1

EARLY PHOTOGRAPHY IN THE DUTCH EAST INDIES: THE POWER OF THE IMAGE

Sadiah BOONSTRA and Janneke VAN DIJK

Introduction

The Tropenmuseum in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, has in its collection 158 collodion negatives of the reliefs of the hidden base taken by Kassian Céphas (1844-1912) in 1890-1891[1]. One hundred and fifty two are original collodion negatives and six of these are reproduction negatives. Two collodion negatives of reliefs 068 and 0160 did not survive for reasons unknown to us. The negatives of the four photographs Céphas took, to give an impression of the way in which the hidden base is attached to the Borobudur, never reached the museum, also for unknown reasons.

It is a great privilege to have the remaining negatives in the collection. The experience of holding them is like holding a genuine treasure. It makes one extremely aware of their uniqueness as original sources of the hidden base. Without these negatives no reproductions could have been made. The negatives are the virtual witnesses of the one moment in history when the hidden base was laid bare in its entirety to be photographed. If a negative shatters to pieces onto the ground, a unique witness of the hidden base will be lost forever.

The prodigious experience of holding and looking at the negatives also raises many questions: what does it mean to scholars who study the hidden base, without actually being able to look at the reliefs in real life? Why do none of these scholars come to the Tropenmuseum to study the original negatives? What value then can be ascribed to the negatives and the valuation of reproduction? What does it mean if people study images and pictures? Are they virtual witnesses of something that in a way does not exist since it is hidden? Then, what exactly is the power of the image?

With these questions in mind the present authors focus in this short paper on early photography in the Dutch East Indies. How photography was valued in the Dutch East Indies in the 19th century and how does that reflect on a contemporary study of the hidden base?

Photographic experimentation in aid of science

The history of the photography image began in 1839 when Louis Daguerre developed a chemical process to affix an image to a light-sensitive surface. The daguerreotype produced a direct positive image on a silver-coated plate, but the image could not be reproduced unless it was copied onto another surface[2]. On 3 July 1839 François Arago (secretary of the Académie des Sciences) announced the French invention of photography widely in an address to the French Chamber of Representatives. Arago explicitly mentioned in his speech the usefulness of photography for archaeological research. He stated that no drawing could surpass the authenticity of photographs. Photography could reproduce the temples of Egypt and hieroglyphics without forgetting a single detail[3]. Deploying the power of natural light, the 'sun picture'

or 'pencil of nature' as photography was termed, seemingly allowed the world to reveal its truthfulness in pictures[4]. Immediately after its invention photography was regarded as quick and accurate. Moreover, the new techniques enabled scientists, students, and art lovers to study and compare antiquities and objects of art without having actually seen them[5]. From this follows that the main power of the image was considered to be its objectivity and its function as a virtual witness.

Since Napoleon's military and scientific expedition into Egypt around 1800, the interest in archaeology had become common in the whole of Europe. Although the focus lay on antiquities in the Near East, Greece and Italy this resulted also in an interest in antiquities outside those areas[6]. As a result of the general archaeological interest in Europe, the Dutch government had been active in the archaeological field in the Dutch East Indies since 1805. The focus lay mainly on the remains of Hindu-Javanese culture on Java[7].

This interest in Hindu-Javanese culture can be explained in terms of colonialism. The Dutch presence in the East Indies was completely dominated by economic interests. As a consequence, there was hardly any concern for the population and their contemporary culture. In Europe the image of the culture and of the political organization of the colonized people was negative. Colonized people were regarded as 'weaker' and 'morally lower' and contrasted with the European self-image. The colonisers tried to reinforce this image by contrasting the great achievements of the past of the indigenous people with what was regarded as the low level of contemporary indigenous culture[8].

As a consequence of this archaeological interest, the demand for detailed knowledge on antiquities and art treasures, both in Europe and the colonies increased immensely[9]. Thomas Stamford Raffles' *The history of Java* (1817) contained schematic engravings of antiquities and fine aquatints of ruined temples, but since then nothing of any importance had been published which was enlivened with detailed illustrations of Javanese antiquities. Photography seemed a promising technique for archaeological research. In a certain way it was one of the many reproduction techniques emerging in the nineteenth century, but one with exceptional possibilities[10].

The Dutch Ministry of Colonies was exceptionally early in giving a photographic assignment to the army health officer Jurriaan Munnich (1817-1865) in 1840. He was sent to 'test and employ photography in our tropical regions'[11]. To this end he had to make daguerreotypes of buildings and antiquities. However, under tropical circumstances the daguerreotype process is very difficult to execute, since the process is very sensitive to moisture and temperature. Due to these difficult circumstances of photographing the result of sixty-four photographs was rather disappointing[12]. In 1842 Munnich published an article about his photographic experiments in *De Kopiist*.

Instead, the assignment was given to the German, Adolph Schaefer, another daguerreotypist, who worked in The Hague in 1843[13]. At the time Munnich's failure became known in the Netherlands, Schaefer offered the Dutch government to supply photographs in return for a free passage to Batavia and an allowance for the first months. Schaefer received a large sum of money to buy new equipment and to visit Daguerre himself for some first-hand information in Paris. He departed for the Dutch East Indies with ten wooden crates and forty-nine cans with chemicals and silver plates[14].

In 1844 Schaefer arrived in Batavia and was ordered to photograph the statues in the collection of Hindu-Javanese sculpture of the Batavian Society of Art and Sciences (Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen), in charge of care, research and conservation of antiquities in the Dutch East Indies. Schaefer demanded 120 to 130 guilders, whereas prices of 10 to 15 guilders were usual in Europe.

According to the government his prices were much too high and it was decided to pay Schaefer a total of 800 guilders. After this assignment, he took photographs of the archaeological objects of the Society[15].

The year thereafter he departed from Batavia to photograph Borobudur where he made the first photographs (fifty-eight daguerreotypes) of the monument[16]. He experienced the same difficulties as Munnich. The preparation of the plates was very difficult under tropical circumstances and there was no suitable darkroom in the house that was set aside for him; wind and dust could enter freely into the traditional open building. Taking the picture was maybe even more difficult. Due to the narrow corridors of the Borobudur, he could not get sufficient distance of the reliefs to get them in their entirety on a single photograph. He was forced to take two overlapping photographs of the reliefs covering several plates, which was a rather expensive method and did not meet scientific standards. He envisaged needing 4000 to 5000 plates to get all the reliefs photographed to get the work done in four or five years. He was willing to undertake the task, but under certain conditions. He asked 150,000 guilders to be paid in monthly installments during the work. This was a huge sum for that period and beyond the financial capacities of the colonial government. Therefore, the governor general suspended the effort[17].

These early photographic experiments did not progress beyond the odd illustration as the production costs were out of all proportion. Although photography promised a cheaper alternative, the promise could not be met in the experimental period. Therefore photographic initiatives temporarily came to a standstill in the Dutch East Indies after 1845[18]. The government harked back to the more traditional graphic technique. F.C.Wilsen (1813-1889), an officer of the Royal Engineers, was commissioned to make drawings of Borobudur and all the reliefs in 1848. With the help of an assistant he drew 988 reliefs on 476 sheets in four years. The drawings show many inaccuracies and additions, on account of which they were not considered suitable for scientific study. Nevertheless, in 1873 a publication of his work was prepared by the director of the Museum of Antiquities in Leiden, Conrad Leemans (1809-1893)[19].

Isidore van Kinsbergen (1821-1905)

Only in 1862 the thread of photography of antiquities in the Dutch East Indies was picked up. By this time photography was widely used elsewhere for documenting ancient treasures and archaeological findings. The technical development in the photo-procede from Daguerreotype to collodion or wet-plate glass process had made photography less complicated and much faster. Egypt in particular was popular among archaeological scholars and adventurous travelers, who crossed the Mediterranean Sea in steadily growing numbers since Napoleon's expedition[20]. In the 1860s the English organized an 'archaeological survey' in India for which photography was used. For reasons of prestige the Dutch government did not want to stay behind[21].

In 1862 the Dutch government and the Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences, launched a new archaeology policy. A scientifically trained antiquities expert had to undertake an inventory tour to see, describe and comment on Hindu-Javanese antiquities. Photographs should be taken of the foremost examples of ancient Javanese culture so that these could be made available 'for the entire scientific world'[22].

The antiquities expert was found in Jan Frederik Gerrit Brumund (1814-1863), who had to make the inventory and indicate which antiquities should be photographed. A photographer was harder to find. In 1862 Isidore van Kinsbergen, photographer and theatre maker, delivered a beautiful set of photographs of Borobudur and the Prambanan temple complex to the Society, taken on a trip with governor-general

Sloet van de Beele. These photographs convinced the Society of his photographic and artistic abilities. The next year, the Society drew up an agreement with Van Kinsbergen, expecting around 300 photographs of the foremost Javanese antiquities within three years. Every month, Van Kinsbergen had to send six prints of new negatives to the Society. It was agreed that the Society would pay him 37,500 guilders, which indicates that photography still could not fulfil the promise of being a cheap alternative for drawings[23].

The Society left the issue as to how Van Kinsbergen should take photographs of the antiquities entirely to his own technical and artistic insights. In 1863 he started his assignment, which ended four years later. The Society was highly pleased with the result and commissioned Van Kinsbergen to make a series of photographs of Borobudur, for which he could choose his object freely[24]. In 1873 Van Kinsbergen took up the huge challenge of photographing Borobudur. He had a clear-cut task: only the finest and best preserved bas-reliefs had to be photographed. However, before he could set to his task, the temple had to be cleared of rubbish, for which he consulted the resident of Kedu extensively. It took an army of forced labourers several months to clear and clean the Borobudur. But then, the artist faced a new challenge[25].

Taking photographs in the tropics was by no means an easy job and especially not while traveling. The collodion process may have been more or less standardized as far as one could speak of this in the 19th century but in the tropics a photographer's knowledge of chemistry and optics was put to the test, since the atmospheric conditions had a major impact on the chemicals and the camera. The photographer had to work so quickly, as the high temperatures dried the collodion so fast that the sensivity to light declined dramatically, that there was barely time to check the compositions properly. It was only in 1880 that useful dry plates, which could be prepared beforehand, became widely available[26].

In 1865 Thomas Pryce, a British amateur photographer, published an article in *Tijdschrift voor Photographie* on the difficulties a photographer met in the Dutch East Indies. 'The heat, sometimes almost intolerable, the dust, the glare, the nonactinic quality of the light; the slight but constant wind, which keeps almost every leaf in motion, the dense and dark foliage, all produce difficulties, for the surmounting of which no ordinary amount of patience and perseverance is required. Add to these the expense and difficulty of procuring good chemicals, and the dampness of the atmosphere, which seems to delight in damaging everything to which it has access, and some idea may be formed of the troubles which had to be contended with'[27].

Years earlier, Schaefer had already experienced the burden of the narrow corridors. Now Van Kinsbergen was far more limited in his choice of objects than he had wished by their narrowness. He was only able to photograph entire relief on corners or directly in front of steps. To avoid the narrowness of the corridors he constructed a special scaffold, so that he could position his camera at enough of a distance to get two reliefs to appear on a single negative. Due to these difficulties and his personality the work progressed slowly. Sometimes it took him ten days to make one photograph[28].

Van Kinsbergen took 65 photographs of the Borobudur in total, but his choice of objects does not give an accurate impression of the temple, since several crucial photographs are missing. For instance, he did not take long shots in galleries to give an impression of the narrowness of the corridors. However, we must concur with the Batavian Society's conclusion, 'in all reasonableness we could not expect anything more from him'[29].

Van Kinsbergen strived for the most beautiful photographic depictions of the reliefs he could possibly make. In order to achieve this he first cleaned all the selected reliefs and sculptures. He removed the

dark, grey and green moss deposit from the reliefs using a brush from coconut palm, and clay from the surrounding area. He also tried to restore them to some extent as far as available materials allowed[30].

He also tried to acquire in his photographs of Javanese antiquities a sense of monumentality. As far as the situation allowed he sought for a view-point that showed off the characteristic form of the building, sculpture or artefact. He often photographed temples and large objects from a low angle to achieve this effect, creating a low horizon so that the objects stood out freely against the background. The viewer had to be given a good idea of the size and volume of an object. However, he never used people to give a sense of scale, although this is a tried and tested method in photography. For instance, in the 1890s, Kassian Céphas (1844-1912) often depicted himself and his son Sem amid the ruins of the Prambanan and the Borobudur[31].

Often, Van Kinsbergen worked with images that filled the entire picture or were simplified in order to do justice to details of the reliefs on richly decorated temples. Possibly, he sometimes chose a lens with a slightly wider angle that enabled him to creep up close to the subject while retaining a large depth of field. In contrast to the attention he paid to achieve this monumentality stand the few overall views he took of the places he visited[32].

Noteworthy is the way in which Van Kinsbergen creatively used the environment with its trees, bushes and streams to enliven his composition. He placed a screen behind a sculpture to isolate it from its environment when he wanted to emphasize the form and character. Occasionally he resorted to a pitch-black background that was to become his trademark. To this end, he removed the layer of emulsion of the negative[33].

In Van Kinsbergen's approach, each photograph he made had to be a small work of art. To achieve this, he occasionally resorted to a noticeable retouching of the negative which had little to do with scholarly execution of his assignment. Using this technique for an archaeological assignment is typical of Van Kinsbergen. In *De Gids* G.P. Rouffaer, expert on Java, praised the 'everlasting joy' of this image, 'The triumph of art as photography can be!'[34] In 1874 Van Kinsbergen completed his work and a year later twelve copies of his album on the Borobudur were published, each containing forty photographs[35].

Van Kinsbergen used direct sunlight to give depth and liveliness to the sculpture he photographed. As a consequence, the few photographs he took in the shadow have a greater flatness about them. The contrasting and dramatic use of available light makes his photographs interesting, but also less useable for scientific research. Leemans criticized Van Kinsbergen's use of light and shade: 'In many [pictures] the contrast between light and shade is too strong, so that the details of the original have become virtually unrecognizable. In general that shrill sharp distinction between black and white creates an unpleasant effect[36].

Besides Van Kinsbergen other photographers made photographs of antiquities, which resulted in a quite considerable production of archaeological photographs. However, the general public showed little interest in archaeological photographs. Nevertheless, the government only gave large assignment in the field of archaeology to maintain the uneven power balance which tipped the scales in favour of the colonial government in the Dutch East Indies[37].

Kassian Céphas (1844-1912)

From 1873 the government had less money for systematic archaeological research since the Aceh

war had broken out in that year. Thereupon many private initiatives developed. In 1885 the Union for Antiquities, Linguistics, Geography and Ethnography or Vereeniging voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde (Archaeological Union or Archaeologische Vereeniging) privately financed excavations of antiquities. It was founded in Yogyakarta by railway engineer Dr Ir J.W. IJzerman (1851-1932) and Isaac Groneman (1832-1912). Their best known undertaking is the excavation of the Prambanan temple complex during two years for which Kassian Céphas, the first professional Indonesian photographer made photographs[38].

Céphas' name was first mentioned in 1884. In that year Céphas took sixteen "photograms" for a book written by Groneman, court physician to Sultan Hamengkubuwana VII of Yogyakarta, on court rituals, dances and regalia. A few years later, in 1888 another book by the same author described the religious festivals and the ceremonial pageants and parades held in the *keraton* on such occasions. Again, Céphas provided the photographic record that constituted the principal value of these publications. As a court photographer he needed the Sultan's permission for such extracurricular activities; it was always requested and invariably granted. The documentation that Céphas was able to provide of the ceremonies performed in the *keraton* is virtually unique and a valuable source of late-nineteenth century Javanese cultural history[39].

Céphas' work appeared for the first time in print for a wider public in 1888. it concerned sixteen "photograms", actually collotypes, in a special portfolio to Groneman's publication *In den Kedaton te Jogjakarta.* With the publication of this booklet Groneman hoped to create interest in this aspect of 'Oriental' culture among the public in the Netherlands. With the permission of the Sultan, Céphas had made a set of more than sixteen pictures of Hindu-Javanese dance scenes. High reproduction costs, however, had forced the writer and publishers to limit publication to 16 collotypes only[40].

However, at the time he already had established his name. To Fontein, followed by Theuns and Asser, it seems likely that Céphas started his career as a photographer in the studio of Van Kinsbergen, since he is the only photographer who is known to have lived in Yogyakarta at the time[41]. However, Knaap believes that court photographer S.W. Camerik (1830-1897) trained Céphas between 1861 and 1871. Céphas was probably appointed court painter and photographer to the Sultan's *keraton* in Yogyakarta as early as 1871. He had received this appointment through the intervention of his friend, Groneman[42].

Céphas always tried to keep up with new developments and the many technical advances in the field of photography. In 1886, he bought a camera for 'photographic instantanee', which could take a picture in 1/400th of a second. Before that time, people being photographed had to remain still for a few moments, which sometimes proved rather difficult. Céphas wanted to make photographs of several sites in town with the new camera and sell large-size prints of them to the public for one guilder each. A few months later, the editor of the local newspaper stated that Céphas' 'photographic instantanee' could compete with the best photographic works from Europe. His work began to be regularly purchased as farewell presents for members of the local European elite when they left Yogyakarta for another place in the Archipelago or for Europe[43].

The period 1889-1890 seems to have been a busy time for Céphas. The reason was that The Archaeological Union had started activities aimed at the study and preservation of the ancient monuments of Hindu-Javanese civilization in Central Java. The temple complex at Prambanan had high priority. In 1890 the Netherlands-Indies government made 3000 guilders available for the completion of the work already begun on uncovering and photographing the site. Céphas made in 1889 and 1890 sixty-four

photographs of the temples Prambanan and Candi Siva within three months on instructions of Groneman. The result is an extremely accurate and comprehensive record, which turned out to be of considerable documentary value to the restorers of the temples and their reliefs[44]. Céphas' son Sem drew ground-plans and profiles of the buildings[45].

Céphas' work constitutes the most significant part of the publication of Groneman's *Candi Prambanan in Central Java After the Excavation,* which was photographed in 1889, but not published until 1893. But afterwards, Céphas's work was criticized by Rouffaer, the man who had praised Van Kinsbergen's work: Céphas had shown 'a lack of good taste' and had 'not given himself enough time to particularly represent certain things of exceptional beauty. The sixty-four photographs lack clarity, character and strength. Céphas has reduced photography to an ordinary mechanical craft'[46].

The already famous Borobudur was also high on the agenda of the Archaeological Union. In 1885 the first chairman of the Union, IJzerman, discovered accidentally the 'hidden base' of Borobudur. He expected that another 300 reliefs with explanatory inscriptions were lying under the ground[47]. IJzerman immediately recognized the value of his discovery and pleaded for research of the hidden base. He also had ideas about the manner in which this research should be carried out: "A narrow trench could immediately lead to this goal; the stones can be removed along several meters length and be put back in place after the work is carried out"[48].

The Union under the chairmanship of Groneman, who was IJzerman's successor since 1886, requested the colonial government to finance the uncovering and photographing of all the reliefs in phases. The request was not granted, but in the Netherlands the Minister of Colonies was prepared to finance this plan and made 9000 guilders available on his budget of 1890[49].

In 1890 Céphas was commissioned by the Union to take photographs of all the reliefs within six months. It was agreed that he would make fifteen prints of each negative[50]. A few years earlier Céphas had calculated that about 300 photographs would be needed for the project. It would take half an hour to shoot each picture and develop the glass negative. The technique used for the negatives was the dry gelatine process. It followed that an assignment would take 150 hours or thirty days of five hours. Céphas' price for the production was ten guilders. On the basis of this calculation, it would seem that Céphas received about one-third of the project's total subsidy[51]. The work could start and was carried out in accordance with IJzerman's ideas; a narrow trench was made, which was broad enough for Céphas to make his photographs. After he shot his pictures, the trench was closed and a new one was made[52]. Céphas made 164 photographs in total of the hidden base: 160 of the reliefs (one photograph of each relief) and four photographs that give a general impression of the hidden base. Up until this day, Céphas's photographs remain the only source of the hidden base and its reliefs. The entire series was published thirty years later in collotype by N.J.Krom in the standard work on the Borobudur.

In the early 1900s, father and son Céphas began to make fewer photographs for archaeological and other public purposes. The reason for this was that in 1901 the colonial government in Batavia had created the Oudheidkundige Commissie, or Archaeological Commission, whose activities encompassed the entire Archipelago. In 1913, the Oudheidkundige Dienst or Archaeological Service replaced the Commission. This organization took care of its own photography. The establishment of such a central body came as a heavy blow for local amateur archaeological unions, like the Archaeological Union, which used their own photographers. Moreover, there were fewer opportunities to cover large-scale festivities in and around the

keraton. Thus the routine aspects of photography, such as making portraits of individuals and families, started to become relatively important for Céphas. Furthermore, competition appeared in the form of commercial studios set up permanently in town, although Céphas was no longer bothered by itinerant photographers occasionally visiting Yogyakarta around 1900. At about the age of sixty, Céphas retired from the photography business[53].

The power of Céphas's photographs

Does anything of what in the meantime has been said help to enlighten the power of the image? We have seen that the early belief in the power of the image lay in its objectivity as a record. Therefore it was considered extremely suitable for archaeological study. When we compare Céphas' photographs of antiquities with those of Van Kinsbergen we notice a remarkable difference in approach. Van Kinsbergen was highly idiosyncratic in his selection of themes and subjects. His work was appreciated for his recognition of the beauty of ancient Javanese art. He photographed what he liked without a desire to convey to the viewer an overall impression of the monuments and sculptures. The power of his images lay in his artistic approach.

As opposed to Van Kinsbergen, the power in Céphas' images lies in the objective records they provide of monuments, antiquities, court nobility and ceremonial life in the *keraton.* He strived for a faithful, meticulous and complete record in his photographic work. Céphas was conscientious and fully aware of the importance of permanent records to posterity.

In line with this, Céphas captured the images of the reliefs of the hidden base without interpreting them. The nature of his photographs of the hidden base is objective and accurate and cause them to be regarded as a form of virtual witnesses. Looking at the images of the hidden base is almost as if one has actually seen the reliefs. The reproduction techniques of photography made it possible that his photographs were distributed and transferred to places where the information the images carry in them could be studied and interpreted. From then on the process of signification of the images started.

Since the Great Exhibition of 1851 in the Crystal Palace a massive rise in photographic awareness had taken place. It was the first of the general exhibition that celebrated photography as one of the newest application and achievement of industry and commerce[54]. Furthermore, from about the 1860s onwards a significant progress was made in photographic technology. These developments made it easier and quicker to reproduce photographs and brought about an increase in the availability of cheap photographic prints. As a consequence, the circulation of photographs exploded[55].

At the time Céphas made his record of the hidden base an established tradition of collecting and exchanging photographic images already existed. Collecting clubs were active in a wide range of areas such as archaeology and natural history. There were two overlapping 'trade routes' through which photographs moved. First, there were those reference collections of individual scholars that have since been deposited in larger institutional archive collections. Second, there were the centralized projects of photographic collection focused on the learned and scientific institutions. While their histories developed differently, they both focused on the promise of the virtual witness. The exchange system was important for the development of a scientific discourse that caused a professionalization of knowledge through the flow of information, the sharing of data and the maintenance of scientific 'social' networks[56]. From this follows that the flow of information in those networks created meanings of cultures[57].

The fifteen sets of virtual witnesses Céphas made were probably intended for such an exchange network. The photographs were distributed; they changed hands, found a use, a meaning and a value through their circulation in scientific and social networks[58]. At first, the photographs circulated mainly to discover the content of the image. Prof. J.H.C. Kern (1833-1917) started researching the hidden base and used Céphas' photographs to decipher the Sanskrit inscriptions on the reliefs in 1895. In 1911 Dr. Th. van Erp (1874-1958) made enlargements of the photographs and sent part of those to Kern for reconsideration, which resulted in the discovery of ten new inscriptions and a better reading of twelve others. Thirty years after the photographs were taken, in 1929, the French orientalist and indologist Sylvain Lévi (1863-1935) ascertained that the reliefs on the hidden base depicted the Mahakarmawibhangga. In 1933, Krom published an extensive analysis in Dutch of the Mahakarmawibhangga on the reliefs of the hidden base. These studies have never been challenged as the basis for contemporary knowledge and interpretation of the hidden base.

However, the value of Céphas' record cannot and must not be limited to the academic understanding of the content of the images he captured. The focus on the content of the image at the expense of historiographical interrogation of the record has meant a neglect of the other histories Céphas' photographs have to tell. The power of his images lies in the value they accrued and still accrue through the social processes of accumulation, possession, circulation and exchange in the scientific and social networks.

By the First World War, a shift in the valuation of photographic material occurred. The idea of photographs as a centralized resource began to decline. They moved from a public 'sphere' to a private one. Some photographs remained largely within the private domain of individual research and publication until they had outlived their usefulness for their originator and were archived, thus becoming 'public domain' or centralized resource[59].

During the research of this paper, the present authors discovered a number of prints of the hidden base in various institutions in the Netherlands[60]. A few of these series are registered as collection in the institutions, but even fewer are used for research. The majority of these sets are 'sleeping' in the archives. Noteworthy is also the fact that the Tropenmuseum possesses 158 collodian negatives of the hidden base, but that these are never studied.

It would be worthwhile to study the way in which Céphas' virtual witnesses were collected, how they were used and how they ended up in the archives they currently remain in. This migration of the series of the photographs of the hidden base would be an extremely interesting study as their power is generated in their signification. The meaning of his images is foremost inscribed in the way they are used and their trajectory. Through these trajectories we can interpret the human transactions and actions in general that enliven them. The present authors would recommend to consider the virtual witnesses of the hidden base by concentrating on exchange roles; consider them in terms of the history they carry within them and the histories around them: their historical refiguring. The power of the image lies not only in the content of the image itself, but foremost in the processes of collection and signification, which inscribe the character and qualities that are associated with the object in both individual and collective memories.

References

Adams, R. (1990) *Borobudur in Photographs Past and Present. Photographs in Dutch Collections*. Leiden: Leiden University Press.

A.J. Bernet Kempers, (1995) *'Borobudur's verbogen voet'* In: *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde,* vol. 111, Leiden: KITLV Press.

Edwards, E. (2001) *Raw Histories. Photographs, Anthropology and Museums.* Oxford / New York: Berg.

Fontein, J. (1991) *'Kassian Céphas. A Pioneer of Indonesian Photography'* In*: Toward Independence. A Century of Indonesia Photographed*. San Francisco: The Friends of Photography.

Groeneveld, A., (1989) 'Fotografie ten bate van de wetenschap. Inventarisatie van het land en de bevolking 1839-1920', pp. 15-49. In: Liane van der Linden, Anneke Groeneveld, Ineke Zweers and Stevan Wachlin, *Toekang portret; 100 jaar fotografie in Nederlands Indië* 1839-1939. Amsterdam: Fragment; Rotterdam: Museum voor Volkenkunde.

IJzerman, J.W. (1886), 'Iets over de oorspronkelijke voet van Boro Boedoer' In: *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde,* vol. 31, pp. 261-269. Batavia: Albrecht & Co., 's-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff.

Knaap, G. (1999) *Cephas, Yogyakarta, Photography in the service of the Sultan*. Leiden: KITLV Press.

Krom, N.J. and T. van Erp (1920), *Beschrijving van BaraBudur*. 's-Gravenhage: Marinus Nijhoff.

Krom, N.J. and T. van Erp (1931), *Beschrijving van BaraBudur*. 's-Gravenhage: Marinus Nijhoff.

Moeshart, H.J. (1991) 'Adolf Schaefer and Borobudur', In: *Toward Independence. A Century of Indonesia Photographed*. San Francisco: The Friends of Photography.

Ryan, J.R., (1995), 'Imperial landscapes: photography, geography and British overseas exploration, 1858-1872', pp. 53-79. In: Morag Bell, Robin Butlin, Michael Hefferman, *Geography and imperialism* 1820-1940. Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press.

Theuns de Boer, G. and S. Asser (2005) *Isidore van Kinsbergen* (1821-1905). *Fotopionier en theatermaker in Nederlands-Indië*. Leiden: KITLV Press.

Williams, C., (1998) 'A Nineteenth-Century Photographer: Francis Frith;, pp. 168-178. In: Paul Starkey, Janet Starkey, *Travellers in Egypt*. London/NewYork: I.B. Tauris Publishers.

Notes

[1] For an inventory of negatives, see Appendix.
[2] Williams 1998: 168-169.
[3] Theuns and Asser 2005:99.
[4] Ryan 1995:54.
[5] Groeneveld 1989:15-16.
[6] Theuns and Asser 2005:99.
[7] Groeneveld 1989:15-16.
[8] *Ibidem*:20
[9] Theuns and Asser 2005:99.
[10] *Ibidem*:95.
[11] Adams 1990: 10; Groeneveld 1989: 16.
[12] Moeshart 1991: 21.
[13] Groeneveld 1989: 16.
[14] Moeshart 1991: 21.
[15] *Ibidem*: 21.
[16] Munnich's fifty-eight daguerreotypes remain in the collection of the Prentenkabinet in Leiden, the Netherlands.
[17] Adams 1990: 10; Groeneveld 1989: 16; Moeshart 1991: 22.
[18] Theuns and Asser 2005: 39.
[19] Adams 1990: 10; Groeneveld 1989: 16.
[20] Theuns and Asser 2005: 99.
[21] Groeneveld 1989: 20.
[22] Theuns and Asser 2005: 39.
[23] Groeneveld 1989: 18-20, Theuns and Asser 2005: 41.
[24] Groeneveld 1989: 18-20.
[25] Theuns and Asser 2005: 73.
[26] *Ibidem:* 105
[27] Theuns and Asser 1005: 105, Pryce, 1865: 83, Zie ook Pryce: 1864.
[28] Groeneveld 1989: 18-20.
[29] Theuns and Asser 2005: 77; Adams 1990: 10-11.
[30] Theuns and Asser 2005: 75.
[31] *Ibidem:* 109-111.
[32] *Ibidem:* 109-111.
[33] *Ibidem:* 111.
[34] *Ibidem:* 115.
[35] Adams 1990: 10-11.
[36] Theuns and Asser 2005: 113.
[37] Groeneveld 1989: 20.
[38] *Ibidem:* 31.
[39] Fontein 1991: 46.
[40] Knaap 1999: 15.
[41] Fontein 1991: 46.
[42] Knaap 1999: 7.
[43] *Ibidem:* 15-16.
[44] Groeneveld 1989: 31; Fontein 1991: 46.
[45] Knaap 1999:16.
[46] *Ibidem:* 25.
[47] IJzerman 1886: 261.
[48] *Ibidem:* 267-268.
[49] Krom and Van Erp 1931: 101; Knaap 1999: 16.
[50] Groeneveld 1989: 32.
[51] Knaap 1999: 16.
[52] Bernet Kempers 1955: 225.
[53] Knaap 1999: 21.
[54] Williams 1995: 169.
[55] Edwards 2001: 29.
[56] *Ibidem:* 31-32.
[57] *Ibidem:* 39.
[58] *Ibidem:* 29.
[59] *Ibidem:* 46-47.
[60] For an inventory of the discovered sets of prints of the hidden base, see Appendix.

Appendix I

Collodion negatives of the hidden base by Kassian Céphas in the collection of the Tropenmuseum, Amsterdam

Relief	Inv.nr.			Relief	Inv.nr.	
01	1001	5739		027	1001	5765
02	1001	5740		028	1001	5766
03	1001	5741	repro negative	029	1001	5767
04	1001	5742	repro negative	030	1001	5768
05	1001	5743	repro negative	031	1001	5769
06	1001	5744		032	1001	5770
07	1001	5745		033	1001	5771
08	1001	5746		034	1001	5772
09	1001	5747		035	1001	5773
010	1001	5748		036	1001	5774
011	1001	5749		037	1001	5775
012	1001	5750		038	1001	5776
013	1001	5751		039	not in the collection	
014	1001	5752		040	1001	5777
015	1001	5753		041	1001	5778
016	1001	5754		042	1001	5780
017	1001	5755		043	1001	5781
018	1001	5756		044	1001	5782
019	1001	5757	repro negative	045	1001	5783
020	1001	5758		046	1001	5784
021	1001	5759		047	1001	5785
022	1001	5760		048	1001	5786
023	1001	5761		049	1001	5787
024	1001	5762		050	1001	5788
025	1001	5763		051	1001	5789
026	1001	5764		052	1001	5790

Relief	Inv.nr.	
053	1001	5791
054	1001	5792
055	1001	5793
056	1001	5794
057	1001	5795
058	1001	5796
059	1001	5797
060	1001	5798
061	1001	5799
062	1001	5800
063	1001	5801
064	1001	5802
065	1001	5803
066	1001	5804
067	1001	5805
068	not in the collection	
069	1001	5806
070	1001	5807
071	1001	5808
072	1001	5809
073	1001	5810
074	1001	5811
075	1001	5812
076	1001	5813
077	1001	5814
078	1001	5815
079	1001	5816
080	1001	5817
081	1001	5818
082	1001	5819
083	1001	5820

Relief	Inv.nr.	
084	1001	5821
085	1001	5822
086	1001	5823
087	1001	5824
088	1001	5825
089	1001	5826
090	1001	5827
091	1001	5828
092	1001	5829
093	1001	5830
094	1001	5831
095	1001	5832
096	1001	5833
097	1001	5834
098	1001	5835
099	1001	5836
0100	1001	5837
0101	1001	5838
0102	1001	5839
0103	1001	5840
0104	1001	5841
0105	1001	5842
0106	1001	5843
0107	1001	5844
0108	1001	5845
0109	1001	5846
0110	1001	5847
0111	1001	5848
0112	1001	5849
0113	1001	5850
0114	1001	5851

Relief	Inv.nr.		
0115	1001	5852	
0116	1001	5853	
0117	1001	5854	
0118	1001	5855	
0119	1001	5856	
0120	1001	5857	
0121	1001	5858	
0122	1001	5859	
0123	1001	5860	
0124	1001	5861	
0125	1001	5862	
0126	1001	5863	
0127	1001	5864	
0128	1001	5865	
0129	1001	5866	
0130	1001	5867	
0131	1001	5868	
0132	1001	5869	
0133	1001	5870	
0134	1001	5871	
0135	1001	5872	
0136	1001	5873	
0137	1001	5874	
0138	1001	5875	
0139	1001	5876	
0140	1001	1585	
0141	1001	5877	
0142	1001	5878	
0143	1001	5879	
0144	1001	5880	
0145	1001	5881	
0146	1001	5882	
0147	1001	5883	
0148	1001	5884	
0149	1001	5885	
0150	1001	5886	repro negative
0151	1001	5887	
0152	1001	5888	
0153	1001	5889	
0154	1001	5890	
0155	1001	5891	
0156	1001	5892	
0157	1001	5893	
0158	1001	5894	
0159	1001	5895	
0160	not in the collection		