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Abstract. The interaction of the public spaces for art with the urban structure of Munich is researched on the basis of mind maps. Three architecturally-town-planning triads belonging to the three various levels were discovered. At the bottom level is the ensemble of the Königsplatz with Propylaea (the central element), Glyptothek and Staatliche Antikensammlungen. At the average level is the mega-ensemble, composed by the Academy of Fine Arts together with Siegestor (the central element), the complex of three Pinakotheks and the Haus der Kunst. At the uppermost level is the «urban triptych», composed by the historical centre of Munich (the central element), the palace and park ensemble of Nimfenburg and the Olympic park. The town-planning forecast concerning the formation of the ensemble of public spaces for art in the northeast quadrant of the city and of the mega-ensemble of public spaces for art in the southwest quadrant of Munich is made.

1. Introduction
Among the numerous public spaces for art in Munich there are some museum complexes which are of the greatest importance: Alte Pinakothek, Neue Pinakothek, Pinakothek der Moderne, Haus der Kunst and the well-known architectural ensemble of Königsplatz with its Glyptothek and Staatliche Antikensammlungen. However until recently there were no significant attempts to reveal the internal logic of the relative positioning of these public spaces for art in the context of the urban structure of Munich. Our article is devoted to this problem. The research is carried out on the basis of mind maps – the analytical tool which for last decades approved its heuristic potential in various scientific spheres (see, e.g. [1–7]). In the research on the basis of mind maps we convert the urban structure in the object of specific art criticism. In our view such approach allows to reveal such features of urban structure which remain out of sight in the case of the other analytical methods. And it would be extremely desirable, for the other authors also have given their variants of the analysis of the public spaces for art in Munich in the context of its urban structure to generate the peculiar «stereoscopy» of this problem.

Starting the generalized architecturally-town-planning analysis of the urban structure of Munich, we will pay first of all our attention to the pair of the crossed geometrical axes – abscissa and ordinate which (as a first approximation) formed on the mind map of Munich by the railway trunk-line and the
river Isar respectively. As a result all the city territory appears divided in four quadrants (Figure 1). The sufficient «urban autonomy» of each of this quadrants permits to analyze them as rather isolated structures on the initial stages of the study. That is why we may quite painless to regard at first only one of four Munich «quadrants», namely the northwest one, which includes both the historical centre of Munich, and its main public spaces for art.
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**Figure 1.** The conceptual division of the Munich territory in four quadrants. The authors’ mind map.

For most of its existence Munich did not spread beyond the territory of this northwest quadrant. We will remind that the first recorded mention of Munich came in 1158). Some decades later (1180) Munich has got the capital status and became the residence of Wittelsbach dynasty. From that time the city has safely enough endured the dramatic centuries of German history, including the epoch of religious wars of XVI century and the Thirty Years’ War 1618–1648. But, paradoxically, the long, material prosperity of Munich began at last to threaten it with serious problems. Up to the end of XVIII century the gripped with the permanent building fever Munich felt itself choked in the ring of the medieval fortifications which have surrounded the Bavarian capital still in the beginning of XIV century. As a result in 1791 it was ordered to pull the medieval walls down. The demolishing of the ancient fortification has opened for Munich new – in literal sense – horizons of its territorial development. This development was provided at first hand by two highways leaving accordingly to the north and to the west: The Ludwigstraße and the Brinnerstraße respectively. The main ornaments of the northern main road became two objects: the stretched along the river Isar so-called Englischer Garten (English garden; created in 1789) and the Siegestor, triumphal arch erected in 1843–1852. At the same time the main architectural dominant of the western axes became the Königsplatz (Figure 2).

While the first author of Königsplatz Karl von Fisher (1782–1820) – tried to put in this architectural ensemble mainly the memorial symbolic, his successor Leo von Klenze (1784–1864) initially treated the Königsplatz in the absolutely different way. For him it was first of all the parade gates to Munich showing by their scale and grandeur the political and cultural status of the Bavarian capital. And his Propylaea in this sense are associated not so much with a triumphal arch, but with other propylaea – Athenian – preparing the spectator to the perception of the architectural masterpieces of the antique Acropolis [8–11]. However the ensemble of Königsplatz failed in the role of the parade entrance to Munich. The point is when the Propylaea were just erected (from 1846 to 1860) the city has already moved ahead in the western direction and literally absorbed Königsplatz.
As a result the role of the virtual propilaea, symbolizing the approach to art and cultural treasures of Munich, has obviously passed from Königsplatz to the other remarkable ensemble located to the northwest from Brinnerstraße – the *Nymphenburg Palace Park*. And though its compositional centre is the baroque building of the palace (erected in 1664–1675 by the architect Agostino Barelli [12, 13]), nevertheless, only in the frame of the magnificent aquapark it is capable to play a conceptual role of the virtual Western propylaea of Munich (Figure 3).

In turn, the other of the mentioned above highways, Ludwigstraße (changing in its northern part the name to Leopoldstraße) – in addition to the English garden which is located to the east side – has received in XX century at the west side the specific «compositional balance» – the *Olympic park* (Olympiapark; Figure 4), created for the 1972 Summer Olympics under the design of the landscape architect Günther Grzimek [14]. Its main structural elements are the next ones: the sport facilities and their infrastructure; the Olympic village; the Olympic press centre; the *Olympic Tower* (Olympiaturm); the *Olympic mountain* (Olympiaberg) and the *Olympic lake* (Olympiasee) which
sprawls across an area of 8 hectares. This lake became simultaneously the geometrical and the compositional centre of the Olympic park. However the channel Nymphenburg-Biedersteiner, connecting the Olympic lake with the Nymphenburger Stichkanal, existed already long before the creation of the 1972 Summer Olympics. As a matter of fact, it is a component of so-called Northern system of the Munich channels (Nordmünchner Kanalsystem), which has formed in the XVII – the beginning of XX century.

Figure 4. The ensemble of Nymfenburg Palace Park in the conceptual role of the virtual western propylaea of Munich. The authors' mind map.

In our conceptual scheme this channel plays rather essential role. Besides its visual contact between Nymphenburg and the Olympic park (that is realised, first of all, thanks to the Olympic Tower), there is other, considerably more tangible communication between two named complexes. On the Figure 5 we have interpreted the channel Nymphenburg-Biedersteiner as the basis of the isosceles triangle which adjacent tops are Nymphenburg and the Olympic park, and the opposite top – the historical centre of Munich. Thus on lateral faces of this triangle are placed symmetrically the pairs of linear objects: from the south – a trunk-railway and Brinnerstraße, and from the east – Ludwigstraße and the river Isar. As a result we see the almost crystal town-planning structure which we rightfully can call the «urban triptych». 
And now we incorporate in this mind map the public spaces for art which were mentioned above. In the ensemble of Königsplatz there are three buildings: Glyptothek (1816–1830; Figure 6a), Staatliche Antikensammlungen (1838–1848; Figure 6b) and Propylaea (1846–1860; Figure 6c). Also in the «zone of cultural attraction» of Königsplatz, there is a whole scattering of the museum buildings which are mainly to the south of the square: the Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, the State Museum of Egyptian Art, the Museum of Casts of Classical Statues and etc., forming together with the Königsplatz the uniform public space for art. Besides, in the vicinity of the square the City gallery in the house of Lenbaha (Städtische Galerie im Lenbachhaus) is located.

Figure 5.
The basic elements which create the conceptual «urban triptych» of Munich. The authors' mind map.

Figure 6.
The ensemble of the Königsplatz in Munich. The authors' collage. a) Glyptothek; b) Staatliche Antikensammlungen; c) Propylaea.
The second compositional kernel which forms round itself the public space for art is the **Old Pinakothek** (Alte Pinakothek, 1826–1836, architect Leo von Klenze; Figure 7a). Reasonably soon after its erection, when this building was not capable to contain all the riches of the royal collection, in its proximity **Neue Pinakothek** has been erected (1853; architects Friedrich von Gärtner and August von Voit; Figure 7b). But this original building was destroyed during World War II and in 1981 the new postmodern building was opened (architect Alexander Freiherr von Branca). The third essential element of this public space for art is the **Gallery of the Modern** (Pinakothek der Moderne, 1995–2002, architect Stephan Braunfels; Figure 7c).
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**Figure 7.** Three Munich Pinakotheks. The authors’ collage. a) Alte Pinakothek; b) Neue Pinakothek; c) Pinakothek der Moderne.

To the east of the complex of three Pinakotheks, almost symmetrically relative to the axis of the Ludvigstraße, in 1933-1937 the **House of German Art** (Haus der Deutschen Kunst; current name – Haus der Kunst) was built (the architect Paul Ludwig Troost; Figure 8).

![Figure 8](image)

**Figure 8.** Haus der Kunst. The authors’ collage.

And finally in the northern top of the imagined isosceles triangle (which lower corners correspond to the complex of Pinakotheks and the Haus der Kunst respectively), in the neighborhood with the **Triumphal arch** (Siegestor; 1843–1852; the architects Friedrich von Gärtner and Friedrich Eduard Mezger; Figure 9a), one more large public space for art – the **Munich academy of Arts** (Akademie der...
Bildenden Künste München; Figure 9b) is located. There are two main buildings – the old one erected in 1876–1885 (architect Gottfried Neureuther) and the new one erected in 2005 (architect Coop Himmelblau; Figure 9c).

**Figure 9.** The Triumphal arch and the buildings of the Munich academy of Arts. The authors’ collage. a) Siegestor; b) The old building of the Academy; b) The new building of the Academy.

When comparing Figures 6 and 9 we see that in both cases the central elements of ensembles are the triumphal arches. Under the first one passes Brinnerstraße, under the second one – Ljudvigstraße. But the Propylaea, Glyptothek and the Staatliche Antikensammlungen are self-sufficient compositionally, i.e. organize the full architectural ensemble. At the same time three buildings of Pinakotheks as well as the buildings of the Academy of Arts cannot create the similar architectural ensembles due to their reciprocal stark stylistic contrast.

However this fact does not prevent the other kind of their interconnection. Namely, all the nine objects which are presented on Figures 7–9, form the unique mega-ensemble [15] as though echoing compositionally the ensemble of the Königsplatz and reproduce it in the increased scale (up to rotation in 90 degrees). So, the Haus der Kunst is consistent with Glyptothek, the complex of Pinakotheks is consistent with Staatliche Antikensammlungen, and Academy of Arts together with the Triumphal arch is consistent with Propylaea (fig. 10). As a result we have three triads executing the peculiar «architecturally-town-planning crescendo».

So at the bottom level is located the ensemble of the Königsplatz which is composed by the buildings of Propylaea (the central element), Glyptothek and Staatliche Antikensammlungen. At the average level is the mega-ensemble, which is formed – along with the Triumphal arch – by the complex of buildings of the Academy of Arts (the central element), the complex of Pinakotheks and the Haus der Kunst.

At last, at the uppermost level is located the «urban triptych», which is formed by the historical centre of Munich (the central element), Nymfenburg and the Olympic park. It is obvious that on the territory of the other three quadrants of Munich – northeast, southwest and southeast ones – there are no to date any public space for art comparable to that which are researched above. At the same time the spatial logic of the mind map (fig. 10) suggests the formation of the significant ensemble of public spaces for art in the northeast quadrant of Munich and the formation of the larger mega-ensemble of such spaces in the southwest quadrant. Simultaneously we may predict the formation of one or even two park zones in southeast quadrant (in the right-of-way of the railway and in the valley of river Isar accordingly), to some extent equivalent to the Nymphenburg and the Olympic park.
Figure 10. The summary mind map of the existing and predicted public spaces for art in the context of the conceptual urban structure of Munich. The authors’ mind map.
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