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The following research records the functionality of collections of wealthy individuals in an effort to clarify the current system of collection categorization. Although many functions were indeed possible, this research will be restricted to the discussion of collections in which objects reveal the collector’s devotional, social, and intellectual curiosity. These classifications reflect the most prevalent themes initiated by my research on collections of royal and affluent collectors during the Early Modern Period, and as such are the three most rational means of discussing collections as functional, working, tools.
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1. Introduction

King Philip II of Spain, like his predecessors, believed his dominion, and that of his successors, was divinely assured by preserving the Catholic Church on earth, and that dying a “royal death” (i.e. humble, repentant, and faithful) ensured God’s blessing on the Spanish crown.¹ Though Philip kept no memoirs, the records concerning the conditions of his passing, published directly following his death, provide scholars with a readily accessible means of determining how Philip spent his final days.² The detailed accounts of how the king and his attendants handled and arranged objects near Philip during the last stages of his illness suggest that these items performed a key role in the structured process of his death. Philip’s secretary and biographer, Jose de Siguenza, reported that the king summoned relics associated with saints dedicated to specific ailments he was experiencing at each stage of his final illness. The king would hold the objects close to the troubled area and utter prayers exclaiming that these “flowers of heaven” would ease his fevered body.³ Other accounts claim that there was hardly an empty space on the walls of Philip’s chambers.⁴ The king indicated how his objects should be placed around him so that at every moment he could view various intercessory saints and statues of Christ’s tormented body. The religious scenes of martyred saints, crucifixes, and relics

³ C. Eire, p. 268.
⁴ Ibid, p. 329.
stimulated Philip’s contemplation and allowed the king to approach the end of his life prepared for the Last Judgment.

Philip’s interest in religious art led him to collect over 1,150 paintings from famous European artists (e.g. Dürer, Patinir, Bosh, Titian, and Corregio). In addition, he also amassed a collection of over 8,000 relics. Though Phillip had more than six royal residences that required decorative objects appropriate for a royal family, the majority of these objects were destined for San Lorenzo del Escorial, the massive cathedral, library, monastery, home, and pantheon to the Spanish Hapsburg dynasty. Like most orthodox Catholics, Philip believed that he could influence his own salvation through suffering and devotion. To that end, he created a private domain in the Escorial designed to help him achieve and maintain a constant state of religious observation. The objects he included and the manner of their display reflected his practice of employing certain types of objects as tools for his salvation.

Unlike other high-profile Early Modern collections, such as those of the Dukes of Burgundy in France, Philip’s Escorial differs from the models that many scholars use when discussing Early Modern collections. A large portion of the scholarship on these collections and collecting discusses them in terms of their relation to modern museums and museology. The

---

5 C. Eire, p. 331.
8 See Germain Bazin’s The Museum Age for a complete discussion of Early Modern collections as aspects of contemporary museum development. Bazin discusses these collections in reference to the phenomenon of their appearance as well as their relation to the development of public museums in the 19th century. Many of the collections begun in the 15th and 16th centuries were absorbed by institutions such as the Victoria Albert Museum or the Louvre. The idea is that these collections represent the modern museum in its infancy.
most commonly used and developed terms are *wunderkammer, schatzkammer, kunstkammer,* and *rustkammer.* These terms appeared in the mid 16th century to define the various kinds of *kammers* one could have, and have been used within modern scholarship to describe unique spatial and functional characteristics of collections. As researchers have developed a focused interest in the functions of collections, the traditional terms have become restrictive, and at times, confusing in the new contexts. As a result, many discussions that rely on the definitions of these terms often ignore, misinterpret, or manipulate certain aspects of the definitions for the sake of their argument.

For example, Guy Lazure, in his article *Possessing the Sacred: Monarchy and Identity in*
Philip II’s Relic Collection at the Escorial, discusses Philip’s collecting as a method of constructing a religious and civil identity for Spain.11 Agreeing with Peter Brown and Patrick Geary, Lazure asserts that Philip believed the presence of relics strengthened the bonds uniting communities, watched over the interests of their owners, guaranteed law and order, and, above all, provided identity and cohesion of and for the citizens of Spain. While his article is effective and contains valuable information regarding Philip’s acquisitions, display, and uses of devotional objects, he misinterprets the function of the collection by highlighting Philip’s diligent quest and care for relics as a way of creating a stylish wunderkammer for social purposes. Lazure stresses that the possession of these items promoted Philip’s knowledge of these topics, the strength of his house, and thus the realm. As he suggests, many similarities do exist between Philip’s collection and the traditional wunderkammer. However, wunderkammern are more commonly associated with students and professionals that observed the wonders of the world in an effort to achieve an encyclopedic understanding of its elements and conduct civil exchanges of ideas.12 Initially, items included in the collection and discussed by Lazure can be understood as Philip’s effort to collect a record of the hagiographic history of Spain as a princely, and intellectual, endeavor. However, the amount of material recorded, and indeed related by Lazure, records Philip’s interactions with the items as being devotional, and not as intellectual, or intentionally social. While Lazure’s reference to wunderkammern aligns Philip’s practices with common princely activities, he fails to acknowledge that Philip used the items more consistently as devotional items rather than as intellectual property.

The misattribution of terms, as in Lazure’s article, is often accompanied by a lack of discussion of a collection’s function. In Anna Maria Massinelli’s chapter in Treasures of Florence: The Medici Collection 1400-1700, the studiolo of Francesco de’ Medici is referred to as a schatzkammer, a traditional store house for valuable political and religious regalia. Considering that the book in which the article is printed is a collection of essays regarding the “treasures” of the Medici, the term is appropriate. However, this term is incorrect on two levels. First, Francesco’s studiolo housed a collection of objects that records reveal he used for the study of alchemical processes and other curiosities, and secondly the space in which it was displayed was meant to be a private space of reflection and observation, not a part of the larger family collection of household “treasure.” While Massinelli mentions the private nature of the space and collection, she is either unaware of the implications of her usage of the term, or utilizes the term in order to cite the collection as treasure for the sake of the publication.

Another tendency of misattribution occurs when museological terms are applied to collections that were constructed before the terms were used within society. Deanna MacDonald discusses Margaret of Austria’s kunstkammer. However, the term kunstkammer came into circulation after Margaret’s lifetime in the 1550’s. In many cases these terms can validly reference innovative aspects of the collection that became popular, documented, styles of collecting within later eras. MacDonald does not make this claim. While MacDonald briefly discusses the collection as a repository for fine works of art, or kunst, the thesis of her argument is that Margaret’s collection is more of an ethnographic survey that supplemented her study of

and interest in the New World. Thus the more appropriate category in terms of function is *wunderkammer*, or what I will define as “intellectual,” stylish and well-known constructions during her lifetime, and not the *kunstkammer*.

In order to correctly identify the function of a collection, the types/variety of its materials, location, scale, and the status of the collector must be considered. The materials included in the collection often established the collection’s focus or specialization (e.g. scientific, artistic, etc), and the location, scale, and collector’s status helped determine their audience(s) and the exhibition style. The exhibition style refers to the way the objects were originally presented and displayed to the viewer. This nuanced the uses and reception of objects in each collection. Collectors of high status tended to favor ornate exhibition styles for their collections. In a period when collecting was promoted as a “gentlemanly” and therefore “princely” activity, constructing palace wings and *kammers*, or chambers, specifically designed for the display of their objects was a popular activity. The allotted space and the collection’s scale influenced the manner in which it was displayed and who had access to it.

Additionally, while a collection may have been conceived for a very specific function, the collectors and patrons often turned the collections to their social and political advantage when necessary. The challenge in these cases is to define the consistency with which, for example, collections were used to achieve social and political advantages versus devotional and intellectual functions. Mis-categorization occurs when the function of a collection is determined by the characteristics of the types of objects included within the collection without considering

---

15 See MacDonald, D. MacDonald discuss the various chambers of Margaret’s collections and stresses the privacy and importance of specific rooms. Institutional locations, such as universities and churches must also be considered as spaces with restricted access and rules.

16 For information regarding gentrification processes in the Early Modern Period see Ryan V. Lawrence’s “Book Four of Castiglione’s Courtier: Climax or Afterthought?” *Studies in the Renaissance* 19 (1972) and Baldasarre Castiglione’s *Il Libro de Cortegiano*. 
how they most frequently functioned. In this thesis function is defined by the collector’s most frequent interactions with and handling of the objects within the collection. For example, a collection predominantly made up of natural history specimens might indicate the collector’s interest in intellectual pursuits. However, collection spaces that contained a specialized set of objects often functioned as a venue for social rather than scholarly activities. In these cases, the primary function of a collection can be falsely identified if generalizations are made about the content of the collection without confirming the frequency with which the objects were used for intellectual purposes.

In this thesis, I am concerned with understanding the ways that collections functioned in Early Modern culture, rather than with their significance within the history of modern museums. I therefore restrict my discussion of collecting to an investigation of the ways in which objects reveal the collector’s devotional, social, and intellectual interests. These three classifications reflect the most prevalent themes that I have detected during my ongoing research on collections during the Early Modern period. In what follows I will give preliminary definitions for devotional, social, and intellectual categories. Though the investigation and classification of collections discussed in this thesis suggests that I have investigated the collector’s devotional, social, and intellectual intentions, intent lies outside the scope of this research. Instead, I will be discussing how the collections appeared to function to period viewers and modern scholars after they were formed.

I have developed these terms (devotional, social, and intellectual) in the course of investigating the growth and characteristics of Early Modern collecting. While I have previously discredited the usage of terms such as *kunstkammer* and *schatzkammer*, I note that they are useful terms that imply specific functions of their own. The terms I outline are not the only
possible functions that were present in Early Modern collections in that they differ in the functions they define, and are narrow in focus. My paper is organized into sections that discuss the characteristics of devotional, intellectual, and social collections and the ways they functioned for their collectors.

The category I am calling “devotional” collections contained reliquaries, sculpture, and paintings depicting religious narratives that aided the processes of contemplation and spiritual self-fashioning. The primary function of these collections was to provide the collector with an opportunity to be near and interact with objects that stimulated contemplation and prayer in order to achieve salvation.\textsuperscript{17}

What I call “intellectual” collections developed in conjunction with the rise of Humanism and the reorganization of institutional learning. The consequent study of classical literature and emphasis on education fostered an interest in natural sciences and the pursuit of the unknown.\textsuperscript{18} Collections of strange or exotic \textit{naturalia} and \textit{artificialia} brought together elements of the macrocosm into a single microcosm that functioned pedagogically and acted as a catalyst for scholarly inquiry. This type of collection became popular among young gentlemen eager to show their knowledge as well as among scholars engaged in the study of the natural world.

What I term “social” collections provided collectors with a way to display their own monetary success, mental aptitude, and social or political innovation as a way of achieving social prestige. These collections utilized a variety of exhibition styles and are characterized by an absence of specialization. Whereas specialized collections contained many objects that were specific to a single area of interest, social collections had no such limitations. Social collections are also unique in that they are directed outward and are public displays of both social and

\textsuperscript{17} See Decker, \textit{The Technology of Salvation: The Art of Geertgen tot Sint Jans}.

\textsuperscript{18} See Olmi.
academic activity. This category is the most fluid of the three I am proposing; its flexibility, I argue, reflects the various needs and agendas of Early Modern collectors.

Early Modern collections responded to, and helped to shape, a variety of social, intellectual, and spiritual needs or demands. Each of these dimensions (devotional, intellectual, and social) could be (and were) present in a single collection. In what follows, I keep in mind that each of the collections I discuss is multivalent and multifunctional but focus on what I have determined to be their “primary” function. I have used a mixture of sources that discuss collections in their original environments, as well as supplemental materials that discuss the social, political, academic, and economic conditions at play during the Early Modern period.
2. Devotion

Collecting devotional materials is not a concept peculiar to the Early Modern Period, Western Europe, or Christianity. Generally speaking, assemblages of religiously charged materials provided the owner/collector with vehicles of devotion, tangible references to their faith, and leverage in the face of opposing systems of belief. For the sake of this argument, I will be discussing devotional functions that are characteristic of collections of European Catholics during the Early Modern Period. Though various cultures, denominations, and periods have participated in this type of collecting, the specific references to Catholic theology and history within this argument apply only to this limited subject group.

One of the most renowned collectors of devotional items during the Early Modern period was Philip II of Spain. Philip was an extremely zealous collector who gathered objects in the Escorial for perpetual devotion. The Escorial was completed in 1591 and included a monastery, palace, basilica, college, seminary, and library. Philip had intended the site to be the final resting place for many of the Hapsburgs and by the time of the Escorial’s completion he had successfully installed sixteen bodies within tombs in the main basilica, leaving the space directly beneath the main altar for his own tomb. Along with the main decorative program on the basilica altar, Philip adorned the Escorial with more than 8,000 reliquaries and more than 1,150 paintings. Most objects were religious, including Cellini’s Crucifix, works by his court painter Navarette ‘el mudo,’ Pellegrino Tibaldi, and Fedrico Zuccaro. Some works, such as Albrecht Dürer’s Great Piece of Turf, exhibited the variety of God’s creations in superb clarity. Philip’s collection is an example of a large and well-known collection. It is also one of the most florid examples of a collection with a strongly (even predominantly) devotional function.

Devotional collections are those that contain objects that aid in the process of religious and spiritual devotion. In these cases the collector’s proximity to, and observance of, religious or spiritually charged objects promotes prayer and contemplation in an effort to achieve spiritual salvation, or ensure bodily protection. Collecting these objects allowed the votary access to a variety of objects that stimulated acts of prayer and contemplation. With the aid of images, statues, beads, and other objects, one could perform penance and ask for God’s favor and/or forgiveness. Shaping the soul through devotion to God, Christ, the Virgin, and the saints, could positively affect the way one experienced the afterlife.

The consistency with which religious subject matter appeared within royal and affluent collections underscores the centrality of devotion as an important impetus for collecting. The need to accumulate personal religious items was an outgrowth of personal piety, which in part had its genesis in the preaching of the mendicant orders and the increased popularity and organization of the cult of the saints and of the Virgin Mary. In this climate of religious zeal, collecting became a culturally sanctioned way of achieving spiritual salvation. Objects within these types of collections include, but are not limited to: reliquaries, sculpture or paintings depicting biblical narratives, icons, crucifixes, and instruments of the mass, such as chalices, vestments, and censers.

Reliquaries are one of the most represented object types in devotional collections. These, often ornate and crafted out of precious materials, housed either bone fragments from the bodies of saints and martyrs, or sacred objects from Catholic history (e.g. instruments of Christ’s Passion, clothing of the Virgin, etc.). Reliquaries often took shapes that referred to the narratives associated with the object, or mirrored the form of the object that was enshrined within (e.g. an

arm-shaped container for the bones of a saint’s arm). In some cases the container incorporated a
glass window or screen that allowed the faithful to view the relics firsthand, while others
displayed the relic on some sort of mount. Reliquaries associated with healing and protection
tended to be particularly prized possessions. For example, the reliquary of Saint Quentin kept at
Saint Quentin Cathedral in Picardy was said to have healed the blindness of the women who
originally found the body of the saint in the 10th century. Philip’s collection followed such
trends and included objects the king and his advisors associated with healing powers. The
thaumaturgic properties of religious items took precedence in Philip’s collection and he
passionately believed in their efficacy. In particular, he credited the relics of San Diego de
Alcala with saving his heir and son don Carlos from a near fatal head injury. He also often
summoned relics known for their curative powers to help in his own battles with gout.

In addition to reliquaries, sculptures, images, and icons were used as tools that aided
devotees during prayer and rituals of the mass. Artists during the Early Modern period
incorporated devotional devices within the content of altarpieces, personal diptychs, icons, and
statues that allowed the viewer to activate the narrative scenes depicted. The votary could
contemplate the stories of the Bible, sacrifices made by martyrs of the faith, saintly and
charitable acts, proper morality, examples of sin as well as the results of sinful living, and the
benefits of living in faith. Items that depicted the saints, and the Virgin Mary, were often prized

---

24 See C. Eire and G. Lazure.
personal possessions used to stimulate prayer. The faithful believed that the saints and Virgin were able to intercede on humankind’s behalf and soften God’s judgment. Such intercession could offer healing, protection, or salvation.  

Wealthy patrons commissioned large altarpieces or small devotional pieces and often stipulated that the images contain their portraits, usually in a prayerful state addressing the saint to whom the piece was devoted. These objects functioned as perpetual acts of devotion in which the patron continuously venerated the saints.

Small personal objects such as crucifixes and pocket-sized diptychs used in personal devotional practices appeared with increasing regularity in the 14th century. Andrea Palmer attributes the mass production of small icons of the Virgin and child to the proliferation of guilds within Tuscany. Galvanno Flamma, a chronicler of Milan in the 14th century, attributes the sudden increase in devotion to these objects to the outbreak of the plague, as well as to the nature of their portability. The incorporation of crucifixes in collections, for example, was inspired by devotions to Christ’s tormented body. Individuals who were infected with the plague could look to Christ’s suffering as a model for dealing with their own pain. One of Philip II’s most intimate possessions was the plain box that held his father’s personal crucifix. His father had held the crucifix during the final hours of his life and bequeathed the box to Philip following his death. During the final hours of his life, Philip summoned the box so that he could perform the

---

29 Ibid.
30 C. Eire.
31 C. Eire. 277.
same devotions his father had, and aid his soul’s transference to heaven. In the four days preceding Philip’s death, his biographer claims that the crucifix was mounted on the inside of his bed curtains so that he might view the image of Christ at every moment.

Philip displayed devotional objects in a variety of locations within the Escorial, making his family, court, and visitors privy to a constant supply of devotional stimulation. This way of displaying one’s collection was not unique to Philip. Wealthy collectors who could purchase large quantities of items were able to place devotional objects in every room. Margaret of Austria, for example, constructed personal chapels and chambers that acted as devotional spaces within her residence. Her most prized and personal devotional objects, however, remained in her bedroom. Margaret’s bedroom and private study contained portraits of her and her immediate family holding rosaries and other devotional items. Of particular importance is the diptych of her grandfather Charles the Bold of Burgundy and her own diptych that was modeled after Charles’ earlier, and now lost, example. While Charles’ image was kept within the cupboard in her bedroom, her own personal diptych was hung on one of her taffeta bed curtains so that she might view the image and perform devotions in her most private space.

---

32 Ibid.
33 Ibid.
35 For discussion of the Escorial created by Philip II see Eire’s From Purgatory to Madrid. For information regarding Margaret of Austria’s collections see D. Deanna MacDonald.
36 One such example portraying Charles was in Margaret's collection and was listed in a 1523-24 inventory of the Palais de Savoy contents. “Item, a rich and very exquisite double painting of Our Lady, dressed in satin brocade, and monsieur duke Charles of Burgundy painted on one of the wings, shown kneeling, wearing golden fabric, [with] a black cushion and a [Book of] Hours resting on a prie-dieu in front of him; the outer surfaces [bors] of said painting [are] deco-rated in green velour, with three silver-gilt clasps [ferrures] serving [to fasten together the panels of] said painting.” Andrea G. Pearson, “Margaret of Austria’s Devotional Portrait Diptychs.” Woman’s Art Journal. 22 no.2 (Autumn 2001 – Winter 2002): 2+19-25.
37 Ibid.
Of the two known diptychs commissioned by Margaret, the one generally considered to have been the one hung in her bedchamber is the full-length format Ghent diptych attributed to the Master of 1499 (fig. 2.1). The left panel depicts the enthroned Virgin and Christ Child. The Virgin looks calmly out to the viewer and the Christ child extends his hand toward the right panel where Margaret is shown kneeling at a *prie-dieu* that supports her open prayer book. Margaret would have used this image during her private devotions along with others kept in her collection. The forward gaze of the Virgin beckoned Margaret to engage in prayer and beseech the Virgin to act as an intercessor to Christ on her behalf. Andrea Pearson also suggests that the gesture of the Christ child alludes to the spiritual privileges Margaret earned thanks to her devout adoration of the Virgin and Child. The Christ child is not shown in conversation with his mother, but instead the directly engages the image of Margaret. A similar diptych is shown hanging over the bed directly behind Margaret in the right panel. This diptych includes the Virgin and Child Enthroned and the Crucifixion. The inclusion of the painting within the painting shows Margaret mimicking Mary’s actions and example. As Mary prays to Christ, so does Margaret. This representation would have been considered a reference to Mary’s instruction as well as to Margaret’s own devotion to the Catholic faith.

Collecting materials for the sake of performing devotion is one way that collecting was actively used within the Early Modern period. By creating collections that functioned as devotional tools, Philip II and Margaret of Austria performed penance and asked for God’s favor and/or forgiveness to positively affect the way they experienced the afterlife. Their collections

---

38 Ibid.
are examples of the ways many individuals responded to the centrality of devotion within Early Modern culture.
Figure 2.1. Master of 1499, *Diptych of Margaret of Austria*, after 1504. Oil on panel, 10” x 9”, Ghent, Museum voor Schone Kunsten. (Reprinted from Andrea G. Pearson, “Margaret of Austria’s Devotional Portrait Diptychs.” *Woman’s Art Journal*. 22 no.2 (Autumn 2001 – Winter 2002))
3. Intellectual

During the Early Modern period, wealthy collectors and universities maintained collections in order to study the natural world. By containing objects that aided various fields of research, collections functioned as devices used to develop the intellect. These collections provided a new framework for teaching and learning that was based on Aristotelian models of intellectual study and Hermetic theory.\textsuperscript{40} Intellectually functioning collections appeared with increasing regularity within the “lay intelligentsia,” or middle class, throughout the later part of the 15\textsuperscript{th} century, in part due to advances made in the cultural and natural sciences. Though scholarship regarding intellectual collections has favored the collections of the middle class, due to their role in the history of natural science museums, the following discussion will focus on the collections kept and sponsored by influential collectors such as Francesco de Medici.\textsuperscript{41}

Europeans during the Early Modern period harvested animals and objects from across the globe and brought them back to Europe for scientific research. Plants, animals, minerals, and utilitarian objects were catalogued as specimens that represented the broadening world. Scholars and collectors referred to these items as \textit{curios}, or \textit{wonders} in reference to the knowledge of the universe they preserved and promoted, as well as their ability to strike “wonder” or “curiosity” in the mind of their beholders.\textsuperscript{42} These were not everyday objects; rather, they were specimens of

\textsuperscript{40} Findlen, Paula, \textit{Possessing Nature: Museums, Collecting, and Scientific Culture in Early Modern Italy}, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1994. Findlen discusses both the Aristotelian and Hermetic theory. Hermeticism was inspired by the 15\textsuperscript{th} century rediscovery of the Hermetic Corpus, a body of allegedly pre-Christian writings attributed to the Egyptian God Hermes Trismegistus that greatly enhanced the symbolic study of nature.

\textsuperscript{41} This is due in part to their relationship to the development of specialized collections during the Enlightenment in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century.

\textsuperscript{42} Joy Kenseth, \textit{The Age of the Marvelous}, This book was developed in conjunction with an exhibition at the Hood Museum of Art at Dartmouth College. These objects include, but are not limited to, natural (naturalia) objects, artificial (artificialia), novelty and rarity objects, foreign and exotic (or the strange and bizarre), the unusually small or unusually large, demonstrations of
the natural world meant for sustained scrutiny by “gentleman” and scholars. As these objects entered markets and private collections with increasing regularity, collectors were able to develop groupings that contained a wide variety of specimens. Aspiring students and well-established scholars used these curios for study and developed the cultural and natural sciences out of their investigations. Homes, institutions, and pharmacies that housed such collections served as places where scholars could gather to debate and exchange knowledge.

Most commonly identified within academia as wunderkammern, “curio” collections are often referred to as cabinets of curiosities, chambers des mervailles, museos naturales, or theatrum mundi. Objects were traditionally kept in freestanding cabinets or armoires (e.g. gabinetti in Italy, kastens in Austria, schranks in Germany), hung on walls and ceilings, or displayed on shelves or cupboards that were installed directly into the walls of private kammers, technical skill or virtuosity (the achievement of the seemingly impossible), objects displaying extreme vividness or verisimilitude, and surprising or unexpected objects. These categories reflect the organization proposed by this exhibit.

Lawrence V. Ryan, “Book Four of Castiglione’s Courtier: Climax or Afterthought?” Studies in the Renaissance 19 (1972). Baldassarre Castiglione recommended that a gentleman should maintain different kinds of collections, or cabinets, “according to one’s own taste,” in order to instill a learned concept of propriety and conformity to virtuous activities that honed the contemplative life of men, a concept taken from Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics and Politics. See also Giovanni Pico della Mirandola’s 1496 publication Oration on the Dignity of Man, in which men were instructed to exercise their spiritual and intellectual powers to search out the causes of things, the ways of nature, the plan of the universe, and the mysteries of the heavens and earth. Pico urges that men should avoid narrowness of mind and acquire knowledge of all the philosophies of nature. Mirandola combines biblical scripture with Aristotelian and Platonic philosophy to develop his theory.


See Findlen, 99.

or _studioli_. These spaces were designed to allow for optimum viewing conditions in which objects could be readily examined side by side or amongst similar objects. The idea was to provoke scientific discovery through the revelations made through direct observation. An etching displayed as the frontispiece for Olaus Worm’s (1588-1654) folio volume _Museum Wormianum_ demonstrates how objects were configured in Worm’s Copenhagen museum during his lifetime (see fig. 3.1). The assortment of shelving and small trays are akin to the more elaborate exhibition styles that were used by wealthy men and women such as Francesco de’Medici at the Palazzo Vecchio in Florence and Archduke Ferdinand II at the Schloss in Ambras. An inventory drawn up immediately after the Archduke’s death in 1596 and later published in the _Jarbuch des Allerhochsten Kaiserhauses_ in 1888 indicates that Ferdinand’s collection included eighteen cupboards that were placed back to back along the main axis of the chamber with two transverse cupboards standing directly in front of them. Francesco’s _studiolo_ in Palazzo Vecchio consisted of approximately twenty cabinets built into the room’s walls that opened to reveal his collection of curios (see fig. 3.2). The exteriors of the cabinet doors were painted with imagery corresponding to the types of objects that would have been found within by artists such as Giorgio Vasari, Giovanni Stradano, and Mirabello Cavalor.

---

48 G. Bazin
49 H. D. Schepelern, “Natural Philosophers and Princely Collectors: Worm, Paludanus, and the Gottorp and Copenhagen Collections,” in _The Origin of Museums_. See also Jy Kenseth, _The Age of the Marvelous_ p 239
51 Marjorie Swann, _Curiosities and Texts_ (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 19. In an account related by Fynes Morryson in _An Itinerary_ from 1594 Francesco’s collection is described as a collection of amber, pearls, Indian knifes, and a “naile half turned into gold by
Figure 3.1. *Musei Wormiani historia*, Fold-out frontispiece from the *Museum Wormianum*, Olaus Worm “Ole Worm,” 1655, Engraving, 27.5 cm. x 35.5 cm. Photo courtesy the John Carter Brown Library Collection.

Tomeser an Alchumist… a stone called Vergoara that cureth poison…[and] a most beautiful head of a Turkish women.”
Figure 3.2. Studiolo of Francesco de’Medici, Palazzo Vecchio.
The *studiolo* was designed by Vasari, 1570-72, on the basis of a complex image program created by Vincenzo Borghini. Francesco’s *studiolo* was specifically designed to inspire intellectual activities. During the life of Cosimo the Elder, the Medici developed an extensive collection that incorporated fine art objects, illuminated manuscripts and other rare books, reliquaries, and natural history or curio items.\(^{52}\) By the end of the sixteenth century, large collections such as these served as valuable symbols of social status, however, Francesco’s collection was a unique example of a collection that was maintained for its intellectual functions. While most royal collectors invited esteemed guests to view the items within their collections as a means of asserting their power and influence, Francesco’s collection was, for the most part, a private and hidden one.

Consequently, the private nature of Francesco’s *studiolo* was not immune from being a part of his power base. Francesco’s contemporaries were aware of the collection’s existence and often commented on the grandiosity of the collection in addition to his knowledge of the subjects within.\(^{53}\) However, scholars such as Germain Bazin have conceded that Francesco used his *studiolo* primarily as a private laboratory for the study of alchemy, astrology, and the elemental sciences, and not for social reasons.\(^{54}\) Bazin’s, and Scott Shaefer’s, discussions of the iconographical program in the imagery of the *studiolo*, period accounts of the contents of the collection, and the changes in functionality that occurred when the collection was relocated to the Uffizi gallery in 1584 suggest this. The program Don Vincenzo Borghini and Giorgio Vasari developed in the 1560s emphasized the relationship of the world to the elements of nature and


\(^{53}\) Swann, *Curiosities and Texts*.

\(^{54}\) G. Bazin, 57.
The properties that govern it. The double row of panels that adorn the cabinets on each side of the room represent a range of Early Modern workshop procedures such as glass-making, bronze casting, alchemical experimentation, and medicinal production. Each subject embodies a manipulation of the natural elements of the earth that made a connection with the contents within the cabinet.

Travelers that were privileged to gain entrance to the collection recorded that the cabinets included: decorated armor; “pearls as they grow in oyster shells;” a clock made of amber; the “head of a turke [sic] all of pure gold;” medicinal and alchemical concoctions; and, according to one description, “an emerald of a perfect green colour… highly valued, being round, and almost as bug as an egge [sic].”

Though the inclusion of these objects reflects Early Modern interest in curios, the sources that discuss objects within the studiolo at the end of the 16th century identify a large number of objects that have undergone some form of alchemical or biological mutation. It is important to note that this may be the result of the recorder’s or docent’s own interests in these types of objects. The individual recording or showing the objects, which in all cases recorded in this thesis was not Francesco, chose to discuss the more exotic material in relation to the “normal” objects within the collection because of their own interests in the objects. However, noting that the objects recorded are traditionally said to make up a large portion of the collection, arguments that make assumptions based on the inclusion of only the objects mentioned in period accounts can be said to be true.

The combination of visual and physical stimulation generated by the system of objects

---

55 C. A. Luchinat, 17.
and imagery within Francesco’s *studiolo* aided in the process of satisfying his curiosity regarding the natural world. Though occupationally he was not a man of letters and learning, his role as Grand Duke of Tuscany warranted the intellectual development that was necessary for someone of his status.\(^{58}\) Prior to the collection’s incorporation into the Uffizi gallery in Florence, the *studiolo* was a personal refuge in which Francesco could escape to indulge in personal interests unrelated to the affairs of state.\(^ {59}\) The Uffizi was constructed adjacent to the Palazzo Vecchio and extended across the Ponte Vecchio bridge on the Arno river. This new context was a public forum designed for the reception of esteemed dignitaries and political discussion that broke the collection’s intellectual system. Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann identifies how the inclusion of a new variety of viewers and the construction of grand structures to house collections acted as representations of social and political authority in his discussions of the Hapsburg collections in Vienna.\(^ {60}\) He claims that while these collections functioned as intellectual devices, by providing the collector with an accessible source for study, inviting viewers into the collection space functioned as a way of maintaining sovereignty socially. The exhibition in the Uffizi likewise may have allowed viewers to interpret Francesco’s possession of the objects as his dominion over land, knowledge, and as such his capacity to govern.\(^ {61}\)

\(^{58}\) N. Machiavelli.

\(^{59}\) C. A. Luchinat, It was a common practice at this time for royalty to maintain a private studiolo that included their prized possessions for personal use. Margaret of Austria’s included books, maps, and curios relating to the discovery of the new world. Deanna MacDonald suggests that her interests were stimulated by her proximity to the Spanish court at the time of Columbus’s voyages. Deanna MacDonald, “Collecting a New World: The Ethnological Collection of Margaret of Austria.” *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 33, no. 3 (Autumn, 2002).


Royal collections of the fifteenth century were largely characterized by generalization rather than specialization.\textsuperscript{62} The idea was to acquire a large variety of objects that covered all aspects of universal knowledge in line with the current academic trends. However humanism caused an increase in the demand for collections that helped scholars gain professional specialization. As previously mentioned, when Francesco’s collection was housed in the Palazzo Vecchio, the majority of the objects included were part of his alchemical studies. The objects he gathered were specifically related to this line of inquiry and as such were part of his personal intellectual pursuits. Francesco was not alone in this interest and his collection may have drawn some of its inspiration from those of recognized scientists engaged in research pursuits. Ulisse Aldrovandi (1522-1605) who was a professor of natural philosophy as well as the director of the botanical gardens at the University of Bologna, for example, amassed a collection that was much larger than Francesco’s and had a pharmaceutical basis. It included some 11,000 animals, fruits, and minerals, as well as 7,000 plants that were thought to have curative powers ‘dried and pasted’ into fifteen volumes (see fig. 3.3). Aldrovandi developed a methodology for the study of medicine that required the direct observation of plants, animals, and minerals. Students and doctors were urged to gather within the chamber to work together with each other and the objects simultaneously.\textsuperscript{63}

The trend of creating intellectual collections as Aldrovandi and Francesco did was initiated by what Luce Gaird explains as the “remapping” and “reshaping” of institutionalized learning.\textsuperscript{64} Giard asserts that while Renaissance universities continued to provide a stable framework for institutionalized learning, a radical change was occurring within the system as it

\textsuperscript{62} G. Olmi.
\textsuperscript{63} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{64} Luce Giard “Remapping knowledge, reshaping institutions” trans Maurice Slawinski in \textit{Science, Culture and Popular Belief in Renaissance Europe}, 31.
adapted to the Aristotelian traditions of learning. Collections in which objects were assembled for first-hand observation supported an Aristotelian method that mandated the direct observation and discussion of nature. Whereas the Medieval concept of pedagogy restricted spaces of learning to the “cloistered world of academic debate and the religious orders,” this new context of learning supported collecting as a way to stimulate intellectual gatherings and debate. The reshaping of institutionalized learning partnered with the increased accessibility to curios, made collecting for the sake of intellectual development a socially sanctioned form of pursuing intellectual activities.

The development of collections such as Francesco’s and Aldrovandi’s for the sake of specifically intellectual pursuits complements the sentiment of discovery and growth that European cultures were experiencing during the Early Modern Period. Through the direct observation and comparison of objects that was made possible by collecting curios and constructing exhibition chambers, scholars were able to broaden their understanding of the current world and make progress to answer the demands of an ever growing and changing society.

---

65 Ibid.
4. Social

The mercantile nature of the Early Modern Period inspired a consumer culture that rewarded accumulation. For a privileged few, this culture allowed them to assert their knowledge, wealth, and political strength publicly. Social elites constructed personal collections of precious goods, leisure items, cultural artifacts, art, and curios as a fashionable, but socially pragmatic, pastime. These collections were not only indices of the owner’s purchasing power, they also reflected the collector’s broad awareness and understanding of current trends in scientific knowledge, other (often ‘exotic’) cultures, and the ‘strange’ flora and fauna of newly explored territories. In a social atmosphere that lauded commodification, those who led, or wished to lead, displayed their own monetary success, mental aptitude, and social or political innovation as a way achieving social prestige.

The previous sections have discussed two distinct functions of collections that contain specific types of objects (i.e. devotional items and curios), and their attendant exhibition styles. In general, collections that are categorized here as “social” collections are not defined by specific genres of objects or any one exhibition style. They utilize all categories of display and can contain any type, variety or amount of objects. In order to determine that a collection performed social functions, the collector’s interest in social assimilation, and/or the pursuit of knowledge as a political and social endeavor must be noted in a variety of sources.

Early Modern consumer culture was based in part on expanding avenues of trade created by contact with new foreign nations as well as the refinement of guild practices that specialized in the mass production of luxury items. Owning a large collection of quality or rare items was a measure of financial success within the new system. Displaying one’s knowledge and success

---

became a necessary and important way of receiving social recognition of this success. As is true today, being recognized as a wealthy and proficient member of society often comes with social, political, and financial advantages.\(^67\)

During the Early Modern period it also became fashionable to collect items as a recreational activity. The spaces where collections were kept became centers of debate and discussion in which “gentlemen” would gather to discuss contemporary events and scholarship. Though this is also true of intellectual collections, social collections differed in that viewing the objects was seen as both a luxurious recreational activity and educational resources, Italian writers, such as Giorgio Vasari, Niccolo Machiavelli, and Baldasarre Castiglione (1478 – 1529) promoted the popularity of collecting as a recreational activity. Their publications acted as social guides for men and women and outlined proper decorum as well as the way to conduct one’s estate. Collecting, or character examples of men and women who were known to have collected, during the Early Modern period were an important facet of these discussions. In Castiglione’s *Il libro del Cortegiano*, for example, the author recommends that a gentleman’s home should contain different kinds of collections that grouped together musical instruments, antique sculptures and medallions, portraits, copper engravings, woodcuts, and foreign tapestries, “according to one’s own taste.”\(^68\) For Castiglione, a collection was a part of performing one’s identity as a gentleman.

Castiglione’s instruction, and the application of these ideals in the Ducal courts of Mantua, impacted the renovations of the collections in Austria at the court of Archduke


Ferdinand II of Tyrol (1529-1596).\(^6^9\) The Austrian Hapsburgs had a long history of interaction with the Italians beginning with the marriage of Maximilian I (ruled 1493-1519) to Bianca Maria Sforza of Milan and continued by the marriage of Francesco de’Medici to Maximilian II’s daughter Joanna of Austria.

Castiglione’s viewpoint reflects the then current interest in Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics* and *Politics*.\(^7^0\) According to Aristotle, the way to complete happiness and civic order was to instill a learned concept of propriety and conformity to virtuous activities that honed the contemplative life of men. Only those with the most virtuous and refined minds and bodies could ensure the proper government of the people. Castiglione’s text stresses the same concepts and seeks to provide practical advice for those aspiring to be the “finest type of mankind functioning within the social order.”\(^7^1\) The Hapsburg collection signaled that Ferdinand II was a learned man who understood that knowledge and contemplation were critical to the welfare of their public and were appropriate activities for those privileged to exercise power. A prince or courtier who

\(^6^9\) Ferdinand II’s collection became of increasing importance within museology in the 19\(^{th}\) century when the 16\(^{th}\) century catalogue was published. The catalogue discusses the restructuring of the collection into the *schatzkammer*, *kunstkammer*, *wunderkammer*, and *rustkammer* as well as their placement in new buildings at Ambras that were constructed with the primary intention of housing the massive collection. Many scholars associate the incorporation of *kammern*, or chambers associated for specific genres of items, to be a reflection of the new importance of taxonomy and aesthetics that would lead to the development of salon style exhibition in France as well as the rise of natural history museums. While this revelation has played an integral role in the documentation of the history of collecting, Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann cites this renovation as a distinctly social construction. Using this interpretation the renovation of the Hapsburg collection becomes an effort to conform to the new fashions of appreciation of the arts and sciences that accompanied current social decorum. T. Kauffmann “From Treasury to Museum: The Collection of the Austrian Habsburgs,” in *The Cultures of Collecting*, eds. Elsner and Cardinal (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1994),

\(^7^0\) Lawrence V. Ryan, “Book Four of Castiglione’s Courtier: Climax or Afterthought?” *Studies in the Renaissance* 19 (1972).

\(^7^1\) Ibid. Castiglione maintained residence in Urbino under the patronage of the Gonzaga and fellow courtiers and princes would have been aware of the document. Several scholars have suggested that this is why Isabella d’Este made such a point of maintaining such a large collection.
knew the ways of the world was more prepared to make political decisions for the greater good of the population as a whole. In other words, in order to perform one’s identity as being rich and powerful, or in Castiglione’s words “gentlemanly,” Ferdinand II, as well as those who wished to attain his same level of public acclaim, needed to collect wisely, widely, and well.

Public interaction with these collections was an integral aspect of projecting social identity. Though many collections of royalty and members of the aristocracy required various levels of clearance for entry, even the “average” visitor usually was granted audience if only to insure the collection’s continued fame in local social circles. As rare or interesting holdings were made public, wealthier clientele made a point of visiting select collections. Some were interested in trading or purchasing items while others appreciated the chance to visit and enjoy the aesthetic value of the collection. For others, the opportunity to visit was an integral part of their socialization as “gentlemen.” Letters of introduction were one of the most common ways for visitors to gain access to a collection, especially if the visitors were not the same social status as the collection’s owner. Collectors tended to be protective of their goods and did not want to admit just anyone to their inner sanctums for fear of the curios being lost or stolen.

City guides and itineraries for travelers, such as those by Ulisse Aldrovandi and Jean-Jacques Boissard, as well as letters to friends and family from former visitors to collections are the most common records that remain of many public interactions with collections. Travel guides such as Boissard’s Romanae Urbis Topographia, published in 1597, beckoned visitors to explore the collections that collectors had gathered. In his publication, Boissard recounts one of his
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72 In 1563 Johannes Sambucas wrote a letter of introduction to Fulvio Orsini, urging him to grant access to his collection to the young scholar Philippe Aianus with instructions to “see to it that he [saw the] library and the antiquities.” William Stenhouse, “Visitors, Display, and Reception in the Antiquity Collections of Late-Renaissance Rome,” Renaissance Quarterly 58, no. 2 (Summer 2005).
numerous tours of the palace and collection of Mario Delfini, a notable collector in Rome.

Boissard describes an encounter with Delfini in which he expressed his regret over pestering and monopolizing his host’s time and for bringing so many visiting scholars with him. Rather than showing any sign of irritation, Delfini, according to Boissard, expressed gratitude for the attention and publicity generated by the many visitors.73 This anecdote points up the interdependence of collector and visitor and demonstrates that the importance and fame of any collection was to some extent dependent on the publicity it could generate. Visitors not only mentioned what they saw, they also commented on the knowledge and courtesy of the collector who owned such goods. Men like Delfini had a vested interest in such accounts of their collections. The objects they assembled, as well as the public’s knowledge of their collections, were critical to their public personae that they constructed with and through their collections.

Royal collectors such as the Medici and the Hapsburgs used public visitation to their collections as a way of conferring social and political favor on esteemed guests and dignitaries. Kaufmann explains that the collections of Rudolf II in Austria were by no means secret, though access was not normally granted to commoners. Instead it was regularly used for diplomatic functions. Ambassadors were invited to Rudolf’s collection when the emperor wanted to give a sign of his favor or in order to make a specific political point. For example, when the Venetian ambassador Piero Duodo congratulated Rudolf on his conquests of the Turks, Rudolf “rewarded” Piero with a visit to the kunstkammer. Kauffmann also relates other interactions with Rudolf’s collection also involved other avid collectors with whom Rudolf routinely carried on a “lively
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73 Ibid. “Are you unaware that by your effort the name of Mario is carried right to the furthest boundaries of the north, which otherwise would be trapped within the boundaries of the walls of Rome? It would not be the case if these noblemen and scholars did not come as guests to see me, to ponder and admire my belongings, and then talk about what they had seen in my palace after they got home.”
exchange of gifts.” A practice used in all major courts in the Early Modern period, gift giving was a sanctioned way of expressing imperial virtue, or “magnanimity,” in the gifts sent to other courts.  

In Florence, the construction of the Uffizi and relocation there of the Ducal collections functioned as a similar projection of status and power. Whereas the studiolo of Francesco de’Medici had been a place of private reflection and learning, the new context within the galleries of the Uffizi provided Francesco with a space that supported his economic, political, and social positions. The Uffizi housed hundreds of works that were previously located among the Medici’s many estates. This new space was designed to be a place to receive foreign dignitaries as well as a space to carry out daily business. The walls were covered by the works of Piero di Cosimo, Andrea del Sarto, Pontormo, Sodoma, Cristoforo Altori, Raphael, rare gems and objects made from precious metals, and a mixture of antiques and naturalia from all corners of the world. The composition of objects that came from all areas of the sciences and contemporary industry produced a system of objects that projected the Medici’s ownership and mastery of all objects as well as their inexhaustible financial resources. Guests and dignitaries that attended the Uffizi on business would be made well aware of the business success that their new partner’s enjoyed as well as the wide territory into which their power extended. In this case the quality, quantity, and variety of objects that was made visually available to guests was the key to social success.

As quasi-public spaces, rooms that housed the collections became centers of discussions where men and women could converge to discuss scholarly topics. Their juxtapositions and

75 G. Bazin. 58.
appositions not only drove and nuanced the discussions about the various objects in the
collection but also reflected the collector’s universal knowledge. As previously mentioned in
the discussion of intellectual collections, while these collections indeed functioned as intellectual
recourses, by providing the collector with an accessible source for study, social collections of
similar construction and content lacked detectable specializations that would have been useful
for intellectual development. In terms of social collections, owning choice examples of materials
found in all areas of science and culture became symbols of the owner’s mastery of the subjects
as a microcosm of the macrocosm. The concept of the micro and macrocosm developed out of
the Humanist’s retranslation of antique texts such as those by Pliny and Aristotle that stressed
that men should directly observe nature in order to achieve understanding of the elements of the
universe. Philosophers and scholars of the sciences understood this to mean that they needed to
acquire every variety of a genre of material in order to compare and define the essential
properties and characteristics of the macrocosm. While scholarly collections are categorized by
specialization, in that there are literally hundreds of objects that pertain to the same genre (as in
the cabinet of Johannes Kentmann), social collections are characterized by an assortment of
genres. Thus in contrast to specialized collections, social collections benefited the collector by

---

Kentmann (1518-74) was a German geologist who studied plant, animal, and mineral varieties in
Meissen. In 1565 he published his treatise *Nomenclature Rerum Fissilium quae in Misnia praecipue et in allis quoque regionibus inveniuntur*, in which he classified fossils that were found
in the area. Along with his classifications was an actual illustration of his collection of minerals,
which he appropriately named Mineral Cabinet. The collection was kept in a cabinet with
twenty-six drawers that were labeled to reflect his system of classification. In total the cabinet
displaying the owner’s wide knowledge of the various samples of the universe and culture that were kept within his chambers.  

This new method of scientific discovery, partnered with contemporary literature that promoted the pursuit of knowledge as an essential aspect of aristocratic decorum popularized microcosmic collecting throughout Western Europe. Once a collection was recognized as well rounded or unique, scholars and other collectors sought entrance to review its contents and take advantage of various opportunities for scholarly debate and social networking. The items that visitors saw when they visited palaces became visual markers that expressed, and at times even legitimized, the owner’s social position. Duke Federico da Montefeltro, who was known as one of the most accomplished and learned men of the 15th century, collected a variety of items dedicated to literature, the arts, and the sciences. Wealthy Italian families would send young men to his palace in Urbino to learn how to live as gentleman, surrounded by the stimuli of scientific and cultural objects. To this end the visitors to the collection were, in many cases, performing the act of looking at, learning from, and owning a collection as a way of practicing how individuals with social favor conducted themselves.

Federico’s collection offers an example of collecting that performed no functions other than the development of social identity. The presence of these types of collections within Early Modern societies highlights the practicality of interactions with and ownership of collections as well as the importance of public opinion. Public recognition of monetary success, mental aptitude, and social or political innovation was a key ingredient of the recipe for public

held 1,608 specimens from 135 locations. Unlike the Hapsburg, Medici, or Worm collections, Kentmann’s collection reflects his acute interest in collecting objects for geological studies.  

79 T. Kaufmann, “Remarks on the Collections of Rudolf II: The Kunstkammer as a Form of Representatio.”  

80 G. Bazin. 51.
acceptance. In a society that associated wealth and intelligence with sovereignty and political strength, collecting would have been one way of achieving status in a socially acceptable way.
5. Conclusion

Collecting during the Early Modern period developed as personal responses to the growing demands of spirituality, humanism, and society. How each collector formed her or his collection, and how it functioned, reflects not only popular trends within culture, but also the factors at play within the private lives of Early Modern people. Modern museology lacks this type of approach to the study of collections. While many art historians are interested in discovering the intent of collectors and their consequent uses of collections, the field of museology is concerned with discussing the history of exhibition style and the institutionalization of collecting in an effort to perfect modern museums and exhibitions. The study of function combines these professional interests to discover more about the nature of collecting at a given time as well as ways in which collecting was used to address specific needs.

Current museology utilizes collections such as those of Francesco de’Medici and Ferdinand of Tyrol as examples of how objects were exhibited in the Early Modern period, as well as examples of the modern museum in its infancy. The advent of the printing press during the Early Modern period and modernized efforts that preserved archival records/texts from the period has provided scholars with valuable information about many of the oldest known collections in the world. Though collecting did exist before this time, Early Modern collections have provided the modern museum with context and meaning.

In many art historical discussions about collections and collecting, there is a constant interplay between current museology terms, such as *kunstkammer* and *schatzkammer*, and the researcher’s subject. Though these terms are useful when discussing museum history, they are often confused by individuals who try to use them as points of reference to the collections they are directly discussing. Referring to a collection as a specific *kammer* in order to reference well
known scholarship regarding the exhibition style associated with a specific term is effective. However, it can also refer to functions that are unique to the term.\textsuperscript{81} For example, many scholars have called Francesco’s collection a \textit{schatzkammer}.\textsuperscript{82} This would imply that it was a storehouse of precious goods that were preserved for their monetary value rather than used as an intellectual aid. As noted in my discussion of intellectual collections, this categorization is in many ways incorrect. The continued use of these terms without investigation and consideration of the collection’s function will continue to produce false and manipulated arguments. While arguments relating to specialized areas of museology and art history are in constant demand and reflect researcher’s intuitive and specific interests in collecting, discussions of function can aid the intentions of all scholarship.

\textsuperscript{81} For an overview of different types of kammers and their functions see Germain Bazin and Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann’s “From Treasury to Museum: The Collection of the Austrian Habsburgs,” in \textit{The Cultures of Collecting}, eds. Elsner and Cardinal (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1994).
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