1. Introduction

On 25 October 1779, Isaac Ouwater, a Dutch painter best known for his townscapes painted the peculiar picture that adorns the cover of this book. The painting depicts a street scene featuring a group of people jostling each other to enter a building. On closer inspection, the inscription reveals that the building in question was the Amsterdam office of the state lottery, run by bookseller Jan de Groot, and that it must have been lottery day. Tucked away between two inns, the ‘ninth house from the Dam’ at Kalverstraat nr. 10 was only a stone’s throw away from Dam Square, the centre of Amsterdam, and from numerous fellow publishers, booksellers, art shops, and print publishers. In 1742, someone taking a stroll from Dam Square, via the Kalverstraat, to the Munt and back along the Rokin, would have passed as many as forty-four bookshops and mapsellers, not even counting the smaller shops in the alleys. Many of these, including De Groot’s shop, had been occupied by booksellers, publishers, and engravers for well over a century.

In this book I argue that the spatial concentration of Amsterdam publishers and other producers of art and culture, as well as its persistence over time, are more than nice-to-know facts. The century-long use of Kalverstraat nr. 10 as a bookshop testifies to the importance of the local reproduction of skills and routines for sustained cultural achievements. Creative outbursts such as the ones in Renaissance Florence, fin-de-siècle Paris, and, the topic of this book, the Dutch Golden Age can, at least partly, be explained by specific local conditions. But what are these conditions, and how do they enable the turning of creative potential into cultural, but also commercial, achievements? In this book these questions are studied through the case of the early modern Dutch Republic, and the answer is sought in the industrial organization of cultural production and consumption.

The research traces the development of two markets for cultural goods – paintings and books – through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Both have been extraordinarily well-researched by experts on art, books, their makers, and their admirers. My aim is to integrate this research through the quantitative mapping of spatial and diachronic patterns, and through the use of analytical concepts from the academic fields of economic geography and cultural economics. The concepts of ‘spatial clustering’, ‘cultural industries’, and ‘life cycle’ in particular make it possible to interpret familiar patterns in novel ways, because they bridge the macro-level explanations favoured by social scientists with the micro-level research of specialized historians.
The Dutch Golden Age

Between the 1580s and 1650s, the Dutch Republic of the Seven United Provinces (hereafter referred to as the Dutch Republic) became the centre of the world economy. The question of how such a small country, in the midst of political troubles, could come to domination has long puzzled historians. Epitomized by world-famous painters such as Rembrandt and publishing houses like the Blaeu firm, cultural production also reached unprecedented levels in terms of scale, scope, and quality during this famous Golden Age. The sheer volume and variety of genres and styles are as much a characteristic of Golden Age culture as the large number of high-end artists. Dutch painters, for instance, produced a breathtaking number of paintings in a variety of genres; a figure in the region of several million is now commonly accepted. For book publishing, estimates are equally impressive: the Republic had the highest per capita consumption and production of books in Europe, and Dutch publishers and merchants fulfilled important export functions. The success, however, did not last, and from the late seventeenth century onwards, the Dutch economy, including its cultural markets, lost much of its momentum (Figure 1.1). Other countries caught up, local markets were saturated, and the market

Fig. 1.1 Number of painters and publishers active in the Dutch Republic, 1580-1800
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for paintings was hit particularly hard when substitute products such as wall hangings became increasingly popular.

How can the dramatic rise in the production and consumption of cultural goods such as art and books be explained? For a long time, historians have attributed the success of Dutch Golden Age painting and publishing to general favourable circumstances as well as to the ingenuity of creative minds. Economic prosperity, population growth, secularization of demand, relative freedom of press and thought, high levels of literacy, and a developed trade network provided fertile ground for cultural production, while artistic geniuses pushed quality and innovation further and further by introducing new subjects and techniques. From these explanations, a coherent picture emerges of the context in which the painting and publishing industries developed, but it leaves unspecified where exactly the favourable circumstances and the artistic geniuses crossed paths. For an answer to this question I turn to economic art historians and urban historians, who suggest we look at markets and cities to identify the mechanisms that propelled cultural production.

**Economic art history: markets**

The field of art history offers convincing additional explanations for the cultural upswing in the Dutch Golden Age. The general premises in what is now widely known as economic art history are that paintings can be seen as commodities, artists as entrepreneurs, and buyers as rational consumers. French-American economist John Michael Montias has been credited with sparking the field of ‘art and market’ studies in the early 1980s through his use of both general economic theory and micro-level archival research to analyse the size and composition of Dutch local art markets. By so doing he revisited questions that had already been asked by art historian Wilhelm Martin in the first decade of the twentieth century but that remained shelved for more than half a century: ‘What was the origin of the hundreds, nay thousands, of pictures which were produced in Holland in the short period from about 1620 to 1700? What motives, what circumstances, occasioned their production? How were the pictures painted, and for what purpose? How did their authors live, and how did they earn their livelihood?’

Now, thanks to manifold studies on these issues by scholars such as Neil De Marchi and Hans Van Miegroet, Marten Jan Bok, Eric Jan Sluijter, Filip Vermeylen, Jan De Vries, and Ad van der Woude, early modern Dutch art and artists have been relatively well examined from an economic perspective. This approach has also been applied to other times and places, but it has
taken hold particularly firmly in the Netherlands, alongside the study of painting of the Golden Age. In book history, publishers and printers have been recognized as entrepreneurs and traders, but a distinct specialization of economic book history was never established. Although studies of the production of books during the Dutch Golden Age discuss many aspects of the business of printing and the book trade, they tend to do so without the explicit use of economic theory or methods of analysis.

The economic approach has informed the by now widely held belief that market forces did much to shape early modern Dutch cultural production. In particular, it has brought to the fore the fortuitous meeting of supply and demand conditions in the first half of the seventeenth century, as well as the successful strategies employed by Dutch painters to tap into new and existing markets. After Antwerp fell to the Spanish in 1585, cities in the Northern Netherlands began to take over as commercial centres, seeing a dramatic increase in wealth, while the last decades of the sixteenth century also witnessed the influx of skilled craftspeople from the Southern Netherlands. At a time when demand for luxury goods increased, immigrant-producers were ideally placed to provide these goods in great quantity and variety.

These favourable conditions shaped a large and varied domestic market, and to meet this demand painters had to increase productivity, preferably without sacrificing the quality of their works. They were able to save time while also introducing novelties for affordable prices, and through the development of novel and affordable types of paintings they managed to further broaden and deepen the market for images. The artistic innovations for which Dutch Golden Age painting became famous, most notably the inconspicuous yet powerful landscapes associated with Jan van Goyen, can therefore be seen as not only creative achievements, but also as product and process innovations that lowered production costs and increased output.

These economic art historical studies also revealed that markets are not simply the net sum of exchanges between buyers and sellers who behave rationally but constellations of institutions, social relations, and conventions. Historians such as Jan de Vries, Marten Jan Bok, and Maarten Prak have emphasized that market conditions alone cannot account for the dramatic expansion of the Dutch art market. A large, sophisticated, and varied market is a necessary but not in itself sufficient condition to account for outstanding achievements, and the cultural expansion in the Dutch Golden Age was supported by formal and informal institutional structures such as local guilds. Increasingly, studies of the early modern Dutch art and book markets have started to recognize the importance of social networks and institutions for cultural market development. Their role, however, has
yet to be analysed in a systematic way.\textsuperscript{21} With this study I aim to redress this, by focusing less on market forces and more on the issue of local organization, especially on an urban level.

**Urban history: cities**

A second set of explanations for cultural booms can be found in the field of urban history. In recent decades the relationship between cities, creativity, and innovation has become of particular interest to academics and policymakers following what has become known as the ‘creative city’ debate.\textsuperscript{22} But even before the notion of creative cities was popularized, several historians and geographers observed that there is something specifically urban about cultural achievements, and about innovation and creativity in general.\textsuperscript{23} In his book *Cities in Civilization: Culture, Innovation and Urban Order*, Peter Hall asked why ‘the creative flame should burn so especially, so uniquely, in cities and not the countryside […]’?\textsuperscript{24} And in the edited volume on material and intellectual culture in early modern Antwerp, Amsterdam, and London, Patrick O’Brien has posed the question, ‘Why do recognized and celebrated achievements, across several fields of endeavour, tend to cluster within cities over relatively short periods of time?\textsuperscript{25} Cities are often viewed as inherently open sites where people and ideas meet and where the entrepreneurial spirit convenes with the reception and adoption of ideas, a union that in turn gives way to innovation. While the relationship between cities and creativity may seem irrefutable at first sight, further investigation into correlation and causation is warranted. How sudden were the onsets and closings of such golden ages really? What do we mean when we speak of urban creativity, innovation, and achievement? And how helpful is it to view them as distinctly urban phenomena? For even if cities were usually the sites of cultural achievements, this does not necessarily mean that they were also their source.\textsuperscript{26}

Economic geographers refer to the more specific advantages that urban areas may offer to producers and consumers as agglomeration economies.\textsuperscript{27} First of all, cities provide access to shared infrastructure such as finances and transport, to a sizable and varied market, and to a sizeable and varied labour force. Such advantages, also known as urbanization economies, are in theory available to all urban participants, and they help producers and consumers alike to cut costs and save time. Secondly, cities also provide opportunities for market participants to be in close proximity to each other. This facilitates specialization, differentiation, exchange of know-how and information, and collaboration, which, in turn, may reduce costs and foster innovation and yield quality improvements – advantages known as localization economies.
It is not difficult to see how urbanization and localization economies may have been at work in early modern European cities in general and in the highly urbanized Dutch Republic in particular. By the sixteenth century, urban Europe had several large cities with over 100,000 inhabitants and a host of smaller towns integrated in regional urban networks. These cities and towns, hosting a number of specializations, ranged from capitals, through court and port cities, to trading and university towns. Many of the large commercial and financial centres also established reputations as hotbeds of innovation and culture. The advantages of such centres for cultural entrepreneurs were well summarized in the sixteenth century by one of the most important publishers in history, Christophe Plantin, in a letter to Pope Gregory XIII: ‘I chose to settle down in Belgium and in this town of Antwerp in particular. What made me decide this was the fact that, in my opinion, no town in the world provides more advantages for the profession I wanted to pursue. It is easy to get here; one sees different countries getting together at the market; one also finds all the raw materials which are indispensable for my craft; and for all professions there is no problem of finding labourers who can be instructed within a short time’. In other words, commercial towns such as Antwerp offered entrepreneurs such as Plantin plenty of opportunities for easy market access as well as for saving costs on materials and labour.

The concept of agglomeration economies is helpful in explaining why cultural production is concentrated in cities rather than the countryside, and why cities that score high on available infrastructure and resources might be particularly attractive to cultural entrepreneurs. Given the rapid commercial development of the already highly urbanized Dutch region during the seventeenth century, we would expect to see nothing less than an expansion of urban cultural production and consumption during the Golden Age. But even if the relationship between the cultural and the commercial seems clear cut, not all large cities were cultural hotbeds, and relatively small cities such as Utrecht and Haarlem could also play major cultural roles. And even if it helps us understand why we should turn to cities when researching cultural achievements, these advantages do not explain how exactly the range of innovations and quality improvements that characterize the Dutch Golden Age came into being. In order to address these questions, my own research focuses less on general urban characteristics and more on local industrial interactions. This approach thus neatly complements explanations that focus on the genius of individual entrepreneurs or firms as well as explanations that emphasize general economic circumstances or urban amenities. In order to operationalize such a meso-level approach, I propose to view the early modern Dutch book
and art sectors as cultural industries with their own socio-economic and spatial organizational structures.32

Cultural industries

Critical theorists Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer coined the term culture industry in the 1930s in their work on popular culture vs. high culture, but today industries involved in the production of cultural artefacts are contrasted mainly with ordinary manufacturing and service industries.33 The purpose of viewing different types of cultural artefacts such as art, books, and architecture as products of the same source – cultural industries – has a straightforward purpose; namely to shed light on how cultural economic competitiveness may be created and sustained. From the 1990s onwards, culture and knowledge have increasingly been presented as the key ingredients for promoting urban and regional economic development in post-industrial societies.34

As a result, research on the relationship between culture and economics has become more urgent to academics and urban planners, as is evident from the popularity of terms such as ‘creative industries’, ‘creative city’, ‘creative class’, ‘cultural entrepreneurship’, and ‘creative economy’.35 It is important to note that these terms often feature as policy catchphrases rather than academic tools of interpretation and explanation. However, the academic literature itself is not all that clear and consistent in defining what they mean. Rather than adding to hype and the often indiscriminate application of these terms to historical case studies, I wish to specify what they mean for me and what they can and cannot contribute to the present study of pre-industrial societies.36

The words creative and cultural are often used interchangeably, and while they may indeed overlap in practice, cultural production is not by definition creative, and creative activities are not always cultural.37 Since my research is concerned with the production of cultural goods rather than with creativity or intellectual property in general, I will employ the term cultural industries rather than creative industries. Most definitions of the cultural industries are based around a combination of five main criteria: creativity, intellectual property, symbolic meaning, use value, and methods of production and distribution.38 The list of cultural industries varies according to the different emphases in definitions, but most scholars agree on the inclusion of the arts, print media and publishing, cultural heritage, audio-visual media (film, music, television,
video, computer games, etc.). Still, the issue of inclusion is not a minor one. Different definitions can, for instance, lead to dramatically different outcomes in terms of economic impact, since a more inclusive categorization amplifies the (perceived) economic relevance of a sector. The scope of the definition also leaves the concept prone to criticism as to its analytical value since it is hard to maintain that all these activities, from art to entertainment to advertising, genuinely share comparable sources of competitiveness.

Although cultural products may be heterogeneous, the sectors that make them are all engaged in the creation of artifacts that are exchanged in commercial transactions but whose symbolic or aesthetic qualities are high relative to their utilitarian purposes. Cultural industries do not just share commonalities in terms of the type of products involved – what I shall define as cultural – but they also share a strong sensitivity on the demand side to rapidly changing fashions and unpredictable consumer preferences in general. And they embody a tendency to compete with one another on the basis of novelty, differentiation, and quality, rather than in terms of radically innovative technology or costs alone. These characteristics have consequences for the ways in which market participants in cultural industries behave and by implication for the ways in which these industries are organized. This, in turn, influences the ways in which industrial competitiveness can be developed and sustained.

In this book I look at the features and consequences of early modern Dutch cultural industrial organization. The aim is not to demonstrate the existence of cultural industries or assess their importance for economic development, but to ascertain whether or not the explanatory frameworks that accompany these terms hold any potential for research into historical cultural achievements such as those of the Dutch Golden Age. One of the most important frameworks in explaining patterns of cultural competitiveness is that of spatial clustering: the geographic concentration of interconnected companies, consumers, and associated institutions in a particular sector or field, linked by commonalities and complementarities.

**Spatial clustering**

Economic geographers have not only observed that artistic and commercial achievements in cultural industries tend to take place in cities, but they point out that these industries tend also to be embedded in distinct organizational structures. Production and consumption often take place in
small- to medium-sized firms that maintain flexible relationships with each other and with customers, are located in close proximity to one another in urban areas, and are underpinned by local institutional support. Such geographic and social concentration of producers in similar or related economic activities is also known as spatial clustering, the most famous contemporary example being the high-tech hub of Silicon Valley.

Although the observation that economic activities tend to cluster in specific places can be traced back well over a century, it gained much more traction in recent years. Researchers and policymakers inferred that this distinct organizational characteristic must offer distinct advantages for post-industrial economies. In general, economic geographers argue, the interaction between producers, consumers, and suppliers, located in close proximity to one another, can create a positive industrial atmosphere, or ‘buzz’. More specifically, the main advantages of clustering have to do with economic efficiency and innovation that are external to the firm but internal to the (local) industry. Spatial proximity allows producers to share a specialized pool of labour and suppliers and eases reproduction and transmission of relevant knowledge and skills. Local industrial concentration may therefore lower costs of search, transaction, and transport, while at the same time facilitating the learning and innovation that enable cultural industries to flourish.

Although the concept of spatial clustering is modelled on contemporary industrial development, there is no reason to assume a priori that early modern producers and consumers did not experience similar benefits from clustering. In fact, the characteristics of post-industrial economic sectors in some ways resemble the organization of pre-industrial crafts. Much like their modern counterparts, early modern cultural firms were small-to-medium-sized firms that often required skilled and specialized labour, faced volatile demand, competed on the basis of product differentiation, and clustered in urban areas.

Note too, that spatial clustering theory has an explicitly historical component since it recognizes that relationships between the producers in a cluster evolve over time and become rooted in specific socio-professional networks and locations. Interactions within geographic concentrations of producers, consumers, and institutions in similar or related fields therefore may have considerable and long-term benefits for the relative competitiveness of those involved. These benefits in turn influence productivity, the direction or pace of innovation, and the character or number of new start-ups, resulting in a self-reinforcing growth dynamic. What follows from this is that location itself can become a key competitive asset, because a complex set
of relationships, historically developed and location dependent, is difficult to reproduce elsewhere.\textsuperscript{47} The question I raise in this book is if and how the evolution of early modern Dutch cultural industries of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was shaped by such specific forms of local industrial organization. Although cluster theory can offer a coherent framework with which to research how place and time might have affected the development of the early modern Dutch painting and publishing industries, it also comes with several weaknesses.\textsuperscript{48} To offset these, adaptations to the general analytical framework of clustering are introduced below. The new framework's primary strength is its ability to organize the plethora of information available in the literature on early modern Dutch cultural industries while promoting an inclusive, long-term, and comparative approach.

A dynamic analytical framework

In order to apply cluster theory to the case of the early modern Dutch Republic, the general theory of spatial clustering can be made more specific. My main concern here is the relative lack of attention given in the academic literature on clusters to structural differences between the composition of local production systems, between types of economic activities or industries, and between stages in the cluster’s existence. I shall add three complementary analytical tools in order to redress these issues: Michael Porter’s diamond model, Richard Caves’s model of the properties of creative industries, and the concept of the industry life cycle.

Michael Porter’s diamond model

Spatial clusters can be conceptualized through what is commonly referred to as the ‘diamond model’ (Figure 1.2).\textsuperscript{49} Developed by economist Michael Porter, this model underscores the interactions between four main sets of local factors: demand conditions; factor conditions; related and supporting industries; and firm strategy and rivalry. The more intense the interactions between these four bases, the greater the productivity of the firms involved. The model emphasizes that strategies and structures of firms are strongly contingent on these specificities and that such local business environments differ between towns, regions, and countries. The diamond model also clarifies that spatial clustering is more than a co-locating of producers; rather, it is about the relationships between different actors that are in close
proximity of one another and that develop over time.\textsuperscript{50} Using this model for the analysis of early modern painting and publishing, I anticipate, will help to identify important actors and relationships in local production systems as well as (potential) sources of industrial competitiveness.

**Caves’s properties of cultural industries**

In this study, the sectors of painting and publishing are both presented as examples of cultural industries. However, within the group of economic activities that qualify as cultural industries, there are also marked differences. The products of the painting and publishing industries can differ considerably in the degree to which aesthetic or symbolic distinctions prevail over more functional purposes. Arguably, a handbook on accounting has more direct functional use than, for instance, a painting of a landscape. A closer look at the work of Richard Caves on creative industries helps to interpret the potential role of clustering for patterns of growth and innovation in different cultural industries.\textsuperscript{51} Caves has argued that the specific properties of services and goods have consequences for the behaviour of producers and consumers, and accordingly also for the economic organization of the sector, contracts in particular.\textsuperscript{52} Applying this reasoning to creative industries, he identified and classified seven main properties (Table 1.1) and explained how such properties can give rise to distinct forms of industrial organization. In the case of cultural industries, features such as high levels
of demand uncertainty and quality uncertainty or the prominence of highly specialized skills can, for instance, amplify the possible benefits of spatial clustering. This implies that the role of industrial organization in shaping patterns of competitiveness can also vary between different types of economic activity. Variations in the intensity of the properties can also influence the dynamic in Porter's diamond model, for instance in terms of the relative importance of relationships with consumers; potential appeal to foreign markets; production methods and the intensity of competition; and the use of related and supporting industries. Analysing two industries that demonstrate comparable but different characteristics helps me to clarify the importance of both general and industry specific developments as well as the importance of spatial clustering in different economic activities.

Table 1.1 Properties of creative industries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties of creative industries</th>
<th>Implications for market organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nobody knows: demand uncertainty</td>
<td>High risks involved, overproduction, importance of selection mechanisms, close relations with (potential) consumers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinite variety: endless horizontal and vertical differentiation</td>
<td>Information asymmetries, importance of selection mechanisms, potential for creating demand (niches)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art for art’s sake: attitude of producers towards their products</td>
<td>Abundance of (would-be) artists, relatively low profit margins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motley crew: projects involve complex interactions</td>
<td>Network embeddedness, flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time flies: timing is essential</td>
<td>Flexibility, distribution, marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ars longa: durability of products</td>
<td>Copyright protection, oversupply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-list/B-list: creative inputs are vertically differentiated</td>
<td>Ranking of talent, skewed income distribution, importance of gatekeepers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Caves 2000

Stylized industry life cycles

Cluster theory is often unclear on the origins of spatial industrial concentration. Few studies have taken a long-term approach, and most research is limited to periods in which cultural clusters are highly successful. Recently, though, a growing historical sensitivity has developed within spatial clustering theory, perhaps most pronounced in the model of the industry life cycle. The general idea in this model is that industries converge to common patterns, known as stylized life cycles and characterized by four stages: emergence, growth, maturity, and decline or saturation (Figure 1.3). The
speed with which industries move through the cycle depends on the type of industry it is and the prevailing competitive circumstances. Stages in the life cycle differ not only in terms of size of the sector and growth rates, but also in type and degree of innovation, character of firms (old or new, large or small), and patterns of spatial distribution (concentrated or dispersed).

What happens in one stage also affects the next one, as previously acquired competitive advantages determine the available options and adaptive capacities in later stages. This dynamic is also known as path dependency. This does not always have positive effects, as it can also cause a reduction of adaptive capacities, known as ‘lock-in’, due to the resilience of established routines and relationships. In itself, however, life cycle theory has no fundamental explanatory power. Like Porter’s diamond model, it offers only a simplified reflection of reality, not its complete and true representation nor detailed causal development. The life cycle model does however allow us to trace the way in which local industries move from one stage to the next more precisely, and distinguish between factors that initiate and factors that sustain upswings in economic and cultural activity. This is particularly interesting in the case of early modern cultural production, since the patterns in the output of book publishing and painting clearly diverged after c.1660. Attending to life cycle histories compels me to consider not only the period of success – the Golden Age – but also the often disregarded eighteenth century.

**Book structure and approach**

This study offers a novel interpretation of Dutch artistic and commercial achievements during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It does so by developing a long-term analysis of diachronic and spatial patterns of artistic and economic competitiveness in Dutch painting and publishing, and by testing and adapting the explanatory framework of clustering for this historical case study. Informed by the larger question of how to explain the extraordinary cultural production in the Dutch Republic, I developed an all-embracing quantitative and qualitative approach, made possible thanks to the numerous studies on art and book production and access to large datasets for both.

Early modern Dutch cultural production is extraordinarily well researched. The general context in which paintings and books were produced has received ample attention, and centuries of detailed investigations by art and book historians have yielded a wealth of data on producers and the
products they made. In recent years, important datasets have been built that allow for statistical analyses of this information. For the quantitative analyses in this book, extensive research was carried out on the basis of four datasets: Short Title Catalogue Netherlands (STCN) and Thesaurus 1473-1800 (Thesaurus) for books and publishers, and ECARTICO and RKDartists& for artists and art. The datasets are comprehensive enough to allow for statistical analysis, but to accurately interpret the estimates of size, scope, and quality of production presented in this book, a brief discussion of the limitations of these data-sets is provided in Appendix I.

In addition to the aggregate data on the Dutch Republic and its most important cultural centres, one town in particular takes centre stage. Amsterdam was the largest town in the Dutch Republic as well as the most important and most culturally diverse centre. This case study serves to take a closer look at the local production system and illustrate the findings. In order to identify common characteristics of local groups of painters and publishers, the method of prosopography has been applied. Prosopographical research aims to identify patterns of relationships and activities of a group of people through the study of their collective biography. Here this was done by collecting and analysing biographical data concerning the occupational groups of painters and publishers for several sample years: 1585, 1600, 1630, 1674, and 1742 (see Appendix I).

The research I undertook is organized in two parts in order to separate the trajectories of the two industries. This helps to present the material in
an accessible manner, and it makes for an analytically meaningful outline of industrial trajectories. In the conclusion, the differences and similarities between the two industries are discussed in more depth. Both parts are subdivided into four chapters each, and the chapters are arranged chronologically. This choice is not arbitrary as the time periods studied in the individual chapters correspond to distinct stages in the life cycles of the industries. Within the chapters, Porter's diamond model is used where possible to distinguish between different key determinants of competitiveness and to trace the relationships between them. For both industries, the period 1610-1650 is treated more extensively, over two chapters, because the evidence and arguments presented there are crucial to the central question of this book: How can we explain the high levels of cultural production of the Golden Age?
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