Many Lives of Ancient Khmer Sculpture: From the Pre-Angkorian Period to Contemporary Cambodia

Chapter · April 2023

DOI: 10.1007/978-3-031-22516-1_2

1 author:

Paul A. Lavy
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa
12 PUBLICATIONS **84** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

CHAPTER 2

Many Lives of Ancient Khmer Sculpture: From the Pre-Angkorian Period to Contemporary Cambodia

Paul A. Lavy

In an essay accompanying one of the first exhibitions in the United States dedicated primarily to Khmer (i.e., Cambodian) sculpture (1961), the American abstract painter Ad Reinhardt (1913–1967) pompously declared that "Khmer civilization contributed nothing to civilization except Art. It is more true of ancient Cambodia than of any county that ever existed, that the 'one' fact of their history is their Art-history."[1] In unattributed quotations that follow, Reinhardt enthused that "Cambodian Art is 'one of the noblest sculptural arts in the history of the human race'" and that "no sculpture anywhere in the world is more compelling, haunting, or hypnotizing."[2] While certainly effusive in this particular case, such sentiments have not been uncommon among Western observers of Khmer sculpture since the late nineteenth century. It has often been praised for its singular aesthetic qualities of elegance, balance, noble grandeur, and sensual restraint. And it has attracted much outside interest from explorers,

P. A. Lavy (✉)
Department of Art and Art History, University of Hawai'i, Manoa, HI, USA
e-mail: paullavy@hawaii.edu

B. Kim, K. Pyun (eds.), *Teaching South and Southeast Asian Art*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-22516-1_2

scholars, curators, art collectors, dealers, forgers, looters, tourists, and political figures—all of whom have left their mark on the history, valuation, and interpretation of this artistic tradition. While cultural meanings for Khmer people have shifted through time, ancient statuary continues to play vital roles in contemporary Cambodian society. In addition to its fundamental religious and ancestral importance, Khmer sculpture has acquired new functions and significance: status as artwork, archaeological artifact, and commodity; political symbol during the colonial, post-colonial, and national eras; local/national/global heritage and attendant roles in programs of cultural renewal, historic preservation, and economic revitalization. Meanwhile, greed, political instability, and the wars of the late twentieth century led to catastrophic levels of looting and destruction followed by a remarkable reversal of fortune in the past few years, which have witnessed an extraordinary and ongoing high-profile tide of repatriated sculpture returning to Cambodia from international museums, collections, dealers, and auction houses—though much remains lost, unaccounted for, and at large.

Yet, despite its market appeal, global notoriety, and standing among specialists, Khmer art is, from my informal personal perspective, rarely taught in the United States. Alongside French colonization of Cambodia (1863–1953), research on Khmer art was overwhelmingly dominated by French scholars and published in the French language. While French scholarship, especially produced in association with the École française d'Extrême-Orient ("French School of Asian Studies," formerly translated as the "French School of the Far East"), continues to make major contributions, there has been an internationalization of research over the past quarter century or more. In the past, the lack of quality English-language publications may have hampered the teaching of Khmer art history at the university level in the United States, but this is no longer the case.[3] Nevertheless, with few exceptions, current university-level art history curricula and surveys routinely omit Khmer art altogether or, at best, briefly acknowledge Angkor Wat, which has become a national, transcultural, and international tourist icon.[4] In the few standard textbooks that include Khmer art, it is treated as a mere appendage of the art of South Asia/India with brief coverage typically limited to Angkor Wat and perhaps one or two examples of Khmer sculpture.[5] This essay will explore some of the many "lives" of Khmer sculpture to highlight selected developments in its study and reception.[6] It argues that Khmer sculpture deserves better attention among U.S. students and educators, not least because of its

distinctive aesthetics, but also because of the lessons it can teach about heritage, the global art market, and the shifting significance of ancient artworks in modern and contemporary contexts.

Contexts, Past to Present

In my teaching of Khmer art to both undergraduate and graduate students, I follow a chronological art historical approach closely informed by archaeology, religious-cultural-political context, formal and iconographic analysis, and historical sources (i.e., ancient inscriptions, chronicles, etc.). These methods and perspectives were of course born of nineteenth-and twentieth-century modes of Western thought, yet they have been transferred through colonization and globalization to Cambodia, where they have been adopted, adapted, appropriated, and "back-translated."[7] Recent scholarship on Cambodian art history has highlighted the inseparability and permeability of largely artificial "outside" vs. "inside" categories (global/local, exogamous/indigenous, passivity/agency, etc.) while at the same time recognizing the importance of using a wide range of sources and cultural artifacts, foreign and local, to seek a more inclusive range of historical interpretation.[8] This involves not only the more robust utilization of "indigenous" and Khmer-language sources, but also the inclusion of more—and more diverse—local and Khmer perspectives that can enrich our understanding of unrecognized or previously ignored aspects of Khmer art.[9]

The term "Khmer" (or "Khmae") refers to the dominant ethnicity of Cambodia and the evolving language of the local historical records from the Pre-Angkorian (circa sixth–eighth century), Angkorian (circa ninth–fifteenth century), and Post-Angkorian or Middle (circa fifteenth–nineteenth century) periods. The Khmer cultural region, however, encompassed not only Cambodia but also northeastern Thailand, southern Laos, and southern Vietnam—areas that were (and still are) inhabited by Khmer people, along with other ethnic groups drawn into what evidence indicates were in the past Khmer-dominated polities. It is also commonly used to refer to an artistic style with a particular aesthetic consistency.[10] However the term "Khmer" is used, it poses difficulties because historical sources do not permit us to know the ethnicities of the artists, patrons, or worshippers. Moreover, art circulates in various ways—through religious donations, migrations, looting, political appropriation—so there is often no way to know whether objects originated in the location where they

came to be studied, or, to put it differently, whether the people who possessed or hosted an object were the ones who made it. Thus, "[p]roblems of nomenclature and identification immediately appear, as a tangle of ethnic, linguistic, political and national meanings can be applied to the term Khmer."[11]

Khmer statuary was essentially religious in nature, whether Buddhist or Brahmanical (i.e., Hindu). The images were embodiments of the divine, and as such, they were expressions of ideal beauty. They were brought into worship through consecration rituals that transformed the images into vessels for awakened deities, and they were housed and worshipped in elaborate temple environments. Sometimes functioning as a form of portraiture, statues of divinities often doubled as images of kings, royal family members, and so on, and were individualized through names and familial relationships. They were often associated with ancestors and seem to have been intended to bring about the unification of an individual with a deity, to thereby secure a form of apotheosis. This ancestral component of Khmer statuary was perhaps inseparable from the veneration of nature spirits (Khmer: *neak tā*) associated with places, trees, and natural features such as mountains, hills, rocks, termite mounds, caves, and springs.[12] The power of these images persisted through the generations, and as a result, they were capable of being reused, taken as spolia, and, at times, were prone to iconoclasm.[13]

In the present, ancient statues are subject to continued and/or renewed veneration, often through various forms of Khmer animism. In addition to their centrality in Buddhist devotional practices, Buddha images and their pedestals may host spirits (Khmer: *boramei, bray preah pā ramī,* or *boramei vat*) that act as temple guardians.[14] Spirits associated with localities and territories, as well as with heroes and ancestors, can be materialized in ancient as well as contemporary sculpture.[15] Veneration of these spirits embodied in statues can often be seen at Cambodian temples and museums and may even involve replicas or restorations of particularly potent ancient images that continue to be worshipped for protection, health, and prosperity.[16] One of the best-known examples is the 3.5-meter-tall, eight-armed statue of Ta Reach enshrined near the western gateway of Angkor Wat's third enclosure (Fig. 2.1). Probably originally a late-twelfth- or early-thirteenth-century sculpture of the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara—or perhaps a pastiche of several images—it has been much restored, and today it is venerated as the "King of Spirits" and the embodiment of Angkor's royal ancestors.[17]

Fig. 2.1 Ta Reach. Angkor Wat, ca. late twelfth–early thirteenth century with subsequent modifications and restoration. Siem Reap Province, Cambodia. Sandstone; H. approximately 3.5 m. (Photo: Paul A. Lavy)

Khmer Sculpture as Art

The transformation of Khmer sculpture from sacred objects to artworks occurred through evaluation of its singular aesthetic qualities, many of which have been emphasized since European explorers/visitors began frequenting Angkor in the late nineteenth century. Such was the case with

the French naturalist Henri Mouhot (1826–1861), who undertook British-funded expeditions to Siam, Laos, and Cambodia from 1858 to 1861. Although often incorrectly credited with having "discovered" Angkor, it is now well understood that Mouhot was not the first European to visit the temples and that the Khmer had never fully abandoned the site, nor had it lost its central place in collective memory.[18] One thing that did distinguish him from his predecessors, however, was his diary, first published in 1863 as a serial in the French magazine *Le Tour du Monde*, that contained his emotional reactions to Khmer art and architecture.[19] Like most European visitors to Angkor, Mouhot was in awe of the place. Relying on his own stock of art references, he suggested that the temples were the work of "some ancient Michelangelo" and that they were "grander than anything left to us by Greece or Rome."[20] He also characterized some of the remains, most notably those of Angkor Thom, as being in the "Egyptian style."[21] Later, the English painter and art critic Roger Fry expressed similar sentiments when describing a Pre-Angkorian sculpture of Kṛṣṇa Govardhana (Fig. 2.2):

> One's first impression is almost like that of an archaic Greek statue in its strict frontality of pose with the head and figure in the same alignment—but no early Greek statue ever displayed this feeling for the texture and surface of the flesh nor the strange spiritual aloofness of this mysterious smile. A French critic has rather happily defined these early Khmer statues as Indian themes which have passed through an Egyptian artist's brain.[22]

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, these were common reactions, and they should be seen (and critiqued) in the light of long-standing and now obsolete European debates over the origin, invention, and hierarchy of the arts and what are now unacceptable racially and ethnically chauvinist theories of cultural diffusionism.[23]

Yet these ideas are often echoed by diverse students today, many of whom, with no prior exposure to the material, immediately associate Khmer and ancient Egyptian sculpture. While such comparisons may be readily dismissed, particularly given the lengthy chronological gap that separates these artistic traditions, they provide an opportunity to discuss not only the prejudices and biases implicit in art (historical) discourse (past and present), but also an invitation for students to use comparison as a tool for considering material, sculpting techniques, the original placement of the objects, and the cultural and religious roles of statuary in their respective historical contexts. For students with limited background,

Fig. 2.2 Kṛṣṇa Lifting Mount Govardhan, ca. 600. Phnom Da, Takeo Province, southern Cambodia. Sandstone; 203.1 × 68 × 55.5 cm (79 15/16 × 26 3/4 × 21 7/8 in.). The Cleveland Museum of Art, John L. Severance Fund 1973.106

formal analysis remains a valuable tool for initiating conversations about the deeper cultural and historical significances of works of art. This may be particularly true for Khmer art, which has been usefully organized by French scholars into a relatively clear progression of distinct styles based on motif-analysis and the hypothesis that art evolves in ways that can be tracked through scrutiny of its constituent parts and by the synchronicity in the development of motifs.[24] Of course, such a paradigm is not without flaws and often fails to consider such factors as overlapping styles, variations among place and workshops, individual ingenuity, archaism, and reuse.

Through changes in the style and iconography of Khmer sculpture, there is also "a high level of consistency and interrelationship in terms of its aesthetic character."[25] For example, by comparison to Indian art, Khmer sculpture is characterized by a more limited use of multiple heads and limbs and a more restricted range of iconography.[26] The latter observation must be qualified, however, by the fact that Khmer sculpture was—as it often is today—most likely enlivened with paint, textiles, and detachable adornments that do not survive, so the present state of the images, divested of their finery, provides only a partial impression of the intended appearance (Fig. 2.1).

The development of Khmer sculpture has been characterized as the alternation between more naturalistic styles and more abstract or hieratic styles, although this tendency is perhaps better characterized as a spectrum rather than oscillating polarities; and there are many interesting juxtapositions of the naturalistic, gentle, austere, and rigid in the same image (Figs. 2.1–2.4).[27] Another developmental aspect emphasized by art historians is the Khmer preference for free-standing figures modeled more fully in the round than Indian sculpture, which more commonly tends to be attached to the backing stele.[28] In particular, the history of Pre-Angkorian sculpture and the transition to the early Angkorian period during the ninth and tenth centuries have been characterized as a series of attempts to transcend the constraints of relief carving, to "liberate" sculpture from its stone background, and to achieve sculpture *en ronde bosse*, or what Philip Rawson called "deep forward projection" and "projecting roundly far forward" (compare, e.g., Figs. 2.2 and 2.4a).[29] This involved the development of various configurations of structural reinforcement and auxiliary support, including arches, braces, and the thickening of the body and limbs. The general trends toward sculpture in the round are indeed discernible; however, if applied too rigidly, the teleology of this model is problematic. It can lead to judgments based on technical matters alone and without allowance for aesthetic preferences and artistic sensibilities. In any case, both developmental schemes can be useful tools to facilitate student engagement with Khmer sculpture, perhaps particularly for studio art majors who may grapple with similar questions in their own work.

Collecting Ancient Khmer Sculpture

One of the most effective ways for students outside of Cambodia to learn about Khmer art is through responsibly curated museums with ethical collecting policies and practices. Khmer art is prominently displayed in many major museums in Cambodia, Thailand, Laos, Vietnam, Singapore, Australia, Europe, Japan, and the United States, most notably the National Museum of Cambodia, Phnom Penh,[30] and the Musée national des arts asiatiques-Guimet in Paris.[31] It has also been featured in numerous recent international exhibitions and their accompanying catalogs.[32] The transformation of ancient Khmer religious icons into artworks and museum displays occurred during the late nineteenth century through "collection, classification, and exhibition," and the formation of foreign collections of Khmer art first developed in tandem with French exploration and colonial expansion.[33] Thus the history of the formation of collections provides a useful opening with students to examine imperialism in Southeast Asia and its complex relationship with art history and archaeology in the region.

The French naval officer, explorer, and artist Louis Delaporte (1842–1925), who had been a member of the Mekong Exploration Commission (1866–1868) and subsequently worked tirelessly to promote Khmer art in France, undertook an official mission to Angkor in 1873, which included among its goals the acquisition of "statues, bas-reliefs, pillars and other monuments of sculpture and architecture" for "our national museums."[34] The kingdom of Cambodia had become a protectorate of France in 1863, but the temples of Angkor in Siem Reap Province were under Siamese authority from 1794/5 until the Franco-Siamese Treaty of 1907. Delaporte apparently received authorization from the Cambodian king, Norodom I (r. 1859–1904), to take stone statues and architectural elements from temples located within his territory, but he seems to have expressly violated a prohibition by the local Siamese authorities in Siem Reap against removing statuary from the temples there. A member of Delaporte's staff, Captain Auguste Filoz (b. 1832), remarked that a headmonk resident at Angkor Wat complained that the Delaporte Mission "had stolen many idols and pillaged the whole country."[35] In addition to plaster casts molded from Angkor Wat and other temples, approximately seventy Khmer sculptures and architectural fragments from both Cambodian and Siamese territory were taken to France where, rejected by the Louvre Museum as being "devoid of real interest," they were displayed in a state of "purgatory" at the Musée Khmer (opened 1874) in the Palais de

Compiègne, some 80 km. outside of Paris, before being relocated to the capital for the 1878 Universal Exposition.[36] One of the earliest colonial universal expositions to feature Khmer art and architecture through a blend of plaster casts and original sculpture, it triggered a sort of "Angkormania" in France that would last for some seventy years or more.[37]

After the exposition, Delaporte's collection was installed in the Palais du Trocadéro as the Musée indochinois, also known as the Musée des antiquités cambodgiennes du Trocadéro (1882–1936).[38] Delaporte significantly expanded the collection through a second mission to Cambodia in 1881, which yielded a further sixty-six original sculptures and also through solicitation of several important donations from various friends and civil servants with Indochinese connections.[39] Meanwhile, the Musée Guimet, initially established in Lyon in 1879 as a museum of world religions, was transferred to Paris in 1889. One year later it was enriched with a collection of sculptures and stone inscription stelae collected from 1882 to 1885 by another French naval officer serving in Indochina, Étienne Aymonier (1844–1929), a renowned linguist and explorer.[40] By 1910 nearly 300 Khmer sculptures resided in these two Parisian museums, and many more must have been finding their way into private collections.[41] By 1931 the Khmer collection of the Musée indochinois had been transferred to the Musée Guimet, which continued to grow, notably in 1936 when assistant curator Philippe Stern (1895–1979) conducted a mission to Southeast Asia in order, among other goals, to acquire pieces that could be sent to France to complete the collection.[42] In a significant change from the days of Delaporte, acquisitions had by this time become selective, as recorded in a 1936 report: "it was understood that no unique piece would leave Indochina in order to leave the artistic heritage intact."[43] Now called the National Museum of Asian Arts-Guimet, acquisition policies have become strict with regard to provenance, and Khmer pieces entering the collection have often been in France for a long time.[44] For example, a well-preserved and extraordinarily beautiful image of the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara was purchased from Agnès Nguyên Hûu Hâo (b. 1903), the sister of the last empress consort of Vietnam, Nam Phương (1914–1963) (Fig. 2.3). Discovered in Vietnam in 1919, it had been part of her dowry when, in 1928, she married Baron Pierre Didelot (b. 1898), a French artilleryman stationed in Saigon, and it was later taken to France, where it resided until entering the Guimet's collection in 1988.[45]

The shift to more systematic archaeological exploration, research, protection, and preservation of Khmer art and temples had occurred with the

Fig. 2.3 Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara, ca. late seventh–eighth centuries. Tân Long, Sóc Trăng Province, Vietnam. H. (without tenon) 171 cm × W. 47 cm × D. 28 cm. Musée national des arts asiatiques-Guimet, MA 5063. Godong/Alamy Stock Photo

establishment in 1898 of the Mission archéologique d'Indo-Chine, renamed the École française d'Extrême-Orient (EFEO) in 1900, and the Phnom Penh Musée du Cambodge, founded in 1917 under the direction of George Groslier (1887–1945).[46] Renamed the Musée Albert Sarraut in 1920, it is today the National Museum of Cambodia, the single most important collection of Khmer sculpture in the world. Characterizing the museum as a "vast rescue ship," Groslier conceived the museum to prevent art from being taken abroad as part of a larger program to revive art production among the Khmer people.[47] French imperialism in the region proceeded with the assumption that Cambodia had fallen into decadence, was facing extinction, and was in need of intervention by the colonizers as the self-appointed caretakers of Cambodian heritage and the purveyors of

the "mission civilisatrice" (civilizing mission) to rediscover, salvage, and restore the glorious Angkorian past.[48] While undoubtedly making valuable contributions to the study and protection of Khmer art, these attitudes also constituted a colonial "dispossession strategy," whereby France appropriated Angkor into its own cultural and national patrimony.[49]

The introduction of Khmer sculpture in the United States followed an altogether different path, namely private wealthy male art collectors. To the best of my knowledge, the first significant published account of an American visitor to Angkor is that of Frank Vincent Jr. (1847–1916), a businessman, explorer, and art collector who traveled throughout mainland Southeast Asia in 1871–1872.[50] In 1885 he donated his collection of sculpture from Cambodia and Thailand to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, thus making it the first major American museum with holdings of Khmer sculpture, albeit mostly small heads of humble quality.[51] Due however to a veritable French colonial monopoly over Cambodia, it should come as no surprise that the more typical path for Khmer sculpture into the United States occurred primarily through art dealers with offices in Paris, such as Ching Tsai Loo (1880–1957), Paul Mallon (1884–1975), and Robert Rousset (1901–1981). Among the earliest American collectors to acquire Khmer art were Denman Waldo Ross (1853–1935) of Boston, a Harvard professor who visited Angkor in 1910; Alfred Fiske Pillsbury (1869–1950) of Minneapolis, the director of Pillsbury (flour) Mills; and lawyer and banker John Lionberger Davis (1878–1973) of St. Louis.[52] Thanks to the donations of Ross, and his collaborations with the influential curator and art historian Ananda Coomaraswamy (1877–1947), the Boston Museum of Fine Arts developed a particularly noteworthy collection of Khmer sculpture by the 1920s.[53] Several other museums were also acquiring Khmer sculpture by this time. In addition to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, these included the Fogg Museum (Harvard), the Cleveland Museum of Art, the Philadelphia Museum of Art, and the Art Institute of Chicago, which, in 1924, acquired a collection that had been assembled by Jean Moura (1827–1885) during his time of service as the French Representative in Cambodia (1868–1879).[54]

The growth of collections outside of Cambodia involved new roles that had emerged for Khmer statues, namely their use as commodities and diplomatic gifts. From 1923 to 1945 the French colonial authorities in Cambodia offered original ancient sculpture for public sale.[55] This practice seems to have begun as a tactic to prevent casual looting by tourists and antique dealers.[56] The argument was made that the objects involved in

such transactions were essentially worthless by artistic standards or for scientific purposes, that they belonged to common and widespread types of artifacts, and that their sale would not deprive Cambodia of any unique or important pieces.[57] However, pressure for higher-quality sculpture from increasingly discerning connoisseurs and influential customers, such as the automobile tycoon André Citroën, led to the easing of limits on these sales with the justification that Khmer art should be promoted abroad.[58] As French financial support for architectural conservation was reduced in the years leading to World War II, the sales may also have generated needed revenue for the EFEO's management of the Archaeological Park of Angkor, formally established in 1925.[59] Thus, significant quantities of Khmer sculpture—some of high artistic merit and important historic value—was sold to foreign collections, including the Boston Museum of Fine Arts (1924), the University of Oregon Museum of Art (1924), the Royal Asian Art Society in the Netherlands (1932), the Honolulu Academy of Arts (1934), and the Metropolitan Museum of Art (1936).[60]

During and after World War II Khmer sculpture was used in diplomatic gift-giving and exchanges, first involving Japanese officials and institutions and, after the war, Americans as well.[61] The most significant example was the 1944 exchange of sixty-nine Khmer objects, including forty-three stone and bronze sculptures, for thirty-one Japanese artifacts.[62] For the EFEO, the Khmer artworks were apparently traded in order to demonstrate the scholarly greatness of France as the savior and inheritor of Angkor.[63] Today this material is housed in the Tokyo National Museum, making it one of the largest collections of Khmer art outside of Southeast Asia and France.[64] The gifting of Khmer sculpture continued into the post-independence period, but now the practice was part of former king and Chief of State Norodom Sihanouk's (1922–2012) cultural diplomacy strategy to promote a program of Buddhist Socialism with himself as the new Jayavarman VII, Angkor's greatest king (r. ca. 1182/83–1219/20 CE).[65] A very different diplomatic role for Khmer sculpture came with the 1968 Summer Olympics in Mexico City. Avery Brundage, the flamboyant American president of the International Olympic Committee and an avid collector of Asian art, lent thirty-six artworks from a dozen Asian countries to the National Museum of Anthropology so as to "afford the interested visitor an esthetic experience" and to "symbolize the presence at this festival—a peaceful reunion of the world's youth—of some countries that were not able to participate in the athletic events."[66] Featured prominently on the cover of the small catalog as the global ambassador par excellence

Fig. 2.4 (**a**) The Hindu Deity Pārvatī, one of a pair, ca. 975–1025. Cambodia; former kingdom of Angkor. Sandstone; H. 41 in × W. 13 1/2 in × D. 6 in, H. 104.1 cm × W. 34.3 cm × D. 15.2 cm. Asian Art Museum of San Francisco, The Avery Brundage Collection, B66S3. (Photograph © Asian Art Museum of San Francisco; (**b**) Standing Śiva (?) ("Golden Boy"), eleventh century. Buriram Province, Thailand, or Cambodia. Gilt-copper alloy, silver inlay; H. (including tang) 50 3/4 in. (128.9 cm); W. 14 in. (35.6 cm); D. 13 1/2 in. (34.3 cm); H. (excluding tang) 41 1/2 in. (105.4 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, from the Collection of Walter H. and Leonore Annenberg, 1988.355a–c)

was a Khmer sculpture of the Hindu goddess Pārvatī resplendent in her youthful beauty (Fig. 2.4a).

In the wake of World War II Khmer sculpture started to be featured in large exhibitions in the United States.[67] It became extremely popular from the 1950s through the 1990s, not by coincidence during an era of war and upheaval in Cambodia and neighboring countries. The most well-known collectors to amass impressive collections of Khmer sculpture were John

D. Rockefeller, 3rd (1906–1978), the aforementioned Avery Brundage (1887–1975), and Norton Simon (1907–1993).[68] Their collections now reside, respectively, in the Asia Society Museum in New York, the Asian Art Museum in San Francisco, and the Norton Simon Museum in Pasadena, and the associated catalogs provide useful teaching resources.[69]

Tragic Loss and Partial Recovery: Homecoming of the Gods

While looting of Khmer sculpture took place during the colonial era and is not a recent development, the late twentieth century witnessed new catastrophic levels of illicit trafficking fueled by decades of violence and instability in Cambodia and a rapacious international art market.[70] Heritage analysts have estimated that perhaps as many as ninety-eight percent of Cambodian temples have been recently damaged and up to half of the nation's artifacts removed from the country.[71] The mechanisms and pathways of the wholesale theft of Cambodian antiquities have been the subject of numerous recent publications, many of which are quite accessible for fostering discussion among students.[72]

Recent investigations have begun to clarify the central role played by Bangkok-based British art collector and smuggler, Douglas Latchford (1931–2020), in the looting and sale of large quantities of ancient Khmer sculpture, as well as his links with numerous dealers, collectors, and prominent museums.[73] Because many pieces were removed after the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, there has been an ongoing series of restitutions to Cambodia, not only from Latchford's family and associates, but also from museums impacted or involved in sales and donations that Latchford helped to broker, as well as by collectors in other countries such as Japan.[74] Additional evidence of wrongdoing has also materialized through the discovery of broken pedestals of statues still at temple sites and corresponding to pieces in various collections. Such was the case with some of the recently repatriated statues originally from the temple of Prasat Chen at Koh Ker in northern Cambodia.[75] And there have been new revelations by local Cambodian looters seeking, it seems, to atone for their past misdeeds.[76] As explained by Phoeurng Sackona, the present

Fig. 2.5 Viṣṇu reclining on the serpent (*nāga*) Ananta ("Phra Narai Lintel"), ca. early twelfth century. Prasat Phanom Rung, Buriram Province, Thailand. Sandstone. (Photo: Dominique Dalbiez, Wikimedia Commons, CC BY-SA 3.0. https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/deed.en)

Cambodian Minister of Culture and Fine Arts, "These objects are not just decorations, but have spirits and are considered as lives [sic]. It is hard to quantify their loss to our temples and country—losing them was like losing the spirits of our ancestors."[77]

Now hundreds of these spirits are making the long journey back home, often with deservedly great ceremony and fanfare. Welcomed by politicians, including Prime Minister Hun Sen, they acquire a new kind of national significance even as heritage authorities are confronted with additional questions regarding the potential for fakes among the repatriated pieces. In some instances, there is also a looming question of origin and whether sculptures with unclear provenance may have been looted from sites, not in Cambodia, but in neighboring countries with potentially overlapping claims to a shared artistic heritage. An example presently causing much online chatter is the spectacular bronze figure known as the "Golden Boy" (Fig. 2.4b).[78] Thailand, in particular, has a long history of pursuing the repatriation of art looted from Khmer temple sites located within its borders.[79] The most famous example is the Phra Narai (Viṣṇu) Lintel from the temple of Prasat Phanom Rung in Thailand's Buriram Province, the return of which became a cause célèbre in the 1980s that elevated the lintel to a place of great national importance (Fig. 2.5).[80]

Whether as sacred icon or archaeological artifact, commodity or contraband, museum exhibit, national symbol, or cultural ambassador, Khmer sculpture constitutes both a singularly rich artistic tradition and a transcultural global phenomenon. It can be approached through many perspectives, and the potential opportunities for teaching are as diverse as the many lives of Khmer sculpture itself.

Notes

1. Ad Reinhardt, "Angkor and Art," in *Khmer Sculpture*, ed. George Montgomery (New York: Asia House Gallery, 1961), 5. For background on Reinhardt's interest in Cambodia, see Rachel Stella, "Ad Around the World: 48 Hours in Cambodia," *The Brooklyn Rail: Critical Perspectives on Arts, Politics, and Culture*, last modified January 16, 2014, https://brooklynrail.org/special/AD_REINHARDT/ad-around-the-world/48-hours-in-cambodia.
2. Reinhardt, 8.
3. Teaching can also be supplemented with high-quality recent documentary films, for example, *Angkor: Land of the Gods* (2013), *Jungle Atlantis / Angkor Revealed* (2014), and *Lost World of Angkor Wat* (2022).
4. Michael Falser, *Angkor Wat: A Transcultural History of Heritage*, 2 vols. (Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2020), 1: 1–8.
5. For example, Fred S. Kleiner, *Gardner's Art through the Ages: A Global History*, 16th ed. (Boston: Cengage, 2020), 466–468; Jean Robertson, et al., *The History of Art: A Global View, Prehistory to the Present* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2021), 287–288, 439–442; Marilyn Stokstad and Michael W. Cothren, *Art History*, 6th ed. (Upper Saddle River: Pearson, 2018), 328, 332–333, 798.
6. My approach is loosely inspired by Richard H. Davis, *Lives of Indian Images* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997).
7. Falser, 1: 38–45.
8. Ashley Thompson, *Engendering the Buddhist State: Territory, Sovereignty and Sexual Difference in the Inventions of Angko*r (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), 1–18.
9. For example, "ethnographic" perspectives such as Ang Chouléan, "Nandin and His Avatars," in *Sculpture of Angkor and Ancient Cambodia: Millennium of Glory* (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1997), 62–69; and Hang Chan Sophea, "Stec Gaṃlaṅ' and Yāy Deb: Worshipping Kings and Queens in Cambodia Today," in *History, Buddhism, and New Religious Movements in Cambodia*, eds. John Marston and Elizabeth Guthrie (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004): 113–126.

10. Robert L. Brown, "An Aesthetic Encounter: Khmer Art from Thailand, Cambodia and Vietnam," *Orientations* 42, no. 3 (April 2011): 50.
11. Brown, 50.
12. Ang Chouléan, *Les êtres surnaturels dans la religion populaire khmère* (Paris: Centre de documentation et de recherche sur la civilisation khmère, 1986).
13. The subjects mentioned in this paragraph are discussed at greater length with additional bibliography in Paul A. Lavy and Martin Polkinghorne, "Bodies of Glory: The Statuary of Angkor," in *The Angkorian World*, eds. Mitch Hendrickson, Miriam Stark and Damian Evans (Routledge: London, in press).
14. Ang Chouléan, "The Place of Animism within Popular Buddhism in Cambodia: The Example of the Monastery," *Asian Folklore Studies* 47, no. 1 (1988): 37–38.
15. Anne Yvonne Guillou, "Khmer Potent Places: Pāramī and the Localisation of Buddhism and Monarchy in Cambodia," *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology* 18, no. 5 (2017): 421–443.
16. Keiko Miura, "From 'Originals' to Replicas: Diverse Significance of Khmer Statues. In *Kultur als Eigentum: Instrumente, Querschnitte und Fallstudien*, eds. Stefan Groth, Regina F. Bendix, and Achim Spiller (Göttingen: Göttingen University Press, 2015), 269–293.
17. Simon Warrack, "Developing Conservation Approaches to Living Heritage at Angkor: The Conservation of the Statue of Ta Reach," in *'Archaeologizing' Heritage? Transcultural Entanglements between Local Social Practices and Global Virtual Realities*, eds. Michael Falser and Monica Juneja (Heidelberg: Springer, 2013), 217–232.
18. Bruno Dagens, *Angkor: Heart of an Asian Empire*, trans. Ruth Sharman (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1995), 22–42; Bernard-Philippe Groslier, *Angkor and Cambodia in the sixteenth century: according to Portuguese and Spanish sources*, trans. Michael Smithies (Bangkok: Orchid Press, 2006); Ashley Thompson, "Changing Perspectives: Cambodia after Angkor," in *Sculpture of Angkor and Ancient Cambodia: Millennium of Glory*, eds. Helen Ibbitson Jessup and Thierry Zéphir (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1997), 22–32.
19. *Tour du Monde* vol. 8, nos. 196–204 (1863).
20. Henri Mouhot, *Travels in the Central Part of Indo-China (Siam), Cambodia, and Laos during the Years 1858, 1859, and 1860*, two vols., trans. G.K. Greville (London: John Murray, 1864), 1:279.
21. Mouhot, 2: 1.
22. Roger Fry, *Last Lectures* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1939), 166.
23. Victor R. Savage, *Western Impressions of Nature and Landscape in Southeast Asia* (Singapore: Singapore University Press, 1984), 290–319; Partha Mitter, *Much Maligned Monsters: A History of European Reactions to Indian Art* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 190–202.

24. Many French scholars contributed to the present understanding of Khmer art styles, but the classic studies are Philippe Stern, *Le Bayon d'Angkor et l'évolution de l'art khmer* (Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1927); Gilberte de Coral-Rémusat, *L'art khmer: les grandes étapes de son évolution*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Van Oest, 1951); and Jean Boisselier, *La statuaire khmère et son évolution* (Saigon: École française d'Extrême-Orient, 1955).
25. Brown, 50.
26. Pratapaditya Pal, *The Sensuous Immortals: A Selection of Sculptures from the Pan-Asian Collection* (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1977), 15–16.
27. Brown, 56. See also Jean Boisselier, *Trends in Khmer Art*, ed. Natasha Eilenberg, trans. Natasha Eilenberg and Melvin Elliott (Ithaca: Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University, 1989), 24–25; and Helen Ibbitson Jessup, "The Khmer Aesthetic: A Chance for New Insights," *Orientations* 29, no. 1 (1999): 46–55.
28. Philip Rawson, *The Art of Southeast Asia* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1967), 27–30; Pal, *The Sensuous Immortals*, 15.
29. Pierre Dupont, "La statuaire en ronde-bosse dans l'Asie du sud-est," *Revue des arts asiatiques* 10, no. 2 (1936): 97–106; Dupont, *La statuaire préangkorienne* (Ascona: Artibus Asiae Supplementum, 1955): 37–42; Philip Rawson, *Sculpture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997), 67, 70.
30. Nadine Dalsheimer, *Les collections du Musée national de Phnom Penh: l'art du Cambodge ancien* (Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient: Magellan & Cie, 2001; Helen Ibbitson Jessup, *Masterpieces of the National Museum of Cambodia: An Introduction to the Collection* (Norfolk, CT: Friends of Khmer Culture, 2006); Khun Samen, *The New Guide to the National Museum-Phnom Penh,* 3rd ed. (Phnom Penh: Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts, 2008).
31. Pierre Baptiste and Thierry Zéphir, *L'art khmer dans les collections du Musée Guimet* (Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux, 2008).
32. Notable examples include Beijing Capital Museum, *Gao mian de wei xiao: Jian pu zhai wu ge wen wu yu yi shu= Smile of Khmer: Cambodian Ancient Cultural Relics and Arts* (Beijing: Bei jing mei shu she ying chu ban she, 2015); Michael Brand and Chuch Phoeurn, *The Age of Angkor: Treasures from the National Museum of Cambodia* (Canberra: The Australian National Gallery, 1992); Louise Allison Cort and Paul Jett, *Gods of Angkor: Bronzes from the National Museum of Cambodia* (Washington, D.C.: Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, 2010); Ishizawa Yoshiaki, *Dai ankōru watto ten =Angkor Wat : Sōreinaru kumēru ōchō no bi : Sekai isan : Punonpen kokuritsu hakubutsukan shozō* (Tokyo: Toei Kabushiki Kaisha, 2005); Helen Ibbitson Jessup and Thierry Zéphir, eds., *Sculpture of Angkor and Ancient Cambodia: Millennium of Glory*

(Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1997); Wibke Lobo and Helen Ibbitson Jessup, eds., *Angkor. Göttliches Erbe Kambodschas* (Bonn: Kunst- und Ausstellungshalle der Bundesrepublik Deutschland GmbH / München: Prestel, 2006); Theresa McCullough et al., eds., *Angkor: Exploring Cambodia's Sacred City* (Singapore: Asian Civilisations Museum, 2018); Sonya Rhie Mace and Bertrand Porte, eds., *Revealing Krishna: Essays on the History, Context, and Conservation of Krishna Lifting Mount Govardhan from Phnom Da* (Cleveland: The Cleveland Museum of Art, 2021); Sophie Biard and Damian Evans, *Angkor The Lost Empire of Cambodia* (Los Angeles: California Science Center, n.d. [2022]).

33. Maurizio Peleggi, "From Buddhist Icons to National Antiquities: Cultural Nationalism and Colonial Knowledge in the Making of Thailand's History of Art," *Modern Asian Studies* 47, no. 5 (September 2013): 1522; Penny Edwards, *Cambodge: The Cultivation of a Nation, 1860–1945* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, 2007), 19–39.
34. Falser, 1: 89; Pierre Baptiste, "De la quête d'une collection à la naissance d'un musée," in *Angkor, naissance d'un mythe: Louis Delaporte et le Cambodge*, eds. Pierre Baptiste and Thierry Zéphir (Paris: Gallimard and Musée national des art asiatiques Guimet, 2013), 115.
35. Auguste Achille Hippolyte Filoz, *Cambodge et Siam, voyage-séjour aux ruines des monuments kmers* (Thonon: A. Dubouloz, 1876), 76. Quoted in Falser, 1: 94.
36. Pierre Baptiste and Thierry Zéphir, "L'art khmer dans les collections nationales françaises", in Baptiste and Zéphir, 2008, 14.
37. Falser, 1: 98. The lesser-known 1867 Universal Exhibition had included a small exhibition of original Khmer sculpture and plaster casts; see Falser, 1: 75–76.
38. Baptiste and Zéphir, "L'art khmer," 14; Baptiste, 121.
39. Jean Françoise Jarrige, "L'art khmer au Musée Guimet: histoire d'une collection," *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 154, 1 (2010): 491; Thierry Zéphir, "Les donations suscitées par Delaporte," in Baptiste and Zéphir, 2013, 166–168.
40. Jarrige, 492–493; Baptiste and Zéphir, "L'art khmer," 15.
41. George Cœdès, "Catalogue des pieces originales de sculpture khmère conservées au Musée indochinois du Trocadéro et au Musée Guimet," *Bulletin de la Commission archéologique de l'Indochine* (1910): 19.
42. Jarrige, 494; Jeannine Auboyer, "Historique des collections indochinoises du Musée Guimet," in *Catalogue des collections indochinoises du Musée Guimet*, Pierre Dupont et al. (Paris: Musées nationaux, Palais du Louvre, 1934), 18–20.
43. Chief curator René Grousset (1885–1952) quoted in Jarrige, 494. Translated by the present author.

44. Thierry Zéphir, "'Angkor aux musées': la sculpture khmère et les grandes collections publiques," in *Angkor VIIIe–XXIe siècle: memoire et identité khmères*, ed. Hugues Tertrais (Paris: Autrement, 2008), 54.
45. Jarrige, 497; Albert Le Bonheur, "Une statue khmère célèbre entre au musée Guimet: 'L'Avalokiteśvara Didelot' (VIIe siècle environ)," *Arts Asiatiques* 44 (1989): 123–125.
46. It replaced the Musée Khmer established by the École française d'Extrême-Orient in 1905 and acquired the name Musée du Cambodge in 1919. Significant colonial era collections of Khmer sculpture also developed in Vietnam: Hanoi's Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology (est. 1908–9), which became the Musée Louis Finot in 1933 (and is now the National Museum of Vietnamese History); and the Blanchard de la Brosse Museum in Saigon, inaugurated in 1929 (now the Museum of Vietnamese History, Ho Chi Minh City). See Gwendolyn Wright, "National Culture under Colonial Auspices: The École Française d'Extrême-Orient," in *The Formation of National Collections of Art and Archaeology*, ed. Gwendolyn Wright (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1996), 127–141; Jonathan Paquette, *Museum-Making in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia: Cultural Institutions and Policies from Colonial to Postcolonial Times* (London: Routledge, 2022), 41–71. For the parallel development of museums in Thailand, many with substantial holdings of Khmer sculpture, see Dhanit Yupo, *The Development of National Museums in Thailand*, 3rd ed. (Bangkok: Fine Arts Department, 1990).
47. Gabrielle Abbe, "'Decadence and Revival' in Cambodian Arts and the Role of George Groslier (1887–1945)," in *Cultural Heritage as Civilizing Mission: From Decay to Recovery*, ed. Michael Falser (Cham: Springer, 2015), 136.
48. Edwards, 29.
49. Falser, 1: 2, 29–30, 38.
50. Frank Vincent, *The Land of the White Elephant: Sights and Scenes in South-Eastern Asia. A Personal Narrative of Travel and Adventure in Farther India, Embracing the countries of Burma, Siam, Cambodia, and Cochin-China (1871–2)* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1874). David Olyphant King, an American businessman and traveler, may have visited Angkor earlier, in 1857 or 1858; see D.O. King, "Travels in Siam and Cambodia," *The Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London* 30 (1860): 179–180.
51. S. C. Bosch Reitz, "Khmer Sculpture," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 18, no. 5 (May 1923): 129–130.
52. Pratapaditya Pal, *American Collectors of Asian Art* (Bombay: Marg Publications, 1986), 5.
53. Ananda Coomaraswamy, "Khmer Sculpture," *Museum of Fine Arts Bulletin* 18, no. 106 (April 1920): 20–21; Coomaraswamy, *Catalogue of the Indian*

Collections in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1923), 69–72, 85–86; Coomaraswamy, "Cambodian Dancers and Other Khmer Sculptures Recently Acquired," *Museum of Fine Arts Bulletin* 22, no. 130 (April 1924): 9–13.

54. Ananda Coomaraswamy, "Catalogue des pièces khmères conservées dans les musées de l'Amérique du Nord," *Arts et Archéologie khmers* 2, fasc. 2 (1925): 235–240; Denman W. Ross, "An Example of Cambodian Sculpture," *Notes (Fogg Art Museum)* 1, no. 2 (June 1922): 2–13; Alfred Foucher, "Matériaux pour servir à l'étude de l'art khmèr: III. La Collection Moura," *Bulletin de la Commission archéologique de l'Indochine* (1913): 93–103; Charles Fabens Kelley, "Cambodian Sculptures," *Bulletin of the Art Institute of Chicago* 18, no. 4 (April 1924): 42–46.
55. Gabrielle Abbe, "The Selling of Khmer Artefacts during the Colonial Era: Questioning the Perception of Khmer Heritage Through a Study of Traded Khmer Art Pieces (1920s–1940s)," in *Returning Southeast Asia's Past: Objects, Museums, and Restitution*, eds. Louise Tythacott and Panggah Ardiyansyah (Singapore: National University of Singapore, 2021), 41–61.
56. Pierre Singaravélou, *L'École française d'Extrême-Orient ou l'institution des marges (1898–1956): Essai d'histoire sociale et politique de la science coloniale* (Paris: Éditions L'Harmattan, 1999): 256–257.
57. Abbe, "The Selling of Khmer Artefacts," 47, 50.
58. Abbe, "The Selling of Khmer Artefacts," 50; Singaravélou, 254–256.
59. Falser, 2: 39, 102.
60. Singaravélou, 251–254; Wallace S. Baldinger, *Cambodian Sculptures Selected from the Murray Warner Collection of Oriental Art* (Eugene: Museum of Art, University of Oregon, 1955); William A. Southworth, "The 'Vereniging' at Angkor: Four sandstone sculptures from Cambodia," *Aziatische Kunst* 42, no. 1 (July 2012): 18–27; Alan Priest, "A Collection of Cambodian Sculpture," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 32, no. 4. (April 1937): 84–88.
61. Falser, 2: 102–106.
62. Fujihara Sadao, "Les échanges entre le Japon et l'Indochine française durant la seconde guerre mondiale: aux origines de la collection d'art khmer du musée national de Tokyo," *Ebisu: Études japonaises* 52 (2015): 155–161.
63. Fujihara, 166–168.
64. Asanuma Takeshi, dir., *Ankōru no bijutsu: Furansu Kyokutō gakuin kōkanhin mokuroku / Angkor: Khmer Art Exchanged with l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* (Tokyo, Tōkyō kokuritsu hakubutsukan, 1998).
65. Falser, 2:164–173, 204–234.
66. Avery Brundage quoted in Beatrice Trueblood, ed. *Selected works of world art: National Museum of Anthropology, October 1–November 30: Avery*

Brundage collection (México: Comité Organizador de los Juegos de la XIX Olimpiada, 1968), 1 (no printed page numbers).

67. C.T. Loo and John Pope, *An Exhibition of the Sculpture of Greater India: A Fully Illustrated Catalogue* (New York: C. T. Loo, 1942), 38–40; Henry Trubner, *The Art of Greater India: 3000 B.C.–1800 A.D.: An Exhibition of Indian Art presented under the patronage of the Embassy of India functioning for the Government of India* (Los Angeles: The Los Angeles County Museum, 1950), 91–94; Sherman E. Lee, *Ancient Cambodian Sculpture* (New York: The Asia Society, 1969).
68. Also important to mention are James (1913–1990) and Marilynn Alsdorf (1925–2019), whose collection is now in the Art Institute of Chicago and Samuel Eilenberg (1913–1998), who made large donations to the Metropolitan Museum of Art in particular. See Pratapaditya Pal, *A Collecting Odyssey: Indian, Himalayan, and Southeast Asian Art form the James and Marilynn Alsdorf Collection* (Chicago: The Art Institute of Chicago, 1997); and Martin Lerner and Steven Kossak, *The Lotus Transcendent: Indian and Southeast Asian Art from the Samuel Eilenberg Collection* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1991), 157–160.
69. Denise Patry Leidy, *Treasures of Asian Art: The Asia Society's Mr. and Mrs. John D. Rockefeller 3rd Collection* (New York: The Asia Society Galleries, 1994), 102–109; Pratapaditya Pal, *Asian Art at the Norton Simon Museum: Art from Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 166–223. Among the many not yet mentioned museums in the United States with important Khmer sculpture are the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art in Kansas City, the Dallas Museum of Art, and the National Museum of Asian Art in Washington, D.C. All of them have online catalogs which can be used to facilitate teaching, particularly *Southeast Asian Art at LACMA: An Online Scholarly Catalogue* (2013), accessed July 15, 2022, http://seasian.catalog.lacma.org/#.
70. Louise Tythacott and Panggah Ardiyansyah, "Introduction: Collecting and Returning Southeast Asia's Past," in *Returning Southeast Asia's Past: Objects, Museums, and Restitution*, eds. Louise Tythacott and Panggah Ardiyansyah (Singapore: National University of Singapore, 2021), 1–37; Tess Davis and Simon Mackenzie, "Crime and Conflict: Temple Looting in Cambodia," in *Cultural Property Crime: An Overview and Analysis of Contemporary Perspectives and Trends*, eds. Joris D. Kila and Marc Balcells (Leiden: Brill, 2015): 292–306.
71. Masha Lafont, *Pillaging Cambodia: The Illicit Traffic in Khmer Art* (Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland, 2004): 67. How such numbers are, or could ever be, arrived at is unclear, but the point is that the toll has been massive.
72. Tess Davis, "Supply and demand: exposing the illicit trade in Cambodian antiquities through a study of Sotheby's auction house," *Crime, Law and*

Social Change 56, no. 2 (2011): 155–174; and Simon Mackenzie and Tess Davis, "Temple Looting in Cambodia: Anatomy of a Statue Trafficking Network," *The British Journal of Criminology* 54, no. 5 (September 2014): 722–740.

73. Malia Politzer et al., "From temples to offshore trusts, a hunt for Cambodia's looted heritage leads to top museums," *International Consortium of Investigative Journalists*, October 5, 2021. https://www.icij.org/investigations/pandora-papers/cambodia-relics-looted-temples-museums-offshore/; Mario Christodoulou, "Stolen treasure traders," *ABC News* (Australian Broadcasting Corporation), July 16, 2022, updated July 20, 2022, https://www.abc.net.au/news/2022-07-17/secret-history-australia-thai-cambodian-art-antiquities/101054392.
74. For example, Tom Mashberg, "Netscape Founder Gives Up $35 Million in Art Said to Be Stolen," *The New York Times*, Jan. 12, 2022, https://www.nytimes.com/2022/01/12/arts/design/james-clark-cambodian-antiquities.html?smid=url-share.
75. Chea Socheat, Muong Chanraksmey, and Louise Tythacott, "The Looting of Koh Ker and the Return of the Prasat Chen Statues," in *Returning Southeast Asia's Past: Objects, Museums, and Restitution*, eds. Louise Tythacott and Panggah Ardiyansyah (Singapore: National University of Singapore, 2021), 62–86.
76. Tom Mashberg, "Cambodia Says Looter Helping It Reclaim Stolen Artifacts Has Died," *The New York Times*, Dec. 5, 2021, https://www.nytimes.com/2021/12/05/arts/design/cambodian-effort-to-find-artifacts-wont-end-with-informants-death.html?smid=url-share; and Matthew Campbell, "An Art Crime for the Ages," Bloomberg US Edition, June 29, 2022, https://www.bloomberg.com/features/2022-cambodia-met-museum-art-heist/.
77. Quoted in Malia Politzer et al.
78. For example, Po Sakun, "Cambodia and Thailand Tussle Over Looted Statue," *Cambodianess*, July 14, 2022, https://cambodianess.com/article/cambodia-and-thailand-tussle-over-looted-statue.
79. M.C. Subhadradis Diskul, "Stolen Art Objects Returned to Thailand," *SPAFA Digest* 10, no. 2 (1989): 8–11; Nancy Kenney, "US hands over two stolen ancient lintels to Thailand after retrieving them from the Asian Art Museum of San Francisco," *The Art Newspaper*, May 28, 2021, https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2021/05/28/us-hands-over-two-stolen-ancient-lintels-to-thailand-after-retrieving-them-from-the-asian-art-museum-of-san-francisco.
80. Charles F. Keyes, "The Case of the Purloined Lintel: The Politics of a Khmer Shrine as a Thai National Treasure," in *National Identity and Its Defenders: Thailand, 1939–1989*, ed. Craig J. Reynolds (Clayton, Victoria: Centre of Southeast Asian Studies, Monash University, 1991), 261–292.

Bokyung Kim • Kyunghee Pyun
Editors

Teaching South and Southeast Asian Art

Multiethnicity, Cross-Racial Interaction, and Nationalism

palgrave
macmillan

Editors
Bokyung Kim
Department of Art and Art History
University of Mississippi
Oxford, MS, USA

Kyunghee Pyun
Art History and Museum Professions
Fashion Institute of Technology–State
University of New York
New York, NY, USA

ISBN 978-3-031-22515-4 ISBN 978-3-031-22516-1 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-22516-1

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG.
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland