



Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) KONINKLIJKE NEDERLANDSE AKADEMIE VAN WETENSCHAPPEN

The problem of transregional framing in Asian history. Charmed knowledge networks and moral geographies of “Greater India”

Bloembergen, M.

published in

Monsoon Asia. A reader on South and Southeast Asia
2023

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

document license

Taverne

[Link to publication in KNAW Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Bloembergen, M. (2023). The problem of transregional framing in Asian history. Charmed knowledge networks and moral geographies of “Greater India”. In D. Henley, & E. al (Eds.), *Monsoon Asia. A reader on South and Southeast Asia*

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the KNAW public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the KNAW public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

pure@knaw.nl

The Problem of Transregional Framing in Asian History: Charmed Knowledge Networks and Moral Geographies of “Greater India”¹

Marieke Bloembergen

Abstract

Since the nineteenth century, today’s South and Southeast Asia have become part of scholarly and popular geographies that define the region as a single, superior, civilization with Hindu-Buddhist spiritual traits and its origins in India. These *moral geographies* of “Greater India” are still current in universities, museums, textbooks, and popular culture across the world. This chapter explores, for the period from the 1890s to the 1960s, how associational networks of scholars, intellectuals, and “Asian art” collectors, and of theosophists and Buddhist revivalists, linking Indonesia, mainland Asia, and the West helped shape these moral geographies and enabled the inclusion of predominantly Islamic Indonesia. It contributes to recent debates on the role of religion and affections in Orientalism, by starting from sites zooming in on knowledge exchange, and by analyzing object biographies, exploring the changing taxonomies, violence, and limits of cultural understanding as objects travel from their sites of origin to elsewhere in the world. It warns against pitfalls of transnational, “Oceanic” approaches to Asian history that focus on cultural flows – including the idea of Monsoon Asia itself – as these can exaggerate the region’s cultural unity and, in doing so, reify the moral geographies of Greater India that the article interrogates.

Keywords: Greater India; Indonesia; transnational knowledge networks; Asian art; heritage; religion; affections; (post-)colonialism

Let us acknowledge it, let us feel that India is not confined in the Geography of India – and then we shall find our message from our part. India can live and grow by spreading abroad – not the political India, but the ideal India

Rabindranath Tagore, 1920²

“Monsoon Asia” is only one of many possible ‘transregional’ frameworks to study South and Southeast Asia, that scholars have proposed in the course of the long twentieth century. Academic reasons these proposals may have had, they were and

are all also political, and have political effects. In his Foreword to *Revealing India's Past* (1939), the famous French Sanskritist and expert on Buddhist iconography Alfred Foucher reflected on the trend of "Pacific Ocean" congresses that archaeologists had been organizing in Asia since the late 1920s. He suggested also having "Indian Ocean" congresses, where, he reasoned, scholars could contemplate the remarkable Hindu-Buddhist civilization of Asia. To understand this civilizational puzzle, he argued, one had to recognize that India was the "center" and "cornerstone."³ The island of Java in the Netherlands Indies was, in that same regard, "only an Indian colony," as he had explained in a public lecture much earlier.⁴ Foucher did not seem to care whether local subjects in Java, colonized by the Dutch and forming a majority of Muslims since at least the sixteenth century, would agree with this. Nor would he have imagined the potential violence of this common scholarly habit of his time: treating what today are South Asia and Southeast Asia as a single cultural region.

This article analyzes, for the period from the 1890s to the 1960s, the makings and politics of a persistent framework of thinking about Asia, for which Foucher's ideas are representative: "Greater India". Both an academic and political concept in Foucher's time, in this essay I use it to refer to a much larger and more fluent yet palpable set of ideas that people in both Asia and the West project on today's South and Southeast Asia. This Greater India implies the idea of a spiritual Hindu-Buddhist civilization that, since ancient times, had spread its wellness from India over a receiving southern region. To its influential believers, it provided the superior standard for understanding culture in what we now call Southeast Asia.

In light of the spatial turn and trans-oceanic and transnational approaches to Asian history, which this volume also reflects, it is pertinent to explore the workings and legacies of this way of viewing the region. Over the past three decades, in the context of a widely felt discomfort about state- and empire-centered historiographies and the artificial boundaries of Area Studies, the "Indian Ocean" has once again become a popular frame for historians of South and Southeast Asia, driven by historical and empathic efforts to understand marginalized "local" and diasporic perspectives.⁵ The present volume's editors' choice for the framing 'Monsoon Asia' is a comparable outcome of this drive. As the example of Foucher shows, however, the framing of transregional geographies as an analytical tool is not new, but rather is indebted to older colonial scholarship that, as others have pointed out before, was not unproblematic.⁶ Although inspired by these more recent "Oceanic" and transnational approaches to Asian history, and lauding the initiative of this volume's editors, to provide a textbook for students to learn from these attempts, this article also warns against their pitfalls as they can reproduce elite-centred essentializing views on the region as a cultural unity and, in doing so, reify ideas of Greater India.

Greater India thinking has displayed a continuity and worldwide reach that, via academia, museums, and popular culture worldwide, has exercised a lasting influence on how people in Asia and the West view South and Southeast Asia. Ideas of Greater India resonate in the worldwide popularity of Yoga and Ayurveda, perceived as unchanged, wholesome goods from an ancient India. And, as this article highlights, they dominate in archaeological research and study in and on Asia, in “Asian art” collecting, exhibits and marketing, and the category of Asian art itself. The question is how and why such ideas developed in that field, and how they thereby became part and parcel of (epistemic) violence, structuring the way many people across the world think of Asia as an overwhelmingly Hindu-Buddhist, spiritual, *Indianized* good. From the Metropolitan Museum in New York to Musée Guimet in Paris and the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, well-choreographed exhibitions strategically use light and space to emphasize the spiritual power and inner beauty of Hindu and Buddhist statues, evoking ideas of Greater India. In this way, they obfuscate the violence underlying how objects were collected and depict Southeast Asia as the passive recipient of a superior Indian civilization.⁷

At the same time, Indonesia, home to the world’s largest Muslim population, is usually absent from both old and new permanent displays of “art” from the Islamic world, like those in the Louvre in Paris (2012) or the Metropolitan in New York (2015). This parallel and complementary problem of ignoring Indonesian Islam has been observed by other scholars as well, though they have focused on the imagination, collecting, and study of Islam.⁸ We need to scrutinize why and how this double bias developed and helped create a persistent moral-cum-spatial imagination of “Asia” as a greater Hindu-Buddhist India. This may also help explain the larger question of why we construct ideas about space in moral and civilizational terms? How and why does the reputation of one idea (here Greater India) come to dominate at the expense of others? And how does this affect our relationships with others, whether we live or move inside or outside of that space?

In the 1920s and 1930s, the idea of Greater India became most clearly embodied politically in the Greater India Society, founded in Calcutta in 1926. This society was formed by Bengali historians and intellectuals with whom the internationally well-connected Nobel Prize-winning Bengali poet Rabindranath Tagore associated. It heralded a nationalist vision of a benign, spiritual, *Indian* civilization having disseminated across Asia in the past, and it propagated the study and revival of that civilization in the present.⁹ The present chapter’s opening quotation is illustrative for the idealistic, and un-complicating optimism this way of thinking entailed. Telling for a colonial mindset, Tagore wrote these lines inspired by stories he had heard while in the Netherlands about (Hindu) Bali, believing it to be a pure remainder of Indian culture. He did so without ever having met actual Balinese, writing *about them* to an English intellectual soul mate.

In a groundbreaking essay, Susan Bayly showed how much this society's vision of Greater India was inspired by French scholars, in particular one of Foucher's colleagues, the Sanskritist Sylvain Lévi in Paris, and how it took on explicit political forms in India.¹⁰ Most critical studies have explored this problem from an India-centered perspective. Here, I will instead follow the perspective of the outsider inside: Indonesia. The question is why and how a predominantly Islamic Indonesia became situated in this Greater India-mindset. To answer this, I explore the roles of sites in Indonesia (ancient religious sites, transforming into heritage sites), their moveable objects, and the affections they stir, as well as the knowledge networks that connect these three categories. I employ a mobile, sites-centered, objects-biographical approach, zooming in on the charmed knowledge networks that objects created, in order to understand how multiple, changing power relations and violence shape knowledge and vice versa.¹¹

Engaging with recent debates on the role of religion in the study of Orientalism,¹² I propose that the motif of love, or empathy, and the related concept of "cultural understanding," and (perceived) affections in knowledge production can help explain the ossifying endurance of ideas of Greater India. I argue, moreover, that the Greater India mindset has plural forms and centers and has had a reach far beyond Calcutta in time and space. To understand the magnitude of its global socio-political impact, we need to explore Greater India thinking beyond India-centered perspectives and understand the workings of "transnational" power relations elsewhere, such as those generated by intercolonial and inter-Asian knowledge networks located in colonial and postcolonial Indonesia.

In exploring the role of affections in creating such moral geographies I am inspired by the work of literary scholar Leela Gandhi.¹³ Her *Affective Communities* (2006) focuses on the politics of friendships between figures that have been marginalized by postcolonial and national histories and that seem to have crossed the divide between colonizers and colonized: the theosophists, vegetarians, and spiritual seekers who traveled between Europe and India during the high tide of imperialism around 1900. Though not taken seriously in national historiographies, these figures were cultural elites who often had financial and political power as well. They were part of the kinds of networks that I focus on here: scholars of Asia, connoisseurs and collectors of "Asian art", Asia-born nationalist intellectuals and *gurus*, Buddhist revivalists, theosophists, and other spiritual seekers. They came together in an associational movement of Asian art lovers against the background of a taxonomical shift, starting in the 1910s, toward the appreciation of ancient religious sculpture from Asia as high-brow art. Followers of this movement self-identified as "Friends of Asian Art" or "Friends of Asia." Gandhi argues that the "affective communities" she discerns could transcend colonial difference and feed into anticolonial critiques.¹⁴ In what follows, I build on that insight to argue

that affective relationships – between these “Friends of Asian Art,” and their love for “art” objects – became both part of anticolonial critiques and supportive of European colonialism. Moreover, they generated blindness toward, or passive tolerance of, the violence of heritage formation within and beyond colonial and postcolonial state borders. All along, these affections fed into India-centered forms of cultural imperialism that ignored Islam or pushed it out of sight.

Local genius: criticizing Indianization theory

Intriguingly, despite the enduring legacy of Greater India thinking in museums, popular culture and certain academic worlds, scholarly critiques of the Greater India paradigm, strongly driven by empathy, reach back to the heyday of Greater Indian scholarship. These critiques, however, have been predominantly archaeological and have had little impact beyond that field. Only recently has it started to subtly influence museums of Asian art, and it has triggered some alternative exhibits of Islamic art that include or even focus on Southeast Asia.¹⁵ In most older museums, though, curators wishing to show more interactive perspectives on ancient Hindu-Buddhist Asia are hampered by bias in their collections and perhaps by their love for them.

From the 1910s, colonial scholars working in the Netherlands Indies, French Indochina, or British Burma and the Malay States began to write critiques of the Greater India paradigm. They did so partly in reaction to their India-oriented Sanskrit teachers, and in the context of a booming study of prehistory in Asia, which resulted in the trendy “Pacific Ocean” congresses mentioned earlier.¹⁶ Against “Greater India,” and working with terms like “flows,” “acculturation,” and “adaptation,” they postulated another romantic concept, that of a creative “local genius” which functioned before the Indians arrived.¹⁷ Basing their thoughts on research they conducted *in* the region, and sympathizing with what they deemed “local,” these scholars provided alternative concepts, sources, and methods of research that could contribute to recognition and gauging of the role of local agency in the region’s civilizational history. In that sense, their work influenced the postcolonial generation of scholars, and in postcolonial Indonesia “local genius” became an argument in archaeology and history writing that emphasized the creative nation.¹⁸

After World War II and violent recolonization wars, when countries in Asia gained formal independence, criticism against Indianization theory continued in archaeological and historical studies, including in the West.¹⁹ In the United States, the new “Area Studies” departments and approaches were developed partly with the help of colonial scholars who had, by today’s standard, unusually long-term research experience in Asia. These new university departments set Southeast Asia

apart from South Asia, now as separate regions. Against that backdrop, from the early 1960s “Indianization” theory, along with European and colonial state-centered historical writing on the region, met with new forms of criticism. These took the form of a sub-regional focus on “autonomous” history and, in handbooks, on the study of Southeast Asia “in itself.”²⁰ The influential Southeast Asian scholar O. W. Wolters, based at Cornell University, critiqued the idea that “Indianization” had introduced a whole new chapter in the region. Taking stock of pre-Indian, prehistorical, and archaeological research in the region, he preferred to talk about “Hindu” or “religious” influences (rather than “Indian” or “political” ones), which “brought ancient and persistent indigenous beliefs into sharper focus.” Wolters argued that Southeast Asian Kingdoms had developed all along while “localizing” the (Indic) model of a *mandala* in the form of multiple overlapping *mandalas* – circles around one king with divine, universal authority.²¹

And yet, in the postwar period the Greater India perspective continued to dominate the field of the arts of South and Southeast Asia. The Metropolitan Museum in New York, for example, after a huge renovation of its Asian art galleries, reopened in 1960 with an exhibition encapsulating material remains of Southeast Asia entitled “The Sculpture of Greater India.”²² Similarly telling is the opening sentence from a popular academic handbook of 1967, *Art of Southeast Asia*: “The culture of India has been one of the world’s most powerful civilizing forces [...] the members of that circle of civilizations beyond Burma clustered around the Gulf of Siam and the Java Sea virtually owe their very existence to the creative influence of Indian ideas.”²³

Still today, despite persistent scholarly criticisms of Greater India views,²⁴ and though some institutions, most notably the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, have produced more nuanced efforts that emphasize reciprocity, we continue to encounter the shining presence of Greater India not only inside most prestigious museums of Asian art or world civilization, but also outside, in influential *high-brow* media. Thus, to a jubilant reviewer in the *New York Review of Books*, two blockbuster Metropolitan Museum exhibits: “Buddhism along the Silkroad” (2012-2013) and “Lost Kingdoms: Hindu-Buddhist Sculpture of Southeast Asia” (2014), were proof that “[...] it is now increasingly clear [...] India during this period radiated its philosophies, political ideas, and architectural forms out over an entire continent not by conquest but by sheer cultural sophistication.”²⁵ He emphasized that “the cultural flow was overwhelmingly one way,” quoting in affirmation Michael Wood, from Wood’s BBC television series on India, that “history is full of Empires of the Sword, but India alone created an Empire of the Spirit.”²⁶

Nor is it helpful that even some of the scholarship that problematizes Indianization theory still works with conference titles like, “Early Indian Influences in Southeast Asia.”²⁷ If we continue to think of a Hindu-Buddhist India as the

source of the cultural-political developments of other regions, then concepts such as adoption, adaption, acculturation, localization, and even interaction remain mere ornaments to a shining center, and a shining idea.²⁸ More nuanced scholarly studies critical of Indianization theory will, moreover, do little to enlighten popular culture worldwide, in which Asia still often stands for India, yoga, the Buddha, and spiritualism. Why, we must ask, is it still so hard for curatorial experts, or art historians of the region's ancient Hindu-Buddhist past and the material sources it left behind to write about Southeast Asia or its sub-regions without starting with India? I think the answer lies in the questions, priorities, and networks of archaeological knowledge production, art collecting, and art marketing, in taxonomic shifts in the appreciation of ancient religious objects from Asia, and thus in love and its potential epistemic violence. By loving, capturing, or moving away an object, we may destroy a unity between the object and its site of origin, and disregard local memories, concerns, and care. This is to enact a form of injustice, because these local concerns matter, whether or not the objects still carry the same meanings as they did for those for whom they were originally made.²⁹

If we want to understand the violent nature, functioning and implications of knowledge production, and the global trade in "Asian" antiquities, implying such love, developing from around 1900, we have to let our historical imagination speak, not through the art displays in the museum, but through the sites of ancient Hindu-Buddhist temples, shrines as well as (Islamic) graveyards in Asia, that delivered objects for them. In what follows I show how various knowledge networks encountering (at) such sites and objects, transformed or destroyed these sites while caring and thereby helped situating Indonesia in moral geographies of Greater India – even if it does not seem so at first sight.

Moveable objects, petrifying love

In 1884, in the midst of the ongoing war of conquest waged by the Dutch colonial army in Aceh, on Sumatra in the Netherlands Indies, the French adventurer-geographer Paul Fauque visited an old, and – he apparently presumed – abandoned Islamic graveyard near Kota Raja and took away three fourteenth-century stiles that he thought were wonderfully sculpted. He sent them to France as a gift to the *Musée de Trocadéro*, the ethnographic museum in Paris recently founded by the Ministry of Public Education, in 1878. In his official report, Fauque described the Islamic funeral practices he had observed in the region and the particularities – date, form, and size – of the stiles, information he must have gotten from local informants. He also provided drawings of the stiles.³⁰ Partly for documentation, he made sure photographs were taken of himself at the graveyard and of the three tombs from

which he took the stiles. Later, in November 1885, these images were used in a seminar at a session of the French Geographical Society in Paris.³¹ Accentuating the conventional self-image of the colonial archaeologist as a great discoverer of unknown and neglected ancient civilizations, Fauque provided no information as to the conditions under which he took hold of the Islamic stiles.³² What had impressed him most was not necessarily their function but rather their beauty, or the aesthetic characteristics with which he could identify. He recognized in them a mix of “Hindu and Arab arts,” which he thought exemplified the “high level” of taste among the ancient population living in Aceh during the “invasion of the Muslims” in the Malay archipelago, which he situated in the mid-fourteenth century.³³

Thus, a selective aesthetic sensation of a French scholar-adventurer, generating his love for the objects, and his abducting them from their original site, signed the curious fate of three ancient Islamic stiles from Sumatra. The stiles were transferred a number of times between various ethnographic museums in Paris and, on the way, they were elevated from the category of ethnographic artifact to that of religious art. Since 1930, they have been held by the Museum of Asian Art in Paris, Musée Guimet.³⁴

Fauque recognized the objects as unmistakably Islamic, and he noted the Arabic text on the back of one, which his unnamed informant translated as a five-times repetition of “Allah.” As such, the stiles are today the only objects from Indonesia on display in Musée Guimet that we can clearly identify as Islamic.



Figure 12.1: Indonesian section, Musée Guimet, November 2017. A Buddha head attributed to one of Borobudur's Buddha statues is in the centre. The Islamic stiles from Aceh are visible in the rear, in the left corner. Photograph by Marieke Bloembergen.

Musée Guimet modernized its permanent exhibition in the 1930s under curator Philip Stern, and like most prestigious museums of Asian art across the world it has ever since employed seductive exhibition techniques to create a modern shrine of ancient remains of Asian Hindu and Buddhist pasts, defined as religious art. The museum was founded in 1889 by the French industrialist and social reformer Émile Guimet (1836-1918), who, before he opened his first museum in his hometown of Lyon in 1876 had traveled to Egypt, Greece, Japan, India, and China.³⁵ Set up originally as a museum of the history of religion for the education of the French people, today it exhibits objects originating from Afghanistan in the west to Japan and Korea in the east. India is presented as the creative source of inspiration, but, in a French touch, the treasures from former French Angkor, in the museum's central court, form the proud and beating heart of the permanent exhibition. Here, within the framework of "Indianized Buddhist" art from Southeast Asia, the Indonesian section – located between those of Burma and Vietnam – also shows mostly material remains of Indonesia's pre-Islamic, Hindu-Buddhist past. Most of the objects date from the seventh to the fourteenth centuries. For the visitors' guidance, the museum's general introduction to this section presents India as the standard: "*Dans la statuaire les apports Indiens sont encore discernible, quoique transfiguré par un art empreint de grâce et du douceur* (In the sculptures, the Indian influences are still visible, however transformed by an imprint of grace and softness).³⁶

Again, this narrative and the manner of exhibiting are not unique. The three Islamic stiles from Sumatra seem therefore all the more remarkable, contradicting as they do the contention of this article that, from the 1880s-1960s, what drew the eyes of Orientalists, adventurers, archaeologists, and collectors in Indonesia was Hindu-Buddhist by dedication. The stiles also seem to defy my previous observation that Indonesia, in almost all the world's prestigious museums of Asian art, ends up represented as a Hindu-Buddhist country. At the same time, due to their "mixed Hindu-Arab style" the Islamic stiles were well-suited to the scholarly diffusionist theorizing on civilizational history that emerged around 1900.³⁷ Like the other Indonesian objects kept in museums of Asian art or of universal civilizations (such as the British Museum), the Islamic stiles were subjected to a dominant interest among scholars and collectors in the external, Indian, civilizational influences in local Asian histories. From around 1910, this interest became pivotal to the inception of a new category of, and theorizing on, "Asian art" and the emergence of the "Friends of Asian Art" movement and market, which I will address below in more depth.

Meanwhile, around 1900, Java's Hindu-Buddhist sites became better known internationally, connecting the networks of scholars, local elites, pilgrims, collectors, and intellectuals from Asia and the West, within a context of rising nationalism, transnational religious revival movements, and multicentered forms of pan-Asianism. These networks, feeding into a new Asian art market that set the standards

of valuation, helped situate Javanese moveable antiquities, and thereby Java and (Hindu) Bali, in moral geographies of Greater India, albeit with different centers.

Whose Asia is one

In June 1899, the eighth-century giant Buddhist shrine Borobudur and the nearby ninth-century Hindu-temple complex of Prambanan in Central Java hosted the French Mission archéologique de l'Indo Chine, founded in Saigon the previous year. This mission was the first of a series of institutional research missions-in-exchange between colonial Java, Indochina, and India. It was prompted by the hypothesis that Indochina's civilizations, in particular the kingdom of Champa (second-fifteenth centuries), via India, owed much to Java: "*son origine, sa religion, et ses arts*" (its origin, its religion, and its arts).³⁸

Newer in the field than other European Asiatic Societies, the Mission archéologique was founded for the good of a Greater France and in conscious competition with research taking place in older European colonies in Asia. By the end of 1899, it had changed its name to Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient (EFEO) and in 1902 it moved to Hanoi. In its founding charter, the EFEO formulated its aim to study the archaeology and philology of Indochina and "neighboring civilizations" in "*l'ensemble des pays d'Extrême-Orient*" (the cluster of countries of the Far East).³⁹ At the first Orientalist Congress it organized in Asia, in Hanoi in 1902, it legitimized this aim by declaring Asia a "civilizational" unity.⁴⁰ "The geographic situation of Indochina, the variety of civilizations to be found here, the mingling of races and languages, religions and arts that has taken place here, mark it out as a natural home for all research on East Asia, from India to Malaysia and Japan."⁴¹

This vision of the region as "one" placed French Indo-China at its center. It suited the EFEO's diffusionist (and then dominant) interest in the origins and flows of ancient Indian civilizational influences in the region, from what was then called "India proper," in "Further India," which encompassed today's Southeast Asia.⁴² It implied more than just a field of study: it had moral-political implications since it seeded site-based ideas about the differentiated beauty of "Asian civilization," and hierarchies between its divisions in terms of their origin, diffusion, importation, and deviation and/or (poor) imitation and thus decline. From this perspective, Indologist Louis Finot, the EFEO's first director, wrote that Panataran temple in East Java represented a stage "*plus avancé*" and was a prototype for studying temple art of Champa.⁴³

The EFEO's articulation of the region as a cultural 'one' at the congress in Hanoi in 1902 coincided well with competing Asia-based views on the region that considered Asia as a wholesome cultural unity, yet superior to the West – which however

had other centres. These views reflected nascent anticolonial, pan-Asianist, and nationalist ideals – in which a superior Asian civilization as spiritual, became an argument against, and solution for, the materialist, superficial and warmongering West.⁴⁴ Ironically, these views were based on the same (Hindu-Buddhist) material remains of the past in Asia, and were partly shaped by, and interacted with, the developing colonial-scholarly ideas on the nature, origin and civilizational influences of Asian culture(s) in Asia.⁴⁵

In 1903, the Japanese intellectual and artconnoisseur Okakura Tenshin, in his *The Ideals of the East*, likewise declared “Asia” as “one.” His message was famously received as the dawn of a new age amongst cultural elites in wider Asia.⁴⁶ Okakura based his ideas of a unity of Asia on the same domain as did the French, but he referred to it as “the great civilizational arts of China and India,” reflecting “the aesthetic values of Buddhism.” Okakura’s Asia, moreover, had different moral centers. Ancient Vedic India played an honorable role as “the motherland” of all Asiatic thought and religion.

Through his connections with art collectors and Japan aficionados in Boston, Okakura became an advisor for collectors of “Asian art” in Europe and the United States. In 1904, he was invited to catalogue the collection of Chinese and Japanese paintings of the new and prestigious Boston Museum of Fine Arts (a civil initiative founded in 1876).⁴⁷ This museum would soon develop a strong interest in “Indian” art as well, within which it included art of Java. Starting in 1917, the year Lankan-English intellectual and art-critic Ananada K. Coomaraswamy, at the advice of Okakura, became its curator, this museum hosted a set of objects originating from the Netherlands Indies/Indonesia, collected and displayed in Greater India framing.⁴⁸

In the same inspiration, Okakura would, for a time, become a good friend of another famous thinker, the internationally adored Bengali poet, philosopher, and globetrotter Tagore, Asia’s first Nobel prize winner (in 1913), who briefly associated with the Greater India Society. Like Okakura, Tagore situated the heart of Asian civilization in India. Unlike Okakura, Tagore would, in 1926 and 1927, travel southeast from India to visit Malaysia, Indochina, and the Netherlands Indies, which he recognized as “India beyond its modern political boundaries.” He thereby incorporated this wider region into his idea of Greater India.⁴⁹

Here, it is as relevant to ponder upon what drove Tagore to the Netherlands Indies in particular. His early expectations about this region were pivotal for his understanding of what the Greater Indian world (should) look like. For, initially, a popular, and romantic imagination of Bali – that is Hindu Bali –, above all made Tagore long to see the archipelago, and further inspired him toward concretizing plans to revive a truthful Greater India. Taking over the romantic colonial attitude of the charmed circles of scholars and lyric artists he met in Europe, he did so without ever having met actual Balinese, writing *about them* to an English intellectual soul mate.⁵⁰ During his visit to the Netherlands in 1920, in the framework of one of his



Figure 12.2: Borobudur, with some of its famous visitors, September 1927. From left to right: the Indian linguist Suniti Kumar Chatterji; Rabindranath Tagore; Keesje Bake Timmers (wife of the Dutch indologist Arnold Bake); the Dutch social democrat Sam Koperberg (secretary of the Java Institute); the Indian painter and musician Dhirendra Krishna Deva Varman; the Dutch archaeologist Pieter Vincent Van Stein Callenfels (representing the Netherlands Indies Archaeological Service); and the Indian architect Surendranath Kar. Photograph by Arnold Bake (Leiden University Library, KITLV Collection, Collectie Bake).

European tours, Tagore had been enthused by stories about Bali, and the ‘delightful Balinese people’. Tagore listened to Dutch Bali aficionados who showed him pictures of (and told him about their bungalow in) Bali, viewed Balinese objects in the ethnographic museum of the Colonial Institute in Amsterdam, and eavesdropped on British and Dutch orientalist ideas on Bali as the living remains of ancient Hindu-Java – put forward, notably, by the head of the ethnographic Museum at the Colonial Institute at the time, J.C. van Eerde.⁵¹ Thus, Tagore concluded that “these people, who had their seclusion that saved their simplicity from all hurts of the present day they have, I am sure, kept pure some beauty of truth that belonged to India”.⁵²

This strong impression of Bali triggered Tagore to write to one of his English friends, India-based Christian missionary and social reformer C.F. Andrews, to ponder further on his plans for the international Visva Bharati University he was to develop in Santiniketan – presented as a “Universal family of man, “ where the best of East and West should meet, but clearly Asianist in purpose, as Stolte has shown.⁵³ During his European tour of 1920, when ideas for Visva Bharati’s

foundation where maturing, Tagore, from Holland, wrote to Andrews (who became a lifelong supporter of Tagore's plans) about the pure ancient Indian civilizational beauty he presumed to be present in Bali:

We must found a special chair in Visva Bharati for the Study of Greater India. We must train teachers by sending them to these places and to China and Japan. The relics of true history of India are outside India. [...] The civilisation of India, like the banyan tree, has spread its beneficent shade away from its own birth place. Let us acknowledge it, let us feel that India is not confined in the Geography of India – and then we shall find our message from our part. India can live and grow by spreading abroad – not the political India, but the ideal India. Our Santiniketan is for this mission.⁵⁴

Tagore may have heralded a relatively more inclusive vision of the character of Asian civilization than Okakura, he emphasized, however, the high value of ancient Hindu-Buddhist India, not Islamic India, as its unifying force.⁵⁵ And with that Greater India in mind, in September 1927, the sixty-six-year-old Tagore traveled to Bali, where he was disappointed by the lack of modern comforts, and to Java, where he admired the temples. At Borobodur, as he wrote in his poem of the same title, he was while looking at it, overwhelmed with a deep sense of loss: of Buddha's gift to the world and thus ancient India's message of "immeasurable love."⁵⁶ In 1928, apparently still overwhelmed by his impressions, Tagore wrote to a friend that his visit to Java and Bali had filled him with the wish to send Indian scholars to that region to study and to help recover these "neglected and forgotten outposts of Indian civilization ... for our own enrichment and for the benefit of the inhabitants."⁵⁷ And indeed, in the late 1920s some members of the Greater India Society did gather data in Java and published histories that depicted the archipelago as ancient colonies of a wholesome India.⁵⁸

Orientalist alliances: theosophy, Buddhist revivalism and re-sacralizing sites

While Indian, French and Dutch archaeologists, Indologists, arthistorians, architects and intellectuals were trying to gauge the meanings of Hindu-Buddhist temple architecture across the 'Greater Indian' region from, they thought, a strictly scholarly vantage point, this didn't hinder others from taking more clearly spiritual and religious interests in sites that had become the object of archaeological research and restoration works. They were part and parcel of the politics of heritage formation, which involved the development of affective relationships between various actors engaging differently with sites, but from shared interests into "keeping," leading to what I refer to as "Orientalist alliances".⁵⁹ These alliances, of scholarly and spiritual interests, together contributed to the further re-sacralization of sites.⁶⁰

Recent scholarly research on the ‘globalizing’ Buddhist revival has pointed to the crucial role of monks like Anagarika Dharmapala in Lanka, of foremen of the international Theosophical Society (founded in New York in 1875, and, from 1883, with its headquarters in India), and of reformist Buddhist King Chulalongkorn, as motors in the Buddhist revival in Asia. This revival was, notably, partly stimulated by, and stimulator of, the archaeological rediscovery of and care for ancient Buddhist sites, which has mainly been studied for the politics of heritage in South Asia.⁶¹ At the site of Bodh Gaya in north India, where Buddha is said to have found enlightenment, Dharmapala, partly inspired by the poet and journalist Edwin Arnold’s worries about the state of this temple, started, with his Mahabodhi Society (founded in 1891), a global movement for the revival of Buddhism, and for the maintenance and restoration of Buddhist sites in Asia. All this, next to scholarly interests, stimulated inter-Asian pilgrimages and heritage activism concerning Asia’s ancient Buddhist sites, and, thereby, the articulation of another moral geography that partly overlapped with “Greater India”: that of one larger “Buddhist Asia,” most often referred to as “Theravadan”. Professionalizing “Asian” archaeology and philology, as well as nationalist “Asianist” ideologies, drew on this geographical imagination.

It is interesting to see how the site of Borobudur in the course of the nineteenth century, through the convergence of political, scholarly, religious and touristic interests, not only became an object of new local forms of historical awareness, but also became situated in these transnational moral geographies of a Buddhist Asia. Notably, as soon as Borobudur became more accessible – after its rediscovery and uncovering under the British interregnum of Lieutenant General T.S. Raffles in 1814, and especially after its galleries were further cleaned and opened up in the 1830s, it inspired Javanese (Muslim) visitors to ponder upon previously existing Buddhist beliefs in Java.⁶² By the 1880s Borobudur had further opened up. While transforming into a – gated – heritage site with an entrance, a visitors’ guestbook and the first site guidebooks appearing, it brought together archaeological research, modern forms of ‘site-seeing’ and religious contemplation. Modest forms of more organized tourist trips to Borobudur, with an average of 20 visitors a day, only started in the 1880s. A qualitative study of Borobudur’s guestbook covering the 1880s-1890s reveals that quite some individuals among the tourists and scholars visiting the temple – Christians and expressed atheists – were clearly aware of the Buddhist revival movement that started in Asia, and that had reached out to Europe and the US as well. By that time, the bestseller *The light of Asia* (1879), by Edwin Arnold, an exalted poem on the life of Buddha, had popularized Buddhism in Europe and the US.⁶³ To some visitors, with awareness of this Buddhist revival, or part of it, seeing and climbing an ancient and magnificent Buddhist site like Borobudur, with its reliefs depicting the lives and previous lives of the Buddha,

was a deeply moving experience. Such experiences also helped situate Borobudur in a wider moral geography of a “Buddhist Asia,” which overlapped with certain versions of Greater India.

In this framework, as I have pointed out elsewhere, we should also appreciate the remarkable theosophical happening at Borobudur, back in the Netherlands Indies, taking place in 1908.⁶⁴ On 18 April of that year, at the occasion of the first annual congress of the Netherlands Indies section of the Theosophical Society which officially united the local lodges, about 70 theosophists, men and some women, Javanese, Dutch and Chinese, gathered for a solemn contemplation and climb of Borobudur, along its multi-layered galleries. Coincidentally, this happened precisely when Borobudur experienced its first major, state-supported restoration (1908-1910), under the direction of the Dutch engineer Theodor van Erp, who hosted the theosophists in his house on the site. Together they climbed the temple, and with Edwin Arnold’s *Light of Asia* as a guide, read the reliefs depicting Buddha’s life, slowly moving to the highest stupa where they held hands. In the eyes of some Dutch and Javanese participants, this event marked the arrival of a new age of progress through spiritual means, and some expressed a sense of brotherhood and oneness with the higher good. Inspired perhaps by the beauty of the temple and the moment, these expressions were as romantic as they were exclusive, certainly when we take into account the colonial hierarchies, and the racial thinking, that determined the activities of the Theosophical Society – also in the Netherlands Indies. Nonetheless, the Theosophical Society in the Netherlands Indies attracted a remarkable number of Javanese, Chinese and later on also Sumatran and Balinese members, generating engagements with supra-local, spiritual ideas, and a so-called *pergerakan kebatinan* (a movement for spiritual progress), with *longue durée* in colonial and postcolonial Indonesia. These, likewise, often took India as origin and standard of an Asian spiritual civilization, thereby contributing to moral geographies of Greater India in Indonesia.⁶⁵

What this event also shows, is how the international theosophical “moment” of around 1900 and the related Buddhist revivalist activism, had – as elsewhere – a deep impact on the re-sacralization of Hindu-Buddhist sites in the Dutch East Indies. Not only were these sites, with the support of the colonial state, being explored (as we saw by Dutch colonial *and* foreign archaeologists), restored, and even reconstructed. Since 1913 the Dutch East Indies Archaeological Survey was officially in charge of selection and procedures. In parallel, sites became the objects of local, and international, theosophical and re-invented Buddhist appropriation and rituals. One of these was the celebration of *Vesak* – in which today, Buddhists all over the world, commemorate the enlightenment and death of the Buddha. Likewise, through inter-Asian, (European) Buddhist revivalist, and the international theosophical society’s mediation, *Vesak* entered the Netherlands Indies, first, since the

late 1910s, in theosophical and Chinese Buddhist lodges.⁶⁶ At Borobudur, *Vesak* has been celebrated since the late 1920s, with some interruptions, up to the present, incorporating the temple, once again, into international moral geographies of a Buddhist Asia.

Meanwhile, like the archaeological sites, museums both in Asia and the West, holding site-related Hindu-Buddhist remains from Asia's past, while also attracting scholars and pilgrims, likewise transformed into sites of scholarly and spiritual learning, and sacralization.⁶⁷ This will take us now to Europe and the US, where an apparent need for spiritual salvation for a warmongering world also entered, and shaped, the field of 'Asian Art' theorizing and collecting, supporting identifications with Greater India.

Arts of Greater India – a matter of cultural understanding

In 1913, a Buddha head from Borobudur was shown at the Buddhist art exhibition of 1913 in Museum Cernuschi, in Paris, founded in 1898 in the mansion of Italian banker and Asian art-collector Henri Cernuschi (1821-1896). There, such religious sculptures became desirable as "distinguished" works of art. As such, this Buddha head changed owners, moving from the famous French art collector Alphonse Kann (1870-1948) to the New York-based Armenian art collector Dikran Kelekian (1866-1951), who in turn sold it in 1917 to the Metropolitan Museum – for US\$3,000.⁶⁸ In 1918, in the Metropolitan Museum's *Bulletin*, a certain "J. B.," described this new acquisition as proof of "Indian genius": "It is to native Indian genius that we owe the familiar type of Buddha, the Enlightened One, the type which is so superbly illustrated in addition to our collections of Asiatic art."⁶⁹ Borobudur, he said, was a "conspicuous" example of "the masterpieces of Indian art of the classic period."⁷⁰

With this kind of connoisseurship, not extraordinary at that time, J. B. identified with a remarkable international movement of art historians, connoisseurs, and collectors who, from the 1910s, came to qualify religious sculpture made in Asia as Indian Art with capital A, of the highest *Western* standards. They were inspired by new and influential art theories that emphasized the Asian sculptures' capacity to visualize the divine. Aesthetics-cum-divinity became a powerful motif for evaluating ancient religious sites in Asia, whether they were still in use or not, and carrying away objects from them to museums in Asia and the West. We shall see that a Buddha statue from Borobudur came to play a decisive role in this taxonomic shift, both inside and outside of the museums, which helped place moveable antiquities from Indonesia into moral geographies of Greater India.

As Tapati Guha-Thakurta and Parta Mitter have shown, around 1910, a new trend emerged in the theorizing of ancient Hindu and Buddhist sculpture

with provenance in Asia, conceived as high art. It found fertile ground in Asia and the West alike through the highly influential works pioneered by Ananda Coomaraswamy and Ernest Binfield Havell (1864-1937).⁷¹ Havell served as superintendent of the Madras School of Arts (1884-1895) and then at the Government School of Art in Calcutta, before he returned to England in 1906, where he published his most influential works. Coomaraswamy, born of Lankan and English parents, presented his views around 1908 to an international public. Through Okakura, he became the first curator of the new “Indian Section” of the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, where he enjoyed a guru-like status.⁷² In a pilot study, I explained how the theories of these two intellectuals not only entailed new evaluations of Hindu-Buddhist antiquities from Asia as expressions of “one” Greater Indian civilization, but also helped to disseminate new, influential exhibition techniques that situated Javanese antiquities more firmly in Greater Indian views on art.⁷³ Most crucial to us here is that both Havell and Coomaraswamy, charmed by the circle around Tagore in Calcutta, placed artistic expressions in Asia under the rubric of Indian art. From this India-centered perspective, both men further argued that Indian art should be appreciated as high art in its own right, and not as a derivative of Greek and Roman standards. The latter view had become commonplace since the late nineteenth-century discovery of Gandharan sculpture, in which Foucher had played such an important role.⁷⁴ Coomaraswamy, at the Fifteenth International Oriental Congress in Copenhagen in 1908, reasoned that Indian art, with its capacity to conceptualize the divine, was decidedly superior to European forms, where the “gods are but grand and beautiful men.”⁷⁵

Havell, in his standard work *Indian Sculpture and Painting* (1908), chose one of the Buddha statues from the north side of Borobudur to make the same argument: “How beautiful it is when the spiritual rather than the physical becomes the type which the artist brings into view.” Though his example was located in Java, Havell concluded that the art was most assuredly “Indian.”⁷⁶ This same statue from Borobudur (or its photographic representation in Havell’s book) sparked a heated dispute at the Indian Section of the Royal Society of Arts regarding its “artistic quality.” This argument underscores the fate of Hindu-Buddhist antiquities originating from Indonesia in the transforming world of Asian art networks and marketing. The Royal Society’s chair, Bombay-born naturalist Sir George Birdwood (1832-1917), who was a great defender of what was then referred to as Indian “applied arts,” condemned the statue as an “uninspired brazen image.” He added, “A boiled suet pudding would serve equally well as a symbol of passionate purity and serenity of soul.” This qualification, made public in the Royal Society’s journal, incited a manifesto in the *Times* of 28 February 1910 signed by the prominent painter, art critic, and India aficionado William Rothenstein (1872-1945) and twelve like-minded artist-critics, which sealed the statue’s taxonomic future and prepared the

foundation of the India Society. To the signers, the Buddha of Borobudur stood for the supreme embodiment of the central religious and divine inspiration of Indian art, which was “one of the great artistic inspirations of the world.”⁷⁷

Tellingly, neither in the contemporary disputes over the appreciation of Asian art that followed, nor indeed in the critical historiography of this alteration in the evaluation of Hindu-Buddhist material remains – from “malign” to high art – does one encounter anyone questioning the label “Indian.”⁷⁸ In the context of this inventive moment and the celebration of Greater Indian art, as well as of Asia-based nationalism, from the 1910s onward cultural and economic elites in Asia, Europe, and the United States began to engage with new academic and private associational activities while self-identifying as “Friends of Asian Art” and “Friends of Asia.” Protagonists, amongst them theosophists, proliferated as modern, avant-gardist connoisseurs of art. Others were esteemed academics or self-made experts on ancient Asian languages, archaeology, or cultures. These associations reflected a globally connected, powerful movement of Greater Indian thinking that fed into colonial and intercolonial networks of knowledge. Examples include the India Society, founded by Havell and others in London in 1911; the Vereniging voor Vrienden van Aziatische Kunst (Society of Friends of Asian Arts, VVAK), founded in Amsterdam in 1918 by the publicist of modern art H.F.A. Visser with the support of Rijksmuseum Director F. Schmidt-Degener, and the Association Française des Amis de l’Orient, founded in 1920 at Musée Guimet with Indologist Emile Senart (1847-1928) and Sylvain Lévi as vice-president and secretary, respectively. This era also saw the establishment of new academic institutions directed toward the study of the civilization of “Greater India”: the Instituut Kern in Leiden, founded in 1926 by Sanskritist Jean Philippe Vogel with the support of archaeologist and director of the Netherlands Indies Archaeological Service F.D.K. Bosch, and the Institut de Civilisation Indienne in Paris, founded in 1927 by Sylvain Lévi. Last but not least, back in the Netherlands Indies, a group of Javanese cultural-nationalist elites and Dutch colonial (self-made) scholars of Javanese culture in 1918 founded the Java Instituut in Surakarta. Among the many relevant associations in British India that made efforts to connect with this movement were the Greater India Society and the Indian Society for Oriental Art. The latter published a journal, *Rupam* (form embodying the highest knowledge present in the Vedas), and was run by the fiercely nationalist, and Greater India-oriented art historian C. O. Gangoly.⁷⁹

These associations shared powerful honorary members. Coomaraswamy is on many of their lists. The Javanese prince Mangkunegara VII, patron and collector of Javanese antiquities, was not only initiator and chair of the Java Instituut but also an honorary member of the India Society. His friend, the Dutch archaeologist Stutterheim (who would become head of the Netherlands Indies’ Archaeological

Service), promoted the India Society in both the Netherlands Indies and the Netherlands, despite making some ambiguous criticisms of Greater India thinking.⁸⁰

The India Society, helped by a governing language, endeavored to play a key role in the Friends of Asian Art movement. One of its first publications, in 1912, was Tagore's own English translation of a portion of his lyrical, Veda-inspired poetic writings in Bengali, "Gitanjali," with an introduction of the by the then already world famous and influential poet W. B. Yeats.⁸¹ One year later this publication brought Tagore the Nobel prize, partly thanks to lobbying by charmed and influential intellectuals and artists he had befriended in Europe. In the 1920s, the India Society hosted and published lectures by international scholarly experts on the wide region of Asia, for which Dutch scholars such as Vogel, Stutterheim, and Visser, the secretary of the Dutch Society of Friends of Asian Arts, were invited as well. They were all asked to discuss the influence of India on the arts of the sub-region of their expertise.⁸² The India Society's volume *Revealing India's Past* (1939), from which Foucher's reflections in this article's introduction were taken, also brought together many internationally admired scholars of the field.

What matters here is how these associations, at least those developing in the West, firmly shared a belief that the collection, study, and united display of Asian (read "Indianized") arts, and contemplation of the civilization in which they could flourish, would benefit the West *and* the East – it would be good for both empire and Asian nationalist self-esteem. In a 1931 letter to the *Times*, board members of the India Society used this argument to defend their long-standing (but never realized) plans for a central Museum of Asiatic Art in London:

Sir, [...] the international value of a Central museum for Asiatic art raises a matter of great importance to the British empire and in fact the world.[...] [T]hroughout Asia & especially in India, art has been the means by which the deepest convictions of humanity have ... found expression. The study of art of Asiatic people is as necessary as that of their literature, if we are to understand them and appreciate their present aspirations.⁸³

Foremen of this Friends of Asian Art movement in Europe came to believe that the understanding and appreciation of this (superior) spiritual Oriental "civilization," perceived as essential to a people or race, and including its spiritual art, was a condition for world peace and reciprocal understanding.⁸⁴ To achieve these aims, they called for the further study and collecting, and the popularization of the arts and the civilization of Asia, which they defined as spiritual, peaceful, and Indian. They thereby presumed, and identified with, a global as well as Indian nationalist need for Asian (Greater Indian) art museums.⁸⁵ This imagination became useful again after World War II and the formal independence of the formerly colonized countries in Asia.

Charmed across decolonization

In the 1950s, the newly independent Republic of Indonesia once again became part and parcel of “Art of Greater India” exhibits, supported by Indian Embassies in several places in the world. To all indications, for their curators the categorization remained unproblematic. One such exhibit was held at the Los Angeles County Museum in 1950.⁸⁶ Organized by the museum’s German curator Henry Trubner, it was introduced by a map of “Greater India,” and displayed loans from private and museum collections in the United States (the majority), Canada, and Europe. Indonesia was represented as “Java,” and exclusively by ancient Buddhist objects from American collections.⁸⁷ Formed by his studies of Oriental Art at Harvard University, Trubner in his introduction to the catalogue followed Coomaraswamy’s idealist theorizing, explaining how the exhibition’s visitors should appreciate Indian art differently from Western art, as objects made not exclusively to please “aesthetically” but “to satisfy a spiritual need.” Indian art was “not to be judged subjectively on the basis of its outward beauty but primarily [...] to be an aid in bringing to life the deity represented, acting as intermediary between the worshipper and the invisible divinity.”⁸⁸ He thus suggested the possibility of spiritually connecting with this form of art through empathy.

This exhibition and its catalogue are enlightening regarding how moral geographies of Greater India can become etched in people’s minds: powerful tools toward this end were the map of Greater India, which framed all objects on display, and the way Trubner defended the initiative: “Today [...] sincere efforts are being made to bring about closer relations between the East and the West, it is important that we attain knowledge of India’s great cultural past and realize the tremendous role that country has played in the history of Far Eastern art. The immediate purpose of the exhibition is to bring about an unbiased and true appreciation of Indian art and a deeper understanding of India’s great heritage.”⁸⁹

So much for the heritage of the other new independent nation-states, the borders of which were obfuscated on the map of Greater India, and whose people were working at home, in parallel, on nation-building through cultural politics. Ironic here is President Soekarno’s December 1953 inauguration of the reconstruction of the Siva temple at Prambanan, a project initiated by the colonial Archaeological Service in the 1920s, as Indonesia’s first national monument. In the country’s National Museum in Jakarta, formerly the museum of the Batavian Society, the Hindu-Buddhist antiquities collected and abducted in the archipelago since colonial times emphatically tell the history, not of India, but of Indonesia.⁹⁰ Nonetheless, in museums outside of Indonesia, from Los Angeles to Calcutta, Amsterdam to Paris, Hindu-Buddhist temple remains from Java still serve narratives of a Greater India.

The study and collection of Indonesian antiquities by the seekers central to this article may have been driven by love, inclusiveness, or motives of (spiritual) peace through cultural understanding. But their search also reveals the potential that love has to spawn epistemic violence and appropriation. Fauque, informed by Western theories of civilizational progress, recognized a transformative civilizational moment in the Islamic stiles in Aceh as beauty. The Friends of Asian Art, captivated by Coomaraswamy's and Havell's theories, identified the Indian artist's capacity to visualize the divine in what were, to them, self-familiar images of a meditative man. Through this kind of self-understanding, and through their networks, and by means of text- and object-based interpretations, sales, and exhibitions, the Friends of Asian Art, whether due to Indian nationalist ideals, art-historical connoisseurship, or a longing for world peace, contributed to the global spread of moral geographies of Greater India, with Indonesia situated therein. Multi-sited and varying in form and outlook, these moral geographies entailed exclusion – a steadfast blindness regarding Indonesia's predominantly Muslim population, which had so many other pasts to identify with beyond those of Hindu-Buddhist kingdoms and *mandalas* labeled as Indian, Indianized, or Indic.

This article warns of the dangers and distortions that transpire from transnational, civilizational-cum-spatial framings of Asia as a homogenized and exclusive field of study. It also alerts us that grounding research and the collection of knowledge, including knowledge of art, in “sympathy” or “affection” will not guarantee truer understandings of “other” people's cultures, histories, and memories.

Notes

- ¹ A longer – partly differing – version of this article appeared under the title, “The politics of ‘Greater India,’ a moral geography: Moveable antiquities and charmed knowledge networks between Indonesia, India and the West,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 63, no. 1 (January, 2021): 177-211. I thank Cambridge University Press for granting permission to republish the (revised) essay in this volume. The longer version traced taxonomic shifts in the journeys of several Buddha heads traveling from Borobudur to museums in Europe and the US (not in the present chapter). This essay, instead, dwells a bit longer on Tagore's perceptions, and adds a paragraph on Theosophical and Buddhist networks, site-resacralization, and the makings of Buddhist moral geographies that compete and partly overlap with those of Greater India.
- ² Tagore to C. F. Andrews, 25 Sept. 1920, Santiniketan, Visva-Bharati, Rabindra Bhavan, Correspondence Tagore.
- ³ Alfred Foucher, “Foreword,” in *Revealing India's Past*, ed. John Cumming (London: The India Society, 1939), xiv.
- ⁴ Alfred Foucher, “The Greek Origin of the Buddha Image,” in *The Beginnings of Buddhist Art and other Essays in Indian and Central-Asian Archaeology*, ed. L. A. Thomas, trans. F. W. Thomas (Paris: Paul Geathner/London: Humphrey Milford, 1917), 115.

- ⁵ For three reviews, see Isabel Hofmeyr, "The Complicating Sea: The Indian Ocean as Method," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 32, no. 3 (2012): 584-90; Nigel Worden, "Writing the global Indian Ocean: Sailors, slaves, and immigrants; bondage in the Indian Ocean World", *Journal of Global History* 12 (2017): 145-154; Michael Laffan, ed., *Belonging across the Bay of Bengal: Religious Rites, Migrations, National Rights* (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), 1-14. Much consulted, influential studies are Engseng Ho, "Empire through Diasporic Eyes: The View from the other Boat," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 46, no. 2 (2004): 210-46; Engseng Ho, *The Graves of Tarim: Genealogy and Mobility across the Indian Ocean* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006); Engseng Ho, "Inter-Asian Concepts for Mobile Societies," *Journal of Asian Studies* 76, no. 4 (2016): 907-28; Sanjay Subrahmanyam, ed., *Explorations in Connected History: Mughals and Franks* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2005); Sanjay Subrahmanyam, "One Asia or Many? Reflections from Connected History," *Modern Asian Studies* 50, no. 1 (2016): 5-43; S. Bose, *A Hundred Horizons: The Indian Ocean in the Age of Global Empire* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2006); Prasenjit Duara, "Asia Redux: Conceptualizing a Region for Our Times," *Journal of Asian Studies* 69, no. 4 (2010): 963-83; Sunil Amrith, *Migration and Diaspora in Modern Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Sunil Amrith, *Crossing the Bay of Bengal: The Furies of Nature and the Fortunes of Migrants* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2014); and, building on the likewise unifying concept "Sanskrit Cosmopolis," see Sheldon Pollock, "The Sanskrit Cosmopolis, 300-1300 CE: Transculturation, Vernacularization, and the Question of Ideology," in *Ideology and Status of Sanskrit: Contributions to the History of the Sanskrit Language*, ed. Jan E. M. Houben (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 197-247; and Ronit Ricci, *Islam Translated: Literature, Conversion, and the Arabic Cosmopolis of South and Southeast Asia* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011). See, more recently, among others, Andrea Acri, "Introduction: Esoteric Buddhist Networks along the Maritime Silk Roads, 7th-13th Century AD," in *Esoteric Buddhism in Mediaeval Maritime Asia: Networks of Masters, Texts, Icons*, ed. Andrea Acri (Singapore: ISEAS-Yusof Ishak Institute, 2016), 1-25; Nile Green, "The Waves of Heterotopia: Toward a Vernacular Intellectual History of the Indian Ocean," *American Historical Review* 123, no. 3 (2018): 846-74; and Kris Alexander, *Subversive Seas: Anticolonial Networks across the Twentieth-Century Dutch Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019).
- ⁶ Discussed at more length below. Compare, among more recent publications: Craig J. Reynolds, "A New Look at Old Southeast Asia," *Journal of Asian Studies* 54, no. 2 (1995): 419-46; Will Hanley, "Grieving Cosmopolitanism in Middle East Studies," *History Compass* 6, no. 5 (2008): 1346-67; Green, "The Waves of Heterotopia," 874.
- ⁷ On the Rijksmuseum's Asian pavilion, see Marieke Bloembergen and Martijn Eickhoff, "Een klein land dat de wereld bestormt, Het nieuwe Rijksmuseum en het Nederlandse koloniale verleden," *BMGN-Low Countries Historical Review* 129, no. 1 (2014): 156-69.
- ⁸ Finbar Barry Flood, "Between Cult and Culture: Bamiyan, Islamic Iconoclasm, and the Museum," *Art Bulletin* 84, no. 4 (2002): 641-59. On heritage politics regarding Indonesian Islam, see Mirjam Shatanawi, *Islam at the Tropenmuseum* (Arnhem: LM Publishers, 2015); Chiara Formichi, "Islamic Studies or Asian Studies? Islam in Southeast Asia," *The Muslim World* 106 (2016): 696-718; and Marieke Bloembergen and Martijn Eickhoff, *The Politics of Heritage in Indonesia: A Cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 22-23, 47-60, 276-81.
- ⁹ Susan Bayly, "Imaging 'Greater India': French and Indian Visions of Colonialism in the Indic Mode," *Modern Asian Studies* 38, no. 3 (2004): 703-44; Susan Bayly, "India's 'Empire of Culture': Sylvain Lévi and the Greater India Society," in *Sylvain Lévi (1863-1935): Etudes indiennes, histoire sociale*, eds. L. Bansat-Boudon and R. Lardinois (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2006); Carolien Stolte, "Orienting India: Interwar Internationalism in an Asian Inflection, 1917-1937 (PhD diss., Leiden

- University, 2013), 75-118; and Kwa Chong-Guan, "Introduction: Visions of Early Southeast Asia as Greater India," in *Visions of Greater India: An Anthology from the Journal of the Greater India Society* (Singapore: Manohar, 2013), xv-xlvi. See also Mark Ravinder Frost, "'That Great Ocean of Idealism': Calcutta, the Tagore Circle, and the Idea of Asia, 1900-1920," in *Indian Ocean Studies: Cultural Social and Political Perspectives*, eds. Shanti Moorthy and Ashraf Jamal (New York: Routledge, 2010), 251-79; Harald Fischer-Tiné and Carolien Stolte, "Imagining Asia in India: Nationalism and Internationalism (ca. 1905-1940)," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 54, no. 1 (2012): 56-92.
- ¹⁰ Bayly, "Imaging 'Greater India'"; Bayly, "India's 'Empire of Culture'."
- ¹¹ Marieke Bloembergen and Martijn Eickhoff, "Exchange and the Protection of Java's Antiquities: A Transnational Approach to the Problem of Heritage in Colonial Java," *Journal of Asian Studies* 72, no. 4 (2013): 1-24; Bloembergen and Eickhoff, *The Politics of Heritage in Indonesia*; Compare Richard H. Davis, *Lives of Indian Images* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997); and Igor Kopytoff, "The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process," in *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, ed. Arjun Appadurai (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 64-92.
- ¹² Richard King, *Orientalism and Religion: Postcolonial Theory, India and 'The Mystic East'* (New York: Routledge, 1999); Roland Lardinois, *L'invention de l'Inde: Entre ésotérisme et science* (Paris: CNRS, 2007); Suzanne L. Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race, and Scholarship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Urs App, *The Birth of Orientalism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010); Michael Laffan, *The Makings of Indonesian Islam: Orientalism and the Narration of the Sufi Past* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011); Kiri Paramore, ed., *Religion and Orientalism in Asian Studies* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016); Alicia Turner, "Pali Scholarship 'in Its Truest Sense' in Burma: The Multiple Trajectories in Colonial Deployments of Religion," *Journal of Asian Studies* 77, no. 1 (2019): 123-38.
- ¹³ Leela Gandhi, *Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-de-Siècle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006). Compare Alicia Turner, "The Bible, the Bottle, and the Knife: Religion as a Mode for Resisting Colonialism for U Dhammaloka," *Contemporary Buddhism: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 14, no. 1 (2013): 66-77.
- ¹⁴ Gandhi, *Affective Communities*, 5, 9-10.
- ¹⁵ James Bennett, *Crescent Moon: Islamic Art & Civilization in Southeast Asia* [exhibition catalogue] Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005).
- ¹⁶ Marieke Bloembergen, "Borobudur in 'the Light of Asia': Scholars, Pilgrims and Knowledge Networks of Greater India, 1920s-1970s," In *Belonging across the Bay of Bengal: Rites, Migrations, Rights*, ed. Michael Laffan (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), 35-56; J.G. de Casparis, "Historical Writing on Indonesia (Early Period)," in *Historians of South East Asia*, ed. D.G.E. Hall (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 121-64.
- ¹⁷ H. G. Quaritch Wales, *The Making of Greater India: A Study in South-East Asian Culture Change* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1951), 17. Regarding this line of thinking, see F.D.K. Bosch, "A Hypothesis as to the Origin of Indo-Javanese Art," *Rupam* 17 (1924): 6-41; F.D.K. Bosch, "Local Genius" en Oud-Javaansche Kunst," *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Academie van Wetenschappen* 15, no. 1 (1952): 1-25; Paul Mus, *India Seen from the East: Indian and Indigenous Cults in Champa* trans. I. W. Mabbett (Clayton, Victoria: Monash University, 1975 [1933]; Monash Papers on Southeast Asia, no 3.); A. J. Bernet Kempers, *Cultural Relations between India and Java* (Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1937; Calcutta University Readership Lectures, 1935); W.F. Stutterheim, *Indian Influences in the Lands of the Pacific* (Wetlevreden: G. Kolff, 1929); W.F. Stutterheim, *Indian Influences in Old-Balinese Art* (London: India Society, 1935); W.F. Stutterheim, "Note on Cultural Relations between South India and Java," *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 79 (1939): 157-78; and

- Robert Heine-Geldern, "Prehistoric Research in the Netherlands Indies," in *Science and Scientists in the Netherlands Indies*, eds. Pieter Honig and Frans Verdoorn (New York: Board for the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao, 1945), 157-178.
- ¹⁸ See "Hasil diskusi arkeologi 'Local Genius': Kepribadian budaya dalam bitalitas local," *Kompas* [Jakarta], 13 February 1984; Ayatrohaedi et al., *Kepribadian Budaya Bangsa (Local Genius)* (Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya, 1986).
- ¹⁹ For an extensive review see the longer version of this article: Marieke Bloembergen, "The politics of 'Greater India', a moral geography: Moveable antiquities and charmed knowledge networks between Indonesia, India and the West," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 63, no. 1 (January 2021): 170-211.
- ²⁰ Harry J. Benda, "The Structure of Southeast Asian History: Some Preliminary Observations," *Journal of Southeast Asian History* 3, no. 1 (1962): 103-38; John Smail, "On the Possibility of an Autonomous History of Modern Southeast Asia," *Journal of Southeast Asian History* 2, no. 2 (1961): 73-105.
- ²¹ O. W. Wolters, *History, Culture, and Region in Southeast Asian Perspectives* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Southeast Asia Program, 1999 [1982]), 21.
- ²² Aschwin Lippe, "The Sculpture of Greater India," *Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, February 1960: 177-92.
- ²³ Philip S. Rawson, *The Art of Southeast Asia: Cambodia, Vietnam, Thailand, Laos, Burma, Java, Bali* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1967), 7.
- ²⁴ Paul Wheatley, "Presidential Address: India beyond the Ganges – Desultory Reflections on the Origins of Civilization in Southeast Asia," *Journal of Asian Studies* 42, no. 1 (1982): 13-28; Hermann Kulke, "Indian Colonies, Indianization or Cultural Convergence? Reflections on the Changing Image of India's Role in South-East Asia," in *Onderzoek in Zuidoost Azië: Agenda's voor de Jaren Negentig*, ed. H. Schulte Nordholt (Leiden: Vakgroep Talen en Culturen van Zuidoost-Azië en Oceanië, Rijksuniversiteit Leiden, 1990), 8-32; Reynolds, "A New Look."
- ²⁵ William Dalrymple, "The Great & Beautiful Lost Kingdoms," *New York Review of Books*, 21 May 2015. At: <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/2015/05/21/great-and-beautiful-lost-kingdoms/> (last accessed 19 July 2020).
- ²⁶ *Ibid.* Compare Michael Wood, *The Story of India* (London: BBC Books, 2007), 97.
- ²⁷ Pierre-Yves Manguin, "Introduction," in *Early Interactions between South and Southeast Asia: Reflections on Cross-Cultural Exchange*, eds. Pierre-Yves Manguin, A. Mani, and Geoff Wade (Singapore: ISEAS, 2011), xiii.
- ²⁸ My thanks to Rudolf Mrazek for an inspiring conversation that led me to define this problem in this way (Leiden, 21 Oct. 2019).
- ²⁹ Compare Davis, *Lives of Indian Images*. For "local" engagements with Hindu-Buddhist remains in Java, see Pauline Lunsingh-Scheurleer, "Collecting Javanese Antiquities: The Appropriation of a Newly Discovered Hindu-Buddhist Civilization," in *Colonial Collections Revisited*, ed. Pieter ter Keurs (Leiden: Research School CNWS, 2007), 71-114; and Bloembergen and Eickhoff, *The Politics of Heritage in Indonesia*.
- ³⁰ Paul Fauque, *Rapport sur un voyage à Sumatra* (Paris: Impr. nationale, 1886), 11; Paul Fauque to Ministre de l'Instruction Publique, 22 Sept. 1884, Archives Nationales de France, F17/2961.
- ³¹ The photographs were reproduced by François Marie Alfred Molténi in 1884, and kept, on behalf of the French Geographical Society, at the Bibliothèque nationale française, Collection Molténi, inventory numbers 0530 (Sumatra), 13, "Cimetière Atche," and 12, "Pierre Tombales." They are both freely accessible online at <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b531365547> (Old stiles at the Islamic graveyard in Aceh), and <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b53000542> (the stiles transformed into "discoveries" of Paul Fauque, who proudly poses next to them).

- ³² Compare Marieke Bloembergen and Martijn Eickhoff, “The Colonial Archaeological Hero Reconsidered: Post-Colonial Perspectives on the ‘Discovery’ of the Prehistoric Past of Indonesia,” in *Historiographical Approaches to Past Archaeological Research*, eds. Gisela Eberhardt and Fabian Link (Berlin: Edition Topoi, 2015), 133-64; Pierre Labrousse, “Brau de Saint-Pol Lias à Sumatra (1876-1881): Utopies coloniales et figures de l’explorateur,” *Archipel* 77 (2009): 83-116.
- ³³ Fauque, *Rapport sur un voyage*, 11-13.
- ³⁴ Quai Branly, D004174/46870, 23 July 1930, Resolution of the Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine Arts for an exchange between Musée de l’Homme and Musée Guimet.
- ³⁵ On Guimet and his museum, see, among others, Keiko Omoto and Francis Macouin, *Quand le Japon s’ouvrit au monde* (Paris: Gallimard/Réunion des Musées nationaux, 1990); Françoise Chappuis and François Macouin, eds., *D’outremer et d’Orient mystique: Les itinéraires d’Émile Guimet* (Souilly-la-Tour: Éditions Findakly, 2001); and Hervé Beaumont, *Les aventures d’Émile Guimet: Un industriel voyageur* (Paris: Arthaud, 2014).
- ³⁶ This is based on the author’s several visits to, and consultations of, the permanent display in 2012, 2014, 2016, and 2017. For an exhibition in Guimet and its catalogue, and on greater Angkor’s role in the French imagination, see Pierre Baptiste and Thierry Zéphir, eds., *Angkor: Naissance d’un mythe; Louis Delaporte et le Cambodge* [exhibition catalogue] (Paris: Gallimard/Musée national des Arts asiatiques Guimet, 2013). For Musée Guimet’s collection of objects originating from colonial and postcolonial Indonesia see Albert le Bonheur, *La sculpture indonésienne au Musée Guimet: catalogue et étude iconographique* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1971). Note: this catalogue does not reference objects that entered the museum after 1968.
- ³⁷ Daud Ali, “Connected Histories? Regional Historiography and Theories of Cultural Contact between Early South and Southeast Asia,” in *Islamic Connections: Muslim Societies in South and Southeast Asia*, eds. R. Michael Feener and Terenjit Sevea (Singapore: ISEAS, 2009), 1-24.
- ³⁸ Louis Finot, *Rapport à M. le Gouverneur Général sur les travaux de la mission archéologique d’Indo-Chine pendant l’année 1899* (Hanoi: EFEO, 1900), 7.
- ³⁹ Finot, *Rapport à M. le Gouverneur Général*.
- ⁴⁰ Catherine Clémentin-Ojha and Pierre-Yves Manguin, *A Century in Asia: The History of the École française d’Extrême Orient* (Singapore: Didier-Millet, 2007), 18; Finot, *Rapport à M. le Gouverneur-général*, 1.
- ⁴¹ From the opening passage of the “Première circulaire du comité d’initiative,” January 1902, translated and quoted in Clémentin-Ojha and Manguin, *A Century in Asia*, 26.
- ⁴² Compare: Clémentin-Ojha and Manguin, *A Century in Asia*; Pierre Singaravélou, *L’École française d’Extrême-Orient ou l’institution des marges (1898-1956)* (Paris: L’Harmattan, 1999), 81-83.
- ⁴³ Finot, *Rapport à M. le Gouverneur-général*, 7.
- ⁴⁴ For an overview, see: Fischer-Tiné and Stolte, “Imagining Asia in Indai”; Frost, “‘That Great Ocean of Idealism’.”
- ⁴⁵ Bayly, “Imaging ‘Greater India’”; Stolte, “Orienting India.”
- ⁴⁶ Kakuzo Okakura, *The Ideals of the East with Special Reference to the Art of Japan* (London: John Murray, 1903).
- ⁴⁷ Tapate Guha-Thakurta, *The Making of a New ‘Indian’ Art: Artists, Aesthetics and Nationalism in Bengal, c. 1850-1920* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 166-69; Duara, “Asia Redux.”
- ⁴⁸ The first registered acquisition was by the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, inventory number 1917-1014: Durga as *mahismardini*, a 1917 donation by Bostonian art historian and art collector Denman Waldo Ross (1853-1935), a wealthy trustee of the museum. This object had been on loan to the museum, from Waldo Ross, since 1913.

- ⁴⁹ Marieke Bloembergen and Martijn Eickhoff, "Save Borobudur! The Moral Dynamics of Heritage Formation in Indonesia across Orders and Borders," in *Cultural Heritage as Civilizing Mission: From Decay to Recovery*, ed. Michael Falser (Cham: Springer, 2015), 96-97.
- ⁵⁰ Rabindranath Tagore, writing from the Netherlands, to C.F. Andrews, 25-9-1920. Santiniketan, Visva Bharati, Rabindra Bhavan, Correspondence Tagore.
- ⁵¹ J.C. van Eerde, "Hindu-Javaansche en Balische eeredienst," *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië* 65, no. 1 (1911): 1-39.
- ⁵² Tagore to C.F. Andrews, writing from Holland, 25-9-1920, Santiniketan, Visva Bharati, Rabindra Bhavan, Correspondence Tagore.
- ⁵³ Stolte, "Orienting India," 83.
- ⁵⁴ Tagore to C.F. Andrews, from Holland, 25-9-1920, Santiniketan, Visva Bharati, Rabindra Bhavan, Correspondence Tagore. Note that this letter is on display in one of the first museum halls in the Visva Bharati Museum in Santiniketan (visit of the author to the museum in February 2018).
- ⁵⁵ Compare Stolte, "Orienting India," 81, who points to Tagore's openness to an experience of Asian kinship and cultural affinity during his journey to Iraq and Persia in 1932.
- ⁵⁶ Rabindranath Tagore, "Boro-Budur," in *English Writings of Tagore: Poems* (vol. 2), compiled by Mohit Kumar Ray (New Delhi: Atlantic, 2007 [1927]), 314-15. On this, see Bloembergen and Eickhoff, *The Politics of Heritage in Indonesia*, 239-42; and Bloembergen and Eickhoff, "Save Borobudur!", 96-97.
- ⁵⁷ R. Tagore, 16 Sept. 1928 [probably to T. K. Birla], Santiniketan, Visva-Bharati, Rabindra Bhavan, Correspondence Tagore, "Java-tour," 179, 1.
- ⁵⁸ Bloembergen, "Borobudur in 'the Light of Asia'."
- ⁵⁹ Compare Gandhi, *Affective Communities*; Turner, "the Bible, the Bottle, and the Knife."
- ⁶⁰ Compare (on Siam's King Chulalongkorn's pilgrimage to Borobudur in 1896) Bloembergen and Eickhoff, "Exchange and the Protection of Java's Antiquities"; (on Bodh Gaya) Geary 2014 and 2017.
- ⁶¹ Amongst others: Upinder Singh, "Exile and return: The reinvention of Buddhism and Buddhist sites in Modern India," *Journal of South Asian Studies*, 26, no. 2 (2010): 193-217; Geary 2014, 2017; Sraman Mukherjee, "Relics, ruins and temple building: Archaeological heritage and the construction of the Dharmarajika Vihara, Calcutta," in *Buddhism in Asia: Revival and reinvention*, eds. Nayanjot Lahiri and Upinder Singh (Singapore: ISEAS, 2016), 147-190.
- ⁶² For elaborations on the transformation and nineteenth-century receptions of Borobudur summarized in this paragraph, see Bloembergen and Eickhoff, *The Politics of Heritage in Indonesia*, chapters 1 and 2. See also Soekmono, "Serat Centhini and the Rejected Buddha from the Main Stupa of Borobudur," in *Fruits of Inspiration: Studies in Honour of Prof. J. G. de Casparis*, eds. Marijke J. Klokke and Karel R. van Kooij (Groningen: Forsten, 2001), 325.
- ⁶³ On Buddhism in Europe and America: Philip Almond, *The British discovery of Buddhism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); Rick Fields, *How the swans came to the lake: a narrative history of Buddhism in America*, 3rd ed. (Boston and London: Sambhala, 1992); Martin Bauman, "Global Buddhism: Developmental periods, regional histories, and a new analytical perspective," *Journal of Global Buddhism* 2 (2001): 1-43; Alicia Turner, Laurence Cox and Brian Bocking, *The Irish Buddhist: The forgotten monk who faced down the British Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020).
- ⁶⁴ More extensively on this gathering, and Netherlands-Indies theosophical connections in the Greater India networks: Bloembergen, "Borobudur in 'the Light of Asia'"; Marieke Bloembergen, "New spiritual movements, scholars, and 'Greater India' in Indonesia," in *Modern times in Southeast Asia*, eds. Susie Protschky and Tom van den Berge (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 57-86. Compare Martin Ramstedt, "Colonial Encounters between India and Indonesia," *South Asian History and Culture* 2, no. 4 (2011): 522-39. For (national) histories of the Theosophical Society in Indonesia, restricted to colonial times: Herman A.O. Tollenare, *The politics of divine wisdom: theosophy and labour*,

- national and women's movement in Indonesia and South Asia, 1875-1947* (Nijmegen: Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, 1996; PhD diss.); Iskander P. Nugraha, *Teosofi, nasionalisme & elite modern Indonesia* (Depok: Komunitas Bambu, 2011).
- ⁶⁵ On the Greater India dimensions of the *pergerakan kebatinan* see Bloembergen, "New spiritual movements."
- ⁶⁶ Bloembergen, "Borobudur in 'the Light of Asia'"; Yulianti, "The making of Buddhism in modern Indonesia: South and Southeast Asian networks and agencies, 1900-1950" (PhD diss., Leiden University, 2020); Ramstedt, "Colonial encounters between India and Indonesia"; Bloembergen and Eickhoff, "Save Borobudur!"; Compare, for Sri Lanka, Anne Blackburn, "Ceylonese Buddhism in colonial Singapore: new rituals and specialists, 1895-1935," (Singapore: Asia Research Institute, University of Singapore, 2012; ARI Working Paper 184).
- ⁶⁷ Stanley K. Abe, "Inside the Wonderhouse: Buddhist Art and the West," in *Curators of the Buddha: The Study of Buddhism under Colonialism*, ed. Donald S. Lopez (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 63-106; Bloembergen, "Borobudur in 'the Light of Asia'."
- ⁶⁸ Assistant director of the committee of purchases, to Kelekian, 4 Dec. 1917, Metropolitan Museum Archives, inventory Scu 480 – Sculpture-Purchased – Far East-Javanese – Dikran Kelekian 1917.
- ⁶⁹ J. B., "A Buddha Head from Java," *Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art* 8 (1918): 22.
- ⁷⁰ J. B. "A Buddha Head from Java." For a more extensive discussion of several Buddha heads from Borobudur, carried away, and traveling across changing valuations and taxonomies to private collections and museums of Asian Art in Europe and the US, see Bloembergen, "The politics of 'Greater India'," 182-191.
- ⁷¹ Partha Mitter, *Much Maligned Monsters: A History of European Reactions to Indian Art* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992 [1977]); Partha Mitter, *Art and Nationalism in Colonial India, 1855-1922: Occidental Orientations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), ch. 8; Tapate Guha-Thakurta, *The Making of a New 'Indian' Art*, 146-84; Kathleen Taylor, *Sir John Woodroffe, Tantra and Bengal: 'An Indian Soul in a European Body?'* (Richmond: Curzon Press, 2001), 61-77.
- ⁷² Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, *The Influence of Greek on Indian Art* (Broad Campden: Essex House Press, 1908).
- ⁷³ Bloembergen, "Borobudur in 'the Light of Asia'," 40-41.
- ⁷⁴ Abe, "Inside the Wonderhouse"; Alfred Foucher, "Buddhist Art in Java," in *The Beginnings of Buddhist Art and other Essays in Indian and Central-Asian Archaeology*, ed. L.A. Thomas, trans. F.W. Thomas (Paris: Paul Geathner/London: Humphrey Milford, 2017), 205-71.
- ⁷⁵ Coomaraswamy, *The Influence of Greek on Indian Art*, 2-3.
- ⁷⁶ Ernest Binfield Havell, *Indian Sculpture and Painting: Illustrated by Typical Masterpieces with an Explanation of Their Motives and Ideals* (London: John Murray, 1908), 24-26.
- ⁷⁷ Bloembergen, "Borobudur in 'the Light of Asia'," 41. Tapate Guha-Thakurta, *The Making of a New 'Indian' Art*, 164-67; Mitter, *Much Maligned Monsters*, 269-71.
- ⁷⁸ Bloembergen, "Borobudur in 'the Light of Asia'," 41.
- ⁷⁹ See for example O.C. Gangoly, "The Origin of Indo-Javanese Art," *Rupam* 17 (1924): 54-57; O.C. Gangoly, *The Art of Java* (Calcutta: A. N. Gangoly, 1967).
- ⁸⁰ For an analysis of Stutterheim's ambiguous engagements with Greater India thinking, see *ibid.*, 45-49.
- ⁸¹ Rabindranath Tagore, *Gitanjali* (London: India Society, 1912).
- ⁸² For a selection, see Josef Strzygowski et al., *The Influences of Indian Art: Six Papers for the Society* (London: India Society, 1925). The lectures were widely reported in the British and British Indian Press, and in newspapers elsewhere in Europe, depending on the country of origin of the invited scholar-speaker. See British Library, European Manuscripts F 147/104 and 105, India Society

Papers, Newspaper cuttings concerning India Society, from 1922. The lectures by Vogel (1925) and Stutterheim (1929 and 1935) were also published separately. See Jean Philippe Vogel, *The Relation between the Art of India and Java* (London: The India Society, 1925) and Stutterheim, *Indian Influences in the Lands of the Pacific and Indian Influences in Old-Balinese Art*.

- ⁸³ "Letter to the Editors of the *Times*," signed by John Zetland and Francis Younghusband, draft, before Feb. 1931, British Library, European Manuscripts F147/72, India Society papers, Museum of Asiatic Art, Feb. 1930-Feb. 1931.
- ⁸⁴ Compare Sarah Victoria Turner on the "Aspects of Indian Art" exhibition held at the Warburg Institute in London in 1940: "'Alive and Significant': 'Aspects of Indian Art', Stella Kramrisch and Dora Gordine in South Kensington, c. 1940," *Wasafiri* 27, no. 2 (2012): 42. Warburg Institute Director Fritz Saxl framed it with comparably worded high aims of "deeper understanding of the life and thoughts of another race" (quoted from "Photographic Exhibition of Indian Art," *Indian Art and Letters* 14, no. 2, 1940: 116).
- ⁸⁵ O.C. Gangoly, "A New Museum of Indian Art at Benares," *Indian Art and Letters*, new series, 5, no. 1 (1931): 9-13; John de la Valette, "The Encouragement of Art and Archaeology in the Indian States," *Indian Art and Letters*, new series, 5, no. 1 (1931): 111-27; Ajit Ghose, "The Need for Museums of Art in India," *Indian Art and Letters*, new series, 5, no. 1 (1931): 140-45; H.F.E. Visser, "A Museum of Asiatic Art in Amsterdam," *Indian Art and Letters*, new series, 5, no. 1 (1931): 146-47. For more contemporary discussions of the plans for a Museum of Asiatic Art in London in the India Society's journal *Indian Art and Letters*, see "Discussion on the Formation of an Oriental Museum in London," *Indian Art and Letters*, new series, 5, no. 1 (1931): 40-59; and "Royal Commission on National Museums and Galleries, Extracts. 1931," *Indian Art and Letters*, new series, 5, no. 1 (1931): 60-64.
- ⁸⁶ Henry Trubner, *The Art of Greater India, 3000 B.C.-1800 A.D.: An exhibition of Indian Art presented under the patronage of the Embassy of India functioning for the Government of India* (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1950); Sherman E. Lee, review of *The Art of Greater India, 3000 B.C.-1800 A.D.*, *Artibus Asiae* 13 (1950): 119-21. See also Henry Trubner, "The Art of Greater India, 1950," *Bulletin VVAK*, new series, 29 (1950): 28-29.
- ⁸⁷ Trubner, *The Art of Greater India*, 107-8.
- ⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, xi-xii.
- ⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, v.
- ⁹⁰ Marieke Bloembergen and Martijn Eickhoff, "Conserving the Past, Mobilizing the Indonesian Future: Archaeological Sites, Regime Change and Heritage Politics in Indonesia in the 1950s," *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 167, no. 4 (2011): 405-36; Bloembergen and Eickhoff, *The Politics of Heritage in Indonesia*.