

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/295098460>

The Visible and the Invisible in a Southeast Asian World

Chapter · July 2012

DOI: 10.1002/9781444396355.ch5

CITATIONS

2

READS

52

1 author:



Jan Mrazek

NUS

17 PUBLICATIONS 32 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



From Bohemia to the Malay Archipelago: Travels in Imagination and in Reality [View project](#)



The Visible and the Invisible in a Southeast Asian World

Jan Mrázek

In English, terms such as “visual art” and “visual culture” reflect the privileging of visibility in the practices and discourses of western art. An overwhelming emphasis on the visual sense, as well as the development of particular, historically specific ways of seeing, displaying, and conceptualizing objects, are indivisibly part of the history of European and American art.

Modern fine art is typically seen, not touched, heard, or tasted. The painting as an illusionary window through which one sees the represented world, the conventional mode of experiencing such painting, museums and art galleries as technologies for seeing in which other senses are systematically suppressed (Do not touch! Silence! No food!), the centrality of photography in writing on art and slides in art history classes (the photography creates visual images in which other senses are forgotten) – all these are aspects of modern art too obvious to be normally questioned (*of course* one can’t touch the Mona Lisa!), but they manifest how the visual sense is the focus and conventional limit of European fine art. This separation of seeing from the other senses is part of a larger history of European thought, and relates particularly to the special place given to vision – looking, observing, inspecting – as the most rational and objective sense. Correlatively, rational thought is commonly construed as a kind of clear vision (rather than, for example, sense of touch or taste), as can be seen in the prominence of visual metaphors of knowledge.

These seeing and thinking habits have also shaped Euro-American approaches to Asian art. This essay explores how things are seen and not seen in Southeast Asia, how seeing is often part of experiences that go beyond seeing, and how what is (un)seen is itself often essentially different from the “art object” of western art history.

While the thinking of this essay grows from studying Southeast Asian art and living in Southeast Asia, most of the examples are from one particular Southeast Asian culture, Java, and even here I focus on a limited number of selected cases, often returning several times to one example as I consider it from different perspectives (notably the *keris*, a dagger with magic powers). It is not my aim to generalize about Southeast Asia (or Java), but rather to let the examples tickle our thinking about the visible and the invisible. It is also my aim to give a sense of some of the local ways of conceptualizing and debating the visible and the invisible.

Anthropologists, historians, students of textiles, and other scholars of culture have written about some of the issues discussed below, more often than art historians. However, some art historians, most notably Stanley O'Connor, have discussed the being of things in Southeast Asia, local forms of connoisseurship, and the "imaginative frameworks" within which objects are perceived, and compared them to European and American connoisseurship and its imaginative frameworks. My own approach learns both from this strand of Southeast Asian art history, and from scholars working in other disciplines.¹

Multisensory Experience

Perhaps the most obvious way in which Southeast Asian art leads us to think beyond the visual is the multisensory nature of the experience of art. For instance, among the most visually striking and impressive objects displayed in galleries of Southeast Asian art are various objects used in performances, such as masks, puppets, textiles, and richly decorated musical instruments. When one perceives these objects in a performance, one does not just see them – not just see, and not just them. One perceives them as integral components of multisensory events, and the objects themselves become more fully what they are through their integration in the larger event. The event, the larger experience, is not simply visual, nor are visual and other experiences juxtaposed to each other, but rather they are one.

Let me use as an example performances in the Central Javanese Mangkunegaran Palace, although much of what I say resonates with innumerable other cases of Southeast Asian performances. When one sees a mask in a performance of masked drama, one perceives it as the face of the sensuous body of the dancer moving to the sound of music. As the dancer dons the mask, it affects his feeling and bodily movements, gives him new identity, becomes part of his living body, while he gives it life, movement, and sight. A person and a thing are united. In this process, seeing is important: the dancer looks at the mask before he wears it in order to better feel and enter into its character – it is a kind of seeing which leads to the unification of the seer and the seen, rather than one in which the subject contemplates an object. During the opening movements of the dance, the dancer may hold the mask and look at it before donning it. The term for this is *ngliling*, a word used also when a mother holds her baby and lovingly looks at her. It is an appropriate metaphor: the dancer nurtures an inner, intimate connection with the mask and its soul.

When the dancer dons the mask, he is looking through the mask's eyes – it is dark inside, and the world is glimpsed only through narrow openings. He makes it appear as if the mask itself has the power of sight and thus brings it to life, at the same time succumbing to its character. Various “looking” gestures are frequent in mask dances (as well as in puppet theater), because creating a feeling that the mask (or puppet) can see is a powerful way to animate the thing. But what happens involves more than seeing. It involves touching, the physical feeling of the mask pressed against one's face, as a constant reminder of one's other face, one's other self (the dancer keeps the mask attached by biting onto a small piece of leather attached to the inside of the mask).

The costume – even as it combines different textiles and accessories that could stand as art objects or decorative items in their own right – is an extension of the mask and becomes organically part of the masked dancer. The costume reveals much about who the character is – not only whether it is, for example, a king or priest or warrior, but also about his or her inner character. For example, small batik patterns are signs of spiritual refinement and restraint, while larger, bolder patterns are appropriate for an extrovert, “macho” warrior. The batik pattern thus collaborates and resonates with other ways through which the character is expressed – the mask, the movements, the musical accompaniment. To fully feel the batik patterns at that moment, one has to feel them as part of this multi-sensory composition of forms, movements, and sounds.

Bodily movements and the sound of music are organically connected; music and movement follow and inspire each other, they give each other feeling, meaning, and expressive power, and they come together to create an experience that is indivisibly visual and aural.

Some performances actively engage the sense of smell. For example, jasmine flowers are placed in the folds of the batik cloth worn by the dancer in such a way that they are gradually scattered and their fragrance pervades the air. For sacred dances, small offerings with fragrant flowers and incense mark the limits of the dance space.

Javanese dance generally does not emphasize abstract visual patterns (formations, creating abstract shapes with the body, and so on) but instead focuses on the refinement of inner feelings, the control of bodily energies, and the correct and powerful expression of character. For example, in masked dance, the dancer's movements, together with the mask, represent the inner nature of a particular character. One does not just see such dance, but feels it inside one's body.

In the Mangkunegaran Palace, the oldest set of gamelan musical instruments is decorated with the same colors and patterns as the architecture – it is indivisibly part of it. One of the most striking aspects of performances in this large audience hall (*pendhapa*) is the exceptionally beautiful, almost otherworldly acoustics: even when each of the many musicians in the large ensemble plays very softly, one can hear each musical part distinctly yet at the same time they all come harmoniously together. The sound seems to be coming from no particular direction, filling the whole space with soft but physically sensuous sound



FIGURE 5-1 Performers of a sacred dance in the grand hall of the Mangkunegaran Palace in Solo, Java, wearing batik and other cloths, with fragrant jasmine flowers in their hair, accompanied by gamelan music. Photograph by the author.

matter. Like a gothic cathedral, at the same time that it defines space and helps to give it feeling and character, the architecture is essentially a giant musical instrument, with the gamelan set being part of it.

When I enjoy such an event, I do not look at it as something outside me, outside my space. Instead, I am immersed in it, I am situated within it – within the architecture (which is not built around the distinction between audience and performers, as is the case in the European proscenium stage), within the music. Seeing is not detached from what it sees nor from other senses, but it grows from the multisensory nature of the perceived world.

In many ways a museum experience is as multisensory as a performance: the smells, sounds, and touching (or not touching), the particular kind of silence of art galleries (the hushed voices, the irritated looks one gets when one raises one's voice or laughs) – all that is memorable, and essentially part of the modern art world. What may be different, however, is how everything in this particular kind of multisensory environment claims that sight is the only meaningful sense, and the other senses are only potential disturbances of visual apprehension. What is different, in other words, is how sight and perception are construed – not necessarily in verbal narratives about the experience, but in the experience itself. Art objects can be sensual and evoke all the senses but typically through the mediating sense of sight (as when one sees flowers or naked bodies in a painting).

Let us return to Southeast Asia. It is not only in performances that things such as masks, puppets, musical instruments, and textiles are more than simply visual. Let us think back to the batik cloth that we have encountered as part of the dancer's costume, but let us think beyond the performance, to batik cloth used in everyday life. In a batik market, one can see how women evaluate batik: they hold it and feel it with their hands to apprehend the quality of the cloth, they put it close to their faces to smell the wax which was used to decorate it, and of course they think of its use, how they are going to wear it, how it will feel and appear on their bodies, how it will make them appear, what will people – perhaps their neighbors, friends, men – think of them when they see them wearing the cloth. Even beyond a performance, people encounter the cloth in a way that is not limited to visual contemplation.

Let us consider another example, to which I will be returning throughout this essay: the *keris*, a dagger common in many parts of Indonesia and the Malay world. It has either a straight or “wavy” blade, and on the blade is visible the *pamor*, a pattern resulting from the blending of light and dark metals. While it is often exhibited in museums for its visual beauty and fine craftsmanship, its traditional meanings and functions are quite different from that of a typical art object. In Javanese culture, it is one of the five essential possessions of a man. Believed to have various magical powers, it can bring good or bad luck to its owner. There is a complex connoisseurship (oral and written discourse describing and categorizing *kerises*, and teaching how to evaluate them), as well as philosophical and mystical explanations that read the *keris* as an esoteric text about man and the world, and a sea of (hi)stories about various *kerises*. I will discuss



FIGURE 5-2 Four Javanese kerises without scabbards, showing the pamor patterns on the blades. Photograph by the author.

the keris in more detail in the next section, but here I want to focus on the multisensory character of people's encounter with it. Looking at the keris is an important way of studying and evaluating it, but it is merely one part of the perception of keris.

To start with, the keris is regularly cleaned with a traditional ointment, which brings out the pamor pattern and gives the keris its characteristic fragrant scent. This scent is an indivisible part of "looking" at a keris. Incense is sometimes burned and fragrant flowers are given as an offering to the keris, since fragrance attracts invisible beings and "facilitates the contact between a person and the keris."² In the mythological and magical world of stories about kerises – a world that is never entirely separate from the material world – scent also matters: for instance, the metals of certain magical kerises are said to be distinguished by particular fragrance (for example, "a sweet fragrance").

The process of examining a keris is governed by an etiquette which ensures that the keris as well as its owner are shown respect, that the people present show respect to each other, and that the keris is protected from physical and spiritual damage. The etiquette regulates ways of holding and handling the keris, and the ways one moves when handling a keris – that is, rules that concern not primarily visual perception, but bodily interaction with the thing. Texture and feel to the touch are also important: descriptions often say how a particular keris or type of iron feels to touch ("when it is touched").

As a part of the examination of the keris, one taps on the blade and listens to the sound. Treatises on keris include long lists of sounds, such as: “*mbren-gengeng* [droning, buzzing, reverberating] like a bee”; “*drung*, long is its sound”; “*kung*, ‘mbrengengeng’”; “*ngong-ngong*, within the sound there is yet another sound, [a] long *ting ngong ngong*”; “*brengengeng*, quivering like from above”; “*nong nging brung*”; “*gung drung*”; “*ting ngeng*”; “*prung jung*, the sound/voice is trailing off.” Magical kerises communicate by way of sound: a keris may shake in the scabbard and make a noise to alarm its owner when a thief enters the house. In some cases, the magical power of a keris is conceived as the maker’s voice – magical formulas uttered by him – “recorded” (as modern texts describe it) on the keris.

Another traditional way to learn more about the keris is sleeping with it: the dreams that it generates help one understand the particular keris. We will discuss below what it is that one learns about the keris, but here the point is that the connoisseurship of keris, like the appreciation of the mask worn in a dance performance, goes well beyond looking. As we will see, one may look at a keris for its visual beauty, but traditionally it is more important to understand something else about the thing, something invisible and not simply aesthetic.

The Thing and the Invisible

The keris is a material, visible object, yet when one reads Javanese texts about kerises, the visible and otherwise perceptible aspects of the keris – the physical form and its details, the pamor, the sound, the feel to touch, and even the signs seen in dreams – are cues to understanding something else, something invisible and immaterial: the keris’s individual character or nature (*watak*, *sifat*), power (*daya*), or content (*isi*). For traditional connoisseurs, it is ultimately this special character and the invisible power that is most important about a keris, and the examination of the visible material object is a means to understand the invisible and the immaterial.

In order to describe the workings of these invisible powers, analogies of electromagnetic waves and transmission are frequently used in modern texts. For example:

According to the science of physics, sound and light are basically a kind of vibration. Attacks of sound can be heard by the human ear, while attacks of light can be seen by the human eye. But in the keris-science, the attacks of the content of the keris cannot be perceived by the tympanum of the ear or the retina of the eye, but by . . . *pangrasa*.³

The Javanese word *pangrasa* (very approximately: “feeling, sensing”; from the root *rasa*) means, the author says, “sensitivity of the heart,” “inner sharpness,” or “what people call the sixth sense.”⁴

The “transmission” between a keris and a person is sometimes compared to the invisible workings of radio or television: a person is like a radio receiver and the keris like the radio broadcasting station.

A radio receives vibration-signs from a broadcaster by way of air, too. However, in order that the reception is clearer, an additional tool/medium is needed, that is, an antenna. In the world of keris, fragrance functions as the antenna. From recording different experiences, we can say that it is true that fragrance indeed facilitates the contact [*kontak*] between a person and a keris. So, when we use the analogy of the mechanism of radio, keris is the object that broadcasts the vibration [*vibrasi*], and, with the help of the fragrance (as the antenna), the human can receive the vibration. At the same time, the human, a radio *receiver*, is also the broadcaster. That is because in a certain manner, the human can also broadcast vibration which can be recorded on the keris.⁵

It is not clear whether the waves are “longitudinal, or transversal, or perhaps [they are] other waves that are completely beyond the sphere of physics,” so they are called the “luck-inducing vibration” (*getaran angsar, vibrasi angsar*), and the kind of waves in “the world of the keris should not be confused with the kind in physics.”⁶ Unlike the vibration in physics (such as light, sound, heat, or radio waves), detectable by one of the five senses (perhaps with the help of a radio and an antenna), the keris-vibration (as well as similar vibration generated by people) is subject to pangrasa.⁷

Pangrasa, also translated above as “inner acuteness/sharpness” is not a knowledge or skill that can be learned. “The soul of children and babies is still pure, and so their pangrasa is still sharp, in comparison to adults.”⁸ On the other hand, pangrasa can be cultivated by yoga-like practices such as breath exercises. Describing one variation of this science, Harsrinuksmo, a Javanese expert and the author of a number of books on the keris, refers to his gurus from the Yogyakarta palace, the late Widyosastrosetiko and Widyosudarmo.

The science is called *ilmu tajeg*, and it is used for the detection [*mendeteksi*] of kerises in an esoteric manner. Basically, *ilmu tajeg* is a science of concentrating the sensitivity of one’s feeling on the attacks of vibration or *vibrasi* which is generated by the keris or another *wesi aji* [“precious iron,” a generic term for keris and other magically potent weapons]. Maybe the vibration or *vibrasi* which is generated is almost the same kind (or maybe even the same) as that what is called radiesthesia in the books written by the Westerners.⁹

In the quotations above, the “content” of the keris is described as a kind of power that produces vibrations. On other occasions, it is described in terms of invisible beings inhabiting the keris. These two are complementary conceptualizations.

A *lelembut*, *makhluk halus*, or *jin* can inhabit the keris. These are immaterial (*lelembut, halus*), and under normal conditions invisible beings or spirits. One is

more likely to feel their presence through the sense of smell (fragrance without a visible source) or hearing (sounds and voices). They may be called in by the keris maker by means of magical formula (*mantra*), which may also “cause the jin to know his tasks . . . such as to safeguard the owner” of the keris in which the jin lives.¹⁰

Jins and other immaterial creatures, like other God’s creatures, including human beings, enjoy certain things. Generally, *jins* and other immaterial creatures like the fragrance of certain flowers, the scent of incense, and offerings of food. This is true about any object, including the keris; if it is regularly given . . . such offerings, a *jin* or another immaterial creature will come and inhabit it. They come because they are “served” offerings that they like. Since the spirit is regularly given food by the owner of the keris, he will respond in “good spirit” according to his abilities. . . . It can happen that the *jin* is one of the “naughty” ones, and s/he will disturb the owner.¹¹

There are “good jins” as well as “bad jins,” and “there are even jins that have a religion.” Most people believe that the jin in their keris is a good one, “although there is no proof.”¹²

According to Harsrinuksmo, there are three kinds of “content”: the “blessing” (*berkah*), “immaterial beings” (*makhluk alus*), and “induction” (*induksi*), and all three of them generate radio-wave-like waves or vibration that can be detected [*dideteksi*] by pangrasa.¹³ Another immaterial inhabitant of the keris may be an ancestor-spirit. Yet another popular opinion of what is the impalpable aspect of the keris holds that the *empu* (expert keris maker) stores powerful words within the pores of the iron. This, too, is expressed through a modern metaphor. The master keris maker, “records” his voice on the keris just as one records sound on a cassette tape or a picture by a camera. He is said to have a “magnetic power.”¹⁴

A keris that contains the voice of the *empu* is called *tayuhan*, and the term is also more generally used to refer to any keris that has some kind of content. The verbal form of *tayuhan* (*nayuh*) denotes the act of perceiving the immaterial meanings of the keris. This includes methods that use meditation, but the most popular forms are those in which the keris is placed in a certain manner by or under one’s body during the night. The dreams then become “the sources of meaning.”¹⁵ One thus comes closer to the invisible content precisely when one’s eyes are shut and one is not conscious. However: “What appears in the dream of the *tayuh*-er is not the content of the keris, but a symbol of the character of the keris’s content.”¹⁶ This suggests that both dreams and the waking world are merely covert signs or symbols of “characters” or “meanings” imperceptible by means other than signs or symbols.

It could be asked what role the metaphors of modern technology, magnetism, and the like play in the language of the keris. The “content” or the “power” (*daya*), or “power to influence” (*daya pangaribawa*) is often said to be “mysterious, inscrutable” (*gaib, ghaib*) and secret, and the inscrutability or inexplicability seems to be essential to its nature. It is not articulated except through

modern technological metaphors. The knowledge about the power is powerfully meaningful in its secrecy, in the way it cannot be easily seen and talked about. Harsrinuksmo, writing from the point of view of a researcher, has talked to several people “who are considered experts in the problem of *isoteri* of the keris”:

However, these discussions were not satisfactory, because, in general, the experts do not like to debate. In fact, when they are chased with a detailed question, they try to evade it. As if most of them were of the opinion that the content and the power of the keris is not to be talked about, let alone debated. There are also those who try to evade answering by talking in a rather diplomatic manner: the knowledge about the keris should be learned in order that one can benefit from it, but should not be discussed, let alone made into a material for research. Also, many have responded: “I am just learning about the benefits of the power of the keris. The question what in fact is the power was not taught to me by my guru.”¹⁷

Another author writes: “The belief that the keris is a *pusaka* which has a mysterious power [*daya ghaib*] cannot be proved by means of the science(s)/knowledge of the external/material”,¹⁸ rather, the “belief is born of *rasa* [taste, feeling, the faculty with which one comprehends hidden meanings and truths; related to *pangrasa*].”¹⁹ Similarly, texts about the symbolism of keris, which treat keris as a source of wisdom about life – as a kind of obscure philosophical text – interpret keris by means of *rasa*. What is perceived by *rasa* is the invisible, the immaterial, the implicit, the inner. The invisible, immaterial aspect of the keris perceivable only by means of “signs” – as interpreted by *rasa* or *pangrasa* (or an “old text,” ultimately based on *rasa*) – is also the locus of its power and its meaning. Clifford Geertz writes:

Rasa has two primary meanings: “feeling” and “meaning” . . . As “meaning,” *rasa* is applied to the words in a letter, in a poem, or even in speech, to indicate the between-the-lines “looking north and hitting south” type of allusive suggestion that is so important in Javanese communication. And it is given the same application to external acts generally: to indicate the implicit import, the connotative “feeling” of dance movements, polite gestures, and so forth. But, in this second sense, it also means “ultimate significance” – the deepest meaning at which one arrives by dint of mystical effort and whose clarification resolves all ambiguities of mundane existence.²⁰

The powers and meanings of keris are essentially inscrutable, invisible to the naked eye, and they cannot be proved in terms of rational thought or by science. In order to suggest that the powers of keris are not necessarily a superstition, modern Javanese authors turn to metaphors of modern technology, pointing out that even in the realm of modern technology and science, the invisible – such as radio waves – can be real.

We have seen that the visible, audible, and palpable aspects of a keris are signs to understanding inner, immaterial, invisible power and character. What and why

do people want to learn about the invisible? Each keris has specific powers – for example, protecting from particular kinds of harm, bringing a particular kind of good luck – and it is appropriate for one person but not another, to the extent that the same keris can bring good luck when matched with the right person but bad luck when owned by the wrong person. The connection between a man and a keris is thus very personal: the term for describing a good match between a person and a keris is the same as that used to describe the right match between a man and a woman (*jodho*). The transfer of a keris from one person to another is traditionally not thought about as sale, but as something more like a marriage, and the money paid is called the dowry. The keris’ invisible, immaterial inner nature is thus at the heart of the connection between a person and the thing. Understanding the invisible – or misunderstanding it – has serious consequences for dealing with the keris, and for what the keris “does” to people, because it can benefit or harm them.

Perhaps any art work, or any object for that matter, is surrounded by, is seen through, the thickness of a tissue of words, conceptions, beliefs, and (hi)stories. The lore of legends surrounding kerises is rich and extensive, and the (hi)stories are an important part of the knowledge and discourse surrounding the things. As we try to think of different kinds of invisibility, we may note that one of the most common plots involves a keris mysteriously disappearing (magically flying away, stolen by a magically potent enemy). Some kerises have the power to become invisible or to make their owners invisible. But one can also ponder how many of the kerises “appearing” in the (hi)stories are invisible in actuality – no one has seen most of the most famous legendary kerises. At the same time, these stories of “invisible” kerises are part of the thinking and feeling with which one looks at and thinks about any keris. In some cases, legendary kerises (re)appear in the real world, even while doubts may remain whether a particular keris is truly a keris from a particular history/legend or not.²¹

The keris is only one of innumerable examples of things – things that are in many cases seen in museums and art books – which are more than simply visible, simply material objects. The conceptualizations vary widely – from things containing invisible powers, spirit beings, divine or ancestral presence, and so on – as do the ways in which these objects are treated and used, but generally they are shown respect, prayed to, given offerings, and believed to have the power to benefit or harm people, from individuals to whole villages or kingdoms. Aside from weapons, one can think of masks, puppets, sculptures and other images (often of gods or divine beings, from Thai Buddha to Filipino Santo Niño images), textiles, and musical instruments. Stanley O’Connor’s pioneering essay on heirloom jars in Borneo provides a thorough reflection on one such kind of object and the “imaginative frameworks” through which they are perceived. Essentially the same kind of more-than-visible thing includes objects that are not man-made, such as stones, trees, and various features of the landscapes, like caves, lakes and mountains. Also charged with similar invisible, immaterial meanings and powers are sacred musical compositions, dances, and oral and written texts. The

things discussed here, such as the keris, share much with “things of nature” as well as with a variety of “things” that are not material objects. In all cases, the visual sense, and especially the kind of aesthetic contemplation associated with art objects, is not enough to apprehend them.

It is not enough to consider how the object looks and what it means; one has to start from what it is, how it is in the world and how people are with it. Earlier, we have seen that certain things are experienced very differently from the typical visual art object because of the multisensory and bodily nature of human involvement with them. Now, we see how things are not simply visible because of the being of the thing, because the thing has an invisible “content.” Seeing visual objects such as the keris is not enough because they are not simply visual and not simply objects. A part of their significance or power is inner, invisible energy, or spirit, or particular “personality.” The things may have their own will and agency, they influence people’s lives, they are open to communication (they may reward offerings or other signs of respect, and so on), they may not be simply inanimate, and they may look back. Magically potent heirlooms (pusaka) – such as kerises and other weapons, gongs and gamelan sets, and so



FIGURE 5-3 Decoration from a royal boat, now at the Radya Pustaka Museum in Solo. Believed to be magically potent and potentially harmful, in the museum it is placed in an altar-like space and presented with flower offerings (visible in the photo) every Thursday evening. Photograph by the author.

on – have personal names, preceded by the honorific *Ki*, used also for revered persons. The visual sense is not enough to apprehend or evaluate such things in a world in which visible and invisible beings coexist, a world that is not fully visible. Seeing is often only one of the ways to access the invisible.

Let me conclude this section with one more example. We have mentioned musical instruments in the previous section because they are, in many cases, visually beautiful and richly decorated, yet they are also meant to produce sound and are typically experienced in multisensory events. In many Southeast Asian cultures musical instruments – some more than others – are venerated, given offerings, treated with respect, and believed to have sacred or magical powers or to be inhabited by spirits or divine beings, and their production may involve taboos and rituals. In Thailand and Cambodia, for instance, a particular kind of drum (*taphon*), but more generally other musical instruments as well, is sacred because it is believed to embody the divine teacher. For some, however, the instrument is not an embodiment but a place where the teacher's spirit dwells. Others believe that the instrument merely symbolizes the divine teacher, or symbolically comes from the teacher. Note here the variety of conceptualizations. The point I would like to make is that people often disagree conceptually about how something is sacred or what the nature of the invisible, immaterial power is, and even one person may offer multiple explanations (the same is true, for example, about the *kerises*); yet, they agree, without necessarily discussing it or even thinking about it, that the object must be shown respect, and that it may bring good or bad luck. People make gestures of respect (*wai*) before playing the instrument, people do not step over it or place it in a disrespectful location, and generally they feel the presence of something that demands reverence and care. Beyond conceptualizations, without necessarily thinking about it, people feel the presence of the invisible and respond to it through their behavior, with what they do and do not do. Even when the invisible is not thought about or consciously perceived, it is present for people.

Visual Images and the Invisible

Understanding art is about much more than visual images. It is also about the being of things, and various forms of the invisible. But visual representation is itself in various ways pervaded by the invisible, and cannot be fully understood without it.

Any visual image is involved with the invisible, it grows from invisibility: it makes the invisible visible. In many cases, the visible images refer to another invisible – human desires or virtues, abstract notions such as purity, and so on – when images and the stories they tell are interpreted symbolically or allegorically, as they often are in Southeast Asia. For example, the battle between a demon and the hero of a story may symbolize the struggle between self-control and desires within a human being.

A somewhat different kind of invisibility – the kind discussed in the previous section – is involved when a visual (or multisensory) representation is used as a means to evoke the invisible sacred or magical world. Visual images, as well as performances that work with visual images, often work in this way: they visualize the invisible (the divine, the spirit world), while often preserving the contradiction of this process (the visible image both is and is not the sacred invisible being; it is both magical and symbolic), and thus emphasize the presence of the invisible in the visible, or the invisible as an inspiration of the visible. The invisible always haunts the visible.

In some cases, the situation is reversed: rather than using the visible to invoke the invisible, the invisible is used to add value to the visible. People are fascinated by the invisible, the secret, the magic, by their own fears and uncertainties. This is true when, for example, an image or a show meant primarily for entertainment or amusement incorporates elements of magic or invisible powers, as is often the case in Southeast Asia. This is true, for instance, about Javanese *jaran kepang*, an entertainment in which dancers with hobby-horses are possessed (or “entered,” as one would say in Javanese) by horse spirits, go into a trance and behave like horses. (This case could be compared to the masked dance discussed earlier: in both cases, the spirit of the thing enters the person in an uncanny way and transforms him or her.) In many cases, one event may function as entertainment as well as a ritual: the line between the two, like the border between the visible and the invisible, is not always very clear.

In short, to understand visual images in Southeast Asia, one needs to see how they are involved with the invisible. One may think of the importance and care that the eyes are given in South and Southeast Asia. In the Philippines, the Santo Niño (Christ Child) images are placed in such a way that their gaze is directed at a place that needs blessing (such as the cashier in a restaurant) or protection from evil spirits or elves (such as an old tree). In the case of objects such as certain kinds of (more or less sacred) sculptures, puppets, and masks, the eyes are made with the most care, after the object is otherwise finished, and this may be accompanied by a ritual of the “opening” of the eyes, the giving of the gift of sight, equated with life, to the image.²² When things look back at us, in the case of these images, or otherwise communicate and live with us, we see them differently.

To Show or Not to Show

To display a Euro-American art object, to make it visible, is to let it be what it was meant to be. The greatest extant works of European art are permanently on display. This kind of visibility is part of the nature of the object, and it does not matter a great deal at what time of the day or on what day of the year one sees the work (if it does matter, it usually has something to do with visibility: when the light is best, when the museum is least crowded).

In Southeast Asia, the temporality of seeing art is often different, as is the way that an artwork works: it does not need to be visible for it to work. Some objects are never displayed, or they can be seen only on special occasions, such as during ceremonies or festivals. Temples and palaces come alive and become a spectacle during festivals but are quiet at other times. In many of these cases, even when the works can be seen, seeing them is not the only or primary reason for displaying them. Instead, the reason may be to pay respect to them and/or to take care of them (as in ritual cleansing of objects). When they are invisible, their presence or existence is still important. For example, magically potent objects – weapons, sculpted images, musical instruments, and so on – are kept in palaces, temples, monasteries, and traditional houses. They are not just stored for future use, but rather their active invisible presence is important for people's well-being. Seeing is thus not always essential to the working of art, and things may be seen only on particular occasions or in special contexts.

This makes the temporality of material art objects – which, we have learned previously, are not merely material – closer to forms of art such as music and dance, to performances. Seeing is a part of a multisensory, social, special event (special in the sense that it does not happen at any time). But even some Southeast Asian performances do not need to be seen, as audience may not be essential. Certain musical instruments are played, and musical compositions and dances are performed, only on very rare occasions (for specific rituals, or at times of disaster), and it is a taboo to play them at other times.



FIGURE 5-4 One of the most sacred objects in the Surakarta Royal Palace, this old cannon is revered but never seen: it is enclosed in a special structure within a larger pavilion. Photograph by the author.

In some cases, objects are forever hidden within larger works. In Thailand, sacred or magically potent objects, such as older and sometimes broken images, puppets, and musical instruments, are permanently “buried” within a new Buddha image.²³ Sacred and symbolic objects are ritually buried under Hindu temples. While these objects are meant to be permanently hidden from sight, they are still important elements within the larger sacred structures, they make them “work,” rather like the hidden (and for me mysterious) workings of my computer.

A New Visibility

The “Southeast Asia” in the paragraphs above is, of course, a fiction. One way in which it is so is that, while many of the traditional attitudes to things and vision are very much alive today – often more than one might expect – I have nonetheless focused on these traditional ways and ignored newer ways of seeing and dealing with things, which we will call, to keep things simple, modern. These modern ways happen to be more or less closely related to those of modern art, with which I have been contrasting Southeast Asian ways of dealing with art. In this section, I would like to give a few glimpses of how traditional and modern ways coexist, mix, and/or conflict.

Let us look at the *keris* again. In most conventional understandings, an essential element of art is “beauty,” or at least beauty and art are closely connected. Let us see how “beauty” figures in Javanese texts on the *keris*, such as a treatise by Ki Darmosoegito (1892–1972). I will focus in particular on the *pamor*, which, as we have seen before, is an important source of meanings and powers of the *wesi aji*. For him, the “beauty” of the *keris* is a quality conflicting with the more traditional (or as he puts it, “old people’s”) values. Or, if one considers the older meanings of *wesi aji* as the real ones, as Darmosoegito does, then considering *wesi aji* as beautiful is a fallacy of our times, and something originating from “the foreigners.” “It is obvious that the *pamor* of the *keris* is not merely a beautification/ornament.”²⁴ “*Pamor* is not a form of ornament, so that it would be beautiful or good to look at, but it is considered to have its own power.”²⁵

Relatively recently, instead of the meteoric material which used to be combined with the iron to create the *pamor*, nickel came to be used, in part because of an erroneous scientific analysis of older *kerises*. “Its appearance is really beautiful. But, when perceived with Javanese *rasa*, it cannot be categorized as *wesi aji*, it is just ‘imitation of goodness.’”²⁶ Later, another investigation of the components of *pamor* was conducted, this time with more advanced technology.²⁷ The new conclusions “changed completely the picture” and titanium was found to be the dominant component.

The Titanium metal is extremely powerful, resistant to heat and rust . . . [and] organic acids . . . In this modern century it is used for missiles and jets . . . We have to respect our ancestors who have chosen this metal for heirloom weapons.²⁸

Before these new findings were published, however, nickel became *the* pamor – after all, it was proven by modern science that nickel *is* pamor. In addition to nickel, other metals came to be used as “pamor,” including silver and gold. The appearance of the “pamor” was also often made more representational; for instance, a popular motif is an art-nouveau-like foliage. Darmosoegito says that this kind of pamor “looks ‘very beautiful’”²⁹ (scare quotes in the original) and comments on the blade called *Gelap Tinandhing*, which employs the new pamor: “Its appearance is very beautiful and pleasing, but when it is considered from the ‘place/function of *pamor* in [the world of] *wesi aji*,’ it is without any meaning, it is just beautiful to look at.”³⁰ Another Javanese author explains that “[t]he common nickel that can be purchased in stores does not have the cosmic vibration [*geteran kosmis*] because it does not contain any mysterious power.”³¹

When Ki Darmosoegito writes about the beautiful new “pamor,” he perceives it as something foreign:

Its use is merely for serving the people from foreign countries who all want to buy souvenirs. So, they do not talk about whether the *wesi aji* is good or bad, but rather observe only and only the “*beauty of appearance*” [italics and quotation marks in the original].³²

. . . The newly made artefacts/weapons strive only for beauty of color/appearance, in order to attract the hearts of people who are absorbed by beauty, in order that they buy it for a high price; however, as a *wesi aji*, it is without meaning/*rasa*/value. Dozens of years ago, the Office of Industry Ngayogyakarta, because they found out from an examination in the *Laboratorium* of Bandung that the *pamor Prambanan* contains nickel, they begun to make various artefacts/weapons, such as: kerises, . . . and small knives for opening letter envelopes, *pamor*-in them with nickel. These creations were very very beautiful, foreigners who all stop by in Ngayogyakarta are all buying it, since they consider them weird objects, and some of them think that the kerises, swords, and the other [products] in the cabinet in the Office of Industry, are the same as the sacred heirlooms that are revered by the Javanese people.³³

For Darmosoegito, the way of thinking and looking which emphasizes the beauty of the keris, originates from foreigners. It is they who value what is beautiful, thinking that the beauty is what is “revered” by the Javanese. They also provide the economic stimulus for the production of very beautiful kerises that, however, are “without meaning/value” for the Javanese who understand what is (for Darmosoegito at least) the true being and value of the keris. This new, foreign way of seeing and valuing the keris, based on the foreigners’ money-power, sense of beauty, and modern science (which was the original stimulus for the employment of the “pamor nikel”), for Darmosoegito conflicts with what for him is the true value of the keris. This Javanese truth is revealed through “Javanese *rasa*,” the “old people,” and the “old texts.” (To understand the authority of these, one may remember that another word for keris commonly used in Javanese text is *pusaka*, or sacred heirloom: the respect for keris is also a respect for revered ancestors.)

The source of the bitterness that one may feel from Ki Darmosoegito's writing as well as other texts is not the production of the new "very beautiful" kerises for foreigners and for "those people whose hearts are absorbed by beauty." Rather, it is the fact that this production, as well as the new meaning and power of the kerises – as well as the concept of beauty itself – replaces (or has replaced) the old ways of creating and appreciating the keris. An appealing new visibility and focus on appearances replaces a way of being with things in which the invisible and immaterial were crucial. This replacement is a kind of disappearance of the keris – the disappearance of the invisible. It may remind us of the disappearances of the keris in Javanese (hi)stories, which typically make people "extremely sad."

Ki Darmosoegito's claims that the beauty of the keris is meaningless from the Javanese point of view are a reaction to the foreign view of the keris as exceedingly beautiful, and in that sense they are as contemporary as, say, the foreigners' influence. The clash between the "traditional" and "modern" is not a conflict of the past and the present, but rather a conflict of two present, living worlds.

Apart from the disappearance of the knowledge of how to make the "real" keris and the respect for the invisible and immaterial aspects of things, old kerises disappear from their old places when kerises are bought by foreigners and also when they move to museums. Let me quote a description of the disappearance(s) of *wesi aji* from the introduction to a Javanese book by Waluyodipuro.

Strangely, since the Dutch period until now, very many foreign nationals have wished to purchase a keris for thousands, and in fact sometimes for tens of thousands of rupiah . . . In the past, Mr. A. GALL (a German) in Surabaya owned *pusakas*, having bought hundreds of them. What would he need them for: just to make them into souvenirs when going back to his country. What nonsense! I do not understand these reasons! In foreign countries, people store *wesi aji* in museums or as a personal possession, [items] that were originally given as a present (souvenir) to foreign diplomats or that were bought. If this goes on, perhaps in the future in Indonesia good and superior *pusakas* will be depleted, and only the coarse and bad ones will remain. In the end, if our descendants would want to learn about good *wesi aji*, they will be forced to go to museums in foreign countries. Will not it be something to laugh at: the Javanese studying Javanese language in Leiden (Netherlands); and to study *wesi aji* they will have to go to Bremen, Moscow, San Francisco, Peking, or London.³⁴

The Indonesian encyclopaedia of the keris has this motto: "Must our children and grand-children learn about the keris from foreigners?"³⁵ The fear that *wesi aji* would be taken away to museums in foreign countries is a reason for establishing "our own" museums. Museums in Indonesia, on the one hand, are intended to protect the old kerises (and other objects) from being carried out of the country. At the same time, however, the Indonesian museums – and the meanings with which they endow the keris – replace the "old" meanings and worlds of the keris. In many writings on the keris, there is a sense that museums are essentially foreign to the world of keris. In the *Encyclopaedia of National Culture: Kerises*

and Other Traditional Weapons the word “museum” is mentioned only once, under the entry: *larung*.³⁶ *Larung* refers to the act of getting rid of an evil keris, which has bad influence on the life of its owner. According to most texts, there are two ways to deal with such a keris. It should be “either stored in a museum or ‘*dilabuh*’ [‘anchored,’ i.e., covered with white cloth and, accompanied by offerings, and thrown into the ocean, in a ritual evoking old Javanese burial practices] – as long as it is not used by people.” Here the museum object is construed as something that is “not used by people,” and the museum as a space in which the keris does not work, in which the meanings and powers of the keris are annihilated. In the index of the *Encyclopaedia*, “museum” is explained as “the place where ancient objects are stored.”³⁷ In traditional texts one gets the sense that the keris is full of powers, it has its own will, personal character, and name, and some kerises can move and act on their own. However, in the museum the keris becomes something new, namely, an “ancient object” – and as such it figures in the modern world. Yet as we can see from the idea that the museum can be used to neutralize evil kerises, its world of beautiful objects does not entirely replace, but coexists and interacts with, the world in which kerises remain alive and powerful.

We should remember here that the keris is merely an example: many other kinds of objects have a similar fate, though each case may be different in details. Much of Southeast Asian art found inside museums, with the exception of modern and contemporary art, was not meant to be there, and in their previous lives, the objects were experienced and appreciated in essentially different ways than in the museum. One can think of, for example, images of the Buddha, one of the most common objects in museum collections of Southeast Asian art, available, when displayed in the museums, for close visual scrutiny and aesthetic contemplation, but with the fragrances, sounds, and human activity and religious feeling of a Buddhist temple taken away.

The Javanese ways of thinking critically of beauty (the kind valued by foreigners), of inappropriate emphasis on appearance, and of museums – all values and institutions new and foreign to the traditional world of kerises – should not make us assume that beauty, appearance, and institutions of collecting are not traditionally important in Southeast Asia. But they should make us realize that they are important in a variety of ways, that beauty and appearance are not always important, and that we have to learn to think about them ever anew.

In the case of kerises, we see that there is a change of emphasis from esoteric interpretation of hidden signs, meanings, and powers to appreciation of visual beauty; from mystical knowledge to visual appearance. This is a more general trend of modern times. Let us look at another example, the Javanese shadow puppet theater (*wayang*).

Javanese often emphasize that wayang stories and characters are essentially signs, and they are explained as analogies and metaphors with which people make sense of the world. According to Javanese interpretations, wayang contains hidden truths about human life and the world, rather like the keris or poetry. These truths, or



FIGURE 5-5 Shadows of Javanese wayang puppets as seen at a performance from behind the screen. Photograph by the author.

rather concealed, obscure cues (*sasmito*) to finding these truths, are searched for in the stories, in particular encounters between characters, in the medium itself (for example, the puppeteer as God, people as puppets), and in the often obscure, archaic, but richly evocative language of wayang. These interpretations are limited in how much they say about the multiple lives of wayang and especially the physical actuality and pleasures of performance events, but they are nonetheless an important and popular form of discourse surrounding wayang. The cue-like symbols of the shadow theater both reveal and conceal, like the shadow as conceived by Heidegger, “a manifest, though impenetrable, testimony to the concealed emitting of light.”³⁸ Heidegger’s description of artwork resonates with wayang and its “hidden cues” rather well: “the primal conflict between clearing and concealing . . . the work is the fighting of the battle in which the unconcealedness of beings as a whole, or truth, is won.”³⁹ The medium of wayang – a play with puppets and shadows taking place in the darkness of the night, evoking invisible forces and beings – seems to encourage this understanding of wayang.

Over the last few decades, wayang performance has been changing and, as people often think of it, modernizing. Generally speaking, everything in wayang has become more clearly visible, and there has been increasing emphasis on pleasing appearances and spectacle. Visual representation has become more realistic and visually explicit: Javanese commentators say that realistic depiction is replacing imagination. In the past, the flickering flame of one oil lamp illuminated the

screen and the puppets. A few decades ago this was replaced by an electric lamp, and, more recently, halogen light, which provides increasingly stronger light and sharper shadows. Additional electric lights now illuminate the stage where musicians and singers sit, and, as everything is more visible, there is more attention to the appearance of the stage and the musicians: the tendency is toward a stage that is pleasing to the sight, neat, clean, and nicely decorated, musical instruments have to be polished, musicians wear neat uniforms, and beautiful and sexy woman singers are seated on an elevated platform so as to make them more visible. The wayang screen against which the puppets are shown has become spectacularly larger, and the puppets in larger performances tend to be gilded and visibly expensive. Stronger light (together with amplification) makes it possible for more people to watch, and some wayang performances have become massive entertainment spectacles watched by tens of thousands of spectators, and increasingly commercialized.

All this brings wayang closer to another entertainment medium, another cultural force in the contemporary Javanese world: television. As wayang enters the world of modern popular entertainment, it comes as no surprise that it has become a popular television program. Television, thus, makes wayang more visible in yet another way: visible beyond the place of the performance and on televisions across Indonesia.

If the truth, or revealing, of wayang is like a shadowy glittering of meaning that can be seen only in darkness, but one that stimulates imagination and philosophical thought, then television can be thought of as the technological embodiment of the representational conceptualization of modern objectivity, in which truth is understood as the correctness of representation, and involvement in the world is accessed through representations which are between us and the world. The representation of reality takes the place of reality; the processed, managed, controlled images of television, set before the subject, replace another way of relating to the world: being included in it. Because modern representation claims that it is not merely an image, but that it corresponds to reality in an objective way, it may, as in the case of much television and scientific instruments, conceal its nature as a man-mediated image, and claim that it is a way to objectively see (rather than represent) reality. The world becomes a world as objectively construed by human subjects, and thus humans are challenged to control and manage this represented world. In controlling and managing the world, the aim is to bring everything into the realm of the visible and the represented, thus subduing the world into surveyability and clarity, which becomes understood as knowledge. To be in the dark, to be hidden, to be obscure, to be outside of human control, becomes understood as not being in truth. To be immediately (through one's own body-mind) involved in the world, to be part of it (as one is part of the social gathering when watching wayang), to let one's imagination respond and be moved by its forces, becomes understood as not having an objective perspective. Wayang grows from darkness and its knowledge is obscure; television, like the Cartesian certainty that is truth-as-correctness, makes everything clear and visible. In becoming more like television, and in becoming

a television program, wayang enters the realm of a new visibility and a new attitude to the world.

Different and conflicting attitudes towards the visible and the invisible coexist and interact (or not) in contemporary Southeast Asia. This interaction plays itself out in areas such as the encounter between traditional arts and the modern media and entertainments, as in the example above, as well as in contemporary art. Many artists in Southeast Asia, even as they are part of the contemporary art world and share many of its values and ways of making and thinking about art, are to different degrees and in different ways inspired by local art and its world, including traditional visibilities. This can be seen on the popularity of performance art and other media that go beyond conventional framed painting, in some cases directly referring to traditional arts. For example, the Yogyanese artist Heri Dono has recreated wayang puppets and performance, and on one occasion he (with friends) painted on the wayang screen.⁴⁰ The process of painting, rather than leading to a finished product and a single visual image, became a multisensory performance, complete with traditional musical accompaniment, emphasizing the movements of the painters and the temporality and transience of visual imagery. One saw this painting through the thickness of the performance event, rather like when one watches a wayang performance. Even in apparently conventional Euro-American style paintings one often finds reflections on the visible. For example, in Lucia Hartini's *Spying Eyes*, disembodied eyes fly around in the air like tiny alien spaceships, attacking a sleeping, half-veiled woman with what appear like rays of light or perhaps laser weapons. Vision here is shown as an aggressive, violent force, detached from humans.⁴¹ One may note that Southeast Asian artists are not alone in reacting to and often breaking away from established conventions of modern Euro-American art, as indeed this is one of the major concerns in contemporary art worldwide. The interaction between older and newer visibilities in Southeast Asia is thus also involved in the contemporary art world, and in the ways that artists reflect on its conventions and possibilities.

Conclusion

As one tries to understand Southeast Asian art, one is forced to rethink the nature and role of seeing. Much art is not simply visual, in that vision is only one of the senses through which it is perceived, in that the visible is only one of the cues about the invisible aspects of (animate) things, and in that the visible and physical are only one aspect of the world. I have introduced several examples of Southeast Asian art that challenge us to think about the (in)visible, but of course I have not tried – nor do I believe that it would be possible – to describe a uniquely “Southeast Asian” attitude to the visible and invisible. Nor do I mean to suggest that there is something uniquely Southeast Asian in the importance of invisibility. Rather, with the help of thinking of Southeast Asian cases, I have tried to raise certain questions about the visible and the invisible and to think towards an openness to the invisible.

Notes

- 1 See Mrázek and Pitelka, *What's the Use of Art?*; O'Connor, "Art Critics"; Taylor, *Studies in Southeast Asian Art*.
- 2 Harsrinuksmo, *Mengungkap rahasia isi keris*, 64–5.
- 3 Harsrinuksmo, *Mengungkap rahasia isi keris*, 63.
- 4 Harsrinuksmo, *Mengungkap rahasia isi keris*, 44.
- 5 Harsrinuksmo, *Mengungkap rahasia isi keris*, 64–5.
- 6 Harsrinuksmo, *Mengungkap rahasia isi keris*, 65.
- 7 Harsrinuksmo, *Mengungkap rahasia isi keris*, 63–6.
- 8 Darmosoegito, *Bab dhuwung*, 15. The same observation is made in Harsrinuksmo, *Mengungkap rahasia isi keris*, 66.
- 9 Harsrinuksmo, *Mengungkap rahasia isi keris*, 41.
- 10 Harsrinuksmo, *Mengungkap rahasia isi keris*, 31.
- 11 Harsrinuksmo, *Mengungkap rahasia isi keris*, 60.
- 12 Harsrinuksmo, *Mengungkap rahasia isi keris*, 32.
- 13 Harsrinuksmo, *Mengungkap rahasia isi keris*, 53–62 ("Hipotesis Isi Keris") and *passim*.
- 14 Koesni, *Pakem pengetahuan tentang keris*, 6–8.
- 15 For detailed descriptions of different ways of *nayuh*-ing, see Koesni, *Pakem pengetahuan tentang keris*, 18–24, and Harsrinuksmo, *Mengungkap rahasia isi keris*, especially 78–83.
- 16 Harsrinuksmo, *Mengungkap rahasia isi keris*, 79–80.
- 17 Harsrinuksmo, *Mengungkap rahasia isi keris*, 31.
- 18 Hamzuri, "Sarasehan bab keris," 12.
- 19 Darmosoegito, *Bab dhuwung*, 10.
- 20 Geertz, *The Religion of Java*, 238–9.
- 21 Pedersen, "An Ancestral Keris," 214–38.
- 22 For a Southeast Asian example, see Mrázek, *Phenomenology of a Puppet Theatre*, 29–46; for Indian examples, see Eck, *Darsan*.
- 23 Thanks to Irving Chan Johnson for this example.
- 24 Darmosoegito, *Bab dhuwung*, 15.
- 25 Darmosoegito, *Bab dhuwung*, 17.
- 26 Darmosoegito, *Bab dhuwung*, 18.
- 27 For details, see Arumbinang, *Pakem padhuwungan*, 10–13.
- 28 Arumbinang, *Pakem padhuwungan*, 11.
- 29 Darmosoegito, *Bab dhuwung*, 20.
- 30 Darmosoegito, *Bab dhuwung* 20.
- 31 Soemodiningrat, "Kerisologi satleraman," 21.
- 32 Darmosoegito, *Bab dhuwung*, 20.
- 33 Darmosoegito, *Bab dhuwung*, 91.
- 34 Waluyodipuro, *Seserepan bab dhuwung*, iv–v.
- 35 Harsrinuksmo, *Ensiklopedi budaya nasional*, 4.
- 36 Harsrinuksmo, *Esiklopedi budaya nasional*, 98.
- 37 Harsrinuksmo, *Esiklopedi budaya nasional*, 229.
- 38 Heidegger, *The Question Concerning Technology*, 154.
- 39 Heidegger, *Poetry, Language, Thought*, 55.

- 40 For images and discussion of this event, see Mrázek, “Heri Dono’s Moving Pictures,” 16–19.
- 41 Wright, *Soul, Spirit, and Mountain*, 134–5 and color plate 37.

References

- Arumbinang, Haryono. *Pakem padhuwungan* [*Keris Treatise/Manual*]. Yogyakarta: Lembaga Javanologi, 1985.
- Darmosoegito, Ki. *Bab dhuwung (winawas sawetawis)* [*About Keris: Some Observations*]. 2nd edn. Surabaya: Jayabaya, 1989.
- Eck, Diana. *Darsan: Seeing the Divine Image in India*. 3rd edn. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Religion of Java*. London: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1960.
- Hamzuri. “Sarasehan bab keris: daja pangaribawaning pamor keris [Discussion About Keris: The Power of the Keris’s Pamor].” *Kunthi* 1 no. 3 (1969): 12.
- Harsrinuksmo, Bambang. *Ensiklopedi budaya nasional: keris dan senjata tradisional lainnya* [*Encyclopaedia of National Culture: Kerises and Other Traditional Weapons*]. Jakarta: Cipta Adi Pustaka, 1988.
- Harsrinuksmo, Bambang. *Mengungkap rahasia isi keris* [*Revealing the Secret of the Keris’s Content*]. Jakarta: Pustakakarya Grafikatama, 1990.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Poetry, Language, Thought*. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
- Heidegger, Martin. *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. New York: Harper and Row, 1977.
- Koesni. *Pakem pengetahuan tentang keris* [*Treatise of Knowledge about Keris*]. Semarang: Penerbit Aneka Ilmu, [1979].
- Mrázek, Jan. “Heri Dono’s Moving Pictures: Painting, Puppets, Performance.” In *The Inoyama Donation: A Tale of Two Artists*, 12–19. Singapore: Singapore Art Museum, 2006.
- Mrázek, Jan. *Phenomenology of a Puppet Theatre: Contemplations on the Art of Javanese Wayang Kulit*. Leiden: KITLV Press, 2005.
- Mrázek, Jan, and Morgan Pitelka, eds. *What’s The Use of Art? Asian Visual and Material Culture in Context*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2008.
- O’Connor, Stanley J. “Art Critics, Connoisseurs, and Collectors in the Southeast Asian Rain Forest: A Study in Cross-Cultural Art Theory.” *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 14 no. 2 (1983): 400–8.
- Pedersen, Lene. “An Ancestral Keris, Balinese Kingship, and a Modern Presidency.” In *What’s The Use of Art? Asian Visual and Material Culture in Context*, edited by Jan Mrázek and Morgan Pitelka, 214–38. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2008.
- Soemodiningrat, B. P. H. “Kerisologi satleraman [A Bit of Kerisology].” *Jaya Baya* (March 13, 1983): 21.
- Taylor, Nora A., ed. *Studies in Southeast Asian Art: Essays in Honor of Stanley J. O’Connor*. Ithaca, NY: Southeast Asia Program Publications, Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University, 2000.
- Waluyodipuro, R. T. *Seserepan bab dhuwung tuwin ubarampe saha lalajenganipun* [*Knowledge About Keris and Its Accessories and Other Matters*]. No place: Pt. Inaltu, no date [1st edn 1959].
- Wright, Astri. *Soul, Spirit and Mountain: Preoccupations of Contemporary Indonesian Painters*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.