Creating Cultural Heritage

Three Vignettes on Carl Jacobsen, His Museum and Foundation

Lunde Jørgensen, Ida

Document Version
Accepted author manuscript

Published in:
Management & Organizational History

DOI:
10.1080/17449359.2018.1547645

Publication date:
2018

License
Unspecified

Citation for published version (APA):
Lunde Jørgensen, I. (2018). Creating Cultural Heritage: Three Vignettes on Carl Jacobsen, His Museum and Foundation. *Management & Organizational History*, *13*(3), 283-301. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449359.2018.1547645

Creating Cultural Heritage: Three Vignettes on Carl Jacobsen, His Museum and Foundation

Ida Lunde Jørgensen

Journal article (Accepted manuscript*)

Please cite this article as:
Lunde Jørgensen, I. (2018). Creating Cultural Heritage: Three Vignettes on Carl Jacobsen, His Museum and Foundation. Management & Organizational History, 13(3), 283-301. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449359.2018.1547645

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Management & Organizational History* on 21 Nov 2018, available online:

DOI: http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/17449359.2018.1547645

Creating Cultural Heritage: Three vignettes on Carl Jacobsen, his museum and foundation

The paper addresses the larger question of how cultural heritage becomes taken for granted focusing on how cultural value becomes assigned. This is illustrated by taking departure in the case of Carl Jacobsen, an élite philanthropist, owner and founder of the New Carlsberg brewery, who came to have a profound effect on Danish cultural heritage through the establishment of the museum The New Carlsberg Glyptotek and the New Carlsberg Foundation in Copenhagen. Using archival sources, the paper investigates the mechanisms by which cultural value is assigned, conceptualizing these through framing, canonization and consecration. The paper shows the prominence of each mechanism with vignettes from the early work of Carl Jacobsen, to the contemporary work of the New Carlsberg Glyptotek and the New Carlsberg Foundation. In doing so, the paper sheds light on the managerial and organizational processes of cultural meaning-making as well as the way in which élite philanthropy may directly and indirectly influence the cultural heritage of a nation.

Key words: cultural history, cultural heritage, élite philanthropy, Carlsberg, museums, art foundations

Introduction

A central divide in the analysis of culture involves a distinction between culture as art (music, painting, sculpture, literature, drama etc.) versus an anthropological understanding of culture as shared values, rituals, language and ways of life. Yet categories of art rely heavily on the

production of shared values and understandings. In this paper, the larger question of how cultural heritage becomes taken for granted is addressed by honing in on the purposeful assignment of cultural value by élite actors and organizations. Specifically, the paper takes departure in the case of Carl Jacobsen (1842-1914), a central art philanthropist in Denmark, who directly and indirectly influenced Danish cultural heritage through the establishment of an alternative national museum (The New Carlsberg Glyptotek, est. 1897) and a prominent art foundation (The New Carlsberg Foundation, est. 1902) as well as examples from the conscious work of these organizations. While in no way negating the role of other actors and organizations involved in the 'creation' of cultural heritage, this paper draws attention to a number of conceptual mechanisms – framing, canonization and consecration – apt to understanding successful élite philanthropy and the relationship between élite philanthropy, the arts and the assignment of cultural heritage.

The paper is structured as follows. First, the theoretical perspective is presented, outlining the central argument, which draws on institutional theories of art and organizations. After a brief methods section, discussing the research approach and sources, the paper introduces Carl Jacobsen and goes on to illustrate three particular processes of cultural heritage assignment: First 'framing' with the case of Carl Jacobsen, followed by 'canonization' with the work of the New Carlsberg Glyptotek and finally 'consecration' with the work of the New Carlsberg Foundation, the most significant private Danish foundation for visual arts. The paper suggests that prominent philanthropists and their organizations are able to exert significant cultural influence through these processes that each assign cultural value at different stages. Finally, the author concludes and argues for further engagement with the mechanisms by which

cultural heritage becomes taken for granted and the ways in which different actors and organizations work to shape what is understood as cultural heritage.

This paper takes an institutional approach to understand how actors and organizations seek to influence institutions, and its underlying premise is that 'art "reflects" the socio-economic structure of the society within which it is produced' (Williams 1981, 34) and strives to engage with the nature of this reflection – by honing in on the mechanisms by which élite actors and organizations purposefully assign cultural value. Previous scholarship on culture and art, exemplified well by the work of Raymond Williams, has emphasized the importance of four particular entities and their relationships; the 'market', the 'patron', the 'professional artist' and the 'state producer' (Williams 1981, 33). This paper places particular focus on the influence of private patronage on the art available to a people – and how it is understood.

Williams studied the historical development of patronage in the British context, distinguishing several pivotal relationships between artists and patrons following the fully integrated or 'institutionalized artist': (1) The '*occasionally* dependent' artist associated with a patronizing household (for some artists, several), (2) the employment of artists through 'retainer and commission', which Williams notes often represents the true cases of 'official recognition', (3) 'protection and support', which represent a milder form of social support, moving towards mere recommendation', (4) 'sponsorship', which is a more independent form of monetary support often directed at the earliest stages of production that 'survived into conditions in which commodity and market relations [became] dominant', and finally (5) public patronage ('from revenues through taxation') (Williams 1981, 39-43). Through the following vignettes about Carl Jacobsen, The New Carlsberg Foundation and the New

Carlsberg Glyptotek, the paper sheds light on particular ways in which a significant patron – and patronizing organizations – have come to influence the conception of Danish cultural heritage within the visual arts. This is a question of how élite actors and organizations seek to shape cultural institutions, and the paper pays particular attention to different strategies that assign value.

Theoretical perspective

The central argument of this paper is that the very definition of cultural heritage is not a happenstance result, eternally fixed or objective quality that can be inferred purely by reference to the nature of the artworks themselves. Rather, cultural heritage, is the product of an ongoing process, where actors and organizations purposefully seek to create shared meanings and definitional boundaries about what constitutes cultural heritage. This approach encourages us to view cultural heritage production as a process, which on one hand involves various types of assignment, contestation and – if successful – different degrees of institutionalization or 'taken for grantedness' by actors and organizations in the public sphere. Where the following paper, pays particular attention to different kinds of assignment.

By applying a historical and institutional approach we can attend to the processes but also evaluate the relative successes of such prescriptive efforts. In doing so, the paper elucidates the strong and purposeful efforts behind the 'taken for granted' art and culture of a nation.

Institutional approach

The question of how cultural heritage becomes taken for granted fundamentally addresses the production of institutions as implicit cognitive structures that shape and enable our

understanding of the world (Aldrich and Fiol 1994; Suchman 1995; Rao 1994). This resonates with the institutional view of the 'art world' (Danto 1983; Dickie 1974), which sees art as the production by various actors, not just artists, but also art organizations, most prominently through museums and museum professionals such as curators, but also patrons, critics etc. (Becker 1982; Thornton 2009), who infuse meaning into the arts and by this process create what we understand as art. Over time, certain artworks or bodies of artwork become infused with particular meaning through the purposeful efforts of certain actors and organizations, and thus become understood as cultural heritage. Using the work initially of Carl Jacobsen and later The Glyptotek and the New Carlsberg Foundation, the paper illustrates different elements in the process of cultural heritage assignment. Specifically the strategic use of extant meanings, and further infusion of meaning through framing, canonization and consecration.

Organizational institutional theorists have taken a keen interest in how meaning is created, in particular how new meaning is infused (Selznick 1957, 17); studies that implicitly or explicitly involve a processual context specific – and therefore necessarily historical – analysis (Suddaby, Foster, and Mills 2014). These studies have taken a variety of approaches. In an early contribution, DiMaggio e.g. focused on how a small number of arts organizations worked consciously to create a consumer base for high culture in 19th century Boston (1982). A larger body of literature has drawn attention to the centrality of 'legitimacy' as the *sine-qua-non* of institutions and organizations (Suchman 1995) and conscious legitimation or de-legitimation in order to maintain, establish, change or dismantle institutions. A strand of this literature, which attends to the conscious role of entrepreneurs, links closely to DiMaggio's early work on cultural and, more broadly, institutional entrepreneurship (1982; 1988). Aldrich and Fiol, for example, show how unknown entrepreneurial organizations can work to gain

legitimacy and thus create new industries (1994). This has inspired an interesting stream of literature investigating the construction of new markets and product categories such as Indian high-end fashion and modern art as process of meaning – and value creation (Khaire 2014; Khaire and Wadhwani 2010). Other scholars have criticized the entrepreneurial literature's 'hypermuscular' view of actors in the face of well-established institutions and drawn attention to the more humble everyday institutional 'work' organizations undertake that proffer particular meanings and practices (Lawrence, Suddaby, and Leca 2009; Lawrence and Suddaby 2006), in particular 'rhetorical work' (Suddaby 2005; Taupin 2013; Jagd 2011), and manipulation of discourse (Maguire and Hardy 2009), to explain how new meanings become taken for granted.

In this process, the author finds three conceptualizations valuable that together describe different elements in the process of national cultural heritage assignment. These are: *framing, canonization and consecration.* Through all applied to the cultural field before (discussed shortly) and prominent in the fields of sociology, museology and theology, they are often used singularly. In this paper, they are used complementarily to theorize different kinds of meaning generation at different stages of cultural value generation and recognition. In doing this, the multiplicity of different kinds of valuation that occurs in the cultural sphere is addressed, and the paper begins to attend to the specificities and complementarities of the particular mechanisms drawing on the example of Carl Jacobsen from his early work to the contemporary work of the organizations he established. The paper thus offers insight into the micro-sociological processes of meaning generation, but also at a macro-level how élite philanthropic actors and organizations purposefully work to shape our cultural heritage.

The concept of the 'frame' draws on Goffman's work on '[s]ocial frameworks [that] provide background understanding for events that incorporate the will, aim and controlling effort of an intelligence, a live agency, the chief one being a human being' (1986, 22). If an entity can successfully frame the social meaning of an event, an object, or a whole gallery of objects – as in the case of Carl Jacobsen and the Glyptotek, then that event and those objects attain that meaning in society until this frame is fundamentally challenged, and the event is reframed. In this sense, framing refers to the 'signifying work' (Benford and Snow 2000, 614), whereas 'collective action frames' are the outcome of a negotiated shared meaning (ibid). Framing fittingly borrows its metaphor from the arts, where the frame physically presents and delimits the image, similarly the metaphorical frame provides contextualization and demarcation of the object or the event i.e. '[f]rames help render events and occurrences meaningful and thereby organize experience and guide action' (ibid). Framing, conceptually stands before processes of canonization, since canonization involves taking an object or an event into a framework of pre-existing meaning – and taking up that object or event as part of that signification.

'Canonization' borrows its metaphor from theology, in reference to what chapters are taken into sacred text or e.g. in the Catholic Church referring to the saints that have been recognized by the Pope (Bennett 2011). The term is increasingly used to describe the process by which powerful art museums create 'schools' or 'genres' that, if successful, attain cultural value in the repertoire of the wider cultural sphere (Leigh 2008; Langfeld 2014). An organization or museum or prestigious actor may thus work to create or expand canons by talking up new events, objects or 'saints' into a common category or repertoire and promoting the status of that category (Bennett 2011). This requires significant resources and status on the part of the canonizing agent, which is predicated on not only the successful framing of a singular event,

but a series of events or bodies of artwork. Once canons have been established, they function as legitimation that field actors, such as other museums or collectors can attain for instance by acquiring or displaying an artwork that has been canonized.

'Consecration' like canonization, borrows its metaphor from theology, but involves the most advanced stage of signification. Here, an individual or organization, has reached a state of establishment that it is able to bestow upon objects or events significant value by their mere association to the benefactor. Importantly, the individual or organization bestows 'sacredness' without the necessity to frame, create or appeal to the object or event's canonical status, allowing for 'discontinuity'(Bourdieu 1992) rather than appeal to resonance and consistency as successful framing demands (Benford and Snow 2000) or to the coherence of a canon. The consecrating effect of bestseller lists, awards and prizes have been elucidated in the fields of film (Allen and Lincoln 2004) and literature (Verboord 2011). The paper argues that this too is the power of well-reputed élite philanthropic actors and organizations. Before moving on to the analysis, the point of departure and sources underlying the paper are discussed.

Research approach

The paper investigates how cultural heritage becomes assigned through three illustrative vignettes. We start, by taking departure in the case of the brewer and businessman Carl Jacobsen, one of the most significant cultural entrepreneurs in Danish history. Denmark provides an interesting institutional context to study the mechanisms of cultural heritage assignment by élite philanthropists, since the country is small[1] and dominated by a limited number of significant philanthropic actors, whose philanthropic work has distinguishable and

[1] Presently home to a population of 5,6 million people and approximately 2,4 million in 1900 (Danmarks Statistik 2000).

observable effects on Danish society (Lund and Berg 2016). As such, Denmark offers a micro-cosmos in which to study the mechanisms of cultural heritage assignment and élite philanthropy. Carl Jacobsen's work is an excellent case to study in this context, in part because his philanthropic work was so influential, but also because he expressed the thoughts and ideas behind his work to the Danish public in writing, a tradition that permeated the organizations he established, thus providing rich documentation for academic inquiry .

Although the paper examines how Carl Jacobsen came to have such a significant influence instead of looking exclusively at the hero-entrepreneur, there is an equal interest in studying later ways in which the organizations Jacobsen founded work to assign cultural value. The paper takes departure in three particularly illustrative points in time that each demonstrate different stages of cultural value assignment, and in turn different ways and degrees of influence. At the earliest stage, at the end of the 19th century-early 20th, we look at how Carl Jacobsen *framed* his private art collection as having national significance through the establishment of *The New Carlsberg Glyptotek,* a large museum in Copenhagen. To study assignment mechanisms of Jacobsen's (by now) highly established organizations contemporarily, we delve into the cultural power of the Glyptotek and the New Carlsberg Foundation – the largest and most significant private art foundation in Denmark dedicated almost exclusively to the visual arts. In the case of the Glyptotek, now in the 1990s, a powerful and well-reputed museum, we look at how the museum worked to *canonize* 'Danish Golden Age Sculpture' as a distinctive category – on par and as part of the Danish Golden Age – and thereby significantly infusing greater value into the collection of sculptures by Danish artists collected by Carl Jacobsen. Finally, we look at how the New Carlsberg

Foundation has become a significant consecrator, an organization which by mere donation can bestow upon an art project – even before it is constructed – significant cultural status.

Carl Jacobsen and his father (I.C. Jacobsen), founders of the new and 'old' Carlsberg breweries, respectively, are perhaps two of the most well-known businessmen and philanthropists in Danish history (Glamann 1997; Glamann 1990; Nørregård-Nielsen 2002b; Nørregård-Nielsen 2002a; Nørregård-Nielsen 2002c). Yet while many studies note their direct power, few have sought to theorize exactly how, in this case – Carl Jacobsen and the organizations he founded – came to have such a profound influence on Danish culture. The authors' interest in how cultural heritage becomes assigned, is thus an interest in how meaning becomes infused by highly skilled and resourceful meaning-makers. Jacobsen's work is a successful case, since public and academic perception of the Glyptotek today is marked by a taken for grantedness of the Glyptotek and the New Carlsberg Foundation as weighty institutions in Danish cultural life (Glamann 1997; Nørregård-Nielsen 2002a; Moltesen 1987).

The paper relies on different sources for the three vignettes. In the first, Carl Jacobsen's own account of the creation of the Glyptotek (Jacobsen 1906) features prominently as a primary source since it is the crafting of this story itself that is of interest. While historical narratives about Carl Jacobsen, his company (New Carlsberg Brewery), his museum (the Glyptotek) and his foundation (the New Carlsberg Foundation) described in detail by Kristof Glamann, Mette Moltesen, Hans Edvard Nørregård-Nielsen and Ida Lunde Jørgensen respectively, have served as valuable secondary sources (Glamann 1997; Nørregård-Nielsen 2002a; Moltesen 1987; Jørgensen 2016). These authors were not only academics, but also connected to the

organizations they portrayed in various ways. Glamann a business-historian, was Chairman of Carlsberg A/S[2] and sat on the board of Carl Jacobsen's father's foundation, the Carlsberg Foundation (from 1969-1993), which owns Carlsberg and from which the New Carlsberg Foundation derives its endowments. Moltesen, a classically trained archaeologist, was Museum Inspector at the Glyptotek for 34 years. Nørregård-Nielsen, was Chairman of the New Carlsberg Foundation, an art historian, public intellectual and author – and while Chairman he was often considered one of, if not *the* most powerful person in the Danish art world (Brovall and Thorsen 2013; Jeppesen 2009).[3] Finally, Jørgensen conducted her dissertation research of the New Carlsberg Foundation over a period of four years, involving a detailed analysis of the foundation's annual reports from 1902-2015 (Jørgensen 2016). In addition to these, the 1982 annual report of the New Carlsberg Foundation, which includes a detailed account and justification of the foundations financial relationship with the Glyptotek, written by Torben Holck Colding the foundations Chairman at the time, has served as a primary source.

The second vignette focuses on how the Glyptotek fostered the inclusion of a hitherto unrecognized part of the Danish Golden Age – and thereby sought to influence the very definition of Danish cultural heritage. Specifically, we hone in on the creation of Danish Golden Age 'Sculpture' as a category. Here, we are interested in the museum's work to establish 'Danish Golden Age Sculpture.' This work involved both an exhibition and concomitant publication of 'Danish Golden Age Sculpture 1800-1850' (Friborg 1994), which

[2] The companies, 'old' Carlsberg brewery, and New Carlsberg, founded by J.C. and Carl Jacobsen respectively, were merged in 1906 and today the company is known as the Carlsberg Group or simply as Carlsberg. Following the 1906 merger the fiercely competitive situation became less pronounced and the merged company began making greater profits in the more stable market.

[3] Nørregård-Nielsen wrote extensively both about Danish art history as well as cultural heritage in the élite sense, but he also documented the 'ordinary' cultural experiences of his humble upbringing in rural Jutland in several biographies, demonstrating the less rigid separation of 'high' and 'low' culture and their observers in Denmark.

forms the primary source material. The book is written by Flemming Friborg, Museum Inspector (1992-2002) and later Director of the Glyptotek (2002-2017), published by the museum, and functions as a canon of Danish Golden Age Sculpture, one that overwhelmingly emphasizes the cohesiveness and 'canonical' status of sculptures from the Glyptotek's own collection.

Lastly, the third vignette focuses on the New Carlsberg Foundation and its ability to consecrate an artistic project. To parse out to the extent possible, the honor bestowed by the foundation, from the art itself, an ongoing project has been chosen, where the foundations 'blessing' has been given, but the actual artwork has not yet been produced. This consecratory power of the foundation is illustrated by a large art project envisioned by ARoS, a significant gallery (not least due to prior donations of art by the foundation) in Denmark's second largest city, Aarhus. Here, we focus less on the representation of the foundation, but rather, on the way in which the foundation is invoked in legitimating the project, both in the museum's own presentation of the proposed artwork on its website (ARoS 2015; ARoS 2014) as well as press coverage of the project (Burmeister 2015; Petersen 2015b; Petersen 2015a; "Aros Får Stor Pengegave Til Prestigeprojekt" 2015; Sckerl and Petersen 2014; Ritzau 2014), which forms the primary sources for the investigation. Since the focus, like in the aforementioned examples, is firmly on general public representation (and to some extent reception), interviews have been disfavored. We now turn to the analysis, preceded by a brief introduction of Carl Jacobsen.

The man, the museum and the foundation

The brewer's son

Carl Jacobsen (1842-1914) held a lifelong interest in art. He grew up as part of a self-aware and internationally oriented industrial élite in Copenhagen, where private enterprise was blossoming after an increased protection of private property was instated with the Danish Constitution in 1849 (Kaspersen 2013). It was a privileged upbringing – the young Carl was exposed to Danish and European high culture both in his home, as part of the Copenhagen cultural élite, and through family travels across Europe. His father, the brewer and original founder of Carlsberg, J.C. Jacobsen, was an enthusiastic admirer of the Danish-Icelandic sculptor Thorvaldsen (Glamann 1997, 15). J.C. Jacobsen made significant cultural donations over his lifetime, most prominently creating The Museum of National History at Frederiksborg Castle in 1878, which has since been funded and run by the Carlsberg Foundation (est. 1876).

As his father's only son, Carl grew up with the expectation that he would one day inherit the family business. He was trained in brewing in Paris, Rotterdam, Strasbourg and several places in Austria and Great Britain before returning to Copenhagen (Glamann 1997, 73–76), where his father helped him rent brewing facilities adjacent to his father's brewery (ibid: 84-86). From these favorable conditions, Carl became exceedingly wealthy and began acquiring (and occasionally donating) visual art and sculpture. In his private home in Valby, where his business was also located and which, therefore, was frequently used for representational purposes, he began establishing his own 'Glyptotek' inspired by Ludwig the First's Glyptothek of Greek and Roman sculptures in Munich and Chatsworth House in northern England (Jacobsen 1906). All the while, Carl and his father were in fierce competition and increasingly in public strife, leading to his father's *de facto* disinheritance of him, through the creation of the Carlsberg Foundation in 1867, which became the legal owner of the original

Carlsberg brewery. In compensation, Carl Jacobsen received a million Danish kroner, with which he created four one-time grants; two for visual art, one for workers' accommodation and one for a church building (ibid: 96).

Carl Jacobsen's development of his private art collection, from an amateur interest and serendipitous purchases, to a more structured and persistent collection of artwork emerged gradually during the last quarter of the century (Glamann 1997, 104). The Albertina Stipend launched in 1879 for the erection of public sculptures in Copenhagen, named in memory of Bertel Thorvaldsen, marks the beginning of his more serious engagement with the arts in the public sphere. And in 1882, he opened his private 'Glyptotek' collection up to the public in Valby (Glamann 1997, 106).

Framing his collection: The New Carlsberg Glyptotek

Carl Jacobsen first voiced the idea of gifting his collection to the public and establishing a new state museum in 1884, in an op-ed (Jacobsen 1884), in relation to a fire at Christiansborg Castle (home of the Danish parliament), which destroyed a significant amount of national art (Glamann 1997, 107; Jacobsen 1906, 20–24). However, at the time, the proposal was mainly supported by the board of the Albertina Stipend, and did not receive significant public interest. A few years later, in 1888, the offer was put forward again and this time the state and Municipality of Copenhagen were more positive (Glamann 1997, 121; Nørregård-Nielsen 2002a, 111). In return for his gift, Carl demanded a suitable building site for the museum and that the state and municipality each committed ½ million Danish kroner to the construction. Shortly thereafter, he granted the museum 1 million Danish kroner to aid its first expansion (Glamann 1997, 190; Nørregård-Nielsen 2002a, 111). At the time, his brewery was struggling

in an increasingly competitive market, in part due to its fierce competition with the 'old' Carlsberg brewery, as well as his extensive art collecting and donations. On the occasion of the Carlsberg Foundations 25th anniversary, September 25th 1901, Carl Jacobsen gifted the Carlsberg Foundation, his financially strained company, the New Carlsberg Brewery, and in one fell swoop created the New Carlsberg Foundation. Its first task would be to ensure the completion of the monumental construction of the New Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen.

Carl Jacobsen's art collection did not immediately gain national or international significance – the collection was not well known by the wider public and expert opinions about the collection were not entirely favorable. In 1896, a year before the Glyptotek opened in Copenhagen, the Austrian-Czech archaeologist and art dealer Ludwig Pollak visited the collection and was fairly impressed with Carl Jacobsen's sensibility to the arts, but was less convinced about the excellence of his primary dealer Wolfgang Helbig (Moltesen 1987, 172). In 1898, the American art collector Edward Perry Warren saw the collection at the newly established Glyptotek in Copenhagen and was greatly underwhelmed, noting that only a few rare items would have had his interest (Moltesen 1987, 176). The significance of the collection grew gradually, firstly through the opening of his private collection to the public – in Valby – thereby framing his collection as a public one. Secondly, by framing his collection on par with extant national cultural heritage as illustrated in the op-ed column published after the fire at Christiansborg Castle (Jacobsen 1884). Thirdly, by placing his collection into the context of a museum, through the creation of the New Carlsberg Glyptotek. The majestic building of the Glyptotek served to infuse the collection with particular cultural meaning, most prominently the building drew direct reference to Ludwig the First's Glyptothek in Munich, a museum of well-established national and international significance, which was

greatly admired by Jacobsen (1906, 24). The New Carlsberg Glyptotek, which has since undergone several restorations and expansions, was initially erected in two steps. A first part opened in 1897 for Carl Jacobsen's modern collection, and almost immediately work began to add several wings for his growing collection of antiquities and a spectacular winter garden in the middle, which opened in 1906 (Glamann 1997, 227).

In Carl Jacobsen's work to frame his collection, the physical and rhetorical effects were inseparable. Two particular aspects of Carl Jacobsen's effort are notable; Carl wanted to bring European cultural heritage to the common man and wider Danish public, and he wanted his collection to attain the status of a national gallery. The words *laboremus pro patria* are chiseled into the architrave of the Glyptotek and contain a double meaning characteristic of Jacobsen. 'Let us work for the fatherland' was not only a nationalistic reprimand to the people – it was how he wished his own work to be perceived – as work for the nation. This was not the inward-looking nationalism that has since co-opted the 'Danish Golden Age' including some of Jacobsen's prized pieces of Danish art from this era. Instead, the modern collection consisted of sculptures and paintings by Danish artists (most notably the sculptures of Thorvaldsen and his students Freund, Bissen and Jerichau – as well as several golden age paintings) alongside modern art from France (notably French saloon sculpture such as Delaplanche's statue *La Musique*, Dubois' *Eva*, Gautherin's *Le Paradis perdu*) – these were soon complemented by Greek, Roman, Etruscan and Egyptian antiquities (Jacobsen 1906, 13). Carl Jacobsen thus framed The Glyptotek's national significance, by placing Danish artwork in relation to a wider European cultural heritage.

Jacobsen recognized that the growing working class and wider Danish public, far removed from his own international élite, had few prerequisites to understand and appreciate high culture and antiquities. As he began collecting more seriously, Jacobsen developed an understanding of his own limits as a highly motivated, but ultimately untrained collector, leading him to employ the professional archaeologist Wolfgang Helbig to help him vet and acquire antiquities (Moltesen 2012). Recognizing his own rather eclectic approach, he framed his collection;

> not [as] a museum, with its demands of scientific ordering and completeness […] no it should be a hall […] where statues stand in festivity and harmony, to beautify life for the living (Jacobsen 1906, 19).

In his own account of the museum, he also writes:

> I sincerely wanted that the New Carlsberg Glyptotek should not be an ordinary museum, mostly for travelers, the interested, art-knowledgeable and students, but rather a place which had its own peculiar aesthetic, whereto the cities inhabitants invariably should feel drawn (Jacobsen 1906, 61).

The presentation would speak to the untrained observer, and in this way Jacobsen framed the Glyptotek as a pedagogical instrument to enlighten the Danish people[4], including those who could not pay. In the second paragraph of the Glyptotek's original charter he specifies that the

[4] The Glyptotek has since fully become a professional academic institution, with significant research activities, and this purpose has thus somewhat been reframed in recent years. However, the challenge of framing the Glyptotek to a public with few prerequisites to understand and appreciate its collection remains an area of particular effort even today.

Glyptotek should be open free of charge a number of days a week (Jacobsen 1906, 72). Jacobsen's collection was thus framed on two interrelated fronts, on one hand to the broader Danish public, on the other, to the two key political stakeholders, the state and the Municipality of Copenhagen, which Jacobsen needed aboard his project to realize the Glyptotek and ensure its continued survival.

In this regard, it is worth noting that the museum and the New Carlsberg Foundation's support of it has been the subject of significant work to maintain the initial framing of the museum as an important national and public institution. For example, following its establishment, the Glyptotek became a heavily research-based institution, and outside its doors the cultural upheaval of the 60s and 70s, which also greatly affected the Danish school system, meant that the Glyptotek faced challenges on several fronts (Jørgensen 2016, 110–12). Firstly, the costs of running the Glyptotek rose tremendously, in part due to the costs of conducting professional research and in part due to increasing maintenance costs of the aging building. During these years, the New Carlsberg Foundation's share of the museum's running costs (which it shared with the state and the municipality) rose to almost half of its budget by 1982 (Ny Carlsbergfondet 1982). Secondly, the public's interest – and prerequisites to understand the museum's collection – decreased, affecting its income from ticket sales. Facing this situation, the museum needed to justify its value in a society less appreciative of its collection and work – and the foundation, strained by the significant demands of the museum, became increasingly unable to pursue its central aim – to fund the acquisition and donation of artwork. In response to this situation, the museum and foundation made significant efforts to lobby the state and municipality for increased support – emphasizing the ownership of the museum as belonging to 'the fatherland of its founders' as the foundation's

Chairman at the time, Torben Holck Colding, writes in a detailed account about the museums financial situation published in the foundation's annual report (Ny Carlsbergfondet 1982, 131). A significant commitment from the state and municipality (and a conservative turn in Danish society during the 1980s) meant that the Glyptotek was able to 'weather the storm' despite appearing less relevant to contemporary society, the museum is able to reclaim its status as a significant cultural institution in the 1990s in part through its role as a well reputed research institution and as a counter balance to the more fast paced contemporary art scene. And in particular, since the 2000s, as a place of contemplation and historical-grounding in a constantly online and frantic society.

As the Glyptotek itself became more established as a professional academic institution, it also became more powerful in defining the distinctions surrounding the cultural artefacts of its own collection, a key example of this is illustrated in the following section.

Canonizing: Danish Sculpture from the Golden Age

> The intention is to give the first broad view. An invitation to the sculptural art of an era in Danish art, which so explicitly has become synonymous with painting alone, or at best with the classic sculptor Thorvaldsen as the only exception. [...] *Danish Sculpture of the Golden Age* has its starting point in the collections of the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, showing its founder Carl Jacobsen (1842-1914) as an avid collector of Danish sculpture (Friborg 1994, 3).

‘Danish Golden Age painting’ was a well-known category already at the time of Carl Jacobsen, while Bertel Thorvalsen, the famous Danish sculptor, was clearly included in this category, other sculptors of the time and their work – in particular the work of Thorvaldsen’s students was not as highly regarded. In other words, no conception of a ‘Golden Age of Danish sculpture’ exists until the Glyptotek begins to take up the idea in 1994. In the publication *Dansk Guldalderskulptur* (*Danish Golden Age Sculpture*), Flemming Friborg, then Director of the Glyptotek, makes a significant effort to argue for the status of Danish sculpture from the Golden Age as a category on par, and part of, a larger ‘Golden Age’ cultural movement (Friborg 1994). Specifically, this status-making involves the outline of a canon of ‘Danish Golden Age Sculpture’ proffered through an exhibition and a Danish/English publication, which on one hand serves as a catalogue, documenting and explicating the exhibition, on the other, works as an autonomous document to establish the category and boundaries of ‘Danish Golden Age Sculpture’.[5] Notably, this canon takes departure in sculptures from the Glyptotek’s own collection, many of which were acquired by Carl Jacobsen and included in his first donation upon founding the Glyptotek (Jacobsen 1888) and thus the canon also enforces the value of the Glyptotek as a museum of national significance.

One of the defining features of a canon, is the delimitation that it also necessitates, this delimitation is also apparent in Flemming Friborg’s catalogue, which begins with Thorvaldsen and his strongly Greco-Roman form of sculpting, and extends to his students,

[5] The book includes an entire simultaneous translation of the text to English and is thus unquestionably also an attempt to communicate an expanded definition of Danish Golden Age art to an international audience increasingly interested in Danish art and culture. The Los Angeles County Museum of Art and Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York both held exhibitions titled “The Golden Age of Danish Painting” in 1994 (Monrad 1993).

most prominently J.A. (Jens Adolf) Jerichau, H.W. (Herman Wilhelm) Bissen and H.E. (Hermann Ernst) Freund. Friborg explains this (new) delimitation along two lines. Firstly, these students travelled and studied directly under Thorvaldsen at the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts and were methodically trained, in part, by their employment in the production of Thorvaldsen's own sculptures, travelling to Rome with their master and receiving much of their education on these travels. Secondly, despite the significant influence of the master, these students literally managed to carve out their own characteristic styles of sculpture – one with a strong basis in Thorvaldsen's tutelage but also representing a more Nordic style:

> In order to represent the "Nordic" and thereby place some distance to both the Antique and (chiefly) to Thorvaldsen, Bissen has furnished his Valkyrie with a helmet-like head adornment which could not be confused with anything Greek or Roman. Nor could the drinking horn into which she is pouring mead hardly have been produced in Hellas (Friborg 1994, 14).

Another element, which stands out in Friborg's text is the employment of the language used to describe (the already canonized) Golden Age Painting in the process of canonization. This is done very explicitly:

> In painting one talks of genre pictures, that is to say works which in anecdotal form depict episodes from ordinary life […] "Genre sculpture" is not used as a concept, but several works by Jerichau perhaps come quite close to such a definition. Both *Little Girl with Cat,* 1856, and *Little Girl with Dead Bird,* 1871,

> in the Glyptotek's collections are just such examples […] their light cloying and sentimentality draws Jerichau far away from Neo Classicism (Friborg 1994, 32).

In his canonization, Friborg also makes reference to the status that is 'owed' Jerichau by virtue of his international recognition, noting that 'despite being appointed professor of the Academy in Rome as early as 1849, [Jerichau] did not gain the footing in a Danish context one could have imagined from this' (1994, 34). Friborg thus argues that the sculptors outlined in his canon had international relevance, yet were overlooked by observers of the Danish Golden Age, since they were not sufficiently nationalistic, remarking that '[t]he implication of the Neo-Classical is above all international' (ibid). Finally, Friborg cordons off the period noting that 'Bissen's *The Danish Soldier* appears to be the conclusion of an epoch' pointing to the gradual turn to the depiction of the Dane, and with this a significantly different end to the sculpting than the Greco-Roman aesthetic.

The above case referred to the first of the two significant organizations founded by Carl Jacobsen (the New Carlsberg Glyptotek), in which we see the museum's conscious work to establish the very categories of Danish cultural heritage. This canonization infuses importance to a larger group of artworks – and specifically ascribes (greater) value to its own collection and begins to shape the boundaries of 'Danish Golden Age Sculpture.' On one hand, this engagement in 'canonization' draws on the existing importance of the museum – and on the other it reifies the museums significance. The ability to engage in canonizing efforts thus illustrates an intermediary stage of a cultural value generation and recognition, requiring a well-reputed actor and organization as well as an academically supported legitimation of the categorical boundaries. We now turn to the way in which the New Carlsberg Foundation

exerts a powerful influence on Danish cultural heritage, through its donations, with an ongoing case.

Consecrating: The Next Level at ARoS Aarhus Art Museum

Preceding events

In 2014, Aarhus art museum *ARoS* announced an expansion of its current museum, with a 'Nordic Pantheon' – a new building set to integrate a large spherical artwork by the American installation artist James Turrell (ARoS 2014). The project announced simultaneously with an initial 100 million kroner donation from the Herman Salling Foundation[6] was quickly retitled *The Next Level* and was initially expected to cost a little over half a million USD (350 million DKK). The title of the first press release read, 'World renowned artist creates piece for a unique expansion at ARoS' with the subtitle stating 'Grocer Herman Salling's Foundation donates 100 million DKK to Director Erland Høyersten's idea about a massive building with e.g. an artwork by American James Turell' (ARoS 2014). Further on, in the press release (under the title 'Total Price: 350 million DKK') the museum wrote:

> With the 100 million DKK from Grocer Herman Salling's Foundation ARoS has financed the first large part of the unique project. With a total budget of 350 million DKK there is still some work to do for the museum director and his staff to collect the remaining funds (ARoS 2014).

[6] The Salling Foundations, named for Herman and his father Ferdinand Salling are connected to and derive their profits from Dansk Supermarked (Danish Supermarket), which owns some of the largest Danish retail, grocery and discount stores in Denmark e.g. Salling, Bilka, Føtex and Netto.

Despite the significant size of the donation in the Danish context, the initial announcement garnered little press. Denmark's Radio aired a small article focusing mainly on the size of the donation supplemented by a brief description of the expansion and the artist James Turell is only mentioned briefly in the very last paragraph (Ritzau 2014). Shortly after, Århus Stiftstidende, a local newspaper, brought a short interview with the Director, Erland Høyersten, about the prospect of more funds to no avail (Sckerl and Petersen 2014).

Enter the New Carlsberg Foundation

> [T]he support from the New Carlsberg Foundation is more than just a seal of approval. It weighs very heavily (Høyersten in Burmeister 2015).

Almost a year later, ARoS announces major changes to the project (Petersen 2015a) in direct connection with a 20 million DKK donation from the New Carlsberg Foundation (ARoS 2015). This donation garners significantly more press (Petersen 2015a; "Aros Får Stor Pengegave Til Prestigeprojekt" 2015; Burmeister 2015; Petersen 2015b), and the way in which the project is discussed is also subtly, but significantly, changed. There is greater focus on the artwork and on the role and status of the New Carlsberg Foundation and the foundation's engagement in the new project, despite its comparatively smaller donation.

Unlike the original donation from the Herman Salling Foundation, Karsten Ohrt, Chairman of the New Carlsberg Foundation (and former Director of the National Gallery), is far more actively employed in the museum's press activities surrounding the project. For example, in

ARoS own press release, Ohrt, rather than the museum director, is quoted to explain the project's significance:

> It is a great pleasure to donate 20 million kroner to realize the expansion project at ARoS. James Turrell is among the world's leading artists, and his artworks will once again mark ARoS as a significant actor on the international art scene (Ohrt in ARoS 2015).

This ability of the foundation to figuratively lift the project to 'the next level', bestowing upon it 'sacred' meaning and status, which cannot be justified solely by reference to the monetary value of its investment or the artwork itself, is viewed as the very essence of consecration. The New Carlsberg Foundation is highly aware of this power, and as a small feature article describes, the foundation has been heavily involved in shaping the new project, rejecting the initial idea – of a 350 million kroner expansion, and bringing the artwork into focus in the project (Petersen 2015b). The foundation can do this because it is the most powerful foundation in the Danish art world (Heltoft 2016), a power that far exceeds its financial resources, and which equally relies on the perception of its power and its art-historical expertise.[7]

Despite its particularities, the abovementioned case illustrates the general consecratory mechanism by which the foundation, through its discretionary donation, is able to bestow the highest honor upon an art project. This is not the first time ARoS has received such an honor. In 2001, the New Carlsberg Foundation donated 40 million DKK for the purchase of

[7] When the former Chairman of the foundation retired, the religious and regal metaphors about his status were also abundant, alongside recognition of his significant scholarship and expertise (Brovall and Thorsen 2013).

artworks, which included its art-historical expertise in selecting said artworks and which significantly helped realize the establishment of the modern-day art museum in Aarhus (ARoS). Two of the most significant artworks in the museum, Ron Mueck's mega sculpture *Boy* and Bill Viola's video-installation *Five Angels for the Millennium*, were acquired by the foundation with about a quarter of these initial funds (Petersen 2015b; Brovall and Thorsen 2013). From 2001-2016, *Boy* occupied the central space of the museum on the ground floor and became the icon of the museum.[8] The original 'Aarhus Kunstmuseum', although Denmark's first provincial gallery, held no greater status than many of Denmark's many other provincial galleries. With its significant funds, but more importantly power and expertise, the New Carlsberg Foundation was able to *consecrate* the new Aarhus Kunstmuseum – ARoS – as we know it today – and most recently it has blessed its expansion through its donation to *The Next Level.*

The New Carlsberg Foundation's consecratory efforts thus illustrate cultural meaning making at the most advanced stage of cultural value generation and recognition. At this level, the significance of the foundation and its work is taken for granted, and it has the ability to point to – and thereby imbue – an individual artwork or project with cultural importance *ex ante*. A brief summary of the key points of the paper as well as a few further questions will now be addressed.

Conclusion and further questions

The preceding paper addresses the larger question of how cultural heritage becomes assigned by resourceful private actors. In doing so, the paper illustrates three different kinds of

[8] From 2016 the space has been used for changing installations.

assignment; *framing, canonization and consecration,* with cases exemplified by the work of Carl Jacobsen, the owner and founder of New Carlsberg Brewery – and the two significant organizations he established – the Glyptotek and the New Carlsberg Foundation, at different stages of their establishment and influence.

In the first case, exemplifying the most foundational stage, the way in which the wealthy businessman Carl Jacobsen managed to ascribe significance to his private art collection through the establishment and articulation of The New Carlsberg Glyptotek is unfolded. Here, the paper finds the concept of 'framing' valuable to describe the process by which a shared understanding of the museums (its artefacts and organization's) value is created, forming a stock of legitimacy upon which more advanced efforts to shape cultural heritage are predicated. To ensure the Glyptotek's expansion and future survival, Jacobsen founded what today is the most powerful private foundation in Denmark, dedicated to the visual arts – The New Carlsberg Foundation. In the second and third case, increasingly more advanced stages of cultural heritage assignment are unfolded. The paper thus elucidates how the Glyptotek, as a professional organization, has sought to create new delimitations of cultural categories through the example of 'Danish Golden Age Sculpture', thus seeking to redefine what is signified by the Danish Golden Age, pointing to the suitability of 'canonization' as a concept to capture this more intermediary stage of heritage assignment, where entire categories are sought manipulated. In the third case, the ongoing example of a large art-project planned at ARoS (the modern art museum in Denmark's second largest city), illustrates the highest level of cultural heritage assignment, the New Carlsberg Foundation's 'consecratory' power, where the foundation has the ability to bless an artwork or project, securing its singular status and cultural value – in this case even before the actual artwork has been created.

It is emphasized that although the mechanisms illustrated by the cases, deliberately distilled and chosen for their particular strength in the precise cases and timings selected; *framing, canonization and consecration* efforts, occur to various degrees at many points of the museums and foundation's history and also occur simultaneously. For example, the museums work to canonize a cultural category also includes an element of framing, as does the foundation's work consecrate, but that 'framing', in the latter case especially, was viewed as only partially descriptive of the type of cultural heritage assignment pursued.

The vignettes of Carl Jacobsen and the work of his concomitant organizations also illustrate significant changes as to how private patronage has played a role in supporting the visual arts in Denmark. Carl Jacobsen employed several contemporary artists through commissions, although many of his artworks and artefacts were bought through dealers, gallerists and at auctions. To use Williams's vernacular, Jacobsen and his organizations married the power of recognition through purchase, retainer and commissions, with 'protection and support' (Williams 1981, 39-43), which valorized and recommended particular cultural heritage to the Danish public. As the more contemporary cases illustrate, both the Glyptotek and the New Carlsberg Foundation retain this power today, but as this paper shows – their power not only stems from their financial power to purchase or sponsor artistic production, but importantly through their ability to influence the discourse and assign increasing levels of symbolic meaning and value to the artwork housed by the museum and supported by the foundation. A point not strongly addressed in the paper concerns the patron-artist relationship and the increasing role of intermediaries (dealers, gallerists and auction-houses), which were important even at Carl Jacobsen's time – and have had an increasingly influence on the nature

of the Danish (and international) art market from the early 20th century to present day. Further historical and ethnographic work of the nature of these relationships and their potential influence over what is bought and potentially assigned as cultural heritage would be an interesting avenue of future research.

A pressing question concerns the awareness of the initial philanthropist, and later concomitant organizational actors to the processes which they have engaged in, and their influence on cultural heritage. In all cases, there appears to be a high level of cognizance about their influence on cultural heritage, in fact – at least in the case of Carl Jacobsen and Flemming Friborg – the goal of the work is manifestly to influence cultural heritage its perception. They are, of course, not theorizing this effort, although Flemming Friborg as an academic would be knowledgeable about the suitability of the 'canonization' as a term for his work. Interestingly, Jacobsen uses the term 'frame' (*ramme* in Danish) colloquially several times during his book documenting the establishment of the Glyptotek (Jacobsen 1906), specifically to describe objects that did or did not fit into his extant collection and idea of the Glyptotek and were acquired or passed up at auction. In the final case of the New Carlsberg Foundation, Karsten Ohrt, the director, explicitly stated 'I really see myself – or rather the foundation – as a kind of helper of the arts. Powerful is such a boring word' in response to being identified as the most powerful actor in the Danish art world (Heltoft 2016). This suggests an acknowledgement of this power, but also a reluctance to fully embrace it, favoring a public emphasis on the foundations role as a provider of support for the arts.

Another question that arose, relates to the success of each case of cultural-valuation. In the case of Carl Jacobsen, the success of framing the Glyptotek as a national institution is

unquestionable; it has continuously been co-funded by the Danish state since its establishment, has historically high visitor numbers (Benarroch 2017; Pedersen 2012) a sign of public 'buy-in' to its value and evidence of its taken for grantedness as a cultural venue. Moreover, it has become a professional authority over the categories in which it has artwork – in part through its own actions to establish these categories. At the same time, it is difficult to discern how successful the Glyptotek's canonization of Danish Golden Age sculpture was, in part because the distinction is somewhat academic. When former Minister of Culture Brian Mikkelsen invited scholars from the fields of architecture, visual art, design, film, literature, music, theatre and children culture to create a cultural canon over the most important pieces of works or artists within each category, Bertel Thorvaldsen was chosen and named as a wider influence in the categories of visual art (in which he was represented) and architecture, but there was no mention of his students or 'Danish Golden Age Sculpture', suggesting at least that the concept has not seen a wider uptake (Ministry of Culture 2006). In the case of the New Carlsberg Foundation's support of *The Next Level* at ARoS, the final installation has yet to be completed and perused by critics and audiences and it is therefore difficult to say if the artwork will obtain a similar status as the iconic *Boy* figure to ARoS image and wider public. However, the significantly increased media interest upon the foundation's donation suggests that the foundation can be viewed at least as a highly contributing factor, if the artwork is ultimately completed, since the foundation has worked as a seal of approval for the project as an investment as well as for the final artwork.

A point, which is only lightly addressed in this paper, is the maintenance and adjustment work involved in framing, canonization and even consecration processes, and the role of changed societal circumstances and active contestation therein. Further work might fruitfully delve

more into the ongoing nature and role of contestation in framing, canonization and consecratory efforts related to cultural heritage as well as other mechanisms that might be relevant to understand the assignment of cultural value.

A final aspect, which might be considered, concerns the extent to which the insights we can gain from Carl Jacobsen, The Glyptotek and the New Carlsberg Foundation are uniquely Danish, or whether they might be conceived as having general value to the understanding of the mechanisms influence philanthropic and cultural actors and organizations more broadly. It is the author's argument that the cases – particularly if conceived more conceptually as illustrations of framing, canonization and consecration events – are able to elucidate some of the fundamental mechanisms by which élite philanthropy directly and indirectly shapes our cultural world. While the paper hopes contribute to – and encourage, scholarship on the processes that underlie and shape understandings of cultural heritage and the role of élite philanthropists their organizations herein, an interesting area of research lies in understanding the way other actors and organizations (both commercial and non-profit) work to assign and shape cultural value – and in particular the interplay of these actors' and organizations' work – in what is ultimately regarded as cultural heritage.

References

Aldrich, Howard E, and C Marlene Fiol. 1994. "Fools Rush in? The Institutional Context of Indsutry Creation." *The Academy of Management Review* 19 (4): 645–70.

Allen, Michael Patrick, and Anne E Lincoln. 2004. "Critical Discourse and the Cultural Consecration of American Films Critical Discourse and the Cultural Consecration of American Films." *Source: Social Forces* 82115182 (3): 871–93.

ARoS. 2014. “Verdenskunstner Skaber Værk Til Unikt Udbygningsprojekt På ARoS.” http://www.aros.dk/om-aros/presse/2014/unikt-udbygningsprojekt-paa-aros/.

———. 2015. “Nyt Design Af ARoS-Udbygning.” http://www.aros.dk/om-aros/presse/2015/the-next-level/.

“Aros Får Stor Pengegave Til Prestigeprojekt.” 2015, October 30. http://stiften.dk/artikel/275995:Kultur--Aros-faar-stor-pengegave-til-prestigeprojekt.

Becker, Howard S. 1982. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Benarroch, Jane. 2017. “Høje Besøgstal På Carlsbergfamiliens Museer i 2016.” *Website*. http://www.carlsbergfondet.dk/da/Nyheder/Nyt-fra-fondet/Nyheder/Hoeje-besoegstal-paa-Carlsbergfamiliens-museer-i-2016.

Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. 2000. “Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 26 (2000): 611–39.

Bennett, O. 2011. “Strategic Canonisation: Sanctity, Popular Culture and the Catholic Church.” *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 17 (4): 438–55.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1992. *Language and Symbolic Power*. New ed. Cambridge.

Brovall, Sandra, and Lotte Thorsen. 2013. “Det Danske Kunstlivs Godfather Takker Af.” *Politiken*. http://politiken.dk/navne/navnenyt/premium/ECE2090853/det-danske-kunstlivs-godfather-takker-af/.

Burmeister, Louise Nyvang. 2015. “Kunst: En Verdensstjerne Udbygger Aros.” *Lokalavisen*, November 3. http://aarhus.lokalavisen.dk/kunst-en-verdensstjerne-udbygger-aros-/20151103/artikler/711039527/1449.

Danmarks Statistik. 2000. “Befolkningen i 150 År.” Copenhagen, DK: Danmarks Statistik. http://www.dst.dk/Site/Dst/Udgivelser/GetPubFile.aspx?id=4576&sid=bef150.

Danto, Arthur C. 1983. “Art, Philosophy, and the Philosophy of Art.” *Humanities* 4 (1): 1–2.

Dickie, George. 1974. “What Is Art? An Institutional Analysis.” In *Art and the Aesthetic: An Institutional Analysis,* 19–52. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

DiMaggio, Paul. 1982. “Cultural Entrepenuership in Nineteenth-Century Boston: The Creation of an Organizational Base for High Culture in America.” *Media, Culture and Society* 4: 33–50.

———. 1988. “Interest and Agency in Institutional Theory.” In *Institutional Patterns and Culture,* edited by Lynne G. Zucker, 3–22. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Friborg, Flemming. 1994. *Dansk Guldalderskulptur 1800-1850 / Danish Golden Age Sculpture 1800-1850*. Kbh.: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek.

Glamann, Kristof. 1990. *Bryggeren: J.C. Jacobsen På Carlsberg*. København, DK: Gyldendal.

———. 1997. *Øl Og Marmor: Carl Jacobsen På Ny Carlsberg*. København, DK: Gyldendal.

Goffman, Erving. 1986. “Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience.” York, PA: The Maple Press.

Heltoft, Nikolaj. 2016. “Formand for Ny Carlsbergfonden: Magt Er Sådan et Kedeligt Ord.” *Politiken*. http://politiken.dk/kultur/kultur_top/ECE3112871/formand-for-ny-carlsbergfonden-magt-er-saadan-et-kedeligt-ord/.

Jacobsen, Carl. 1884. “Af Hvad Der Ligger For.” *Dagens Nyheder,* October 19.

———. 1888. *Glyptotheket På Ny Carlsberg: Vejledning for de Besøgende*. Kbh. http://www.kb.dk/permalink/2006/poma/264/es/text/?open=id3087105.

———. 1906. *Glyptotekets Tilblivelse*. København: Nielsen & Lydische.

Jagd, S. 2011. “Pragmatic Sociology and Competing Orders of Worth in Organizations.” *European Journal of Social Theory* 14 (3): 343–59.

Jeppesen, Michael. 2009. “Magtens Top 100 i Dansk Kunst.” *Information,* June 19.

https://www.information.dk/kultur/2009/06/magtens-top-100-dansk-kunst.

Jørgensen, Ida Lunde. 2016. “Institutions and Legitimations in Finance for the Arts.” Copenhagen Business School. http://hdl.handle.net/10398/9337.

Kaspersen, Lars Bo. 2013. *Denmark in the World*. Edited by Ole Gammeltoft and Martin Lauerberg. 1st ed. Copenhagen: Hans Reitzel.

Khaire. 2014. “Fashioning an Industry: Socio-Cognitive Processes in the Construction of Worth of a New Industry.” *Organization Studies* 35 (1): 41–44.

Khaire, Mukti, and R. Daniel Wadhwani. 2010. “Changing Landscapes: The Construction of Meaning and Value in a New Market Category--Modern Indian Art.” *Academy of Management Journal* 53 (6): 1281–1304.

Langfeld, Gregor. 2014. “How the Museum of Modern Art in New York Canonised German Expressionism.” *Journal of Art Historiography* 11 (May).

Lawrence, Thomas B., and Roy Suddaby. 2006. “Institutions and Institutional Work.” In *Handbook of Organization Studies*, 2nd ed., 215–54. London: Sage Publications.

Lawrence, Thomas B., Roy Suddaby, and Bernard Leca. 2009. *Institutional Work: Actors and Agency in Institutional Studies of Organisations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leigh, Mary Anna. 2008. “Building the Image of Modern Art.” Leiden University.

Lund, Anker Brink, and Christian Edelvold Berg. 2016. *Dansk Fondshistorie*. Copenhagen: Jurist- og Økonomforbundets Forlag.

Maguire, Steve, and Cynthia Hardy. 2009. “Discourse and Deinstitutionalization: The Decline of DDT.” *Academy of Management Journal* 52 (1): 148–78.

Ministry of Culture. 2006. *Kulturkanonen*. Kulturministeriet. http://kum.dk/uploads/tx_templavoila/KUM_kulturkanonen_OK2.pdf.

Moltesen, Mette. 1987. *Wolfgang Helbig : Brygger Jacobsens Agent i Rom 1887-1914*. Kbh.: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek.

———. 2012. *Perfect Partners: The Collaboration between Carl Jacobsen and His Agent in Rome Wolfgang Helbig in the Formation of the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek 1887-1914*. Copenhagen: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek.

Monrad, Kasper. 1993. *The Golden Age of Danish Painting*. New York: Hudson Hill Press.

Nørregård-Nielsen, Hans Edvard. 2002a. *Ny Carlsbergfondet 1902-2002 (Bind 1)*. København, DK: Gyldendal.

———. 2002b. *Ny Carlsbergfondet 1902-2002 (Bind 2)*. København, DK: Gyldendal.

———. 2002c. *Ny Carlsbergfondet 1902-2002 (Bind 3)*. København, DK: Gyldendal.

Ny Carlsbergfondet. 1982. "Årsskrift." København.

Pedersen, Pia Svejgaard. 2012. "Besøgsrekord På Glyptoteket." *Website*. http://www.glyptoteket.dk/pressemeddelelser/besoegsrekord-paa-glyptoteket.

Petersen, Hans. 2015a. "Aros Får 20 Millioner Til Ændret Storværk." *Århus Stiftstidende*, October 30. http://stiften.dk/artikel/276032:Aarhus--Aros-faar-20-millioner-til-aendret-storvaerk.

———. 2015b. "»Gå Hjem Og Glem Det«." *Århus Stiftstidende*, October 31. http://stiften.dk/kultur/Gaa-hjem-og-glem-det/artikel/276085.

Rao, Hayagreeva. 1994. "The Social Construction of Reputation: Contests, Credentialing and Legitimation in the American Automobile Industry, 1895-1912." *Strategic Management Journal* 15 (S1): 29–44.

Ritzau. 2014. "Sallingfondene Donerer 100 Millioner Til Aros- Udbygning." *DR*, November 7. https://www.dr.dk/nyheder/kultur/kunst/sallingfondene-donerer-100-millioner-til-aros-udbygning.

Sckerl, Kristine Lefevre, and Hans Petersen. 2014. "» Ja , Jeg Har Talt Med Nogen Om Flere Penge «." *Århus Stiftstidende*, November 8. http://stiften.dk/aarhus/Ja-jeg-har-talt-med-nogen-om-flere-penge/artikel/229706.

Selznick, Philip. 1957. *Leadership in Administration*. New York: Harper Row.

Suchman, Mark C. 1995. "Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches." *Academy of Management Review* 20 (3): 571–610.

Suddaby, Roy. 2005. "Rhetorical Strategies of Legitimacy." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 50 (March): 35–67.

Suddaby, Roy, William M. Foster, and Albert J. Mills. 2014. "Historical Institutionalism." In *Organizations in Time*, edited by Marcelo Bucheli and R. Daniel Wadhwani. NY: Oxford University Press.

Taupin, Benjamin. 2013. "The More Things Change... Institutional Maintainance as Justification Work." *M@n@gement* 15: 529–62.

Thornton, Sarah. 2009. *Seven Days in the Art World*. Vol. 2. London: Granta.

Verboord, Marc. 2011. "Market Logic and Cultural Consecration in French, German and American Bestseller Lists, 1970-2007." *Poetics* 39 (4). Elsevier B.V.: 290–315.

Williams, Raymond. 1981. *Culture*. Glasgow: Fontana Paperbacks.