The reputation that my Bengal draughtsman had acquired by his botanical drawings, performed under the inspection of Dr. Buchanan, having come to the knowledge of his Birman Majesty, or, in the Birman phrase, having reached the Golden Ears, the King was pleased to desire a specimen of his skill, and sent over a painting on glass, executed by a Siamese artist in his own service, signifying his royal will that it should be copied upon paper. This picture, which was a tolerable performance, represented the mode of catching wild elephants in the forests. [...] My painter performed the task so much to his Majesty’s satisfaction, that a request was made for his further services.¹

Michael Symes, 1800

The Filipino can raise his head high; the defamatory belief that he is incapable is eradicated. The Filipino is capable, capable of being a genius. This has been pronounced by the Board of Judges of the Universal Exposition in Paris. [...] Luna, Resurreccion Hidalgo and Pardo de Tavera have been given awards in that Exposition!²

La Solidaridad, 1889

Roughly bracketing the 19th century, these two quotations offer a sense of the scope of activities that could be considered “art” in Southeast Asia in that period, and its potential significance. In the first, the Bengali company painter Singey Bey, who accompanied Michael Symes on a British diplomatic mission to the court of Ava in 1795, transmits his skills in drawing to the artists of the Burmese court. This is the domain of the draughtsman, of forms of visual representation like illustration, map-making, reverse-glass painting and trade painting. In the second, expatriate Filipino painters in Europe are awarded high honours for their mastery of Western-style academic painting and sculpture, genres of practice which are more easily recognisable as “fine art.” To privilege only this latter type of activity in 19th century Southeast Asia would be to ignore a whole crucial domain of interaction and change, as suggested by the quotation from Symes. In this period, formal art schools were relatively rare and much of the transfer of new techniques and media in art occurred informally. It is thus important to situate the achievements of well-known 19th-century artists within a broader visual culture, one which was undergoing its own changes. However, there is a significant common thread between
Authority And Anxiety
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the two domains of practice: a sense of the representation of Southeast Asia to the world. Just as the Filipino artists were celebrated for contesting the narrative of the uncivilised colonial subject on the world stage of the Universal Exposition, Singey Bey’s illustrations of Burmese people and customs were also destined for a European audience. In the context of the colonial world order, questions of how people and cultures were represented, and by and for whom these representations were made, had a critical political resonance.

In the 19th century, much of Southeast Asia was under the control of various European powers (British, French, Dutch and Spanish). While in parts of Southeast Asia there had been contact with Europe for centuries prior, in general this was substantially different from the colonial systems of the 19th century. Areas of present-day Indonesia, for example, experienced Portuguese presence from the early 16th century, which was followed by the arrival of the Dutch, whose trading company (the VOC, or United East India Company) established a stronghold at Batavia (now Jakarta) in 1619. Dutch activities in the 17th and 18th centuries were primarily concerned with establishing dominance in trade. However, the 19th century saw the takeover of VOC territories by the Netherlands government, ushering in a period of greater intervention and control, which had a far more significant impact on the local culture and social fabric.

The major exception to the 19th-century arrival of colonialism was the Philippines, where a system of colonial rule had been established early, following the beginnings of Spanish conquest and Catholic proselytisation in 1565. There, the major alteration was not the imposition of colonialism but economic change, as the colony became more closely linked with global markets. Debates over liberalism and secularism in Spain also had their echoes in the colony, alongside the birth of Filipino nationalism. Even areas of Southeast Asia which had avoided colonisation could feel the impact of European presence on the region. Though Siam (present-day Thailand) managed to remain independent – through a combination of cultural diplomacy, strategic territorial concessions and political reform – its rulers initiated major changes that must be understood in the context of the colonial threat.

Why begin a narrative of modern art with the colonial? Colonialism and modernity were not the same thing, but colonisation did bring a different system of values into close contact with the existing structures and local cultures of Southeast Asia. To the extent that “the modern” is understood in terms of a conceptual break with the past, the environment of change and uncertainty created by this interaction can be seen as the beginning of a modern condition. The general anxiety associated with the social changes of modern experience was compounded by the colonial situation: new value
systems were often associated with colonial authority and its underpinning prejudices and prohibitions. Similarly, new practices in art which were the result of Western influences through colonial channels – such as realism, painting in oils, one-point perspectival systems, etc. – were adapted and used by local patrons and artists. But the meaning of such adaptations is open to interpretation, and could signify variously an embrace of change, an assertion of status, a sense of insecurity or a demand for recognition. At the core, however, was the agency of local patrons and artists, operating within the anxious constraints of colonial systems. While the 19th century did see new forms of art and representation in Southeast Asia, this is not to suggest that the past was abandoned or forgotten. Rather, it was subjected to a critical re-appraisal. The preservation of tradition could become a deliberate statement, as self-conscious as the adoption of the new. An interesting case is the Museum of the Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences, opened in 1868, building on the work of a learned society which had operated since 1778. The museum displayed ethnographic objects and archaeological artefacts, as well as precious items and weaponry that had been seized in colonial conflicts (fig. 1). By grouping together these objects from different spheres of local life, the structure of the museum suggested a kind of distancing between past and present. However, certain pioneering Indonesian artists such as Raden Saleh (c.1811–1880) Mas Pirngadie (1878–1936) and Kassian Cephas (1845–1912) were connected with the Batavian Society and its research activities, showing the new context in which tradition could be experienced in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

To propose a history of art in Southeast Asia in the 19th century requires an exploration of these tensions between past and present, self and other, looking particularly at the dynamics of local agency and colonial representation. In offering such a history it is also important to note the anachronism of “Southeast Asia” as a construct when applied to the region in this period. Additionally, changes in art were not experienced in a uniform way across the region. In what follows, therefore, selected specific cases are described in their local context, to reveal both common problems and divergent situations.
Patronage in Transition

Changes at the political level in the nineteenth century had an impact on artists, as royal courts and local elites had been their traditional patrons. For courts which continued to function, art patronage in the 19th century could serve new purposes and advance new interests, while in areas where the local elite was displaced by colonial powers, new classes of patrons emerged. The court of Siam demonstrates the strategic potential of patronage in 19th century Southeast Asia. The reformist kings Mongkut (Rama IV, r. 1851–1868) and Chulalongkorn (Rama V, r. 1868–1910) – made careful use of art, photography and material culture to enhance their authority in an international context of competitive colonialism.12 King Mongkut, who had spent decades in the monkhood, patronised the construction and decoration of Buddhist temples. He commissioned the monk-painter Khrua In Khong (active 1850s–1860s) to paint murals for the royal temples of Wat Bowon Niwet and Wat Borom Niwat. Khrua In Khong composed highly innovative mural schemes using Western painting techniques such as shading in dark and light and unified perspectival space (fig. 2). This was a different approach from traditional murals, which spatially compressed multiple episodes of the narrative.13 Khrua In Khong also included a number of Western figures and buildings, likely inspired by American prints and other images presented as diplomatic gifts.14 The murals were allegorical representations of Buddhist morality: different from the usual subjects of episodes from the past lives of the Buddha or the traditional cosmographic diagram. The treatment of the subject suggests the influence of the movement amongst Buddhist intellectuals, supported by King Mongkut, to reform those aspects of Buddhist practice considered to be “accretions of superstition and mythology,” instead enthusiastically embracing scientific modernity.15

King Mongkut’s patronage of innovative temple painting can be viewed as an assertion of modernity within the framework of tradition. However in other respects he broke completely with past conventions, lifting a taboo against the representation of the king’s image. King Mongkut’s photograph was circulated to other heads of state in the late 1850s and early 1860s, asserting his status on a global stage (fig. 3).16 These early images reveal some awkwardness: “photography appears not yet sufficiently mastered, and so it fails to shield its subject from its negative rhetorical possibilities.”17 By contrast, his son and successor King Chulalongkorn was at ease with photography, evident in both the formal and intimate portraits he commissioned, which were also circulated through reproductions (fig. 4). Chulalongkorn was a keen amateur photographer, and sparked a craze for photography in court circles (fig. 5).18
Mongkut and Chulalongkorn also began to commission portraits and commemorative statues. Often, photographs were sent to artists in European ateliers as references, creating a strong interplay between the practices of art and photography. Chulalongkorn also sat for some artists during his European tours, favouring relatively conservative salon painters.

Such was the significance now given to royal portraiture that in 1896, he commissioned retrospective portraits of the previous kings of the Chakri dynasty, most of whom had never been realistically portrayed. These portraits were created first as sculptures, using the descriptions of people who had seen these kings personally to generate a likeness. In 1896–1897, Chulalongkorn also commissioned oil paintings from an unknown European artist, likely based on photographs of the sculptures. Phra Soralaklihkit (1875–after 1950), a painter who had trained with Italian artists working at the Siamese court, made a copy after the portrait of King Nangklao (Rama III, r. 1824–1851) (fig. 6). Despite the meticulous realism of this painting, it was the result of later reconstructions and repetitions of the King’s likeness.

The circumstances surrounding the production of this portrait illustrate the drastic changes to the function of the kings’ image in the 19th century. The case of Siam indicates the possibilities for the patronage to affirm – and even re-shape – the authority of elite patrons. For other courts, however, colonial pressures led to collapse, and court artists had to find new means of support. An example is Saya Chone (1866–1917), who at a young age attained the status of a royal painter in King Thibaw’s (r. 1878–1885) court in Mandalay. Court art in Mandalay was changing, and Italian artists had been invited there in 1883.

As in Siam, there was also a passion for photography at court. However, the court collapsed when King Thibaw surrendered to British forces in 1885. After this time, Saya Chone developed a hybrid style of painting, which combined the density, brightness and stylisation of Burmese narrative painting with aspects of Western-style painting, such as landscaped backgrounds shown with perspectival regression. Family Portrait reflects these characteristics (fig. 7). It is an example of a newly developed genre in Burmese painting, representing aristocratic family groups, often with generic features, suggesting that they were “types” rather than strictly portraits. These paintings were likely shown at a unique local form of public exhibition: at the festive cremation ceremonies for monks, where elaborately decorated paper and bamboo pavilions displayed paintings at their base (fig. 8). Saya Chone may have also found work painting theatrical backdrops and advertisements.

The travelogue of the colonial administrator Vincent Scott O’Connor, who had occasionally commissioned work from Saya Chone, gives further insight into the artist’s position:
“But the last time I saw my friend [Saya Chone] in Mandalay he was gloomy and dejected [...] ”

“It is ill with me,” he answered. “Art does not pay. I will become a trader in rice.”

And then he talked of the disinclination of people to buy pictures and pay for them, of the decline of the Phôngyi-Byans (the monk-burnings), at which of old his pictures found a market.

Another result of the artist’s relationship with O’Connor was the publication of images by Saya Chone representing the fall of the court, including scenes of King Thibaw’s abdication and departure into exile, painted in a vibrant, linear style (fig. 9). Like Khrua In Khong, Saya Chone created visual innovations from within the vocabulary of local aesthetics. However, as these paintings document, historical circumstances forced him to work beyond the context in which he had trained.

For other artists, the potential existed to work in different ways across court and colonial markets. One of the earliest indigenous photographers in Indonesia, Kassian Cephas worked at the Yogyakarta courts of Hamengkubuwana VI (r. 1855–1877) and VII (r. 1877–1921), where he was likely trained by a European photographer attached to the court in the 1860s. Cephas had a varied career. In addition to his work at the court, he sold prints to the public through a commercial studio practice.

Dr Isaac Groneman, a Dutch physician also at the Yogyakarta kraton (palace), Cephas created photographic documentation of the court dances and elaborate ceremonies of the period. Certain of these were published as collotypes for circulation in the Netherlands (fig. 10). Cephas’ photographs demonstrate the emphasis on court ritual in the 19th century: in fact, the splendor of the courts was maintained even as their political influence declined, since Dutch authorities were concerned to maintain the appearance of the traditional prestige of the Javanese ruling class. Cephas was also given important photographic commissions through the work of the Archaeological Union in Yogyakarta: during the period of 1889–1891, he was responsible for documenting the monuments of the Lara Jonggrang and Borobudur temple complexes (fig. 11). The kind of documentation projects with which Cephas was engaged were characteristic of 19th-century Southeast Asia. Archaeological projects were often associated with colonial learned societies or the colonial state, and fed into narratives of exploration and scientific discovery. Similarly, the documentation of ritual and ceremonial practice was related to the burgeoning fields of ethnography and museology, as well as supplying a market for exoticism abroad. A continuation in the Javanese context of these kinds of documentation projects can be seen in the early 20th century, in Mas Pirngadie’s collaborations with the colonial administrator J.E. Jasper.
An unusual hand-painted album from Vietnam shows a similar concern to document court tradition, at the very point when its significance in practice and symbolic authority was waning. The album, painted by Nguyễn Văn Nhân (c. 1830s–1840s to before 1919), contains images of the costumes of the Nguyễn imperial court, representing the formal clothing of each rank of the royal family, civil and military administrations, as set down in official imperial edicts (fig. 14). The album also reveals signs of its own modernity: it is painted in a realistic style, with injections of humour and whimsy (fig. 15). Little is known of the artist, but he appears to have worked for the French colonial administration. His only other known painting is a portrait of a Buddhist monk, painted in a traditional, frontal manner. The reason for the album’s commission is also unknown, but it is possible that it was made for a French official. Since 1883, the Nguyễn court had been operating under a French protectorate. Thus while the album might seem a validation of the traditional order, it is notable that it was produced during the reign of Thành Thái (r. 1889–1907), under whom the court reached a low point in prestige and political authority. Thành Thái also appears to be the Emperor pictured in the album, although he is not identified in the captions.

In the case of the Philippines, the significant transition in patronage was the movement away from the dominance of the Catholic Church as principal patron. The secularisation of local patronage coincided with the increasing openness of Manila as a port city, bringing a new group of traveller-patrons into contact with Filipino artists. The economic prosperity of the port also brought about the rise of a new local merchant class, many of whom were Chinese mestizo (mixed race, indigenous and Chinese). The figure of Damián Domingo (1796–1834) represents this shifting environment. Chinese mestizo in origin, Domingo had a successful practice in painting portraits, including of Spanish colonial officials (fig. 16). These are now known through miniatures on ivory, but an early source suggests the existence of full-size portraits by Domingo in the palace of the Governors-General. Domingo was also active as a painting teacher, and had offered private tuition in his residence from 1821. In 1827, Domingo was appointed as the professor of an art school funded by the Real Sociedad Económica de Amigos del País (Royal Economic Society of the Friends of the Country), which had opened a few years prior. This was the first official art school in Southeast Asia, and represents an historical turning point in the recognition of artists as a professional class. The school was also inclusive: an extract of the certificate from the Royal Economic Society, which laid out the regulations of the School, noted that “he [Domingo] will enroll any
applicant of whatever class whether Spanish, mestizo or Indio.” This stance was highly significant, given the defined privileges which different ethno-social groups normally had in the stratified society of the colonial Philippines.

It was also through the Royal Economic Society that Domingo met an important patron, the Armenian Don Rafael Daniel Baboom (1770–1832), who was active in the textile trade in Calcutta and Manila. Baboom commissioned an album of tipos del país, or local types, painstakingly rendered to represent minute details of costume and fabric (figs. 17 and 18). There are four extant versions of this album, including one with each page signed by Domingo. The other three versions of the album are thought to be multiples, and it is not clear whether they were painted under Domingo’s direct supervision. While the original patron’s interest in the subject was driven by the burgeoning textile trade, tipos del país became popular souvenirs for visitors to the newly flourishing port of Manila.

The market for tipos del país was similar to that of the paintings produced for the export market in the Chinese workshops of port cities like Hong Kong, Canton (now Guangzhou) and later, Singapore. Chinese export painters also produced images of native “types,” local trades and port scenes. In fact, there is evidence that these markets were directly connected: images after one of Domingo’s followers, Justiniano Asunción (1816–1896), were copied in the workshop of the well-known export painter Tingqua.

Asunción’s tipos del país were also re-circulated as lithographs (figs. 19 and 20). An earlier demonstration of the interaction between the Philippines and the Chinese export painting market can be found in a pair of paintings on ivory by an unknown Chinese artist, depicting a relatively common view of Macau and a view of the Pasig River, Manila, which was perhaps copied from a print (figs. 21 and 22).

A taste for miniaturist detail, reflected in the popularity of tipos del país, remained evident in the local development of secular portraiture in the Philippines, as can be observed in a portrait by Simon Flores (1839–1904) of the Quiason family (fig. 23). Flores situated this family of wealthy entrepreneurs against a background of comfortable domestic prosperity. The artist has paid fastidious attention to the details of texture and lustre, using invisible brushwork so that no surface effects interrupt the appreciation of the concrete materiality of the represented objects. Through the parallel messages of material prosperity and familial order, the Quiason family portrait represents the growing status and self-confidence of the ilustrado (educated) class. As Patrick Flores has noted of the painting: The family is not only to be apprehended as kinship based on blood, but also as a constellation of social ties. To reflect on this portrayal of the family is to...
reflect on the social system that allows this kind of family, obviously of the ilustrado kind, to prosper. In this way the work also prefigures an image of the secular, modern nation, as the late 19th century saw the rise of anti-colonialism and reformism among this influential emergent class.

Artists and Cultural Authority

Just as local patrons used new forms of art to encode messages about their status, aspirations and values, so did artists themselves. For certain artists in the 19th century, mastery of the technical forms of Western painting could be a means of claiming cultural authority: proving that artists from the colonies could equal their European peers in privileged cultural practices. While it was still a rare occurrence for artists from Southeast Asia to study in Europe in this period, such artists often came to occupy an exalted position within local art histories, because their success had been validated at the colonial centres. Although these artists could be supported by bursaries from the colonial administration, they were not necessarily propagandists for colonialism. In fact, their prowess in prestigious forms of Western art could be a powerful counter-narrative to colonial prejudices.

Raden Saleh, born in Semarang, Central Java, was the earliest known artist from Southeast Asia to study art in Europe. In his youth, he was apprenticed to Antoine Payen (1792–1853), a Belgian landscape painter active in Java (fig. 24). Saleh travelled to The Hague in 1829, where, supported by the Dutch Ministry of Colonies, he studied with the portraitist Cornelis Kruseman (1797–1857) and the landscape artist Andreas Schelfhout (1787–1870). He stayed in The Hague for close to ten years, followed by another eleven elsewhere in Europe, where he experienced both artistic and social success. He was widely commissioned, some of his works were shown in prestigious salon exhibitions and collected by the elite. A turning point in Saleh’s practice took place in Dresden, where he was welcomed into a vibrant intellectual environment, and he came to adopt a social persona which reflected the exoticism expected of a Javanese painter in Europe. He developed an interest in painting Orientalist genre scenes of animal hunts, following the fashion created by painters like Horace Vernet (1789–1863). Although Saleh’s lion hunt compositions were fictional constructions, inspired by precedents within painting, he drew on earlier studies of lions he had made from life (fig. 25).

In Forest Fire of 1849, Saleh transposed the conventions of Orientalist painting into a Javanese setting (fig. 26). The work represents the desperation of wild animals, pushed by a fire to the edge of a precipice.
Dramatic intensity is heightened by the convulsed postures of the animals, which dominate the condensed pictorial space. In the centre of the canvas, a roaring tiger confronts the viewer in a moment of suspension. Saleh sent the painting to King William III of the Netherlands in 1850, and perhaps it contributed to his receiving the title of “King’s Painter” in the following year.

As Marie-Odette Scalliet notes, the monumental scale and complex composition of the work were a realisation of Saleh’s aspirations as a painter: to create the kind of painting that would be considered the pinnacle of achievement in the world of the European salon. At the same time, however, the painting reiterates the cliché propounded by Orientalist painting of “the East” as wild and primal.

In 1851, Saleh returned to colonial Java, a society less open than that which he had experienced in Europe. Here, he created his only history painting, depicting the 1830 arrest of Pangeran Diponegoro, the last Javanese ruler to resist Dutch domination. As with *Forest Fire*, Saleh also presented this painting to King Willem III, and it remained in his collection until it was returned to Indonesia in 1975. The Arrest of Pangeran Diponegoro has been convincingly interpreted as proto-nationalist statement. It is, however, a fraught exercise to position Saleh within the mold of modern nationalism and political activism. On the one hand, Saleh was a Europhile, he maintained close connections with members of the European aristocracy and the colonial administration, and he continued to work within the structures of colonial patronage. On the other, he pursued an unconventional life in the hierarchical and racist society of the colony, leading to social isolation and even outright suspicion.

Saleh’s career has many parallels to that of Juan Luna (1857–1899). Already trained in academic painting in the Philippines, Luna travelled to Madrid in 1877 to study at the Royal Academy of Fine Arts of San Fernando, where he soon distinguished himself. In 1884, his monumental canvas *Spoliarium* (fig. 29) won one of the gold medals at the National Exhibition of Fine Arts in Madrid, while Luna’s compatriot Félix Resurrección Hidalgo (1853–1913) was awarded one of the silver medals (fig. 30).

Nonetheless, these successes were perceived as victories for the prestige of the Philippines by expatriate Filipino intellectuals in Spain, and the classical subject matter of Luna’s painting – a reference to the brutality of blood sport in the Roman coliseum – was understood as an allegory of colonial oppression. In the same year, Luna painted...
España y Filipinas. Two figures in classical dress allegorise Spain and the Philippines, painted from the back as they ascend a marble staircase towards a golden sunrise (fig. 31). Although representing a benevolent image of colonialism, the Spanish figure is dominant, ushering her companion forward. Luna produced this painting for his friend and occasional patron Pedro Alejandro Paterno (1857–1911). Paterno, a wealthy Filipino expatriate, believed in the Philippines’ colonial relationship with Spain. However, he also actively promoted the work of Filipino artists, and wrote books about the pre-Hispanic culture of the Philippines. While his scholarship was sometimes fantastical, his attitude reflected a general desire among Filipino intellectuals abroad to valorise their native culture.64

España y Filipinas was a successful composition for Luna, and he painted as many as six different versions in later years.65 One immense version was commissioned by the Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs for display at the Barcelona Universal Exhibition of 1888, demonstrating that the allegory was appreciated for its propaganda value for the colonial project. How might this painting be reconciled with Luna’s seemingly anti-colonial position in Spoliarium? The answer lies partly in the inclinations of its various patrons. Further, however, is that 19th century attitudes may map poorly onto contemporary concepts of nationalism: amongst the expatriate Filipino community in Spain, there was an array of views relating to the future of the Philippines. Some advocated independence, others reform, hoping for the recognition of the Philippines as a province of Spain, while others directed their criticism towards the exploitative power of the Church.66 This latter sentiment was reflected in a speech by the journalist Graciano López Jaena on viewing a subsequent version of España y Filipinas:

Although incompetent, I allow myself a criticism of his painting, because it lacks one detail, a very important detail: a friar on the third step blindfolding with a handkerchief the eyes of the India so that she may not see the path of glory towards which Spain leads her.67

Through the receptions of Luna’s painting by his contemporaries, we can see the potential significance of art in this period, not only for establishing the cultural authority of the artist, but as a means of projecting an imagined (national) future.

Conclusion

Across the region, the situation for artists and artisans in this period was not identical. Nonetheless, it is possible to propose an impulse that was widely
shared: namely, the drive to use art and visual culture to shape a claim of authority within the instability of the period. In many cases, this authority was connected to the aspiration to be “modern,” and to consciously re-fashion the self. In the background of this self-fashioning was a broader field of representation, where images of the people, lands and cultures of Southeast Asia were circulating via the many travelogues, print albums and photographs made at this time. Such products often articulated an “exotic” vision of the region for foreign consumption, but surprisingly, could also bear a strong resemblance to articles produced for local patrons. This is apparent when we consider – for example – that photographs of Southeast Asian elites (presumably commissioned by or at least consented to) could be also resold to foreign markets as part of series of exotic “types.” The impact that such representations had on local tastes is also yet to be fully understood. What these interactions suggest, however, is a shared space of representation in which images were appropriable and manipulable for various purposes. At the same time, it is important to recognise that certain aspects of 19th century art – such as those connected to local elites, or prestigious artists like Saleh and Luna – are currently far better understood than others. Whether crafts, popular arts and the vernacular had a strong orientation to the modern in Southeast Asia in this period is not yet clear. Similarly, the impact of the circulation of Chinese imagery – and Chinese artists and photographers – is an area requiring further consideration. The full depth and complexity of nineteenth century art in Southeast Asia has still to be explored.
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