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Pronken as Practice.
Material Culture in The Netherlands, 1650-1800

HESTER DIBBETS
The starting point for this article is 18th-century Maassluis, a booming fishing village in the south of the province of Holland, near Rotterdam. Studying its probate inventories, one enters a world of abundance, a world that apparently offered ample room for performative display of goods nullifying their functional qualities. Inhabitants of Maassluis not only crammed their cupboards with whole arrays of silver buttons, piles of sheets, and hundreds of cups, saucers and plates, but they also displayed all sorts of chinaware on racks and ledges. Especially in the first half of the 18th century, the more well to do must have truly wrestled with space. Until specific storage cabinets for chinaware appeared on the scene in the mid-18th century, in some houses even the cupboard beds were used as storage space. Two hundred pieces of porcelain per household in an 18th-century upper-class family was not an exceptional situation.

The sheer amount must have been eye-catching, as must have been the collected objects themselves: most of them were shiny and remained so as the years went by. Chintz, painted and polished furniture, mirrors, glazed pottery, enamelled porcelain and Delftware: what most objects that were added to the domestic interior in the 17th and 18th centuries seem to have in common was their shiny surface and bright colouring.

Apart from the number of items and their qualities, also the ways in which they were arranged suggest abundance. It often happened for example that an extra (small] kitchen for cooking purposes was furnished apart from the so-called inner kitchen that often was not used at all.

As far as the world outdoors was concerned, the wide spread of silver and gold ornamental garments could not remain unnoticed, among which the ornamental 'headpiece' was one of the most impressive and exquisite. Earlier, in the 17th century, such headpieces had functioned as small and barely-visible functional items, but during the course of the 18th century they developed into large casques.
What was performed here? And what were the effects of these ways of displaying artefacts? These are the questions on which this article focuses. Analysing the material culture in 18th-century Maassluis, the striking feature of Dutch material culture is its uniformity. The basic forms of expressing status and achieving comfort were remarkably similar between city and country, and between rich and poor. It was the cost and specific quality rather than the types of objects and their general form that differed. Having compared our findings for Maassluis with those for another community (namely the garrison town of Doesburg), I am inclined to claim that as far as the 18th-century is concerned, the striking feature of Dutch material culture is diversity instead of uniformity, at least if we look at the ways in which objects were actually used. Apart from reflecting on matters of uniformity or diversity, I will also reflect on the concepts of Old and New Luxury as they were introduced by Jan de Vries. Was it true that the Maassluis inventory showed us a sort of luxury that did not automatically make daily live more comfortable, at least not in the sense that all those consumer goods which people possessed were actually used.

Elaborating on these points, in the second part of this article I will refer to Jan de Vries’ recently published work ‘The Industrious Revolution’. First, the question will be put forward whether we can consider 18th-century Dutch material culture to be as uniform as Jan de Vries considered it to be in the late 17th century, writing: ‘By the late 17th century the striking feature of Dutch material culture is its uniformity. The basic forms of expressing status and achieving comfort were remarkably similar between city and country, and between rich and poor. It was the cost and specific quality rather than the types of objects and their general form that differed.’ Having compared our findings for Maassluis with those for another community (namely the garrison town of Doesburg), I am inclined to claim that as far as the 18th-century is concerned, the striking feature of Dutch material culture is diversity instead of uniformity, at least if we look at the ways in which objects were actually used.

Apart from reflecting on matters of uniformity or diversity, I will also reflect on the concepts of Old and New Luxury as they were introduced by Jan de Vries. Was it true that the Maassluis inventory showed us a sort of luxury that did not automatically make daily live more comfortable, at least not in the sense that all those consumer goods which people possessed were actually used.

One may consider the phenomenon of pronken as described above as a form of conspicuous consumption, as the lavish spending on goods mainly for the purpose of displaying income or wealth. The concept of conspicuous consumption was introduced by Thorstein Veblen in 1899 in The Theory of the Leisure Class. According to Veblen, this kind of behaviour results from individual efforts to outdo one another and a desire to excel one’s neighbours in the accumulation of goods, in order to attain or maintain social status. Veblen’s theory of conspicuous consumption has been criticized among others by sociologist Colin Campbell. Part of Campbell’s critique is that the theory is too vague, that it cannot be tested. Should conspicuous consumption for example be considered as the result of rational or instinctive behaviour, and what are the precise motives or intentions behind it? Veblen’s tests are not explicit enough on this issue, Campbell argues.

Interestingly, it has been noted that Campbell’s own theories on conspicuous consumption are equally difficult to test. Trying to understand the history of consumer behaviour by taking the role of emotions into concern, as sociologist Morgan does, brings all kinds of fundamental questions to the fore, which - as it appears - we are only in the beginning of getting some grip on.

Looking at phenomena such as conspicuous consumption and flaunting, at least it seems wise not to stick to the traditional distinction between conscious and unconscious behaviour, and to be aware of the multiple ways in which the material and the visual appeal to people’s senses, as they are located between the physical and the cognitive. What about, for example, the aesthetics of glazed and glittering items? Moreover, even the thought of owning goods which are considered by people as highly valuable for economic, aesthetic or other reasons, may make people longing for them.


Following Pierre Bourdieu, Judith Butler and others, I furthermore find it insightful to look at the phenomenon of pronken primarily as a performative practice which does not much reflect, but rather create social and cultural distinctions. Thus in this article, the question is not so much what the specific intentions or motives behind practices of pronken were, or what the function of pronken was, but what was performed, what was created in these practices.

3 Performing female virtues and familial bonds

Studying the phenomenon of pronken, one inevitably enters the never ending debate about gender specific patterns in consumption practices. Luxury was, and still often is, associated with female desire, and the same counts for the practice of pronken as described above, the display of household goods such as Chinoiserie, printed Indian cottons and silver cutlery, nullifying their practical qualities.

Indeed, according to several authors in the 17th and 18th centuries, women especially showed a tendency for ‘conspicuous consumption’ that resulted in ‘useless’ displays. For example, in his burlesque De huwelijken stelt published in 1684, doctor Pieter Bernagie mocked the husband who ‘lives in a big house, but [who] is not allowed to use it. He is even not allowed to enter the best room only to smell it, the woman also enter this room only twice a year, in May and at All Saints’ Day, when they clean it. During the rest of the year, the room is shut.’

Other authors depicted women as hysterical collectors of ceramics. In Het groot Ceremonie-boek (1735), Van Laar created a character called Johan, who claims that the most foolish of all foolish human behaviours is the enthusiasm that ‘Burgers Vrouwen’ show in arranging cabinets with old, fragile porcelain. ‘These women are ruining their husbands.’ Since villages such as Maassluis could in fact be characterized as a woman’s domain for several months a year (when the men were at sea), the Maassluis interiors may have been considered as the embodiment of such female ‘foolishness’.

On the other hand, it may be noted that the distinction between household goods for everyday use and those for display at least created the possibility to keep some areas in the house orderly and clean, and thus to display - or perform - virtues such as the lavish spending on goods mainly for the purpose of displaying income or wealth. The concept of conspicuous consumption was introduced by Thorstein Veblen in 1899 in The Theory of the Leisure Class. According to Veblen, this kind of behaviour results from individual efforts to outdo one another and a desire to excel one’s neighbours in the accumulation of goods, in order to attain or maintain social status. Veblen’s theory of conspicuous consumption has been criticized among others by sociologist Colin Campbell. Part of Campbell’s critique is that the theory is too vague, that it cannot be tested. Should conspicuous consumption for example be considered as the result of rational or instinctive behaviour, and what are the precise motives or intentions behind it? Veblen’s tests are not explicit enough on this issue, Campbell argues. Interestingly, it has been noted that Campbell’s own theories on conspicuous consumption are equally difficult to test. Trying to understand the history of consumer behaviour by taking the role of emotions into concern, as sociologist Morgan does, brings all kinds of fundamental questions to the fore, which - as it appears - we are only in the beginning of getting some grip on.

Looking at phenomena such as conspicuous consumption and flaunting, at least it seems wise not to stick to the traditional distinction between conscious and unconscious behaviour, and to be aware of the multiple ways in which the material and the visual appeal to people’s senses, as they are located between the physical and the cognitive. What about, for example, the aesthetics of glazed earthenware, porcelain, chintzes, gold an silver? What about the sensations of joy and excitement people experience dreaming about, imagining or actually entering a room full of brightly coloured Chinoiserie? What about the sensations of touching glazed, glittering items? Moreover, even the thought of owning goods which are considered by people as highly valuable for economic, aesthetic or other reasons, may make people longing for them.
as order and purity. Popular moralists such as Jacob Cats considered the kitchen to be a place ruled by women, who functioned as defenders of the honour of the family. Thus, keeping one kitchen for display only could be interpreted as an indication of something honourable, with the best kitchen being seen as an embodiment of the housewife’s carefulness. It is also in this context that we probably should interpret the presence of no less than three kitchens in the house of the Maassluis notary Cornelis van Dam and his wife Laurentia Suiker. The inventory from 1717 mentions an inner kitchen (binnenkeuken), a ‘living-kitchen’ (woonkeuken), and a kitchen for cooking (koekkeuken). The difference in status between them becomes immediately clear: the inner kitchen contained six Spanish walnut chairs, covered with green cloth, the living kitchen contained a set of five brown chairs and three matching armchairs, and the cooking kitchen only had five old chairs. Throughout the house, people were reminded of the female virtues by images on tiles and wooden objects, and by texts painted on kitchenware and on signs often positioned close to the front door.

Many of these reminders may have been quotes from well-known moralistic songs and poems that celebrated the female virtues. For instance, an anonymous 17th-century poem praised the linen cupboard in the following way: “Come along, Dutch maiden, make yourself at home. Behold, linen neatly piled as high as mountains. Expensive laces, all kinds of satins. Which shine brighter than the stars. Silks in copious variety, Which would eclipse the wardrobe of a queen. Come, lady, with many guests, To this rich bride and groom, All the precious beauty of the world is gathered in this cupboard, this treasure is to be admired!”

Apart from showing off the evidence of female virtue, the display of luxury goods also performed a role in the cycles of life and familial duty. Because a substantial part of the items kept in those linen cupboards consisted of gifts that were given and received on occasions such as births and marriages, the display of these riches emphasised and reinforced familial bonds. Intersecting in this context are the explicit mentions of ‘pronkvoorwerpen’ in probate inventories, such as little pronk-emmerterjes (show-buckets), pronk-ketels (show-kettles), pronk-stoelen (show-chairs), and pronk-lakens (show-bedlinen). Probably these objects were given as wedding gifts, though the same may be said for the numerous collections of small silver ‘dolls’ objects’ that together formed a miniature world, with tiny tankards, men, horses, lions, and household goods such as linen-presses, teapots and irons. Presuming that the collections of pronk-items (and miniature objects) indeed were inherited and as a rule passed on from one generation to the other, such displays also showed the continuity of the family line.

15 Another possibility is that these silver miniature objects were received as maternity gifts. All kinds of items, including decorated earthenware pots, glasses and pewter with Dutch motifs, are described in inventories, see: I. Veldman, Strategic affective gift exchange in seventeenth-century Holland. Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 2006.
In the Maassluis archives, many examples can be found of people who were busy dividing their possessions between their heirs, presumably according to the idea that patterns of culture could be passed on from one generation to the other by the bequest of household goods. The Bible and its stand were given to a dear relative, as was the linen chest together with the pots that belonged to it. By doing so, identities were reaffirmed or revised: by inheriting the possessions of deceased relatives, one’s own identity could be incorporated by the heirs. A substantial part of the items displayed being made of earthenware, porcelain or other breakable materials, the 'best kitchens' and 'best rooms' also ensured that a stable and sedentary way of living, in which there was no frequent need to move, existed.

### Sacralizing the profane

What position did the church take in respect to these forms of performative display? And what role did religion play when it came to pronken? In Maassluis, the majority of the population belonged to the Dutch Reformed Church, and considering (for example) the widespread possession of bibles displayed on a stand, religion seems to have played an important role in daily life. In contrast to what is often presumed, the Dutch Reformed Church did not proclaim that people should refrain from all luxury. The 17th-century moralist Petrus Wittewrongel even wrote in his *Oeconomia christiana ofte Christelicke huys-houdinghe*, "Not only are we allowed to furnish our dwellings with things that are needed, it is also allowed to strive for our comfort and the enjoyment of abundance." Other moralists may have been less mild than Wittewrongel in this respect, but nonetheless, one could say in general that furnishings and dress had to be sober but not necessarily poor. The Reformed Church may have even advocated pronken as discussed in this context.

Seen from a theological perspective, the practice of keeping apart certain objects from everyday life, is evidently a form of sanctification. The Sunday dress is perhaps the most well known example, but in probate inventories one comes across several other objects explicitly indicated as items kept apart for the Sunday.

---


17 Not always as much as one would think: in probate inventories one can also find that objects were given to a relative as a gift in the way that was given to the poor, but in this category only a few cases could be found. J. van der Zanden, Geboden en beschikkingen: een onderzoek naar de betekenis van overlijden voor de nalatenschappen en de erfgoedverdeling, Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 1995, p. 145-147. See also H. Cramer, "Proeve van kultuur", p. 208.

18 Forms of conspicuous consumption related to food were regarded as more problematic. The reverend Franciscus Ridderus, whose books were found in several Maassluis' inventories, rejected exquisite dishes and tableware, and he made clear that people should not organise dinners too often, dine too long, and certainly refrain from exquisite meals in one's own home. See also: M. Cramer, "Het geschenk", p. 144-145.

Presumably, pronken should be understood as being part of a process labelled by the historian Willem Frijhoff as 'the Christian ritualisation of everyday culture'.

This was a process in which various forms of sociability — drinking tea for example — but apparently also everyday artefacts became 'sanctified'. The craving for luxury in home furnishings and dress may have been considered a sin by most moralists, but things were different as far as the celebration of Sundays, important occasions within one's life, and female virtues such as good housekeeping were concerned. This may also explain why the 18th-century ethnographer Le Francq van Berkhey found 'Pronk-bedstede's in the northern provinces of Holland ornamented with chintz and various sorts of other textiles and lace. These bedsteads, Le Francq noted, looked just like a domestic altar.

As anthropologists and ethnologists studying religious culture from a practice-oriented approach have repeatedly remarked, the division usually made between the sacred and the profane should be questioned. Focusing on everyday practices studying early modern material culture, it further appears that traditional custom and consumption are not incompatible, as John Styles has noted. In fact, quite the contrary is true; luxury goods can be used for celebrating communal values. By the display of shiny, bright, new, or new-looking gear, the villagers celebrated family ties and community life outdoors on Sundays, on market days and on major occasions such as weddings and funerals. In the next paragraphs the focus will shift to these communal aspects of pronken.

21 W. Frijhoff, ‘Vraagtekens bij het vroegmoderne kersteningsoffensief’ in: G. Rooijakers en T. van den Zee (eds.), Strijdaren rondom het christendom. De spanning tussen de voorgeschreven en de geleerde praktijk. Nijmegen, SUN, 1986, p. 71-89. See also Daems, Hermenent beeld, Matrijsk Cultuur in West- en Midden-Europa, 1450-1550. Nijmegen, SUN, 1991, p. 164. For the way in which new forms of availability related to the introduction of coffee and tea were also sanctified, an illustrative example offers a poem by reverend Kasparus Alardin, titled 'Heropvoedtijdtje en hemelsHas-gaertsje, alfe begeerte overbringen der de thee, gedeeltlik op Christus Jesus tendeert, tot demping van wereldse en ydele discoursen onder het Heerlijkhouden'. An explicit reference to the relation between drinking tea and the church can be found in HindeLoopen, in Friesland, where the front of the church is decorated with a tea kettle. See J. Le Francq van Berkhey, Natuurlyke historie van Holland. 1773, deel 1.1, p. 153.

22 Le Francq van Berkhey wrote: ‘Deze Pronk-Bedstede is versierd met Chitzen, Katoenen en andere Spreien; op drobben liggen grote hoofdkussens, die met breede kanten bekleed, en vooral bij de Landlieden, niet sneller dan 18 st., op deze bedden is metaal voorzien, gedeeltelijk aan beide zijden, en eene of de andere kant, met deel van een ander mondmoord, voor een zoowel ornament, eene of voor vrome vertrekking. Hij ziet geen kamer Bedstede met kleine Dekkens, en als dezeLasten geregeld worden, omdat hy iets, dat rignum wel naar een naer gemaakt worden, aan de Le Francq van Berkhey, Natuurlyke historie van Holland. 1773, deel 1.1, p. 153.

23 As has been stressed also by a.o. C. McConnell, Material Christianity.

It is tempting to regard Maassluis as a model for the Dutch Republic as a whole, as a model for the world we know from historical accounts about the Netherlands with its love for porcelain, Delftware, tea and other novel luxuries.
It must have been an impressive sight, but the room itself was not furnished comfortably, with only a bedstead, a bed and eleven chairs, but no table or lighting and in the hearth only one pair of tongs. Consequently, the ownership of luxury objects does not imply that everyday life became more ‘comfortable’: many of the luxury goods people acquired were displayed in rooms that were used only on special occasions, if at all. This leads us to the second restriction that should be made in respect to the special occasions, if at all.

Consequentially, the ownership of luxury comfortably, with only a bedstead, a bed and eleven chairs, but no table or lighting objects does not imply that everyday life became more ‘comfortable’: many of the women who dressed in this way were recognizable in a single glance as being from the country.

All of the variants however had one thing in common: the women who dressed in this way were recognizable in a single glance as being from the country. In some villages earpieces were worn by almost all local women except the wives of non-local dignitaries or those affiliated with the urban elites. Apart from the fishing village of Maassluis, this pattern also becomes visible in nearby Maasland, where even the rich trades-peoples wives followed the example of the farmers wives in the sense that they continued to wear headpieces. In the villages of Weesp and Weesperkarspel near Amsterdam, the situation was slightly different: here headpieces in particular were apparently associated with the agrarian class, and the wives of local trades-people parted with their earpieces as early as the first half of the 18th century, preferring to concentrate on nearby and metropolitan Amsterdam where the headpieces had grown out of fashion.

By wearing local dress, village people showed a self-consciousness that accentuated their community bond. Indoors, the same development can be noticed as the urban elites replaced their linen cupboards with fashionable cabinets and banned their Delftware to the cooking kitchens while villagers consciously cherished their linen cupboards and Delftware items as prouesses. This process of traditionalisation, as it has been called, was not a result of isolation, nor can it be regarded as a form of resistance to change: in fact, this development should be seen as part of a more general process of ‘modernisation’, in which many innovations were appropriated. What differed was the way in which objects were used: new textiles such as chintz from the Orient (for example) were used for Sunday clothes and not for domestic wear as was the case among the wealthy bourgeoisie.

6 / Town and countryside in 18th-century Europe

Provincial with consumer items was not something typical for Maassluis, nor something typically Dutch: nor can it be claimed that only the rural communities in the Dutch provinces were affluent enough to acquire such goods to flaunt with. Even the debate about flaunting was not typically Dutch: as has been noted, during the 18th century people began to discuss what came to be known as the luxury of peasants (by which they meant the growing opulence in some sectors of the rural communities) in several parts of Europe. For Tuscany, in the second half of the 18th century, moralists noted: “Store-bought purchases, particularly in urban shops, are growing. For weddings, tables are as bountiful as those of the wealthiest and most dissolute Eastern people. [...] Peasants living near cities have been seen attending urban theatres. But in particular clothing reveals the growing opulence of rural families. [...] The churches, on Sundays, are now places of ostentation and luxurious and multi-coloured fabrics, naturally to the detriment of religion.” In the Swedish fishing community of Ockero, where ownership and display of objects made of copper, pewter and silver was widespread and inventories also mentioned porcelain plates, mirrors and objects for making coffee and tea, the local elite was explicitly critical about the way some of their inhabitants flaunted their possessions. At a parish meeting of 1770, the extravagant display of luxury articles was condemned by the councilors, who said that: ‘… farm hands and young people who have got themselves pocket watches, silver shoe-buckles and meerschaum pipes should dispose of them.’

Ockero is an interesting case, since, like Maassluis, it was involved in herring fishery. Byron stresses however, that the forms of material display were well established long before the main influx of new settlers into the islands in the 1770s and the height of the fishery from 1790-1800. Furthermore, Ockero was situated near the large town of Goteborg, where both fashionable goods and urban ideas were available for the islanders.
It remains to be examined more systematically to what extent the peasants in Tuscany and fishermen in Ockero and Maassluis shared repertoires of flaunting, both within their own communities and with the people living in cities near by. In the cities also, people celebrated the customary calendar and dressed in their Sunday dress, eliciting critical comments from the elite. As noted before, town and country people did indeed share a lot, if only because in the 18th century a major part of the urban population consisted of migrants from the countryside. What remains a fact, is that throughout Europe over the course of the 18th century specific styles of dress and domestic furnishing developed that were labelled, recognized and cultivated as 'rural'.

In fact, already in the early 17th century there had been a development of stereotypical images of farmers and fishermen that had developed together with the notion that the Dutch Republic had become 'Frenchified', and that previously normal values and customs considered as essential to the identity of the Republic were lost. As parts of the elite seemed to affiliate with courtly ways of behaviour, so the stereotypical image of the rude, uncivilised peasant became less negative. Traces of this can already be found in the early 17th century among authors such as Roemer Visscher and Gerbrand Adriaensz Bredero, and in the midst of the 17th century among painters such as Jan Steen. As early as about 1700, next to the Parisian dolls dressed in fashionable dress, dolls dressed in local dress were also made. While parts of the elite trained themselves in the use of consumer goods in a 'courtly' manner, others

The development of locally cultivated cultures may have been stimulated by local notables as Hendrik Schim, but also by members of the ‘old’ elites living in cities such as Amsterdam and Rotterdam. Being the proud owners of countryside, these elites withdrew from noisy city life in the 18th century, temporarily or otherwise. At the same time, their interest in both the (in their view) idyllic and romantic sides of daily life in the country and the technical aspects of farming grew. Some patriots even went to Maassluis to see it for themselves, as if it was a curious attraction, and they wrote about it. One of them was Balthasar Huydecoper, who in 1730 even mentioned Maassluis as a ‘famous fishing village’. In the same way as tourists nowadays visit Volendam to see a fishing-village, in the 18th century they visited Maassluis. An example is Le Francq van Barkhey, one of the late 18th century ethnographers who described the local differences in dress and customs of fishermen, farmers and townspeople, both systematically and in a detailed way. It was here, in this village, that he encountered the authentic keepers of Dutch identity, and the kind of prank that needed to be cherished, not only as local but above all as national cultural heritage. Thus yet another meaning was added to the term *het pronken.*

8 / Conclusion

In the 17th and 18th centuries, various sorts of flaunting of one’s material goods existed, each of which could have had various meanings and performed various roles. In Maassluis the flaunting of one’s porcelain collection and Indian cottons was part of a lifestyle in which the flaunting of one’s family bible, silver, birth and wedding gifts, and Sunday clothes played an important role. What was performed through the flaunting, and what was the effect? At least the result was not necessarily more comfort in the sense that these precious possessions were used in an everyday context. Through the specific way of *pronken* as described above, the attachment to Christian virtues, family bonds and the local community was expressed.

Through performative display people made themselves visible outdoors on market days and major occasions such as weddings and funerals, but also indoors with the display of shiny goods in *pronskameren* and ‘best-rooms’. The collective ways in which flaunting was practiced may have had a cohesive effect. Experiencing radical economic, social and cultural change, the community bonds were accentuated through a collective ritualised, ceremonial use of objects in a way that turned into a means of image building, both for the people’s own groups and for others. Gradually, a concern for what we would now call ‘cultural heritage’ emerged. Sandwiched between those who adhered to the cultivation of (courtly and urban) aristocratic modes of behaviour and those who adhered to rural custom, the local elites were the ones who may have played a central role in this dynamic development.

Although important progress has been made in research on material culture, our focus too often remains primarily on the possession of consumer goods instead of on everyday practices and cultural differences in the actual use (or non-use) of objects. A focus on practices is important when researching luxury in the early modern period, since increased access to a wider range of commodities invited newer modes of behaviour that may have developed differently depending on the local context. While some people used their precious porcelain teacups for drinking tea, consciously refining their bodily gestures and modes of conversation as they did, others kept their teacups for display only, putting them safely away in a cupboard.

More in general, historical research on material culture may profit from an ethnological and anthropological approach. Developments in ethnology and archaeology during the last two decades have made us aware not only of the fact that objects only become meaningful within specific settings. They have also made us aware of the need to pay more attention to the role of the senses in everyday life and the need to reconsider the dichotomies that have been regarded as self-evident for too long, such as the dichotomy between conscious and unconscious behaviour, and between the sacred and the profane. As is the case nowadays, also in the early modern period the confrontation with new, eye-catching, economically, socially, and culturally highly valued luxury goods must have strongly appealed to people’s senses. Their appeal may have been even stronger as long as these goods were kept apart and fostered as special or even sacred objects.
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"Wohl dem der's sehen kann!"*
Private Amsterdam Art Collections, 1770-1860

CORNELIA FANSLAU

*R "Lucky the one, who can see it!" H. Sander, Beschreibung seiner Reisen durch Frankreich, die Niederlande, Holland, Deutschland und Italien; in Beziehung auf Menschenkenntnis, Industrie, Litteratur und Naturkunde insonderheit. Leipzig, 1783, p. 589.