A Problematic Construct: 'Islamic Architecture'

GÜLEN ÇEVİK
Miami University

This paper interrogates the origins and provenance of the term 'Islamic Architecture,' making the argument that it is misleading. The term reflects nineteenth-century Orientalist discourse and diminishes the remarkable diversity of architectural traditions found in the predominantly Muslim countries of Asia and North Africa. The paper will survey the early terminology used to discuss the architecture of European colonies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and then discuss the reasons for rejecting the term 'Islamic architecture.' A major point will be to note how local traditions of architecture tend to trump the importance of religious function, so that the continuities between the architecture before and after the introduction of Islam are stronger than the similarities that emerged subsequent to conversion to Islam.

The result has been that the academic study of the architecture of the Muslim world has produced a false impression of homogeneity about this architecture parallel in many respects to the false homogeneity Western discourse has often attributed to 'Orientals' themselves (cf. E. Said, Orientalism). The lack of definable stylistic criteria among examples of so-called Islamic architecture forces its advocates to emphasize the spiritual qualities of these works of architecture. In the field of architectural history, the outcome is a skewed picture that includes the following problems: an excessive focus on religious monumental architecture and the prominence of a narrow canon of Middle Eastern mosques; a tendency to foreground ornamental elements rather than structural ones; a simplification of the complex cultural traditions, Muslim and non-Muslim, which contributed to this architecture; and a misinterpretation of certain aspects of architecture as purely religious.

In his pivotal three-volume work, The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization (1974), American historian Marshall Hodgson (1922-1968), coined the term 'Islamicate' aligned with the concept of 'Italianate,' and 'Islamdom' after 'Christendom.' Hodgson acknowledges 'the

Islamicate civilization' 'as the latest phase of the Irano-Semitic culture, which goes back, in the lands from Nile to Oxus, to Sumerian times.' (Hodgson 1974: 43) He suggests, 'the distinctive civilization of Islamdom, … may be called "Islamicate."' (Hodgson 1974: 95) While Hodgson's definition alleviates the problem, it does not present a complete reconciliation.

Although the terms Islamic architecture and Islamic art are widely used today, there is still debate as to what they really connote. The strong association of particular works of architecture or art with a religion, its branding with the word 'Islam' results in othering of the Muslim peoples -all the while augmenting the Orientalist and colonialist narratives with powerful patriarchal undertones. The terminology, which contains the name of a religion, denies the very nature of architecture and art as a complex product of fluid cultural relationships and appropriations. Yet, the hybrid disposition of art and architectural works is ever so powerfully present, especially in the so-called specimens of Islamic art and architecture. The use of the terms Islamic art and Islamic architecture results in decontextualization and cultural isolation.

'ISLAMIC ARCHITECTURE'

Architectural historians started to use the term 'Islamic' over a century ago. The overall perception of what was considered to be prestigious architectural works had a profound impact on how we understand the term 'Islamic architecture' today. In English, the word 'Islamic' was first used in philosophy in the 1700s to indicate a distinct system of theology.[1] Julius Franz-Pascha titled his book Die Baukunst des Islam (Architecture of Islam) (1887). Later, in a 1908 article titled 'Ein Islamisches Baudenkmal des X. Jahrhundrerts,' the inaugural director of the Museum für Islamische Kunst (Museum of Islamic Art) in Berlin, Friedrich Sarre was among the first scholars to use the word 'Islamic' with spatial connotations as 'Islamic buildings of historic significance' or 'Islamic monuments.' However, the term did not immediately gain widespread currency. Exposition d'art musulman at Palais de l'industrie (1893), Exposition des arts musulmans at Musée des Arts Décoratifs in Paris (1903) and Meisterwerke muhammedanischer Kunst in Munich (1910) were three important exhibitions which branded the

Figure 1. *Ausstellung München 1910* postcard, Max Schwarzer.

iconic works from the Middle East and Central Asia as 'Muslim arts' and introduced it to Europeans in an organized fashion. Although the 1893 exposition was less scholarly and perhaps tailored for a less sophisticated crowd, its significance due to the sheer size of its collection and the level of exposure it received should not be underestimated. As indicated in their title, the preference for terminology was 'Muslim' or 'Mohammedan art.'

The exhibition in Munich, Meisterwerke muhammedanischer Kunst (1910), was a turning point in the reception of Islamic art in the West. Its curators employed 3,600 artifacts to endow Islamic art 'a place equal to that of other cultural periods.'[2] Serving on the exhibition committee were Friedrich Sarre, Ernst Kühnel, Max van Berchem, F.R. Martin and Ernst Diez and as its chair, Hugo von Tschudi. Several of the objects displayed became icons of 'Islamic art.' The representation of the East in Europe by Europeans has been problematic for various reasons. A series of illustrations by Max Schwarzer for Ausstellung München 1910 reveal the stereotypes which have dominated the Orientalist narrative. Schwarzer represents the Eastern Muslim male as a plump, brown-skinned, bearded man with a grand turban on various promotional material. The

physical and cultural differences between the Oriental and Occidental are clearly highlighted on this postcard where 'the Arab' is in between two fair-skinned European women with gracefully corseted slim figures and tight-fitting dresses (Fig. 1). The hyper masculinity of the Arab is articulated with his seemingly out-of-control, overgrown facial hair and the fact that he is walking along with not one but two women, one in each arm. The supremacy of the stereotypical despot Muslim man was contextual, limited only to his own harem. In Schwarzer's graphic art, the Oriental is out of place, merely a cartooned laughing stock for the consumption of Europeans. Governed by emotions rather than reason, he is feminized. Incapable of disciplining his body and his worldly desires, he is overweight. The artist achieved a kind of a naïve yet unsettling look on the face of this caricatured man. He is stuck in time, incapable of progress in his baggy pants, turban, and çarıks. The artist granted the Oriental no dignity. The branding of Islamic art along with the stereotypes of the Oriental is anything but flattering. Even if well-intended, in this context, the art of the Orient cannot be represented respectfully for its sophistication and diversity. Art branded as Muslim, Mohammedan or even Islamic is destined to be smeared by the prejudices which prevailed for centuries. The use of the term 'Islamic' to

Figure 2. Sankoré Mosque, 1578, Mali, Photographer unknown.

denote art and architecture results in decontextualization and cultural isolation.[3]

In Mohammedanism (1911), British scholar David Samuel Margoliouth states: 'It is uncertain whether we are entitled to speak of Islamic architecture, though we now possess a library of volumes dealing with 'Arabic' or 'Mohammedan' art. It seems like that the architects of the great Islamic buildings were regularly foreigners.'[4] A Muslim Indian missionary stationed in Berlin, Abdus Sattar Kheiri titled his book Islamiche Architektur (1922). Since Kheiri sought to weaponize Muslim religious identity against the West, his choice of term is not surprising. Distinguished historian of Egyptian architecture, K. A. C. Creswell, preferred the term 'Muslim architecture.' Historian of Persian art, Arthur Upham Pope used the term 'Islamic architecture' in a scholarly publication in the 1930s. Until then, the term had always been modified with cultural identifications, such as 'Persian Islamic architecture' or 'Indo-Islamic architecture.' Following 'Mohammedan architecture' and 'Muslim architecture,' scholars settled on 'Islamic architecture' in the late 1950s.

Scholars have struggled with the meaning, boundaries, and limitations of the word 'Islamic.' In 'Towards Understanding Islamic Architecture,' Spahic Omer argues that Islamic architecture exists; citing 'a comprehensive culture and civilization which bears the imprints of Islamic values.'[5] However, isn't it true for any major religion? Omer states, 'Islamic architecture is an architecture whose functions, and to a lesser extent forms, are inspired primarily by Islam. … It facilitates, fosters and stimulates the Muslims' ibadah (worship) activities.' Omer's description relies heavily on the notion of a single, unified identity of Islamic culture and civilization. Furthermore, Omer hinges his argument for Islamic architecture on spiritual qualities:

"What makes an architecture Islamic are some invisible aspects of buildings, which may or may not completely translate themselves onto the physical plane of the built environment. The substance of Islamic architecture is always the same due to the permanence of the philosophy and cosmic values underlying it." [6]

Yet, 'in the Koran itself there is no indication for the existence of a new kind of Muslim religious building.'[7] The lack of definable stylistic criteria among examples of so-called Islamic architecture forces its advocates to emphasize the non-material qualities of these spaces and reinforces the so-called dichotomy of the rational 'West' against the emotional 'East.' In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, archeological expeditions was an extension of the colonial enterprise. The discoveries resulted in the plundering of numerous precious objects to fill European museums.[8] Rather than rightful ancestors, it was the colonial powers to inherit these valuable historical and cultural artifacts. Beyond the physical removal of relics from their natural context, white men often misinterpreted the stories of these objects and the people who created them. Through colonial lenses, the primitiveness of natives prevented them from studying and understanding their own history despite the fact that these artifacts were made by their ancestors. The colonial powers sought to explain the meanings of these primitive objects, sites, societies, and bodies through excavations, interpretation, and display. The term 'Islamic architecture' belongs to the same epoch when vandalism of history was assumed as a righteous act by white men. Today, scholarly scientific disciplines like anthropology, archeology, and museology have interrogated and come to terms with their past. There is a necessity for history of art and architecture to go through the same exercise and readjust itself towards a more inclusive and unbiased narrative.

In The Formation of Islamic Art (1973), Oleg Grabar states that 'the term "Islamic" would be comparable to those like "Gothic" or "Baroque" and would suggest a more or less successful cultural moment in the long history of native traditions.'[9] Grabar writes about a 'special' 'Islamic overlay' that transformed 'local energies or traditions.' Yet, unlike the term 'Islamic architecture,' both 'Baroque' and 'Gothic' mark a specific time period and location. The influence of Baroque was much more sweeping than Islam. Baroque dramatically altered urban environments by carving out large public spaces within the existing Medieval fabric. Gothic and Baroque manifest in distinct architectural elements such as flying buttresses, elongated proportions, stained glass windows, or for Baroque, a preference for oval and elliptical shapes, overlaid geometric forms resulting in complex plans and sections; interior spaces sculpturally defining the structure; the use of concetto (concept); and dramatic use of light in combination with sculptures, etc. A similar list for works of architecture in Islamic lands would be too wide-ranging to be meaningful.[10]

Figure 3. Blue Mosque (Sultan Ahmed Mosque), 1609-1723, Architect Sedefkâr Mehmed Ağa, Istanbul, Turkey, Photograph by Sarah Johnson.

The term Islamic architecture devalues the contributions of non-Muslim craftsmen who lived, fashioned, and built in the vast Islamic empires. The Dome of the Rock and the Great Mosque of Damascus are recognized as two of the key examples of 'Islamic architecture' in history of architecture seminars. Kühnel credits the Byzantium-schooled craftsmen who were involved in the construction of these two very important early examples of so-called Islamic architecture.[11] This certainly was not an isolated occurrence. The patrons kept utilizing the very best craftsmen available, regardless of their religion, in the conception of so-called Islamic monuments. It was this freedom of appropriation and eclecticism that allowed the Ottomans adopt Hagia Sophia as an exemplary building and employ builders and craftsmen, irrespective of their religious beliefs, for the design and construction of some of the most significant examples of monumental and religious buildings. Identifying them as merely examples of 'Islamic architecture' is a rejection of this historical, cultural and social complexity. As Godfrey Goodwin states '[Ottoman builders] came from many regions, and not all of them were believers of Muhammed; … So, … Ottoman architecture was derivative and acknowledged

no frontiers: it fed on the compost of the other cultures in order to develop its own individual style.'[12]

The diversity among architectures of Muslim faith is observed in the Great Mosque of Xi'an in China, Sankoré Mosque in Mali (Fig. 2), the Great Mosque of Damascus in Syria, the Badshahi Mosque in Lahore, Pakistan, or the Blue Mosque in Istanbul, Turkey. Furthermore, even within the same geography, the architectural divergence is widened dramatically when two contemporary examples such as Sancaklar Mosque (2012) in Istanbul by Emre Arolat Architects (Fig. 3) or Behruz and Can Çinici's TBMM (Turkish Grand National Assembly) Mosque (1989) in Ankara, against a historical example such as Mimar Sinan's Selimiye Mosque (1575) in Edirne are examined. In the TBMM Mosque, the meditative inwardness of Islamic worship interiors is transformed as a clear glass wall that opens onto an exterior space replaces the traditionally solid mihrab wall. Sancaklar Mosque does not manifest even a trace of the majestic skyline-dominating Ottoman mosque as it eases itself gently onto the landscape (Fig. 4). Its interiors speak a language of movement, light, and shadow in an asymmetrical layout. Arolat Architects use darkness to accentuate the dramatic light in the

Figure 4. Sancaklar Mosque, EAA - Emre Arolat Architecture, 2012, Büyükçekmece, Turkey, Photographs by Thomas Mayer.

prayer hall. This diversity of form and space exposes the absence of a common ground in terms of architectural qualities inherent in Islam.

Architectural categorizations based on geography, date or patrons are consistent since there is no ambiguity about location, era or centers of political power. The term 'Ottoman architecture' has clearer connotations as it denotes a certain period of time, geography, and patrons. Usually, the term 'Islamic architecture' is understood to indicate the monumental architecture of Muslim patrons. It almost never designates vernacular spaces. When the canonical monuments of religion become the focus of the architectural historian, the role played by the architectural forms of everyday life is undermined.

Architectural historians often rely on descriptive classifications and physical architectural forms in their organization of information. The eighteenth-century interest in Greek and Roman antiquities resulted in an unmistakably Eurocentric architectural history. Physical form and visual similarities determined classifications when it comes to any other sampling but the Islamic realm. However, contemporary scholars concede the lack of a common language among examples of Islamic architecture. The British scholar of Islamic art and architecture, Patricia Baker acknowledges there is 'little immediate visual similarity' between Ottoman, Moroccan, Chinese, or Malian mosques.[13]

There are several reasons to search for new ways to define the architectures of dominantly Islamic lands or buildings which serve Muslims. An evolutionary development in building technologies did not concur with the acceptance of Islam to create a gap between 'Islamic' and pre-Islamic architectures. In contrast, pre-Islamic forms kept reappearing, because pre-Islamic methods of construction remained the most reasonable way to build even centuries after the introduction of Islam. For example, the use of stalactite squinches has been cited as distinctively Islamic. While the design of the squinch was undeniably further developed in Islamic lands, the use of squinches as transitional elements from the square floor plan to the dome was nothing new. Pre-Islamic buildings such as the Sasanian Palace of Ardashir I (3rd century CE) and Rabat-i-Safid (ca. 200 CE), a fire temple in Iran, utilized squinches.[14]

The term 'Islamic architecture' undercuts the significance of local culture and national heritage. It presupposes that regional, ethnic, and national uniqueness was overwhelmed and suppressed into something else by Islam. An unwarranted assumption that there is a stronger relationship between religion and architecture than there is between culture and architecture is then constructed. Islam did not entail neither the extinction of regional cultural tendencies, nor the assimilation of local building traditions. In Early Islamic Art (1987), Oleg Grabar acknowledges the fuzzy borders between what is Islamic and what is not. In the early period [661-800], he

explains, 'especially in Syria and Palestine, Byzantium played the part of one of the many parents who brought a new Islamic art to life.'[15] Grabar also admits that Islamic civilizations 'did not develop the coherent system of architectural forms of power found in Imperial Rome.'[16] While at first, the use of this term may seem helpful for the production of a collective identity and a source of pride, consequently, it is not a construction originated by the Muslim community and remains merely an appropriation of the identity of the Other initiated by the colonial enterprise. Khalil Pirani explains how Islam, as a 'dynamic faith,' is 'adaptable to any society or period' and thus, its architecture 'cannot be a specific style.'[17]

A significant question still remains. Christianity was not any less foreign than Islam in regions and countries before it altered them. Cultural and architectural implications of religious conversions to Christianity of those who previously practiced polytheism, Zoroastrianism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism, and many others were not any less profound than conversions to Islam. Arguably, the architectural output of Christianity often ignored local traditions more so than Islam. For example, a Roman Catholic minor basilica, the Ōura Church (1864) presents no vernacular architectural qualities (Fig. 5). Several other churches built by missionaries and colonists were no different. One of the oldest Christian structures in Asia, the Church of Saint Paul, Malacca (1521) in Malaysia follows European architectural precedents. Indeed, there is often a powerful visual connection between the colonialist works and their European precedents.[18] These buildings stand as alien objects in unfamiliar climates and landscapes. The European missionaries and colonists perceived themselves as rightful residents in various parts of the world. Then how can we explain the lack of a sweeping parallel term: Christian architecture?

The term 'Islamic architecture' creates a Eurocentric hierarchy of aesthetic value within the Islamic world and makes a false generalization about architectural forms by privileging the architecture of the Middle East, and possibly parts of Asia. No single term is broad enough to encompass all the architectures and art forms in all the lands where Muslim people live. Yet another inadequacy of the term 'Islamic architecture' becomes evident with the reconsideration of the non-religious architectural manifestos that shaped these works of architecture. The close relationship between pre-Islamic and what has been called 'Islamic' is not limited to a couple of earlier examples when Muslims were searching for a new identity and an architectural language expressing it. It can be observed for centuries even after the introduction of Islam. In The Timurid Architecture of Iran and Turan (1988), Golombek and Wilber note 'that the structural determinants of certain eleventh and fifteenth-century Iranian and Central Asian buildings can be associated with the 'Golden Mean' (or the Golden Section) [which has its roots in ancient Greece].'[19] One of the most significant building types of monumental architecture, the palace, is an expression of political leadership. The earlier Seljuk and Ottoman

examples assumed the Anatolian vernacular as their paradigm, whereas the last greatest Ottoman palace, Dolmabahçe, was deliberately modeled after Versailles. As subscribers to the Islamic faith, and leaders of a so-called Islamic empire, the sultans chose both the secular local and the non-Muslim distant to conceptualize their architectural legacy.

Remarkably, the distinguishing commonalities among what has been called 'Islamic architecture' are not architectural, but rather ornamental. Since it is not possible to define an 'Islamic architecture' parallel to Western categories of architecture, historians have often relied on ornamental features or isolated examples of architectural elements. It is easier to define what is Islamic in terms of decorative crafts and arts because they have standardized and more distinctive artistic features. The foremost significant architectural component that is seemingly particular to Islam is the minaret. Strikingly, the other three components, which are considered distinctively Islamic, are non-structural and can be perceived almost exclusively in interiors, namely muqarnas, minbar, and mihrab. Although these members may at first seem typical, all three do not occur in all Islamic monuments, but rather in one specific type of building: the mosque. Except for muqarnas, none of these architectural components are used in secular buildings in Muslim lands. In other words, even if these members may be identified as 'Islamic', they don't present themselves as conclusive evidence to classify Islamic architecture isolated from everything else.

The absence of figural imagery is another characteristic which some scholars use to justify classification of Islamic architecture and art separate from anything else. However, this is not true for all architecture or arts in Islamic lands. Grabar acknowledges that 'Abbasids, the Fatimids, and almost every secondary dynasty, as well as the non-dynastic substructure of Islamic civilization sponsored and utilized figural art.'[20] In discussing "the establishment of Islam over the vast conquered area," Grabar notes that "most of material life can be assumed to have continued without significant modification" and that it was in the eight century when a difference of attitude in representation could be detected.[21] Miniature painting, a figurative art form is especially significant in the heartlands of Islam; Middle East, Turkey, and Central Asia. Grabar explains that 'After the middle of the twelfth century, there occurred a true explosion of such [figural] images which continued in India, Iran and the Ottoman empires, although a taste for and interest in representations disappeared almost entirely in the Arab world c. 1350 onward.'[22] So, at least until the fourteenth century, the dominance of pre-Islamic Iranian traditions and the shamanistic, Buddhist Central Asian background of Seljuks, Ottomans, and the Mughals over a so-called common Islamic culture resulted in a wealth of figural imagery. Necipoğlu notes 'the widespread combination of figural with an iconic imagery in medieval Islamic artifacts.'[23] The use of the term 'Islamic architecture' requires the removal of a sense of time and space.

Islam as a religion, its history and the architecture it produced and continues to produce, gained an unmanageable mass and an unsustainable fabricated sense of continuity -a continuity

Figure 5. Ōura Church, 1864, Nagasaki City, Japan, Photograph by Houjyou-Minori.

limited to its own believers.

A characteristic presented as Islamic is the deployment of gendered spaces. Yet, the notion of gendered spaces existed in pre-Islamic and also in non-Islamic cultures. Universally, power relationships between men and women become crystalized in the construction of gendered spaces. Daphne Spain argues that 'spatial segregation is one of the mechanisms by which a group with greater power can maintain its advantage over a group with less power.'[24] Several ancient Athenian houses had androne, a space dedicated to the use of men. In some cultures, gendering of spaces extended even beyond life. Predynastic Egypt was home to gendered burial sites.[25] Gendering of spaces, can be observed in diverse geographies from Africa to South America; in Algerian Berber houses, and the Colombian Barasana tribe houses.[26]

The harem particularly has been the subject of considerable attention by Western travelers and scholars. It was a complex product of the Western imagination. The notion of segregated

spheres and the seclusion of women enabled Orientalists to construct the other ever more vividly. The differences between the 'East' and the West were also characterized in gendered terms; assigning the subordinate role and supposedly feminine qualities to the East while the West represented masculinity, the rank of power. In this construction, the West embodied knowledge and reason instead of emotion while asserting its capability for change and development against its static counterpart. Therefore, it was necessary for the colonialist discourse to emphasize the segregation of the sexes in so-called Islamic architecture. The dominance and the brutality of men, non-productive idle bodies passing time in the harem, absence of intellectual abilities of slave wives were some of the most common criticisms directed towards the Orientals in eighteenth and nineteenth century harem literature. The status of women, including in Europe, was always attached to a male, grounded in her reproductive skills and her sexuality. While during the pre-modern era, women in the West may have enjoyed more freedom in certain aspects of life depending on the specifics of race and class, their placement within the frame of power relations did not differ all that drastically compared to the women in the East. Strikingly, 'in the early modern period, … all faiths [Judaism, Islam, Christianity] assumed that men, as head of the household, needed to have violence, or at least the credible threat of violence, at their disposal if they wished to keep their subordinates, including their wives, in line.'[27] In England, between the period from sixteenth to the nineteenth century, 'one customary alternative to divorce by private Act of Parliament for the laboring class was wife-sale' even announced sometimes in a local newspaper scheduled to take place in markets where larger numbers of potential buyers could be realized.[28] The lower status of women and the segregation of spaces was nothing particular to Islam but a result of a universally prevalent patriarchy.

CONCLUSION:

The use of the term 'Islamic architecture' and the effort to collect the inexhaustible architectural cultures under a single umbrella can only reinforce the otherness of Muslim people. There is no question that religion as part of culture plays a role in the formation of architecture. However, Islam as any religion can be acknowledged as a catalyst for distinctive art forms and architecture rather than an originator. There is a reciprocal interaction between culture and religion as culture influences how faith will be interpreted and practiced. Religious rituals generate certain building types while responding to a functional need. Yet, there are not enough persuasive commonalities to identify those architectures as 'Islamic' at once, since they were derived from a diverse range of locations, cultures, and interpretations of Islam. Arts and architecture in Muslim regions were as open to new inspirations as the religion of Islam was open to new followers.

While the architectures of the non-Islamic world are allowed to reform itself, the Islamic world and its architecture are fixed in time. Stressing and normalizing the seclusion of women in Islamic architecture or suggesting that this practice is exclusively Islamic can only help the discriminatory discourses which constructed a subservient identity of Islam and the 'East' in the first place. The acceptance of separate spheres for men and women as a staple design strategy in Islamic architecture pins Islam permanently in a pre-modern era at best; allowing an Islamic orthodoxy take the center stage while leaving no space for progressive Muslims or the modern version of their religion which they intend to live.

Historicism causes Islamic religious architecture to remain a banal type. Builders in various regions take inspiration from readily available visual stock: local historical precedents. The notion of a powerful over-arching design language for the entirety of the religion of Islam paralyzes its architecture. The arrangement of so-called 'Islamic architecture' as a monolithic and separate entity from anything else captures it within its own silo and suggests a sterile separation between the East and the West. This creates a problematic condition especially considering the contemporary political climate in the world today.

ENDNOTES

1.   For example, Johann Jacob Brucker's five-volume Historia Critica Philosophiæ (Critical History of Philosophy) (1742-1744) mentions "Islamic system of theology." Cited in William Enfield, The History of Philosophy, from the Earliest Times to the Beginning of the Present Century; drawn up from Bricker's Historia Critica Philosophiæ, Vol. II (Dublin: P. Wogan, 1791), p. 244.

2.   Andrea Lermer and Avinom Shalem, 'Introduction' in After One Hundred Years: The 1910 Exhibition 'Meisterwerke muhammedan-ischer Kunst' Reconsidered, eds. Andrea Lermer and Avinom Shalem (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), p. xvii.

3.   The othering of non-westerners obviously predates the construction of Islamic Art and Architecture as an area of study. Moreover, racially-driven representations of brown and black people were not limited to the Muslims. Following the Enlightenment, anthropology originated as a colonialist scholarly inquiry to study the foreign, the other, the sub-European bodies and societies.

4.   David Samuel Margoliouth, Mohammedanism (London: Williams & Norgate, 1911), p. 227.

5.   Spahic Omer, 'Towards Understanding Islamic Architecture,' Islamic Studies Vol. 47, No. 4 (Winter 2008): 483-510, Islamabad: Islamic Research Institute, International Islamic University.

6.   Ibid., p. 489.

7.   Oleg Grabar, The Formation of Islamic Art (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), p. 100.

8.   Some European locations were not immune to nineteenth-century artifact looting either. For example, the famous Parthenon Marbles were removed from the temple in Athens between 1801-1812 to be displayed in the British Museum. Yet, more often, the looting targeted non-European locations. In addition, the motivation to display the Parthenon Marbles or an artifact from a distant land of the other were not the same.

9.   Oleg Grabar, The Formation of Islamic Art (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), p. 2.

10.   Grabar also recognizes that 'almost no part of the world conquered by Islam between seventh and twelfth centuries ever gave up its particular cultural identification.' He continues to explain the need to modify the term 'Islamic' 'by a series of further adjectives such as "early," "late," "classical," "Iranian," "Arab," "Turkish," or whatever else scientific ingenuity can devise.' Ibid, p. 3.

11.   Ernst Kühnel, Islamic Art and Architecture (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1966), p. 42.

12.   Godfrey Goodwin, A History of Ottoman Architecture (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2003), p. 6.

13.   Patricia L. Baker, Islam and the Religious Arts (London; New York: Continuum, 2004), p. 86.

14.   Spiro Kostof, A History of Architecture: Settings and Rituals (New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 224.

15.   Oleg Grabar, Early Islamic Art, 650-1100 (Lincolnshire, UK: Ashgate/Variorum, 2005), p. 4.

16.   Oleg Grabar, "The architecture of power: Palaces, citadels and forti-fications" in Architecture of the Islamic World, G. Michell ed., 48-80 (London: Thames and Hudson, 1996), p. 74.

17.   Khalil K. Pirani, 'Discovering Concepts from Faith,' in Understanding Islamic Architecture, eds. Atillo Petruccioli and Khalil K. Pirani, (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002), p. 31.

18.   The visual connection between the architecture created by the colonizers in these new lands and the precedents in their respec-tive homelands exist in various building types. Yet, the power of this continuity is especially evident in religious architecture. For example, Guadalupe Church in Granada, Nicaragua (1626), Lutheran Church in Strand Street in Cape Town, South Africa (1792), Dutch Reformed Church in Franschhoek, South Africa (1847), The Christ Church (Christuskirche) in Windhoek, Namibia (1907), Felsenkirche (Church on the Rock) in Lüderitz, Namibia (1911), and several others.

19.   Lisa Golombek and Donald Newton Wilber, The Timurid Architecture of Iran and Turan (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988) cited in Patricia L. Baker, Islam and the Religious Arts (London; New York: Continuum, 2004), pp. 84-85.

20.   Oleg Grabar, Early Islamic Art, 650-1100 (Lincolnshire, UK: Ashgate/Variorum), 2005, p. 49.

21.   Oleg Grabar, The Formation of Islamic Art (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), p. 99.

22.   Oleg Grabar, Early Islamic Art, 650-1100 (Lincolnshire, UK: Ashgate/Variorum), 2005, p. 49.

23.   Gülru Necipoğlu, 'The Scrutinizing Gaze in the Aesthetics of Islamic Visual Cultures: Sight, Insight, and Desire' in Muqarnas: An Annual on the Visual Cultures of the Islamic World, Gazing Otherwise: Modalities

of Seeing in and Beyond the Lands of Islam, ed. by Olga Bush and Avinom Shalem, Volume 32, (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2015), p. 36.

24.   Daphne Spain, Gendered Spaces (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992), p. 15.

25.   Fekri A. Hassan and Shelley J. Smith 'Soul Birds and Heavenly Cows: Transforming Gender in Predynastic Egypt' in In Pursuit of Gender: Worldwide Archeological Approaches, Nelson, S. M. and Myriam Rosen-Ayalon, eds., (New York: Alta Mira Press, 2001), pp. 43-67.

26.   Daphne Spain, Gendered Spaces (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992), pp. 41-46.

27.   Margaret Hunt, Women in Eighteenth-Century Europe (London & New York: Routledge, 2014), p. 73.

28.   Bridget Hill, Women, Work & Sexual Politics in Eighteenth-Century England (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994), p. 215.