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ABSTRACT

Popular images of people and places, usually in the form of cheap print, existed well before industrialization. This chapter focuses on the development of popular visual media that are relevant to stereotypical thinking and visual clichés. It reconstructs when and how technology, epistemology, and politics – reproducible images, objectivity claims, and national discourse – amalgamate into these all too familiar clichés. To this end, this chapter considers mass production and popularity of images, aesthetic principles imposed by available technologies, the negotiation of claims to truth, and realism attributed to the images. Perspective prints and catchpenny prints are discussed in detail. The change of classificatory categories in the description of images of people and places results in new insights about the moment when national categories gained importance in the description of people and places.
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3.1 INTRODUCTION

Images of people and places existed well before industrialization, even in popular formats. Popular images, usually in the form of cheap print, were seen by people of different ranks across western Europe and its overseas colonies. This chapter will serve as a backdrop against which we will see diversity, continuity, and change in both motifs and functions of images of people and places.

Instead of an encompassing overview, this chapter focuses on those aspects relevant to stereotypical thinking and its visual expressions in clichés: when and how did technology, epistemology, and politics – reproducible images, objectivity claims, and national discourse – amalgamate into those clichés with which we are all too familiar? To answer this question, mass production and popularity of images, aesthetic principles imposed by available technologies, and the negotiation of claims to both truth and realism attributed to the images will be considered. The change of classificatory categories in the description of images of people and places will be traced to show when the national gained importance in the marking of difference among people and places.

The European nation-state, as we know it today, started to take shape in the course of the late seventeenth century. What “nation” would mean in relation to the state differed largely over the course of the centuries. For this chapter, the decades around 1800 are particularly relevant, as this is the time when nation-states were founded across Europe, and when researchers in the newly emerging empirical disciplines such as anthropology and geography (previously parts of natural history and history) applied the national as a central category in their work. In his reference work *La Révolution Française, 1789-1799*, Michel Vovelle (1992) explains the change in meaning of the term “nation” before and after the French Revolution. Before the French Revolution, the king was the sovereign, and “nation” was confounded with fidelity to monarchy. As the dividing line between the people and the aristocracy was sharp, “nation” did not refer to the people. After the fall of the monarchy, the term “nation” became identified with the people and “the nation” filled the void left by the sovereign, hence the association of the “nation” with the Republic. As I will argue, visual media helped to consolidate this new understanding of nation and nationality by providing visual evidence for national differences.
A selection of popular seventeenth- and eighteenth-century visual media, images, and travel writings will clarify when the preconditions are met so that one can ask the question “where does supposed common knowledge about the Dutch and the Netherlands come from?”. This question holds at least three implications. First, images and discourses need to be widely spread across social classes, time, and space in more or less the same form. While single, unique images, even when moved and exhibited, can only be seen by a small number of people, widespread images require a technology for reproduction of images. The first technique that allowed this was woodblock printing. Although it was invented in the Chinese empire as early as 220 BC, it only became known in Europe around 1450 AD.

Second, images and the discourses in which they appear need to make a truth claim about the (visual) representation of people and places, i.e. topographical and ethnographical truthfulness must be relevant criteria. This requires the emergence of a specific concept of science and faithful pictorial representation in which empirical, quantitative, and descriptive research methods (such as field work and measuring) are valid approaches and are accepted as accurate. It also requires an epistemology in which these concepts have their place in methodology. This new kind of “realism” gained importance in the early seventeenth century. Visual expressions of this interest in “realism” are found, among other places, in (Flemish) genre paintings of everyday life (see Chapters 3.3 and 6).

Third, the categories “the Dutch” or “the Netherlands” must figure as meaningful descriptors. In order to state that an image shows “a typical Dutch scene” or “the Dutch man”, the national must be an established category of difference. National attributions gain impact in the aftermath of the French Revolution in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century.

### 3.2 VISUAL CULTURE BEFORE INDUSTRIALIZATION

The interrelation of different visual media, beliefs existing in a society, and a refusal to understand social realities and their (visual) representations as two discrete entities make it reasonable to embed this study in what has emerged as the academic field called Visual Culture. Visual Culture is an interdisciplinary field bringing together scholars from history, art history, media studies, and literary studies. Visual Culture defends the visual aspects of the objects studied against a restrictive notion of text stemming from semiology that would not distinguish between the “text” of writing and the “text” of images. Visual Culture also breaks with a traditional approach in art history that restricts itself to “aesthetically important” fine arts produced by genius
artists-authors. Visual Culture explicitly defends mundane everyday life items, such as advertising posters and comic strips, as valuable objects in academic research (Cf. Mitchell 2005, especially 346–350).

Within the study field of Visual Culture, emphasis is put on the study of modern and postmodern societies, thus covering mainly the period from the nineteenth to the twenty-first century; even historical works in the field of Visual Culture usually do not investigate periods prior to the mid nineteenth century. The enormous boost in image production and quicker distribution in the nineteenth century, in my opinion, should not lead to linking Visual Culture with visual literacy and modernity. After all, neither mechanically reproducible images nor international distribution of identical copies of images are inventions of modernity. Just because images were not as omnipresent as in the nineteenth century, it does not follow that one should restrict the study of mundane everyday culture, visual spectacle, fleeting phenomena, the materiality of objects, and the passion for the visual to modernity. By tying these criteria exclusively to their modern realizations, Visual Culture unnecessarily narrows its scope. This is all the more surprising as edited volumes and textbooks in the field mention the importance of print yet no case studies on print in popular visual culture before industrialization are included (cf. footnote 2).

Without ignoring the differences between the visual in popular culture of modernity and the age of Enlightenment, I wish to add pre-nineteenth century media and images to discussions in the field of Visual Culture. Popular culture made use of images before the age of industrial mass reproduction, and images were not exclusively available in closed-off collections of aristocrats and very rich tradesmen or the frescos and stained glass windows in Catholic churches. Neither perspective prints nor catchpenny prints are mentioned in any of these contemporary scholarly edited volumes. Both early mass media played an important role in popular visual culture in western European states and their colonies and within these media, views of other cities and other people were a very popular genre. Catchpenny prints, perspective prints, and cheap print in general influenced viewing practices and aesthetic traditions. Popular print thereby influenced which subjects and meanings were expressed and circulated – and later mass produced images built upon this established knowledge.
3.3 THE SAME IMAGE AT VARIOUS PLACES FOR THE FIRST TIME: IMAGES OF PEOPLE AND PLACES IN POPULAR PRINT

Before lithography and photography were popularized in the nineteenth century, black-and-white prints from engravings, etchings, or woodblocks were the only available techniques of uniform image production in several copies. Prints on paper were produced in intaglio and gravure (e.g. etchings and engravings) or relief and letterpress printing (e.g. woodblocks).

These prints could be hand-coloured afterwards, which brought variation into the uniformity of these prints as different coloured versions of black-and-white images are a common phenomenon. Engravings and etchings made from copperplates were more expensive and allowed for finer detail than woodcut prints, but woodcuts allowed printing of images and text on one page, which, according to Brian Maidment (1996, 15), presupposed “an intense relationship between an image and a written text” in this medium. Since the reinvention of print in Europe in the fifteenth century, prints have been used for visual communication about matters that could not be described easily in written language (e.g. botany, anatomy, architecture, city views, and construction plans of machines, reproduction of artworks). Printing images was more costly than printing text. For printing up until the 1660s, Helen Pierce states:

The act of illustration […] whether enabled through the printing of copper plates or woodblocks, incurred additional costs. Such costs could be borne by the publisher of a work, or, more commonly, passed onto the purchasers of the resulting work in a retail price that could be double that of its non-illustrated equivalents. Thus the possibility of illustration could easily be rejected by authors and publishers as an unnecessary expense, setting the mnemonic qualities and visual appeal of the printed image conspicuously at odds with its potentially superfluous nature. This tension between aesthetics and economics was frequently addressed through the reuse of previously commissioned engraved plates or woodblocks in new and often thematically distinct publications. (Pierce 2011, 265)

Printed images were thus only used in domains in which the images would add something to what was expressed in text. William Ivins states that it was only through print that the transmitted visual content in various copies would stay the same. Whereas different styles of handwriting would not alter the described object in different copies of a manuscript, variation in hand-copied sketches would not convey the same information. Before print, sharing exactly the same visual and graphical information was only guaranteed by exhibiting the same painting, sketch, object, artwork, or machine – which limited the
distribution range and impeded scientific progress. After all, the creation of shared visual knowledge is dependent “upon information conveyed by exactly repeatable visual or pictorial statements” (Ivins 1953, 3). Not until the middle of the sixteenth century did

[...] the single sheet print in the various mediums then available had begun its task of carrying across Europe in all directions information about buildings and works of art that themselves never travelled. [...] Nothing like this has ever happened before. *The same identical pictorial statements were made in each example of the edition, whether of a single sheet print or of an illustrated book.* (Ivins 1953, 163, emphasis added)

Although the degree in which standardization can be stated is subject to debate (Eisenstein 1979; Johns 2002; Eisenstein 2002), Eisenstein insists that “[...] printed copies were sufficiently alike to change conditions within the learned world, to make it possible, for example, for scholars to correspond about a common text” (Eisenstein 2002, 94) – and, I would add, to correspond about a common image as well. Without the invention of exact image copying – which caters to a centralized production of (copies of) images – visual knowledge could not be homogenous. The exactly repeatable visual or pictorial statement was central to communication of knowledge.

The print’s possibilities are not endless. For example, in reproduced paintings or sculptures, qualities such as brushstroke, structure of the surface, colour, and size could not be conveyed. The consequence of these medium-specific limits is a focus on iconography and the relation of iconographic elements to one another.

The most that anyone looking at one of these engravings could hope for was that the broad general scheme of the composition was indicated in a generally adequate way, and that the iconographic detail was more or less truthful. The print never conveyed any information about the surface of the original or the manner in which it was worked. (Ivins 1953, 89, emphasis added)

With the increased visual communication through print, only certain aspects of a work of art could become generally known. The possibly disseminated visual information influenced the perception of e.g. works of art. By the eighteenth century,

a blighting common sense descended on the vision of the educated world. This showed itself not only in the terms in which that world talked
about art but in the contemporary art the works relished. *Its principal interest had been diverted by the means of reproduction away from the actual qualities of the originals and works of art and directed to generalized notions about their subject matters.* [...] The eighteenth century talked about harmony, proportion, dignity, nobility, grandeur, sublimity, and many other common-sense abstract verbal notions based upon the gross generalities of the subject matter that came through into the engraved reproductions. (Ivins 1953, 173–174, emphasis added)

Privileging iconographic detail over specific qualities is a reduction of complexity inherent to print technology – and this specific form of reduction of complexity of print is linked to stereotypical thinking in several ways. After all, stereotypical thinking and its visual expressions focus on motifs and details, not on qualities such as colour, size, or surface. Furthermore, as defined in Chapter 1, supposed common knowledge has to be a shared idea, communicable at several places and displayed in the same manner over time through different media. The circulation of visual knowledge in exact copies led through the selection of possible representations, to a severely limited amount of used representations that are constantly repeated.

The increased availability of images due to print led to homogenization rather than diversification of imagery. Without print it would be difficult to imagine a broadly shared corpus of images in which “typical” elements could be identified and distinguished from others. Through the availability of single images compiled in botanic atlases, artwork reproductions, encyclopaedias, and bundles of city views, a reproducible and systematic comparison of similarities and differences was possible for the first time – since it is only through these compiled works, distributed throughout the scientific libraries of western Europe, that studies could relate to the same corpus. What could be observed in images shifted from an individual characteristic to classified – and even more important – categorized difference. *Characteristics could be typified.*

### 3.4 Epistemological Status of Images of People and Places

Before the seventeenth century, truthfulness to topographical facts was not the most relevant criterion in the presentation of people and places within the aesthetics of Western fine arts. Until then, images in cheap print products would depict real existing persons in pamphlets for political and religious campaigns, often with symbolical or coded meaning of the images (Cf. VanhaeLEN 2003; Kunzle 1990).

Not all images of people and places were intended to inform about char-
acteristics of single entities or point to the unique or typical features of that person or place; some images served to establish categories and concepts or link a name to a city. This makes a great difference in the epistemic value of images of places and people. Early printed illustrations of cities were probably not intended to inform about the characteristics of a city but simply linked a name to a topographical entity (Cf. Gombrich 1983, 59-60). Pictures, according to Gombrich (1983, 59 and 77), cannot be true or false as they are not propositions; only captions can determine the truth of a picture. Hence, it does not make sense to criticize an image for not depicting people and places in a realist way if that is not what the caption proposes. Similarly in argument, Roland Barthes states that images in mass communication always come together with text. Barthes investigates how the polysemy of images is limited by signifying practices, one of them being “anchorage”:

[T]he caption [...] helps me to choose the correct level of perception, permits me to focus not simply on my gaze but also my understanding. (Barthes 1977, 39, emphasis added)

The caption, Barthes continues, “no longer guides identification but interpretation”; instead, the linguistic elements repress possible interpretations that the – in his view, always polysemic – image provides (1997, 39). To say that an image is “inaccurate” and “false”, then, is only a valid argument if a caption to an image claims to depict the motif in a realist or documentary way. And this discourse is not found in captions for images of places before the seventeenth century.

Although some Flemish landscape paintings date back to the sixteenth century – Braun and Hogenberg published a six-volume atlas with maps and bird’s-eye views of cities as early as 1572-1617 (Cf. Braun and Hogenberg 1965 [1617]) – it was in the seventeenth century that the aim to present landscape in a topographically more “realist” way was broadly shared. The distinction “after nature” or “after life” and “after imagination” came up in the early seventeenth century. As David Freedberg (1980) points out, imagination and reality were not seen as diametrically opposed, yet “after imagination” put more emphasis on the artist’s choice and freedom of combining elements taken from the study of reality, whereas “after life” emphasized the probability of the elements combined by the artist. Landscape paintings “after life”, Freedberg continues, “became increasingly realistic” (Freedberg 1980, 11) from the end of the first decade of the seventeenth century onwards. This changed the aesthetics in landscape prints from giving “the impression of being wholly imaginary” to appearing “much more realistic, even when closer examination reveals them to be quite carefully composed” (Freedberg 1980, 11).
The increased realism in literature, paintings, and prints encouraged artists to describe and depict the mundane. 7 From this moment onward, paintings and prints “after life” that show “probable” and “possible” landscapes were produced in larger numbers – and some of them even link the represented landscape or place to a determinable topographical site (see figures 3.1 and 3.2). This slow shift – from putting the world as God had probably intended it on canvas, to selecting and combining elements of nature in order to document a mundane place “as it is” without explicit intervention – implies differences in the function and aesthetics of images of places and people.

The seventeenth-century concept of topographical truthfulness expressed in true-to-nature captions differs a lot from the mid nineteenth-century’s conviction of accuracy. Truth-to-nature, according to Lorraine Daston and Peter Galison, expressed the “idea in the observation, not the raw observation itself”. Pictures showed the ideal skeleton, leaf, animal, bubble etc., “which may or may not be realized in nature and of which this particular skeleton is at best an approximation” (Daston and Galison 2007, 73). Interpretation was a legitimate scientific method to gain information about reality (and, very probably, artistic realism in turn was tied to scientific practice of early modern science and the skills and values around close observation).

The universal [...] could only be known through minute acquaintance with the particular in all its details, but no image of a mere particular, no matter how precise, could capture the ideal. Only the observer with the experience and perspicacity of the sage could see it. (Daston and Galison 2007, 74)
Eighteenth-century sciences took over the “realist turn” from aesthetics to epistemology (the arts and the sciences were not seen as opposite, mutually excluding systems yet). The search for universals and the typical in nature led to a new function of scientific images: the *communicative aim* of scientific images was to share knowledge; therefore, illustrations needed to be recognizable. Atlases on e.g. botany did not depict several exemplars of a plant but illustrated *one typical* image. Accuracy of visual information meant precisely *not* to produce an exact image of a specimen. Galison argues that the scientific duty of the enlightenment “scientist-illustrator” was to dismantle the universals contained in the specimen or individual object. The accurately working artist or scientist was to produce a typical, *metaphysical* image.

Being true to nature allowed – indeed demands – massive intervention, even if the plant or skeleton or crystal stood before the scientist-illustrator’s eyes. [...] [O]ne could not simply draw what one saw because the *Typus* could not depend on any particular instance. (Galison 2010, 10)

The medium-specific aesthetics of print – abstraction of concrete qualities and reduction of the depicted to iconographic detail – were therefore not at odds with the dominant epistemology of the Enlightenment age. The *interpretation* of the object in the process of the image production deeply rooted in the technique of printing should not have been regarded as problematic *per se*, for accuracy was a matter of correct interpretation and intervention of the sage scientist anyway (Cf. Galison 2010, 11 and 69-70). In the course of the nineteenth century, the tasks, ethics, and the scientific self as well as epistemological value systems and research methods changed. Science was now seen as a
practice that would suppress the scientist’s subjectivity as best as possible (Cf. Daston and Galison 2007, 17–54). Scientists were appreciated for not interfering in the production of the image but were cherished if they succeeded in mechanical documentation of the world before them in a supposedly objective manner (a discourse that became highly relevant about photography). At this moment in time, science and the arts parted: while the scientific self should be stripped of any subjectivity, the artistic self was required to do exactly the opposite, namely express their full subjectivity and “impressions” of the world in their artistic creations in word and image.

From the seventeenth century onwards – that is, before and after these shifts in epistemology – prints communicated knowledge on places with a claim to topographical accuracy. In the following section, I will look at the information that can be retrieved from printed images of places. Two things should be kept in mind. Firstly, popular culture often circulated images that were not up-to-date with the newest scientific findings as exhibitors adjusted the precious artifacts to new demands by simply telling another story around the motif or by changing the caption. Secondly, these images were presented with the voice of the itinerant showperson and were as much part of oral as of visual culture. Re-using and repurposing images was the norm rather than the exception. Theories and statements about the meaning of these images in history therefore must content themselves to possible meanings, not realized ones.

**3.5 TOPOGRAPHICAL IMAGES: VEDUTE, PROSPECTS, AND PERSPECTIVE PRINTS**

A *veduta* (Italian for “view”) is a highly detailed, usually large-scale painting of a cityscape or some other vista. This subgenre of landscape originated in Flanders, where artists painted *vedute* as early as the sixteenth century. In the seventeenth century, Dutch painters became known for detailed, accurate, and recognizable city views and landscapes that were fashionable among wealthy Dutch tradesmen. These paintings showed the city where the proud owners lived; they were not commissioned for public exhibition. In the eighteenth century, the city view became a popular genre in painting – and specialized painters put views of major cities (mostly of western Europe) onto canvas. *Vedute* painters strove for topographical accuracy; they intended to represent the city or town “faithful enough to identify the location” (Ehresman and Hall 1980, 114). *Veduta* paintings were unique objects and not part of popular culture; still, they are closely related to the genre of the city views in prints from copper engraving or etchings. In the seventeenth century, many city views also
appeared in the print genre of the prospect, which held close connections to cartography and mapping. City views in the prospect genre followed an observational approach for delineating cities and strove to be true and exact (Cf. Turner 2010).

As mentioned above, landscape prints already enjoyed commercial success in the seventeenth century. The newly accepted position that images could not only depict imaginary landscape scenes, but also the mundane world in a predominantly realistic manner created room for the topographical genre of city views. In the eighteenth century, printed copperplate engravings or etchings of city views were centrally produced and internationally distributed. In Augsburg, Martin Engelbrecht issued a series of European city views in 1730-1740, art trader Pierre Fouquet employed various sketchers and engravers to produce views of Amsterdam that he published between 1760 and 1783 (Fouquet 1960), and a series from the 1730s consists of 100 engravings with views along the river Amstel (Rademaker 1968) – to name just a few. Albeit cheaper than painting, such series of copperplate engraving were still very costly and beyond the reach of the vast majority of people.

The Popularized City View: Perspective Prints in Peepshows

City views in prints from copper engraving or etches were not only popular among the better-off; there was a market for cheaper copies as well – the perspective print or prospect. Those who could not afford to own images had the chance to see them, performed as part of a peepshow, presented in wooden boxes (see Chapter 2).
The prints of the copper engraver Giambattista Piranesi (1720-1778) are a well-documented example for the popularity of the genre and can also serve to show the content migration from elitist into popular forms. Piranesi’s prints from copper engravings enjoyed success among the intellectual elite who were wealthy enough to buy books and spend (some of) their time studying but who could not afford a collection of oil paintings. Piranesi produced some 940 etchings of city views, mostly from Rome, that were published in Paris by his descendants between 1835 and 1837. Already during his lifetime, Piranesi’s work was published in several editions; his series *Vedute di Roma* (“city views of Rome”) was very popular and went through many print runs in various formats (Cf. George Glazer Gallery 2014; Wilton-Ely 1994). His etchings were available throughout (at least) western Europe and were also bought as souvenirs by British gentlemen on their Grand Tour. It is worth mentioning that these high-quality prints from copper engravings were intentionally produced as artworks. They were printed on thick paper – a handmade luxury product in those days – and either framed and hung on walls for decorative purposes or bound with other prints and placed in the library of the collector. These prints were not coloured; the first high-quality colour printing processes were chromolithography and mezzotint, only invented in the beginning of the nineteenth century. Because of the vedute’s status as artworks, such prints were generally not manipulated, but they were occasionally hand-coloured.

The perspective print, on the contrary, was often manipulated by the
exhibitors to heighten the sensational effects for dissolving views and day-and-night changes, as can be seen in the popular adaptation of Piranesi’s work.

As can be seen, the perspective print reproduced above was an adaptation of Piranesi’s work; it was coloured in a very simple way and the lines are not worked as carefully as in the original. Furthermore, the perspective has been slightly modified: both buildings in the back are now situated on the same level in the middle ground and the vanishing point runs “straight into the middle” of the image and not slightly transversely, as in the original. In addition, the relative difference in scale between figures in the foreground and figures in the middle ground is bigger in the perspective print’s version of the motif. Both changes increase the effect of depth, which is even more accentuated when watched through the lens of the peepshow box (see Chapter 2).

Quite obviously, the *veduta* print and the perspective print differ not only in their aesthetics, the place they were looked at and the performance situation; they also served different purposes. Whereas, in the print version of the *veduta*, scientific accuracy and craftsmanship are relevant criteria, and practices around these images were collecting, storing, archiving, and tradition, the popularized version emphasized the spectacular, thereby the *effect*. This may be explained by considering the audience: Around 1780, for farmers and craftsmen, places such as Haarlem and Rome must have been as exotic as landscapes described in fairy tales. None of the spectators would get the chance to compare these images, neither to the place nor to other images circulating on the same topic, simply because they were not within their reach.

The perspective print was made available for home use shortly after its invention. Sets of small parlour-sized peepshow views for miniature peepshows, or special viewing devices like the zograscope or the viewing table, were available to those who could afford them (Cf. Whalen 1998; Chaldecott 1953). Class difference thus was not primarily defined by the kind of images that one saw, but through access and device: those who owned perspective prints (and other images) themselves could choose when to look at which print and also with which device to look at the images.

To sum up, prints with topographical content of the seventeenth and eighteenth century vary in motifs – some display streets, some ports, some landscapes or buildings. All of them are titled according to the city or building they show. No reference to nations or countries is made in the prints’ captions. All cited studies point to the fact that motifs of popular visual culture were taken from patterns that were already well-known among the better-off. The observation of motifs taken from high art that were subsequently popularized is in line with theories of popular media, the result of a trickle-down effect rather than an independent art form.

With the exception of Richard Balzer’s publication, the cited studies
embed the perspective prints in the discourse of “travel with eyes”, “armchair travel”, or “virtual travel”. I will examine this discourse more closely in Chapter 5. I wish to emphasize here that these images were not just substitutes for travel but also had a communicative function: the city views of perspective prints contributed to what could be known about the world. Although I have not found any information about print runs, it seems that, with the concentration of image production to six publishers, the motifs and styles that circulated became limited. The fact that the captions of the prints often come in various languages (German, French, English) suggests their circulation across Europe. If we conclude that unification of imagery was already taking place in the eighteenth century, this needs to be investigated in other studies. Although the information assembled here is quite scarce, it is probably not completely hypothetical to assume that the largest part of Europe and its colonies looked at the same 1600 or so available topographical images. In hundreds of topographical prints, characteristics of cities were recorded and buildings were pictured that informed what other places looked like. And this information was – across the lines of class and throughout Europe – the same for everyone.

3.6 REALIST IMAGES OF PEOPLE IN POPULAR MEDIA: CATCHPENNY PRINTS

For images of people, it is less obvious to determine the beginnings of claims to realism towards the depicted person. Portraits of kings, conquerors, and other masters linked the image to a veritable persona. Prints of fashion and costume certainly had a realist claim to the depicted subject and were already common in the sixteenth century. Depictions of lower-class people with realist claims are found in some seventeenth-century landscape oil paintings (and, consequently, in prints that copied them). None of these images were called ethnographic at that time, for the term was not broadly used before the 1820s – but, when looking at the captions, there was already an implicit claim that “people actually dressed/looked like this”. Although such images of people hold a claim to realism, they did not yet present groups of people systematically.

In the eighteenth century, ethnography was not a separate discipline; ethnologic and anthropological questions were addressed as part of studies in natural history (see Chapter 4). Illustrations to theories of the development of the “human races” and their respective habitat were part of encyclopaedias and expensive study books. Next to books for the intellectual elite, cheap print products disseminated images to a broader audience. The most popular print format in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was the catchpenny print. In the examples of six catchpenny prints from the late eighteenth and early
nineteenth centuries with some claim of ethnographic realism, I will trace
when nationality emerged as a category for the description of people – a topic
that I will elaborate in detail in Chapter 4.

“Hier wordt de Klederpracht bespot”
(“Here we mock fashionable costumes”)

The first example mocks costumes and behaviour of people of different
classes. Despite the parody of this print, the mocked practices and costumes
are documented. In none of the verses are the people described as Dutch or
Flemish; they are not even located in a certain city. Visual and textual elements
inform of gender and profession or class.

Fig. 3.5 “[Hier
wordt de Kleder-
pracht bespot...].
Catchpenny print (c. 1775-1813).
The next example combines information on profession with information of nationality, but does not fully establish a “national type”.

These images hardly have any symbolic meaning; they present the professions and characteristic tools to exercise them: a pan maker with a pan, a seller of liquor with glasses and a tray, a market visitor with a basket and a pot, a seller of tripe with a knife and cats crawling around him, a watchman with a pipe, and a soldier with a rifle and ammunition in his belt.9

This catchpenny print is interesting for the different logics it makes use of: on the one hand, the nation is the topographical entity referred to in the title (and not the city or the region); on the other hand, emphasis is put on the professions. The single images do not hold what the title promises, as the images and their captions do not refer to a country or nation but to profes-
Fig. 3.7 “Verschillende vreemde volkeren – Different peuples étrangers”. Catchpenny print (c. 1806-1814).
visions. If at all, these images are tokens of Italian people as pan makers, as liquor sellers, as tripe sellers etc., but they are not types of Italian people. The profession remains the most important category.

“Verschillende Vreemde Volkeren” (“Diverse Other Peoples”)

This early example that assembled “different people” mixes different modes of presentation: this seemingly arbitrary group of people shows the absence of systematic classification, even though there is uniformity in the size and format of presentation. Attributions to a country (“Bewoonders van Griekenland”) are found alongside attributions to a region (“Bewoonders van Siberië”) and even a city (“Bewoonder van Quito”). Some captions put the nation as adjective (“Russische Man en Vrouw”), but the French version refers to them as “homme et femme de la Russie” – a man and a woman from Russia, not as Russian man and woman (that would have been “homme et femme russe”). This difference might seem minor, but the French version “from Russia” does not presuppose that the man and woman must be Russian. In the second case, the national attribute is tied more strongly to the concept “man and woman”, leaving no option for interpreting them as non-Russians. The only image that labels the person after the locality is “patagoonges/le patagonees” – the Patagonian. The men and women are set in picture without background and rarely have props with them (occasionally a bow, a pipe for a Greek); most of the depicted people are Native Americans. The “Russian man and women” are more elegantly dressed than the “inhabitants of Siberia”, while the Native Americans are depicted with skilfully sewn dresses: elegance of costumes is not exclusively found among Western people.

The variation in the link between image and caption, thus person and place, is not fully operable for classification or description of typicality. It seems that the information “these people live in the place X or belong to the people Y” were precise enough. National references come in but are not the dominant scheme of attribution.

“Een Friessche Boer en Boerin uit de kerk komende...”
(“Frisian Farmer and wife coming from Church...”)

This four-image catchpenny print presents people from different regions of the Netherlands (some are mentioned, some are not) in various costumes. The Frisian farmers go to church; the farmers of Schouwen, an island in the province of Zeeland, go to the market. The regional origin of the figures depicted
in the other two images is not indicated in this print; in the image bottom left, the male figure asks the female out to attend the fair together; in the other, the male and the female figure produce or repair fishing nets. Various costumes are shown, in particular the headdress differs. With the exception of the fisherman next to the spinning woman, no one wears wooden shoes. There is variation among the dresses of the Frisian farmers, and not all the props in the images would later be known as “typically Dutch”. The churchgoers carry a Bible each, the man a box (probably with coal inside to warm himself while in

Fig. 3.8 “[Een Friessche Boer en Boerin uit de kerk komende]”. Catchpenny print (c. 1814-1830).
church). In another image, we see a man smoking a pipe; the women who go to the market carry a basket. None of these figures is referred to as “Dutch”.

Just like perspective prints, catchpenny prints borrowed from highbrow material. In this case, the source of the motifs can be easily identified as originating from Evert Maaskamp’s *Afbeeldingen van kleeding, zeden, en gewoonten in de Bataafsche Republiek, met den aanvang der negentiende eeuw* from 1803-1805. I will discuss Maaskamp’s publication in detail in Chapter 4.2. As I will show there, this publication was intended to contribute to a nationalizing project and was praised for the ethnographic accuracy of the images.

The case of the *Afbeeldingen* and their reprint in catchpenny prints shows that images intentionally produced for a nationalizing project were not always used in that line. Instead, the combination of word and image performs a regional and professional identity of these figures. The discussion of this catchpenny print shows that the trickling-down of images does not guarantee trickling-down of the original *meaning*. It is also a very good illustration of
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Fig. 3.9 “Friessche boer en boerin” (“Friesian farmer and wife”). Hand-coloured copperplate print from *Afbeeldingen van kleeding, zeden, en gewoonten in de Bataafsche Republiek* (Maaskamp 1803-1807).
the power of captions in the production of knowledge, and, as such, should encourage consideration of more than just the image content in studies of content migration from one medium to another. I will come back to this in Chapter 7.

“Dus toont men hier een schets van wintervrolykheden”
(“We Here Give an Impression of the Joys of Winter”)

The print titled “Dus toont men hier een schets van wintervrolykheden” comprises one large image. The print shows a scene with foreground, middle ground, and background and a remarkable amount of details. In the elaborate background, three windmills and two churches are seen. The image foregrounds people drinking at the tent of the tea and liquor seller; a big flag of the
Netherlands waves from the tent. In front of the tent, a man smokes a pipe. The people wear different hats and costumes, marking class difference. In contrast to other catchpenny prints, the differences of clothing are elaborated within one image. The message of a united people on ice under the Dutch flag is echoed in the text. After the reader is warned, in the first verse, against spending too much time and money, the pleasures on the ice are praised for appealing to farmer and bourgeois, man and woman, young and old. Popular folklore is integrated into national identity, replacing the excessive parts (drinking, spending money, sexual encounters) with modest behaviour (drinking tea, not spending too much money, showing a bourgeois way of courting, i.e. have the courted women sit in a sleigh instead of holding hands while skating next to each other). The introduction of bourgeois morals in combination with the national will be addressed in more detail in Chapter 5.

Fig. 3.11 “Dus toont men hier een schets van Wintervrolykheden...”. Catchpenny print (c. 1817-1830).
In order to emphasize the continuity and change of styles and expressed meaning to later products, one example should suffice here. Van Heurck and Boekenoogen state that national subjects increase remarkably in catchpenny prints after the Napoleonic war and the separation from Belgium in 1830. Soldiers, for example, were rarely a topic printed prior to that war (Cf. van Heurck and Boekenoogen 1930, 27). Also, the Society for Common Benefits (*Maatschappij tot Nut van ’t Algemeen*) produced catchpenny prints with the aim to spread moralizing and instructive images and to nourish patriotic feelings. The style of these images greatly influenced other catchpenny prints of the nineteenth century (cf. van Heurck and Boekenoogen 1930, 36–41.)

One of the Society’s prints reads “In this print, the children should learn that people differ very obviously according to the character of each region and learn about the special dresses of a nation/people”11. In the first row, two figures, a man and a woman, stand in for a continent, highly favouring the “Europeans” over everyone else. In contrast to the men and women from “Asia”, “Africa”, and “America”, the bodies of the Europeans are covered with skilfully
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118 | **Fig. 3.12** “[In deeze Prent zullen de Kinderen opmerken...]”. Catchpenny print. Issued by the Society for Common Benefits (c. 1794-1820).
sewn costumes and there is no body contact between the European man and woman. The Europeans are portrayed in upright position and do not kneel close to the ground. Whereas the figures from other continents are portrayed against an iconic background, the Europeans seem to have intrinsic meaning. In the second row, variation in European clothing is shown. All Europeans are depicted with figures from the upper classes; the figures that represent the colonies are lower-class people. The supposed superiority of the Europeans is thus achieved in adding the facets of other binary hierarchies, namely gender and class.

In this print, the geopolitical categories of continent and nationality are clearly the most important ones – and the image of the nation is that of an upper-middle-class man. Next to the difference in depiction, the reader/viewer is asked to search for differences through the title of the print’s title.

3.7 EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY Images OF PEOPLE AND PLACES IN OTHER POPULAR MEDIA

Catchpenny prints and perspective prints were not the only media in which images of places and people circulated. Almanacs, the magic lantern, museum catalogues, travel writings, and geographical magazines also existed in the eighteenth century and contributed to what was known about the world and the Netherlands. Almanacs and art collection catalogues sometimes contained printed reproductions of artworks – and, among those reprinted paintings, some eventually featured Dutch landscapes, city views, and people. However, before the nineteenth century, the images in these media were either not yet mass-produced or not yet widely distributed: The broad circulation of identical motifs on lantern slides only became possible after printing on glass was invented in the 1820s and popularized in the 1850s. Magic lantern slides of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were unique and hand-painted artefacts. Although the practice of copying subjects from printed books (Cf. Mostert 2012) probably limited the styles and motifs to some degree, there is not enough evidence to state that the slides circulated the same motifs on large scale. Almanacs were highly popular in the eighteenth century, but the most popular almanacs were intended for regional distribution only (for a list of publishers in the Netherlands, see Salman 1999, 387–411). Furthermore, as van Eeghen shows, illustrations in almanacs were partially made from the woodblocks that were used for catchpenny prints (Cf. van Eeghen 1982). Beate Reifenscheid’s investigation of illustration in almanacs (1996) is restricted to the more costly literary almanacs and yearbooks and focuses on the nineteenth century. Through published art collection catalogues, information on
the collections reached a broader public in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Before, inventories of collections would only serve the curator’s work (Seeling 2011, 2). These catalogues were popular among travellers and were thus read by an international elite public (Bähr 2006, 3). However, such catalogues were barely illustrated in the eighteenth century and were definitely not a mass medium.

**Geographical Magazines and Travel Reports**

Geographical magazines and travel reports were not separate genres before the mid eighteenth century; both geographical treatises and travel reports, served as ancillary science to natural history or historical political studies (Cf. Griep 1999, 62). The first exclusively geographical publications were issued in the 1760s. These publications focused on descriptive-empirical aspects: descriptions on the surface of the earth and comments on new maps often combined with statistics and topographical details. The number of publications on ethnology and geography increased at the end of the eighteenth century, but most of the journals did not manage to establish themselves for a longer period of time (Cf. Griep 1999, 65–68).

Although such journals were certainly not a widespread product in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, they were not restricted to academic readers alone. In fact, geographical magazines depended largely on appreciation from the non-academic community in order to sell enough copies, and scientists complained about the lack of readers to cover the costs for illustrations. The dependence of academic research on popularized sciences must have influenced the selection of subjects to be illustrated and thus the corpus of visual knowledge within that discipline. Griep observes that magazines that featured news items and entertaining components issued more volumes than those magazines that were restricted to topographical and statistic details (Griep 1999, 69). The dependence of a discipline on popular appreciation is not exclusive to the discipline of geography; still, the degree to which geography became a topic in educational entertainment of the nineteenth century is remarkable. To understand the widespread interest in geography in the nineteenth century (which I will discuss in more detail in Chapter 5), it is worth keeping in mind that market orientation and popularization strategies preceded the age of industrialized mass reproduction.
Travel Writings

Reports on travels to other places and things seen “elsewhere” are even older than the myth of Odysseus. In the late sixteenth century, travellers and authors added to their account on foreign places “technical information” on where to stay, what to see, how to get from one place to another etc. Travel writings, not yet separated from geography in the eighteenth century, were an ancillary science to historical political studies. Eighteenth century travel writings mostly took the form of what Bernhard Struck calls an “encyclopaedic narrative”: a very detailed description of the travel route, means of transports, distances, and topography were interwoven with accounts on historical events in these regions, mostly battles and wars and long quotes from previous travel writings (Cf. Struck 2004, 76). In this way, travel writings mixed different kinds of information. Madeleine van Strien-Chardonneau observes this mix in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century French travel writings on the Netherlands:

Wonder, similarity, truthfulness, these travel topics have as a prerequisite a special rhetoric among the readers in which the double function of useful and entertaining lecture becomes apparent. (van Strien-Chardonneau 1994, 210, my translation)

Travel writings of the eighteenth century rarely contain images. The texts are nevertheless relevant for the study of images of Dutchness: the evocative description on “what there was to be seen and known” named the (topographical) sites and added a meaningful comment to those sites. This connection between site and meaning makes use of different textual strategies – description and comment. These rhetorical strategies can still be observed in illustrated travel writings of the nineteenth century, where illustrations can have descriptive, documentary, or illustrative functions. In this way, eighteenth-century travel writings prepare the meaning that was ascribed to subsequently produced images of people and places. Seen in this light, non-illustrated travel writings are relevant sources for the meaning-making of (later) visual material as topoi in nineteenth-century travel writings and supposed common knowledge partially originated in the eighteenth century.

For research on the emergence of national clichés, those aspects that link the description of people and places to attributions of typicality and the national are important. Bernhard Struck observes a change in the way that travel writings between 1750 and 1850 describe the act of crossing the border. He makes a stunning observation in the travel description by Swiss mathematician and astronomer Johannes Bernoulli to Poland in 1779 and 1780: despite the detailed description of almost all aspects of travelling, the act of
crossing the border is hardly described at all. Landscape, clothing style, state of the roads, and language vary from village to village – the border is perceived of as a region rather than a clear-cut border line. He quotes five other travel descriptions that follow the same pattern – ethnographic and topographical differences are described in terms of regional variations, not in terms of national borders. Because of the mix of styles observed in border regions, what is “Dutch” or “German” or “French” is not found close to the frontier. Only further inland do authors perceive the villages as “Polish” or “French” (Cf. Struck 2004, 75–81).

The perception of the border changed in travel writings around the 1820s, when travellers started to write about “leaving their own fatherland behind” when approaching the border. The frontier line marks crucial differences. Now, the people, their character and costumes are completely different on both sides of the border – French, and not German. The change from border region to border line did not happen as a sudden rupture; Struck finds combinations of both patterns until the late 1820s. From the early nineteenth century onward, the narrative motif of the linear, dividing, national boundary line gained importance over regional, gradual change (Cf. Struck 2004, 83-85). By the 1840s, the description of the nation used established, distinct, and exact borders – the travel writings are part of the discursive construction of national borders:

Around 1840, “nation”, “homeland”, “state” as well as the national attributions “German” and “French” are part and parcel of accounts, partially already around 1820, in the perception and description of the Franco-German neighbourhood. This is reflected in the linear, abrupt, national border. (Struck 2004, 86, my translation)\(^\text{13}\)

Struck concludes his study by taking the argument one step further: not only did the national border appear in travel descriptions, regional variation was also no longer carefully described (2004, 90). After the nation/al was established as a descriptive category, so it seems, it obstructed the perception of difference within the nation – which is in line with Anderson’s finding that “regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship” (Anderson 1996, 8). The nation as a main category of difference was established.
3.8 CONCLUSION

This glimpse into visual culture at times prior to industrialization, technical mass production of images, and nation-states has untangled the diverse aspects of the emergence of national clichés. Changes in technologies, epistemologies, and categories contributed to nationalizing supposed common knowledge about people and places; the national became the dominant frame to inform about people and places by the 1820s.

Today’s supposed common knowledge about other places and people has visual, textual, and economic roots that precede the nineteenth century. Many forms of popular culture in the age of Enlightenment implied a visual component and, as this survey has shown, neither mechanically reproducible images nor international distribution are inventions of the nineteenth century. Enlightenment and Renaissance image traditions influenced form, style, and aesthetics of visual media in later centuries – especially the turn to depict the mundane world in non-allegorical images and the use of empirical evidence instead of historical narrative.

Furthermore, the historical study of visual media questions whether phenomena typically attributed to industrialization emerged only then. A trickle-down effect can be observed already in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: renowned motifs of topographical and ethnographical content were copied from established art and adapted to popular forms. Cheap print was a profitable niche segment in the media landscape of the early modern age and the age of Enlightenment and was popular across the lines of class and region.

Taking these findings to debate whether modern elements can be found before Visual Culture’s periodization would have it, or if the beginning of modernity needs to be dated prior to 1789 is beside the point. Instead, I wish to stress that, next to the doubtlessly huge changes that occurred in the nineteenth century, there is also continuity and the links between an image and its meaning are therefore historically constructed, too. Epistemological assumptions change over centuries, and the epistemic status of images varies over centuries and across disciplines as well.

Through various forms of cheap print, visual knowledge, and, as part of it, the visual knowledge of people and places, increased. This increase in knowledge accommodated the logic of national clichés. Technologies of image display and image production (and the skill of the operator or artist) modify what can be expressed at all. When only print was available, there was no way to avoid the limits imposed by that technology, namely the focus on iconographic detail. Engravings could not convey information about qualitative aspects of the depicted object or artwork, such as colour and surface structure. Ivins notes:
It was impossible to verify any qualitative visual information except by going to where the thing was and looking at it, and when this was done the information was never accurate. [...] All the eighteenth century could do with the pictorial mead available to it was to take a series of visual statements and draw a sort of statistical average of what they contained. But no statistical average has ever existed in nature as a concrete fact. The moment we begin to think in terms of averages we confess that we have lost contact with the concrete things from which the average is calculated. (Ivins 1953, 91)

The focus on iconographic details and form, and the abstraction of concrete things to statistical averages is deeply intertwined with stereotypical thinking that looks for typicality and suspects that every single specimen, person, or item should be congruous to the average. After 300 years of print, how could this tradition of communicating visual information not influence ways of looking, even when other media technologies became available?

Additionally, the interpretative categories in the sciences are historically determined, too. Only after the national became an established descriptive category could people and places be seen as Italian, German, French, Dutch etc. People and places appeared as motifs in visual products before they were referred to as part of a nation. Although nation-states and national languages existed, and differences were perceived, the national in the late-eighteenth century was not a discrete category but a category of relative degrees of difference. Relevant criteria for the meaning-making of images of people and places were gender and class, religion and profession, the city and, sometimes, the region (I will reconstruct the shift of categories in Chapter 4).

Once the national became a marker of difference in the early nineteenth century, discourses in which images of places and people appeared picked up that category to produce meaningful distinctions from about 1820 onward. This can be observed across all the discourses in which images of places and people appear; be it leisure and consumer culture (tourism, advertising, and entertainment), or empirical sciences (anthropology, cartography and geography). I will investigate the role of images in these discourses in Chapters 4, 5, and 6.

Cheap prints on single sheets of paper enjoyed commercial success well into the mid nineteenth century. In addition, other visual media and image production processes emerged or gained popularity, such as stereo photography, the magic lantern, and film. Images of people and places migrated (partially) into these new media or onto other carriers, and were seen by audiences of different ranks and classes, leaving the unanimated printed image to take a secondary role in popular entertainment. After c. 1850, images reproduced
from photographic technologies gradually replaced prints from etching and engraving; this goes all the more for documentary images with an objective true-to-nature claim. Scientists of the fieldwork disciplines of geography, anthropology, and ethnography increasingly made use of photography as a means to document their findings more accurately, i.e. more objectively. Prints from etchings and engravings on paper were used in art production (especially mezzotint and colour lithography) and remain the most common technology of image production in illustrated magazines until c. 1900.

The choice of what to look at and when was severely limited in the age of Enlightenment. The distinction between those who could look at images whenever they wanted to because they owned these paintings or prints (and the devices to look at them), and those who could only afford to see what was put before them for the time of the show by itinerant exhibitors certainly was more significant than in the late nineteenth century, when images were less scarce. From the mid nineteenth century on, chances to see images multiplied through an increasing availability of images in various media. The developments in printing techniques and technology can hardly be overstated. The explosion in quantity of image production and dissemination (mostly in print but also in other forms) in the last quarter of the nineteenth century took visual culture to a new quality. In addition, new possibilities to travel for middle-class citizens allowed different parts of the world to be connected, images of people and places were thus experienced as “more real”.

NOTES

1 “La Nation existait depuis longtemps, mais elle se confondait avec la fidélité monarchique. La césure radicale qui s’est établie entre peuple et aristocratie, peuple et monarchie, à mesure que se dégradait l’image royale, a donné au terme un tout autre contenu. On a rêvé un temps – dans l’illusion unanimiste des fédérations de 1790 – de la réconciliation sous la devise ‘la nation, la loi, le roi’, masquant le transfert de souveraineté déjà réalisé du monarque au peuple souverain. À partir de 1792, la chute de la royauté, mais aussi l’état de guerre avec l’”Europe des despotes’’ donnent à la nation la plénitude de sa signification; elle s’identifie aux peuple et acquiert toute sa puissance unificatrice dans l’affrontement avec la crise intérieure et la guerre extérieure. Une fusion s’opère momentanément entre nation et patrie […]. La nation, a-t-on dit, occupe le lieu laissé vide par la royauté, d’où son association avec l’idée de la République.” (Vovelle 1992, 57).
The Visual Culture Reader (Mirzoeff 1998), for instance, includes one text on a premodern invention, the camera obscura, with emphasis on the subject position (Crary 1998). Although the authors of Practices of Looking mention the long history of reproduction and the importance of print for the production of exact copies, they exercise their thoughts exclusively on photographic media (Sturken and Cartwright 2009). The editors of A History of Visual Culture claim to cover visual culture from the eighteenth to the twentieth century, but only start in 1780 (Kromm and Bakewell 2010), and The Nineteenth-Century Visual Culture Reader, by definition, argues for the study of Visual Culture in the nineteenth century (Schwartz and Przyblyski 2004, 3–14).

Nicéphore Niépce experimented with heliographic prints in the 1820s, the Daguerrotype by Louis Daguerre was invented and refined in the 1830s, and William Fox Talbot experimented with negative exposure in the 1840s. Alois Senefelder invented lithography in 1796; chromolithography experiments from the 1820s onwards were finally patented in 1837.

Copperplate engraving and copperplate etching are different techniques to prepare the copperplate for intaglio printing. As I am only interested in the product, I will not pay attention to the fabrication of the plates and use the term “print” for “prints of etchings, engravings, and woodblock on paper”. Detailed information on printing processes is given in e.g. Griffiths (1996).

Repeatability of an experiment or a visual statement is a strong criterion for judging the validity of a finding in the exact sciences. Livingstone underlines that the repetition also had to work in public. An account of the experiment would not suffice for the status of a new finding or knowledge, pointing to the dependences between the private and the public sphere of science. “Because an experiment ‘worked’ in the private recesses of the scientist’s workplace was not sufficient to establish its claims as genuine knowledge. To secure that level of cognitive standing, it had to receive the approval of the relevant experimental public. A gulf thus opens up between what has been called the ‘trying’ of an experiment and the ‘showing’ of an experiment. Only when the journey from private to public space had been successfully concluded, could a scientific claim enjoy the privilege of knowledge status.” (Livingstone 2003, 24).

The status of prints in art history and historiography and the question of whether reproductions should illustrate art history were debated among art historians in the eighteenth century. “Prints were largely consulted as reproductions [...]. As such, reproductive prints were often subject to discussions of faithfulness, as determined by the engraving techniques and the abilities of engravers to grasp the artist’s style” (Vermeulen 2010, 264). This was all the more obvious when reproduction of the same artwork by different engravers differed in detail. I did not find references that this concern was shared about popularized versions.
Ruth Bernard Yeazell (2008) traces the interrelations between nineteenth-century literature and Dutch genre painting of the seventeenth century, paying special attention to the notion of “realism” that authors of the nineteenth century projected backwards onto earlier paintings that, at their time, probably were perceived very differently.

There are many links between paintings and printed copper engravings or etchings; one is to be found in trade: printed copper engravings or etchings served the traders on the international art market to describe the objects. These prints were first regarded as a tool giving reference to the “real” artwork before they became an object for collection themselves (van Eeghen 1960, iii–vi). Secondly, some painters produced prints in addition to their paintings to disseminate information about their artworks (e.g. Albrecht Dürer, 1471-1528).

For similar prints in the British context, cf. Sean Shesgreen’s study on the “Cries of London” (Shesgreen 2002).

A simple test illustrates the difference. The sentence “I saw a man from Russia” can be followed by “but he is not Russian” without being logically incoherent, whereas “I saw a Russian man but he is not Russian” cannot. In the first example, the national attribute describes the place of origin; in the second case, it is inherent to or characteristic of the person.

Original: “In dezer prent zullen de kinderen opmerken dat de aard van elk Gewest en de bijzondere kleding van een volk, de Mensen van elkanderen zeer duidelijk doen onderscheiden.”

Original: “Merveille, similitude, véridique, ces thèmes du voyage qui suscitent une rhétorique propre à conditionner le lecteur, ressortissent à cette double fonction, lecture utile et lecture de divertissement.”
