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Introduction

It is a tale well known in our circles. Sir John Soane, the 'romantic artist',
'difficult' in the way of romantic artists. When 'nothing tended to ruffle his mind, his
manner was animated and presupposing in an eminent degree', but his 'excessive
reaction to any form of criticism' made him a 'captive to his own self-torturing
mind'. Possessing many 'personal idiosyncrasies', he nonetheless 'felt with the
utmost acuteness those unsparing reflections upon his peculiarities'. He was not,
in the ordinary sense, a happy man', for 'his happiness was only such as he could
ring from a jealous and hostile world'. Given his 'complex character', 'he was
irritable, impetuous and intractable' and given to 'petulant wrangles'. With his
'terse notebooks' and 'self-justifying pamphlets', which featured 'occasional
explosions of anger or self-pity', he gave into 'inner conflicts' that 'a better
disciplined mind would have disregarded'. Always 'impatient of criticism', his
'complex character', almost 'paranoiac', displayed 'edginess and vanity', and 'he
could not bear a contradiction'. 'In curiously unimportant ways Soane could be
mean', and his 'persecution complex and unyielding Old Testament morality' fuelled 'his inability to weigh his misfortunes against his blessings'.
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Stuck by a pronounced ‘trait of melancholia’, he was given to ‘intrigues’, ‘addicted to mystification’ and ‘a bit of rebel’. As one of the most colourful comments on his character asserts:

the narrow passages and the small openings which in Soane’s later work seem to be related to his escape from hostility and disappointment. It may be appropriate to leave Soane in Lincoln Inn’s Fields, nursing resentments within his marble mouse-trap.

From the time of his demise to the present, the flaws rightly or wrongly ascribed to Soane’s character flow through almost every discussion of him. Moreover, this assignation is essential, as his personality and architecture are linked, for, as the renowned former Curator John Summerson asserts, that ‘the strangeness of the one reflects the abnormality of the other seems, on the face of it, likely’. And this is reason he is still alluring to the contemporary world, as Henry-Russell Hitchcock claims, because the difficulties of his disposition ‘make it possible for him to appeal so strongly to us across a century of incomprehension’.

This particular tale transcends the mere salaciousness of characterization. It was his ‘conviction bordering on megalomania that his great abilities would be transmitted to his stock’ that led to his most profound grief. ‘His belief that they would become inheritors of his genius, in fact the dream of an architectural dynasty, was the source of his greatest and deepest disappointment.’ Undoubtedly influenced by the early demise of John, his elder son, and the increasing questionable behaviour of his younger son George, Soane moved beyond his family as the inheritors to his architectural legacy. This ‘failure of his dynastic plans’ gave rise the transformation of 13 Lincolns Inn Fields (LIF) from a residence to the Sir John Soane Museum, where ‘no changes of consequences have been made to the building’ since his death on 20 January 1837.

Yet, like most tales, the telling is only the beginning.
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'Salvaging this hoarded cargo from the shipwrecked dream' 39

There is no doubt that Soane's latter years were marred by bad relations with his younger son and his elder son's widow. Shortly after Soane's death, Professor Thomas Donaldson, a Museum Trustee, 40 pronounced in a speech dedicated to the recently departed architect:

I regard him only so much as respects his conduct as a public man. I would not disturb the solemn repose of the tomb, in which his remains have just been deposited, by allusions to those various sources of joy or sorrow, which chequered his domestic life. 41

This magnanimous (and very public) gesture would have been entirely unnecessary had Soane's "domestic life" been anything approaching affable or private. However, there is more to his bequest than the partial motivation of personal disappointments and pettiness. Soane moved from a living legacy of future architects to the presentation of himself through the architecture, collections and arrangement of 13 LIF, and did everything in his power to preserve those elements as he left them.

Soane began investigating the possibility of bequeathing 13 LIF and its contents to the public in 1824, when Timothy Tyrrell, a long-time advisor, wrote Soane on 16 April of that year to give advice on potential future Trustees. 42 Believing the official approval of the government was the only way to safeguard his wishes, eventually he sought a private Act of Parliament. George’s petition to block its passage, lodged via William Cobbett MP, was eventually rejected, 43 and the bill passed on 20 April 1833.

The Museum,

comprising, among other valuable effects, the Belzoni Sarcophagus, a Library of Books and Manuscripts, Prints, Drawings, Pictures, Models, and various Works of Art, all of which are deposited and arranged in a house and offices in the occupation of the said Sir John Soane, built and expressly adapted for the purposes of the said Museum 44

was limited to the premises of 13 LIF, which, as the above passage aptly noted, was a house that was 'specifically altered' to become a museum. Along with the interest from a £30,000 bank annuity, the rents from 12 LIF would support the museum 45 and
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pay the Curator and Inspectress £300 and £100 per year respectively. Yet this generosity was not unfettered, as it came with conditions:

whereas the said Sir John Soane is desirous that such Museum and Library and Works of Art should be kept together... but he is unable, without the aid of Parliament, to carry such his intentions into effect: therefore, to the end that the said Museum or Collection, Library, and Works of Art, may be preserved and maintained for the public benefit, according to the intention of Sir John Soane. His collection would remain as he intended. 13 LIF remained in Soane’s possession until his death, when the Trustees named in the Act would become vested with both of 13 LIF and 12 LIF, the latter only to be rented out to support the venture, never conceived as part of the Museum proper. Meanwhile, the Curator was charged with keeping ‘the said house, offices, and Museum, at all times, as nearly as circumstances will admit, in the state and condition in which the same shall be left at the decease of the said Sir John Soane’. Investigating the contemporary meanings of the words so specifically chosen for the Act further highlights the protective and restrictive trust Soane cemented with the signature of the King. Each Trustee was ‘one to whom something is committed for the use of another’ and ‘one to who any thing is made over or bequeathed for the use and benefit of another; a guardian’, while the Curator was ‘a guardian by law’ and ‘one who has the care and superintendance of a thing, place, or person’. Charged to preserve, ‘to save; to defend from destruction or any evil’ and ‘to keep from danger, corruption or destruction’, as well as maintain, ‘to not suffer to change’ and ‘to support; to assert as a tenet’, there is no question that this Act was meant to tie those in charge of LIF with leaving it precisely in the condition Soane left it.

Architect Arata Itozaki held that 13 LIF was ‘a family portrait, yet without the family’, but this sentiment does not quite fit the circumstances. Soane was a man in control of his career and the presentation of himself to his peers. That his later experience of his sons was, at best, difficult spurned him to transform particular circumstances of his own life. For instance, promulgated the fantasy that George
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was not his biological child, but a changeling, an allegation George later unsuccessfully used to challenge his father’s will.\textsuperscript{58} Ostensibly, the bequest was for ‘the public benefit’,\textsuperscript{59} yet during his lifetime Soane made no real use of any part of his collection for educational purposes, not even while he was the Professor of Architecture at the Royal Academy.\textsuperscript{60} Though his passionate hopes for the professional within him to live on as the founder of an architectural dynasty expired, his quest to continue in another way (which he could control) did not, for ‘his death, at a great age, was part of an orderly transfer. The house and museum, its collections and endowment secure, and, finally, published as he wished, would speak for him after his departure. Family affairs apart, there were no loose ends’.\textsuperscript{61}

Except his “family affairs” were resolved, for these surviving relatives were not vested as the standard-bearers for Soane. Had his sons or even grandsons successfully followed him into architecture, the property would have entered the hands of his descendants.\textsuperscript{62} In the 1832 edition of Description Soane declared,

\begin{quote}
At my death, the property will descend to my Grandson, the son of the late John Soane, with sufficient funds to enable him to maintain and use the House, the Museum, and the Library, in the same manner as during my lifetime, including the salary of a Curator.\textsuperscript{63}
\end{quote}

Yet circumstances had changed by the time of the Act’s passage. 13 LIF and its contents were completely left in the control of Trustees. His grandson is mentioned only in Section XIV, which allowed John Soane to apply to the trustees to reside in his grandfather’s house once he reached twenty-five, if he provided a bond and agreed to the conditions as it ‘is now arranged and is to be preserved’.\textsuperscript{64} Although he could live there, he would not be the Curator, and could only consult the Library and manuscripts if he was an architect. However, he died before the Trustees formerly considered his request,\textsuperscript{65} and the final prospect of a living Soane participating in this form of continuation died with it.

Another Soane construction designed for personal use, the Soane Mausoleum in Old St Pancras Churchyard, constructed in 1816,\textsuperscript{66} shows both the
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specificity of Soane’s selections and his lack of investment in his family in his final years. In 1827 sixteen year old Charlotte fell seriously ill, but Soane would offer no assistance. Upon her death on 29 November of that year, Soane would not even respond to George’s request that she be buried in the family vault. In the end, only Soane, his wife and his son John, whose protected illness and early death of tuberculosis somewhat mitigated his father’s conception of his failings were laid to rest in that small but still admired tomb. Soane’s propensity to acknowledge in a constructed selective reality that he found more palpable is evidenced by who he selected and did not select for the official Soane resting place, a family tomb that excluded all but one of his blood relatives.

What Soane had quite effectively resolved by his death in 1837 was protecting the Act, his will and insuring that 13 LIF, its contents and their all-important arrangement would remain as he stipulated. He went to great lengths to have his bequest ratified by Parliament and signed by the King, and didn’t stop with that. In the last years of his life he also produced two documents, Details Respecting the Conduct & Connexions of George Soane, also of Frederick Soane and Memoirs of Mr. and Mrs. John Soane, Miss Soane and Captain Chamier, which detailed at great length the failures and misdeeds of his children, their spouses and grandchildren. Described as ‘a tedious catalogue’ by a man who ‘unleashed his resentment’, it had a far more practical purpose—as evidence gathered, organized and printed, ready for use in case his family challenged his wishes. Predictably, George and John’s children combined forces to do just that, and it was the veracity of the document concerning George that led to the Judge upholding the bequest. Soane’s investment, energy and consuming yearning to survive in some manner after his death focused on 13 LIF.

Theory of Collection

While ruminating on the possible motivations Soane might have had in collecting, organizing and eventually bequeathing the building and contents of 13 LIF to the British public, Peter Davey dismisses the role of personal memorial relatively quickly:

Soane's own work—drawings, projects, models and, of course, the building itself—is an important element of the composition of the museum. No doubt the idea of a personal memorial formed a part of Soane’s conception of his museum, but this interpretation does not explain the presence of so many ancient and contemporary objects which have no direct relevance to Soane’s life.71

However, this short dismissal shows no contemplation for the role of the collector and the collections formed. Davey mistakenly emphasizes the origin of the objects, seeing them as a part of the thousands of divergent contexts from which they were taken.

These items, no matter how different they might appear, were all selected, and it is this selection over countless other possibilities open to Soane that is significant, as the ‘very act of collection endows the work presented with a heightened sense of significance’.72 As former Curator Arthur Bolton noted in his Introduction to the 10th edition of the Description, ‘Soane had a very clear idea of what he wanted, and refused many things that would have been of value, because he did not feel that they were really within the limits of his objective’.73 The items included in 13 LIF were there to the exclusion of all that was available to Soane, and these choices were purposeful. Since the 16th century, Western European collectors assembled a wide variety of objects in order to convey meanings and ideas via their arrangement,74 communicating the desired aims through placement and emphasis in relation to the other elements of the collection as opposed to considering an individual object in isolation. From the drawings to the paintings to the models to the manuscripts, each item within Soane’s surroundings, by its selection and organization, was removed from its previous contexts and re-emerged as his museum piece. For in ‘acquiring objects, the collector replaces production with
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consumption: objects are naturalised into the landscape of the collection itself.\textsuperscript{75} And that landscape was the designed environment of Soane's 13 LIF.

For this is the case despite whatever level of function these items might have had before their consumption by Soane, because as museum pieces they cease to function in any way other than as museum pieces.\textsuperscript{76} The individual temporal and geographical origins and history of each item is overwhelmingly secondary the synchronous self-contained microchasm of the collection's world. 'The collection does not displace attention to the past; rather, the past is at the service of the collection, for whereas the souvenir lends authenticity to the past, the past lends authenticity to the collection'.\textsuperscript{77} In Soane's epoch, a museum was defined as 'a repository of learned curiosities',\textsuperscript{78} and each curiosity, 'a rarity',\textsuperscript{79} was made even rarer and more select by the modifier learned meaning, 'skilled; skilful; knowing, with in; skilled in scholastick, as distinct from other knowledge'.\textsuperscript{80} The collector, 'a gatherer',\textsuperscript{81} built a collection, 'an assemblage of things in the same place',\textsuperscript{82} with an assemblage being 'the collecting of a number of individuals together so as to form a whole'.\textsuperscript{83} By the process of selection, organization, placement and emphasis, Soane was creating his own visual history, using these diverse physical fragments of the past to form narratives of his own making.

To say that Soane was obsessed with the exact placement of the objects in 13 LIF is an understatement. As former curator Peter Thorton succinctly put, 'He took an immense amount of trouble over every detail of their structure, decoration, furnishing and arrangement'.\textsuperscript{84} The Act's formal requirement for the collection's arrangement to remain as unchanged as possible was a purposeful one, as John Britton noted:

To preserve these in there entireness within the walls which were purposefully raised for their reception, and display, and in union with the numerous architectural forms and effects which belong to the house, the most prudent and strict clauses were introduced into the act.\textsuperscript{85}
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He was vested in a composition that took years to develop. Beginning in 1808 and continuing until 1837, his office produced numerous detailed and gorgeously executed watercolours, far too many to ever be used for exhibition of publication. For in Soane's architectural office, 'always if there was nothing else to do the Museum was there to be drawn, or its "ornaments," i.e., the casts that enliven its walls'. The student sketches and drawings within the Museum archive is filled with detailed interior views of proposed and executed item placements. This task occupied not only pupils and junior staff members such as James Adams, R. D. Chantrell and Frank Copland, but his chief clerk George Bailey. This represents a significant outlay of office time and effort, and literally illustrates how much Soane cared about the minute positioning of each item in his ever-expanding collection. Some of the most extraordinary of these watercolours, most notable by Bailey and Joseph Gandy (Figures 1, 2 and 3), whose collaboration with Soane as his chief draughtsman was 'almost a true partnership between equals', are reproduced as postcards on sale in the entrance hall to this day. Not only did he concern himself with the actual spaces, objects and display, but how they were represented in two-dimensional form.

As Summerson noted in 1949, 'Over-riding the individual units is the increasing interest of the institution as a whole', and that arrangement and the spaces built for that placement was (originally) Soane's. When University College London Professor T. Roger Smith suggested on 15 November 1892 that 13 LIF be
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abandoned and the collection sold across a number of other public institutions. The editorial staff of The Economist, although publishing his letter, vigorously opposed the proposition, because

... has very originally and well, natural, with a unique only as a gift to the nation... but not a less of the public part of the success of the

Figure 1: Crypt

1825 and the House Staff and the essential and the minimum, complete the lecture and to
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abandoned and the collection split across a number of other public institutions, the editorial staff of The Builder, although publishing his letter, vigorously opposed the proposition, because

Sir John Soane evidently wished his very originally-planned house, with its collections, to remain not only as a gift to the nation, but as a kind of monument to himself, and it would be, to our thinking, unjustifiable to frustrate this intention; while to the public, part of the interest of the Museum consists undoubtedly in the house itself, and the special and individual character of the Museum consists in the house and its contents taken together, and would be destroyed if they were separated. Although many of these items were not from Soane’s epoch, by the process of collection he ascribed to them the qualities of his own world, and these items relate very much to him.

That Soane would connect such physical manifestations to a piece of architecture and what was contained in is illustrated by the Dulwich Picture Gallery. Almost a labour of love, Soane never billed fees for this project and at one point even offered to pay for part of its construction. Eventually encompassing an art gallery, a mausoleum devoted to the possessor and collector of the pictures as well as six almshouses, Soane created a cohesive combination of these elements of legacy, death and continued life. It was Soane who decided that the Mausoleum would be combined so thoroughly with the gallery, as the benefactor wished for his tomb to be adjacent to the nearby Chapel. What Soane produced was a series of spaces where the ‘founders are immortalized by the juxtaposition of their lifework with their tombs, by gallery-cum-mausoleum’. Although the only burial at 13 LIF was his wife’s dog Fanny, it is clear Soane strongly connected the outcome of the process of collection with the memory of the person who compiled and owned those collections.

Between 30 August and 22 September 1812, Soane penned a manuscript he never published entitled CrudeHints towards a History of My House in LI Fields, an extraordinarily odd composition written in the guise of a scholar, identified only as ‘An
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Antiquary, ruminating on the ruins of 13 LIF, which was still under construction in 1812. Imagining 13 LIF discovered in ruins, Soane held that 'so much notice has been taken of the ruins and very extensive assemblage of fragments of ancient works pertly buried and in some degree attached to a building' that his combined efforts would survive enough to illustrate his character and self-professed role as an architect and professor, for

do we not account most satisfactorily for that great assemblage of ancient fragments in the interior of the building which must have been placed there for the advancement and knowledge of ancient Arts and may not these varieties in the Caviourium evidently the work of different artists have been fixed there in like manner to exemplify later changes in Architecture and to lay the foundation of a History of the Art itself—its origin—progress—meridian splendour and decline!—all this seems most clear and if further evidence was necessarily to establish this last portion of the premises having appertained to an Architect.

The relics are not considered to be less or more revealing of Soane's character by the fact they were not produced by him, since he omitted no opportunity of expressing his opinion on the works of all ages, not because he thought highly of his own discernment and acquired knowledge (for he was humble and modest, at the same time said to be of lively fancy) but in order to call forth the better and more useful observations of others, and thereby to provoke discussion on his favourite Art.

Even in a romantic imagined state of ruin, Soane envisioned that his union of architecture, collection and arrangement would still speak to his person, and it was his selection, possession and placement of these objects within the spaces of his design that gave them this power, even in such a deteriorated state. Be it his own creation or influences upon what he created, upon entering Soane's collection each item became part of Soane's apparatus.
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Before Soane's Death

Despite his convictions that not even the crumbling passage of time would completely dismantle his physical manifestations, Soane was obviously concerned with the integrity and remaining completeness of the collection, so the Act required that each newly appointed Curator,

before he shall enter upon the said office of Curator, give satisfactory security to the said Trustees, by a joint and several bond from himself and two sufficient sureties, in the sum of One Thousand Pounds, that no part of the said Museum, or any of the Books, Manuscripts, Paintings, Drawings, Pictures, Models, Works of Art, or effects in the said Museum or offices, shall be taken away from the said Museum, or lost or embezzled. 107

Unfortunately, this fear of purposeful misappropriation was fulfilled before the Act came into effect.

Charles James Richardson was Soane’s final pupil, one so fond of his master that he remained in his service after his terms of articles expired in 1830. 108 This affection was mutual, as in his will Soane left him a small monetary legacy and even suggested he be made an assistant curator, 109 a position he was never offered due to lack of funds 110 or because it did not conform to the specifics of the Act. 111 Richardson’s legacy would prove quite different than what Soane’s anticipated.

Although the vast majority of drawings and paperwork of architectural practices from this period were not preserved, Soane was scrupulously fastidious in conserving everything, including daybooks, account journals and drawings from the imagined schemes of his youth to the realized projects of his final years. This massive archive, consisting of well over 10,000 items, was fully open to Richardson. Between 1824 and 1837, Richardson purloined at least 1,200 articles from Soane, 112 whose selected carefully and across Soane’s career, 113 perhaps removing them from
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the property under the pretext of making copies for study. All that is known with certainty is that they were once within 13 LIF and their exit from that premises was permanent.

That Soane authorized this substantial pruning of his decades of accumulation is doubtful. Firstly, his drawings are mentioned specifically in the Act ten times—they were clearly intrinsic to the bequest. A number of the drawings from the Richardson collection were removed from what were once complete sets within the Soane collection, fracturing series in a manner completely inconsistent with a man who consistently and painstakingly preserved the remnants of his own work for a half of a century. That he valued the drawings produced by the architectural offices of others is demonstrated by the £200 he paid for fifty-four volumes of drawings by John and Robert Adam in 1833, when that office closed. A few of these Adam drawings made their way into Richardson’s hands as well, works Soane went to great lengths and expense to acquire.

That this removal was a result of a wrongly trusted employee taking advantage of the disorganization stemming from Soane’s decline is further supported by the subsequent actions of George Bailey, Soane’s appointee as first Curator. As the Act specifically called upon him to ‘make out and subscribe with his own name a full and complete catalogue or schedule of all such Books, Manuscripts, Prints, drawings, Pictures, Models and various Works of Art, and other things, as shall be placed under his charge’, he would have noticed that some of these drawings were gone, especially as he entered Soane’s office in 1806 and remained for another 31 years. Contemporary accounts clearly reflect how zealously Bailey managed and guarded the Museum’s library and drawings, often provoking the criticism of those who access was limited by his zealousness:

No: the Museum, as we have said before now, is visited by hundreds instead of thousands,—the books and drawings are “safe,—and untouched,”—carefully locked up,—and useless. There is a whole locked-up air, indeed, about the whole house; visitors, when they have obtained a card and gained admittance, feel that they are on sufferance.

Even The Builder obituary for Bailey used the forum as an opportunity to lobby for a change in his resolute policies:

116 New Description 97.
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We would like to express a hope, without meaning the slightest reflection on the course pursued by the late Mr. Bailey (who did what he considered best), that, in appointing his successor, the trustees of the Soane Museum will seek to make such arrangements as will ensure to the public the freest access possible.  

Perhaps “what he considered best” was to guard the Soane collection from further dispersal. That none of Richardson’s collections publicly entered the market until after Bailey’s death is telling in and of itself, especially as Richardson was suffering from financial difficulties. What the evidence indicates is that Richardson took advantage of Soane’s declining years and trust to surreptitiously amputate this cache without his master’s knowledge.

Just over 8,000 of Soane’s architectural drawings remain within the Museum. Through gift and purchase, around 1,200 drawings from Soane’s architectural practice entered the Victoria & Albert Museum, all directly or indirectly through C. J. Richardson. That multiple collections found their way to this one public collection over fifty years is an astonishing amalgamation of luck and accident. However, other fragments of the Richardson collection have appeared for public sale, including 40 items from the estate of Sir Albert Richardson auctioned at Christie’s on 30 November 1983. How many drawings remain in private hands, or simply haven’t survived the passing years, remains unknown. This testifies to the fact that the Act’s restrictive clauses were violated in principal even before it formally came into effect.
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Museum as a Time Capsule

Yet, despite the fact that Soane’s intention of what actual items were going to be part of his legacy to the British people was already compromised, the myth of the Sir John Soane Museum as changeless remains. It is ‘an astonishing time-capsule building. It still manages to feel as though Soane himself has just popped out to see a client but will be back shortly’, 127 and all that surrounds the visitor is how Soane intended, as the placement ‘has been done, chiefly by the ingenuity and sense of order of the collector himself, by whom the bulk of the collection was arranged just as it now stands’. 128 It as if the laws of time have no effect, and, since ‘it has survived virtually unaltered for over 150 years’, 129 the contemporary individual is transported into the 1830’s. ‘The experience of visiting the Soane Museum today is often likened to travelling back in time. Passing furtively into the Dressing Room or Breakfast Parlour, the visitor cannot help but wonder if the architect has just stepped out of the door opposite’. 130 And this empathetic impression is not without a ghostly response, as the visitor is ‘seeing Soane seeing you’. 131 And this fallacy is not reserved to the occasional writer and scholar only touching on an aspect of this Museum in print. Former Curator Peter Thorton imagined that ‘general appearance of the [Breakfast] room is one of which Mrs. Soane would not have been ashamed’. 132 Margaret Richardson, the most recently retired Curator, pronounced, ‘When you work closely with Soane, you realise he was a bit of rebel’. 133 However, it is impossible to see, be seen in a hallway, gain the approval of or work with someone who is dead.

Although much is understood about the past, believing anyone is capable of approaching a full comprehension of its conditions and contexts is a considerable lapse. ‘Our knowledge of the past may increase incrementally, but our understanding of it does not.’ 134 Individual, simplified aspects of the past are still available to the present, but are unavoidably inserted in the homogenising context of the present, into constructed histories. The past and the histories later generations produce are by no means synonymous. Learning about the past through the
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narratives of history and cultural tourism is distinctly separate from experiencing the events as a contemporary person rooted in another epoch.

Archives, buildings, monuments, drawings, photographs, books, articles, newspapers, letters, journals, diaries—these are just a fraction of the myriad of historical evidence available for any given time period or subject. Yet ‘facts do not speak for themselves, but the historian speaks for them, speaks on their behalf, and fashions the fragments of the past into a whole whose integrity, in its representation, a purely discursive one’. 135 Fragments of evidence are selected and put together, and it is that act of compilation in a linear framework that both creates the particular history and the literary representation.

True historical empathy, this concept of a time capsule with some sort of direct communication back and forth with the past, is impossible because the historian is inextricably a product of her/his present:

Given then that there is no presuppositionless interpretation of the past, and given that interpretations of the past are constructed in the present, the possibility of the historian being able to slough off his [her] present to reach somebody else’s past on their terms looks remote. 136

This impulse towards empathy is not to enter and begin to approach a comprehension of an alien past, but a mechanism for the past becoming part of the contemporary realm. It is the quest for a mirror to expand the comprehension of the present and how that particular past might have produced it. ‘The only way to bring people in the past (who were so different to us) under our control is to make them the same as us’. 137 And this is within the realm of contemporary interpretation, not empathy. Historians translate fragments of the past still available into the present, to relate to the present and speak to the present. So, for someone completely tied to the present world, with its technological advances, socio-economic conditions and a innumerable other aspects so tied to current existence, to walk into a building and believe they are almost with Soane is an extraordinary leap.

Yet this empathetic impulse is in keeping with Soane’s own intentions of perpetuating his character and personality in these walls and the array of items placed within them. As early as 1880, 13 LIF was interpreted almost as speaking for the dead Soane. ‘In this rather rambling interior thus formed are found objects of architectural or archaeological interest of the most varied description, showing how
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wide were the interests, and how active the mind, of the collector.' And it was the union of all elements of architecture, art, sculpture and paintings, not to mention furnishings and fixtures, which communicated this impression:

But perhaps the most interesting thing of all is the house and collection taken as a whole, the multifarious nature of its contents and the ingenious and original manner in which they are arranged; the whole giving the impression of being the work of a very vigorous and original mind. And this translation of items as seen by the casual visitor to the Museum in the present as the "true" John Soane continues to this day, for 'what you are seeing here is the career, the mind and vision of a great architect made manifest in his things'.

Soane went to great lengths to translate his efforts at 13 LIF, from commissioning Britton's guide as well as privately publishing three editions of his own Description to having multiple interior perspectives drawn at set vantage points of the rooms. Yet when Soane died on 20 January 1837 in a small second floor bedroom, the translation of Soane was taken up by a series of Curators. That the translator was also the Curator, with control over the architecture and contents, meant that these shifts in emphasis came with it physical alterations.

139 'The Soane Museum,' The Builder 73, no. 2864 (25 Dec 1897): 537.
141 New Description 98.
A Question of the House within the Museum

Pitzhanger Manor, Soane’s first grand effort in personal domestic environments, had two distinct functions beside the function of a weekend residence: a training ground for the promulgation of his intended architectural dynasty, and as a ‘fitting state’ for Soane himself, one that would solidify and confirm his own eminence, both socially and professionally. Like the latter 13 LIF, both properties were spaces that had to be presented—unveiled and toured. That he sold Pitzhanger in 1810 upon belatedly realizing neither of his sons would follow into the profession is telling. However, it clearly demonstrates that, to Soane, a house was far more than a domestic arrangement.

Although the word ‘house’ is used in regards to 13 LIF, in the Act it is difficult to define this bequest as a house-museum, as the ‘absence of bedrooms, bathroom and kitchen’ is conspicuous to this day. The only mention of 13 LIF as a house in Section III, as in Section I the term house is qualified as ‘built and expressly adapted for the purposes of the said Museum’. As Soane wrote and privately published two of the three editions of Description of the House & Museum on the North Side of Lincoln’s-Inn Fields, the Residence of John Soane before the passage of the Act, the most effective way to establish what he conceived as his gift to the public is to turn to those volumes.

Of the seventeen plates featured in the 1830 edition of Soane’s Description, ten are interior perspectives of the areas of 13 LIF he chose to focus on: the Breakfast-Room; the recess behind the Apollo (Figure 4); the parlor of Padre Giovanni, also known as the Monk’s Parlour, the room adjoining the Sepulchral Chamber; the Picture-Room (Figure 5); the Dining-Room; the Library; the
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Shakespeare Recess,\textsuperscript{155} the Tivoli Recess,\textsuperscript{156} and the Model-Room.\textsuperscript{157} These spaces were designed ‘with the observer in mind, combining an eighteenth-century theatricality with this nineteenth-century model of visuality’.\textsuperscript{158} None of these are rooms essential to a house—these are all areas designed and arranged for public consumption, spaces frequented by esteemed friends, colleagues and potential clients, and not for private life. Illustrations are included here to show the resolutely professional manner of these engravings, their lack of any sort of domesticity. That there was insufficient space in the volume is difficult to argue, as Plate XVII is Soane’s Design for the State Paper Office, which has nothing to do with 13 LIF.\textsuperscript{159} Soane’s \textit{Description} is a room-by-room visitor’s guide, prescribing the order in which they should be viewed and what of interest is contained in them—his desire to control not only the spaces, contents and arrangements but to stipulate exactly how those elements are to be properly seen is astounding. It is an exercise in public presentation, not domestic existence.

John Britton, the antiquarian Soane commissioned to write the first published discussion of 13 LIF, \textit{Union of Art, Architecture, Sculpture and Painting}, contended that, ‘Instead of vainly attempting to prognosticate the ruling passion and character by phrenological bumps, or craniological organs, we shall find a better and surer criterion of judging man, by referring to his domestic habits and associations.’\textsuperscript{160} And this criterion of judgement was far greater than any based on salacious gossip, for ‘he has done more for the advancement of the art, both by his own practice and precepts, than almost any of his contemporaries or predecessors in England.’\textsuperscript{161} Seven years later, he wrote a brief biography of Soane which emphasizes this concept of being understood through professional output as opposed to personal foibles. As he elucidated, ‘The public character of an artist is generally indicated by his professional works, and these are the chief, if not the only, legitimate objects of commentary for the literary essayist and biographer’.\textsuperscript{162} 13 LIF is not interpreted as a home, but as a mechanism for translating Soane the man, the constructed and much neater man Soane preferred to present. This structure was not a house, but instead may be regarded as ‘an index, epitome, and commentary on the architect’s

\textsuperscript{155} Plate XIV: View in the Shakespeare Recess, Soane, \textit{Description}, 1830.
\textsuperscript{156} Plate XV: View of the Tivoli Recess, Soane, \textit{Description}, 1830.
\textsuperscript{157} Plate XVI: View of the Model-Room, Soane, \textit{Description}, 1830.
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professional abilities'. Perhaps his construction of what was seen and described in print is best thought of as a portrait of a man as he wished he could have been.

In spite of what Soane chose to present in his Description, 13 LIF was his house and defined as his residence in the Act. As contemporary definitions attest, a house is 'a place where a man lives; a place of human abode' and 'a building wherein a person or human creature dwells', and a residence is a 'place of abode'. If it is the act of living in a building that predicates, Soane ceased his contribution towards that categorization on 20 January 1837. As George Bailey willingly acknowledged in the 1840 introduction of the abbreviated Description produced by the Trustees as a guide book to the Museum,

The peculiar designations given by Sir John Soane in that work to the several rooms and to various portions of the building are, for obvious reasons, retained in this, as are likewise the position of several Works of Art in the Museum, so far as has been found compatible with the arrangements necessary for the accommodation of the greatly increased number of visitors, now it partakes of the character of the Public Institution rather than, as before, the private residence of an individual artist.

From the beginning of the Museum as an institution, decisions were made to not only limit what rooms were available to the public, but that those rooms were considered outside the prohibition against unnecessary change. Soane's death marked the end of 13 LIF as the living space of Soane, and the end of any sort of presentation or real preservation of his intimate life through spaces such as bedrooms, bathrooms and kitchens.

Yet the end of this place as Soane's house did not end its role as a residence. The Curator was given a bedroom and a sitting room as he was to live on the premises, which meant that, even within the Act itself, at least two of the upstairs living quarters were not considered essential to preserve. Soane certainly lived and died in 13 LIF, but he was not the only one to do either.

---
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The Curators before World War II

George Bailey, long-time and trusted member of Soane’s office, served as Curator from 1837 to 1860. A skilled and respected member of the staff, his contributions to the actual design of 13 LIF might have gone beyond dramatic interior perspectives expressing Soane’s intentions, both preliminary and completed. His sectional perspective of the ‘Dome’ area of 13 LIF from 1810\(^{169}\) supersedes earlier designs for the area, and Bailey was allowed to exhibit the work under his own name at the Royal Academy.\(^{170}\) If he authored the solutions for better visual connections between the ground and basement levels of the space or not, his devotion to Soane’s office and person is unquestionable. Although 13 LIF was Soane’s home, for decades it was George Bailey’s place of work, a place he knew extraordinarily well, and upon Soane’s death it became his residence.

Two years before this occurred, in 1835, Bailey began the arduous process of inventorying the contents of the Museum,\(^{171}\) a monumental task, as he ‘bewailed the collection’s disorganized state’ at the first Trustees meeting,\(^{172}\) completed in 1837. Also in the first year of the Museum as a public institution, some of Soane’s furniture was sold to raise funds,\(^{173}\) and in 1838 the first recorded furniture movement occurred.\(^{174}\) As mentioned above, by 1840 Bailey easily admitted to altering non-public spaces in 13 LIF in order to accommodate the changing functions of the Museum. Contemporary accounts of his zealousness and protectiveness of the collection explored at length in the Richardson affair attests he was dedicated to Soane’s legacy, but day-to-day realities the Museum also had to be considered. Even in the decades immediately after Soane’s death, it was impossible to keep to the letter of the Act. Dying in 13 LIF on 17 December 1860,\(^{175}\) Bailey truly set the tone of change within the framework of changelessness, a time capsule altering with time.

Difficulties surrounding the appointment of the next Curator further illustrate the care and respect those charged in preserving and maintaining the Museum truly had despite the alterations already underway. With an annual salary of £300, in addition to free board and a full time servant,\(^{176}\) this post was a desirable one,

\(^{169}\) 13 Lincoln's Inn Fields, Section through Dome, looking east, entitled 'View of Various Architectural Subjects Belonging to John Soane, Esqrs. R.A. as Arranged in May MDCCXX,' George Bailey, 1810, watercolour, 96 x 62.5 cm (SJSM 14/6, 3. 13 L.I.F.).
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Figure 6:
Bailey’s sectional perspective through The Dome, 13 LIF, May 1810
especially for a man approaching the end of his career. Although the Royal Academy appointed Joseph Bonomi to replace Bailey in March 1861, 177 the Trustees refused to accept him, as they believed he did not meet the qualifications set by the Act 178 which required the Curator to be a 'man of the Arts who may have distinguished himself or gained any Academic Prize'. 179 As an anonymous letter published in The Builder charged,

But is he an architect in the sense of the Act of Parliament, which limits that choice? ... Mr. Bonomi is the son of an architect and brother of one, but was a pupil of Nollekens, and was educated and practised professionally as a sculptor. 180

As Bonomi trained as an architect in Egypt and only practiced in a limited capacity, 181 the trustees required further evidence of his qualifications and the Royal Academy refused to appoint anyone else. Only upon the resignation of two Trustees, Mr. Tidd Pratt and Mr. Jones, in March 1862, did the remaining Trustees decide 'unanimously on appointing Mr. Bonomi curator, pro tem., and he has already entered on his duties. The appointment, we are glad to hear, is understood to be permanent'. 182 This sort of resolution, of refusing an appointee rigorously defended by the Royal Academy, strongly demonstrates that even in the 1860's the Act and honouring it was taken seriously. Whatever physical changes that had taken place to this point were not done out of lack of respect, but changes nonetheless took place.

As an Orientalist who went to Egypt and 'adopted the Arab dress, and assimilated himself to their mode of life', 183 Bonomi focused much of his efforts on reproducing the hieroglyphs on the Belzoni Sarcophagus. Other than that, his primary contribution was making the library and collections more available to the public than under Bailey's tenure, to the delight of many. 184 His fourteen years at 13 LIf were a calm period compared to those of his successor, James William Wild (Curator 1878-1892), whose appointment over Wyatt Papworth, the published favoured candidate of 185 (and credited contributor to 186) The Builder, earned him the briefest published announcement of any Curator: 'Mr. James Wild has been elected
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Curator of Sir John Soane’s Museum'. The changes in the Museum escalated during his tenure, and when Summerson states that the ‘Victorians strained hard against the veto and it is open to doubt whether they did not, on several occasions, actually infringe it,’ Wild would be the foremost of those transgressors.

Unlike Bailey, who dedicated his professional career to Soane, and Bonomi, whose lack of practice caused such many problems, Wild was a fairly prolific architect in his own right. Before his tenure as Curator, he designed a number of churches, including Christ Church, Streatham, in addition to St. Martin’s Schools, the architectural courts of the South Kensington (now Victoria and Albert) Museum and the Bethnal Green Museum (Now the Victoria and Albert Museum of Childhood). Although he, like Bonomi, also lived in Egypt and adopted local dress and customs during that time, his career went beyond primarily antiquarian interests—he was an active architect. Therefore it is hardly astonishing that he altered the physical framework of 13 LIF. In 1889, Wild re-integrated a room from 12 LIF, Soane’s original Picture Room, and created a new room off the Ante-room, which obviously came with further re-arrangement of Soane’s collections. His structural alterations did not end there, as ‘the basement rooms have been re-arranged’, by 1891. This was done with the full knowledge and support of those vested with the Museum by the Act, for ‘the present Trustees undertook the enlargement of the Museum, which has been carried out under the direction and from the designs of Mr. Wild’. Yet, despite this published acknowledgement of alterations, in 1897 The Builder asserted that 13 LIF was in ‘original’ condition. Wild’s contributions fell to the pervasive myth of 13 LIF as Soane’s time capsule.

Although Wild was the most active Curator until modern times, changes continued long after his passing. Wyatt Papworth (1893-1894), who many hoped
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would have taken office instead of Wild, died after only a brief tenure, and was replaced by Arthur Birch (1894-1904), whose reconstruction of an Old London Street was the highlight of the Health Exhibition of 1884 in South Kensington. Soane, whose exhibition at the Royal Academy in 1999 referred to Soane as the architecture of light, relied on oil lamps for light in 13 LIF, and his artistic legacy was assuredly partly how he addressed the technological realities and developments of his time. Yet when Birch installed electricity in 1897, his main concern was the cost. Better known as an antiquarian than as an architect, it is significant to note that his appointment was seen as appropriate because the 'Museum was then valued mainly as a collection of architectural and archaeological relics, rather than as a specimen of Soane’s idiosyncratic architecture'. That the Act and Soane’s intentions were no longer in the forefront in the Victorian era is no understatement.

Walter Spiers (Curator 1904-1917) had a relatively uneventful tenure, despite the difficulties raised by World War I, but his death at 13 LIF brought John Bolton (Curator 1917-1945) to the office. In addition to writing many works dedicated to or touching on Soane and his works, he further altered 13 LIF. The last curator to live in 13 LIF, he was another architect with little professional practice, but his lack of such experience didn’t hinder him from converting the Tivoli Recess (despite its prominent place and illustration in Soane’s Description) into a bathroom in 1917 or moving Soane’s models to another second story room in 1918. Outside of his control was the damage imposed by the Blitz of World War II, most notably the destruction of the remaining stained and coloured glass by a bomb exploding nearby in 1941. Yet the most prominent and lasting alterations would take place during the tenures of tenures of Summerson, Thornton (1984-1995) and Richardson (1995-2005).
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An Aura of Changelessness in the Midst of Change

Although the renowned John Summerson (1945-1984) made a number of changes within 13 LIF, the most significant events of his years in service were the end of the Act as the regulating force of Museum and the extension of its facilities beyond 13 LIF. In 1969, 12 LIF was vacated by its tenants, and a new scheme replaced Soane's Act, The Charities (Sir John Soane's Museum) Order of 1969. As the explanatory note states, 'Its principal object is to enable the Trustees to take No. 12 Lincoln's Inn Fields... into use as a part of the Museum, in order to amplify the provision already made in No. 13 Lincoln's Inn Fields.' Superseding the Act of 1833, objects were officially allowed to move to 12 LIF and Trustees were given 'absolute discretion' to remove any object from display at any time, for any reason. These allowances make the following acknowledgement of the original Act rather hollow:

Provided that in taking any action under this clause the Trustees shall have regard to the principle that Number 13 Lincoln's Inn Fields shall be maintained as nearly as circumstances will admit in the state and condition in which it was at the date of the death of the founder, Sir John Soane, in January 1937.

Seeing as the arrangement, placement and definition of the Museum as 13 LIF was completely overturned, there is very little this apologetic clause effectively governed. Any additional changes could be (and still are) allowed by simple amendments to this new ruling document. Additionally, the Curator was only required to be selected by the Royal Academy—the qualification of being an architect who had won a prize was removed, and Summerson would, in fact, be the last qualified architect to hold the post to date.

'It is hard to remember a time when keyhole-surgery work of some kind or another has not been going on at the Soane Museum.' Restorations meant to replicate the Museum as Soane left it upon his death in varying degrees of thoroughness were commissioned, such as Summerson's campaign between 1951 and 1953 to restore the original finishes of the Dining Room, Library, Breakfast Room, Study and Dressing Room, and arduous Five Year Restoration Plan.

208 New Description 104.
Explanatory Note.
210 Charities Order, 2.
211 Charities Order, 17 (1).
212 Charities Order, 17 (2).
213 Charities Order, 17 (1).
214 Charities Order, 18.
215 Pearman 25.
216 New Description 104.
initiated in 1989 and overseen by architect Julian Harrap. Yet other projects, such as expanding the Museum to 12 LIF, must be distinguished from more conservative programmes.

Upon the incorporation of 12 LIF into the Museum proper, it was decided that the Breakfast Room, made famous by Gandy’s watercolour perspective, would be restored, especially as the removal of subsequent layers of paint revealed the ‘trompe-l’oeil painted vault’. In a process that would take over twenty years, the 12 LIF Breakfast Room would, for the first time, become part of the visitor’s experience, ‘by means of re-opening the door to the yard beyond the stair in 12, which Soane had blocked when he left the house in 1812’. In the chronology provided in the first appendix to the tenth edition of the *New Description*, the text reads that the ‘cleaning and restoration of the No. 12 Breakfast Room ceiling was completed in April [1994]
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and Joy and Wilm Huning then painted the walls, following paint analysis by Dr. Ian Bristow. But this was not precisely what happened. Bristow did, in fact, analyze the original paint, but as the surviving ceiling decoration had faded Thorton decided the authentic shades ‘could have been too bright, so the problem is to strike a balance between the old colours and the new’, so the walls were not repainted in nearly the objective manner stated. Furniture, fabrics and details were taken from Gandy’s perspective, yet, as John Britton succinctly noted in 1827, ‘Drawings, however accurate, are inadequate to impart the necessary information’. When addressing the reliability of watercolours in regards to Soane’s use of coloured glass, Summerson himself stated, ‘watercolours are of course pale rendering of the real thing’. Yet a single work in this medium was the primary contemporary evidence actually used for the restoration. That the Breakfast Room of 12 LIF is a thorough recreation of that painting is certainly not in doubt.

Although great efforts went into restoring the Breakfast Room, the Dining Room at 12 LIF was a different matter. For the ‘adjacent front room, originally Soane’s Dining-Room (and painted “Etruscan” red at the time), is now the “Soane Gallery”, with showcases designed by Eva Jiricna (1995). Although Bristow performed analysis in that room, there is no pretence of restoring the walls, or any other part of it, as it was decided that this space should be used to display drawings Soane bequeathed as part of 13 LIF. The display cases are mostly free-standing but they crowd the space so that little of the original character of this distinguished room is now apparent, with no attempt being made to recreate Soane’s original scheme. That one room would receive such active efforts in between restoration and reconstruction and the other would not even get its walls appropriately painted is difficult to comprehend.

Another example of this odd impulse of restoration that doesn’t precisely restore is the discovery of seventy-two unique blue and white Chinese tiles, which ‘date to the early eighteenth century, during the reign period of Kangxi (1662-1722), and are decorated with floral, figurative and landscape designs’. An account of
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The "discovery," published in 2003, emphasized the changes that have taken place in the eyes not in the public eye and outside of contemporary published note. The description of the "discovery" is not a direct result of "discovery." The description of which was published in the description...
this "discovery," published in 2002, emphasizes the changes that have taken place in the areas not in the public eye and outside of contemporary published note. These tiles decorated the fireplaces in two rooms: the Curator's Office, formerly Soane's model room, an engraving of which was published in his Description, a drastic alteration of function which is hardly justifiable by any reading of the Act; and the Assistant Curator's office, Soane's former bathroom. For the private areas, including the spaces moved public to private after the commencement of the Act, were even more susceptible to alteration than those on the tour.

After his appointment in 1878 as curator of Sir John Soane's Museum, Wild carried out many alterations to the interiors. From the time of Soane's death until 1947, rooms on the second floor—

Indirect archival evidence indicates that Wild brought the tiles into 13 LIF and placed them in 1891, and they were somehow overlooked as part of his personal estate. Like Bailey, Wild also died in the Museum, yet the obviously extreme alterations he made, especially when seen in light of the restrictions imposed by the Act, are only mentioned in specialty publications.

As to these Chinese tiles, in some fashion they are now in the public view. The basement of 13 LIF contains a small, locked closet, with a large plane of glass in the top portion so Soane's dishes are visible. On the floor on the left side of that space are a number of long, thin plastic storage containers labelled 'Chinese Tiles' by hand, removing the Wild contribution from the fireplaces. Yet the Assistant Curator's room is still not a bathroom and the models are stored in 12 LIF, outside of the room Soane specifically intended for their arranged display. This selective interpretation of what to reconstruct, what to leave in place and what to ignore fuels the untenable dichotomy of a state of changelessness in a place marked by thoroughly documented change down to the present day.

Considering all this, it is extraordinary that the idea of the Museum as fundamentally unchanged remains perpetuated in print by the Curators who, in fact, altered it. Thornton contends that, "To a remarkable extent, this request has been upheld by the trustees and successive curators, but some elements have been lost—

notably carpets and curtains," when he was fully aware that the least of the
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changes involved rugs and window dressings. Although admitting that earlier Curators had 'actually infringed the act, Summerson goes on to assert that 'the Soane continues with all its quaintness'.

Summerson's learned Inspectress, Dorothy Stroud further asserts that, of Soane's works, 13 LIF is 'the best preserved (thanks to his own testamentary provisions and the piety of successive curators)'. That those so intimately aware of the changes within spaces within and beyond the public eye would make such comments is fairly questionable.

However, the most unexpected alteration to the Museum took place in 1996, when the institution was awarded funds to purchase 14 LIF. This building, purchased by Soane in 1823, was rebuilt in 1824 and immediately leased out. Soane never lived in it, no doors or hallways ever connected it with 13 LIF and it was never meant to have any part of the bequest. None of his collections were ever displayed there and none of the rooms were designed with the concept of accommodating them. Never even mentioned in passing by the Act, Soane bequeathed the property to his family. Although this conglomeration is poetically lauded as an act to 'reunite the three houses Soane built here between 1792 and 1823', there was nothing to reunite, as Soane never conceived of 12, 13 and 14 LIF as a unified whole outside of their balanced facades. There is no evidence that Soane ever intended 14 LIF to have any part in his bequest to the British public, as either a source of revenue or additional footage for display.

Despite this, 12 LIF is now formally part of the Museum's address, and, for the first time, will be physically connected to 13 LIF. 'Discrete doorways made at two levels from the existing museum next door will tie it in to the visitor circulation loop and make sure all visitors are monitored through Soane’s front door'. After restoration, furniture will be moved from 13 LIF, as well as the Adam drawing portfolios and material for temporary exhibitions, to 14 LIF. That additional space is needed for educational purposes and office space is absolutely valid—there is nothing wrong with this institution taking the opportunity to expand its facilities. What is improper is the upholding the idea, whether directly stated or implied by the resounding silence of lack of acknowledgement, that it was within Soane's intentions and in the spirit of the now long defunct Act.
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The present Sir John Soane's Museum, consisting of 12, 13 and 14 LIF, with its present collections and as they are presently arranged, is not what John Soane intended, as the analysis of the ground floor below. There are, naturally, strong currents of what Soane intended, but these impressions are largely on superficial levels and dependent on both a limited and prescribed circuit of rooms available to the public and a lack of knowledge of the events of this Museum after Soane's death.
Conclusion

There are no time capsules, there is no escape from the steady passage of time. The Sir John Soane’s Museum is far more than ‘the astrolabe of the Enlightenment’ and is certainly not an unmediated trip back to the past, a conduit for a metaphysical conversation with a man long dead. In the 169 years of its existence as a public institution, men have lived and died there, and devoted their lives to the spaces and objects in their trust. Curators and Inspectresses have not only written books, articles, pamphlets and guides—they and numerous Trustees have devoted themselves to its continuation, and that continuation has necessarily come with a full spectrum of alterations. This Museum transcends Soane, and speaks of far more than the period of its initial creation. Legacies, no matter how tied into restraining covenants, adjust in time, as do what is valued or derided in a building or the career of an architect. That these points of value would manifest in the physical conditions of the Museum is neither unexpected or necessarily negative. Some things simply are, but insisting that the present circumstances are what Soane intended in the 1833 Act is not only factually false but at the expense of all those whose efforts have insured that the Museum is still in existence.

At one level this is a cautionary tale, illustrating the dangers of simply accepting what falls before one’s eyes as absolute, for not moving past the well known tale. Yet this by no means limits the usefulness and possibilities of the Museum, for it provides the opportunity to study how what is valued has changed the building as a document, to compare what is or isn’t changed as the years pass, to utilize the archive beyond Soane in order to better understand the evolution of architectural history and the times that this Museum has passed through.

Due to the small size of this institution, the detailed records tucked away in its archives and the fairly consistent publication of works concerning it, the Museum provides a tantalizing opportunity to better understand the mechanisms of conservation and change, starting at the very beginning of the path leading to the modern museum. Not only would detailed studies of these issues better illustrate the difference between the past and its histories, but would give us all a much richer understanding and appreciation of the Museum, its architecture and contents. Focusing almost exclusively on Soane lessens the possibilities of what can be gained from the Museum, for to understand our present translations of that extraordinary architect into our histories, we need to better grasp how he (and his Museum) was translated into past generations. Just like the paper in your hands, the Museum in its
present state is a construction of Soane, as complicated and messy as Soane's endless construction and alterations to 13 LIF. In ignoring that overlapping series of constructions, both physical and metaphorical, the Museum is limited to its untenable mythology as a time capsule, as a tale often repeated but poorly known. Soane only occupied 13 LIF for twenty-four years; perhaps it is time to focus on what occurred in the subsequent one hundred and sixty-nine.
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