Before the 1987 publication of Richard Ettinghausen and Oleg Grabar’s *The Art and Architecture of Islam: 650–1250,* students seeking to forge overarching perspectives of Islamic art relied on the few cursory surveys available, on a mosaic of specialized publications, and on museum installations. These three resources are inextricably entwined: scholars can readily gain access to, study, and publish objects that are already in public collections; their publications influence the collecting market; and private collections are avidly sought by museum curators in repeating and mutually reinforcing cycles. That scholars and curators in Islamic art have sometimes been collectors—even dealers—has further complicated the relationship of scholarship and collecting. The purpose of this paper is to explore the impact of art historical surveys of Islamic art on the museum world by examining one private collection as a case study.

Vividly and conveniently presenting the breadth and variety of the field, surveys of Islamic art inspire the installation and acquisition efforts of every curator charged with presenting a collection of Islamic art to the public. Nevertheless, in the museum world of politics and priorities, where curators must compete for budgets, gallery and storage space, and staffing, inspiration is often at several removes from practice. Additionally, curators rarely have freedom in building the collections they must work with but often inherit assemblages that may be more or less specialized or idiosyncratic, depending on the conditions, motives, and criteria for their creation. For new acquisitions, curators are dependent on access to funds, connections within the art market, and donors.

It is largely due to this last category—donors—that the collection of Islamic art at the Harvard University Art Museums has been assembled. For more than a century, Harvard’s many friends have shown extraordinary generosity. Gifts usually arrive a few at a time, but on occasion a substantial or sustained gift utterly transforms the Museums’ holdings in a particular area. Such is the case with Harvard’s most recent gift of Islamic art, the Norma Jean Calderwood Collection.

Norma Jean Calderwood assembled her collection of more than 150 works of art over a period of three decades, ending in 1997. From the scattered documentation that accompanied the collection, it appears to have been almost entirely purchased from the international art market, occasionally at auction but for the most part from established dealers based in London, Tehran, and Frankfurt. Except for a handful of Iraqi, Indian, and Turkish objects, the collection is entirely Persian. More than half the collection consists of works of art on paper, primarily paintings and text folios detached from manuscripts. There is a sprinkling of lacquer objects and metalwork, but the remaining sixty-three works of art are ceramics.

A work of art in and of itself, a private collection is sometimes the patient accomplishment of a lifetime of study, searching, and negotiation, and sometimes the result of an obsessive focus. It is often created for myriad personal reasons. A curator fortunate enough to acquire a private collection tries to understand how, when, and according to what criteria it was assembled. Because it has come to a university museum, the Calderwood collection will presumably have a formative effect on the training of future historians of Islamic art. Thus it is additionally worthwhile to understand the degree to which this collection was influenced by earlier scholarship, and perhaps even to pinpoint those sources. This paper will ask what publications—specifically what art historical surveys—influenced Norma Jean Calderwood in building her collection, the great achievement of her life.

A number of caveats are necessary. First, Mrs. Calderwood was not able to contribute to this study. The analysis that follows is constructed from a paper trail, and an incomplete one at that. The principal sources for determining the influences on Mrs. Calderwood’s collecting are her personal library of art history books, the texts of her lectures on Islamic art.
and her curriculum vitae. Her thought process remains elusive, as perhaps it should be.

Second, this paper will not be concerned with the authenticity, or even the degree of authenticity, of the works of art in the Calderwood collection. The great majority of objects appear to be authentic, but at least one (fig. 14) failed a recent thermoluminescence test. To quote a fellow curator of Islamic art, “A curator who never makes a mistake is a curator with no imagination,” and the same latitude must be granted to a collector.

Third, emphasizing the survey nature of the Calderwood collection unavoidably distorts its character. While she does appear to have tried to obtain examples representing most of the major developments in Persian ceramics from the ninth through the seventeenth century, Mrs. Calderwood collected in her own particular areas of interest as well, but these areas will not be explored in this paper.

There is no question that Mrs. Calderwood was well acquainted with surveys of Islamic art. The Calderwood collection was assembled by a woman who owned and read surveys, taught from them, and assigned them to her students. Fluent in several languages, she was a voracious and meticulous reader with an unquenchable thirst for knowledge.

Mrs. Calderwood’s career of collecting Islamic art falls into two broad phases, divided somewhat arbitrarily by the first appraisal of her collection in September 1978, but also defined by her concentration on two different media. In the first stage she focused on ceramics, and in the second stage on the arts of the book. This division into two unequal periods of ten and twenty years also roughly coincides with Mrs. Calderwood’s training in Islamic art.

The initial stage of approximately ten years opens with what appears to have been Mrs. Calderwood’s first purchase of Islamic art: in 1968, from a dealer in Tehran, she bought two twelfth-century Persian pottery bowls. By the end of this period, she had acquired at least fifty-seven examples of Islamic ceramics and five works on paper.

These first ten years represent a learning phase for Mrs. Calderwood. In 1967 she began her volunteer efforts at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, studying the collection and soon presenting gallery talks on Islamic and Asian art. In the fall of 1974, she began graduate studies in Islamic art at Harvard University, studying primarily with Oleg Grabar and Stuart Cary Welch, Jr. The energy, devotion, and resources with which Mrs. Calderwood pursued her interest in Islamic art is also reflected in her travels: in these ten years, she traveled four times to Iran and also to Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Yemen, Turkey, Egypt, Afghanistan, and Central Asia.

The second phase of Mrs. Calderwood’s collecting covers nearly twenty years, from the end of 1978 until her last purchase in 1997. By this period, her schooling in Islamic art was almost finished, and her coursework shifted to independent study for her dissertation. With three seminars on Islamic painting and two years of Persian language study behind her, Mrs. Calderwood was pursuing a dissertation topic on illuminated frontispieces in Persian manuscripts. Perhaps inspired by her academic work, or vice-versa, her collecting focus changed dramatically from ceramics to works on paper. During these years, she added more than eighty paintings, drawings, illuminated frontispieces, and text folios, but only five or six pieces of pottery.

Mrs. Calderwood’s accumulated knowledge and experience in the field were also reflected in activities other than collecting. In this second phase, she embarked on a career as a college instructor, teaching Islamic survey courses at Boston College and Simmons College. At the Museum of Fine Arts, she continued giving lecture series in Islamic art, wrote labels for the reinstallation of the Islamic galleries, and assisted with a handbook of the collections. She continued her travels in the Islamic world but increasingly concentrated on her dissertation research, examining Islamic collections in Paris, Berlin, Vienna, Lisbon, and Uppsala. The culmination of many factors, Mrs. Calderwood’s collecting in the second phase reflected her confident and mature understanding of the field.

For the theme of this paper, however, the phase of her collecting that is of most interest is the first, from 1968 to 1978, when Mrs. Calderwood was initially self-taught, and presumably more reliant on or influenced by survey-type publications to formulate her conception of the field. An insatiable and disciplined reader, Mrs. Calderwood avidly acquired art history books. In 2001, her private library of more than two thousand volumes was donated to Boston College; it contains most of the major publications on Islamic art and more specifically on Persian art.

A second issue to consider in the formation of private collections, and of particular significance to the Calderwood collection, is the influence of museum

...
collections. Within their own limitations, museum installations often strive for a survey presentation of the arts of the Islamic world, usually arranging the objects regionally or by medium. Over a period of thirty years, Mrs. Calderwood became familiar with the most important public collections of Islamic art, but for the earlier phase of her collecting, the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston was probably the formative influence.

None of the major surveys of Islamic art available to students and collectors today had been published by 1978, the end of the first phase of Mrs. Calderwood’s collecting. A few earlier publications appear to have had a profound influence on her early acquisitions, although the proof may not appear self-evident. Mrs. Calderwood frequently underlined, annotated, and scribbled in the margins of her books. For the most part, her comments simply outline the text to have a marked resemblance to objects in her own collection; in both cases these appear in publications by Charles K. Wilkinson.

In her copy of Wilkinson’s 1963 exhibition catalogue, *Iranian Ceramics,* Mrs. Calderwood wrote the word “mine” next to the plate reference for a Nishapur bowl of the yellow-staining black variety (fig. 1). Mrs. Calderwood’s note was probably referring to a small bowl she purchased in Tehran in 1973, the only example of this type in the Calderwood collection (fig. 2). Although these two vessels do not closely resemble one other stylistically, both feature stylized birds set amid contour clouds filled with dots and peacock eyes.

In the second notation referring to her own collection, Mrs. Calderwood wrote “NJ” in Wilkinson’s 1973 summary of the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s excavations, *Nishapur: Pottery of the Early Islamic Period.* The initials appear in Wilkinson’s section on black-on-white wares, where he noted that, in the epigraphic wares, the bifurcation of bent tips of the vertical elements is a “feature that appears only in vessels of good quality.” Only one vessel in the Calderwood Collection bears bifurcated bent tips—a small jug with black letters on a white ground, purchased in 1972.

Curiously, Mrs. Calderwood wrote no comments about two bowls illustrated in Wilkinson’s 1963 catalogue that bear a marked resemblance to objects in her own collection. A bowl with a boldly stylized bird in the technique of “superimposed slip-painting” (fig. 3) may have been a favorite of Wilkinson’s, for the bird serves as a decorative leitmotif throughout the catalogue. In 1971—quite early in her collecting career—Mrs. Calderwood purchased a close cousin to this vessel (fig. 4). Two very closely related bowls in the collection of the Museum of Fine Arts may also have strengthened her resolve to purchase.

An object on the market presumably increases in desirability when it has a virtual twin in a major museum collection. Thus Mrs. Calderwood’s decision in 1973 to acquire a beautiful “Sultanabad” bowl with a duck surrounded by petals (fig. 5) may have been influenced by Wilkinson’s illustration of a very similar vessel in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (fig. 6). Wilkinson’s *Nishapur* is the most heavily annotated of Mrs. Calderwood’s books on ceramics. Harboring a great appreciation for Samanid-period pottery, Mrs. Calderwood acquired no fewer than fifteen vessels by the time of the 1978 appraisal. It is surely no coincidence that the Calderwood collection contains examples from each of Wilkinson’s major categories: buff ware with figural designs, color-splashed ware, black-on-white ware, polychrome-on-white ware, and ware with yellow-staining black.

Of the fifteen, seven bear epigraphic decoration, and three represent Wilkinson’s buff wares with animate designs. The three examples of animate buff wares in the Calderwood collection are strikingly similar to illustrations in Wilkinson’s 1963 and 1973 publications. For example, the motif of a square-headed woman raising her right hand and flanked by long-necked birds appears in a bowl in Wilkinson’s *Nishapur* (fig. 7) and in a Calderwood bowl purchased before February 1974 (fig. 8). In both bowls the background is painted in yellow slip; costume details and interstitial motifs are closely related.

For Mrs. Calderwood, Wilkinson’s publications served primarily to establish typologies of Persian ceramics and to illustrate objects she could emulate in her own collecting. The 1973 summary of the Nishapur expeditions, saturated with the kind of technical descriptions that delighted Mrs. Calderwood, undoubtedly inspired her enthusiasm for the Samanid period. But Wilkinson’s publications proved an inadequate guide to the full range of Persian ceramics. His 1963 catalogue covering Iranian ceramics from the eighth millennium B.C. through the Qajar period is copiously illustrated with ninety-nine plates, but for text offers only an eleven-page essay written in tight, dry prose.
Fig. 1. Bowl. (Photo: after Wilkinson, *Iranian Ceramics*, pl. 29)

Fig. 3. Bowl. (Photo: after Wilkinson, *Iranian Ceramics*, pl. 50)

Fig. 4. Bowl. Earthenware with underglaze slip-painted decoration. Sari or Amol, eleventh century. The Norma Jean Calderwood Collection of Islamic Art, 2002.50.64. (Photo: courtesy Arthur M. Sackler Museum, Harvard University Art Museums, ©President and Fellows of Harvard College)

Fig. 6. Bowl with flat rim. (Photo: after Wilkinson, *Iranian Ceramics*, pl. 74)
Fig. 7. Bowl. (Photo: after Wilkinson, *Nishapur*, color pl. 2)

The most influential author for the first phase of Mrs. Calderwood’s collecting was not Charles Wilkinson but his polar opposite in writing style: Arthur Upham Pope, co-author with Phyllis Ackerman of the 1938–39 Survey of Persian Art. Pope’s 218-page chapter on ceramics in the Survey appears to have had a seminal influence on Mrs. Calderwood. To judge from her many marginal notes, she was in no way an uncritical student of Pope and Ackerman’s magnum opus, recognizing the emotional basis of many of their arguments. Her knowledge of ceramics, especially of their technical aspects, was ultimately more sophisticated than that presented in the Survey. Nevertheless, to judge from her collection and from copies of her lectures on Islamic ceramics, she seems to have internalized Pope’s approach and values.

If one were to summarize Pope’s chapter on ceramics and then subtract all categories except those wares on which he lavishes his most extravagant praise, the result would closely correspond to the outlines of Mrs. Calderwood’s ceramics lectures and would also neatly align itself with the backbone of her collection. Although she rarely did so, she could in fact have illustrated her ceramics lectures with objects from her own collection.20

In her lectures on Islamic ceramics, Mrs. Calderwood focused almost exclusively on wares produced in Iran, which she defined as encompassing Mesopotamia and southern Russia. This broad definition allowed her to include ceramic developments traditionally attributed to ninth-century Samarra and to avoid Pope’s tortured attempt to credit Iranian rather than Iraqi potters with the invention of luster painting on ceramics.

Pope’s influence on Mrs. Calderwood did not extend to her paraphrasing his florid language. In the surviving texts of her lectures, she largely eschewed description or formal analysis in favor of historical and technical information. In this, she followed the lead set by Arthur Lane in his classic surveys, Early Islamic Pottery and Later Islamic Pottery. On occasion, she referred to both Lane and Pope by name in her lectures.

Of the two, Pope’s influence on Mrs. Calderwood is more foundational, albeit more subtle. Mrs. Calderwood’s lectures on Islamic ceramics coincided closely with the Survey, not only in their nearly exclusive focus on Iran, but also in the classes of ceramic types illustrated and the importance assigned to them.

Reinforcing the influence of the Survey on Mrs. Calderwood was Pope’s role in the development of the Islamic collection—particularly its ceramics—at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. Relentlessly advancing the cause of Persian art, Pope developed a close relationship with Edward J. Holmes, director of the MFA from 1925 to 1934, and on several occasions lectured at the museum, notably in January 1932 on the topic “Islamic Ceramics.”

In Iran in 1931, Pope purchased more than fifty ceramics for the Museum of Fine Arts, hoping that these objects would be the first installment of a “representative” or “systematic” collection. In his opinion, a comprehensive collection that represented the varied types of Persian pottery as defined by style and technique was more valid and valuable than an assemblage of masterpieces.

Curatorial records at the Museum do not preserve the name of the dealer or dealers from whom Pope acquired individual objects, but an idea of the purchase can be gained from two photographs (figs. 9 and 10), in which many of the vessels are displayed on a table. The accession numbers are handwritten on the photographs. Of the fourteen objects in the Museum of Fine Arts subsequently illustrated in the chapter on ceramics in the Survey, ten had been purchased from Pope himself. After years of pressure, Pope finally convinced the Museum of Fine Arts to join the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania in an archaeological expedition in Rayy, which netted more than 300 pieces of pottery, metalwork, glass, stucco, and coins for the collection.

Comparing Mrs. Calderwood’s collection to the 1939 Survey must not be interpreted as a negative judgment of her collection or lectures, for in both areas she ultimately demonstrated a broader and more current knowledge of the field. The comparison is intended to reveal the influence of surveys, the Survey of Persian Art in particular, on collectors. It is a commonly held opinion in the academic world that no one bothers to read the Survey any more, but that it is still a great source for photographs. To a novice collector, however, Pope and Ackerman’s text may be very seductive, because it presents specific guidelines on the characteristics of a period style and the criteria by which to determine quality. With its comprehensive scope, distinguished contributors, and innumerable scholarly references, the Survey conveys an authority commensurate with its multi-volume, large-folio format. Written in mesmerizing language with moralistic overtones, it continually proclaims the artistic genius of the Per-
Fig. 9. Documentary photograph of Persian ceramics purchased by A. U. Pope for the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1931. (Photo: ©2002 Museum of Fine Arts, Boston)

Fig. 10. Documentary photograph of Persian ceramics purchased by A. U. Pope for the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1931. (Photo: ©2002 Museum of Fine Arts, Boston)
sian peoples, offering assurance to those investing in the field.

The photographs in the Survey are indeed superb and have appeared in many subsequent publications and countless slide lectures. By canonizing certain styles, techniques, aesthetic qualities, and levels of restoration, they have had an enduring influence on the field. Given that Pope was an enterprising and energetic dealer, a question that may be worth exploring in the future is the degree to which the Survey—and more recent surveys as well—drive the art market.

Issues of condition and restoration warrant further attention, in that the photographs in the Survey and Pope’s own activities as a dealer probably influenced Mrs. Calderwood’s attitudes towards the completeness and cosmetic appearance of Persian ceramics. Reflecting what she would have seen in the Survey and in the Museum of Fine Arts, many of the Calderwood Persian ceramics are pieced together from fragments, with areas of plaster fill and over-painting added. Lost parts of the painted design are thus restored or even invented.

The first batch of ceramic vessels that Pope purchased in Iran for the Museum of Fine Arts underwent some degree of restoration at Pope’s behest before they were received at the museum. In a letter to museum director Edward J. Holmes, Pope cheerily noted, “The faience for Boston from Persia has arrived here in Paris, an exceptionally quick delivery from Persia, and is being put in the hands of the repairers tomorrow.” No response from Boston has been preserved.

For two of these ceramic vessels, the Paris repairs were later deemed insufficient, at least for reproduction in the Survey. Pope wrote to the museum asking that in-painting be added to the vessels before photography. Arguing that the retouching would render them more rather than less authentic, Pope asked that cracks be filled in and missing sections of the design restored. Finding the museum unwilling to alter the vessels, Pope negotiated a compromise that allowed him to retouch the photographs. He noted in disappointment, “I am still puzzled why museums the world over do not hesitate to make the most permanent and often somewhat hypothetical restorations and reparations on oil paintings, and at the same time hesitate to put a piece of charcoal or soluble wash on a piece of decorative pottery. There must be some reason, for they all do it.”

Rather than leading a lengthy “Pope’s tour” of the entire Calderwood collection, this paper will focus on only a few of the categories in which the Calderwood vessels relate particularly closely to those favored in the Survey of Persian Art. Nevertheless it is worth taking note of the transcendent qualities Pope attributed to Persian pottery, for they may have inspired Mrs. Calderwood’s initial concentration on this medium.

Pope opened his chapter on ceramics with breathtaking claims for the merits of Persian pottery. Pottery, he asserted, offers “the oldest, most ubiquitous” and “perhaps the most characteristic manifestation of Islamic Persian aesthetic genius.” It is not only “the most comprehensive record of the artistic life of Islamic Persia” but is influential to the development of many other art forms, including carpets, textiles, paintings, and even the beginnings of sculpture. “The character of each epoch as well as the deeper cultural trends that were fashioning Persian life both find expression and record in pottery.” Written in an age that sought to define national characteristics in art, the Survey blends cultural attributes and aesthetic principles in what may have seemed a reliable introduction to the art of an unfamiliar world.

The Persian potters took every advantage of [the natural qualities of clay] without violating the limitations. Their natural, happy, sensitive touch was as apt to the shaping of the body as to the rendering of the gay, free decorations, congruous with its light fragility...The Persians were certainly by temperament particularly disposed to such an art. Their quick wit, active imagination, and lively mental tempo were essentially congenial to the task. In pottery they were expressing themselves as naturally and adequately as a minstrel in song. The supreme achievement in art is always the result of these fortunate coincidences.

In his subheading, “The Qualities of Beauty in Persian Faience,” Pope articulated at length the characteristics that distinguish Persian pottery from other ceramic traditions and the criteria by which to judge quality. Shapes, colors, types of decoration, design, and themes are considered individually and in the aggregate as “The Ensemble of Qualities.” In describing what he considered the finest examples of Persian pottery, Pope frequently evaluated them according to these categories. A light, deft touch and a design that harmonizes with the shape of the vessel are qualities he praised repeatedly. To judge from the objects in her collection, Mrs. Calderwood grasped and applied his principles.
In Pope’s classification, the history of Persian ceramics is divided into three periods. First is the “Early Islamic Period,” “up to roughly, the beginning of the eleventh century.” Second is the “Middle Period,” “comprising the time of the Seljuq and Mongol dynasties.” And the third period is defined as “since the fifteenth century.”

In the section on the Early Period, “a time of imitation and creation,” Pope singled out luster painting as the most important invention. In this and subsequent sections, he lavished upon it some of his most high-flown praise: “Painting in lustre expands the ceramic art into a new dimension and adds what the Persians especially love, a hidden resource unexpectedly revealed. The sudden flashing of golden fire from the sober pattern soured the miraculous and was one form of that intensity with which the Persians infused their lightest art.” The Calderwood collection contains fifteen examples of luster-painted wares.

Pope argued tenaciously for the Persian invention of luster painting on ceramics, and he thus attributed to Iran fourteen vessels of the ninth through eleventh century most of which would now conventionally be ascribed to Iraq. In her own lectures on ceramics, Mrs. Calderwood always included examples of these early luster wares and attributed them to Mesopotamia or Iraq, which, as noted above, she included in the Iranian cultural orbit. The four examples of this type that she acquired for her own collection are, to my knowledge, the only non-Persian ceramics she purchased.

Her tightly composed bowl with a fat-tailed deer (fig. 11) illustrates several of the qualities Pope valued in this ware. The animal is rendered in an ornamental rather than a naturalistic manner, and the composition exudes a decorative momentum. With a subtle regard for symmetry, the figure of the deer largely fills the bowl, and in “an even more significant mark of maturity, the contours of the figure are adapted to the contours of the vessel, the rotund outlines fitting well into the curves of the bowl.”

In an uncanny way, this Calderwood bowl combines features of two bowls that appear one above the other as Plate 578 A and B in the Survey (figs. 12 and 13). The deer in the upper bowl (A) features similarly elongated antlers, a prominent tail, and rounded haunches. The lower bowl (B) incorporates Kufic inscriptions nearly identical to those in the Calderwood bowl. In each of the three bowls, the stylized animal motif is surrounded with contour clouds filled with rows of dots, and the entire composition is ringed with a scalloped rim.

The “Wares of Samarqand (Afrasiyab) and Tashkent (Shash)” command equal attention in the Survey and are touted as “one of the most important classes of Persian pottery.” Lauding the cultural achievements of the Samanid dynasty, Pope noted, “Aside from the literary remains, it is the pottery that gives the most adequate and impressive record of the character and taste of the time; and, so judged, it was admirable, for the pottery is marked by a sobriety and richness, an originality and robustness of pattern, as well as a depth and warmth of colour that make an ensemble which was hardly surpassed by the great ceramic achievements of Kashan and Rayy.”

Pope singled out the epigraphic wares as the finest expression of Samanid ceramics: “But perhaps the most distinguished ornamental feature of the entire series is the splendid Kufic inscriptions which constitute the sole decoration on many pieces…and which…attain a noble and elevated beauty that is relatively rare in any medium…” Mrs. Calderwood acquired seven examples of the powerful epigraphic ceramics, praising them as “…probably the most sophisticated, restrained, and distinguished of all Islamic wares.”

Nearly half of the chapter on ceramics in the Survey is devoted to the Middle Period, “a time of fulfillment and perfection,” covering the late eleventh through the fourteenth century. Pope categorized the wares from this “golden age” by technique and attributed them to production centers according to style.

In Pope’s opinion, the “Carved Polychrome Wares” rated as one of the most important developments of the Middle Period, and constituted “one of the most splendid and imposing of all Persian ceramic styles.” Of the many types of carved polychrome techniques that have survived, Pope considered the “so-called Aghkand” wares “more intellectual, more Persian, and ultimately more interesting” than any others, and ranked them “among the finest wares Persia has produced.” Of the various sgraffiato wares, Mrs. Calderwood mentioned only the Aghkand type in her lectures, showing a slide of a bowl illustrated in the Survey and referring her audience to the MFA’s large bowl with a rooster, then on display. In two lectures, she referred to this type of ware by the term “Aghkand.”

In 1975, Mrs. Calderwood purchased an Aghkand-style plate bearing a crowned horseman (fig. 14), but she acquired examples of no other types of carved...
Fig. 11. Small Bowl. Earthenware with luster decoration. Iraq, ninth or tenth century. The Norma Jean Calderwood Collection of Islamic Art, 2002.50.71. (Photo: courtesy Arthur M. Sackler Museum, Harvard University Art Museums, ©President and Fellows of Harvard College)

Fig. 12. Bowl. (Photo: after Pope and Ackerman, Survey, pl. 578 A)
polychrome ware. Her plate is closely related to a bowl illustrated in the Survey that Pope singled out as “the finest piece of the group,” noting its “poetic and elusive quality” (fig. 15). This “poetic quality” seems to reside largely in a “duality of pattern”:

The foreground figure is placed against a background of scrolling vines that are independent in scale and movement. Both the foreground and the background patterns have a character and individuality of their own, and superficially may seem opposed. In the better pieces there is no merging of contours. At nearly every point of contact the scrolling vines cross the outlines of the major figure at right angles, thus completely dissociating the movements of the two.50

In addition to featuring vines that intersect the main figures at the recommended angle, both vessels also show coiling scribbles, stripes of alternating colors, and colors that bleed beyond the engraved contours. Both vessels are also enveloped in “the mellow golden glow of the lustrous glaze,”51 but, as stated above, the Calderwood plate is of modern manufacture.

The “Monochrome Wares of the Middle Period” found special favor in Pope’s eyes: “These quiet and often subtle monochromes serve to remind us that Persian art had its contemplative and tranquil moments and that brilliance and excitement were only one of its moods.”52 Mrs. Calderwood’s lotus-mouthed ewer with relief decoration on the shoulder (fig. 16) markedly resembles a turquoise ewer illustrated in the Survey (fig. 17) that Pope had sold to the Museum of Fine Arts in 1931. Pope acknowledged both the ubiquity and wide variation in quality of this type of relief ware and singled out the MFA ewer as one of the “few pieces that are outstanding for brilliance or liquid quality of glaze.”53 In comparison, the Calderwood ewer shows finer articulation of shape, better preservation of glaze, and a more elegantly resolved design of confronted animals set against a background scroll.

Pope divided the “Black-Painted Wares,” which constitute “one of the largest, handsomest, and most characteristic types of the time,”54 into painted and carved designs. Mrs. Calderwood pointed out this distinction in a lecture and obtained examples of both types for her collection.55 A small, flat-topped bowl in which the design is carved and scratched through the black slip (fig. 18) bears a close relation to a bowl

Fig. 15. Bowl. (Photo: after Pope and Ackerman, Survey, pl. 610 B)
illustrated in the *Survey* (fig. 19), as well as another that Pope sold to the Museum of Fine Arts in 1931 (fig. 20). All three are examples of the carved technique that Pope labeled “champlevé,” and in their lower halves all exhibit the “very smart striped effect”\(^56\) he considered characteristic of Rayy.

Noting that in Iran a vessel of this shape was colloquially known as “*dakhli*, meaning ‘saving,’” Pope described these examples as alms bowls and believed the form originated in Persia\(^57\). In his view, the utilitarian nature of Persian pottery was key to its enduring quality as an art form and its ability to reflect the culture in which it was produced: “To be in intimate daily contact with the life of the people and in constant practical use is an advantage to any art. Such a dependence gives art sanity and soundness, and brings to bear upon all its inventions the inherent character of the race, its ideals and special genius.”\(^58\)

Mrs. Calderwood, too, celebrated the utilitarian basis of Persian pottery, titling one of her public lectures “Setting the Table” and stating, “The title of today’s lecture...was not at all meant to be facetious. It is very important to remember when examining these wares that they represent something far more than just an exercise in creation. These ceramic objects were all used, many of them on a daily basis, and some few of them were probably used by rulers or...
Fig. 18. Alms Bowl. Fritware with underglaze decoration carved in black slip. Iran, twelfth century. The Norma Jean Calderwood Collection of Islamic Art, 2002.50.86. (Photo: courtesy Arthur M. Sackler Museum, Harvard University Art Museums, ©President and Fellows of Harvard College)

Fig. 19. Alms Bowl. (Photo: after Pope and Ackerman, Survey, pl. 747 B)
Thus, she may have delighted in finding a vessel (fig. 21) quite similar to the “sweet meat dish” illustrated in the Survey (fig. 22), especially since, according to Pope, very few have survived. Both compartmentalized dishes represent Pope’s “transitional style,” which he placed between the “monumental” and “miniature” styles of luster painting that he attributed to Rayy. In this phase, “far more of the white background is exposed, the lustre ornaments being treated almost like jewels.”

As noted earlier, Pope waxed most lyrical about luster painting: “For sheer opulence it is rivaled by no other ware and in the best examples constitutes one of the most brilliant and characteristic expressions of the Persian genius for decoration.” Pope largely followed the earlier work of Richard Ettinghausen, who had defined distinctive styles and phases of luster painting and attributed them to the cities of Rayy and Kashan. Pope further extended the Rayy and Kashan stylistic classification into what he termed “Polychrome Overglaze Painted Ware (So-called Mināʾi Ware).”

In the exhibition labels that Mrs. Calderwood wrote for the reinstallation of the Islamic collection in the Museum of Fine Arts sometime prior to 1982, she employed the Rayy/Kashan distinction for the luster and mināʾi objects. In what may be one of her earliest lectures, she showed at least eight slides of Persian luster ware to illustrate differing styles and qualities, concluding that because of the variety, “there must have been a number of centers.” Describing the Kashan and Rayy styles, she wryly noted that “the finest of these is designated as [being] from Kashan, based on signed and dated tiles and pottery and the honesty of your dealer.” At some later date, undoubtedly due to Oliver Watson’s 1985 publication, Persian Lustre Ware, she revised this lecture, crossing out the paragraphs describing the Kashan and Rayy luster styles. In his influential study, Watson reviewed the evidence for the production of luster ware in multiple sites in Iran and persuasively dismissed all but Kashan. According to him, the varied styles should be viewed not as “separate schools but
Fig. 21. Sweetmeat dish. Fritware with luster decoration. Iran, twelfth or thirteenth century. The Norma Jean Calderwood Collection of Islamic Art, 2002.50.59. (Photo: courtesy Arthur M. Sackler Museum, Harvard University Art Museums, ©President and Fellows of Harvard College)

Fig. 22. Sweetmeat dish. (Photo: after Pope and Ackerman, Survey, pl. 644 C)
as differing traditions that achieve a synthesis.” By 1985, however, Mrs. Calderwood had already acquired twelve of her fifteen luster objects, including all those from the late twelfth to early thirteenth century. Thus the Rayy/Kashan classifications prove useful in evaluating her purchases.

Mrs. Calderwood surely felt the absence in her own collection of an object painted in the “Rayy Monumental Lustre Style,” which, according to Pope, was “one of the noblest in Persian ceramic art.” Happily, however, she was able to acquire several examples of the “Rayy Miniature Lustre Style.” Among these is a beautifully preserved bowl with a radial composition (fig. 23). With its arabesque spokes and cross-hatched pendants emanating from a central daub of luster, and its pseudo-inscriptional rim decoration based on paired ascenders, this bowl closely resembles another one illustrated in the Survey (fig. 24), which in Pope’s estimation was “ingenious” and “brilliant” because of its “radial and concentric systems” that imparted a “structural character” to the design. For Pope, compositions that feature “architectonic divisions of the field” expressed one of the finer characteristics of this style.

The Survey devotes more than thirty pages and fifty photographs to the “Kashan Lustre Style,” which he exalted as “one of the most individual and important creations in Persian ceramics.” The Calderwood collection contains four examples of objects painted in this style, the most impressive being a large scallop-rimmed dish with a courtly couple at the center (fig. 25) that can be fitted into the category of “great plates,” of which Pope offered lengthy examination. Underlying much of this discussion is the famous plate in the Freer Gallery of Art signed by Sayyid Shams al-Din al-Hasani and dated 607 (1210) (fig. 26). Pope attributed to Sava (fig. 30). In 1931, Pope purchased a number of quite similar mīnā’i bowls for the Museum of Fine Arts, including a turquoise bowl (fig. 31).

Beyond simply filling in the gaps, the Calderwood “Sultanabad” bowl with the duck is a superb example of the gray, white, and blue vessels that Pope termed “the most distinctive product of the Sultanabad region.” Her bowl illustrates what he considered to be this ware’s finest qualities: it is made with low-relief modeling; it exhibits rare grace and naturalism in the depiction of an animal; and it bears a pattern beautifully fitted to the shape of the vessel. For Pope, this last feature—the fitting of surface pattern to ceramic form—was the sine qua non of the best Persian pottery, transcending all periods and types of wares. In choosing the pottery in her collection, Mrs. Calderwood also favored decoration harmonizing with the shape of the vessel.

Following the representation of wares in both the Survey of Persian Art and Wilkinson’s catalogue, Iranian Ceramics, the Calderwood collection is rich in ceramics from the ninth through the fourteenth century, but rather spare in “wares from the fifteenth century onward.” For both authors, the later period was largely uncharted.
Fig. 23. Bowl. Fritware with luster painting. Iran, twelfth or thirteenth century. The Norma Jean Calderwood Collection of Islamic Art, 2002.50.103. (Photo: courtesy Arthur M. Sackler Museum, Harvard University Art Museums, ©President and Fellows of Harvard College)

Fig. 24. Bowl. (Photo: after Pope and Ackerman, Survey, pl. 639 A)
Fig. 25. Dish with scalloped rim. Fritware with luster decoration, Kashan, ca. 1210. The Norma Jean Calderwood Collection of Islamic Art, 2002.50.56 (Photo: courtesy Arthur M. Sackler Museum, Harvard University Art Museums, ©President and Fellows of Harvard College)

Fig. 26. Plate. (Photo: after Pope and Ackerman, Survey, pl. 708)
Fig. 27. Bowl. Fritware with overglaze painted and gilt decoration. Iran, twelfth or thirteenth century. The Norma Jean Calderwood Collection of Islamic Art, 2002.50.53. (Photo: courtesy Arthur M. Sackler Museum, Harvard University Art Museums, ©President and Fellows of Harvard College)

Fig. 28. Bowl. (Photo: after Pope and Ackerman, Survey, pl. 657 B)
Fig. 29. Bowl. Fritware with overglaze painted decoration. Iran, twelfth or thirteenth century. The Norma Jean Calderwood Collection of Islamic Art, 2002.50.114. (Photo: courtesy Arthur M. Sackler Museum, Harvard University Art Museums, ©President and Fellows of Harvard College)

Fig. 30. Bowl. (Photo: after Pope and Ackerman, Survey, pl. 697 B)
Arthur Upham Pope’s death in 1969 came only a year after Mrs. Calderwood purchased her first piece of Persian pottery. He nevertheless had a profound influence on the formation of the Calderwood collection through the massive Survey and his energetic efforts to steer the collecting of Persian pottery at the Museum of Fine Arts. In his lifetime, Pope had only negligible influence on the other side of the Charles River. With the arrival of the Calderwood collection at Harvard University, however, his overview of Persian ceramics takes concrete form, for during the decade she concentrated on acquiring pottery, Mrs. Calderwood successfully built a “survey” of Persian ceramics largely in keeping with Pope’s delineation of the field.

With more than sixty years of hindsight, it is easy to criticize the work of Pope and Ackerman. There is surely much dead wood in the Survey—including its racially-tinged, moralistic, and metaphysical overtones, as well as its assertion of many ceramic production sites that more recent scholarship has dismissed. The authors nevertheless deserve our gratitude for gathering scores of high-quality photographs and constructing the basic scaffold of a chronological presentation organized according to technical groups. Indisputably, the Survey and the many works that have reproduced its images and classifications have canonized certain types and qualities of Persian ceramics, privileging some varieties over others. The Persian ceramics in the Calderwood collection allow us to examine at first hand the tangible results of Pope’s influence on the field. Insofar as the Calderwood ceramics embody his approach, they illustrate the value and limitations of a “representative” collection.

Examining the influence of surveys of Islamic art—in the form of both publications and museum collections—offers only a narrow window onto the Norma Jean Calderwood Collection of Islamic Art. With its many superb objects, its broad range, and even its idiosyncratic areas of specialization, the Calderwood collection transcends the influences that helped shape it.
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4. Mrs. Calderwood suffers from Alzheimer’s disease. Her late husband, while more than willing to answer questions, was only minimally involved in her collecting.

5. The lawyers from Choate, Hall, and Stewart charged with the Calderwood estate kindly allowed me access to files that pertained to Mrs. Calderwood’s collection or teaching career. Many typed drafts of her lectures have been preserved, although they are frequently incomplete, undated, and heavily edited. Ten of the surviving lectures treat Islamic ceramics. Only three bear dates: 1976, 1983, and 1994. Most appear to have been prepared for audiences at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. It is of course impossible to know how Mrs. Calderwood might have departed from her prepared texts.

6. Information on when Mrs. Calderwood purchased individual objects in her collection is uneven and sometimes open to interpretation. Appraisals of the collection conducted in 1978, 1992, and 1995 help to chart its growth. Dealer invoices survive for many objects, although it is not always possible to identify the object described. An invoice dated August 1973 from the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston lists ten objects in her collection for which thermoluminescence tests were conducted. There is also a set of snapshots, dated February 1974, of forty-one objects. From this mosaic of sources I have attempted to sketch the evolution of her collecting.
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NOTES


2. This article is an expanded version of a talk presented at “Surveys on Islamic Art and Architecture,” a symposium organized by the Aga Khan Program for Islamic Architecture at Harvard University, May 17–18, 2002. Participants explored the production and impact on universities and museums of comprehensive surveys of Islamic art from the viewpoints of survey authors, publishers, professors, and curators. This article attempts to contribute to the ongoing discussion of Islamic art historiography so ably explored in Stephen Vernoit, ed., *Discovering Islamic Art: Scholars, Collectors, and Collections 1850–1950* (London: I. B. Taurus, 2000), and in the seven papers brought together in Linda Komaroff, ed., “Exhibiting the Middle East,” *Ars Orientalis* 30 (2000), and the Norma Jean Calderwood Collection of Islamic Art was donated to the Arthur M. Sackler Museum, Harvard University Art Museums, by Stanford Calderwood—Norma Jean Calderwood’s husband—in April 2002, just weeks before his death. A tribute to the Calderwoods and a preliminary discussion of the collection can be found in Mary McWilliams, “With Quite Different Eyes: The Norma Jean Calderwood Collection of Islamic Art,” *Apollo* 155, no. 489 (Nov. 2002); 12–16.

4. Mrs. Calderwood suffers from Alzheimer’s disease. Her late husband, while more than willing to answer questions, was only minimally involved in her collecting.

5. The lawyers from Choate, Hall, and Stewart charged with the Calderwood estate kindly allowed me access to files that pertained to Mrs. Calderwood’s collection or teaching career. Many typed drafts of her lectures have been preserved, although they are frequently incomplete, undated, and heavily edited. Ten of the surviving lectures treat Islamic ceramics. Only three bear dates: 1976, 1983, and 1994. Most appear to have been prepared for audiences at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. It is of course impossible to know how Mrs. Calderwood might have departed from her prepared texts.

6. Information on when Mrs. Calderwood purchased individual objects in her collection is uneven and sometimes open to interpretation. Appraisals of the collection conducted in 1978, 1992, and 1995 help to chart its growth. Dealer invoices survive for many objects, although it is not always possible to identify the object described. An invoice dated August 1973 from the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston lists ten objects in her collection for which thermoluminescence tests were conducted. There is also a set of snapshots, dated February 1974, of forty-one objects. From this mosaic of sources I have attempted to sketch the evolution of her collecting.

7. I am grateful to Adean Bregman, Babst Art Librarian, Boston College, for allowing me to examine Mrs. Calderwood’s art history library. Until the cataloguing of Mrs. Calderwood’s books is completed, a more accurate count will not be available.


11. Ibid., p. 93.


17. In her lectures, Mrs. Calderwood often explained in some depth the technical aspects of the different types of pottery.

18. Plate numbers are frequently incorrect, however.


20. The exceptions appear to be a splash-glazed bowl of the type usually described as imitation T’ang ware (2002.50.104), a large bowl from the Samanid period with red and black inscriptions (2002.50.88), a white bowl with pierced decor- ration (2002.50.48), and a bowl with mina’i decoration (prob- ably 2002.50.53). Because she simply wrote the words “mine” or “NJ’s bowl” in the margins of her lectures, it is not al- ways certain to which object she was referring.

21. N. J. Calderwood, in an undated lecture on Islamic ceramics, presumably to an audience at the MFA: “It would be almost impossible to show you all the ceramic wares and all the techniques and all the decoration that appeared in the Islamic world from the ninth century on. I have chosen those that I personally like for the most part. They have been primarily from Iran, but an Iran that stretched over a vast territory and included Mesopotamia and S. Russia, and in- cluded many ceramic centers and many outside influences.” In another undated but seemingly later lecture for the MFA, she included a Fatimid luster bowl and a blue-and-white bowl from Hama but noted, “the ceramics of Iran are considered the high point of Islamic ceramics.” In her survey course for Boston College Mrs. Calderwood added a separate lecture on Iznik ceramics.

22. Arthur Lane, *Early Islamic Pottery* (London: Faber and Faber, 1947) and *Later Islamic Pottery* (London: Faber and Faber, 1957). Mrs. Calderwood’s explanations of pottery techniques borrow from Lane and other authors. Lane’s surveys were assigned reading in her classes on Islamic art at Boston College. Copies of Mrs. Calderwood’s class schedules and
bibliographies are preserved in her files but are unfortunately undated.

23. Files of Directors’ Correspondence, Archives of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, contain six folders filled with letters from Pope to various museum employees covering the period 1921–36. Following Holmes’ retirement from the directorship at the end of 1934, Pope’s influence at the museum waned rapidly.

24. In a letter of October 30, 1931 to Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, then Fellow of Indian, Persian, and Muhammadan Art at the Museum of Fine Arts, Pope defended his recent selection of ceramics as “representative” and “systematic,” using the latter term four times. Directors’ Correspondence, MFA Archives.

25. Publications include Lane, Early Islamic Pottery, and David Talbot Rice, Islamic Art (London: Thames and Hudson, 1965).

26. Directors’ Correspondence, MFA Archives, preserves a telling exchange of six letters between Pope, Holmes, and the registrar D. J. Story (whose initials vary in the correspondence).

27. Letter from A. U. Pope to E. J. Holmes, Nov. 2, 1930. Directors’ Correspondence, MFA Archives, folder 3. Discussing the fragmentary nature of Islamic pottery, Arthur Lane (in Early Islamic Pottery, p. 3.) noted: ‘The art of ‘restoration’ reaches its height on early Islamic pottery; at workshops in Paris missing fragments are replaced by pieces from other vessels or made up in plaster, and the whole so skillfully over-painted as to baffle the most expert eye. Genuine pots are often re-decorated or given fraudulent inscriptions, and in this largely unknown field impossible forgeries have for a time gained credence.”

28. Directors’ Correspondence, MFA Archives, preserves an interesting correspondence between Pope and various members of the Museum staff on the matter of improving the appearance of objects for their publication in the Survey. For example, “If [the requested restorations] could be done, the bowl will be far more beautiful and just as authentic, in a sense, really more so.” (A. U. Pope to H. L. Story, Oct. 22, 1933). Or, “Would it not be possible to touch out the black cracks on the negatives of the white cup and the bird? These cracks are no part of the design, and they spoil the space in which the bird is fluttering. In every way they are a detriment to the piece.” (A. U. Pope to Charles H. Hawes, Dec. 31, 1931).


30. Mrs. Calderwood echoed these claims, albeit with greater restraint: “We have looked at two major elements in Islamic art this afternoon, paintings and ceramics. Both of these techniques were used in architecture. Many of their designs and themes were used in rugs.” From “Introduction to Islamic Art” (undated lecture, ca. 1976).


32. Ibid., p. 1451.

33. Ibid., p. 1459: “It is not, then, the supremacy of any one quality that gives to Persian ceramic arts its pre-eminence, but rather the serene harmony that unites them all into a single expression. This just balance of contour, surface, pattern, and colour is, in the finest pottery, never transgressed, and in the outstanding examples is carried to a perfection that is the goal of art everywhere and a major source of its intensity and conviction.”

34. In less florid language, Mrs. Calderwood noted, “Technical skill in building and later in throwing and turning clay had long been present in Iran, and this technical skill was sometimes matched by the successful arrangement of simple designs to the shapes of vessels.” From “Ceramics” (lecture, 1994).


36. Ibid., pp. 1487–88. Pope’s poetic imagery contrasts dramatically with Wilkinson’s matter-of-fact discussion of Iranian luster painting; “To turn from the monumental to the exquisite, the twelfth century also saw a great flowering of the art of luster painting, which was practiced in both Rayy and Kashan. Although the Iranians cannot be credited with its invention, they developed it to a very high point of artistry, combining it with transparent color to obtain the richest effects…” Wilkinson, Iranian Ceramics, p. 9.

37. According to Stanford Calderwood, an Iznik tile (2002.50.108), the one example of Turkish ceramics in the Calderwood collection, was a gift from a dealer.


39. So uncanny is the resemblance of the three bowls that it may have raised suspicion. Mrs. Calderwood had this bowl and nine others tested for authenticity by thermoluminescence at the MFA, Boston, in Aug. 1973. The test confirmed its ancient manufacture.


41. Ibid., p. 1474.

42. Ibid., p. 1476.

43. N. J. Calderwood (undated lecture on Islamic ceramics, missing title page).

44. The wares as labeled by Pope include: “carved,” “poly-chromed graffito,” “provincial,” “lustre-painted,” “poly-chrome overglaze painted,” “polychrome and gilded relief ornament,” “cobalt with overglaze painting,” “black-painted,” “black champlvé,” “black silhouette figural,” “monochrome,” and “grey and blue underglaze-painted.”

45. Pope recognized the following production sites: Rayy, Kashan, Nishapur, Sava, Sultanabad, Sultaniva, and Tabriz.


47. Ibid., p. 1526.


49. N. J. Calderwood, “Ceramics” (lecture, Feb. 17, 1983; and also in an undated lecture on ceramics, missing its title page): “The variety during the Seljuk period seems endless. Here a magnificent rooster fills the entire bowl. We have a bowl like this on display right now. The background is filled with the arabesque, which we mentioned last week. The decoration is done in the sgraffito technique, which simply means that it has been cut into the surface, which was covered with a white slip. Then paint was added between the lines. The incising would also help keep the paint between the lines. The most obvious prototype is again metalwork. These objects are usually credited to Aghkand, near Tabriz, and are called Aghkand ware.” At some later point, Mrs. Calderwood crossed out the last sentence.


51. Ibid., p. 1528.

52. Ibid., pp. 1618–19.

53. Ibid., p. 1619.

54. Ibid., p. 1608.
55. N. J. Calderwood, “Islamic Pottery or Ceramics” (undated lecture): “This jug is an example of a group of wares in which black pigment was mixed with the slip. The mixture was sometimes applied with a brush or else the entire vessel was covered with the black slip and later the design was carved out leaving a light colored background. Then a turquoise glaze was applied...Here is another bowl of the same turquoise color, but your eye should tell you that the technique is different. Here the black design has been painted on a light-colored background...Then the glaze covered the painted surface.”


57. Ibid., p. 1448.

58. Ibid., p. 1448, and also p. 1447: “One reason why the pottery of Persia is such a comprehensive record of Persian art is that it was so intimately associated with the life of the people, for it functioned in life at every turn in useful ways and as adornment, too, so that it became as indispensable and natural to the Persian people as their garments.”

59. N. J. Calderwood, “Introduction to Islamic Ceramics: Setting the Table” (lecture, 1994).

60. Pope, Survey, p. 1553.

61. Ibid.

62. Ibid., p. 1545.

63. Richard Ettinghausen, “Evidence for the Identification of Kashan Pottery,” Ars Islamica 3 (1936): 44–75. This thesis was followed by Arthur Lane, Early Islamic Pottery, and other writers.

64. Mrs. Calderwood listed the reinstallation on a curriculum vitae dated 1982.


66. For example, “The plump birds who encircle the shoulder have been identified with Kashan and thus help us determine where this style probably originated...The little white spirals in the background are typical of Kashan wares...But if you compare the looser design of this lustre bowl, you find an equally fine lustre but a looser, different technique. The horse and rider fill the interior, and the arabesque lacks the nervous quality of the little hooks and spirals in the Kashan ware. These characteristic features usually indicate that these lustres come from Rayy...” From “Ceramics” (undated lecture).

67. Oliver Watson, Persian Lustre Ware (London: Faber and Faber, 1985).

68. Pope, Survey, p. 1550.

69. Ibid., p. 1555.

70. Ibid., p. 1590.

71. Ibid., p. 1595.

72. Ibid., pp. 1563–65, and pls. 656 B, 657 A, 657 B, and 659 B.

73. Another incentive for Mrs. Calderwood in acquiring the bowl in figure 27 might have been the presence in the Museum of Fine Arts of a beautiful “Rayy mina’i” bowl with a similar enthronement scene (63.1391).

74. Pope, Survey, p. 1596: “The overwhelming prestige of Rayy has for a long time obscured the fact that Kashan also produced polychrome overglaze painted pottery, which, if it did not equal in quantity the products of Rayy, at least competed with it in quality. But if Rayy gradually surrendered to Kashan’s supremacy in the lustre-painted ware, which by the end of the thirteenth century was almost a Kashan monopoly, the charm of the Rayy polychrome painted type, combined perhaps with the pressure for concentration on the lustre painting, resulted finally in the eclipse of the Kashan polychrome style.”

75. Ibid., p. 1641. He also listed Nishapur, Sultaniyah, and Tabriz as ceramic-producing sites in the Middle Period but noted that understanding of their output was still preliminary.

76. Ibid., p. 1655.

77. The Calderwood “Sultanabad” bowl compares very favorably with, for example, the bowl illustrated in Pl. 779 B, which Pope praised as “the outstanding example of this style as practised in the fourteenth century.” Survey, p. 1636.