readily adopted Western architectural styles, continued to commission domed mosques and often decorated them with Classical or Baroque features.

The Mosque of Muhammad 'Ali, which covers over five thousand square meters, is the largest mosque built in the first half of the nineteenth century. The design is often attributed to Yusuf Bishnuq, a Greek from Istanbul, but all that can be said about the architect is that he was somewhat familiar with both Ottoman and contemporary European architectural practice. The general scheme—a square forecourt (35 by 57 meters) preceding a square prayer hall (45 by 45 meters) covered by a central dome and four semi-domes resting on four great supports—repeats that of the Şehzade [175], Ahmed [188], or Fatih [291] mosques in Istanbul, but few if any of the subtleties in the models were understood. For example, the massing and articulation are comparatively crude and uninspired, for the blocklike walls contrast sharply with the rounded forms of the roof, without the mitigation of arched windows and tympana typical of Istanbul mosques. The corner turrets are elongated and fussy versions of Mamliuk makhrura ("incense-burner") minarets, while the 83-meter minarets are themselves unusually attenuated. The marble (or alabaster) revetment on the lower walls has yellowed and pitted, and the structure was poorly engineered. The domes showed cracks by the end of the century and were replaced in the 1930s. Nevertheless, the building is one of the most popular tourist sites in Cairo. The orientalist painter Eugène Fromentin (1820—70) said that it was "barbaric in style, but very luxurious.... The interior is utterly sumptuous."211 On the north-west side of the court is a stubby tower surmounted by a pavilion decorated with Gothic traceried and Moorish arabesques. It houses a clock presented to the sovereign by Louis Philippe in 1846 in exchange for the obelisk erected in the Place de la Concorde in Paris. Muhammad 'Ali's white marble cenotaph lies to the right of the entrance in the west corner of the mosque behind a gilded bronze grille.

The process of Europeanization in Egypt accelerated after Khedive Ismail (r. 1863—79) visited the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1867 and engaged the Egyptian engineer 'Ali Mubarak to transform Cairo into a modern city as Baron Haussmann had transformed Paris.39 The distinctive Mamliuk style was not revived in Egypt until later in the century with the Mosque of al-Rifai (1866—1912). Ordered by the Princess Khaybat, mother of Khedive Ismail, the building was designed by the architect Husayn Pasha Fakhry. It replaced a cairn of the Sufi shaykh al-Rifai (d. 1182) and included the tomb of 'Abdallah al-Ansari, a companion of the Prophet, as well as tombs for the founder and her descendants.24 Work was suspended ca. 1880 for financial reasons and resumed in 1905. Although the planning reflects the strong symmetries of the Beaux-Arts tradition and is quite foreign to any Egyptian style, the decoration, completed under the direction of Max Herz, an Austrian member of the Committee for the Conservation of Monuments of Arab Art, was based on examples taken directly from Cairene buildings, and the minarets are copies of those of the fourteenth-century Mosque of Sultan Hasan opposite.25 It is somewhat ironic that the conservation and preservation of the incomparable heritage of Islamic Cairo were assumed by Europeans, to the exclusion, whether systematic or not, of most Egyptians.26 Egypt, which had relied on Turkish export goods since the Ottoman conquest in 1517, was flooded by European manufactures in the nineteenth century. The French traveler Maxime du Camp commented in 1854 that "Egyptian art is not even in decadence, it simply no longer exists."27 The increased presence of European tourists, particularly after the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869, created a new demand for souvenirs, and local craftsmen were encouraged to recreate the glorious works of the past that tourists could see in the Arab Museum (originally housed in the Mosque of al-Hakim). While passing through Cairo, the Governor-General of India Lord Curzon (1839—1915), for example, ordered a copy of an inlaid bronze lamp (which had been made for Baybars II in 1309) to be given as a gift to the Taj Mahal. The pair of bronze doors of Barquq's madrasa (1384—6) were copied for exhibition at the Street of Cairo at the Midway Plaisance in the Chicago 1893 Columbian Exposition.28 One of the most popular works copied was the octagonal stand made in 1372 by Muhammad b. Sunqur al-Baghdadi for al-Nasir Muhammad, of which some six copies are known.29 European travelers also encouraged the revival of inlaid metalwork in Damascus, where mostly Jewish craftsmen did free interpretations of Mamliuk models. A large brass tray inlaid with silver and copper [391], for example, combines Mamliuk-style arabesques with seven Old Testament scenes rendered in a neo-Ancient Near Eastern style. Such objects are a provocative counterpoint to metalwares of the thirteenth century which were made by Muslims but decorated with specifically Christian scenes, probably for Christian patrons.30 The commercial development of carpet manufacture in

...
Iran was similarly tied to European taste. As early as 1858, Persian carpet manufacturers had begun to alter traditional designs and dimensions to suit a new European demand for their products. Whereas Turkish rugs had been popular in Europe for centuries (see Chapter 16), Persian carpets were hardly known there. The first known enterprise to organize rug manufacture in Persia with foreign capital was the Manchester-based firm of Ziegler. Its initial involvement was limited to importing European cotton to Iran and exporting new and used rugs available on the market to Europe. The most famous antique rugs handled by the firm were the Ardabil carpets, one of which [314] was acquired by the South Kensington Museum in 1853. Ziegler’s need to find a dependable supply to meet the ever-increasing Western demand for carpets led to the establishment of an agency in Sarababad (now Arak) in central Iran between 1877 and 1882. The firm provided weavers with ready-dyed wools and charts of the required designs, which were based on small repeating floral patterns of Persian origin but adapted to the taste and interior spaces of the growing European middle class [316]. Ziegler and Co. were soon joined by a second generation of manufacturers, such as the Oriental Carpet Manufacturers, Nearest Castelli & Brothers, and Persische Tepichgesellschaft AG, who established their own weaving factories for greater quality control. Carpets were produced in standard dimensions of 3 by 5, 4 by 6, 8 by 10, and 9 by 12 feet, and synthetic dyes, which had been developed in Europe in the 1850s, were introduced by the 1870s. Cheaper and easier to apply than natural dyes, these vivid colors were often unstable in light and not colorfast when washed.44

The traditional technique of lustre pottery was also revived in Persia about this time, probably as a result of European interest in the technique and in collecting early examples.45 In addition to collecting antiques, Sir Robert Murdoch Smith patronized contemporary Persian potters, such as ‘Ali Muhammad, a young potter who emigrated from Isfahan to Tehran in 1884.46 Most of ‘Ali Muhammad’s work follows the florid, European-inspired style popular in the nineteenth-century Iran, but several pieces imitate medieval wares [317] and may have been made either to replace damaged or destroyed originals or to deceive. At the request of Murdoch Smith, ‘Ali Muhammad composed a technical treatise describing his working methods, which was published in Edinburgh in 1888 under the title On the Manufacture of Modern Kashan Earthenware Tiles and Vases.47 Curiously, the potter concentrates on underglaze-painted wares and omits any mention of lustre, perhaps to preserve the secret of the technique.

European notions and techniques of fine art were also imported into the Islamic lands. Oil painting on canvas, for example, had been introduced into Iran in the seventeenth century (see Chapter 12), where it continued to enjoy a certain vogue. The most famous practitioner of the technique in Turkey was Osman Hamdi (1842–1910), son of the

Ottoman grand vizier and ambassador Ibrahim Edhem Pasha. In 1857, Hamdi was sent to Paris, where he trained under the academician Gustav Boulanger (1821–88) and the orientalist painter Jean-Leon Gérôme (1824–1904). Returning to Istanbul in 1868, Hamdi served in several official positions, becoming director of the new Imperial Ottoman Museum at the Çini Kiosk in 1861 and founding the Fine Arts Academy in 1883. His works, which he regularly exhibited in Paris, were inspired by European orientalist paintings, and like them were often executed with the aid of photographs. Mihrah [306], one of his best-known works, painted in 1901, shows a beauteous woman in a tight-fitting European-styled dress seated on a table, or folding stand for manuscripts of the Koran, in front of a tiled mihrah. Spread about her feet is a jumble of manuscripts—many of them identified copies of the Koran—on an old rug. The artist’s sympathies clearly lie with the woman, who represents European progress and gazes with contempt at the dusty traditions of Islam and Islamic art, represented by the accoutrements spread about her. The devices of European orientalism, which had been used in Europe to depict a strange and exotic world of escape, have been adopted somewhat paradoxically by the very Orient depicted for a more trenchant social purpose.

At virtually the same time, the frankly European style of building practiced at the Ottoman court by European-trained Armenians was being replaced by an eclectic orientalism brought to Istanbul by Europeans. The German architect A. Jachmund (d. 1927) was either sent or invited to Istanbul in 1890, where he designed the Sirkeci Railroad Terminal for the Orient Express [307]. Its combination of Moorish horseshoe arches, neo-Mamluk striped masonry and rose windows, and Indian chinoiserie perfectly exemplifies the eclectic orientalism of the day. The Ottoman elite enthusiastically received the building as a real and symbolic gateway to Europe and modernity.48 The French architect Alexandre Vallaury, chief instructor at the School of Fine Arts and architect to the imperial palace, designed banks and public buildings in Istanbul in a variety of European and orientalist styles. One of his most important commissions was the Archaeological Museum erected on the grounds of Topkapı Palace between 1891 and 1907. Standing opposite the delicate Çini Kiosk (279), this long U-shaped building in
an austere Neoclassical style was designed to exhibit the extraordinary collection of Graeco-Roman art excavated under European auspices throughout the empire. Vallauri and Jachmuiden, director of the architectural program at the new Civil Service School of Engineers, was able to cultivate a young generation of Turkish architects.

Jachmuiden's students included Kemalmetin (1870–1927), who designed the Fourth Vakif Han in Bâbcheps between 1912 and 1926 [400]. The Vakif Han, an immense seven-story block on an irregular site, was one of seven office buildings designed by Kemalmetin and planned by the Ministry of Public Foundations (Vakif) to generate rental income. The traditional façade of cut stone conceals the steel skeleton that supports the building and the high and narrow central column. Several elements of Ottoman architecture as the carefully controlled fenestration, lead-sheathed domes, tile panels, geometric carving, and rich moldings give an attractive Ottoman guise to a standard turn-of-the-century office block.

Architects followed this first, but rather superficial, national style with one in which inspiration was sought in the traditions of domestic and vernacular building, rather than in the urban and monumental tradition of architecture with which this book has been largely concerned. Instead of looking at Sirrin, they looked at the anonymous wooden houses of Turkey with projecting balconies and, even, projecting eaves, lead-sheathed domes, tile panels, geometric carving, and rich moldings give an attractive Ottoman guise to a standard turn-of-the-century office block.

The basic work on Islamic architecture is Donald M. Wilber, The architecture of Islam from the Bûhabur to the Seljuks, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1966. It contains general essays on architectural style and a catalogue of major monuments in Iran. The notes here will only cite subsequent publications.

3. Most of these framers are discussed in Entisâr and Grabar, Ch. 7, pp. 95–103.


9. The grace itself has been the focus of June Tobin's doctoral dissertation and excavations (in progress by Chatberg Ade, whose work is summarized in a brief article on the site in the Archéologie du Caire, 1974). The flanged tower has been studied by Robert Hillenbrand, "The Spangled Tower Tower at Bâbcheps," in The Archaeology of Islamic Epigraphy, in an eto du monde moderne, ed. E. Chatberg Ade (Paris, 1976), pp. 33–54 and 357–63. Blair (in her note 6 above) has hypothesized that Radistrib's tower also stood behind the qibla wall of his mosque at the Radistrib Bâbcheps.


9. Of some 300 meters above the roof. Compare this to the minarets of Fars, which vary in height from 1 to 3 meters.
11. For example, the minaret was built in 1234 for Sayyid al-Din Ayyub, sep- arately from that of al-Mu'all al-Mustakfi, which was built in 1233. The minaret of Sayyid al-Din Ayyub is described as 254 ft. (77 m), whereas the minaret of al-Mu'all al-Mustakfi is described as 275 ft. (84 m).
12. See Michael Metrock, The Revival of Minaret of the Mamluk Sultan Qaytbay (London, 1988), pp. 122-123. This is the most comprehensive study of the minarets of Cairo and is highly recommended.
21. For example, the made in 1234 for Sayyid al-Din Ayyub, sep- arately from that of al-Mu'all al-Mustakfi, which was built in 1233. The minaret of Sayyid al-Din Ayyub is described as 254 ft. (77 m), whereas the minaret of al-Mu'all al-Mustakfi is described as 275 ft. (84 m).
23. For example, the made in 1234 for Sayyid al-Din Ayyub, sep- arately from that of al-Mu'all al-Mustakfi, which was built in 1233. The minaret of Sayyid al-Din Ayyub is described as 254 ft. (77 m), whereas the minaret of al-Mu'all al-Mustakfi is described as 275 ft. (84 m).
29. For example, the made in 1234 for Sayyid al-Din Ayyub, sep- arately from that of al-Mu'all al-Mustakfi, which was built in 1233. The minaret of Sayyid al-Din Ayyub is described as 254 ft. (77 m), whereas the minaret of al-Mu'all al-Mustakfi is described as 275 ft. (84 m).
38. For example, the made in 1234 for Sayyid al-Din Ayyub, sep- arately from that of al-Mu'all al-Mustakfi, which was built in 1233. The minaret of Sayyid al-Din Ayyub is described as 254 ft. (77 m), whereas the minaret of al-Mu'all al-Mustakfi is described as 275 ft. (84 m).
42. For example, the made in 1234 for Sayyid al-Din Ayyub, sep- arately from that of al-Mu'all al-Mustakfi, which was built in 1233. The minaret of Sayyid al-Din Ayyub is described as 254 ft. (77 m), whereas the minaret of al-Mu'all al-Mustakfi is described as 275 ft. (84 m).
46. For example, the made in 1234 for Sayyid al-Din Ayyub, sep- arately from that of al-Mu'all al-Mustakfi, which was built in 1233. The minaret of Sayyid al-Din Ayyub is described as 254 ft. (77 m), whereas the minaret of al-Mu'all al-Mustakfi is described as 275 ft. (84 m).
50. For example, the made in 1234 for Sayyid al-Din Ayyub, sep- arately from that of al-Mu'all al-Mustakfi, which was built in 1233. The minaret of Sayyid al-Din Ayyub is described as 254 ft. (77 m), whereas the minaret of al-Mu'all al-Mustakfi is described as 275 ft. (84 m).
Chapter 12: The Art of India Under the Safavids and Zandis

1. For the Safavids, see Roger Savory, Iran under the Safavids (Cambridge, 1968), and The Art of Islam in Iran: The Safavid Period, cd. Peter Jackson and Lawrence Lockhart (Cambridge, 1968).

2. Three illustrated folios were detached from the manuscript in Istanbul (Topkapi Palace Library, MS. Or. 5227, fols. 64a-66a; or. 5229, fols. 16v-18v), and by Pisal Mahdavi. The first manuscript is the Khoosheh illustrated in Mofid’s Shahnameh (Istanbul, Topkapi Palace Library, MS. 5113, fols. 48v-50v), and the second manuscript is the Khoosheh illustrated in Nourizad’s Shahnameh (Istanbul, Topkapi Palace Library, MS. 5117, fols. 25v-26v). The illustrated manuscripts are in the possession of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.


4. Figures 1 and 2 illustrate the incomplete text of the Zand manuscript, and the entire manuscript is in the British Library, London.

5. For the Safavids, see Roger Savory, Iran under the Safavids (Cambridge, 1968), and The Art of Islam in Iran: The Safavid Period, cd. Peter Jackson and Lawrence Lockhart (Cambridge, 1968).

6. Two illustrated folios were detached from the manuscript in Istanbul (Topkapi Palace Library, MS. Or. 5227, fols. 64a-66a; or. 5229, fols. 16v-18v), and by Pisal Mahdavi. The first manuscript is the Khoosheh illustrated in Mofid’s Shahnameh (Istanbul, Topkapi Palace Library, MS. 5113, fols. 48v-50v), and the second manuscript is the Khoosheh illustrated in Nourizad’s Shahnameh (Istanbul, Topkapi Palace Library, MS. 5117, fols. 25v-26v). The illustrated manuscripts are in the possession of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
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10. Two illustrated folios were detached from the manuscript in Istanbul (Topkapi Palace Library, MS. Or. 5227, fols. 64a-66a; or. 5229, fols. 16v-18v), and by Pisal Mahdavi. The first manuscript is the Khoosheh illustrated in Mofid’s Shahnameh (Istanbul, Topkapi Palace Library, MS. 5113, fols. 48v-50v), and the second manuscript is the Khoosheh illustrated in Nourizad’s Shahnameh (Istanbul, Topkapi Palace Library, MS. 5117, fols. 25v-26v). The illustrated manuscripts are in the possession of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.


12. Figures 1 and 2 illustrate the incomplete text of the Zand manuscript, and the entire manuscript is in the British Library, London.

13. For the Safavids, see Roger Savory, Iran under the Safavids (Cambridge, 1968), and The Art of Islam in Iran: The Safavid Period, cd. Peter Jackson and Lawrence Lockhart (Cambridge, 1968).

14. Two illustrated folios were detached from the manuscript in Istanbul (Topkapi Palace Library, MS. Or. 5227, fols. 64a-66a; or. 5229, fols. 16v-18v), and by Pisal Mahdavi. The first manuscript is the Khoosheh illustrated in Mofid’s Shahnameh (Istanbul, Topkapi Palace Library, MS. 5113, fols. 48v-50v), and the second manuscript is the Khoosheh illustrated in Nourizad’s Shahnameh (Istanbul, Topkapi Palace Library, MS. 5117, fols. 25v-26v). The illustrated manuscripts are in the possession of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.


16. Figures 1 and 2 illustrate the incomplete text of the Zand manuscript, and the entire manuscript is in the British Library, London.

17. For the Safavids, see Roger Savory, Iran under the Safavids (Cambridge, 1968), and The Art of Islam in Iran: The Safavid Period, cd. Peter Jackson and Lawrence Lockhart (Cambridge, 1968).

18. Two illustrated folios were detached from the manuscript in Istanbul (Topkapi Palace Library, MS. Or. 5227, fols. 64a-66a; or. 5229, fols. 16v-18v), and by Pisal Mahdavi. The first manuscript is the Khoosheh illustrated in Mofid’s Shahnameh (Istanbul, Topkapi Palace Library, MS. 5113, fols. 48v-50v), and the second manuscript is the Khoosheh illustrated in Nourizad’s Shahnameh (Istanbul, Topkapi Palace Library, MS. 5117, fols. 25v-26v). The illustrated manuscripts are in the possession of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.


20. Figures 1 and 2 illustrate the incomplete text of the Zand manuscript, and the entire manuscript is in the British Library, London.
CHAPTER 15: ARCHITECTURE AND THE ARTS IN CENTRAL ASIA UNDER THE UZBEKS

The Uzbek sultans, sometimes called the Neo-Khwarizm, after the seven-sea Khan who took Khwarizm from the Tatars in 1449 and whose grandson, Al-Nasir Muhammad ibn Al-Abd al-Malik ibn (615-707) conquered Transoxiana from the last Tatars in 1500.

They are also called the Jontaks, after the founder of the Jontak in Transoxiana, and the oldest artistic origin in the town of the Khvoristan (Torchak) on the Volga. For the preferred term in Jontak, see the Jontakib, Salarzay, and Salarzai of the Central Asian Journal (4) 1983 64-84.

The best known in the political system of the period was the Uzbek sultan Micah Sheibani (615-707) who became the greatest of all the Uzbeks. He took Khwarizm from the Tatars in 1449 and whose grandson, Al-Nasir Muhammad ibn Al-Abd al-Malik ibn (615-707) conquered Transoxiana from the last Tatars in 1500.
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