

Elsewhere, the events of 1870-71 pushed collectors in different directions: an ardent Bonapartist, Louis Carrand, could not reconcile himself to the new French Republic and bequeathed his own medieval and Renaissance artefacts to the Barghello in Florence.¹¹ Having narrowly escaped being shot by Communards, the violence in Paris prompted Théodore Duret and Henri Cernuschi to journey to Japan in 1871, a visit which profoundly shaped the development of Asian collections at the Musée Cernuschi, now owned by the City of Paris.¹²

Conflict and revolution were catalysts for the consolidation, the relocation and the dispersal of collections, although these processes have often been difficult to acknowledge within conventional institutional histories. Nonetheless, period observers could be disarmingly candid about the prospects for buying art in wartime. The paintings acquired by William Tilden Blodgett, and which represent the founding collection of the Metropolitan Museum in New York, were sourced in Belgium and France in 1871. 'At any other time their purchase would not have been possible' according to *The New York World*.¹³ This chapter explores the traffic of art out of France during or immediately after the political crisis. The aim is to consider the impact of the war on different kinds of artworks- especially Old Master paintings and the decorative arts- which left French shores and appeared in London auctions. It goes further in insisting that the dislocation and circulation of artworks was not just a side-product of the conflict, but a crucial means through which curious Londoners could experience the drama at one remove. In the spring of 1871 they could already relive the siege of Paris thanks to a special exhibition held on Argyll street in a building branded 'The Palais-Royal', and where they could see maps, models, 'living photographs' of captured French and German 'officers' and even a mitrailleuse or volley-gun used in the battles (see figure 1.1).¹⁴ In a less sensational vein, the London salerooms were another venue in which the British

public could directly encounter the fall-out from the conflict, its victims, its ideas and its ruins, just as they had encountered the remnants of earlier French revolutions.

[figure 1.1 around here]

Cross-Channel Commerce

On 8 September 1870, Paul Durand-Ruel left his family and travelled to London with thirty-five crates of paintings where he set up business in the unfortunately named 'German Gallery' on New Bond Street. In January 1871 Durand-Ruel's life was changed when he was introduced to the young draft-dodger, Claude Monet. As the compelling exhibition at the Tate in 2017 demonstrated, the future Impressionists were among the least commercially successful of the colony of refugee artists in London, since they were rejected from exhibiting at the Royal Academy (unlike Salon favourite Jean-Louis Gérôme), failed to find patrons (unlike the Communard sculptor, Jules Dalou), and failed to attract much attention at the Kensington international exhibition in spring 1871 (unlike Meissonnier). In Camille Pissarro's gloomy analysis: 'Here there is no art, it is all a matter of business.'¹⁵ Their marginal position in the market is radically different from an artist like Albert-Ernest Carrier-Belleuse, the sculptor who organised successful sales of his terracottas through Christie's in November 1871.¹⁶ The focus on a handful of avant-garde painters has prevented reflection for how the so-called *année terrible* played out on other sections of the art market.

One valuable window on this process comes from the stock books of Agnews, a firm originally from Liverpool but with premises on Bond Street and which emerged as leading dealers of reproductive prints, Old Masters and contemporary painting. Intriguingly, Charles Morland Agnew was fascinated by events in Paris and his diary records a trip he and his father

William made to the French capital in mid-September 1871, mirroring the delight many British tourists took in the sublimity of the ruins. On this occasion he visited many of the sites reduced to rubble either by Prussian shelling or the terrible fires of *la semaine sanglante*, the week of street-battles fought between the Communards and the Versaillais troops determined to recapture the city. The scars of battle were apparent everywhere ('marks of firing on several houses'); the Tuileries and the Hôtel-de-Ville lay in ashes, shot-marks were visible on Notre-Dame, the outlying Palace of Saint-Cloud was a 'mass of burnt things' and he inspected 'the stump of the Vendôme column, which the communists pulled down'. Agnew also found time to visit studios of artists like William Wyld, see the galleries of the Louvre which were still accessible ('some of it is burned down') and examined 'a very pretty picture in Mr. Petit's rooms, which W. wanted to buy.'¹⁷

The ledgers in London confirm the importance of Agnew's contacts with European dealers. On 6 August 1872 Paul Durand-Ruel bought from Agnew's Paul Delaroche's *Christ in the Garden* and on 30 June 1873 he sold them a genre scene by Antony Serres, *The Widow*. Such academic and Romantic canvases were more regular staples of Durand-Ruel's dealing than the works of Manet or Monet, which were a minor concern at this juncture. He even took a gamble on the English school: on 12 June 1871 he sold to Thomas Agnew a work by Pre-Raphaelite painter John Everett Millais, namely *The Bridesmaid*, which now hangs in the Fitzwilliam Museum.¹⁸ Durand-Ruel was only one of several French dealers in modern painting who were active in London during these busy years. Agnew's conducted with Georges Petit and Alexandre Bernheim, both of whom would in future play a major role in marketing Impressionism. In 1870-71, by contrast, they were trading in Barbizon landscapes by artists such as Daubigny, Troyon and Diaz, as well as the fashionable Félix Ziem, all of whom already had a loyal following among British industrialists.¹⁹

Moreover, the presence of French dealers was matched if not exceeded by that of Belgian agents. In the bifocal analysis of Guerzoni, centred on the rivalry of London and Paris the role of Brussels is underrated, yet it attracted a significant number of artistic refugees in 1870-71 (including Eugène Boudin and Carolus-Duran) as well as anxious collectors and dealers like Durand-Ruel. Belgian dealers were also highly influential in London, not just the so-called 'prince of the Victorian art world', Ernest Gambart, who had pioneered the successful 'French Gallery' in the 1860s, but also Prosper-Léopold Everard, who opened a distinct 'Flemish Gallery' on Pall Mall in 1871.²⁰ As the case of Gambart suggests, the war did not represent a sudden breakthrough so much as an acceleration of the international business ties that had been growing across the past two decades. In the famous words of Pamela Fletcher, shoppers could already do a 'Grand Tour on Bond Street' taking in European art schools simply by passing by different dealers' windows. The luxury shopping precinct around St James and the West End was predicated on a certain cosmopolitan spectatorship and continental chic.²¹ Already in May 1870, a month before war was declared, Everard had organised a sale of popular Flemish and Dutch artists at Christie's.²² These continuities in personnel were crucial for helping refugees assimilate. Durand-Ruel's chief associate in London, Henry Wallis, had previously succeeded Gambart at the 'French Gallery'.²³

What goods, though, were actually changing hands? In what follows my analysis will be focused on the evidence from Christie's, Manson & Woods on King street, who were the chief handlers of the period, although it is important to recognise other relevant sales were held by rival firms such as Philips and Fosters.²⁴ Sales labelled as 'From Paris', or 'Property of a French Nobleman' punctuated the calendar of Sotheby's and Foster's auction houses through the spring and summer of 1871.²⁵ On closer inspection, this supposed nobleman was often a fictive persona, created to tie together and enhance disparate lots, only some of which

might have originated in France. Take the sale of decorative arts objects which took place at Christie's on 10 July 1871, where the consignment records reveal that the anonymous vendor was Charles-Félix Maillet du Boullay. A student of Charles Percier, this prominent architect had undertaken major restoration work in Rouen, although in the summer of 1871 he listed his home address as Trevor Square in Knightsbridge and the Rue royale in Brussels, where he had presumably taken refuge.²⁶ Among his rich collection of porcelain, glass, carved panels and jewellery was a superb 1737 Beauvais tapestry, mounted by the arms of the marquis de Boufflers and one of eight designed and signed by Oudry, who was then director of the factory. It was sold to Moon for £37 6s.²⁷

By using the consignment books and annotated catalogues, the identities of the sellers and those transporting the lots to and from the premises at Kings Street can be reconstructed, testifying to a web of cross-Channel connections.²⁸ When considering French aristocratic vendors who used Christie's in the wake of the Commune, two consecutive sales in June 1871 merit dissecting in some detail. On 3 June 1871, hidden within a larger sale, appeared 'twenty important pictures, the property of the marquis du Lau'.²⁹ This abbreviation referred to the marquis Alfred du Lau d'Allemans, famously depicted by James Tissot as a lounging gentleman in the golden waistcoat on the far left of his group portrait of the exclusive social club, the *cercle royale* (fig. 1.2). In the words of one recent historian, he was the 'paragon of elective sloth', deciding due to his unbending monarchist principles to retire from public life.³⁰ The marquis was also a noted collector with an eye for a profit, as recalled in the memoirs of Durand-Ruel. He had sold Durand-Ruel Delacroix's *Convulsionnaires of Tangiers* in 1869 at a price of 48,500 francs, having paid only 29,000 francs for it eleven years before.³¹ Whilst he saw military service during the Franco-Prussian War, it seems he turned to Christie's as the

surest way to generate capital, needed to repair his ancestral home Montardy in the Dordogne whose library which had been wrecked by fire in 1870.³²

[figure 1.2 around here]

The first lot of his twenty paintings was not delivered by the marquis, according to consignment records, but Charles Haas, his Jewish comrade from the Jockey Club (and one of the models for Swann in Proust's epic novel) whose address in London was listed as Duke Street.³³ It was a Romney portrait of a young lady snapped up by Colnaghi for £186 10s- one of the top prices of the sale. A second lot, this time a Renaissance Madonna by Marco d'Oggione, appears to have been put forward by another French aristocrat, Henri Edmond comte de Lambertye-Tornielle, who was at that time a resident of Piccadilly.³⁴ The eighteen remaining lots were eclectic - embracing Spanish and French historical portraits by artists as diverse as Boucher and Coello, as well as Dutch genre scenes and landscapes (many of which had impressive provenances linking back to the cabinets of the *ancien régime*). At an after-sale, Durand-Ruel acquired a large Cuyp landscape with three cows for 700 guineas, a reminder of his continued activity in dealing Old Masters.³⁵ The highlight, though, was lot 49: a portrait of Thomas Kiligrew, page and poet to Charles I, depicted in his page's costume and accompanied by a dog wearing his master's name emblazoned on the collar. Attributed to Van Dyck, it was bought by Graves for £299 5s, and in 1892 was acquired by the National Portrait Gallery.³⁶ In addition to the obvious concessions to English taste - including a supposed portrait of Anne of Denmark, painted by Franz Pourbus- this compact selection of paintings was united by their common pedigree and scholarly credentials.³⁷

Two days later, on 5 June 1871 occurred the sale of the marquis H de V, subsequently identified by Fritz Lugt as the baron Antoine-Marie Héron de Villefosse.³⁸ The descendant of a scholarly family, with his father an esteemed mineralogist, Héron de Villefosse was an acclaimed archivist and archaeologist of Roman Gaul who in 1869 had been assigned to the department of antiquities in the Louvre. Only weeks before, he had allegedly helped protect the museum collections against the Communards by refusing to step down from his post and demonstrating 'prodigious quick-thinking and bravery'.³⁹ In his capacity as secretary to the French Society of Numismatics and Archaeology, he thundered against the horrific losses suffered by Parisian libraries and private collectors during the Commune.⁴⁰ Although only his name appeared on the catalogue, this disguised a composite sale made up from different French sources, notably the dealer Deloris (an exceptionally active supplier of furniture and china to Christie's, operating from rue Joubert in Paris) and Madame Goguet. The first day was dominated by samples of the decorative arts, including Limoges enamels, snuff boxes, candelabras, furniture and clocks (including a Louis XIII style piece originally from the château of Arenberg). Purchasers included some of the major dealers in European curiosity, including Baker, Benjamin, Pond, Lewis, Jarvis, Aymard, Rhodes, Agnew, Donder and Durlacher.⁴¹

The pictures on the second day, however, were the main event, and derived from Villefosse personally. They proved to be of extremely fine quality, a mix of seventeenth-century Dutch and eighteenth-century French genre paintings many boasting eminent provenances.⁴² However, it is striking that very few of the Rococo works found a home, even if they did attract some considerable bids. One hundred guineas were offered for the Greuze painting of a Bacchante originally in the cabinet of Prince Paul of Wurtemberg, whilst 130 guineas were insufficient to secure Pater's *Plaisir d'été*, linked with the eighteenth-century cabinet of Randon de Boisset. In most cases, though, artists like Chardin failed to attract bids

of over ten pounds, a fifth of that spent on acquiring a landscape by Wouwermans.⁴³ We might remember that French eighteenth-century painting was still viewed as decadent by mainstream British opinion; whilst the decorative arts of the *ancien régime*, whether original pieces or artful reproductions, were avidly fought over, eighteenth-century painting was condemned as immoral or trifling.⁴⁴ The only exception to this rule, importantly, was a set of three panels featuring painted conversation by Le Prince which was sold for £120 and 15 guineas- its far higher price linked not to the identity of the artist, but its utility for interior decoration. French eighteenth-century artists were outperformed by Romantic stars of the Salon such as Horace Vernet, Camille Roqueplan and Gabriel Descamps, of proven market appeal.⁴⁵

In the final and third section, the lots were listed as the 'property of a French gentleman'; thanks to the Christie's consignment books, we can see that these were dispatched by one Villars in Boulougne-sur-Mer, who had dropped off the crates of pictures in early April.⁴⁶ Of the pictures in this section a few Italian primitives changed hands for small sums, and a supposed Watteau harlequin failed to reach its reserve- but more striking is the large quantity of major paintings listed in the catalogue but inexplicably passed over during the sale, with no bids recorded next to them. This includes a Tiepolo painting of the Virgin and Child, a Carracci *Vision of St Jerome*, a Tintoretto *Descent from the Cross* and a Brueghel *Landscape with figures*. According to the consignment books, these unsold pictures were not sent back to France but to one Szarvady living on Upper Bedford Row- perhaps the sign of a subsequent, private sale, or another instance of cross-Channel co-ordination.⁴⁷ The most important painting which did sell in this section was Peter Lely's portrait of the Duchess of Cleveland and her son, acquired by the dealer Graves for the sum of £25, and now hanging in the National Portrait Gallery (figure 1.3).⁴⁸

[figure 1.3 around here]

Aristocratic vendors like the marquis du Lau and Héron de Villefosse were eager to take advantage of the buoyant London market, motivated by fears for the security of their possessions in revolutionary Paris and by hopes of commercial speculation. Their objects were able to enter London thanks to a cosmopolitan network of social and professional intermediaries, whose collaboration often pre-dated the crisis. The logistics of the Villefosse sale hinged on the collaboration between a Paris-based dealer based on the rue Chaussée d'Antin- most probably Émile Barre, a well-known expert at the Drouot salerooms- and one Steinmitz who lived on Argyll street in London. Together they co-operated in transporting twenty cases of furniture and paintings into Christie's over six different deliveries between 11 April and 24 May 1871.⁴⁹ Judging from the bidding, the appeal of historic British portraits far outstripped other European schools, and it is not surprising such pictures eventually came into the possession of national museums. The fact that numerous other pictures went unsold due to the hefty reserves suggests that vendors like Villefosse were in no rush to make a sale. Rather, they could afford to see if London buyers would take the bait and pay prices in excess of what might be expected in Paris. This willingness to wait-and-see was a luxury that our second group of vendors, the survivors of the imperial regime, could not afford.

Imperial Dissolution

Due to their speedy and desperate exit from France the former paladins of the Empire found themselves in significant hardship and quite cramped new surroundings. At Camden Place, Chislehurst, Eugénie confessed to her son's tutor, the historian Ernest Lavisse, that her court

resembled the raft of the Medusa, whose survivors often thought of eating each other.⁵⁰ She told her lady-in-waiting of her despair to learn of the destruction of the furniture in her apartments at Saint-Cloud and in the Tuileries.⁵¹ Eugénie's agent Rouher made frequent travels back and forth across the Channel in order to fight for the return of the possessions of the imperial family. It remained a vexed issue what lawfully belonged the Bonapartes as their private property, and what belonged to the state as acquired through the civil list- ongoing battles over rights and restitution would drag on unresolved until Eugénie's death in 1920.⁵²

Urgently needing funds, the imperial family began to sell off its holdings: the Emperor handed some of his horses and the palais des Césars to the Italian government; the Empress sold her properties in Spain; meanwhile the republican government put the former home of the Princesse Mathilde on the rue de Courcelles up for sale in 1873.⁵³ Upon fleeing from France, Eugénie had managed to hide a portion of her jewels through the help of her friend Pauline von Metternich, who helped transfer them to the Bank of England for safe-keeping in the last phases of the war. Nonetheless on 24 June 1872 Eugénie consented to putting these pieces up for sale. Her name was officially omitted from the catalogue at Christie's, which referred in vague terms to 'the magnificent jewels, the property of a distinguished personage'. Nonetheless, word quick went round about the true identity of the vendor - after all, many items were decorated with an 'E' monogram- and there was considerable public excitement.⁵⁴ The catalogue spelled out that she would be selling off jewels not just with illustrious provenances - such as the marquise ring with pink diamond which had been worn by that earlier Empress Joséphine and her daughter Hortense - but also jewels that had been given as diplomatic gifts, including a bracelet of sapphires from the Viceroy of Egypt to commemorate the opening of the Suez Canal, or an emerald-set tiara from the Sultan of Turkey.⁵⁵ The sale drew in many of the leading jewellers and wider dealers in London, but also

rich foreign buyers including Edmond de Rothschild and the Gaekwad of Baroda (who reputedly bought the so-called Eugénie diamond for £12,000). The 23 lots raised the imposing sum of £45,000 sterling- although as Bertrand Morel has argued, this was perhaps only half of their real market value or cost when commissioned.⁵⁶

The symbolism of such sales was unmistakable for audiences who were present at those events, or who read about them in then newspapers. They were witnessing the end of an era, and to attend or take part in such auctions was one way to lay claim to a piece of history. A view by Meissonier of Eugénie at the town-hall in Nancy was advertised in one April 1871 sale as even more desirable in light of recent events: 'A very important work, with portraits of celebrated personages, executed by command of the Emperor Napoleon III. This work, after the recent events on the Continent, will form an important episode in history.'⁵⁷ The liquidation of the Second Empire on English shores was matched by dispersal sales happening in parallel across the Channel. In March 1872, the Pereire brothers, the financial wizards of the Second Empire, brought their exceptional collection of Old Master paintings to hotel Drouot auction house.⁵⁸ 'Just now the whole town is talking of the Pereire sale,' enthused *The Daily News*. 'The Messrs Pereire are very skilful in giving publicity to their merchandise. They do not act on the proverb which tells us that good wine needs no bush. The sale of their gallery was advertised by the telegraph all over the United States, in Russia and other countries where money bags are recklessly emptied.' This global publicity machine was necessary to grab the attention of American buyers who were increasingly drawn into the art market, and whose extravagance could help repair the shortfalls occasioned by the war crisis. 'It was easy to foresee that Messrs Pereire would repair many of their financial losses through the sale of their pictures.'⁵⁹ The following month, it was the turn of the duc de Persigny, whose death emptied of its treasures the chateau of Chamarande (a one-time gift

from the Emperor to his Minister of his trusted Interior).⁶⁰ At the same time, the republic authorised selling off the remainder of the *liste civile* to pay off impatient creditors, much to the bemusement of the press: this included Fourdinois furniture from the imperial yacht, Sèvres porcelain services (which attracted healthy interest, especially from foreigners and Americans), tablecloths and tableware (which pulled in just a few domestics and restaurateurs), and forty thousand bottles of wine from the imperial cellars.⁶¹

One auction above all others advertised this change of fortunes in the most spectacular way: that of the Emperor's cousin, Prince Napoléon-Jérôme, known to his intimates as 'Plon-Plon', and to his critics as 'le Bonaparte Rouge'. The Prince was the third son of Napoleon I's youngest brother, Jérôme, and had shocked conservatives by standing as the republican deputy for Corsica in 1848. Throughout the Second Empire he was a champion of democratic and anticlerical policies, and after the catastrophe at Sedan, took the lead in machinations to return the Bonapartes to power. His own revenues had been decimated by the fall from favour, and he was forced to sell his beloved chateau at Prangins, Italy, at a substantial loss. Renting an apartment overlooking Hyde Park, he came to dislike London as a 'an expensive, boring town, and impossible to live in all year round.'⁶² He was a frequent caller on his cousin at the new home in Camden Place, Chislehurst, and was the architect of a hair-brained scheme to launch a coup against the new Republic by gathering loyal veterans and storming back into France from across the Swiss border at Thonon. Having sounded out Bonapartist agents abroad, and even Bismarck, the date set for this replay of the Hundred Days scenario was January 1873 - but for the scheme to work not only would his cousin need to stay healthy, which was far from guaranteed, but substantial sums were needed, not least to keep bribing the British press to run stories predicting a Napoleonic comeback.⁶³

The sale through Christie's from 9 May 1872 was designed to grab maximum publicity. The Prince Napoleon had owned one of the most recognizable properties of the Second Empire, the whimsical Maison Pompéienne on the avenue Montaigne.⁶⁴ The luxurious neo-Greek, neo-Roman and neo-Etruscan revivalist art objects commissioned for the villa from leading designers such as the goldsmith Christofle and the *bronzier* Léroolle, not to mention a special dessert service from Sèvres, made for a colourful début to the three-day sale. London dealer such as McClean, Holloway, Solomon and Agnew competed to own the stylish candelabra and amphorae on offer.⁶⁵ This buzz of interest continued on the second day thanks to the Prince's collection of armour, some with historic associations- such as a helmet engraved with the medallion of Pope Julius II- but much more of it was of exotic manufacture. Among the fashionable Oriental items- including a thirteenth-century lamp taken from the tombs of the Caliphs near Cairo in 1863, at the time of the excavations of Auguste Mariette, for which Agnew paid £230- were many other ethnographic oddities (like the sundry ornaments made of Scandinavian buffalo horns, or the cigar-stand fashioned out of crocodile skin). These strange, piquant items were mixed in with more traditional connoisseurial fare, including Urbino earthenware pottery and monumental sixteenth-century bronzes, including a large figure of Bacchus.⁶⁶

There was an added frisson by the knowledge that this represented only a portion of what had been lost in the fires of the Commune. At the time when war broke-out, Plon-Plon had followed his father by living in the ancient seat of the Orléans family, and home of the Conseil d'état, the Palais-Royal. In May 1871, the complex was set alight, and although local residents rushed in to contain the flames, the Valois wing of the Cour de l'horloge and the central floors of the building were wrecked. Prince Napoléon-Jérôme estimated that the fire that night cost him 700-800,000 francs worth of property, including a finely-stocked library

(fig. 1.4).⁶⁷ The preface to the sale catalogue mused on the sad destiny of the Palais-Royal and its contents, so often haunted by the scourge of revolutionary violence, whether in 1791, when the duc d'Orléans sold his inherited masterpieces to fund his unhappy political ambitions, or in February 1848, when the Palais-Royal was sacked by the crowds who brought down the July Monarchy, or now in 1871. This curse seemed appropriate for a building which had previously housed many paintings that Cardinal Mazarin had bought at the Commonwealth sale following the execution of Charles I in 1649. This latest twist of fate was described as a terrible loss not just to the owner, but to 'all lovers of art', as the preface recited the names of artworks which were destroyed by the 'communists' the year before.⁶⁸

[figure 1.4 around here]

After this roll-call of incinerated masterpieces, the ordeal of the pieces that survived the inferno only heightened their allure. According to the reporter for the *Daily News* on 9 May, the public could still discern abundant traces of the damage from when the house on the avenue Montaigne had been 'sacked and burned during the reign of the Commune' (in fact, the prince had sold it in 1868, and the abandoned house stood until 1891). A Chinese enamel vase had its surface 'fused and destroyed', a bronze inkstand modelled after the candelabrum at San Marco had been 'subjected to great heat', whereas the glass cup on the cigar stand had been 'melted down upon the metal'. The reporter continued: 'Two marble busts, by Clésigner, of Rachel- one as Tragedy, the other as Comedy- still bear the indelible marks of petroleum, but they were completely black when found in the ruins. A bust of Ponsard, the poet, resembles the bronzes found buried for centuries at Herculaneum.'⁶⁹ There was an added irony here that fire had transfigured these neo-classical sculptures-

including the bust of prince's old mistress, the actress Rachel- into the semblance of real antiques, which had been rescued from the destruction of Vesuvius. In its 'luxury, refinement, anti-modernism and Roman references' the Pompeiian House was an iconic building of the Empire, and many observers wanted to believe it shared the regime's fate.⁷⁰ The near-brush with catastrophe made the lots more desirable: 'Most of these costly articles however have, by some extraordinary chance, escaped, and many must have been rescued.'⁷¹

The largest bids were reserved for the third day, and the prince's remarkable gallery of pictures. Like the duc de Morny and other pillars of the Empire, Plon-Plon had embraced contemporary painting as a type of speculative investment, making big purchases at the Salons. In February 1868 he had sold over one hundred works to Durand-Ruel for a total of 300,000 francs, a haul which included some of the most iconic pictures of the entire century by David, Ingres and Meissonnier.⁷² It was the Old Masters from the Palais Royal, however, which were offered in London, and while many had been 'cleverly restored' in euphemistic parlance, they included some star pieces. This included a Bronzino portrait of Cosimo de Medici, a Beltraffio portrait of a lady, a version of Christ carrying the Cross by Sebastiano del Piombo, a Botticelli Virgin and Child, as well as other versions of this sacred subject by Cima da Conegliano and Giovanni Bellini, both signed.⁷³ Lot 321 was identified as 'a youth in a black dress and cap' by Francesco Raibolini, the Renaissance painter more commonly known as Francia. Rutley was willing to part with £409 10s for the lively portrait, which has since been identified as the young Federico Gonzaga of Mantua and hangs in the Metropolitan Museum in New York (fig. 1.5).⁷⁴ This spectacular sale did not bring down the Third Republic- Napoleon III's fatal gallstones scotched any hope of a coup paid for by the proceeds- but it did release some significant artworks onto the market for the eventual and lasting benefit of museums on both sides of the Atlantic.

[figure 1.5 around here]

Conclusion

The boost to the London art trade was among the indirect consequences of the Franco-Prussian War. If Guerzoni offered a macro-level analysis to show the spike in the total sales held in London, by comparison with Paris, this chapter has zoomed in to uncover the identities of some key players, from aristocrats hunting for quick profits to the rump of the Bonapartist party adjusting to exile. The importance of London's salerooms as a clearing house and side-show to the political crisis raging in France conformed to an earlier pattern, by which revolutionary upheaval triggered an exodus of artworks abroad. In the 1790s, the most famous example of this cultural transfer was the Orléans art collection from the Palais-Royal, which was initially bought by a consortium in 1792 and distributed between country estates, but whose finest pieces continue to flow back into institutions like the National Gallery. Eighty years later, part of the contents of the Palais-Royal was once again for sale in London, a clear sign of the continuity in political calculations and in the dense web of Anglo-French partnerships. There would be clear benefits of extending the existing work on *circulations culturelles* in times of strife, so far most developed for the period c.1789-1830, far deeper into the nineteenth century.⁷⁵ In 1870-71 too at least some British buyers seized on the sudden bonanza: in his memoirs Merton Russell-Coates recalled that one Glaswegian businessman John Anderson amassed no less than £30,000 worth of 'property, furniture and effects at the Palais Royale in the aftermath of the Commune'.⁷⁶ Whilst exciting new work has focused on the seizure and dislocation of artefacts provoked by colonial expansion, surprisingly little attention has been paid to date to the relationship between the art market and internal

European conflicts and crises, whether the shock of secularising policies and civil wars in Spain and Switzerland in the 1830s and 1840s, or the fall-out from the Wars of Unification in Germany or Risorgimento Italy in the 1850s and 1860s, and work is only just beginning to map the transformation of the global art market in the heyday of European imperialism.⁷⁷

In its own way the Franco-Prussian War also had lasting consequences for how artworks were categorised and displayed, although this has been easier to demonstrate within a museum environment. The war sharpened the antagonism between the perceived qualities of the French and German schools of painting, an antagonism played out in the collections of the annexed city of Strasbourg, which had been 90% destroyed during the bombardments of the war; these collections were entirely reconstructed on new Germanic principles after 1871 by museum director, Wilhelm von Bode.⁷⁸ In contrast to the fixity of art in public museums, however, a focus on the market examines the fortunes of art in motion, and its circulation far beyond the territories of the belligerent powers. By discussing speculators in London, Brussels and even New York, this article has demonstrated that the consequences of a war can have resonance for museums and galleries located much further afield. This insight applies to many subsequent conflicts too, whether we think of what American and Portuguese galleries owed to the dismantling of the imperial collections in the Soviet Union, or, tragically, the spoliation of Jewish families permitted by countries nominally neutral during the Second World War, such as the significant quantity of looted art channelled through dealers in Switzerland, raising complex issues of opportunism and complicity.⁷⁹

Vicissitudes in the art market, and by extension, the rise and demise of collections, serve as a barometer of the cultural fall-out from revolutions and military campaigns. In contrast to the eirenic or internalist accounts of their evolution, museums have commonly grown in fits and starts, relying on tactical opportunism or windfalls from unexpected sources.

In the brief months before his death in 1873, Louis Napoleon found time to donate a set of copies after excavated Roman sites by Annibale Angelini to the South Kensington museum.⁸⁰ This chapter has frequently emphasised the degree of Anglo-French interaction in artistic circles during 1870-71, and the refugees often forged relationships that would continue to germinate in the years ahead. Having sheltered in Brighton during the siege of Paris, Eugène Dutuit was introduced to the Fine Arts Society, to whose 1877 exhibition he would submit his superb Rembrandt etchings as a corresponding member when back in France.⁸¹ But the experience of war could also push collectors apart, in the instance of the Wallace Collection depriving the long-time host country of permanent ownership. From the safety of North-East England, John and Joséphine Bowes avidly followed the twists and turns of 1870-71, desperate for news from their friends and their housekeeper as to whether the artworks they had purchased and housed in Paris would survive.⁸² Even within European cities, memories of violence exerted an influence on where collections took root. Eugène Dutuit and his brother Auguste cited the trauma of the war and Commune as one reason why in 1902 they donated their antiquities, bronzes, early paintings and prints to the Ville de Paris, and not to the Louvre, which remained vulnerable to political assault.⁸³

Another consequence of warfare was ideological, injecting a new note of venom into heritage politics. Whilst most British observers had generally seen the downfall of the Second Empire as just desserts for years of foreign aggression and moral delinquency, they were disturbed by the ruthlessness of the Prussian siege and appalled by the Commune, whose ringleaders were treated as pariahs by some of the artistic establishment.⁸⁴ A.G. Temple, curator of the Guildhall art gallery, had originally approached the radical journalist Henri Rochefort for the loan of some of his Dutch paintings. Temple had a crisis of conscience on the doorstep in thinking of 'an individual whose ardent energies had been given up to anarchy

and whose hands were stained with the blood of innocent persons.’ He concluded that to ask such an individual to lend his assistance to ‘an ancient and honoured Corporation, which had for centuries been renowned for its upholding of order and authority’ simply ‘would not do’.⁸⁵ The repudiation of Rochefort was exceeded by the hostility aimed towards the painter Gustave Courbet, who was charged with paying for the costs of rebuilding the demolished Vendôme column. His actual crimes were rumoured to be far worse, from smashing apart statues of classical art or selling the finest paintings from the Cluny Museum to the English. For his part, Courbet refused to have anything to do with Edmond Du Sommerard, the administrator of the Musée de Cluny, accusing him of colluding with Nieuwerkerke in 1871 to stage an exhibition at South Kensington ‘with the Prussians in France.’⁸⁶ The bitter splits between republicans and royalists, Communards and Versailles, turned repeatedly to how individuals had profited from exile in 1870-71 and with whom they had associated.

In Paris after the Commune, a belligerent discourse had sprung up around historic preservation, seen as a means to defy the unsated iconoclasm unleashed by the recurrent episodes of revolutionary violence.⁸⁷ Echoes of this militant tone can be found in the writings of British art critic Philip Hamerton, founder of the journal *The Portfolio*, and who had experienced the conflict first hand from his rural retreat outside Autun.⁸⁸ In his 1873 work *The Intellectual Life*, he raged against the brutish hostility to the past perpetrated by the democratic spirit. Before 1870, few would believe that the democratic temper would go so far as to assault museums, monuments and the libraries of France. ‘We know that every beautiful building, every precious manuscript and picture, has to be protected against the noxious swarm of Communards as a sea-jetty against the Pholas and the Teredo.’⁸⁹ In contrast to the vandalism of the democrats, Hamerton evoked the aristocratic spirit as that which respected the ancestors and fought in the vanguard of heritage conservation. ‘Compare this

temper with that of a Marquis of Herford, a Duke of Devonshire, a Duc de Luynes! True guardians of the means of culture, these men have given splendid hospitality to the great authors and artists of past times, by keeping their works for the future with tender and reverent care. Nor has this function of high stewardship ever been more nobly exercised than it is today by that true knight and gentleman, Richard Wallace. Think of the difference between this great-hearted guardian of priceless treasures, keeping them for the people, for civilization, and a base-spirited Communard setting fire to the library of the Louvre.⁹⁰ Even in Britain, the calamities of 1870-71 had underlined that private collecting could be a political, and patriotic act, the antidote to revolutionary excess. The Franco-Prussian War and its turbulent aftermath raised the stakes for the art market, turning auctions into spectacles of regime change, throwing new works into circulation, and rebranding investment in art as a tool of physical and moral reconstruction.

Upon first glance, it might seem that the Franco-Prussian War has limited implications for European museums. In France, the defeat was a source of intense humiliation: whilst the incoming Republican government erected memorials to celebrate the episodes of resistance -such as defence of besieged Belfort- the conflict has occupied a shadowy place in the country's major museums, partly rectified in 2017 with a landmark show at the Musée de l'Armée.⁹¹ Equally, the Paris Commune, which emerged out of the conflict, unleashed an unacknowledged civil war, and its commemoration and mythologisation was adopted only by unreconciled radicals. Yet the seeming absence of these events from public narratives and museums contrasts dramatically with the conflict's role in unsettling and remaking collections on both sides of the Channel. It is in the realm of private, market activity, extending far beyond the framework of the nation-state, that the full impact of the war on heritage can be measured. Consider Lady Charlotte Schreiber who entered Paris on 1st June 1871 and found

It a 'City of the Dead'. Despite her shock at the burned out buildings on all sides, and stories that some of her contacts had been driven mad or died of fright, nothing could blunt her collecting instinct: 'Within minutes of arriving in Paris, she went out into the ruins to try to discover what had become of her trusted dealers and whether there were any bargains to be had.' Among her gleanings were an old maroon set of Chelsea china, which she donated to the South Kensington Museum in 1884.⁹² The practice of collecting is intimately tied to processes of dislocation, appropriation and reconfiguration, and thereby draws on destructive and creative energies alike. Quite apart from studying the physical traces of conflict, then, the history of collecting can illuminate war's potency as an engine of cultural change, bringing new opportunities for consumers, middlemen and curators. Notes

¹ Guido Guerzoni, 'The British Painting Market, 1789-1914' in *Economic History and the Arts*, ed. by Michael North (Cologne: Bohlau, 1996), pp.115-16.

² Barbara Lasic, 'Vendu à des anglais: Collecting of Eighteenth-Century French Decorative Arts, 1789-1830' in *Networks of Design: Proceedings of the 2008 Annual Conference of the Design History Society*, ed. by Jonathan Glynn and Viv Minton, (Boca Raton: Universal, 2009), pp.183-89; Kristian Jensen, *The Revolution and the Antiquarian Book: Reshaping the Past, 1780-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

³ *London and the Emergence of a European Art Market, 1780-1830*, ed. by Susannah Avery-Quash and Christian Huemer (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2019).

⁴ According to the 'Green Book' in the Christie's archives [CA], Louis-Napoleon's furniture sale occurred on May 21 1849, whereas Louis-Philippe's pictures were sold on May 6 1853, with other articles following on May 28 1853 and china on June 16 1857. I am extremely

grateful to Lynda MacLeod for her patience and expert assistance when consulting the Christie's archives.

⁵ Guerzoni, 'The British Painting Market', pp.116-17.

⁶ Bénédicte Savoy, *Patrimoine annexé: les biens culturels saisis par la France en Allemagne autour de 1800*, 2 vols (Paris: Éditions Maison Sciences de l'Homme, 2003), vol.I, p.279, 282-85.

⁷ The idea of a 'cultural atrocity' is more often employed by scholars of the First World War, like Christina Kott; see Jo Tollebeek, Eline van Assche (eds.), *Ravaged: Art and Culture in Times of Conflict* (Brussels: Mercatorfonds, 2004). On the destruction in Strasbourg, see Rachel Chastril, *The Siege of Strasbourg* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2014), pp.94-100.

⁸ Emmanuel Fureix, *L'oeil blessé: politiques de l'iconoclasme après la Révolution française* (Seysse: Champ Vallon, 2019), pp.301-26.

⁹ See the essays in *Le comte de Nieuwerkerke: art et pouvoir sous Napoléon III* (Compiègne: Musée national du château de Compiègne, 2000).

¹⁰ See Lasic, 'Splendid Patriotism: Richard Wallace and the Construction of the Wallace Collection' in *Journal of the History of Collections* 21: 2 (2009), 173-82; Suzanne Higgott, *The Most Fortunate Man of His Day: Connoisseur, Collector and Philanthropist* (London: The Wallace Collection, 2018), pp.274-317.

¹¹ Giovanna Gaeta-Bertelà, 'La donazione Carrand al Museo Naziolae del Bargello' in *Arti del Medio Evo e del Rinascimento: Omaggio ai Carrand 1889-1989* (Florence: Studio per Edizioni Scelte, 1989), pp.1-38.

¹² Ting Chang, 'Collecting Asia: Théodore Duret's Voyage en Asie and Henri Cernuschi's Museum', *Oxford Art Journal*, 25: 1 (2002), p.21

¹³ Cited in Katharine Baetjer, 'Buying Pictures for New York: The Founding Purchase of 1871', *Metropolitan Museum Journal*, 39 (2004), p.163.

¹⁴ This poster is from the Gabrielle Enthoven collection at the V&A (S.663-2016).

¹⁵ See *Impressionists in London: French Artists in Exile 1870-1914*, ed. by Caroline Corbeau-Parsons (London: Tate Publishing, 2017); Petra ten-Doesschate Chu, 'The Lu(c)re of London: French Artists and Art Dealers in the British Capital, 1859-1914' in *Monet's London: Artists' Reflections on the Thames, 1859-1914*, ed. by John House, Chu, Jennifer Hardin (St Petersburg Florida: Museum of Fine Arts, 2005), pp.39-54.

¹⁶ Edward Morris, *French Art in Nineteenth Century Britain* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005), p.248.

¹⁷ Charles Morland Agnew, *Travel Diary: The Continent*, September 16th-18th 1871.

NGA27.27.6, National Gallery London. I am very grateful to Alison Clarke for sharing this diary with me.

¹⁸ See Agnew's Stock Book, 1871-74, no.6884, 6930, 6527. NGA21.1.1.4, National Gallery London.

¹⁹ For references to Petit and Bernheim, see Agnews Stock Books, 1871-74, nos. 671, 7300, 7392, 8244. NGA21.1.1.4, National Gallery London. For a sense of the type of contemporary art collections formed in exactly this period, see Andrew Watson, 'An Englishman in Paris: John Waterloo Wilson's Remarkable Collection of French Nineteenth-Century Art', *Cahiers bruxellois*, 48 (2016), pp.83-104.

²⁰ According to one Christie's catalogue, Everard offered clients 'many of its choicest pictures, which have been selected during the last three years with the greatest care and taste from the studios of the most celebrated artists, and from the various continental exhibitions.' *Catalogue of the last and most important portion of modern and continental*

pictures of Messrs P.L. Everard & Co (18 February 1871). See Jan Dirk Baetjens, 'The Belgian Brand: Ernest Gambart and the British Market for Modern Belgian Art c.1850-1870', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 92-4 (2014), pp.1277-1310.

²¹ Pamela Fletcher, 'The Grand Tour on Bond Street: Cosmopolitanism and the Commercial Art Gallery in Victorian London' in *Visual Culture in Britain*, 12: 2 (2011), pp.139-53.

²² Prosper Everard was listed at Bedford Square, London and rue des Croisades in Brussels. See *Catalogue of an important collection of high-class modern pictures by continental artists*, 14 May 1870.

²³ Jeremy Maas, *Gambart, Prince of the Victorian Art World* (London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1975), pp.222-23.

²⁴ Pamela Fletcher and Anne Helmreich, 'Introduction: The State of the Field' in *The Rise of the Modern Art Market in London*, ed. by Fletcher and Helmreich (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), p.9.

²⁵ A sale at Christie's on March 9-10 1871 disposed of 'the property of a French nobleman who had then sent them to London from Paris before the siege of that latter city', in 'Picture Sales', *The Art Journal*, 1 May (1871), p.140. This is Lugt catalogue 32362; see also 'From Paris' at Sotheby's 3-4 April 1871 (32404) and 'A French Nobleman' at Christie's on 20 April 1871 (32433).

²⁶ According to day books (1871-73) the consigner 764W is identified as Ch. Du Boullay, whose objects appeared in sales held on 23 June, 1 July and 10 July 1871. Christie's Archives.

²⁷ *Catalogue of a valuable assemblage of decorative objects, consisting of old Sèvres and Dresden porcelain, miniatures, cinque-cento jewels, carvings in ivory and marble, venetian glass, arms, fine old French furniture, wood carvings, tapestry &c including a small collection received from Paris* (10 July, 1871), p.6 (no. 71).

²⁸ For instance, a batch of 93 lots of Oriental bronzes and porcelain sold at Christie's on April 20th 1871 for 'Mme Boisthiery' (Lugt: 32433) refers presumably to Hélène Butler-Fellows, the Dorset-born wife of Charles Alfred, marquis de Boisthiery, a long-serving prefect in multiple localities who owned a chateau near Tours.

²⁹ *Catalogue of eighteen capital ancient & modern pictures, the property of a nobleman; twenty important pictures, the property of the marquis du Lau* (3 June 1871) (Lugt: 32516).

³⁰ Caroline Weber, *Proust's Duchess: How Three Women Captured the Imagination of Fin-de-Siècle Paris* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 2018), pp. 181.

³¹ Paul Durand-Ruel, *Memoirs of the First Impressionist Art Dealer (1831-1922)*, ed. by Paul-Louis Durand-Ruel, Flavie Durand-Ruel, trans. Deke Dusinberre (Paris: Flammarion, 2014), p.14, 66.

³² See 'Nécrologie' in *Bulletin de la Société historique et archéologique du Périgord*, 45 (1918), p.102.

³³ Day books (1871-73) identifies 611W as Charles Haas, who had 3 pictures delivered to Christie's on 30 May, of which 1 (the Romney) was sold in the Du Lau sale. Christie's Archives.

³⁴ See Day books (1871-73) and annotated copy of *Catalogue of eighteen capital ancient & modern pictures*, no.51. Christie's Archives.

³⁵ See annotated copy of *Catalogue of eighteen capital ancient & modern pictures*, no.54 (735 crossed through and replaced with 700 guineas). Christie's Archives.

³⁶ See annotated copy of *Catalogue of eighteen capital ancient & modern pictures*, no.49. Christie's Archives. At the National Portrait Gallery the painting, now seen as from the studio of Van Dyck, is NPG 892.

³⁷ See the annotated copy of *Catalogue of eighteen capital ancient & modern pictures*, no.49. Christie's Archives.

³⁸ *Catalogue of the choice collection of pictures and decorative objects of the marquis H. de V* (5 June 1871) (Lugt: 32517).

³⁹ Émile Beaussire, *La guerre étrangère et la guerre civile en 1870 et 1871* (Paris: Germer-Baillière, 1872), p.220.

⁴⁰ See Antoine Heron de Villefosse, *Rapport à la société française de numismatique et d'archéologie, présenté dans la séance générale du 29 décembre 1871* (Paris: Imprimerie Jules Le Clere, 1872).

⁴¹ In the Day- Books (1871-73), Deloris appears frequently as a consigner in the spring and summer of 1871. See also the annotated copy of *Catalogue of the choice collection*. Christie's Archives.

⁴² For the eighteenth-century French portraits by Nattier and, inherited through the Villefosse family, see Paul Eudel, *L'hôtel Drouot et la curiosité en 1887-1888, avec une préface par Edmond Bonnaffé* (Paris: Charpentier, 1889), pp.247-48.

⁴³ A *Stag Hunt* by Wouwerman was bought by Thomas Maclean for 57 guineas 16. See the annotated copy of *Catalogue of the choice collection*, nos. 179, 211, 227. Christie's Archives.

⁴⁴ On this resistance, see the essays in *Delicious Decadence? The Rediscovery of French Eighteenth-Century Painting in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. by Guillaume Faroult, Monica Preti, Christoph Voghterr (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014).

⁴⁵ See the annotated copy of *Catalogue of the choice collection*, nos. 212, 238, 243. Christie's Archives.

⁴⁶ Villars appears as 332 W in the Day Books (1871-73), and is recorded as having brought two crates, one containing 33 pictures, the other 20, on 4 April 1871. Christie's Archives.

⁴⁷ See the annotated copy of *Catalogue of the choice collection*, pp.27-28. Christie's Archives.

⁴⁸ Annotated copy of *Catalogue of the choice collection*, no.305. Christie's Archives.

⁴⁹ Barre and Steinmitz appear as 365 W in the Day Books (1871-73). Christie's Archives.

⁵⁰ Cited in Raphael Dargent, *L'imperatrice Eugenie: l'obsession de l'honneur* (Paris: Belin, 2017), p.569.

⁵¹ Marie des Garets, *L'imperatrice Eugenie en exil: la mort de Napoleon III et du Prince imperial 1870-1880* (Paris: Editions Paleo, 2009), p.31.

⁵² Catherine Granger, *L'Empereur et les arts. La Liste Civile de Napoléon III* (Paris: École des Chartes, 2005), pp.441-444. On her battle over patrimony, see also Elizabeth McQueen, *Empress Eugénie and the Arts: Politics and Visual Culture in the Nineteenth Century* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), pp.269-317.

⁵³ Granger, *L'Empereur*, p.382.

⁵⁴ *Catalogue of a Portion of the Magnificent Jewels, the Property of a Distinguished Personage; also, few fans and parasols* (24 June 1872) (Lugt: 33321).

⁵⁵ See annotated copy of *Catalogue of a Portion of the Magnificent Jewels*, no.74 (it did not reach its reserve price when bidding closed at 780 guineas). Christie's Archives.

⁵⁶ Bertrand Morel, *Les joyaux de la couronne de France: les objets du sacrés des rois et des reines suivis de l'histoire des joyaux de la couronne de Francois Ier à nos jours* (Paris: Fonds Mercator/Albin Michel, 1988), p.354.

⁵⁷ *Catalogue of the Magnificent Collection of Ancient & Modern Pictures and Water-colour drawings of Mr Brooks, of the St James Gallery, no.17 Regent Street* (29 April 1871), p.8 (no.39).

⁵⁸ *Galérie de MM. Pereire: catalogue des tableaux anciens & modernes des diverses écoles dont la vente aura lieu Boulevard des italiens no.26 (6-8 March 1872).*

⁵⁹ 'Picture sales in Paris', *Daily News*, 13 March 1872.

⁶⁰ Persigny's paintings (including a fine Terburg) were sold at Drouot on 4 April, with the objects from Chamarande following on 6-8 May 1872. See the notices in *Chronique des arts et de curiosité*, 31 mars and 28 avril 1872.

⁶¹ Granger, *L'Empereur*, p.384.

⁶² Michele Battesti, *Plon-Plon. Le Bonaparte Rouge* (Paris: Perrin, 2010), p.517.

⁶³ Alain Strauss-Schom, *The Shadow Emperor: A Biography of Napoleon III* (New York: St Martin's Press, 2018), pp.4117-18.

⁶⁴ Marie-Claude Dejean de la Batie, 'La maison pompéienne du Prince Napoléon, avenue Montaigne' in *Gazette des beaux-arts*, 87 (1976), pp.127-34.

⁶⁵ See the annotated copy of *Catalogue of Works of Art from the Collection of his Imperial Highness the Prince Napoleon: Fine Pictures by Old Masters, Chiefly of the Italian School, Magnificent Cinque-cento Bronze Figures, Majolica, Marbles, Sèvres Vases, Arms and Armour, Saved from the Conflagration of the Palais-Royal* (9 May 1872), p.7-11. Christie's Archives (Lugt: 33182).

⁶⁶ The life-size Bacchus and a Faun (c. 1580) was sold to Wareham before passing into the collection of Andrew Mellon and entering the National Gallery of Art in Washington D.C. (1937.1.1133). See annotated copy of *Catalogue of works of art of his imperial highness*, nos.196, 220, 221. Christie's Archives/National Art Library.

⁶⁷ Battesti, *Plon-Plon*, p.516.

⁶⁸ See the remarkable 'Preface' in *Catalogue of works of art of his imperial highness*, p.3.

⁶⁹ 'Picture sales in Paris', *Daily News*, 13 March 1872.

⁷⁰ On the apocalyptic appeal of Vesuvius in the nineteenth century, see Goran Blix, *From Paris to Pompeii: French Romanticism and the Cultural Politics of Archaeology* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), p.213.

⁷¹ 'Picture sales in Paris', *Daily News*, 13 March 1872.

⁷² These extraordinary paintings included Meissonnier's *1814*, Géricault's *Cuirassier blessé* and a version of David's *À Marat*. Durand-Ruel, *Memoirs*, pp.55-59.

⁷³ William Roberts, *Memorials of Christie's: A record of art sales from 1760 to 1896* 2 vols (London: George Bell and Sons, 1897), pp.222-23.

⁷⁴ It came into the Metropolitan Museum of Art in 1913 via the Benjamin Altman bequest (14.40.638). *Catalogue of works of art of his imperial highness*, no.321.

⁷⁵ See *La circulation des œuvres d'art/ The circulation of works of art in the revolutionary era 1789-1848*, ed. by Preti-Hamard, Roberta Panzanelli (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes/ Getty Research Institute, 2007).

⁷⁶ Merton Russell-Coates, *Home and Abroad: An Autobiography of an Octagenarian*, 2 vols (Bournemouth, 1921), vol.1, p.39. I am grateful to Simon Spier for this reference.

⁷⁷ On the global dimension, see *Acquiring Cultures: Histories of World Art on Western Markets*, ed. by Charlotte Guichard, Christine Howald, Bénédicte Savoy (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018).

⁷⁸ See the recent exhibition 'Wilhelm von Bode, une pensée en action' which ran from September 2017 to February 2018 at the Musée des beaux arts in Strasbourg, with Pascal Griener as scientific advisor. For broader perspectives on this antagonism see Mathilde Arnoux, *Les musées français et la peinture allemande, 1871-1981* (Paris: Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, 2007).

⁷⁹ Among the major buyers at the Hermitage sale were Andrew Mellon (donor to the National Gallery of Art in Washington DC) and Calouste Gulbenkian (whose collections, through the political accident of the Second World War) are now in Lisbon. See *Selling Russia's Treasures: The Soviet Trade in Nationalized Art, 1917-38*, ed. by Natalya Semenova and Nicolas Iljine (New York: Abbeville Press, 2013). On the role of dealers outside of Germany who trafficked in looted art both during and after the war see Jonathan Petropoulos, 'Art Dealer Networks in the Third Reich and in the Postwar Period', *Journal of Contemporary History* 52: 3 (2017), pp.546-65.

⁸⁰ These are copies after decorations found at the Palace of Tiberius (646-1872/ 653-1872), and documentation can be found in the archives at Blythe House.

⁸¹ Stacey Pierson, *Private Collecting, Exhibitions, and the Shaping of Art History in London: The Burlington Fine Arts Club* (New York: Routledge, 2017), pp.29-30.

⁸² Caroline Chapman, *John & Josephine: The Creation of the Bowes Museum* (Barnard Castle: Bowes Museum, 2010), pp.109-120. For a more detailed discussion of the Bowes reactions in 1870-71, see the forthcoming PhD by Lindsay Macnaughton (University of Durham).

⁸³ See Jose de los Llanos, 'La collection Dutuit: deux frères, un musée' in *Choisir Paris: les grandes donations aux musées de la Ville de Paris* ('Actes de colloques', INHA online].

⁸⁴ On British revulsion for democratic excesses, see Matthew Beaumont, 'Cacotopianism, the Commune and England's anti-Communist Imaginary, 1870-1900', *English Literary Review*, 73 (2006), pp.465-87.

⁸⁵ Jordanna Bailkin, *The Culture of Property: The Crisis of Liberalism in Modern Britain* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2004), p.183.

⁸⁶ Courbet to Joute, March 1872; Courbet to Castagnary, 16 January 1873. *Letters of Gustave Courbet*, ed. by Petra ten-Doesschate Chu (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), p.455, 472.

⁸⁷ See Tom Stammers, 'Catholics, Collectors and the Commune: Heritage and Counter-Revolution, 1860-90', *French Historical Studies*, 37: 1 (2014), pp.58-87.

⁸⁸ For these experiences, see Philip Gilbert Hamerton, *Round My House: Notes on Rural Life in France in Peace and War* (New ed.) (London: Seeley and Co, 1908).

⁸⁹ This is an allusion to shipworm. Hamerton, *The Intellectual Life* [1873] (London: Macmillan and Co, 1929), pp.295-96.

⁹⁰ Hamerton, *The Intellectual Life*, p.296.

⁹¹ See the exhibition catalogue *France-Allemagne(s) 1870-71: la guerre, La Commune, les mémoires*, eds. by Sylvie Le Ray-Burimi, Christophe Pommier (Paris: Gallimard, 2017).

⁹² Jacqueline Yallop, *Maggies, Squirrels & Thieves: How the Victorians Collected the World* (London: Atlantic Books, 2011), pp.128-30.