

LOHUIZEN-DE LEEUW, J. E. VAN†:

Indo-Javanese metalwork. Stuttgart: Linden-Museum, Staatliches Museum für Völkerkunde, 1984, 218 pages, 211 catalogue numbers, 1 map, 6 colour plates, 220 black-and-white plates, 4 drawings.

Because of her untimely death the author of this richly illustrated catalogue of ancient Javanese bronzes was unable to attend to its final publication herself. Gerd Kreisel of the Linden-Museum accepted the responsibility for editing it and added an introductory chapter on the cultural background of the period to which the bronzes belong.

In a clearly structured manner the catalogue presents 211 ancient Javanese bronze and other metal objects, all of which belong to the collection of the Linden-Museum in Stuttgart. A whole page has been assigned to almost each piece, the description being on the left and the illustration on the right. The description is preceded by a heading defining the object represented and mentioning the material it is made of, as well as its height, the period to which it may be attributed, and its Linden-Museum inventory number. It is followed by references to former publications dealing with the same object, and to publications presenting comparable objects. The descriptions themselves are accurate. The author did not avoid the use of Sanskrit words for various iconographical terms, such as sitting postures, handposes, attributes and head-dresses. Those who are not familiar with these Sanskrit words can turn to the glossary at the end (p. 209–211) which explains each of them in English. The catalogue is preceded by a preface and introduction to the objects by van Lohuizen and, as already mentioned, a more general introduction by Gerd Kreisel.

The objects are arranged thematically. The catalogue commences with images of Buddhist and Hindu deities (cat. nos 1–47), then focuses on »religious objects« (cat. nos 48–107) such as temple bells, processional staffs, priest's bells, censers, holy water pots, and offering trays, and finally presents »domestic objects« (cat. nos 108–211), among which van Lohuizen includes mirrors, weapons, toy animals, oil-lamps, boxes, cups, bowls, and cattle-bells. One of the great merits of this catalogue is in my opinion the fact that it gives equal attention to all these objects, regardless of their aesthetic quality or cultural value. Even the most simple bowls are presented together with a photograph or drawing, which was something new at the time. Such full documentation is of great importance for future research. The division between »religious« and »domestic« objects (in the introduction called »ritual« and »secular«) is not, however, as clearly demarcated as van Lohuizen presents it. Mirrors, for instance, have also been used in ritual worship. This can be concluded from reliefs on Candi Borubudur depicting people who pay homage to the Buddha or other Buddhist deities while holding a mirror in one hand and an incense burner in the other. It can also be derived from the fact that some mirrors have been excavated together with objects the use of which definitely was ritual. The same holds true for lamps.

As van Lohuizen notes, the dating of ancient Javanese

bronzes is a difficult matter. Only few of them bear dates (in the Śaka era), such as catalogue numbers 52 and 92. In order to date the others one has to rely on less trustworthy criteria such as style and, if known, findspot. Perhaps wisely, van Lohuizen makes only rough distinctions. She distinguishes between bronzes dating from the Central Javanese Period (sometimes specified as early or late Central Javanese); bronzes dating from the East Javanese Period (sometimes early or late East Javanese Period); and objects dating from the post East Javanese Period. Unfortunately she does not point out the stylistic characteristics which make her identify an object as Central, East, or post East Javanese, in this way leaving it to the user of the catalogue to find out for himself. In general I think her datings are correct. I would, however, like to adjust one mistake as regards catalogue numbers 47 and 144, which were discovered in the regency of Gunung Kidul. Van Lohuizen assigns them to the early Eastern Javanese Period, apparently because she was misinformed about the exact situation of Gunung Kidul. She has mapped it in East Java (see the above catalogue numbers and the map), while in reality it belongs to the province of Central Java where it stretches from Parangtritis (south of Yogyakarta) eastward to the border of Central and East Java. This is of consequence for the dating of the above two objects and two others as well (143 and 145), which, corroborated by stylistic evidence, should in my opinion rather be attributed to the Central than to the East Javanese Period.

The identification of the images of gods does not present many problems, as we are fairly well-informed about their iconography. Some of the ritual and domestic objects, on the other hand, carry narrative scenes which are difficult to interpret. Van Lohuizen has accepted the challenge to provide new interpretations for a number of these puzzling representations (cat. nos 55, 58, 122, 149, 152, 153, and 157 for instance; cf. her arguments on pp. 16–32). However, I do not think they solve all iconographic problems. For instance, the story which van Lohuizen connects with catalogue number 55 (cf. p. 22) cannot explain the dagger – or is it an arrow? – which Garuda holds in his left hand, nor the fact that Garuda carries his father, the sage Kaśyapa, on his back. I even have my doubts about van Lohuizen's identification of the latter person as the sage Kaśyapa, for neither his headdress nor his clothing seem to be that of a sage, at least not as far as can be judged from the photograph. Further, van Lohuizen identifies the male figures on catalogue numbers 114, 152, and 153 as the God of Love, Kāma, on the ground of the fact that all three hold a bow. However, except for the bow, they differ considerably from each other, and one might therefore question whether the presence of the bow is sufficient evidence for identifying them as Kāma. Unfortunately no unambiguous representations of Kāma are known from ancient Java to serve as a frame of reference (cf. p. 26).<sup>1</sup> In contrast, van Lohuizen's identification of the male person on an East Javanese handle of a mirror (cat. no. 122) as Kṛṣṇa can be tested against existing evidence, as Kṛṣṇa figures in a number of narrative reliefs on various late East Javanese temples (the main temple of the Panataran complex, Candi Jago, and Candi Kedaton). In all these cases he is represented in so-called wayang style and