Much has been written about the effects of imperially driven institutional factors on the emerging field of Islamic art in the late nineteenth century, as well as on pioneers in the discipline such as Osman Hamdi Bey (1842–1910), Gaston Migeon (1861–1930), Émile Molinier (1857–1906), Friedrich Sarre (1865–1945), and others. Nevertheless, it is important to reiterate the role played by the amateur collectors and collector-dealers who first initiated the circulation of many objects. The establishment of a market for “Islamic” objects, achieved primarily by these collector-dealers, preceded their public display in exhibitions and museums, let alone any controversy about their rightful place, patrimonial or otherwise. This paper revisits the inception of the field of Islamic art through the lens of a late nineteenth-century Ottoman collector-dealer named Hakky-Bey, who was part of an often intriguing global network of individuals involved in the field’s rather unsystematic, idiosyncratic making. I argue that this formative era left an indelible mark on the discursive nature of the field of Islamic art, despite its growth and reformulation at later points in time.

There are a few scattered references to Hakky-Bey in French journals from the turn of the century that even in their scarcity are indicative of his significant role as a collector in the art market. Two publications merit especially close analysis for what they reveal about his professional identity: a short-lived bilingual journal in French and Ottoman Turkish titled Le Miroir de l’Art Musulman (Mirror of Muslim Art) and Mîrʾāt-i ṣanāyiʾ-ı îslâmiye (Mirror of the Arts of Islam), and an auction catalogue recording Hakky-Bey’s collection of predominantly Islamic objects, which was originally quite substantial (fig. 1). In these two sources, Hakky-Bey reveals his cosmopolitan worldview as he describes a global network of scholarly and often self-taught collaborators, and takes a remarkably erudite stand against the orientalizing approach to non-Western objects among his European counterparts. The haphazard path that led to his becoming a collector-dealer directs us to various factors—from linguistic and epigraphic studies to unofficial archaeological excavations—that affected the formation of the field. In Le Miroir, Hakky-Bey prided himself on his participation in the archaeological digs through which he validated the provenance of the excavated material. He played the connoisseur in making attributions based on his epigraphic and numismatic knowledge, and also described and classified artifacts. Throughout the second half of the nineteenth century, Hakky-Bey seems to have honed all these necessary skills and thus turned himself into the most prominent Ottoman collector-dealer of Islamic objects. And he chose to coordinate the international circulation of objects from Paris, at that time the main hub for collectors.

This article aims to graft the new discursive vocabulary of an emerging field onto the fragmentary but informative chronology of Hakky-Bey’s “documentary” appearances between circa 1881 and 1906. Using his journal, I will interpret his burgeoning career as a collector-dealer in relation to the gradual establishment of the arts of the Islamic world as an academic discipline and the earliest discourses about collections and exhibitions, which conceptually grappled with the field’s grow-
ing content and shifting categories. The annotated auction catalogue of his vast collection from 1906 exemplifies how objects were described and valued within the framework of the market and how that language vastly differed from that of the quasi-scholarly field that Hakky-Bey and others generated to support it. The catalogue also serves as a text that marks the very moment of dispersal among a new crop of collectors, a process reflective of shifts in the market generated by socio-political factors. Ultimately, however, this article is about a rather atypical individual’s scholarly endeavors set against the background of the centrally driven project of empires, and how each affected the other. It is also an exploration of Hakky-Bey’s personal desire as the first Ottoman collector-dealer of the era to extend beyond the urban intellectual sphere of Istanbul. Though he was not alone in this regard—along with others he formed a web of personal and professional connections—the scope of his ambition distinguished him from his peers.

The journal he created particularly reflects his ambition, which was driven fundamentally by the historical context of his time. Crafted by a quintessential Ottoman intellectual of the Tanzimat era of bureaucratic institutional reforms (1839–76), the journal portrays a collector who was also politically engaged. At different points throughout the text, Hakky-Bey appears to be grappling with the new and thorny notions of patrimony (vatan), patriotism (hamiyetperver), and nationhood (milliyet), while negotiating the specifically Ottoman terms for a more all-encompassing, universalistic Muslim religion.

Fig. 1. The French and Ottoman-Turkish covers of Hakky-Bey’s journal Le Miroir de l’Art Musulman / Mirʾāt-ı ṣanāyiʿ-ı islāmiye, March and April, 1898. (Photo: courtesy of the Fine Arts Library, Harvard University)
He brings these concepts and constructs to bear on his historical accounts of selected works of art from his collection.

Hakky-Bey’s approach to the field was not driven solely by the marketability of his collection, but also aimed at framing a cogent internal coherence for his objects under the rubric of “Muslimness” (though a very complex one that was not limited to the spiritual parameters of a shared religion). Artifacts were thus endowed with a specific and resonant historicity. He propounded a religious identity aware of its heritage in crafts. The considerable level of historical didacticism seen in the collector’s discourse is all the more surprising when Hakky-Bey deliberately intertwines it with the rhetoric of an Ottoman coming to terms with the changing political climate of his empire. He comes across, then, as a cosmopolitan figure inclined to embrace the universalizing idea of his empire as the rightful protector of all Sunni Muslims, even as this notion became part and parcel of the dynastic proto-nationalism, or “Ottoman-ness,” emerging at the time. This manifested itself aesthetically through the imperial-bureaucratic trilingual book project *Uṣūl-ı Miʿmārī-i ʿOs̱mānī*; prepared for the 1873 World’s Fair in Vienna, this work formulated a theory of Ottoman architecture through a historicizing analysis of its monuments. Hakky-Bey’s social and aesthetic spheres of influence collided in the production of his own art historical narrative, which at the same time reflected the desire to create a grand narrative of Islamic art, although it had to be articulated using the newly adopted vocabulary of the post-Tanzimat Ottoman political consciousness. Therefore, like many other peripatetic Ottomans of his ilk, he complicates today’s facile understanding of a nineteenth-century Ottoman intellectual in exile as a comfortably uprooted, placeless, and affluent individual disinterested in the socio-historical moment that precipitated his deracination.

**POLITICAL RENEGADE, RELUCTANT COLLECTOR**

In the latter half of the nineteenth century, a collector in Paris was at once an amateur, a hobbyist, and an enthusiast, with an addiction to objects that was described in the *Grand dictionnaire universel du XIXe siècle* as “une manie dont on ne se débarrasse pas facilement et qui s’attache à ses victimes comme une robe de Nessus” (a mania which one cannot get rid of easily and which attaches itself to her victims like a robe of Nessus). He could amass items merely for pleasure and status, or combine social distinction with a desire to profit from the objects’ material value. He might also choose to classify, write, and ruminate on his collectibles, rather than leaving them to gather dust in the cramped interiors of his cabinets until they could be liquidated to pay off gambling debts. Collecting could also become a real-time occupation—buying, selling, re-buying, and reselling inherently coherent groups of items to enhance their market value or even pioneer a market for them. This meant that the late nineteenth-century collector, unlike his more genteel, aristocratic predecessors, had an ability to define and financially benefit from shifting tastes; he could deal and profit from the all-consuming collector’s affliction (the mythological robe de Nessus). Francis Haskell describes this moment of divergence as “when the art historian-dealer takes over from the artist-dealer as the arbiter of taste.” Hakky-Bey’s collecting venture was a part of that very moment when a relatively more private antiquarian mania for “things” turned public.

The best collector-dealer of the late nineteenth century was also often a connoisseur of specific categories of things, a specialist not only of more traditional object-categories like gems, medallions, and stamps, but also of objects with epigraphic details such as coins, seals, and manuscripts, which motivated a different kind of connoisseurial rigor. He could shut himself up in one of the rooms at the Bibliothèque nationale de France to study and assess his collection of ancient coins by consulting the relatively newly formed catalogues of the library, thereby cultivating his knowledge. He could thus measure the singularity, and hence, value of his coinage with those in the collections of institutions. Richard Ettinghausen’s historiographic essay titled “Islamic Art and Archaeology” details the eighteenth-century antiquarian interest in Kufic coins that jumpstarted a more object-centered approach to the field, as opposed to the linguistic methodology that had prevailed until then. (Note, for example, one of the earliest sections of Hakky-Bey’s journal, where he tells his readers about how he
channeled his childhood curiosity towards Arabic, Persian and Turkic inscriptions, whether in Kufic or a variety of other old scripts, to become a skillful epigraphist, largely of coins.) In fact, from Larousse’s *Grand dictionnaire universel* we become aware that the first collectors were fanatics for medallions. The enthusiasm of these savants would eventually be reflected in the collections of the Bibliothèque nationale de France, a point made by Ettinghausen and later stressed by Michael Rogers and Stephen Vernoit. During these antiquarian fine-tunings, however, our collector would consciously conceal his amateur status, along with its more glamorous and seedier connotations.

Collecting in the late nineteenth century was, therefore, an interesting venture for lesser-known categories of objects, often initiated and advanced by amateur connoisseurs with a bit of business savvy. Sometimes these collectors played the part of archaeologists, who created disciplines out of the study of the fragments that they uncovered; at other times they acted as couriers who helped to circulate objects along the Mediterranean, from the Near and Middle East to metropolitan centers such as Paris and London, and across the Atlantic to New York, which not only housed museums interested in increasing their “oriental” holdings but also contained a burgeoning community of private buyers.

In fact, the variety and abundance of names of individuals from the East—such as a Moussa Effendi Freige of Beirut from 1896, who operated through a European agent named Morel, or more obscure contemporary individuals such as “Kouchakji” (lit. “smuggler”) and “Monsieur Kateb,” who appear in the minutes of purchases of Paris’s public museums, now among the holdings of the Archives nationales—are suggestive not only of the sudden surge in the appeal of these objects but also of the casual and often private selling practices of their owners, intermediaries, and agents. Furthermore, there are folders upon folders listing the names and titles of a variety of individuals, from consuls to young adventurers, involved in France’s *missions scientifiques*, as well as otherwise unrecorded archaeological sites in the East that yielded artifacts like the famous “Winged Victory of Samothrace,” which the French navy delivered in multiple shipments to the Musée du Louvre before the Ottomans began to curb foreign excavations. However, the acquisition of antiquities was not only a European endeavor. Safvet Paşa, a one-time minister of education, as well as E. Goold and Anton Déthier, the two directors of the Ottoman Imperial Museum preceding Osman Hamdi, also engaged a network of mostly non-Muslim agents in the Ottoman provinces to collect and dispatch antiquities to enrich the inventories of the museum. According to Wendy Shaw, these agents often deliberated with governors from even the far reaches of the Ottoman domains, who willingly partook in the process of collection. She also underlines the resulting province-based organizational principle in the curation of the museum from the 1870s onwards. The collector-dealers found their place within such networks, carving out a versatile if often shady engagement with the artifacts. Most of the objects were probably sent to the Imperial Museum, but it would be safe to assume that these agents and governors also sold some items to individual dealers in back-room deals. In other words, there were always objects and people that fell outside the official circles of exchange. Islamic artifacts trickled onto the market as a sideline to the more obvious and fervent interest in and circulation of Egyptian and Greco-Roman objects—a result of the practicalities of a shared geography of the objects offered up to and sought by collectors and museums. The market for certain objects often depended on their relative abundance or scarcity. Vernoit indicates that around the 1890s the taste for all things Japanese seemed to have died out when the supply of such objects decreased. Those collectors then shifted their interest from the Far East to the Middle and Near East—hence the emergence of “Islamic” as a collector’s category.

As an erudite Ottoman jack-of-all-trades, Hakky-Bey was one privileged figure among many who happened to participate in a multitude of ways in the circulation of objects from his familiar geographies. I emphasize here his heritage, because he is, so far, the earliest-known Ottoman amateur to have made a scholarly contribution to the emerging field of Islamic art. Analogous to the project crafted by the authors of the *Uṣūl*, Hakky-Bey’s attempt at formulating a discourse laced with patrimonial undertones counters the still persistent assumption that nineteenth-century scholars from the Near and Middle East were indifferent to their cultural
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heritage, only to be later enlightened by their European counterparts.20

Presumably Hakky-Bey did not keep a bureaucratic post for a long period of time and, therefore, was not incorporated into the Ottoman biographical registers of the nineteenth century. As a result, information about his early life is regrettably sparse, but he seems to have spent it in Istanbul. However, in an unusual footnote in the Ottoman-Turkish section of the second issue of his journal (referring to a faceted ceramic pitcher with a coral-encrusted silver spout from his collection), Hakky-Bey recalls his earlier language and literary studies with Hoca Mecid Efendi (date of death unknown), an Ottoman bibliophile from Amasya. In a study circle under Hoca Mecid Efendi, Hakky-Bey recalls his earlier language and literary studies with Hoca Mecid Efendi (date of death unknown), an Ottoman bibliophile from Amasya. In a study circle under Hoca Mecid Efendi, Hakky-Bey closely read the requisite Maqāmāt of al-Hariri in order to learn Arabic and the Rubaʾ’īyyat of Omar Khayyam to improve his Persian:

My teacher of virtuous nature, his Excellency, the late Hoca Mecid Efendi, was given the name “walking library” by the late Âli Paşa, out of respect for his authority in theological knowledge. One day, while I was in the study circle of the above-mentioned virtuous one, he, by deviating from the scope of our class and introducing a Persian couplet on the sounds of pitchers and cups, uttered the following story. According to him [Hoca Mecid Efendi], Omar Khayyam asked Hakim-i Hindi a question as to which sound was the most pleasant, in this manner:

Omar Khayyam’s question [from here the conversation is provided by Hakky-Bey in Persian]: “Hakim-i Hindi, which one of these makes a more pleasant sound?” Hakim-i Hindi’s answer: “The following four sounds please me the most: [The sound of] ṣeb-ṣeb when kissed on the lips, [the sound of] ġul-ġul of a cup and pitcher, [the sound of] cız-bız of kebab on a skewer, and [the sound of] his-his of a belt on trousers.”

Hoca Mecid Efendi was a private tutor of Arabic and Persian. His clientele comprised the sons and daughters (mahādim-i kibār) of wealthy Istanbul bureaucrats of the early nineteenth century, among them the famous lexicographer Hatice Nakiyye Hanım (1846–99), who would later become a member of the Assembly of Public Education.22 However, the footnote cited above from Hakky-Bey’s journal is also telling for what it reveals about Âli Paşa (1815–71), a better-known and controversial statesman of the post-Tanzimat era (who became the primary target of younger intellectuals such as Namik Kemal and his reformist group, the Young Ottomans [Yeni Osmanlılar]). Âli Paşa seems to have been well enough acquainted with Hakky-Bey to share with him the affectionate and respectful attribute he had coined for their learned tutor—a “walking library.”23 In fact, in 1867 Hoca Mecid Efenci was part of the small and intimate delegation that accompanied the vizier when he visited Crete to implement administrative reforms and curb the vehement Russian interest lobbying for the island’s autonomy. Âli Paşa also converted the Magazine of Antiquities in Istanbul into the Imperial Museum. Safvet Pasha, a member of the vizier’s political circle, initiated contact with local governors to have them gather up antiquities to be sent to the expanding institution. In the revealing comment quoted above, which he makes only in Ottoman, Hakky-Bey indicates his place among the intellectual and bureaucratic milieu of Istanbul in the earlier half of the century. His training as a well-educated Ottoman in the upper echelons of the urban environment put him in proximity to the most important scholarly and administrative personages of the time. In this footnote Hakky-Bey also showcases his linguistic prowess in both Arabic and Persian as he effortlessly moves from one language to another; his readership would be expected to know these two texts, and to be attuned to intricate plays on words and sounds. His expertise in languages, together with the epigraphic skill on display throughout the rest of the journals, strongly implies his involvement in the Ottoman Translation Office established in 1821, of which Âli Paşa was an early product.24

The Ottoman Translation Office was one of the first institutions established to create a more worldly approach to foreign relations during the Tanzimat era. It was conceptualized as a diplomatic agency that would enable closer engagement with the empire’s provinces and bolster diplomatic relations with Western Europe.25 At first young bureaucrats with proven language skills were chosen primarily to exert tighter control over the empire’s dwindling territories in the Balkans. However, the office also employed bureaucrats with in-depth knowledge of Arabic and Persian. A brief stint in this institution may have brought Hakky-Bey into contact with foreign diplomatic circles. His work at the Ottoman Translation Office may also have brought him to Paris,
where he subsequently settled. Or he could have been one of the many administrators in the new institutions established under the supervision of Āli Paşa’s circle who were later fired by Sultan Abdülaziz’s new vizier, Mahmut Nedim Paşa, after the sultan’s death in 1871. Radical political displacements such as this, not unfamiliar in the nineteenth-century Ottoman bureaucracy, often provoked the anti-government allegiances that defined Hakky Bey’s political leanings after relocating to Paris. In an attempt both to excuse his grammatical mistakes and apologize for his literary rustiness in finding the right phrases for the Ottoman section of his journal, he blames not just the onset of old age (ibtidā-i herim) but also his lengthy estrangement from his homeland, which led to his forgetting (nisyân) the literary skills he had acquired during childhood. Here he also alludes to the deep heartache he felt as a result of his sorrowful absence from his beloved country (âlam-ı ġurbet ile dil-āzâr). This corroborates the possibility of a forced or self-imposed exile due to political disagreements.26

He kept up with the latest French and Ottoman journals and his flexible occupation afforded him the freedom to travel, allowing him to form a vast social network. In this way Hakky-Bey became acquainted with the Young Turks, most likely through their European contacts in Paris, Geneva, and London. In his Young Turks in Opposition, Şükrü Hanoğlu speaks of an aged Hakky-Bey as “one of the first and probably best examples among individuals, who fled to Europe without any organizational affiliation and who then joined the Young Turk Revolution.”27

Among the private papers of the German archaeological conservator and one-time curator of the Louvre, Wilhelm Fröhner (1834–1925), are two letters from Hakky-Bey that were penned exactly twenty years apart, the first and longer one dated June 9, 1881, and the second from February 8, 1901.28 These letters reveal two crucial turning points in Hakky-Bey’s life in Paris: while one signals his reluctant entry into the world of the sale of antiques, the other points to the professional success he eventually enjoyed during his quarter of a century in exile. The letter from 1881 also confirms that the Hakky-Bey with Young Turk leanings whom Hanoğlu mentions is, in fact, our very collector-dealer. Addressed to Henry Hoffmann, a collector from Cologne and Fröhner’s close friend and business associate, the letter from 1881 describes one of Hakky-Bey’s first private sales and exposes his strikingly diffident entry into the antiques business. He seems to have written it to defend his honor after a dispute in which Hoffman had called him a liar. Hakky-Bey had acted as a commissioner in introducing Hoffmann to a merchant (in this case unidentified, but recommended to Hakky by a close acquaintance). Hoffmann was under the impression that the commissioner had broken the ethical code of conduct and was two-timing his clients by taking the merchant and his goods to other interested buyers. Ever wearing his heart on his sleeve, in his letter Hakky pleads, “If there is one thing in this world that I look to most it is to preserve my honor.”29 He maintains that if the merchant had been looking for other potential buyers, he was certainly acting alone, and that he would find out their names from the merchant and immediately procure their signatures to prove that he had not been present during those transactions. In French that is ardent if not grammatically correct, Hakky underlines his continual pursuit of an honorable life and stresses how he relinquished his chosen profession (as a relatively high-ranking government official) for his true passion (his nation) as soon as he arrived in Paris:

Monsieur, I am not an antiquarian [misspelled in the letter as “antiquitaire”]. Before coming to Paris, I was an official in the Ottoman government, and most recently the secretary of the former khedive of Egypt, Ismail Pasha. For the love of my Ottoman nation, I left my office with the former khedive to publish a journal in Turkish, and in the present returning to my country has become impossible because I have been writing against the current policy of the Ottoman government, as well as the Sultan, and now I am condemned to death if I return to Turkey.30

We also learn how a member of the Ottoman scribal community, one who was surely among the finest bureaucratic letter writers of the nineteenth century to have been recruited to the post of secretary of the khedive, could reinvent himself in Paris as a connoisseur [again misspelled as “connaissaire”] of the Turkish, Persian, and Arabic languages. To make it in the business of Islamic objects, he had to play the part of an orientalist-epigraphist:
Until now, no one has known me as a liar, but the world has sought me out in Paris as the connoisseur of the Turkish, Arabic, and Persian languages to explain to them the meaning of their objects, which they wanted to better understand and appreciate.31 Fröhner, who was also a foreign collector-dealer in the Parisian art market, could be considered a professional predecessor to Hakky. Finding himself without an institutional affiliation after the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, he turned himself into a connoisseur of epigraphy, and made a living by writing auction catalogues for wealthier friends and patrons like Hoffmann.32 In the meantime, to improve his skills in ancient Greek and heighten the aesthetic allure for miniature artifacts, he put together a collection of small antique objects the majority of which were inscribed.33 Unsurprisingly, among the eclectic mix of collectors that satisfied Fröhner’s particular penchant for miniature figural objects were a number of Ottomans, as well as European residents of Istanbul. We come across Fenerly Pacha (Fenerli Paşa), listed as a military doctor from Constantinople; Osman-Noury (Osman Nuri), a collector who had his collection sold in 1905; Van Branteghem, a Belgian resident of Constantinople with substantial terracotta and vase collections; and Stanislaw Chlebowsky, the renowned Polish painter, who had stayed in Constantinople as Sultan Abdulaziz’s court painter.34 In fact, immediately after his departure, Ottoman officials realized that Chlebowsky had made off with some valuable objects, such as a book of poems of Sultan Süleyman (Ṣulṭān Süleymān hān-i evveli bir eṣer-i manẓūmları) and a very old Koran (ġāyet kadīm bir muṣhaf-i şerīf). He was later caught selling them in Paris to someone called “Didu.”35

Well into the late nineteenth century, whoever had easy access to the cornucopia of Near Eastern artifacts dabbled in the trade, and it was through well-connected figures such as Fröhner that these items found their way into the European sellers’ markets. These individuals generally tended to retain their day jobs, usually as government officials. Thus, in 1881 Hakky reluctantly assumed his role as a commissioner: “Until now, I’ve been considered a commissioner for antiquities, but this is not my livelihood (mon pain quotidien). All that I earn from this affair, I will use for the continuation of my journal, and you can inquire about me and my honor from your friends in Constantinople.”36 He then signed his letter with what he considered to be his main title, “Hakky-bey, redacteur du journal turc le Teessouf.” He promoted the romantic principles of the Young Ottomans (who favored a constitution for a self-governing public), which were later upheld by many of the post-Tanzimat Ottoman idealists (vis-à-vis their positivist Young Turk successors). Leading a life of honor meant advocating to expand the rights of the people of his nation and resisting the monarchical system that opposed a parliamentary system and was altogether ineffective at dealing with the increasingly insurgent nationalisms on the empire’s peripheries. Hakky-Bey trusted that the global voice of journalism would connect him with other like-minded exiles; along with many other resistance journals and pamphlets of the period, his publication engaged in an anti-absolutist discourse and found its niche in the relatively uncensored and diverse European channels of the ever-expanding opposition of the Young Turks.

If the first letter cast doubt on his future as a collector, the one from 1901, written in a flowing cursive and addressed to an unidentified “Cher Seront,” divulged a Hakky who had fully assumed that role. In response to Seront’s inquiry as to whether he knew an individual named Posno from Champigny, he related that while he was the first secretary of the former khedive Ismail Paşa, Gustave Posno had been a resident of Cairo and, at the time, the khedive’s jeweler. Posno’s collection of Egyptian antiquities was sold in a four-day sale in 1883 at an auction in Hotel Drouot. According to the writers of the preface to the auction catalogue, the quality and uniqueness of Posno’s large Egyptian bronze statuettes were matched only by the rarities found in the Museum of Bulaq (now the ill-fated Egyptian Museum in Cairo).37 The writers encourage not only individual collectors but also prominent museums to enrich their holdings through the jeweler’s loot.38

Hakky informs Seront that he had bought some objects from Posno’s collection fourteen years earlier—when, the auction catalogue preface briefs us, some pieces from the collection had been on exhibit. He further writes that he still had these items in his possession, and that the letter reminded him that he should write to Posno and pay him a visit. Even in 1901 Hakky still felt
the need to refer to his service as the first secretary to the former khedive, who had died six years prior to this letter. Hanioğlu lists the names of two individuals—Ibrahim al-Muwaylihi and Wasif Bey—who led peripatetic lives between France, Belgium, and Italy while pamphleteering against the Hamidian regime throughout the 1890s. Both of these dissidents had also served as secretaries of the former khedive and likely received his financial support to rouse opposition in European intellectual and political circles (largely through a bombardment of journals) against the current administrative affairs of the Ottoman government. Hanioğlu categorizes the efforts of these figures under “individual initiatives,” which seem to have run in tandem with and not directly under the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP), the official faction of the Young Turks. Nevertheless, the ex-khedive kept his own agenda in meddling in Ottoman affairs in the global arena, by dispatching a group of his men to Europe, enough to form their own faction and mainly from among his language-savvy secretariat, to join in the anti-regime fervor. The Fröhner letters add Hakky into the fold, and single him out as perhaps the first of the three rabble-rousing khedival scribes. Another figure that benefited from Ismail’s generous subsidies was a well-connected Freemason by the name of Ali Şefkatî, who published journals in various European cities and attempted to form what eventually proved to be tenuous links with the CUP. I would argue that Hakky, by continually invoking the name of his one-time benefactor, was showing his allegiance to his own faction, the network associated with the ex-khedive’s name, and the Egyptian locus of his political opposition.

Having found a cause that would benefit from his historical knowledge and journalistic practice, Hakky-Bey saw his correspondence with his readers, which he hoped would become a regular part of his art journal, as another forum in which to call on the cooperation of his co-religionists. His language of resistance seeped easily into that of art history. As a man of the pen, during the 1880s he contributed generously to the organization by publishing journals that were as idiosyncratic as they were short-lived, the political Teessīf (Sorrow) and satirical Gencine-i Hayāl (Treasure of Imagination), even as he also sought to find his footing as a collector-dealer. For that very reason, the address 3 rue La Grange Batelière in the ninth arrondissement, which he listed on his earlier journals and kept before moving into his permanent home on rue Alfred Stevens, is noteworthy. This was the street where Hakky would conduct his newfound trade, as it led to the Hotel Drouot auction house and was among the offices of the commissioners, auctioneers, and object assessors. In 1891, he started another journal titled Cürʾet (Audacity). However, this time, having completely embraced the cause, he would refer to himself as “an old Young Turk” and, more strongly perhaps, as a patriot (hamiyetperver); he considered himself a member of the Parisian and Genevan branches of the CUP. He would achieve what the Freemason Şefkatî had only initiated and merge his individual efforts with the official representative body of the opposition. From 1898 onwards, he corresponded frequently with Ishak Sükûti, the head of the Geneva branch and publisher of its main newspaper, Osmanlı (Ottoman), in which Hakky’s fervent letters were published. In one issue of Cürʾet, he published a portrait of Abdülhamid II in chiaroscuro, which further exaggerated the sultan’s prominent nose and also featured an upturned mustache and piercing eyes lined with kohl. This was Hakky’s version of the epitome of evil and the principal target of all of his journals (fig. 2). The rhyming caption under the picture reads: “Abdülhamid Khan, the faithless” (ʿAbdülhamīd ḫān-ı bī-īmān). Hakky seems to have fully established himself as a patriotic presence in émigré politics by the late 1890s and this new and more pressing interest may have been the reason for the discontinuation of Le Miroir at exactly that time.

The archives of the British Museum first record Hakky-Bey as a collector-dealer in 1882, when he was described as having sold “Greek and Egyptian antiquities to the museum between 1882 and 1894.” Owner-
ship is attributed to him for seven objects in the museum: a Roman onyx cameo from the second century B.C.; a gold-plated bronze fibula; a terracotta figure of Pan from the third century B.C., Tanagra; a pyxis from Hellenistic Pergamon; and a few stone figures with hieroglyphic details from Egypt. Hakky-Bey must have started his business dealing in antiquities. His substantial collection of antique objects, sold in a small auction in May 1906, tells us of such early leanings (fig. 3). The highlights of his collection were the terracotta Tanagrine nudes, excavated in Boeotia, Greece, in the 1860s, which quickly captured the imagination of artists such as Jean-Léon Gerome (fig. 4). The Ottomans’ 1884 ban on the circulation of antiquities, much more restrictive in its stipulations than the earlier law of 1874, may have put an end to Hakky-Bey’s supply of Egyptian and Greco-Roman artifacts and prompted him to turn to Islamic objects. Indeed, the ban in its earlier version restricted the circulation of non-Islamic antiquities. Then the Ottoman Imperial Museum turned its attention toward the creation of a history of their material culture. This was likely instigated by the decision of Abdülhamid II (r. 1876–1908) to revitalize the Ottoman sultan’s caliphal role over the Muslim subjects of the empire. Museum officials therefore started putting together a collection of Islamic art.

From the journal that Hakky-Bey published in the late 1890s we know that for the first seventeen years of his life in Paris he spent much of his free time in the Bibliothèque nationale de France picking out the rarest and oldest of coins from the Catalogue des monnaies musulmanes des Khalifes orientaux (Catalogue of Muslim Coins from the Time of the Oriental Caliphas). While filling in the missing chronologies in his personal coin collection, he discovered the earliest coins of an entirely Muslim origin. As a result of his nearly two-decade-long numismatic quest and his budding business in antiquities, for a short period Hakky-Bey entered the
active world of publishing and, along with it, the journalistic frenzy of nineteenth-century Paris. However, as someone attuned to cultural trends in Istanbul, he was certainly aware of the emergence there of a newspaper-reading public and of the younger generation of Ottoman bureaucrats who responded to this public interest by taking up political journalism in addition to fulfilling their duties as civil servants. In this respect, Hakky Bey’s discourse not only addressed the direction of market forces in the collecting world and exhibitions but also reflected the socio-political circumstances of his own state. There was a definitive political bent to the strictly connoisseurial, object-oriented world of antiquarians described by Hakky-Bey.
HAKKY-BEY'S ISLAMIC ART

Hakky-Bey began to publish his bilingual art journal in 1898. The first issue was published on March 1st, five years after the first exhibition of Islamic art in Paris, at the Palais de l'Industrie, to which he had loaned a few objects (fig. 5) and been assigned his own grand display cabinets in which to curate items from his collection. It was at this exhibition that oriental objects were presented for the first time under the term "Muslim Art" (l'art musulman), having previously been classified according to a range of religious and ethnic attributes such as Muhammedan, Arab, or Persian. When naming his journal, Hakky-Bey was well aware of the continually shifting taxonomic developments in the emerging field. With the designations he chose, l'art musulman and şanāyi'-i islāmiye, Hakky-Bey—the earliest independently operating non-Western scholar in the field of Islamic art—stood guard over the most comprehensive attribution that could be given to the field. This was perhaps an obvious choice for an Ottoman living in the Hamidian era, when the state was strongly propounding...
its caliphal claims over all Sunni Muslims. Nevertheless, Hakky-Bey’s decision to name his journal *Le Miroir de l’Art Musulman* seems to represent a pan-Islamic view that did not limit itself to this new Ottoman patriarchal self-fashioning but instead found and celebrated variety among the religion’s different cultural manifestations.\(^{52}\)

Georges Marye wrote two reviews of the exhibition for *La Gazette des Beaux-Arts*. He expressed his disappointment in the organizers’ orientalizing approach to the displays (as sites of seduction), as well as their apparent disregard for the more methodological and scholarly goals of the lending collectors (who wished to convey historical information):

Organized with the alternating enthusiasm and weariness of artists and of amateurs, the Exposition, if one were to speak of it frankly, does not convey a methodical arrangement that one would have hoped to find. It is obvious that the picturesque was sought, [and] cherished, and the development of its charms has caused some harm to the character of a work that should have only been scientific. This fair criticism, which was formulated from the beginning, could not have been avoided entirely…At first, it was necessary to strike the eyes and to react to conventional orientalism.\(^{53}\)

The phrase *l’orientalisme de convention* was first discussed by David J. Roxburgh, in a reference to Marye’s review, as an intriguing but unrealized rejection of the tendencies seen in earlier displays toward an ahistorical, aesthetic excess. Such tendencies are precisely what Hakky-Bey, one of the most important and generous lenders to this exhibition, wanted to remedy through his scholarly journal. He favored a more rigorous, scientific approach in the formation of the discipline, holding the object-specific ground between the language-centered orientalists (such as the Austrian historian Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall) and trend-minded lovers of things (such as the French collector-dealer Albert Goupil). Hakky-Bey can be seen as an Islamophile with a keener desire to grapple with object provenance.\(^{54}\) And, from Marye’s review, it seems that Hakky-Bey was not alone in this more methodological and museological impulse away from the type of representation of objects seen in the oriental rooms of earlier collectors. He was, in fact, part of a new generation of amateurs dictating the more taxonomic and historicizing models of displays that preceded and later spearheaded the austere exhibitionary mode of museums. At the 1893 exhibition Islamic objects were still viewed as items valuable primarily for their dazzling oriental auras and origins. Later, at the exhibition *Meisterwerke muhammedanischer Kunst* held in Munich in 1910, the placement of the Islamic objects on display not only heightened their specificity and their role in a larger historical trajectory but also dictated connoisseurial engagement with their form, function, and provenance. Calligraphic works, for example, were highlighted through the scholarly contribution of the Swiss epigraphist Max von Berchem.\(^{55}\)

The publication of a quasi-scholarly journal, however short-lived, was a novel way for a collector-dealer to promote his collection in the late nineteenth century.\(^{56}\) The structure of Hakky-Bey’s journal was also unique, and reflected the individualized nature of his enterprise. The French text, printed and illustrated with phototypes of objects from his collection, appears on one side of the journal, while the Ottoman-Turkish text, handwritten and with fewer illustrations, all hand drawn, appears on the other. The Ottoman Turkish-to-French translations of the text are more or less verbatim, except for a few unexpectedly personal footnotes on the Ottoman side. Along with the earlier example of the curious footnote elucidating his upbringing, there is one other noteworthy moment in the Ottoman text, when Hakky-Bey complains about not being able to find a good calligrapher in Paris to write the Ottoman-Turkish title of the journal in the proper *thuluth* script. Therefore, he pens his own “title,” in addition to handwriting all the epigraphic material that appears in the object descriptions in the following pages. The Ottoman-Turkish text exposes the author’s voice more than the French; his native language allows him to fully optimize the partly descriptive nature of his undertaking, a point to which I will return. For the second and last issue of *Le Miroir*, published in April 1898, he was at least able to have the Ottoman-Turkish cover typeset.

Hakky-Bey’s journal is an object in its own right, reflecting the handiwork of an amateur scholar involved in the ambitious documentation and placement of artifacts in a historical narrative. The resulting documents capture the idiosyncrasies of this private endeavor.
Hakky-Bey is at times candid in revealing the journal’s shortcomings and conveys misgivings about gaps in information and not having the correct representative phototypes for certain objects. At times he promises intriguing content for future issues, such as an image of Süleyman the Magnificent wearing the spectacular bejeweled helmet-crown crafted in Venice in 1532. In the late nineteenth century, engravings of the crowned Sultan Süleyman circulated in publications of royal portraiture, and Hakky may have easily encountered them in his many bibliophilic visits to European libraries. Furthermore, as a man who carved his profession out of dealing in precious works of art, Hakky must have felt compelled to highlight one of the quirkiest pieces that entered the sixteenth-century Ottoman world of objects—an era he hoped to glorify if he had been able to publish a third issue. The French cover for the two issues features a faceted copper candleholder from thirteenth-century Mosul; it was inlaid with silver and bore well wishes written in the thuluth script, as well as animal figures, scrolls, and arabesques. The object is surrounded by old coins, pointing to the numismatic origins of Hakky-Bey’s grander project. The Ottoman-Turkish section of the journal depicts the elaborately carved muqarnas-vaulted interiors of the Alhambra. Hakky-Bey’s understanding of the Muslim arts and their historiography extends unequivocally from practical uses of objects (i.e., coinage that furthers trade), to the material and formal qualities of luxuriant ones. His statement of purpose in the preface of the first issue indicates a straightforward desire to propagate all knowledge of Muslim art—not only in Europe but also among a group that he refers to as the ignorant antiquarians of Constantinople who toil in the antiquities trade in the Grand Bazaar. These dealers were known to often make mistakes in determining the provenance of objects: “Damascene earthenware such as plates, vases of all forms, and tiles, etc., which are dubbed Eski-Madem, that is to say, Maden or Mineral by the ignorant classes (cehl şınıfı) of antiquities’ dealers of Constantinople, have a superiority over all other polychrome earthenware from the East.” Hakky-Bey provides an abridged, but heavily researched and footnoted, history of Islam from the Prophet Muhammad to the early caliphs, the Umayyads, and the Abbasids, with a chart that lists all other minor and major players of the Islamic world, from 632 to the Qajars in 1898 (fig. 6). After this brief account of Islamic history comes the art historical pendant to the chronology: he uses the coins he encountered in the Bibliothèque nationale de France, the South Kensington Museum, and the Ottoman Imperial Museum to demonstrate the latest debates over a distinctly “Muslim” provenance.

The journal reveals how scholarly figures involved in numismatic and antiquarian studies crafted their networks. If they were not able to resolve questions of provenance among themselves, they would consult the libraries of European cities, and if these proved unhelpful they then sought the help of people further away, such as Suphi Paşa (Soubhi Pacha) in Iraq, who came to be known among members of this group as the grand master of numismatic epigraphy. Another object of study was an inscribed stone from the Umayyad period discovered in Palestine, which was once commissioned to inaugurate a road built to connect Jerusalem and Damascus. Rauf Pasha, the governor of Jerusalem between 1877 and 1879, sent it to be deciphered by M. Clermont-Ganneau, a former dragoman of the French consulate in Jerusalem and a member of the Institut national des langues et civilisations orientales (fig. 7). The afterlife of these artifacts could be colorful: the particular interests of political figures mobilized the international circulation of objects and brought together unusual, always contingent collaborations.

The second and last issue of the journal reveals more about Hakky-Bey’s scholarly project, as he includes a bibliography for background reading and also reveals the contents of his own library of French and Ottoman histories. The historical account he conveys is a well-rehearsed amalgam of the works of scholars, ranging from those of the nineteenth-century Ottoman historian Ahmet Cevdet Pasha to the infamous social psychologist Gustave Le Bon’s Le civilisation des arabes, published in 1884. Hakky-Bey received all the engravings of objects and architecture from the Firmin Didot printing press, whose main publications related to Muslim art and history were then advertised with their sales prices in the bibliography, with the books of all the familiar orientalist scholars of the nineteenth century, from Jean-François Champollion to Jules Bourgoin (fig. 8).
In the second issue, Hakky-Bey has four motives in mind, ranging from the scholarly to the commercial, as he resumes his historical account from the end of the Umayyad Empire in Damascus to the Islamic dynasties in Spain and Sicily. In line with the authors of the *Uṣūl*, he sees a golden age in the early arts and architecture of Muslim Spain (for instance, he regards Hispano-Moresque earthenware as best reflecting the taste of the time). He emphasizes his epigraphic prowess by pointing toward his first-hand observation of the inscriptions and the personal drawings of architectural fragments (fig. 9) and Kufic inscriptions that he made during one of his three visits to Spain (fig. 10). He also presents all his historical accounts through the concept of material dynastic progress, stressing Muslim rulers’ contributions to commerce, from coinage to roads to the textile trade. And, lastly, he shows a dealer’s awareness of how objects accrue value from sale to sale by providing the history of the provenance for many of his pieces. He weaves his own collection into a carefully crafted historical account in which he argues that socio-cultural progress in successive Islamic dynasties was achieved through trade-centered economic prosperity. He then presents each piece as the finest artisanal representation of its efflorescent dynastic context. In the first journal he introduces his coin collection, metalwork, and so-called Damascus pottery (correctly identified in the 1930s as green, purple, blue, and turquoise-colored Iznik wares), while in the second issue he groups together his Hispano-Moresque and Rhodian earthenware (also later correctly identified as red-colored Iznik wares).

All the while, Hakky-Bey was keen on maintaining the bilingual nature of his undertaking. French readers were given their requisite scholars, who worked on
sized the courage, mercy, and benevolence of the Muslim conquerors of Spain. Ziya Paşa’s Endülüs Tarihi (History of Andalusia), published in 1887, was a lengthy historical compilation of French and Ottoman sources written by one of the first Young Ottomans; it became a significant source for Hakky-Bey’s journal, and he referred to it frequently throughout the second issue. In fact, in the latter half of the nineteenth century a fad for Muslim Spain also became manifest in nineteenth-century Ottoman architecture: Ottoman imperial commissions in Istanbul included the Çırağan Palace (1863–72), the Beylerbeyi Palace (1861–65), and the Pertevniyal Valide Sultan Mosque (1869–71). These buildings comprised designs from Iberian structures made instantly popular by the publications of Owen Jones (d. 1894) and Jules Goury (d. 1834) in the first half of the nineteenth-century. The exteriors and interiors of all three monuments contain decorative schemes consciously adopted from the Alhambra. The imperial publication Uṣūl, which succeeded the completion of these edifices and was illustrative of the official discourse on national architecture at the time, subsequently ordained these buildings the best examples of the Ottoman architectural revival. It was not a coincidence, then, that as the self-proclaimed patriarchs of the Sunni Muslim world the Ottomans would emulate the period that, according to figures such as Gustave Le Bon and his contemporary Louis-Pierre-Eugène Sédillot, had undergone an Islamic renaissance.

The didactic and commercial purposes of Hakky-Bey’s journal project went hand in hand. For instance, the second issue contains a job advertisement for a bilingual (French and Turkish-speaking) storekeeper for the Istanbul branch of a famous furniture and carpet house, as well as a notice by a professor offering language classes in Paris—Turkish, English, Armenian, and German. Did he intend to open up his own branch in Istanbul? Would he be the one teaching all these courses? The wording of the announcements does not yield any answers. And, in light of the abrupt discontinuation of Le Miroir after the second issue—which promised more information for the following month specifically related to Ottoman history—we are left to ponder the project and personality of Hakky-Bey of 7, rue Alfred Stevens.
AUCTIONING OFF LA COLLECTION HAKKY-BEY

It is clear that Hakky-Bey was well known in Parisian art circles. In 1906, the auctioning of his collection was announced in three issues of *Le Bulletin de l’Art Ancien et Moderne*, the first time with the opening statement, “Formed by a well-known specialist, who was one of the first contributors in this era to spread the taste for Muslim arts, which has become so prevalent.” The provenance of pieces from his collection was discussed in a variety of French museum bulletins. Today, these speak of an informal and more flexible practice of lending among collector-dealers. Surprisingly, however, his name does not appear among Ottoman francophiles present in Paris in and around this time, either as part of diplomatic envoys after the Crimean War or as one of those forced into political exile. Nor have I come across a sense of euphoria for the international exhibitions that helped calibrate the Ottomans’ political stance against the colonial powers and the now semi-autonomous Egypt. Ahmet Ersoy has knitted together the Ottoman network of intellectuals and bureaucrats involved in the imperial production of the *Uṣūl*. Hakky-Bey was definitely not far removed, both physically and in his intellectual project, from figures such as Osman Hamdi Bey, the renowned Ottoman painter, director of the Imperial Ottoman Museum, and founder of the Archeological Museum in Istanbul, and Ahmet Vefik Paşa, the Ottoman statesman, bibliophile, and philologist: as a coin specialist, Hakky-Bey was familiar with and cited the work of Ismail Galip Bey, the famous Ottoman numismatist who was the brother of Osman Hamdi and son of
Ibrahim Edhem Paşa, the Ottoman statesman and director of publication for the *Uṣūl*.73

It is also important to note that Hakky-Bey owned a copy of this imperial publication. Not cited as a source in *Le Miroir*, it likely became a part of his library after the publication of his journals. Therefore, at least in discursive terms, where the circulation of books created a critical realm for the emergence of the field of Islamic art, Hakky-Bey was well aware of most recent publications in the field. On a less scholarly note, an anonymous columnist for *Le Musée Revue d’Art Mensuelle*, writing under the title “Le carnet de l’amateur” (The Amateur’s Column), announced that Hakky-Bey “was much loved by his co-religionists; there has also been an auction that received genuine oriental applause and an enthusiasm resulting in deafening cries and expressive gestures.”74 This testifies to Hakky-Bey’s interaction with an international circle that included his Muslim brethren.
Again, Hakky-Bey’s journal reflects his intellectual milieu. It reads not only as an abridged but footnoted historical introduction for those not well acquainted with Muslim art, but also as an open letter avidly inviting all collectors of objects, some of whom he cites by name, from predominantly Muslim regions. He thus creates a quasi-scholarly environment for connoisseurial discussions. He intended to construct a salon of letters among his readership for the study and promotion of an art that he thought surpassed all others and, having experienced a period of efflorescence and then a decline, had to be taken up as its own distinct field, especially by his fellow compatriots (vaṭandaşlar).

To the efendis, lovers of the ancient arts of Islam! Efendis, my intent in writing this journal is to provide a report to you, to the extent that it is possible, on the arts of Islam… In fact, the purpose of my modest undertaking is only to provide my compatriots an idea of the ready advances made today on the attributes of works of Islamic art. And, that this work, like those other rare works, is among a handful that serves [this purpose], and so will most certainly be welcomed. 75

Hakky-Bey’s writing, which is very personal, sometimes takes on an autobiographical tone, not just in a fleeting reference in a footnote but in the body of the text as well. For example, after introducing his collection of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century metalwork from Yemen (fig. 11), Hakky-Bey begins a discussion of Damascene earthenware (fig. 12) by referring to the mosque lamps of the Süleymaniye Mosque in Damascus and the Damascene tiles of the mosque and tomb of Abu Hanifa in Baghdad, which was commissioned by Sultan Süleyman. Aware of the Ottoman origins of these tiles, which were at the time misattributed by European connoisseurs to Syrian-Damascene artisans, he mentions the time he “traversed” Baghdad and saw all its sites in the early 1870s.76

Those were the years when the Ottomans attempted to redevelop Baghdad and Mosul by appointing the reform-minded statesman Midhat Pasha as Baghdad’s governor. A young, idealistic group of Tanzimat bureaucrats went along with him to revitalize land allocation, infrastructure, public works, and taxation.77 It was around this time that Osman Hamdi Bey was appointed to the Foreign Relations Office in Baghdad.78 Could it be
that, at that very moment, there emerged among this group of intellectuals an awareness of antiquarianism? A sense that Ottoman surveyors and reformers required a thorough and modern historical understanding of their imperial heritage as they traversed the sites under their rule? For example, we know that one of the earliest groups of objects sent to the newly founded Ottoman Magazine of Antiquities in Istanbul, which, as mentioned earlier, subsequently became the Ottoman Imperial Museum, was a set of inscriptions in cuneiform dispatched by Midhat Pasha from Baghdad.79 We also know that Osman Hamdi’s earliest encounters with archaeological excavations and the precarious nature of object circulation took place during his time in Baghdad, detailed in many letters he penned to his father.80

Hakky-Bey’s name reappears in the jubilee catalogue of the Musée Guimet of 1904, published to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the institution.81 Once again he seems to don his antiquarian identity in lending antique pieces to the museum, including an Etruscan amphora, a Chinese celadon plate, and bronze sculptures of winged figures. Hakky-Bey’s name proliferates in the art journals before and immediately after he sold his entire collection in two one-week auctions: 700 Arab and European objects of art that generated much curiosity were auctioned on March 5–10, 1906, and a much smaller collection of antiques was sold May 31–June 2, 1906.82 Interestingly, the journals advertising the auction mention only the predominantly oriental portion of the sale and not the antiquities.83

In “Le carnet de l’amateur,” Hakky-Bey is described in the past tense, almost as in an obituary. Karl Baedeker’s 1907 guidebook to Paris identifies the no longer extant “Mahometan Cemetery with a small mosque” inside the Père Lachaise and mentions the tomb of an Ismail Hakky-Bey (d. 1903), “a small Moorish mausoleum capped with a crescent.”84 If, in fact, Hakky-Bey died in 1903, then it was his wife, the anonymous Madame Hakky Bey—a Levantine or French woman perhaps—who decided to part with her husband’s large collection. After 1906, Madame Hakky-Bey supplants her husband in art and archaeology journals, and of particular note is an announcement of her induction into the Société française des fouilles archéologiques with the aid of Monsieur Babelon, the main curator of the numismatics collection at the Bibliothèque nationale de France and
Hakky-Bey’s benevolent instructor in the early days of his numismatic studies at the library. Babelon’s name is listed in the acknowledgments of *Le Miroir*. The second figure involved in presenting Hakky Bey’s spouse to the Société was Marcel-Auguste Dieulafoy, the renowned archaeologist of Susa and author of the four-volume *L’art antique de la Perse; Achéménides, Parthes, Sassanides*, published in 1884. It is interesting to find a female figure taking an active role in the global community of archaeologists and contributing in their salons to the quasi-scholarly discussions they had on recently excavated material. Also of note is the strong presence of Jane Dieulafoy in these gatherings. She participated in her husband’s excavations and before their second career as archaeologists both of them fought in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–71, after receiving special permission for Madame Dieulafoy to participate in combat. Thereafter, she toyed with gender roles, at times appearing in masculine attire (fig. 13). These bohemian adventurists formed the European half of Hakky’s circle of object enthusiasts.

The anonymous author of the column “Le carnet” seems to have attended the sale of the objects that generated high curiosity and provides for us some of the highlights concerning the items that fetched the highest prices: Italian Renaissance plates from Deruta and Gubbio, 5,600 to 6,900 francs, respectively, and a large Damascene plate, 7,055 francs (fig. 14). In announcing the results of Hakky-Bey’s auction, another bulletin expands on the dismal conditions of the French art market for objects of the decorative arts. It demonstrates that there was a scarcity of valuable objects in contrast to an increase in the supply of ordinary ones: at 6,900 francs, a plate, the handiwork of Master Gubbio, with *une forte*
fêlure (a strong and visible crack), formerly in the Leroux Collection, sold for much more than its 1896 auction price of 450 francs.88

The auction catalogue is an enigmatic document, opening with a photograph presumably of the interior of Hakky-Bey’s shop, containing layers of various kinds of objects. The image intensifies the materiality of an overwhelming richesse, as Roxburgh has observed, like that of a Parisian department store of the period (fig. 15).89 This is an annotated copy, which offers up an American buyer’s handwritten notes of every buyer’s name, along with the going price of each object for the first five days of the weeklong exhibition; the most prevalent buyers (mostly Armenian) form a circle of interest around specific types of objects. These must be organized according to category, medium, or origin in order to understand the market for particular objects in turn-of-the-century France.90 The auction catalogue lists each item’s previous owner, along with the date and occasion of their public displays, the 1893 L’exposition being the most prominent.

The introductory language of auction catalogues did not seem to follow the classifications used in Islamic art exhibitions of the same period: in the former, the titles and descriptions followed less academic lines of attribution, mostly in a more orientalizing mode. Objects remained inside the indiscriminately exoticizing approach of a cabinet of curiosities, which categorized “Arab” or
“oriental” items alongside Italian Renaissance earthenware (of which the Gubbio and Deruta pieces were the favorites among buyers), as well as porcelain, altarpieces, and papal seals. However, in the object categories of the collection, what was initially introduced in the title as Arab art is further classified as art oriental, art turc, art arabe, and art persan. My understanding of the logic behind these classifications is that these objects were at the time given names according to the ethnicity of their maker: if unidentified, the handiwork of the artisan would then be categorized as “oriental,” designating a general geographic region. Seemingly the safest, most established categories were for oriental pottery, but there too the myth persisted that the Damascene earthenware (predominantly blue and purple) and Rhodian earthenware (with red pigment) were crafted by, respectively, Syrian artisans in Damascus and communities of nomadic Persian origins in the island enclave of Rhodes: Iznik was as yet not accepted as the actual site of their making nor was their Ottoman designation (fig. 16).91

The European collectors were banking on this perception of oriental diversity (and Hakky-Bey’s scholarly didacticism was probably the weakest in this respect), and propounded an understanding that each ethnic group excelled in a particular medium: if Arabs were good at metalwork, Persians monopolized the earthenware crafts, while Kütahya pottery, with its precisely established origins, fetched marginal amounts, almost as cheaper souvenirs (fig. 17).

Although buyers of European objects constituted a diverse group of individuals, two names stand out as the competing bidders on Hakky-Bey’s collection of objects from the Islamic world. One of them was a Monsieur Antoine, who, I believe, is Antoine de la Narde, the relatively unknown second owner of Khalil Sherif Paşa’s Courbet painting, L’origine du monde.92 The other was Dikran Garabed Kélékian, a famous Ottoman-Armenian dealer and the owner, since 1895, of an antique store on Madison Avenue, who had established close dealership ties with artists such as Mary Cassatt, Milton Avery, and the Fauves. He also held the diplomatic post of Persian ambassador to the United States from 1903 onwards (changing the name Garabed to Khan). A more visible figure than Hakky-Bey, he promoted his
archaeological ties to collecting and dealing, and played a significant role in the excavations at Raqqa in 1896, which he emphasized in his antiques business. The Ottoman tools of the collecting trade were then picked up primarily by a close-knit Armenian network, which began in Kayseri, a city in south-central Anatolia, with connections in Europe and the United States. Thereafter, this little-known city appears to emerge as a silent but central nexus in the dissemination of objects, artifacts, and fragments through this circle of Armenian dealers.

In the late nineteenth century, Hakky-Bey’s Parisian connections ranged from scholars in museums and universities to dragomans, members of the French academy, and ministers of education and foreign affairs. To my mind, his crowded network perfectly captures a transparent moment when politics and displays of art intersected, bringing purely political, international realms into conversation with the minutest details of inscriptions on objects. During this very brief period, connoisseurial debates operated beyond national boundaries and therefore flourished among amateurs, propelling new art historical fields to the fore. Questions of legality were gradually becoming of concern, which today form the very basis of the anxieties many Western museums have over issues of ownership. Unease about the nature of earlier transactions hinders contemporary scholars from receiving full disclosures on provenance.

If Hakky-Bey’s object-oriented life’s work depended relatively more on official diplomatic relations and social ties, the covertness of his political work stood in great contrast. It is tempting to assume that as an old
Fig. 17. The lowlier status of Kütahya ceramics (left) among anonymous early-twentieth century collectors (right), from the second auction of Hakky-Bey's collection, March 5–10, 1906. Objets d’art et de haute curiosité arabes & européens, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, 1906. (Photo: courtesy of the National Gallery of Art Research Library, Washington, D.C.)

man looking back on a life spent among French bohemians—adventurous men and women like the Dieulafoys—he must have found the revolutionary model that the CUP promised a lot more thrilling an undertaking. Hakky-Bey must have also assumed that his links to the art market, mostly made up of persons with political connections that enabled the circulation of objects, would support his political cause. However, the two models that this solicitous cosmopolitan identified with—the antiquarian and revolutionary—required him to negotiate the constantly shifting imperial boundaries of both European states and his own country, due in large part to the nationalistic fervor both inside and out that threatened their integrity. In the next decades, the transatlantic networks that would take over the once Paris-centered market for Islamic objects worked in favor of much more uprooted figures for a reason: the new route was easier now to navigate and had changed hands, from collectors with collaborative but always contingent networks, such as Hakky-Bey and his acquaintances, to much more systematic, professionalized ones that were put in place largely by more interconnected groups steered by Armenian families. These, in turn, would strengthen close ties with museums and lead to much more frequent exhibitions. The field of Islamic art would thus acquire an increasingly museological orientation from the early twentieth century onwards.
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NOTES

Author’s note: This article is the product of a seminar taught by Professor Gülru Necipoğlu in the spring of 2010 titled “Islamic Ornament and the Aesthetics of Abstraction.” In February 2011,
I had the privilege of presenting a revised version of this seminar paper as part of a lively College Art Association (CAA) panel titled “Collectors, Dealers, and Designers on Modern Asia: Historiographical Categories Revisited,” organized by Mercedes Volait (CNRS, Paris). I am indebted to Andras Riedlmayer (head of the Aga Khan Documentation Center at Harvard University) for bringing Hakky-Bey’s gem of a journal, Le Miroir de l’Art Musulman, housed in the Fine Arts Library, to my attention. For a brief discussion of the journal as a source, see Deniz Türker, “Le Miroir de l’Art musulman,” in “The Fine Arts Library at 50,” special issue, Harvard Library Bulletin 5 (2003): 63–64. Riedlmayer also helped me locate two letters by Hakky-Bey in the Goethe-und Schiller-Archiv in Weimar, Germany—these are the clearest and only documents that cast light on the collector’s identity. I would also like to thank the reference librarians at the Art Research Library of the National Gallery in Washington, D.C., for facilitating my research on the annotated auction catalogue of Hakky-Bey’s collection. Himmet Taşkömüür generously gave of his time and expertise in helping me decipher Hakky’s handwriting in the Ottoman-Turkish sections of the journal. Without the encouragement of Professors David J. Roxburgh and Gülru Necipoğlu this seminar paper would never have seen the light of day.

1. Prior to the exhibition Pars Décors? Arts de l’Islam, regards du XIXe siècle (held in 2007–8 at the Musée des arts décoratifs, Paris) and the comprehensive survey of collectors outlined in the work of Stephen Veronot, scant attention had been given to these individuals, whose work jumpstarted the field of Islamic art and propelled its later museological orientation. Regarding this truly idiosyncratic group of nineteenth-century individuals, who demonstrated their interest in artifacts from the Islamic world by collecting, writing, and exhibiting them, see the exhibition catalogue Pars décors?: Arts de l’Islam, regards du XIXe siècle: Collection des Arts Décoratifs, ed. Rémi Labrusse (Paris: Arts décoratifs, Musée du Louvre 2007), which contains an exhaustive list of collectors and dealers, and Discovering Islamic Art: Scholars, Collectors and Collections, 1850–1950, ed. Stephen Veronot (London: I.B. Tauris, 2002).


Richard Ettinghausen, “Islamic Art and Archaeology,” in Near East Culture and Society: A Symposium on the Meet-

13. “Āṣār-ı ‘atıfe-i islāmiyede ‘arabī, fārisī, türkī yazılarda gerek Küfi ve gerek ‘uşūb-ı kadıme-i sa‘i’r-e üzerine olsun çıkmakla, beri merak etmiş olduğumdan genç bir çocuk şu‘übetlere uğradıma da ‘inayet-i Bārī ile bunları kırı’at ve terecmelerine da’‘ım mubahırdı, oldum.” (From childhood I was curious about Kufic or other kinds of old scripts in Arabic, Persian and Turkish on the works of Islamic art, and although I experienced many setbacks, I was always able to read and translate them with utmost care.) See Hakky-Bey, *Le Miroir de l’Art Musulman* 1, 2 (1898).


15. Marilyn Jenkins-Madina has written an insightful analysis of the antiques trade in Ottoman figures in the United States in the nineteenth century; it complements the more recent articles by Ayşin Yoltar-Yıldırım and Benjamin Cudron on dealers and their role in making the discipline (see n. 2 above); see Marilyn Jenkins-Madina, “Collecting ‘the Don on dealers and their role in making the discipline (see recent articles by Ayşin Yoltar-Yıldırım and Benjamin Cudron),” in *Discovering Islamic Art: Possessors and Possessed: Museums, Archaeology, and the Visualization of History in the Late Ottoman Empire*, ed. T. Cuyler Young (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1951), 17–47.


17. There is compelling documentary evidence that the Ottomans were involved in the excavations in Samothrace conducted between 1863 and 1896 by Charles Champoiseau, the French consul to Thessaloniki: Archives nationales de Paris, under Fr7/17243–17244.


20. Sibel Bozdoğan and Gültürk Necipoğlu have already pointed to the *Uṣūl*, with its emphasis on the “Islamic” and “Ottoman” categories and architectural examples, to argue for the Ottomans’ burgeoning consciousness of their architectural heritage, artistic sensibility, and output in the late nineteenth century. This would counter the contemporaneous European discourse that foregrounded the creative agency in “Arab,” “Persian,” and “Indian” art. Hakky-Bey was, without doubt, a product of this kind of emergent cultural awareness. See Sibel Bozdoğan and Gültürk Necipoğlu, “Entangled Discourses: Scrutinizing Orientalist and Nationalist Legacies in the Architectural Historiography of the ‘Lands of Rum,’” in *Historiography and Ideology: Architectural Heritage of the ‘Lands of Rum ,’* special issue, *Muqarnas* 24 (2007): 6.


23. The Hungarian orientalist Ármin Vámbéry (1832–1913), a gifted linguist, and later a British agent, who had established an intimate rapport with prominent members of Sultan Abdulmecid’s Tanzimat court and representatives in Istanbul by going native and adopting the name Reshid Effendi (Reşit Efendi), was deeply impressed by Áli Paşa’s philological knowledge. The vizier’s private library would, at times, serve as the European philologist’s refuge for all things related to the Chagatai language. Ármin Vámbéry, *The Story of My Struggles: The Memoirs of Arminius Vâmbéry*, 2 vols. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1904), 1:138 and 152.


29. Ibid. “Sîl-y avâd was dans ce monde une chose que je puisse mieux observer ce n’était que de préserver mon honneur.”

30. Ibid. “Monsieur, je ne suis pas un antiquaire [sic] moi avant venir à Paris j’étais fonctionnaire du gt. [sic] Otto-
mane et la dernier temps comme secrétaire de l'ex. kédivé de l'Égypte Ismail Pacha. Pour l'amour de ma nation Ottoman, j'ai quitté l'ex kédivé pour rédiger un journal en Turc et à présent mon retour dans mon pays est devenu impossible, car j'écrivais contre la politique active du gouvernement ottomane et même le Sultan et je suis condamné à mort ausitôt que je serais de retour en Turquie."
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35. Ottoman State Archives (Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivleri [BOA]), HR.TO. 537/74. Chlebowsky's buyer, identified as "Didu," was likely Ambroise-Firmin Didot (d. 1876), one of the sons of the famous printer and typeface inventor Firmin Didot (d. 1836). While serving as an attaché in the French embassy in Istanbul, Ambroise-Firmin, a devoted student of ancient Greek, also participated in the archeological missions in Greece. Coincidentally, the Firmin Didot bookshop owned by his family would later supply Hakky-Bey with his collection of art and architectural history publications of the period.
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39. Hanioğlu, Young Turks, 68. Muwaylihi, better known as a man-of-letters than Hakky-Bey but with similar ties to the Egyptian khedive, penned a series of essays critical of the Ottoman government and Sultan Abdulhamid II; they were published in 1896 in a single volume entitled Mâ Hunâlika.
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42. Ibid., 68 and 263.
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45. The website of the British Museum has made all its object suppliers from the nineteenth century searchable online, and Hakky-Bey is easily found in the collections database of the museum. Some of the images of the objects he supplied to the museum are also on view under the search results for "Hakky-bey." See britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/search.aspx?searchText=hakky-bey (accessed March 17, 2014).

46. Ibid.


48. In addition to Wendy Shaw's informative study of the gradually increasing policing of the foreign archeological missions by the Ottoman government, one can also go straight to the source, "Åsār-ı 'atīḳa Niẓāmnāmesi," Düstūr Zeylî 4 (İstanbul: Maṭbaʿa-ı ʿOs̱māniyye, 1891): 89–93. A much more in-depth and critical analysis of the Ottoman government's continually evolving responses to the extraction and exportation of antiquities is provided in a recent collection of essays, Scramble for the Past: A Story of Archaeology in the Ottoman Empire, 1753–1914, ed. Zainab Bahrani, Zeynep Çelik, and Edhem Eldem (İstanbul: SALT, 2013).


51. For publishing in late nineteenth-century France, I have been greatly informed by Roger Bellet, Presse et Journalisme sous le Second Empire (Paris: A Colin, 1967), as well as by the collected essays in Making the News: Modernity & the Mass Press in Nineteenth-century France, ed. Dean de la
Motte and Jeannene M. Przybyski (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999). More specifically, in the art historical context one of the most celebrated journals was the art dealer Paul Durand-Ruel’s Revue Internationale de l’Art et de la Curiosité (1869), along with his short-lived but influential L’Art dans les Deux Mondes (1890–91).
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Siegfried Bing (1838–1905), a prominent collector of objects from the Far East, was one of the first to publish an art journal, Le Japon Artistique (1888–91), which also promoted his collection.


In “Süleyman the Magnificent and the Representation of Power,” Necipoğlu provides an engraving of Süleyman donning the crown that appeared in an 1872 book of portraits. See William Stirling-Maxwell, Examples of the Engraved Portraiture of the Sixteenth Century (London and Edin-

The most famous of these popular European publications was the collaborative work of the French and British architects, who were companions on the Grand Tour, which took them from Italy and Greece to Turkey, Egypt, and Spain. It was the Alhambra’s ornaments that most fascinated them, and was at the core of their ornament, pattern, and color theories. With their twelve-part chromolithograph publications, Jones and Goury were pivotal in turning the art and architecture of Nasrid Spain into the most popular style for mid-nineteenth-century European architecture. See Jules Goury, *Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra: From Drawings Taken on the Spot in 1834 by Jules Goury*, and in 1834 and 1837 by Owen Jones, with a Complete Translation of the Arabic Inscriptions, and an Historical Notice of the Kings of Granada from the Conquest of That City by the Arabs to the Expulsion of the Moors, by Pasqaul de Gayangos (London: Owen Jones, 1842–45). If Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details jumpstarted the stylistic turn, Owen Jones’s seminal Grammar of Ornament (London: B. Quaritch, 1910), which constructed color theory out of the examples he had seen in the Middle East segment of his Grand Tour, solidified Islamicophilic interest in its works of art.


Louis-Pierre-Eugène Sédillot’s *Histoire générale des Arabes* (Paris, 1854) and Gustave Le Bon’s *La civilisation des Arabes* (Paris, 1884) were two pseudo-historical accounts that picked up from and bolstered Owen Jones’s discourse on the visuality of the great Arab spirit. Sédillot’s *Histoire* was central to Ernest Renan’s controversial lectures on “L’Islamisme et la science,” given in 1883, which propounded the idea that only in Muslim Iberia did Islamic cultures experience a golden age in art and science. The fact that Hakky-Bey, a man who so keenly stressed the concept of universalism in the discipline of Islamic art, still consulted both Le Bon and Sédillot with respect to the history of Muslim Spain is indicative of the seminal nature of these two texts at the end of the century, despite their predictable Western bias and orientalizing shortcomings.

Le Miroir 2: 48.


In addition to the pieces on loan to the first Muslim art exhibition in Paris, the items in Hakky’s collection appeared in Max Van Berchem, “Notes d’archéologie arabe II: Étude sur les cuivres damasquinés et les verres émaillés, inscriptions, marques, armoiries,” *Journal Asiatique* 10, 3 (January–February 1904): 5–96, esp. 54. See also Robert Forrer and Hartmann Fischer, *Addresbuch der Museen, Bibliotheken, Sammler und Antiquare* (Strassburg: Schlesier und Schweikhardt 1897), 195, and *Le Courrier de l’Art* 10, 4 (1890): 89, which both mention Hakky’s donations to the Musée Guimet.


*Le Miroir* 2: 1–3. Addressing the “amateurs de l’art musulman,” Hakky-Bey writes: “La présente publication aura but, nous l’avons dit, la propagation de la connaissance de l’art musulman” / “Şanâyî-i kadîme-i İslâmîyye muhîbleri efendîlere efendîler şu mecmû’ami neşirden garâzim şanâyî-i İslâmîyyeyi ‘alâ-kadîr’ül-imkân bildirmektedir.” More specifically addressing his compatriots, “Cette Revue a d’ailleurs pour but la propagation de l’art musulman dans le monde de l’Islam; comme de tels ouvrages sont si rares publiés dans notre pays, il m’est agréable de supposer que cette publication trouvera un accueil bienveillant auprès de mes compatriotes Musulmans.” / “Zaten maşcad-ı ahlâkarâname şurf aşar-i ‘atîfe-i İslâmîyyeye dâ’îr terakûkâyât-ı hâzaradan vaṭânâştârlarâbî bir fikr-i mahûş vermek kî bu da birde tîbsı o nevâdîr aşar gibi kalî’il-’emsâl hîdêmâttan olduğu için elbette maşkûle geçer.” For the formulation of the argument concerning the Spanish renaissance (kemâl) and its later decadence (zevâl) and decline (înâ irâz), see *Le Miroir* 1: 33.
Edhem Eldem, Gökhan Çetinsaya, and Zeynep Rona (Istanbul: Mimar Sinan Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1992), 65–89.


Catalogue des objets d’art et de haute curiosité arabes et européens: Anciennes faïences italiennes, hispano-mauresques et orientales, bronzes arabes, manuscrits orientaux, émaux de Limoges, étoffes composant la collection Hakky-Bey, Commissaire-priseur Paul Chevallier, experts Mm. Mannheim (Paris: Georges Petit, 1906). On the second, less well-known and smaller auction, see n. 47.

For example, Le Bulletin de l’Art Ancien et Moderne 7 (1906) provides three articles solely on the sale of Hakky-Bey’s collection of high-curiosity objects.


My initial research on price evaluation, from francs to euros to dollars, spanning a century, has revealed that 7,000 francs would be around $100,000 today. The entire auction fetched 189,210 francs, which would correspond to approximately $3,000,000.

The reviewer of the closing of the auction, who wrote for Le Bulletin de l’Art Ancien et Moderne, noted the disappointing sum that the valuable objects fetched: “La vente Hakky-Bey s’est clôturé sur un total de 189 210 francs: c’est un chiffre peu élevé si l’on ne tient compte que du nombre des objets, très abondants, et fort satisfaisant, au contraire eu égard à leur qualité. N’oublions pas, en effet, que M. Hakky-Bey était marchand, et qu’il avait réalisé a l’amiable, en ces dernières années, ses plu belles pièces, a peu d’exceptions près.” (The Hakky-Bey auction came to a close by an anonymous attendee at the auction in 1906.

The annotated copy is mentioned in Frits Lugt, Répertoire des catalogues de ventes publiques: Intéressant l’art ou la curiosité, tableaux, dessins, estampes, miniatures, sculptures, bronzes, émaux, vitraux, tapisseries, céramiques, objets d’art, meubles, antiquités, monnaies médailles, camées, intailles, armes, instruments, curiosités naturelles, etc. (The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1938–87). I am indebted to András Riedlmayer for bringing this to my attention.

My initial research on price evaluation, from francs to euros to dollars, spanning a century, has revealed that 7,000 francs would be around $100,000 today. The entire auction fetched 189,210 francs, which would correspond to approximately $3,000,000.

The reviewer of the closing of the auction, who wrote for Le Bulletin de l’Art Ancien et Moderne, noted the disappointing sum that the valuable objects fetched: “La vente Hakky-Bey s’est clôturé sur un total de 189 210 francs: c’est un chiffre peu élevé si l’on ne tient compte que du nombre des objets, très abondants, et fort satisfaisant, au contraire eu égard à leur qualité. N’oublions pas, en effet, que M. Hakky-Bey était marchand, et qu’il avait réalisé a l’amiable, en ces dernières années, ses plu belles pièces, a peu d’exceptions près.” (The Hakky-Bey auction came to a close by an anonymous attendee at the auction in 1906.

The annotated copy is mentioned in Frits Lugt, Répertoire des catalogues de ventes publiques: Intéressant l’art ou la curiosité, tableaux, dessins, estampes, miniatures, sculptures, bronzes, émaux, vitraux, tapisseries, céramiques, objets d’art, meubles, antiquités, monnaies médailles, camées, intailles, armes, instruments, curiosités naturelles, etc. (The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1938–87). I am indebted to András Riedlmayer for bringing this to my attention.


For a biography of Kélékian as a collector, see Jenkins-Madina, “Early Tastemakers in America.” For excavations at Raqqa and the Ottoman-Armenian involvement in the circulation of the objects found there, see Marilyn Jenkins-Madina, Raqqa Revisited: Ceramics of Ayyubid Syria (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), and Yoltar-Yıldırım, Raqqa: The Forgotten Excavation of an Islamic Site in Syria.” Also, for Kélékian’s presentation of his own collection vis-à-vis Islamic art and particularly Persian art, see Dikran Kélékian, La collection Kélékian (Paris: Librairie centrale des beaux-arts, 1909); and Dikran Kélékian, The Kélékian Collection of Persian & Analogue Potteries (Paris, 1910). Jenkins-Madina’s “Early Tastemaker’s in America,” 73, points to the intriguing fact that almost all the Ottoman Armenians in the collecting trade started their careers in Kayseri, their city of origin. A two-volume hometown history was commissioned by a group of Armenians from Kayseri who survived the 1915 and 1918 genocides to settle in Cairo. This book offers very insightful biographies of the nineteenth-century inhabitants of the city, including the Kélékians. See Arshak Alpoyachean, Patmut’ıwn hay Kesariyay Teghagranak, patmakan ew azagagranak usumnasirat’ıwn, 2 vols. (Cairo: Hratarakut’ıwn Kesarioy ew shrjykayits’ hayrenakts’akan mıt’ıun Gahirîi varch’ut’eăn, 1937).