Review Articles: Lost Kingdoms

Piriya Krairiksh and John Listopad review an outstanding exhibition and catalogue


This catalog was published in conjunction with the exhibition of the same name at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, from April 14 through July 27, 2014. John Guy, Florence and Herbert Irving Curator of the Arts of South and Southeast Asia at the Met, who initiated, undertook and oversaw the exhibition as well as the accompanying volume, must be highly congratulated for having accomplished this Herculean task with such success. He cannot be praised too highly for having brought under one roof some of the finest pieces of sculpture ever created in
Southeast Asia. Even though most of the sculptures in the exhibition were selected for their superlative artistic quality, they were also chosen to illustrate art historical compatibility. For the sake of brevity only the outstanding pieces will be mentioned here.

It was a surprise to be confronted with so many choice treasures from Śrī Ksetra. Foremost among them are the Throne Stele (CAT.12) in the National Museum of Myanmar, Yangon, and the Vikrama dynasty Buddha in Meditation (CAT.41) in the Thiri Khittaya (Śrī Ksetra) Archaeological Museum. Although the piece de résistance, the inscribed reliquary excavated at the Khin Ba mound (CAT.27) failed to materialize, having been deemed too fragile to travel, other treasures from this hoard are well represented including the Relic-Chamber Cover (CAT.26), a selection of stūpa deposits (CAT.28-31) as well as the terracotta relief depicting Prince Temiya from the Mughapakkha Jātaka (CAT.32).

The National Museum of Cambodia sent some of its best known pre-Angkorian pieces. Most impressive are Buddha Offering Protection from Angkor Borei (CAT.43), a Krsna Govardhana from Phnom Da, Angkor Borei (CAT.72), that is matched by the equally spectacular Krsna Govardhana now in the Cleveland Museum of Art (CAT.73), whose original provenance was Phnom Da as well. Other masterpieces from the National Museum of Cambodia include Visnu from Prasat Rup Arak, Phnom Kulen (CAT.79) which is considered “a masterpiece of this period”, a rare image of Śiva as an Ascetic from Kampong Cham Kau, Stung Treng province (CAT.96), an image of the horse-headed Kalkin (CAT.74), an elephant-headed Ganeśa (CAT.99), both of which were discovered together in the region of Phnom Da, a ravishing figure of Devī from Koh Krieng (CAT.94), and a voluptuous Durgā Mahisāsuramardinī from Prey Veng province (CAT.66) as well as a door lintel depicting Visnu Anantaśāyin and the Birth of Brahmā from Wat Po Veal, Tuol Baset (CAT.75), that is compared to a tympanum depicting the same subject from Temple E1 at My Son (CAT.76) in the Museum of Cham Sculpture, Danang.

The Museum of Cham Sculpture, Danang, is one of the Vietnamese museums that contributed some of their finest pieces to the exhibition. It dispatched an early Yaksa figure from Tra Kieu (CAT.15), a superb image of Ganeśa from Temple E5 at My Son (CAT.100), and an equally impressive Enthroned Planetary Deity from the Buddhist Monastery at Dong Duong (CAT.156) that is matched by a companion piece from the same site now in the Cleveland Museum of Art (CAT.155). The National Museum of Vietnamese History, Ho Chi Minh City, sent a Visnu wearing an ankle-length waist cloth, “the only surviving bronze Visnu image in this style” from Tan Hoi, An Giang province (CAT.61) that is paired with a stone counterpart excavated in Dong Thap province (CAT.59) in the Dong Thap Province Museum, Cao Lanh. From the same museum came two renowned Buddha images from Tra Vinh province: one seated in meditation found in Phnom Cangek (CAT.47) and the other an Enthroned Buddha from Son Tho (CAT.108). Less well known is a rare image of the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara complete with its support in the form
of an arch from the same province (CAT.134) and two Cham bronze Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara: one from Quang Binh province (CAT.169) and the other from Binh Dinh province (CAT.170).

The Bangkok National Museum dispatched a selection of important pieces, among them two types of stone images of Visnu: one wearing a long garment from Si Mahosot (CAT.60), the other wearing a brief loincloth from Si Thep (CAT.71); and a Sūrya (CAT.70), also from Si Thep, that compares favorably with a fine example from Ba The (Oc Eo) in the National Museum of Vietnamese History (CAT.68). It also sent a trove of Buddha images led by a superb specimen from Wat Na Phra Men, Ayuttaya (CAT.117), whose head graces the cover of this book, followed by a terracotta head discovered at Nakhon Pathom (CAT.118), whose serene beauty gave the name Wat Phra Ngam (Monastery of the Beautiful Buddha) to the mound from which it was found. Two heads of masterly workmanship show the contrasting styles of the Mon Buddha’s physiognomy: one sharp and lineal from Ayuttaya (CAT.115) and the other curvaceous from Wat Mahathat, Ratchaburi (CAT.116). Among them is an image of Buddha Calling the Earth to Witness, the iconography of which is rare for the period, from Buriram province (CAT.113), and three steles: one depicts the Twin Miracles at Śrāvasti (CAT.126), another shows a Buddha in Meditation under a Seven-Headed Nāga flanked by stūpas (CAT.111), which is paired with another one showing a Buddha in Meditation flanked by stūpas from the National Museum, Prachinburi (CAT.112). Apart from stone Buddhas, it also sent three of its finest bronze images: an Enthroned Buddha Vairocana (CAT.163), an Eight-Armed Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara (CAT.166) and Bodhisattva Lokanātha (Avalokiteśvara) Granting Boons (CAT.167). Then come the terracotta favorites from Khu Bua, Ratchaburi province: an Enthroned Buddha Preaching (CAT.110), Head of a Crowned Bodhisattva (CAT.146) and a standing Bodhisattva (CAT.147). Stucco is represented by a crisply modeled Head of a Male Divinity (CAT.150) from Nakhon Pathom. A clay impression Depicting a Ship at Sea from the 4th-5th century (CAT.1) and a sealing Depicting Heavenly Palaces from Phatthalung province (CAT.154) round up the Bangkok Museum contributions.

Thailand’s provincial museums also contributed their finest pieces. Chaiya sent its chef-d’oeuvre, Buddha in Meditation (CAT.42). Nakhon Si Thammarat lent its outstanding bronze Torso of Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara (CAT.6), which is paired with its counterpart from Andhra Pradesh in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (CAT.7). U Thong dispatched a historic local find, a copper Coin from the Reign of Roman Emperor Victorinus, 269-271, an Antefix with Head of Śiva (CAT.106), which is shown together with an Antefix with a Male Head from An Giang province in the National Museum of Vietnamese History, Ho Chi Minh City (CAT.107), and a superb bronze Buddha Teaching with the hands in the double expository gesture (vitarkamudrā) (CAT.119). Phra Pathom Chedi National Museum sent among others a fine example of a Dharmacakra (Wheel of the Law) (CAT.123), three stucco reliefs
from the Chula Pathon Chedi: an Assembly of Noblemen (CAT.151), a Kubera (CAT.152), whose head adorns the book’s back cover, and a Kinnara (CAT.153), as well as a stucco Lion Guardian (CAT.128).

Muzium Negara, Kuala Lumpur, sent its undisputed masterpiece, “the single most important multi-armed sculpture of Avalokiteśvara from the region to have survived” from Bidor, Perak, the Bodhisattva Amoghapāśa (Avalokiteśvara) (CAT.157). The Asian Civilisations Museum, Singapore, contributed the pride of its collection, Buddha Granting Boons from Bujang Valley, Kedah (CAT.20).

Musée National des Arts Asiatiques-Guimet, Paris, lent its inscribed image of Buddha Preaching from Tuol Preah That, Kampong Speu province (CAT.44), two images of Visnu from the 9th century: one Cham Visnu Mounted on Garuda found in Danang province (CAT.78), another Khmer found in Siem Reap province (CAT.79), a Devī from Koh Krieng, Kratie province (CAT.95), and a Skanda, god of war, from Prei Veng province (CAT.98), that is compared to a Skanda from Kampong Cham province in the National Museum of Cambodia (CAT.97). The veritable masterpieces of the Guimet’s assignments are the stone Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara from Rach Gia (Tan Long), Soc Trang province (CAT.137) and the bronze Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara from Central Java (CAT.161).

The above list does not include sculptures on loan from museums in the United States, which together with the loan pieces gave the exhibition a comprehensive view of artistic achievements in Southeast Asia from the 6th to the 8th century that no other museum could emulate. This reviewer could not agree more with the New York Times reviewer who wrote that “when the Metropolitan of Art gives its all to an exhibition in terms of space, money and scholarship, and the art involved is as rich as a massed chorale and as haunting as a single-voice chant, no institution on earth can produce more impressive results”. Furthermore, “projects like this, which entail the shipping of big and preposterously fragile things cost a mint. For that reason alone, the chance of anything like a reprise within a generation is pretty much nil” (Cotter 2014). In view of this the accompanying catalog is invaluable to lovers of Southeast Asian Art who did not have the opportunity to attend the exhibition.

The exhibits were arranged in chronological order, beginning with imported objects which became models for locally made artifacts, followed by sculpture representing indigenous nature cults which facilitated the assimilation of Indic religions, then early Buddhist icons and their regional variations, ending with images of Hindu gods in their different manifestations. The catalog, on the other hand, “is organized thematically to draw out the major narratives that shaped the region’s distinct cultural identities, notably the importation and integration of Indian religions, the role of Brahmanical cults, the emergence of state sponsorship and the role of savior cults” (Guy 2014, IX). The catalog is divided into five chapters, each corresponding to the dominant themes of the exhibition: I. Lost Kingdoms; II. Emerging Identities; III. The Brahmanical World; IV. State Art; and V. Savior Cults.
Each chapter contains short articles written by prominent scholars in the field linking the exhibits to the key themes and providing contextual backgrounds for the objects. To integrate the exhibits with the themes of the exhibition a catalog of the exhibits, written by the curator, is appended to each chapter.

The first chapter “Lost Kingdoms” contains four articles, two by the curator. The first “Introducing Early Southeast Asia” discusses the different interpretations of “Indianization”, the transmission of Indian religious imagery and the introduction of Brahmanism and Buddhism to Suvarnabhumi “Land of Gold” or Suvarnadvīpa “Island of Gold”, as well as influences of Indic languages and South Indian scripts in Southeast Asia. The second article, “Principal Kingdoms of Early Southeast Asia”, enumerates different city-states and polities that existed during that period. “Southeast Asia and the Early Maritime Silk Road” by Bérénice Bellina emphasizes pre-existing trade exchanges within Southeast Asia from the mid-1st millennium B.C. before the process of “Indianization”. Geoff Wade’s “Beyond the Southern Borders: Southeast Asia in Chinese Texts to the Ninth Century” gives a synopsis of Chinese historical records pertaining to Southeast Asia. Although progress has been made in identifying Chinese place names with specific locations, this reviewer remains doubtful where Dvāravatī was located, since Si Thep has as much a claim as Nakhom Pathom. For Xuanzang’s direction, archaeological evidence at Si Thep and the discovery of an inscription found in Nakhon Ratchasima province seriously demand a reevaluation of the matter. The fact that a number of silver medals were found at Nakhon Pathom, U Thong and In Buri bearing a Sanskrit text, “meritorious deed of the ruler of Dvāravatī”, does not prove that his kingdom was located there. But a king from a neighboring kingdom, called Dvāravatī, might have chosen to make his merit there. If Dvāravatī were to have been located at Si Thep, then the polities named in Chinese texts as being south of Dvāravatī would have to be realigned accordingly.

The catalog entries, entitled “Indian Imports” and “Nature Cults” conclude the first chapter. Pamela Gutman and Bob Hudson convincingly identify the central figure on the reverse of the Throne Stele from Śrī Ksetra (CAT.12) as Vāsudeva-Krsna of the Bhāgavata cult, which was the earliest Brahmanical cult to penetrate Southeast Asia, and propose a date around the end of the 1st century for the stele (Gutman and Hudson 2012-2013, 17-46), three centuries earlier than that given in the catalog. As for Lotus Base with Squatting Gana Figure (CAT.17) from Wat Na Phra Men, Ayuthaya, its iconography is directly inspired by Chinese sculpture, such as Śākyamuni Triad from Hua Yin, Eastern Shensi, executed during the Northern Wei dynasty (386-534) (Siren 1970, PL. 138), in which the flanking Bodhisattvas are shown standing on a lotus base supported by a squatting dwarf. Chinese influence is also detected in the anthropomorphic dragon depicted on a Lintel with Anthropomorphic Dragon in Foliage (CAT.18) where “analogous expressions of a monster-faced anthropomorph appear in funerary sculpture of the Northern Qi and Sui dynasties (6th-7th centuries)” (Guy 2014, 50).
The second chapter with four articles deals with “Emerging Identities” with an article on “Early Indic Inscriptions of Southeast Asia” by Arlo Griffiths who proposes that the term “Late Southern Brāhmi” be used instead of “Pallava script” to describe the form of writing found in most Southeast Asian inscriptions. Another article on inscriptions by Peter Skilling, entitled “Precious Deposits: Buddhism Seen through Inscriptions in Early Southeast Asia”, gives a survey of Buddhist inscriptions beginning in the early centuries AD, when the Sūtra on “Dependent Arising” (Prātiyasamutpāda Sūtra) was put inside reliquary caskets in India, to the 4th and 5th centuries when a condensed version known as the “Ye dharmā” formula in either Pāli or Sanskrit was inscribed on objects of veneration found throughout the region. Based on the language of the inscriptions, the author divides Southeast Asia into the Pāli zone: Myanmar and central Thailand; and the Sanskrit zone: Cambodia, Vietnam, the Malay Peninsula, Borneo and the islands of the Indonesian Archipelago. Analogous to the “Dependent Arising” stanza is the verse that expresses the principle of causation in terms of rebirth and karma that is found only in the Sanskrit zone. Since “the stanza is not known to exist in any known South Asian inscription, and its source has not been identified in any Buddhist scripture”, the reviewer proposes that the alternative is to look to East Asia for it. The author observes that although Śrī Lanka is the home of the Theravāda school, there is a scarcity of Pāli language inscriptions. “In term of geography, Śrī Lanka falls into the Sanskrit zone.”

This chapter also contains two articles on art and civilization: one by U Thein Lwin, U Win Kyaing, and Janice Stargardt on “The Pyu Civilization of Myanmar and the City of Śrī Ksetra” and the other on “Early Cham Art: Indigenous Styles and Regional Connections” by Pierre Baptiste. The former gives a comprehensive history of Śrī Ksetra, gleaned from a diverse field of advanced archaeological research, which is divided into an Early-Phase Śrī Ksetra, 2nd century BC to 4th century AD, into which the Throne Stele (CAT.12) would have to be placed on account of Gutman’s and Hudson’s research; Phase I of Pyu Buddhism at Śrī Ksetra, 4th to 6th century, where the Khinba mound hoard belongs (CAT.26-32); and Phase II of Buddhist Culture at Śrī Ksetra, 7th to 9th century, which saw the development of stone sculpture of Buddha, such as the Vikrama dynasty Buddha in Meditation (CAT.41). Pierre Baptiste supplies a background to Early Cham sculpture, such as the Yaksa from Tra Kieu (CAT.15), the Nāga Protected Deity found at Temple G1, My Son, now lost, whose chignon is similar to that of Śiva of Kampong Cham Kau (CAT.96), and the standing Ganeśa from Temple E5 at My Son.

The catalog appended to the second chapter is entitled “Arrival of Buddhism”. In view of the possible existence of Sanskrit Buddhism in Myanmar (Ray 1936, 19-24), might the terra cotta relief depicting Prince Temiya from the Mughapakkha Jātaka (CAT.32) be identified as King Śibi whose flesh is being scraped and hacked off in exchange for a dove from a Sanskrit-language avadāna tale? More importantly, this reviewer would like to see further research on the correlation between the different
ordination lineages (nikayās) of the Buddhist monkhood with the iconography of the Buddha images. There is no denying that an image is a replica of its prototype, because the Pāli word for an image of Buddha “patimā” means a copy. Thus an iconographic type might be indicative of its lineage. For example a Buddha Granting Boons from Wiang Sa, Surat Thani province (CAT.9) probably belonged to the same Sammitīya lineage as Buddha Granting Boons from Sārnāth region, Uttar Pradesh (CAT.10). However, on account of the different manner of wearing the monastic robe and the undergarment, Buddha Granting Boons from Tuol Ta Hoy, Kampong Speu province (CAT.50) was probably affiliated with the Sthaviravāda (Theravāda) lineage (Kraiirksh 2013, 20).

“The Brahmanical World” is the title of the third theme. It comprises four articles. Pierre-Yves Manguin contributes an article on “Early Coastal States of Southeast Asia: Funan and Śrīvijaya”. The sites of Dong Thap and Angkor Borei were inhabited a few centuries before the establishment of the kingdom of Funan in the 1st century. By the 3rd or 4th century after extensive canal systems were developed, the archaeological site of Oc Eo (Ba The) became a moated city and a manufacturing center for luxury artifacts some of which were exported overseas. Cultural and trade exchanges with India took place during this period. From the 5th to the mid-7th century a number of brick temples proliferated among which was excavated at Dong Thap a Visnu image (CAT.59). As attested by inscriptions, Vaisnava received royal support until it was supplanted by Śaivism after the fall of Funan. The author accepts the view of Coedès and Wolters that Śrīvijaya was located in Palembang, Sumatra, from the time of Yijing’s visit in the 670s, when it was called Shili Foshi, to the mid-11th century, when it was known as Sanfoqi. This reviewer, however, agrees with Takashi Suzuki that the location of Shili Foshi was not Palembang, but Chaiya on the Peninsula (Suzuki 2012, 109-126).

Agustijanto Indradjaya’s article, “Early Traces of Hinduism and Buddhism across the Java Sea”, shows that during the early centuries AD the islands of the Indonesian Archipelago were trading not only with India but also with Han dynasty China (206 BC to 25 AD). The recent excavations at Batujaya, West Java province, and at Uma Anyar, Bali province, have contributed to our knowledge of Buddhism in the Indonesian Archipelago. At Batujaya the remains of a brick structure, Candi Blandongan, bear some similarities with Wat Phra Men, Nakhon Pathom. A common type of sealing depicting a triad with the central Buddha seated with legs pendant flanked by two standing Bodhisattvas, with three Buddhas seated in meditation above them, has also been found. But, unlike those found in Continental Southeast Asia, the Batujaya variation has four stūpas decorating its frame, two on each side. The form of these stūpas resembles those excavated at the Khin Ba mound, Śrī Ksetra (CAT.31A,B) and at the Chula Pathon Chedi, Nakhon Pathom. Inscriptions bearing the Sanskrit mantra “ajñānāc cīyate karma”, which expresses the principle of causation in terms of rebirth and karma, were also found there. Two hundred and
fifty sealings, classified into eleven types have been found at Uma Anyar, Bali, some similar to those found at Batujaya.

Le Thi Lien’s “Hindu-Buddhist Sculpture in Southern Vietnam: Evolution of Icons and Styles to the Eighth Century” emphasizes that recent excavations by Vietnamese archaeologists have turned up artifacts in their original settings, providing for the first time religious and ritual context for them, such as a Śaiva linga on its lustration basin excavated at Sanctuary G1A, Cat Tien, Lamdong province. A one-of-its-kind bronze Dūrga Mahisāsuramardini excavated from Ke Mot, Kien Giang province shows strong stylistic affinities with its Khmer counterpart (CAT.66). Wood was the most common material for the making of Buddha images. Twenty-three have been discovered at Go Thap alone. The author argues that the Buddha Granting Boons found at Nen Chua, Kien Giang province has been influenced by the Sārnāth school. However, as it belongs to the same iconographic type as the Buddha Granting Boons from Tuol Ta Hoy, Kampong Speu province (CAT.50), it might have been affiliated to the Sthaviravāda ordination lineage as well (Krairiksh 2014).

Hiram Woodward’s essay, “Stylistic Trends in Mainland Southeast Asia, 600-800”, discusses the dating of some of the exhibits from Thailand, Cambodia and Vietnam. First he selected three lintels to show the stylistic evolution from the earliest type with makara and the double cupped arch from Sambor on the Mekong (CAT.62) of the late 6th century to the Wat Eng Khna lintel (CAT.88) from the third quarter of the 7th century, in which the arch has been straightened out and foliage medallions replace the makaras. The final outcome is the design of the Prasat Phum Prasat lintel, dated 706, which is composed purely of vegetal scrolls, at the center of which the author sees a stylized “ghost of a monster mask”, which is “more typical of Chinese than of Indian art”. Thence he proceeds to date 7th to 8th-century Cambodian and Thailand Dvāravatī period sculpture in the exhibition “in the light of these three lintels”, which as he admits, “takes us into the realm of subjective judgements”.

Two catalog entries, entitled, “Visnu and Kingship” and “Śiva’s World”, bring to a close the theme of “The Brahmanical World”. The fourth theme is “State Art”. Under this heading there are three articles on Thailand’s Dvāravatī period art and architecture: “Dvāravatī Sculpture” by Robert L. Brown, “Cakra: Quintessential Symbol of the Buddha’s Law” by Thierry Zéphir, and “Buddhist Architecture and Ritual Space in Thailand, Seventh to Ninth Century” by Stephen A. Murphy. Apparently, the curator must have thought that Buddhism in Thailand between the 6th and the 8th century must have had the same state support as it has today. However, prior to the passing of the Sangha Act of 1902, which brought Buddhism under state control, Buddhism was supported by three strata of society, namely the people, the sangha (Buddhist monkhood) and the royal court. Each entity contributed its own particularities to Buddhist art.

Robert L. Brown observes that, although the predominant source for the typical Dvāravatī Buddhas (CAT.117) was the Sārnāth style, “it shares many characteristics with Chinese sculptures, such as the tightly clinging robe, without folds, that hides...
the genitals”. He believes that both Dvāravatī and Chinese Buddhas of the Northern Qi dynasty (550-577) were influenced by the Sārnāth images. Other sculpture typical of Dvāravatī are the Wheel of the Law (CAT.122-123), raised on pillars, and the standing or seated Buddha flanked by attendants on a flying animal (CAT.124), which might have been placed on the hubs of the wheels. He hypothesizes that the combinations represent that “the Buddha is giving a lecture from the sky”, which is in tune with the popularity of the scene of the Miracles at Śrāvastī (CAT.126), in which the Buddha preaches from the sky. However, this reviewer has identified the type of standing Buddha, wearing the robe covering both shoulders, showing asexual nudity, with both hands executing the gesture of argumentation as representing Amitābha/ Amitāyu (Infinite Light/Endless Life), the Mahāyāna Buddha of the Sukhāvatī cult who descends from Sukhāvatī, Land of Bliss, to receive the souls of the faithful. The scene of descent from Sukhāvatī is depicted by Amitābha/Amitāyu attended by the Bodhisattvas Avalokiteśvara and Mahāstāmaprāpta, standing on a composite winged animal (Krairiksh 2012, 88-92) that could have symbolized anger, greed and illusion. When affixed to the hub of the Wheel of the Law, raised on a pillar and covered with gold leaf, it would have tallied with a passage from the “Larger Sukhāvatī-Vyūha: Description of Sukhāvatī, the Land of Bliss”, which says that “Buddha Amitāyus stood in the midst of the sky with Bodhisattvas Mahāstāma and Avalokiteśvara, attending on his right and left respectively. There was such a bright and dazzling radiance that no one could see clearly; the brilliance was a hundred thousand times greater than that of gold.” (Cowell 1969, 175-176). Nevertheless, this reviewer agrees with the author’s conclusion that “Dvāravatī, and probably most art associated with the name, can be securely placed only in the seventh and eighth centuries” and that “the political history of Dvāravatī presented today is a construct, not a reality”.

Thierry Zéphir’s “Cakra: Quintessential Symbol of the Buddha’s Law” discusses three different types of cakras in Buddhist art: the Jewel Wheel (ratnacakra), one of the seven gems of the universal monarch (cakravartin), the Wheel of Life (samsāracakra) and the Wheel of the Law (dharmacakra). The Wheel of the Law is linked to the Buddha’s first sermon at Sārnāth, the “Sermon on Setting in Motion The Wheel of the Law” (Dhammacakkappavattana Sutta), which lays out the tenets of the Buddha’s teaching. While some Dvāravatī dharmacakras bear excerpts from this sermon on the rims of the wheel, others are inscribed with the “Independent Arising” formula.

Stephen A. Murphy’s “Buddhist Architecture and Ritual Space in Thailand, Seventh to Ninth Century” covers moated urban settlements with monastic architecture in northeastern Thailand at Muang Fa Daed, Kalasin province, and at Muang Sema, Nakhon Ratchasima province. The ordination halls (ubosot) had a set of eight or sixteen stone boundary markers (semas) around them. Some have scenes from the life of the Buddha, others those of his former lives (jātakas). At Muang Fa Daed, there are remains of foundations for seven stūpas inside the moat and seven outside. Excavations half a kilometer from the moat of Muang Sema.
revealed the foundation of an assembly hall (vihāra) that used to house an eleven-meter long stone image of Buddha in mahāparinirvāna posture, in the vicinity of which a dharmacakra was found. Excavations also revealed a monastic compound at the center of the settlement complete with a large vihāra, an ubosot, and numerous stūpas. The reviewer would like to suggest that the findings at Muang Sema indicate the presence of Theravāda Buddhism where both the town-dwelling monks (kammavāsi) and the forest-dwelling monks (araññavāsi) had once coexisted.

The theme of “State Art” is carried onto the catalog entries, in which, with the exceptions of two images of “Enthroned Buddha”, one from Son Tho, Vietnam (CAT.108) and the other reportedly found in Myanmar, in the Cleveland Museum of Art (CAT.109), all are Dvāravatī period sculpture.

“Savior Cults” is the name of the fifth theme of the catalog and the exhibits. It consists of a single article on Thailand’s Dvāravatī period, entitled “The Transformation of Brahmanical and Buddhist Imagery in Central Thailand, 600-800”, by Pattaratorn Chirapravati. Under the heading “Si Thep: Ancient Cosmopolitan Center of the 8th and 9th Centuries”, the author surveys the recent excavations there as well as reports on the findings of Tang Dynasty (618-906) ceramics and sealings depicting Buddha in meditation with a Chinese inscription giving the name Wenxiang. Six images of Sūrya may have been discovered at Si Thep, the most in Thailand, one of which is in the exhibition (CAT.70), as well as an image of Visnu (CAT.71) and two of Krsna Govardhana. As Sūrya is sometimes depicted seated at the base of a dharmacakra, with both hands holding a lotus bud, the dharmacakra is identified with the sun. Following Robert L. Brown’s opinion that “the double katakamudrā, a gesture used consistently by Sūrya, may indicate an association between the Buddha and the sun”, the author then surmises that Sūrya’s double katakamudrā “may be the source of the popular double teaching hand gesture (vitarkamudrā), a pose that is not known in India”. The reviewer suggests that a prototype should be sought in China where a bronze Amitābha/Amitāyu from the Sui dynasty (518-618) in the Musée Guimet is depicted with the double vitarkamudrā held in front of the chest (Munsterberg 1967, PL.24). Since a rock-cut relief at Buduruvagala, Śrī Lanka, depicting the Bodhisattva Maitreya is shown with the double katakamudrā, the author concludes that “while Sūrya’s double hand gesture of katakamudrā is used on the standing image of Maitreya, the double hand gesture of vitarkamudrā was developed for Śākyamuni”. The reviewer does not believe that stylistic analysis can adequately explain the transformation of Buddhist iconography, because iconography follows the evolution of Buddhist thought as expressed through successive ordination lineages. The answer, therefore, must be sought not from the outside, but within the Buddhist religion itself. Ultimately, the theme of “Savior Cults” fails to connect with the superb images of bodhisattvas that grace the catalog section.

The book concludes with appendices consisting of two articles on technical matters: Federico Carò and Janet G. Douglas on “Stone Types and Sculptural
Practices in Pre-Angkorian Southeast Asia”, and Lawrence Becker, Donna Strahan, and Ariel O’Connor on “Technical Observations on Casting Technology in First-Millennium Cambodia, Thailand, and Vietnam”. A thoughtful addition is a Glossary of Sites in First Millennium Southeast Asia included for the benefit of general readers. Although it does not claim to be exhaustive, it is extremely useful, nonetheless. *Lost Kingdoms: Hindu Buddhist Sculpture of Early Southeast Asia* is a compendium of present knowledge of Southeast Asian sculpture from the 6th to the 8th century. As such, it is a must-have volume for anyone interested in the subject. Unfortunately, our understanding of Early Southeast Asia is limited to research based on a 20th century paradigm of “Indianization” that has closed our mind to the equally potent force of “Sinicization”. Although Chinese historical sources from the 1st century onwards are the principal provider for our knowledge of the history of these “Lost Kingdoms”, archaeologists and art historians have so far neglected to study the “Sinicization” of Early Southeast Asia. 

Piriya Krairiksh
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The exhibition Lost Kingdoms: Hindu-Buddhist Sculpture of Early Southeast Asia brought together 170 sculptures from across Southeast Asia dating from the seminal period from the 5th through 8th centuries when local communities began to coalesce into civilizations. When I first looked through this landmark exhibition catalog, I was struck by the number of pieces that were literally of “National Treasure” stature that had been borrowed from the museums of six Southeast Asian countries: two in Europe and from collections in the United States. Not only does this 318-page lavishly illustrated catalog document this extraordinary exhibition, but it is presented in a fresh and insightful manner with contributing essays by many of the top scholars in early Southeast Asian history, art history, Buddhist and Hindu studies, and linguistics. It discusses and presents advances in scholarship that have been made towards understanding this complex and crucial period in the development of Southeast Asia in the last few years. As John Guy notes in the Preface, without these advances in scholarship, this exhibition could not have been undertaken a generation ago, and even a few years ago it would not have been possible to obtain the loan of so many important objects. John Guy is to be congratulated for the difficult and subtle negotiations that resulted in such a diverse group of strong national and regional interests cooperating together to loan so many important objects, not only to the history of their cultures, but also to the history of Southeast Asia as a whole.

As one who has regularly taught classes on Southeast Asian art history, the problem of how to coherently present the developments that follow the bronze and iron ages has always been a problem. Traditionally the art and architecture of this period have been presented according to modern political division and primarily categorized in terms of an ethnic group or nation state, or a combination of both. This does not adequately reflect the conditions during the 5th through 8th centuries. Similarly, an approach based on religious traditions also has shortcomings. In organizing this exhibition John Guy chose to approach the material using not just a single methodology, but from multiple viewpoints that both stand by themselves and overlap with each of the other groupings. The resulting sections of the exhibition clearly discuss and place in a relative context select groups of objects, permitting them to be understood as both distinct within local religious and cultural frameworks, and related to larger regional developments.

The catalog is divided into five thematic sections, and each section is introduced with essays by leading scholars in their respective disciplines. These serve to define the underlying premise of each section and contextualize the catalog objects. John Guy’s well researched and carefully considered catalog entries then analyze each
object and also provide a continuous and interrelated narrative. In teaching my first class in Southeast Asian art history after reading this catalog, I rearranged the material for this period according to some of the groupings used. The lectures flowed more evenly and the students were better able to critically analyze and relate the material than in previous years.

Section 1, titled “Lost Kingdoms”, begins with an introductory essay by John Guy, “Introducing Early Southeast Asia”, that discusses traditional and new views as to how Indic ideas were selectively adopted and adapted to local cultural conditions in Southeast Asia. The subsections within the chapter outline past scholarly assumptions and the reevaluation of these existing connections in light of new scholarship concerning Southeast Asia’s earliest contacts with other civilizations and religions. They are: “Defining the Kingdoms in Space and Time;” “New Religions;” “Respect the Buddha, Revere the Brahmans;” “Lands of Gold;” and “Scripts and Inscriptions.” John Guy’s second essay, “Principal Kingdoms of Early Southeast Asia”, gives a brief introduction to the early kingdoms of Southeast Asia in terms of indigenous historical records and recent archaeological evidence. The kingdoms of the Pyu, Funan, Zhenla, Champa, Dvāravatī, Kedah, and Śrivijaya are concisely introduced.

These two introductory essays are then followed by Bérénice Bellina’s short essay, “Southeast Asia and the Early Maritime Silk Road”, which discusses the changing view of Southeast Asian trade routes made possible by recent advances in geo-archaeology and archaeo-botony, and the laboratory analysis of finds. These studies have shown that from Neolithic times, there were extensive, well-developed trade routes throughout Southeast Asia. When they came in contact with the global trading network linking the West through India to China, these interregional trade networks interacted with it both from within and from without the local infrastructure, supplying goods for export and receiving in payment items made specifically for their local consumption. The competition between the local elites to control trade along the interregional networks contributed to the cultural complexity of the region. Geoff Wade’s essay, “Beyond the Southern Borders: Southeast Asia in Chinese Texts to the Ninth Century”, concludes the first section. As there are few early indigenous inscriptions and most are very short, much of what we know about these formative societies is known from Chinese references to them. As noted by Wade, this is not a comprehensive or coherent selection of available Chinese sources, but is “… aimed at illuminating the early societies in a synoptic manner, by extracting from a wide range of sources the data most relevant to the traditions represented in this publication.” Each region and culture is viewed in light of Chinese sources with a brief discussion as to the interpretation of the texts and their reliability. The catalog entries for Section 1 by John Guy on objects 1-18 follow under the heading “Indian Imports and Native Cults.”

Section 2 is titled “Emerging Identities” and begins with Arla Griffiths’ essay,
“Early Indic Inscriptions of Southeast Asia”, which is an analysis of the Indic scripts used in early Southeast Asian inscriptions, the general nature of the inscriptions, and the role of these inscriptions as art-historical sources. Peter Skilling’s essay, “Precious Deposits: Buddhism Seen through Inscriptions in Early Southeast Asia”, examines the nature and context of Buddhist inscriptions in early Southeast Asia, especially the role of the “stanza of causation” \( \text{pratītyasamutpādagāthā} \), the four-line formula that is a summary of the Buddha’s teaching. Both Pali and Sanskrit inscriptions are introduced in the context of the religious doctrines that they embody. He concludes that while Southeast Asian Buddhists participated in the pan-Asian Buddhist ritual culture, they “forged their own identities and developed their own practices and customs.” The essay by Thein Lwin, Win Kyaing, and Janice Stargard, “The Pyu Civilization of Myanmar and the City of Śrī Kṣetra”, concisely summarizes the history of the Pyu at Śrī Kṣetra through the presentation of inscriptive and archaeological evidence. Concentrating primarily on the findings from Śrī Kṣetra beginning in the 5th century, Buddhist inscriptions, sculptures, and religious structures are introduced. Concluding Section 2 is Pierre Baptiste’s essay, “Early Cham Art: Indigenous Styles and Regional Connections”, which weaves Cham inscriptive evidence together with Chinese records in contextualizing the Hindu and Buddhist art of the early Cham civilization; Baptiste also provides stylistic comparisons with South Indian art and other Southeast Asian civilizations. John Guy’s catalog entries from 19 to 56 for the section follow under the title “The Arrival of Buddhism.”

While Section 2 looks primarily at Buddhist influence and the local states that adopted it, Section 3 is titled “The Brahmanical World.” Pierre-Yves Manguin’s essay, “Early Coastal States of Southeast Asia: Funan and Śrivijaya”, looks at how recent archaeological research has changed our view of the evolution of the region, especially the early kingdoms of Funan and Śrivijaya. This essay begins with a concise presentation of the archaeological evidence for the economic and religious development of the Oc Eo floodplain and concludes with the question of why the site was abandoned and major cultural activity was shifted elsewhere. Pierre-Yves Manguin then looks at the Kingdom of Śrivijaya through both Chinese records and indigenous inscriptions before exploring how Śrivijaya established itself as the first large state in insular Southeast Asia based on international trade. Using archaeological evidence, he places the center of the kingdom along the Musi River at Palembang and proceeds to discuss the archaeological evidence and its implications. Then, using Chinese records and inscriptions, he concludes with the circumstances linking it to the rise of Central Java. Agustijanto Indrajaya’s “Early Traces of Hinduism and Buddhism across the Java Sea” is a short essay which expands upon Manguin’s. Le Thi Lien’s essay, “Hindu Buddhist Sculpture in Southern Vietnam: Evolution of Icons and Styles to the Eighth Century”, reviews the archaeological evidence for southern Vietnam, including the site of Cat Tien, which was excavated in the 1990s. His stylistic analysis of stone Buddha images considers both Indic
origins and local synthesis and is followed by a review of Śaivite and Vaisnava sculpture. Hiram Woodward’s “Stylistic Trends in Mainland Southeast Asia 600-800” is one of the best essays in the catalog. He establishes the value of Khmer art in setting a baseline for the stylistic study of artistic developments in Southeast Asia due to the relatively large number of monuments and their accompanying dedicatory inscriptions that permit the stylistic development to be considered over time. Beginning with a clearly defined and presented discussion of the changes among three early Khmer lintels, he establishes reference points. A discussion of early Khmer sculpture follows, again establishing reference points with regards to both indigenous and Indic prototypes. He concludes his essay with a brief discussion of the complexities involved in the study of 8th century sculpture, as dates are often open to interpretation and many images display a subtle mixture of influences from different sources. Following these essays are John Guy’s catalog entries 57 through 187 under the headings “Viṣṇu” and “Śiva’s World.”

Robert L. Brown’s essay, “Dvāravatī Sculpture”, begins Section 4 titled “State Art”, reflecting that Dvāravatī is referred to in its own inscriptions in terms that we equate with statehood. He first looks at why the term Dvāravatī has been applied to the 7th and 8th century Mon civilization of central Thailand, the development of scholarship and stylistic analysis of Dvāravatī sculptures, and the influence of the Gupta Sarnath style on the development of the Dvāravatī Buddha image. He then discusses how the argument that a single style of art and characteristic iconography with inscriptions and records serve to establish Dvāravatī as a real place. While most scholars speak of Dvāravatī as lasting until the 11th century, Brown then points out that there is so little evidence of Dvāravatī as a political presence from the 8th through the 11th century that there has been a rush to arbitrarily classify the art and architecture to build a bridge between Dvāravatī and modern Thailand. He continues with the advent of the Thai in the region in the 12th century. The fact that Dvāravatī and most of the art associated with it can only be placed in the 7th and 8th centuries has also been argued from other disciplines such as those of Peter Skilling, Pierre Baptiste, and Claude Jacques, who argues in an essay that the political history of Dvāravatī is a construct, not a reality. Thierry Zéphir’s essay, “Cakra: Quintessential Symbol of the Buddha’s Law”, is an in-depth review of scholarship concerning the Dvāravatī “Wheels of the Law” from the political and religious sources in South Asia and contributes a concise discussion of their possible religious significance in the Dvāravatī context. The last essay in Section 4 is by Stephen A. Murphy on Dvāravatī Buddhist art in Northeastern Thailand, “Buddhist Architecture and Ritual Space in Thailand, Seventh to Ninth Century.” This essay discusses the development of a cult of large stone boundary markers, sema, used to designate the sacred space within whose boundaries all crucial Buddhist ceremonies need to be conducted. He suggests that Buddhism influenced the development of urban and political life of the early polities and states of Northeastern Thailand. John Guy’s catalog entries 108
through 130 for Section 4 are presented under the title “State Art.”

The final section of the catalog is titled “Savior Cults.” Pattaratorn Chirapravati’s “The Transformation of Brahmanical and Buddhist Imagery in Central Thailand, 600-800” is the sole essay in this section and concentrates on the ancient cosmopolitan center of Sri Thep that was located in the Pa Sak River Valley along a major regional trade route. Easily accessible from Mon Dvāravatī centers in Central Thailand, the art and architectural remains show that Buddhism and Brahmanism were practiced concurrently. In addition to Buddhist sculptures, several large images of Surya and Viṣṇu have been found. The core of the author’s thesis is that the worship of Surya was associated with the rulers of Dvāravatī and Surya was also conceptually connected with the Dvāravatī appreciation of the “Wheel of the Law,” dharmacakra. Building upon the research of Robert Brown and Hiram Woodward, she concludes with the suggestion that in the fluid religious atmosphere of Dvāravatī: “Southeast Asian Buddhism incorporated different Indian and Sinhalese styles and iconography, seemingly creating their own versions of objects best suited to the ritual and cultural needs of Si Thep and other Dvāravatī sites.” John Guy’s catalog entries 131 through 170 are presented under the category “Savior Cults.”

The Lost Kingdoms catalog concludes with two technical essays by research chemists on the type of stone used in Southeast Asian stone sculptures and metal casting technology. The essay by Federico Carò and Janet G. Douglas, “Stone Types and Sculptural Practices in Pre-Angkorian Southeast Asia”, presents observations on the different types of stone used for the production of early Southeast Asian sculpture. While detailed geological, mapping, and petrographic studies are still lacking for most of Southeast Asia, some information is available for Cambodia and permits some general conclusions. For this publication twelve stone sculptures from the National Museum of Cambodia and the Museum of Vietnamese History, Ho Chi Minh City, were analyzed, with the full reports published for two objects—an early 6th century Viṣṇu and the mid-7th century Lintel with a King’s Consecration—in the exhibition. Lawrence Becker, Donna Strahan, and Ariel O’Connor’s “Technical Observations on Casting Technology in First-Millennium Cambodia, Thailand, and Vietnam” presents an overview of early Southeast Asian metal casting technology based on the examination of sculptures in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. General observations are that the images were cast using the direct lost-wax technology. Sculptures under 25 cm in height are generally solid, while larger ones are hollow with iron armatures supporting the sculpture on the interior. Techniques are similar to those used in Northern India, and the continued use of iron armatures in Southeast Asia—even in relatively small sculptures—points to a conservative tradition. General studies are presented for Dvāravatī, images from the Prakhon Chai Hoard, and Pre-Angkorian Khmer and Vietnamese images, noting the general quality of the casting, the percentages of the metals comprising the alloys, along with notes on the armatures and general casting technology. The catalog
concludes with a well thought out and easy to reference research bibliography and a Bibliography, as well as a comprehensive glossary of important archaeological and cultural sites in Southeast Asia. Organized by country, it is clear and easy to use.

While the essays and research material contain some new theories and summarize the advances that have been made to date in the understanding of how the art and cultures of these early states developed and provide suggestions as to how their religious beliefs can be appreciated, it is John Guy’s carefully researched and insightful catalog entries on each of the 170 objects in the exhibition that form a consistent narrative throughout the catalog. While specialists might find fault with his interpretation or approach with a few objects, the overall quality of the research and discussion of the objects is consistently high and helps to bring both them and the cultures that produced them alive to the reader. The curatorial vision and selection of objects for the exhibition is also worthy of comment. As noted earlier, the difficulty of putting together an international loan exhibition is a daunting challenge; and to obtain the loan of so many extremely important and high quality pieces from so many different museums in Southeast Asia is unprecedented. Hopefully this will pave the way for future collaborative exhibitions. For anyone interested in early Southeast Asian studies, this is a “must have” addition to their library.

John Listopad