KATHARINA PILASKI KALIARDOS

# The Munich Kunstkammer

*Spätmittelalter, Humanismus, Reformation*
*73*

Mohr Siebeck

# Spätmittelalter, Humanismus, Reformation

## Studies in the Late Middle Ages, Humanism and the Reformation

herausgegeben von Volker Leppin (Tübingen)

in Verbindung mit
Amy Nelson Burnett (Lincoln, NE), Berndt Hamm (Erlangen)
Johannes Helmrath (Berlin), Matthias Pohlig (Münster)
Eva Schlotheuber (Düsseldorf)

73

Katharina Pilaski Kaliardos

# The Munich Kunstkammer

## Art, Nature, and the Representation of Knowledge in Courtly Contexts

Mohr Siebeck

Katharina Pilaski Kaliardos, born 1972; studied Art History in Münster, Vienna, Strasbourg, Berlin, and Santa Barbara; 2007 PhD; doctoral fellowship at the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts in Washington, DC; currently a lecturer at The Catholic University of America, Washington DC.

ISBN 978-3-16-152188-1 / eISBN 978-3-16-158611-8 unveränderte eBook-Ausgabe 2019
ISSN 1865-2840 (Spätmittelalter, Humanismus, Reformation)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.



The book was printed on non-aging paper by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

# Acknowledgements

The dissertation on which this book is based would not have been possible without the inspiration and support of my advisor Mark Meadow. In our discussions, he has continuously opened up new perspectives for my research, and his unflagging enthusiasm about my work has been an invaluable source of energy especially during the difficult stretches of my archival explorations. I am grateful for his extraordinary intellectual and personal generosity as my advisor.

I also owe thanks to the other members of my committee. Ann Jensen Adams initiated me to the fascinating field of the history of science and the role that images play in this context. Bruce Robertson has been tremendously helpful in restructuring my project at a point when it seemed to have gotten too large to manage. Philip Soergel has provided invaluable suggestions that helped shape my reflections on natural prodigies and their confessional implications.

One of my greatest debts is to Matthias Pohlig. My conversations and discussions with him have shaped my own research interests in no small degree. Since our high school days, he has been an enthusiastic reader of my work and has continuously provided me with valuable suggestions and constructive criticism. He has also helped me whenever I encountered difficulties with my Latin sources. I would like to express my gratitude for his friendship and encouragement.

For financial support, I am very grateful to the University of California, Santa Barbara, especially the Art History department, for providing me with generous funding throughout my doctoral studies. The research and writing of this book were largely made possible by the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts at the National Gallery of Art in Washington, DC. I would like to thank the Center, its Deans, and also my colleagues during the year in residence for their support. I am specifically indebted to Peter Parshall, whose comments on my CASVA shoptalk helped shape Chapter 4 of this book. I must also thank the staff of the Interlibrary Loan office at the National Gallery, who has been able to procure sources from even the most remote locations, and has greatly facilitated my research by providing me with extraordinarily large quantities of non-art historical material from the Library of Congress, thus enabling me to do most of my work in the Gallery's reading room.

The research for this book was largely conducted in Munich, and I would especially like to thank the staff at the Hauptstaatsarchiv and the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek for their friendly assistance. My stay in Munich would not have been as successful as it was without the support of many people there. I am especially grateful to Winfried Schulze, who generously invited me to participate in his weekly colloquium and daily lunch circle. My thanks also to all the colleagues and friends from this group for making my time in Munich a truly enjoyable experience, and for sharing their knowledge and their insights into the local archives and libraries. Special thanks to Cornel Zwierlein, who has been helpful with deciphering some particularly messy lines in archival documents, and has transcribed and translated Greek quotations in Latin texts. Lorenz Seelig kindly offered encouragement during the early stages of the development of this project, Peter Diemer was extremely generous in sharing the fruits of his work on the Munich *Kunstkammer*'s inventory with me, and Christl Karnehm has given me helpful insights into the role of the Fuggers at the Munich court. I would particularly like to thank Gabriele Wimböck, whose enthusiastic interest in my research has always stimulated my thoughts.

My special gratitude goes to my husband Bill Kaliardos, who has ensured that my life was not entirely consumed by the work on this book, and has stayed by my side and tolerated my moods during its writing. My parents have been infinitely generous and supportive throughout my academic studies, and it is with profound thanks that I dedicate this book to them.

# Table of Contents

# Introduction

When Albrecht V, Duke of Bavaria, died in October 1579, the Ingolstadt physician Ioannes Boscius dedicated a funeral oration to him in which he praised the Munich court as only comparable to the imperial one, a place full of generous knights, nobles of illustrious birth, the wisest clerical and worldly councilors, the most knowledgeable doctors, and excellent musicians. Following this enumeration of Albrecht's entourage, and before he went on to laud the duke's magnificent palace, its decoration, the splendid spectacles and tournaments that were held there, as well as the thriving state of Bavaria and its people, Boscius praised the ducal *Kunstkammer* as a "Theatrum earum rerum, quas memorabiles atque suspiciendas natura vel ars machinata est amplißimum."[1] By describing the ducal collection as a *theatrum amplissimum*, Boscius used the same terms that Samuel Quiccheberg, the Flemish physician who served as Albrecht's advisor in matters of collecting, had employed in the title of his treatise that gave instructions for the foundation of a princely *Kunstkammer*. [2] The fact that Boscius described the contents of the Munich collection as consisting of nature and the mechanical arts is further evidence that his perception of this *Kunstkammer* had been shaped by Quiccheberg's ideas, which focused on the collection's function as a site for the production of practically applicable knowledge. It is one of the central premises of this book that the Munich *Kunstkammer* was conceived in close conjunction with the development of Quiccheberg's ideas, and that these ideas and their intellectual context are essential for understanding the *Kunstkammer*'s conceptual

[1] See *Orationes Funebres in Exequiis, Serenissimo Illlustrissimoque Principi ac Domino, Domino Alberto V.* (Ingolstadii: Ex Officina Weissenhorniana, apud Wolfgangum Ederum, 1580), p. 29f.

[2] See Samuel Quiccheberg, *Inscriptiones vel tituli theatri amplissimi* (Munich: Adam Berg, 1565). A modern edition with a problematic German translation was published by Harriet Roth (see Harriet Roth, *Der Anfang der Museumslehre in Deutschland. Das Traktat "Inscriptiones vel Tituli Theatri Amplissimi" von Samuel Quiccheberg. Lateinisch-Deutsch. Herausgegeben und kommentiert von Harriet Roth.* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2000).). An edition with English translation is forthcoming: Mark Meadow and Bruce Robertson, eds, *Samuel Quiccheberg, Inscriptiones vel tituli Theatri Amplissimi, Munich, 1565*, in series *Texts & Documents*, Getty Research Institute. I am using this translation with the kind permission of the editors.

roots and the duke's rationale for investing in such as vast, lengthy, and costly project of courtly representation.

The Munich *Kunstkammer* was one of the earliest foundations of a universal collection at a princely court north of the Alps.[3] Albrecht had started collecting at a steadily accelerating pace from the beginning of his reign in 1550; already in 1557, his councilors found it necessary to admonish him to curtail his expenses that considerably aggravated the court's already precarious financial situation.[4] As the councilors insinuated, this development not coincidentally paralleled the duke's intensified contact with Hans Jakob Fugger. Fugger, as the internationally educated scion of the wealthy Augsburg merchant family, was one of the driving forces behind Albrecht's efforts to expand his collections, and it was through him that Albrecht had made the acquaintance of Samuel Quiccheberg. [5] In the early 1560s, Albrecht's plan to erect a separate building to house a universal collection must have started to evolve, and construction work on the project began in 1563. The exterior structure of the building was mostly finished by 1567, but work on its interior continued at least until 1578; however, visits to the collection were already

[3] Lorenz Seelig presented a seminal study of the Munich *Kunstkammer* in 1986, which included his reconstruction of the *Kunstkammer*'s arrangement on the basis of Fickler's inventory (see Lorenz Seelig, "Die Münchner Kunstkammer," in *Jahrbuch der Bayerischen Denkmalpflege* 40 (1986): 101–38; an earlier, shorter version was published in English, see Lorenz Seelig, "The Munich *Kunstkammer*, 1565–1807," in *The Origins of Museums: The Cabinet of Curiosities in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe*, ed. Oliver Impey and Arthur MacGregor (Oxford 1985): 76–89). A more extensive discussion of the *Kunstkammer* by Lorenz Seelig can be found in "Die Münchner Kunstkammer", in *Die Münchner Kunstkammer*, ed. Dorothea Diemer, Peter Diemer, Lorenz Seelig, et al., 3 vols. (München 2008), vol. 3: 1–114.

[4] The financial records of the court show a slight increase in expenses for luxury goods, building activities, and collectibles since 1551 (see Otto Hartig, "Die Kunsttätigkeit in München unter Wilhelm IV. und Albrecht V. (1520–1579). Neue Forschungen," *Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst, N.F.* 10, no. 3–4 (1933): 147–252. p. 169); the *Denkschrift* issued by Albrecht's councilors is published in Sigmund Riezler, "Zur Würdigung Herzog Albrechts V. von Bayern," *Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1894): 67–132). Their admonition seems not to have had any impact on Albrecht's proclivity for pursuing his collecting activities (see Hartig, "Kunsttätigkeit," p. 171).

[5] See Riezler, "Würdigung," p. 126. For my discussion of this document and a brief summary of Fugger's role at the court, see Katharina Pilaski, "Wissen, Handel, Repräsentation. Exotica und lokale Monstrositäten in der Kunstkammer Albrechts V. von Bayern," in *Wissenswelten. Perspektiven der frühneuzeitlichen Informationskultur*, ed. Wolfgang E. J. Weber (Augsburg 2003): 181–199, pp. 181–183, 187. On Fugger's role for Albrecht's collecting activities, see also Mark Meadow, "Hans Jacob Fugger and the Origins of the *Wunderkammer*," in *Merchants & Marvels: Commerce, Science, and Art in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Pamela H. Smith and Paula Findlen (New York 2002), 182–200.

possible at the end of the 1560s.[6] Quiccheberg published his treatise in 1565, and died in 1567, thus before the *Kunstkammer* was completely installed. Nonetheless, his ideas had a detectable impact on the particular characteristics of the Munich collection, and their close investigation in conjunction with that of the *Kunstkammer* itself lead to a better understanding and partial reevaluation of the phenomenon of the princely *Kunstkammer* in the second half of the sixteenth century.

It is particularly important to place both Quiccheberg's treatise and the Munich collection in the larger intellectual contexts and traditions from which they stemmed. Previous scholarship on the Munich *Kunstkammer* has not attended to the epistemological issues involved in the sixteenth-century interest in this type of collection.[7] In this book, I discuss the Munich *Kunstkammer* as a prime example of a cultural phenomenon based on an epistemology peculiar to the second half of the sixteenth century. The widespread notion of the *Kunstkammer* as a 'curiosity cabinet' is ill-suited to describe what princes of the sixteenth century had in mind when they founded such a collection. The idea of a collection containing only the strange and rare whose sole function was to leave the visitor gaping with speechless stupefaction in the face of the wondrous objects displayed was a development of the seventeenth century, and its retroprojection onto the sixteenth century *Kunstkammer* bars us from understanding period perceptions of this type of collection.[8]

Quiccheberg conceived of a universal collection as a site with eminently pragmatic functions. It was to be a place that served to further useful knowledge about the world, useful in particular for the governance of the territory.[9] This idea of gaining practically applicable knowledge through the investigation of objects and images was quite an innovative claim in the sixteenth century, whose notion of *scientia* was still dominated by the Aristotelian notion of deductive reasoning. As I argue in Chapter 2, the *Kunstkammer*, at the time of its inception, was a phenomenon that grew out of a productive con-

[6] On the construction history of the *Kunstkammer* and visitors to the collection, see Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (2008), pp. 1–3, 10–12, Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (1986), pp. 101–103.

[7] Seelig stresses the importance of Quiccheberg's treatise, discusses its importance for the architectural design of the *Kunstkammer* building, and repeatedly refers to it in his analysis of the contents and layout of the collection (see Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (2008), pp. 17–19 and passim). Peter Diemer briefly discusses the treatise and its connection to the Munich collection in Diemer, *Kunstkammer* (2008), vol. 3, pp. 346–349.

[8] This understanding of the *Kunstkammer* phenomenon from a seventeenth-century viewpoint underlies Lorraine Daston's work on the topic (see Lorraine Daston, "The Factual Sensibility," *Isis* 79 (1988): 452–470, p. 458; Lorraine Daston and Katharine Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature. 1150-1750* (New York: Zone Books, 1998), pp. 255-301). Against this view, see Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, "From Mastery of the World to Mastery of Nature," in *The Mastery of Nature. Aspects of Art, Science, and Humanism in the Renaissance* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993): 174–194, p. 181, 303, n. 56.

[9] I discuss this at length in Chapter 2.

junction of traditional approaches to collecting, ordering, and storing knowledge, and a new interest in the empirical investigation of nature. The early *Kunstkammer* was thus one manifestation of the larger developments within the history of science concerning new approaches to nature and technology that took place in the context of princely courts.

Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann has warned against neglecting the particular aims and functions of the earlier universal collections,[10] and his ideas about the *Kunstkammer* of Emperor Rudolf II as a form of *repraesentatio* have provided an important inspiration for my own research.[11] I investigate the representational function that the *Kunstkammer* served from two angles, which correspond to the two principal meanings that the term 'representation' has acquired in modern scholarship: one the one hand, I look at the collection as a tool of political representation, understanding 'representation' as the visual display of rulership and its legitimacy.[12] On the other hand, I use the term 'representation' in the sense of an object, image or reproduction that serves to make an absent thing, person, place, or event present within the *Kunstkammer*.[13]

The first meaning entails iconographical questions concerning the particular contents of the collection, their arrangement and display, and the arguments that are being constructed with them. Thus, I shall show in Chapter 1 how in the Munich *Kunstkammer*, dynastic and territorial representation are played out in order to construct arguments about the status, legitimacy, and confessional conviction of the Wittelsbach dynasty and the territory over which the family ruled. Quiccheberg, in his systematic overview of the various types of objects to be included in such a collection, laid particular stress on objects and images that represented the founder, his dynasty, and his territory. Jean-Marie Moeglin has stressed the extremely close connection between the Wittelsbach dynasty and the Bavarian territory that was made in

[10] See Kaufmann, "Mastery," p. 295, n. 9.

[11] See Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, "Remarks on the Collections of Rudolf II: The *Kunstkammer* as a Form of *Representatio*," in *Art Journal* 38 (1978): 22–28.

[12] This is what Hedda Ragotzky and Horst Wenzel have identified as the dominant meaning of the term in modern historical scholarship concerned with courtly representation during the medieval and early modern periods (see Hedda Ragotzky and Horst Wenzel, eds, *Höfische Repräsentation. Das Zeremoniell und die Zeichen* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1990), p. 180).

[13] On the complex tradition of the term from which these two meanings have evolved, see Hasso Hofmann, *Repräsentation. Studien zur Wort- und Begriffsgeschichte von der Antike bis in 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1974). For a concise summary, see also Eckart Scheerer, "Repräsentation," in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, vol. 8, ed. Joachim Ritter, Karlfried Gründer, Gottfried Gabriel and Rudolf Eisler (Basel: Schwabe, 1971). More generally on the meaning and use of the term in cultural history, see Carlo Ginzburg, "Repräsentation. Das Wort, die Vorstellung, der Gegenstand," in *Holzaugen. Über Nähe und Distanz*, ed. Carlo Ginzburg (Berlin: Wagenbach, 1999): 97–119.

political documents of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and the idea that the fate of Bavaria is inextricably linked with that of the Wittelsbach dynasty can be traced throughout Bavarian territorial historiography.[14] Quiccheberg's ideas about dynastic and territorial representation were thus particularly suited to the Bavarian situation; at the time he wrote his treatise, this traditional inclination to demonstrate the legitimacy of Wittelsbach rulership by showing an organic connection between the dynasty and the *Land* gained particular urgency through the duke's efforts at the consolidation and centralization of his princely power against the local competencies of his estates. Knowledge about the territory was crucial to maintaining and expanding ducal rulership, and its representation within the *Kunstkammer* was therefore both a means of displaying the duke's capacity to rule, as well as a way of storing this knowledge at the court. Chapter 3 presents a case study of this representation of territorial knowledge and dynastic legitimacy through the inclusion of 'relics' of prodigious events within the Munich collection, investigating this interest in prodigies with particular regard to the confessional stance of the Catholic Munich court.

The epistemological sense of 'representation' involves questions of the status of objects and images in the process of the production of knowledge, and the relationship between an original object and its reproduction. While Chapter 2 investigates the intellectual traditions from which the new confidence placed in material objects and images for the production of knowledge originated, in Chapter 4, I consider the specific phenomenon of the abundance of ephemeral reproductions of natural objects in the Munich *Kunstkammer*, and relate it to contemporary attitudes and practices regarding visual and material representations, particularly within the religious context.

From this should emerge a new image of the Munich *Kunstkammer* that sees it as a grandiose attempt at the production of universal knowledge through the orderly assemblage of objects and images, serving as a representation of princely territorial rulership and confessional allegiance to the Catholic Church, in which knowledge about the territory is embedded in a totality that demonstrated the duke's status as a ruler who derived his legitimate power from a divine source.

[14] See Jean-Marie Moeglin, *Dynastisches Bewußtsein und Geschichtsschreibung. Zum Selbstverständnis der Wittelsbacher, Habsburger und Hohenzollern im Spätmittelalter* (München 1993), pp. 17–21.

Chapter 1

# A Central Repository of Knowledge: The *Kunstkammer* and the Consolidation of Princely Power

The Munich *Kunstkammer* was at its time one of the largest courtly collections North of the Alps. According to the inventory that the court jurist Johann Baptist Fickler wrote up in 1598,[1] it contained over 6,000 objects, and the breadth of its scope made it the first truly encyclopedic princely collection in Central Europe.[2]

In comparison to the contemporary courtly *Kunstkammern*, such as those of Ferdinand II at Ambras, and of August of Saxony at Dresden, and also to the slightly later one at the imperial court in Prague, the Munich collection is distinguished by an exceptional emphasis on the representation of its founder, his dynasty, and his territory.[3] This focus comprises several classes of objects, including portraits, coats of arms, chorographical representations, *naturalia* of Bavarian origin, and a diverse range of historical objects, such as weapons, clothes, and Roman remains excavated in Bavaria. The presence of the duke and his dynasty in the *Kunstkammer* asserted the ducal possession of this collection, while advancing arguments about dynastic legitimacy; on the other hand, the representation of the Bavarian territory turned the *Kunstkammer* into a central repository of knowledge about the duke's sphere of power.[4]

In an article about collections of antiquities in courtly contexts, Gerrit Walther posed the question of how the production and display of knowledge

---

[1] See Johann Baptist Fickler, *Das Inventar der Münchner herzoglichen Kunstkammer von 1598. Editionsband. Transkription der Inventarhandschrift cgm 2133*, ed. Peter Diemer (München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004).

[2] See Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (1986), pp. 104, 117; Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (2008), p. 84 (here more broadly on the Munich *Kunstkammer*'s place in the history of sixteenth-century collecting, pp. 71–85).

[3] Seelig has called the territorial and dynastic representation the "constitutive" feature of the Munich *Kunstkammer*, which, especially with regard to high-level visitors, almost assumes the role of a "propagandistic instrument" (see Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (2008), p. 32).

[4] Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann has first established the interpretation of the *Kunstkammer* as a means to the representation of (in that case) imperial power with regard to Rudolf II's collection at Prague (see Kaufmann, "Remarks on the Collections of Rudolf II").

functioned in contexts whose primary concern was the exertion of power.[5] This question is of particular relevance to the Munich *Kunstkammer*, as Quiccheberg's treatise confirms that the knowledge that could be gained in this collection was thought to be of both theoretical and practical value, as well as of particular importance for the governance of the state. I shall discuss this theoretical claim and the question of the epistemological status of knowledge gained from the investigation of objects at greater length in Chapter 2. This first chapter is concerned with the same issue on the more concrete level of territorial and dynastic representation within the collection itself, and its symbolic, political, and practical functions. Following a brief overview of the *Kunstkammer*'s mode of display and the various types of objects contained in the Munich collection in general, I shall discuss the question of their arrangement, and analyze how the *Kunstkammer*'s focus on the representation of the ruler, his dynasty, and the territory was presented to the *Kunstkammer*'s visitor, and which rhetorical or practical functions these objects may have served. I shall then set these observations in the context of the political situation of the Munich court at the time the collection was founded.

## The Collection's Setting, its Contents and their Display

The Munich *Kunstkammer* was set on the top floor of a three-story building that was constructed in the years between 1563 and 1567 by adding a fourth section to three pre-existing buildings, thus combining them into a four-winged structure with an open inner courtyard surrounded by arcaded galleries (fig. 1).[6] On the ground floor, the building housed the courtly stables, while the first upper story provided space for the tack rooms along with the living quarters for the equerry and other personnel of the stables.[7] While the exterior structure was likely finished by 1567,[8] sources report the *Kunstkammer*'s still unfinished state in 1568, and ongoing work on the interior until at

[5] See Gerrit Walther, "Adel und Antike. Zur politischen Bedeutung gelehrter Kultur für die Führungselite der Frühen Neuzeit," in *Historische Zeitschrift* 262 (1998): 359–385, pp. 361f.

[6] For a brief overview of the building's history in the sixteenth century, see Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (2008), pp. 1-3. For a more extensive history of the building, see Michael Petzet, "Das ehemalige Marstall- und Kunstkammergebäude in München und sein Ausbau zur königlichen Münze," in *Jahrbuch der Bayerischen Denkmalpflege* 40 (1986): 15–100, pp. 16–36. The question of the architect is unsolved, as Petzet points out (see ibid., p. 18).

[7] See Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (2008), p. 1. On the combination of stables and collections in one building in the sixteenth century, see ibid. pp. 12–17.

[8] See Petzet, "Das ehemalige Marstall- und Kunstkammergebäude in München," pp. 17f.

least 1579, the year of Albrecht's death.[9] In the 1570s, however, the collection was already in a state that allowed for visitors to enter it.[10]

Thus, the state of the collection that is documented in Fickler's inventory of 1598 may roughly have been reached by the end of Albrecht's lifetime. Documents show that Wilhelm V, Albrecht's son and successor, facing ongoing quarrels with the Bavarian estates about financial matters, agreed early during his reign to make no further acquisitions for the courtly collections.[11] While he nonetheless added numerous objects, the majority of which were gifts or were transferred from various parts of the ducal residence, he did not change the *Kunstkammer*'s character in any fundamental way.[12] Thus Fickler's inventory, which is the only source documenting the contents and arrangement of the Munich *Kunstkammer* in a comprehensive manner, may, *cum grano salis*, be taken as reflecting the Munich *Kunstkammer*'s original conception under Albrecht V. In my general overview of its contents, I follow the hypothetical reconstruction of the *Kunstkammer*'s setup offered by Lorenz Seelig (fig. 2).[13]

The objects in the Munich collection were displayed openly on about 60 large and smaller tables. Unlike in the roughly contemporary *Kunstkammer* at Ambras or the later one in Prague, comparatively little was kept in cabinets or chests. Further objects – paintings and reliefs, as well as sculptures and vessels – were hung on the walls or placed upon two shelves surrounding the room in the upper section of the wall facing the courtyard.[14] A few stuffed animals were hung from the ceiling.[15]

This open presentation of the objects in the impressively large space of approximately 1,200m$^2$ was geared towards open visual access to large numbers of objects. Through this generous manner of display, the planners of the collection avoided the impression of crammed disorder among the *Kunstkammer*'s heterogeneous contents.[16] The aim was to convey the impression of the breadth of the collection's scope, but not to leave the visitor dumbstruck by confronting him with a "hodge-podge" of disorderly arranged 'curiosities', as has been argued by Lorraine Daston with regard to this type of collection.[17]

---

[9] See Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (2008), p. 2f.; Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (1986), pp. 102f.

[10] On the Kunstkammer's accessibility under Albrecht V and his son, see Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (2008), pp. 10–12. See also Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (1986), p. 103.

[11] See Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (1986), p. 115, Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (2008), p. 48; on the chronology of objects and their inclusion in the *Kunstkammer*, see ibid. pp. 44–49.

[12] See Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (2008), p. 48; Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (1986), p. 115.

[13] See Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (1986); Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (2008), pp. 4f., pp. 19–27.

[14] See Fickler, *Inventar*, p. 169.

[15] See Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (1986), p. 106; Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (2008), p. 26.

[16] See Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (1986), pp. 106f.; Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (2008), pp. 26f.

[17] See Daston, "The Factual Sensibility," p. 458; Daston and Park, *Wonders*, pp. 255–301.

As any universal collection of the early modern period, the Munich *Kunstkammer* contained both objects of nature (*naturalia*) and objects of art (*artificialia*). Many of the *naturalia* were unaltered samples and specimens of inorganic or organic materials, i.e. minerals, ores, and parts of animals such as teeth, bones, horns, or shells. These objects were of either local or exotic origin; some, but not all of these were deformed or otherwise anomalous. The topic of natural wonders and prodigies will specifically be addressed in Chapter 3 of this book. Apart from a few pieces of wood and branches of trees, original parts of plants were relatively scarce in the *Kunstkammer*.[18] This was probably due to issues of conservation, and indeed there is no lack of plants in the form of reproductions.[19]

Reproductions make up a significant portion of the *artificialia* in the Munich *Kunstkammer*. While many artificial objects in this collection certainly were primarily prized for their aesthetic value or for their material preciousness, a large number of images also or solely fulfilled documentary functions. Copying the natural specimens or human body parts faithfully – by means of pictorial representation (usually on paper), as casts in plaster or metal, and even carved in wood – they were clearly conceived as substitutes for the original objects. This prevalence of ephemeral documentary imagery is quite unique to the Munich *Kunstkammer*, and it belies the common notion that such collections functioned solely or even primarily as a "declaration of independence for the disciplines of invention and high artifice".[20] Besides the various forms of imagery reproducing natural specimens, portraits formed a particularly large group of pictorial documents in the Munich *Kunstkammer*. The collection contained a total of 579 portraits of historical and living personages, many of which were conceived as sets.[21] These were generally listed

[18] See Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (1986), p. 108.

[19] See Seelig, "Kunstkammer" (2008), p. 38.

[20] Peter W. Parshall, "Imago Contrafacta: Images and Facts in the Northern Renaissance," in *Art History* 16, no. 4 (1993): 554–579, p. 555. In this seminal article on Renaissance documentary imagery, which provides the basis of my understanding of images as documents in the Munich *Kunstkammer*, Peter Parshall, with reference to Lorraine Daston's view of such collections, cast the relationship between art and nature in *Kunstkammer* collections as antithetical to the documentary impetus that he discerned in other areas. As I shall discuss, this is a problematic view with regard to the Munich *Kunstkammer*.

[21] On the portrait collection in Munich, see Franz von Reber, "Die Bildnisse der herzoglich bayerischen Kunstkammer nach dem Fickler'schen Inventar von 1598," in *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-philologischen und historischen Classe der königlich bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1893): 2–56 and also Reber, "Die Gemälde der herzoglich bayerischen Kunstkammer nach dem Fickler'schen Inventar von 1598," in *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-philologischen und historischen Classe der königlich bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1892): 137–68, and more recently Peter Diemer, "Wenig ergiebig für die Alte Pinakothek? Die Gemälde der Kunstkammer", in Diemer, *Münchner Kunstkammer*, vol. 3: 125–224.

# Index of Historic Personages

# Index of Subjects