CONTAINS PULLOUTS
6 CONCLUSION

6.1 ‘Scotland to the World, the World to Scotland’

It has been two years since NMS re-opened its doors, inviting a new generation of local and international viewers to engage with Tibetan material culture. In that time, the question I posited as part of the Living Lands gallery development – how were historical encounters between originating communities and those local to the Museum influencing the construction of the world in Scotland, through material culture –\(^1\) has been interrogated through both the process of creating those displays and the research undertaken in this thesis.

Reflecting on those final displays, in light of the conclusions that can be drawn from my own research, highlights the difficulty that museums have faced when confronted with both historical legacies and contemporary attempts to interrogate them. In the Living Lands gallery, positioned on the ground floor in an area deemed to receive high visitor traffic,\(^2\) Tibet’s material heritage plays a central part in an ethnographically focused display of the traditional values and contemporary lives of indigenous peoples.\(^3\)

The objects have been divided between three cases: one large, one small and one table-top. Around these cases are photographs of the Himalayan landscape, the completed wall of prayer wheels commissioned from Samye Ling.

\(^1\) See Introduction, section 1.1, ‘Scotland to the World, the World to Scotland’: 16.
\(^2\) Even the placement of Tibetan objects within the Museum building is a reflection of changing understandings of the significance of the collections and of the types of objects visitors now except to view.
Monastery, and a taxidermy specimen of a yak – representing the relationship between Tibetans and this important indigenous domesticated animal. Within the larger case the variety of Tibetan life – nomadic and sedentary, wealthy and humble – is explored through objects taken from all the collections that make up the Museum’s Tibetan holdings (Figure 51). However, this display is not just a representation of Tibetan culture, but also a representation of the people who brought the objects to Scotland. Each section of the gallery includes a small biographical panel about one of the collectors and how they contributed to the Museum’s (and therefore the public’s) understanding of Tibetan culture. In this instance, a panel about Annie Taylor and a photograph of her taking tea with Puntso and Sigu (Figure 3) are placed in conjunction with the objects in the photograph, set out ready for the moment to be re-enacted. By bringing the collector back into the public view, the NMS displays have attempted to show how Scotland’s museums (and their contributors) aided the development of British representations of Tibetan culture through objects. These objects, through their display and interpretation, subtly offer the viewer a collaborative mosaic of all the expectations, intentions and influential ideological concepts that have been analysed throughout this thesis. This display, in line with the other large display

---

4 The display of natural history alongside ethnography in modern museum displays (see also the redisplay of Kelvingrove Museum, Glasgow) actually draws on display methods used far earlier. Harris discusses the use of such concepts at the Crystal Palace, after its move to Sydenham Hill in 1851, which included a Tibetan display. Here, she notes, models of Tibetans dressed in Tibetan clothing and surrounded by appropriate material culture artefacts, were placed in a landscape depicting Himalayan flora and fauna (Harris, The Museum on the Roof of the World, 31). This fauna included the mounted specimen of a yak, placed within the displays as a specific signifier of Tibet’s remarkable environment, as the yak can only survive at great altitude (Ibid., 33).

5 Although Annie Taylor is the only collector associated with Tibetan material discussed within the gallery, as a result of this thesis the other collectors associated with the Museum’s current displays will form part of a new web resource outlining the history of the Tibetan collections at NMS. This will go live in 2014.
cases in the gallery, is a clear part of the Museum’s wider re-engagement with its ethnographic collections. Objects are not just representative of a past historical moment but a contemporary engagement with indigenous identities.

By contrast to the domestic and pastoral scenes depicted within the larger case, the adjacent smaller case offers the viewer a reconstruction of a Tibetan Buddhist altar accompanied by a text panel titled ‘The Spiritual Fabric of Tibet’ (Figure 52). The text explains that ‘Buddhism influences all aspects of Tibetan life and is central to its culture’, suggesting that whilst the idea of ‘Tibetan culture’ as ‘Tibetan Buddhist culture’ remains within the conventions for displaying Tibetan objects, the definition of those terms is somewhat broader than has been historically recognised. This case contains an altar table (collected by David Tyrie), a shorten (collected by Eric Bailey), a thangka (collected by Annie Taylor), Lilian Le
Mesurier's shrine case, several sculptures and other items that have historically fallen under the category of 'Tibetan Buddhist art'. As individual objects, these items were collected in extremely disparate circumstances, spanning the entirety of the temporal and spatial activity outlined in this thesis. In placing them together the Museum has continued the process of 'flattening out' the history of the collection, whilst also adhering to a conventional form for displaying Tibetan Buddhist artefacts. One could argue that this form of display has allowed Tibetan Buddhism to remain static and unchanging – in contrast to the other parts of the display, which attempt to engage with more innovative modes of interpretation and visitor interaction. The altar display is also a link to the Museum's past, re-displaying some of the items previously seen as part of the single case of Tibetan material (focusing on Tibetan Buddhist art) that was available for public view in the latter decades of the twentieth century. Yet by placing Tibetan Buddhist artefacts within a far broader range of objects deemed culturally Tibetan than has been the case historically, this display has an important function, connecting past perceptions of Tibetan Buddhism as Tibetan culture, with modern interpretations that examine cultural diversity. Tibetan Buddhism still has a core function (as seen in both NMS and other museum displays around the world) but no longer acts as a single signifier of Tibetan culture. The display of the Tibetan altar sits amongst the

---

6 The display of Tibetan Buddhist artefacts as they would be seen on a traditional altar can be seen at the World Museum Liverpool, The Newark Museum New Jersey and the Rubin Museum New York.

7 For example, the Tibetan displays of the British Museum created in 1905 and discussed in Chapter Three (page 373). These displays were created almost exclusively out of material obtained from monasteries relating directly to the practices of Tibetan Buddhism, a particular and narrow field of Tibetan material culture. The single display case of Tibetan material in the RSM in the later twentieth century was created in much the same way, only including metalwork associated with monasteries and Tibetan Buddhist 'religion'.
larger case displaying the rich history of the NMS collections, the video and prayer wheel installation examining the dynamism of contemporary Tibetan practices and the landscape backdrops. It attempts to connect the overall Tibetan displays both chronologically and intellectually – showing the development of western constructions and interpretations of Tibetan material culture from the collector, to the museum, to a re-engagement with originating communities.

Figure 52: The representation of a Tibetan Buddhist altar and associated material culture, Living Lands gallery, NMS. © Inbal Livne.

In the introduction to her book *The Museum on the Roof of the World*, Harris asks if Tibetan culture must be determined by ‘religion and traditionalism, or if it can embrace modernity, biculturalism and global cosmopolitanism’. It is perhaps a shame that, given the opportunity for full-scale redevelopment at NMS,

this challenge was not taken up more fully, despite offering an opening for such questions to be asked. The video installation, focusing on the building of the prayer wheel wall at the centre of the gallery and the work of Samye Ling monastery in the Scottish borders, offered an opportunity to discuss the changing global representation of Tibetan Buddhism, as more and more adherents come from outside of the ethnic Tibetan community and develop their faith outside of the Himalayan landscape. As Samye Ling becomes a place for Scottish school children to learn about Tibetan Buddhism (just as the NMS displays have become), what are the implications of their experiences taking place in the Scottish landscape amongst European Buddhist practitioners, who find themselves in the monastic setting for a variety of reasons and come from a diversity of backgrounds?9

The video installation begins with an interview in which a (Scottish) Tibetan Buddhist nun explains how Samye Ling ‘makes great efforts to ensure that all the buildings and all the artefacts and everything we do, that’s related to the practice of Tibetan Buddhism, is absolutely authentic and traditional’.10 Does this mean that modernity and globalisation are inauthentic, that their impact, which has the ability to alter traditions and create new ones, should not form part of how we think about Tibetan Buddhism in the West today? I do not believe that such views, echoing Orientalist scholarship of the late nineteenth century, are an intentional

9 The project with Samye Ling was organized with the approval and assistance of the late Akong Rinpoche, co-founder of Samye Ling monastery. However the people who worked on the project came from a wide variety of backgrounds and life experiences. Although all were practitioners of Tibetan Buddhism, they were not necessarily monks or nuns and their number included a car bodyshop worker and several pensioners. During the building of the prayer wheel house I was fortunate enough to go to Samye-Ling and meet with some of these artists. None of their stories feature in the film, nor are the reasons why they came to Samye Ling recorded.

10 This video can also be viewed at: http://www.nms.ac.uk/our_museums/national_museum/explore_the_galleries/world_cultures/living_lands.aspx
outcome of this video, which is ostensibly about how a prayer wheel is made and how it is used. As the nun speaks, the video pans the temple, filled with people, praying together, of various social and racial backgrounds, showing that Buddhism in twenty-first century Scotland is indeed global. The video then, creates a mixed message about Tibetan Buddhism in the West today.

It may seem unfair to expect a museum, which now caters largely for family groups, children and tourists to focus its energies on social and global concerns that are so far reaching and broad ranging. Yet, in bringing 'the World to Scotland', is this not what the NMS was established to do? Has it not always strived to innovate and face the future? Such missed opportunities cannot necessarily be laid at the doors of museum staff responsible for creating the displays. As we have seen, historically the pressures and politics of both internal and external forces have often guided the development of the Museum, and this process continues today. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries Messrs Vallance and Dobbie found their work at the Museum influenced and constrained by the Scotch Education Board, the interests of the powerful missionary societies and Scotland’s economic concerns, such as mining. Today, curatorial staff face pressures from the Scottish Executive and other funding bodies, the National Curriculum and a constant struggle to boost visitor numbers. In the face of such concerns, straying too far from traditional, proven methods of display is understandably an undue risk if the Museum does not have the full backing of both those external agencies and internal high-level management. Frustratingly, the Museum itself remains the perpetrator of much of its perceived entropy and the continuation of the flattening out of object biographies.
Despite this, the The Living Lands gallery paints a vibrant picture of Tibetan culture and our western engagement with it. In a subtle fashion it tries to show that the terms ‘art’ and ‘ethnography’ can remain fluid and multi-dimensional, providing us with a variety of ways in which to interpret material culture within the museum setting. Tibetan objects are also displayed in other areas of the Museum; sometimes in a conventional manner (the Buddhist statues in the Sculpture Gallery) and sometimes in ways which engage with new techniques of museum display to reanimate objects of performance and ceremony that have been forced to remain static by traditional modes of interpretation (the cham costumes now displayed in Performance and Lives). The NMS has continued, in part, to visualise Tibet through a historic lens, tied to its own institutional history and the history of western collecting. However, these tropes are now placed in juxtaposition with contemporary academic enquiry and dialogue with both originating and emerging communities, making these histories more visible and more easily questioned. The often difficult relationship between ‘representation’ and ‘external reality’ is perhaps a good one to have in an institution founded on a desire to make known the world around it.

There has, through the story of Annie Taylor and Puntso and through the video installation, been some attempt to reinstate Tibetans in displays of their material culture. The excellent provenance of the NMS collections allowed

\[\text{This idea, which engages the public with the multiple ways in which the same objects can be viewed as both art and ethnography is developed more explicitly in another of the galleries, Artistic Legacies. As the panel text at the entrance to that gallery states: ‘what you perceive as art depends on your perspective. Neither art nor tradition have straightforward definitions, this applies as much to 2000 years ago as it does to today’.

12 Refer back to the discussion on representation versus external realities in Timothy Mitchell’s work, in the Introduction, section 1.2.3, ‘Knowing’ Tibet: constructing Tibet through the process of collecting: 37.}\]
curators, including myself, to unpack the relationships between collectors and indigenous agents from whom they collected. Through this collector biography-based research, the theme of the empathetic collector was developed - collectors who had created particularly strong bonds with the communities from whom they had collected, and who had left the NMS with a substantial collecting legacy. As noted, within the Tibetan section, Annie Taylor became the collector focus, an important choice because it reflected the Museum’s longstanding relationship with Tibetan material, which began before the 1904 Expedition. The Pitt-Rivers founding collection (those objects collected by Pitt-Rivers himself) included Tibetan material, some of which is currently on display, and the British Museum had a significant collection of Tibetan material prior to 1904, which is also displayed today. However, the importance of the NMS displays, and in particular the use of Annie Taylor as an interpretative tool, is in the explicit exploration of collecting practices and British-Tibetan relationships formed before 1904, which does not form a significant part of the interpretation of Tibetan material culture in many other national museums. This choice highlights the significant contribution Scottish collections are making to a study of the earlier history of British-Tibetan encounters.

The displays in the Living Lands gallery show that over one hundred years of grappling with the terms used to classify Tibetan material culture – as ‘Tibetan Buddhist’, as ‘religious’, as ‘ethnography’ and as ‘art’ – has allowed Tibetan

---

13 Harris discusses one of these early pieces from the Pitt-Rivers collection and its changing interpretation over the course of the late nineteenth century (The Museum on the Roof of the World, 27). She also notes that Waddell’s collection of ‘fixtures and fittings’ from his Sikkemese temple was deposited with the British Museum in 1896 (Harris 2012: 46), meaning that a well provenanced and studied selection of material was already in the British Museum’s hands before Waddell was contracted to collected on their behalf in 1904.
material culture to remain malleable, allowing it to continue to be positioned in multiple categories. It is this fluidity that has made these Tibetan collections an excellent area of study, for examining how objects can be vehicles for personal expectation and intent within a developing sense of how British encounters with other cultures should be represented. Again, it can be argued that the NMS displays do not go far enough to engage with post-colonial theory and do not allow Tibetans to have enough of a say in the representation of their culture, both historically and contemporarily. If the Museum wished to be truly self-reflexive, to give a voice to those made invisible by its own history and processes, should the developing narrative not have focused on Puntso himself? Had the Museum taken up the challenge to represent the contemporary, diasporic, Tibetan community and the emerging community of non-Tibetan Buddhist practitioners, we may have been able to get a clearer sense of this theoretical stance in action.¹⁴

NMS is unlikely to undergo another such radical redisplay in the next two to three decades. Their challenge now is to use educational programmes, visiting researchers, performers, teachers and practitioners to continue to debate these questions. What is Tibetan culture? Who defines it? Who represents it? What is its relationship with western ideologies, globalism and changing attitudes to ‘religion’ in the modern world?

¹⁴ Whilst post-colonial theory is of course not a new concept, most permanent museum gallery spaces are only redeveloped every twenty to thirty years. The last ten to fifteen years there has been a significant increase in museums grappling with these issues, finding spaces and medium in which to engage with originating communities and emerging diasporic ones in both traditional and creative ways. In Scotland alone the last fifteen years have seen redevelopments of ethnographic displays in Glasgow, Edinburgh and Dundee museums.
6.2 Constructing a multi-dimensional Tibet in the western imagination.

Using Tibetan collections in Scottish museums as a primary base of evidence, I set out to examine encounters between Tibetan objects and British (and particularly Scottish) people. The idea that accumulating possessions creates personal identity has been commonly deployed as a strategy of western identity formation. The chapters in this thesis have clearly shown how this process has taken place, highlighting how objects not only accumulated their own biographical detail, but performed important social functions for collectors and were often a part of the production of the identities of a variety of people with whom they interacted. It is through this process of engagement that these objects have been shown to contribute to the construction of many differing, but related, notions of Tibet within Britain: as collectors enforce a wider variety of roles upon objects, more layers of biographical information become available for analysis.

The central chapters of this thesis have laid out a mosaic of collectors and other agents associated with the collecting of Tibetan material culture. The variety of these individuals had the potential to prevent any clear analysis of these collections, but by understanding these varied constructions of Tibet as coming out of related ideological concerns and imperial influences, collectors have been threaded together in ways that have allowed informed comparisons to be made between them and their various collections.

Clifford, "Objects and Selves: An Afterward", 238.
Within the object biography model, both Appadurai and Kopytoff stress the importance of context in ascribing agency to objects and people. Contextualisations have been central to my ability to retrieve an object's biography, and make visible the relationship that an object has to the people who gave it movement and agency. Therefore the important questions are not always about the objects themselves, but about the object/collector relationship in particular spatial and temporal contexts. That being the case, however materially stable objects may appear to be, they will in fact present themselves as different things in different contexts.

The chronology of the chapters and the establishment of context have mapped how historic events and organisational frameworks changed imperial ideologies, which in turn continuously reformulated ideas about object collection, presentation and display. But it is the way in which collectors used objects, not just to present an image of Tibet to Britain but to present themselves with a significant role within that process, that has been fundamental to this thesis. This has been made possible by the extensive information on collection provenance which has been retrievable for Scottish museum collections, and which has shed light on a long and varied interaction between British agents and Tibetan objects.

---

16 Appadurai ("Commodities and the Politics of Value") focuses on the relationships of exchange and, he asserts, the ways in which objects are commoditized relies on a series of contextualisations, both in terms of specific moments of exchange (commodity situation), and the wider social arenas that allow things to become commodities (commodity context). For Kopytoff ("The Cultural Biography of Things"), context ascribes value to commodities through process such as being marked as 'sacred' or the process of singularisation, both of which require an analysis of the context of each object/person encounter.

6.2.1 Revealing the significance of Scotland’s Tibetan encounter

When I first approached a selection of Scottish museums with Tibetan material, I discovered that apart from a few objects within NMS, these collections had not been displayed and had gone unpublished. The processes of getting objects out of storage, discussing them with curatorial staff, analysing them and locating them within the wider discourses regarding the position of Tibetan material culture in the West has gone some way to rectify this omission. My research has built on important new evidence, expanding the current and growing academic interest in the western construction of Tibet through the use of material culture.  

Neither the theoretical model nor the methodological approach used within this research are new, but have been applied to new material and have therefore created new ways of seeing these re-discovered collections. For example, the distinctness of collector groups and the quantity of provenanced material in Scottish museums that can be associated with them has shed light on the important ways in which Scotland contributed to the British Empire’s dominance on the Indian subcontinent and evolving interests in Tibet.  

Significantly, this thesis has made visible once more agencies that had been hidden by museum processes and the passage of time. By revealing these agencies, particularly those of female and Tibetan agents, I have uncovered new perspectives on British-Tibetan encounters, which can inform not only the way

---

18 Since the mid-2000s there has been a small but flourishing academic interest in Tibetan collections in British museums, which for the most part have focused on English museum collections. This has included publications (Harris, *The Museum on the Roof of the World*) and doctoral theses (Myatt, “British, Chinese, and Tibetan representations of the Mission to Tibet of 1904”); Zamponi, “British Collectors and Collections of Tibetan Art and Artefacts, 1850-1960”; and Martin, “Charles Bell, A Collector in Tibet”. The importance of material things in the study of British-Tibetan encounters was noted at the 2010 conference for the International Association of Tibetan Studies, held in Vancouver, which included a panel on material culture.
scholars continue to develop ideas about how Tibet was constructed in the West, but can also inform how post-colonial theory continues to advance methods of interrogating material culture. As museums strive to include indigenous voices and to reposition indigenous agents within their narratives, this will no doubt prove a significant development in how we analyse encounters between objects and people.

6.2.2 Constructing one Tibet out of many: the global, the organisational and the personal within imperial ideologies

In the introduction I described the 'imaginative' ways in which Tibet was historically encountered. Within the following chapters I explored how the imperially, geographically and personally imagined Tibet related to another trio of ideas – global, organisational and personal perspectives, and the ways in which they related to imperial ideologies. How individuals ‘imagined’ Tibet in relation to their position within an organisation (missionary or military) and against the backdrop of wider imperial concerns, revealed a hugely varied series of responses to Tibet and Tibetan material culture. Despite the limitations placed on access to Tibet, a wide variety of collectors were able to collect Tibetan objects and find a place for them within Scotland’s museums. Although a series of coherent ideas, intentions and uses for objects link the collectors that make up the three identifiable collector categories, tensions and differences have been revealed within and between groups. Yet together these collections, which span a hundred years of collecting history, several countries (and continents) and a variety of social
changes, form a mosaic of constructions of Tibet, representative of the broad sway of expectations and intentions that collectors were placing on Tibetan material culture. Imperial ideologies were embedded in each action collectors participated in, so that their relationship to objects, and the ways in which objects offered a service to them, became a part of the making and remaking of colonialism, further embedding them in the Empire’s ideological concerns. This study has sought to reinstate this multidimensionality of relationships between people, and between objects and people, contextualising the detail of individual collector intent into a wider social discourse.

This has been possible by using a methodology linking the personal and the global. Too great a focus on individuals without wider contextualisation would have caused the loss of the major connecting threads that tie each collector group together: analysis would have been lost within narrative detail. Likewise, a focus on organisational and imperial ideologies alone would have created a false homogeneity, leaving the diversity of networks and agencies of collectors, Tibetans and objects perpetually hidden.

This approach to analysing the effect of imperial ideologies – the personal, organisational and global – has proved the importance of missionary and military collecting practices and, crucially, the way in which their collected objects held significant social roles. Without this analysis the impact of missionary collections, which provided the foundations for Tibetan collections in Scotland’s two largest museums, would not have been recoverable with as much texture and detail as

---

19 Refer back to Introduction, section 1.2, Constructing an image of Tibet: 25, for an initial discussion on the importance of interrogating the public roles given to objects.
has been possible, potentially obscuring crucial evidence of British-Tibetan encounters before 1904.

Whilst previous studies of the British-Tibetan encounter have taken into account the material evidence in Scottish museums, ‘Scotland’ has often been deeply embedded within ‘Britain’, hiding the specific importance of Scottish museum collections in forging a place for Tibetan ‘ethnographic’ objects in Britain, at a moment when Tibetan ‘art’ was being highlighted as the pinnacle of Tibetan material culture in the major museums of London. Chapter Five showed that the Museum’s commitment to all of its Tibetan collections continued behind the scenes despite the creation of new object hierarchies that publicly prioritised ‘art’.

6.3 Recounting the biographies of people and things

The central chapters in this thesis followed the trajectories taken by objects and people to unpack collector intent for the missionaries, military personnel and other colonial agents whose objects now make up the holdings of Tibetan material in Scottish museums. In the Introduction I established the aims of the thesis and set out a methodological approach. This inter-disciplinary model has brought together elements of post-colonial theory with a methodology based on the object biography model, to use both textual and object-based evidence. Theory and method were contextualised within the historical and social climate of late

---

20 Harris includes material from the National Museums Scotland in her study (The Museum on the Roof of the World) and other scholars have corresponded with NMS regarding Tibetan material for scholarly publications. During my time as Assistant Curator of East and Central Asia (2005-2009), I had several other enquiries from scholars wishing to engage with this material, but have yet to see any other published academic work into which it has been incorporated.
nineteenth and early twentieth century Britain and British India. The example of Thomas Wise was a starting point for showing how collector intent could be made visible through objects themselves, supplemented by textual evidence.

The next three chapters each focused on a different group of collectors who had, to a certain degree, shared ideological concerns, personal circumstances and uses for Tibetan material culture. Missionaries and military personnel were quantitatively significant as collector groups within Scottish museum collections, but their importance also lay in their spatial and temporal distributions. Missionary collections were largely made in the late nineteenth century, making them pioneers of Tibetan object collection. From the 1880s to the 1910s missionaries centred in West Bengal in India, or Xinning in China, began laying the foundations for Scottish museum collections. The Reverend James Thomson and J.W. Innes-Wright remain responsible for over eighty percent of Glasgow Museum’s Tibetan holdings and Annie Taylor and Innes-Wright were both instrumental in the early transformation of the EMSA’s fortunes, turning only a few items into a substantial collection. These were not just quantitative contributions, but began the process of constructing new ideas of Tibet in Scotland. Although it would not be until after the 1904 Expedition that the RSM would highlight their Tibetan collections, these early collections would provide the counterbalance against which Ottley’s chorten would later be displayed and interpreted as ‘Tibetan Buddhist art’.

Influenced by the ideological concerns of missionary organisations, and through the use of objects as tools of education, commerce and authenticators of personal experience, missionary collectors presented a Tibetan culture, and Tibetan people, reminiscent of the British working class poor – in need of the same
pastoral care and Christian enlightenment as the ‘needy’ already present in British society. This attitude provided a way of associating their work in Tibet with British social culture, linking missionary work, Tibetan objects and society in quite specific ways.

Chapter Two brought out the greatest distinction of ‘Scottish’ concerns within the wider rubric of British imperialism, due to the nature of Scottish Presbyterian missions and their impact on missionaries both within larger missionary organisations and those working independently. The Reverend James Thomson offers an important tension in our understanding of how Scottish identity and missionary activity in West Bengal impacted on the collection of Tibetan material culture. As the only member of the CoSFM to have collections represented in a Scottish museum, his case study suggests that something significant was taking place, distinguishing the work of the CoSFM and affecting their relationship to Tibetan material culture. What is not represented in Scottish museum collections is therefore highly significant and helpful to our understanding of how organisational ideologies and practical concerns could be disruptive of established or expected patterns of collecting.

There were a variety of roles ascribed to both female and Tibetan agents in the missionary context. Some, like Annie Taylor, remain highly visible within both the archival evidence and object evidence whilst others, such as Rebecca Innes-

---


22 Further analysis of the collection of material culture by CoSFM workers is certainly needed. The organization did engage in the circulation of objects, including the establishment of ‘factories’ which trained local workers and whose products were sold by churches and at bazaars within Scotland. Material culture was therefore circulating in entirely different ways within that particular organization, further stressing the heterogeneity of missionary collecting practices.
Wright and Sarah Ridley, are almost invisible. Because of Taylor’s higher profile, Puntso was able to forge a position for himself in her work and in her collection. By contrast, Innes-Wright’s apparent ambivalence towards Tibetan culture and Tibetan people shows that missionary responses to the communities amongst whom they worked varied widely.

The importance of missionaries as collectors came in their sustained, personal interaction with Tibetans, which meant that exchanges of objects came out of long-term relationships and negotiations, highlighting ‘ordinary’ working Tibetan peasants and nomads, who had been culturally invisible in western collecting and would become invisible again after the 1904 Expedition. These missionary collections actively fed into the Scottish public’s construction of Tibet through the profile given to them by their collectors. The objects became part of the enactment of imperialism and missionary identity through public lectures, tours and exhibitions. The commoditisation of these collections on entry into museums highlights an important function that missionaries ascribed to collections, showing that objects were not just vehicles for promoting missionary work through public engagement, but were a necessary part of meeting practical needs.

The collectors examined in Chapter Three form the most cohesive group, linked by the influence of the military’s organisational framework, closely connected class and family ties and, most importantly, a focus on a very specific moment of collecting – the 1904 Expedition. This pivotal moment in British-Tibetan relations cemented the category of Tibetan Buddhism as ‘religious’ in order to distinguish it from the British perspective of ‘secular’. In doing so, British officers
could discredit monastic power and create bounded definitions for Tibetan culture, and specifically Tibetan material culture. The latter could then be further reified as 'art', within a western hierarchy of world cultures and artistic traditions.

There was also a stark contrast in the process of collecting undertaken by military collectors. Rather than building long-term relationships or participating in mutual exchanges, the military collecting process largely relied on violent encounters, looting and a disregard for Tibetan sacred spaces. Even diplomatic gift giving evidenced the ideological domination of British imperialist governance over their Tibetan counterparts.

Not only were military collectors changing the terms on which Tibetan material culture was placed in western cultural categories, but they gave objects very different public roles to missionary collectors. There was a shift from educational and community benefits to collecting for personal prestige and the advancement of certain types of knowledge that had been of less concern, or less readily accessible, to missionary collectors. Military knowledge was broadly viewed as scientific and verifiable and therefore given prominence thanks to its relationship to British imperialism. As such, military officers were assumed to have an authority over the representation of Tibetan material culture that was publicly acknowledged by learned societies and museums.

Yet as the case study of the Bailey family shows, even though the influences of military imperialism were prominently displayed in collector intent, objects quickly moved from the battlefield to the home. Within the home, Tibetan material culture was domesticated, whilst still retaining relevance, through modes
of display, to imperial triumphalism. When under the influence of those not
directly associated with the 1904 Expedition, objects were often transferred from
male to female agencies and given radically different roles once more. No longer
just representational of violent encounters and dubious conduct, objects became
markers of personal prestige (for female agents as well as male collectors) and
family legacy.

Chapter Four developed the methodological approach of the previous chapters.
Through the use of Sarah Byrne's reworking of Latour's Actor-Network-Theory, it
re-examined and broadened the object biography model. Whilst the collectors in
this chapter did not have the same coherence as a group as was achieved by
missionaries and military personnel, through a series of short case studies
collectors were threaded together not by occupation or location, but by intent and
expectation as this related to the collecting process and their differing roles within
it. This approach to examining collectors made visible an emerging series of
concerns relating to class, gender and indigenous agency that followed objects
from maker to collector to Museum. This methodology not only highlighted
agencies that were known (collectors) but the potential agencies of other
previously unknown actors (specifically female and indigenous agents). Colonial
collectors had the least amount of textual evidence available for study. However
this approach made visible their collector intent often through objects alone,

---

23 See Chapter Three, section 3.9, Case study: Florence Bailey – military acquisitions and the
domestic space, Shelton, Collectors, Expressions of Self and Others 10.
25 The exception being the collection of Lilian Le Mesurier, which provides the strongest
connections between objects and texts.
offering new insights into how to locate such intentions in collections that usually has little or no accompanying textual evidence.

Chapter Five focused on Tibetan objects that entered NMS and examined the trajectories of these collections as they negotiated institutional concerns, the personal expectations of staff and the continuing interest of their collectors, as well as the tension that existed with other, more prominent, collections. Here the museum became an artefact for study, continually modified by institutional process within it, and practices that took place around it. Rather than just providing a narrative history of Tibetan displays within the Museum, I highlighted the importance of the spaces around Tibetan objects, which often had the greatest impact on the direction in which Tibetan collections travelled. Crucially, within the struggle for visual and intellectual space within the Museum, the biographical details highlighted in the previous chapters often became ‘flattened out’ within the museum context. Curators and visitor were then required to work hard to relocate the biographies of objects and re-connect them to the biographies of people.

Perhaps the most significant conclusion of this chapter was that it was within the Museum and not in the field at the moment of encounter, that the categories of ‘art’ and ‘ethnography’ became most clearly articulated, both in textual and display form. The Museum had engaged with the creation of the category of ‘Tibetan art’ in the post 1904 period, but the substantial amount of material the museum held that did not fit this categorical construct also led to the formation of ‘ethnographic’ Tibetan collections. There was not always a clear distinction between these categories, an issue that the Museum wrestled with through the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Crucially though, the
Museum finally made salient these unspoken divisions that were already visible in the way collectors constructed their own collections.\textsuperscript{26}

6.4 Tibetan material in Scottish museums: highlighting research themes

As the above summary of my chapter conclusions has shown, reoccurring themes amongst all collectors are visible, despite the heterogeneity of their circumstances, experiences and intentions. Gender, class and race have been important categories for positioning both collectors and collections, and their effect on collecting practices will be analysed in more detail later in this section. An interest in finding ‘authenticity’, creating authority and denoting value for objects were universally acknowledged processes for the collectors I have examined. Additionally, all collectors, to varying degrees, took part in the construction of ‘Tibetan Buddhism’ as a category within western systems of classification and some were part of the construction of further categories, such as ‘Tibetan Buddhist art’. This was linked to the wider construction of Tibetan Buddhism as a ‘religion’ in a sense that was meaningful and intelligible to a western audience, but which negated Tibetan interpretations of their own heritage, customs and practices.

It is the process of collection itself which has elicited such a variety of responses and actions of Tibetan agents. All but invisible to the viewer in the museum, Tibetan agency has appeared in different ways in each chapter: though

\textsuperscript{26} I noted in the introduction that the verbalization of this division was somewhat artificial, but within the Museum, it was articulated in a much clearer fashion. See Introduction, section 1.4.1, Collecting: a biographical model: 78.
often unacknowledged, Tibetan agents can be seen to have inserted themselves into the process of constructing Tibet in the western imagination, making different claims on Tibetan material culture and Tibetan identity, in a variety of circumstances. In the cases of Lilian Le Mesurier and Annie Taylor we clearly saw the way in which Tibetans helped form part of the collector's construction of Tibet. Conversely, within the collection of Lord Carmichael, I have had to uncover those processes by which Tibetan agency helped form a collection, but which were hidden; either by or from the collector. Often Tibetan agency has only been visible through an interrogation of the objects themselves, remaining hidden in more explicit sources, such as texts. The subversion of western collecting strategies, such as through the process of keeping-Whilst-giving (highlighted in the cases of Lilian Le Mesurier's shrine box and Lord Carmichael's cham costumes) has been particularly insightful, uncovering the dynamism of Tibetan agency in the collecting process.

These concepts formed a fundamental part of imperial ideologies, around which constructions of Tibet were created through material things. Collectors were often unaware of the ways in which their collecting practices related to these concepts, but through their own actions these concepts were being 'performed' continually.

6.4.1 Authenticity, authority and value

Within this thesis two types of authenticity have come to light, one pertaining to the object, and the other to the collector. I have shown that the notion of an 'authentic' object is an ideological construct, part of a social and political invention,
yet also in part relational, as a local tactic imposed by the collector at a certain
moment.\textsuperscript{27} Objects missionaries thought representational of Tibetan culture, such
as amulet packets or small, personal \textit{gau}, were markedly different from a military
interpretation which presented only the material culture of monasteries as
authentically Tibetan. Yet despite the difficulty in defining an object's authenticity,
nearly all the collectors implicitly or explicitly sought to create a sense of the
‘authentic’ within their collections.

Collector authenticity was linked to notions of authority – who had the
authority to speak about Tibetan culture and who had the authority to say which
objects were and were not authentic. Collector authenticity was located in the
unique personal experience of the collecting process and the very fact that the
collector had been the person ‘on the spot’ at that moment of encounter. In this
sense, objects were the evidence that authenticated personal experience,\textsuperscript{28}
ascribing the collector with the authority to make pronouncements about Tibet,
because \textit{they were actually there} when others were not. For certain collectors who
were less embedded in formal centres of knowledge production (for example the
RGS and the Royal Asiatic Society) such as missionaries, this type of authenticity
was particularly important. Annie Taylor, Harry French Ridley and J.W. Innes-
Wright all worked incredibly hard to promote their experiences, but being
accepted as having authoritative knowledge was far easier for military officers and
civil servants who had the right sort of connections to both social elites and
learned societies. Such distinctions were also tied to gender and class prejudices,

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
27 Clifford, \textit{The Predicament of Culture}, 12.
\end{flushright}
which undermined missionary knowledge production because it related to non-
elite Tibetans and was often gathered from work with women and children (or by
women, who made up a substantial portion of the missionary community).

Annie Taylor’s speaking tours and publications were full of new information
about Tibetan culture, flora and fauna, and should have been well received by the
knowledge-hungry imperial elite. However her position as a missionary, who
worked against British attempts to force Tibetan diplomacy, her disregard for
British social etiquette when living in Tibet, her gender and her writing style –
aimed at the missionary enthusiast not the learned scholar – stopped her from
being seen as a credible source of authentic knowledge about Tibet. Unlike Lilian
Le Mesurier, who worked with elitist prejudices in order to overcome them, those
with power and influence did not consider Taylor an authority on the subject. By
contrast, Lord Carmichael was opening museum conferences and passing
judgement on Indian culture from the moment he arrived in India, when he had
yet to experience it first hand. It was his place as a member of the British imperial
elite, and his knowledge and patronage of European art that gave him the
authority to make pronouncements on all material culture that crossed his path.

Tied to notions of authenticity and authority have been ideas of value and
the processes through which values were ascribed to Tibetan material culture.
These were not fixed, but changed with developing interests and understandings
relating to different aspects of Tibetan material culture. Economic value drove
much of the missionary collecting encountered in Chapter Two, with the notable
exception of the Reverend James Thomson. Even collections that were not created
with a commercial purpose in mind were commoditised when necessary, such as
the collections of W.J. Ottley, Eric Bailey and Lilian Le Mesurier. The amounts of money that moved between collectors and museums, from the 1890s until the 1930s, is a good indication that Tibetan material culture had an economic value, peaking around 1904-1905 in line with the social and political turbulence of the 1904 Expedition. But, importantly, The EMSA was always willing to pay for Tibetan material in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, regardless of whether it came from an eccentric missionary or an upstanding military officer; Tibetan material was always valuable.

6.4.2 The creation of Tibetan Buddhism and Tibetan Buddhist art

'Tibetan Buddhism' was a well known term by the time missionary collectors were engaging in their collecting activities, but it was during the transition from missionary to military frames of reference in the early twentieth century that the categories of 'Tibetan Buddhism' and 'Tibetan Buddhist art' were cemented as ways of defining Tibetan culture and its material manifestations. Missionary collectors often focused on 'popular' Tibetan Buddhism, which drew in objects considered 'ethnographic' by the developing scholarly field of anthropology, used and acquired outside the context of the monastery and often in the domestic setting. This was in part due to access, which restricted missionary encounters with Tibetans to outlying areas of India and Tibet inhabited by nomads and traders. Missionary objects of 'Tibetan Buddhism' were therefore reflective of the practices of a specific sector of Tibetan society and contain a proliferation of small gau, tsa-

---

tsa, mani stones and other amulets, material more closely associated by scholars with Bön 'superstitions' than authentic Tibetan Buddhist practice, which was classified as 'religious'.

Missionary representations of Tibetan Buddhism were tied to their vocational concerns and the relationship between Christianity and Tibetan practices. Objects were tangible proof of the necessity of missionary work, not the evidence required by scholars of Tibetan Buddhism or Sanskrit as validation of library based research.

A major turning point in the construction of 'Tibetan Buddhism' in the West was the publication of L.A. Waddell's research within a Tibetan Buddhist temple, and his impact on the 1904 Expedition. By taking up Waddell's approach (based on anthropological methodology) and accepting his assessments of the objects associated with Tibetan Buddhist practices, a variety of collectors (not just those associated with the 1904 Expedition) cemented Tibetan Buddhism as an artefact, controllable by Europeans and modifiable according to European social and political needs. Waddell's book, understood as a scholarly work, was designed for those who wished to comprehend Tibetan Buddhism as a foreign object, and therefore made his notion of authentic Tibetan Buddhism (monastic), worthy of study.

This particular vision of Tibetan Buddhism, as something organised, oppressive, degenerative and classifiable as a 'religion', required a new understanding of its associated material culture. The nature of the 1904 Expedition

---

30 See Lopez, “Foreigner at the Lama’s Feet”, 283.
31 Harris, The Museum on the Roof of the World, 46. Also Hovell McMillin, English in Tibet, Tibet in English, 76.
gave access to monasteries and the homes of social elites, opening up new object
types, categorisations and hierarchies of object value. Tibetan Buddhist art as an
object category therefore developed in conjunction with Tibetan Buddhism as a
‘religion’ over the course of the 1904 Expedition and in light of the new
enthusiasm for collecting Tibetan material culture that came in its aftermath. The
cementing of these terms and their relationship to one another was reflective of
European attempts to position Tibetan culture as ‘Other’ and therefore backward,
oppressed and flawed when compared to the ordered, civilised and rational
societies exemplified by collectors themselves. In this new order, ‘authentic’
Tibetan Buddhism, and therefore authentic Tibetan Buddhist art, was tied to the
monastic system, so that the gau, tsa-tsa and amulets collected by missionaries as
examples of Tibetan Buddhist paraphernalia were replaced by sculptures and
manuscripts, often made of precious materials and of high quality craftsmanship
that were seen as examples of monastic art. The repositioning of these objects
within western hierarchies of culture and art gave them an increased value,
shifting the overall values given to different categories of Tibetan material culture
within Britain. Yet this process created a political and social tension. Whilst the objects of
this authenticated form of Tibetan Buddhism, and the associated category of
Tibetan Buddhist art, were worthy of acquisition, study and display, the
organisational structure that governed it, the Tibetan monastic system, was not.

Myatt, “Trinkets, Temples and Treasures”, 147.
33 This was, as discussed later in this chapter, heavily tied to ideas of class amongst British
collectors. As Harris notes, ‘a miniaturized Tibet had been incorporated into the imperial dominium,
and Tibetan art was enshrined as the legitimate property of the British elite’ (The Museum on the
Roof of the World, 77).
The construction of these terms, and their use by British officers associated with the 1904 Expedition allowed Tibetan culture to be split, so that the ‘art’ of the monasteries could be kept, whilst the 1904 Expedition force simultaneously attempted to dismantle the power and authority of Tibet’s monastic system, which had created it. This was very much a political tactic, enabling the British to delegitimise Tibetan forms of power through the creation and use of the divisions ‘religious’ and ‘secular’. Western imperialism could then acknowledge certain aspects of Tibetan culture whilst silencing others.

The expression of this shift has been most clearly seen in Lilian Le Mesurier’s collection and accompanying papers, specifically the article ‘Tibetan Curio’s. The article shows how these views, outlined by Waddell and secured by the 1904 Expedition (while Le Mesurier was writing), existed and moved beyond the boundaries of that event with great speed. Le Mesurier’s straight split between ‘religious’ and ‘secular’ objects, and the hierarchy of value she clearly gave them, were the culmination of these social and political processes of re-evaluating Tibetan material culture associated with Tibetan Buddhism.

6.4.3 Tibetan agency and racial prejudice

‘Tibet has been, and continues to be, imagined entirely in terms of great physical and temporal distance... resulting in the denial of ... agency to those who live and create ‘Tibet’, that is, Tibetans’.  

34 Ibid., 57.
35 Harris, In the image of Tibet, 17.
The implementation of terms such as 'Tibetan Buddhist art' and 'Tibetan Buddhism' allowed the West to dominate the meaning and value of Tibetan material culture, whilst silencing the values given to objects by their Tibetan makers and users. Yet as I have shown, Tibetan agency was not absent from the collecting process, even if the evidence for Tibetan involvement is not always explicitly visible. The roles of the monks who assisted Le Mesurier, particularly the Kushok of Spituk, and those in Darjeeling from whom Lord Carmichael bought his Tibetan cham collection, show the influence of local populations on what was and was not collected, suggesting this influence was far more important than scholars have so far recognised. What these case studies show is that local people (in this case Tibetans) had 'a whole set of possibilities for manipulating the white men who arrived in their region: anthropologists, colonial officers, missionaries and soldiers'. This study has not only tracked Tibetan agency, but the agency of all those involved in the collecting process – collectors, Tibetans, collectors' families and museums.

The collection of Annie Taylor is interesting because she gave a greater importance within the collection to Puntso, both through his name as the donor on many of the object labels and through his participation in her speaking tours and publicity. Puntso had a place in the collections because he made one for himself – there is no denying his own agency in the process – but equally because Taylor gave him one. The methodological approach of this study, tying global and

---

37 Ibid., 9.
personal perspectives together, has made these individual agencies visible again, contextualising them within wider social and imperial concerns.

Collectors rarely acknowledged that the invisibility of Tibetan agents was firmly tied to their own racial prejudices. Yet encounters between Tibetans and British agents were embedded in assumptions about racial hierarchies, which travelled from Britain to India and were rearticulated in response to specific encounters. Generally speaking, Tibetans had agency in the collecting process in spite of collectors, not because of them. The fact that so many of the Tibetan agencies that have come to light in the course of my research were hidden from collectors themselves (or collectors chose to ignore them), is indicative of the unspoken importance of race as a constituent part of dominant imperial ideologies.

6.4.4 The role of gender and class in the collecting process

Gender played a significant role not only in the collecting process but in the long-term biographical development of objects and collections. In each chapter where collecting occurred in quite different contexts gender roles, whether ascribed to (as in the case of Florence Bailey) or not (for example, Annie Taylor), were formative influences on the 'life' of an object. Yet there was not always a clear trend for collecting on a gendered basis and whilst gender was important to collecting practices, it was not always displayed in stereotypical ways.38 So, for example, the military collections outlined in Chapter Three are more indicative of

38 The collection of Agnes Christison being the most obvious exception to this statement, as a prime example of gendered collecting. See Chapter Four, 4.5.4, Agnes Christison: 332.
the social and imperial context of the 1904 Expedition and the type of material available than a sense of a ‘male’ collecting strategy, which was in fact a consequence of the situation.

Women in particular used their relationship with Tibetan objects to construct their own position within wider society. Sometimes this was expressly manifested, as in the case of Florence Bailey, and sometimes was not, as with Lilian Le Mesurier, who invested in class hierarchies to establish her position. Whilst it could be argued that military collecting by default was a masculine enterprise, analysis of the full life history of military collections has shown women to be active mediators in the latter phases of an object’s life, particularly moments involving display and interpretation. Importantly, women’s roles were enacted in Britain and are therefore visible in statistical records such as birth, death and marriage, or census returns. Such records make for a richer analysis of the social context in which collecting took place by bringing to light those female participants who are otherwise absent. The women associated with military collections are distinct as none of them travelled with their male relatives, forming their entire relationship with Tibetan material culture from a spatial and ideological distance. Their actions therefore show that the moment of collecting was often a far less active moment in an object’s life history than moments of display. Additionally, female agency was often deployed in unpredictable ways that did not necessarily conform to gendered stereotypes. Being absent from the actual moment of collection, women associated with military collections had to position themselves quite deliberately

39 A full description of the ‘life phases’ of objects was outlined in the Introduction, see section 1.4.2 Collecting: a methodological approach for analysing objects: 80.
within the lives of these objects, in ways that other women collectors, and keepers of family collecting legacies, did not.

Conversely, within missionary and colonial collector contexts women were active participants in every stage of the collecting process, although some were more visible than others. Women such as Agnes Christison and Rebecca Innes-Wright have left no traces of their own biographies but have been brought to light through the interrogation of the collections associated with them and their husbands. These objects have highlighted the ways in which women were active partners, made silent by their positions as wives and mothers within an imperial framework and through organisational practices, which have obscured their contributions through reliance on official, written records. Paradoxically, these collections also show the variety of opportunities available to women within the same framework whose official legacy renders them voiceless. Imperialism as a strategy for dominance, employing a host of ideological and practical processes of governance and administration, has been shown to promote female agency by offering a moment of release from many of the societal constraints that governed gender roles within Britain.

Class was a concept that bonded many of the collectors together, with the majority classified as middle or upper-middle class. The hierarchies of the British class system, a crucial part of imperial ideologies, were transported with collectors from Britain to their encounters with Tibetans. Therefore the way collectors encountered different ‘classes’ of Tibetan society, largely mirrored their own station in life within Britain. On this basis, the collections in Scottish museums should be limited to the upper echelons of Tibetan society. I argue that it is
through missionary collectors, who generally worked with the nomadic and peasant communities, that the material available for study in Scottish museums now forms a mosaic of the Tibetan population, from nomads, peasants and monks to the Lhasa elite. Missionaries as a collector group pulled away from the confines of the British class structure in order to fulfil their missionary ambitions. The collections of Tibetan material in Scottish museums are richer for it.

In fact, social status often had a greater effect than gender in making certain collectors more visible within their collections. Taylor’s success in cultivating a certain amount of celebrity around her name and her collection was largely due to her status as an independent missionary who was able to dictate the way in which her collection was used and recorded, and make decisions about what associations were recorded with it. Her ability to establish an independent venture was reliant on her social position as part of the burgeoning industrial upper-middle class, showing her social status and the trappings it brought her to have a greater impact on her ability to collect than her gender or her occupation. Both Le Mesurier and Lady Carmichael were also wealthy women with the mechanisms to support their collecting activities. Unlike Taylor they were married and located in India thanks to their husbands’ positions within imperial politics. But both women had enough status in their own right to undertake collecting activities completely independently of their male companions. Crucially, Le Mesurier forged relationships with Tibetans directly, allowing her to dictate collecting strategies far more specifically than, for example, Agnes Christison.

The class concerns that faced female collectors were often mirrored in the concerns of their male counterparts. Men such as General McDonald and Lord
Carmichael were taken seriously by museums, who courted their patronage. Conversely, Innes-Wright’s absence from public records within the EMSA is not just a reflection of his occupation and physical absence from Scotland but also of his class, which contributed to his decision to sell, rather than donate, his collections for much needed cash.

Whist Tibet was never a formalised colonial territory, the mentality of colonialism that existed within British-Indian communities was transposed onto the British-Tibetan encounter. Colonial settlements like Darjeeling, I have shown, had a very distinct population balance, which included far more women and children than other parts of India, or the Empire at large. The lack of distinctive colonial settlement within Tibet generally denied the sorts of collecting opportunities that created gender-distinct collecting patterns in other areas. For example, Pearce notes that women’s collecting activities in nineteenth century Britain was heavily tied to domestic routine, meaning that women tended to collect material that had a place within the domestic interior and could be blended with home furnishings and ornaments. This sort of stereotypical female collecting therefore required a particular context tied to the domestic routine, which was unavailable for most men and women associated with Tibetan collecting practices. Only Agnes Christison’s collection can be regarded as ‘colonial’ in this way, and her object collection, centered on the home and her children, suggests that colonialism was indeed a major influence on domestic, female collecting.

Many ideological concepts came together to construct not just an image of Tibet but also the identities of those who participated in that construction. These

---

40 Pearce, On Collecting, 207.
concepts were fundamental to the 'personal' aspect of the developing imagined Tibet and were just as important, though often more opaque, as imperial and geographical imaginings.

6.5 Coda: 'Scotland to the World, The World to Scotland'

These words, carved into the floor of NMS are a constant reminder of the long associations Scots have forged with foreign territories. The positioning of these words, in a circle, read and re-read continuously, also reminds us of the fluidity of cultural exchange and that such encounters require a variety of participants. The biographical cycle of these Tibetan objects in Scottish museums has not been arrested, but is being engaged with in new ways, over one hundred years after the first objects of this encounter were brought into the EMSA.

Figure 53: Eric Bailey's legacy - the suit of armour collected in Gyantse now in the 'Discoveries' Gallery of NMS.41

41 Armour for a man (NMS A.1909.406).
Tibetan material culture today has multiple sites of encounter with the museum visitor across NMS. At the centre of the Museum is a gallery called Discoveries. The Museum’s website states that Discoveries allows the visitor to:

‘Discover the legacy of Scots whose ideas, innovations and leadership took them across the world. Innovators and inventors, diplomats, military leaders, adventurers or the celebrities of their time: intriguing objects reveal the stories of their lives and achievements in Scotland and around the world’.42

Here, the collector is central to the narrative, and the collectors as Scots, members of Britain’s imperial dominating force of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century world, is a crucial part of that narrative. There are many interesting ideas surrounding this gallery, not least its relationship to the ever-changing role of a ‘Scottish’ national museum, as Scotland once again attempts to rearticulate its position in Britain. Collectors are offered as a key tool in the narration of this nationalist interest. At the centre of Discoveries is a case containing the suit of armour Eric Bailey acquired in 1908. The label discusses his role as trade agent in Gyantse and his career as an important political officer for the British Indian government. Bailey as a collector has been reinstated, but just as the suit of armour was part of a collection given a specific public role by its collector, now the Museum has recast the collector in the role of the object,

presenting him as in service to the intentions and expectations of the institution that houses his collecting legacy.
7 Appendix
7.1 Appendix A: Collector Biographies

The following table provides biographical outline for the majority of the collectors examined in this thesis. Collectors have been arranged along a time line, making it easier to see associations between contemporaries.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Thomas Alexander Wise</th>
<th>Robert Brown</th>
<th>Agnes and George Christison</th>
<th>Dr. Henry Martyn Clark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1824: Qualifies as a doctor from Edinburgh University</td>
<td>c.1825-1850: Works as surgeon for Bengal Medical Service</td>
<td>1848: Agnes born in Edinburgh, father Robert Symington Grieve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1828: Marries Emily Isabella Disney in Calcutta</td>
<td>c.1825-1850: Works as surgeon for Bengal Medical Service, based in Bombay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1828-1839: Resident in Calcutta (wife dies 1839)</td>
<td>1848: Marries Anna Maria Rivett Carnac, daughter of Governor of Bombay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1851: returns to Dundee</td>
<td>C.1850-1870: Resident in Hampshire.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1862: George Watt Christison begins working for Lebong Tea Co. in Darjeeling. One of first tea planters in the area.</td>
<td>1881: Graduates from Edinburgh University and joins the CMS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1882: Marries Emma Mary Ireland and goes to Amritsar to join his father. Establishes the Amritsar Medical Mission where he is a medical missionary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1892: Qualifies as MD, continues to work in Amritsar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Thomas Alexander Wise</td>
<td>Robert Brown</td>
<td>Agnes and George Christison</td>
<td>Dr. Henry Martyn Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. 1900: Moves with two youngest children to Blackheath, London.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1909: Agnes Donates collection of Nepalese and Tibetan objects to RSM. George donates weapons from Assam and Natural history specimens to RSM.</td>
<td>1907: Retires from Amritsar Mission and returns to Edinburgh. Lectures at Edinburgh University on deceses in tropical climates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. 1910: Returns to Darjeeling.</td>
<td>1909: Made an elder of St. George's United Free Church and serves on the Foreign Missions Committee of the United Free Church of Scotland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1916: Dies in Edinburgh, buried in Dean Cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. 1920: Return to London?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1924: George Christison dies in London.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1927: Agnes Christison dies in London. Son Somerville Christison erects memorial to parents in Darjeeling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Rev. James Thomson</td>
<td>Annie Royle Taylor</td>
<td>J.W. Innes Wright</td>
<td>Brigadier-General J.R.L. Macdonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1875: Graduates from University of Aberdeen.</td>
<td>1872: Decides to become a missionary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1878-1882: Marries Anne Dundas Glover (1878). Works as Missionary Professor in General Assembly's Institution, Calcutta.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>1883: Makes 6 week trip to Kalimpong with Rev. W. Sutherland. Works at SUMI and collects in Sikkim.</td>
<td>c.1883-4: Enrols at Queen Charlotte Hospital, London. Studies nursing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>c.1887-1894: St. Aidan's Parish, Edinburgh</td>
<td>1887-1888: Leaves CIM and travels through China and then to Australia</td>
<td>1891: Census lists Wright as 'American Merchant Agent', living in Kelvin, Glasgow. Head of family following death of father.</td>
<td>1891: Appointed Chief Engineer of the Uganda railroad between Mombassa and Lake Victoria. Made a fellow of the RGS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1892: Working at the Water St. Mission in Glasgow, selected as the 2nd missionary to be sent to the CoS Mission in Kalimpong.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1891: Census lists Wright as 'American Merchant Agent', living in Kelvin, Glasgow. Head of family following death of father.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td></td>
<td>1892-1893: Attempts to travel from the Chinese border to Lhasa, accompanied by Puntoo. Is turned away.</td>
<td>1892: Working at the Water St. Mission in Glasgow, selected as the 2nd missionary to be sent to the CoS Mission in Kalimpong.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>1893: Returns to Britain to recruit missionaries for the Tibet Pioneer Mission (TPM), which she plans to run independently.</td>
<td>1893: Sails to Calcutta and marries fellow Galgog missionary Rebecca R. Johnston. Works for CoSM at St. Andrew's Homes (with Dr. Graham) for 6 months and then moves to Darjeeling because of illness, then back to Calcutta.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Rev. James Thomson</td>
<td>Annie Royle Taylor</td>
<td>J.W. Innes Wright</td>
<td>Brigadier-General J.R.L. Macdonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>1894-5: TPM moves first to Darjeeling and then Gangtok (Sikkim). Mission abandoned in 1895 and Taylor and Puntsa resettle in Yatung, Tibet.</td>
<td>1894-1896: Resigns from CoSM and returns to Glasgow to raise funds for independent missionary venture supported by the Glasgow Faith Mission.</td>
<td>1894: Returns to military service in India.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>1896: Goes to India and then Nepal on a reconnaissance mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1897: Returns to Britain. Tours England and Scotland, drumming up support for her new independent mission in Yatung. Sells two collections of objects to the NMS and a small collection to Glasgow Museum.</td>
<td>1897: Founds the Nepal Mission, Sukhia Pokhri, nr. Ghoom. Referred to as the 'new Scotch Faith Mission'. Sells collections to museums in Edinburgh, Glasgow, London and Liverpool, through Mr. George King (Glasgow).</td>
<td>1897-8: Returns to Uganda and commands military operation for Lord Kitchener during attempts to recapture Sudan. Also undertakes job to map territory between Lake Victoria and Fashoda.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>1897-1903: Runs her independent mission, with the help of other female missionaries in Yatung. Puntsa and his wife Sigu also help run mission.</td>
<td>1899: Finishes mapping Uganda following mutiny of muslim Ugandan troops in 1898. Commands Juba Expedition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1902: Rebecca Wright (nee Johnston) dies.</td>
<td>1900: Active service in Boxer Rebellion and then Director of Railways for China Expeditionary Force. Made General Commanding Officer in Mauritius.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1903-4: Encounters the Youngusband Expedition in Yatung. Moves to the Chumbi Valley to act as a nurse for the 1904 Expedition. Puntsa continues to run the mission.</td>
<td>1903: Returns to Glasgow and sells more objects to museum there.</td>
<td>1903-1904: General commanding military force during Youngusband Mission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>1904: Marries Ms Elizabeth Mary Colvill from Argyll.</td>
<td>1905-1912: Returns to post as General Commanding Officer in Mauritius.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1907: Brother and sister visit her in Yatung and bring her back to Britain. She is deemed unfit and placed in Otto House, Fulham.</td>
<td>1904 - c.1922: Continues to run the Nepal Mission with his wife and an expanded staff of nurses to attend to the community's medical needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1912: Retires from army and moves to Bournemouth, Hampshire.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1922: Dies at Otto House. Buried in Norwood cemetery and commemorated with the rest of the Foukes-Taylor family on the family memorial there.</td>
<td>c.1922: Returns to Glasgow and dies. Mission amalgamated with Tibetan mission in Darjeeling and no longer connected with the Wright family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1926: Dies</td>
<td>c.1925-7 Mrs Elizabeth Mary Innes-Wright continues to support missionary work, as a patron of the Tibetan Mission, Darjeeling. Lives in Callander, Perthshire.</td>
<td>1927: Dies in Bournemouth, Hampshire.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td></td>
<td>1932: Family bequeath his ethnographic collections from Tibet, China and Africa to the Marischal Museum, Aberdeen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Rev. James Thomson</td>
<td>Annie Royle Taylor</td>
<td>J.W. Innes Wright</td>
<td>Brigadier-General J.R.L. Macdonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1942: Family bequeath his etching and Chinese collection to the Marischal Museum, Aberdeen.
1958: Mrs E.M. Innes-Wright dies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lord Carmichael of Skirling</th>
<th>Dr. J.G. Cormack</th>
<th>H.F. Ridley</th>
<th>E.H.C. Walsh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>1877-1884: St. John’s College Cambridge - received his B.A and M.A.</td>
<td>1879: Begins missionary work in York.</td>
<td>c.1875-1882: Attends Trent College and University College London.</td>
<td>1882: Joins Indian Civil Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1886: Became private secretary to the Secretary for Scotland. Marries Mary Nugent.</td>
<td>1889-1890: General Secretary of Wakefield YMCA.</td>
<td>1890-1891: Joins CIM and lives in Kangding for a year.</td>
<td>1891: Made Magistrate and Collector in Orissa and marries Beatrice Ivy Huntingdon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1890-91: Graduates from University of Edinburgh. Joins the CIM. Goes to China</td>
<td>1892: Moves to Gansu</td>
<td>1894: Marries fellow missionary Sarah Querry and moves to Xinning. Gets caught up in riots there and provides medical assistance to the injured.</td>
<td>1895: Made Junior Secretary to the Board of Revenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>1895-1900: Member of Parliament for Midlothian.</td>
<td>1898: Takes a furlough and decides to train as a doctor.</td>
<td>1898-1904: Undertakes medical training at University of Edinburgh. Sells collection of mostly Chinese (and some Tibetan) artefacts to RSM (1904).</td>
<td>1899: Ridley’s go on Furlough to England. H.F. Ridley gives an address at CIM annual meeting in Exeter Hall on May 1st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1899: Returns to Gansu but end up at coast because of Boxer Rebellion.</td>
<td>1900: Made Deputy Commissioner of Darjeeling.</td>
<td>1901-1904: Assistant Commissioner (under political officer J.C. White). Part of the 1904 Expedition.</td>
<td>1903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lord Carmichael of Skirling</th>
<th>Dr. J.G. Cormack</th>
<th>H.F. Ridley</th>
<th>E.H.C. Walsh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1908: Appointed Governor of Victoria, Australia.</td>
<td>1907: Builds a chapel in Xinning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1911: Appointed Governor of Madras.</td>
<td>1910-1912: Second Furlough in Britain. Sent Children to school in Edinburgh and sells collection to RSM (1912).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1912: Becomes Baron Carmichael of Skirling and is appointed as Governor of Bengal.</td>
<td>1913: Becomes Principal of Peking Medical College.</td>
<td>1913: Return to China. Sarah Ridley dies.</td>
<td>1912: Appointed to the Orissa Board of Revenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1919: Donates a collection of Tibetan Cham costumes to the RSM.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1923: Builds 'Tibetan gospel inn' in Xinning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1926: Dies in Scotland. Wife auctions off the remainder of his art collection, mostly consisting of European pieces.</td>
<td>1927: Retires to Costorphine and sets up a private medical practice.</td>
<td>1926: Ridley moved to Urumqi (1700km from Xinning). Becomes a travelling missionary with no fixed base.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1929: Traveled through the Takla Makan desert to Kashgar, along southern arm of silk road. Leaves many copies of 'Pilgrims Progress' along the way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1932: Retires and returns to Allenheads, lives with his sister.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1944: Dies.</td>
<td>1943: His wife dies and around this time he returns to Dumfries, Scotland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1954: Donates his Tibetan collection to the RSM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1965: Dies in Dumfries, Scotland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Col. David Alexander Tyrie/ Isabelle A. Tyrie</td>
<td>W.J. Ottley</td>
<td>Lilian Le Mesurier</td>
<td>N.V.L. Rybot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>1863: David Tyrie born in Arbroath, Scotland, son of a shipping master Capt. George Tyrie.</td>
<td>1870: Born in Bandon, Co. Cork, Ireland into a wealthy landowning family.</td>
<td>1873: Born in Gloucester, father was Robert Bruce, Master of the King’s Bench, Ireland.</td>
<td>1876: Born on the Island of Jersey, son of Col. G.O. Rybot (Bengal Artillery).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>c.1875: pupil at West End Academy, Dundee then apprentice for George Gilroy, Jun. &amp; Co. Went on to work for Trades Lane Calendaring Co. as cashier.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1888: went to India as assistant salesman for Trades Lane Calendaring Co., before joining Indian army. Also associated with the Port Gloster Jute Manufacturing Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1892: Joins Indian Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1892: Joins Indian Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1897: David and Elizabeth have a child who dies at birth.</td>
<td>1899: Eugene posted to Gangtok as temporary Political Officer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1903-4: Leading officer for the Mounted Infantry, 32nd Sikh Pioneers. Part of the Younghusband Expedition. Made Brevet Major in 1904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>1905: Isabelle Tyrie born in Calcutta, India. David Tyrie working as Assistant Deputy Commissioner to the Governor of Bengal. Also has interests in the Jute trade around Calcutta.</td>
<td>1905: Elected a Fellow of the RGS. Loans his collection to the RSM. First Wife, Bertha Valentine, dies.</td>
<td>1905: Return to England, move to Sevenoaks, Kent. Son Roderick born.</td>
<td>1903-4: Officer in the Younghusband Mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>C.1905-7: Made Assistant Deputy Commissioner to the Governor of Bengal. Nine year posting.</td>
<td>1906: Publishes his account 'With Mounted Infantry in Tibet'. Sells his collection to the RSM.</td>
<td>1906-1907: Eugene Le Mesurier dies, Lilian sells collection to RSM (1907).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Col. David Alexander Tyrie/ Isabelle A. Tyrie</td>
<td>W.J. Ottley</td>
<td>Lilian Le Mesurier</td>
<td>N.V.L. Rybot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1914-1918: David Tyrie promoted to Colonel, commanded the Bengal Artillery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1920: David Tyrie retires, family move back to Dundee. Family lived in 'St. Helens House'. Wife dies (1928) and David and Isabelle continue to live together. He goes on to be President of the Royal Dundee Institution for the Blind, Director of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, Director of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Member of the council for the RSJS and County Commissioner for the Boy Scouts. David and Isabelle travel extensively all over the world, and collect objects all over the world.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1922: Retires from the army with the rank of Colonel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1933: Made an O.B.E for her work with juvenile offenders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1989: Isabelle Tyrie dies. Bequeaths her father's Tibetan collection to RSM. His Chinese and Japanese material, along with a few Tibetan pieces, go to Dundee Museum.</td>
<td>1911: Remarries Mrs. Shilbey De Mar in Vancouver.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1914-1918: As Major of 76th Punjabs served in defense of Suez Canal (1914), transferred to Mesopotamia and fought at Basra (1915), part of British advance on Baghdad, captured by Turkish forces in Kut (April 1916). Spent rest of war as Turkish prisoner of war and survived 'death march' to Turkey. Released in 1918. 1920: Retires from army and returns to Jersey. Becomes secretary of the Société Jersiaise and spends the next twenty years writing books and articles about the Island's history and archaeology, as well as carrying out archaeological excavations. 1928: Elected as Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries. 1961: after a fall at his home his is admitted to hospital and later dies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Frederick (Eric) Bailey</td>
<td>John Francis Cecil Dalmahoy</td>
<td>Ernest Stephen Lumsden</td>
<td>Duncan Morrison Metcalfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1882: Born in Lahore, India to Florence and Frederick Bailey Snr. Father works for forestry department of the Indian Civil Service. Mother's parents were missionaries.</td>
<td>1881: Born in Allahbad. Son of Patrick Carfrae, Bengal Army.</td>
<td>1883: Born in London.</td>
<td>Born: 1887, Scotland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>abt. 1890: Family return to Edinburgh, Scotland.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1891-1894: Attends Edinburgh Academy with his brother Percy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900: Joins Army (17th Bengal Lancers), sent to India.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1903-5: Member of the 32nd Sikh Pioneers. Part of the 1904 Expedition Made a Lt. at end of Mission.</td>
<td>1903-4: Member of the 40th Pathans. Part of the 1904 Expedition.</td>
<td>1903: Studies at the Académie Julian in Paris.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1906-1909: Works as British Trade Agent stationed variously at Gyantse, Chumbi and Yatung (Tibet). Sends over 100 Tibetan objects to parents in Edinburgh.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1908: Offered lecsturship at Edinburgh College of Art.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1910-14: Travel and exploration in central Asia. In 1913 he travelled through the Tsangpo River Gorge and discovered the blue poppy, later named meconopsis baileyi. He continued to provide plant specimens to the Royal Botanical Gardens, Edinburgh throughout his career.</td>
<td>1914-1915: Fights with 40th Pathans in WWI. Dies in Belgium (1915) and buried in New Irish Farm Cemetery.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1912-1927: Makes a series of trips across India/Himalayas/ North America/ Canada. Marries Mabel Royds (1913) who travels with him. 1923: Elected to RSA. 1925: Published 'The Art of Etching'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Frederick (Eric) Bailey</td>
<td>John Francis Cecil Dalmahoy</td>
<td>Ernest Stephen Lumsden</td>
<td>Duncan Morrison Metcalfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1918-1920: Sent by the British government to Central Asia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1922-1943: Qualifies as doctor from University of Edinburgh. Holds various appointments as Urologist to the Royal Hospital for Sick Children and Deaconess Hospital, Edinburgh, Assistant Surgeon, Urology, Edinburgh Royal Infirmary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1921-1928: Marries Irma Cozens (1921) and becomes Political Officer in Sikkim.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1927: Returns to Edinburgh, continues to lecture at Edinburgh College of Art.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>1928-1938: Various roles in Political Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1938: Retires to Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1943: Elected fellow of the Royal Society. Resigns from hospital role following scandal in which he is implicated for taking part in homosexual acts (illegal at this time).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1948: Donates a selection of Tibetan material, supposedly from the 1904 Expedition, to RSM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1964: Donates another selection of Tibetan material, supposedly from Younghusband Mission, to RSM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2 Appendix B: history of NMS, including historic name changes


1862 - Industrial Museum, under Director Thomas C Archer, opens to the public in Argyll Square, Edinburgh.

1864 - Industrial Museum renamed the Edinburgh Museum of Science and Art.

1866 - *Edinburgh Museum of Science and Art* opens in Chambers Street in a new building, designed by architect, Francis Fowke.

1904 - Edinburgh Museum of Science and Art renamed *Royal Scottish Museum*.


1998 - The Museum of Scotland opens in a new building in Chambers Street, designed by architects Benson and Forsyth.

2006 - Renamed *National Museums Scotlan*
7.3 Appendix C: Tibetan and other ‘Himalayan’ material in Scottish museums – a collection breakdown

National Museums Scotland

- 1227 items within the World Cultures collection with the associated descriptor ‘Tibet’, either as place of manufacture, place of collection or an associated place.
  - NB: Many of these items are made up of parts, which are all listed individually, so that the total Tibetan collection is actually approximately 800-850 items.
- 315 additional items described as ‘Himalayan’, associated with Nepal, Ladakh, Sikkim, Bhutan or the Darjeeling area of West Bengal.
  - NB: These also contain objects with multiple parts and the total of complete objects is approximately 200 items.
- KEY COLLECTORS:
  - COLONIAL COLLECTORS: Lilian Le Mesurier, Lord and Lady Carmichael, Agnes Symington Christison E.S. Lumsden, Isabelle A. Tyrie.

Glasgow Museums

- 333 items within the World Cultures collection associated with the descriptor ‘Tibet’, either as place of manufacture, place of collection or an associated place.
- 114 additional items described as ‘Himalayan’, from Bhutan and Nepal.
- KEY COLLECTORS: J.W. Innes Wright, James Thomson, Annie Royle Taylor (all missionaries).
Marischal Museum, University of Aberdeen

- Approximately 150 items within the World Cultures collection, associated with the descriptor ‘Tibet’, either as place of manufacture, place of collection or an associated place, including thirty photographs.
- KEY COLLECTORS: General James Ronald Leslie Macdonald (military officer).

The McManus Art Gallery and Museum, Dundee

- Fifty-eight items within the World Cultures collection, associated with the descriptor ‘Tibet’, either as place of manufacture, place of collection or an associated place.
- Twenty-two additional items described as from Nepal.
- KEY COLLECTORS: Thomas Alexander Wise, Isabelle Tyrie (colonial collectors).

Smith Art Gallery and Museum, Stirling

- Two objects associated with the descriptor ‘Tibet’ and a further twenty associated with the descriptor ‘Nepal’.
  - NB: These did not form part of this study.

Elgin Museum

- Three objects associated with the descriptor ‘Tibet’ and a further four associated with the descriptor ‘Nepal’.
  - NB: These did not form part of this study.
### 7.4 Appendix D: breakdown of J.W. Innes-Wright collection by museum (1897-1904)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>British Museum</th>
<th>Liverpool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amulet: filled cloth parcel</td>
<td>Amulet: filled cloth parcel x2 (one on girdle)</td>
<td>Amulet: made of thread</td>
<td>Amulet: filled cloth parcel x4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armlet: conch shell</td>
<td>Armlet: conch shell</td>
<td>Armlet: conch shell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beater: for a gong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell: Driibu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bell: Driibu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl: Brass (from Lhasa)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bowl: Brass (from Lhasa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl: wooden x2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bowl: wooden</td>
<td>Bowl: wooden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter lamp</td>
<td></td>
<td>Butter lamp x2</td>
<td>Butter lamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charm: paper</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charm: paper</td>
<td>Charm: paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cheese x3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chopstick set: knife, chopsticks, case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing: garter, complete outfit, woman's hat</td>
<td>Clothing: pair of boots</td>
<td>Clothing: Coat, man's hat, woman's hat, socks</td>
<td>Clothing: Garter, woman's hat, monk's hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaru (drum)</td>
<td>Damaru (drum) x2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Damaru (drum) x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorje</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dorje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earrings: woman's Lhasa style</td>
<td>Earrings: woman's Lhasa style</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earrings: woman's Lhasa style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger Ring x2</td>
<td>Finger ring</td>
<td>Finger ring x3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewer: copper</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ewer: Copper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Guard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gau x2</td>
<td>Gau x5</td>
<td>Gau x2</td>
<td>Gau x4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girdle: Brass, female</td>
<td>Girdle: Brass, female</td>
<td>Girdle: Brass, female</td>
<td>Girdle: Brass, female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gong: Bronze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headdress: wooden, belonging to Lama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapala (Skull cup)</td>
<td>Kapala (Skull cup)</td>
<td>Kapala (Skull cup)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luck flag x4</td>
<td>Luck Flag</td>
<td>Luck flags x2</td>
<td>Luck flag x 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Pail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milk pail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>padlock and key</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>British Museum</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer beads:</td>
<td>Prayer Beads x2</td>
<td>Prayer beads x3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wooden</td>
<td>(wood and human bone)</td>
<td>(wooden, conch shell and human bone)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer Wheel</td>
<td>Prayer Wheel x2</td>
<td>Prayer wheel x2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing blocks</td>
<td>Printing block x2</td>
<td>Printing block x2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purse: leather</td>
<td>Purse: leather</td>
<td>Purse: leather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heart shaped x2</td>
<td>Purse: leather heart shaped</td>
<td>Purse: leather heart shaped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpture:</td>
<td>Sculpture: Avalokiteśvara</td>
<td>Sculpture: Avalokiteśvara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalokiteśvara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal: for an</td>
<td>Seal</td>
<td>Sword and scabbard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>official x2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabacco pouch:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpet: conch</td>
<td>Trumpet: conch shell</td>
<td>Trumpet: conch shell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shell</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trumpet: copper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpet: thigh</td>
<td>Trumpet: thigh bone</td>
<td>Trumpet: thigh bone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsa-tsa</td>
<td>Tsa-tsa x2</td>
<td>tsa-tsa x2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrist-guard</td>
<td>Wrist-guard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.5 Appendix E: Reverend James Thomson’s Map of Sikkim

Section of the map the Reverend James Thomson took to Sikkim, during his tour of the area with William Sutherland. This detail shows Thomson’s route markings, which suggest he and Sutherland planned to venture further into Sikkimese territory, past Tumlong.

Map reference
Survey of India: North Eastern Trans-Frontier, Sheet No.7, N.W.3 (1879-1884).
7.6 Appendix F: 1904 Expedition Collections

Collections are broken down by object type, following the divisions used by the RSM in the early twentieth century. These divisions are however reflective of divisions made by military collectors, examined in Chapter Three. The category of ‘tantric or grotesque Tibetan Buddhism’ appears to relate specifically to items made of bone which related to monastic-based ceremonial practices.

I have included items bought at auction and collectors I have assumed are associated with the 1904 Expedition (due to types of objects/dates collections were made/came into museums).

All object numbers are approximate due to the nature of museum accessions, which sometime group parts of the same object under one number, and sometimes do not.

NB: I have given details of object numbers both with, and without, the addition of Eric Bailey’s collection, which is made up of both Expedition and later material.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer Name</th>
<th>Weapon/Armour</th>
<th>Domestic Use</th>
<th>Popular Religion</th>
<th>Monastic</th>
<th>Sculpture</th>
<th>Thangkas</th>
<th>Buddhist Items (Tantric or 'grotesque')</th>
<th>Books and Writing</th>
<th>Personal Items</th>
<th>Textile/Clothing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Dowell (Auction House)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Bell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Bruce Turnbull</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. F.M. Bailey</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Duncan M. Morison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.H.C. Walsh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General J.L.R. Macdonald</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C. Stevens (Auction House)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Mason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Francis</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil Dalmahoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major N.V.L. Rybot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major W.J. Ottley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major W.L. Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Mclean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (with Bailey)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Without Bailey)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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