Available online at
http://ejournal.uin-suska.ac.id/index.php/asiapacific/index
E-ISSN 2715-1816 | P-ISSN 2442-7896]

Asia Pacific Journal on Religion and Society
Volume. 9 Number 2 July-December 2025
Page. 102-112

BEYOND POST-ORIENTALISM:
Reframing Representation and Civilisational History in Southeast Asian Studies

Maulana[1]*, Imam Hanafi[2]
[1] Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah, Jakarta, Indonesia
[2] Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim, Riau, Indonesia
*Correspondence author: Email: maulana@uin-jkt.ac.id; Tlp. +62 813-1061-8115

KEYWORD

Post-Orientalism;
Representation;
Southeast Asian civilization;
Mobility;
Area Studies;
Regional epistemology

ABSTRACT

This article analyzes the epistemological shift in Southeast Asian Studies following Edward Said's critique of Orientalism by critically examining Adrian Vickers' work, Southeast Asian Studies after Said. The study employs a qualitative approach based on conceptual-critical analysis and discourse reading to investigate how Southeast Asia has been constructed as an object of knowledge through practices of representation. The analysis reveals that post-Said responses within Southeast Asian Studies have often generated a methodological paradox, namely the delegitimization of textual and philological studies, which paradoxically weakens the analysis of representation itself. Vickers proposes the rehabilitation of representational studies as the methodological core of area studies and reformulates Southeast Asia as a civilization shaped by mobility and transregional symbolic circulation. The Panji tradition is presented as an illustrative case of how the region operates as a fluid zone of cultural interaction that transcends modern national boundaries. This article proposes a Beyond Post-Orientalism framework as an effort toward epistemological reconstruction, positioning representation, mobility, and civilization as foundational analytical categories for Southeast Asian Studies. This approach contributes to the revitalization of area studies as a site of local epistemological production within the broader global debates on Area Studies and modernity.

INTRODUCTION

Southeast Asian Studies, since its inception, has never been entirely "natural" as a field of knowledge. Historically, the term *Southeast Asia* was a geopolitical construct that emerged in the 1940s, primarily as a strategic military designation during World War II, before gaining broader political legitimacy through regional institutions such as ASEAN in the Cold War and post–Cold War periods (Naisbitt, 1996). In this sense, Southeast Asia as an object of study is not merely a geographical space, but the product of processes of representation and institutionalized knowledge that have shaped its boundaries, identities, and regional "unity" within academic discourse (Duara, 2001).

Paradoxically, as Southeast Asia became more consolidated within regional political and economic frameworks, methodological and epistemological debates within Southeast Asian Studies

intensified (Noor, 2021). One of the most significant turning points was Edward Said's critique in *Orientalism* (2023), which exposed how studies of "the East" often functioned as mechanisms for producing colonial discourse—constructing the Orient as a passive object to be defined, managed, and dominated by the West. In many area studies traditions, this critique generated suspicion toward textual studies, philology, and representation, which were seen as potentially reproducing colonial patterns of knowledge production (Donzé-Magnier, 2017; Said, 2004).

However, the reception of Said's critique within Southeast Asian Studies generated an epistemological paradox. Rather than enriching methodological approaches, certain post-Said tendencies led to the marginalization of textual and representational dimensions of the field (Said, 2021). As Adrian Vickers observes, many Southeast Asianists effectively "threw out the textual baby with the Orientalist bathwater"—rejecting textual and philological scholarship wholesale, as though these traditions were inherently synonymous with colonial projects. Yet the study of Southeast Asia, a region characterized by immense plurality—encompassing hundreds of languages and complex cross-linguistic ethnic formations—requires analytical frameworks capable of examining how Southeast Asia has been "brought into being" and "understood" through representation (Vickers, 2009).

Another significant issue concerns the dominance of particular historiographical traditions in shaping the "face" of Southeast Asian Studies. Historical scholarship has played a defining role, especially through major interpretive projects such as the *Age of Commerce* thesis, which emphasized regional integration through trade between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries (Ishii, 2018). While important, this approach carries epistemological consequences: first, the risk of economic determinism; and second, the narrative challenge of explaining Southeast Asia after the seventeenth century, a period often portrayed as one of decline or disruption under colonial domination. In this context, the search for an "autonomous history" has also entailed methodological pitfalls. Efforts to authenticate the "indigenous" may collapse into projects of essentialism, equating authenticity with nativeness and framing foreign elements as deviations. As Reynolds has argued, such models risk producing an epistemological cul-de-sac, in which authenticity recedes endlessly into the past without ever being fully substantiated, while frameworks of statehood and modernity continue to borrow implicitly from Western models.

Simultaneously, contemporary pressures within global social sciences have generated a broader crisis for Area Studies. The field is often criticized as parochial, ethnocentric, and increasingly irrelevant in a globalized, fluid, and transnational world. Internal critiques suggest that Southeast Asian Studies has not always kept pace with theoretical developments in disciplines such as anthropology, geography, and cultural studies. Some scholars even position Area Studies as a direct legacy of pre-war Orientalism, raising ethical and methodological questions about why and for whom regions are studied.

This article adopts a different position. It argues that the solution to this crisis is not the abandonment of representation and textuality, but their reformulation within a post-Orientalist framework. As Vickers emphasizes, the study of representation does not necessarily entail the reproduction of colonial discourse, since Orientalism itself was not monolithic. Many Orientalists were not fully aligned with colonial projects, and numerous scholars operated within hybrid spaces—Eurasian, mestizo, or cross-cultural intellectual contexts. In Southeast Asia, philological and textual studies can, in fact, illuminate the region's complex cultural interconnections—for example, in the transmission of the *Ramayana* and the Panji/Inao narratives across Java, Thailand, and the Malay world—revealing Southeast Asia as an enduring zone of historical interaction rather than a static entity.

Accordingly, this article repositions Southeast Asia as a "civilization" shaped by mobility, narrative circulation, and transregional symbolic exchange. Vickers illustrates this through the Panji

tradition, which functions as a form of cultural archive transcending modern national boundaries. Versions of the Panji narrative appear across Burma, Thailand, Khmer, Lao, Cham, Malay, Javanese, and Balinese contexts, extending even into modern media such as television serials. These narratives encode fluid boundary logics, aristocratic mobility, and shifting centers of power, patterns more coherently understood as civilizational formations rather than as homogeneous "cultures." This approach resonates with Eric Wolf's conception of civilization as a zone of symbolic interaction structured around tributary hegemony, yet inherently competitive and plural.

Building on this argument, the article proposes a *Beyond Post-Orientalism* framework. This approach does not stop at critiquing colonial discourse but moves toward reconstructing a methodology of representation that positions Southeast Asia as a producer of its own epistemology and modernity. It rejects the assumption that Southeast Asian modernity is merely a response to the West, instead understanding it as a process shaped by local agents, national institutions, and global representational dynamics. Within this framework, Southeast Asian modernity may be read as a distinct "Southeast Asian epistemology"—a mode of thinking, representing, and world-making emerging from histories of mobility and cross-cultural encounter.

In sum, this article makes two primary contributions. First, it offers a methodological critique of reductive post-Said approaches that too hastily dismiss textual, philological, and representational studies. Second, it constructs a conceptual framework for understanding Southeast Asia as a civilization rooted in mobility and symbolic circulation, thereby opening space for integrating cultural history, anthropology, media studies, and readings of both classical and popular texts within a coherent analytical field. In doing so, the article not only repositions Southeast Asian Studies within the debate between Area Studies and Global Studies, but also restores representation as the core of regional epistemology.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework of this article is grounded in the understanding that Southeast Asia is not merely a geographical entity, but a discursive formation—an object of knowledge constituted through regimes of representation, academic institutions, and specific geopolitical configurations. In Foucauldian terms, objects do not precede discourse; rather, they emerge through discursive practices that render something speakable, categorizable, and institutionalized as a "region" (Foucault, 2013). Within this context, "Southeast Asia" is the product of the geopolitical configurations of World War II and the Cold War, subsequently institutionalized through universities, academic journals, and regional organizations such as ASEAN.

Edward Said (2023) provided a foundational intervention in area studies through his concept of Orientalism as a knowledge regime—a network of texts, archives, philological traditions, and colonial policies that produced the "Orient" as an epistemic object within relations of power. In this framework, representation is not merely descriptive but performative, actively constituting social reality. Said demonstrated how philological and orientalist scholarship was intertwined with colonial projects, thereby rendering knowledge an instrument of power.

However, as Vickers has shown, the reception of Said's critique within Southeast Asian Studies produced ambivalent effects. Rather than deepening analysis of representation as a structure of power, certain post-Said responses led to the wholesale delegitimization of textual and philological scholarship. This phenomenon may be understood as an incomplete epistemic rupture: a break from earlier traditions without the construction of an equally robust methodological alternative. In Bourdieu's (2018) terms, the academic field underwent a symbolic reorientation without adequate reconstruction of its analytical apparatus.

Accordingly, this article adopts post-Orientalism as a reconstructive rather than destructive project. Post-Orientalism here is not conceived merely as an extension of Said's critique, but as an effort to rebuild representational studies within a reflexive and non-essentialist framework. As Irwin

(2019) argues, Orientalism was never a singular discourse; it comprised diverse national traditions and complex intellectual figures, some of whom maintained sympathetic relationships with their subjects of study. Vickers further demonstrates that in Southeast Asia, numerous philologists and translators occupied hybrid spaces, making it reductive to categorize them solely as colonial agents. Representation, therefore, must be understood as a historically plural arena of epistemic negotiation.

The second dimension of the framework addresses the epistemological crisis of Area Studies. Since Smail (1961) proposed "autonomous history" as a means of liberating Southeast Asia from colonial narratives, there has been a strong impetus to assert regional autonomy. Yet Reynolds (1992) warns that such projects risk falling into essentialist logic: the "authentic" is opposed to the "foreign," while models of statehood and historiography continue to draw upon Western paradigms. From Chakrabarty's (2009) perspective, this reflects the failure to radically provincialize Europe—that is, the inability to fully displace European categories of modernity in interpreting non-Western histories.

Vickers also critiques the economic determinism embedded in grand narratives such as Anthony Reid's *Age of Commerce*. While this thesis expanded horizons of regional integration, it remained teleological in positioning colonialism as a total epistemic rupture. Consequently, Southeast Asian modernity is often framed as derivative of the West rather than as the outcome of more complex historical interactions. In light of Eisenstadt's (Davis et al., 1987) theory of multiple modernities, such interpretations oversimplify social and cultural transformations beyond Europe.

To address these limitations, this article adopts "civilization" as a more elastic analytical category than "culture" or "nation-state." Vickers proposes that Southeast Asia is better understood as a civilization formed through symbolic circulation and transregional mobility. This conception resonates with Eric Wolf's (Ríos Díaz et al., 2018) definition of civilization as a zone of ideological and economic interaction structured by symbolic models replicated and negotiated by elites within particular orbits. Civilization, in this sense, is not homogeneous but relational, plural, and competitive.

The Panji narrative serves as a key illustration within this framework. Vickers demonstrates that the Panji (*Inao*) tradition circulates across Java, Bali, Thailand, Burma, Khmer, Lao, Cham, and Malay contexts, and continues to be reproduced in modern media forms. This phenomenon can be interpreted through Bhabha's (2014) notion of cultural translation, whereby meaning is not linearly transmitted but renegotiated within diverse social contexts. Through Panji, Southeast Asia emerges not simply as a geographical space, but as a circulatory cultural zone characterized by narrative mobility, elite exchange, and symbolic transformation.

Mobility here is not conceived as a feature of contemporary globalization, but as an ontological structure of the region itself. Narratives of shifting kingdoms, itinerant aristocracies, and fluid identities suggest that boundary fluidity is intrinsic to Southeast Asian epistemology. In Appadurai's (1990) terms, Southeast Asia historically constituted interacting ethnoscapes and ideoscapes long before modern globalization.

The final dimension concerns modernity and the production of local epistemologies. While colonialism is often framed as an epistemic rupture, Vickers suggests that representational transformations in Southeast Asia were nonlinear and heterogeneous. Yamashita & Picard, (1999) study of Bali and Heryanto's (2007) work on popular culture demonstrate that Southeast Asian modernity emerged from negotiations among Western representations, national institutions, and local practices..

In sum, this article integrates four conceptual dimensions:

1. **Discourse and Knowledge Regime** – Southeast Asia as a discursive formation constituted through representational practices.

2. **Epistemic Break and Reconstruction** – Orientalism and colonialism as moments of rupture requiring methodological reconstruction rather than total rejection of textual studies.
3. **Civilisational Circulation and Cultural Translation** – Southeast Asia as a zone of symbolic circulation and transregional narrative mobility.
4. **Multiple Modernities and Local Epistemologies** – Southeast Asian modernity as an epistemological production emerging from historical interaction rather than Western derivation.

Through this synthesis, the *Beyond Post-Orientalism* approach does not merely revise Orientalism but constructs an epistemological framework that positions representation, mobility, and civilization at the center of analysis. Southeast Asia, in this perspective, is not an externally represented object but a historical agent that produces and transforms regimes of knowledge through its own discursive practices.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative approach with a critical conceptual analysis design (Stephan, 2014). The focus of the research is not on testing empirical hypotheses, but on conducting an in-depth reading of knowledge production in Southeast Asian Studies in the post-Said era. Accordingly, the text is treated as an epistemological arena in which concepts, arguments, and methodological positions are negotiated. The primary source of data is Adrian Vickers' article, *Southeast Asian Studies after Said* (Vickers, 2009), which is analyzed as a key text in debates concerning representation, Orientalism, and the future of Area Studies in Southeast Asia. This text is positioned as a primary discourse that both reflects and reconstructs the epistemological foundations of regional studies. To strengthen the analysis, the study also draws upon supporting theoretical literature in postcolonial studies, discourse theory, Southeast Asian historiography, and theories of modernity as secondary sources (Ormond et al., 2006).

The analysis proceeds in three stages. First, a close reading of Vickers' text is undertaken to identify its argumentative structure, conceptual oppositions, and principal theoretical propositions, particularly regarding critiques of reductive post-Orientalism and the rehabilitation of representational studies. Second, critical discourse analysis is employed to examine how "Southeast Asia" is constructed as an object of knowledge through specific regimes of representation, and how the text seeks to enact epistemological reconstruction. Third, a conceptual synthesis is conducted to formulate the *Beyond Post-Orientalism* framework as an analytical model integrating representation, mobility, and civilization as foundational categories for interpreting Southeast Asia. The validity of the analysis is maintained through theoretical triangulation, comparing Vickers' arguments with key literature in Southeast Asian Studies and postcolonial theory, while ensuring hermeneutic consistency between interpretation and textual structure. This approach enables a reflective and systematic reading of epistemological shifts in Southeast Asian Studies without falling into normative generalizations or historical reductionism (Repko & Szostak, 2020).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Southeast Asia as a Discursive Object and Knowledge Regime in Area Studies

Vickers begins from a decisive position: "Southeast Asia" is not a natural category, but a relatively recent historical-political construct, emerging in the 1940s as a strategic military designation and later institutionalized through political and academic structures. By emphasizing this origin, Vickers effectively shifts the focus of inquiry from "Southeast Asia as a region" to "Southeast Asia as an object of knowledge." What must be examined, therefore, is not merely social

realities within the region, but the ways in which the region is "brought into presence," "named," and "rendered thinkable" through representational practices.

Within Vickers' framework, Southeast Asian Studies cannot be understood simply as a reflection of pre-existing social realities. Rather, it forms part of a knowledge regime—a discursive and institutional configuration that enables "Southeast Asia" to appear as a recognizable, mappable, and researchable object. The term knowledge regime here refers to the network of relations linking discourse production, academic authority, and institutional legitimacy that simultaneously shape both the object of study and the boundaries of thought surrounding it. In other words, Southeast Asia was not merely "discovered" by scholars; it was constructed through organized practices of knowledge production (Reid, 1990; Xanthaki, 2008).

Academic journals, university departments, area studies centers, scholarly conferences, and research funding schemes are not neutral apparatuses. They function as mechanisms of epistemic selection and reproduction, determining which topics are deemed relevant, which approaches are legitimate, and which narratives achieve authority. When a journal defines itself as the *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, for instance, it implicitly establishes imaginary boundaries regarding what counts—or does not count—as "Southeast Asia." This process produces an effect of coherence: a region that is in reality profoundly plural and heterogeneous appears as if it possesses stable internal unity. In this way, Southeast Asia becomes not only a geographical space but an epistemological entity (Reid, 2017; Smail, 1961).

Within this context, methodological debates are crucial because they touch upon the very foundations through which the region is produced as an object of knowledge. If Southeast Asia is discursive—in the sense that it is constituted through representational practices—then the central questions extend beyond empirical descriptions of trade, politics, or culture. More fundamental questions arise: Through which categories is the region defined? Through what language is it narrated? Through which paradigms is it understood? Methodology thus becomes not merely a technical tool but an epistemological battleground shaping the form and direction of knowledge production. Vickers calls for a shift from a substantive to a reflexive approach. Without awareness of how the region is discursively produced, Southeast Asian Studies risks reproducing assumptions that appear natural but are in fact historically and politically sedimented. Concepts such as "regional integration," "autonomy," or even "Southeast Asian culture" are not neutral descriptors, but products of discursive formations shaped by colonialism, the Cold War, and Western academic development.

Representation, therefore, cannot be treated as a supplementary layer in regional studies; it constitutes their epistemological foundation. Representation is the medium through which the region is imagined, bounded, and connected to broader concepts such as modernity, tradition, or globalization. Without analyzing representation, area studies tend to assume that their object is stable and transparent, whereas that stability itself is an effect of discursive and institutional practices. The implications are both methodological and political. Methodologically, Southeast Asian Studies must integrate discourse analysis and representational studies as core components of research frameworks, rather than as secondary reflections. Politically, recognizing the knowledge regime opens space to question global epistemic hierarchies: who has the authority to define the region, from which positionality knowledge is produced, and how local voices are negotiated within international academic structures.

By treating Southeast Asia as an entity produced through regimes of knowledge, Vickers effectively reorients the paradigm of area studies—from investigating "what Southeast Asia is" to interrogating "how Southeast Asia is made knowable." This shift places representation at the center of epistemological inquiry and transforms methodological reflection from an internal disciplinary concern into part of a broader project of decolonizing knowledge. If Southeast Asia emerges through

discursive formation, then the crisis of Southeast Asian Studies is not merely an institutional or relevance crisis, but a crisis of representation—of how the region is academically constructed and narrated. This constitutes the entry point for post-Said critiques and the debate on the future of Area Studies in Vickers' text.

The Post-Said Paradox: *Anti-Orientalism and the Hollowing Out of Representational Analysis*

Vickers acknowledges Said's *Orientalism* as a major intervention that illuminated how studies of the "East" could reproduce colonial domination through texts, scholarly categories, and policy frameworks. Yet he identifies a sharp paradox: post-Said responses within Southeast Asian Studies often did not strengthen the analysis of representation, but instead rejected textual and philological scholarship altogether. Vickers characterizes this tendency as "throwing out the textual baby with the Orientalist bathwater." The consequences extend beyond a mere shift in methodological preference; they constitute a deeper epistemological problem. While Said's critique of Orientalism was widely accepted, the very tools required to analyze how representation operates—the core of Said's intervention—were weakened (Aziz, 2021; Wahid, 2025). When textual studies are treated with wholesale suspicion, area studies lose a crucial pathway for understanding how Southeast Asia has been constituted through translation, narrative, archives, and cross-linguistic symbolic circulation.

At this juncture, Vickers also rejects the assumption that Orientalism was a singular and monolithic discourse. Drawing on Irwin's discussion, he demonstrates that Orientalism comprised diverse traditions and intellectual figures, some of whom were not fully aligned with colonial agendas. In the Southeast Asian context, Vickers points to hybrid philological figures—scholars deeply embedded in local languages and cultural spaces—whose work cannot be simplistically reduced to colonial agency. The equation "textual studies = colonial domination" thus proves analytically inadequate. Importantly, Vickers is not engaged in a project of "whitewashing" Orientalism in the sense of defending colonial traditions or normalizing the power relations embedded in the historical production of knowledge about the East. Rather, he undertakes a methodological repositioning. He seeks to disentangle Said's epistemic critique of Orientalism as a regime of domination from the wholesale rejection of analytical tools associated with texts, philology, and representation. In Vickers' framework, the primary issue lies not in Said's critique itself, but in how that critique has been received and translated into the practices of area studies.

Here Vickers identifies a phenomenon of over-correction: a condition in which the agenda of decolonizing knowledge moves so far that it produces counterproductive methodological restrictions. In attempting to avoid reproducing colonial discourse, Southeast Asian Studies undergoes a form of analytical foreclosure. Tools that should have been sharpened through critical engagement—textual analysis, representational critique, narrative interpretation—are instead treated as inherently suspect and subsequently sidelined. The result is not merely a change in scholarly orientation, but a form of discursive impoverishment. Area studies lose one of their primary means of examining how Southeast Asia has been shaped through language, symbols, and practices of cultural translation.

Vickers' argument becomes particularly compelling when considered in light of Southeast Asia's historical characteristics. The region has long been a multilingual, multiethnic space marked by intense cross-border narrative circulation. In such a context, representational studies are not optional supplements but epistemological necessities. To disregard texts and philology is to abandon one of the most productive avenues for tracing interregional connections, negotiating identities, and understanding how "Southeast Asia" functions as a zone of symbolic interaction. In other words, the post-Said moment should not lead to the erasure of representational studies, but to the intensification of reflexivity within them. Critique of Orientalism ought to foster more power-conscious readings of texts, greater sensitivity to processes of categorization, and heightened awareness of the researcher's positionality. Yet, as Vickers observes, what has often emerged instead

is the substitution of methodological critique with methodological suspicion: texts are treated as colonial residues rather than as analytical terrains through which colonialism itself can be interrogated.

The implication of Vickers' repositioning is that decolonizing Southeast Asian Studies cannot be achieved merely through rejecting older traditions; it requires reconstructing analytical tools capable of grasping the region's complexity. Representational studies, from this perspective, are not a return to Orientalism but a means of moving beyond reductive post-Orientalism. By restoring texts, narratives, and symbols to the center of analysis, Vickers calls for a Southeast Asian Studies that can once again engage with the region's mobility, fluidity, and heterogeneity—not as anomalies disrupting theory, but as the very basis of its epistemology.

Civilization and Mobility: *Panji as Evidence of a Zone of Interaction and a "Southeast Asian Epistemology"*

The culmination of Vickers' conceptual intervention lies in his effort to construct a way of reading Southeast Asia beyond economic determinism and the confines of national boundaries. While he acknowledges the dominance of regional integration narratives such as Anthony Reid's *Age of Commerce*, which emphasizes trade networks in the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries, he also highlights their limitations—particularly the risks of economic determinism and the narrative problem of explaining the post-seventeenth-century period, often resolved by positioning colonialism as a total rupture. Vickers redirects attention toward another trajectory: representation and narrative circulation as archives of civilization.

It is here that the Panji tradition becomes central. Vickers presents Panji (*Inao*) as a narrative corpus circulating across Java, Bali, the Malay world, Thailand, Khmer, Lao, Burma, and Cham regions, and continuing into modern forms such as television serials. Analytically, Panji is not merely literary data; it functions as an "archive of mobility," revealing that the boundaries of kingdoms, identities, and cultural spaces in Southeast Asia have historically been fluid. Kingdoms shifted, aristocracies moved across territories, and ethnic and linguistic identities were continuously negotiated. From this perspective, Vickers proposes that Southeast Asia is more accurately understood as a civilization rather than simply a "culture" or a geopolitical "region."

Vickers further acknowledges that colonialism did generate epistemological breaks—significant transformations in how the social world was understood, classified, and represented. However, he rejects readings that frame colonialism as a singular rupture operating uniformly and linearly across Southeast Asia. In his view, colonialism did not install modernity as a ready-made package directly imposed upon local societies. Instead, it functioned unevenly and asynchronously, often failing to produce immediate transformations at the level of representation even when political control had been established.

Vickers' emphasis on uneven temporalities and differentiated forms of change is crucial, as it challenges a common historiographical assumption: that modernity emerges immediately with colonial domination and that modernity is synonymous with Western institutions, rationalities, and epistemic categories. He demonstrates that there are often generational gaps between the moment of colonial political dominance and transformations within the civilizational-symbolic sphere—particularly in language, aesthetics, cultural discourse, and modes of self-representation. Such temporal disjunctions indicate that epistemic change is not solely determined by formal structures of power, but also by processes of internalization, adaptation, resistance, and negotiation within local social fields.

From this vantage point, Vickers advances the argument that Southeast Asian modernity is not a linear derivative of the West, but rather a field of negotiation involving at least three interrelated forces: (1) global representations that introduce categories and imaginaries of modernity; (2) national institutions that mediate and simultaneously produce official discourses; and (3) local

practices that translate, adapt, and transform modern meanings in accordance with indigenous epistemologies. Modernity, therefore, does not arrive as an "import," but as the outcome of complex processes of cultural translation—where modern elements are not transferred intact but rearticulated within local symbolic languages.

This argument carries significant methodological implications. If Southeast Asian modernity is neither linear nor uniform, then approaches that rely solely on narratives of colonial disruption or institutional transformation are insufficient to capture the region's dynamics. Instead, Southeast Asian Studies must restore representation to the center of analysis, since epistemic transformations are most visible at the level of meaning production: how societies visualize modernity, incorporate it into narrative forms, and represent it through art, architecture, texts, and popular culture.

In this sense, representational studies open the way to understanding modernity as the production of local epistemologies—how Southeast Asia constructs knowledge about itself in relation to global modernity. Modernity is no longer reducible to "Westernization," but emerges as a discursive encounter producing localized, hybrid, and distinctive forms of modern life. Within this framework, Southeast Asia appears not as a passive object of Western modernity, but as an active agent generating its own modernities through evolving practices of representation.

CONCLUTION

This article demonstrates that Orientalist studies of the Qur'an constitute a complex and multilayered epistemic phenomenon, shaped not only by theological, philological, and comparative motivations within Western academic traditions, but also by broader knowledge–power relations, including colonial, missionary, and global academic contexts. Orientalist epistemic motives—such as tendencies to delegitimize Qur'anic revelation, to interpret the text through Western historical frameworks, and to situate Qur'anic narratives within comparative structures alongside other scriptural traditions—have profoundly influenced how the Qur'an and Islam have been understood within Western scholarship.

In the Asia–Pacific region, particularly Southeast Asia, Orientalist discourse does not appear solely in the form of doctrinal critique, but is also institutionalized within academic spaces through higher education, scholarly bureaucracies, and scientific publications. Orientalist works are studied, cited, and contextualized in Islamic universities and research institutions across Indonesia, Malaysia, Brunei Darussalam, and Singapore. Muslim responses to Orientalist discourse in this region are notably plural. These include apologetic responses that seek to preserve the distinctiveness of revelation; dialogical responses that allow comparison without epistemic subordination; postcolonial–critical responses that situate Orientalism within the historical and epistemological legacy of colonialism; and reformist–contextual responses that selectively employ modern academic tools while remaining grounded in Islamic epistemology.

Accordingly, Qur'anic Orientalism should not be understood merely as a Western tradition of critique directed at Islam, but rather as a site of epistemic negotiation in which Muslim scholars in the Asia–Pacific region actively develop interpretive models that are more contextual, dialogical, and socially reflective. These findings broaden the understanding that Qur'anic studies are not limited to textual polemics, but are deeply intertwined with the dynamics of religion and society, religious identity formation, and the negotiation of pluralism within contemporary global contexts.

REFERENCES

Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *7*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/026327690007002017

Aziz, S. (2021). Orientalism, empire, and the racial muslim. In *Overcoming Orientalism: Essays in Honor of John L. Esposito*. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190054151.003.0009

Bhabha, J. (2014). Child migration and human rights in a global age. In *Child Migration and Human Rights in a Global Age*. https://doi.org/10.20889/12590

Bourdieu, P. (2018). The forms of capital. In *The Sociology of Economic Life, Third Edition*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429494338

Chakrabarty, D. (2009). Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference. In *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.2002.29.1.214

Davis, J., Eisenstadt, S. N., & Roniger, L. (1987). Patrons, Clients and Friends: Interpersonal Relations and the Structure of Trust in Society. *Man*, *22*(3). https://doi.org/10.2307/2802524

Donzé-Magnier, M. (2017). Edward Said: Orientalism. *Geonum Ed.: ISRN GEONUM-NST*, (1).

Duara, P. (2001). The discourse of civilization and pan-asianism. *Journal of World History*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1353/jwh.2001.0009

Foucault, M. (2013). Politics, Philosophy, Culture. In *Politics, Philosophy, Culture*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203760031

Heryanto, A. (2007). Can there be southeast Asians in southeast Asian studies? In *Knowing Southeast Asian Subjects* (Vol. 9780295804255). https://doi.org/10.4000/moussons.2658

Irwin, R. (2019). For Lust of Knowing: the Orientalists and their Enemies. In *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* (Vol. 53, Number 9).

Ishii, Y. (2018). The Junk Trade from Southeast Asia. In *The Junk Trade from Southeast Asia*. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies. https://doi.org/10.1355/9789814519793

Naisbitt, J. (1996). *Megatrends Asia: Eight Asian Megatrends that are shaping our World*. Simon 7 Schuster.

Noor, F. A. (2021). Introduction: Booking Southeast Asia: The History of an Idea. In *The Discursive Construction of Southeast Asia in 19th Century Colonial-Capitalist Discourse*. https://doi.org/10.1017/9789048527489.002

Ormond, A., Cram, F., & Carter, L. (2006). Researching our Relations: Reflections on Ethics and Marginalisation. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/117718010600200108

Reid, A. (1990). The Seventeenth-Century Crisis in Southeast Asia. *Modern Asian Studies*, *24*(4). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0026749X00010520

Reid, A. (2017). Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce, 1450-1680. In *Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce, 1450-1680*. https://doi.org/10.12987/9780300159455

Repko, A. F. , & Szostak, R. (2020). *Interdisciplinary research: Process and theory*. Sage Publications.

Reynolds, C. J. (1992). Authenticating Southeast Asia in the absence of colonialism: Burma. In *Asian Studies Review* (Vol. 15, Number 3). https://doi.org/10.1080/10357823.1992.9755401

Ríos Díaz, F., Marín Ferrer, M., European Commission, Commission, E., Adger, W. N., Barnett, J., Morphology, T. C., Adger, W. N., Quinn, T., Lorenzoni, I., Murphy, C., Sweeney, J., Arnell, N. W., Tompkins, E. L., Bendell, J., Berrang-Ford, L., Ford, J. D., Paterson, J., Biesbroek, R., … Campbell, B. (2018). E-Learning Course: Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation. *Nature Climate Change*, *8*(3).

Said, E. (2004). Orientalism Once More. *Development and Change*, *35*(5). https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.2004.00383.x

Said, E. (2021). From orientalism. In *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003135593-3

Said, E. (2023). Introduction to Orientalism. In *Imperialism: Critical Concepts in Historical Studies: Volume III* (Vol. 3). https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003101536-3

Smail, J. R. W. (1961). On the possibility of an autonomous history of modern southeast asia. *Journal of Southeast Asian History*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0217781100000314

Stephan, W. G. (2014). Intergroup Anxiety: Theory, Research, and Practice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *18*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868314530518

Vickers, A. (n.d.). Southeast Asian Studies after Said. *Arts: The Journal of the Sydney University Arts Association*.

Wahid, M. A. (2025). From Orientalism to neo-Orientalism: medial representations of Islam and the Muslim world. *Textual Practice*, *39*(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/0950236X.2023.2288112

Xanthaki, A. (2008). Land rights of indigenous peoples in Southeast Asia. *Melbourne Journal of International Law*, *4*(2).

Yamashita, S., & Picard, M. (1999). Bali: Cultural Tourism and Touristic Culture. *Indonesia*, *67*. https://doi.org/10.2307/3351382