

Historical archaeologists will no doubt turn to those chapters that are more relevant to their own research, whether in terms of time period or region. But several authors within the volume make persuasive points that colonization is more than just Europeans in the New World, but rather the term can be used to encompass many different kinds of interactions and relationships. Authors such as Stein and van Dommelen take this on as their main charge, contending that *colony* is a term that does not solely refer to situations of European capitalist expansion. As van Dommelen argues, the term *colonial* is an elastic category. For example, it is commonly used in Mediterranean archaeology to describe people living in “foreign” regions while taking on a very different meaning in modern contexts (pp. 121–122). I do think, however, that some of these concepts may have limited utility within historical archaeology. For example, many historical archaeologists will have difficulty in applying notions of “trade diasporas” as forwarded by Stein and Domínguez, as the contexts they describe are so different than those encountered by most historical archaeologists.

Yet at the same time, the colonial case studies in the volume provide historical archaeologists with opportunities to conceptualize archaeological contexts a bit more creatively than simply colonizer/colonized and domination/resistance. Certainly there are epistemological limits to what we can know about colonial communities, as clearly there were a myriad of experiences and material expressions in any colonial context. The case studies presented in this volume can provide us with ways to think beyond the categories that have become so familiar to us. As methodological and theoretical avenues regarding the impact of colonialism and postcolonialism in archaeology and the modern world are still emerging, *The Archaeology of Colonialism* provides important insights and is highly recommended for all historical archaeologists.

DIANA DiPAOLO LOREN
PEABODY MUSEUM OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
11 DIVINITY AVENUE
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

*If These Pots Could Talk: Collecting 2,000
Years of British Household Pottery.*

IVOR NOËL HUME

Chipstone Foundation, distributed by
University Press of New England, 2001.
472 pp., 648 illus. (544 color), ref., index.
\$75.00 cloth.

Buy this book! Ivor Noël Hume has been the established authority for dating English ceramics ever since 1957, when he was hired by Colonial Williamsburg as the director of their Department of Archaeology. Occasionally Colonial Williamsburg has the good fortune to hire a productive scholar who makes major contributions to the literature that have an impact beyond its own institution. Clearly, Noël Hume is a shining example of this. Within a few years of his arrival at Williamsburg, Noël Hume was publishing articles on ceramics and glass in *Antiques* magazine, *The Journal of*

Glass Studies, and in the Smithsonian’s *Contributions from the Museum of History and Technology*. Many of these publications are listed in the bibliography of *If These Pots Could Talk*. In 1969 he published *Historical Archaeology: A Comprehensive Guide for Both Amateurs and Professionals to the Techniques and Methods of Excavating Historical Sites*, which was the first textbook for historical archaeologists. This was followed in 1970 by his book *A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America*, which appears to be the most cited reference in historical archaeology. In 1971 Stanley South extracted the date information from Noël Hume’s *A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America* and gathered additional date information from him to create his mean ceramic date formula (South 1971). The table of dates in South’s article has been widely used by many archaeologists to date their ceramics. If you use these dates, it is time to update—buy this book for Noël Hume’s latest information on the chronology of these wares. In addition to having the latest date information, this book is richly illustrated with 544 wonderful color plates taken by Gavin Ashworth. Noël Hume waxes eloquently about Ashworth’s photography in the acknowledgments where he states, “Although he would be last to claim it so, this is as much his book as mine” (xix). Ashworth is the photographer for Chipstone’s journal *Ceramics in America*. Noël Hume’s book was highly subsidized by the Chipstone Foundation of Milwaukee and is a bargain at \$75.00.

If These Pots Could Talk was written to preserve the knowledge that Ivor and Audrey Noël Hume gained from 40 years of collecting and researching ceramics commonly made and used in England and its colonies. Their collection has been given to the Chipstone Foundation, which together with this great book will provide a wonderful resource for scholars. Noël Hume’s catalog includes information on where the vessels were collected and a detailed documentation of events that many of them commemorate. A number of the pots have names and dates inscribed on them. For these vessels Noël Hume was often able to find information on the persons named, where they lived, and what was being commemorated by the date. Ivor and Audrey’s ability at what some would call “antiquarian research” is very impressive. It is unfortunate that some processualists in the 1970s spent time attacking those that were not into “the new archaeology” for being antiquarians and particularists. In doing so, they steered young scholars away from artifact research, and our progress in the area of chronology and typology was slowed down as a result.

Audrey and Ivor’s collecting objective was to answer basic questions about chronology, to illustrate changes in technology, and to improve the knowledge of changing ceramics usage through time. They also focused on collecting wares commonly found on archaeological sites but rarely in museum collections. Their approach is the antithesis of connoisseurship. Noël Hume makes this very clear on page nine by quoting a 1913 statement by the Keeper of Ceramics of the Victoria and Albert Museum, who “warned his superiors of the need to acquire only masterpieces because they alone ‘are the source of inspiration—and by the number of its masterpieces a collection is finally judged.’” Noël Hume goes on to say that collections created by this elitist policy provide a “totally false impression of who had what, and when.” I find it refreshing to see Noël Hume separate himself from the

vacuous world of connoisseurship and the quest for perfect masterpiece vessel virgins.

Beyond providing archaeologists with a great reference for common English ceramics from Roman times into the 20th century, Noël Hume's book gives us an insight into how historical archaeology developed in England after World War II, when there was minimal institutional support and funding for excavation was close to nil. It was a period of salvage archaeology on London sites bombed during the war and on sites in the process of being developed. Archaeologists were dependent upon the good will of the landowner for access to the sites being destroyed. Noël Hume worked at London's Guildhall Museum from 1949 until being hired by Colonial Williamsburg in 1957, where he was able to practice a more relaxed style of archaeology. During his time at the Guildhall Museum, Noël Hume's interests were focused on Roman pottery, English glass, German and English stoneware, and English delft. He sought out sites and, working with Audrey and volunteers, salvaged a number of collections of these wares. In addition, he was given large collections of sherds from properties along the south shores of the Thames by Sir David Burnett and the waster sherds from the Pickleherring delftware kilns. Some of these collections came with Noël Hume to Virginia and now to the Chipstone Foundation.

Noël Hume's description of archaeology in post World War II London probably seems unusual to most archaeologists under the age of 40. What was happening in London was similar to the salvage archaeology in the United States prior to when the environmental laws came into effect in the 1970s. One can only imagine the vast quantity of what has been lost during the period when we were dependent on volunteers with limited access and time for working sites being destroyed. What Noël Hume has described reflects my own experience of working in the 1960s with Arnold R. Pilling and Gordon Grosscup at Wayne State University in Detroit. We commonly visited downtown construction sites, received permission to collect artifacts, and salvaged what could be gotten before the sites were destroyed. Funding was close to nonexistent, and most of the work was done by volunteers or for course credit. Environmental laws in England and the United States have changed the ways that archaeology is done today. What was a common practice in an earlier period has given way to new standards of access, funding, and curation. Today environmental archaeology is coming under scrutiny and seems to be in danger of being choked back in terms of survey and mitigation process. One can only hope that the golden age of historical archaeology is not coming to an end.

In addition to giving us an enjoyable read with a good supply of wry humor, Noël Hume provides insight into the process of tracing the history of some of the pieces acquired on the antique's market. He and Audrey made annual trips to England for research and antiquing on Porto Bello Road and other haunts. The book is filled with stories of great finds in antique shops purchased at low prices and the follow-up research that put them into a larger historical context. Finds from antiquing are much like fishing stories, complete with the ones that got away that Noël Hume regrets not having purchased. In a couple of cases, he describes being faked out by reproductions such as a Doulton jug that he thought was early-German stoneware. Noël Hume also

records many finds mud larked from the banks of the Thames that he was able to match later to finds excavated in Virginia. One example is of a small delft sherd from the Thames with the head of a man with a curled moustache that was later matched with a sherd excavated at Tutter's Neck Plantation in Virginia and to a sherd found 20 years later by another person on the banks of the Thames (p. 61). The third find was more complete and showed the figure was wearing a turban. Noël Hume then goes on to show a print of a very similar drawing titled "Turks Head" from a child's book of the 1780s that resembles the three sherds. He then points out that "The Turks Head" was a sign commonly associated with coffeehouses in London.

Over and over again, Noël Hume takes you through the antiquarian process of placing his finds into a context. In several cases he even shows his false conclusions that were later dashed by new finds. This is interesting in light of footnote 17 of chapter two that reads, "Among archaeologists, leaping to conclusions is a favorite acrobatic exercise." Noël Hume probably includes himself in that statement, for in footnote 28 of chapter 7 he states, "Noël Hume, *Here Lies Virginia*" (p. 218). When I wrote this I dated the bottles to 1725–1730, a time span so narrow that it should be dismissed as the arrogance of youth." Not many authors would show their mistakes, and the process of how conclusions are reached is usually devoid of the blind alleys traveled.

Noël Hume began mud larking on the Thames in the late 1940s, and he would take his finds to Adrian Oswald of the Guildhall Museum. This led to Noël Hume being hired as Oswald's assistant, where he learned his archaeology by doing rather than by a formal education in archaeology (Kale 1996: ix). Today, many museums and archaeologists see collecting as a conflict of interest, which it can be. However, those who collect almost always have a wider exposure to whatever they are collecting than do the curators and archaeologists who do not collect. Archaeologists who collect ceramics often have the advantage of having whole and marked pieces available to illustrate their reports and presentations. Noël Hume's record of research and publications has clearly fed off of his collection, and this collection should be an object lesson to other archaeologists. Many are under the assumption that they cannot afford to collect because of the high cost of antiques. There are two ways to collect; one involves spending lots of money, and the other involves spending lots of time looking. The knowledge that most archaeologists have almost always puts them at an advantage over most antique dealers. Even if one does not find anything to purchase, collecting provides the opportunity to handle the ceramics, which is a very important part of the learning process. Handling ceramics is one of the major advantages the antiques market has over museum collections. If you are a student of ceramics, a broken vessel or one missing its handle or lid can be very cheap. Broken and damaged vessels can provide as much information as a vessel virgin. Noël Hume's collection and this book are a great testimony to what can be accomplished by involvement with the marketplace.

If These Pots Could Talk represents what Ivor and Audrey were interested in rather than the complete range of ceramics that were in common usage. The collection is strong on German and English stoneware, English delft, slip-decorated

wares, painted creamwares and pearlwares, English stoneware gin bottles, commemorative wares, and Goss commemorative wares of the early-20th century. Noël Hume expressed their tastes in ceramics when he came to describe molded white salt-glazed stoneware in the statement:

For Audrey and for me, the same attributes that made white salt glaze such a hit in the mid-18th century were the ones that made us dislike it. Our vicarious relationship with the craftsmen who shaped the pot with his hands or painted the Wan Li designs on a delftware plate could not be transferred to the slap-it-down and lift-it-off plate production of the new, increasingly mechanized age. We much prefer the fussy and folksy.

Even so, the collection contains some of these wares with valuable insights into their place in the development of the English ceramic tradition.

Any book the size and scope of *If These Pots Could Talk* of course will have some errors and no doubt I have missed some of them. The following ones are worth noting because they should be corrected in any future edition of the book. It is my profound belief that the demand for the book once it is out of print will be very great and it probably will be reprinted.

For me, the section on creamware and transfer printed ware was problematic on a couple of counts. One is that Noël Hume has not kept up on what has been published on these wares in the last couple of decades. In the early 1970s he published a major paper titled "Creamware to Pearlware: A Williamsburg Perspective" in *Ceramics in America* (Noël Hume 1973). In 1972 he also published "The Who, What, and When of English Creamware Plate Design" in *Antiques* magazine (Noël Hume 1972). These articles provide a clearer documentation of the development of creamware than what he has written in *If These Pots Could Talk*. Noël Hume's discussion on creamware and Wedgwood is limited to information from Eliza Meteyard, Simeon Shaw and Llewellynn Jewitt. Noticeably missing from his references are the important works by Neil McKendrick (1982), David Barker (1990) and Ann Smart Martin (1994). McKendrick provides an excellent analysis of the way Wedgwood marketed his creamware. Barker provides the best description of the development of creamware and pearlware, and Martin provides an excellent documentation of introduction and use of creamware in Colonial America. One thing that was surprising was his retelling of the story from Shaw's 1829 Staffordshire history of Wedgwood, having presented Queen Charlotte a "caudle set" that captured her attention and led to the sale of a dinner set (p. 209). This story has been rejected by almost all later ceramic historians and Noël Hume himself used Meteyard's history to put the old story aside in his 1972 article on English creamware plate design. Why he brought this hoary bit of mythology back to life is a bit of a mystery. Noël Hume lists Wedgwood as having developed his version of creamware in 1763, which is a bit late considering Josiah entered into an agreement with John Sadler of Liverpool to transfer print his creamware in 1761 (Price 1948:27). Noël Hume also misunderstood the transfer printing process that John Sadler employed. For

example, on page 214 he describes a creamware plate with a print of the "The Punch Party"; he goes on to state, "... being unmarked, it offers no proof that it was one of those biscuit pieces that Wedgwood sent to Liverpool to be decorated and then returned to him to be glazed and fired again." Sadler and Guy Green printed on top of the glaze and refired the wares in Liverpool. Stanley Price's book documents some of the problems that Sadler had in refiring the wares from his correspondence to Wedgwood (Price 1948:36-37). Noël Hume does not have any discussion of overglaze printing in this book that might have clarified this problem. Several of the figures in the chapter on creamware are overglaze printed. Figure XIII on page 293 also appears to be an overglaze bat print. It is described as a "Bone china saucer with a black transfer print depicting a country mansion . . . This is the Collection's only example of New Hall hard-paste porcelain Ca. 1815-1825." In this case, the ware is ambiguous, given that bone china is not hard paste porcelain. What the creamware discussion lacks in clarity is compensated for by great color plates of the pieces being described.

These minor problems in *If these Pots could Talk* are but small imperfections in an otherwise great book and one that all historical archaeologists should consider adding to their library. It is a great book, great insight into how our field developed, and great collection of wares that have been beautifully photographed and published by Chipstone Foundation at a subsidized price. Buy it now or be sorry when it goes out of print, and the price soars.

REFERENCES

- BARKER, DAVID
1990 *William Greatbatch, A Staffordshire Potter*. Jonathan Horne Publications, London.
- KALE, WILLFORD
1996 Forward to *In Search of This & That: Tales from an Archaeological Quest: Selected Essays from the Colonial Williamsburg Journal*. By Ivor Noël Hume, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, VA.
- MARTIN, ANN SMART
1994 "Fashionable Sugar Dishes, Latest Fashion Ware": The Creamware Revolution in the Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake. In *Historical Archaeology of the Chesapeake*, Paul A. Shackel and Barbara J. Little, editors, pp. 169-187. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.
- MCKENDRICK, NEIL
1982 Josiah Wedgwood and the Commercialization of the Potteries. In *The Birth of a Consumer Society: Commercialization of Eighteenth-Century England*. By Neil McKendrick, John Brewer, and J. H. Plumb, pp. 99-144. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- NOËL HUME, IVOR
1969 *Historical Archaeology: A Comprehensive Guide for Both Amateurs and Professionals to the Techniques*

and *Methods of Excavating Historical Sites*. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York.

- 1970 *A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America*. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York.
- 1972 The Who, What, and When of English Creamware Plate Design. *Antiques* CI(2):350–355.
- 1973 Creamware to Pearlware: A Williamsburg Perspective. In *Ceramics in America*, Winterthur Conference Report 1972, Ian M. G. Quimby, editor, pp. 217–254. The University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville.
- 1996 *In Search of This and That: Tales from an Archaeological Quest: Selected Essays from the Colonial Williamsburg Journal*. Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, VA.

PRICE, STANLEY

- 1948 *John Sadler, A Liverpool Pottery Printer*. Published by the author, Cheshire, England.

SOUTH, STANLEY

- 1971 Evolution and Horizon as Revealed in Ceramic Analysis in Historical Archaeology. *The Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers 1971*. Vol. 6, Part 2:71–106.

GEORGE L. MILLER
URS CORPORATION
561 CEDAR LANE
FLORENCE, NJ 08518

Caetana Says No: Women's Stories from a Brazilian Slave Society.

SANDRA LAUDERDALE GRAHAM
Cambridge University Press, NY, 2003.
xiv+183 pp., 13 illus., maps, charts, tables,
bibl., index. \$18.00 paper, \$50.00 cloth.

This slim volume provides deep insight into the lives and social relationships of two very different Brazilian women in the early and mid-19th century. *Caetana Says No* is presented as two stories set in the coffee plantation region along the Paraíba River Valley in eastern São Paulo province and Rio de Janeiro province. The coffee harvests were the source of great riches for planters and of great labor for enslaved men and women. The two women presented in this book both resided in the Paraíba Valley, yet they were distant from each other in both social status and geography: Caetana was a Creole slave woman from the region near the headwaters, while Inácia was a woman of the planter elite residing several hundred miles downstream.

Caetana Says No illuminates not only these two women but also the complex web of relationships in their society. Their lives are explored primarily through the legal documents that tied them to relatives, friends, and the structure of the Brazilian religious, legal, and political systems. The Brazilian custom of keeping meticulous and detailed records of nearly all transactions has resulted in a tremendous documentary record. An exhaustive search of archives, libraries, and court records has enabled Sandra Lauderdale to realize a depth of detail beyond the bare facts. The book is

enhanced by its maps and illustrations, including photos of places that would have been familiar to these women. In addition, selections from the primary documents are provided, in English, to make visible the connections between the written record and the interpretation.

Caetana's story is one of patriarchy confronted and confounded. In October 1835, Caetana, personal maid to the women of her owner's family, married a fellow slave, the tailor Custódio, at the order of their owner. She was an extremely reluctant bride, and despite the legal and religious formalities having been observed, she refused to accept the marriage. She fled from her new husband to her godfather (also her uncle), who threatened to beat her if she did not return to her husband. Astonishingly she next fled to the master. Convinced she would never accept the marriage, the master not only separated the couple but launched an ecclesiastical petition to annul the marriage.

Over the next five years an extensive and lengthy document was created, recording intricate details of the entire annulment process. Caetana's story has a clear resolution in ecclesiastical terms: in 1840 the High Court in Bahia confirmed a lower court's refusal to grant the annulment. It is less clear what happened in practice, census and probate records suggest she was never required to return to Custódio. At one end of the plantation's scale, Caetana and Custódio were slaves expected to show loyalty and obedience to their master. At the other end, their owner expected to be obeyed. Yet her ability to say "No!" and his willingness to be persuaded suggest the plantation's master saw Caetana, sometimes, as a person as well as a property.

Inácia's story is also one of patriarchy confronted, but in this case, confirmed. Inácia Delfina Werneck, daughter of a prominent and wealthy plantation family, neither married nor took holy orders. When she dictated her will to a notary in 1857, Inácia was free to dispose of her estate as she wished. She left legacies, gifts of money or jewelry, to an assortment of friends and relatives and then gave the bulk of her estate to provide for a slave woman, Bernardina and her children, who had long been in Inácia's service. Although no one acted directly against her will, in the end Inácia's intentions were not honored.

What Inácia did not know, because she relied on literate male relatives to handle her accounts, was how much she owned and how much she owed. In a cash-poor society, like 19th-century Brazil, accounts were often paid over many years as part of a continuing series of transactions. Brazilian law required that the debts and expenses of the estate must be paid before any other distribution could take place. If these exceeded the total value of the estate, the heirs were required to pay the remaining debts. Unfortunately, when Inácia's estate was distributed, it fell short of the amount needed to pay her expenses, leaving Bernardina and her children – so recently slaves – liable for a sum of money they could not hope to pay. While trying to give her slaves, her companions for many years, a boost into free life, Inácia left them with very little security.

In the end, the slave woman Caetana was more successful at imposing her wishes on the world around her than the elite plantation mistress Inácia. These two women have more in common than may appear at first glance. Despite the difference in wealth, both women were illiterate, and both had to rely on men to interact for them in the official

2004. Harvard A to Z. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press. Google Scholar. Browman, D.L. 2002. Frederic W. Putnam, and the rise of U.S. anthropology, 1866-1903. *American Anthropologist* 104(2): 508-519. Google Scholar. Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology. 2013. Available at <https://www.peabody.harvard.edu/> (accessed 26 April 2013). Putnam, F.W. 1898. *Guide to the Peabody Museum of Harvard University, with a statement relating to instruction in anthropology*. Salem (MA): The Salem Press Company. Google Scholar. Spencer, F. 1997. *History of physical anthropology: an encyclopedia*, Volume Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, 11 Divinity Avenue, Cambridge MA 02138, USA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S095977430322014X>. Published online by Cambridge University Press: 28 November 2003. Abstract. This article examines the boundaries of clothing and the body in constructions of political identity in French colonial Louisiana. Archaeological, ethnohistoric, and visual data are used to investigate how French colonizers attempted to construct a body politic by regulating dress and the bodies of colonial subjects, while colonial "others" attempted to constitute themselves as political bodies through self-fashioning. [Back to Previous](#). Peabody Museum of Archaeology & Ethnology, Harvard University. Cambridge - Harvard Square. 11 Divinity Ave Cambridge, MA 02138 (617) 496-1027 Ext. 617 [Send Email](#) | [Visit Website](#). From towering Native American totem poles and large Maya sculptures to precious artifacts of the ancient world, the Peabody Museum is among the oldest anthropology museums in the world. Founded in 1866 by George Peabody, the museum has one of the finest collections of human cultural history found anywhere. Drop-in tours by Harvard students are available during the fall and spring. Admission to the popular Harvard Museum of Natural History is included. [Show More](#). Amenities. 11. 12. [On View](#). From towering Native American totem poles and Maya sculptures to finely woven textiles and everyday utensils, the Peabody Museum is among the oldest archaeological and ethnographic museums in the world with one of the finest collections of human cultural history found anywhere. The Peabody Museum is a member of the Harvard Museums of Science & Culture (HMSC). [Visit the Peabody Museum](#). [Hours & Admissions](#).

Get directions, reviews and information for Peabody Museum of Archaeology & Ethnology in Cambridge, MA. As an Archaeology student here at Harvard University, the Peabody has been an amazing resource for my studies and interests. The staff Read more.

Description. Founded in 1866, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology is one of the oldest museums in the world. The museum houses records of human cultural history in the Western Hemisphere. Based in Cambridge, Mass., it engages in anthropological discourse through exhibitions, workshops, symposia and publications. The Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology has completed an inventory of human remains and associated funerary objects, in consultation with the appropriate Indian Tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations, and has determined that there is a cultural affiliation between the human remains and... Patricia Capone, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, 11 Divinity Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138, telephone (617) 496-3702, email pcapone@fas.harvard.edu. End Preamble Start Supplemental Information. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION The museum was founded in 1866 by George Peabody and is one of the oldest museums devoted to anthropology. It has one of the most comprehensive collections of North American anthropology in the world. Constantin WOcak 14, 2019. FotoYraf. Igili Aramalar. peabody museum of archaeology and ethnology cambridge. peabody museum of archaeology and ethnology cambridge photos. peabody museum of archaeology and ethnology cambridge location. peabody museum of archaeology and ethnology cambridge address. peabody museum of archaeology and ethnology cambridge. harvard peabody museum cambridge. 11 Divinity Ave Cambridge, MA 02138 ABD. Yol tarifi al. zu saate kadar kapal: 09:00 (Daha fazlasn gster). Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, 11 Divinity Avenue, Cambridge MA 02138, USA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774303210143>. Published online by Cambridge University Press: 28 November 2003. Abstract. This article provides a brief overview of recent archaeological literature about bodily constructions of identity. Loren, Diana DiPaolo 2008. Threads: Collecting Cloth in the North American French Colonies. Archaeologies, Vol. 4, Issue. Book Number: 12944 Book Title: Peabody museum of American archaeology and ethnology Harvard University papers vol.12 Book Author: Book Language: English Number of Pages: 394 Publisher: The Museum; Cambridge;1931 Subject: Museums, United States; National museums, United States; Art museums, United States Source URL: http://asi.nic.in/asi_books/12944.pdf Year: 1931. Addeddate. 2017-11-04 19:26:58. Identifier. in.gov.ignca.12944.