

AUTHOR: LINDA KOMAROFF

TITLE: Exhibiting the Middle East: Collections and Perceptions of Islamic Art

SOURCE: *Ars Orientalis* v30 p1-8 2000

The magazine publisher is the copyright holder of this article and it is reproduced with permission. Further reproduction of this article in violation of the copyright is prohibited.

ABSTRACT

Recent interest in the historiography of Islamic art has focused on scholarship, museums, and collecting from the mid-nineteenth through the mid-twentieth century, the formative period for the field. Such scholarly attention is essential insofar as future directions in the field will be delineated in part through rediscovering the past. This special volume of *Ars Orientalis* presents an intriguing view of the early period of Islamic art history by examining collections, collecting patterns, and special exhibitions in Western Europe, the United States, and Turkey as part of the evolutionary process of the discipline.

THIS GATHERING OF PAPERS addresses some of the ways in which collecting patterns, collections, and special exhibitions have shaped and altered scholarly as well as popular perceptions of Islamic art. What was collected, in the Middle East and in the West, in the past and up to the present day, is crucial to these perceptions. The history of collecting is closely tied to the history of the field of Islamic art and its maturation as a scholarly discipline. In fact, these two spheres have developed a reciprocal relationship: what was collected initially dictated what was studied, and what was studied has helped to refine collecting patterns. Special exhibitions, ranging from broadly defined nationalistic and formalistic approaches, as in the great Persian Exhibition of 1931, to exhibitions focusing on a particular period, dynasty, medium, or even a single work of art, especially from the 1980s until the present, have influenced and in turn been influenced by developments in the field.

Along with special exhibitions, the installation of a museum's permanent collection provides one of the most public arenas—that is, outside of the Middle East—for experiencing Islamic art at first hand. On the most basic level, the installation itself, the choice of objects, their arrangement, their interrelations and implied visual relations make a fundamental statement about Islamic art and, by extension, the cultures that fostered its development. The evolution of museum installations (both permanent collections and special exhibitions), from an emphasis on the concerns of ethnography and applied arts and crafts to a more historical, synthetic approach, has largely been driven by advances in the field of Islamic art. More recently, a renewed interest in Western museums as educational institutions, coupled with a new sensitivity to multiculturalism, has begun to alter the general concept and concerns of the installation.

The topics outlined above are important for understanding the historiography of Islamic art, which has begun to attract scholarly attention. One recent publication that addresses certain of these issues is the proceedings of a conference held at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, in 1996, whose aim was to examine the growth and change of Islamic art as a serious discipline, focusing on the role of collectors, museums, and scholars, primarily in Europe, in the evolutionary process.(FN1) The conference, which took a thoroughly historical but uncritical approach to the subject, provided the inspiration for a much smaller North American meeting held at the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, in 1998 under the auspices of Historians of Islamic Art. The present collection of papers is an outgrowth of the Toronto meeting and should be viewed as a complement to the proceedings of the V&A conference. A comprehensive treatment of so broad a subject is clearly beyond the confines of any single collection

of papers; however, this special volume of *Ars Orientalis* will, it is hoped, provoke discussion and further interest.

The issues discussed in this volume help to delineate some of the developments in the field of Islamic art, a field that has evolved considerably in the last three decades. Edward Said's *Orientalism*,^(FN2) postmodernism, postcolonialism, theoretical and contextual approaches, as well as a broadening of the geographical and temporal areas of inquiry have all influenced the discipline and have led some scholars to question the traditional notion of a "universal" Islamic art. Insofar as the future directions of the field will to some extent be determined by reexamining the past, the essays in this volume should make an important contribution. These papers, which themselves demonstrate different methodologies and systems of interpretation, concentrate on the collecting as well as temporary and permanent exhibition of Islamic art in Western Europe, the United States, and Turkey, from the second half of the nineteenth through the first half of the twentieth century. Without purporting to be comprehensive, this volume presents an intriguing view of the early history of the field of Islamic art, one that is partially filtered through the veil of commerce.

David Roxburgh's article focuses on collections and temporary exhibitions of Islamic art (some of which were primarily commercial in nature) in the last decades of the nineteenth and the opening years of the twentieth century. He emphasizes the role played by exhibition practices and Western museology as a means of understanding the motivations and responses of scholars/amateurs/collectors. He begins with a fictive description of a display of Oriental carpets and textiles in a Parisian department store and goes on to consider the relation of commercial design and display to design and display in early exhibitions of Islamic art (commercial and otherwise). His premise is both significant to the subject and relevant to museum practice in the later twentieth century, not merely because of the burgeoning commercial enterprises that are today attached to many of the world's great art institutions but because numerous museums have begun to regard their visitors as customers to be studied and pleased, often gearing their installations to optimize a specific message.

Late nineteenth-century exhibitions of Islamic art skillfully blended connoisseurship, scholarship, and commercialism with the pretext of authenticity through the (re)contextualization of the objects on display. Frederick Martin's exhibition of his own extensive collection, staged in Stockholm in 1897, represents perhaps the most thorough amalgam of these seemingly disparate elements.^(FN3)

Roxburgh describes early exhibitions such as that of Goupil's Islamic collection in Paris in 1888. This was actually an exhibition cum sales display, in which the objects were arranged within a carefully constructed architectural space intended to provide an appropriately "Oriental" ambiance. Other subsequent exhibitions—an 1893 exhibition, again in Paris but not exclusively commercial, and Martin's aforementioned 1897 Stockholm exhibition—continued to recreate an "authentic" setting in which vast numbers of objects were artfully displayed, helping to reinforce the notion of the immense riches of the "Orient." Although Roxburgh cites one contemporary criticism of this type of installation and its Orientalizing tendencies, such display tactics seem to have been the accepted norm. The great 1910 Munich exhibition, which intentionally eschewed the bazaar mentality in terms of display, was thoroughly criticized for its expansive spaces and whitewashed walls. Roxburgh sees in this exhibition a new approach in which the objects are organized, and the installation is designed, to recount the history of the art. In fact, much of the criticism of the 1910 Munich exhibition seems to center on its spacious design, which allowed visitors to focus on individual objects and their relation to one another, and its lack of contextualization of these objects.

These points become especially interesting in relation to some of the responses to the installation of the Metropolitan Museum of Art's Islamic galleries, which opened to the public in 1975. Revealing for the first time the vast scope of the museum's Islamic collection, this installation displayed more than 1,000 objects, organized chronologically and geographically among ten galleries. For its time, the Met's galleries, whose basic layout and configuration have remained essentially unchanged, were state of the art, utilizing, for example, innovative in-gallery storage/display techniques (many of which proved to be impractical).(FN4) Detached manuscript illustrations were (and are still) exhibited beneath table-level, slanted plexiglass decks provided with chairs, helping to recreate the experience of looking at a manuscript in a leisurely and, within the confines of a museum, a comparatively intimate manner. Also significantly, the works of art were not, wherever practical, segregated by medium (something that also may have been partially attempted in Munich in 1910). Rather, pottery, metalwork, works on paper, glass, and textiles were exhibited alongside one another in an effort to make specific visual connections; for instance, writing occurs not only on the manuscript page but also on a textile, or on pottery, metalwork, stone, or glass.

The Met's Islamic galleries elicited two illuminating responses, which were in fact published together in 1976. One is by Oleg Grabar, whose role in the field of Islamic art needs no further clarification, and the other by Amy Goldin, a self-professed "amateur."(FN5) In reaction to the juxtaposing of so many objects, Grabar sees the constant repetition of particular decorative themes and the recurrence of certain shapes, techniques, and styles that helped to reveal the nature of Islamic art as indicative of the scope and scale of the Met's collection rather than the result of conscious curatorial choices about what to exhibit, and where and how to exhibit it, in order to establish visual relations and analogies. He attributes the effectiveness of one gallery devoted to material from the museum's excavations at Nishapur to the massing of related objects "as though the group makes better sense than any one of its elements."(FN6) He goes on to suggest that works of Islamic art are perhaps not best understood within "a setting that excerpts them from their purpose, and that they are in fact to be seen as ethnographic documents, closely tied to life, even a reconstructed life, and more meaningful in large numbers and series than as single creations."(FN7) Grabar proceeds to discuss the apparent requirement of context—that is, architectural context—noting the effectiveness and popularity of the Met's Syrian room (a virtually complete room from an early eighteenth-century Damascus house). He states further on that it is the "real or fantasized memories of the Alhambra, of Isfahan or of Cairene mosques [that] provide the objects with their meaning."(FN8) The sort of installation that Grabar seems to suggest here comes very close in practice, if not theory, to those of the late nineteenth century discussed by Roxburgh, and what Grabar criticizes in the Met's installation is in many ways similar to condemnations of the 1910 Munich exhibition.

The second review, by Goldin, also comments on the lack of architectural context, noting that its "exclusion contributes immeasurably to the general impression of a consumer paradise."(FN9) Apparently, for Goldin, this massing together of so many luxurious objects was evocative of, perhaps, a department store display, which again brings us back to Roxburgh's associations between nineteenth-century exhibition practice and the retail context, still alive and well according to some perceptions in the latter part of the twentieth century. Grabar's 1976 article observes the enormous advances in the field of Islamic art since the nineteenth century in terms of dating, attributions, regional distinctions, and social and symbolic associations, although the means by which this information was to be communicated through a museum installation evidently was and continues to be something that curators still must grapple with, as Roxburgh's paper underscores.

While Roxburgh's article reflects on the early collecting and exhibiting of Islamic art, Tomoko Masuya's considers the means by which one type of object—Persian overglaze painted luster tiles from the Ilkhanid period (1256-1353)—came into European collections, most notably the Victoria and Albert Museum. Such luster tiles, which served as architectural revetment on secular and especially religious edifices, had a strong appeal in the West, where they were admired for their wondrous reflective surfaces and because they fed the imagined view of the Orient, serving as "a revelation of a lost art redolent of the romance of the East."(FN10) Masuya's study seeks to reconstruct the circumstances under which Ilkhanid tiles were acquired and to locate the buildings from which they came.

One of the questions Masuya poses is: How did these tiles, some of which share numerous features with tiles found at Takht-i Sulaiman, the sole excavated palace of the Ilkhanid period, whose excavators found no evidence of modern disturbances, find their way to Europe in the nineteenth century? In answer to the riddle of the Takht-i Sulaiman tiles, Masuya cogently argues that they were removed from their original site in the fourteenth century and reused to decorate two mausoleums in Qum. She very convincingly demonstrates that the removal of these tiles from Iran, along with others from a fourteenth-century mausoleum in Natanz (that of ʿAbd al-Ṣamad) and a shrine in Varamin (Imāmzāda Yaḥyā), was effected in part through the agency of several individuals. Each of these individuals seems to have had some relationship to the Qajar government that would have enabled the removal and export of tiles from religious monuments. These buildings are all now largely denuded of their original tile decoration.

A key figure in these enterprises was Robert Murdoch Smith, the director of the Persian Telegraph Department in Tehran, who in 1873 became an agent for the South Kensington (later Victoria and Albert) Museum. Murdoch Smith made a number of important acquisitions for the museum, some of which may have been aided by his relationship with the Qajar ruler Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh (r. 1848-96).(FN11) These acquisitions were accompanied by reports, which, as Masuya notes, by 1877 were distinctively less forthcoming about the origin of the tiles. In 1875, Murdoch Smith had recommended that tiles removed from religious buildings be purchased quickly, because the attention of the ʿulamā had already been attracted, and indeed in the following year the Qajar government, urged on by the religious authorities, issued an injunction against the pillaging of religious monuments. Although this edict does not appear to have hindered Murdoch Smith's continued acquisition of tiles, it does seem to have led to the deliberate obfuscation of facts regarding their provenance.

This same widespread removal of works of art to the West affected other Islamic lands in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.(FN12) For example, in Egypt, the increasingly rapid disappearance of works of art from Cairo's mosques and other religious institutions, due in no small part to the rapaciousness of Western collectors, led in 1881 to the creation of the Comité de Conservation des Monuments de l'Art Arabe. The Comité soon began to transfer objects to the al-Hakim mosque, which in 1886 became the first home of the Arab Museum (later the Museum of Islamic Art).(FN13) Elsewhere, antiquities regulations began to be introduced; the concomitant emergence of a newly defined sense of national identity in Turkey would lead to the creation of the first Islamic arts collection at the Ottoman Imperial Museum.

Ottoman interest in the collecting of Islamic art forms the topic of Wendy Shaw's article. The burgeoning sense of nationhood and a desire to possess the cultural symbols of the immediate Ottoman past were important factors in the formation of a collection of Islamic art at the Ottoman Imperial Museum in 1889, more than forty years after the founding of the museum. Shaw proposes that the designation "Islamic"

art (perhaps a late nineteenth-century byproduct of the encyclopedic museum that encompassed all of world art, taxonomically arranged to conform to a Western system of cultural development) was in a sense subverted by the Ottomans for their own nationalistic purposes. Namely, the Ottomans used the concept of a universal Islamic art and the related idea of Islam as a national characteristic to reassert the political connections between the empire and Islam.

Shaw also suggests that a growing awareness of the strong European attraction to this art and a desire to withhold it from the West furthered the development of a national collection of Islamic art. Reported thefts of tiles and carpets from historical monuments, despite the enacting of a comprehensive antiquities law in 1906, encouraged the removal of such works of art to the Imperial Museum. But the thefts also led to the recognition that these works of art had monetary value. Shaw cites an interesting note from a local police chief concerning a tomb in Beşiktaş frequented by foreign tourists; the police chief expresses fear that the guardian may be tempted to steal the tomb's standard because of its value and suggests that the standard be removed to the Imperial Museum for safekeeping.(FN14)

Many works of Islamic art that were incorporated into the Ottoman Imperial collections and displayed in the purely secular context of a museum exhibition hall had been removed from religious institutions. Through this transfer, such objects exchanged much of their original devotional or functional meaning for a new aesthetic and historical appreciation. According to Shaw, certain paintings that incorporate depictions of objects from the Ottoman Imperial Museum by Osman Hamdi, director of the museum from 1881 to 1910, symbolically encapsulate the recontextualization of this art. There is a certain irony in this, as displays of Islamic art in Europe at this time were attempting to (re)create the lost context of the object, while the Orientalist painter (in whose tradition Osman Hamdi was trained) purported to have captured it.

Islamic art from the Ottoman Imperial Museum today forms the core of the collection of the Turkish and Islamic Museum, Istanbul. Located since 1983 in the renovated sixteenth-century palace of Ibrahim Pasha, the museum functions as both an art and an ethnographic museum, with two different but related collections.(FN15) In many ways, this museum, housed in an Ottoman palace, with its "period" rooms on the first floor representing traditional Turkish life and historically arranged galleries of Islamic art on the second floor, presents one solution to some of the issues of exhibiting the Middle East considered above.

In terms of the collecting of Islamic art in the West, the great national museums of Europe, such as the British Museum and the Louvre, both founded in the eighteenth century, had a considerable head start on American institutions; the first major art museums in the United States (e.g., the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston) were founded only in the 1870s. But the later nineteenth-century European enthusiasm for collecting Islamic art also extended to American collectors. Some of these individuals bequeathed their collections to institutions like the Museum of Fine Arts and the Metropolitan Museum, while men such as Henry Walters and Charles Lang Freer used their collections to establish public museums named in their honor. Walters and Freer, along with their advisors, guided the formation of the Islamic collections of the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, and the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., respectively.

Marilyn Jenkins-Madina demonstrates in her article on the formation of the Met's Islamic collection that this largest and most comprehensive assemblage in the United States was significantly shaped not by curators or specialists but by the collectors and dealers who donated or sold to the museum. The statistics compiled by Jenkins-Madina indicate that more than half of the present-day Islamic collection of

11,000 objects had entered the museum prior to 1932, when a department of Near Eastern (later Islamic) art was formed. Among the generous and civic-minded collectors who contributed to the Metropolitan Museum were Edward C. Moore, James F. Ballard, and the Havemeyer family. The latter relied heavily upon the dealer/collector Dikran Kelekian (1868-1951) for their Islamic acquisitions.

Kelekian was one of several influential Armenian dealers who amassed a large and important collection of Islamic art and for whom dealing and collecting were analogous pursuits. In addition to his indirect and direct involvement with the Metropolitan Museum of Art, which mounted two exhibitions from his collections, Kelekian sold to the Boston Museum of Fine Arts and the Freer Gallery of Art. He also played a leading role in the formation and expansion of Henry Walters's collection of Islamic art; this important relationship is documented and discussed in Simpson's article.

Henry Walters appears to have met Kelekian at the 1983 Columbian Exhibition in Chicago, which represented the young dealer's first foray into the American art market. Shortly thereafter, Walters began to acquire works of ancient and Islamic art from Kelekian on a regular basis. Simpson suggests that collecting Islamic art may have appealed to Walters partly as a way of making tangible the imagery and objects represented in the Orientalist paintings collected by Walters's father and familiar to him from childhood. Whatever the reason, as Simpson notes, Kelekian was tremendously influential in Walters's acquisition of Islamic art. Of special interest among the materials Simpson uses to document her study are the photographic albums, compiled by Kelekian for Walters, containing images of works of art that Walters had purchased or was being encouraged to purchase (see Simpson's fig. 9).

Apart from Kelekian, the Islamic collections of the Metropolitan Museum and the Walters Art Gallery have another point in common—one that is shared, in fact, by nearly all American public collections of Islamic art, namely the preponderance of Persian decorative arts, especially pottery. Kelekian (though not to the exclusion of all other dealers) may have had a hand in this. As both Jenkins-Madina and Simpson note, Kelekian through his own "collections" and related publications stressed the importance of Persian art in general, and ceramics in particular, in an attempt to cultivate the taste of new collectors and confirm the taste of more seasoned ones. A letter of 1898 from Kelekian to the president of the Metropolitan Museum, cited by Jenkins-Madina, indicates the dealer's consternation that this material had not yet attained popularity among collectors. Shortly thereafter, Kelekian's collection of Persian pottery and related material was exhibited at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, thereby providing the dealer with an excellent opportunity to effect a change in taste.

Kelekian certainly did not create a predilection for Persian art in the United States, but he may have helped to increase the appetite for it among the many collectors and institutions to whom he sold. This dealer seems to have been especially recognized by the Iranian shah, as he was named Persian Consul-General in New York in 1902 and Commissioner-General at about the same time. This distinguished status, noted by both Jenkins-Madina and Simpson, may have given his "collections" a certain imprimatur, while it also, presumably, would have made it easier for the dealer to obtain and export works of art from Iran.

The great popularity of Persian art may be traced to a variety of factors not necessarily exclusive to Kelekian. One important factor was availability. Comparatively large numbers of high-quality objects are preserved from medieval Iran, as noted more than thirty years ago by Grabar, who referred to this phenomenon as a veritable "artistic explosion." Ettinghausen later attributed it to an artistically favorable climate promoted by patrons from the rising mercantile class.(FN16) In the early twentieth century, commercial and clandestine excavations at Sultanabad, Rayy, and Varamin

produced great quantities of ceramic wares and tiles. And although Nishapur was excavated by the Metropolitan Museum of Art between 1935 and 1947, objects from commercial excavations there first began to reach the art market at a much earlier date.(FN17) Finally, in contrast to Turkey and Egypt, where national collections (ancient and Islamic) began to be formed in the later nineteenth century, such museums were only founded in Iran in the 1930s, which until then allowed for a greater laxity in the enactment and enforcement of export laws (for example, the apparently ineffectual edict of 1876 noted above). Admittedly, the quest to uncover Persian works of art, either through excavations or by other means, may itself have been driven by the popularity and hence monetary value of this material.

Throughout much of the nineteenth and well into the twentieth century there seems to have been a perception among collectors, dealers, and some scholars that Iran was the source of all that was original or perhaps best in Islamic art. Non-Persian works of art, such as Iznik pottery, often continued to be referred to as Persian, even after evidence to the contrary was produced.(FN18) Such misperceptions and misrepresentations may have had their roots among certain racial theories promulgated in the mid-nineteenth century, which found their way into commentaries on art.(FN19) According to these theories, since the Persians were defined racially as Indo-European or Aryan, it naturally followed that their art would be superior to that of the non-Aryan Arabs and Turks.

Racial overtones aside, perhaps the chief proponent of the view that Persian art was inherently separate from and superior to other arts produced in the Islamic world was Arthur Upham Pope, who has been described, not entirely inaccurately, as “the P. T. Barnum of Islamic art.”(FN20) It is today somewhat difficult to define accurately exactly what Pope was—scholar, dealer, charlatan, opportunist, entrepreneur? Perhaps, he should be viewed simply as the ultimate “spin-doctor” for Persian art and culture. Nowhere was Pope’s advocacy of Persian art and culture more apparent than in the 1931 International Exhibition of Persian Art in London, which is the subject of the final article by Barry Wood.

The 1931 exhibition, more spectacle than historical representation, included more than 2,000 works ranging from prehistoric times through the Islamic period. As Wood describes it, this vast assemblage presented a very particular and one-dimensional view of Persian art, one that was held and expounded by the show’s main organizer—Pope. Pope was concerned with an art of pure form, making it possible through the exhibition to link the art of ancient Iran with that of the Islamic period (and up to the then-present day), by promoting the idea of a Persian “spirit” that transcended foreign conquerors and the changing and varied ethnic and religious identities of Iran’s peoples over the centuries. The exhibition and especially the monumental *Survey of Persian Art*, which was published seven years later, had a profound impact on a generation of scholars, collectors, and amateurs alike. Among its positive effects, as Wood points out, was the establishment of the basic framework for the field of Persian manuscript illustration.(FN21) The great Persian Exhibition also influenced the collecting patterns of many museums (especially in America), which acquired works brought to prominence by the 1931 exhibition that had been in the hands of dealers and private collectors.

Wood concludes his article with a comparison between the 1931 exhibition and the 1989 exhibition *Timur and the Princely Vision*, shown in Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles. Both exhibitions gathered quantities of Persian art from far-flung corners of the earth, and both were concerned to present an explicit view of the nature and meaning of this art. Finally, both were instrumental in stimulating specific kinds of research, one strictly formalist, the other thoroughly engaged with questions of cultural

and especially political context and reflecting the increasing maturation of scholarship in the field. Wood's article points to a more accurate understanding of these different junctures in the history of the study of Islamic art, as well as the evolution of exhibition practice in the twentieth century.

ADDED MATERIAL

FOOTNOTES

1. Stephen Vernoit, ed., *Discovering Islamic Art: Scholars, Collectors and Collections, 1850-1950* (London: I. B. Taurus, 2000). Another more broadly related collection of articles is included in *Museum International*, no. 3 (July-September 1999); it comprises a guest editorial by Oleg Grabar and several articles focusing on the history of Islamic collections and/or their display at the Hermitage; the British Museum; the Museum for Islamic Art and State Museum, Berlin; the Museum of Islamic Art, Tehran; and the Turkish and Islamic Museum, Istanbul. Also see Stephen Vernoit, "The Rise of Islamic Archaeology," *Muqarnas* 14 (1997): 1-10 and, by the same author, an excellent article on the early collecting of gilded and enameled glass in Europe, "Islamic Gilded and Enamelled Glass in Nineteenth Century Collections," in *Gilded and Enamelled Glass from the Middle East*, ed. Rachel Ward (London: British Museum Press, 1998), 110-15.
2. Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon, 1978).
3. On Martin's commercially successful exhibition of his collection of manuscript illustrations in 1912, see Glenn Lowry with Susan Nemazee, *A Jeweler's Eye: Islamic Arts of the Book from the Vever Collection* (Washington, D.C.: Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, 1988), 31-32.
4. I am grateful to Marilyn Jenkins-Madina for sharing with me some of her memories of the installation of the Met's Islamic galleries.
5. Oleg Grabar, "An Art of the Object," *Artforum* 14 (March 1976): 36-43; Amy Goldin, "Islamic Art: The Met's Generous Embrace," *Artforum* 14 (March 1976): 44-50.
6. Grabar, "Art of the Object," 37.
7. Grabar, "Art of the Object," 39.
8. Grabar, "Art of the Object," 39.
9. Goldin, "Met's Generous Embrace," 44.
10. The quotation comes from Henry Wallis's introduction to *The Godman Collection: Persian Ceramic Art of Mr. F. DuCane Godman, F.R.S.: The Thirteenth-Century Lustered Tiles* (London: n.p., 1894), 3, cited more fully at the close of Roxburgh's essay in the present volume and providing a perfect segue to Masuya's article. There is a further link, as some of Godman's Persian tiles, now in the British Museum, were acquired through the very means described by Masuya; see her appendix.
11. Stephen Vernoit, "Murdoch Smith, Sir Robert," in *The Dictionary of Art*, ed. Jane Turner (New York: Grove's Dictionaries, 1996), 22:340.
12. See Stephen Vernoit, "Islamic Art and Architecture: An Overview of Scholarship and Collecting, c. 1850-c. 1950," in *Discovering Islamic Art*, ed. Vernoit, 1-61, esp. 7-14.
13. See Donald Reid, "Cultural Imperialism and Nationalism: The Struggle to Define and Control the Heritage of Arab Art in Egypt," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 24 (1992): 57-76.
14. Masuya, in this volume, also cites an interesting and related event, described by an early twentieth-century source, in which Europeans actually approached the caretakers of a shrine in Qum in order to obtain tiles. The caretakers declined to sell due to the low price offered, but the determined Westerners hired thieves to steal the tiles instead.
15. See Nazan Ölcer, "Living the Past: The Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art," *Museum International*, no. 3 (July-September 1999), 32-37.

16. Oleg Grabar, "The Visual Arts," in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 5, *The Saljuq and Mongols Periods* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 626-58, 626; Richard Ettinghausen, "The Flowering of Saljuq Art," *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 3 (1970): 113-31.
17. Charles K. Wilkinson, *Nishapur: Pottery of the Early Islamic Period* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1973), xxiii.
18. E.g., see Nurhan Atasoy and Julian Raby, *Iznik: The Pottery of Ottoman Turkey* (London: Alexandria Press, 1989), 71-72.
19. See Vernoit, "Islamic Art and Architecture," in *Discovering Islamic Art*, ed. Vernoit, 6-7.
20. Stuart Cary Welch, "Private Collectors and Islamic Arts of the Book," in *Treasures of Islam*, ed. Toby Falk (London: Sotheby's, 1985), 26-31, 28. Welch repeats the comparison with P. T. Barnum in a blurb quoted on the dust jacket of the biography of Pope and his wife Phyllis Ackerman, *Surveyors of Persian Art* (Ashiya, Japan: SoPA, 1996): "I lump him ... with such glorious people as Captain Cook, Picasso, assorted gangsters, pirates, and quite a few politicians, pioneers!"
21. On this same subject, but considered from a highly personal perspective, see B. W. Robinson, "The Burlington House Exhibition of 1931: A Landmark in Islamic Art History," in *Discovering Islamic Art*, ed. Vernoit, 147-55.